

philippine studies

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

Kutibeng: Philippine Poetry in Iloko, 1621 - 1971

Review Author: Florentino Hornedo

Philippine Studies vol. 25, no. 3 (1977) 368–370

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

basic Filipino values, in particular, the Filipino's giving priority to group demands over ego and individual needs.

The fifth article is entitled "The Role of Filipino Philosophy in Filipino Psychology." "Filipino Philosophy" is taken to mean the Filipino world-view. Psychology in the Philippines is claimed to be heavily loaded with Western concepts and models. Thus, in general, the role of Filipino Philosophy would be to uncover the alien models subtending psychology to make it more faithful to the Filipino mind of which it is to be a description. The Filipino world-view is characterized as group-oriented, intuitive, non-aggressive vis-a-vis nature. The article recommends that psychology in the Philippines should be guided by these traits accordingly.

The sixth article, "National Goals and Philosophy of Education," is first of all a critique of the 'colonial' orientation of our educational system. The Filipino philosophy of education, if it is to be true to the communal spirit of which it is to be the expression, must be group-oriented, holistic or non-dualistic, interpersonalistic, intuitive. The author thus recommends that Philippine education, in content, form, and style, be delivered of its colonial encumbrances and should be recast in accordance with the Filipino world-view as already defined.

In the seventh and last article, "Modernization and Filipino Philosophy," the main thesis seems to be that the various characteristics of the Filipino world-view, as previously mentioned, — interpersonalistic, paternalistic, group-oriented, non-linear, non-aggressive, holistic — are not necessarily contrary to progress and modernization. Social values are claimed to be ambivalent. It recommends that instead of doing away with them, we must build on them, presumably by way of a critical attitude, retaining what remains of human value, and discarding what has proved to be untenable.

In general, the articles are loosely constructed, full of hasty generalizations, owing perhaps to their occasional origin and nature. The book as a whole is unsatisfactory as social science and just as inadequate as philosophy. As an attempt to describe the Filipino world-view, it lacks method and rigor. As an attempt to make some evaluative recommendations regarding work organization, business management, educational reform and other areas of application, the book shows lack of that sense of philosophical grounding in terms of clarity, coherence, and the ulterior possibilities of man.

Ramon C. Reyes

KUTIBENG: PHILIPPINE POETRY IN ILOKO, 1621-1971. By Marcelino A. Foronda, Jr. Manila: De La Salle University, 1976. viii, 153 pages.

Philippine poetry in Iloko is made up, at least of (1) Iloko folk poetry and song in oral tradition; (2) lyrics of songs in Iloko zarzuelas (see A. G.

Hufana, "The Songs in Available Iloko Plays," *General Education Journal* 2 [1966-67]: 8-18); and (3) Iloko poetry of known authorship, other than those in the plays. The anthology of Foronda covers only the third.

Kutibeng: Philippine Poetry in Iloko, 1621-1971, therefore, is representative of a fraction of Philippine poetry in Iloko. This the author himself acknowledges. The coverage of 350 years is neat, but unevenly represented. The seventeenth century is represented by two poems: "*Algunos Romances Devotos Para Mover a los Ilocanos*" — there is only one in spite of the plural title, suggesting that the title herein adopted may have been the title of a collection — and a "*Letrilla al Niño Jesus en el Pesebre*," by a Spanish priest, Francisco Lopez, and a third by Pablo Inis. The eighteenth century is represented by only one; the nineteenth century is represented by six poems. The bulk of the anthology is of the twentieth century. Or is Foronda saying that Philippine poetry in Iloko was really very thin prior to the twentieth century?

In view of the apparent disproportion in representation, one wishes the methodology and the criteria of selection were more explicit. The work is confessedly pioneering, but its value, which is considerable, could have been enhanced immensely. The increasing demand for Filipino national cultural dialogue toward integration makes such works very valuable, and at the same time perceptive, rigorous, comprehensive, and critical scholarship is becoming an absolute necessity.

To serve the best interests of dialogue in a multilingual cultural situation like that of the Philippines, translation of regional literature into one of the current national media of communication (Filipino or English) is praiseworthy. This Foronda has done. The Iloko texts are accompanied by English translation. In general, the translations should be satisfactory; but English-Iloko bilinguals will be puzzled occasionally by slips like *iti tengngana* being rendered as "its orbit" (p. 98). Should it not be "axis"? Should not *bumur-burek* (p. 99) be "boiling" rather than "curdling"? The translations are not uniformly literal although researchers who are non-Ilokanos would probably prefer literal translations.

The introduction to the anthology, which contains the cultural and historical background of Iloko poetic tradition, touching as it goes some aspects of pre-Hispanic Iloko literature and giving a bird's-eye view of the historical developments in Iloko poetry, sets the collected poems in perspective. One can only wish for some more. The notes on orthography, translation, and order of arrangement enhance the value of the work for scholarship. However, one could wish that more attention should have been given to a critical exposition on at least the salient literary features of the anthologized materials, and a bit more explication of the methodology and criteria used in the selection of materials. The result of this lack has been the plea for judging the poems "for what they actually are, and not what they ought to be" (p. 17). I see the validity of *appreciation* for what they are, but judging

without standards is difficult to imagine. Or is this meant to be understood as an apology?

Kutibeng should be a good library acquisition, and should be both helpful and interesting for literary historians, teachers, and students of Filipino vernacular literature. It is the only one of its kind at present, and it should be an inspiration for more exhaustive anthologization of Filipino poetry in Iloko. It should serve also to inspire other anthologists to undertake similar collections in the other major Filipino regional literatures.

Florentino Hornedo

CADAANAN NGA UGALI: A BRIEF SURVEY OF ILOKO FOLKLORE, WITH A PRELIMINARY ILOKO FOLKLORE BIBLIOGRAPHY. By Marcelino A. Foronda, Jr. (De La Salle Occasional Papers No. 3). Manila: De La Salle University, 1975. iv, 46 pages.

The publishing of scholarly journals is a vexing task anywhere, but particularly so in a country unable to afford the ink and paper for them, not to say the writers, assuming there are enough writers of scholarly work to publish. Even in the affluent West, getting articles published in scholarly periodicals is a kind of self-flagellation, the contributors getting paid only in the form of offprints of their articles which they then exchange among themselves and add to the listings in their resúmes.

Occasional papers are a way out of the difficulty, and the present volume is a welcome effort from a ranking professor at De La Salle University, perhaps thanks in part to a government directive requiring that an institution of university rank should have a graduate school and a graduate school should publish scholarly work.

Dr. Foronda's book indicates that the earliest mention of Iloko folklore was by Spanish missionaries, referring to certain folklife items about Ilokandia in their writing, generally to advert to them as works of the devil and therefore damnable. Thus the Spanish chronicler Father Juan Gonzales de Mendoza, in his *History of the Great Kingdom of China* (Madrid, 1556). This is altogether in keeping with the early European missionaries' custom of identifying all indigenous deities in their missionary outposts with the anti-Christ and his cohorts — a tendency that still vitiates similar work, though now to a lesser degree, thanks to the labors of trained ethnologists. Today these discredited deities are generally called evil spirits rather than by their names in the vernaculars, and one is tempted to suggest that if a multiplicity of names is cumbersome where there are a great many native tongues, they should be designated by their approximate equivalents in European folklore, which is better ordered and better known.