

On Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero's Frustration: Denouncing Official Culture of traditional Asian Family

Antonius Herujiyanto

English Language Education Study Program, Sanata Dharma University

Abstract

*The purpose of this study is twofold, looking into a Philippine dramatic text, Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero's three-act play Frustration, and finding the meaning of the work. The aim of bringing to bear upon it the analytical perspectives of New Criticism, Russian Formalism and Structuralism, is to highlight the belief that any approach implemented is but to reveal its covert meaning. This is indirectly agreeing with the credo *l'art pour l'art* and that of the so-called instrumentalism [or rather, antirealism] instead of exercising the 'weird' attitude of investigating the political style of pretending to appreciate and be concerned with literary works.*

Keywords: *criticism, colonialism, culture, covert meaning*

Introduction

It is admitted that more than three centuries of Spanish colonialism and about fifty years of American rule have influenced Philippine theater. This can be seen clearly in the folk theater such as *sinakulo*, *komedya*, *tibag*, *panunuluyan*, *sarsuwela*, etc. They displaced the indigenous rituals and native theater of the pre-colonial times, even as those forms integrated elements of the indigenous drama. If *sinakulo* is essentially based on the *pasyon* (The Life and Passion of Christ) adapted into drama, and the *komedya* of the 19th century Philippines is characterized by a lot of presentational gestures and stylized movements, then, the *tibag* and *panunulyan* are religious dramatization performed during the Holy Week which formed part of the overall effort to christianize the natives. The *sarsuwela*, which supplanted the *komedya*, became popular during the early years of American colonialism (1898). It revolves around the intricacies of domestic life, usually revolving around a love story which focuses on a big-hearted hero and a heartless villain. In the work of Balagtas, however, the *sarsuwela*

became a political allegory with the characters representing ideas juxtaposing nationalism and collaboration.

Philippine Literature in English, however, is divided into many types and numerous periods. Croghan, for example, considers three stages through which the literature has passed: The Early Period, from 1900 to 1930; The Middle Period, from 1930 to 1960 and The Modern Period from 1960 to 1974. Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero, like Nick Joaquin, belongs to The Modern Period.

It is understandable why the name of Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero should be mentioned when one talks about modern Philippine drama: being a prolific playwright and influential leader of the University of the Philippines Dramatic Club (1946-1966?) for which he produced and directed over 120 plays. Guerrero studied at the Ateneo de Manila, at the University of the Philippines, and, briefly, at Columbia University. He wrote his first play at 14, and his play in Spanish, *No Todo Es Risa*, was produced at the Ateneo when he was 15. In 1962 he organized and directed the U.P. Mobile Theater with over

1000 performances. Guerrero teaches Acting, Playwriting, and Directing at the University of the Philippines. He has also the unique distinction of being the only Filipino who has had a theater named after him while still alive: the Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero Theater, at the Arts and Sciences Building, U.P. inaugurated on September 16, 1976.

The following is but a few of what people say about him:

“You capture vividly the atmosphere of the life of your people. ... Perhaps you could learn, if you want to, the methods of the international dramatist. I am by no means sure, however, that it would not be more useful if you aimed at writing professionally for your own country. As a matter of fact, I think that drama very much needs just now to be reborn in the context of specific cultures” – Joseph Wood Krutch, internationally known drama critic and writer, in a letter to Guerrero dated August 2, 1952, from Phoenix, Arizona.

“Guerrero’s plays have been obviously influenced by Ibsen, but his writing seems to belong to no school except that which he has founded for himself ... Guerrero’s plays were written to be acted on an intimate informal stage by capable actors. But any reader with a modicum of imagination will digest the players lines, envisage the completely life-like characters going through their paces, and enjoy the true beauty ...”– Lt. Fred J. Archibald

“Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero is, essentially, a satirist. He likes to pick fault. And the extraordinary thing about him is that he knows what and where the fault is: he pinpoints it, shows it up in grotesque figures, gives you several healthy laughs in the process, then as you dry your tears of laughter, you look around yourself and feel a little foolish, because you realize you have been laughing at yourself ... He is a caricaturist with the deft and delicate touch of a piña embroiderer ... with the yellow glint highlighting of an Amorsolo.”

– Lamberto V. Avellana (*from his Foreword to 8 Other Plays*)

“... His comedies are pieces of very effective stage showmanship; they bustle and flare with a vitality and a humor peculiarly Filipino.” – The late Dr. Paz Latorena (from her Foreword to the 2nd printing of 13 Plays).

“What Guerrero has written, what he will write, are historical portrayals and stirring sermons. More than any other Filipino playwright Guerrero is the historian and moralist of this confused, turbulent period when our time-honored virtues and way of life are somewhat giving way to a new and frightening system of thought and morals.” – Arsine B. Arabia (from his English M.A. thesis entitled “The Plays of Guerrero” (1951).

“Guerrero’s plays show clearly that he knows his milieu, whether it be the simple impassioned life of barrio folks or the braazy, artificial, and corrupted life of middle class society and those of politicians In this sense, Guerrero is a Filipino who speaks about Filipinos for the whole world, without meaning to shun or insult them, but with the thought of showing that they are no different from all other people everywhere.” – Celso Al. Carunungan (from his Foreword to 7 More Plays)

Guerrero has been the recipient of three national awards; the Rizal Pro-Patria Award (1961), the Araw ng Maynila Award (1969), both for Drama, and the Republic Cultural Heritage Award (1972) for Literature.

Instead of the ‘weird’ attitude of investigating the political style of pretending to appreciate and be concerned with literary works, looking into his *Frustration* in this study is meant to highlight that any approach implemented is but to reveal the covert meaning of the work. Both the credo *l’art pour l’art* and that of the so-called instrumentalism [or rather, antirealism] would be, then, put ‘behind the door’.

Guerrero's three-act play *Frustration*

Admitting that the analytical perspectives of New Criticism, Russian Formalism and Structuralism in this study are purportedly made used to highlight the character aspects of the play. It is unavoidable, however, that the discussion would also deal with the other elements essential to any work of literature. Besides its physical objects and moods, for example, Ingarden at least mentions sounds, meaning of words and sentences; the objects presented; the schematized appearances and 'metaphysical qualities.'

The setting of Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero's *Frustration* is Manila in 1940s. The characters are Araceli, Imelda, Victor, Dr. Fernando Solis, Fermina, Elena, Geronima, Rafael Esteva, Rosalinda Magno, Tony Escasa, Pura Roco, Maria Rita and Nemesio.

Araceli's frustration began when she had to leave her fiancé, Fernando, only to marry Tirso to save her parents' pride. They, then, had two children, Victor and Imelda. Araceli's love to Fernando Solis, however, never died. And so did Fernando's love to Araceli. Tirso's sister, Fermina, who lived together with them had never got along with Araceli. She always knew that Araceli had never been in love with her brother. Knowing that his wife had never loved him, Tirso ran to another woman, Pura Roco. With Pura, he had a daughter called Maria Rita. Both the love life of Victor and Imelda did not go smoothly either. All of this frustration comes into surface when Tirso died of a heart attack. Toward the end of the story, however, Araceli managed to make Victor change his mind to commit suicide. Araceli said, "Love is a gift, and like any other gift, it must not be sought after, but gratefully received."

New Criticism

Not only did the New Critics seek precision and structural tightness in the literary work, but they also favored a style and tone that tended toward irony. As a result, they insisted on the presence within the work of everything necessary for its analysis. They did not want to know anything

to do with matters outside the work itself: the life of the author, the history of his times, or the social and economic implications of the literary work. In other words, what the work says and how it says it as inseparable issues.

The words, phrases, metaphors, images, and symbols are expected to be examined in terms of each other and of the whole. By doing so – establishing the "internal logic" – the overall form of the work is identifiable. Images, themselves totally dissociated when joined in the circuit of a particular emotion located with specific relation to both of them, conduce to great vividness and accuracy of statement in defining that emotion. So, when that "internal logic" has been established, we are very close to identifying the overall form of the work.

In the case of drama, characters, as we know, comment upon themselves and others so that we can establish a tone peculiar to each and can evaluate speeches (and actions) by a kind of yardstick established by the play as a whole. The playwright's attitude can be traced through how he or she poses his/her characters against each other and the sorts of dialogue he/she puts into their mouths. The essence of any dramatic situation is that of the conflict established.

Actually, there is another important facet of context: the "world" of the work. It is understood how an author imagines and creates a world in which his/her characters move and have their being. For example the author desires a fictional world that closely mirrors the actual world with which we as the reader can relatively easily identify. So, to account for the world of a literary work, we need to ask what the "laws" are that control and define the behavior of the characters. Do they permit frequent violations of probability? Do they justify or proceed from some idea of a deity, or do they merely reflect the disordered state of an isolated mind? Are there recognizable links between causes and effects or merely inexplicable series of incidents that seem to have little or no necessary connections? Sometimes we also need to ask whether the world highly restricted in time and space, expansive in space or time, or timeless? Is there a highly

structured society or are anarchy and chaos prevalent? Such questions, indeed, would explain the setting: we can see the world presented by the work in terms of every implication, innuendo, and viewpoint.

In order to look into Guerrero's *Frustration*, we may begin interpretation by characterizing the world of the work. The setting, we know, is Manila in 1940s. It is, indeed, a world peopled by Guerrero's characters: the world of the scene of all the three acts is taking place in the luxurious living room of Araceli's house, an upper class one. It is a kind of unpleasant or rather hatred world. It was only three days ago that Araceli's husband died. Two guests, Elena and her sister Geronima came to express sympathy.

Actually, both of them are also representing those who are fond of gossip and nosing into other people's affairs. Geronima, in Act I, for example, says to her sister Elena:

I'm always curious to see the reaction of people when they lose somebody ... Because I can always, tell how much a person has loved the dead person. When I see them crying and being hysterical, then it's my guess that their love is deep and true. But then when they shed no tears and don't even faint – ay, it seems suspicious.

They know that Fermina, Tirso's sister who lives with him does not like Araceli. They can also feel that there is something wrong about the relationship between Tirso and Araceli. Elena and Geronimo, however, start to talk about things to establish their 'nosy' habit:

Elena. Araceli and Tirso were a perfectly happy couple, weren't they?

Geronima. I suppose so.

Elena. (Scandalized). What do you mean you suppose so! I've never heard of any serious quarrel between Araceli and Tirso.

Geronima. Married people don't always quarrel in public, you know.

Elena. But we would have heard! Fermina would have told us.

Geronima. I hope you are right. Hmp, but I have my suspicions!

Making use of the similar 'easy-to-follow' conversations, Guerrero is actually, in Act I, introducing the characters: Elena, Geronima, Araceli, Fermina, Imelda, Nemesio, Fernando, Victor, and Rosalinda. In telling how Fermina dislikes Araceli, for example, he writes:

Elena. The servant told us she was resting.

Fermina. She (Araceli) woke up a short while ago.

Geronima. It must have been a terrible shock to her, poor Araceli. They loved each other so much.

Elena. Such an ideal couple, I always said

–

Fermina. (smiling bitterly, without looking at them.) No, no, she never broke down. ...She didn't shed any tears ... she didn't attend the funeral ... She stayed at home ...

The rest of the characters, indeed, comment upon themselves and others. We can easily see a tone peculiar to each character: Elena is dominated by her elder sister, Geronima. We cannot see a kind of intimacy between Araceli and her sister in law, Fermina.

The dramatic situation of the play can also be found merely from the conflict between the characters: the plot of the play. When Araceli had an argument with Fermina, for example, Guerrero is trying to expose the Inciting Moment. Araceli asked ironically whether grief should be worn always on the outside; and then gave a comment, "There's such a thing as bad taste." The argument stopped after Fermina broke into bitter sobs and said that both of them had never understood each other.

Through his characters Guerrero makes the story run very smoothly. About Araceli or even Geronima and Elena, for example, he writes:

Geronima. And Victor is two years older, isn't he? But Araceli can't be more than – (She stops, aghast)

Araceli. (Cuttingly). I've never kept my age a secret; I am forty-three.

Elena. Forty-three! No!

Geronima. I am fif- (But she stops embarrassed)

Elena. How do you manage to look so young, Araceli?

Geronima. Yes, what cream do you use?

Araceli. (Annoyed by the women's remarks.) You could still get married, Geronima, if you wanted to.

Geronima. (Hurt). Why, Araceli – !

Guerrero writes in such a way that we can easily follow or even guess what is going to happen next. What is going to be faced by Imelda – she canceled her wedding and broke with Rafel and was in love with Tony who was a married man – for example, is signaled by the following conversation in the middle of Act One:

Elena. This Tony is a very attractive young fellow. Several girls have lost their heads over him.

Geronima. What a fine baritone voice he has. Did you hear him sing in "Rigoletto"? (Imelda begins to sway.)

Araceli. (Quietly). Imelda –

Fernando. What's wrong? (Imelda, conscious of the stares, pull herself together.)

....

Imelda. I'm all right, really I am. Please excuse me. (Imelda goes out. Elena and Geronima, smelling something, discreetly nudge each other.)

Geronima. I wonder why Imelda became so upset all of sudden. (Standing.) I'll see if I can help –

It is clearly put by Guerrero that Act One is to carry the exposition. He knows how to anticipate the subsequent actions. He is, in fact, smoothly preparing us for what is to follow. In the beginning of Act Two, the foreshadowing is easily seen through the talking of the bottle of arsenic brought by Nemesio. Guerrero makes his characters speak for themselves. The bottle of arsenic can be interpreted easily that it is nothing to

do with his characters such as Araceli and Imelda. It would go to the weak character: Victor. We can see even before reading or watching the whole play what this poison is leading to.

Victor has a broken heart. Then, in Act Three, Victor with a bottle (of arsenic) in hand, rushing in across the stage, followed by his mother:

Victor. Don't come near me, Mama!

Araceli (Terrified). No, my son, no! The bottle – give the bottle!

Victor. No, I won't, I won't!

Araceli (Imploringly). The bottle, Victor, the bottle!

Victor (More threatening). Don't come near me, I said!

From the events stirred by the characters of the play we may grab and see what the theme of the play is. The roles of or rather what happen to the characters manage to embody the play: *Frustration*. Guerrero has 'forced' us to enter the world of all the characters' enduring frustration. Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero employs twisted idioms and a kind of gesture to help expose the inner compromises and failures of the insatiable part of society.

Russian Formalism

The Russian Formalists believed that critics should be able to establish a 'science' of literature – a complete knowledge of the formal effects, namely devices, techniques and so forth – which together make up what we call 'literature.' The literary aspects of a play, then, are those which concerned with transforming raw material like facts, emotions, stories ... into the play. Reading a play is, therefore, for many reasons: for comfort, for inspiration, for entertainment.

Guerrero said, "I started by reading plays ... Sometimes I get an idea while watching a play or a movie ... the definition of the most original man in the world is the one who reads a lot." The Formalists, however, read literary works in order to discover their 'literariness' – to highlight the devices and technical elements introduced by writers in order to make language literary. Victor

Shklovsky believed that literary devices 'defamiliarize' our perceptions of reality.

Guerrero's *Frustration* culminates in evoking what Ingarden calls 'metaphysical qualities.' The play's 'baring' of its literary devices – in this case a mixture quality of the frightfulness (of the characters' fate) and the firmness of the protagonist's life: first, the characters are in difficult and embarrassing situations. In Act One, for example, we can see how Elena and Geronima are embarrassed when they talk about age and marriage in front of Araceli; when Fermina has to argue with Araceli about custom and tradition; when Araceli mentions about Imelda's wedding and so forth. In Act Two we can see how Imelda is in an awkward position when Fernando mentions Tony Escasa; when Fermina finds out in front of everybody that Araceli never loves her brother; when Fermina sees Araceli and Fernando are in each other's arm or when Fermina realizes that her brother is not such an angel as she thinks; or in Act Three when Aurora happens to see that her husband, Tony, has special relationship with Imelda, when Victor should face the fact that Rosalinda does not love him, etc.

Secondly when the main characters such as Araceli, Imelda, Victor, Fermina face a kind of domestic difficulties: the death of Tirso in Act One, Imelda's canceling her wedding in Act Two and in Act Three Victor and a bottle of arsenic. Thirdly, the play has a happy ending: Victor and Imelda, like two frightened children, nestle in Araceli's comforting arms.

Structuralism

The Structuralists might also be included in those of what so called the Formalists in the sense that they were also concerned with the way in which the individual work of art (or *parole*) was perceived differently against the background of the literary system as a whole (or *langue*). The Structuralists, however, set themselves the task of describing the organization of the total sign-system itself by dissolving the individual unit back into the *langue* of which it is a partial articulation. In short, a study of superstructures or rather of ideology is what

they undertake. The object is, thus, seen as the unconscious value system or system of representations which orders social life at any of its levels. One of the structuralist thoughts that is going to be used in this study, anyway, is 'Binary Oppositions.'

As we know, forms of binarism have been there in human thought. In philosophy and religion, for example, we recognize subject and object, God and man, temporal and eternal and so forth. It is understandably when Raman Selden exposed the concept of 'privatives' in analyzing Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman*. He writes that the world in terms of *absence* of certain qualities: darkness is an absence of light, an object is still when it lacks movement. The concept can, indeed, cover certain substantive 'Binary Oppositions' (BOs): 'woman' – as feminists have pointed out – is defined as lacking certain male features. Deconstructive critics talk about the pervasive presence of binary logic in Western discourse and, needless to say, structuralists have argued the importance of BOs in human language.

Arguing that there is possibility of discovering binary structures in texts, Jonathan Culler proposes what he calls "the reader's use of BOs as a means of attributing significance to literary texts." Appearance and reality, country and city, body and soul, reason and feeling, are a few of many BOs which readers have employed as interpretive strategies. The danger of BOs, he further explains, is that they permit one to classify anything beside the fact that we can always find some difference between any two items. There is a good example of how we might go through this unexpected thing: being tempted to align two BOs and to regard them as possessing the same structure ('homologous') just because they are both present in a text. On the other hand, certain BOs are capable of generating a whole series of associated oppositions within a text: the biological nature and Divine Nature, the organic and mechanical, and fancy and judgment.

In Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero's *Frustration* we can find in Act I:

Geronima. We wanted to come last night, but we were afraid Araceli might be indisposed.

Fermina. No, Araceli is not indisposed at all.

Elena. The servant told us she was resting.

Fermina. She woke up a short while ago.

Geronima. It must have been a terrible shock to her, poor Araceli. They loved each other so much.

Elena. Such an ideal couple, I always said

–

Fermina. No, no, she never broke down.

Elena. But of course when Tirso died –

Fermina. She didn't shed any tears.

Geronima. Araceli didn't weep?

Elena. Surely at the funeral – a

Fermina. She didn't attend the funeral.

Geronima. She didn't?

Fermina. She stayed at home.

Elena. How strange. I remember when my husband died, I broke down several times. For five days I lay in bed –

Geronima. And Elena insisted on going to the funeral.

Elena. They had to carry me home, unconscious.

Geronima. How strange of Araceli.

Fermina. Yes, rather. But Araceli says tears are no sign of grief.

Both Geronima and Elena are shocked knowing that Araceli was not indisposed; instead of having a terrible shock she never broke down; instead of shedding tears she didn't weep, didn't attend the funeral Both Geronima and Elena came to know why Araceli was "strange" only after Fermina explained [bitterly] "Araceli says tears are no sign of grief."

In Act 2 Araceli tried to inform her two children, Imelda and Victor after they find out that their mother never loved Tirso:

Imelda. If you never loved Father [Tirso], why did you marry him?

Araceli. Fernando and I were already engaged –

Imelda. You were in love with him?

Araceli. We loved each other deeply.

Imelda. And then?

Araceli. My father – your grandfather – made a serious slip.

Imelda. What kind?

Araceli. He had one vice: gambling. One day, he over bid and lost.

Imelda. How much?

Araceli. One hundred.

Imelda. One hundred!

Araceli. The fear of a scandal, family pride –

Imelda. Amor propio!

Araceli. Yes, my dear, human pride. Two little words, but the tragedies they have brought to countless persons!

Imelda. And so-- ?

Araceli. For one whole week – I fought and struggled. Finally –

Imelda. Grandfather won – you lost.

Imelda knows the reason why her mother never loved Tirso. On the other hand, Tirso was indifferent to her. Her mother has been in love with only one man, Fernando. Tirso, on the other hand, then, had a love affair that surprised Fermina:

Araceli. This is Fermina, Tirso's sister.

Pura. Fermina – yes, I heard Tirso mention your name very often.

Fermina. You knew my brother?

Araceli. Extremely well.

Fermina. I didn't catch your name – if you please –

Pura. Pura Roco.

Fermina. I don't remember – he came to ask for help.

Fermina. For help?

Araceli. This is her daughter. What's her name?

Pura. Maria Rita.

Araceli. A pension used to be given to them, but this has been stopped. Tirso, I understand, used to give her this pension.

Fermina. My brother gave you a pension?

Araceli. Maria Rita is studying at St. Anthony's Girls' Institution

Fermina. What has got to do –

Araceli. You don't seem to understand, Fermina. Maria Rita is his.

Fermina. His? Tirso's? I don't believe it!

Araceli. This child is Tirso's.

Fermina. No, you're lying! My brother didn't, couldn't – you've no proof!

Araceli. I shall help you, of course.

Fermina. No, no! It would imply we approve of his immoral relationship!

*Pura. Tirso, you see, never loved his wife.
He told me – more than once.*

Fermina was surprised to know that his “angel” brother went to another woman. He had even a daughter with the woman, Pura Roco. The worst of all was that Tirso did not love his wife, Araceli. She, then, regretted to have said that by helping Pura Roco was approving of the immoral relationship.

The following is what happened to Imelda toward the end of Act one:

Araceli. What are you trying to tell me?

Imelda. About our wedding.

Araceli. You want to postpone it?

Imelda. No. I broke with Rafael.

Araceli. You – what – !

Imelda. I broke with Rafael.

Araceli. When?

Imelda. This afternoon.

Araceli. But weren't you at the modista – ?

Imelda. Precisely. While having my gown fitted, I suddenly – decided it.

Araceli. But why?

*Imelda. I don't know, Mama, I don't know.
It just came to me.*

The reason of why Imelda decided to break with Rafael is quite obvious: she would not have loved him that much. Somehow she felt that she would not be happy with him. Later, in the next conversation with her mother Imelda admitted that there was no such an excitement, vibration and the like whenever she was with Rafael ... the kind of feelings when she was with Tony. The similar situation also happened to Victor in Act Three:

Victor. Rosalinda, may I talk to you alone?

Rosalinda. What for?

Victor. I'm awfully sorry for what I said the other day –

Rosalinda. I'm through with you, I told you!

Victor. Can I see you tonight?

Rosalinda. I have a date with Sandy.

Araceli. Please, Victor –

It is very clear that Rosalinda does not love Victor. What happened next was even worse:

Araceli. I want your happiness above all.

Victor. Happiness! What happiness? Damn that girl!

Araceli. You've chosen the wrong girl, Victor. She isn't worth it.

Victor. But I love her.

Araceli. Look for a girl with more understanding.

Victor. I can't! I want only her!

Araceli. You're still young, son. Put your mind and energy in your studies first.

Victor. She's the only girl I want! I wish I had never met her!

We can see now that Victor is another victim of frustration. The following dialogue might make everything clearer:

Victor. I'm sick of everything – everything!

Araceli. Your infatuation for a frivolous girl like Rosalinda has sent you to the bottom. Look at you now! A man, my son, owes it to himself to keep his self-respect.

Victor. What do you know?

Araceli. More than you imagine.

Victor. You admitted you – never loved Father – why did you – marry him then?

Araceli. Because, like you, I was a coward.

Victor. A coward –

Araceli. We often get married to the wrong person because circumstances – or social convention or convenience – or weakness – or plain cowardice – compel us to. Then we go through life, silently and bitterly nursing our disillusion, victims of our own frustrations, hoping to escape from them and seldom succeeding – except for a few brave and determined souls. You, Victor, are a man, and a man should have a strong enough backbone not to allow a shallow, worthless girl like Rosalinda to lick you.

Victor. Love – why must we love? Because I love Rosalinda too much, I've lost her.

Araceli. My son, always remember this, this implacable rule of nature: in every love, however mutual, one loves less profoundly than the other.

Victor. I found that out – to my regret

The patterns of contrast and similarity between the characters turn upon certain qualitatively significant binary oppositions,

which have been active all the time in the analysis above, so far. The BOs are apparent in key correlation between attitude and frustration. What is meant by frustration here is feeling disappointed due to many things such as the death of the husband, love failure, unexpected behavior and so on.

We can express the BOs as they relate to particular characters as follows:

<i>Ariceli</i>	<i>Elena</i>
reserved	demonstrative
<i>Araceli</i>	<i>Fermina</i>
logical	emotional
<i>Araceli</i>	<i>Geronima</i>
frank	hypocritical
<i>Araceli</i>	<i>Victor</i>
coward	coward
<i>Imelda</i>	<i>Tirso</i>
brave	compensating
<i>Araceli</i>	<i>Tirso</i>
coward	indifferent

Those are some possible BOs in the play that produce significances: following Culler's view regarding the BOs reading strategies.

Final Remarks

Having looked into Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero's *Frustration*, not only can we see the work better, but we can also see a better picture of the play as well as the playwright. He seems to bravely but sensibly denounce the so-called official culture of the traditional Asian (in this case the Philippines) family: a male-imposed double-standard. His *Frustration* is a kind of social critic, a gentle one.

References

- Alegre, Edilberto N. and Doreen G. Fernandez, *Writers and Their Millieu, Part II*. Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1993.
- Croghan, Richard V. S.J., *The Development of Philippine Literature in English (Since 1900)*. Quezon City, 1996.
- Guerrero, Wilfrido Ma. *My Favorite 11 Plays*. Quezon City, 1976.

Ingarden, Roman, *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (Halle, 1931) in Ewa M. Thompson, *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism*. The Hague: Mouton & Co. N.V., 1971.

Jameson, Frederick, *The Prison-House of Language*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Selden, Raman, *Practising Theory and Reading Literature*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989.

Thomson, Ewa M. *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Torres, Maria Luisa F. "Brecht and the Philippines: Anticipating Freedom in Theater," *Brecht in Asia and Africa XIV*. 1989: pp. 134-138.

¹ Maria Luisa F. Torres, "Brecht and the Philippines: Anticipating Freedom in Theater," *Brecht in Asia and Africa XIV* (1989): 134-138

² Richard V. Croghan, S.J., *The Development of Philippine Literature in English (Since 1900)* (Quezon City, 1996), 3

³ Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero, *My Favorite 11 Plays* (Quezon City, 1976), v-vi

⁴ R. Ingarden, *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (Halle, 1931) in Ewa M. Thompson, *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism* (The Hague: Mouton & Co. N.V., 1971), p. 111-112

⁵ Edilberto N. Alegre and Doreen G. Fernandez, *Writers and Their Millieu, Part II* (Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1993), p. 204 et 211

⁶ Raman Selden, *Practising Theory and Reading Literature* (Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989), p. 38

⁷ Ewa M. Thomson, *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism* (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1971), p. 112-113

⁸ Frederick Jameson, *The Prison-House of Language* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974), p. 101-102

⁹ Raman Selden, *Practising Theory and Reading Literature* (Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989), p. 55

¹⁰ *ibid.*, 56-57