

philippine studies

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

Kasaysayan at Pag-unlad ng Dulaang Pilipino

Review Author: Rene B. Javellana, S.J.

Philippine Studies vol. 32, no. 3 (1984) 361–363

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

concerting about a westernized Filipino detective. "The Demonstrator" is a ghost story with a political message that is somewhat dated, and "Christmas in Bethlehem" is a story of the supernatural with a theological note. "Stop-over Saigon!" is more of an essay than a short story. "And looking on the fair city, he felt no resentment, no hatred of it because it had bewitched him. He looked on its lights and his heart swelled with love . . . It was enough" (p. 156). "Quo Vadis, Joel Syquia" is a parable for the Filipino's search for meaning, and "Seven Aboard the 747" is an experiment with point of view that doesn't quite succeed. Patterned on Thornton Wilder's *The Bridge of San Luis Rey*, it is a story of seven Filipino (one supposes) lives in the economy class of a 747 traveling west, linked by the memories of what they were and what they are. "In that hushed darkened cabin 45,000 feet up in space, the dreamers form an image of each (sic) of their own memory and desire, of past and present. And so they sail on, boats against the wind, lights whizzing past in the night, towards Camelot and the Klondike and other points West" (p. 49). But there is no real unity beyond the cabin of 747 and the common dream of the Filipino who cannot go home again. Isagani Cruz lamented that Quirino "should not be writing short stories anymore. The time has come to write longer works, to experiment with novels" (p. 203). Quirino responded: "I've begun writing several novels only to cut them short to be converted to short stories." Perhaps, Quirino is right. One should not tamper with the talent that is here—the talent of the journalist who writes with ease about every topic under the sun. He is, as he himself admits, an entertainer. Maybe we need more of that in our sad and disillusioned world.

Joseph A. Galdon, S.J.
English Department
Ateneo de Manila University

KASAYSAYAN AT PAG-UNLAD NG DULAANG PILIPINO. By Arthur P. Casanova. Manila: Rex Bookstore, 1984. 468 pages.

The topic that Arthur P. Casanova seeks to explore in his book, *Kasaysayan ng Pag-unlad ng Dulaang Pilipino*, is broad indeed. He narrates in 468 pages the history of Philippine drama from the precolonial period to the present '80s. The broad scope of his topic is at once the strength and the weakness of the book. Often when a writer wishes to cover a topic extremely broad his analysis tends to be shallow, his argumentation shoddy and his manner of exposition hurriedly done.

As a book that seeks to fulfill the need of students on the tertiary level and as a reference for those taking up courses in Education, Pilipino, or the Theater Arts, Casanova's book, in spite of its shortcomings, has its virtues.

Firstly, it is written in Pilipino, and very few of the monographs on Philippine theater have been written in the vernacular. Secondly, the book is a veritable treasure house of information. Where can you find within one book information such as the names of dozens upon dozens of theater groups, professional and amateur, that continue to keep the theater scene alive and well in the Philippines? Where can you find the list of winners of the Palanca Awards along with those of the less known but productive Paligsahan Pandulaan of the Dulaang Sibol in the Ateneo de Manila High School? The book also serves as a corrective to those who think theater of the Spanish colonial period consisted only of *moro-moro*, *sinakulo*, and *zarzuela*. There were also forms like the *carillo*, *putaje* and *putong*. As for indigenous forms, the book mentions the *dallot*, *dalling-dalling* and the *bayok* or *embayoka* of the Maranaw, forms hardly mentioned in other books. The work rightly claims and demonstrates that theater is as old as the history of the Philippines, and that the Filipino has a penchant for show.

However, as a book which seeks to be counted as a reference and a textbook for courses in Pilipino, its users must exercise critical caution. The reader will notice that 57 pages have been allotted for the whole history of Philippine theater from the pre-Hispanic period to the end of the Second World War, and the rest—more than 400 pages—for the period after the war. There is lack of proportion here, 57 pages for a history more than 400 years in length and more than 400 pages for a history of less than four decades. Come to think of it, Casanova's book is wrongly styled a history of Philippine drama; it is more aptly a history of contemporary Philippine drama with an introduction.

Aside from lack of balance, the author may be faulted for continuing to publish information which more careful scholarship has already disputed. For instance, he claims that a certain Fr. Gaspar Aquino de Belen wrote the first *pasyon*, and that this was followed by Don Luis Guian's *pasyon* in 1750. He then goes on to say that this was followed by the *Pasyong Pilapil* in 1814 written by Fr. Mariano Pilapil. He claims that Pilapil was a native of Norzagaray, Bulacan. Dr. Lumbera's essays [*Philippine Studies*, 16 (October 1968): 622-62; 17 (July 1969): 388-99] have proven that Gaspar Aquino de Belen was no priest; he was a master printer who worked for the Jesuits. It is wrong to suppose that Pilapil wrote the *pasyon* of 1814; he was merely its ecclesiastical censor. Concerning the date of publication of Guian, we have Pardo de Tavera quoting Jose Delgado's *Historia*, which places this *pasyon* in the year 1740. And the priest who was from Norzagaray was Aniceto de la Merced, not Pilapil, so says Salvador Pons y Torres in *El Clero Secular Filipino*. We may not fault Casanova altogether for erroneous data, since after all he is merely quoting Eufronio M. Alip. If Casanova is to be faulted, it is for a lack of critical use of sources.

At times, however, the author does provide inadequate or erroneous

information. For instance, he mentions only two drama groups in the University of the Philippines, Dulaang UP and UP Repertory. UP has other drama groups equally as active as these two, for instance Bodabil and Teatro Laboratorio. The book also claims that the Moriones is celebrated in Mindoro, when this is presented in Marinduque.

Concerning his bibliography, it is surprising that the author makes no mention of published books and monographs on different areas of theater. For instance, we have Tiongson's books on the *sinakulo* and the *komedyá*, Fernandez on the Ilongo zarzuela, Manlapaz on Aurelio Tolentino, and Ramas on Cebuano theater. The author's bibliography consists primarily of articles. Such an oversight results in a history which for the most part is the history of the development of Tagalog drama, and thus rather provincial. Where is the colorful tale of the Ilongo zarzuela or a biography of the Cebuano playwright, Piux Kabahar, who wrote zarzuelas by the dozen?

While Casanova's book may be helpful, and his Tagalog style certainly readable, it is a pity that Casanova has sacrificed careful and critical scholarship for broadness of scope. This broadness of scope demonstrates that Philippine drama certainly is a rich heritage. The book's shortcomings show that we have only begun to fathom this rich resource. Perhaps a comprehensive history is premature or, if it is not, then it should be the work of a team of scholars, writers, and researchers, and not the project of a single man.

Rene B. Javellana, S.J.
Theology Department
Ateneo de Manila University

INTRAMUROS OF MEMORY. Edited by Jaime C. Laya and Esperanza B. Gatbonton. Manila: Ministry of Human Settlements, Intramuros Administration, 1983. ix, 172 pages.

Intramuros of Memory is a picture book of rare and vintage photographs showing old Manila "sa loob" at the turn of the century, and before the devastating desecration of this "high altar" of the noble and ever loyal city.

Commissioned by the Intramuros Administration, the book must be evaluated within the parameters of a wider project. "This book is the result of the first efforts of the Intramuros Administration to conceptualize its work, to gather available material for use in zoning, restoration and evaluation of building proposals" (p. viii). The "best finds" of this research are presented in this volume for our nostalgic delectation.

Divided into six sections, Fortifications, Streets, Government Offices, Schools, Destruction, the whole album is preceded by an evocative essay by Nick Joaquin on his own recollections of Intramuros, which he calls the