

EDITOR'S NOTE

In this issue of *Humanities Diliman*, the Editorial Board is pleased to present a selection of articles written from various disciplines and from perspectives that manifest diversity in authorial subject positions. As any writing in the humanities would attest, there is really no authentic, privileged position between 'insiders' and 'outsiders' because all writers are subject to and limited by language or a way of seeing that, we are to be reminded of, is already exterior to the objects of study being comprehended. Humanist writers engage heterogeneous worlds in an attempt to evaluate human works that conjure them. They articulate the art of criticism into how worlds are lived and imaginatively constructed. They sufficiently and coherently interpret works as human processes, adequately support these within methodological and discursive traditions, and persuasively communicate their understandings to a public culture by means of a writing that is often poetic.

In this issue, we highlight the heterogeneity of perspectives on Philippine humanities, without claiming, however, for comprehensiveness for this is not possible in a single issue. The first two articles in the issue concern indigenous arts from Southern Philippines, specifically, music, visual design on textiles, and clothing. In these essays, the intersubjective, the experiential or the participative, is brought to the fore. The last two articles are critical assessments: one, on the historiography of Catalan and Filipino *ilustrado* nationalisms during the last quarter of 19th century and the other, on the states of academic discourse on Philippine plays and theater in the near past.

Ethnomusicologist Manolete Mora writes about the intermediality of T'boli aesthetic representations in musical sound and visual designs in abaca woven textiles. Sound and sight, according to him, articulate a shared embodied cultural perception in which a play of components (1) figure, (2) ground, and (3) ornament occurs and is felt. Drawing on studies in cognitive anthropology and phenomenology, Mora maps out analogical correspondences of these in both aural and visual sensoria. He writes about a coherent T'boli aesthetic ethnotheory

that, as we shall appreciate, is rooted locally in the phenomenology of colors, of nature that is worldly referenced in both music and textile designs, and with a mention to the praxis of T'boli arts in which adepts multiply or simultaneously specialize in a number of artistic activities. For me, this is the reason why it is easy to understand the synaesthetic correspondences between sound and sight in T'boli artistic expressions. After all, indigenous Philippine artworlds are not compartmentalized domains as these would be in a modern, Western-based context. Thus, despite Mora's outsider authorial position, I believe his intersubjective, dialogical relationship with T'boli research associates is convincing.

Related to intersubjectivity is the issue on "insider" and "outsider" knowledge. Cherubim Quizon saliently discusses this in her contemplation of naming, ethnic identity, and clothing, which is its sign, among the cultural minorities in the Davao region. According to Quizon, indigenous peoples (IPs) from that place do not refer to themselves as "lumad." This is a supralocal term that outsider agencies (such as government and non-government groups) use to refer to them; instead IPs use "netibo" or "tribu." How ironic, for all these terms originate from the outsiders! "Lumad" in particular, Quizon argues, is pertinent to politics in which the ceremonial attire of leaders called *datu* is used to project a generalized minority identity vis-a-vis dominant Filipino culture. While the *datu's* attire is useful as a representational sign in the majority-minority context, the term "lumad" Quizon asserts erases the particularities of the ethnolinguistic groupings from the area. For example, Quizon highlights that women, who produce the ceremonial attire of men, are bypassed in the term "lumad." Quizon's article is thus interesting for it deals with culture as it is practiced in everyday life, with due consideration of course to women's role in particular; it warns us to be critical of the terms that we use to denote "others."

A historian writes the third article in this issue, using a particularist historical lens. This, I believe undermines the official version stemming from the Spanish capital, Madrid. Sharp and lucid, Glòria Cano revises our common understanding of the sources and influences of the propaganda that was sowed in both metropole and colony by the Filipino *principalia/ilustrado* during the last quarter

of 19th century. Reading primary sources that she had accessed in the place where is currently based (i.e., Barcelona), Cano specifies how Catalan progressive secular liberalism and nationalism were crucial to the ideological formation of the Filipino propaganda movement that was advocated by intellectuals in the likes of Mariano Ponce, Graciano López Jaena, Marcelo H. Del Pilar, and Jose Rizal. Influenced by their Catalan intellectual peers, they advocated writings for democracy and for enlightened social and political reforms in the administration of the Spanish colony, the Philippine Islands. Unlike mainstream culture radiating from Madrid, Barcelona's Catalan culture as this was articulated by the Catalan intellectuals had affinity with that of the Filipinos for both were subordinate to the dominant Spanish culture based in Madrid. Catalan cultural renaissance, which followed the path of liberalism after the 1868 deposition of the Bourbon monarchy, was spurred by romanticism. This was characteristic of the ethos in the said period. Filipino writers, Cano asserts, did not miss the affinity with Catalan culture and history; its geography was likened to Lost Eden (as was Las Islas Filipinas) before the coming of colonization and its folklore was studied by the Filipino intellectuals. It was this context of affinity that fuelled the aspirations of both Catalan and Filipino intellectuals for political recognition in the Central Spanish bureaucracy. One mirrored the other's desires, mutually sharing the same set of polemical ideas as a civil society would; their interests were not other-worldly (as a theocratic Spanish friar-controlled Philippines would) but overtly secular and capitalist. Cano claims that José Rizal's progressive masonic orientation was clearly influenced by the same Catalan patriotic clamor that Rizal saw articulated in the voluntary associations among the intellectual-bourgeoisie class in Barcelona. In fact, Rizal patterned his La Liga Filipina after that of the Catalan association.

Lastly, Apolonio Chua assesses past researches on Filipino plays and theater that were mostly submitted as requirements for masteral and doctoral degrees in Philippine and international universities from the 1950s to the 1990s. Periodizing these researches according to different foci, Chua lists four time periods, namely, (1) 1950s to 1960s, (2) 1960s to 1970s, (3) 1970s to 1980s, and (4) 1980s to 1990s. Chua found certain thematic patterns that define the

researches done within those periods of research. Those in the first group were text-oriented, i.e., focusing on plays as literary works and as masterpieces by major playwrights whose biographies were also attended to. The second group was interested with theater per se and thus their researches focused on genre typifications (defined according to space and time) with their production methods and techniques. The highlight of research from this period was Nicanor Tiongson's hefty volumes on the different genres of Filipino theater. These volumes were based on careful documentary field research. To the third period belong researches that were approached socially and contextually (materialist to be more exact), the best example of which is the most widely read book by Resil Mojares on the Cebuano folk theater. The last stage of theater research production is culturalist or anthropological. This draws heavily on notions of Filipino-ness. Thus, topics bent towards Philippine ritual as theater and of performativities that are enacted in those lived representations.

José S. Buenconsejo
JOSÉ S. BUENCONSEJO
Editor-in-Chief