

philippine studies

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

Filipino English Poetry: A Double Alienation: Philippine Contemporary Poetry

Review Author: Francisco Arcellana

Philippine Studies vol. 14, no. 3 (1966): 541–543

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 27 13:30:20 2008

of faith (no beatific vision), possessing no hierarchical functions (she is a woman). For a more worked-out example of Mariology according to these principles Laurentin refers the reader to his earlier book, *Court traité de théologie mariale* (*Queen of heaven*, Dublin, 1956).

Laurentin proposes the problem very forcefully. Unfortunately I find his solution sadly deficient. Neither of Laurentin's books mentioned above explains what is meant by Mary's spiritual motherhood or her mediation. Fr. Laurentin actually seems embarrassed by these doctrines. He mentions them only to censure those who would impose exaggerated meanings on these titles. But he proposes no positive explanation of his own. And this, I think, is the main flaw in Laurentin's position. For if he would bridge the gap between Marian devotion and true Marian doctrine, Mary's spiritual motherhood should be the central focus of his explanation. For it is on this point that the two main schools of Mariology never fail to clash. The Church looks on Mary as its "Mother". And the Catholic must be made to see how this doctrine detracts nothing from Christ's unique mediation. As long as this question is not met, there can be no organic unity in the Church's Mariology. Curiously enough, Laurentin's fundamental principle cited above furnishes the key to a positive solution such as that expounded by Fr. Schillebeeckx in his book, *Mary, Mother of the redemption* (New York-London, 1964). Perhaps Fr. Laurentin does not pursue the question to its final conclusion, because he does not wish to "arouse internal opposition nor give ecumenical offense." But then how else can we unravel the knot that Laurentin himself spotlights so clearly in his book?

EDUARDO P. HONTIVEROS, S.J.

FILIPINO ENGLISH POETRY: A DOUBLE ALIENATION

PHILIPPINE CONTEMPORARY POETRY. *The Beloit Poetry Journal* 14:4 (Summer 1964).

How universal after all is the difficulty of recognizing poetry, how it is after all everywhere elusive! Rare is the knowledge of poetry: rare has it ever been, rare now, rare (it seems) shall it always be—here, there, everywhere, wherever human beings are, wherever moves the spirit, rare. And even more rare, the power to create it—for if poetry is not anything, it is not uncreated.

Consider these twenty-eight poems written in English by sixteen Filipinos. Wasn't it Sartre who said you speak in your native tongue

but always write in a foreign language? Allow me to extend the statement to apply to the situation in prose and poetry: prose you write in your native tongue, poetry you compose in a foreign language. A poem written in English by a Filipino is therefore twice-removed: it is a double alienation: he is separated from the fact of poetry by the language and by the nature of poetry itself. The implication is that whatever language a poem is written, it is always written in a foreign language.

So, first, there is the formidable matter of language which, for the Filipino writer in English, is a formidable matter indeed: English is, to the Filipino, not only a foreign language, it is also largely an uncreated one. Impossible for the Filipino writer to create poetry in a language which is, for him, largely uncreated!

Then, there is the no less formidable matter of art itself, poetry, the artist, the poet, reality. As text for this review, let me quote Richard Wilbur:

.... The relation between the artist and reality is always an oblique one, and indeed there is no good art which is not consciously oblique. If you respect the reality of the world, you know that you can only approach that reality by indirect means. The painter who throws away the frame and rebels at composition is not a painter any more: he thinks the world is himself, and that there is no need of a devious and delimited struggle with it. He lacks that feeling of inadequacy which must precede every genuine act of creation.

So that paradoxically it is respect for reality which makes a necessity of artifice. Poetry's prime weapon is words, used for the naming, comparison and contrast of things. Its auxiliary weapons are rhythms, formal patterns, and rhymes. It is by means of all these that poets create difficulties for themselves, which they then try to surmount. I can't see that any of them needs or ought to be dispensed with.

In some of these poems, the relation (essential to art) between the artist and reality is not even achieved—the disabling circumstance being the situation itself (if the language is not real, how can the life, which that language utters, be?) and the nature of poetry itself. In poems where the relation is achieved, it is not oblique enough. Poetry is indirection—if it is anything.

The form (or forms) of poetry is part of that indirection: it is the frame that encloses. The poet who throws away the frame is not a poet any longer: Frost's tennis player with the net down.

In most of these poems, no difficulties are created by the poets: where there are no difficulties, there can't be difficulties to overcome.

And poets, by their very nature, must overcome.

Where difficulties are created by the poets themselves, only in four poems by as many poets are the difficulties overcome.

In the rest, the poets do not overcome their self-created difficulties: it is the poets who are overcome.

FRANCISCO ARCELLANA

INTERNATIONAL LIQUIDITY AND DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY ISSUES AND THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. New York: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 1965. 33 pp.

This is the report of the group of experts convened by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to consider problems of trade and development in the context of current studies on the future of the international monetary system. The primary conclusion reached by the report is the feasibility and desirability of establishing "a link between the creation of international liquidity and the provision of development finance, without detriment to either process."

As a logical setting to this conclusion, the report first presents the forceful need for a reform in the world's monetary system. The need is based chiefly on two factors, both adverse to developing countries—the past and future trends of world trade and the competitive struggle among developed countries to maintain equilibrium or surpluses in their balance-of-payments. The report states, for instance, that participation of developing countries in world exports fell from almost 33 percent in 1950 to 20 percent in 1964. In addition, the terms of trade also have moved in favor of developed countries.

The net effect is chronic and acute pressure on developing countries to adjust to trade imbalances, often as if the adjustments were the overriding national economic concern. Such imbalances are expected to remain in the future along with declining rates of growth. Already, the annual growth rate of developing countries has decelerated from about five percent in the early 1950's to four percent in the 1960's. In the meantime, the flow of long-term capital and aid to developing countries has not increased since 1961 from a moderate dimension of