

The Synod of Manila: 1581-1586

BY LUCIO GUTIERREZ, O.P.

I will try to present in this article the teachings of the First Synod of Manila, of 1581-1586, about the legitimacy of the Spanish conquest of the Philippines and the methods to be used in the preaching of the Gospel to pagan people. These teachings are practical applications, to the concrete historical context of the Philippines, of the teachings of Fr. Francisco de Vitoria and Fr. Bartolomé de Las Casas, the two great Dominican theologians of the sixteenth century. These two persons more than anybody else contributed to the clarification of the problems involved in the conquest and christianization of America and the Philippines. They exercised a lasting influence upon their contemporaries, an influence that it is very much felt even today.

The Spanish conquest of the Philippines was perhaps the most humane ever achieved in the history of mankind. It was done in an incredible short span of time and with a minimal spilling of blood. The acceptance of the Dominican method of conquest and evangelization, advocated not only by Las Casas and Vitoria, but by the Augustinians and Franciscans and, above all, by Fr. Domingo de Salazar, O.P., first bishop of the Philippines, explain, to a great extent, the rapid and orderly fashion of the conquest of the Philippines.

Philip II made a serious effort to avoid in the conquest of the Philippines the abuses and sanguinary results of the conquest of Mexico and especially of the Inca empire of Peru. The school of Vitoria, based on St. Thomas Aquinas, emphasized the rights of infidels. These rights were based on natural law. Even if the people of the Philippines were not Christians they enjoyed inalienable rights. Philip II adopted this new method, based on the teachings of Francisco de Vitoria, for the conquest of the Philippines. It was his chance to prove that peaceful conquest, as-

similation and evangelization were possible. When we read Philip II's *Instructions to Legazpi* we are reading Vitoria's *Relecciones de Indis*. These Instructions show that the Spanish Court had adopted the Dominican approach about peaceful evangelization and conquest and the need to avoid bellicose and military methods. Vitoria's method was adopted by missionaries and conquistadores in the case of the Philippines.

The problems confronting Domingo de Salazar and the rest of the people at the beginning of the decade of the 1580's were many and serious, but in Salazar the Philippines found the right man at the right moment. The problems were many, but most of them were mainly related to the legality of the Spanish conquest and the best means to bring the Filipinos to the fold of the Christian faith.

How could the Filipinos be incorporated into the Spanish Crown? What methods were to be used in the conversion of the Filipinos? The Augustinians held that the Spaniards were responsible for many of the evils inflicted upon the natives during the pacification of the country and its incorporation into the Spanish dominions.

Justice had often been violated. The natives had been robbed and abused. Hence the Spaniards were bound to restitution. If not, they could not be given sacramental absolution. If restitution had to be done, to whom? Many of the injustices had been committed during the first years of the conquest and the people were already dead. Who was obliged to restitution? Those directly involved or also those who were instrumental in the injustice? In the event of the death of those who committed the injustice, were the living morally obliged to pay the restitution *in solidum*, *in toto*, or only their corresponding part? Who would decide how much was due for restitution? Behind all these problems there was still a more vital and fundamental one: the legitimacy of the Spanish conquest of the Philippines. This last point was essential for the understanding of all the others. If the Spanish King had no legal title to the Philippines it followed that everything done up to then was unjust and immoral. Taxation was no more than robbery. The conquest a mere spoliation. All those dead who took part in the conquest had perished in hell. Those living were obliged to restitute *in solidum*.

Domingo de Salazar arrived in Manila in September of 1581. He was no stranger to the struggle for justice. For 23 years he had fought tenaciously for justice and humanization in the vast fields of Mexico and Florida. The Augustinians and Franciscans, the latter had arrived in

1578, received a man well seasoned in the struggle for justice. He was a learned theologian and a lawyer, invested with episcopal dignity, a privilege that placed him so high in the Spanish colonial system. The religious received a valiant man, indefatigable in the fight for justice, a man who could confront, if need be, the Spanish authorities in the Philippines. Salazar's arrival would indeed mean a greater impetus in the process of Christianization and the struggle for justice.

From the very first moment of his arrival there was a clash with the governor and the civil authorities. Some of his actions brought him into direct and bitter conflict with the secular powers. Many of the laws promulgated by the Spanish Crown in defense of the Filipinos were due to the fighting spirit of the first bishop of the Philippines. But it was a noble struggle in which it was worthy to take part.

As soon as Salazar arrived he tried to come to grips with the situation. Although he recognized the misery and poverty of the Spanish encomenderos and soldiers, he was not ready to tolerate real abuses. Following the spirit of the Augustinians, Salazar also saw the sufferings of the natives. He felt he had to side with the weaker part, that is, with the natives. He had to do something to change the situation. He came to realize that unless something was done immediately the evangelization of the Filipinos would be endangered. God's power could perform and did indeed perform miracles and the Filipinos were accepting the faith of their conquerors. But abuses and injustices belied the faith they preached. He had full trust in the resources of the Christian faith. God's admirable power was there for all to see, but men, Christian men at that, were supposed to concur with God's grace rather than belie it with their evil deeds.

There was a danger that instead of peacefully accepting the Spanish rule and the light joke of Christ they would conspire against the Spanish and come to hate Christianity. If so, the main purpose of the arrival of the Spaniards, the conversion of the natives to Christianity, would never be achieved.

Salazar had a solid moral and intellectual formation. He possessed a dynamic and fighting spirit which gave impetus to his life. As he himself confessed, it was the spirit of Bartolomé de Las Casas, the great defender of the Amerindians, which permeated his whole being. Salazar wrote to the King of Spain:

"I was reared up in the doctrine of the bishop of Chiapas."¹

In January of 1991 the bishops of the Philippines, over a hundred of them, will be celebrating the II Plenary Council of the Philippines. The problems to be discussed are distinct from those discussed by the first bishop of the Philippines, Fray Domingo de Salazar, during the First Synod of Manila of 1581-1586. This II Plenary Council happens over four hundred years after the First Synod of Manila, convoked and presided over by Salazar. But behind the two Councils we should be able to discover the commitment of the Church in favor of man's liberation and salvation. Salazar was threatened by the civil authorities. An encomendero told him that he could hit his miter with his arquebus at a distance of fifty meters. And the bishop is supposed to have answered: I am a defender of the poor - the *pater pauperum* of the fathers of the church - and you will be punished by God. At another occasion the governor of the Philippines, Don Gonzalo Ronquillo de Peñalosa, reminded Salazar that he was a descendant of Spanish cavaliers who had no scruples in sending bishops to the gibbet. Salazar responded that when justice was at stake, his life counted for nothing and he had no fear of him.

Historians are oftentimes ridiculed for dealing with things of the past. Their interests are always of ages gone by, of people already dead. They seem to be out of touch with reality. If we need to justify ourselves, and try to find an excuse for the time spent in studying problems so strange as the justification of the Spanish conquest of the Philippines during the sixteenth century, the answer is simple. We are dealing with the universal problems of justice and fraternity. Hence, they have a permanent importance, now and forever. Today we are living in a new and ever expanding world, in which the nations of diverse cultures and religions must learn how to live together. The events of this very moment, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, and the prospect of a bigger conflict, have an immediate repercussion anywhere in the world. Today like yesterday the desire of the civilized world is to see that justice triumphs. Then like now the problem is tremendously complex due to the variety of nations confronting one another. The particular solutions to the problems of the past might not attract us today, but the basic problem subsists - and man's determination to solve it - to discover what justice

¹Letter of Domingo de Salazar to the Spanish King, Manila, June 18, 1583, Archivo General de Indias (AGI) Patronato 25; Also Filipinas 74.

is and how to insure its triumph. Only in this manner history becomes a *magistra vitae*, and man finds great joy in discovering the reasons why.

The Filipinos came to accept Spanish rule willingly due to the efforts of the missionaries. They were seen as defenders of the people against the injustices of the authorities. We have an extraordinary episode, unique in the history of colonization, where the Filipinos were asked to submit to the Spanish dominion decades after the conquest had been achieved. In front of Fray Diego de Soria, O.P., second bishop of Nueva Segovia, and co-founder of the University of Santo Tomas, a Filipino stood up and said:

"We answer that we wish the king of Spain to be our King and our Lord, for he has sent us Castilians to us to free us from the tyranny and dominion of our principales, and also Fathers to aid us against the Castilians themselves and to defend us from them."²

If Domingo de Salazar and the first missionaries of the Philippines had not spoken against the abuses of their fellow Spaniards, if they had dedicated themselves to the only task of baptizing the people of the Philippines, if they had closed their eyes to the misdeeds and rapacity of the governors and rulers, would things have changed in the Philippines? Would there have been any friction between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities? The whole world knows Domingo de Salazar, first bishop of the Philippines, the whole world knows Dom Helder Camara, and the whole world knows bishops of the Church, like St. Ambrose of Milan, St. John Chrysostom, who died in exile, and the great St. Basil. The latter when threatened with exile by Modestus the representative of the Roman Emperor for defending doctrines opposed to the doctrines of the imperial authorities, answered:

"The confiscation of goods does not harm one who has nothing, unless perchance, for these tortures and sufferings you need a cloak and a few books which are my whole life. Exile I do not know, for I am bound to no one place: not only this my own land in which I live, but the whole world into which I may be banished, I hold as

²JUAN DE MEDINA, O.S.A., *Historia de los sucesos de la orden de N. gran P.S. Agustin de estas islas Filipinas desde que se descubrieron y se poblaron por los Españoles, con las noticias memorables* (Manila, 1893), p. 134, written in 1630, as quoted by JOHN N. SCHUMACHER, *Readings in Philippine Church History*, Quezon City, Loyola School of Theology, 1979, p. 38.

my own, for the whole world is for God, whose dweller and sojourner I am. These tortures, what harm could they do me, not having a body, except so to speak, the first blow. Of these things only you are lord. But death would be an act of kindness for it will bring me nearer to God, for whom I live, and for Whom I have been created and to Whom in the greater part I have died and towards whom I hasten."³

The imperial prefect, astonished at such words, responded: "No one until now has spoken to me in such a manner and with such liberty of words." And Basil, the fearless and learned bishop, replied:

"Perhaps you have never met a bishop before. Where God is endangered and exposed, there all other things are considered as nothing. Him alone do we look to. Fire, sword, beats and the instruments for tearing the flesh are wished for by us as delights more than horrors. Afflict us with such tortures, threaten, do all that you can now, devise, enjoy your power. Also, let the Emperor hear this, that at all events you will not persuade us nor win over us to the impious doctrine, though you threatened with cruel deeds."⁴

Today, in the Philippine context, many problems are waiting for a true evangelical solution, problems on divorce, abortion, manipulation of life, hedonism, Aids, injustice, corruption, violence, abuse to ecology, politicians' rapacity and other similar ones. Let the bishops who will come to the II Plenary Council take heed of what their predecessors in the apostolic college have done for the Gospel and for man. And this in the Philippine context, in the early decades of the history of the Christianization of the Philippines, by bishops like Domingo de Salazar and Miguel de Benavides. The last one already elected first bishop of Nueva Segovia wrote a letter from Madrid in 1595 to his fellow Dominicans in the Philippines:

"For the Filipinos [indios] we have obtained great favors, praise be the Lord. We have to understand that it must be through love of God and not through punishment, that the work of God will be achieved. It has been decided that since the natives, before the arrival of the Spaniards, were lords and rulers, they must continue to be so, as our Dukes and Counts are lords here. Through a

³As quoted in JOHANNES QUASTEN, *Patrology*, A Christian Classics Reprint, Vol. III, p. 206.

⁴*Ibidem*.

memorial that I presented to the Council of Indies this was obtained. Your reverences know very well that the Order of St. Dominic has always been the protector of the native indios, and it is honorable to end our lives in imitation of our forefathers."⁵

Without any doubt, this is a role to be cherished by the Philippine church today.

1. Main Aim of the Synod of Manila

Only a month after his arrival, Salazar, having felt the pulse of the country, convoked the ecclesiastics and some important laymen to a special meeting to discuss some of the grave problems affecting the Spaniards and natives of the Philippines.

The problems to be discussed and studied were many and serious, all related to the conquest and evangelization of the Philippines, such were the administration of the sacraments to conquistadores and encomenderos, the collection of tributes from the natives, the restitution for the evils inflicted upon the natives, the methodology to be used in preaching the Gospel to pagans and many other related problems. One problem which could not be forgotten, because it was at the bottom of everything, and gave meaning to all other problems to be discussed, was the legitimacy of the conquest of the Philippines.

We read in the 'Acts' that the Council, or Synod was convoked

"by the bishop of these islands, Don Fray Domingo de Salazar, to remove scruples about very grave things that must be objected in confession, and also to quiet down many penitents. Present at the gathering were the prelates of the religious orders, learned people from the orders and some jurists."⁶

⁵Quoted by JESUS GAYO ARAGON, O.P., *Ideas Jurídico-Teológicas de los Religiosos de Filipinas en el siglo XVI sobre la conquista de las Islas*, Universidad de Santo Tomás de Manila, 1950, p. 154.

⁶The Original Acts of the Synod of Manila have not come down to us. The Dominican Fr. Valentin Marín, in his book *Ensayo de una síntesis de los trabajos realizados por las corporaciones religiosas de Filipinas*, Manila, 1901, 1, pp. 195 & ff. gives us part of the Acts under the title: *Memoria de una junta que se hizo a manera de concilio el año 1582 para dar asiento a las cosas tocantes a la fe y justificación de las conquistas hechas y que además se hicieren por los españoles*.

The Franciscan, Fr. Lorenzo Pérez, in his article *Orígenes de las misiones franciscanas en el Extremo Oriente*, in *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, 1915, II, 386-387 denies the authenticity of the Acts as they appear in Marín. According to Pérez, Marín mentions (p. 260), when dealing with the *Ordenes e Instrucciones que han de guardar los Alcaldes Mayores*, this paragraph:

The Synod started already in 1581, and with some interruptions it lasted, more or less, until 1586, the year in which one of the main protagonists and secretary for some time of the council, the Jesuit Alonso Sánchez, left the Philippines for Spain and Rome.⁷

"For no offense, cause or reason, pecuniary penalties must be inflicted on the Indians, because the king so ordered in the Instructions he gave to governor Gómez Pérez Dasmariñas."

Governor G. P. Dasmariñas came to Manila on June 4, 1590, as he personally testifies in a *Letter to Philip II*, Manila, June 20, 1590, in: AGI, Filipinas 18. This being so, says Pérez, that *Memoria de una Junta*, published by Marín, cannot be anterior to Dasmariñas' arrival.

Pérez forgets that Marín published the *Memoria* in his book in the order he wanted. Gayo writes about this:

"In the four copies that exist in the archives of the University [of Santo Tomas] and Province [of the Most Holy Rosary] the said *Ordenes e Instrucciones* are found at the end of the document, as we also find the *Arancel* and the *Instrucciones que han de guardar los protectores de Indios*, not forming part of the chapters of the Act. This shows that the three mentioned works were added later on. In one of the copies, although of a different hand, we read the word *Finis*." Cfr. J. GAYO, *Ideas Jurídico-Teológicas de los religiosos de Filipinas en el siglo XVI sobre la conquista de las islas*, Manila, 1950, 60, note 17.

The Acts are found in: *Archivo de la Provincia del Santo Rosario* (APSR), vol. 253, fols. 123-175, and Vol. 60, fols. 130-186. Also in: *Archivo de la Universidad de Santo Tomas* (AUST), Sección de Becerros, NN, 14 & 15.

The copy of AUST, Sección de Becerros, No. 14 was published in *Philippiniana Sacra*, Vol. IV, No. 12, September-December, 1969, pp.431-537.

⁷The start of the Synod of Manila, absolutely speaking, should be taken with the general meeting of October, 1581, convoked and presided by bishop Salazar, where the burning problem of slavery was discussed. Cfr. H. DE LA COSTA, S.J., *The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581-1768*, Harvard Univ. Press, 1969, p. 23.

We read in one of the letters of Sedeño, a Jesuit who took part in the Synod:

"El obispo, tomada la posesión de su iglesia, comenzó a dar orden cómo se sosegasen las conciencias de los que por acá están. Juntó para ésto los superiores de las órdenes y los demás que para ésto podían ayudar. Hízose mucho en cosa de dos meses que duraron las juntas. No se acabó lo que se llevaba entablado, aunque se dió mucha luz a muchas cosas, porque cayó enfermo el provincial de los agustinos y luego tras él el P. Alonso Sánchez que era el todo en todo . . ." In: *Letter of Fr. Antonio Sedeño to the General of the Order*, Manila, June 12, 1852, *Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu*, (ARSI), Phil. 9, 7-10. For the duration of the Synod Cfr. ALONSO SANCHEZ, S.J., *Respuesta del P. Alonso Sánchez de la Compañía de Jesús, a los puntos de una que el obispo de las Filipinas escribe a su Magestad*, in ARSI, Philip. 9, 217-22. Cfr. APSR, *Historia Eclesiástica*, tomo 3, Doc. 2; Cfr. AUST, L. 188.

From its inception the Synod tried to tackle problems which were eminently pastoral and practical. People were restless. Only an extraordinary meeting, presided over by the bishop, with the concurrence of the most representative people of the religious orders, and some of the laymen of importance, experts on the problems related to the conquest of the Philippines, could try to offer a solution to these problems. The problems to be clarified were concrete, existential and practical. They touched the daily lives of the people. Thus the Acts tell us:

"What we shall try to do is to give advice to the confessors, how they must act with the persons of their commonwealth, and for this we have to know where these people usually fail."⁸

What better way of studying the problems than by coming together in a Synod? The conclusions adopted in the assembly could be accepted more easily since they would be the effect of the discussions that had taken place in the general assembly. What those present in the Synod expected to achieve was to put a stop to the injustices committed by the encomenderos and other Spanish officials against the natives of the Philippines. Furthermore, it aimed to set the conquest on just and solid bases, and give themselves heart and soul to the noble task of christianization and evangelization.

One of the thorniest problems to be discussed was that of the tributes. The confessors did not want to absolve the Spaniards who had unjustly collected tributes from the natives, unless they were ready to retribute what had been taken. What else could the Synod demand?

The participants of the Synod did not want to give general laws, as the kings and governors could do for their kingdoms and provinces. Rather they intended

"to give a summary of the things necessary to be known in this land so that the ministers, due to the lack of knowledge, or books where to study, or because they are very busy in the ministry of souls, can find them all together, briefly and clearly, in this memorial."⁹

In his *Respuesta* Sánchez says that the Synod lasted for five years:

"In that *Reasoning* (which the Council commanded to put in writing) nothing important will be found that was not discussed and defended many times by the bishop and all the religious from there, especially in that Council which lasted, at times, four or five years . . ."

⁸V. MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 195.

⁹*Ibidem*.

For years already religious and laymen alike were in a state of confrontation, to the scandal even of the Filipino Christians. What was worse, in that religious atmosphere of the sixteenth century, the consciences of colonizers, encomenderos and royal officials, and even those of the missionaries, were full of anxiety, faced as they were with daily problems for which seemingly no solution could be found. The religious ate with scruples the little food they received as sustenance, since they considered it an effect of the robberies perpetrated by the Spaniards.¹⁰

The conquistadores and encomenderos complained that after having left behind fatherland and family, and come to this far away country, fought for God and king, to bring those people to a more civilized way of life - thus helping efficaciously in the task of evangelization - they were denied a morsel of food to keep together body and soul. They were called oppressors and robbers. Was this the recompense they deserved for so many trials experienced and so many tears shed?¹¹

What to do to solve the problem? Salazar had found an answer: the Synod of Manila.

¹⁰"Out of pure scruples of conscience some religious are very sad, as they understand that, even what is given to them as food, cannot be received with sure conscience, because everything was badly received and badly taken," *Letter of Fr. Martín de Rada, O.S.A., to the Viceroy of New Spain*, Manila, June 1, 1573, in: *Archivo Histórico Hispano-Agustiniano* (AHHA), El Escorial, 1923, 186-187. Cfr. COLIN-PASTELLS, *Labor Evangélica de los Obreros de la Compañía de Jesús en las Islas Filipinas*, 3 vols., Barcelona, 1900-1902, I, 134. TORRES LANZAS-PASTELLS, *Catálogo de los documentos existentes en el Archivo de Indias relativos a Filipinas. Historia General de Filipinas*, 8 vols., Barcelona, 1926-1936, II, p. XIII.

¹¹*Letter of Diego de Aguilar and other Spanish soldiers from Manila to Philip II*, Manila, July 18, 1581, in: COLIN-PASTELLS, *Labor*, I, 263, we read:

"We have seen service in the conquest and pacification of these islands and their settlement, some of us 10 years, others 12, and others 15, with only the original grant-in-aid which the officials of your Majesty's treasury of New Spain released to us in Mexico on our way hither. It was soon spent by reason of the necessities we encountered in the pacification of these natives; so we have been forced to rob them and imposed upon them in other ways, burdening our consciences in this fashion merely in order to subsist. We thus have a heavy load on our souls which we are unable to shake off by reason of our great poverty," as translated by H. DE LA COSTA, *Asia and the Philippines. Collected Historical Papers*, Manila, 1967, 26.

2. Influence of Alonso Sánchez on Domingo de Salazar

Before entering into detail in the study of some of the most important points discussed in the Synod, and in order to understand the attitude of Salazar during the duration of the Synod, we have to discuss the influence exercised by the Jesuit Alonso Sánchez over Salazar and over the whole Spanish colony during the years 1581-1586.

The arrival of Salazar in the Philippines could mean a hardening of the relations with the civil authorities. And indeed it meant so up to 1583. In this very year, busy as he was with the problem of the conquest of China, Salazar sent to the Spanish king a letter and a questionnaire about the urgent need to enter China militarily.¹²

How did Salazar come to change so radically in so short a time? This question shall become clearer in the process of our study. He will be our witness. His letters will show, and this without any doubt, that Salazar changed his theologico-juridical ideas, or at least their practical application, to the concrete Philippine and Chinese political situation. We are faced with a fact where the concrete existential reality of a country influenced so much the mind of a man that he finally bypasses some basic theologico-juridical principles that have been the basis of his action for a whole life and adopts, for the time being, other principles alien to his fundamental formation.

As soon as Salazar became acquainted in the ship from Acapulco to Manila with the Jesuit Alonso Sánchez, he started to feel the attraction of this romantic and intelligent Jesuit. Salazar took Sánchez as personal adviser and theologian, in spite of having with him a loyal collaborator in the person of the young Dominican Fr. Cristóbal de Salvatierra. Sánchez wrote later on:

"From the first day when he heard me deliver a sermon in the ship we were travelling together, he called me and started to show me so much trust, love and humility, that he even wanted to consult me on the quantity and quality of his prayer, and the penance that he made as a saint, and started to increase; what food or drink to take, or what dress, whether to have a new or an old habit."¹³

¹²*Letter and Information of Domingo de Salazar to Philip II, Manila, June 18, 1583, AGI, Patronato 25.*

¹³*Respuesta, ARSI, Phil. 9, 217-222.*

A little later on, Sánchez adds:

"Whether in the management of his house, or in taking some servants, or the provisions of prebendaries for his church, how to proceed in law-suits, whether in court or summarily, or in the great contradictions about the pacification of that land, with the governor, encomenderos, with Augustinians or Franciscan friars, with *alcaldes mayores*, merchants, captains, soldiers, mariners, Chinese, *Indios* and other difficulties, he never dared to move without me, compelling me to give him my opinion, which he always followed, and to my superior to allow me to sleep outside our house and stay in his, or in the monasteries we used to go to."¹⁴

If we were to take literally what Sánchez says about Salazar, it would seem that the bishop was a simple marionette in his hands. Yet, even if we take away what might be exaggerated - and there is a lot of exaggeration, for Sánchez was writing around 1591-1592, to defend himself of having betrayed the bishop - it cannot be denied that he exercised a strong, powerful and extraordinary influence on Salazar. This influence was felt in all fields of colonial life in the Philippines. The dependence of Salazar was such that the Jesuit superior, Fr. Antonio Sedeño, built a room in their house, where the bishop could stay for long periods of time.

It was Salazar himself who manifested to the king his dependence upon the Jesuits. This is what he writes in 1583:

"I tell your Majesty, with the honesty I have to manifest always, that after I came to these islands, in all the cases I have had, and the afflictions I have been confronted with - and they have not been few - I have had no other recourse but these fathers. I think I would not dare to remain in the land if they were to leave."¹⁵

In one of the sessions of the *General Junta* of 1586, in the heat of the discussions, the Dominican Cristóbal de Salvatierra, personal secretary of Salazar, mentioned something against Sánchez. The latter asked the bishop to come out into the open to his defense. The answer of the bishop is both a defense and a praise of Sánchez:

"In the sight of God, who is going to judge us, I have to say that in six years that I have dealt with him, I have never seen any personal

¹⁴*Ibidem.*

¹⁵*Letter of Domingo de Salazar to Philip II, Manila, June 18, 1583, AGI, Filipinas 74.*

interest or respect except for God. I have never erred in following his advice, and many times I have erred in not following it . . . I have conversed, discussed, shared and consulted most familiarly with him all affairs, cases, and difficulties that have arisen in this bishopric, and since this is a new land, the occasions have been many and most serious and full of difficulties. I have always found in him virtue and zeal for the truth, without human respect, and a great erudition to solve any kind of difficulty."¹⁶

According to Chirino, Sánchez was the secretary of the Synod. The participants, most especially the bishop, asked him to put in writing the decisions and resolutions adopted by them. In Chirino's view, whenever Sánchez gave his opinion about any point, everybody was easily convinced.¹⁷

Sánchez himself tells us:

"About the affairs of the council, the bishop came to me many times, why I did not put it in clear form to send it to Spain. Due to my inability, he pressed a servant called Stephen, to put it in clear form, so that I would bring the manuscript and show it to his Majesty, if there would be any chance."¹⁸

It seems, however, that the participants at the Synod did not so easily accept the opinions of Sánchez as we are made to believe by Chirino, nor are we to accept so easily that the fathers of the Synod supported, without any objections, the militaristic approach to conquest and evangelization presented by Sánchez, especially regarding the 'affair' of China.

Sánchez had to explain at length and in depth, to those present at the Synod, his point of view. Thus he confesses:

¹⁶*Respuesta, Ibidem.*

¹⁷Chirino writes about Sánchez' intervention in the first meetings of the Synod:

"The task of putting in writing the decisions of all the sessions was given to Fr. Alonso Sánchez. I saw the notes in his own writing later and I read them with esteem as something so wise and just. I will not omit to mention what I was told by some of those who were present during the Council: that when the bishop asked him to speak first, nobody disagreed with him. All followed him, remitting themselves to him, without adding anything, for he said things so well that he did not let anything to be added," In: COLIN-PASTELLS, *Labor*, I, 264.

¹⁸*Respuesta, Ibidem.* Most probably the copy of the Acts found in ARSI is the one mentioned here by Sánchez.

"That in a junta convoked by the bishop of Manila, to which all the ecclesiastics and religious residing there took part, the affair of the right of conquest of his Majesty about the said empire [China] was discussed. And all followed the general opinion [of the theologians of Spain], even the bishop, who had followed that opinion for 23 years, and even written a book."¹⁹

Whether they were convinced by Sánchez' arguments, or by other motives, what happened to Salazar also happened to the participants at the Synod: they rejected, at least for the moment, all scruples regarding the justification of the conquest of China, and other neighboring countries. They followed Sánchez' view, which was that of armed conquest to bring the Gospel of Christ to them. Salazar is the best example for this change. Let us listen to him:

"Your Majesty knows how scrupulously these affairs of Indies are to be dealt with, how almost all the scholars of Spain, and even those of Indies, condemn the conquest done against the Indians, forcing to restitution for all the evils, deaths and robberies committed, all those who organized them and found themselves in them. I was of this opinion for some time, for I was reared up in the doctrine of the bishop of Chiapa. I was of this opinion for more than twenty-three years that I was in New Spain. But after I came to these islands, with the office your Majesty knows I have (although I am not worthy of it) having consulted it first with learned and God-fearing people, God has given us to know what we have to hold on this. Due to this, many consciences here, which were very restless, have found peace, for they could not find anyone to hear their confessions. And before that, I would never had dared to hear their confessions."²⁰

The quotation presented above shows clearly the change which took place in Domingo de Salazar. During his twenty-three years as a missionary in Mexico and Florida, he had been a defender of the injustice of the Spanish conquest of America. Now, in the Philippines, having consulted the matter with learned and God-fearing people, he has changed radically his opinion. Without any doubt Alonso Sánchez, the prime mover of the conquest of China through military means, was one of the learned and God-fearing people he had consulted.

¹⁹*Respuesta, Ibidem.*

²⁰*Letter of Domingo de Salazar to Philip II, Manila, June 18, 1583, AGI, Patronato*

During the lengthy meetings to discuss, once more, the justification of the conquest of China in 1586, Sánchez was always beside the bishop. He writes:

"During the night, the oidor Pedro de Rojas, and the fiscal of the Audiencia, and the royal factor [Juan Roman] came to discuss with me their problems in the room of the bishop where I slept."²¹

At this point we believe it would be superfluous to bring any other testimony to prove the influence of Sánchez on Salazar, and on the whole Spanish colony. This influence was felt until Sánchez' departure for Spain in 1586 as official delegate of all the segments of Philippine society.²²

3. Doctrine of the Synod about the legitimacy of the Spanish Conquest of the Philippines

One of the burning problems the participants at the Synod were confronted with was the legitimacy of the Spanish conquest of the Philippines. What title could the Spaniards adduce to call themselves masters of the country? If, as many religious defended, the Spaniards had taken over the Philippines unjustly, why did they continue there?²³

The religious could not escape the question of the legitimacy of the Spanish conquest of the Philippines. The permanence of the Spaniards in the country, the justification of the collection of tributes, and the thorny and ticklish problem of restitution, were based on the first one. Once the legitimacy of the conquest was denied, there was no more basis for collecting tributes. This being so, people could be compelled, under

²¹*Respuesta, Ibidem.*

²²The fever of conquest remained until the arrival of the Dominicans in 1587. Most of them were disciples, or at least, admirers of Bartolomé de Las Casas and Vitoria. They could not endorse the methods approved earlier by the Synod of Manila and imposed upon the people by Sánchez' convincing powers. The Dominicans opposed vigorously the military conquest of China, re-stated the problem of the legitimacy of the conquest of the Philippines, and defended the peaceful preaching of the Gospel of Christ.

²³*Opinion of Fr. Martín de Rada about the tributes on the Indians, San Pablo, Manila, June 21, 1576, BLAIR, E. H.-ROBERTSON, J. A., The Philippine Islands: 1493-1898, 55 vols., Cleveland, 1903-1909, III, 254, where we read:*

"I have taken the opinion of all the fathers who were to be found here. They unanimously affirm that none among all these islands have come into the power of the Spaniards with just title."

penalty of mortal sin to restitute everything collected from the Filipinos and pay back the losses inflicted upon them during the conquest. It cannot, then be denied that the problem was very serious.

It strikes us as strange that subjects of the most powerful king on earth discussed and questioned so serious a problem. But we must not forget that the Spaniards of the sixteenth century enjoyed an astonishing degree of freedom of thought and speech. But behind all this, we discover an admirable spiritual and moral sensibility, inspired by the Gospel of Christ, through which those men gathered in the Synod of Manila did not forget that the people of the Philippines, primitive though they were, were men, with the same rights as the Spaniards. Their inferior culture was no excuse to deny them those basic rights.

At the very preamble, the Acts mention the fact of the actual possession of Mexico, Peru and other kingdoms.²⁴ In the Philippines, everything was *de facto* in the hands of the Spaniards. But could Spaniards, *de iure*, in principle, claim, in accordance with justice, possession of the Islands?

All were anxiously waiting for a satisfactory answer. Hence the Acts, after recognizing the difficulty of the question, say:

"For these reasons, it is necessary to say something about this, because if the fact is not so difficult, that it is even probable, this being so, the minister of the Gospel must busy himself with his ministry and leave the lawsuits and discussions, for it is a great scandal to the Indians."²⁵

A quick solution to this problem would free the Spaniards, both religious and laymen, from fear and inhibition in the evangelization and colonization of the Philippines. It would save a lot of energies spent uselessly in clarifying questions which were supposed to have been solved already.

The Acts pass on to say that the Philippines did not come into the power of the Spanish kings by inheritance, donation or by just war. The first point is evident. The second is but a practical application of the teachings of Vitoria, Soto and other Spanish theologians who denied any legal value to the papal donation of the Indies to the Spanish kings. And

²⁴MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 196.

²⁵*Ibidem*.

this for the simple reason that the Pope had no universal dominion over any foreign kingdom.

The participants of the Synod are faithful disciples of Vitoria and Soto.²⁶ Their ideas were inspired by the teachings of the two Dominican theologians.

The third statement 'by just war', if we were to take it in all its extension and implication, would mean that the Spaniards had unjustly occupied the country, and had no other option but to abandon it, or look for a just cause to remain in it, such as the voluntary submission by the natives to the Spanish king.

The theologians of the Synod had in their minds the exclusion of any 'just war' through the so-called natural right. There was no exclusion of 'just war' through the spiritual right, as we shall presently see. Otherwise, the statement of the problem would make no sense and the discussion would be a pure waste of time, and a simple scholastic past time.

The title invoked by them to justify the conquest would be spiritual: the opposition of the natives of the Philippines to the preaching of the Gospel.

According to the Acts, which follow pretty closely the teachings of the theologians and jurists of sixteenth century Spain, the Christian has the right, which becomes a very serious obligation, to preach the Gospel of Christ to all the world.²⁷ In the case of the new territories discovered by the Spaniards, such a right and obligation were entrusted to the kings of Spain by the Pope.²⁸ This right and duty, in turn, are entrusted by the Spanish king to the missionaries and other Spanish officials. Thus we read:

"The captains, soldiers, governors and justices have no more rights over these lands than the ones given them by their kings. And the king did not give them more than the one he has from Christ, which

²⁶FRANCISCO DE VITORIA, *Relecto de Indis o Libertad de los Indios*, editores L. PEREÑA y J.M. PEREZ PRENDES, Madrid, 1967, pp. 43 and ff. To be quoted hereinafter as DE INDIS. Cfr. VENANCIO CARRO, O.P., *Domingo de Soto y su Doctrina Jurídica*, Madrid, 1943-1944.

²⁷DE INDIS, 1, 2, 8, 87.

²⁸DE INDIS, I, 3, 9, 88.

is the power to send people to preach the Gospel to all the earth, not to take from anybody what rightfully belongs to them."²⁹

In one word: these people are sent to preach the Gospel, not to spoliage kingdoms or dispossess rightful owners. The preaching of the Gospel implies the teaching of the truth; above all, the salvific truth of Christ.³⁰

According to the thinking of the theologians and jurists of the Synod, the preaching of the Gospel implied the right to protect the preachers, and declare war against those who hindered the exercise of this right,³¹ but it gave no right to take anything from anybody, because the Gospel does not dispossess, on the contrary, it defends the rights of all men. We read:

"That is the only right handed over by the king, to send people to secure the ministers of the Gospel in their right to preach, and to protect the newly converted people, and to perform in their lands everything necessary related to the temporal government ordained to this spiritual aim: namely, the free conversion and maintenance of the newly accepted faith. But it does not follow that they can take everything, because the Gospel does not dispossess any man of what really belongs to him."³²

In this quotation we see three titles of the spiritual nature which Vitoria considered just in order to declare war and depose those who hinder and oppose the preaching of the Gospel. These titles were:

1. Protection of the ministers of the Gospel.³³
2. Protection of the new converts.³⁴
3. Right to depose the pagan princes for not facilitating or, rather for hindering the conversion of their citizens. The

²⁹MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 197.

³⁰DE INDIS, I, 3, 10, 11, 87.

³¹DE INDIS, I, 3, 8, 98.

³²MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 197.

³³DE INDIS, I, 3, 11, 89.

³⁴DE INDIS, I, 3, 13, 92.

Christian princes can give new laws for the protection and maintenance of the new Christian communities.³⁵

If the emperors, kings, or chieftains of any nation are clearly opposed to the preaching of the Gospel, or try to induce the new converts to go back to their idolatry, they can be deposed and substituted, and their kingdoms given to other rulers who would ensure the preaching of the Gospel and the faith of the new converts. The fathers of the Synod are very near Vitoria when they say:

"If the kings or emperors of those foreign lands entrusted to our kings would hinder the preaching, or the conversion of their vassals, or would pervert the new converts, they can be despoiled of their kingdoms so as to be able to ensure this aim."³⁶

Vitoria had written that the Spaniards could

"preach even against their will [kings of foreign lands] and give themselves to the conversion of those people, and if it would be necessary for this reason to declare or accept war, to do so, until they would give the opportunity and security to preach the Gospel."³⁷

Was this the reason by which the Spaniards had taken over the Philippines? The Augustinians, faithful and consistent in their teaching since their arrival in the Philippines in 1565, well versed in the affairs of the country and how the conquest had been conducted, could certify that the natives of the Philippines had not opposed the preaching of the Gospel. They had opposed the Spaniards who did not treat them with justice. In the words of Martín de Rada:

"As soon as they arrive in a village they tell them that they want peace and friendship with them, and have to pay the tributes. If not, they declare war on them. And this without giving them any news about God or about his Majesty."³⁸

³⁵DE INDIS, I, 2, 13, 92.

³⁶MARIN, I, 198.

³⁷DE INDIS, I, 3, 11, 89.

³⁸*Letter of Fr. Martín de Rada to the Viceroy of New Spain, Manila, June 1, 1573, in: TORRES LANZAS-PASTELLS, Catálogo, II, XIII.*

The Filipinos, as we see from this quotation, did not oppose the preaching of the Gospel, rather they resisted those strangers who, without basis and cause, pressed them to pay the tributes.³⁹

It could not be alleged, without any further clarification, that, since the Filipinos had opposed the preaching of the Gospel, war had been declared on them and, as a result of this, they had legally and lawfully been dispossessed of their power and substituted in the government by the Spaniards. There was no basis to state this.

If the Filipinos had not opposed the preaching of the Gospel, as the Augustinians could prove to the fathers of the Synod, but rather they had resisted the conquistadores who, without talking to them about God, demanded tributes from them, it followed that everything done by the Spaniards was unjust. The conquest was a pure spoliation.

This manner of thinking by some of the participants at the Synod seems to be reflected in this passage from the Acts:

"For this reason, found in all the converted lands, some ministers have been filled with scruples and have doubted whether they could hear the confessions of the governors and ministers of justice, because they took over the government, political power and temporal justice, which by temporal right belongs to the Indians. The king and the Pope cannot take it away."⁴⁰

In order to understand the question, the Acts of the Synod explained that since the king of Spain had received the command of the Pope to preach the Gospel all over the Indies, he was also obliged to prepare the way for the preaching of the Gospel.

According to them, three essential conditions were required for Christianity to take root in a country, even when it did not offer direct opposition to the preaching of the Gospel. If these three conditions were not to be found, the temporal and political conquest of a kingdom could be justified. Let us see the three conditions they mention:

1. The existence of a government and some laws in accordance with right reason, that will not go directly or indirectly against the Gospel.

³⁹*Opinion of Fr. Martín de Rada to Philip II, BRPI, III, 254-255.*

⁴⁰MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 197.

2. A cultural level in the land that would ensure the progressive growth of Christianity and all its institutions.
3. A people so well behaved that they will respect the rights of others, guarantee the preaching and of whom no suspicions could be entertained that they would try to destroy the Christian religion and expel the preachers of the Gospel.⁴¹

If all these conditions were fulfilled in the new territories discovered by the Spaniards, to depose the people would be plain tyranny. The Gospel perfects and frees man; it does not oppress. To take away from them the government, and give it to the Spaniards, would be a terrible injustice. The temporal government had to remain with the native rulers of the newly discovered nations.

What would be the nature of the power enjoyed by the Spanish king who sent them ministers of the Gospel, in fulfillment of the injunction of Christ to proclaim the Gospel?

According to the Acts

"the king had that universal dominion due to the great end to which he must lead them."⁴²

We do not know what this "universal dominion" meant in the minds of the theologians of the Synod. When the natives became Christians they became subjects of the Pope. Their native rulers did not lose the temporal power they enjoyed before. The Pope passed on the Spanish kings certain spiritual attributions which essentially belonged to him as universal pastor of the Church. By papal concession the Spanish kings participated in the spiritual power of the supreme shepherd and could promulgate laws geared to facilitate the conversion of the pagans, laws that the native rulers had to support and favor. In this sense, perhaps, we can explain the "universal dominion" of the Spanish king, a spiritual dominion that would not take away anything from the local rulers. All this, presupposing that the three conditions mentioned above were found in the new territories.

⁴¹MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 198. Cfr. J. GAYO, *Ideas*, 63-64; Cfr. H. DE LA COSTA, *The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581-1768*, Harvard Univ. Press, 1969, p. 27.

⁴²MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 198.

Had this been the case of the Philippines? Here is where the fathers of the Synod descend to clarify the situation, something eagerly desired by the Spaniards, for many of them were filled with anxieties because of the doubt of the legitimacy of the conquest.

The Acts declare that the conditions that would invalidate the conquest are not found in the Philippines. Here no government has been found that could have assured the triumph of Christianity and the protection of the new converts. The government was so primitive and imperfect that the progress of the Christian religion was put in danger. More still, there was the fear of a counter-reaction, unfavorable to Christianity, that could put in jeopardy all the advances made in the Philippines.

The natives of the Philippines had no laws worthy of that name. They were engaged in permanent, petty and destructive wars. All this meant a serious danger for the missionaries and for Christianity. There was a need to impose a new government to protect and defend the preachers of the Gospel. Let us listen to the Acts:

"But because it is difficult to find people where the three conditions be found, it is also difficult to find people to whom we could entrust the total temporal power of which we speak.

The first condition has not been found up to the present in the Indies, because the people are barbarians, blind and have forgotten God, due to their many sins. Even the natural law is lacking. Thus for the faith to reach these people, it is necessary to give them a new government, because theirs not only is not good for the faith, but not even for the natural government.

The second condition is not found among them because they are so incapable, vile and weak that it would not be convenient to entrust the things of our faith to them. The high and pure government that the Christian commonwealth observes even in the purely secular matters, with which the spiritual, to which it is ordained, is interlocked, cannot be entrusted to them. And although it is true that the Indians had good government in some things, but these are few in relation to the many things that are necessary. This does not change the picture much. To relieve them and bring other people to take over their government will not be prejudicial to the Indians."⁴³

⁴³*Ibidem*, 198-199. No mention is made in the Acts of the Synod of the third condition.

Since the three conditions demanded could not be found and realized in the Philippine context, the participants at the Synod concluded that the king of Spain had over the Philippines not only that 'universal dominion' of the spiritual order, but also the political and temporal power in order to achieve the spiritual aim - *in ordine ad finem spiritualem*. And this not to extend his temporal dominion, but rather to obtain the spiritual good of the conversion of the natives of the Philippines, for otherwise this aim could not be achieved.

Some of the fathers objected seriously to this solution. If the dominion were taken away from the natives because of their tyrannical laws, or lack of laws properly speaking, and due to the injustices committed against their neighbors and companions, what could be said of the Spaniards? All had seen the injustices committed by some Spaniards at the beginning of the conquest, and how tyrannically they had conducted themselves during the conquest. Why the difference of attitude? The Spaniards, then, had also lost the right to govern due to these injustices and tyrannies committed. Not only the Augustinians, who had found themselves present from the beginning of the conquest, but also Salazar, had seen the injustices committed in the Philippines. These people could protest against the supposed double standard of the fathers of the council.

The participants at the Synod were not afraid to denounce the abuses of their compatriots. We see in them a real courage. But the case between the natives and the Spaniards was very distinct, the fathers present at the Synod said.

In the first case, the case of the Filipinos, the laws, or rather the lack of them, made them hold principles against reason and natural law. Their government was unjust *a radice* (at its very roots). It was justified to substitute it for another that would secure the achievement of a higher spiritual aim.

In the case of the Spaniards, the laws and royal ordinances not only were good, but, to a certain extent, impossible to improve on them. The failure was not in the principles but in the practice. The injustices of the Spaniards, which nobody could deny - they were denounced by them - did not invalidate their government. The solution lied in forcing the Spaniards, above all, the royal officials, to fulfill exactly the laws and ordinances of the king. A better conduct from all could be demanded and exemplary punishment given to all those who did not fulfill the laws.

The fathers emphasized the grave obligation on the part of the king to send as his representatives truly just and responsible Christian people.

To give the government back to the former rulers of the Philippines, especially at that time, and under the circumstances in which the country found itself, with a large number of Christians, a greater number of candidates for baptism, a social and political security never known before by the Filipinos, would be a step backward, a regression of serious consequences. Christianity would be put in mortal danger.

It sounds strange and even bizarre that, after so many discussions, the theologians and jurists of the Synod concluded to the legitimacy of the conquest through the mixed title of opposition to the Gospel and the low degree of culture of the natives of the Philippines.

Vitoria had written about the lack of culture of the natives of the Americas as a possible title to take away the government from them, but he never dared to propose it as something final. For him, it was a doubtful title.⁴⁴

If we study the circumstances through which the country was passing and the psychological and moral state of many Spaniards, we can understand the solution offered by the theologians and jurists present at the Synod.

In the first place, not many people were ready to support the Augustinians' view that the Filipinos had not opposed the preaching of the Gospel. They would prove that from the beginning of the conquest they had been betrayed repeatedly by the natives.⁴⁵ The Spaniards had fulfilled to the letter and the spirit the ordinances about the new conquests,⁴⁶ especially at the time of Legazpi, who read the *Requerimiento* repeatedly to the natives of Cebu.⁴⁷ The *maese de campo* of Legazpi, Mateo del Saz, gave three titles, juridically valid for him, to declare war against the people of Cebu. These were the following:

⁴⁴DE INDIS, I, 3, 17, 97-98.

⁴⁵Answer to the 'Opinion' of Fr. Martín de Rada about the tributes, BRPI, III, 252-253.

⁴⁶Letter of the citizens of Manila to Philip II, Manila, June 18, 1581, COLIN-PASTELLS, *Catálogo*, I, 263, note 3.

⁴⁷Anonymous Relation, in: F. UNCILLA Y AJOITAJAUREGUI, O.S.A., *Urdaneta y la Conquista de Filipinas, Estudio Histórico*, San Sebastián, 1907, 225.

1. Treacherous death against Duarte Barbosa and other 20 companions right after the death of Magellan.
2. Apostasy of the people.
3. Rebellion against the king of Spain to whom, during the time of Magellan, they had promised obedience and submission.⁴⁸

Many of those present at the Synod were not ready to follow the opinion of those who defended the view that all the conquests had been unjust. Not only Sánchez opposed vigorously this opinion, but many others believed sincerely that the conquest carried out by the Spaniards in the Philippines, in spite of some serious abuses committed in the process, was just and in accordance with natural and international law.

The theologians and jurists were confronted with the scruples of many confessors in the Philippines. The conquest was a *fait accompli*. The progress achieved in the country, not only from the social but also from the political point of view, was enormous. To abandon the Islands would mean a terrible blow to the cause of Christianity. Hence the fathers had recourse to a wide title to justify the conquest, set at peace the troubled spirits of many missionaries, pacify the conscience of many conquistadores, and set free the energies of missionaries and laymen alike, to dedicate themselves to the noble task of evangelization and colonization. It was a practical way of saying: let us abandon, once and for all, the disputes with the civil authorities and encomenderos and set ourselves down to the fulfillment of our evangelical obligation.

The spirits of the fathers, however, did not seem to be set at peace, for we find this meaningful addition:

"After offering so many reasons about it, it is concluded that the viceroy and the governor of a province have the obligation to place some governors or judges from the most important Indians where they are already pacified and settled down, and the king has the obligation to order this."

"On the supposition that the king and his governor exercise a just sovereignty in their land (as we have said) we affirm that the governor is obliged not only to appoint *alcaldes mayores*, but also to authorize in the larger and more settled towns native magistrates,

⁴⁸Letter of Mateo del Saz to Philip II, Cebu, May 31, 1565, in: TORRES LANZAS-PASTELLS, *Catálogo*, I, CCLXXIV.

elected by the natives themselves, who shall have charge of public peace and order, and the hearing of ordinary cases. In the first place, in order that the *alcaldes mayores* who try cases of greater moment, may not always be among the natives, since this is not so advisable. Secondly, because this is of natural right, and nature itself enjoins it even on brute animals. Thus we see that cranes, ants and sheep have governors and chiefs belonging to their respective species and not to others, and what rules the members of the body is itself of the body, namely, the head, and St. Thomas shows that the head must be homogeneous with the body, that is, of the same nature . . . Thirdly, the magistrate should be familiar with the laws, customs, uses and abuses of his community, and this the *alcalde mayor* cannot be, because he has to depend on an interpreter and if the interpreter is native he has no command of Spanish, whereas if he is a Spaniard he understands the native but ill. And so even with the best of intentions, he is liable to commit serious errors, to the scandal of the natives, who see only what is done and not what is intended. It follows from this that the *alcaldes mayores* are not qualified to attend to the details of administration. Let them leave these matters to the native magistrates who without incurring the expense of having interpreters and scribes, but solely by word of mouth can administer them better than the *alcalde mayor*, with his interpreters and scribes, because of his familiarity with local conditions.

"For this reason, it is the opinion of the Synod that the governor is obliged under penalty of mortal sin and restitution of the damages that may otherwise arise to institute native magistrates wherever possible. And let him not do that as a mere formality, but in such a way that they are truly magistrates; to this end he must prescribe the limits of their jurisdiction and back them up with his authority so that they will have the power to chastise those subject to them if they deserve."⁴⁹

From what we have said this far, we can state that the fathers of the Synod defended the removal of the government from the natives of the Philippines due to the opposition to the preaching of the Gospel. This opposition was not violent, but rather it was due to the primitive nature of their government and the lack of just laws that could regulate the

⁴⁹MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 216-217, as translated by H. DE LA COSTA, *The Jesuits*, 34-35; Cfr. J. GAYO, *Ideas*, 67.

relations among the different groups of the country. Due to this, the preachers could not easily announce the Gospel of Christ. They had to be ruled by a more rational government, with just laws that not only would secure but also facilitate the rapid triumph of Christianity.

The title was mixed, based on the opposition to the Gospel and the lack of a high culture among the natives of the Philippines. The king of Spain was the natural and legitimate lord of all the Philippine Islands, but he was lord based on a spiritual title, the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, as the Acts tell us:

"Since we understand that the kings of Spain have under their care the lordship and government of these lands, based only on their title of the preaching of the Gospel, they fulfill their obligations in sending to those islands ministers of the Gospel, as they have done so far, and provide them with everything necessary to the good spiritual government, and in relation to the temporal government by sending cédulas, laws and just and Christian ordinances that through this they will be able to satisfy their consciences'.⁵⁰

What is left to us now is to know whether Salazar, who was presiding, and under whose initiative the Synod had been convoked, also embraced this doctrine of the Acts regarding the legitimacy of the conquest of the Philippines. Although in Mexico he had rejected all the conquests done by the Spaniards, and even written a treatise about that,⁵¹ in the Philippines he abandoned that doctrine, after having consulted with learned and God-fearing people.⁵²

J. Gayo says that Salazar entertained doubts about the doctrine of the Acts, adducing as proof a letter-memorial of Salazar of 1582.⁵³ This proves nothing in favor of Salazar's doubts because, as we have already

⁵⁰MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 199.

⁵¹The title of the treatise was *De Modo quo Rex Hispaniarum et eius locum tenentes habere teneantur in regimine Indiarum*, In: ALONSO DE ZORITA, *Historia de Nueva España*, Madrid, 1908, pp. 13-14.

⁵²Letter of Bishop de Salazar to Philip II, Manila, June 18, 1583, AGI, Patronato 25.

⁵³Memorial of Domingo de Salazar about the State of the Philippine Islands, AGI, Filipinas 6; Filipinas 76; Cfr. W. E. RETANA, *Archivo del Bibliófilo Filipino*, II, Madrid, 1898, II; Cfr. LÚCIO GUTIERREZ, O.P., *Domingo de Salazar's Memorial of 1582 on the Status of the Philippine Islands: A Manifesto for Freedom and Humanization*, in: *Philippiana Sacra*, Vol. XXI, No. 62, 258-314, No. 63, 444-483.

noticed before, the change he suffered took place after the Synod had started, and reached its peak in 1583, when he writes⁵⁴ to the king about the urgent need to start, as soon as possible, the armed conquest of China. We hold that Salazar was in agreement, at least in the external forum, with the doctrine of the Acts of the Synod regarding the legitimacy of the conquest of the Philippines. Another point is to know whether that attitude of Salazar was adopted due to external pressure and due to the historical situation of the Philippines, or whether there was indeed an internal intellectual change in him.

The return of Alonso Sánchez in 1583, after his first embassy to China, explaining vigorously the tenacious opposition of the Chinese rulers to the entry of the Gospel into that kingdom, and the negative reports of the Portuguese about the Chinese, 'compelled' the bishop to change. Surely, this doctrine did not seem to agree with the teaching of Vitoria and the spirit of Las Casas. It also ran counter to his actuation as a missionary in Mexico for over 23 years. We could agree that perhaps the bishop accepted the doctrine of the Synod as an imposition from outside, a kind of iron vest that made violence on him, but the change was there for all to see.

In a letter to the king, Salazar recanted years later and went back again to his original views.⁵⁵ For the moment, from 1583 to 1587, Salazar defends the legitimacy of the conquest of the Philippines, and still the more transcendental plan of conquest of China. If the change were not enough, Salazar highly recommended Sánchez as his extraordinary ambassador to Madrid and Rome in 1586,⁵⁶ precisely Sánchez who was the spokesman and advocate of the *fait accompli* of the conquest, and the great supporter of starting the conquest of China and neighboring kingdoms.

4. The Preaching of the Gospel to Pagans

How was the Gospel to be preached to the pagans? This was one of the most important problems facing the fathers of the Synod of Manila. They had to find a solution if they wanted to release the dormant

⁵⁴ *Letter of Domingo de Salazar to Philip II, Manila, June 1583, AGI, Patronato 25.*

⁵⁵ *Letter of Domingo de Salazar to Philip II, Manila, June 24, 1590, AGI, Filipinas 74.*

⁵⁶ *Letter of Domingo de Salazar to Philip II, Manila, June 24, 1586, AGI, Filipinas 74.*

energies of missionaries and Spanish officials. At the time, consciences were tormented, spirits divided and Spaniards, both secular and religious, were at a loss regarding the best means to be used in the preaching of the Gospel to pagans.

We have to deal at some length with this topic, so as to give an exact picture of the problems confronting the missionaries and Salazar during the last decades of the sixteenth century.

The Christian in general, and the missionary in particular, have the grave task of preaching the Gospel to all people. This task has been received from Christ. The distinctive mark of a Christian must be this inner dynamism which compels him to bring the Good News of Salvation to all the world.⁵⁷

Christianity is fundamentally dynamic and missionary. The vocation of a Christian demands to preach the Good News of Salvation to all men. What about the method to be used in preaching the Gospel? What should be the attitude of Christians when confronted with persecution, especially in semi-civilized or kingdoms entirely opposed to the entrance of missionaries?

Were the duty-bound to face danger, even death, while preaching the Gospel? Could they abandon this mission received from Christ? Would it be right to have some soldiers as guardians of the missionaries, so as to dissuade authorities from harming the missionaries? Would it be better and more apostolic for the missionary to reject even the external protection of soldiers and go alone into the new mission fields?

From the very beginning of the conquest of America, the Spaniards had discussed passionately about the best means to be employed in the preaching of the Gospel. It was still a burning problem at the time of Salazar's arrival in the Philippines. If soldiers were called in to protect the missionaries, would this not be a corruption of the apostolic spirit and an adulteration of the purity of the Christian message? If they defended the need for military protection, was this not an imitation of the methods of Mohammed?

Which was the attitude of the first apostles? Could the apostolic way of preaching the Gospel be applied to the letter to the new times and

⁵⁷DE INDIS, I, 3, 8, 87; 89.

the new territories discovered and conquered? If the fathers of the Synod approved the need for soldiers to accompany the missionaries, as a deterrent to pagans not to harm them, would this not be a dangerous precedent in the history of the Christianization of the Philippines?

Bartolomé de Las Casas, the fiery defender of the American Indians, always defended the need to preach the Gospel *apostolico modo*. The soldiers should never be called in to protect the missionaries, or help in preparing the way for the preaching of the Gospel. He wrote a book in which he exposed his ideas.⁵⁸ His influence on the missionaries of America, especially the Dominicans, was great. Salazar, as we have stated before, was for more than 23 years a faithful disciple of Las Casas. Yet, among the great missionaries and evangelizers of the New World, passionate lovers of the Amerindians, we find many who disagreed with Las Casas.

The fathers present at the Synod had to give a clear answer to the concrete historical situation in the Philippines. We have to stress the fact that the fathers did not defend the doctrine of military conquest first, as Sepúlveda had done before,⁵⁹ but only the need for soldiers to go with them as protectors, guardians and deterrent if pagan rulers did not give the missionaries the chance to preach to those who were ready to listen to them.

The fathers knew that the faith is a mysterious and supernatural gift of God that cannot be won through arms. The soldiers would simply facilitate the way for the Gospel to be preached.

Soldiers were unknown in primitive times. The early Christian missionaries, pilgrims for Christ and for His Gospel, traversed the width and length of the Roman Empire, announcing the Good News of Salvation to those ready to listen to them. They relied on the power of the Gospel, on their total commitment to the Good News and on God's inexhaustible grace.

The Acts of the Synod accepted this apostolic method as the best in itself. But the fathers realized that, unfortunately, they were not living within the Roman world.

⁵⁸*Del Unico Modo de atraer a los pueblos a la verdadera religión*, Ed. AGUSTIN MILLARES CARLO, México, 1942.

⁵⁹J.G. DE SEPULVEDA, *Democrates Segundo*, ed. A. LOSADA, Madrid, 1951, 84-85.

During primitive Christianity God conferred on the missionaries special charisms which were not conferred now in the same manner, and with the same intensity. The times the new missionaries were living were very different. The socio-cultural and political situation of the New World differed radically from the Hellenistic and Roman World in which Christianity was born. The Roman World, the world of Jesus, the world of Peter and Paul, given its high cultural and moral level, and its excellent political organization, offered to the Christian missionaries security and freedom to preach the Gospel. The Roman world tolerated all religions, as long as they did not attempt to destroy the socio-political and religious set-up of the empire. The high level of culture, the proliferation of new mystery religions, the widespread level of literacy of the people offered an excellent opportunity for Christianity to be heard. No hindrance was presented to the early Christian preachers. The freedom of religion and speech was unbelievable. People yearned for religion and for mystical experience. Christianity found the way prepared. The social, political, cultural and religious milieu of the Greco-Roman world would serve as a pedagogue to Christ. Paul preached and the people listened to him. Some of them laughed at him but he was never in danger, except from fanatic Judaizers, who considered him a traitor to the Mosaic Law. The Roman Empire, at the time of the Apostles, had truly achieved a universal peace, the *Pax Romana*.

The New World, on the whole, was ferocious and savage. It did not offer any security to the Gospel. The pure preaching of the Gospel, *modo apostolico*, was the most noble, and in accordance with the Lord's command, but it could not be applied to all the new territories discovered. The missionaries were not given the chance to preach the Gospel. Some pagan authorities had strictly forbidden, under penalty of death, the entry of missionaries, especially in China. Without soldiers to protect the missionaries, the latter would be killed or thrown forever in prison.

It was, then, imperative for soldiers to accompany the missionaries in their task of evangelization. The Gospel had to be given a hearing. The fathers had in mind not only the territories under Spanish control, but also Mindanao and Borneo, and more especially China, whose gates remained hermetically closed to the entry of missionaries. The opposition of the Chinese to the peaceful entry of missionaries into their empire radicalized many people who, like Salazar,⁶⁰ belonged to the

⁶⁰Letter of Domingo de Salazar to Philip II, Manila, June 12, 1583, AGI, Patronato 25.

school of Vitoria and Las Casas. The negative attitude of the Chinese authorities to the entry of missionaries had a tremendous influence upon the Spanish colony in Manila.

The Jesuit Alonso Sánchez, in pursuit of his ideal of military conquest of China, defended at the Spanish Court in 1590 that the Spaniards had tried to enter *peacefully* China at least nine times.⁶¹ The doors of China remained always closed. The Gospel could not penetrate the mysterious land of the Grand Cathay of Marco Polo. Why did they keep their door so resolutely locked against foreigners? Why not force the gate open? The Spaniards convinced themselves of the futility of peaceful means.

Regarding the problem of whether the preacher can be accompanied by soldiers or not, we read in the Acts of the Synod:

"To open the way [militarily] to the Gospel is not evil but just (although many say this method is abominable). The Pope commissioned the Spanish king to preach the Gospel, according to the passage in the Gospel *Praedicate Evangelium et pasce oves meas, et alias habeo quae non sunt ex hoc ovili* [Preach the Gospel . . . tender my sheep and I have other sheep which do not belong to the flock . . . etc.] As the preachers commissioned by the Pope could not do this without grave and manifest dangers, the king, who received the papal commission, had to find, in accordance with prudence, the best means to protect and defend the preachers, and thus encourage the newly converted Christians, lest through fear of reprisals they might abandon the faith, or might not even receive it. This is just in itself. It is more just in the new times, and the new lands, and the new people, as they are radically different from the times and peoples in which the primitive Church was born."⁶²

This is how those people present at the Synod thought. The Gospel had to be preached, people had to be brought to the knowledge of the salvific truth of Christ. This commission was urgent and serious and the Spaniards had received it from the Pope.

In the mentality of the sixteenth century, the encomenderos, the soldiers, the royal officials and the missionaries were all *coadjutors* in

⁶¹*Apuntamientos breves de algunas cosas de China por parte de las Islas y Castellanos*, in: COLIN-PASTELLS, *Labor*, I, 365 & ff.

⁶²MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 209.

the task of evangelization. To conquer and evangelize, to evangelize and conquer, were terms which the Spaniards oftentimes interchanged. It was an age of faith. Thus, the fathers of the Synod defend the right to preach the Gospel with an escort of soldiers.

We have to avoid here the thought that the missionaries decided to bless to flint of the arquebus or the sword of the conquistadores. Those present at the Synod were men of peace. They were evangelical men. They had a great sensibility for the values of the Gospel. Salazar presided at the Synod and behind him, and behind most of those present there, there was a pacifistic and humanistic theological tradition, like the one established by Las Casas and Vitoria.⁶³

What strikes us most, and even is a cause of admiration and wonder, is the struggle carried on by the fathers of the Synod against the rapacity of exploiters, and the effort exerted to avoid violent means in preaching to the natives of the Philippines.

What the fathers anxiously desired was the conversion to Christianity of the Filipino people. They did not want, in any way, to compel the infidels to become Christians. The Acts of the Synod emphasize the serious obligation all people had to fulfill the laws and ordinances regulating the conquest of new lands. Vexations, abuses and deaths had to be avoided at all costs.

If it is true, according to the Acts, that there is a right to preach the Gospel with military protection, would it be absolutely necessary to exercise this right in the Philippines? Was the right lost due to the abuses committed by the soldiers who accompany the missionaries?

The Acts answer that the right is not lost in spite of the possible abuses of the soldiery.

"This right is not lost due to the abuses and insults committed by those who accompany the preachers, neither do the Pope and the governors lose the right to send preachers to fulfill that office to the best of their ability. If those who accompany them, to give them protection, would hinder with their vices, the task of preaching, let them be reprimanded as sheep, and punish them as is due. If it is not possible to remedy everything, yet the preaching must not be abandoned for the preaching is not bad, for although it may happen

⁶³A certain basis for the doctrine of the Acts can be found in ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theologiae*, II-II, 66; III, 68.

that the preacher is bad, what he preaches does not stop being the truth. We then say that once the particular evils have been avoided and restitution for them made, something can be given to these coadjutors of the Gospel, so that the preachers may fulfill their task with security."⁶⁴

This text manifests pretty clearly the mentality of the fathers of the Synod. The robberies and abuses must be condemned without fear. The governor must punish energetically those people who, through their evil deeds and offenses, make the office of *coadjutors* of the missionaries a mockery and a scandal.

This point had been seen by Salazar before embracing the new ideas, when in a *Memorial* of 1582 he wrote to the Spanish king:

"I shall not omit to mention here a thing which is of great embarrassment for the Christians who have lived here, and even to all of us who have come to hear of it, and is this: the natives of these islands, from their earliest times, were heathen, of whom there are still many in these and other islands. From the island of Burney, Moros have come to these islands, to preach the law of Mohammed, through whose preaching a large number of pagans have become Moros. Those who have received this dirty law, keep it with great pertinacity. Having come to know the reason - to our shame and confusion - is that they were better treated by the preachers of Mohammed than they were and are treated by the preachers of Jesus Christ. Since they received that sect of good will, due to the good and loving treatment, it took root in their hearts. Thus they abandon it with difficulty. This does not happen with ours, for since we preach it with so many bad treatments and evil examples, they say yes with the mouths and no with their hearts."⁶⁵

The doctrine of the Synod, as some fathers said, seemed abominable to many people. There was not, however, a great opposition to what was finally accepted by the fathers of the Synod about the validity of preaching the Gospel to pagans with military escorts, to protect the missionaries in their apostolic endeavors.

⁶⁴MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 209-210.

⁶⁵*Memorial of Domingo de Salazar about the State of the Philippine Islands*, AGI, Filipinas 6; Filipinas 74; Cfr. W.E. RETANA, *Archivo*, III, 15-16; BRPI, V, 225-226; GUTIERREZ, *Philippiniana Sacra*, No. 62, p. 283.

By 'preachers' Salazar means encomenderos, officials and soldiers. All were *coadjutors* in the task of evangelization.

What was Salazar's opinion about all this? Did he agree with the fathers, as he had agreed also about the legitimacy of the conquest? Was he against the decision of the fathers?

If we were to believe him from a letter he wrote to the king in 1590, he never defended such ideas in his whole life, not even in the Philippines, when the problem of China and its military conquest were discussed. Salazar felt shocked and scandalized when Sánchez, who had been sent to Spain in 1586 as the official representative of all the segments of society, exposed in front of the king and his counselors that Salazar and the synodal fathers defended the necessity to preach the Gospel with military escorts.⁶⁶

We can rightly understand the sense of indignation from the part of Salazar when he received these reports. In the letter, Salazar denounces Sánchez and asks the king that Sánchez' *Razonamiento* be

⁶⁶Letter of Domingo de Salazar to Philip II, Manila, June 24, 1590, in: ARSI, Phil. 9, 213-216, Cfr. COLIN-PASTELLS, *Labor*, I, 389.

Salazar wrote:

"We have come to know how Alonso Sánchez, of the Society of Jesus, who went as procurator of these islands, proposed to your Majesty and your Royal Council things that he had not been instructed about, nor did it ever cross our minds to command them to him. If he proposed them by order of any person here, surely it was not with my consent, or of the religious who are here. I can say without any arrogance that none of the opinions coming from here, unless they are signed by me and the prelates of the orders, should be approved or accepted. Let us go to the fact: none of the people here know better than we do the situation and the right absolutely none . . . As we can see, and as we judge from the *Reasoning* of Alonso Sánchez, what he tries to prove it that the preachers of the Gospel cannot and ought not to go alone, but rather they should go with men of war to secure the way for them."

The Franciscan Jerónimo de Burgos and the Dominican Juan Volante had been trying to convince the Spanish king to send a large mission to China without passing through the Philippines, to preach the Gospel *apostolico modo*, as Christ had taught and the early apostles had practiced. According to news received in Manila by Salazar, perhaps in 1589 or 1590, sent to him by Burgos and Volante, Sánchez defended in front of the king and his counselors the futility of sending directly missionaries to China, unless they had military escort. To support his doctrine, Sánchez said that in the Philippines the bishop and the ecclesiastics were of that opinion. The plan of Volante and Burgos did not receive any royal support. This was due, in the view of Volante, to the machinations of Sánchez and the relation given by him in his *Reasoning*. Volante, together with Burgos, wrote to bishop Salazar complaining bitterly against Sánchez. Cfr. COLIN-PASTELLS, *Labor*, I, 388-407. Cfr. H. DE LA COSTA, *The Jesuits*, 102-105.

examined by the Inquisition. Neither he nor the religious of the Philippines ever defended the absolute necessity of preaching the Gospel with an escort of soldiers, less to implant it by fire and sword.⁶⁷

This was true, but the bishop in 1590 was forgetting that he had defended it before, during the celebration of the Synod and during the general meetings held in 1586 about the conquest of China.

In his *Respuesta*, Sánchez reminds the bishop that he has changed his opinion, or that perhaps he has forgotten the long discussions about these problems. According to the Jesuit, he could present signed documents where the bishop defended the legitimacy of the preaching of the Gospel with the escort of soldiers. Thus, in reference to the Synod, which is the point under discussion, Sánchez tells Salazar:

"All this, in short, was preached one Sunday by the bishop in the Church of Santa Ana, in front of the governor and the whole people, saying that in relation of expeditions and pacifications that usually were condemned, not only it was not unjust but rather they were obliged to undertake them."⁶⁸

We could think that Sánchez misrepresented the teaching of Salazar at the time the problems were discussed in Manila. We have to say this, although Salazar never defended the need for soldiers to accompany the missionaries with the intensity that Sánchez wants him, and much less that this was the only way to bring the Gospel to China and other nations, it cannot be denied that during the Synod, Salazar accepted the opinion of the fathers present there regarding the justification of armed conquest and the validity of military protection for missionaries. This is stated clearly by Salazar in a letter of 1583, where he tells the king that the problems of the Indies were seen differently in the mission field than in the peaceful towns and aulas of the Spanish universities:

"I would like to break the deception of many people regarding this matter. As they are ignorant of the situation, [*hecho*] they do not know how to apply the right [*derecho*] to the concrete situation. Thus, due to this ignorance, they keep the door of China closed to the Gospel. I know how many people feel about this, especially in

⁶⁷Letter of Domingo de Salazar to Philip II, June 24, 1590, in: ARSI, Phil. 9, 213-216; Cfr. COLIN-PASTELLS, *Labor*, I, 389.

⁶⁸*Respuesta*, *Ibidem*.

Spain. They consider this way of preaching the Gospel unjust. And this because, according to them, nobody can be compelled to receive the faith. Others base their objection on the abuses and robberies perpetrated by the army, following St. Paul, who says *non sunt facienda mala ut veniant bona*. They condemn this doctrine as more proper to Mohammed than to the Gospel. I say the contrary and I have no doubt about this doctrine, and nobody would have any doubt if he were to know the basis of this doctrine."⁶⁹

Which, then was Salazar's opinion about the way of preaching the Gospel to pagans during the celebration of the Synod of Manila? From the previous quotation, and our exposition, we have to conclude that Salazar defended the validity and licitness of military protection in the preaching of the Gospel. It was surely alien to his theological and juridical formation, but the historical situation of the Philippines and the Far East, and the influence of Sánchez, induced him to embrace this new way of thinking.

After Sánchez abandoned the Philippines in 1586, Salazar returned to his former ideas. And this time he became more radical. Salazar rejected all types of military protection in the preaching of the Gospel, even when there was a serious danger of death for the missionaries, and when the Gospel was not given a hearing, like in the case of China. That kind of military protectorate, to remove the obstacles to the preaching of the Gospel, was defended by Vitoria. Salazar went beyond that. He went definitely to the side of Las Casas. The only valid method had to be the evangelical one, the one loved and recommended by Christ and practiced by the first apostles. Precisely to defend this, and other related problems, he sailed from the Philippines in 1591. In Spain, in front of the king, in 1593 and 1594, Salazar defended valiantly that the only method was the apostolic one, as he had defended in his 23 of missionary life in Mexico and during the first years of his labors in the Philippines.⁷⁰

⁶⁹Letter of Domingo de Salazar to Philip II, Manila, June 18, 1583, AGI, Patronato 25; Cfr. COLIN-PASTELLS, *Labor*, I, 312-313.

⁷⁰"Of the clause 147 there is no memory, nor can those who govern be persuaded that this most holy manner of preaching the Gospel be tried. Since your Majesty does not give license to the bishops or to other prelates, to try to preach the Gospel like the Apostles, but rather all authority is given to the governors, or they take it - although in order to observe this clause the bishops and not the governors should be the ones to judge whether it would be convenient or not for preachers to go alone or accompanied - it follows that as the governors pretend more than the conversion of the Indians, they never find the opportunity to fulfill this clause."

But this was happening in 1593. And it was happening in Spain. During the Synod of Manila, and all through the time of Sánchez' stay in the East, the spirit of Las Casas seems to have been drained up from Salazar. That spirit only sleeps. It is not dead.

Why, then this sensational and tremendous change in the bishop? Was Sánchez' strong personality the only reason why Salazar turned around in his theological and juridical ideas? We find some other reasons that concomitantly influenced him in this change.

The situation of the Philippines was grave. The poverty and misery widespread. The external dangers serious. The internal revolts common. The danger of pirates from China and Japan very much felt. The morale of the soldiers low. The exploitation of the natives frequent. The division of the colony real. Faced with so many dangers and the fear that just overnight all would be carried away by the wind, Salazar felt compelled to petition the king for immediate help to avoid what he and many others in the Philippines thought was a total collapse of Christianity. Only through stability in the Philippines, and military expansion to China and other kingdoms, could they alleviate the hopeless poverty of the Spaniards.

When we consider all these things we understand the spirit of crusade, foreign to many religious of the Philippines, that overtook some of them. They thought that this was the only way to secure the political and religious future of the new fragile Christian society being born in the Philippines. This explains why, in this atmosphere of insecurity, the encomenderos had stopped being robbers,⁷¹ and have become collaborators and *co-adjutors* in the noble task of evangelization.⁷² The change, from all points of view, was notable and of great consequences for the Philippines.

"It is without any doubt shameful and unworthy for those of us who profess such a law that we should not trust in God that sometimes the preachers would do more alone than accompanied with arquebus and pikes. And although I do not deny that this is lawful, and sometimes necessary, it would not be a bad idea to try sometimes this other way. This will not be done unless your Majesty orders otherwise," *Memorial of Domingo de Salazar*, AGI, Filipinas 6; Filipinas 76; BRPI, V, 235-236; RETANA, *Archivo*, V, 25-26; GUTIERREZ, *Philippiniana Sacra*, No. 62, 297-299.

⁷¹MARIN, *Ensayo*, I, 210.

⁷²*Ibidem*, 208.