

VARIATION IN PHILIPPINE VALUES: A WESTERN BISAYAN CASE-STUDY

F. Landa Jocano
National Museum

INTRODUCTION

In a separate paper (6) we have called for a “rethinking” of some sociological assumptions relative to the nature of Filipino values and value-orientations which many students of contemporary Philippine society *uphold* as *fundamental* in understanding the pattern of Filipino cultural behavior, if only on the grounds that these generalizations have been formulated on the basis of inadequate data. This paper is intended to supplement this earlier proposal with a specific case-study from Malitbog, a small barrio in Western Bisayas(2). In order to have greater control over our theoretical frame of references we shall limit our discussion, in this respect, to three major relational imperatives involved in local dyadic relations. These are the concepts of *iningod* (neighborhood), *háyá* (shame, self-esteem, etc.) and the two-level definition of normative behavior: the *utang nga kabubút-on* and the *utang nga kabarasilan*.

The ka-ingod/iningod complex

Let us begin with the *kaingod* (pl. *iningod*) or the concept of “being neighbors.” The concept of neighborhood is basic to the social life of the people in Malitbog; that is, the residents attach high value to “living together,” irrespective of the prevailing economic difficulties that characterize this togetherness. As most of our informants put it:

Even if we have to eat leaves of grass (i.e., vegetables) if we are all together, it would not matter much at all.

Sociologically, this aphorism embodies not only the normative principle of togetherness but it also characterizes indirectly, the structure of being "*kaingod*" or "*iningod*."

Malitbog is composed of five sitios. Within each sitio are clusters of houses that constitute one's immediate neighbors (i.e., his *iningod* or *kaingod*). The identity of each of these subgroups is revealed by the statements informants give when asked about their relationship should it be known that they are not kin: "*Ah, magiringod kami.*" (Ah, we are neighbors) or "*Kaingod ko day-a si.....*" (.....is my neighbor). The term is derived from the root-word "*ingod*," meaning "to be close". Suffix *ka* or *ining* indicates the degree of closeness. *Kaingod* is much closer than being *iningod*, spatially. The closest translation of the latter is "within the environs" and the former is "next door." These linguistic categories suggest that the *kaingod* or *iningod*, to be meaningful, has to be perceived as a frame of reference in terms of physical proximity of household units. It is this spatial propinquity that, as among the people in Tzintzuntzan, Mexico.

...establishes ties between villagers and creates, if only on a low level, bonds of common interest. A suspicious character in the street, is a matter of concern to all, as is a householder's vicious and dangerous dog, or an arroyo made impassable by a flash flood, thus preventing passage to a maize mill. Neighborhood interaction is often the basis of friendship but not all neighbors are friends. (5:1183).

In spite of sentiments attached to being close to each other, the *iningod* or *kaingod* has no autonomous existence of itself if only because it is not bound by fixed social, legal, traditional, or physical landmark within the barrio. Its existence is wholly dependent upon the intensity of interactions obtaining between members of the unit and of the social content involved in the relationship. Should anyone become disgruntled with the neighborhood, he can move to other groups and there establishes local attachments. In a word, it is the kind of relational categories that define local groupings and that in spite of the com-

munal orientation of the barrio relative to the municipal government, it is still within the context of these small, contiguous neighborhood units that Malitbog society operates. For one thing, the *kaingod* is deeply rooted, on the whole, to the "life-sphere" of the farmers; and, for another, the neighborhood represents the most effective segment of the rural society where collective responsibility and social control are best carried out.

The *iningod* functions primarily in areas of group life which is not served by the immediate nuclear family or household unit on the one hand and by the entire community on the other. It may therefore be characterized as a sociological construct — a conceptual frame of reference which, even if it is not verbalized by the people unless pressed for explanations of their actions, serves as an outline in defining set of relationships that are vital to the functioning of the barrio as a whole. Although the *iningod* is a cohesive force insofar as physical proximity is concerned, it is, at the same time, a fragmenting mechanism insofar as institutionalized behavior is concerned. It subdivides the barrio or even the sitio into a number of small, compact units or segments, defined in terms of traditional patterns of living and behaving. This we think underlies the stable adaptation and traditional practices to the prevailing conditions. For as soon as consensus about almost anything is formed among them, the *iningod* members do not allow much latitude for deviancy in behavior without sanctions.

Moreover, spatial proximity influences the intensity of interactions that underlie the configuration of the people's world view relative to specific value-orientations (7). Values are developed through group interactions and are normally expressed in the manner in which people agree and disagree about specific things, beliefs, and actions. Once a common understanding is reached about these things, beliefs, and actions, these become important to the functioning of group life. They become the constituent elements of common ends and "values toward which all members are oriented and in terms of which the life of the

group is organized" (1:115).

Functionally, group norms are not only ways of doing things, but they are also the right ways. They include folkways, *mores*, laws, beliefs, and assumptions which underlie the recurrent and consistent behaviors of the members of the group. They are, as Robert Redfield defined them, "the conventional understandings, manifest in acts and artifacts that characterize societies" (10:132). By understanding is meant the meaning which one attaches to any act or to any object under observation. Since society is composed of interacting individuals, the meanings which can be abstracted from any cultural form are expressed in actions.

This brings us to the nature of the rights and obligations accruing from the fact that persons or group of persons are neighbors. We stated that the *iningod* principle is best exemplified in terms of how one regards another. Next to consanguineal relations, friendship is another strong *iningod* norm. It reinforces neighborhood affiliations. Neighbors are expected to help one another in time of great need or even in ordinary chores which require the assistance of another person. It is not uncommon, in this respect, to hear someone call for the neighbor to "please keep watch over our house while we are away." A mother would normally request the neighbor to keep an eye on her child or children while she is away — in the market or in the field. A person who is delayed by other pressing business transactions in the town during market days would usually look for a neighbor and send through him or her what he had purchased. This is known as the *ulayhon*.

During special occasions neighbors are expected to come and offer their assistance. They help in the kitchen, butcher the livestock, fetch water, gather fuel, and assist in all other jobs that are necessary in making the occasions fitting and successful. On other occasions, they are as intermediaries for the marriage arrangements (*pamalayi*), as retinue of the bride-groom and the bride during marriage, and so on. Should a carabao get loose during the night, a

neighbor is called to help search for it. The people also unite in time of need against the common enemy like cattle rustlers, bandits, and other "gangs" from the outside by organizing themselves into night patrols known locally as *runda*.

The trait which is most expressive of *iningod* sentiment and of the selective nature of the system is the reciprocal exchange of food (the *garalwanay*). Every time a person brings home some not-too-ordinary foodstuff, cooked or uncooked, he sends a plateful or a slice to the neighbor with whom he maintains closer ties. Among the cooked food being exchanged are: chicken, beef, pork, seafoods, *pansit* (noddles) and canned goods. The norm underlying this reciprocity is discussed at length in the succeeding section. At any rate, it might be said here that food exchange strengthens the *iningod* relationship. That it can also weaken such relationship is quite true. For the moment one fails to meet his expected obligations, he disappoints the other individual and conflicts emerge. The former is branded by the latter as "*kuum*" (stingy) "*maha-kug*" (greedy) and other terms signifying "unwillingness to share." This can mean the end of the good relation.

The significance of the *iningod* as a primary unit of interactions to the generalized Malitbog society may be summed up in the words of Raymond Firth when he wrote:

Such primary groups are socially vital. They offer many types of personal satisfaction — in opportunities of feeling secure amid group support, of exercising power over others, of showing skill and petty inventiveness in adapting things to immediate group needs, in getting gratifications of a moral kind, through the display of love and self-sacrifice. They are essential also for cooperation, in economic and other fields (3:44).

The significance of *iningod* to cooperation, especially in economic pursuits, is best exemplified in the field of group work known as the *sul-ug* or *dagyaw*. As we have stated earlier, *sul-ug* is a freely offered, reciprocal serv-

ice rendered to any member of the barrio in the spirit of neighborliness. By freely we mean without compensation in cash or in kind. It is moreover either solicited or voluntarily given, but whosoever initiates this group work imposes upon himself the obligation to return the labors of those who responded to his request or who volunteered to do him a favor. Although the *dag-yaw* or *sul-ug* is free, the host serves the laborers three meals during the day and coconut beverage (*tuba*) in the afternoon after the work is over.

Apparently more work is done during the *sul-ug*. The individual who lags behind during the *sul-ug* work is likely to be branded as *uya-ya*, or "slow-foot" by his fellow workers and this is an affront to his dignity and social prestige. Added to this is the spirit of *kasadya*, which means center of group attention. In this way, *sul-ug* also operates work, the men sing, tell stories, relate interesting experiences, discuss problems concerning the welfare of the barrio, the forthcoming fiesta, and many other things, all of which enliven group activity. A man with many jokes or possessed with a good sense of humor or wit becomes the center of group attention. In this way, *sul-og* also operates as an occasion where one can display his talents and command the admiration of his fellows.

The *kumbuya* is another kind of communal labor, wherein a group of men or women pool their resources and undertake certain projects with the end in view of gaining profit from their joint labor. Unlike the *sul-ug*, the *kumbuya* is formalized as a partnership with profit-sharing in mind. This kind of group work is generally employed in harvesting rice and corn, in building a house, and in catching fresh-water fish. Another term for this kind of group among neighbors is *pakyaw*. Non-fulfillment of this reciprocal obligation is one of the major causes of the breakdown of the *iningod* sentiment.

This introduces us to two other fundamental concepts which are crucial in understanding the recurrent and consistent behavior in Malitbog. These are the *huya* (Tag. *hiya*) and the two-level feeling of personal obligations

the *utang nga kabaraslan* and the *utang nga kabubut-on*. These concepts function side by side in determining social relations between neighbors and also in general conflicts between them. They constitute the framework upon which beliefs, values, symbols, and meanings are organized, emphasized and repressed in and for the individual members of the *iningod* in particular and of the *barrio* in general. They may be considered, furthermore, as the conceptual blue-prints from which emanate the spontaneous figuring out, so to speak, of which belief, which value, which symbol is called for at a given moment in order to make the consequent action proper, and of which appropriate meaning should be attached to any proper belief, value, or symbol in order to make the action justifiable.

HUYA

In a generic sense *huya* may be translated as "self-esteem", *dignidad*, *amor-propio*, *dongog* (honor) and in other terms which involve a breach of self or group expectations. Specifically, *huya* is put into operation when what is infringed upon deals with relationships pertaining to (1) personal dignity or honor of the individual; (2) status or position of the principal actor relative to other people; (3) the internal cohesion of the family as unit; and (4) the reputation of the entire kin-group relative to the outside world. Violation of linguistic etiquette — i. e., the tone of the voice, the choice of words, etc., — also generates *huya*. For the latter, however, the Malitbog people have a specific term — the *saklaw*. It is close to the English term "embarrass."

As we have stated, *huya* ramifies throughout Malitbog life-ways. It is expressed in the attitudes, emotional attachments, and behavior relative to socio-economic life, religion, morality, and individual decorum.

Huya and socio-economic status. Our first encounter with *huya* connected with the people's socio-economic status came in 1956. When we arrived in Malitbog, it was the end of the planting season. This time of the year is always (as has been) critical in that food is scarce and

the prices of staples are high. Even the economically well-off in the barrio during this part of the year complain about economic hardships in life. This is the time of the year when even tubers and roots are not yet ripe for food. Local term for this is "*maganas*." Water from continuous rain has been absorbed by the roots so that when these are cooked they will not become soft. Corn is not yet ripe, either. Thus, when we arrived, our host did not have anything to offer us in terms of staple food and this was considered the most humiliating situation. Although we mentioned we brought our own food supply, our host told us to keep it for the time being. Surreptitiously, the wife sent one of the small boys to the pastor's house to borrow (*lingit*) a tin-can-ful of white rice. When this was cooked, none of the children joined us in the meal. But they all gathered around, looking hungrily and having occasional guttural swallows, but they were told to stay away. And they did.

Later we learned that having nothing to offer to strangers as soon as they arrive in one's house is shameful. "*Kahuruja*" is term for it. Unless there are visitors, the people in Malitbog would seldom borrow staples from other people, unless they are close relatives or *kaingod* with whom they carry reciprocal food exchange. Asked why, Tia P said: "*Mayad kun pahuramon kaw, pay kong indi gani, mahuy-an ka lang. Daw parihu ka nagatinda ka lang ka kinawara mo. Hambalon ka lang ka iba*" (Free transl.: "It is good if they will lend you, but if not, you will be shamed. It is like 'selling' (i.e., making public) your shortcomings; people will talk.")

In other words, all kinds of social camouflage have to be done in order not to reveal one's economic difficulties to other people, especially to newcomers in the area. Among themselves, there is some degree of levelling process which minimizes the sentiments attached to *huya*. For one thing everyone knows that during certain parts of the year almost everyone is in difficulty. Everybody is in need. It is thus not so shameful to admit that one has nothing to eat. In fact, it is to one's advantage, in the final analysis,

in that potential borrowers, if one is well-off, are forward-ed about the difficulty. Hence, they would not come to press the issue on borrowing rice. But this is done only to a certain extent. Because the people know who are well-off and who are not, certain amount of reservation is placed on statements of those who are known to be well-off regarding their economic difficulty. Many seldom take the "rich" man's words seriously. The concept of *huya* is used as an instrument to make an individual reveal himself and to rend wider the screen of pretentions. It reverses the situation where the well-off will feel "ashamed" of himself for not being a good neighbor, a generous relative. As Itik the owner of the rice-mill admitted: "*Kis-a daw ikaw do malang mahuya sa lawas mo. Kon pabalik-balik ang tawo waay kaw it mahimo. Malooy ka man. Ti taw-an mo do lang eh. Daad kabaribad kaw apay ti anhon mo hay naga-pakihuoy.*" (Free transl.: "Sometimes you feel ashamed of yourself if the person returns several times. So you give him whatever he asks because you take pity on him. Of course you have said no but well, what can you do because he is 'insisting'").

Generally, to be insistent is humiliating. In normal circumstances the people in Malitbog would never do this. But in difficult times, one forgets the norm. As the barrio captain said: "*Ginapatay mo lang ang huya mo*". (Transl.: You 'kill' — i.e., to bear the brunt of — your shame). Thus such statements as "*waay huya*" (without shame) or "*patay it huya*" (bereft of shame) are commonly heard from the lenders when the borrowers fail to meet their obligations after several attempts to collect. From the borrower's point of view the collector is also "*waay it huya*" in that he keeps coming back, even if he has been promised payment. These points of view are oftentimes the root of quarrels in the area. What is most resented is not the fact that one cannot meet his obligations but that his presence "shames" the debtor before other people. "*Ginapakahuy-an mo ako*," (You are putting me to shame) is the most frequently used phrase when one cannot take the interaction any more.

As we have stated the people in Malitbog are keen about *huya* associated with economic status. This consciousness wields tremendous influence over local behavior so that it is almost possible to predict the type or kind of reaction an individual will have as soon as the problem of economic status comes to fore. Thus, when Tio C came home one evening and told Tia P that a group of town officials were passing through the barrio and would like to spend the night with them, the latter was upset. She did not say anything of course but she started kicking things around and shouted at the dogs and cats. Picking this as a cue, Tio C approached her and said: "What shall we do? They are passing by. They will stay long, anyway." Tia P stood up, picked up her chewing pouch (*maram-an*) and sat by the window. Then she looked back at Tio C and curtly said: "What will you serve them for meals, sand? Bha — you are 'advertising' your *kinawara* ('poverty') to other people." Tio C did not answer. He went down the house.

Several minutes later he came back carrying a bundle of kasava-roots. While we were roasting the roots in the kitchen, the Barrio Captain came up. He told Tia P and Tio C that he had received word from the town officials that they were coming. "Could you please accomodate them? My house is very small," the Barrio Captain said. Thereupon, Tio C confronted him: "And what do you think of our house? It is very small, too. Besides Mr. Ukano is already staying with us." The Barrio Captain smiled at us and said: "That's all right. I think Mr. Ukano wouldn't mind." "What do you mean all right," Tia P put in again. "It is all right ha! It doesn't matter to you because you have enough food to serve them. But us, — Bha — we have nothing to eat. Go to the kitchen and see for yourself. We are eating kassava. What shall we give the visitors, roots?"

Tio C suggested that if the Barrio Captain and other members of the barrio contributed rice and chicken, they would be willing to accommodate the town officials. The Barrio Captain said he would do "the best I can — I will go around the barrio." Then he left. When he came back,

he had three gantas of red rice and two small chickens. When Tia P saw the rice, she told the Barrio Captain to "bring it to Itik, the rice-mill owner, and have it changed to white rice." She added: "It is shameful to serve this kind of grains to visitors."

Another incident worthy of mention because of its implication for *huya* arising from economic status of the people was the coming of a group of researchers who identified themselves as fieldworkers doing "nutrition survey." Before they came to the area, the leader of the team wrote the town mayor. The mayor picked Malitbog as one of the barrios where they could work. He sent word to the Barrio Captain, informing him about the arrival of the team. In turn, the Barrio Captain made the round of the barrio and asked the well-to-do members if they would accommodate the researchers. There was consternation among the people in the barrio. No one wanted to have visitors stay in their place. "You know this is the most difficult time of the year. We have nothing to eat," many complained. "We will be shamed if they know what we are eating — or how many times we eat during the day. Can't you ask the mayor to tell these people to go elsewhere?"

In spite of this local concern the researchers came. The Barrio Captain immediately brought them to Itik, the rice-mill owner, whom he coerced into accommodating the newcomers. Then he introduced them to the families among whom they would "like to measure food eaten by the people in terms of nutritional content." These measurements, the families were informed, would be done three times a day, three days a week. Nobody said "No," if only because each was *huya* to protest. Should they protest, the visitors' curiosity might be aroused and they would be asked to explain. Their economic "inadequacy" therefore would be found out.

During the first day, the team went to visit Tio C's family in the morning. Measurements of the food eaten, left-overs, and those fed to the domestic animals were made. The day's menu consisted suddenly (we did not have it before) of eggs, dried fish, rice, salt, and tomatoes. From

our supply Tia P served coffee and sugar. After breakfast, the researchers stayed for a while and asked a number of questions: "How many times do you eat a day?" "What constitutes your breakfast, lunch, and supper?" "How often do you have meat, fish, vegetables, noddles and others in your meal?" "What are your food preferences?" There were many other questions.

By this time a number of people had gathered in the house. Tia P was hard put in answering the questions. She hedged questions and gave generalized answers. Then she would look at the people around who, taking the cue perhaps, would contribute an answer which they thought the researchers wanted. There was, apparently, always a ready answer for the questions asked. When the researchers finally left, the people started talking among themselves. Tia P and her neighbor C borrowed money from Sambe so they could purchase in town the things they told the researchers they serve each mealtime. "They are coming back tomorrow and it would be shameful if they found that we are not really eating the things we told them."

We were surprised over this statement which was uttered unguardedly. We never realized until this incident that for a stranger to ask about what people eat, how many times they eat, and so forth is a breach of proper conduct. What was interesting, in this connection, was that in the course of our stay, we heard people ask and inform each other about food — i.e., whether a neighbor had already cooked lunch or supper and what it consisted of. In fact, we had watched them exchange cooked viands. Small boys did not wash their hands should they chanced to have sardines for viands and they went about in their games making other children smell their hands. It is, we learned later, considered prestigious to have canned food for viands.

In about the same manner that the people feel *huya* when they do not have food that they feel *huya* if they fail to share with the *kaingod* whatever extra food they have. This brings us to exchange of food among immediate neighbors. We have already discussed the social implications of this system. Suffice it to say here that ex-

changing food with the neighbor is a sign of generosity and anyone who violates this expectation is considered "*waay et huya*." Aside from cooked food, staple and meat are also exchanged raw. When bigger livestock is butchered, every *iningod* receives his share. This bolsters the family's prestige and position in the community.

The kind of staple or dish which is served during mealtime is a measure of the family's economic status. Red rice (*bahay*) is considered a low-status variety. Should an individual chance to come up the house when the family is eating, he would be invited to "come and eat, but our rice is *bahay*. You should excuse us for this." White rice (*bisaya*) is considered prestigious and is oftentimes reserved for visitors. Corn is not considered a staple; it is a supplementary cereal and it is of low status. Young corn — roasted or boiled — is for snacks. When ripe corn is ground and mixed with rice (*lamud*), it is served only to members of the family. Should a visitor come unannounced, an apology is made about the kind of cereal being served. When we insisted on eating mixed rice-and-corn meal, our host said: "Do not try to make fun of us. We will feel bad if you do so. You are not used to this kind of cereal. You might have stomach ache. This is a poor man's meal."

The value which people place on food they eat affects the kind of staple they raise. Corn is raised for sale. It is considered fitting only for fowls and pigs. No one will cook ground corn for meals unless it is during the most difficult part of the year. Red rice variety is not considered desirable because "even the *Insik* (Chinaman) would not buy it." Interestingly enough, the storekeepers (three Chinamen and ten Filipinos) we interviewed in the poblacion agreed that red rice variety (*bahay*) was one of the difficult varieties to sell. Hence they gave us a very low and discouraging price. Only few farmers plant the red rice variety. This variety is known for its yield and resistance to pests.

Huya and attire. How one dresses himself in the barrio is closely rooted in how one feels other people would

feel about him. To wear a clean dress every day is to invoke such comments as: "*Daw si sin-o ka gid. Indi kaw mahuya magpadayaw-dayaw diyan sa baryo.*" (Transl.: "You think as if you are somebody. Are you not ashamed of yourself — showing off in the barrio?). Correspondingly, a newcomer who immediately dons dirty clothes hoping that he would be accepted by the people as one of them in that everyone wears dirty work-clothes is apt to be regarded as "*naka-insulto*" (very insulting). Not being part of the group, he is expected to behave differently. To imitate the way the barrio folks dress is a breach of proper conduct: the act is oftentimes interpreted as adding insult to injury. This is more so if the newcomer comes from the city or is educated.

During occasions, however, everyone is expected to don the appropriate attire. This means clean shirt, trousers for males, and clean blouse and skirt for females. Wanting to impress her peer group that she just arrived from the city where she had been studying, A's daughter put on her black jeans and thin blouse and went to the party held in honor of her newly baptized nephew. When her father stepped out of the kitchen and saw her in her attire immediately he upbraided her.

"Hoy kahuruya kaw. Uli tu kag mag-ilis. Karaway kadang bisti mo. Daw sa urag-uragan kaw. Ano ang gusto mo hambalon kaw ka tawo doon?"

(Free transl.: You are shameful. Go home and dress properly. You look humiliating in that dress. You look like an ill-repute. Do you like to be the talk of the people here?)

The girl tried to reason out. But her mother came to her father's defense. Soon every relative was commenting on her attire. While they admit it was nice on her and that it was the 'fashion' of the time, yet, as her aunt stated: "It is good if we are only among ourselves. But there are visitors and what will they think? It is indeed shameful. Go home and change it." The girl relented.

The awareness about *huya* related to dress is developed early in childhood when children are impressed with the need of dress. A child who goes around naked is at

once scolded and told not to display his genitals. "You are now old enough to be ashamed of yourself." This is interesting in that many male children run around the barrio without any pants at all. By the time the children become adults they are fully aware of the *huya* and its implications in terms of one's self-esteem and of one's family position in the community. It needs to be emphasized in this connection that an individual's wrong-doing reflects not only his personal concern but it also reflects how the parents have trained him.

Huya and social interaction. Fundamental to Malitbog social interactions is the observance of the existing form of conduct prescribed by the values set down by tradition. One of the mechanisms through which this is achieved, we have already said, is through the *huya*. *Huya* may be viewed in Redcliffe-Brown's terms as the "the reactions toward the particular or general behavior of a member of the community which constitute judgments of disapproval." (9:206). This involves one's feelings about or evaluation of the situation relative to his relationship with other people. As social psychologist Tomatsu Shibutani has expressed it:

Each person attempts to guide his conduct in a deliberate effort to maintain an acceptable view of himself; [each] perceives his surroundings as well as himself from the standpoint of the group in which he is participating; he takes into account certain expectations that can be reasonably imputed to others. (11)

Huya, from this standpoint, functions as a culturally-defined code of self- or group- appraisal that underlies interactions. Social action is dependent on the degree to which an individual or groups of individuals take into account and respond to another individual or groups of individuals. Relationship in this context is more than the physical contact in that each person does something to another. It encompasses the expectations which members of the group have of each others, which, as soon as they become standardized, they take on elements of right and

wrong; they become social norms — the principle which reinforces the ability of an individual or groups of individuals to anticipate the behavior of others and to adjust their own behavior accordingly.

The common expression "*mahuya ta or kita*" (we will be ashamed) clearly states this pattern of expectations. In fact, when an individual is requested to approach someone for something, the first statement he or she utters is: "*Ah — nahuya takon*" (I am ashamed). Or if a person is persuading another not to do what he plans to do, he simply reminds the latter: "*Indi day-a pagpadayona, mahuya kita sa tao.*" (Don't proceed with your plans, we would be shamed before other people). To show disapproval for another's behavior, the expression "*kahurunya ang ginbuhat mo*" (Your actions are shameful) is used to make the individual stop. In other words, the term *huya* is used as a means of sanctioning all types of behavior in the barrio.

There are two levels of actions which are the common source of conflicts, due to the *huya* they generate among the people. One involves breach of linguistic etiquette and the other is trespass of approved mode of conduct. The former is referred to as *saklaw*. It is often used to characterize an offended feeling due to a comment or statement made, intentional or non-intentional, about another person's action, including ways of speaking, manner of attire, physical deformity, and so on. It is not so much an individual's shortcoming that is considered *hurting* as an overt statement of a consensus about the shortcoming that is *nakasaklaw* (embarrassing or being shameful).

During a Sunday school meeting, a group of men were listening to the Pastor emphasize a point in the Bible. A discussion followed between E and the pastor. The latter strongly argued his position that in the end, E accepted having misinterpreted the Biblical passage: "*Hu-u, ah, belid ron ko*" (Yes, ah, I do believe now).

Near him were seated B and A. Upon hearing E's *ay belid* (for believe) they laughed. E was embarrassed because present in the crowd were his

relatives. When B and A further teased him for saying "belid" instead of "believe", E stepped out of the Church and refused to go to church anymore. When the pastor tried to persuade him, he said: "I'd rather worship at home; anyway the people in the church are making fun of me."

"Well, for that simple thing you are offended. We are no longer boys," the pastor tried to appease him.

"Ofended? Huh- it is not what they said that really hurt me; it is the fact that they know I do not know and yet they have to say it in public. And in front of all my relatives! Bha — who they really think they are? If that happens to you, Pastor, you will also do the same."

To be more direct in speaking to people, one is likely to generate the *saklaw* feeling. Choice of words is another aspect in the conversation which causes troubles between people. Malitbog dialect does not possess respect terms similar to the Tagalog "po." Instead, respect (or breach of it) is expressed in the tone of the voice when speaking. Malitbog people speak in soft, cool tone (similar to what the Tagalogs call 'malambing' and anyone who speaks in a loud, harsh manner transgresses the prescribed linguistic etiquette. He *saklaw*s the fellow he is speaking to or even his friends who hear him do it.

Related to *saklaw* but much deeper in implication for dyadic relations is the *pasipala*. This is to upbraid someone in public. Younger people are oftentimes afraid to contradict older men in group gatherings because of *pasipala*. As one of our informants said: "You like to be shamed in the public then *sublang* (contradict) the old people in public discussions." The reason why Badu nearly bolloed Mal-am Itik was that the latter upbraided him for his public misdeemeanor. Badu was somewhat drunk (tipsy) when he entered the house of Mal-am Itik to join the group of young people who came to visit the old man. Because he did not call out ("panagbalay") before coming in, Mal-am Itik was mad. He spoke to him in a loud voice: "*Waat batasan, waat huya. Bisan managbalay indi.*"

(Transl.: 'No character, no shame. Even to call out before entering you did not bother!'). Badu unsheathed his bolo and laughed at the old man. Cool and quicker hands prevented him from inflicting harm to the old man. When subdued, Badu kept saying: "Why did he shame me, why did he shame me."

Another easily noticed Malitbog behavior is the extending of the hand(s) downward when passing between two or more people who are conversing. This is known as *panabi-tabi*. Its implication ramifies from observance of simple politeness to recognition of social status. Which-ever is emphasized one obtains an explanation involving *huya*. It is improper for one not to do this. And those who trespass this norm are immediately reprimanded. If it is a child who does it, he receives a pinch; if it is a grown up, he is scolded and told that he has no '*huya*.' So deeply internalized is this mode of conduct that almost all people in Malitbog unconsciously and spontaneously extend their hands, stoop a little, and ask permission to be allowed to walk between two persons conversing.

Learning this norm starts early during childhood. Efforts are made by the parents and other members of the family to impress on the child the proper mode of behavior. When a child cries in the presence of visitors, the mother tells him to stop because it is "*kahuruya*" (shameful) to the visitors. He is also told to obey what the elder people tell him to do because "it is shameful for children to be lazy." To answer back an older member of the family is to receive physical punishment — pinching, slapping, beating across the mouth, etc. — followed by a reprimand: "Next time learn to check your behavior because it is *makahuruya* (shameful)." The underlying principle here is, we learned later, that the person is not only held responsible for his behavior but his family, especially the parents, are blamed for it as well.

Thus when Clarit's little boy brought home the toy-dog of the neighbor, she was very mad. She scolded the boy. "Go — return that toy or I will peel your buttocks with a beating-stick. What will people in the neighborhood

think — I am not teaching you good conduct?" The boy ran back and returned the plaything.

We believe no one will object to the assumption that an individual's standing in the community is largely a matter of accepted social usage. Clarit's deep concern over what her little boy did exemplifies this. Her alarm was less on what the boy did, but more so on what people would say about the act. In this context, then, even the behavior of the child is considered a reflection of the family's standing in the community; that is, they are good or bad, depending upon how well-behaved the members are. And this is so, too, in the mature world of the adults. Whatever an individual does also involves the reputation of the family. It is the "shame" of the family, in fact, that matters in the final analysis.

2.2 *Utang nga kabaraslan* and *Utang nga kabubut-on*

Closely associated with *huya* are two other fundamental norms that underlie Malitbog dyadic and group behavior. These are *utang nga kabaraslan* and *utang nga kabubut-on* (buot). They form the basic framework of reciprocity in the barrio. The term reciprocity is used here to mean the tendency to perceive and anticipate social relations. As a system of social usage, *utang nga kabaraslan* and *utang nga kabubut-on* constitute the conventional rules that govern a wide variety of transactions in the barrio, with strong emotional overtones.

There are no English equivalents into which the terms may be translated without clarifications. Their basic features are likewise difficult to isolate, describe and analyze with precision in that they ramify throughout all facets of local value-orientations and system of actions. Our present analysis must therefore be taken as suggestive of the pattern and not as a conclusive statement about them. Be this as it may, it is nevertheless the best approximation of what we can deduce from the people's overt behavior, reinforced by their statements about reciprocal obligations. For one thing, the people in Malitbog utilize either of these concepts to define the nature of their orientation toward each other and to delimit the extent of socially accepted

patterns of responses and modes of choices.

Semantic base — A good grasp of the functional dynamics of *utang niya kabarasan* and the *utang nga buot (kabubut-on)* may be had by first describing the semantic base of the terms. Both types of reciprocal obligations — the *kabarasan* and the *kabubut-on (buot)* — are anchored on the basic concept of *utang*. *Utang* is a generic term for “debt” or “obligations”, incurred as a result of a behavior done, a service rendered, a material object handed out as a loan or given as a gift. It must be pointed out that the people in Malitbog do not *utang* without a good reason for doing so. It may be to meet a previous obligation, to help another individual (friend or kin), to provide for his current needs, and so forth. Normally, a business transaction like obtaining a loan from loan shark or a government agency is conceived to be devoid of sentiments. Business is business. But in Malitbog, the fact that someone in the community, however disliked at other occasions, or, in the agency however condemned for his acts, is of assistance in time of need is enough to establish a sentimental bond between that particular person and the one in need. For in the transaction that follows both orient their relationships not purely on the business is business proposition but on the extra-business sentiments of the *utang*. Sentiment is used here behavioristically “not so much in terms of any particular act but through their organization” (11:333). It constitutes, in other words, the organization of attitudes and perception, as well as normative expectations that surround the *utang*. Functionally, it provides us with cues for the proper understanding of the component tendencies underlying Malitbog behavior related to the *utang*.

The second word in both phrases is *nga*. It corresponds roughly to the English preposition “of” and its function is to show relationship between the *utang* (obligation) and the nature of indebtedness. That is, whether the *utang* has been incurred by soliciting for material loans, gifts or services, or be receiving a voluntary assistance from someone without asking for it. The sentiment underlying the configuration of responses involved in the former is

known as *kabaraslan*, that of the later is *kabubut-on*, or plainly *buot*. There is a wider latitude of choice in the latter. *Kabaraslan* is derived from the root-word *balos* which means "to reciprocate, to return, to give back, to vindicate."

Ka- is a prefix which indicates the futurity of the action and *-an* is a suffix signifying "state of being or the condition" of the act. There is an internal lexical shift from lateral "l" to thrill "r" but this phonetic alternation does not, in any way, affect the meaning of the term. It is more structural than semantic. The term *kabaraslan* therefore would mean "something to be repaid, reciprocated, or vindicated" in the future — be it a favor, a service, or a material object.

Kabubut-on is similarly derived from the root-word *buot*, the closest English equivalent of which are "state of being good, possessing goodwill, generosity of the heart, having conscience." *Ka-* is a prefix indicating futurity and *-on* is a suffix indicating the condition of the fact. Hence, *kabubut-on* may be translated as "goodwill, goodness, or generosity of the heart."

Utang nga kabubut-on would then approximate any of these English phrase: "debt of goodwill, debt of gratitude, or debt of generosity of the heart," while *utang nga kabaraslan* would mean "debt to be repaid, reciprocated, or vindicated." The term "debt of gratitude" which has been associated with the Tagalog term *utang na loob* applies to both types of Malitbog *utang-* the *kabaraslan* and the *kabubut-on*. Linguistically, Malitbog dialect (*Kinaray-a*) has apparently no term (or least we have not found any) similar to the Tagalog specifying-term "kaloob" for gift. The Spanish term "regalo" is used; hence, it is difficult to be precise about the behavioral attributes of the "gift" in translating the term associated with it. At any rate, the most important thing to keep in mind is that *utang nga kabubut-on* is established through unsolicited extension of assistance in the form of either gift or services while *utang nga kabaraslan* is created through solicitation of another's help or services in realizing the goals desired.

Structure of the relationship. — As we have stated the basic unit of our analysis of *utang nga kabarasan* and *utang nga kabubut-on* as functional concepts in Malitbog is the sentiment of reciprocity underlying the interactions associated with them. How things are done, how security is achieved, how local power is manipulated to meet one's ends and so forth — all these, in the final analysis, are dependent upon the quality and number of reciprocal ties one has established with his *iningod* (*neighbors*), friends, relatives, people with higher economic and social status in and outside the barrio, and with government officials like the municipal mayor, the chief of police and his staff, the forest rangers, and the health officers. Non-government officials who are regarded with equally high status are Catholic priests and Protestant ministers. Contractual obligations are similarly established with the environment spirits (the engkanto, tomawo, etc.), saints and Virgin Mary. Jesus Christ is acknowledged as the Redeemer but the Virgin Mary is regarded as the more powerful person if only because the former is her son.

The creation and validation of these contractual ties is done through reciprocal exchange of goods, services, and "goodwill" (*kabubut-on*). Once instituted each contractants expect to receive something from the other "at times in ways and in forms that are clearly understood by both... or in ways and forms that are a function of the type of relationship involved (4:1281)." We have said earlier that there are two types of reciprocal obligations operating in the barrie: the *kabarasan*, which arises through exchange of material objects or solicited services, and *kabubut-on*, through exchanges of goodwill and unsolicited services. The degree of involvement in this system is proportionate with the length of the relationship and the status of the persons involved.

If the *kabarasan* is carried out with friends, relatives and neighbors, the psychological commitment is of shorter duration. As soon as repayment in kind or services has been made, the relationship ceases to be defined in the context of reciprocity. None of the participants feel the qualms of obligations and the underlying feeling of *huya*

(shame) to each other does not come to fore in face-to-face interactions. This is best exemplified in communal work in agriculture, in house building or transferring, and in other odd jobs. As soon as the *kabaraslan* is repaid the commitment is terminated. Another situation is needed in order to create another reciprocal obligation. The injunction *warat kabaraslan* cannot be used or invoked to sanction an unfavorable response. In this respect, the system is operating on a horizontal base in that those who are involved are of some economic and social status.

On the other hand, if the principal actors are of different socio-economic status, the sense of obligations involved in *kabaraslan* is of longer duration on the part of the initiator while it may be minimal on the part of the respondent. The vertical nature of the base accounts for this unequal involvement in the value system. For example, if the farmer requests the clerk at the municipal treasurer's office in town to facilitate his land tax clearance or the processing of whatever papers he needs, he creates an *utang nga kabaraslan* obligation. Next time he comes to town the farmer brings to the clerk's house eggs, chickens, vegetables, and so forth. But the feeling of obligation is not terminated here. The status of the clerk is much higher and the services rendered are beyond the capacity of the farmer to perform. Moreover, the fact that the clerk attended to his request is proof enough that former has "*maayo nga kabubut-on*" (of generous [heart] conscience). Here the commitment shifts somewhat from pure *kabaraslan* to *kabubut-on*. Thus even if the title of his land and other papers pertaining to it were done five years ago Baldis still reminisce his relationships with the clerk in town. He would shake his head and say: "*Man hanggod ang kabaraslan kay* (mentions the name of the clerk) *nga day-a.*" (Free translation: "You see, my debt of obligation to is indeed big").

On the other hand, the *utang nga kabubut-on* is more emotionally laden and of longer duration than the *utang nga kabaraslan*. It transcends the relationship between the contractants. That is, even if social relations are termi-

nated, some people in Malitbog still remember how well received they were when they went to the house of a friend acquaintance, or an official's house and that they have an *utang nga kabubut-on* to them. The reasons for "parting way" are always given and these have two individuals. The alternative term for *kabubut-on* is *amuma*. The transcendental quality of the *kabubut-on* obligations emanates from the fact that those who are involved in the process are not required, by custom, consensus or traditional norm, to repay the obligations right away. It is incurred in the first place, through voluntary offering of assistance or of giving gifts. If a farmer is overtaken by night or rain near a friend's or an acquaintance's house and he is requested or offered to pass the night, and he accepts it, he immediately incurs an *utang nga kabubut-on* to that friend or acquaintance. In a similar circumstance or in any situation in the future, he must reciprocate even if the choice is open for him to do so or not. If he does not, he may be branded as *warat utang nga kabubut-on* but not openly as in the case of *utang nga kabaraslan*. The same norm operates when an individual voluntarily contributes to baptismal, wedding or funeral rites.

It must be pointed out that *utang nga kabubut-on* does not operate within the nuclear family. It is *utang nga kabaraslan* which is weighted as the reinforcing principle in inter-family relationships. As we see it, this is perhaps due to the fact that inherent in the structural relationships of the individuals involved are specific rights and obligations. These rights and obligations are kinship-defined, making the relationship, first of all, a required one. That is, it is the right of the children to demand support and protection from the parents and it is the parent's obligation to provide them these in return for their right to demand obedience and respect. The nexus of relationship, in other words, is oftentimes expressed in material goods and "kinship-obligated" services. Birth and siblinghood are considered as gift and forced-situation (i.e., the choice of sibling is not voluntary). Hence, the value-commitment in the relationship is *kabaraslan* rather than *kabubut-on*. Outside of the family, however, as well as within the narrow

confines of close relatives, it is the *utang nga kabaraslan* which is the main conceptual frame of reference of interactions. In other words, the boundaries of these two concepts are largely determined by the kind of relationship the contractants have, the propinquity of residence, the frequency of interactions and the level of socio-economic status in the community.

REMARKS

Thus far we have discussed the various aspects of social relations wherein the concepts of *iningod* or *kaingod* (neighborhood), *huya* (shame, self-esteem, *amor proprio*), and *utang nga kabaraslan* and *utang nga kabubut-on* are best exemplified. We wish to state here that this discussion is not the last statement relative to the nature and function of these concepts; we are still involved in an ongoing research in this respect. Hence no conclusion is in order. It needs to be pointed out nevertheless that whatever positive relationships and inter-personal conflicts are generated by these cultural norms are resolved in terms of contingency principle — i.e. wider latitude of choice-patterns — emanating from local definitions and evaluations of social categories involved in the interactions of people. It is, in other words, the circumstances or the situations surrounding the mode of interaction — (and which are normally of moment) — that define the kind of type of relationships among the people, at least in this barrio, and not merely the presence of these conceptual categories as many writers have argued that leaves them no other recourse but to act accordingly. After all

“the basic life task facing the individual is . . . given only a finite store of time and other resources, to juggle the multitudinous commitments and demands of his position and relationships and demands following from his role-identity hierarchies in such a way as to negotiate a ‘safe’ and ‘meaningful’ passage through life” (8:234).

REFERENCES

1. Robert C. Angell. "The Moral Integration of American Cities," Special Supplement. *The American Journal of Sociological Review*. Vol. 75, July 1951. 140 pp.
2. Fieldwork in Malitbog has been supported by a grant from the the Community Development Council (CDRC) of the University of the Philippines. Opinions expressed in this are those of the writer and have nothing to do with the policies of the sponsoring agency.
3. Raymond Firth. *Elements of Social Organization*. London: Watts & Co., 1951.
4. George M. Foster. "Dyadic Contracts in Tzintzuntzan, II: Patron-Client Relationship," *American Anthropologists*. Vol. 65 (1963).
5. George M. Foster. "The Dyadic Contract: A Model for the Social Structure of a Mexican Peasant Village," *American Anthropologists*. Vol. 3, December 1961.
6. See F. Landa Jocano. "Rethinking Smooth Interpersonal Relations" (SIR), Typescript, 25 pages.
7. Florence R. Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck. *Variations in Value Orientations*. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1961.
8. George J. McCall and J.L. Simmons. *Identities and Interactions*. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
9. Radcliffe-Brown. *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*. The Free Press, 1952.
10. Robert Redfield A.R. *The Folk Culture of Yucata*. Chigago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
11. Tamatsu Shibutani and K.M. Kwan. *Ethnic Stratification*. Macmillan, 1965.