

Language Planning and Intellectualisation

Andrew Gonzalez

De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines

The development of the national language of the Philippines is sketched from the initial selection of Tagalog to its standardisation and propagation as *Wikang Pambansa* (national language), and its renaming as Pilipino, subsequently FILIPINO.

The last phase of language development is the phase of cultivation which has many aspects. Usually the national language is cultivated as a language of imaginative literature, the mass media, a medium of instruction in the basic educational system, as the language of governance, and as a language of academic discourse.

The last phase can be considered as a process of modernisation (through its use to thematise current realities and as a process of intellectualisation (as a medium of oral and written academic discourse)).

The intellectualisation phase consists not only of lexical expansion (through modern terminologies for the disciplines) but likewise of stylistic differentiation (using syntactic devices for different types of prose discourse). Intellectualisation is examined as process and product and according to its inner (psychological) and outer (sociological) dimensions.

Some theoretical insights from the Philippine experience are discussed; the intellectualisation of Filipino is unprecedented because it is an ongoing process that can be documented in detail through the corpus being generated and should enrich the scholarly literature on this topic.

Introduction

The process of intellectualisation in the development of a language may be described as a phenomenon of many dimensions. Hence, for the purposes of this paper, aspects or dimensions of the process will be cited and described for the national language of the Philippines, Tagalog, referred to as *Wikang Pambansa* ('national language') after 1939, renamed as Pilipino in 1959, and now called Filipino by the 1987 Constitution of the Republic.

Intellectualisation is one aspect of language development. Following Ferguson (1968) and Haugen (1968), language development usually begins with selection of a living language as the basis of a national language if the society is multilingual; once selected, the language is propagated or disseminated, resulting in its spread across a geographical area. As it spreads and as it is increasingly written, it undergoes a process of standardisation whereby forms and structures become more or less uniform by social consensus among its speakers, or by the declarations of a national language planning agency. This standardisation is usually codified by means of grammars (for various purposes, especially pedagogical) and dictionaries. The language, if subjected to planning, is considered by those responsible for such work in the society (usually members of a language academy) and is given status (official, national, etc.), usually by a legislative or administrative body. A corpus of writings can then be built up to thematise topics of value to the society. On the basis of such bodies of writing dealing with a specific subject area what are called registers of the language come to be created.

One important register is the register for school teaching. Another is the creation of a body of literature, usually initially imaginative literature, subsequently other types of writing especially for use at all levels of schooling from elementary to tertiary, assuming that the language becomes a language of the schools. The thematisation of topics at the highest levels of discourse in academia is called *intellectualisation*, for the language then becomes used not only in everyday conversational discourse in the community but as a means of learning subject matter especially at the highest levels of intellectual application and displaced discourse about abstract (concrete) realities.

The first part of this contribution describes in chronological sequence the ongoing development of Tagalog-based Pilipino, now Filipino, the national language of the Republic of the Philippines, as a language of intellectual discourse.

The second part, based on the experiences of Filipino from 1936 (when Tagalog was chosen by the National Language Institute as the basis of the national language) up to the present, attempts to make some generalisations as well as a partial contribution to the theory of the process of intellectualisation of a language through language planning, without claiming, however, that what happened in the Philippines during the period under discussion is necessarily paradigmatic of what happens to other languages in the process of being transformed from a common everyday language of the home and the immediate community to a language of scholarly discourse in academic circles. It is this movement from a common everyday language of the home and the immediate community to a language of scholarly discourse which is perhaps the most concrete way of describing the process of intellectualisation. One insight that this discussion will yield is that no two languages follow an identical path of development, since development is a vector of many factors, not only linguistic but sociological, political, economic, even religious, and the confluence of many causes which happen to converge at a certain point in time in the history of a nation. Moreover, the role of charismatic characters, as in all history, must be factored in and taken into account, for in language development, as in history, one person can make a difference.

The contribution concludes with a short summary and an encapsulation of theoretical insights.

The Cultivation of Filipino as a Language of Academic Discourse

The 1935 Constitution of the Philippine Commonwealth, preparatory to full Independence 10 years later, mandated that the National Assembly would take steps towards the formation of a common national language based on one of the existing Philippine languages. Implicit in this statement was the establishment of a language academy, which was enacted as law late in 1935 and was called the National Language Institute; it was this body which selected the official language in 1936.

Tagalog, the language common to the people who lived along the Pasig River in Central Luzon, at the mouth of Manila Bay, was the language of the *taga-ilog*, 'those who lived along the river, presumably the Pasig River'. The area inhabited by those people subsequently became the capital of the Spanish colony as it was

then, even as now, an entrepôt where different ethnic tribes converged in a place called Manila, *May-nilad*, 'a place where an aquatic vine *nilad* thrived' (Joaquin, 1999: 5).

Even at the time of the take-over of Manila by the Spanish under Miguel Lopez de Legazpi in 1571, Tagalog-speaking Manila (with its former *Kapampangans*), because of its port facilities, had speakers of other ethnic languages although the lingua franca, one concludes, was already Tagalog, and it was the lingua franca among sailors coming from Manila. At the time of independence, Tagalog was already well entrenched. Being the main language of the capital city, and being likewise the language used as a lingua franca among seamen frequenting the port, Tagalog was the natural choice as the basis of the national language even though numerically, at the time of selection in 1936, there were more Bisayan speakers. These Bisayan speakers were speakers of the mutually unintelligible languages of the Bisayan group (the main ones being Cebuano, Hiligaynon, and Waray, as well as Bicol in Southern Luzon). When combined they outnumbered the Tagalogs, who had more linguistic homogeneity, undoubtedly because of the fact that Tagalog was spoken in a clearly identifiable unified territory rather than on different islands, a situation which tended to create dialect differentiation to the point of mutual unintelligibility in the Bisayan group.

The condition set by the National Language Institute was that the official proclamation of Tagalog as the basis of the national language could not be made until Tagalog had its own grammar; such a grammar was subsequently supplied by Lope K. Santos, who created a Latinate grammar of Tagalog written in Tagalog (Gonzalez and Kaluag, Forthcoming). A dictionary had become available by 1939 (although the dictionary was actually a bilingual Tagalog-English/English-Tagalog word-list). On this basis Tagalog was proclaimed the national language in 1939 and was called *Wikang Pambansa* (national language).

The National Language Institute (renamed Institute of National Language in 1939) began the process of cultivation almost immediately through the sponsorship of lectures and publications on aspects of the grammatical structure of Tagalog and on aspects of Tagalog literature. This was possible because Tagalog had enjoyed some cultivation for religious purposes as early as the late 16th century, and as a language of poetry and narrative as well as of political exposition during the period of nationalism and political revolution in the last quarter of the 19th century (Schumacher, 1973). It was also the language that had the greatest number of dictionaries (Hidalgo, 1977) including the most complete one for its time, compiled by Pedro Serrano Laktaw (1914) and the language enjoyed some prestige because of this.

The period immediately prior to the Japanese Occupation (1942–1945) saw conscious efforts towards the propagation of the national language through summer schools; its teaching as a one-semester subject to future teachers beginning in 1940; its teaching as a subject to fourth year high school students beginning in the same year and the resumption of its teaching as a subject for every grade of primary and secondary school during the Independence Period (i.e. from 4 July 1946).

Standardisation continued after World War II under the auspices of the Institute of National Language through the publication of bilingual and multilingual word lists, through reworkings and popularisations of the Lope K. Santos *balarila*

(grammar), through the publication of bilingual (English–Tagalog/Tagalog–English) dictionaries, especially one by Vito C. Santos (1978) expanding the 1939 issue into a larger volume.

However, while the *Wikang Pambansa*, renamed Pilipino from 1959 for better acceptability among non-Tagalogs, was taught as a subject in schools, it was not used as a medium of instruction in schools until the Bilingual Education Programme began in 1974. At the time when Tagalog had been taught as subject, it was taught through the medium of English. This resulted in the strange situation that when translation exercises were assigned, they were likely to go from the less well-known local *Wikang Pambansa* to the better-known (at least in school) second language, English. At the same time the number of popular weekly and even daily publications in the language increased, its use in the cinema (begun even before World War II) and in the mass media (radio and subsequently TV) expanded, and token efforts were made to expand its domain of use (in public ceremonies, in government offices during National Language Week in August), in official functions such as oath-takings, and in political speeches (which were however of a popular colloquial nature catering to the masses). The register of early publications in the *Wikang Pambansa* (e.g. essays on literature, religious literature, religious history, largely done by the clergy) was in what is still known as *Malalim na Tagalog* or ‘Deep Tagalog’, that is to say, in a variety of Tagalog used for formal discourse which used vocabulary and idioms of a variety unfamiliar to speakers of Colloquial Tagalog in Manila and second-language speakers of Tagalog who used Tagalog as a lingua franca in their trade and their travels.

Thus, if one has to establish a convenient date for the beginning of the historical development of Tagalog as a language of academic discourse, one would have to use 1974, the beginning year of implementation of the bilingual education programme of the Department of Education. The introduction of Tagalog began at the basic level (initially primary school) adding an additional level each subsequent year. The use of Tagalog was encouraged though not mandated at the tertiary level for social science courses, especially Philippine History and Government, which was a required subject for all college students. (See DEC, 1974; Gonzalez, 1980 for a historical review of the movement.)

Thus the use of Tagalog for education, mostly for elementary and secondary school, began only 28 years ago. When the Bilingual Education Programme was evaluated nationally in 1985 (Segovia, 1988: 76), 61.53% of the schools had still not begun implementation of the programme. In the evaluation to be carried out in 2001, one would expect to find that the programme has been almost fully implemented, except in the teaching of Economics where much teaching is still in English on the argument that it is almost impossible to get economics teachers to teach in Filipino, since many teachers of Economics learned their subject matter in English and find it difficult to translate economic terms, concepts and principles into Filipino.

At the tertiary level, while there were many attempts to use Filipino as a medium of instruction in as many subjects as possible between 1969 and 1972, those efforts have come to a standstill; additional subjects are not being taught even in the centres where the use of the language is being consciously cultivated (e.g. at Ateneo de Manila University and De La Salle University). The last major

effort occurred through a massive textbook writing programme, which took place at the University of the Philippines during the incumbency of Emil Javier as President (1993–1999) under the management of the *Sentro ng Wikang Filipino* [Centre for the Filipino Language], which published a total of 71 textbooks and source books in Filipino during this period.

The use of Filipino as a medium of instruction at the tertiary level began not at the national or official level of the Department of Education but on the initiative of nationalistic professors and students who felt, during the period 1969–1972, that the Filipinos had been ‘miseducated’ in English (see Constantino, 1982). At the University of the Philippines, a policy of leaving to the individual professor the choice of medium (English or Filipino) to use in his/her classes was introduced, and in the enthusiasm of the moment, mathematics and science classes (even including physics classes) came to be taught in Filipino. This also occurred at the Ateneo de Manila University with initiatives taken by individual teachers to teach Philosophy in Filipino. The same process also occurred at De La Salle University under a Language Coordination Committee (*Sanggunian ng Wika*) which attempted to encourage and plan the increasing use of Filipino in an increasing range of subjects. It seems, however, that the period of Martial Law (September 1972 to January 1981) and subsequent developments in the country slowed this process at the Ateneo de Manila University and De La Salle University, and there was little increase in the number of new subjects being taught in Filipino. (See Gonzalez & Bautista, 1981 for a description of the university initiatives during the 1970s.)

During this fervid period of using the national language in classrooms, especially at the tertiary level, the need to use technical terms in a range of disciplines called for the development of terminology lists for terms or *katawagan*, similar to the *istilahs* in Malaysia (cf. Omar, 1979). Bautista and Gonzalez (1994) have reviewed this terminology movement and describe the different initiatives, usually by individual professors, to come up with subject lists, e.g. in Chemistry (Miranda, 1996; Tengonciang, 1978), in Economics (Tullao, 1999), in all the fields under Gonzalo del Rosario’s (1981) *Maugnayng Pilipino*, by the National Science Development Board (*Lupon sa Agham*, 1969), through general principles of terminological development (Santiago, 1979; also see Gonzalez *et al.*, 1983 on family planning and sex education terms).

The aftermath of these initiatives was the discovery that such terms will not gain currency or validation unless they are used by a group of ‘significant others’ and are more widely propagated. The only site where this kind of spread took place, and then only within the lifetime of the ‘founder’, was the *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* of the late Professor Virgilio Enriquez at the University of the Philippines in the field of psychology (Enriquez & Antonio, 1983).

Of more lasting effect than a mere enumeration of scientific and discipline-specific terms have been actual books (trade books) and textbooks produced in Filipino which are in current use at least in the primary and secondary schools of the country, where social studies and the social sciences have been taught in Filipino under the 1974 Bilingual Education scheme. The terms developed by corpus planning work have gained currency in these areas because of their use in schools and they are slowly spreading through the mass media (print,

radio and TV), e.g. through newspapers published in Filipino and through weekly magazines in Filipino (for example, the *Liwayway*).

In the Philippines at present, concrete and determined efforts to use Filipino in subjects beyond the required minimum social sciences in an expanded fashion as the medium of instruction have come to a halt. While classes have continued to be taught in Filipino, the range of subjects taught in Filipino has not expanded. Moreover, this range of subjects is really only being taught in the main universities in Manila, and there is hardly any teaching in Filipino outside of Manila.

Instead, what has happened is that tertiary level subject matter in the Philippines is taught in a code-switching variety of Filipino and English. Code-switching is used because of the difficulty for the teachers of explaining some concepts and difficulties for the students in comprehending these concepts when they are taught solely in English (Bautista, 1975, 1990, 1991; Pascasio, 1978, 1984). This is especially true in many large universities which cater to lower middle and middle income students, although it has been found even in more expensive and prestigious universities. The increasing use of code-switching rather than English might lead to the evolution of a more formal and consistent variety of standardised Filipino as a medium of instruction. In this case, as Sibayan (1991) suggests, the intellectualised variety of Filipino might well turn out to be a better codified and improved variety consisting of the results of this massive code-switching. What may happen is a gradual devolution from a formal type of Filipino initially used in schools to a colloquial mixture of Filipino and English, after a period of code-switching, which may lead to the development of a mixed language which is likely to become the intellectualised variety of Filipino in everyday academic teaching. Whether this mixed language will spread into academic writing in publications and dissertations remains a question, however, as the more conservative forces eschew and even condemn such code-switching.

In the Philippines, there is a three-way conflict between English, Filipino and a mixed language for the status of the normal language of academic discourse which could be resolved through language planning. However, the principal language planning agency tasked with the work of intellectualisation, the *Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino* (Commission on the Filipino Language [KWF]), which took the place of the former Institute of National Language, is not addressing this conflict. There is little direction coming from the KWF, which spends much of its time on jejune debates of the personal opinions of members of the academy, while the work which is necessary (translations, original publications, congresses using Filipino as a medium of scholarly discourse, the writing of reference books and encyclopedias) remains neglected.

One is led to the conclusion that Filipino might become a minority national language (in the sense of Fishman, 1984) which is fated to be spread as a *lingua franca* but which will never see use as an intellectualised variety except in literature, because of the convenience of English as an available code for intellectual academic and university work and for the international needs of Filipinos, with only the code-switching variety (which may turn into a mixed language) as the popular 'scholarly' medium for the Filipino student who is less than fully conversant with the English language which s/he has failed to master.

Generalisations from the Philippine Experience

In discussing the dimensions of language planning Haugen (1968) listed four: selection, standardisation, propagation and elaboration. Subsequent investigations on the fourth aspect (Gonzalez, 1988; *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 1988; Sibayan, 1991), indicate that there are many sub-dimensions of cultivation. The cultivation of a language entails its use by a wide variety of individual speakers in a society. The individual speakers expand the uses of the language from thematising common everyday realities, which are usually physically present or cognitively prominent in the mind-sets and memories of the speakers, and applying the code to thematise new realities, which are displaced (i.e. not physically present) or are abstract (i.e. existing in the mental realm of ideas and principles, syllogistic reasoning and conclusions). These mental realms admit what the medieval scholastics (see Gilson, 1938; Maritain, 1948) described as the 'degrees of abstraction': being as qualified, being as quantified, and being as being (the most abstract in metaphysics).

The sub-dimensions of cultivation involve different processes based on the purposes and distinctive features of these processes. One such purpose is to thematise contemporary realities with terms which have been borrowed or translated as loans and to use the language to deal with such modern realities. Thus, one can speak of modernisation (see Sibayan, 1985) whereby the local language is used to speak of modern realities not only employing appropriate new terminology, but also capturing describable new phenomena. For example, our predecessors did not have to speak of atomic physics and information technology; now these are taken for granted as objects of conversation, and speakers must learn to use the technical descriptive vocabulary and to discuss the processes in science wherein these elements are assumed to undergo change. The term 'modernisation', however, does not only apply to new scientific and technical realities but also to social and ideological realities which represent developments in modern social life.

For me, the term *modernisation* captures one aspect of cultivation; it is a linguistic process mirroring the development of a social process called modernisation. It connotes, for the most part, the topicalisation of realia, mental objects and ideas that capture the *Zeitgeist* of the contemporary period and serve to characterise its code and terminology. It serves also to distinguish the contemporary period from all earlier periods in which these lexical items (and the realities they signify) were not present to the consciousness and were not included in the discourse of the society. Societies themselves, of course, mirror or undergo modernisation in different stages and at different rates; the meaning of the term *modernisation* is not necessarily univocal. More specifically, in contemporary discourse, *modernisation* connotes a process following Western models and promoting the technology and scientific applications of the West in all realms of life.

A parallel term – one which is both wider in scope in the sense of cutting across all of contemporary knowledge and science and at the same time narrower in scope in the sense of being confined to the academic domain – is the term *intellectualisation*, which the Prague School linguist Vilem Mathesius used in his essays on language development in the 1920s (see Garvin & Mathiot, 1968). To my knowledge – although the process of intellectualisation is an ancient historical

process and must have been referred to in informal ways when talking about language – it was the Prague School which coined the term and called attention to this process as a specific aspect of language cultivation.

I confine the universe of discourse of this essay, therefore, to the process of the intellectualisation of a language as its use extends discourse about everyday present realities to the discourse of academic disciplines, especially in the school-setting, and in the West, in the university-setting. It is the academic domain that is being captured here – the domain of the academic disciplines as these have developed in the West and as these disciplines have been transferred across societies and cultures and have become acculturated in other cultures while maintaining their basic function; that is, to thematise the current stage of development in academic disciplines as these have emerged in the university domain. Depending on the discourse mirrored, according to the gradations of academic discourse, one can speak of intellectualisation at the primary and secondary school levels, and – most significantly in this context – at the tertiary (i.e. university) level, where knowledge of an advanced nature – usually of an abstract character dealing with theoretical elements and explicit paradigms of thought or models of disciplines – are detailed, critiqued and revised to make room for other paradigms and models of thought in each of the disciplines.

The extent and depth of intellectualisation of a language is a function of the state of the art of that discipline in the society and in the academic community which is using the language. Unless an intellectual discipline has taken root in a society or an academic setting (thanks either to the active intellectual genius of the academicians of that society, or thanks to the transfer of knowledge from one society to another as a result of the globalisation of knowledge), the use of the specific language for thematising a specific discipline may not find cultivation in that society.

There are, likewise, sociological dimensions to the intellectualisation of a language. For example, if the society chooses to use the local language for its thematising in specific domains, there is a resulting development of the sociology of knowledge and the growth and development of disciplines within the society which are conveyed through that language. If, on the other hand, speakers intend to learn a foreign language and to use it for the intellectualisation of a specific discipline in the country, then the local language does not undergo intellectualisation for that specific domain and for that specific academic discipline.

Intellectualisation: Product and Process

In making a judgement as to the degree of intellectualisation of a code, or to answer the question whether or not a code has already reached a minimum level of intellectualisation, the investigator has to be sensitive to the sentiments of users of the code who might not be familiar with the universe of discourse and vocabulary of language development. This leads to a potential terminological conflict.

In the minds of certain egalitarians (those who believe, like structuralist linguists, that all languages are inherently equal, each one capable of thematising any subject matter or theme) any talk of ‘intellectualising’ a language is considered undemocratic and patronising since it conflicts with the notion of the

inherent equality of all codes and the universality of higher order cognitive activity or thinking. Even to suggest that some languages are not yet fully capable of being instruments of 'thinking', 'ratiocinating', 'using scientific discourse' is tantamount to labelling certain languages as inferior (compared to 'superior' languages), as 'primitive' rather than equally 'advanced'. Therefore, the users of such a language are thought to be depicted as somehow unequal to users of 'advanced' languages such as English, German, French, Spanish, Japanese. I have been taken to task for my idea of intellectualising language and have been accused of being elitist – worse, of being racist – and of reviving a discredited discriminatory description of language stages such as one exemplified by the Russian linguist Marr during the Stalinist Period in the USSR (Thomas, 1957).

Closer to home, when the Linguistic Society of the Philippines – using the terminology and the pioneering work of Vilem Mathesius – started speaking of 'intellectualisation', some sensitive liberals (who had been chafing under what they perceived as the continuing colonialism of English) took umbrage at the term *intellectualisation* as if somehow one could not be an intellectual in the Philippines without English, or that one could not carry on higher order cognitive activities or critical thinking in the local languages, but only in English.

The misunderstanding, it seems, arises from a failure of communication and a lack of awareness, resulting from:

- (1) the paucity of knowledge of historical developments of the languages of the West and of Japan;
- (2) the gradual, stage-governed nature of language development, which obliges one to speak in terms of degrees of readiness of a language for intellectual use; or
- (3) the uneven time period during which a particular language has been used or not used as an instrument of academic and scientific discourse.

Here, one can borrow from the Scholastic philosophy of the high Middle Ages, which echo earlier Aristotelian descriptions, and speak of potency (the potentiality of an entity) and act (the perfection of an entity). All creatures have the potentiality to become developed within their own species or genres, but not all have reached such a potential or attained actuality in development. To speak of stages of development is not to denigrate or despise those who have not yet attained such development, but rather merely to give an objective description showing that they are still in the process, *in fieri*, of becoming what they are potentially capable of becoming, and hence are still in the process of actualisation.

Products of intellectualisation

The theory of language development needs a more comprehensive frame of reference and a set of operational criteria describing what empirical evidence (preferably measurable by actual scores or more realistically by numerical indicators) there is that a language has been intellectualised. There exist such operational criteria for measuring the success of other elements of language planning. Standardisation is indicated by accepted conventions of usage in style manuals, dictionaries, rhetorical handbooks, spelling rules and the actual use of these manuals and dictionaries through a specific corpus or literature in different domains. Propagation is relatively easily evaluated on the basis of census

figures, self-reports, field testing, and various outputs (e.g. newspapers, magazines and other publications in the written phase; radio and TV and formal usage in the oral phase). Similarly, to ensure proper understanding of how the students of language development define intellectualisation, one must look at objective criteria which preferably are somehow measurable. In this way one avoids the misunderstanding that one is downgrading a language by not considering it inherently equal to another language. The languages are inherently equal in their potential for intellectualisation, for they are all products of the minds of human beings who are inherently equal, but not all languages are actually used in all language domains and hence are still in a process of reaching a higher degree of intellectualisation. While it is taken for granted that languages, each being a medium of thought communication, are intellectualised equally at a basic level, and are capable of thematising topics and relationships of everyday life in the home, in the community, even in the larger society, new domains of language use require new linguistic resources.

As an initial way to proceed operationally, we can describe a language as intellectualised when a rich corpus of literature (imaginative and non-imaginative) is available in that language. This obviously presupposes that there are degrees of intellectualisation. The process of the creation of an adequate corpus of 'literature' will not, of course, be necessarily uniform in all domains. Some fields may be more adequately represented than others, in the sense that the available published literature is more extensive, while in some fields the corpus may be minuscule because the process of using the language as a medium of discourse in a specific field may just be beginning. This imbalance happens even in advanced languages which have been used for scientific discourse for quite some time.

In addition to examining the corpus of publications available in a language in the process of intellectualisation, one can also examine bookstores and libraries and records of printing output in a country to see the number of titles and the number of copies of titles put out by the publications industry in each year. In fields of knowledge or academic disciplines, one can see trends, and one can make some generalisations based on case studies of languages and their status in different countries. Thus, one can examine the use of the local language (usually the national language based on one of the local languages or vernaculars) for the creation of lyric and narrative poetry, for fiction (the short story and the novel), for drama, and for the informal essay usually found in journalistic pieces. Newspapers are likewise indicators of intellectualisation of a language and constitute part of the publications output in each year of the industry.

As a further measure, in the domain of the school and subsequently of the university, one can use the language as a medium of instruction. This may begin at the primary level and as a transitional language for general education and can then move on from the primary to the secondary level, and creating and/or expanding discourses, and so on to tertiary level. At both secondary and tertiary levels, the easiest domain in which to begin would be the domain of creative literature and culturally sensitive areas such as history, civics, and cultural anthropology. More difficult, it seems, judging from the case studies of the past and records of history, are the domains of mathematics, the natural sciences (e.g. biology, chemistry and physics) and applied sciences (e.g. different types of engineering and more recently, information technology). Thus the

tangible manifestation or evidence of intellectualisation capable of being measured and described quantitatively provides answers to issues such as (in addition to published output):

- the amount of use of the language as a medium of instruction in teaching;
- at which level of education the language is used;
- for which subject areas or domains (humanities, social sciences, natural sciences) it is used;
- for which levels of abstraction it is used.

As a result, when one examines the products of intellectualisation, one can relatively easily gauge how intellectualised a language is with regard to these products. Where it is needed and desirable, one can then quantify these indicators to get a better gauge of the level or degree of intellectualisation in order to be able to make comparisons from society to society with regard to the main code of the society, that is, its official language or its official language of discourse in the domains of education, legislation and governance, which are more or less in the public domain, and which constitute what Sibayan (1989) calls 'controlling domains'.

The products will be uneven, and the extent of intellectualisation will be dependent upon the domain, the field, and the degree of abstraction. One cannot expect a uniform development on all fronts, but rather an uneven development as a product of history, circumstances, charismatic leadership and relative prosperity of the economy that will permit corpus build-up as well as on the establishment of institutions of higher learning and research where the language in the process of intellectualisation is institutionally established as the official language of communication and academic discourse.

Another aspect of product which can be measured and relatively easily gauged consists of the number of individuals in the society who actually use the language to create more products and to join the body of contributors to the creation of these intellectualised products of language which enrich the corpus of the code, ensure its vitality of use, provide the instruments needed to guarantee that present and future generations continue to use the code for scholarly purposes. Crucial to this arrangement is the institutionalisation of code use through language policy in schools and in government offices and language policy in the mass media if there is any such policy. If a mass media language policy is non-existent, then language policy here can be dictated by the masses voting with their feet and opting to use the language in various domains and for expanding purposes. Thus, to gauge products one must look, likewise, at legal documents, at studies of the implementation of legal policies, and at measures of actual societal use through consumer behaviour with respect to the products of mass media (e.g. TV programmes, radio programmes, films, movies, VCs, CDs, DVDs).

If one wishes to go into further detail, one can then look at the classroom behaviour of both teachers and students and find the extent of use of the language for discourse in the classroom, the extent of code-switching if any (which indicates a state of flux with regard to implementation), the quality of discourse, the availability of learning materials in the form of textbooks, notes and library holdings and the use of the language for tests and other evaluative

activities. The extent of use of the language(s) outside of the classroom (e.g. in the corridors, in canteens, on the playing fields, and among the students when they socialise outside the school) can also be used to gauge whether or not a language is being maintained or whether or not a local language in the process of intellectualisation is expanding its domains of use and its range. A simple metric could explore what language is used by students when they are discussing academic topics in study groups or by faculty in informal academically focused conversations and between faculty and students.

Process

Examining the products of an intellectualised language (as indicators of the intellectualisation stage of the language) should be complemented by examining in detail the process by which this intellectualisation is taking place or has already taken place. Here one posits a logical order, rationalised in an ideal world. However, in actual fact, these processes go on simultaneously in different domains; not all domains exhibit the same degree of intellectualisation. Domain differentiation is a function of need, of the availability of a second language, of the social and cultural conditions which obtain in the country, of the political decisions taken by the country itself making intellectualisation an imperative, and of the willingness of the country's decision-makers to allocate sufficient funding for the intellectualisation of the language, assuming that there are sufficient resources in the country's financial budget to warrant such a long-term investment, and of the political will to devote these resources to intellectualisation.

One key dimension of intellectualisation is the development of a standardised form of the language which can be used to develop academic discourse. Standardisation is best accomplished through the compilation of a descriptive grammar – ideally a reference grammar, which gives rise to pedagogical grammars, which are then used by teachers as the basis for their grammar lessons and discussions in class, and for the actual composition of teaching materials. Also essential are a dictionary (monolingual, showing the description of the lexicon of the language using the language itself as a metalanguage), and manuals of rhetoric or style guides dealing with aspects of genre and register for academic writing. The form these materials will take is dependent upon the grammar model which is chosen, and, in educational use of these, selection is a key issue, since it is impossible to teach all of the grammar, the lexicon, or the rhetorical options available for any language. Ideally such considerations should precede the development of such materials; however, in many cases, such as the Philippines, one has to make do with what one has. Unlike a highly developed language for science and technology such as English, Filipino has few well-written grammars and monolingual dictionaries and there has been little discourse analyses of Filipino. The choice is limited by the small quantity of published materials available.

Together with standardisation, and in reality already following from it, parallel with it (because standardisation takes some time and must conquer its domains little by little), what is essential is the propagation of the language through the mass media, the school system, workshops and seminars for teach-

ers and for those members of the public at large who are not first language speakers of the official and/or national language (unless the language, at least in its non-intellectualised form, is already spread throughout the country as the result of some accident of history, or of previous use of the language as a lingua franca or as a bazaar trade language). It does not seem appropriate to undertake propagation of the language through government legislation. Our experience is that legislation is not really effective and that a *laissez-faire* approach is better, especially where it is supported by incentives for publications, etc. in the language being intellectualised. Then the long process of cultivation needs to take place. Cultivation, a metaphor borrowed from horticulture and agriculture, connotes creating an ecology or climate for such language use and, more important, where possible the active promotion of such a process through purposive language planning. Need usually dictates the use of the language for academic work, especially if one is working within a vacuum where there is no existing intellectualised language available to the society.

In post-colonial situations, where an already intellectualised language brought by the colonial authorities is available, there are bound to be competing loyalties between the intellectualised language of the colonialists and the emergent intellectualised local language of the post-colonial society. If there are external social realities which maintain the second language, then the chances are that the need for rapidly intellectualising the local language is less urgent and the development of the latter will be slower since the society has the second language to count on and to fall back on.

This is the case of English in the Philippines, for example, and in Singapore, where there is a conscious effort to maintain English as a second language, and for some even as a native first language (side by side with a local language) and where for practical purposes the society has decided not to emphasise the official national language, Malay, for intellectualised purposes, but to keep it within the informal conversation repertoire of the family, the neighbourhood, and the community, and for primary education.

Intellectualisation, it seems, can be implemented by purposive and explicit planning only in the domain of academia (either for all specialties or only for some) and in the domain of publications (of scholarly and semi-scholarly literature). The mass media, however, do not seem to respond to intervention in the same way as these other domains, because market forces beyond the mass media dictate the development of the domain. This limitation on the scope of effective language planning for intellectualisation presupposes a language use policy, or a medium of instruction policy, or a scheme for continuing to use the colonial language and gradually increasing the use of the post-colonial local language in more and more domains of academia. A policy on language use will succeed, or not succeed, depending on the structure of the school system, the genuine commitment of teachers at all levels towards the expanded use of the national language, the willingness of parents and even their encouragement to create the change, and the resources dedicated to the composition and translation of teaching materials consisting of reference books, teaching aids, textbooks, and in general a library of readings for the intellectualisation of language. Ultimately numbers will spell the difference, but the initial impetus can come from an individual: Eliezer Ben Yehuda in Israel, Ivar Aasen in

Norway, Chaucer and later Shakespeare in England, Martin Luther in Germany, and the other Protestant Reformers, such as Jan Hus in Bohemia and John Knox in Scotland.

The process of intellectualisation of the language is realised through the creation of domains in the corpus planning for the society, either as the domains are developed or as a result of language planning to introduce the language into a domain not previously used. In language planning for intellectualisation, corpora of texts (usually written) may be purposely built up by an incentive system composed of both financial and psychic rewards to build up texts for use in the language. On the basis of such corpora, registers for academic discourse can be codified and promoted.

For the creation of language registers, viewed strictly from the point of view of the code itself or from the point of view of the structure of the language, the first task of the language developer or the language planner is to create a technical vocabulary or a set of terms to be used in discussing certain topics. These conventions are mostly derived from the West in post-colonised societies, specifically, from the colonising country. They have to be translated into the local language which is in the process of intellectualising. The common practice is to use loan translations or calques for these items, which must then be propagated and accepted by a critical mass of people in order to become a manifestation of the standard. From observation it seems relatively easy for these terms and technical phrases to be mastered in the intellectual or academic register. More difficult are the technical terms which are discipline-specific.

Over the centuries, the strategies employed by language users in so far as technical terms are concerned is typically either outright loans, loan translations, or newly coined original terms based on the resources of the language. The latter alternative can be artificial, and, unless there is a charismatic intellectual leader whose set of terms will be adopted by a group of 'significant others', the terms can remain inert and may never be used. Moreover, if there is no control over terminology development, there will be a proliferation of terms according to the model proposed by each compiler, with the terms having no chance of gaining currency unless there are other sociological conditions present.

In new fields, such as information technology and computer science, which was developed in English-speaking countries, it might be more effective to adopt the loan words directly since information technology seems to have a group of 'significant others' interacting with each other across national and linguistic boundaries.

To use a language for academic discourse, as a medium of instruction in universities and as a language of science for publications, however, one needs more than terminology (see Bautista & Gonzalez, 1994). One needs to think not only in the context of terminology (summarised in phrase books, or what Malaysians call *istilahs*, and what in the Philippines we call bilingual word lists for subject specific terminology, *katawagan* (terms)). One needs to create an entire register, or a special variety of the same language, for it is not terms that will realise the register, but a whole style of presentation using the intellectualising variety of the language. The process is ongoing and may take decades to stabilise before some standardisation is possible. Thus, a rhetorical metalanguage consist-

ing of transition markers and cohesive devices is needed with a set of *istilahs* or compilations of technical terms for each discipline.

It likewise means using a specific kind of rhetoric for expository academic writing, with its own conventions for introductions and conclusions, modes of presentation and paragraphing as well as discourse development. Based likewise on the prevailing paradigm of the science in question, there is a set of assumptions and presuppositions as well as a set of acceptable modes of inquiry and reporting which must be rendered in the receiving language (on 'doing science', see Kuhn, 1970). Elsewhere, I have termed this process a process of reconceptualisation (Gonzalez, 1992) more than one of translation for one does not translate line by line and certainly not word for word but one re-thinks in the target language what one has thought about in the source language and then restates this in the target language in a process ending up as translation, but not quite, since it often means paraphrase rather than translation, restatement more than transfer, demanding the rethinking of the entire subject matter and subsequently of the discipline in the target language. In the process, the rhetorical style for scientific exposition, description, and argumentation is developed in the target language to create a body of literature in the field. Subsequently the mode of exposition, description and argumentation can be embodied in guidelines or handbooks, which will aid permanency or stability in publications and in written conventions.

However, these individual examples of *parole* depend on sociological processes for propagation and acceptance by a group of 'significant others', intellectual disciples if you will, who will in turn use the same technical vocabulary and terminology, the same style of rhetoric and presentation, to create a school of thought or a group of 'significant others' who will carry on the tradition of the master and propagate it in the academic departments where they will find employment after they complete their studies and their degrees. Unless this group of significant others expands and continues publishing and teaching in the mode of the master, the tradition can be short-lived and die with the master and the movement may be discontinued.

Social conditions, especially those of a political or economic nature, may accelerate the process of publishing, or library build-up, or the creation of a corpus of scientific literature in the intellectualising language. Alternatively, the process may take place more gradually, without pressure, and follow the slow process of nation building and consciousness raising. Yet again, it may be accelerated by purposive means, by intention, within a policy and a programme of language development supported by the society through government policy and appropriations. It may even be accelerated through the accumulation of negative forces; e.g. by switching the system of instruction totally into the local language and away from the former colonial language or by postponing the learning of the colonial language to the upper grades in favour of hastening the development of the local national language for purposes of symbolism and interethnic communication. These are choices that a society makes and, depending on how firm and organised and in control the government of that society is, the policies are implemented. But if there is no political will, no force that unites the society to pursue national language development 'with might and main' (to borrow a Spanish expression used by Norberto Romualdez, an enlightened language planner and

politician in the Commonwealth government of the Philippines in the 1930s), then the intellectualised variety of the language will be formed only gradually and after much time, and success will occur only if the second language ceases to be fully accessible to the society because of a poorly developed educational system.

In understanding the steps that are needed in getting together a creative minority that will use the language, one has to turn to the findings of the sociology of knowledge for some insights. Such a creative minority emerges when an intellectual leader using the intellectualising language attracts unto himself/herself some disciples who are willing to listen to him/her in the new variety of the language, discuss concepts using this variety and read works in the new variety and follow him/her in creating a body or corpus of literature in the new variety that will, in effect, constitute the beginnings of a library and therefore result in a register. Eventually the group may even form a school of thought, for often the master attracts disciples not from the use of a particular language but rather by the brilliance and significance of his/her insights, so that one has the situation of a school of thought intellectualising the language within a particular domain, and using the emerging variety.

An example of this phenomenon occurred on a small scale in the 1970s in the Department of Psychology at the University of the Philippines under the charismatic leadership of the late Virgilio Enriquez, who created a school of thought of exploring Filipino psychology using non-Western methods of inquiry (mostly ethnographic descriptions in Western terms). His writings and those of his students exploited the resources of Pilipino/Filipino to create a body of knowledge and to attract disciples who did research and contributed to this body of knowledge by self-consciously using Filipino as the medium of scholarly discourse and in the process, *per accidens*, pursuing insights from the Filipino languages to develop new interpretative hermeneutic work on sentiments and thought that in effect constituted the metaphorical features (some dead but now revived) of the Tagalog language; those features yielded insights into Filipino attitudes, modes of reasoning and modes of expression, and consequently created a body of knowledge remarkable for expounding the rich language of sensitivity and sensibility of the Filipino user of Tagalog.

It seems there are two possible paths to intellectualisation to be seen in the Philippines. Where there has been a missionary presence, the progression seems to be from the field of religion, to the field of imaginative literature (especially poetry and narrative usually of a religious nature again because of the missionary presence). Where there has not been a missionary presence, the path seems to be from a tradition of imaginative song and chant in the society to a pragmatic discourse of an instructional type (or what in Tagalog we call *aral* and its Filipino equivalent in the other languages of the archipelago). Eventually, once the notion of schooling and the university has been transplanted, intellectualisation moves to the registers of academic disciplines, using literature first (the humanities) and subsequently the descriptive social sciences (history as narrative, ethnography and anthropology or the soft social sciences).

In the expansion of domains of use in the process of intellectualisation, one thinks of the use of the local language going beyond the physical space of the home and the neighbourhood (even the ghetto) into the larger community

through a process of geographic spread from the neighbourhood to the centres of population, from rural to urban areas, from outlying areas to the capital. The process may also come from above – from the capital, and expand to the countryside.

In the centres of influence in the country, especially in the capital, there is further expansion into non-physical domains – domains of the mind in fields such as worship, government or administration, education, political legislation, Sibayan's (1989) 'controlling domains'. The expansion may take place simultaneously in all controlling domains or may occur selectively, with some areas given second priority in time because of competing or immediate priorities; thus, the mass media lends itself easily to expansion of domains but administration and legislation may be more resistant and hence slower. Political campaigning lends itself to the indigenous language, but such campaigning belongs more properly to expansion under the mass media and hence may be subsumed there. Within academic registers or special domains of language (according to themes or subject matter), medicine and law seem to be most conservative and most resistant, the domain of law especially so.

Within other domains, such as education, there may be further divisions or sub-domains where the process is less rapid, as has already been mentioned; the humanities and literature lend themselves to intellectualisation in the language, but change in areas such as mathematics, science, applied science may be slower because these areas are themselves larger technical innovations in the culture, implicating more than just linguistic change. The reality should precede the code, for one does not invent a code (except arbitrarily and quite unnaturally) before the reality becomes an integral part of everyday life, as in the case of applied science.

Expansion of domains does not only move horizontally through geographical and cognitive (or mental) space but likewise moves vertically. I have already spoken of levels of abstraction, from the concrete to the abstract, from the physical to the spiritual. For example, in theology, it is easy to use loan translation without guaranteeing genuine comprehension and understanding, as has happened with Christian theology in its difficult-to-comprehend doctrines (e.g. the Trinity, the Incarnation, personhood and nature), where formulae and loan translations are used and rote memorisation of these as formulae often seems to be the practice in seminaries, rather than understanding the concepts involved. However, it will be more difficult to call for genuine originality of thought about abstract realities, which require the reconceptualisation of theology in another language. Thus the Christian concepts of being and existence, based on Greek and Latin categories, have been found to be difficult to translate into other languages, especially into languages lacking the verb *to be* and these concepts are sometimes more easily learned in a Western language than reconceptualised and presented in categories that do not exist in local languages.

Similarly, quantitative realities (being quantified, as in mathematics and in physics) and displaced objects (which are inferred and posited as givens more than observed, as in particle physics), are difficult to articulate in a new language. One needs to read books in molecular biology, atomic physics, quantum mechanics, particle physics and to speak of these in a non-Western language such as Filipino; instead of communication, obfuscation often happens because

of the unfamiliarity of the realities behind the labels and even the lack of labels in the first place.

It is this same need for speaking of displaced realities and abstract objects, as well as principles, which makes intellectualisation so difficult when speaking of highly specialised subject matter that has developed in Western science but as yet has not been developed to the same degree in Eastern science. Perhaps one can also say that there are concepts and principles in Eastern science that are difficult to translate into Western languages; e.g. the concepts of *ying* and *yang*, special points in acupuncture, descriptions in oriental medicine, and such concepts in geomancy as *feng shui* where one is speaking of a totally different and perhaps strange-because-unfamiliar universe of discourse.

From a more practical consideration, one can posit concepts and principles easily available in a language for discussion in the lower levels of schooling (i.e. Grades 1 to 4). However, the use of these terms may cause difficulty when one begins using other concepts for more specific subject areas for Grades 5 and 6 and in the specialisations in high school, where subject matter specification becomes important. More difficult is the level of abstraction needed at the collegiate level in specialised subjects in science and mathematics, applied sciences, law and medicine and now the largely Western-dominated field of information technology. That is why there has to be a differentiation of codes for different levels of teaching, as educational systems have evolved in all countries at present using a predominantly Western model of basic and higher education. Thus, a language may be sufficiently intellectualised for use in primary and secondary education but not necessarily at the tertiary or university level, or a language may be sufficient for communication of abstract realities at the undergraduate level but not at the graduate level, and master's and doctoral levels may be left to the international *linguae francae* of academia, whether this be English (as is the case at present), or Russian, Spanish, or perhaps in the future, Chinese and/or Japanese.

The difficulty for intellectualisation of some national languages lies in the nature of science itself. Science is, by definition, cumulative, and its accumulation is not nationally isolated but internationally communal. Scientists, wherever they live and speaking whatever language they use, must have easy access to global science (which is published in a restrictive range of languages, especially English). While unquestionably science can be developed in Filipino, it cannot be globally shared in Filipino, and while monolingualism in Filipino may be satisfactory for most purposes, a monolingual Filipino scientist would soon lose touch with his/her discipline. In short, both drawing on the international bank of scientific knowledge and contributing to that bank cannot be done solely in Filipino, no matter to what degree the language is intellectualised. In theory this gap can be bridged by translation, but the resources needed to both intellectualise Filipino and translate all the required critical material into it would be prohibitive. In addition, there would need to be outward translation as well so that advances made in Filipino would be available to others. As such, intellectualisation of some languages will always be affected by the necessity of using other languages for at least some of the communicative needs of the disciplines involved.

The Inner and Outer Dimensions of Intellectualisation

Inner dimensions of language intellectualisation: A psychological viewpoint

In an earlier study (Gonzalez, 1992), I made a translation from an English source text of an excerpt from a technical description in articulatory phonetics and attempted to render it into Filipino. I did it to observe by inner reflection the processes the language user must go through to be able to render an 'intellectual' academic topic (hitherto not available in Filipino) in the target language. In my view, anyone attempting this process of discussing unfamiliar topics and thematising them in a new language will find difficulty doing so because of the lack of technical terminology (in this case, the names of different parts of the articulatory system) and the need to assume a template of description (the human articulatory organs and the buccal cavity) using the syntax and discourse rules of one's local language. The process involves translation. However, as I experience it, the translation means more than a line-by-line rendering and involves an actual reconceptualisation involving a total review of the articulatory organs and the buccal cavity and their parts and the processes of articulation in English, and then a rendering of them into Filipino. The re-expression or translation was clearer, rendered easier, and certainly more useful when reconceptualised and re-thought in Filipino taking into account the frame of reference of articulatory phonetics.

One insight I arrived at as a result of this thought-experiment was that the most difficult part of the reconceptualisation process was not a different kind of logic and mode of reasoning as I earlier suspected. Rather, it was the difficulty of describing in detail and labelling a physical reality that hitherto, in a non-intellectualised language, had a name or a construct not broken down into its different components, and that required new and specific labels to deal with unfamiliar functions. This is the kind of cultural re-examination that one needs to go through in technical descriptions. Anatomy and physiology, for example, which are basic to the study of medicine, have been re-intellectualised in the modern European languages, including English. For example, in discussing anatomy, one needs specific labels for concepts which in Filipino would be identified simply as *ugat* (a term for both arteries and veins). Accordingly, in biology these concepts would need relabelling and specifying at least into names for different veins and arteries, so as to render description precise. In English, a Latinate or Greek technical terminology has been developed, accepted and passed on from one generation to another, whereas in Filipino it is being done for the first time, as a new classificatory system for veins and arteries becomes relevant in the Filipino context. (See Alisjahbana, (1976: 72) for an example of how this lexical relabelling problem was worked out in Bahasa Indonesia.)

Psychologically, then, what renders intellectualisation such an arduous task is this process of reconceptualisation, relabelling, redescription according to the dominant paradigm of the specific discipline. The task is rendered easier if one has been educated in the relevant Western academic tradition and has developed the relevant concepts in that tradition before attempting to adapt them into a new one. One may only guess at the complexity of the cross-cultural transfers that must be made by someone from a different tradition.

Outer dimensions of language intellectualisation: A sociological viewpoint

Like all other language phenomena, the manner of intellectualisation, the mental process, and the products of this intellectualisation within a specific subject specialty (found in bilingual wordlists, monolingual terminological lists, actual exemplars of intellectualised language varieties through books and publications) have to be gone through by every individual mind trying to learn the discipline in the target language.

Whether or not this process will be repeated in other individuals is a matter of social relationships, of the leadership and charisma of the intellectualiser (e.g. Ivar Aasen or Eliezer Ben Yehuda), one person, although the stimulus may also come from a group of persons (e.g. Virgilio Enriquez and his students at the University of the Philippines) and the amount of influence the intellectualiser(s) has(have) on current and future generations that in effect will become part of the tradition for this intellectualised variety and will develop it even further through lectures, delivery of papers, meetings, conferences, seminars, conventions, and through imitation by others of similar processes, and in effect through the creation of a school of thought, in the process following sociological rules of intellectual 'spread'. In simpler terms, if one follows and uses the same terms, adds one's own, and carries on discourse in the new variety, then the movement will take on life, the terms will acquire currency, and in effect the variety thus propagated among a group can be enlarged and spread throughout the country. This, as mentioned earlier, is more easily accomplished in literature (prose and poetry), but seems to demand more concerted effort and conscious planning in other registers, especially those of science and technology, because usage is less frequent and more specialised. The products of these processes will constitute the corpus of the register.

Historically, these processes have taken a long time. However, in the event that certain sociological, economic and political pressures are present, the duration of the processes can be collapsed into a shorter period, as happened in Russia after 1917, where the intellectuals of 19th century pre-Revolutionary Russia had used French as their language of higher cognitive activity. Similarly, the process moved quickly in Japan during the Meiji Restoration, as the Japanese learned from Europe, especially Germany, and then intellectualised Japanese. In the absence of such outside pressures the process may take a long time, as happened with English and Latin, and less so with Greek. However, such instances of rapid change do not guarantee the intellectualisation of a language. The speed of spread is a matter of social conditions more than it is of linguistic conditions or potentiality, for all languages have the potential for intellectualisation. Society itself must choose whether or not to use the local language as an intellectual lingua franca for the internationally-oriented academic community. English continues to expand its domains and continues its hegemony as an intellectual scientific language, and will most likely continue to do so at least for this present century. In the process of intellectualisation, some national languages may be developed fully across all domains. Other national languages, official and in use as media of instruction for the local school systems, however, may not be developed as major as opposed to minor national languages, to use Fishman's (1984)

terms, simply because the nations in which they are cultivated are small, with limited resources and with no prospects of political hegemony, in which case one can foresee intellectualisation only to a limited degree, for certain registers (e.g. literary) and for certain levels (basic education, perhaps undergraduate education but not graduate education), the choice made willingly or unwillingly, without real alternatives. This seems to be the case of Filipino, given the present political, social and economic situation of the Philippines. However, this realistic limitation of possibilities has yet to be recognised by nationalists in the Philippines.

An important aspect impinging upon the choice for intellectualisation in all spheres is the financial aspect of language development. If a country has good resources, and if it deems it imperative for its own cohesion and its survival (usually as a way of excluding immigrants or competing ethnic groups), and if it is willing to allow the sacrifice involved in temporarily setting aside the world language it uses at present in favour of developing its indigenous language(s), then rapid development, at least within the country, can take place (as it has for Bahasa Malaysia where resources in manpower training, materials by way of textbooks and supplementary writings, and government policy demanding competence in the intellectualised variety for qualification in civil service jobs and for national examinations, were made available). Other countries less economically blessed, or having a different set of priorities for development, may opt rather for a token development of the national language in favour of real development of an international language. Again, in the Philippines, the issue is a cause of division, with those favouring the maintenance of English being in the majority but without explicitly declaring themselves so because of nationalistic image-building, and the minority nationalists who insist on going the way of Malaysia with its risks and hopefully temporary setbacks as a result of the transition. The full intellectualisation of Filipino and many other languages thus remains problematic, and without a clear and easy solution.

Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Andrew Gonzalez, FSC, De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines .

References

- Alisjahbana, S.T. (1976) *Language Planning and Modernization: The Case of Indonesian and Malaysian*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (1975) *The Filipino Bilingual's Competence: A Model Based on an Analysis of Tagalog-English Code-switching*. Pacific Linguistics Series C-No. 59. Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (1990) Tagalog-English code-switching revisited. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 21 (2), 15-29.
- Bautista, M.L.S. (1991) Code-switching studies in the Philippines. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 88, 19-32.
- Bautista, M.L.S. and Gonzalez, A.B. (1994) Language reform in Tagalog-based Filipino (Pilipino). In I. Fodor and C. Hagège (eds) *Language Reform History and Future* (pp. 643-60). Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Constantino, R. (1982) *The Miseducation of the Filipino* (pamphlet edition). Quezon City: Foundation for Nationalist Studies.

- Del Rosario, G. (1981) Ang maugnaying talasalitaan sa Agham at Aghimuan [The Maignayin Vocabulary in Science and Technology]. In M.L.S. Bautista and A. Gonzalez (eds) *Aspects of Language Planning and Development in the Philippines* (pp. 87–95). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Department of Education and Culture and Sports (DEC). (1974) *Implementing Guidelines for the Policy on Bilingual Education*. DEC Memo 25, series 1974. Manila: Republic of the Philippines.
- Enriquez, V.P. and Antonio, L.F. (1973) *Diwa: Katipunan ng mga lathalaing pangsikolohiya* [Thoughts: Collections of psychology publications].
- Ferguson, C. (1968) Language development. In J. Fishman, C. Ferguson and J. Das Gupta (eds) *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (pp. 27–35). New York: John Wiley.
- Fishman, J.A. (1984) On the peculiar problems of smaller national languages. In A. Gonzalez (ed.) *Panagani-Essays in Honor of Bonifacio P. Sibayan on his 67th Birthday* (pp. 40–45). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Garvin, P.L. and Mathiot, M. (1968) The urbanization of the Guarani language: A problem in language and culture. In J. Fishman (ed.) *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (pp. 365–74). The Hague: Mouton.
- Gilson, E. (1938) *Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.
- Gonzalez, A.B. (1980) *Language and Nationalism. The Philippine Experience Thus Far*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Gonzalez, A.B. (1988) The intellectualization of Filipino. Agenda for the twenty-first century. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 20 (2) (December), 3–6.
- Gonzalez, A.B. (1992) Reconceptualization, translation and the intellectualization of a third world language: The case of Filipino. In K. Bolton and H. Khaw (eds) *Sociolinguistics Today: International Perspectives* (pp. 300–22). London: Routledge.
- Gonzalez, A.B. and Bautista, M.L.S. (1981) *Aspects of Language Planning and Development in the Philippines*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Gonzalez, A. and Kaluag, A. (forthcoming) *The Spanish Grammatical Sources of Lope K. Santos' Balarila*. Manila: De La Salle University.
- Gonzalez, A., Postrado, L., Matociños, A.M. and Jimenez, T.R. (1983) *Preference for Pilipino Terms Related to Sex and Population Education. A Guide to Usage*. Manila: Integrated Research Center, De La Salle University.
- Haugen, E. (1968) The Scandinavian languages as cultural artifacts. In J. Fishman, C. Ferguson and J. Das Gupta (eds) *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (pp. 267–284). New York: John Wiley.
- Hidalgo, C. (1977) *Philippine Lexicography from 1521 to the Present*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines.
- Joaquin, N. (1999) *Manila, My Manila*. Manila: Bookmark.
- Kuhn, T. (1970) *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lupon sa Agham, Pambansang Patnugutan sa Paunlarang Pang-Agham [Science Committee, National Science Development Board] (1969) *Maignaying talasalitaang pang-agham: Ingles-Pilipino*. [Inter-Related Science Dictionary] Ermita, Manila: National Science Development Board
- Maritain, J. (1948) *A Preface to Metaphysics: Seven Lectures on Being*. New York: Sheed & Ward.
- Miranda, B.T. (1996) *Panimulang Kemistri* [Beginning Chemistry]. Quezon City: Sistemang Unibersidad ng Pilipinas.
- Omar, A.H. (1979) *Language Planning for Unity in Efficiency: A Study of the Language Status and Corpus Planning of Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Universiti Malaya.
- Pascasio, E.M. (1978) Dynamics of code switching in the business domain. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 9 (1 & 2) (June and December), 40–50.
- Pascasio, E.M. (1984) Philippine bilingualism and code switching. In A. Gonzalez (ed.) *Panagani-Essays in Honor of Bonifacio P. Sibayan on his 67th Birthday* (pp. 122–34). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Philippine Journal of Linguistics* (1988) Setting a research agenda for the intellectualization of Filipino. *Special Issue* 20 (2) (December).

- Santiago, A.O. (1979) The elaboration of a technical lexicon of Pilipino. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ateneo de Manila-Philippine Normal College Consortium, Manila.
- Santos, V.C. (1978) *Vicassin's Pilipino-English Dictionary*. Manila: National Book Store.
- Schumacher, J.N. (1973) *The Propaganda Movement: 1880-1895. The Creators of a Filipino Consciousness, the Makers of the Revolution*. Manila: Solidaridad.
- Segovia, L.Z. (1988) The implementation of the bilingual education policy at the tertiary level. In A. Gonzalez and B.P. Sibayan (eds) *Evaluating Bilingual Education in the Philippines (1974-1985)* (pp. 71-98). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Serrano Laktaw, P. (1914) *Diccionario Tagalog-Hispano*. Manila: Imprenta y Litografia de Santos y Bernal.
- Sibayan, B.P. (1985) Reflections, assertions and speculations on the growth of Pilipino. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science* 13 (1), 40-51. In E.C.Y. Kuo (ed) Special focus issue on sociolinguistics in Southeast Asia.
- Sibayan, B.P. (1989) Language domains and the development of Filipino. *Perspective* 9 (3) (September), 24-7 and 9 (4) (December), 26-31.
- Sibayan, B.P. (1991) The intellectualization of Filipino. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 88, 59-82. Also B.P. Sibayan and A. Gonzalez (eds) *Sociolinguistic Studies in the Philippines*.
- Tengonciang, S.G. (1978) *Ang Kemistri sa araw-araw na pamumuhay [Chemistry in Everyday Living]*. Quezon City: Manlapaz.
- Thomas L.L. (1957) *The Linguistic Theory of N.Y. Marr*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Tullao, T. S., Jr. (1999) *Unawain natin ang Ekonomiks sa diwang Pilipino [Understanding Economics in Filipino]* (teacher's guide) (2nd edn). Quezon City: SIBS Publishing House.