



UNDERSTANDING FAITH AND THE EBED-YAHWEH FOR FILIPINO VALUES EDUCATION

Jan Gresil KAHAMBING*

Abstract

Values Education presents a plethora of value-laden topics that can be used for life. Among the topics that require deepening is the value of faith. In discussing the value of faith, students in the Philippines majoring in the course as their specialization are exposed to the context of the Filipino and Filipino culture. Filipino values are often shaped with a high degree of religiosity stemming from a Catholic perspective, which are then translated into moral precepts that are further moulded into Filipino society and culture. In an interdisciplinary attempt, the aim of this study is to deepen the discussion of the value of faith in the aspect of Christology and Ecclesiology, both areas of Theological studies that centre on Christ and the Church. To do this, this paper will 1) attempt to refocus a contextualization of the starting point of Christology, 2) show the role of faith in it, and 3) present the relevance of the Ebed-Yahweh to contemporary ecclesiology to make sense of faith for values education.

Keywords: Faith, Ebed-Yahweh, Suffering Servant, Christology, Ecclesiology.

1. VALUES EDUCATION: KEY TAKEAWAYS

There are key terms to consider in values education. The first of course is “values.” Under this, one can start with the nature of values to be applied in ethical situations (cf. Findlay, 1970). Another approach would be a looking beyond of aesthetic and political machinations through philosophical and axiological studies (cf. Skowronski, 2013). The significance of the term should be clarified and integrated well (Tan, 1989). There are many values to consider, so there is an inclination to reduce them to the important ones – those that form an integral component of life. Ramirez (2007), in this respect, presents six core values but in the framework of the moral life while the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS) before provided some seven core and corresponding related values (1997).

The second key term is “education.” Under this, one is assailed into asking fundamental questions: ‘What, Why, and for Whom’ (Esteban, 1989). The emphasis is shifted to ‘education’ as in education in values (Esteban, 1990; see also Palispis, 1995). A number of relevant sources can be inserted in this. There are the developmental studies classically incorporated in education such as Super (2012), Bandura (1995), and Kolb (1984), to name a few. The project of Curko et. al. (2015) is commendable in this regard for producing manuals for teachers and education. Hawley et. al. (1985) also puts emphasis on human values within the ‘classroom’ setting. Another is the Arendtian understanding that education must be a love for the world and that ESP or ‘Edukasyon sa Pagpapakatao’ is gearing towards a humanistic way of loving (cf. Miranda, 2016). It also means staging moral reasoning in raising good children (cf. Lickona, 1994) either through active parenting (Popkin, 1987), character building (David, 2001), or building moral intelligence (Borba, 2001). Aside from such, moral recovery programs acquire significance too (Shahani, 2003).

The third is the *context*, which is to say, that one must also take note of Values Education in the “Filipino” setting or in the “Contemporary” setting. Lovat’s (2017) contextualization in Australia for Values Education in the 21st Century can be applied as an instance here. The same goes with the constructivist understanding of education (Har, 2013). This third point has been expounded further by Andres (1996) in *Effective Discipline Through Filipino* and Andres et. al. (1998) in *People Empowerment by Filipino value*. The understanding of setting therefore grounds the two previous concepts which goes beyond terminological definitions (cf. Jocano, 1982) and strengthens its notional presentation (cf. Jocano, 1992). In terms of a just and peaceful Filipino society, Garcia (1988) can be consulted. In addition, the contemporary setting calls for a description as well as understanding of Filipino values today (Timbreza, 2003).

Moreover, a proper ground of values in the Filipino cannot neglect the importance of religiosity, no matter that its application to real life is disjointed (Bulatao, 1966). The Catholic worldview albeit tainted with colonial elements remains a predominant worldview in the roots and inculcation of values in the Philippines

* Research Coordinator for the Social Sciences, Political Science, and Values Education, Social Science Unit, College of Arts and Sciences, Leyte Normal University



(cf. De Torre, 1985). In this case, the (Catholic) Church stands as an authority of moral identification and safeguarding. Its teachings inform the Christian as well as moral life (cf. De Torre, 1987). As such, the moral precepts of values find its life and center in Christ (cf. De Torre, 1984). It thus comes as no surprise why Punzalan (2006) specifically conducts evaluations on BEC Values that form essential part of the Catholic practice of Christian life. Studies on Filipino religiosity also arise due to their popularity (cf. Deguma, et. al., 2019).

However, with the changing demographics and ramifications of religiosity not only in the Philippines but throughout the world as well (Kahambing, 2015a, 2015b, 2016), the value of faith needs a refocusing. But this subject matter does not proselytize. On the contrary, the value of faith here remains an aspect of the whole values education course while taking note that majority of the students specializing are either oriented to the Catholic worldview or its denominations. In which case, those outside the Catholic religious bent can learn its ways in this paper while recommended to read other sources for different religions and types of religiosity. Considering the key concept of religiosity in the Filipino setting then, this paper delves into the value of faith through, as limitation, Christology and Ecclesiology whose central tenets are on Christ and the Church. To do this, the paper will 1) attempt to refocus a contextualization of the starting point of Christology, 2) show the role of faith, and 3) present the relevance of the Ebed-Yahweh to contemporary ecclesiology to make sense of faith for values education.

2. FAITH AS STARTING POINT FOR CHRISTOLOGY

The 'Question for beginnings,' or the inquiry of asking the principle of things, to an *Urstoff*, still remains. Indeed, to query on the *alphas* of things is to question an existence 'who' is, as the angelic doctor puts it, traced back from a name above all other – God. The tracing is vital because as 'the philosopher' in the *Summa* demonstrates, God is the *Unmoved Mover, the Uncaused Cause* (Aquinas, I-I Q. 2, Art. 3, *respondeo*). Quite reasonably, the same philosopher demonstrates in his *Physics* that it is best to start from what one knows towards what one do not know, that is to say, from the most intelligible. So the question on God is a pursuit for a demonstration that is concerned with *a posteriori* facts, with effects, and therefore those that are most visible and intelligible to man in the likeness of pure divine vestigium. This ultimately points someone who has assumed humanity *for* humanity – the Christ. A mediator (1 Timothy 2:5) then reveals himself as a starting point. As is well known, He is found in the *Gospels*, the *Creed*, and *Dogmas*, the *Faith* of the Christian people, in *History*, and in the *dialectics of logic and belief*. The succeeding question should then be: which is the most viable starting point for Christology?

The charge of *a posteriority* should perhaps ground the anti-thesis in choosing the specific points for inauguration. The Scriptures should provide an important source for Christ. After all, it has, for the most part, assumed the title of bearing the 'good news': that Christ is God, the Son of God, the Messiah, the Incarnate Word. Together with the Creed and Dogmas of the Church and the historical approach, one finds a Christ that is present in history, who is imbued with glory even in his earthly life, but who is nonetheless God as the Church professes. This opens toward a dialectical approach that caters the intertwining reasonableness of faith and 'faith-filled'-ness of reason.

There are four things, however, that are deemed problems in the look-out for finding solutions in effects (in what the Christians know) and they make up the areas of concern. First, there is 'Textual Lacuna' as the gap that distances the reader in reception to the Sacred Scriptures as modern hermeneutic thinkers would claim. Second, there is 2) 'High Christology' with the emphasis of Christ from a high point above. Third, there is the situation of being 3) 'Scholarly-trapped' as the intellectual claim of isolating the living object of research. Fourth, there is the effect of being 'Abstractly Spiraled' as the restless entrapment of the mind to concepts. With these points from the charge of *a posteriority*, one is confronted with a degree of difficulty and ambiguity in approaching the knowledge of Christ.

Safe in this scrutiny, however, is the value of faith: the *faith* of the Christian people, which begins with what one knows, how one conceives Christ, as a witness to a living Jesus. Such faith speaks of a life that bears piety. It begins with the self, the question of the self, and the search for Jesus within. In response to textual lacuna, faith bridges the gap of horizons when it puts its trust in the Word of God. In response to the other three, faith also appreciates, in effect, the Christ on High, and accommodates scholarly writings as well as abstractions.

A viable chance of starting with Christ then is first through the emulation of faith. It does not, however, despite its being a query on its own, demand a reasonable account above all else, but a *subject* – one who encounters the subject of Christ from the point of view of a subject's faith. This faith stands as a testament against the modern understanding of pure subjectivity. This is a faith that concerns – as Soren Kierkegaard the 'anti-wisdom par excellence' would have it – *existenz*, life in accordance to life, the believer's



life to Christ's life living in the believer. Faith puts more trust in the intelligibility of life itself. While accommodating abstractions, it escapes the charge of abstractness, of ethereal conceptuality. Faith, in this regard, starts at the threshold of this life as it grows, questions, and emulates the life which is lived by Jesus, before and ever. From this witnessing, from this growth and life of the Christian, the other points follow. The Christian, to help him in his faith, reads and contemplates on the *Word of God*. He is able to *profess* as a subject in full participation. He becomes more eager to know Jesus *historically*, as before. And all the more he concerns himself with the *rationality* underlying his faith. The other points aid further and complement this starting point which is faith because it is a faith that first of all is situated in life, as it grows, questions, and emulates in the life of Christ. The faith of the Christian is something that one can never take away. For him, this faith is as the life given to him, a responsibility that he has to take care amid the difficulties and turmoil of his environs.

2. THE ROLE OF FAITH IN CHRISTOLOGY

The 'academic rock-star' and the 'most dangerous philosopher in the West,' Slavoj Žižek, reflects and inverts Marx's challenge: namely, that before, in the era of Marx, the challenge for philosophers was not just to interpret the world but to change it, and now, because the world has already changed, the challenge is to interpret it *again; precisely to start thinking* (Žižek, 2015). Has anything, if at all, failed? Modernity and its projects (despite its legacies), for one, made some failures, but it still haunted the present era through the critical foundations it enshrined in postmodernity. The age of enlightenment has ironically reached its dark impasse in the midst of contemporary irrationalities, but is *faith* the new interpretation? Time and again, the enduring Christian belief today is that, more than ever, the believer needs the Holy Spirit, for Christians are living after all under its guidance as a Church that received its birthright during its fiery downpour. Christ left humanity with the Spirit, but Christians still have faith in the factual event that the Christ is still alive, still interceding for humanity in the Father's bosom. Christ made it possible that Christians can, in any *human* way possible, observe and imitate him throughout his life until his resurrection and ascension. The only question here is: '*how?*' or precisely, where does the significance reside in faith today and in what manner does it serve its role in a time when life is fraught with the paradoxes of thinking and believing (cf. Kahambing, 2014b)?

The fabric that ties faith with the life of Christ can be historically evident. The value of faith has undergone historical maneuvering throughout time and its believers – a "history of faith in Jesus" (Williams, 2001). Crucial to this historical faith is a terminology that transcends time – the coinage of '*devotion*' as the faith of a *living* Jesus. Devotion is only proper as the one who believes in a heavenly Lord as the object of adoration (Rev. 1:17), seen in the splendor of God (2 Cor. 4:6). The faith of Christ, in early Christianity, bespeaks of the gift as Jesus' voice was, how he taught prayer, and how he acted upon it as a 'moral exemplar,' thereby exemplifying a spiritual and an ethical paradigm. One's faith, therefore, must reflect on that exemplarity as an epitome of a personal-political living, suggestive of gift-giving as a form of life-giving to others.

It is never outdated to act in '*imitatio*' towards the devotion of Christ, following Ignatius of Antioch's prayer of imitating the passion of God (Rom 6:3). When Christianity came to be culturally accepted in Rome, Christ became a sage or 'poet' reflecting the Greco-Roman gods, the artistic manner for instance of depicting the machismo ardor of the crucified Lord with the muscular body of Apollo. Then the fourth century onwards shifted from an object of devotion to a devotion to a Eucharistic Christ who is '*to come,*' in anticipation to living in the end times. The eighth-ninth centuries of iconoclasm clarify this faithful depiction of a divine transcendent and clashed the picture of the intelligible humanity in Jesus.

The medieval era sustained this fragile picture of '*human on the cross*' – in art as well as in liturgy, in psychology as well as in meditative texts of the '*Man of Sorrows*', from a devotional object as a life-giving patron into a petitioner in the human condition, a sympathizer of humanity's appeals. Julian of Norwich's *Revelations of Divine Love* (1670), at the beginning of modernity in the early fourteenth century, portrays the compassionate Lord of faith (cf. Ramirez, 2016).

In effect, the individualistic theme of the modern configuration of ideas sought a devotional literature in Thomas a Kempis' *The Imitation of Christ* (c.1418-1427), a personalized Christ signaling the romanticism of erotic imitation of a human '*towards*' the divine, an imitation nonetheless that Michel de Certeau points as a '*homeless*' drama of restlessness along with the rise of monasticisms and modern self-emptying (self-searching). The only problem with this, as Teresa of Avila warns, is the tendency to objectify the devotion of Jesus' '*divinity*' as the '*terminus*', even if it starts with his humanity, explicated in the movement '*towards*'. Even during the time of Gregory of Nyssa (c.335-394 AD), Jesus was not the terminus of one's devotion or faith but an *absence*, a space for meditation and prayer residing in the Christian



imagination, a void that can only be filled by a faith that, as the eastern Christian tradition views it, 'deifies' in 'embodying' the prayer of Jesus, not as a terminus but as a means.

The *life* of Jesus, however, as a starting point of faith, is seen variably. One of the transitions of faith-devotion in the moral paradigm of Jesus' life, is Jeremy Taylor's *The Great Exemplar* of 1649, which narrates Jesus' earthly life as reflective of his human and divine nature (cf. Taylor, 1859). The modern eighteenth century onwards trailed along this path where the Christians find David Strauss – even meditated de facto by Nietzsche in his *Untimely Meditations* – publishing his '*Life of Jesus*' in 1835 with a neutral reading of the gospels using a devotional perspective.

Ernest Renan on the aspect of aesthetics looks at Jesus' life in the humanistic devotional language of art, looking at Jesus as a 'beautiful soul', a poetic genius (cf. *Vie de Jesus*, 1864). In the ambit of modern history, Jesus' life became a pastoral fantasia that becomes sensitive to a figure of Jesus as a cultural hero, a pop-icon for the educated and enlightened modern human being. Immanuel Kant rendered the highest human nature to Jesus, reechoed by Emerson and Tolstoy in the thought that Jesus' radical love precedes over legalistic authorities.

What transpired after a provision of faith's role throughout time is a further sketch of two dimensional pathways in theologizing faith in the Christ, either in (1) the faith that, at the encounter of Christ, radically questions and extracts change or (2) the faith that, as a believer, shares with the conviction that God remains the source of change. The point that Žižek noted is therefore relevant, because today, more than ever, Christians come to share in the role of faith in the pathways of either these two: the faith that radically thinks for change and the faith that relates to God the hope that things will change. One shares then with the fact that with this two in sum, the Christians have the role of faith in Christology as that which thinks and prays for change, for the betterment of society within time and beyond.

The main deviation of these two roles of faith is important: that devoid of these two, faith remains as a devotion where Jesus, the Christ, persists only as an *object*, a distanced reality that even though imbued with a human nature, remains apart nonetheless as he lives his life as utter superior to ours. Outside the faith that thinks and prays change is the faith that adores but does not practice, the faith that murmurs prayers but does not sing. The role of faith looks at Christ surely as a divinity, as Lord, as God, but this role has to socialize with the realms of inductive experience, to a process that doubts and humanely questions, a movement of change throughout history sustaining for the Christians a growth in the aspects of ethics, dogma, morals, and eventually values education. Jesus is not an object of devotion, as the role of faith would have it before, but as a *subject*, one who has life, living and reigning.

It is this historical sense of faith, Foucault also reflects this subjectivity in history, that in the critical analysis of life, one finds an archaeology of knowledge that emanates from a systematized yearning. In this case, from a faith in the auspices of time: in early Christianity, in the Fathers, in modernity, and today. Faith in Christology must make the Christians aware of a dimension in time that history too is changing. Such change that the Christians *are* is spelled out in the Eucharistic prayer: "Our prayer adds nothing to your (God's) greatness, but makes *us grow* in your Grace."

Incidentally, this answers the critique that the Christians find themselves in the mouth of Nietzsche when he says that he only believes in a God who can sing and dance (cf. Hovey, 2008). Through the incarnation, Jesus sang and danced, ate and drank, radically loved and journeyed with humanity. Jesus made the Christians realize that the role of faith is to embody a life that is pleasing to the Lord, one that does not remain stagnant but questions, one who does not act stupidly as Tolstoy puts it, but one who puts trust in the Lord in the hope that change will come, that the Christians share in that change, and that the task of rethinking and reinterpreting his life to ours, as *subjects* altogether journeying in the life of faith, is a role that befits the life of a Christian. In that sense, the Christians can be sure that they truly become believers, as a people of faith, aware of the manifold graces the Lord shares with them, aware that faith is not just for the divine life but also for the humble human. In that sense, the Christians are proud to say that the Christians *are* Christians. Nietzsche says of the *only Christian who died on the cross*. Viewing this death that presaged a life of suffering, the crucial importance therefore of looking at the value of faith especially in its role in the Church lies in the figure of a suffering servant, *Ebed-Yahweh*.

3. THE 'EBED-YAHWEH' IN CONTEMPORARY ECCLESIOLOGY

In transit from Christology to Ecclesiology, the next question concerns context: 'how can the Christians have faith, as a Church, in the *cross* of Christ as a necessary value?' Already in the foreshadowing of the Old Testament, the icon of the Ebed-Yahweh or the *suffering servant* provides the Christians a beacon by which the Christians stand as a community of believers. To believe occasionally reflects on the point: 'why do bad things happen to good people?', 'what have the Christians done to deserve such a life of



suffering.' While others say that happiness is ephemeral and suffering is universal, the reality governing the human condition concerns each of the grounds for a safer space, a momentary distance, or an ecstatic flight.

The narrative of *Job* depicts the ultimate causal question for suffering – 'WHY?' is the big question. And yet the Christians find the role of his friends as the interpreters of the suffering event. Among other interpretations, they are for one, the theologians, the scientists of God, the psychologists of today who find solace in the scientific audacity they declare upon a subject who suffers; a subject for reification. But how relevant is suffering today, and how can the Christians find the sharing of such suffering, metaphorically analogized in the cross of Christ, as ultimately in the figure of the suffering servant? More than ever, the Christians need a Church who understands suffering, and the Christians need to imitate the *Ebed-Yahweh* to understand it.

The term *Ebed-Yahweh*, however, is ambiguously held. *Ebed Yahweh*, or Servant of Jehovah, is used by Isaiah in various meanings (Notz, 2008). It designates, firstly, all of Israel when it views Israel as a suffering people. The second view sustains that it is just a part of Israel. The third view presents the *Ebed-Yahweh* as an individual (Notz, 2008). There is a sense to believe that the term designates the people of God, for it continues the promise of salvation. For in Isa 42.6 and 49.8 the *Ebed* is portrayed as a covenant to the people (Kim, 1983). It remains to question whether the primacy is stressed on the covenant and not on whether it concerns a group or an individual, because still, some espoused amid individuality for an interpretation of his death as a covenant sacrifice (Kim, 1983). This controversy is indeed one to clarify. As early as 1899, the meaning accorded to the *Ebed-Yahweh* songs portrays the people, and not to an individual (Budde, 1899). Ginsberg claimed that the oldest interpretation is to equate the servant with the *Maskilim* (Enlightened or Enlighteners) as "justifiers of the Many" when they suffered martyrdom and resurrected (Ginsberg, 2013).

However, while some accommodate the advocacy of pluralism that major religious communities will produce bases for the "ultimate messianic predictions of worldwide, peace, justice, prosperity, and salvation" to "*crown our faith in God's deliverance,*" (Maller, 2009, p. 249) some commentators think that it was a prophetic address. The prophecy is that *Yahweh's* servant is a personal figure (Notz, 2008, pp. 10-11). Schreiber (2009) says, on a Jewish vantage point, that the Bible accidentally concludes with Jeremiah as God's spokesperson, God's servant *par excellence*. But following this in the New Testament is Jesus, a "man of rare qualities, who took his destiny into his own hands and played it out as a role model for future generations, *much the way Jeremiah did*" (Schreiber, 2009, pp. 43-44; cf. Kahambing, 2014a).

Story (2009) would further divide the three servant figures, following the phrases "*the Servant's suffering makes him worthy of great exaltation, the Servant will be utterly despised by other humans, the Servant's suffering is for us, and brings us peace with God*" (pp. 100-110) as (1) one servant (Israel) in need of redemption, one servant (Second Isaiah) who proclaims redemption, and one servant (the Messiah) who procures redemption, this servant of the fourth song being not the prophet himself or Israel but a servant figure whose sacrifice will break the yoke of Babylon. The personal figure suffers for the sake of the people and not just whether he was the *Ebed* in place of the people. Hence, Stuhlmacher concludes: "His self-surrender (in Mk 10: 45) is not the only substitution for Israel, but also for the nations of the world, i.e. for all the men who are far from God" (Stuhlmacher as cited by Kim, p. 59).

In modern literature, the furtherance of the *Ebed* as a personal figure finds the theme of accepting human vulnerability, ineffectiveness, and helplessness into a heroic journey of spiritual growth that finds an analogous structuring of one's existence from a mother-like God (Kim, 2012). The interplay of suffering in a man's life concerns the whole, putting the weight of suffering for the sake of many, that all may be saved. The servant, in other words, does not only concern the Christ, as a personal figure, but also the *salvation* of all. And this does not do away with the fact that the point for redemption remains to be in the servant who would bear the sin of many (Isa 53.12) and give his life a ransom for all (cf. Mark 10.45) (Kim, p.110). This humbling scene pictures a man told of receiving not just the blows of the world, of the physicality of pain, but also of humiliation, of piercing words. The irony lingers when throughout the writing, repetition may be classified. Paul Raabe highlights the contrast of repetitive phrases of humiliation and exaltation (Raabe, 1984), two categories that find a classification in the address to the servant.

The figure of the *Ebed-Yahweh*, if it rests on a personality, finds a sure designation in Jesus Christ. The concept 'Jesus and *ebed Yahweh*' has its origin with Jesus himself (O'Collins, 2009, p. 148). The servant, who will continue the covenantal *promise of salvation* in Jesus' ministry and *suffering*, is the one who embodies a 'way of life' that is fitting for the universal reality of pain and suffering. Thus, aside from the Christological-soteriological interpretation of Jesus' ministry and/or suffering, there is also an *ethical* purpose. The apologetical-polemical function becomes dominant from the mid-second century onward



(Zamfir, 2013). What the Christians can realize is this: "it is no accident therefore that the pronouncements were made precisely in terms of the 'Son of Man': it is precisely in fulfillment of the mission of "the 'Son of Man'" that he *had to go to the cross.*"¹

In this reading, the cross shines ever brighter in the figure of the Ebed-Yahweh, the symbol of Christianity as distinct from other religions. The Christians can find a God who suffers for all, a God who became man, the Incarnate Logos, not only so that the Christians might be saved, but that He might *show us a way of life* that they ought to follow in his name, a way of life that is closer to the reality of suffering, one who understands suffering. This cross, which symbolizes the suffering the servant had to endure in the final moments of his life, reflects the essence of God's love as shown in his life. While others may view this cross as resulting from a violent cosmic murder of a son, following Richard Dawkins (2006, p. 51) who spoke of the cross of Christ as 'vicious, sadomasochistic and repellent', Christians can find a consolation in John Stott (1967) who says:

As I look at the cross I cannot tell which is more apparent – the relentless antagonism of God against our sin and rebellion, or the inextinguishable love of God towards guilty sinners. Both are fully satisfied at the cross. God has done everything necessary for my forgiveness. What then is there left for me to do? Nothing – except to acknowledge my rebellion against God, turn from it, and receive Jesus Christ into my life as my Saviour, committing myself personally to him, and asking God to take my sins away.

The cross reveals God the Father's heart – who desired to crush the Son – not because he enjoyed it, but in order to bring many back to him; and *if the Christians humble themselves*, they can receive the great blessings of what the Servant, Jesus Christ, suffered for them (Dray, 2008, p. 85). While it does not necessarily follow that to be humiliated means to humble oneself, *humility* remains a prior attitude of the servant concerning reality. It is personal growth for one to establish a maturity of disposition to allow suffering to transform the human, that suffering is as vital as life itself. Only when life has been tied with suffering can man find for himself a salvific way of life, a life that is patterned on the one on the cross. As a Church, this is a challenge the Ebed-Yahweh on the cross shows. The challenge of the suffering servant to both individuals and communities is to shoulder its responsibilities, that is, with the personal and the political, in order to experience fuller *personhood* (Wilks, 2005).

4. RECAPITULATION/CONCLUSION

In assessing the importance of suffering in Christology and Ecclesiology with the *Ebed-Yahweh* as a model, values education can better understand the context of faith. Understood in this sense, faith is not the last resort one needs in the suffering of life. On the contrary, faith is a disposition that embraces suffering as a daily resolve.

There are three important points to glean from above albeit in the Catholic perspective. First, bearing in mind that faith is historical, the value of faith shows a striking commonality with the suffering of others through time (past, present, and future). Under this heading, faith reconnects with reason as its impetus. Such a paradoxical pairing connects to the second point. Secondly, faith must be understood with a subject and does not regard its object as object per se. This means that the object of faith is paradoxically not an object but a subject. The discussions show that this subject can be explained through the figure of the suffering servant. Thirdly, with the *Ebed-Yahweh*, one is acquainted with a collective consciousness. Even with the three senses of the term, there is an outward regard for the other. If understood in terms of Israel, whether by whole or in part, faith still acquires a social consideration. If understood as a person, the figure points to Christ who suffered for the sake of many. In these three senses – historical, paradoxical, and social – faith acquires an exemplary figure in Christ.

From this lesson in Christology to Ecclesiology, the value of faith in the Catholic perspective means educating oneself to bear in mind the suffering of others. As against modern conceptions, faith is not a personal thing that is totally devoid of objectivity. In values education, therefore, one should take note that faith for the Christians is not in a sense tied to pure belief: it has its own subject, historical junction, and social component. It relies on suffering, rather than shuns it and it shines ever more when it reconnects itself to the suffering of its redeemer. It provides a starting point in not only enduring life but also embracing it in educating oneself as well as others.

¹ If Jesus understood himself as "the 'Son of Man'" who by fulfilling the functions of the Ebed Yahweh – the vicarious atonement and the establishment of the covenant – was to create and gather the eschatological people of God, then he could have announced his passion and God's vindication in advance. Seyoon Kim, "The 'Son of Man'" as the Son of God, 85.



REFERENCES

- Andres, T.Q. (1998). *People Empowerment by Filipino Value*. Quezon City: Rex Book Store.
- Andres, T.Q., et al. (1996). *Effective Discipline Through Filipino*. Quezon City: Rex Book Store.
- Aquinas, T. (1225?-1274). *Summa Theologiae*, Complete Works.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Borba, M. (2001). *Building Moral Intelligence*. USA: Jossey-Bass.
- Budde, K. (1899). The So-Called 'Ebed-Yahweh Songs,' and the Meaning of the Term 'Servant of Yahweh' in Isaiah Chapters 40-55. *The American Journal of Theology*, 3(3).
- Bulatao, J. (1966). *Split-level Christianity* (Ateneo de Manila University Press).
- Caputo, J., & Vattimo, G. (2007). *After the Death of God* (Robins, Jeffrey, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Curko, B. et al. (2015). *Ethics and Values Education Manual for Teachers and Educators*. Erasmus+ Ethika. Ljubljana.
- David, I. (2001). *Character Building, A Guide for Parents and Teachers*. Ireland: Four Courts Press.
- Deguma, J., Case, M., Tandag, J. (2019). Popular Religiosity: Experiencing Quiapo and Turumba. *American Research Journal of Humanities & Social Science*, 2(6), 1-11.
- Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God Delusion*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- De Torre, J. (1984). *Christ and the Moral Life*. Manila: Sinag-Tala Publisher, Inc.
- De Torre, J. (1985). *The Roots of Society*. Manila: Sinag-Tala Publisher, Inc.
- De Torre, J. (1987). *Social Morals The Church Speaks on Society* (2nd Ed.). Manila: Southeast Asean Science Foundation.
- Department of Education, Culture and Sports (1997). Values Education Program Framework, The Seven Core and Corresponding Related Values. In *Values Education for the Filipino*. Revised Version of the DECS Values Education Program. Pasig City: Department of Education.
- Dray, P. (2008). Isaiah 52: 13-53:12: Isaiah on the Suffering Servant. *Evangel* 26, 2.
- Esteban, E. (1989). *Education in Values: What, Why and for Whom* (Manila: Sinag-tala Publishers, Inc., 1989).
- Esteban, E. (1990). *Education in Values*. Manila: Sinag-Tala Publisher, Inc.
- Findlay, J.N. (1970). *Axiological Ethics*. London: Macmillan and Co Ltd.
- Garcia, E. (1988). *The Filipino Quest for a Just and Lasting Peace*. N.p.
- Ginsberg, H.L. (2013). The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant. *Vetus Testamentum IOSOT*.
- Har, L.B. (2013). *Constructivist Learning and Teaching*. The Hongkong Institute of Education.
- Hawley, R. et al. (1985). *Human Values in the Classroom*. Hart Publishing.
- Hovey, C. (2008). Nietzsche and Theology. London and New York: T& T Clark.
- Jocano, L. (1967). Filipino Catholicism: A Case Study in Religious Change. *Asian Studies*, 5(1).
- Jocano, L. (1982). *Teaching Beyond Content*. Q.C.: Great Books Trading, Inc., 1982.
- Jocano, L. (1992). *Notion of Value Filipino Culture*. Q.C.: Punlad Research House, 1992.
- Julian of Norwich (1670). *Revelations of Divine Love*. R.F.S. Creffy.
- Kahambing, J.G.S. (2014a). Prolegomena to a Future Church. *Inter Nos*, 26(1).
- Kahambing, J.G.S. (2014b). Visual Paradoxes of Contemporary Faith-Light Relations in Lumen Fidei. *Benavides*, 19(1), 22-28.
- Kahambing, J.G.S. (2015a). The Event of Interreligious Betrayal. *Inter Nos*, 27(1), 69-71.
- Kahambing, J.G.S. (2015b). Political Crossroads for Peace? Interpretations on Politico-Religious Disputes. *Inter Nos Bulletin*, 2(2-3).
- Kahambing, J.G.S. (2016). Freedom in Omens: Why I think Syria is a 'Serial Question'. *Inter Nos*, 28(1), 77-80.
- Kim, J. H. (2012). The Journey of the Suffering Servant: The Vulnerable Hero, the Feminine Godhead and Spiritual Transformation in Endo Shusaku's *Deep River*. *Exchange*, 41.
- Kim, S. (1983). *The 'Son of Man' as the Son of God*. Tubinger, Mohr.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Case Western Reserve University.
- Lickona, T. (1994). *Stages of Moral Reasoning Raising Good Children*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Lovat, T. (2017). *Values Education for 21st Century Learning: Evidence from Australian Research and Practice*. UK.
- Maller, A. (2009). Isaiah's Suffering Servant: A New View. *Jewish Bible Quarterly*, 37(4).
- Miranda, J. (2016). 'Edukasyon sa Pagpapakatao' and Education for the Love of the World. *Social Ethics Society Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 2(1).
- Nietzsche, F. (2003). *Writings from the Late Notebooks*, ed. Rüdiger Bittner (Kate Sturge, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1969). *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for Everyone and No One* (Hollingdale, R.J., Trans.). Penguin Books.
- Nietzsche, F. (2003). *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols and Other Writings* (Aaron Ridley and Judith Norman, trans. Judith Norman). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Notz, W. F. (2008). *On the Signification of the Ebed Yahweh in the So-called Ebed-Yahweh Songs of Isaiah*. [Digital version]
- O'Collins, G. (2009). *Christology: A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic Study of Jesus*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Palispis, E. (1995). *Introduction to Values Education*. Quezon City: Rex Printing Company, Inc.
- Popkin, M. (1987). *Active Parenting*. Harper and Row Publisher.
- Punzalan, T. (2006). An Evaluation of the Implementation of BEC Values Integration Program. Manila: Philippine Normal University Center for Continuing Education and Educational Leadership.
- Raabe, P. (1984). Critical Notes: The Effect of Repetition in the Suffering Servant Song. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 103(1).
- Ramirez, J. (2016). *Julian of Norwich: A very brief history*. London.
- Ramirez, V. (2007). *The Six Core Moral Values*. Philippines. University of Asia and the Pacific.
- Renan, E. (1864). *Life of Jesus*. London: The Temple Company.
- Schreiber, M. (2009). The Real 'Suffering Servant': Decoding a Controversial Passage in the Bible. *Jewish Bible Quarterly*, 37(1).
- Shahani, L.R. (2003). *A Values Handbook of the Moral Recovery Program*. Quezon City: Vibal Publishing House, Inc.
- Skowronski, K.P. (2013). *Beyond Aesthetics and Politics: Philosophical and Axiological Studies on the Avant-Garde, Pragmatism, and Postmodernism*. Value Inquiry Book Series. Amsterdam, Rodopi.
- Story, C. (2009). Another Look at the Fourth Servant Song of Second Isaiah. *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 31.
- Stott, J.R. W. (1967). Was it Necessary for Jesus to Die on the Cross. In Colquhoun, C.F., *Hard Questions*. Falcon Books.
- Super, D. (2012). *Donald Super Developmental Self-concept*. Careers New Zealand.
- Tan, E. (1989). *The Clarification and Integration of Values*. N.p.
- Taylor, J. (1859). *The Great Exemplar* (vol. 2). New York: R. Carter & brothers.
- Timberza, F. (2003). *Filipino Values Today*. National Bookstore.
- Wilks, J. (2005). The Suffering Servant and personhood. *Evangelical Quarterly*, 77(3).
- Williams, R. (2001). A history of faith in Jesus. In Bockmuehl, M. (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zamfir, K. (2013). From Humble Servant to Incarnate Logos. *Christology, Ethics, Apologetics and Polemics in the Early Christian Readings of ISA 52-53*. *Sacra Scripta XI*, 2.
- Žižek, S. (2015). Don't Act, Just Think. *Big Think*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Igr6uaVqWsQ>