

Mayroon bang Pilosopiyang F/Pilipino?

*Isang diskusyon sa
pilosopo@kssp.upd.edu.ph.*

RENATO B. MANALOTO

Discourse on Filipino Philosophy still focus on formulating the bases and approaches that would make Filipino philosophy known and rise above the rest. The following are the aspects of the discourse that has been molded: (1) wholistic approach, (2) comparative analysis, (3) contextualization of western philosophy in Filipino awareness, (4) phenomenology of Filipino experience, (5) compilation of texts in philosophy written by Filipino and (6) in depth study of Filipino concepts. Results of the new discourses made are usually just the repetitions of these bases and approaches.

Though the bases and approaches used differ from each other and are conflicting at some point, this should not be a reason to delay the discourses made on Filipino philosophy. In fact, much can be gained from these types of discourses because though they somehow disrupt the continuity of these studies made, they are rather seen as improvements to it.

SADYANG HINDI MATATAWARAN ang pakinabang na naidudulot ng makabagong teknolohiya ng kompyuter sa pagpapalawak at pagpaparalad ng mga diskurso sa pilosopiya ng hindi na kinakailangang magkatagpo-tagpo ng personal ang mga kasali. Kamakailan halimbawa ginawang lunsaran sa e-mail ang *pilosopo@kssp.upd.edu.ph* (sa pangunguna na rin ni Dr. Leonardo de Castro, tagapangulo ng UP Departamento ng Pilosopiya at sa tulong ni Prop. Peter Sy, coordinator ng computer lab ng KSSP) para sa mga diskurso sa pilosopiya. Nauna nga sa diskusyon ang Pilosopiyang P/Filipino. Ganito ang tanong ni Dr de Castro:

Mga kaibigan,

Matanong ko nga kayo — para sa inyo, mayroon bang Pilosopiyang Filipino (Pilipino)? Ano ba, para sa inyo, ang maaaring ibig sabihin nito?

Narito ang ilan sa mga katugunan sa tanong:

GINAGAWA MUNA BAGO ITINATANONG KUNG ANO ITO

> *R. Ibana*

Naalaala ko ang kwento ng isang propesor noong isang linggo sa *round-table discussion* ng *Philosophy Circle* dito sa Ateneo. Ang sabi ng isang propesor sa isang estudyanteng may katulad na tanong: Katulad raw ito ng isang higad na masayang namamasya. Minsan tinanong siya kung paano siya maglakad. Pagkatapos nito, hindi na nakahakbang ang higad dahil tinatanong nya kung paano siya nagialakad.

May isang hindi pa nailalathalang akda si P Roque Ferriols na ginagamit namin bilang pambungad sa unang araw ng pamimilosopiya. Ang pamagat ay “Sapagkat ang Pilosopiya ay Ginagawa.” Isa sa mga islogan na lumitaw mula sa akdang ito ay “Lundiagin mo, Baybe!” Kung rinanais raw ninuman na matutong lumangoy, kailangang lumundag sa tubig. Gayundin, para sa sinumang naganais mamilosopiya, kailangan niyang gawin ito mismo bago itanong kung ano ito. Sa mismong pamimilosopiya, litaw ang pilosopiyang Pilipino. Hindi naman sa walang pilosopiyang Pilipino. Sa palagay ko,meron nito.

Pero dahil nakalubog tayong lahat sa pagkameron nito, mahirap makalitaw na para bagang hiwalay tayo at pinag-uusapan “Ang mga Pilipino.” Dapat ding gawin ang paglitaw na ito, paminsan minsan, para

Pilipino.” Dapat ding gawin ang pagitaw na ito, paminsan minsan, para hindi malunod. Pero iba ang gumagawa sa nanonood. Maari tayong pumili ng ating mga posisyon: manonood o manggagawa: miron o meron. Walang makapagbawal kung ano ang dapat na posisyon. Maaari pa ngang magtulungan sila.

PRODUKTO NG NAMAMILOSOPIYANG PILIPINO

> *P. Khalid:*

Well, it is like this: borrowing from American composer Leonard Bernstein, “American Music is Music composed by an American” and so a Filipino philosophy is a product of a Filipino who philosophizes. Now, if there is a problem about a Filipino “systematic” philosophy, I don’t think we should spend sleepless nights over it, let us just continue doing philosophy and something good will come out on it. For starters, the government, CHED particularly, industry should see the value of philosophy in a college curriculum. My idea is, just get the Filipino to philosophize then something of a Filipino philosophy will emerge. When I mean philosophize, it is more than asking metaphysical questions, but more of understanding our society, the Western & Eastern philosophers in a SCHOLARLY way, funding conventions like the Philosophy Association of the Philippines and the Philosophy Circle... these are ways where we can develop our philosophy of being Filipino. Let us not dwell whether we have one or not, let us roll up our sleeves and start to do scholarly philosophical works...

KAUGALIANG MINANA NATIN SA ATING MGA NINUNO

> *M. Dela Cruz:*

Sa aking palagay ang Pilosopiya ng mga Filipino ay isa lamang kaugalian na minana natin sa ating mga ninuno. Ito ay hindi natin ginaya sa mga banyaga. Halimbawa, ang pagtanaw ng utang na loob sa mga magulang natin. Sa pagtugon natin dito minsan iniwanan natin ang ating sarili para lamang dito, hindi ba parang pilosopiya ni Levinas?

Ang aking tanong ay, alam ba nila ang pilosopiyang ito? kilala ba nila si Levinas?

MAYROONG PILOSOPPIYA ANG MGA FILIPINO PERO WALANG PILOSOPPIYANG FILIPINO

> D. *Odchimar III*

Ang Filipino ay mayroong pilosopiya ngunit walang pilosopiyang Filipino.

Kung ang ibig nating sabihin ng pilosopiya ay isang pananaw o *worldview (perspective)* ay maari nating ipagkaloob na mayroong mga pananaw na katanungan sa isang tao sa isang sitwasyon. Maaaring ang sitwasyon na kanyang kinaroroonan ay magduculot ng kaibhan at mga pagbabagu-bago ng pananaw.

Ang mundo samakatuwid ay kung papaano ito nararanasan ng isang tao o *how it appears to the person*. Dahil sa tinitingnan natin ang mundo mula sa sitwasyon na kinaroroonan natin, malaran ang ang mundo ay ayon palagi sa kung papaano natin ito nakikita. Kung gayon, ang mundo ay pananaw lamang natin.

Tayo ay mga pananaw. Dahil dito wala kahit na isa man sa atin ay mayroong parehong tingin sa mundo. Maaring sabihin na tayo ay nananahan sa iba't ibang hiwa-hiwalay na mundo. Maaari lamang siguro na magkakahawig ang pananaw natin sa mundo ayon sa kalapitan ng lugar na kinaroroonan at mga impluensiya nito sa atin, ngunit ang pagka *particular* natin bilang mga *highly specific* na indibidwal na hinhiwalay ng *time at space* dahil sa tayo ay mga *historical being situated in a material world* o "*phenomena*" ayon kay Kant o *world of Appearances* ayon kay Plato.

Ang pag-pangalan na Filipino sa mga pananaw ay isang pagtatangka na burahin ang lantay na pagkapalitukular ng mga pananaw.

Ang pagpupunilit na mayroon pilosopiyang Filipino ay isang malinaw na pagtatangkang ibukod ang nakabukod nang kaayusan.

Ako ba ay Filipino? Ano ba ang Filipino? Sino ba ang Filipino?...

MGA ETNIKONG IDEYA, PARADIGM AT PESPEKTIBO

>N. *Manauat*

For one who's working on identity issues: race and ethnicity, class, gender and sexual orientation, I find that these categories aren't as neat

as many of us think. IMHO, a person's identity can not be boxed in so simple a manner. For example, i am all these: filipino, ex-catholic, "middle-class" (private-schooled but low-incomed --- what can i do, i'm in the academe!), lesbian feminist woman who does philosophy. But is what i do "Filipino" philosophy? is Filipino = the person's nationality? are ideas, paradigms, and perspectives 'ethnicized'? Is there a Filipino way of doing things, and if so, is it applicable to how one does philosophy?

Perhaps certain patterns may emerge but i am wary of falling into the structuralist's trap of falsely speaking for everybody.

TATLONG LAPIT

Antropolohikal, Tradisyunal (Historikal) at Konstitusyunal

Mayroong tatlong lapit sa pilosopiyang Pilipino, ayon kay R. Gripaldo (bilang pagsipi na rin sa kanyang akdang "Filipino philosophy: A Critical Bibliography"): Antropolohikal, Tradisyunal, at Konstitusyunal. Subalit umani ang mga lapit na ito ng batikos mula kina C. Sayson, Jr at E. Vera.

Nasa ibaba ang palitan nila ng mga kuru-kuro. Iniayos ito sa paraang dayalogo:

ANTROPOLOHIKAL NA LAPIT

>R. Gripaldo

The first is the anthropological approach which was popularized by William Graham Sumner in his book "Folkways." In the Philippines, this is adapted by Leonardo Mercado, Florentino Timbreza, and others. This is the collective view of the Filipino people based on their languages, sayings, riddles, epithets, folklore, and the like.

>C. Sayson, Jr

But are they in fact philosophical views? This criterion begs this substantive question, by blurring the distinction between social philosophy (worldview, weltanschauung, pananaw sa buhay) on the one hand, and philosophy on the other.

TRADISYUNAL NA LAPIT

>R. Gripaldo:

The second is the traditional approach which is generally the one used by historians of philosophy which is the enumeration of the philosophies of individual thinkers. When we speak of "Greek philosophy," for example, we enumerate Thales, Anaximenes, Anaximander, Xenophanes et al. This is true with British philosophy, "German an philosophy," "French philosophy," etc. When we speak of "Filipino philosophy" in this traditional sense, we must be able to name Filipino thinkers like Rizal, Mabini, Jacinto, Bonifacio, up to the present time. This is the individual views of Filipino thinkers.

>C. Sayson, Jr:

Again, this begs the question whether the work of such men as Rizal, Mabini, Jacinto, and Bonifacio is in fact philosophy, and whether they are philosophers in addition to being revolutionaries.

KONSTITUSYUNAL NA LAPIT

>R. Gripaldo:

The third approach I call the constitutional one in that the subject matter is definitely Western or Easterns (non-Filipino), but interpreted by Filipino authors, that is, "Filipino" as defined by the Philippine constitution. In the light of hermeneutics, since the writer/interpreter is a Filipino, then there is an interpretative input by a Filipino (as constitutionally defined). About 75% to 80% of writings in philosophy by Filipinos at present are of this nature. Examples of titles are: "The Social Philosophy of Plato," "The Ethical Philosophy of Confucius," "Zen Buddhism and the Will of the Wind," "The Theory of Justice of Aristotle," "The Private Language: Argument of Wittgenstein", etc.

>C. Sayson, Jr :

So, every dissertation written by a Filipino citizen in a foreign university, for example, no matter what the theme and point of view, is Filipino philosophy? Isn't it just philosophy that happens to be written by a Filipino? (I mean, of course it IS Filipino philosophy, but only in

an empty, legalistic sense. It's like saying that Bernard Williams' philosophy is British philosophy because he is a British subject, even though he spends most of his time at Berkeley. The point is: Does the question even come up in such cases?

ANTROPOLOHIKAL, TRADISYUNAL O HISTORIKAL

>R. Gripaldo

I do not have much time to elaborate on these three, but when we ask the question, "Mayroon bang Pilosopiya ng Filipino?" the answer is definitely yes. However, if we want to be more specific, we can raise the question, what do you mean by "Filipino philosophy"? The anthropological, traditional, or constitutional approaches? Or all three?

>C. Sayson, Jr

When we look at our answers to the question "Is there such a thing as Filipino philosophy?", it is necessary to ask in what sense the answer could be "no". In the anthropological sense given above, the answer could not possibly be no, since every culture has in fact some kind of worldview. But many such worldviews are of a mythic character and do not rise to the level of philosophical thinking. All myth is part of the collective thought of a culture, but from this it doesn't follow that that culture has a philosophy. Thus, for instance, the worldview of Homer's 'Iliad' is considered part of Greek thought, but not of Greek philosophy.

In fact none of the criteria proposed by Dr Gripaldo engages the prior and substantive question, what is philosophy? Unless we are clear about this, we are at risk of putting the emphasis on "Filipino" rather than on "philosophy" whenever we try to characterize "Filipino philosophy".

HISTORIKAL NA LAPIT AT PILOSOPHIYAS NG PANG-ARAW-ARAW NA PAMUMUHAY

>R. Gripaldo

As I said in my answer to the question "Is there Filipino philosophy?" that I have no time to elaborate on the three approaches to Filipino philosophy. I did discuss/explain in the first

edition of "Filipino philosophy: a critical bibliography" the meaning of philosophy. The title of the first chapter is "Towards a definition of Filipino philosophy" where the three concepts "Filipino," "philosophy," and "Filipino philosophy" are clarified. The best way really to respond to Prof. Sayson's remarks is to read this chapter.

But I will quickly just say the following:

1) I am taking the point of view of a historian of philosophy. As such, any historian of philosophy transcends the quarrel of different philosophical schools in which one school denies that the other schools are engaged in philosophy. For example, Bertrand Russell distinguishes between a philosopher (one engaged in the philosophy of logical analysis) and a social critic (one who makes critical views about/comments on life, society, etc.). David Hume and Rudolf Carnap rejected metaphysics as philosophy. On the other hand, the existentialists discarded logical analysis as meaningless to one's life, etc. But a historian of philosophy considers all these as philosophy and includes them in his history of philosophy. While analytic philosophy emphasizes logic and continental philosophy emphasizes life, pragmatism tries to bridge the two by stressing both logic and life. Morton White argues that the hedgehog (existentialists, phenomenologists and the like) may lie down with the fox (analytic philosophers) and the result need not be grotesque. He suggests that the two types of philosophizing should be reconciled. Rorty began as an analytic philosopher who studied continental philosophy and ended up a neopragmatist (or a postmodern pragmatist). Of course, pragmatism need not be the only way to bridge the two camps.

>C. Sayson, Jr:

... But I never questioned any of that. There has never been any question of the pluralistic nature of philosophical method. To make it quite simple, there have been three main methods of doing philosophy: (a) logical/linguistic/conceptual analysis; (b) transcendental/phenomenological analysis; and (c) dialectic. And there has never been any question, either, that myth can be subjected to any or all of these modes of analysis. But there you have it: these are all modes of ANALYSIS. Even phenomenological description is, in effect, an analysis of the categories of our lived experience.

Sure, the point of view of a historian of philosophy exempts one from taking a stand on which method is the “correct” philosophical method; but it doesn’t exempt one from explaining why one thinks that myth is or can be considered philosophy. Perhaps this is explained in your book, but I hope the explanation can be formulated neatly enough in a short simple paragraph for those of us who have no access to it.

>E. Vera

Please clarify this point: If an historian of philosophy needs to transcend the quarrel of different philosophical schools in which one school denies that the other schools are engaged in philosophy, how does he or she know that both systems are philosophies? Is it because they just claim to be so? Compare this with an historian of science who needs to choose between different explanations for physical phenomena, classifying some as scientific, others as superstition. He might begin with nearly animistic belief but after a while he rejects them. By the time he talks about the discovery of magnetism he no longer refers to astrology as a science. Similarly the historian of philosophy justifies the claim that say two lines of inquiry, existentialism and linguistic analysis are philosophical fields, while provincial beliefs about peculiar nature of humans (such as all men are by nature polygamous) are not.

>R. Gripaldo:

2) In contemporary philosophy there is the philosophization of everyday life, that is, the attempt to efface the boundary between the low road to philosophy (unsystematic philosophical views about life, society, etc.) and the high road to philosophy (systematic thinking such as those of Plato, Kant, Schopenhauer et al.). I do not have much time to explain this, but the point is, “philosophy” has come down to us to have a very broad meaning that even myths (see Roland Barthes—a poststructuralist) can be philosophical. This is not to say that all myths, the social sciences, etc. are philosophies. All I am saying is that a philosophically-minded person can “see” philosophizing in them

>C. Sayson, Jr

... To say that myths can be “philosophical” is a statement so vague as to be practically useless. Anyway, I think I answered this point in reply to (1): that philosophy can be and is applied to the study of myth and with remarkable results as Barthes showed. But how does this show that myth is or can be philosophy?

Why do you categorize Plato as a ‘systematic’ philosopher? To Plato, philosophy is the difficult and painstaking task of making conceptual distinctions. From his earliest work up to the very last, his dialogues are remarkable attempts to get clear about the meanings of certain terms (justice, virtue, good, friendship, courage—all ordinary concepts that are part of moral discourse).

>E. Vera

Does the philosophically minded person “see” the philosophizing in them or does he put it there? It’s one thing to examine a text whose author intends as philosophical, and then to “look for” the philosophy in it, but to “see” it in a myth or other common belief... it makes me stop and wonder. This view wouldn’t include “personal philosophy” in the sense that, “Well, my philosophy in life is blah, blah, blah...”, would it?

Anyway, I agree this leads to Dr. Gripaldo’s next point...

>R. Gripaldo

3) It really all boils down to “what is philosophy?” My answer to this is rather long, but can anyone give us a definition that will include all the “philosophical views” that are supposed to be included in any history of philosophy? Can Prof. Sayson give us his criteria of what ought or ought not to be included as philosophy which will suit the perspective of a historian of philosophy like Frederick Copleston? I will give you a clue: any definition of philosophy must take into account Wittgenstein’s doctrine of family resemblances.

>C. Sayson, Jr

... Does Father Copleston consider myth philosophy? I think not! And I didn’t say that our problem “all boils down” to the

question, what is philosophy? I said that question needs to be answered first before we can do anything else. Lastly, family resemblances can be quite deceiving. If you follow family resemblances uncritically, you can be led insensibly down a slippery slope. A few months ago, a newspaper columnist wrote a fatuous editorial where he equated “critical thinking” with “making criticisms”, e.g., personal criticisms, and then drew the irresponsible conclusion that it is perilous to engage in critical thinking. The “argument” trades on the family resemblance between the terms “critical thinking” and “making criticisms”. (Fortunately his column did not go unchallenged.) Another example: In the Athens of Plato’s time there were family resemblances between the two terms ‘sophos’ and ‘sophistes’, such that it was unclear how to distinguish one from the other. Plato made a lifelong attempt to distinguish the two terms. The ‘sophos’ is one who can make distinctions between ideas in a reliable way, according to the nature of things as they really are; the ‘sophistes’ is one who wantonly disregards these distinctions for the sake of winning an argument and persuading his hearers, and for financial gain. Socrates was accused of being a ‘sophistes’ and put to death for it, but Plato showed mankind that Socrates was really a ‘philosophos’, i.e. a ‘lover’ of ‘sophia’, someone who is unswervingly committed to the human task of searching for the truth, not by having it revealed to him but by going out and engaging others in disciplined conversation. Philosophy, in Socrates’ and Plato’s minds, is an activity, not a body of doctrine.

Well, I guess that too is my conception of philosophy, and I think it’s a damn good one!

>E. Vera:

We can begin with the following guide questions:

1. What do these philosophical schools intend to do? — Almost all of these seek to explain or justify something, answering questions like, (a) What is real? (Covers just about everything from Thales to the present), (b) How should we act? (Same. I’m not an expert but doesn’t this sooner or later involve existentialism as well as ethics?), (c) Are my arguments for (a) and (b) good or bad? (Logic), (d) Is there only one way of assessing the correctness of my arguments?, (e) How do I justify my judgments?

I dare say the last question even sums up the ONLY question in philosophy. Everything else either rephrases the question or explores the details.

The next problem is distinguishing this from the physical sciences, comparative literature, or any other sort of inquiry...

I dare say the last question even sums up the ONLY question in philosophy. Everything else either rephrases the question or explores the details.

The next problem is distinguishing this from the physical sciences, comparative literature, or any other sort of inquiry...

2. It's the method and the depth -- Philosophers answer their questions without necessarily using the scientific method (especially since some of them are busy examining the scientific method). I'm not too clear how to describe the "method" here, save perhaps to say that we use logic (but then again, what science doesn't?).

I notice, however, that serious philosophical enterprises seek ultimate justification for their claims. They keep to get the reason behind the last reason... at least until their spade is turned. Furthermore, they seek an ultimate general principle. I mean they seek a general principle, a rule that applies not only to the inquiry at hand but to every other inquiry. Note how Aristotle's theories, or Plato's before him, would have something to say about how to answer any question.

And compare how a modern student of the discipline would use Wittgensteinian techniques to answer any other question like, "What is justice?", "What is the nature of man?", and "Why do 7 and 5 make 12?"

Not all philosophers have written on so many subjects, but my point is that it's possible to apply their principles to other subjects. How would cartesian thinking explore ethics or politics? I am not versed in all of Descartes' s writings but I think he wrote none on this subject. How different would it be from, say, Kantian ethics? If they didn't actually write on everything, at least their principles should be capable of being taken to other directions.

That's generality.

(Hmm. Maybe Descartes didn't cover those areas because it didn't interest him, or the project would prove too broad. But note how different philosophers can share a tradition, a way of doing philosophy, and team up on these philosophical problems. Which rationalist tackled ethics? Didn't the Vienna circle do something like this (teaming up on problems)? Can we do something like this?)

3. Finally, it's the discipline --- Given the length of time humans have existed on this planet, I bet people have tried to answer the foregoing questions. Even before Thales, even before Confucius, even before people lived in Mohenjo Daro, Harappa or what have you. Unfortunately, nobody did any writing, or if they did, these were lost. Think of philosophy as a great conversation between all the thinkers of the human race. Next, to participate, we have to be thorough. We imagine our arguments, justify it, and anticipate counter arguments... and then we write them down. Furthermore, we assume the truth of our conclusions and imagine their implications (if you find that *modus ponens* holds in all possible worlds, does this imply that logical principles are more real than to write them down.

Does this mean that unwritten thoughts are not philosophy? Only to the extent that some great thinker in human history is not deemed a philosopher... because no one ever heard of him.

Now, what would make philosophy Filipino? Probably the same criteria we use to refer to Continental philosophy, Anglo-American philosophy, Chinese philosophy, Ancient Greek philosophy, and Islamic philosophy. We normally talk like this to distinguish the way they do philosophy in some place from the way they do it in other places. Their theories were original, cogent, and supported. They also enjoyed prominence (or notoriety) in places outside their geographic location. If we want to have a Filipino philosophy in the same vein, we should continue writing our answers to the philosophical questions. By their generality, peculiarity, and coherence, shall our ideas distinguish themselves.

I imagine there will be other issues here like, "Should Filipino philosophy be in Filipino?" My first answer is "No, there's no need." Others feel that our very language delineates the kind of philosophical question we would pose, as well as how to answer

them. I used to think this way too but lately, I'm not so sure of my position.

FAMILY RESEMBLANCES AT MODUS PONENS. BILANG PAGLILINAW SA
PILOSOPHIYA VS MITO

> *C. Sayson, Jr.*

I intend the above points to be conjunctive; a thorough essay on how best to wear pajamas is not philosophy, and a shallow explanation of ethical principles ("Because the spirits decree it! Isn't that enough?") both fall short of the requirements.

This, like the proverbial hundred lawyers chained to the bottom of the ocean, is "a good start". What is the philosophical mode of explanation as contrasted with the mythic mode?

One thing we cannot do is to argue from resemblances. That is to say, we can't argue that since there are family resemblances between certain types of mythical thought and philosophy, then there must be and substantive relation between the two. Resemblance is not a transitive relation, i.e., if x resembles y and y resembles z, it doesn't follow that x resembles z. [It's like the relation "mother of": If A is the mother of B and B is the mother of C, it doesn't follow that A is the mother of C.] Any resemblance between philosophy and myth is inconclusive as to their real connections.

On an earlier point raised, I'm not sure what it means to ask whether modus ponens is true in all possible worlds. Perhaps the point of the question is: whether modus ponens is validity-preserving for all formal systems. There's one philosopher who argued that modus ponens is masculine form of inference, that it expresses the male domination of society, and thus is valid only for a certain range of discourse. (I'm sorry I forgot her name, but she was mentioned prominently in an exchange of letters in the *New York Review of Books* several years ago.) The mistake here is in thinking that a form of inference can be critiqued on the level of the pragmatics of discourse, which opens the way to the kind of ideological critique she wants to do. It cannot—its critique must be done on the level of formal semantics. (Simple distinctions like this go a long way. It keeps you from worrying about problems that aren't really problems.)

WIKANG FILIPINO

Panlinang sa Pilosopiya ng F/Pilipino

> *M. I. Lamongo:*

Kung ating likilalanin na isa sa mga paraan upang linangin ang “mga pilosopiyang Filipino” (anumanang uri ng mga nilalang ito) ay sa pamamagitan ng paggamit ng wika ng Filipino, hindi maiiwasang harapin ang kakulangan ng mga pagsasalín ng mga akda (pilosopikal man o hindi) sa Filipino. Kahit sabihin natin na marami-rami na ring mga aklat sa pilosopiya ang nasusulat sa Filipino (ng mga Pilipinong pilosopo), naroroon pa rin ang hindi maitatawang kakulangan at kahirapang matagpuan ng mga pangunahing teksto sa Filipino. (Sa isang TV show noong nakaraang taon, binigyang-pansin ni Homobono Adaza ang kakulangan/kawalalan ng mga pagsasalín ng mga “classics sa world literature” sa ating mga *bookstores*.) Sa aking palagay, kung talagang seryoso tayo sa paglinang ng “mga pilosopiyang Filipino,” kailangang seryosohan din natin ang gawain ng pagsasalín. Siguro, kailangan nating hikayatin ang isa’t-isa na magsagawa ng mga pagsasalíng ito.

Sa aking personal na karanasan, Ingles ang pangunahing paraan ng aking pakikipagtagpo sa iba’t-ibang mga pilosopo at pilosopiya. Pero napag-isip-isip ko na kung rinanais kong makatulong sa gawain ng pagsasalín, kinakailangan kong mag-aral ng iba pang wika bukod sa Ingles at aking inang wika. Nagsisimula ako sa Aleman at nangangarap na balang-araw ay makapagsalín sa aking paboritong pilosopong si Nietzsche.

Gayunpaman, hindi pa rin maiiwasan ang mga kontrobersiya. Sa TV show na nabanggit ko kanina, ibinahagi naman ni Alex Magno na isinalin niya ang “The Prince” ni Machiavelli bilang “Ang Pinuno” at ipinabasa sa kanyang mga estudyante. At tinanong daw siya ng mga ito kung walang ingles noon dahil nahihirapan silang intindihin (nalalaliman?). At dahil nga raw sa punang tula bumababa ang kalidad ng edukasyon sa paggamit ng wikang Filipino, ipinasya niyang bumalik sa pagtuturo na ang ginagamit na wika ay Ingles.

*Tabak Philosophy at Wikang Pilipino***> J. m.p. Javier:**

...Sa aking palagay ay mayroong Filosopiyang Pilipino. Ang mga ginawa ng ating mga ninuno na pagsisikap na maunawaan ang kanilang kinalalagan sa buhay ay tinatawag kong pamimilosopiya. Ang kanilang kaisipan ay ipinahahayag sa pamamagitan ng panulat ng ating mga naging bantog na bayani kabilang na sina Rizal, Bonifacio, atbp. Hindi ko alam kung ang iba pang mga bayani matapos ang 1521 at bago ang mga Ilustrado ay nagawang maipahayag sa pamamagitan ng pagsulat...Ang kanilang tinalakay, ang paksa ng kanilang pamimilosopiya ay ang ating KABANSAAN. Sasabihin ng isang nag-aaral sa kasalukuyan na sila ay Social or Political Philosophers. Ang ginawang pakikihamok ng mga Pilipino laban sa mga dayuhan para sa kalayaan at kasarinlan simula pa ng dumating ang mga Kastila (at hanggang sa kasalukuyan!) ay nagpapakita ng kanilang pagiging gising o mulat ang mga mata at bukas ang kaisipan sa mga nagaganap sa kanilang paligid, sa buhay. At ito ang nagsisilbing batayan at nagbubunsod ng kanilang pamimilosopiya. (Ang tawag ko rito ay "TABAK PHILOSOPHY"). Sa katunayan, kung tatanggapin natin na may "pattern" at "continuity" ang daloy ng Kasaysayang Pilipino ay naroroon at buhay pa rin ang pamimilosopiyang ito hanggang sa sandaling ito! Hindi yata tumpak na hanapin natin sa Pilipinas ang tinatawag na "pilosopiyang" natagpuan ng iba sa Gresya o sa Tsina o sa Amerika, atbp

Ang TUNAY na Pilipino ay namimilosopiya sa wikang Pilipino kahit pa sa impiyerno!!!—itong mabagsik na pananalitang ito ay para sa taong dapat lamang tamaan... Marahil hindi pa niya naiintindihan ang kahulugan ng "NO BLOOD NO HEROISM"... PARDON TO MORE SENSITIVE READERS AND BROTHERS... BUT I JUST WANT TO BE CLEAR...

*Wikang Pilipino vs Tunay na Pilosopiyang Pilipino: Tungo sa Feministang Pilosopiyang Pilipino***> N. Manuat:**

Pilosopiyang Pilipino sa wikang Pilipino? Heto na naman tayo... Sa bansang Pilipinas, hindi lamang iisa ang wika. Sa aking

pananaw, hindi makakadagdag o makakabawas sa diwa ang paraan ng pagsaad nito— kesyong ilahad ito sa Inggles, Tagalog, Ilonggo, Waray, etc. Hindi lamang ang pagbigkas o pagsulat ng sariling wika ang tanging batayan sa pamimilosopiyang Pilipino. A case in point: Si Jose Rizal—isang *socio-political philosopher*. Hindi maitatwa ang kanyang pagmamahal sa bayan. Ngunit mas marami siyang isinulat sa Espanyol kaysa Tagalog. Isa pa, maraming manunulat na gumagamit ng wikang Pilipino/Tagalog ngunit hindi ito sapat para sila ay maituring na pilosopong Pilipino.

Ano nga ba ang “tunay” (*authentic*) na pilosopiyang Pilipino kung mayroon nga nito? Para sa akin hindi madaling hanapan ng sagot ang katanungang ito. Mas marami pang katanungan ang ibubunga nito, e.g. mayroon nga bang pilipinong kasarinlan (*identity*)? Kagaya ng nabanggit ko kanakailan. May iba pang kategorya na dapat isaalang-alang maliban sa sa ating pagkapilipino. Maliban sa *ethnicity*, nariyan pa ang panlipunan-ekonomiyang banagdan, kasarian, orientasyong sekswal, abilidad, etc. Kung mayroon ngang pilosopiyang Pilipino paano tayo makakasiguro na ito nga ay totoo at hindi lamang nagrerepresenta sa *status quo*? Kagaya ng paraan ng pagtuturo ng pilosopiya sa kolehiyo. Naging pangkaraniwan na ang magtatag at panatilihin ang “*canon*” Hindi ba’t sila Platon, Aristoteles, Santo Tomas, etc., ang laman ng ating klase sa “*Intro to Philosophy*” at ating itinuturing na “*canonical*”? Marami sa atin ang nagsasaisang-tabi sa mga kababaihang pilosopo at hindi mula sa kanluran. Marahil hindi malayong magkaroon din ng “*feministang pilosopiyang Pilipino*”, hindi ba?

Lumalabas sa mga talakayan sa itaas ang kahirapang makahagip ng malinaw na pamantayan/lapit/pananaw sa pagtutukoy kung ang pilosopiya ay Pilosopiyang F/Pilipino. Samut sari ang mga pamantayan/lapit/pananaw na naihad na, subalit wala ni isa sa mga ito ang maalwal na kinikilala bilang matibay na pamantayan/lapit/pananaw sa pagtutukoy/pagtutuklas/pagpapalutang sa Pilosopiyang F/Pilipino. Kung kaya hindi masisisi kung naging pananaw ng marami ang “Mabuti pa ay mamilosopiya na muna tayo. Saka na natin itanong kung ano ang ating pamimilosopiya”. Sabay sipi kay Padre Ferriols, “Lundagin mo, baybe!”.

Gayunman, nanatili ang tanong, “Mayroon bang Pilosopiyang F/Pilipino?” hindi lamang dahil sa pagnanais na makahanap ng pilosopiyang

maituturing na pilosopiya ng mga Pilipino upang maihanay sa mga kinikilalang pilosopiya sa mundo gaya ng Pilosopiyang Pranses, Pilosopiyang Aleman, Pilosopiyang Inasik, Pilosopiyang Indiyang atbp, kundi dahil na rin sa pagnanais na makilala ang sariling kaakuhan na higit na pinahalalagan sa kasalukuyang pamimilosopiya dahil na rin sa pananaw na (laluna ng postmodernismo) ang pamimilosopiya ay kaakuhan. Sa pagsagot kasi sa tanong nagiging malinaw ang pagkilala sa sariling kaakuhan.

Ilan lamang ang mga nabanggit sa itaas sa mga pamantayan/lapit/pananaw na sinubukan ng gamitin sa pagtutukoy sa Pilosopiyang F/Pilipino. Ilan pa sa mga ito ang: *holistikong lapit* n. Leonardo Mercado¹; *komparatibong analisis* n. Emerita Quito²; *pagsasakonteksto ng pilosopiyang kanluranin sa kamalayang Pilipino* ni Leonardo de Castro³; *penomenolohiya ng karanasan* ni Manuel Dy, Jr.⁴; *pagtitipon ng mga akdang isinulat ng mga Pilipino sa pilosopiya* ni Romualdo Abulad⁵; *tungo sa katatubong Pilipino at pagsasakatutubo ng Pilosopiyang Pilipino* ni Florentino Timbreza⁶; *pamamaraang vital thought at reflexive thought* ni Ramon Ejea⁷; *antropolohikal na paglalahad* nina Dionisio Miranda⁸ at Albert Alejo⁹; *mga pagsusuri ng mga konsepto ng Pilipino* nina Dionisio Miranda, Albert Alejo, Prospero Covar¹⁰, Reynaldo Ileta¹¹, Zeus Salazar¹² at Emmanuel Lacaba¹³.

Kung tutuusin ang mga pamantayan/lapit/pananaw na ginamit sa itaas ay pag-uulit lamang sa alinman sa mga nasubukan ng mga pamantayan/lapit/pananaw na ito. Walang dudang ang "historikal na lapit" na ginamit ni Gripaldo at "Ang pilosopiyang F/Pilipino ay walang iba kundi ang pamimilosopiyang ang namimilosopiya ay Pilipino" n. Khalid ay tulad ng "pamamaraang pagtitipon ng mga akdang isinulat ng mga Pilipino sa pilosopiya" ni Abulad. "Ang Pilosopiyang F/Pilipino bilang kaugalang minana natin sa ating magulang" ni de la Cruz ay walang ipinagkaiba sa "ang pilosopiya ay ang kabuuang kaugaliang amana natin sa nakalipas" ni P. Roque Ferriols, at ang "wikang Filipino bilang pantukoy sa pamimilosopiyang F/Pilipino" ni Lamongo ay gaya ng "metalingwistikang analisis" ni Mercado.

Nagkakaiba't nagsusunangalngalan man ang mga inuhaing pamantayan/lapit/pananaw nakalatapong naman ang mga ito sa pagpapalawak at pagpapaulad ng diskurso sa pilosopiyang F/Pilipino. Sadya nga marahil na ang hinihingi ng kasalukuyang diskurso ay hindi ang kaagad na iisang

marami dahil sa ganito: karaniwang nakukita ang hinahanap. At saka na nga natin marahil kailangang tukuyin ang ating hinahanap na matibay at katanggap-tanggap na pamantayan/lapit/pananaw sa Pilosopiyang F/ Pilipino.

Samantala tayo na munang makisawsaw sa diskurso.

MGA TALA

- ¹ Binubuo ito ng metalinguistikang analisis at penomenolohiya ng kilos ng mga Pilipino. Tingnan halimbawa ang kanyang *The Elements of Filipino Philosophy* (Taaloban City: Divine Word Publications, 1973) at *The Filipino Mind* (Manila: Divine Word Publications, 1994)
- ² Ganito ang mapapansin sa kanyang *The Merging Philosophy of the East and the West* (Manila: DLSU Press 1983),² “Pilosopiya sa Diwang Pilipino” na nasa *A Life of Philosophy* (Manila: DLSU Press, 1990) at *Lectures on Comparative Philosophy* (Manila: DLSU Press, 1979)
- ³ Tingnan ang kanyang *Etika at Pilosopiya sa kontekstong Pilipino* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1995)
- ⁴ Malinaw na inilhad ito sa kanyang “Paghahanap ng Weltanschauung ng Pilipino”. *Ang Pandaigdigang Pananaw ng mga Pilipino*. (Quezon City: Philippine Psychological Research House, 1978)
- ⁵ Ito rin ang kanyang iminumungkahing lapit sa *Options for Filipino Philosophy* (Manila: DLSU Press, 1984)
- ⁶ Mapapansin ito sa kanyang *Pilosopiyang Pilipino* (Quezon City: Rex Publishing Co., 1982)
- ⁷ Makikita ang ganito sa kanyang “Sources of Filipino Thought”. *Philippine Studies*, Fourth Quarter, 1973.
- ⁸ Isa ito sa mga pamamaraang kanyang ginamit sa pag-aaral ng konseptong “loob”. Tingnan ang kanyang *Loob: The Filipino Within* (Manila: Divine Word Publications, 1989)
- ⁹ Ginamit rin ito na Alejo sa pagsusuri niya sa konseptong “loob” Tingnan ang kanyang *Tao Po, Tuloy!: Isang Landas sa Pagtubak sa Loob* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Univ. Press, 1990)
- ¹⁰ Sinuri nito ang pagkataong Pilipino sa pamamagitan ng “Loob”. Makikita ito halimbawa sa kanyang “Kaalamang Bayang Dalumat ng Pagkataong Filipino”. Isang lekturang propesoryal na binasa sa Bulwagang Rizal, Faculty Center, UP Diliman, Lungsod Quezon noong ika-3 ng Marsc 1993.
- ¹¹ Sa kabuuan gumamit ito ng historikal na hermeneutika sa pag-aaral ng “Loob”. Tingnan ang kanyang *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines 1840-1910* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979)

- ¹² Sinuri niya ang mga konseptong “loob”, “hiya”, “kamalayan” at “diwa” gaya rin ng makikita sa kanyang *Ang Kamalayan at Diwa: Isang paglilinaw ng ilang konsepto ng Kinagisnang Sikolohiya* (1977) at *Wika at Diwa: Isang Pansikolingwistikang Analisis sa Halimbawa ng Konsepto ng “Hiya”* (1981).
- ¹³ Mayroon din siyang pasusuring ginawa ukol sa “loob”. Tingnan ang kanyang “Ang Loob: Ilang Tala sa Paghiliming Pilipino” nasa *Komunikasyon at Lipunan* (Lungsod Quezon: Departamento ng Pilipino at Panitikan ng Pilipinas, 1981)