but in most cases this exercise does little to produce better understanding among religions because one is asked to sacrifice or dilute the principles and doctrines of each religion in order to carry on dialogue. There is, however, little about which one can have a dialogue when there are no principles to be defended (p. 263).

Thomas J. O'Shaughnessy, S.J.


...ans such as Jesús Gayo Aragón, Horacio de la Costa, and Lucio Gutiérrez;... not to speak of earlier writers, have called attention to the key role played by the “Synod of Manila” of 1582 in setting the direction for Spanish colonial... Moreover, no complete text of its proceedings is readily available for the non-specialist. Father Valentin Martín y Morales, O.P., published extracts at the beginning of this century in his Ensayo de una síntesis... More recently Father Pablo Fernández published photostatically in... from the archives of the University of Santo Tomas a... of the proceedings of the synod. Its 17th century calligraphy, however, has made it chiefly available to professional historians...

The present volume is part of a series on the synods of Hispanic America... edited in preparation for the fifth centenary celebration of Columbus’ discovery of America. The treatment is exhaustive. After an introduction on the Mexican and Philippine background of the synod, there are biographical sketches of the two key figures—Bishop Domingo de Salazar, O.P., and Father Sánchez, S.J. The editor then reproduces the key passages from the texts... from the seventeenth century to the present, in which... and mass abundant reference is made to the synod. From a study of these...
and the two key existing documents emanating from the synod, he arrives at a number of conclusions, all of them tending to show that no previous author has been fully accurate in his treatment, and that a good number of them apparently never even saw the documents of the synod.

Porras' research establishes with considerable solidity several hitherto unclear points — the date of the synod (1582); its distinction from the other juntas of the period; the major topics treated at the synod itself and the reason why the surviving documents deal only with the questions of justice and restitution; the nature of some documents evidently added to the Manila version of the synod at a later time. Since neither the Dominican document nor that from the Jesuit Roman Archives are the original proceedings, which were lost in the fire that destroyed the cathedral in 1583, Porras gives a plausible explanation of the origin of these two major documents which he convincingly shows are the essential ones. The Jesuit Roman manuscript and the published Dominican manuscript were certainly written by different people, the former probably by Fr. Alonso Sánchez himself, the latter also in the 16th century (though the present copy is later). But in their content they have clearly come from one source, that is, the synod, for they treat the same matters, though in different fashion, and thus complement each other. Both these manuscripts have been reproduced in the appendix, but in modern Spanish orthography, making up one-fourth of the book.

Another fourth is the glosa, in which the editor summarizes these synodal documents chapter by chapter, at times merely quoting paragraphs, other times summarizing sections or commenting briefly on them. He makes use now of one, now of the other of the two documents reproduced in the appendix, with footnote references, so as to present a connected account letting one document make up for the deficiencies of the other.

There is little to be criticized in this carefully done work. The publication of the Roman manuscript is surely to be welcomed by those who would not otherwise have access to it. Though most of the introductory material, at times even too abundant, has been known before, the author has cut through the many discrepancies and contradictions in the various accounts for a clearer picture of the synod. Only on the question of "slavery" of Filipinos by Filipinos (as distinct from Spanish enslavement of Filipinos, forbidden by the Crown) can he be faulted (pp. 108-12). First, he apparently does not understand the difference of pre-Hispanic Filipino slavery from European chattel-slavery. Secondly, he is unaware that the Filipino institution continued, at least the aliping namamahay, and not merely clandestinely, as Porras says, but legally, until the end of the 17th century. For parish censuses continue to record "mancipia" even in remote provincial villages until that time, who are clearly Filipinos and not the Cafres and Malabares brought into the country from Africa and India by Portuguese slave-traders. One may also wish to dis-
With his statement that the synod of 1582 was not a synod in the strict sense of the word (p. 9), but it is clear from his explanation that it was equivocal. These are minor points in a useful edition of the Manila synod. It is a pity that it was not made more useful by an index.

John N. Schumacher, S.J.