

# philippine studies

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

---

## **Bibliography of Philippine Ethnography: Preliminary Bibliography of Philippine Ethnography**

Review Author: Miguel A. Bernad

*Philippine Studies* vol. 16, no. 4 (1968): 795–797

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](mailto:philstudies@admu.edu.ph).

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

This English edition has become even more valuable because of a Preface by John B. Metz and an Introduction by Francis P. Fiorenza. The former brings out the meaning of Rahner's "anthropocentrically oriented theology," the latter deals mainly with the confrontation which *Spirit in the World* presents between Thomas Aquinas and Immanuel Kant.

The quality of the translation is easily guaranteed by the fact that William Dych, as Rahner's student, has become intimately familiar with his thinking and that, moreover, he was his teacher's able interpreter on a recent lecturing tour through America. Several years ago the writer of this review translated some passages from *Geist in Welt* for classnotes. Going over the same passages in Dych's translation makes him wish that this fine piece of work could have been presented at an earlier date.

RUDOLPH H. VISKER, S.J.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PHILIPPINE ETHNOGRAPHY

PRELIMINARY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PHILIPPINE ETHNOGRAPHY. By Shiro Saito. Institute of Philippine Culture and The Rizal Library, Ateneo de Manila, 1968. 388 pp. mimeographed.

Although this book is not published in the full sense of the word (it is "privately circulated for annotation and comments"), its importance and the fact that it has been given wide distribution would seem to call for at least passing notice. The importance of the work can not be overstated. The compiler, who is Reference Librarian of the Sinclair Library in Hawaii, worked for several months in the Filipiniana Room at the Ateneo de Manila, and compiled this impressive list of books and articles on the ethnology of the Philippines.

Just how many titles are included, it is hard to say. The compiler in his introduction mentions his target as "a select list of about 1,000 titles." Quite probably he has achieved that number; but the exact number of titles is hard to ascertain because of duplication—a point to which we shall return.

The work is divided into four main sections. The first section ("General") takes up the first 216 pages. The entries are subdivided in to the various subject-headings related to cultural anthropology: Adolescence, Adulthood and Old Age; Property; Clothing; Marriage; Warfare; Women; Education; Language and Communication; etc.

The second section (Luzon) is subdivided first into regions, then into subject-headings as above, and finally into linguistic-cultural groupings: Apayao, Bicol, Bontoc, Pangasinan, Tagalog, etc.

The third section (Visayas and Palawan) and the fourth (Mindanao and Sulu) are similarly subdivided into subject-headings and into linguistic-cultural groups. There are altogether 50 such linguistic-cultural groups listed: 19 in Luzon, 14 in the Visayas and Palawan, and 17 in Mindanao and Sulu.

Because this is a tentative edition, a few suggestions might be made which might perhaps be taken into account in preparing the definitive edition.

1. While the repetition of entries is unavoidable, it might be helpful if the fact were indicated that it is a repetition. To mention two examples: Colin's *Labor evangélica* is mentioned twice (first as item A53, and again as item AJ23). Garvan's Report on Drinks and Drinking is listed at least three times: first as B56, then as B63, and again as B75 (under the respective tribal headings). In both cases the double or triple listing is not only justified but necessary, but perhaps some indication could be made (either by cross-reference or by retaining the same item-number) that the title listed under one number is identical with that listed under another.

2. A slightly more serious difficulty is the ambiguity with which some of the listings are made. Colin's *Labor evangélica* is again a case in point. As item A53, it is said to be a 3-volume work published in Barcelona between 1900-1902. As item AJ23, it is said to have been published in Madrid in 1663 and republished in second edition by Pastells in Barcelona, also in three volumes in 1904. The beginner might be puzzled: Are these two different works? Are they two different editions of the same work? The difficulty in this case appears to have been one of verification. Item AJ23 had been verified by the compiler (an asterisk indicates that fact); item A53 had not been verified.

3. Lack of verification has led to other listings even more ambiguous. For instance, under Mindanao and Sulu, item A39 is the collection of letters from the Jesuit missionaries in Mindanao (*Cartas de los PP. de la Compañía de Jesús de la Misión de Filipinas*). It is listed as having been published in Manila in 1878. This would give the impression that it is a one-volume work; actually it is a multi-volume work published from time to time during almost two decades, and all the volumes contain ethnic material on Mindanao and Sulu.

The difficulty in this particular case is compounded because the same work (*Cartas*) appears again in two other places, namely, AJ60 and AJ61. In both, it is listed as a five-volume work. But why only five, when *all* the volumes contain ethnic material? In this case,

incidentally, verification would not have been difficult because there are two complete sets of the *Cartas* at the Ateneo de Manila, one of them in the very room where this Bibliography was compiled.

4. Since "Language and Communication" is one of the categories included in this Bibliography, it is difficult to see why some of the pioneering work on the tribal languages has been omitted. For instance, Father Mateo Gisbert's two-volume Dictionary of the Bagobo Tongue. Or Father Guillermo Bennásar's Dictionary of the Tiruray Language, also in two volumes.

Or again, if Saleeby's *Sulu Reader for the Public Schools of the Moro Province* is deemed worthy of inclusion, why not Father Juanmartí's *Compendio de la historia universal*, written in the Spanish and the Maguindanao tongues, and in both Roman and Arabic characters? (The difficulty of printing such a book in Manila compelled the author to have it printed in Singapore.)

For that matter, why not Juanmartí's Dictionary of the Magindanao Language? Or his *Gramatica de la lengua Maguindanao* (Manila, 1892)? Or Smith's English translation of that Grammar for the use of American soldiers (Washington, 1906)?

Undoubtedly these items were omitted because they belong more to a "linguistic" than to an "ethnographic" category: but then what is the scope of the category entitled "Language and Communication"?

There are other omissions, some of them quite puzzling. If one might make a personal mention, Father Achútegui and I are honored to find Volume One of *Religious Revolution in the Philippines* included under the category of "Ecclesiastical Organization." But why not Volume Two (1st edition 1966, 2nd edition 1968)? Volume Two is as much concerned with "Ecclesiastical Organization" as is Volume One.

5. There is also the problem of orthography. It is understandable that traditional "Bicol" should be spelled "Bikol", or the traditional "Ilocano" rewritten "Iloko." Both forms have become accepted usage. It is even understandable that the traditional "Cebuano" should be written "Sugbuhanon", reverting to pre-Hispanic usage. But is it really necessary to rewrite the traditional "Taosug" as "Taw Sug"?

This matter of orthography should perhaps merit the attention of Philippine scholars.

These are a few minor points that might be raised. It is of course hoped that a definitive edition of this Bibliography will come out. But even if it does not, we are already in Mr. Saito's debt.