suggestive, indexed topical outline to prompt further research, and a 1300-item selected bibliography (pp. 30-172). The paper closes with a geographically-arranged index to the bibliography (pp. 173-85). As the author himself explains, this publication is almost the same as his earlier article of the same title in Current Anthropology (Vol. 2, No. 1 [February 1961] 27-61). He has here updated the bibliographic entries through 1961, made some corrections, and added the subject index to the outline.

The bibliography and its index (pp. 30-185) are good, workmanlike productions, of the high grade we have come to expect of Conklin. They will be of immeasurable help to anyone desirous of consulting the literature on the subject. Useful and painstaking as they are, however, they cannot match in significance two other contributions the author makes in this paper. The first is his presentation—more accurately, adumbration—of an ecologically-oriented approach to shifting cultivation, illustrated by a helpful three-dimensional diagram (pp. 6-9). The second is the Topical Outline (pp. 10-22).

Of the two, I consider the approach the greater contribution. For if you understand the approach that Conklin describes (and know more than a little about shifting cultivation), you should be able to make your own outline. If you have not understood the approach, then his outline will be as useful, or useless, to you as pages out of Murdock's Outline of Cultural Materials.

Conklin makes the now familiar and regularly neglected point that the failure "to distinguish clearly between native environmental categories (and associated beliefs) and those used by the ethnologist, can lead to confusion, misinformation, and the repetition of useless clichés in discussing unfamiliar systems of land use" (p. 7). The case against ethnocentrism would have been much stronger if Conklin had given one brief comparison to show the uninitiated what is missed by neglect of the local categories of thought and action.

As the title indicates, the publication is bilingual: terse, accurate, English, and terse, accurate Spanish. It is a good paper.

FRANK LYNCH

THE EXPULSION OF THE JESUITS

Last year, 1964, marked the 150th anniversary of the restoration of the Society of Jesus. Restoration reminds us that there was a destruction. The present book is about that destruction.

On August 16, 1773 a brief suppressing the Society of Jesus throughout the world was issued by Pope Clement XIV, reluctant victim of a campaign against the Jesuits which John Hungerford Pollen has characterized as "frenzied hostility."

The *catacro male agentium* which bayed for the kill on this Calvary was composed of Rulers of Europe and their ministers. The papal brief was the culmination of their persecution, but long before that the screws had begun to turn. Father Cushner describes one small part of the Spanish contribution. Four years before Clement's *coup de grace*, a decree of exile banishing the Jesuits from the Spanish dominions was conveyed to their Manila communities. It was May 19, 1768. Father Puig tells us about it.

The expulsion of the Jesuits was carried out on four vessels, three of which went to Spain by the Cape of Good Hope. The passage of the fourth was by way of the Pacific Ocean and Mexico. On August 3, 1769 twenty-four Jesuits, eighteen of whom were priests and three were lay brothers, set out for Acapulco on the San Carlos. Father Francisco Puig was superior of the group. This was his second attempt to obey the decree of banishment, for just a year before he was one of 64 Jesuits who had set out on the Pacific route, and got almost as far as the Marianas before, badly battered by storms, they were forced to limp back to Manila. Two priests died from that experience.

The San Carlos brought the Jesuits to Acapulco. From there they went to Veracruz, where they boarded another ship that landed them in Cadiz on August 9th, "alive and sound, although weak and tired", slightly a year after their departure from Manila.

On October 14, 1770 they were again put on board a ship which took them to Italy and diverse destinies. Four Philippine Jesuits lived to see the restoration of the Society; but none of the group whose experiences are described in this diary.

There were in 1768, Father Puig records, 148 members of the Philippine Province, and three other Jesuits temporarily resident. In addition to the work being done in six colleges and one seminary the Jesuits were caring for about 180,000 in 85 towns. Translating these mute statistics into realities, one can understand the calamitous character of the royal act, if he imagines all the priests of the 81 parishes of the archdiocese of Cebu today, or of the 76 parishes of the diocese of Lipa being suddenly removed. It is true that an attempt was made to send replacements for the Jesuits removed. Nevertheless it is not an exaggeration to say that the Church in the Philippines has not yet recovered from this staggering blow. The same may be said of the other Spanish dominions.
One finishes the diary full of admiration for the Jesuits who are described in it. They were holy and strong, undismayed by their shattering fate, unafraid of the incredible hardships of the sea travel of the time. It is interesting that on the whole they were well treated by their fellow Spaniards, who for some reason failed to share the misgivings about the Society which were troubling the royal bosom. With few exceptions, the secular and regular clergy, the government officials and Spanish citizens were kind and endeavored to lighten the blow. The people among whom the Jesuits worked were shocked. Indicative of the place which the Jesuit missionaries occupied in the hearts of the common people was the experience of Father Puig's group as they crossed from Acapulco to Veracruz. Though of course the people had never seen these particular Jesuits, their journey was a triumphal procession. Father Puig notes the scandal caused to the people by the suppression; if exemplary spiritual guides could be hauled off like common criminals, perhaps their religion ought to be subjected to second thoughts.

Obedience to the decree was exact. Perhaps the union of King and Church made the Jesuits look upon the decree as an order from a spiritual authority. That they should have been resigned to God's will, that they should have refrained from any resistance, and that they should have been especially anxious to negotiate the whole painful transaction with minimum damage to souls, all this is admirable. But perhaps a few blunt appraisals of the monstrous injustice of the act would have been in place. Like John Ogilvie's when the Scottish king thought to deny him residence in Scotland. The royal examiner chided Ogilvie: "You ought not to have come into this realm against the King's commands."

Ogilvie answered: "The King cannot forbid me my country without legitimate reason, for the same natural law which makes him King makes me a subject. . . . I am a subject as free as the King is a King. He cannot exile me, if I be not an offender, which I am not."

Father Cushner's translation reads smoothly. He says that he leaned to literalness, but in any case (with a few exceptions perhaps) he has given us a very readable text. Certainly readers interested in the Philippines will find the story fascinating. The notes are copious, even in spots excessive. However they are consistently interesting and informative. The book contains a helpful historical introduction with several appendices, two of them lists of Jesuits who in one role or another entered into the drama.

This is not Father Cushner's first appearance in print. He has written for The Americas, Mid-America and Philippine Studies. This is however his first book. It is a very impressive start.

LEO A. CULLUM