

philippine studies

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

Philippine Who's Who

Review Author: Antonio G. Manuud

Philippine Studies vol. 7, no. 2 (1959): 248–250

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

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

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

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 30 13:30:20 2008

nesian languages at the time of their origin? The author supposes that the Chinese words were monosyllabic; if so, then we can presume that the pitch at that time had phoneme value as well. The Indonesian speech-community did not take over the pitch as phoneme. But if we disregard the pitch, a Chinese word can have many meanings so that it is very easy to find correspondences in meaning.

Fortunately this difficulty is eliminated to a great extent by using compound words. For instance, the Chinese *ka*, prescinding from the pitch can have many meanings; the same is true with *tiék*; but *katiek*, even regardless of the pitch, can only have one meaning; "fastened bamboo"—at least according to a Chinese informant I have consulted.

All these difficulties sound serious in the abstract, and the possible critic has the right to be skeptical of Mr. Manuel's work. But in the concrete I have the impression that these difficulties do not vitiate Manuel's work because of the multitude of examples offered by him. Moreover the conservatism itself (in some respects) of Tagalog would seem to give enough probability to his statements. At least I hope that eventually it will become clear that Arsenio Manuel is right in his inferences.

EUGENE VERSTRAELEN

PHILIPPINE WHO'S WHO

THE PHILIPPINES WHO'S WHO. By Isidro L. Retizos and D. H. Soriano. Capitol Publishing House. Quezon City. 1957. Pp. xlii, 327.

TABLEAU. Encyclopedia of Distinguished Personalities in the Philippines. Edited by Godofredo Jacinto et al. National Souvenir Publications. Manila. 1957. Pp. xxiii, 1-a (sic) to 658.

The volume by Messrs. Retizos and Soriano is welcome in spite of limitations which the authors themselves are quick to acknowledge. "We have," they confess, "inadvertently overlooked a good number of names." The fact is that there are in their book 398 entries all together, two short of the 400 claimed in the foreword. Of these entries, 149 are names of political figures, 64 are businessmen. Add to these the 89 representing careermen in the government (including those in the foreign service), and you have over three quarters of the book.

A sociology student might regard this as symptomatic of the Filipino's fondness for the limelight focused on high political office, espe-

cially since the authors saw fit to cite but 28 men in education, nine in scientific endeavors, only one in belles lettres, and only one in religion. Are we to infer from the selection that very few Filipinos, or Philippine residents, have (a) distinguished themselves in fields other than politics, or (b) attained to non-political positions and offices that by their very weight and nobility confer importance on the persons who hold them?

To cite some instances: We missed among many others the names of Nick Joaquin and N. V. M. Gonzalez among the writers, of Jovita Fuentes and Ramon Tapales in music, of Jean Edades and the Avellanas in theatre arts, and finally the names of *all* the country's worthy painters from Don Fernando Amorsolo to Don Fernando Zóbel.

As to those whose high office invests them with importance and dignity, surely among the most deserving of mention are the Roman Catholic archbishops and bishops who exercise pastoral authority over 80% of the country's population. Not one is listed. The reader would furthermore expect mention of the rector of the oldest and one of the largest among the universities in the Orient. His name is not on the list, nor for that matter are the names of several other presidents of the many notable, and in some cases noble universities and colleges in the land, e.g., the rector of the hundred year-old Ateneo de Manila, alma mater of Rizal. In this connection, it is interesting though probably irrelevant to note that close to 15% of those listed in the *Who's Who* of Messrs. Retizos and Soriano are Ateneo alumni.

Apart from this, the book has many excellences: it includes short biographies of the more outstanding Filipinos whom death has disqualified from the main listing; it presents little write-ups of all the Philippine administrators and presidents from the days of the First Republic; and it explains, finally, in the beautiful prose of Mr. Leon Ma. Guerrero, the manner in which Filipinos choose their heroes: "...we reserve our highest homage and deepest love for Christ-like victims whose mission is to consummate, by their tragic 'failure,' the redemption of our nation... When, at their appointed time, they die, we feel that all of us have died with them, but also that by their death we have been saved, and shall live again, in freedom, peace, and greatness."

As for the book entitled *Tableau*, there appears little else we can do for or about it, except perhaps suggest it as a rare item for curio collectors. Its baroque layout matches the lavish and rhapsodic style of its writing. The definition of the book's objective is typical: "In this volume are portrayed men and women who have consistently and untiringly replenished the ever-demanded supply line of the mammoth storehouse of peerless and grandiose Filipino achievements through all the principal inroads of intellectual functions and activities. Spotlighted

are luminaries who have carved niches in the Philippine historical firmament with dazzling brilliance and towed the Philippine star of promise in the dizzying heights of present-day atmosphere. We have searched deep and wide in the panorama of Philippine personalities with such siftingly selective eyes that in the process only the refined, only the brilliant, only the constant remain." The editors, however, show themselves no more fastidious in their choice of persons than in the unconventional diction of their prose.

ANTONIO G. MANUUD

AGAINST "INTELLECTUALISM"

THE PROXIMATE AIM OF EDUCATION. A Study of the Proper and Immediate End of Education. By Kevin J. O'Brien, C.S.S.R., M.A. The Bruce Publishing Company. Milwaukee. 1958. Pp. x, 267.

In his insistence upon Christian perfection as the *proximate* end of education, Father O'Brien intends to part company with those Catholic philosophers of education whom he terms the "Intellectualists." He sums up the intellectualist view as follows: "The school's proximate end is intellectual formation. Its remote end to which intellectual formation, a good in itself, is directly ordained, is man's Christian perfection. Its ultimate end is man's possession of God in heaven."

According to the author, this view cannot be reconciled with Papal doctrine on the end of education. The Popes do not speak of Christian perfection as a remote end, nor as an end pertaining merely to the integrity of education; they describe it as a proximate, essential end. "The teacher in the school is to be immediately and essentially concerned with the pupil's moral formation in Christ." Moral formation and intellectual formation: this is the proximate end of true education. Nor do the Popes make any distinction between "education" and the "school."

After developing his main thesis that Christian perfection is the proximate end of the school's activity, the author then proceeds to explain the teaching function of the school in a manner which, to this reviewer, seems to be scarcely reconcilable with his main thesis. As the author himself might express it (for he shows himself extremely fond of homely illustrations) he goes around a sharp corner without sufficiently signaling for the turn.