

philippine studies

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

Intramuros of Memory

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

Philippine Studies vol. 32, no. 3 (1984) 363–364

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

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

“innermost sanctum, the holy of holies” of Manila. Although it is a personal record of one man’s love for this lost city, the essay raises some vexing questions: why the neglect of Intramuros right after the war; why the myopic cry against Intramuros (“Not Philippine history!”); why the abandonment of this “high altar” by the religious orders who were its guardians? Loss of nerve?

What we have lost as monuments in stone and wood, however, we can hopefully remember through this photographic essay for which diverse sources such as books and archival collections in the Philippines and in the United States had to be scoured. Among the results: photographs of a crowd waiting below the forbidden walls of Santa Clara monastery; Calle Real in 1898; a seventeenth-century house on Calle San Francisco; the patio of an eighteenth-century house; an intimate view of a house interior circa 1898; the physics laboratory of Sto. Tomas made famous in Rizal’s *Fili*; the *salon de actos* of San Juan de Letran; the grand staircase of the Ateneo de Manila. Also, the lost splendor of the seven churches of Intramuros: the neo-gothic Sto. Domingo with its ribbed ceiling; the baroque main *retablo* of the Recoletos church, dating to the eighteenth century; the neoclassical San Ignacio with its pulpit carved by Isabelo Tampingco.

A picture, it is said, is worth a thousand words. For evoking the lost glory of Intramuros (summed up in the final photograph on page 168, showing the remains of the city after the Second World War), this picture book is invaluable. But as with any album of memories, its parameters are limited by the memories of its compilers. We may question whether pinning down our memories of Intramuros to the turn of the century and to the early twentieth does justice to this patch of earth which has seen so much of Philippine history. Visual records from an earlier period, like maps and sketches, could have augmented this feast for the eye. We may ask whether recollections of Intramuros should have been limited to published accounts, when perhaps a personal diary or an unpublished letter in some archive may have captured better the moods and moments of the city than the rather self-conscious jottings of foreigners who were out to publish their memoirs of this strange, European-like but not-quite city in the East. But then this may perhaps call for an altogether different book.

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