

REVISITING THE CONTROVERSIAL CATEGORY OF EXPOSITORY PHILOSOPHICAL WRITING IN FILIPINO PHILOSOPHY

Feorillo Petronilo A. Demeterio III
De La Salle University, Philippines

This paper takes another look at the controversial category of expository philosophical writing in the context of Filipino philosophy. Expository philosophical writing is understood here as writing about the philosophical thoughts of a given philosopher, who is usually Western. This paper starts with how Quito and Abulad denounced this mode of philosophical writing as inferior. With Abulad's realization of the necessity of this mode of writing, the author took a parallel look at how he grappled with this controversial category from the late 1990s to the present. Agreeing with Abulad on the necessity of this mode of writing, this paper offers a typology of expository philosophical writing consisting of: 1) introductory/overview writing, 2) curation writing, 3) archeological writing, 4) forensic writing, 5) comparative writing, 6) polemic writing, 7) writing as a prelude to appropriation, and 8) writing in the Filipino language. This paper has two substantive sections. The first one catalogues eight typologies of expository philosophical writings together with their strengths and weaknesses. The second one sharpens further the idea of expository philosophical writing by contrasting it with related modes of philosophical writing. This paper will be useful to Filipino philosophy students, philosophy teachers, thesis advisers, and thesis panelists, as this paper attempted not only to clear away the mark of inferiority that Filipino philosophy placed on expository philosophical writing but more so to provide some guideposts on how specific types of expository philosophical writings should be pursued by Filipino researchers of philosophy.

Keywords: Emerita Quito, Expository Philosophical Writing, Filipino Philosophy, Philosophical Research, Romualdo Abulad

INTRODUCTION

Philosophy can talk about so many things. It can talk about the physical world, although this subject matter is being more and more taken over by the natural sciences. It can talk about the social world, although this subject matter is also being more and

more taken over by the social sciences. It can talk about man's internal world. It can talk as well about the various intersections of these three worlds. This paper is concerned with a different level of discourse when philosophy talks about how other people (whom we usually know as philosophers) talk about any of these three worlds or their various intersections. In Filipino philosophy, we refer to this level of discourse as expository philosophical writing. This mode of doing philosophy gained some sort of notoriety when the grand dame of Filipino philosophy Emerita Quito (1929-2017), subtly marked it as inferior to real philosophizing (Quito 1983, 9).

Let us pause for a moment here and try to contextualize Quito's subtle denunciation of this mode of philosophizing. Quito was one of the Filipino philosophers who opened the floodgates of Western philosophical theories that inundated our once-parched land that knew only the philosophies of Thomas Aquinas and the Scholastics. This created a season of enlightenment and a season of darkness. Enlightenment in the sense that the excitement generated by this influx of intellectual novelties resulted in a stream of philosophical papers about how this or that philosopher talks about any of the three aforementioned worlds or their various intersections. Darkness in the sense that in that period many of our aspiring philosophical writers were most probably ill-mentored and were most surely working on meager bibliographic resources with very little chance of accessing the original texts of their chosen philosophers and no chance at all of perusing through their archives. It was also a time when most of our own philosophical figures were problematizing the absence or underdevelopment of our own Filipino philosophy. Thus, the piles of articles and book chapters that they produced were not very impressive, both per se or from the eyes of these philosophical figures.

Romualdo Abulad (1947-2019), who rightfully considered Quito as his mentor, followed her subtle denunciation of expository philosophical writing. In a less subtle way, Abulad periodized Filipino philosophical writings into four, namely: 1) the first colonial phase, which is dominated by Thomism and Scholasticism; 2) the second colonial phase, which is characterized by the influx of foreign philosophies; 3) the early phase of indigenization, which is focused on the search and construction of a nationalist philosophy; and 4) the late phase of indigenization, which is a movement away from the concerns of the preceding period (Abulad 1988, 3-11). Writing at a time when the Filipinization of philosophy was the overarching trend, Abulad's association of expository philosophical writing with the category of colonization was a clearer denunciation of such a mode of philosophizing. To dramatize his dislike for expository philosophical writing, Florentino Hornedo (1938-2015), another iconic figure in Filipino philosophy, coined the term "intellectual necrophilia" (cited by Altez-Albela 2016, 66). In many of my articles, I also marked expository philosophical writing as an inferior mode of doing philosophy (Demeterio 1999, Demeterio 2014, Demeterio 2020a).

In 2016, Abulad expressed his change of heart towards expository philosophical writing as something necessary for philosophical apprenticeship (Abulad 2016, 4). This view is something that was already contained in his paper published four years prior to his association of expository philosophical writing with colonization when he emphasized that a person engaged in this kind of philosophical activity would "profit

from an intense and thorough absorption in some great philosophical system” (Abulad 1984, 23). There must be good and bad expository philosophical writing. Filipino philosophy had the misfortune of having a tremendous amount of bad expository philosophical materials that led to the feeling of senselessness and discontent and eventually resulted in the blanket denunciation of expository philosophical writing as something inferior. But how to write a good expository philosophical paper is something that was not tackled clearly by Abulad, as he merely challenged Filipino scholars of philosophy to excel in their craft.

I had more than a decade of experience as a philosophy research teacher and coordinator for undergraduate student research at the defunct Department of Philosophy and Human Resources at the then San Beda College and I still supervise the term papers, theses, and dissertations of some philosophy graduate students from time to time at De La Salle University, and the question on how to write a good expository philosophical paper haunted me and still haunts me. In this paper, I will attempt to offer a partial solution to this persistent question by laying down a typology of expository philosophical papers. The examples that I will mention are overdetermined by my being a Filipino philosophy and cultural studies scholar. I may not be able to fully guide everyone on how to actually write this or that specific type, but at least this paper will open the possibility for other Filipino philosophy writers and teachers of philosophical research to contribute to how each type can be written well.

International literature does not give us much on what are the types of expository philosophical papers, as such literature tends to dwell on the technicalities of writing philosophical research papers. This gap in the international literature reinforces my initial assumption that the stature of expository philosophical writing may be relevant only within the context of Filipino philosophy and not in other places of the world. A short document entitled “Statement on Research” from the American Philosophical Association, however, provides a scant starting point for our project as it states that research in philosophy could focus on refining analyses, development, advancement and criticism of interpretations, exploration of alternative perspectives and new ways of thinking, suggestion, and application of modified or new modes of assessment, and promotion of new understanding (American Philosophical Association 1996). This scant starting point does not pertain to expository philosophical writing in particular but to philosophical writing in general.

In the late 1990s, I already grappled with the same problem in an unpublished textbook *Thesis Writing Manual for Filipino Philosophy Students*, where I stated: “It is fine if Filipino philosophy students decide to study foreign philosophies as long as they will not forget that ultimately the purpose of these foreign philosophies is to provide conceptual tools for all of us to grapple with our own philosophical problems” (Demeterio 1998, 12). In that same work, I also already noticed the trend in Filipino philosophy, as primarily advocated by Rolando Gripaldo, that studies the philosophical contributions of Filipino intellectuals (Demeterio 1998, 12). Thus, while I tended to mark expository philosophical writing as inferior, I gave it some leeway as long as; first, it can provide Filipino philosophy with conceptual tools and, second, it deals with the philosophies of Filipino intellectuals.

This paper has two substantive sections. The first one catalogues eight types of expository philosophical writings together with their strengths and weaknesses. The second one sharpens further the idea of expository philosophical writing by contrasting it with related modes of philosophical writing taken from the 12 modes of Filipino philosophical writing that I catalogued in 2014 (Demeterio 2014b). This paper will be useful to Filipino philosophy students, philosophy teachers, thesis advisers, and thesis panelists, as this paper will attempt not only to clear away the mark of inferiority that Filipino philosophy placed on expository philosophical writing but more so to provide some guideposts on how specific types of expository philosophical writings should be pursued by Filipino researchers of philosophy. This paper sincerely hopes that other Filipino teachers and researchers of philosophy will critique, refine, and add to the types and guideposts initially offered by this paper for the benefit of the further development of philosophical research in our country.

TYPES OF EXPOSITORY PHILOSOPHICAL WRITING

Expository philosophical writing is understood in this paper as a philosophical discourse that talks about the philosophical discourse of a given philosopher. I have identified, from the scant literature and my previous writings, eight types of expository philosophical writings, namely: 1) introductory/overview writing, 2) curation writing, 3) archeological writing, 4) forensic writing, 5) comparative writing, 6) polemic writing, 7) writing as a prelude to appropriation, and 8) writing in the Filipino language. Each of these types will be thoroughly explained in the succeeding subsections.

Introductory/Overview Writing

This is the type of expository philosophical writing that Filipino philosophy is particularly wary about. This is the prime analogate of expository philosophical writing in the Philippines that unfortunately caused the mark of inferiority for expository philosophical writing in general. This type of writing attempts to portray the philosophical corpus of a given philosopher or aspects of such corpus in a journal article, thesis, dissertation, book chapter, or book. Here, breadth is more important than depth, as depth can be taken care of by the succeeding writers. This type of philosophical writing is actually useful in popularizing the covered philosophers, in making their thoughts immediately accessible, and in providing a conceptual bridge for the yet uninitiated readers toward the primary texts of the covered philosophers.

The primary problem with this kind of expository writing is the possibility of repeating what has been published already. This problem can be solved with a diligent literature review using easily available internet-based search engines that contain up-to-date materials. During the time of Quito, this literature review based on up-to-date materials was almost impossible to undertake. I can still remember how frustrating it was to use the physical catalog of even of our best libraries in Metro Manila. I am not sure how many of our younger Filipino philosophy scholars were able to use or even see those clumsy chests of drawers resembling Chinese medicine cabinets that contain

references and cross-references of authors, keywords, and titles. Another problem with this kind of expository writing is our lack of access to the covered Western thinker's unpublished materials that are usually archived somewhere in the West.

I had a satisfactory experience pursuing this kind of expository writing on the philosophy of the American Iris Marion Young (1949-2006), where I systematized her thoughts in a single journal article (Demeterio 2014b). I was certain that in 2013, I was the first one to do such a thing, based on a literature review using Google Scholar. Although I did not have access to Young's archive, most of her publications were accessible to me. I was lucky that the philosopher that I covered was an Anglophone. Things would have been entirely different if she were German or French. It would be very difficult to do expository philosophical writing about a philosopher whose language is inaccessible to the one doing such writing as he/she will be forced to wait for accessible translations, and by the time such translations are available, there would have been so many introductory/overview writings published already.

The study of the philosophical contribution of Filipino intellectuals that I already mentioned above most often belongs to this type of expository philosophical writing. It was very easy for Filipino philosophy to see its value because there is very scant literature on philosophy and these intellectuals. If and when these intellectuals have their archives, it would be easier for us to access these. If these intellectuals do not have their archives, which is often the case, our research about them can be enriched by interviews with them if they are still alive or with their contemporaries and descendants if they are already deceased.

Curation Writing

Whereas introductory/overview writing tends to be repetitive, curation writing is an expository philosophical writing that consciously aims at presenting a new perspective on a philosopher who is already fairly known, or at least at inviting a fresh look on such a philosopher. Let us take museum curation as our analogy here. The curator has a collection of artifacts. Most of these artifacts were already exhibited in one of the museum's galleries. But in planning for a new exhibit, the curator can make that particular exhibit unique by deciding which artifacts to show, which artifacts to hide, even which artifacts to borrow from other collections, which of the artifacts' individual facets will be highlighted, and how these artifacts will be arranged. An exhibition is an assemblage, you add an artifact or subtract an artifact or tweak the constellation of artifacts, and the message of the whole assemblage will change as well. The curator aims to make a new presentation of the artifacts without thinking that the other previous and contemporaneous presentations were and are wrong or inferior. Here, depth is more important than breadth, as breadth can be taken care of by introductory/overview writing.

This type of philosophical writing is useful in the sense that the intellectual corpus of a given philosopher is something that cannot be captured by uniform introductory/overview write-ups. Even aspects of such corpus will not yield some uniform interpretations. Furthermore, the milieu of the writer will also affect which aspects of the said philosophical corpus need to be highlighted and how such aspects

be interpreted. The interplay among the diachronic and synchronic dimensions of the covered philosopher's corpus, as well as the demands of the writer's milieu, can potentially explode into an infinite number of possible curations.

This type of expository philosophical writing needs a keener knowledge of the literature in order for the writer to be able to visualize his/her new way of presentation of the thoughts of the covered philosopher. Whereas a literature review for introductory/overview writing is concerned with what is already in the literature, a literature review for curation writing is concerned with how the individual published materials presented the covered philosopher. Curation writing also needs a deeper knowledge of the intellectual corpus of the covered philosopher. In introductory/overview writing, it is possible for the writer to put into his/her text everything he/she knows about the thoughts of the covered philosopher, but in curation writing, what will eventually appear in the write-up could just be a fraction of what the writer knows about his/her covered philosopher, just as the museum curator only puts on the gallery a small fraction of artifacts from the same collection while keeping the rest hidden in the museum vaults. Access to the covered philosopher's archives is not as crucial here as in the case of introductory/overview writing.

I had a satisfactory experience pursuing this kind of expository writing on the cosmology of Plato when I worked on my licentiate in philosophy thesis that shortly after, I reworked for my master's thesis (Demeterio 1992). Plato is usually represented as an idealist, metaphysician, moral theorist, and political philosopher, and very rarely as a mathematical cosmologist. I gathered a few scant references to Plato as a cosmologist and made them the starting point of my own curation writing. This project was done during the time when the Chinese medicine cabinet catalogs were still the search engines, and I had to rely more on the relatively excellent book collections of the University of Santo Tomas, as well as on the contextual knowledge of my mentor, Fr. Dr. Norberto Castillo, OP. I compensated for the complexity and shortcomings of using those Chinese medicine cabinets with long hours of library work, spending a whole summer on my preliminary research. Since curation writing is not concerned about who makes the first write-up, the language barrier is not as significant here as in the case of introductory/overview writing. We can rely on the massive translation industry of our Anglophone friends in the West. In my case, I wrestled with Plato with my rudimentary Biblical Greek.

Archeological Writing

The name has nothing to do with the elaborate methodology developed by Michel Foucault (1926-1984), which he called the archeology of knowledge. Instead, let us take the discipline of archeology as our analogy here. Foucault probably also considered this analogy when he named his elaborate methodology. The archeologist digs for artifacts. Sometimes, they know what they are looking for. For example, a shard of an important pottery might spur him/her to look for other fragments to be able to recreate that ceramic piece. Other times, the archeologist will just accidentally stumble on an artifact that would change the general narrative connected to such artifact. For example, a bronzeware that, after some laboratory analyses, turned out to

be older than the general starting point of the Bronze Age would cause the revision of the general starting point of the said age. Archeological writing is a search for some missing pieces that would eventually complete the overall presentation of the thoughts of a covered philosopher. It could also be a project that is focused on coming up with a clearer interpretation of some hazy aspects of the overall thoughts of the covered philosopher. Archeological writing could also be a serendipitous finding of a previously unknown manuscript or obscure publication of a covered philosopher that is followed by trying to piece back such finding on the overall thoughts of the said philosopher. This piecing back may or may not change the general overall interpretation of the thoughts of the same philosopher. Here, the interplay between depth and breadth is crucial. Although the image of an archeologist digging would suggest the importance of depth, the not-so-vivid image of the same archeologist engaging in anastylosis of his/her shards would actually suggest the equal importance of breadth so that he/she can tell to which part a specific shard should be pieced back. This type of philosophical writing is useful because it can contribute either to a fuller or a new understanding of the thoughts of the covered philosopher.

This type of expository philosophical writing also needs a keener knowledge of the literature in order for the writer to be able to know the specific parts that are missing or are hazily understood within the overall thoughts of the covered philosopher or, in cases of serendipitous discovery of previously unknown parts to be able to know the value of such discovery, where to piece it back on the overall thoughts of the covered philosopher and sense if such piecing back would change the general overall interpretation of the thoughts of the same philosopher. Access to the covered philosopher's archives is more crucial here than in the case of introductory/overview writing, as more often, the missing pieces and previously unknown pieces come from unpublished documents than from obscure publications.

I did not have the chance to pursue this kind of expository philosophical writing, but we can easily think of a hypothetical scenario. I was tempted to talk about the lost books of Aristotle, but it would be advantageous to talk about something closer to us Filipinos. Jose Rizal's (1861-1896) status in Filipino philosophy is now more or less secured, and his correspondence with the Austrian orientalist Ferdinand Blumentritt (1853-1913) is a fairly known corpus. Rizal's letters to Blumentritt were carefully archived by Blumentritt, but most of Blumentritt's letters to Rizal were lost. Thus, what we have now is practically just half of their conversations. If, by some stroke of luck, we can retrieve the missing letters of Blumentritt suddenly for Rizal, we will better understand the contents of Rizal's letters to Blumentritt. Knowledge of the language of the philosopher covered is crucial here because the missing and serendipitous texts are almost certainly written in the said philosopher's original language. One might be tempted to say that since these missing and serendipitous texts are, more often than not, shorter textual pieces anyway and could be easily translated using today's powerful internet-based machine translators, thereby canceling the necessity of knowing the covered philosopher's original language. But one should not forget that archeological writing presupposes prolonged exposure to the covered philosopher's original texts and their intertexts, just as the archeologist undertakes the digging in the original locations of his/her covered interest.

Forensic Writing

Forensic writing has nothing to do with crime scene investigations popularized by the international television series *Crime Scene Investigation* (CSI) or by the local documentary series *Scene of Crime Operatives* (SOCO). The term forensic has another meaning related to legal and evidence-based argumentation, and this is the basis of the name for this particular type of expository philosophical writing as far as this paper is concerned. I could have used the term polemic, but I eventually decided to use that term for another type of expository philosophical writing. Forensic writing is about contesting a given interpretation and, consequently, providing an alternative interpretation of some aspects of the thoughts of a covered philosopher. It is related to curation writing in the sense that it proffers an alternative interpretation, but curation writing is not premised on contestations and does not insist that what it proffers is the correct or the better way of interpreting this or that aspect of the thoughts of a covered philosopher. Forensic writing is both critical and interpretive. Forensic writing could also be about siding with one existing interpretation against another and providing evidence-based argumentation for doing so. Here, depth is more important than breadth, as what is usually contested are aspects of the thoughts of a given philosopher rather than the totality of such thoughts. The totality of the thoughts of a given philosopher is also an assemblage that may change with the introduction of aspectual changes. But working on such consequential changes in the breadth of the thoughts of a given philosopher is already something that is derivative and beyond the scope of the original forensic write-up. Such changes in the assemblage can be taken care of by introductory/overview writing or curation writing. This type of philosophical writing is useful in sharpening the interpretations of the covered philosopher, opening further debates on the more tenable interpretations, and encouraging new interpretations.

This type of expository philosophical writing still needs a keener knowledge of the literature for the writer to detect contestable interpretations, or conflicting interpretations, of some aspects of the thoughts of a covered philosopher. Whereas a literature review for curation writing is concerned with how individual published materials presented the covered philosopher, a literature review for forensic writing compares potentially questionable interpretations of some aspects of the thoughts of the said philosopher and compares these with the intellectual corpus of such philosopher. Access to the covered philosopher's archives is even more crucial here than in the case of archeological writing because forensic writing always carries not only the burden of proving that an existing interpretation is defective but more so the burden of proffering something better. The twin tasks of critique and interpretation could depend so much on the unpublished materials of the covered philosopher.

I did not have the chance to pursue this kind of expository philosophical writing, but we can easily think of a hypothetical scenario again. With the surge of populism in Philippine politics, the mention of Plato's *The Republic* is a timely example. It is very easy for many scholars to state that this particular work of Plato is an anti-democratic discourse, as it clearly favors enlightened monarchy and aristocracy over timocracy, oligarchy, democracy, and tyranny. This superficial reading of Plato can

actually be contested. His types of political leadership need to be clarified first. Enlightened monarchy pertains to Plato's dream of having a philosopher king. Greek aristocracy means the rule of the best, which is in contrast to our current understanding of aristocracy as the rule of the nobility, the elite, or the wealthy. Thus, Plato's enlightened aristocracy pertains to having the best leaders who, at the same time, are trained in philosophy. On the other hand, Plato's democracy pertains to the rule of the largely ignorant masses, which is actually the populism that our country is experiencing at present. Thus, at a deeper reading, Plato's enlightened aristocracy, which is his alternative choice for the enlightened monarchy, is actually closer to our idealized notion of representative democracy, while his disfavored democracy is actually closer to the populism that many pro-democracy political thinkers also disfavor. Using Plato's types of political leadership, we can even say that while we have democracy in our country, the actual power is controlled by the oligarchs, or more accurately, by the plutocrats. Greek oligarchy means the rule of the few, while Greek plutocracy means the rule of the rich. We are actually confronted with the choice between the rule of the enlightened best leaders on the one hand and the collusion among the ignorant masses and the greedy plutocrats on the other hand. Without a reliable educational system for the people, Plato was suspicious of democracy. But even with our contemporary mass educational system, we still failed to produce our desired democratic citizenry, a citizenry that became even more intellectually vulnerable with the emergence of internet-based disinformation. Thus, Plato's *The Republic* is not just about condemning democracy, as it can actually help us visualize a better form of democracy. Plato does not have an archive, and I only whipped out this hypothetical scenario with my rudimentary Biblical Greek and the use of intertexts. But I think for more recent philosophers, their archives and original texts will be very important for forensic writing. Thus, knowledge of the original language of the covered philosopher is also important for this kind of expository philosophical writing.

Comparative Writing

This type of expository philosophical writing is composed of two or more introductory/overview writings that are followed by a point-by-point comparison and contrast. We have defined expository philosophical writing as a philosophical discourse that talks about the philosophical discourse of a given philosopher. Comparative writing happens to deal with two or more philosophers. There is actually a little curation writing involved here, in the sense that the presentations of the individual covered philosophers here are designed to have more or less the same point-by-point outline. Such parallelism facilitates the efficient comparison and contrast, which is actually the main feature of comparative writing. As primarily premised on introductory/overview writing, comparative writing is also more interested in breadth than depth. This type of philosophical writing is useful in trying to understand better the thoughts of each of the covered philosophers, as each thought system will be used as the Heideggerian fore-structures in grasping the sense of the other thought system/s.

This type of expository philosophical writing needs ample knowledge of the literature for the writer to be able ~~not only~~ to prove that a particular comparative project has not been done. Furthermore, such knowledge of ample literature enables the writer to conceptualize a justifiable, uniform point-by-point outline for the covered philosophers. Access to the covered philosophers' archives is not as crucial here as in the cases of introductory/overview, archeological, and forensic writings.

I had a satisfactory experience pursuing this kind of expository writing with one of my doctoral students when we compared and contrasted the effectiveness of the panopticon as theorized by Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and Foucault in analyzing the contemporary phenomenon of digital surveillance (Parreno & Demeterio 2021). The most challenging part of our project was actually the conceptualization of the uniform point-by-point outline for Bentham and Foucault's panoptic theories that would also fit into how we conceptualized the different modes of digital surveillance. A good way to undertake this conceptualization is to start with a table that we worked on and reworked after several returns to our literature. I have to admit that this work on Bentham and Foucault might not be a very neat example for beginners in comparative writing, as this work has already ventured into the application of philosophy to current problems. I have other works on comparative writing, such as the one on the novels of Albert Camus (1913-1960) and F. Sionil Jose (1924-2022) and the one on the murals of the Mexican Diego Rivera (1886-1957) and Carlos Francisco (1912-1969), and still another one on the Quito and Mary John Manzan (born: 1937) that I wrote with my former doctoral student (Demeterio 2008; Demeterio 2013b; Demeterio & Liwanag 2018). Except for Camus, Quito, and Manzan, our other subjects here are not philosophers. But I still believe that beginners in comparative philosophical writings will find these other works useful in the sense that these spent some paragraphs laying down the hermeneutics of Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) and Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900-2002) as the foundational framework for comparative writing in general. Similar to curation writing, comparative writing is also not concerned about who makes the first write-up, and neither is it concerned with the nitty-gritty items of archeological and forensic writings. Thus, the language barrier is not as significant in comparative writing, and again we can rely on the massive translation industry of our Anglophone friends in the West.

Polemic Writing

We have defined expository philosophical writing as a philosophical discourse that talks about the philosophical discourse of a given philosopher. Polemic writing talks about the philosophical discourse of a given philosopher in an unfavorable manner. I already alluded to the conceptual proximity of polemic writing to forensic writing. The crucial difference between these two types of expository philosophical writing is that forensic writing critiques a particular interpretation of the thoughts of a given philosopher, while polemic writing critiques the works, or aspects of such works, of the given philosopher him/herself. Both forensic and polemic writings should not be confused with critical Filipino philosophy because critical Filipino philosophy is not an expository philosophy but the application of some philosophical theories in critiquing

aspects of the Philippine world. Another difference between forensic and polemic writing is that forensic writing is obliged to proffer a new interpretation, while polemic writing may or may not do such a thing. Like forensic writing, polemic writing could also be about siding with one philosopher against another in a specific debate or in a conflicting view on a specific topic and providing evidence-based argumentation for doing so. Here, depth is again more important than breadth, as what is usually contested are aspects of the thoughts of a given philosopher rather than the totality of such thoughts.

Polemic writing is useful in sharpening our appreciation of the thoughts of the covered philosopher and in starting philosophical debates that would lead to new philosophical theorizing. Filipino writers are hesitant to undertake polemic writing, especially if the covered philosophers are living Filipinos, based on our collective valorization for smooth interpersonal relationships. But polemic writing can actually spur the development of Filipino philosophy.

This type of expository philosophical writing also needs a keener knowledge of the literature in order for the writer to be able not only to detect contestable aspects of the thought of a covered philosopher or conflicting views of the covered philosophers on a given topic but more so to be able to select the appropriate framework to be used for this critical project. This framework can be a philosophical theory or intertexts that will serve as the Archimedean point or the intellectual fulcrum that will enable the writer to pry loose the subject of his/her critique. Even if one will use the deconstructive reading of Jacques Derrida (1930-2004), wherein texts are critiqued using their own standards, Archimedean points will still be needed, although these will be gleaned from the same subject texts. Access to the covered philosopher/s' archives is not as crucial here as in the case of forensic writing because the writer can always delimit his/her critique on what I published.

I did not have the chance to pursue a full work of this kind of expository philosophical writing, but I can mention one fragmentary work that is embedded in my reading and reading of Quito and Filipino philosophy (Demeterio 1999 & Demeterio 2020b). Quito suggested that Rizal's Filosofo Tasio contributed to the circulation of the negative image of philosophy among Filipinos (Quito 1983, 9). In my first attempt to critique this insinuation, I used literary criticism as my Archimedean point and argued that Filosofo Tasio should not be a cause for the negative image of philosophy in the country, for on the contrary the character is actually a symptom of our country's lack of space for intellectuals, as the central intellectual sphere during Rizal's time was occupied by the Scholastics (Demeterio 1999, 9). Filosofo Tasio is actually a character archetype that is known in literary criticism as a *raisonneur*, and Rizal was forced to place him in the margins for the sake of realism (Demeterio 1999, 9). In my second attempt to critique the same insinuation, I was able to locate a historical text that was 33 years older than Rizal himself and 59 years older than the novel *Noli Me Tangere*, and this text documented the Filipinos' negative image of philosophy (Demeterio 2020b, 179). This text that I used as my Archimedean point is Henry Piddington's (1797-1858) 1828 book *Remarks on the Philippine Islands, and on their Capital, Manila: 1819 to 1822*, and it advises westerners who intend to visit the Philippines never to introduce

themselves as philosophers because such term is “an epithet of reproach” (Piddington 1828, 145). Just as polemic writing does not necessitate the use of the covered philosopher/s’ archives, knowledge of the original language of the covered philosopher is also not crucial here as in the case of forensic writing. The need to go back to the original contested texts can be taken care of by today’s powerful internet-based machine translators.

Writing as Prelude to Appropriation

This is a specific form of curation writing that is intended to present aspects of a covered philosopher’s thoughts that are useful as a theoretical framework in studying aspects of the Filipino world. This is accompanied by pointers on how to actually operationalize these thoughts in studying which aspects of the Filipino world. Here, breadth is more important than depth, as depth will be taken care of by those who will actually appropriate the pertinent thoughts of the covered philosopher. Writing as a prelude to appropriation is useful in inviting students and scholars in philosophy and related fields to appropriate the thoughts of the covered philosophers. More importantly, this type of expository writing is useful in providing them with a reliable introduction to the useful aspects of these philosophers’ thoughts. The actual appropriation of a given philosophy is a difficult mode of philosophizing as this will require mastery of the thoughts of the selected philosopher, as well as the mastery of that aspect of the Filipino world on which the selected thoughts will be applied as an analytic framework. It is in this sense that writing as a prelude to appropriation will substantially make the actual appropriation much easier to undertake.

This type of expository philosophical writing also needs ample knowledge of the literature for the writer to be able not only to prove that this particular project has not been done yet but more so to be able to know which aspects of the covered philosopher’s thoughts are relevant for appropriation and how these aspects are actually appropriated. Access to the covered philosophers’ archives is again not as crucial here as in the cases of introductory/overview, archeological, and forensic writings.

As an advocate of appropriative philosophical writing and critical Filipino philosophy, as well as a research teacher in cultural studies and Philippine studies, I have a fairly solid experience with this type of expository philosophical writing. I have authored and co-authored preludes to appropriation for cultural and Philippine studies and Filipino philosophy on Theodor Adorno (1903-1969), Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), and Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911); Heidegger, Rudolf Bultmann (1884-1976), and Gadamer; Jean-Francois Lyotard (1924-1998); Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002); and Jean Baudrillard (1929-2007) (Demeterio 2011b; Demeterio 2011a; Demeterio 2012a; Demeterio 2013a; Demeterio & Liwanag 2014; Demeterio & De Leon 2015). Many of my graduate students actually used these materials for their respective research projects. Like curation writing, writing as a prelude to appropriation does not necessitate knowledge of the original language of the covered philosophers.

Writing in Filipino Language

Expository philosophical writing in the Filipino language could be any of the previously mentioned seven types as long as this is pursued using the specified language. At this point, one could wonder why I made this a separate type of expository philosophical writing. The reason for this is that in Filipino philosophy, the choice of writing using the English or Filipino languages is never a neutral and superficial choice. Going for the Filipino language should be seen as a choice of opening up our writings to more Filipino readers and pulling our discourse closer to the Filipino world with all its problems and intellectual resources. I have personal experience using the analytics of Academia.edu to realize how my Filipino language papers are read much more than my English language papers. Thus, expository philosophical writing in the Filipino language could mean pulling these covered philosophers closer to our world and enriching our intellectual resources with their theories and categories. This kind of expository philosophical writing, therefore, is not only important for the development of Filipino philosophy but also for the development of the Filipino language and Filipino intellectual culture. It is very sad to note that this special kind of expository philosophical writing is being discriminated against by many Philippine journals, maybe because of their desire to attain international status, as well as by many colleges and universities, maybe because of their well-entrenched path dependence on the English language. It seemed that the pioneering efforts of Quito, Roque Ferriols (1924-2021), Abulad, and Florentino Timbreza (born: 1938) were not able to make a dent against our collective enchantment with the English language.

Since writing in the Filipino language could be any of the previously mentioned seven types of expository philosophical writing, it follows that access to the covered philosophers' archives, the nature of literature review, and the necessity of the knowledge of the covered philosophers' original language would be determined by the more specific type of expository philosophical writing that is being pursued. As somebody now belonging to the Department of Filipino at De La Salle University, I have a number of works that I authored and co-authored with my graduate students and former graduate students that strategically used the Filipino language.

OTHER MODES OF FILIPINO PHILOSOPHICAL WRITING THAT ARE CLOSE TO EXPOSITORY PHILOSOPHICAL WRITING

In my 2014 article "Assessing the Developmental Potentials of Some Twelve Discourses of Filipino Philosophy," I was able to identify twelve academic and textualized modes of Filipino philosophy (Demeterio 2014b, 191-192). The expository philosophical writing that this present paper talks about corresponds primarily to the first mode, Filipino philosophy as the exposition of foreign systems, and secondarily to the eleventh mode, Filipino philosophy as the study of Filipino philosophical luminaries. In this section, I mention, describe, and relate to expository philosophical writing some modes of Filipino philosophy that are very close to the mode that this paper talks about.

In the preceding section of this paper, I already mentioned two other modes of Filipino philosophy that are related to expository philosophical writing, namely critical Filipino philosophy and appropriative Filipino philosophy. Critical Filipino philosophy, which is the sixth mode in my 2014 article, could actually be considered a type of appropriative Filipino philosophy, which is the fourth mode in that same article. The other modes of Filipino philosophy that can also be considered as types of appropriative Filipino philosophy are Filipino philosophy as the application of logical analysis, which is the second mode, and Filipino philosophy as the application of phenomenology and hermeneutics, which is the third mode. In the sub-section on writing as a prelude to appropriation, I already mentioned that such a type of expository philosophical writing would make the actual appropriation of a given philosophy much easier to undertake. Such a statement, minus some degrees, maybe, could also be made about the other types of expository philosophical writing, as the one undertaking the actual appropriation would no longer be obliged to return to the scattered primary texts of the selected philosophers. Thus, expository philosophical writings are not only contributions to the development of Filipino philosophy on their own rights but could also potentially spur further developments in the more specific mode of appropriative Filipino philosophy.

Since I am an advocate of critical Filipino philosophy and appropriative Filipino philosophy, as well as a research teacher in cultural studies and Philippine studies, I have a number of works in these modes of Filipino philosophy, although I do not have any in the more specific mode of the application of logical analysis. Some of my works in these modes are even co-authored with my graduate students or former graduate students.

There is another mode of Filipino philosophy that I identified in my said 2014 article that is related to expository philosophical writing, namely revisionist writing. The term should not be confused with historical revisionism, which, I think, in the context of our country's fragile democracy, was already secretly concocted and slowly poured into the minds of Filipinos through social media at the time when I was writing that same article. Revisionist writing as a mode of Filipino philosophy is something that I picked up from Gripaldo when he advised Filipino philosophy scholars not to stop at the point when they have already mastered the biography, works, and theories of the foreign philosopher of their choice for there is always that possibility that they can create philosophy breakthroughs by going beyond the doctrines of their selected thinkers (Gripaldo 2009, 5). What is implied by Gripaldo is that it is perfectly all right to pursue various expository philosophical writings on the various aspects of the thoughts of a selected philosopher because there is this possibility that the one undertaking such writings will be able to build on the thoughts of that selected philosopher, or even over the ruins of such thoughts, something that is new and original. Thus, again expository philosophical writings are not only contributions to the development of Filipino philosophy themselves but could also serve as the starting points for the emergence of Filipino philosophy as revisionist writing.

I must admit that I do not have a full work that can be labeled as revisionist philosophical writing, but I do have small patches of revisions embedded in some of my works. In my book on the political ideologies of the Catholic Bishops' Conference

of the Philippines, I improved and sharpened the two-dimensional political construct of the Dutch political scientist Hans Slomp (born: 1945) (Demeterio 2012b, 18). In my paper on the drug war photo-documentation of the photographer Rafael Lerma (born, 1978), I turned upside down the semiotics of Roland Barthes (1915-1980) and called it counter-semiotics to enable it to analyze the icons used by the less privileged and dominated classes (Demeterio 2020b). In a paper that I co-authored with a former doctoral student on the capitals of some Filipina e-trepreneurs, we added emotional capital to the four main capitals of Bourdieu to make his theory more attuned to Filipino psychology (Resurreccion & Demeterio 2021).

CONCLUSION

This paper was able to demonstrate that expository philosophical writing per se is not something inferior. When properly pursued, it can be a legitimate and useful philosophical project. In its own right, it can already be a contribution to the development of Filipino philosophy, and as a preliminary material can contribute further to the development of the more specific modes of appropriative and revisionist Filipino philosophy. The logistic and human resource-related problems that badly affected the quality of expository philosophical writing during the time of Quito have now mostly receded into the horizon. Although Filipino philosophy scholars will still be challenged by our lack of access to foreign philosophers' archives and our lack of mastery of their original languages, the developments in information technology and artificial intelligence can more and more narrow these gaps. Furthermore, this paper was able to show that the necessity of the archives and original languages is not something that is uniform through all of the eight types of expository philosophical writing.

Aside from providing eight types of expository philosophical writing, which philosophy students, teachers, and scholars can confidently pursue, this paper also provided some guideposts on how these can be pursued better. I do not pretend that the eight types of expository philosophical writing that I discussed in this paper are exhaustive. I would be very glad if some other philosophy research teachers would point out some other types of this mode of writing. I do not pretend either that the guideposts that I presented are perfect and comprehensive. I would be very glad if some other philosophy research teachers would improve or critique these guideposts. What is important is that these types and guideposts are brought out into the open, as critique and additions to them are much easier to pursue than the efforts undertaken by this paper.

REFERENCES

- Abulad, Romualdo. 1984. Options for a Filipino philosophy. *Karunungan: Official Journal of the Philippine Academy of Philosophical Research*, pp. 17-30.
- Abulad, Romualdo. 1988. Contemporary Filipino philosophy. *Karunungan: Official Journal of the Philippine Academy of Philosophical Research*, pp. 1-13.

- Abulad, Romualdo. 2016. Doing philosophy in the Philippines: Towards a more responsive philosophy for the 21st century. *Suri: Journal of the Philosophical Association of the Philippines* 5 (1): 1-20.
- Altez-Albela, Fleurdeliz R. 2016. Phenomenologizing Filipino organic thought: Florentino H. Hornedo's philosophical anthropology. *Kritike: An Online Journal of philosophy* 10 (2): 61-67.
- American Philosophical Association. 1996. Statement on research. *American Philosophical Association Webpage*.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 1992. The history of Plato's theoretical physics. Master's thesis. Manila: University of Santo Tomas.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 1998. *Manual for a thesis work in philosophy: A guide for Filipino students, thesis advisers, and student research moderators*. Unpublished textbook. Manila: San Beda College.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 1999. Re-reading Emerita Quito's thoughts concerning the underdevelopment of Filipino philosophy. *Scientia: The Research Journal of the College of Arts & Sciences, San Beda College*.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2008. A comparative study on the theme of human existence in the novels of Albert Camus and F. Sionil Jose. *Kritike: An Online Journal of Philosophy* 2 (1): 50-67.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2011a. Ang Hermenyutika nina Friedrich Schleiermacher at Wilhelm Dilthey bilang batayang teoretikal sa araling Pilipino. *Kritike: An Online Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1): 1-14.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2011b. Ang pilosopiya ni Theodor W. Adorno bilang batayang teoretikal sa araling Pilipino. *Scientia: The Research Journal of the College of Arts & Sciences, San Beda College*, pp. 97-126.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2012a. Ang mga dialohikal na hermenyutika nina Martin Heidegger, Rudolf Bultmann at Hans-Georg Gadamer bilang batayang teoretikal sa araling Pilipino. *Kritike: An Online Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1): 17-39.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2012b. *Ang mga ideolohiyang politikal ng Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines: Isang pag-aaral sa mga piling pahayag mula sa limang panahon ng kontemporaryong eklesiastiko-politikal na kasaysayan ng Pilipinas*. Manila: De La Salle University Publishing House.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2013a. Ang pilosopiya ni Jean-Francois Lyotard bilang batayang teoretikal sa araling Pilipino. *Kritike: An Online Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1): 99-111.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2013b. Looking at Botong Francisco from the horizon of Diego Rivera: A visual dialogue between two modern muralists. *Philippiniana Sacra* 48 (144): 299-328.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2014a. Assessing the developmental potentials of some twelve discourses of Filipino philosophy." *Philippiniana Sacra* 69 (147): 189-230.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2014b. Iris Marion Young's theory of structural justice and collective responsibility. *Scientia: The Research Journal of the College of Arts & Sciences, San Beda College* 3: 185-212.

- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2020a. A Critical reflection on my reading and re-reading of Emerita Quito's thoughts on the underdevelopment and hope for the development of Filipino philosophy. *Philosophia: International Journal of Philosophy* 21 (2): 169-186.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2020b. Rafael Lerma's photojournalistic take on the Duterte administration's drug war: A counter-Barthesian semiological study. *Plaridel: A Philippine Journal of Communication, Media, and Society* 17 (1): 75-110.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. & De Leon, Emmanuel C. 2015. Ang pilosopiya ni Jean Baudrillard bilang batayang teoretikal sa araling Pilipino. *Kritike: An Online Journal of Philosophy* 9 (1): 08-123.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. & Liwanag, Leslie Anne L. 2014. Ang pilosopiya ni Pierre Bourdieu bilang batayang teoretikal sa araling Pilipino. *Kritike: An Online Journal of Philosophy* 8 (2):19-46.
- Demeterio, Feorillo A. & Liwanag, Leslie Anne L. 2018. Emerita Quito, Mary John Mananzan, and Filipina philosophy: A critical comparison of the thoughts of the two leading female philosophers of the Philippines. *Humanities Diliman* 15 (1): 108-138.
- Gripaldo, Rolando M. 2009. *Is there a Filipino philosophy: The making of a Filipino philosopher and other essays*. Mandaluyong City: National Bookstore.
- Pareno, June Benedict & Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2021. Metacritique on Bentham and Foucault's panoptic theories as analytic tools for three modes of digital surveillance. *Plaridel: A Philippine Journal of Communication, Media, and Society* early view, 1-48.
- Piddington, Henry. 1828. Remarks on the Philippine Islands, and on their capital, Manila: 1819 to 1822. *The Philippine Islands 1493-1898*. Edited by Emma Helen Blair & James Alexander Robertson. Cleveland, Ohio: the Arthur H. Clark Company. Vol. 1, No. 51.
- Quito, Emerita S. 1983. *The state of philosophy in the Philippines*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- Resurreccion, Analiza D. & Demeterio, Feorillo A. 2021. Si Mara, si Tara, at si Vhaya: Tatlong case study tungkol sa Batangueñang e-trepreneurship gamit bilang lente ang modipikadong teorya ng mga kapital ni Pierre Bourdieu. *Malay* 33(2): 58-73.