

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Editor's Preface

Philippine Studies vol. 31, no. 2 (1983) 127–129

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

Editor's Preface

The articles, notes and reviews of this issue of *PS* all draw in one way or another on *history*, either of centuries long past or from fairly recent times. First there is the lengthy article of Dr. Luciano Santiago on the "First Filipino Priests," based on new findings uncovered while working in local archives, regarding the first Filipinos to be raised to the priesthood of the Catholic Church. Enough significant new data are presented on Filipinos ordained by Archbishops Camacho and Cuesta, and on the vicissitudes of the new Seminary of San Clemente, to alter considerably the widely-accepted prejudiced accounts of the early Filipino clergy, and to modify certain positions of Philippine Church historians on the first Filipinos ordained. The analysis of the Rosario Parish document of 1721 is particularly informative; a concluding Table provides a chronological list of the first Filipino priests with a summary of the factual data presently available concerning each.

Recent Philippine economic history provides the background for Dr. Daniel Doeppers article on mortgage financing in pre-war Manila, and its relation to the export economy. While the Tables and graphs may be a bit difficult for the non-professional economist, the text offers an intriguing background to the origins of the PSB, the PNB, the MBLA, as well as to the recent financial maneuvering in Makati among some Filipino financial giants.

N.V.M. Gonzalez provides the counterpoint to these historical approaches with his essay on "Myth and Creativity." He argues convincingly for the essential place in human historicity for myths, those "reservoirs of articulate thought on the level of collective thinking." So the Filipino sensitivity, in story, image and song, to the sacred in the profane, to new awareness of time

and space in the ordinary, exemplifies the insights of Kitto and Eliade in concrete fashion.

The following note, "Sulu in Ming Drama" by Roderich Ptak, in a way combines both history and myth. In a carefully researched textual critique of an ancient Chinese drama which mentions Sulu, the author exemplifies the scholarly approach of the professional historian to classical texts — especially literary and redaction criticism — while at the same time treating the actual content of the drama which combines both "accurate historical facts and imaginative elements." Ptak thus illustrates both the place of myth heralded by N.V.M. Gonzalez and the historian's craft — pursued in great technical detail — that was exercised in Philippine religious history by Santiago, and in Philippine economic history by Doeppers.

Two review articles follow, the first dealing with the history of Chinese Americans in their struggles against racist and especially sexist oppression, as portrayed in two works of Maxine Hong Kingston. Dr. Susan Evangelista provides a sensitive, insightful introduction to this gifted Chinese-American author, "the first writer since Carlos Bulosan to give voice to the struggles, defeats and triumphs of ordinary Asian-Americans, not as whites would have them, but as they see themselves." The second review article by Fr. Sabino Vengco offers a critical assessment of the official Filipino translation of the new revised Catholic Roman Missal of 1970. Since this translation is of great practical import for the liturgical practice in the Tagalog areas of the country, this critique is published in the hope of eliciting further serious comment and effort to improve the use of Filipino in liturgical works.

Joseph L. Roche, S.J.