

# *Kapwa* in *pamilya* rooted in *loob* of divine image: Thoughts from a Filipino Catholic theologian

Levy Lara Lanaria

The Filipino culture and society is essentially familial.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the native notion of kinship system “lies deep in the heart of Filipino community social organization.” For better or for worse, it “affects, if not dominates, the shaping of local institutions, values, emotions and actions.”<sup>2</sup> Beyond domestic confines, familial solidarity is tangible in politics, business, and even in the ritual practice of religion. The family “stands at the heart of social life” and is considered as the only corporate unit in the society that serves both as the bond of group decisions/actions and source of personal security.<sup>3</sup>

A scientific study administered to Filipino students in the 1970s disclosed emotional closeness and security of the family as a major Filipino value.<sup>4</sup> Another fairly recent study showed that of the top ten most important components of the good life identified by the Filipino respondents, six of these represent emotional support provided by the family.<sup>5</sup> A more recent Philippine Happiness Index (PHI) study conducted in 2010 revealed that “family” topped the list of things that made Filipinos happy.<sup>6</sup>

The structural-functional and the symbolic-interactionist value of the family<sup>7</sup> can be overshadowed, however, by a number of

constricting forces. They threaten healthy, mutually trusting and truthful relationships within the family and vitiate the integral growth of family members and the family itself both *ad intra* (within the family) and *ad extra* (in relation to the community and society at large). Three major shortcomings of the Filipino family can be noted as pointed out by local anthropologists and sociologists. These are the propensity to be clannish or social individualism wherein common good is subordinated to familial interests, manifestations of authoritarianism which block off trusting and truthful two-way communications, and the presence of patriarchal elements in the family which relegate the wife to an inferior role.<sup>8</sup> These are stumbling blocks to the healthy and integral development of the family members and the family vis-a-vis the larger community and society. If Jesus Christ has envisioned a world where there is fullness of life (John 10:10b: “I have come that they may have life, life in all its fullness”), then his followers ought to facilitate the development of attitudes and the creation of structural conditions which make possible the fulfillment of such a vision.

This paper attempts to proffer a philosophical-theological framework as a heu-

ristic device to undergird efforts towards facilitating this fullness of life in the Filipino familial culture/society.<sup>9</sup> It prescribes the concept of “*kapwa*” to bring out what is deeply implicit in the Filipino social psyche awaiting to be harnessed towards reconstructing a more ‘life-giving’ familial culture. *Kapwa* is the core value of the native lowland culture as propounded by the Filipino sociologist, Virgilio Enriquez.<sup>10</sup> In the context of our deeply religious orientation, I propose to ground it upon the traditional Christian theological concept of *imago Dei* (image of God) mediated by another indigenously and equally popular concept of *loob*.

### ***Kapwa*: Core Social Psychological Value**

*Kapwa* literally means “both” or “fellow.” It is one of those terms in the Filipino lexicon which enjoy common usage both in oral and written form. Very often it is used as a qualifier, thus *kapwa manggagawa* (fellow worker) or *kapwa guro* (fellow teacher). Or it can be used as a subject as in *kapwa nagmamahalan* (both loving each other) or *kapwa matalino* (both [are] intelligent). In any case the emphasis is on sameness and relational-ness.

Enriquez regards *kapwa* as a “superordinate concept” which can help render an emic account of patterned Filipino interpersonal behavior. Its more dynamic derivative *pakikipagkapwa* (“relating”) subsumes at least eight behaviorally recognizable levels which Enriquez clusters into two general categories: *ibang-tao* or “outsider” and *hindi ibang tao* or “one-of-us.” Under the “outsider” group are the levels of *pakikitungo* (amenities/civility), *pakikiwalamuha* (“mixing”); *pakikilahok* (joining/participating), *pakikibagay* (conforming), and *pakikisama* (adjusting). The “one-of-us” category ranges from *pakikipagpalagayang-loob* (mutual trust/rapprochement), *pakikisangkot* (getting involved), and *pakikiisa* (fusion, oneness and full). These are not merely interre-

lated modes of interpersonal relations but are levels of interaction. Neither are they merely conceptually but behaviorally different as well.

More significantly, Enriquez refers to *kapwa* as “shared inner self,” which presupposes the sharing of “collective values with the rest of humanity and deep respect for the dignity and inherent worth of a fellow human being.” It is marked by “a reflexive quality, such that what is good for one is shared and is good for the other, what would be to the detriment of one is accepted in fact as detrimental to the other.” The derivative *pakikipagkapwa* is intimately linked with the personalist trait of the Filipinos. To a villager, there is no such thing as impersonal relationships, only highly personalized one. This is not to be equated with the American concept of “individualism” where autonomous individuated self takes precedence over inter-relations. Filipinos are oriented to relating to one another as part of the collectivity. The expression, *pine-personal* (taking things personally), captures the essence of *pagkamapagkapwa* as an element of value orientation.<sup>11</sup>

*Pakikipagkapwa* is more inclusive and goes much deeper than *pakikisama* (smooth personal relations), for which Filipinos are noted in terms of the degree or level of commitment to a relationship.<sup>12</sup> While *pakikisama* is very often associated with avoidance of conflict and pleasing the other/others it does not necessarily denote depth of commitment to the *kapwa* or *mga kapwa* (plural), *pakikipagkapwa* means the ego-sharing-identity-with-the-other. Take note that it is not the ego-dominating-over-the-other. The latter is the Western ego of the enlightenment which post-modern philosophers have criticized vigorously for its propensity to make other peoples into its own image and likeness to the exclusion of

otherness, difference, multiplicity.<sup>13</sup> In the *kapwa*-scheme I am proposing, the other, endowed with his/her own uniqueness, remains my *kapwa* not just on the basis of his/her status or standing but because the *ako* (I) and *siya* (he/she) or *ila* (they) essentially partake of the same humanity. *Kapwa* is difference-in-sameness. Another Filipino sociologist refers to *pakikipagkapwa* as “humanness as its highest level.”<sup>14</sup>

A person starts having *kapwa* not so much because of a recognition of status given him by others but more because of his awareness of shared identity. The *ako* (ego) and the *iba-sa-akin* (others) are one and the same in *kapwa* psychology: *Hindi ako iba sa aking kapwa* (I am no different from others). Once *ako* starts thinking of himself as separate from *kapwa*, the Filipino “self” gets to be individuated in the Western sense and, in effect, denies the status of *kapwa* to the other. By the same token, the status of *kapwa* is also denied to the self.

To be denied of the selfhood or personhood (*pagkatao*), that last remaining ‘line of defense’ of the individual, is a terrible misfortune for a Filipino. A popular Filipino movie illustrates the deepest value of *pagkatao*. The heart-rending plea of a Filipina mother beseeching her daughter with whom she has a heated altercation says it all: “*Kung hindi mo na ako gustong galangin bilang ina, galangin mo naman ako bilang tao*” (“If you don’t want to treat me as your mother, treat me as a human being”). It is an appeal to relate to her as her daughter’s *kapwa* (fellow human being) as motherhood loses, rightly or wrongly, its moral ascendancy.<sup>15</sup>

*Kapwa*, then, has an innate ethical dimension which *a priori* recognizes and respects and advances the cause of human dignity.

One may refer to it as a pre-existent metaphysical force which makes an ethical claim on our personhood. A very famous Filipino slogan puts it this way: *kapwa ko, pananagutan ko* (my fellow human being, my responsibility). Interestingly Enriquez’ treatment of *kapwa* in Chapter 4 of his book bears the title “*Kapwa and the Struggle for Justice, Freedom and Dignity*. The struggle to re-build a just, free and humanistic world is intimately linked to or passes through *pakikipagkapwa*.

### ***Kapwa Rooted in Loob of Divine Image***

In the entire chapter of his book solely devoted to *kapwa*, Enriquez does not explicitly tie up the concept with the anthropological value of egalitarianism. One can, however, extract a vital surplus meaning from the rich and deep dimensions of the concept. Here I will attempt to argue that *kapwa* has the intimations of equality hence *pakikipagkapwa* in its profound meaning is two co-equal persons relating to one another. However, the *kapwa*-construct needs to have, as it were, an ontological grounding to serve as persistent corrective of dominating tendencies that might be wrongly subscribed to the *kapwa*-principle.<sup>16</sup> The ontological foundation I have in mind is another very rich native concept which has been reflected upon by contemporary Filipino philosophers and theologians in recent decades: the concept of *loob* (literally, inside or interior).

The Filipino philosopher-anthropologist Albert Alejo has done extensive research on the concept in his excellent published work in Filipino, *Tao po! Tuloy! Isang Landas ng Pag-unawa sa Loob ng Tao*.<sup>17</sup> In the process he was able to gather an ensemble of descriptions by a group of local thinkers who had reflected on the concept using different theoretical lens such as historical, metalinguistic analysis, psychological analysis, and theological hermeneutics.

*Loob* is described variously as cave of Filipino thought, holistic self of the Filipino, state of feeling and core of character, genuine self of the person, and the person in his/her deepest interiority. There was also the post-modern critique of the ‘embalmed’ *loob* as instrument of conquest.<sup>18</sup> At the end of Alejo’s book is a remarkable collection of 261 *loob*-idioms alphabetically ordered by the author with their respective meanings.

The indigenous concept of *loob* so caught the theological imagination of a popular Filipino lay theologian Jose de Mesa that he has creatively re-constructed an inculturated theology upon the native concept for lowland Filipinos.<sup>19</sup> He is known to have pioneered the use of the native expression *kagandahang-loob* as a culturally appropriate category to refer to God’s *pagmamahal* (love).<sup>20</sup> He is fond of translating his preferred theological expression *kagandahang-loob ng Diyos* into English as winsome benevolence (a synthesis of beauty and goodness) of God. In his popular 1987 published work *In Solidarity with the Culture: Studies in Theological Re-rooting* de Mesa shares his observation on the depth-meaning of *loob* as “the inner self... the core of one’s personhood and where the true worth of a person lies. It is what makes the lowland Filipino what he is and who he is as a person. Not only that, it is an appropriate term to describe a person in relationship to others because it provides an insight as to what kind of person one is.”<sup>21</sup>

*Loob* is an essentially relational concept. One’s *loob* is appreciated only in terms of how he/she relates to his/her *mga kapwa* (plural). If he/she has been showing repeatedly signs of remarkable *kabutihan* (goodness) to them, in time, they will describe him/her as of *magandang-loob* or *mabuting-loob*. The qualifier *maganda*

literally is beautiful thus emphasizing the aesthetic dimension of *loob*, while *mabuti* is good which brings out its moral side. If the person is oftentimes unkind or mean or selfish towards others, people will eventually describe him/her as possessing *masamang-loob* (bad-*loob*). *Loob* is beyond ethical judgment when it does not manifest itself in outward behavior. However the concrete way by which a person relates to others in general may not necessarily be reflective of the *mabuting loob*. This simply means that his/her attitude/behavior is disconnected from his/her *loob*. This person is perceived as *plastik* (plastic), *doble-kara* (double-faced), *balatkayo* (deception), *may maskara* (with mask) - all referring to the hypocritical behavior. *Loob* manifests itself “through external behavior, and behavior in an authentic person stems from the *loob* and is not used to camouflage the inner self.” In the *loob*-scheme the *labas* (external) or *katawan* (body) is not a mere accessory, or adjunct, it is an essential part of our interiority. That is why Alejo dares to exclaim: *Walang loob kung walang katawan!* (There is no *loob* if there is no body). *Pakikipagkapwa* can only manifest itself through the corporeal self, and the *magandang-/mabuting-loob* or *masamang-loob* will be sensed through time.

A popular adage among Filipinos is *ang sakit ng kalingkingan ay damdam ng buong katawan* (the pain of a little finger is felt by the entire body). When a *kapwa* suffers, we also feel his/her suffering (unless vitiated by calloused indifference) that is why we “feel with” (*dumadamay*) the pain. The rootword of *dumadamay* is *damá* (feel). If we do not show concern to a suffering person, we forget that our body is rooted in the shared *loob*. Hence we call a person who does not feel the pain of the *kapwa* as ‘*manhid*’ (insensitive). If someone tells you “*Manhid ka!*,” (you feel nothing)

ing) it is tantamount to being told that you are not a human being because you do not know how to feel with a *kapwa*.

The state of a person's *loob* affects as well his/her outside world. If there is disconnect or disjunction between the external and the internal "(t)he world will forever be in turmoil as long as people either fail to distinguish between reality and appearance or continue to behave outwardly in a mode that runs counter to what their *loob* is."<sup>22</sup> The construct of *loob*, then, does not only point to the core of one's personhood, but directs us to what kind of core is this that is in a relationship. To belabor the point, *loob* is one concept which has something to do with emphatic relating. It is not just the measure of one's personhood as such; it is likewise the measure of the person as *kapwa* of the other.

### **Human *Loob* as Shared Trinitarian *Loob***

To put the discourse in a theological plane, we go to the Christian sacred book. According to the Scriptures, when God created human beings He was first projected as a relational God-within. "We shall make God in our image, to our likeness" (Genesis 1:26).<sup>23</sup> One is God but He is not alone in the innermost depths (*kaloob-looban*) of his divine being. God's *loob* is essentially an intra-relational self - which is why Christians love to refer to Him as 'Trinity' (three-in-one). For a Christian believer there is so much beauty within the intra-relational *loob* of God. For this reason he/she look up to the Trinitarian image as the model-par-excellence of *pakikipagkapwa* among members of biological families and ecclesial communities. In a profound manner, the one Triune God wishes to *ipagkaloob* (give; share) to His creatures the beautiful intra-relationships happening within His *loob*.<sup>24</sup> It is not just His 'being-God' that He wants to

be shared, but His 'being-God-in-relationship-with.' "Then Yahweh God formed Man, dust drawn from the clay, and breathed into his nostrils a breath of life and Man became alive with breath" (Genesis 2:7) - and man became an intimate and inseparable part of God's *loob* and the divine image dwelt in man's *loob*. Filipinos are wont to saying "nothing happens to us which is not God's *kalooban*" (will). If God's will is profoundly rooted in His *loob* and man partakes of the divine *loob*, then God's *kalooban* from the innermost core of His being finds an echo in man's *kaloob-looban* (depths).

The Christian theological tradition has given names to the three-in-one God: Father, Son and Spirit. Within the innermost Triune *loob* is a dynamic interaction of co-equal persons in perfect unity. Christians normally commune with the Triune God through Jesus Christ the one mediator between God and humankind (1 Timothy 2:5 "As there is one God, there is one mediator between God and men, Christ Jesus"). Believers refer to him as the incarnation of God's love (John 3:16 "Yes God so loved the world that he gave his only Son that whoever believes in him may have eternal life"). If God is *kagandayang-loob* (winsome benevolence; love), then Jesus Christ, as de Mesa stresses, is God's *kagandayang-loob*. To be united with the Triune God is to be united with and through Jesus Christ-God who had 'gone down' from the Spirit world and became our *kapwa*-in-corporeality. The union with Jesus who had returned to the spiritual world in His resurrected body but now present in Spirit "is an intrinsic one, based on an ontological reality" wherein he "communicates his life, his being to (them) from an innermost dwelling place within (their) being" thus enabling them to be animated by his Spirit and to live in him.<sup>25</sup>

## Loob-rooted *Kapwa* in Familial Ethos

*Pagkakaisa* (unity), as propounded by Enriquez, is the highest expression of *pakikipagkapwa*, and I suggested earlier that the concept of *kapwa* must be ontologically rooted in the divinely gifted loob of the Trinity. This is, as it were, the mystical bond which inextricably links us to one another. The ultimate unity among the members of the Christian family, then, is founded neither on blood nor on their culturally-prescribed roles and functions but on their shared loob, the core of their *pagkatao* (personhood).

The *kapwa-in-loob* has an attached moral injunction which summons the family to re-order its hierarchical structure based on authority and seniority. This is not an appeal to do away with parental or elderly authority/seniority but to strip it of its domineering tendencies and absolutist pretensions and relativize its exercise in the family in a way that authority/seniority is not immune to constructive criticism. In the most basic nuclear family form parents remain parents and children remain children but each of them *kapwa Kristyano* (fellow Christians) tries to work out his/her domestic roles within a context of relationships where authority becomes subordinated to the *kapwa-in-loob* normative principle of equality *en Cristo*.<sup>26</sup> Between husbands and wives, among siblings of different genders, among all the members of the family household making the socio-ethical value of *pakiküwa*-as-egalitarianism truly operative remains an ongoing challenge for the Filipino family. This mode of *pakikipagkapwa* turns members of the family into dialogical persons who can communicate with each other through a healthy and mutually trusting/enriching interaction. A well-formed dialogical attitude, which trumps the attitude of superiority entails humble listening and understanding each other's differences especially in

vital matters which have a bearing on individual and family well-being. This is not an invitation to a chaotic relationship but a moving together of unique-yet-co-equal persons in the depths of their shared *loobs* towards a possible consensus or collective decision.

Outside the realm of internal domestic relationship the sublime value of *pakikipagkapwa-pakiküwa* moored in the shared *loob* of divine image urges the Christian families to identify itself with the sufferings, struggles, hopes and aspirations of humankind for a much better country and world. In this pro-person, pro-community agenda, the common good of the deprived, marginalized, the poor, the powerless and the voiceless have a special place.

The strangers, those outside of the kinship system, are *hindi ibang-tao* for they are *kapwa-tao*. Social individualism ought to give way to the normative principle of shared divine-human *loob* to ensure that the family does not separate itself from the peoples' struggle to build a more just and more humane social order. The task is brought to the fore in bold relief in light of what the Second Plenary Council of the Philippines refers to as imbalances in the country's economic and political situation.<sup>27</sup> Working for gender equality and social justice as an ethical demand of the principle of unity springs forth from a decidedly Christian faith-perspective that builds on humanitarian impulse of *pakikipagkapwa*. Jesus Christ, the full embodiment of God's shared *kagandahang-loob* is in the human.

The virtue of hospitality (*taos-puwong pagtanggap*<sup>28</sup>), which is at once a cherished cultural value of the Filipinos and the early Christian household communities, appears in a tangible expression of *pakikipagkapwang pagkakaisa* (relating of the unity kind). The world today is one that is ravaged by so much indifference and exclusiveness. This leads to imposed suf-



fering of individuals and groups caused by the structure of injustice built into our social institutions. De Mesa suggests that the salvation brought by Jesus be recast today in terms of “intimacy and communion, fellowship and solidarity.”<sup>29</sup>

Described by a couple of Christian authors as “a spirited openness to others from outside the family circle,” the virtue of hospitality may be considered a realization of Jesus’ salvific mission.<sup>30</sup> In its radical form it is making room and giving space to the unwelcomed (*Hindi sila mga ibang tao*; They are not strangers anymore) and working as well for their becoming welcome in the larger society. At its depth it is acknowledging human bonded-ness as a reality of earthly existence and the essential interconnectedness of all social life. A Church document affirms this: “God did not create human beings for life in isolation, but for the formation of social unity” (*Gaudium et Spes* #32).

*Kapwa ko, pananagutan ko.*

## Notes

- 1 Landa Jocano, *Filipino Social Organization: Traditional Kinship and Family Organization. Anthropology of the Filipino People III* (Metro Manila: PUNLAD Research House, 1998), 62; Francis Gustilo, “Towards the Inculturation of the Salesian Family Spirit in the Filipino Context” (Ph.D. diss., Rome 1989), 65.
- 2 F. Landa Jocano, *Filipino Worldwide: Ethnography of Local Knowledge* (Metro Manila: PUNLAD Research House, Inc., 2001), 66.
- 3 Niels Mulder, “Filipino Culture and Social Analysis,” *Philippines Studies* 42 (1994).
- 4 Jaime C. Bulatao, “The Manileño’s Mainsprings” in *Four Readings on Philippine Values*, ed., Frank X. Lynch and Alfonso de Guzman II (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1972), 50-86.
- 5 Ly Sycip, Maruja M.B. Asis, and Emmanuel Luna, “The Measurement of the Filipino Well-being,” Technical Report (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies, 1999).
- 6 See “Pinays Rank Food at 5th, Sex Life at 18th, *Says Poll*,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer* (November 11, 2010), A1 and A8.
- 7 See Leny G. Ocasiones, “The Family: Facing the Challenges amid a Changing Environment,” in *Young People’s Health: Challenges for Education and Intervention* by Fiscalina Amadora-Nolasco, Elmira Juday T. Aguilar and Zona Hildegard S. Amper, 52-63 (Cebu City: University of San Carlos Press, 2012), 52.
- 8 See Levy Lara Lanaria, “The Filipino Family - Lights and Shadows: Challenges to the Domestic Church,” *Asian Horizons Dharmaram Journal of Theology* 7, no. 2 (June 2013): 250-257.
- 9 The framework will serve as well to undergird the *Pamilya ng Diyos* (Family of God) model which I have proposed as culturally appropriate for the Philippine local church precisely in the context of the familial culture of the Filipinos (see Levy Lara Lanaria, “*Uwi na Tayo*”: Towards a Lay-Centered Filipino Church as *Pamilya ng Diyos*, foreword by Jose M. De Mesa (Cebu City, Philippines: University of San Carlos Press, 2011 [This book was for the most part based on my doctoral dissertation in Applied Theology])).
- 10 Notably in his book, *From Colonial to Liberation Psychology: The Philippine Experience* (Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1994). Enriquez is the acknowledged Father of Filipino Psychology “*Ama ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino*”, and the founder of the *Pambansang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, (National Organi-

- zation of Filipino Psychology), which started in 1975 ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Virgilio\\_Enriquez](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Virgilio_Enriquez)).
- 11 Levy Lara Lanaria, "The Filipino Family - Lights and Shadows: Challenges to the Domestic Church," *Asian Horizons Dharmaram Journal of Theology* 7, No. 2 (June 2013): 247. *Pagkamapagkapwa* can be translated in English as pro-fellow or fellow-oriented (mine). *Pagkamapagkapwa* connotes a condition or a conviction of (*pagka-*), of preferring for something or someone (*mapag-*), in this case a fellow person. To be *mapagkapwa* connotes the preference of a relationship that is personal (Felipe Landa Jocano, *Towards Developing a Filipino Corporate Culture: Use of Filipino Traditional Structures and Values in Modern Management* [Quezon City: PUNLAD Research House, 1988], 127).
  - 12 See the critique of a Filipino historian, Renato Constantino in his *Dissent and Counter-Consciousness* (Quezon City, Philippines: Malaya Books, 1970) on the inordinate attention given to *pakikisama* which is well attuned to the interests of the elite and vested interest groups who are ready to "reward docility, conformity and western orientation. The logical consequence is that they shrink away from social protest" (Navarro 1974 cited in Enriquez, *From Colonial*, 71; Navarro's work not found in Enriquez's bibliography).
  - 13 Cf. Terry A. Veling, *Living in the Margins: Intentional Communities and the Art of Interpretation* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing, 1996), 77-101.
  - 14 Carmen E. Santiago, "The Language of Food," in *Culinary Culture of the Philippines*, 133-139, ed. Gilda F. Cordero (Philippines: Bancom Audiovision Corporation, 1976) cited in Enriquez, *From Colonial*, 45.
  - 15 From the popular Filipino film, "Anak" ("Daughter") of the late 90s.
  - 16 Like the *kapwa* that conquers or controls.
  - 17 Alejo is a Filipino Jesuit priest who earned a doctorate degree in anthropology at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. A published poet and philosopher in his native Tagalog language, he is now based in Mindanao (south of the Philippines) where he engages in advocacy for indigenous peoples' rights and in dialogue with Muslim civil society, through the Mindanawon Initiatives for Cultural Dialogue which he heads. He teaches graduate courses in anthropology, philosophy and development studies at the Ateneo de Davao University, where he serves both as director of its Research and Publication Office. ([https://www.goodreads.com/author/show/5956667.Albert\\_E\\_Alejo](https://www.goodreads.com/author/show/5956667.Albert_E_Alejo)). *Tao po* is the Filipino way of knocking at a gate or door to visit a house which expresses explicit assurance that he is *tao* (person). *Tuloy* (come in) is from the host. *Isang landas ng pag-unawa sa tao* is, in English, a path to understanding in the person's interiority
  - 18 Albert E. Alejo, *Tao po! Tuloy!: Isang Landas ng Pag-unawa sa Loob ng Tao* (Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Office of Research and Publications, 1990. Printed by Raintree Trading and Publishing, Inc.), 11-38.
  - 19 De Mesa is a known advocate of inculturation in the Catholic Christian country. Currently Visiting Luzbetak Professor of Mission and Culture, Chicago Theological Union, he completed his Ph.D. in Religious Studies at the Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium. A writer of several published articles and books, his book *Mga Aral sa Daan: Dulong at Paraang Kultural sa Kristolohiya* (Manila: De La Salle Uni-



- versity Press, 2004) won the 2004 National Books Award (Theology and Religion). He used to be the editor of the Jesuit-run *East Asian Pastoral Review* at the Ateneo de Manila-Quezon City and established the theology program of the De La Salle University-Manila.
- 20 Alejo equates *Kagandahang-loob* or its variant *magandang kalooban*, with *kabaitan* [benevolence] or *kabutibang walang daya* [goodness without deceit]. See its other meanings in Alejo, *Tao po!* , 139.
  - 21 Jose de Mesa, *In Solidarity with the Culture: Studies in Theological Re-rooting*. Maryhill Studies 4 (Quezon City: Maryhill School of Theology, 1991), 45.
  - 22 Reynaldo Clemena Iletto, *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Press, 1979), 240.
  - 23 Biblical citations in this articles are taken from Christian Community Bible Catholic Pastoral Edition version.
  - 24 See Karl Rahner, "Grace" sa Rahner, pat. *Encyclopedia of Theology: The Concise Sacramentum Mundi* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1975), 596. Cahill, *Family: A Christian Social Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 4-5.
  - 25 William P. Roberts, "The Family as Domestic Church," in *Christian Marriage and Family: Contemporary Theological and Pastoral Perspectives*, ed. Michael G. Lawler and William P. Roberts, 70-90 (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1996), 83.
  - 26 Galatians 3:28, "Here there is no longer Greek, or between slave and freedman, or between man and woman; but all of you are one in Christ Jesus."
  - 27 The Council has observed that "[t]he poverty and destitution of the great mass of our people are only too evident, contrasting sharply with the wealth and luxury... Power and control are also elitist, lopsidedly concentrated on established families that tend to perpetuate themselves in political dynasties" (Acts and Decrees of the Second Plenary Council of the Philippines 20 January 17-February 1991 [Pasay City: St. Paul Publications 1992] n. 24). The Second Plenary Council of the Philippines was a momentous gathering of various church sectors within the Philippine Catholic Church in 1991 to assess the Church vis-a-vis the changing realities in the society and to move forward from there as a continuously relevant religious institution.
  - 28 Ironically the native Filipino language does not have a one-word translation of hospitality. *Taos-puwong pagtanggap* can be literally rendered as "whole-hearted reception" (mine).
  - 29 Jose M. de Mesa, "Re-rooting Mission in the Family," *Mission Studies* 19, no. 1 (2002): 140.
  - 30 Mitch and Kathy Finley, *Christian Families in the Real World: Reflections on a Spirituality for the Domestic Church* (Chicago, Illinois: The Thomas More Press, 1984), 33; de Mesa, "Re-rooting Mission in the Family," 143-144.