

philippine studies

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

The Burgos Manifiesto: The Authentic Text and Its Genuine Author

John N. Schumacher, S.J.

Philippine Studies vol. 54, no. 2 (2006): 153–304

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

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

The Burgos *Manifiesto*: The Authentic Text and Its Genuine Author

John N. Schumacher, S.J.

The struggle of the Filipino clergy against the attempts taken to deprive them of any parish of significance in favor of the friar orders reached its culmination in the decree of 1861, leaving them almost none in the Manila archdiocese. Fr. Pedro Peláez led the struggle in Manila and Madrid until his death in the earthquake of 1863. Rumors circulated in Manila that he had planned a conspiracy to overthrow Spanish rule that very day. When the Madrid newspaper, La Verdad, repeated that calumny, the Filipino clergy issued a manifesto defending their rights and vindicating Peláez's name. Republished in Hong Kong in 1889, the manifesto has been attributed to Fr. José Burgos. The first part of this article establishes the genuine text of the original, provides an English translation, and identifies the 1889 interpolations. The second part investigates whether, and to what extent, the original was written by Burgos. Its conclusions trace the factual basis for the interrelationships traditionally postulated among Peláez, Burgos, and Rizal.

KEYWORDS: Burgos; Peláez, *Manifiesto*, *Recollects*, Rizal

PART ONE

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE 1864 DOCUMENT

Among the many articles, pamphlets, and even books published in the latter half of the nineteenth century on both sides of the struggle of the Filipino clergy to defend their parishes against their appropriation by the friar orders, the one most cited in Philippine historiography is a manifesto first identified by Rizal in his letter to Mariano Ponce as having its

origin with Fr. José Burgos.¹ This manifesto, defending Filipino clergy rights, has been generally accepted by historians as a Burgos document, beginning with Manuel Artigas y Cuerva in the early twentieth century. Because the original text was unknown, or rather ignored, all have made use of the text found in a rare antifriar pamphlet published in Hong Kong by José María Basa in 1889. This text I first published in full with an English translation. While expressing lingering doubts as to whether it had been interpolated in places by another hand, I relied on Rizal's passing mention that it was genuinely from Burgos.

Not only did I publish it in a collection of primary documents concerning Fathers Peláez, Mariano Gómez, Burgos, and the Cavite Mutiny of 1872 (Schumacher 1972a, 58–115), but I republished it in my more systematic and enlarged edition, which is more centered on Burgos (1999, 56–105), with minor revisions of translation and notes and a more extensive introduction. With these publications the work was generally accepted as a genuine Burgos document.

However, the doubts as to its total integrity that I expressed more strongly in the second edition of the document led me to look further for the original work. In the course of research for a larger study on the Cavite Mutiny, I chanced upon a reference that alerted me to the fact that the original had been an article published in a Madrid newspaper (Uy 1984, 228–30). This led, with the aid of two Spanish historian friends, to the recovery of the original text, presented here with a trans-

1. Since nineteenth-century Filipinos wrote their names of Spanish origin according to the rules of accentuation for the Spanish language, I have retained the accents as the individuals of that time would have written their names. Thus, for example, I have written Peláez and Gómez, and José Rizal, though these names are no longer accented in modern Filipino English. Similarly, though the rules for alphabetization for Spanish differ from those of Filipinos, I have followed Filipino alphabetization. This is particularly true of surnames preceded by the particle "de," which in Spanish is ignored for alphabetization. Twentieth-century Filipinos generally incorporate those particles as an integral part of their surname, though different ones do it in different ways. I have followed the way that Filipinos today individually deal with those particles in the signatures of their surnames, and alphabetized the references accordingly.

All translations from languages other than English, unless specifically indicated, are my own. For the list of abbreviations, please see pages 297–98.

lation, as well as the discovery of archival documents that, while circumscribing the role of Burgos in its composition, revealed the further importance of the manifiesto. The examination of the genuine 1864 document in connection with other documentary evidence has enabled me to make a more exact explanation of the role of Burgos in its composition, and a clarification of his stance as a nationalist. Moreover, the identification of what precisely were the interpolations in the 1889 version, through comparison with the original, has led to concrete evidence of the generally assumed but never clearly established, direct links from Peláez to Burgos, and from Burgos to José Rizal, mediated by his brother Paciano. Although the original document is not the work of Burgos alone, it was through him that it came to Rizal. Hence, the 1889 version that I had published previously appears as ultimately the work of Rizal, building on the foundation of Peláez and Burgos. In the process of showing this, we may delineate more clearly the stages of the nineteenth-century nationalist movement, finally transmitted in quite altered, but still recognizable, form to Bonifacio and Jacinto.

The Nature of the Document

This document, the most substantial published text attributed to Father Burgos—if we except the collective series of letters he wrote to the Madrid newspaper *La Discusión* in 1870 (Schumacher 1999, 125–82), which in fact evidence a dependence on it—was first published in Spanish with an English translation in my two major books on Burgos (Schumacher 1972a, 58–113; 1999, 56–105), as outlined above. A partial English translation had appeared in the 1920s in a collection of essays by Filipinos, *Thinking for Ourselves*, published by two professors of English (Hilario and Quirino 1928/1985, 47–63). The latter compilers, however, did not indicate the source from which they translated, and simply omitted, with a brief note, many paragraphs dealing with technical ecclesiastical matters. Nonetheless, the paragraphs actually published in full are sufficient to be certain that they translated from the same source used by Schumacher (1972a; 1999), which, as we hope to show, although almost certainly connected with Burgos, is not his genuine text as he wrote it. The interpolated and abbreviated English text of Hilario and

Quirino seems clearly to be the source of the English version printed in Manuel (1955–1986, 2:82–92), though it is not listed as a reference.

The ultimate source of all these publications used until now was an antifriar propaganda pamphlet of 1889, published in Hong Kong by José Ma. Basa. This publication was actually composed of two sections, connected only by their common attacks on the friars in the Philippines. The pamphlet as a whole bears the title of the presumed Burgos pamphlet, *Manifiesto que a la noble Nación Española dirigen [sic] los leales Filipinos en defensa de su honra,[sic] y fidelidad gravemente vulneradas por el periódico, "La Verdad" de Madrid.*² In fact, however, the text of the supposed 1864 document occupies only the first twenty-four out of forty-one pages in the pamphlet, finishing with the signature, "LOS FILIPINOS" and the date of 27 June 1864. I had published this part from the Basa pamphlet in my two Burgos books, in spite of my awareness of some interpolations. The rest of the pamphlet is a series of ephemeral antifriar writings in continuous pagination with the *Manifiesto* itself, based on alleged antifriar incidents in Manila of 1887–1888. Pamphlets and leaflets (*proclamas*) of a similar nature were widely distributed in Manila during this period in connection with the demonstration against the friars and Archbishop Pedro Payo, O.P., by Pedro Serrano Laktaw, Doroteo Cortes, José Ramos, and their associates, who formed the clandestine Comité de

2. The Basa pamphlet is itself undated and without publisher, though the added documents on pp. 25 to 41 are from 1888, which is the date Retana (1906, 3:1109, no. 2625) conjectures for the whole pamphlet. Pardo de Tavera (1903, 246, nos. 1597, 1598, 1599), who was in frequent contact with Rizal and other Filipinos of the Propaganda Movement in Paris at this time, and thus in a much better position to know, straightforwardly says that it was published in Hong Kong in 1889. As will be seen below, this is the correct date. Although in the past I myself have dated it to 1888, all the evidence points to early 1889, as Pardo says. Retana (1119, no. 2669) attributes this and another earlier pamphlet to "la colonia filipina de Hong-Kong." However, as is evident from the published correspondence of Basa with Rizal and del Pilar, the former was the principal financier and director of the printing of such materials, as well as the channel by which they were smuggled into the Philippines through his multiple business contacts (Schumacher 1997, 126–27). Rizal and del Pilar, and perhaps others, provided him with materials, but he was the publisher. Hence we will refer to this pamphlet for simplicity's sake as the "Basa pamphlet" or the "1889 version."

Propaganda supporting del Pilar (Schumacher 1997, 123–27). In this article, we are interested only in the initial 24-page section signed by “Los Filipinos,” and dated 27 June 1864, as only that section deals with the concerns of Burgos.

Reality of the Alleged 1864 Pamphlet

An original pamphlet of 1864 has not been located either in the Philippines or elsewhere, although two apparent references to such a pamphlet deserve attention.³ One of them is a footnote in the careful study of Burgos’s academic career (Villarroel 1971, 60, n. 84), referring to a pamphlet in the archives of the University of Santo Tomás (AUST, *Folletos*, 52), listed in the catalogue there as being of Burgos. Fr. Fidel Villarroel, O.P., kindly provided me with a photocopy of this material. However, on closer examination this “pamphlet” proved actually to be the Basa version. This became clear by the appearance of an untitled part of an antifriar tract of 1888, whose beginning is clearly missing, on the facing page 25 of the photocopy. Moreover, the main title contained the misspelling “derigen” on the cover, like the Basa version, although in the footnote of his published book Villarroel, probably inadvertently, had corrected the misspelling.

However, without denying that it could have been written by Burgos, Villarroel had rightly noted that all those who have attributed such a pamphlet to him, beginning with Manuel Artigas (1911a, 4, cited in Villarroel 1971, n. 85), were writers who belonged to the twentieth century. Moreover, “none of them has advanced substantial evidence to prove this conclusion” (Villarroel 1971, 60).

There is no doubt that Artigas has been the principal source for the events surrounding the Cavite Mutiny for all other twentieth-century writers of any seriousness. They followed him in attributing the work to Burgos, as he had done, first in his journal, *Renacimiento Filipino* (1911a), and in the same year in his well-known book with the same title as the journal article (1911b). Until fairly recently this book, *Los Sucesos de 1872*, was the standard history of the events leading to the Cavite Mutiny,

3. I myself carelessly referred to an 1864 “pamphlet” in *Kasaysayan* (Guerrero and Schumacher 1998, 12).

though its many weaknesses, acceptance of spurious documents, careless transcriptions, and inaccuracies have been proven for some decades now (Schumacher 1972b, 622–30). In spite of these published deficiencies, whose existence has been reaffirmed in other scholarly articles and books, O. D. Corpuz nonetheless published a translation of Artigas, ignoring, or ignorant of, its major shortcomings almost all of which he repeats without taking any account of their faults (Artigas 1996). Given the lack of Spanish competence increasingly evident in historical works, and the relative rarity of Artigas's original, the English translation will undoubtedly further compound the ignorance of the real historical facts. (Curiously, Corpuz reproduces a supposed title-page of the original Spanish with the publication date of 1913, while the only edition known to bibliographers is 1911.)

In the original, Artigas *implicitly* claims to have seen the pamphlet (*folleto*) by giving its exact dimensions (18 ½ cm. x 13 ½ cm.). Given the generally careless treatment of facts common in Artigas, even when dealing with the numerous genuine documents to which he had access, it is all but certain that what he knew, if he read it at all, was the Basa pamphlet. For no bibliographer among those likely to know, namely, Retana or Pardo de Tavera, claims the existence of any pamphlet actually published in 1864, though both refer to the Basa pamphlet we have described (Retana 1906, 3:1109, no. 2625; Pardo de Tavera 1903, 246, nos. 1597, 1598, 1599). The dimensions Artigas gives are sufficiently close to the Basa pamphlet of 1889—a centimeter different—that in the absence of any direct assertion that he had handled a pamphlet of 1864, and knowing his general carelessness on details and his haste in publishing, there is already a presumption that he was similarly deceived by the date at the end of the *Manifiesto* proper, i.e., on page 24, into thinking that it was indeed a complete original pamphlet.

Not satisfied with this strong probability, I made further inquiry from Father Villarroel, the archivist of the university.⁴ He graciously supplied

4. I am deeply grateful to Father Villarroel for the information from the AUST that he has generously sought out for me, given my present inability to work personally in the archives. Even in the midst of his own research for a truly scholarly history of the University of Santo Tomas for its fourth centenary in 2010, he has also been generous with his explanation of various particulars

me with meticulously accurate information that readily explains the difference in dimensions between those in Artigas's assertion and my photocopy of the alleged 1889 pamphlet (Villarroel 2005a).⁵ An unknown archivist of the early twentieth century had bound together a series of miscellaneous pamphlets of vastly different dates (1826 to 1904!) and subjects. The *Basa Manifiesto* of twenty-four pages was by chance bound into the resulting volume, following another related antifriar pamphlet, *Viva España. Viva el Rey. Viva el Ejército. Fuera los Frailes.*, precisely following page 24 of the latter. This is followed by its purple cover, entitled VIVA ESPAÑA, FUERA LOS FRAILES. After this comes the *Basa Manifiesto* of twenty-four pages, ending as reprinted (Schumacher 1972a; 1999) with the place and date on page 24, "Manila, 27 de Junio de 1864." This, in turn, is followed, not by the pages 25 to 41 of the *Basa Manifiesto*, but by other antifriar propaganda originally forming the latter part of *Viva*, pages 25 to 38. It seems clear that the archivist of that time simply saw various similar antifriar writings of that type and, since the first 24-page numbers corresponded, carelessly attached the second part of *Viva* to the first part of the *Basa Manifiesto*. What happened to the second part of the latter at the AUST is unknown. Being trivial antifriar propaganda, the pages may simply have been discarded. But both from the sample page reproduced at the end of the photocopied *Manifiesto* and from the fact that its conclusion is on page 38 (the final page of *Viva* [1888]; cf. Retana 1906, 3:1119, no. 2669) instead of the forty-one pages that the integral *Basa Manifiesto* pamphlet contained, this latter part of the AUST pamphlet clearly must belong to *Viva* 1888. To anyone who has read much of this type of antifriar propaganda, it is not surprising that a nonprofessional archivist of those times should have without further research bound all these scurrilous materials together without consulting any bibliography such as Pardo de Tavera (1903). The

of the academic system at use in the university at the time of Burgos, and of some intricacies of the Patronato Real. My references to his several books on the university make clear how much I have depended on his published works as well.

5. It is relevant here to note that, at the time that Artigas was writing his *Los Sucesos*, he was also working on his history of the university (Ferrer 1970), thus most likely making use of the AUST, where he could have seen the presumed Burgos pamphlet.

latter work certainly, and perhaps Retana's (1906) also, already existed at the unknown time the binding of the disparate materials was done, since it must have been later than the 1904 English address of Taft, rather capriciously bound into that same volume.

The fact that all these varied pamphlets were sewed together in binding, as well as the fact that after binding the resulting volume was "guillotined," that is, all cut to one uniform size, explains the slight difference in size—approximately a centimeter, as noted above—between the photocopy of the Basa *Manifiesto* from the AUST and the measurements given by Artigas. This is true even if we are generous enough to suppose that, in this particular case at least, that prolific but careless historian was absolutely accurate to the last fraction of a centimeter. Finally, Artigas gives the number of pages as twenty-four, which corresponds to the *Manifiesto* part of the Basa pamphlet, but, as will be seen later in this article, would certainly be much less for the genuine 1864 article in *La América*. This will become clear with the reproduction of the genuine 1864 document in the following sections of this study, with an indication of the extent of the interpolated paragraphs of the Basa pamphlet, which lengthened the relatively brief 1864 original article to fully twenty-four pages. This fact, together with the details so meticulously supplied by Villarroel, clinches the case that what Artigas saw was the 1889 pamphlet, or, rather, the first part of it. In the absence of any other assertion not dependent on Artigas, there is no evidence that an 1864 pamphlet ever existed, much less was published in Manila. It was, however, in Manila that *composition* of the 1864 article took place, which was then sent to Spain for appearance in a periodical there, which we now know to be *La América*.

There is no question, therefore, that the pages following page 24 of the Basa pamphlet are not from Burgos but from 1888–1889. For they deal entirely with events which occurred in 1887 to 1888. But even the *Manifiesto* itself in its twenty-four pages has sections quite out of character with Burgos, especially at this stage of his life when he was about to be ordained a priest. This is especially true of that section calling for the government confiscation of all the lands of the religious orders and their complete expulsion from the Philippines, as I had noted from the beginning (Schumacher 1972a, 36–37; 104–6, n. 35; 1999, 34, n. 69; 98–99, nn. 34–35). That demand was a demand of the more radical nation-

alists of the 1890s, not those of the 1860s. Indeed, it contradicts other places, in the Basa version as well as in the original, where the author praises not only the Jesuits, who had no haciendas, but likewise the Dominicans who did, yet is far from calling for their expulsion.

Burgos and the 1889 *Manifiesto*

Nonetheless, though I was alert enough to observe that the 1864 text undoubtedly had been interpolated in the Basa publication, I could not prove it at the time. As my suspicions became stronger, I investigated the possible existence of the original 1864 pamphlet (as I had always thought it was) both in Spain and in the Philippines. This duality of versions was nonetheless clear, even apart from joining to the purported Burgos original the *antifriar* handbills of 1888, probably brought with him from Manila by del Pilar, as we have noted, in late 1888.⁶

Del Pilar, however, could hardly have done much, if any, of the actual interpolation of the original text since he left home on 28 October 1888 and, after his stop in Hong Kong with Basa, was in Barcelona by very early January 1889. In the days of at least a month's journey from Hong Kong to Spain, this would have precluded his spending more than a few days in Hong Kong (del Pilar 1955–1958, 1:5, 7; Rizal 1930–1938, 2:96–97, 116). He most likely would have been the one to have brought the *antifriar* leaflets to Hong Kong, whether in manuscript or printed form, for he had been still in the Philippines when the events alleged in these leaflets were supposed to have occurred.

Rizal, however, as we will show, almost certainly brought the 1864 text to Basa. Likewise, he certainly aided Basa in interpolating the 1864 text, or perhaps even did it entirely himself, leaving the publication to Basa. For he spent a considerable amount of time in Hong Kong after leaving

6. As Pardo de Tavera correctly notes, though the Basa pamphlet puts them in continuous pagination with the supposed 1864 pamphlet, there are really three separate works, each with their own title page (1903, 1597, 1598, 1599). It is possible that the latter two had already been published in Manila in the clandestine press used for such purposes by José Ramos for the Comité de Propaganda, but this can only be a plausible conjecture (Schumacher 1997, 115, n. 15; 123–24).

the Philippines the second time in 1888. As will be seen in the notes to the actual text of the original 1864 article, in several places the hand of Rizal is quite evident in the interpolations, as, for example, the passages citing the scientific conclusions of the work of German anthropologists as well as those on the wealthy haciendas of the friars. For during his stay in Calamba the hacienda dispute with the Dominicans had begun and one of his principal concerns in Hong Kong was to look into the finances of the friar orders in preparation for the struggle he planned (Rizal 1961, 142–43).

The Authorship of the 1864 Document

Fr. Fidel Villarroel was apparently the first to raise the question of the authorship of Burgos, shortly before my own publication. But, apart from noting the dependence of all other authors on Artigas (1971, 60–61), he refrained from giving an apodictic answer. However, when I published the 1889 *Manifiesto* the following year, I did not rely on Artigas but principally on the assertion of Rizal that among the antifriar writings earlier published by Basa in Hong Kong—namely, the *Viva* pamphlet mentioned above—were “articles [*artículos*] by Burgos” (Rizal 1930–1938, 2:149; Schumacher 1972a, 22–23, nn. 38, 41). The principal knowledgeable bibliographers, Retana and Pardo de Tavera, had connected these two pamphlets of 1888 to 1889 to the agitation that accompanied the demonstration of 1 March 1888 demanding the expulsion of friars and the archbishop (Retana 1906, 3:2625, 2669; Pardo de Tavera 1903, 432, no. 2807; Schumacher 1997, 114–20).

Hence, in spite of my recognition that there had been an undetermined amount of interpolation to the 1889 pamphlet, the fact that Archbishop Gregorio Melitón Martínez had asserted to Nuncio Lorenzo Barili his conclusion that the 1864 document came from “the secular clergy”—together with the failure to suggest any other likely original author (ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, no. 2046; Schumacher 1972a, 23; 1999, 20)—gave me confidence to affirm that the Basa pamphlet reproduced at least the main substance of a manifesto whose author in 1864 had been Burgos.⁷ I also relied on the fact that “almost all the ideas of the *Manifiesto* reappear” in the certainly genuine Burgos articles that appeared

in the Madrid newspaper *La Discusión* in 1870 (Schumacher 1972a, 23; 1999, 21; 98–99, n. 34). (This last argument was, of course, invalid by itself, as it only proved that Burgos had a copy of the 1864 publication and made use of its arguments. But the fact that in the 1870 articles the author did not use some of the more radical proposals, such as the expulsion of the friars and the confiscation of their lands, was at least a probable indication of Burgos's authorship.) However, it is now clear that the interpolations and modifications by Rizal and/or Basa were much greater than I had supposed.

As I came to know more of Burgos himself through later research more doubts arose, but did not prevent my republishing the Basa version in my edition of 1999, but with further cautions as to undoubted interpolations (Schumacher 1999, especially 98–99, n. 34). Since then, however, rereading for another larger article still in process, references that I had seen fifteen years before my second edition, but forgotten, gave me second thoughts. Especially when I noted certain references whose implications I had not taken account of previously, I became aware of the tenuousness of the evidence for an 1864 *pamphlet* and was led to the research detailed above, showing such a pamphlet to be non-existent. However, the 1864 document had to exist in another form.

The references were in a detailed study of the correspondence of the papal nuncio, Lorenzo Barili, on the state of the Philippine church with major figures of the secularization controversy beginning with Fr. Pedro Peláez (Uy 1984, 161).⁸ Rereading it finally alerted me to the fact that the original document of 1864 was nowhere said to be a *pamphlet*. Rizal had

7. To avoid confusion, I have used the word "manifesto," in lower case, in the ordinary sense of the word, namely a document propounding a cause. I shall reserve the capitalized Spanish word *Manifiesto* to designate the 1889 pamphlet with its interpolations and alterations.

8. In my 1963 research in the ASV for my book *Propaganda Movement*, I had copied, to the extent my time permitted, a number of documents of this correspondence, but did not have the opportunity for more thorough research. Hence, in this article, for those facts that I have from my own research, as well as the copies of those letters of Peláez found in the Jesuit archives here, I have cited directly. Other facts I know only from the later book of Fr. Antolin Uy, S.V.D., and for these my references are to the ASV or the AHN as cited in his valuable work.

referred to “articles” (*artículos*) of Burgos. What the other articles were—if there were any—is impossible to say now, though a possible conjecture is that they were those written by Burgos to the Madrid newspaper, *La Discusión*, in 1870 (Schumacher 1999, 131–92). However, no other such articles were republished, and it seems likely that in using the plural, “articles,” Rizal was simply speaking loosely and from memory. His real concern at the time he wrote the letter to Mariano Ponce in Barcelona, where the newspaper *La Solidaridad* was still being published in early 1889, was that whatever materials of Burgos there were should be utilized. For Rizal’s main purpose was to urge him to write articles letting the readers know more about outstanding Filipinos like Fathers Burgos, Peláez, Mariano García, and others whose names he would add in subsequent letters. The reference to “Burgos articles” was incidental. Moreover, he was certainly referring principally, if not solely, to the 1889 Basa pamphlet, since he said that, if they did not have any there in Barcelona, to let him know, as he had a large number (*una infinidad*) with him in Paris, from where he was writing (Rizal 1930–1938, 2:149).

That the original article was published in 1864 we know from several sources. Gov.-Gen. Rafael de Echagüe wrote to the Overseas Minister (*Ministro de Ultramar*) in August 1864, warning him “to exercise caution in reading the articles originating from the regular clergy.” He was referring to those in the newspapers *La Verdad* and *La Regeneración*, both subsidized by Fr. Guillermo Agudo, O.A.R.; and *La Esperanza*, subsidized by Fr. Celestino Mayordomo, O.S.A. Both of them occupied themselves in denigrating the archbishop and the Filipino clergy. Echagüe, referring to “the impropriety of their virulent articles,” said that he also knew that “in this or the preceding mail,” “on the way to Madrid for publication is an extensive *article* in defense of the secular clergy, appealing to the judgment of the nation, the author of which is not unknown to me” (Echagüe-Ministro de Ultramar, 18 Aug. 1864, AHN, Ultramar, leg. 2206, exp. 41; cited in Uy 1984, 161; italics mine). In fact, though he said he gave little importance to it, he had gotten hold of a copy of this supposedly secret article and had informed the ordinary (the archbishop), who was totally ignorant of it (*ibid.*). This undoubtedly was the basis for the archbishop telling the nuncio that the “secular clergy” had published the article.

This statement of Echagüe clearly signifies that he was convinced that the author was a member of the Manila secular clergy known to him,

and confirms that it was an article to be published in Spain, not a pamphlet. In the archbishop's letter to the nuncio telling of Governor Echagüe's having called this article to his attention, he termed it "some kind of manifesto (*manifiesto*) to the nation" (ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 447; no. 2046, 4 Sept. 1864, in Uy 1984, 161). Father Uy goes on to say: "After a check, Barili confirms Martínez's supposition that it had appeared in *La América*." Barili assured the archbishop, however, "Be sure that nobody paid any attention to it. Even none of the procurators of the religious orders. I am not a subscriber of the newspaper; nobody talked to me about such a manifesto" (ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 447, no. 873, 21 Mar. 1865, in Uy 1984, 161, n. 91). In fact, the nuncio was naïve in this matter. The Recollect procurator, Fr. Guillermo Agudo, had found out about it from his multiple contacts with publishers and knew that it had been presented to *La América* for publication. Moreover, as will be seen below, once it was published he presented copies to the Overseas Ministry and was planning a counteraction.

Preliminary Conclusions

To sum up, we may make several conclusions from this combination of sources. First, the original work was not a pamphlet, but an *article* written in Manila, then published in the Madrid periodical, *La América*. Second, the nature of the article was such that both archbishop and nuncio spontaneously referred to it as a "manifesto," as in fact it was in the common meaning of the word, though, as will be seen in the transcription below, that word does not appear in the original article or its title. Third, Echagüe, Melitón Martínez, and Barili all spoke of it as an article/manifesto directed "to the nation," which, as we will see, was the actual title in *La América*. Fourth, though the author seems not to have been known, or at least was not named at that time, except perhaps by Echagüe to the archbishop, it was signed by "Los Filipinos." Fifth, when Basa, or whoever was the author, went to publish the 1889 pamphlet, he seized upon these four indications to give a title to his pamphlet, which, albeit not in the original, was striking and accurately descriptive of its original nature: *Manifiesto que a la noble nación española derigen [sic] los leales Filipinos en defensa de su honra y fidelidad gravemente vulneradas por el periodico "La Verdad" de Madrid.*

Erroneous Attributions

Thus, Basa or the author put it in continuity with the earlier struggle of the Filipino clergy to defend themselves against some friar orders. Begun by Fathers Peláez and Gómez, and carried on by Burgos, it had culminated in the executions and exiles after the Cavite Mutiny of 1872. Moreover, though that title did not appear on the 1864 original, it expressed its contents. Hence, Uy, who had no reason to consult the rare periodical in Madrid since the topic of his dissertation was the state of the church in the Philippines, concluded from the archbishop's use of the word "manifiesto" that it was the same as the 1889 pamphlet, entitled *Manifiesto*, which I had unwisely published in 1972. This was an error that I myself would have shared had I been writing at the time of Father Uy's book (1984, 161, n. 91).

In fact, though my 1999 book had a new and much more extensive introduction, reflecting a number of new documents as well as the research done since 1972 by historians, particularly Prof. Leandro Tormo Sanz and myself, there was no change in the text of the *Manifiesto*. The only changes were certain clarifications in the introduction and the footnotes, mostly verbal, except for the one of some importance to which I have already referred, that is, calling special attention to what I believed certainly to be an interpolation by Basa or Rizal into Burgos's genuine text. My reasons were mainly two. First, as I have mentioned above, was its incongruity with what we knew of Burgos in 1864. The second was its being the most glaring exception to the general fact that all the substantial arguments in the *Manifiesto* were later found in some form in Burgos's certainly genuine articles of 1870–1871. For there was nothing in the original manifesto about expelling all friars and confiscating their lands (Schumacher 1999, 98–99, n. 34), nor did Burgos call for that in his articles of 1870. Although I did not fully perceive its significance at the time, it was to be the turning point in the search for the 1864 original text of the *Manifiesto*.

While I was writing another piece, the allusion concerning the article of the secular clergy in *La América*, made by Father Uy in 1984, came to my attention. After I obtained a photocopy of the original article, it became clear that we were no longer dealing with a few passing interpo-

lations into a fundamentally genuine document, but that there had been many and major antifriar additions that the author of the 1864 manifesto had neither thought of nor intended. Hence, we can now publish here the certainly genuine 1864 article, with an English translation.⁹

However, that being done, we must examine the strength of the evidence we now have of its being an authentic work from the pen of Burgos. Dr. Roberto Blanco Andrés in his recent doctoral dissertation, “Iglesia y Estado en Filipinas: las ordenes religiosas y la cuestión de curatos (1776–1872)” (2004b), has brought forth new evidence that calls the Burgos authorship into question.¹⁰ In discussing this evidence and its significance for establishing whether the 1864 document is truly a Burgos document, we will rely not only on the evidence from the various external sources but likewise on the internal coherence of that authorship with the 1864 article reproduced in the next section. The footnotes will make clear the major changes and the lengthy and more radical interpolations to the genuine 1864 document found in the Basa pamphlet.

9. Here I must express my gratitude to Dr. Fernando Palanco Aguado, who went to the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid, located the article in *La América*, and had it photocopied for me. Moreover, given the smallness of the print in the photocopy, he took the trouble to type out a more manageable first draft of it for me, which enormously facilitated my final reproduction and translation of it in this article. For such generosity, I am deeply grateful.

10. I owe another debt of gratitude to Dr. Blanco Andrés, who supplied me with many documents needed for this article, both from his dissertation and from his personal photocopies of materials in the Augustinian and Recollect archives. Moreover, as may clearly be seen from the list of references at the end of this article, we engaged by e-mail in a scholarly debate and exchange of information concerning the topic of this article. Though I have given credit to specific facts that I have received from him, the exchange of ideas in this long discussion by e-mail has enabled me to form and sharpen my conclusions on the subject of the article. Without that and the information he has supplied, I could not have written this article. Though we are not in full agreement on every point, and my conclusions are my own responsibility, his contribution to my thinking has been even greater than actually appears credited in the references, and I want to express my deep gratitude to him.

Original Text of the 1864 Article¹¹

A LA NACIÓN

Los varios artículos referentes a los curatos de aquellas islas, que de algunos meses a esta parte constituyen el tema obligado del periódico *La Verdad* que se publica en esta corte,¹² escritos en sentido muy favorable a los regulares, atribuyendo a éstos preferentes derechos a los espresados curatos de los que se pretende excluir gratuitamente al clero secular, exhibiéndolo para este fin de una manera poco decorosa e indigna por sus merecimientos, virtud y saber, nos mueve a salir del acostumbrado silencio con que hasta ahora se nos ha conocido, permitiéndonos por esta vez dirigir nuestra humilde voz a la *nación*, no sólo para desvanecer la atmósfera ya creada tal vez, aunque con la enunciación vaga e indeterminada de *rebelión* abortada en este país, sino mas bien para evidenciar aquellos derechos, y las tendencias de cuanto entrañan los mencionados artículos en contra de los filipinos.

Al efecto, y sin embargo de que nuestra instrucción y conocimientos no sean de la talla del periódico, o del articulista que asegura haber emitido razones indestructibles en todo lo que lleva escrito a favor del clero regular, proclamándose su defensor sin causa, trataremos de demostrar la inexactitud de sus apreciaciones en lo concerniente a la preferencia de derechos a la cura de almas, y la falsedad de sus juicios con respecto a la capacidad intelectual de los filipinos, a quienes se ha tratado de deprimir y anular, y contra quienes se han lanzado tremendas e injustas filípicas. Y para que no se nos achaque de que interpretamos mal las palabras, iremos entresacando algunos párrafos de diferentes números del citado periódico, que por una extraña casualidad leímos. Y si al emitir las razones que nuestra limitada inteligencia alcanza no pudiéramos

11. This article appeared in *La America*, VIII, 17 (12 Sept. 1864): 11–13. In presenting the original text, I have retained the variations of spelling characteristic of the time and place it was written, since they have some bearing on its genuineness. However, there seemed to be no good reason to preserve the highly erratic and inconsistent accentuation or lack of it, so I have used the accentuation norms of modern Spanish. In all other respects, unless specifically noted, I have preserved the text exactly as it was originally published, including the lengthy paragraphs, the use of quotation marks, and the many misspellings or

Translation

TO THE NATION

The various articles concerning the parishes of the Philippines have been for some months here the unfailing theme of the newspaper, *La Verdad*, published in this [sic] capital.¹² Written in a sense very favorable to the regular orders, they attribute to them preferential rights to these parishes, from which they gratuitously aim to exclude the secular clergy. To achieve this end they picture that clergy in a manner quite unseemly and unworthy in the light of that clergy's merits, virtue, and knowledge. All this moves us to abandon the usual silence for which till now we have been known and to permit ourselves for once to direct our humble voice to the *nation*. We wish first to clear the atmosphere already created, perhaps, with just that vague and indeterminate enunciation of an aborted *rebellion* in this country. In addition, we will instead give proof of those rights, as well as show the tendencies of all that those articles contain against the Filipinos.

To begin, we acknowledge that our knowledge and skills may not be at the high cultural level of the newspaper, or those of the author of the article, who assures us that he has brought forth irrefutable reasons in all that he has written in favor of the regular clergy, proclaiming himself its defender without any reason. Nonetheless, we will try to demonstrate the inaccuracy of his assessments with regard to the preferential rights to the care of souls and the falsity of his judgments regarding the intellectual capacity of the Filipinos, whom he has occupied himself with humiliating and belittling and against whom he has launched dreadful and unjust invectives. And, so that no one may charge us with interpreting his words badly, we will proceed by choosing for quotation some paragraphs of different sections of the abovementioned newspaper, which by chance we happened to read. If, in expressing the reasons that our

inaccurate names and titles. I have, however, corrected them and realigned them according to modern practice in the English translation

12. Though the original has "esta," which would imply that the articles were appearing in Manila, it is clearly a misprint, which is corrected to "esa" in the 1889 version.

imitarlo en su culto y clásico lenguaje, esperamos se nos perdone el que usamos, el de la verdad en su sencillez natural, pudiendo asegurar que en la amargura de nuestro corazón por golpes tan duros como inesperados, en medio de nuestra ineptitud y rudeza, atendemos más que a las reglas de la oratoria, a la ingenua manifestación de nuestros sentimientos, desgraciadamente interpretados hasta ahora por pasiones bastardas de una colectividad miserable en sus miras egoístas de engrandecimiento, y temible por el ascendiente y elementos de que dispone. Bajo este concepto, pues, empezamos nuestra tarea.¹³

«Que además del derecho —dice el articulista— que conceden los siglos, las costumbres y la conveniencia, además del reconocido título que allí en Filipinas tienen adquiridos los regulares para desempeñar el cargo parroquial, hay otra razón poderosísima que les concede este absoluto privilegio, y no es otra sino la conservación, adelanto y progresos de tan hermosas colonias.—El arzobispo de Manila, rodeado por una clerecía indígena que tiende al dominio de unos derechos que no le competen . . . »¹⁴

Mucha ignorancia del derecho supondríamos en el autor de estas frases si no tuviéramos la convicción de que esa ignorancia es afectada. Y no nos tomáramos siquiera la molestia de refutarlas si no creyésemos que tal vez algunos cándidos lectores, a quienes no incumbe el deber de estar instruidos en esta materia, habrían acogido de buena fe tan falsas ideas. Para desengaño, pues, de los ilusos, vamos a dar una ligera reseña de la jurisprudencia canónica y civil que rige sobre el particular, advirtiendo de paso que las leyes de Indias y cuantas disposiciones se dictaron después de su compilación hasta 1826, reconocen de conformidad con los cánones y disciplina de la Iglesia el derecho *preferente* que tiene a los curatos *el clero secular de Filipinas*, sin pararse a considerar si es o no indígena.

13. The whole previous section is expanded, paraphrased, and added to significantly in the 1889 pamphlet, referring to the attacks on the archbishop as well as the secular clergy, and mentioning the role of the Recollects and their attack on Peláez. The general orientation, however, remains the same.

limited intelligence attains, we should not be able to imitate him in his refined and classical language, we hope that he may pardon us for the language we use, that of truth in its native simplicity. We can assure him that in the bitterness of our heart at blows as harsh as unexpected, in the midst of our ineptitude and rusticity, we pay attention to the candid manifestation of our feelings rather than to the rules of oratory. Unfortunately, these have been interpreted until now by the warped passions of a wretched collectivity in its selfish designs of aggrandizement, one that is formidable for its power and the resources of which it disposes. With this idea, then, we begin our task.¹³

The writer of the article says:

Apart from the right bestowed by the centuries, by custom, and by their usefulness, apart from the acknowledged title that the regular orders have acquired there in the Philippines to carry out the office of parish priest, there is another very strong reason that gives them this absolute privilege. It is no other than that of the preservation, advance, and progress of such beautiful colonies. The archbishop of Manila, surrounded by a native secular clergy that aims at the possession of certain rights that do not belong to it . . .¹⁴

We would suppose great ignorance of the law in the author of these phrases if we did not have the conviction that that ignorance of his is feigned. We would not even take the trouble to refute them if we did not believe that perhaps certain unknowing readers, who do not have the duty of being well instructed in these matters, might have accepted in good faith such false ideas. In order, then, to disabuse those who have been deceived, we shall give a brief review of canonical and civil jurisprudence on the particular matter. We observe in passing that the Laws of the Indies, and all the dispositions of law that have been made after their compilation until 1826, acknowledge, in conformity with canon law and the discipline of the Church, the *preferential* right that *the secular clergy of the Philippines* has to the parishes, without stopping to consider whether or not it is a native secular clergy.

14. This paragraph and the eight succeeding ones are reproduced identically in the 1889 pamphlet.

El derecho canónico novísimo no concede a los regulares aptitud para ser curas párrocos sino a falta de *sacerdotes seculares*. Así lo enseña expresamente el sabio cuanto celoso pontífice Benedicto XIV en varias de sus constituciones, y en especial en la de 8 de noviembre de 1751, que empieza *Cum Nuper*,¹⁵ donde dice terminantemente las siguientes palabras:

«Es verdad, así como no puede negarse, que según los antiguos Cánones los monges y regulares eran capaces de regir iglesias parroquiales, lo cual expresamente declara Inocencio III en su decretal que comienza *quod deitimorem*.¹⁶ Del mismo modo, ahora es cierto que, según la moderna disciplina canónica, les está prohibido a los regulares tomar la cura de almas sin dispensa apostólica, que no suele concederse por el pontífice romano sino a instancia del obispo, ni por éste pedirse sino cuando lo aconseja la necesidad de la Iglesia.»

Trae los fundamentos de esa doctrina y continúa así en el par. 2º:

«Ni debe creerse que se aparta de esta regla nuestro predecesor S. Pío V cuando por sus letras que comienzan *esponi nobis*, de 21 de marzo de 1567 (y que es el principal argumento a favor de los regulares), habilitó a los religiosos para aceptar parroquias y ejercer otras funciones de curas en las regiones de las Indias del mar Océano; porque fundó esta concesión en que los mencionados religiosos habían hasta entonces ejercido el oficio de párrocos, por falta de presbíteros seculares. Con lo cual se demuestra suficientemente que lo dispuesto en aquellas letras sólo tiene lugar donde no hay ni pueden ser habidos sacerdotes seculares para ejercer la cura de almas, según la declaración dada por nuestro predecesor de feliz memoria Inocencio X, en sus letras apostólicas, de 15 de mayo de 1607, que comienzan *cum sicut accepimus*, en las cuales hablando de esta constitución

15. This bull of Benedict XIV, together with one of 1744 entitled *Firmandis* and one of 1745 entitled *Quamvis*, gave the definitive solution from the part of the popes to the much-disputed question concerning the right of priests of religious orders to hold parishes. If they did so out of necessity, it affirmed the power of the bishop to conduct a visitation over parish priests belonging to religious orders. Since the sixteenth century these rights had been bitterly contested in the Philippines as well as in the rest of the Spanish empire in the Indies. Though these papal briefs settled the questions from a canonical point of view, only during the time of Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Santa Justa

The most recent *canon law* does not grant the religious the capacity to be parish priests except where there is a lack of *secular priests*. This is the express teaching of Benedict XIV, as wise a pontiff as he was zealous, in several of his constitutions and, in particular, in that of 8 November 1751, beginning *Cum Nuper*,¹⁵ where he says definitively the following words:

It is undeniably true that, according to the ancient Canons, monks and religious were capable of ruling parish churches, as Innocent III expressly declared in his decretal beginning *Quod Dei timorem*.¹⁶ All the same, it is now certain that according to modern canonical discipline it is forbidden to religious to undertake the care of souls without apostolic dispensation. The Roman Pontiff does not ordinarily grant the latter except at the petition of the bishop. Nor does the latter ordinarily request it except when the need of the Church makes it advisable.

He goes on to bring forth the foundation of this doctrine, and continues thus in paragraph 2:

Nor should it be thought that Our predecessor St. Pius V departed from this rule when, by his letter that begins *Exponi nobis* of 24 March 1567 (and this is the principal argument in behalf of the religious), he enabled the religious to accept parishes and exercise other functions of parish priests in the regions of the Indies of the Ocean Sea. For he based this concession on the fact that until that time those religious had exercised the office of parish priests because of the lack of secular priests. This fact shows with sufficient clarity that the dispositions of that letter are valid only where there are not, nor can there be had, secular priests to exercise the care of souls, according to the declaration given by Our predecessor of happy memory, Innocent X, in his Apostolic Letter of 15 May 1607, beginning *Cum sicut accepimus*. In the latter document, speaking of the

y Rufina in 1768 was an attempt made to enforce their provisions in the Philippines.

16. Innocent III was pope from 1198 to 1216. "Decretal" is the term used for papal decrees having permanent force of law.

piana determina que ella no tiene vigor sino en los lugares donde faltan párrocos.»

Habría que transcribir íntegra esta Bula, que parece escrita para poner de relieve las atrevidas aserciones de *La Verdad*, que arriba citamos. Pero para no ser difusos, seguiremos extractándola únicamente. En el párrafo 3º, asegura el mismo Benedicto XIV que esa fue la opinión generalmente admitida en la congregación del Concilio.¹⁷ En el pár. 4º, que no es justo que un privilegio concedido a los religiosos en tiempos en que no abundaban los presbíteros seculares en las Indias, tenga la misma fuerza cuando ya hay en ellas muchos de estos, los mencionados presbíteros. En el pár. 5º, declara contra aquellos regulares que decían que sólo están sujetos al obispo *in officio officiendo*,¹⁸ es decir, en lo que es privación del párroco (error que todavía cunde en no pocos frailes de Filipinas); que lo están también en su moralidad, porque no es imposible, añade, que la vida de algunos de ellos sea tal que se oponga al cargo parroquial y sirva de escándalo al pueblo.

Esto es por lo que respecta al derecho canónico. Por lo que hace a la jurisprudencia civil, recomendamos al oficioso articulista del periódico aludido lea a nuestro célebre Solórzano, en el libro 4º de la política indiana y en el libro 3º, números 32 y siguientes de *indiarum gubernatione*, y al no menos célebre Frasso de *Regio Patronatu*, tomo 2º capítulo 66, núm. 67 y siguientes.¹⁹ De todo lo cual es una muestra la real cédula del año 1618, que trae el referido Solórzano y dice así:

«Mi virey, presidente y oidores de la ciudad de los reyes²⁰ de las provincias del Perú: como tenéis entendido, al tiempo que se descubrieron esas provincias, por no haber en ellas número suficiente de clérigos que administrasen los Santos

17. The Congregation of the Council was the body of cardinals set up after the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century, to interpret the decrees of that council such as the one in question here concerning the jurisdiction over parish priests who were regulars, i.e., belonging to religious orders.

18. *In officio officiendo* is a technical canonical term meaning that the regular parish priests were subject to the bishops only in matters pertaining to the exercise of their office as parish priest and not in those pertaining to their private lives, which fell under the jurisdiction of their religious superiors.

Constitution of Pius, he determines “that it has validity only in those places where parish priests are lacking.”

It would be fitting to transcribe this bull in full, since it seems as if written to give prominence to the rashness of the assertions of *La Verdad* cited above. But in order not to be diffuse, we will continue only to make extracts from it. In paragraph 3, the same Benedict XIV asserts that this was the opinion generally admitted in the Congregation of the Council.¹⁷ In paragraph 4 he says it is not right that a privilege given to religious in times when secular priests were not numerous in the Indies should have the same force when there are already many of these priests there. In paragraph 5 he declares against those religious who said that they are only subject to the bishop *in officio officinando*,¹⁸ that is, only in what belongs to the office of parish priest (an error still common among not a few friars in the Philippines). Rather, they are also subject to the bishop with regard to their moral life, because it is not impossible, he adds, that the life of some of them be such that it is opposed to the office of parish priest and is a source of scandal to the people.

This is with regard to canon law. As far as civil jurisprudence is concerned, we recommend to the meddling writer of the article in the newspaper cited above that he read our renowned Solórzano in book 4 of the *Política Indiana* and in book 3, nos. 32 and following, of the *De Indiarum gubernatione*; likewise the no less renowned Frasso, *De Regio Patronatu*, vol. 2, chap. 66, nos. 67 and following.¹⁹ A sample of all this is the Royal Cédula of 1618, cited by Solórzano, that reads as follows:

My viceroy-president and *oidores* of the City of the Kings [Lima]²⁰ of the provinces of Peru: As you are aware, at the time those provinces were discovered there was not a sufficient number of secular clergy

19. Juan de Solórzano and Pedro Frasso were Spanish jurists of the seventeenth century, who, in the works cited here, commented on the *Leyes de Indias*, particularly on matters concerning the exercise of the Patronato Real.

20. Lima was called the *Ciudad de los Reyes*.

Sacramentos, y ser los lugares y partes donde lo habían de hacer tantos y tan distantes, los señores reyes, mis progenitores, suplicaron a la Sede Apostólica permitiese y dispensase que los religiosos de las órdenes mendicantes, o algunos de ellos, pudiesen ser curas doctrineros de algunos pueblos de Indias, de manera que por ese medio se supliese la falta de ministros y se acudiese a cumplir con una obligación tan precisa. Y habiéndose concedido así, se espidieron diversos breves sobre ello, por los sumos pontífices Alejandro, León, Adriano y Pío V....»

En vista, pues, de tan claras y terminantes disposiciones de varios Sumos Pontífices, y de la potestad civil, ¿se insistirá todavía en negar al clero secular de Filipinas el derecho preferente que tiene a los curatos? ¿Tendrá aún el valor de asegurar en tono magistral que *la clerecía indígena tiende a unos derechos que no le competen?*—Pero se dirá acaso que esas doctrinas son añejas. Tan lejos de ser así, tan lejos de olvidar la Sede Apostólica la exigencia de la falta de sacerdotes seculares para poder darse las parroquias a los frailes, la inculca en las *sólitas*, o sea facultades especiales que cada diez años suele conceder a los obispos de Indias.²¹ Véanse las concedidas a los actuales prelados y se leerá en el núm. 22: *Preficiendi Parochis regulares, eis que suos deputandi vicarios in defectu Secularium.*

«El filipino, prosigue el mismo periódico, por su índole, por su carácter, por influencia del clima o de raza, no es bueno para desempeñar cargos elevados. Se dice vulgarmente que el tagalo es un excelente soldado, un regular cabo, mal sargento, no pudiendo de ningún modo desempeñar el cargo de oficial, por ser inepto para ello. Pues de la misma manera, el filipino que se consagra al servicio de los altares puede ser un buen ejecutor en el desempeño de los cargos mecánicos de una iglesia, pero nunca llega a sobresalir cuando se halla adornado con la investidura sacerdotal. Esto es positivo y cierto, en tales términos, que la experiencia ha demostrado muchas veces lo que por una práctica constante se halla robustecido con numerosas pruebas y curiosísimos

21. Certain special faculties or powers were regularly granted by the Holy See to bishops in the Indies. These were to be renewed every ten years. They were *sólitas*, or customary, in the sense that they were granted as a matter of course to all bishops in the Indies, but *especiales*, in the sense that they were privileges peculiar to the churches of the Indies.

to administer the holy sacraments. Moreover, the places and regions where they had to do so were so many and so far distant from one another. Hence, the lords kings, my ancestors, requested the Apostolic See to give permission, and to grant a dispensation, so that the religious of the mendicant orders, or some of them, could be parish priests of certain towns and villages of the Indies. In this way, they would supply for the lack of ministers and would help fulfill an obligation so necessary. This concession having been granted, the Supreme Pontiffs, Alexander, Leo, Adrian, and Pius V, dispatched various briefs on the subject

In view, then, of such clear and peremptory dispositions of various holy pontiffs and of the civil power, will there be further insistence in denying the secular clergy of the Philippines the preferential right it has to the parishes? Will the author still have the audacity and boldness to assert, in magisterial tones, "the native clergy aims at certain rights that do not belong to it"?

But perhaps it will be said that these doctrines are out of date. So far is this from being true, so far is the Apostolic See from having forgotten about the necessity that there be a lack of secular priests in order to be able to give parishes to the friars, that it emphasizes this in the customary faculties, that is to say, the special faculties that it is accustomed to grant every ten years to the bishops of the Indies.²¹ See those granted to the current prelates and we will read in no. 22: "[The faculty] of putting regular clergy in charge of parishes and of empowering their vicars for them, if secular clergy be lacking."

The same newspaper continues:

The Filipino, by his nature, by his character, by influence of the climate or of race, is not good for carrying out high offices. It is a common saying that the Tagalog is an excellent soldier, an ordinary corporal, a bad sergeant, cannot at all discharge the position of an officer, because he is unfit for it. Now, in the same way, the Filipino who consecrates himself to the service of the altar can carry out well the routine functions of a church, but he never succeeds in excelling when he is adorned with the dignity of the priesthood. This is indubitably certain, to such an extent that experience has shown

accidentes.—Apoyándose el arzobispo, equivocadamente en un breve del papa Clemente XIII, quiere arrojar a los regulares del desempeño de las Parroquias, sustituyendo al cura regular español por el cura indígena, como si la alta e importante misión que aquél desempeña pudiera ser imitada por los clérigos, tal como allí se llaman los que no tienen carácter europeo.—Ni pueden desempeñar por las circunstancias de que su inteligencia no está al alcance del elevado cargo de cura de almas.»

Mal informado debe de estar el articulista, o mucho nos engañamos, si en la emisión de estas absurdas y chocantes ideas no ha hecho traición a su propia convicción por seguir ajenas inspiraciones;²² porque de no ser así, no concebimos cómo puede en su ilustración ignorar lo que Cantú en su renombrada *Historia Universal* trae sobre la unidad de la especie humana.²³

«A mayor abundamiento, dice aquel sabio, es de todo punto positivo que las diversidades reales entre las razas se reducen al color del cutis y a la calidad de los cabellos, sin extenderse a los órganos más nobles de la vida. La ciencia de Gall, que intentaron algunos practicar en apoyo del materialismo, prueba la unidad de nuestra especie. Hace muy poco que Tideman [Teichmann], de resultados de sus excelentes indagaciones sobre el cerebro, ha encontrado que el del negro se diferencia ligeramente del nuestro en su estructura exterior y de ningún modo en su estructura interna, y que aparte alguna disposición más simétrica en las circunvoluciones [circunvoluciones(?)], no se asemeja más a la cabeza del orangutang que el de los europeos.»²⁴

22. The Basa version inserts six lines here, explicitly derogatory to the friars.

23. The world history by Cesare Cantú (1804–1895), which appeared in Italian in thirty-two volumes from 1836 to 1847 under the title *Storia Universale*, was quickly translated into other European languages, and in many editions. The first Spanish translation began in 1854. The young Rizal would later be an avid reader of this work.

24. Franz Josef Gall (1768–1828), German anatomist and physiologist, was known for his pioneering studies on the brain and nervous system. Ludwig Teichmann (1823–1895) was a noted German anatomist and pathologist. The

many times what constant practice has confirmed with numerous proofs and curious events.

The archbishop, mistakenly relying on a brief of Pope Clement XIII, wants to expel the regulars from the administration of the parishes, substituting for the Spanish religious parish priest the native parish priest, as if the lofty and important mission that the former carries out could be imitated by the secular clergy, such as they call there those [priests] who do not have the quality of being European.—Nor can they carry out that office because of the circumstance that their intelligence is not at the level of the lofty charge of pastor of souls.

Either the writer of the article must be ill informed, or we greatly deceive ourselves if, in the utterance of these absurd and provocative ideas, he has not been a traitor to his own convictions to follow alien inspirations.²² For otherwise we do not understand how, in his enlightenment, he can be ignorant of what Cantú brings out in his well-known *Historia Universal* concerning the unity of the human species.²³ That learned man says:

Furthermore, it is completely certain that the real diversities among races can be reduced to the color of the skin and the quality of the hair, without extending itself to the more noble organs of life. The science of Gall, which certain people attempted to make use of in support of materialism, proves the unity of our species. A very short time ago, Tideman [Teichmann], as a result of his excellent research on the brain, found that that of the Negroes differs very little from ours in its exterior structure and in no way in its internal structure. Moreover, apart from a certain more symmetrical arrangement of the circumvolutions, it is no more like the head of the orangutan than is that of the Europeans.²⁴

otherwise unknown “Tideman” was corrected in the 1889 Basa version to Teichmann, undoubtedly by Rizal, who had made extensive private studies in anthropology and the capacity of different races. Likewise, “circumbalaciones” is corrected in the 1889 version to “circunvoluciones,” a more likely term concerning the brain. Again the hand of Rizal, the doctor of medicine, is obvious.

Este sabio deduce de todo que nuestra preeminencia sobre el negro, no estriba en ninguna superioridad congenial de la inteligencia, sino en su educación solamente.²⁵

En corroboración de esta opinión, admitida ya en el día, rogamos al articulista mismo que lea la preciosa carta del señor D. Francisco López de Adán, oidor decano que fue de esta real Audiencia, escrita al R.P. Pedro Murillo Velarde, que éste estampó en el principio de su obra *Cursus Juris Canonici*,²⁶ y en ella vera admitida y ensalzada por aquel sabio magistrado la capacidad, inteligencia y talento del filipino, que le hizo decir: «que le parecía hallarse, no en Indias y Filipinas donde se venera Mercurio dominante, sino en las universidades de Europa, donde tiene su trono Minerva.»²⁷

Esto mismo aseguraba el conde Filipino al Sr. D. Fernando VII, padre de nuestra augusta Reina (q. D. g.) en la dedicatoria a S. M. de su libro titulado *Parnaso filipino*.²⁸

«Son tantos, decía, los progresos de las ciencias en esta Asia española, que con solo leer los fastos de sus universidades se hallarán a millares los estudiantes matriculados, mas de setecientos doctores y maestros en las escuelas jesuítica y tomística, muchos abogados de matrícula, canónigos, un arzobispo de esta metrópoli, y, por último, hasta los indios netos, sin mistura de español, han dado grandes hombres como son un Máximo, cura que fue de Manila; un Sanguising [sic], del pueblo de Quiapo; un Rodríguez; del de Mariquina; y un Espeleta, obispo que fue de Cebú, interino gobernador, capitán general y presidente de esta real Audiencia.»²⁹

25. Though in the original this sentence is included in the quoted paragraph from Cantu, with a second close quotation mark, it is clearly a comment of the author, which the printer (or author) inadvertently included in the quoted paragraph. Hence, to avoid confusion, I have separated it, even in the Spanish, from the quoted paragraph.

26. *Cursus juris canonici, hispanici at indici* (2 vols., Madrid 1743). This work by Father Murillo Velarde, for many years professor of canon law at the University of San Ignacio in Manila, went through many editions and was still being used at the University of Santo Tomás during the time of Burgos's studies there (Villarreal 1971, 63).

27. Mercury was the Roman god of the sun; Minerva, the goddess of wisdom.

This learned man deduces from all this that our preeminence over the Negro does not depend on any innate superiority of intelligence but only on education.²⁵

In proof of this well-founded and well-demonstrated opinion, we ask the writer of the article to read the precious letter of Señor Don Francisco López de Adán, formerly *oidor decano* of this Royal Audiencia, written to Rev. Fr. Pedro Murillo Velarde, who printed it at the beginning of his work, *Cursus Juris Canonici*.²⁶ In it he will see that the capacity, intelligence, and talent of the Filipino were admired and exalted by that wise magistrate, so that he was led to say: "he seemed to find himself not in the Indies and the Philippines, where Mercury is the ruling deity, but in the universities of Europe where Minerva is enthroned."²⁷

The Filipino Count gave the same assurance to Don Fernando VII, the father of our august Queen (May God keep her), in the dedication to His Majesty of his book entitled *Parnaso Filipino*.²⁸ He said:

Such is the progress of the sciences in this Spanish part of Asia that, simply reading the solemn annals of its universities, one will find thousands of students registered: more than 700 doctors and masters in the Jesuit and Thomistic schools, many registered lawyers, canons, one archbishop of this capital. Finally, even the pure Indios, without any mixture of Spanish blood, have produced great men, such as a certain Máximo, who was parish priest of Manila; a Saguinsin, of the town of Quiapo; a Rodríguez of that of Marikina; and an Espeleta, who was bishop of Cebu, interim governor, captain-general, and president of this Royal Audiencia.²⁹

28. Rodríguez Varela 1814. The author, a criollo, styled himself "El Conde Filipino." His extravagant pretensions in this period of unrest in Manila, concomitant with the revolutions of Spanish America, led to his being sent off to Spain in 1824. His book was principally a defense of the criollos, or *españoles filipinos*, and quite absurd in its claims. See Retana 1894, 3:1317, no. 3577.

29. In the 1889 pamphlet, a number of other outstanding Filipinos—including one apparent layman, [Tomás] Pinpin—are added, presumably by Rizal, whose constant concern was to exalt the great Filipinos of the past, and who possessed the historical knowledge to identify such. Espeleta, however, was not an indio but a criollo.

«Ocuparíamos mucho papel si hubiéramos de formar nomenclatura de los hombres sabios que dio esta pequeña ciudad de Manila, de entre los cuales descuella el Ilmo. Sr. Dr. y maestro D. Manuel José Endaya y Haro, que fue canónigo de la catedral de Cuenca, e inmediatamente de la de Santiago, cuyas bulas le fueron otorgadas por Inocencio IX, sin costo alguno en atención a sus grandes méritos. Con el título de conde de Noreña, fue obispo de Oviedo y de la Puebla de los Ángeles y arzobispo de Méjico. Convocado por la santidad de Benedicto XIII para el concilio Lateranense, concurrió en él como obispo asistente al Supremo Pontificio Solio y Prelado doméstico del Sacro Colegio, títulos que le dió Su Santidad como los de embajador de los dominios de España en Roma.»³⁰

En la serie cronológica de obispos en estas islas, hallarían también si quieren ver, los nombres de varios filipinos, de entre los cuales recordamos solamente los Ilustrísimos Sres. Dr. D. Francisco Pizarro de Orellana, Dr. D. Domingo Valencia, Dr. D. Gerónimo de Herrera, Dr. D. Felipe de Molina, maestro D. Protasio Cabezas, D. Isidoro Arévalo y D. Ignacio Salamanca; no habiendo ejercido esta alta dignidad por renuncia los Sres. Dr. D. José Cabral, cura que fue de Balayan, en Batangas, D. Rodrigo de la Cueva Girón y D. Tomás Cazañas, deán de esta santa iglesia catedral.³¹ Y en la primitiva Compañía de Jesús en estas Islas, la dieron también esplendor varios sacerdotes filipinos, notables por su saber y virtud, cuyos nombres sentimos no recordar en estos momentos, pudiendo únicamente citar a un tal Pedro Vello, *provincial* que fue de aquel nunca bien celebrado instituto.³²

Y si en nuestros días no vemos descollar más filipinos en las ciencias, atribúyase no a influencias de clima, ni mucho menos de raza, sino al desaliento que de algunos años a esta parte se ha apoderado de los

30. In fact, Bishop Hendaya seems to have been neither bishop of Puebla nor archbishop of Mexico. See Abella 1957, 223–34. The Lateran Council referred to was not one of the ecumenical councils, but a Roman council.

Here again the printer has inadvertently placed quotation marks on what are obviously the words of the author.

31. All of these bishops were, of course, *criollos*. See the series of articles of Domingo Abella (1959, 1960, 1962, 1963) on the bishops of the Philippines in *Philippine Studies*.

We would take up a great deal of paper if we were to draw up a list of the learned men that this little city of Manila has produced. Among them there stands out the illustrious Dr. Don Manuel José Endaya y Haro, who was canon of the cathedral of Cuenca, and immediately after that, one of Santiago, whose bulls were granted to him by Innocent IX without cost in view of his great merits. With the title of Count of Noreña he was bishop of Oviedo, and of Puebla de los Ángeles and archbishop of Mexico. Summoned by His Holiness Benedict XIII to the Lateran Council, he took part in it as bishop assisting at the Supreme Pontifical Throne and domestic prelate of the Sacred College, titles that His Holiness gave him, as well as those of ambassador in Rome of the dominions of Spain.³⁰

In the chronological series of bishops in these Islands, one who wishes to see will find the names of various Filipinos, among whom we recall only those of their Illustrious Lordships, Dr. D. Francisco Pizarro de Orellana, Dr. D. Domingo Valencia, Dr. D. Gerónimo de Herrera, Dr. D. Felipe de Molina, Master D. Protasio Cabezas, D. Isidoro Arévalo, and D. Ignacio Salamanca. In addition, there are those who have not exercised this lofty dignity because of their having renounced it: their Lordships Dr. D. José Cabral, parish priest of Balayan, Batangas; D. Rodrigo de la Cueva Girón, and D. Tomás Cazañas, dean of this holy cathedral.³¹ And in the primitive Society of Jesus in these Islands various renowned Filipino priests likewise gave it splendor by their knowledge and virtue. Unfortunately, we do not recall their names at this moment and are only able to cite a certain Fr. Pedro Vello, who was provincial of that never sufficiently praised institute.³²

If in our days we do not see more Filipinos outstanding in learning, let this not be attributed to the influence of the climate nor much less to that of race, but rather to the discouragement that for some years

32. No such person named Pedro Vello is known to have been provincial of the Jesuits. There was a Francisco Vello, procurator of the Philippine Jesuits in the seventeenth century, who published a petition to the king (Pardo de Tavera 1903, 426, no. 2771). Two paragraphs are inserted here in the 1889 version, naming outstanding Filipino lawyers in addition to the clergy named in the previous paragraphs.

jóvenes por la falta casi absoluta de estímulo. Porque, en efecto, ¿qué joven se esmerará todavía en sobresalir en la ciencia del derecho o de la teología no vislumbrando en el porvenir más que oscuridad e indiferencia? ¿qué filipino aspirará aún a ser sabio y consagrará a este objetivo sus desvelos, viendo que sus sentimientos más nobles se marchitan bajo la deletérea influencia del desdén y del olvido, y sabiendo que son para él fruto vedado los empleos honoríficos y lucrativos?

Pero así y todo, en medio de ese desaliento, el clero secular [actual] de Filipinas no ha desmerecido del antiguo, y cuenta en el día con individuos que lo honran, tanto con su saber e instrucción como por su virtud, celo en el cumplimiento de sus deberes y abnegación, y contra los cuales nada hallara que decir la calumnia más procaz. Nos referimos a los señores chantre y doctoral de esta iglesia catedral, a los dignos provisosores de los obispados de Camarines y Cebú, a los párrocos de Santa Cruz y la Ermita en la provincia de Manila, a los de Boac y Mocpog en la de Mindoro, a los de Mariquina y San Mateo en Moron, a los de Calamba y Tunazán en la Laguna, a los de Rosario y Taisan en Batangas, a los de Bacoor y de Naic, de Maragondon y de San Roque [.] de Rosario (a) Salinas y Bailen en la de Cavite, debiendo llamar la atención este último por su actividad, que con ser no más que interino y su parroquia de creación muy reciente, ha conseguido en medio de la pobreza de aquel nuevo curato levantar y tener concluidas la iglesia y su casa parroquial, fomentando a la vez que la cría del ganado vacuno, la agricultura, particularmente del café, desconocida anteriormente en aquellos bosques. ¿Y qué diremos del párroco de Lubao en la Pampanga? Es muy reciente aún la abnegación de ese respetable anciano, que para la fundación de un colegio de instrucción primaria y latinidad aplicó la suma de diez y ocho mil pesos, fruto de cuarenta años de fatigas en el ministerio parroquial. No nos detendremos ya en elogiar el generoso desprendimiento del penúltimo cura de Antipolo, el finado D. Hermenegildo Narciso, que ha invertido todas sus economías, que forman una suma respetable, en embellecer su iglesia de una manera que han admirado desde la primera autoridad de la isla hasta el último de cuantos han visitado aquel celebre santuario antes del memorable terremoto que con horror recordamos aun. Empero no podemos prescindir de hacer especial mención de los ya dichos curas de Naic y

now has taken possession of the youth, because of the almost total lack of incentive. For, as a matter of fact, what young man will still make efforts to excel in the knowledge of law or of theology if he does not see in the future anything but obscurity and indifference? What Filipino will still aspire to be learned and consecrate his efforts to this goal, seeing that his most noble aspirations wither away under the lethal influence of scorn and obscurity, and knowing that honorable and lucrative offices are for him forbidden fruit?

Nevertheless, in spite of everything, in the midst of that discouragement, the contemporary secular clergy of the Philippines has not been unworthy of its predecessors. It counts today with individuals that honor it as much by their knowledge and learning as by their virtue, zeal in the fulfillment of their duties, and selflessness. Omitting those who hold various positions in the capital and suburbs, since they are well known to all, we refer to, among others, the worthy provisors of the dioceses of Camarines and Cebu, the deserving parish priests of Boac and Mogpog in the province of Mindoro [Marinduque], the parish priests of Marikina and San Mateo in Morong, those of Calamba and Tunasan in Laguna, those of Rosario and Taysan in Batangas, those of Bacoor, of Naic, of Maragondon, of San Roque, of Rosario (a) Salinas, and of Bailen in the province of Cavite. The latter deserves special attention for his activity, since even though only an interim parish priest—and his parish is of very recent foundation—nevertheless he has succeeded, in spite of the poverty of that new parish, in erecting and having completed the church and the convento. At the same time, he has encouraged cattle raising and agriculture, in particular the cultivation of coffee, previously unknown in those forested areas. Moreover, what shall we say of the parish priest of Lubao, Pampanga? The selflessness of that respectable old man is still fresh in our minds, since, for the foundation of a school of primary education and of Latinity, he applied the sum of 18,000 pesos, the fruit of forty years in the labor of the parish ministry. We will not delay now in praising the generous altruism of the second-last parish priest of Antipolo, the deceased D. Hermenegildo Narciso, who invested all of his savings—a respectable amount—in beautifying his church in a fashion that everyone has admired, from the first authority of the Islands to the least who visited

Salinas; el primero por sostener a espensas suyas dos escuelas de párvulos en su pobre parroquia, cuyos rendimientos apenas bastan a cubrir sus necesidades, y haber levantado y concluido una hermosa casa parroquial a pesar de la escasez de los fondos de su iglesia; y el segundo por haber asimismo construido a costa suya la casa parroquial, y contribuido no sólo con su laboriosidad, sino también con su propio peculio a la fábrica de la iglesia, que es de mampostería.³³ En fin, sería molesto el enumerar los individuos del clero secular que a ejemplo de estos merecen bien de la Iglesia y del Estado por sus importantes servicios y por la inteligencia, celo y honradez con que desempeñan sus respectivos cargos a satisfacción de sus superiores. Hay y habrá siempre excepciones; empero estas no destruyen una verdad, en cuya comprobación ahí están los testimonios que se acaban de citar y pudieran citarse aún.³⁴

«El arzobispo de Manila, continúa, hace una guerra injusta al clero regular que tantos servicios tiene prestados a la civilización y a nuestra patria.»

¡Acusación falsa! ¿Cómo y cuándo este señor arzobispo ha hecho una guerra injusta al clero regular? ¿En qué? Todos los que aquí conocemos a este señor y estamos al corriente de sus actos, no sabemos de alguno que tienda a inferir a aquél ningún agravio.

«Sólo a una imaginación poco privilegiada puede ocurrírsele la idea de dividir los curatos, creando otros servidos por jesuitas o clérigos indígenas.»

33. All of these priests here named, together with their accomplishments, are repeated in the 1889 version without change, since Rizal was no doubt ignorant of who the outstanding Filipino clergy at that time might be. Certainly the great majority of those praised were dead, and their parishes had presumably been turned over to the Recollects. Hence, the examples were quite irrelevant in 1889. However, at least Dr. D. Vicente García, the *provisor* (diocesan ecclesiastical judge) in 1864 of Camarines (Nueva Cáceres), though retired, was still alive, and in 1889 wrote a nuanced defense of Rizal's *Noli me tângere*, combating the 1888 condemnatory pamphlets of Fr. José Rodríguez, O.S.A. Though the old priest was willing to send his defense to Rodríguez, or even have it published over his own name, he was persuaded to let it be published for his own safety under the pseudonym V. Caraig (a not very subtle anagram of his real

that celebrated sanctuary before the unforgettable earthquake we still recall with horror. But we cannot omit making special mention of the previously cited parish priests of Naic and Salinas. The first deserves mention for supporting at his own expense two primary schools in his poor parish, whose resources were scarcely sufficient to cover his needs, and for having built and finished a beautiful church in spite of the lack of funds. The second deserves mention for having likewise built the convento at his own expense and contributed with his diligence and with his own private funds to the construction of his church made of brick.³³

To sum up, it would be wearisome to enumerate the individuals of the secular clergy who, following the example of these priests, deserve well of the Church and the State for their important services, and for the intelligence, zeal, and integrity with which they discharge their respective responsibilities, to the satisfaction of their superiors. There are, and there will always be, exceptions. Nevertheless, these do not destroy a truth that the testimonies just cited above, and still others that we could cite, prove to be accurate.³⁴

The article continues: "The archbishop of Manila is making an unjust war on the regular clergy, who have rendered so many services to civilization and to our country."

False accusation! How and when has this archbishop made an unjust war on the regular clergy? In what regard? All those here who know this man and are acquainted with his acts know of nothing that tends to cause any grievance to that clergy.

"Only to a deficient imagination could the idea occur of dividing the parishes, creating others served by the Jesuits or native priests."

name) in *La Solidaridad*, 31 March 1890. Rizal was overjoyed at the news, declaring: "To have an old man at my side like that is to believe that I am not in opposition to the spirit of my country," and wrote him an eloquent and grateful letter on how important it was for his generation to learn from their elders (Schumacher 1997, 100, 241; Rizal 1930–1938, 2:51; 3:136–37; 5:331–32).

34. A lengthy paragraph is inserted here in the 1889 pamphlet, challenging the Recollects to compete fairly with the secular clergy in the competitive examinations (*oposiciones*) for appointment to the parishes. The secular clergy would be satisfied with this.

Ya caemos en lo que llaman guerra injusta. Sabemos ya ahora por dónde les duela a los regulares. Verdaderamente que este señor arzobispo les hace una guerra injusta con su pretendida división de curatos, atacando sus intereses pecuniarios; pues al adoptar esa medida, por más justa y de apremiante necesidad que fuese, debía tener en cuenta que los curas regulares, que son los que tienen los más pingües curatos, sufrirán una baja considerable en sus rentas. Porque claro es que, dividido uno de aquellos curatos de veinte, treinta o cuarenta mil almas, en dos, tres o cuatro, como pensó hacerlo inspirado por su celo pastoral, dejarán ya de percibir los referidos curas, los seis, ocho o diez mil duros que perciben al año. Y de ahí el juego de cubilettes, haciéndose presentar victimas pobres y resignadas de este señor arzobispo.

«Llamamos de nuevo la atención del señor ministro de Ultramar sobre la importante cuestión que se agita hoy en Filipinas promovida por el señor arzobispo sobre la provisión de curatos a favor de los clérigos indígenas, postergando al clero regular.»

¡Con que este señor arzobispo posterga al clero regular en la provisión de curatos!³⁵ ¿Cuándo y qué curato les ha quitado a los frailes para darlo a los clérigos? ¿No es, por el contrario, reciente el despojo que éstos han sufrido del de Antipolo, que los padres Recoletos se han empeñado en tomarlo para sí, y lo consiguieron, mal que pesó a este mismo señor arzobispo? En la división de algunos de sus curatos, llevada a cabo hasta aquí a solicitud de los mismos pueblos, ¿han entrado acaso los clérigos a ocupar los nuevos curatos, a no ser interinamente y a petición de los propios prelados regulares por no tener frailes súbditos de qué echar mano? Y en la razonada exposición que elevara este señor arzobispo al trono, en la que hacia presente a S. M. la necesidad y conveniencia de dividir los grandes curatos (cosa muy justa y urgente, por cierto), para poder los curas atender con mayor solicitud a sus feligreses, y éstos no verse privados, como se ven en el día, de los socorros espirituales, particularmente estando enfermos, que no pocas veces mueren sin los Sacramentos, ya por vivir en barrios distantes donde no los alcanza con

35. In the 1889 pamphlet one sentence is inserted here, accusing the Recollects of lying.

Now we come to understand what they call an unjust war. Now we know just where the regulars feel pain. Truly, the archbishop is making an unjust war against them with his intended division of parishes, thus attacking their financial interests. For, in adopting that measure, no matter how just and how urgently necessary it would be, he should have taken into account the fact that the regular parish priests are those with the wealthiest parishes and will suffer a considerable drop in their revenues. For it is clear that dividing one of the parishes of 20, 30, or 40 thousand souls into two, three, or four, as he thought of doing under the inspiration of his pastoral zeal, the abovementioned parish priests would cease receiving the six, eight, or ten thousand pesos they receive each year. From this comes the conjuring trick of presenting themselves as poor and resigned victims of this archbishop.

“Once again we call the attention of the overseas minister to the important question today being debated in the Philippines at the instigation of the archbishop, concerning the bestowal of parishes on the native secular priests in preference to the regular clergy.”

So then, this archbishop passes over the regular clergy in filling the parishes!³⁵ When, and what parish, has he taken away from the friars to give it to the secular clergy? On the contrary, is it not just recently that the latter have suffered being dispossessed of the parish of Antipolo? Have not the Recollect Fathers made every effort to take this for themselves, much as it caused pain to this same archbishop? In the division of some of their parishes, carried out up to now because of the petition of the towns themselves, have any secular clergy entered to take over the new parishes except as interim parish priest, and at the petition of the religious superiors themselves, who did not have any friar subject to dispose of?

Moreover, in the well-reasoned exposition that the archbishop elevated to the Throne, he informs Her Majesty of the necessity and advisability of dividing the large parishes (a just and urgent matter certainly), so that the parish priest can attend to the faithful with greater solicitude, and the latter might not see themselves, as they do at present, deprived of spiritual assistance. This is especially true of the sick who frequently die without the sacraments, either because they live in distant barrios, so that the priest who goes to hear their confessions, having to make a

vida el sacerdote que va a confesarlos, por tener que andar una jornada de cinco o seis horas; ya también porque obligados por los curas, como con tanta inhumanidad se ve practicar en algunos pueblos, a ser trasladados en hamacas desde sus casas a la iglesia, o bien espiran en el camino, o bien mueren como paganos en sus mismas casas, por no haber quienes les lleven o no tener con que costear su conducción. En esa exposición, repetimos, ¿se pedía acaso para el clero secular los nuevos curatos? ¿No se proponía allí mismo el ensanche de los actuales colegios de misiones en la península, o el establecimiento de otros cuatro noviciados en diferentes puntos para poder admitirse mayor número de frailes destinados a ocupar los nuevos curatos de estas islas? Si no estamos mal informados, en esa exposición que se acaba de citar no se pedía para el clero secular más que la conservación de los pocos o muy reducidos que le quedaron y posee en el día. Y esto ¿es por ventura «querer arrojar a los regulares del desempeño de las parroquias, sustituyendo al cura regular español, por el cura indígena»? Se dirá acaso que allí también se proponía el ensanche del Seminario conciliar para la educación de mayor número de jóvenes indígenas que aspiran al sacerdocio, pero ¿se ignora acaso que el destino de esos jóvenes no es más que ser esclavos de los frailes? ¿Pueden tener otra aspiración los más de esos jóvenes que se eduquen en el Seminario, que la de ser coadjutores? ¿Qué motivos hay, pues, para achacar al señor arzobispo como le achacan, de que está ofuscado por unas tendencias que no están en consonancia con la rectitud que debe regir a sus acciones, y de haber tenido la desgracia de declararse enemigo del clero regular?³⁶ ¡Lo que trabaja la maledicencia para desprestigiar a este prelado! Y todo no es más que por ser clérigo contra quien, tan luego como se supo aquí su nombramiento, se conjuraron los frailes en tales términos que a algunos de ellos se ha oído decir que el nuevo arzobispo no ocupará por mucho tiempo la Sede arzobispal: *intelligenti pauca*.

36. In the 1889 version, the following two sentences are omitted and three harsher ones are inserted, calling for the expulsion of the friars, as that “never sufficiently praised” Archbishop Sancho de Santa Justa y Rufina had said. The

journey of five to six hours, does not reach them before they die. Worse, in some towns the inhuman practice exists, imposed by the parish priests, of having to carry the sick in hammocks from their houses to the church. As a result, they either die on the way, or die like pagans in their own house if they do not have anyone to carry them, or do not have the means to pay for their being brought to the church. In that exposition of the archbishop, we repeat, did he ask that the new parishes be given to the secular clergy? Did he not propose in that very document the enlargement of the existing mission colleges in the Peninsula, or the establishment of four other novitiates in different places, so as to admit a larger number of friars destined to occupy the new parishes of these Islands? If we are correctly informed, in that exposition just cited nothing more was asked for the secular clergy than the preservation of the few or very small parishes that remain to them and which they possess at the present time. Is this, perchance, "to wish to expel the religious from the charge of the parishes, substituting for the Spanish religious clergy the native parish priests"?

Perhaps someone might reply that the same exposition likewise made a proposal to enlarge the conciliar seminary for the education of a larger number of young natives who aspire to the priesthood. But is it not known that the future of these young men is none other than to be the slaves of the friars? Can the majority of these young men who are educated in the seminary have any other aspiration than that of being coadjutors? What motives are there, then, to accuse the archbishop, as they do, of "being deceived by certain tendencies that are not in consonance with the rectitude that should rule his actions, and of having had the misfortune of declaring himself an enemy of the regular clergy?"³⁶ What efforts slander makes to discredit this prelate! And all of it with no more reason than that he is a member of the secular clergy. As soon as his appointment was known here, the friars conspired together against him to such an extent that some of them have been heard to say that the new archbishop will not occupy for long the archiepiscopal See: *intelligenti pauca* [Few words are needed for one who understands].

archbishop, of course, had been a mortal enemy of the religious orders in his time (1767–1787).

«Es sabido y está reconocido por todos los que conocen el Archipiélago Filipino que éste debe su desarrollo, su civilización, su progreso y sus adelantos a los constantes desvelos del clero regular español.»

¡Hola! ¿Con que para nada ha tenido que ver el gobierno con la civilización, progreso y adelantos de este país? Ahora salimos de duda. Muchas gracias, señor articulista.³⁷ Pero, en justa correspondencia, séanos también permitido consignar aquí nuestra opinión sobre el particular; y la vamos a decir para que la sepa la nación. Los frailes son en este país la rémora constante de todo el progreso moral y material del mismo y de sus habitantes. En prueba de ello, recórranse dichos pueblos, y se observará con admiración la mas completa ignorancia en que están del idioma castellano, a pesar de las repetidas reales órdenes y cédulas que desde muy antiguo se han venido expidiendo por los monarcas, mandando o recomendando la enseñanza de aquel idioma para que se generalice entre los indios; las que nunca han tenido efecto, por haberlas frustrado con maña los frailes, como están frustrando el nuevo plan de instrucción primaria, mandado plantear últimamente aquí.³⁸ Hay, sin embargo, entre los mismos honrosas excepciones, curas ejemplarísimos, tales son el agustino de Tondo, el dominico de Binondo, el franciscano de Pandacan, el recoletano de Pollok, y algunos otros no sólo intachables, sino edificantes de que se puede hacer mención, incluyendo entre estos a la mayor parte de los dominicos, gracias a la clausura de sus casas parroquiales y a otras circunstancias de esa orden. Y nos complacemos en rendir a la verdad este homenaje en prueba de nuestra imparcialidad.³⁹

Pero tan excesiva importancia se les ha dado y se les da aún que, arrogantes, no tienen reparo en asegurar por medio de su órgano *La Verdad*, que a ellos solos debe el país todo lo bueno que tiene, sin atribuir nada al gobierno.⁴⁰

37. At this point in the Basa pamphlet, several sentences derogatory to the friars are interpolated, coming from their other mortal enemy of the eighteenth century, Gov.-Gen. Simón de Anda.

38. In place of this denunciation of the friars for their opposition to teaching Filipinos Spanish, the 1889 pamphlet has a lengthy accusation of several paragraphs to the effect that they have done so in order to foment fanaticism and to hide their own crimes and scandals, again making use of calumnious accusations from Anda.

“It is well known and recognized by all who know the Philippine Archipelago that it owes its development, its civilization, its progress, and its advancement to the unceasing labors of the Spanish regular clergy.”

Come now! Are we to say that the government had nothing to do with the civilization, the progress, and the advancement of this country? Now we are no longer in doubt. Thank you very much, *Señor* writer.³⁷ But as a deserved answer, let us also be permitted to set down our opinion on the matter; and we want to tell it so that the nation may know. In this country, the friars are the constant obstacle to all the moral and material progress of the country and of its inhabitants. In proof of this, travel through these towns, and one will see with amazement the most complete ignorance which they are in of the Castilian language, in spite of the repeated royal orders and *cédulas* that the king has been dispatching, commanding or recommending the teaching of that language so that it may become widespread among the indios. Never have these had any effect because they have been astutely frustrated by the friars, just as they are at present frustrating the new plan of instruction that was recently ordered to be implanted here.³⁸ There are, however, honorable exceptions that can be mentioned, such as the Augustinian priest of Tondo, the Dominican of Binondo, the Franciscan of Pandacan, the Recollect of Pollok, and some others who are not only irreproachable but edifying. Among the latter we include the majority of Dominicans, thanks to the cloister of their parish houses and to other circumstances of that order. We are happy to render this homage to the truth, in proof of our impartiality.³⁹

But such excessive importance has been given them, and still is, that in their arrogance they do not hesitate to assure us through their organ, *La Verdad*, that they are the only ones to whom the country owes all the good it has, without attributing anything to the government.⁴⁰

39. In the 1889 version, this passage, conceding praiseworthy exceptions to the preceding denunciation, omits all reference to individual friars, but retains the exemption of the Dominicans from the general denunciation.

40. In the 1889 version, there follows a lengthy denunciation of friar wealth, which makes them unworthy of government encouragement and protection.

La pérdida de estas islas,⁴¹ las ideas de emancipación que con porfiada insistencia se han estado vertiendo en las columnas del periódico tantas veces citado, y de algún otro de su partido,⁴² no son más que un artificio con el que pretenden los mismos asustar al gobierno e inducirlo a que los juzgue necesarios en el país para su conservación. Nada hay más distante de nuestra imaginación que esas ideas, porque conocemos y sabemos muy bien que fuera del nombre español y de la bandera que nos cobija, nada seremos, y quizás peor que la nada misma; porque no ignoramos que emancipados de la magnánima y generosa nación española, este país será entregado a la más completa anarquía, ó será esclavo de la dura dominación del extranjero, que espía con ávida mirada el momento de poder echar sus garras sobre este codiciado suelo. En nuestro interés, pues, está el sostenerla, amparándonos bajo su sombra, grande protectora y eminentemente civilizadora. Así lo hemos probado en el entusiasmo con que rechazamos la invasión inglesa, en cuyo triste y lamentable periodo hemos demostrado en fidelidad lo que podemos y somos.

La pérdida, repetimos, de estas islas ó su emancipación de la madre patria, si algún día llegase, que no lo deseamos, no será ciertamente por falta de adhesión de sus naturales a la nación, a la que se reconocen deudores de todos los beneficios que disfrutaban en el día. Podrán sí, dar lugar a aquella desgracia que lamentaremos en el fondo de nuestro corazón las injusticias, la excesiva centralización de todo y en todos los ramos de la administración, la exclusiva tan odiosa como irritante hasta para los destinos más subalternos, y la protección tan decidida que de algunos años a esta parte viene el gobierno otorgando a los frailes en perjuicio de ciertos derechos.⁴³

41. From this point on, the 1889 version has two lengthy paragraphs, using a different argumentation, to the effect that the separation of the Philippines is not possible for various reasons. Moreover, it adds that all the minor revolts that have taken place in the nineteenth century, which the friars use as proofs of their own necessity as parish priests, have taken place in friar-administered towns. Besides, these have all been put down without difficulty.

42. This was *La Regeneración*, likewise subsidized by the Recollect commissary-procurator, Fr. Guillermo Agudo (Uy 1984, 103, n. 70).

The loss of these Islands,⁴¹ the ideas of emancipation, which with obstinate persistence they have been hammering at in the columns of that repeatedly cited newspaper as well as in a certain other one of their party,⁴² are nothing more than a trick with which they aim to frighten the government and lead it to judge them necessary for the preservation of the country. There is nothing further from our imagination than those ideas of theirs. For we know and understand very well that, away from the Spanish name and from the flag that waves over us, we will be nothing, and perhaps worse than nothing. For we are not unaware that, once emancipated from the magnanimous and generous Spanish nation, the country would be handed over to the most complete anarchy, or would be a slave under the harsh rule of the foreigner who looks with greedy eyes for the moment in which he can lay his claws on our coveted soil. It is to our own interest, then, to uphold that flag, sheltering ourselves under its great shadow, a source of protection and of the highest culture. We have proved this in the enthusiasm with which we resisted the English invasion. During this sad and lamentable period, we have shown by our loyalty what we can be and are.

We repeat, the loss of these Islands or their emancipation from the Mother Country, if it should some day come about, something we do not desire, will certainly not be due to lack of adherence of its natives to the nation, for they acknowledge themselves debtors to it for all the benefits they enjoy today. The causes that indeed can be an occasion for the disaster that we would lament in the depth of our heart are the injustices, the excessive centralization of everything and in every branch of the administration, the monopoly, as odious as it is irritating, of even the most subordinate government positions, and the resolute protection that, for some years now, the government goes on giving to the friars to the detriment of certain rights.⁴³

43. The insertion among the grievances of the clergy of the complaint that positions in the government bureaucracy were being monopolized by peninsulars in an ever more centralized administration is an indication of the participation of lawyers in drawing up the manifesto. The following paragraph is a further indication, for it was in 1837 that the Philippines was excluded from the Spanish Cortes, and governed thenceforth by special laws, denying them the liberal reforms of the Peninsula.

Españoles por convicción y sentimientos, aunque filipinos por nacimiento,⁴⁴ deploramos los errores y la política torcida, que con respecto a estas provincias han observado desde el año 36 los diferentes gobiernos que se han ido sucediendo desde entonces.⁴⁵

Si prevaleciendo desgraciadamente los sofismas de *La Verdad*, el gobierno no tiende una mano protectora al clero secular de este país y lo levanta del abatimiento en que hoy día yace, cercenando algún tanto la protección que dispensa a los frailes en beneficio del mismo; si en lugar de crear estímulos para los jóvenes que aspiran al sacerdocio se ha de continuar mostrándoles un porvenir oscuro y sombrío ¿qué sucederá? La pronta extinción del clero secular que ya principia a dejarse sentir, porque apenas hay ya quienes se presenten a vestir los hábitos, que es precisamente el fin a que tienden las declamaciones de aquel periódico, para así dejar seguros a sus patrocinados en la pacífica posesión de sus curatos, contra la cual nada se podrá entonces objetar, porque tendrán aquellos de su parte el privilegio convertido en derecho por falta de presbíteros seculares que los sirvan.

Con esto nada gana la nación. El tiempo dirá lo que pierde. Sin los clérigos no tendrá el gobierno para sus miras ulteriores el preciso equilibrio o un punto de apoyo. Porque si teniendo a éstos, se atreven los frailes a darse una desmedida importancia, haciéndose creer

44. This sentence has to be understood in the sense of the Spanish distinction between *patria grande* and *patria chica*. It may be seen clearly today, even within the Peninsula, where particularly Catalans, moderate Basques, Gallegos—with varying degrees of intensity—identify themselves first with their *patria chica*, with their language, culture, and autonomous governments, but, except for the Basque extremists of ETA, consider themselves part of the *patria grande*, España. Despite the judicial murders and exiles perpetrated by Izquierdo in 1872, those criollos, Spanish or Chinese mestizos, and indios—who were beginning to identify themselves as “Filipinos” in the decades before 1872—were, with the rarest exceptions, seeking equal rights with peninsular Spaniards, not separation from the *Madre Patria*, which was Spain. Since the unification of Spain under Fernando and Isabel in the fifteenth century, Spain had always recognized various *reinos* (kingdoms) within the Spanish Empire. Hence, this sentence must be understood in that sense. When that equality continued to be denied, the nationalists of the last decade or two of the century would think in terms of independence, immediate or gradual. If one wants to call “nationalists” only those

Spaniards by conviction and by sentiments, although Filipinos by birth,⁴⁴ we deplore the errors and the distorted policy that since the year 1836 has been observed with respect to these provinces by the different governments that have gone on succeeding each other since then.⁴⁵

If, unfortunately, the sophisms of *La Verdad* should prevail, and the government does not put forth a protecting hand to the secular clergy of this country and raise it up from the despondency in which it lies today, if the government does not limit to some extent the protection that it gives to the friars so as to favor the secular clergy, if instead of creating incentives for the young men who aspire to the priesthood the government is to continue showing them a dark and dismal future, what will happen? The prompt extinction of the secular clergy, which is already beginning to make itself felt. For there are already scarcely any who present themselves to don the priestly habit. This is precisely the goal toward which the invectives of that newspaper are directed. Thus, it will leave its patrons secure in the undisturbed possession of their parishes. No objection can then be made against this, because the latter from their part will have their privilege, now converted into a right, due to the lack of secular priests to serve the parishes.

The nation gains nothing with this. Time will tell what it loses. Without the secular clergy, the government will not have the necessary counterweight or point of support for its further objectives. For if, while the secular clergy exists, the friars dare to give themselves such immense importance, making people believe them necessary even to the point of

who advocated immediate independence, we cannot speak of nationalism in the 1860s—perhaps only of “protonationalism.” But that is to ignore the history of the Spanish—and the Filipino—nation. Hence, when we speak of “Filipinos” in this article, we mean all those born in the country, of whatever ethnicity, who called and considered themselves Filipinos.

45. The 1889 pamphlet omits this entire paragraph. By this time Rizal, at least, and others of his colleagues, no longer looked on themselves as being Spaniards, certainly not indefinitely, and eventual independence was already in their minds. See, e.g., Schumacher 1997, 259; 1991, 91–101. Since Basa would later issue a manifesto calling for an American protectorate or outright annexation by the United States rather than independence for the Philippines, we may quite certainly attribute this deliberate omission to Rizal.

necesarios hasta la exageración, luego que aquellos falten... la consecuencia es obvia.

Si como medio de sostener en este Archipiélago el prestigio español y de conservar estas provincias en la obediencia a la Corona de España, se cree necesario tener al frente de los curatos sacerdotes españoles, fúndense enhorabuena seminarios en la península y háganse venir clérigos de allá,⁴⁶ y en el ínterin pueden continuar los mismos frailes, pero secularizados antes, y privándoles de sus pingües haciendas, que deben pasar a poder del Estado, y teniéndolos a sueldo como a los demás servidores del Estado, y como a los virtuosos y desinteresados padres jesuitas, a quienes no sabemos porqué, miran con cierto recelo o prevención.⁴⁷

Porque la conservación de los institutos monásticos con sus señoríos y haciendas en pleno siglo XIX es contraria a las exigencias de la época, es una anomalía que solamente una imaginación fácil y extraviada no [*sic*] puede concebir. Hubo, es verdad, hubo tiempo en que los frailes de aquí fueron puestos en el Olimpo, donde se burlaban seguros de los vientos de la contradicción, porque se los creía idolatrados de los naturales, y los únicos capaces de sostener los derechos nacionales. Pero este tiempo ya pasó como el de las ilusiones, y viéndose ya las cosas tales como son en sí, sabiéndose que, lejos de sostenerse la Metrópoli por los frailes, son estos sostenidos por la fuerza material de aquella,⁴⁸ no debe quedarles otra consideración que la de clérigos españoles, regidos como los demás del estado eclesiástico por las leyes generales de la Iglesia y del reino, sin

46. The author was well aware that it was unlikely that Spanish secular priests would come to take parishes in the Philippines, for even those who came to occupy prestigious and lucrative positions in the cathedral chapter most often saw this as a step to a similar, and more lucrative, position in the Peninsula. The suggestion, however, was made by the archbishop to be able to divide the enormous parishes, but received no attention from the Spanish government. But here the pretended welcome served to distract attention from the fact that the secular clergy were almost identical to the native clergy.

47. The 1889 version develops the ideas here at great length, amplifying the alleged enormous wealth of the friars and asserting the need that the government should confiscate it. On one hand, it portrays the confiscation as a means of restoring the orders to their original fervor, a result for which supposedly

exaggeration, then when the secular clergy should be lacking . . . the consequence is obvious.

If it is believed necessary to have at the head of the parishes Spanish priests as a means of upholding Spanish prestige in this archipelago and of preserving these provinces in obedience to the Crown of Spain, by all means let seminaries be founded in the Peninsula, and let secular priests come from there and be welcome.⁴⁶ In the meantime, the friars themselves can continue, but secularized first, and deprived of their rich haciendas, which should pass to the authority of the State. They should be kept on a salary like the other servants of the State, and like the virtuous and detached Jesuit Fathers. We do not know why they look on the latter with a certain suspicion or prejudice.⁴⁷

For the preservation of the monastic institutes, with their estates and haciendas in the midst of the nineteenth century, is contrary to the exigencies of the age. Only a superficial and distorted mind can conceive such an anomaly. There was, it is true, there was a time when the friars here were placed on the heights of Olympus from which they scoffed, secure from the winds of contradiction, because it was believed that they were idolized by the natives and were the only ones capable of upholding the rights of the nation. However, that time has already passed, as the time of delusions. Now, seeing things as they are in reality, we know that, far from the nation being sustained by the friars, it is they who are sustained by the material force of the nation.⁴⁸ Hence, no other consideration should be given them than that of Spanish secular priests, ruled as others of the ecclesiastical state are, by the general laws of the Church

they will be grateful. The encomium of the Jesuits, on the other hand, is considerably expanded, as a contrast to the friars. Both these amplifications are very likely the work of Rizal, who was at this time investigating the financial holdings of the Dominicans and Augustinians in Hong Kong (Rizal 1961, 142-43), and who still remained devoted to the Jesuits. The latter, of course, were not secularized, but were subsidized by the government since they had no other income, their *haciendas* having been confiscated in 1768 when they were expelled.

48. The Basa pamphlet inserts here a parenthetical remark that, were the friars not protected by the government, the Filipinos would drive them out, because of the harsh and insulting treatment they received from them. This was a constant theme of the Propaganda Movement.

esas exenciones y sin esos privilegios a cuya sombra se permiten cometer los mayores abusos y escándalos que la autoridad episcopal es impotente para corregir, y la civil o delegados del gobierno se ven precisados a transigir muchas veces, ora por no perder la amistad de tan ricos y poderosos vecinos, ora por no conciliarse la malquerencia de tan terribles enemigos y experimentar los efectos de su cólera, teniendo quizá presente, entre otros, un hecho gravísimo y muy funesto que nos ha transmitido la historia de este país,⁴⁹ cual es el asesinato en su mismo palacio del gobernador capitán general D. Fernando Bustamante Bustillo y Rueda con su hijo, en un motín que se fraguó en la iglesia de los padres Agustinos calzados, y en el que se viera a los frailes de todas las órdenes con Santos Cristos en las manos animar a los amotinados a gritos de ¡Viva la fe de Dios! ¡Viva la religión!

Sobre la inconveniencia de la existencia de las comunidades religiosas, tenemos de nuestra parte no sólo la opinión dominante hoy día, sino también al célebre Cantú ya nombrado, que dice en su citada historia lo siguiente:⁵⁰

«Es hereditario el sacerdocio de la tribu de Leví, debiendo ligarse el poder conservador a lo pasado por herencia. Asistido el Sumo Pontífice por los príncipes de los sacerdotes, resuelve todas las dudas que acerca de la interpretación de la ley pueden suscitarse. No obstante, el gobierno dista mucho de ser sacerdotal, y los sacerdotes no constituyen como entre los orientales una casta custodia privilegiada del saber y del culto. La tribu de Leví no tiene que transmitir misterios y fraudes; al revés, esta obligada a hacer conocer todos los libros de que es depositaria. Tampoco logra una acción directa en el gobierno; si debe a los diezmos una existencia holgada, no posee en propiedad provincia

49. Prior to repeating the hostile narration of the Bustamante episode, the 1889 pamphlet also attributes to the friars in general the arrest of Gov.-Gen. Diego Salcedo by the Augustinian Commissary of the Inquisition in 1663. Both incidents are referred to frequently, and in distorted form, in the antifriar writings of the Propaganda Movement.

50. Just prior to the citation from Cantú, the 1889 pamphlet has two lengthy paragraphs calling for (and ascribing to Cantú, whose ideas were quite different) the dissolution of the religious orders and the confiscation of their lands, as Spain had done in earlier dates in the nineteenth century. Likewise it attributes

and the realm, without those exceptions and those privileges under whose protection they allow themselves to commit the greatest abuses and scandals. These the episcopal authority is powerless to correct; and the civil authority, or delegates of the government, find themselves compelled to tolerate them many times, either so as not to lose the friendship of such rich and powerful neighbors, or so as not to bring on themselves the ill will of such terrible enemies and experience the effect of their anger.

In doing this, perhaps they have in mind, among other deeds, a very serious and terrible one the history of this country has transmitted to us.⁴⁹ That was the assassination in his own palace of the governor and captain general, D. Fernando Bustamante Bustillo y Rueda with his son, in a revolt plotted in the church of the calced Augustinian Fathers. In it, the friars of all the orders were seen with crucifixes in their hands, encouraging the rebels with shouts of "Long live the faith of God! Long live religion!"

On the inappropriateness of the existence of the religious communities, we have on our side not only the dominant opinion today but also the renowned Cantú, named earlier, who says in his history we have cited:⁵⁰

The priesthood is hereditary in the tribe of Levi, since the conservative power should be linked to the past by heredity. The Supreme Pontiff, assisted by the princes of the priests, resolves all doubts that can be raised concerning the interpretation of the law. Nonetheless, the government is far from being sacerdotal, and the priests do not constitute, as they do among the Orientals, a privileged caste, the guardian of knowledge and of worship. The tribe of Levi does not have to transmit mysteries and frauds. On the contrary, it is obliged to make known all the books of which it is the depositary. Neither does it exercise a direct action on the government. It possesses a leisured existence due to the tithes. It does not possess as owner any province.

these same measures to all of Europe. It is obvious that the passage quoted from Cantú, despite the Spanish translation of "High Priest" by "Supreme Pontiff," refers to the people of Israel according to the Old Testament in the mind of its original author.

alguna. Está dispersada en todo el país dividido entre las demás tribus, y *así evitan los abusos que produce en otras partes la estrecha unión de los sacerdotes.*»⁵¹

Nunca terminaríamos nuestra tarea si hubiésemos de continuar poniendo en evidencia las muchísimas y muy graves faltas de exactitud en que ha incurrido ese periódico mal titulado *La Verdad* al tratar las cosas de este país. Y en la imposibilidad de seguir por ahora refutándolas, sólo nos haremos cargo de otra calumnia atroz que nos ha afectado muchísimo. Nos referimos a la peregrina especie de rebelión, que dejamos indicada al principio, echada a volar por los mismos frailes, y que con dolorosa sorpresa encontramos estampada en las columnas de aquél con las siguientes palabras:

«Veamos lo que dice nuestro corresponsal de Manila sobre aquel dignísimo capitán general en el siguiente párrafo de su carta fecha 5 de noviembre.—Pero diga V., la caída de la catedral revelaba y ponía en pie el feo fantasma de la rebelión; y este señor Echagüe, sin ruido, sin escándalo y sin medidas estrepitosas ha salvado la colonia de dos gravísimos males, de los cuales era el terremoto el menor.—Esto, como pueden conocer nuestros lectores, es grave. Esto significa cuando menos que en aquel país había sugetos dispuestos a una tentativa. De aquí se infiere cuán cierto sea que todos los que directa o indirectamente tratan de rebajar, de matar o quitar el prestigio y fuerza moral que allí tienen nuestros misioneros españoles, y que tanto conviene conservar en aquellas islas, ayudan por consecuencia, aunque sea sin advertirlo, a los malintencionados a la emancipación.—Alerta, alerta, que los enemigos son astutos y sagaces, y si hallan quien les cubra con su sombra serán atrevidos y emprendedores.»

Al leer las precedentes líneas, una justa indignación se apodera de todo hombre que estima en algo la verdad. Si el párrafo de esa carta que se cita se refiriese a alguno de los que vivimos, volveríamos la cabeza con desdén y no haríamos caso de una tan gruesa calumnia. Pero por lo mismo que se alude en él a un hombre que no puede ya salir a la defensa

51. From this point onward, the 1889 pamphlet reproduces the text of the original 1864 article faithfully, without interpolation or omission.

It is dispersed throughout the country, divided among the other tribes, and *thus they avoid the abuses that in other regions are produced by the close union of the priests.*⁵¹

We would never end our task if we had to continue exposing the very many and very grave failures of accuracy which that newspaper, badly named *La Verdad* [The Truth], has committed in treating the affairs of this country. In the impossibility for now of continuing to refute them, we will only make mention of one atrocious calumny, although it has affected us deeply. We refer to the strange specter of rebellion that we left aside after mentioning it at the beginning. Given currency by the friars themselves, with sorrowful surprise we find it treated in the columns of that newspaper in the following words:

Let us see what our correspondent from Manila has to say about that most worthy captain-general in the following paragraph of his letter dated 5 November 1863.—“But note this, the collapse of the cathedral revealed and brought to the surface the ugly specter of rebellion. Señor Echagüe here, quietly, without commotion or disturbing measures, has saved the colony from two most serious evils. Of the two evils, the earthquake was the lesser.” As our readers can recognize, this is grave. At the least, this means that in that country there were people disposed to attempt rebellion. Hence it may be inferred how certain it is that all those who directly or indirectly try to reduce, to destroy, or take away the prestige and moral force that our Spanish Missionaries have there, and which it is so necessary to preserve in those islands, necessarily help (even without adverting to it) the malicious in their efforts toward emancipation. Take care, take care, our enemies are clever and astute. If they find someone to hide them with his protection, they will be daring and venturesome.

On reading the preceding lines, just indignation overcomes any person who has any esteem for the truth. If the paragraph of that letter just quoted referred to one of those of us who are alive, we would turn our heads aside in disdain and pay no attention to so gross a calumny. But because of the very fact that it alludes to a man who cannot come out in defense of his person because he already rests in peace, we are going

de su persona porque ya descansa en paz, vamos a vindicar su memoria, siempre grata para nosotros, por más que el rencor, el espíritu de venganza y la envidia trabajen de consuno en mancillarla y hacerla odiosa. Ese hombre es el malogrado, cuanto sabio y virtuoso sacerdote Sr. D. Pedro Peláez, prez y honor del pueblo filipino, que en la aciaga noche del 3 de junio pereció con otros individuos, sus compañeros del *cabildo* eclesiástico, bajo las ruinas de la que fue catedral. Sí, a este sacerdote lleno de saber, de timorata conciencia, amigo de la paz y enemigo de todo desorden, es a quien se ha designado misteriosamente con el nombre de insurgente, atribuyéndosele el plan de una rebelión que debía estallar, al decir de sus detractores, en la mañana del Corpus, en el acto de la celebración de las sagradas funciones de ese día.⁵²

¡Vaya un disparate! ¡Elegir para llevarlo a cabo un día como ese, en que toda la guarnición está sobre las armas! Esta sola circunstancia ya revela la impostura a la vez que los cortos alcances de sus inventores; y el creer eso de un hombre de talento, como era el finado P. Peláez, sería la mayor injuria que se podría hacer a su memoria. Veamos, no obstante, si ha tenido aquél motivos para pensar en eso o para urdir ese plan tan descabellado que se le supone.

Para que un hombre de la talla del P. Peláez pudiera concebir ese proyecto era necesario que ese hombre, o bien tuviese quejas al gobierno, por haber sufrido postergas en su carrera y no haber visto recompensados sus servicios y atendidos sus méritos, o bien porque ambicionase el poder y abrigase miras de engrandecimiento personal. Afortunadamente, ni lo uno ni lo otro podía existir. No lo primero, porque el P. Peláez ocupaba un puesto elevado en el coro. Era dignidad de tesorero de esta santa iglesia catedral. Por otra parte, el gobierno lo había distinguido muchas veces con varias comisiones honoríficas, dando con esto muestras del valor y aprecio que hacía de su saber y virtud, con lo que él estaba muy satisfecho. No lo segundo, porque el P. Peláez era modesto en sus aspiraciones por lo mismo que era virtuoso. Estaba tan

52. In fact, the rumor spread about the alleged revolt named not only Peláez but also his colleague and friend, Fr. Ignacio Ponce de León, a *racionero* of the cathedral chapter, and *fiscal* of the archbishop. The archbishop in the beginning mentions him together with Peláez as the objects of the rumor making them the

to vindicate his memory. It is a memory ever dear to us, no matter how much resentment, the spirit of vengeance, and envy, by common consent, exert themselves to besmirch it and make it odious. That man is the unfortunate but equally wise and virtuous priest, Fr. Pedro Peláez, the glory and honor of the Filipino people, who on that tragic evening of 3 June 1863 perished with other individuals, his companions of the ecclesiastical *cabildo*, under the ruins of the cathedral. Yes, it is this priest, full of wisdom, a man of scrupulous conscience, a friend of peace and enemy of all disorder, who has been mysteriously given the name of insurgent. To him is attributed the plan of a rebellion that was to break out, according to his detractors, on the morning of Corpus Christi during the moment of the celebration of the sacred ceremonies of that day.⁵²

What an absurdity! To choose a day such as that to carry it out, one on which the whole garrison is in arms! Just this single circumstance already reveals the deceitfulness as well as the slight mental aptitude of its inventors. To believe that a man of talent, such as the late Father Peláez was, could conceive this project would be the greatest insult that could be made to his memory. Let us see, nonetheless, if he had motives for thinking of such a thing or for contriving a plot as preposterous as is supposed of him.

For a man of the stature of Father Peláez to conceive that project, it would be necessary that that man either had complaints against the government for having been bypassed in his career and not having seen his services recompensed and his merits esteemed, or, on the other hand, that he be ambitious for power and cherish intentions of personal glorification. Fortunately, neither the one nor the other could have been possible. Not the first, because Father Peláez occupied a lofty place in the ecclesiastical chapter. He held the dignity of treasurer of this holy ca-

leaders of the plot, though it is clear from his subsequent letters that he does not believe it. The Dominican provincial, Fr. Domingo Treserra, however, did not hesitate to believe both were involved, but his fellow Dominican, Bishop Gaínza, denounced the deliberate calumny of the authors, whom he believes he knows (Uy 1984, 248; Gaínza 1864, 188–90). See n. 76 below.

contento con su suerte, que todo su afán en los últimos años de su vida era santificarse más y más. Tan pura era su vida que su confesor, el austero y virtuoso jesuita P. Bertrán, con quien se confesara por última vez en el mismo día que plugo al Cielo privarnos de aquel modelo de cristianas virtudes, no ha vacilado en asegurar a sus amigos que el P. Peláez murió con la muerte del justo. Con tales antecedentes, pues, no es posible creer que haya existido ese plan supuesto de *rebelión* más que en la cabeza de los que lo han inventado, que no han sido otros sino los frailes de ciertas y determinadas religiones, por resentimientos que engendrara en ellos la conducta de aquél, y que nosotros la vamos a esponer para que sea del dominio público y la nación se convenza de la perversidad de ciertas gentes.

El P. Peláez era un buen patricio, y amaba mucho al clero a que pertenecía. En las ocasiones que el clero se veía despojado de sus curatos por la ambición de los frailes, era él el que lo defendía. Y aunque nunca tuvo el consuelo de ver atendidos los imprescindibles derechos de aquél por la preponderancia de sus adversarios, les chocaba a estos, sin embargo, su leal y patriótico proceder, y de ahí la ojeriza que le cobraron. Agréguese a eso que, siendo vicario capitular de este arzobispado en sede vacante, tuvo que adoptar en cumplimiento de su deber ciertas medidas, muy suaves por cierto, contra tres curas frailes por escesos contrarios a la moral y tranquilidad pública, cometidos uno en la provincia de Cavite, y otros en la de Pampanga,⁵³ cuyos pormenores no queremos detallar por respeto al decoro (pero que estamos dispuestos a hacerlo y publicarlos si la necesidad nos obligare a ello, así como otros idénticos o acaso peores escesos de que son teatro todos los días estos infelices pueblos, y cuyos irrecusables datos tenemos a la vista para que lo desmientan, si quieren, los interesados) y se comprenderá la mala voluntad que le profesan, que lejos de cesar con su muerte parece

53. Though the details are not given, these seem to correspond quite clearly to three cases that Peláez mentions to the new archbishop in his report on handing over the government of the archdiocese to the archbishop (Peláez 1862a, unnumbered pp. 7–8).

thedral. In addition, the government had distinguished him many times with various honorable commissions, thus showing tokens of the value and esteem that it had for his wisdom and virtue. With this, he was very satisfied. Not the second either, because Father Peláez was modest in his aspirations by the very fact that he was virtuous. He was so content with his lot that all his efforts in the last year of his life were directed toward sanctifying himself more and more. So pure was his life that his confessor, the austere and virtuous Jesuit, Father Bertrán, to whom he made his confession for the last time on the very day on which it pleased Heaven to deprive us of that model of Christian virtues, has not hesitated to assure his friends that Father Peláez died the death of the just.

With such antecedents then, it is not possible to believe that supposed plan of *rebellion* has existed anywhere but in the head of those who invented it, who could be no other than the friars of certain determinate religious orders, because of the resentment that his conduct produced in them. We are going to set forth this conduct here in order that it may be in the public domain and that the nation may be convinced of the perversity of certain people.

Father Peláez was a good citizen and loved much the clergy to which he belonged. Whenever the secular clergy saw itself deprived of its parishes because of the ambition of the friars, it was he who defended it. Although he never had the consolation of seeing the indisputable rights of the secular clergy attended to because of the dominant power of his adversaries, nonetheless his loyal and patriotic action offended them. Hence the grudge they conceived against him. In addition to this, while he was vicar-capitular of this archbishopric, *sede vacante*, he had to adopt, in fulfillment of his duty, certain measures—very gentle measures certainly—against three friar parish priests because of their excesses contrary to public morality and tranquility; one committed in the province of Cavite, and others in that of Pampanga.⁵³ We do not wish to give their details out of respect for decorum (but we are ready to do so and make them public if necessity should oblige us to do it; moreover, there are other identical cases or perhaps worse ones of which these unhappy towns are the scene every day; we have before our eyes incontrovertible data, so that the interested parties may deny them, if they wish). Thus, the ill will they profess toward him will be understood. Far

fomentarse; y esto se explica claro: porque como en vida no se atrevían a lanzarle ningún cargo, reservaron para después de ella el forjar contra él esa calumnia. Pero para un hecho semejante se sabe que hay en el Diccionario de la lengua una palabra que no les aplicamos por delicadeza. Demostrado, pues, queda que el espíritu de venganza y otras pasiones siniestras son los que han podido únicamente inspirar a esos hombres extraviados la existencia de ese plan de *rebelión*, que ciertamente no es mas que un verdadero *fantasma*.

Ahora no nos resta mas que pedir, primeramente a Dios, nos dé un corazón capaz de arrostrar los insultos y de soportar las calumnias. Y después a la nación magnánima y generosa, a quien nos dirigimos, para que haga justicia a nuestros leales sentimientos.

[27 de junio de 1864]⁵⁴

LOS FILIPINOS

54. This place and date do not appear in the original in *La América* but are found in the 1889 pamphlet. The date, however, is consistent with the time that it would take for the *La Verdad* article attacking Peláez to reach Manila and to have the article of refutation composed, before sending it from Manila to reach Madrid in time for the agent of the clergy to get it published in *La América* of 12 September 1864. At this time, mail in either direction normally took up to three months, or a little less. The place and date are also consistent with those on the letters of Governor-General Echagüe and Fr. Juan Felix that will be seen

from ceasing with his death, it seems to burn more fiercely. This is clearly understandable. Because during his lifetime they did not dare to hurl any charges against him, they waited until after his death to build up against him that calumny. But for a deed of this kind there is in the dictionary a word, which we do not apply to them out of *delicadeza*. It is clear, then, that the spirit of vengeance and other evil passions are the sole inspiration for those misled men in conceiving the existence of that plan of *rebellion* of theirs, which is certainly no more than a true *phantom*.

Now nothing remains for us to do but, first, to ask God that he give us a heart capable of bearing insults and enduring calumnies. Secondly, we ask the magnanimous and generous nation, to whom we address our words, to do justice to our loyal sentiments.

[Manila, 27 June 1864]⁵⁴

THE FILIPINOS

in this article's second part, in which each claim to have copies of the manuscript article. The most probable explanation for its absence in *La América* is that the date did in fact appear on the original sent to Madrid, but was, purposely or inadvertently, dropped out by the editor. If, then, our conclusion in Part Two will be shown to be correct, the copy we have postulated to have been possessed by Paciano and passed on to José Rizal did have the date of the original manuscript. Consequently, it was reproduced in the 1889 pamphlet from that copy.

PART TWO
IS THE 1864 ARTICLE A GENUINE WORK
OF FR. JOSÉ BURGOS?

José María Basa's Role

We may begin by examining how the 1864 document may have come into the hands of Basa and his associates. Although the document could have been preserved by Basa from a copy of *La América* that he might have obtained in 1864 when he was still a merchant in Manila, there is every reason to doubt that this was so. For, though he was certainly a liberal and antifriar in sentiment even before his exile in 1872, which he later attributed to their intrigues, there is no evidence that he was at all concerned with the struggles of the Filipino clergy to prevent their being despoiled of their parishes. This is clear from his intercepted letters, found among those assembled by Gov.-Gen. Rafael Izquierdo to justify the draconian penalties he imposed after the Cavite Mutiny, today preserved in the BAH. These letters to and from Basa show the latter to be a typical anticlerical liberal progressive, seeking reforms in the Philippines and strongly opposed to the friars, whom he considered to be the main obstacle to the liberal reforms that he and others of his class advocated (Tormo 1973, 98–122). (After 1872 he would be much more fiercely antifriar, attributing to them his exile after the Cavite Mutiny.) However, he cannot be considered a nationalist in any real sense. He had extensive business interests in the Philippines, but it was only these that concerned him, and he would show himself ready to accept any regime that provided liberal and progressive reforms.⁵⁵

He was indeed a Manila correspondent for the newspaper, *El Eco Filipino*, edited in Madrid by his brother-in-law, Federico Lerena, but this

55. At the time of the revolution of 1898, though supposedly aiding the revolutionary cause from Hong Kong, Basa quickly came to the conclusion that the Philippines would prosper more under the United States than as an independent nation. Hence, as noted above, he actively worked for an American protectorate, and even annexation by the United States (Agoncillo 1971, 146–47; 797; Taylor 1971, 2:491–92).

provides no substantial connection with the clergy's struggle. For the newspaper did not make the secularization struggle a major concern, as may be seen from perusing the photocopies of the collection of this short-lived publication (5 Sept. 1871 to 8 Apr. 1872) found in the PNL. It was rather an advocate of the extension to the Philippines of the radical reforms enacted by the makers of the 1868 revolution in the peninsula and, consequently, resolutely antifriar, seeing in them the main obstacle to liberal reforms (Tormo 1973, 110–11). The few anonymous articles in the newspaper that deal at all with the secular clergy seem clearly not to have been written by any Filipino priest. Rather, they were answers to attacks on the competence of native-born priests made by conservative newspapers in the peninsula, and so promptly published as to preclude the possibility that the answer could have come from the Philippines.⁵⁶ In fact, when the mutiny broke out and news came to Madrid that the priests were arrested and later executed, the reactions of *El Eco Filipino* assumed their guilt and condemned the mutiny unreservedly. With regard to the executed priests it gave its verdict: "That the three condemned secular priests be called traitors because the carrying out of their sentence *leads one to believe it was reasonable*" (14 May 1872, in Sánchez Fuertes 1988, 81–82; emphasis in the original). Likewise, the correspondence of Lerena in February 1872 with his brothers-in-law in

56. In a twentieth-century article, "El Eco Filipino' boicoteado" (de Veyra and Ponce 1914, 180), Mariano Ponce, only a child (b. 1863) at the time of the newspaper's existence, nonetheless lists all those—priests, lawyers, merchants—who were executed or exiled in 1872, together with some others, as having been supporters of the periodical. This is certainly erroneous. The main point of Ponce's article was the fact that, after the mutiny, the archbishop issued a pastoral letter dated 19 February 1872, forbidding the clergy to read this periodical, which, as a matter of fact, was already in its dying days. In this, he is accurate. However, his other facts are now clearly seen to be confused and erroneous, such as making Manuel Regidor the editor (an error repeated in Schumacher 1972a, 27, written before the appearance of Tormo 1973) and giving an incorrect name to Lerena. The source of the information in the present note is found in the cited pages of the Lerena-Basa correspondence in Tormo 1973, found among the Colección Bauer in the BAH. Based on these letters in Tormo's book, a correct discussion of the newspaper and its minimal relation to the clergy may be found in Schumacher 1999, 25–26.

the Philippines, then prisoners, and his mother-in-law considered the mutiny a disaster, totally contrary to what he had hoped to achieve through *El Eco Filipino* (see Tormo 1973, 106–11).

Two Groups of Activists

Nor does it appear that Izquierdo knew any priest to have been a subscriber to *El Eco Filipino* with the possible exception of Fr. Vicente García of Naga, who accidentally received a copy from a friend and wrote in praise of it in a personal letter to Lerena (Tormo 1973, 114–15, 104–5). No extant document, however, shows García, though prominent among the Filipino clergy as former *provisor* of the diocese of Nueva Cáceres, to have had any contact with the Manila priests headed by Burgos (*ibid.*, 114–15). Nor was he in any way molested, or apparently even investigated, after the Cavite Mutiny. This may have been because, in a letter of 14 November 1871, the *alcalde-mayor* of Camarines had written to Izquierdo:

The indio priest, Don Vicente García . . . exercises an immense and decisive influence on all the natives of this province, and very particularly with those who cherish the condemnable intention of disturbing its tranquility. . . . I judge, and with me all the Spaniards residing here, that while this man stays here, there will always exist a motive for disturbance. But though that is certain, it is no less certain that it would be difficult, if not dangerous, that I on my part alone should take an extreme decision, given the conditions of prestige and affection that verges on adoration that the natives have for him. (*ibid.*, 237)

Doctor in theology and *bachiller* in philosophy, García had been appointed provisor and *vicario general* of Nueva Cáceres, in spite of (like Peláez) lacking the theoretically required degree in canon or civil law, owing to his outstanding merits and the lack of any candidate with the proper degree. He was only replaced, after he had resigned, by the new bishop, Francisco Gaínza, O.P., in 1865, given the availability of a European Spaniard with the proper degree. But it is clear that he maintained his stature among Bikolanos to a degree that made Izquierdo hesitant to touch him (PNA 1863; 1865).

The priests of the archdiocese of Manila were indeed attempting to found a Madrid newspaper in 1871 to protect their interests, but were working through their agent in Madrid, the criollo Manuel Regidor, brother of Antonio, who was involved with Burgos and his associates in Manila. A letter of 18 October 1871 from Manuel Regidor's patron, Rafael M. Labra, to Fr. Agustín Mendoza, parish priest of Santa Cruz, Manila, acknowledged the receipt of 7,000 pesos for such a newspaper. However, Labra replied that the amount Mendoza had collected was insufficient to found a newspaper devoted to Philippine interests. He and Regidor, therefore, had decided to apply the money to Labra's own newspaper, *El Correo de España*, which would then be able to increase its frequency and coverage of the Philippines (Tormo 1973, 113–14). To what extent, if any, the clergy made further contributions to Labra is unknown. But as late as 19 February 1872, evidently not yet informed of the fate of Burgos and his colleagues two days earlier, Manuel Regidor wrote again to Burgos of the necessity of more subscriptions for Labra's *El Correo de España* (*ibid.*, 132–33).⁵⁷

In fact, though Izquierdo would similarly punish all of them with execution or exile, the priests, lawyers, merchants, and landowners who were agitating for liberal reforms were not a single group with homogeneous purposes. The clergy, led by Burgos, with financial support from Fr. Agustín Mendoza and the parish priests of other wealthy Manila parishes remaining with the secular clergy, had Manuel Regidor, close confidant of Labra, as their agent in Madrid, both for the newspaper and for the exposition asking for the return of the secular parishes given to the friars, which they had drawn up some time earlier. Given the impossibility of founding their own organ in the Madrid press, Regidor persuaded them that Labra would be a likely one to assist them. Representing under various governments Cuba and Puerto Rico, for

57. Though the date was overlooked in the printing of the Spanish text cited here, it is supplied in Antonio Molina's translation (Tormo 1973, 51). No doubt to prevent any interference with his own plans, Izquierdo, though in continual telegraphic communication with the overseas minister, only informed him of the sentence of execution of the three priests in a telegram of 19 February, two days after the executions had taken place (PNA 1870–1873). Hence, the news would only become public some days after that.

which he sought autonomy, Labra was a prolific writer on colonial questions. Hence, his periodical, chiefly devoted to Spain's other overseas colonies, could seem a likely mouthpiece for Philippine issues, specifically those of the clergy (Tormo 1973, 113, 131–33, 134; *Espasa* 1907b; Schumacher 1999, 49, 57, 60, 152, 158, 208).

In contrast, *El Eco Filipino*, the brainchild of the peninsular Federico Lerena, supported in the Philippines by his brother-in-law, José Ma. Basa, and actively promoted by the criollo Mason, Enrique Paraiso, an active agitator in many causes (Tormo 1973, 99,102; Schumacher 2004, 6–7), was representative of a different and seemingly unconnected group. These men, like Basa, showed no particular interest in the native clergy's cause, but were advocates of liberal and anticlerical reforms. Hence, despite the archbishop's banning its reading by the clergy after the executions, thus appearing to associate it with the priests that were victims of Izquierdo's resolve to annihilate all opposition to the politically necessary friars, there is no convincing evidence for the supposed connection. More likely, it was an effort of the archbishop to placate Izquierdo, who had arrested those actually connected with the newspaper.

The *Manifiesto* of Hong Kong, 1889

However, all this lay several years in the future when the 1864 manifesto appeared in the Madrid review *La América*. In the light of the above information on *El Eco Filipino*, Basa probably never saw the 1864 manifesto before 1888, when it was put into his hands, almost certainly by Rizal, as we shall see. Rizal was in Hong Kong most of the month of February 1888 (Retana 1907, 146–49; Rizal 1930–1938, 2:109–10, 149) during which time many of the antifriar leaflets and pamphlets began to circulate in increasing numbers in Manila, culminating in the demonstration demanding the exile of Archbishop Payo and the expulsion of the friars. Rizal, however, though aware of what was being planned, had no part in the group organizing that demonstration, and had advised against attacking the archbishop (Rizal 1930–1938, 4:30; Schumacher 1997, 120–26).

Del Pilar, presumably brought with him the 1888 leaflets that made up the last sixteen pages of the Basa pamphlet, as Rizal had left Hong

Kong some months before del Pilar's brief stay there. Rizal presumably would have had access to the original 1864 article through his brother Paciano, who, as a student of the University of Santo Tomás at that time, lived with Burgos until 1872, and later took an active role in his younger brother's activities abroad (Rizal 1959, *passim*; 1961a, *passim*). We will treat below just what their relationship was, but suffice it to say at this point that there is no evidence of any other means by which Basa would have made this 1864 article the heart of his 1889 antifriar pamphlet. Rizal, on the other hand, wrote his letter to Ponce, cited above, as one who had full knowledge of the whole series of antifriar works being smuggled into the Philippines by Basa, and who even in Paris had a large number of these publications.

Role of Burgos

To return to Burgos, it is a fact that he only became publicly active in the secularization controversy in 1869, because of his presence at the demonstrations with various liberal lawyers and businessmen in honor of Gov.-Gen. Carlos Ma. de la Torre. He attracted even more hostile attention once he began to sign his name to the letters published in the Madrid newspaper, *La Discusión* in 1870. The archbishop himself affirmed to Izquierdo that Burgos had been denounced to him as *antiespañol* only from 1869 onward and especially since 1870 (letter of 30 Jan. 1872, PNA, in Schumacher 1999, 264–65).⁵⁸ At the time the 1864 manifesto appeared in Madrid, however, Burgos, though not yet a priest,⁵⁹ despite having completed the basic courses in theology as well

58. Since the cataloguing of the PNA was only in a rudimentary stage at the time photocopies of these documents concerning the Cavite Mutiny were first given to me, I cannot give more definite catalogue numbers, nor is it clear if the cataloguing has reached these documents at the point that I am writing. They were accessible in 1969, but I cannot give a more precise location at present, except to testify to their exactness as I have published them in my books (1972a; 1981; 1999) on the role of the clergy in the nationalist movement.

59. Though he was already qualified theologically for the priesthood, and even pursuing further graduate studies in theology, Burgos deliberately postponed his ordination because of his intention to work for a doctorate not only in theology

as a graduate degree in philosophy, was already a member of the University *Claustro* by virtue of that licentiate degree in philosophy. Moreover, he held secondary-level administrative positions, which would increase during his academic career, and often even acted as one of the examiners of candidates for various degrees, including young Dominicans. Even as a deacon, therefore, he was already a prominent figure, both in the ecclesiastical and academic world of Manila.⁶⁰ His career as a student would finally be concluded less than a year before his death, when, having already obtained a doctorate in theology, he was awarded the doctorate in canon law on 16 April 1871 (Villaruel 1971, 113). But these were not exclusively academic years by any means. By then he had clearly emerged as the leader in the struggle of the secular clergy to stop and reverse the process by which they had been, and would continue to be, despoiled of almost all the parishes of the archdiocese of Manila. But until the ostensibly freer atmosphere of Governor de la Torre's term came, when he was already secure in his

but also in canon law. According to civil law and the statutes of the university at the time, the candidate for a bachelor's degree in canon law was required to take the course in civil law at the same time. Since ancient Church law forbade priests to take a degree in civil law, those intending to work for degrees in canon law had to postpone their ordination until after they held the bachelor's degree and were finished with civil law (Villaruel 1971, 55–56). Thus, Burgos chose to postpone his ordination to the priesthood until January 1865, when he had finished the course in civil law. Nonetheless, even though not yet a priest, when the examinations for the two benefices of the “Parroquia del Sagrario” of the Manila cathedral were held in September, Burgos competed, and placed third, just behind Fr. Jacinto Zamora, already several years a priest himself. When Fr. José Zamora, who had won first place, chose the more lucrative, if less prestigious, parish of Marikina, Frs. Jacinto Zamora and José Burgos were named to the two vacant positions, though Burgos could actually be installed only after his ordination in January 1865 (*ibid.*, 56).

60. The *Claustro* of those times has been described as “roughly correspond[ing] to our modern Academic Senate, Council of Regents, Economic Council, and Faculty staff put together” (Villaruel 1971, 49). Though according to the university statutes it included “all the Doctors, Masters, Licentiates graduated by, or incorporated to, the University,” in fact the numbers composing it were for various reasons relatively small, and those who actually attended

position as the outstanding Filipino priest, he seems clearly to have kept a low political profile.

Contemporary Evidence for the Authorship of the Article

This lengthy account of his academic career has been necessary before undertaking the question at hand: Was Burgos in fact the author of the original 1864 document, which, though not bearing that title in its primitive form, was in 1889 given the title of *Manifiesto* as the principal part of an antifriar pamphlet? The multiplicity of his academic and professional occupations during that period has been cited as a possible reason for doubting that he would have had the time to compose such a document, but this is difficult to estimate in the case of a man of such undoubted intellectual capacity as Burgos. In fact, as can be seen in the section on “Original Text of the 1864 Article” in Part One, pp. 168–209, the genuine 1864 document was much briefer than the 1889 *Manifiesto*, which is what the objector had in mind in raising that doubt. Nor was he at that time publicly engaged in polemic activities. Moreover, Burgos, or whoever the author could have been, will be shown below to have had the earlier comprehensive notes of Fr. Pedro Peláez on the subject, which supplied a number of the arguments used in the 1864 article.

Serious objections, as well as partial answers, have since come to my attention, chiefly through the work of Dr. Roberto Blanco Andrés, which he has generously communicated to me. Through the rest of this article, aside from my particular citations of his work, the fruits of our lengthy discussion by e-mail will be felt, with much gratitude on my part, even where I disagree with him. It would seem best to discuss first the ex-

its meetings, where important measures specified by the Statutes were discussed, were even smaller. Villarroel notes that probably the biggest number present was those who signed the invitation for the honorary investiture of the new archbishop, Gregorio Melitón Martínez, in 1862—a mere thirty. Hence, one can judge the assiduous involvement of Burgos, who attended all but one of the eighteen meetings held during his membership, from 1860 to 1872, more than any others, except the Dominican professors (*ibid.*, 48–51, and *passim*).

ternal factors connected with Burgos's authorship, followed by the different indications that led to the positive conclusion drawn by myself earlier (Schumacher 1999, 19–21), and repeated in the first part of this article. Finally, we may offer a more secure conclusion as to the degree of certainty of Burgos's role, given the present state of knowledge.

The Peláez Background of the 1864 Document

The remote occasion for the original manifesto has been described elsewhere.⁶¹ Fundamentally, in conformity with a series of royal decrees in the 1860s, the Recollects were to be given compensation for the parishes they had turned over to the Jesuits in Mindanao. All of these parishes forming the compensation were eventually decreed to be taken from those of the Manila secular clergy, leaving the latter with almost no prospect except that of being a coadjutor to a friar parish priest. This despoliation was the culmination of a series of transferals of parishes from the secular clergy of Manila to the Recollects, and to some extent to other friar orders, particularly the Augustinians, especially since 1849 (Schumacher 1972a, 15–22, 194–247; 1999, 13–19, 193–238; Uy 1984, 139–61, 237–50; Blanco Andrés 2004b, 603–65; and more succinctly in 2004a). Compounding the earlier despoliation of the secular clergy in 1826, all these cases, due to political motives and/or greed on the part of certain Recollects and Augustinians, provoked a strong reaction from the secular clergy. Fathers Gómez and Peláez had managed the lobbying in 1851 in Madrid against the 1849 measure (Schumacher 1999, 46–55; Peláez 1851), though unsuccessfully.

Reform Proposals of the New Archbishop

The new despoliation of the early 1860s led to a more intense series of harsh attacks and abrasive replies from both sides. On the one hand, the relatively long period of Father Peláez ruling the archdiocese as vicar-

61. To avoid confusion, as noted in Part One of this article, I have referred to the 1864 manifesto in lower case, without italics or quotation marks, but to the 1889 interpolated edition by its actual Spanish title, *Manifiesto*.

capitular (24 April 1861 to 27 May 1862) had opened a new period of official, though indirect, communication with the Holy See through the nuncio in Madrid, Archbishop Lorenzo Barili. A similar private correspondence had already been initiated by Fr. Francisco Gaínza, O.P., professor of canon law at the University of Santo Tomás, and soon to be named bishop of Nueva Cáceres. Thus, when the new archbishop, Gregorio Melitón Martínez, the first secular priest in a century to occupy that see, arrived, he was well fortified with information from the nuncio on the serious problems of the Philippine church. He was further informed by Peláez through a lengthy and factual account of his actions during his incumbency as vicar-capitular (Peláez 1862a). He took the occasion in early 1863 of Cebu's Bishop Romualdo Jimeno, O.P., being in Manila to join him in the consecration there of Francisco Gaínza, O.P., as bishop of Nueva Cáceres, for the gathered bishops to propose a series of reforms for the church in the country. It was an extraordinary opportunity since these three were the only bishops at the time, and both the Dominican bishops were equally reform-minded. The most important and controversial of the proposals brought forth by the bishops in a meeting with the provincials of the religious orders concerned the subjection of religious order parish priests to *amovilidad ad nutum*—that is, a religious order parish priest could be removed from that position at the initiative of either the bishop or his religious superior, without having to go through a canonical judicial process. This was the general law of the Church for parish priests of religious orders, and the friars themselves had bitterly opposed its being superseded by the Royal *Cédula* of 1795. That intervention of the Patronato Real, besides largely nullifying the religious priest's vow of obedience to his superiors, had made it in practice almost impossible for the archbishop to remove a scandalous parish priest, as the publicity of a canonical trial became a worse scandal, and often the witnesses withdrew their testimony out of fear.⁶²

In addition, the archbishop proposed other reforms for the orders: that the law of cloister be restored to the parish houses (the Dominicans and Jesuits already observed it), that overlarge parishes be divided,

62. The whole problem is discussed briefly but clearly in Uy 1984, 139–42.

new novitiates should be opened in the Peninsula for the Philippine orders, that diocesan seminaries be reformed, and other measures to improve discipline among the clergy and promote better pastoral care. Peláez, as well as Gaínza (Peláez 1862a; Uy 1984, 115–16, and *passim*) had urged all of these on the archbishop, who already had his own similar ideas from his conversations with the nuncio before leaving Spain.

Resistance of the Friar Orders

In spite of the obvious benefit to the reform of the orders, the Recollect and Augustinian commissaries in Madrid, Frs. Guillermo Agudo and Celestino Mayordomo, saw, or affected to see, in these reforms an attack on the friars for the purpose of promoting the secular clergy.⁶³ Both

63. By means of the papal bull, *Inter graviores*, conceded to the Spanish king under royal pressure in 1804, the four friar orders were governed by their vicars-general in Spain, unless the general of the order was himself a Spaniard, who must then take up residence in Spain. Since the exclausturation of 1836, the orders had no legal existence in Spain for many years except for one college for each order with provinces in the Philippines, designed to provide missionaries for there. Though at least some of the orders, such as the Dominicans, were, after 1843, ultimately governed by *comisarios apostólicos* appointed by the Holy See, these were not recognized by the Spanish government. Hence, in practice they were governed by their provincials in Manila, and, except for the Dominicans after these managed to be reunited with their master-general in Rome and the rest of the order in 1872 and bring about needed reforms, these provincials exercised direct authority over the Philippine provinces of their orders. But given the difficulties and time required for communication with their subjects teaching or studying in Spain, each order had an elected *comisario* in the Peninsula, who in some orders acted with considerable independence from the Manila provincials, especially before the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, and the later establishment of telegraphic communications. All the orders, including the Jesuits after their reestablishment in the Philippines in 1859, had a *procurador* in Madrid, to deal with the government, which even under the declining Patronato Real of the nineteenth century still intervened considerably in all Philippine ecclesiastical affairs, including the presentation of bishops for appointment by the Holy See and at times in the internal affairs of the orders. In the friar orders, this procurador was elected in the provincial chapters. In the Augustinian and Recollect orders at least, the *comisario* and the procurador were nor-

these consequences, they maintained, were a danger to Spanish sovereignty in the Philippines. Writing to the vicar-provincial in Spain in 1871, when Burgos had become publicly active, the Recollect provincial, Fr. Mariano Cuartero, later bishop of Nueva Segovia, expressed the ideas that had motivated Agudo since 1849. Criticizing the policy of the archbishop in trying to preserve at least some parishes for the secular clergy, he wrote:

From the time that the secular clergy have shown signs of rebellion [1861, the date of Peláez's becoming vicar-capitular], all agree that all the parishes near to Manila, should not be in their hands, but rather should be occupied by Spanish parish priests. Thus this gentleman, with his mania for always supporting the native clergy, is losing much popularity.⁶⁴ (Mariano Cuartero to A. Iturriaga, Manila, 18 Jan. 1871, in *AM*, leg. 7, 1; quoted in Bengoa 1998–1999, 140)

mally the same person. (The Jesuits did not have a province in the Philippines after their reestablishment, but formed a mission of the peninsular province of Aragón, with a subordinate superior in the Philippines. Hence, their procurador was appointed, not elected, and directly subject to the provincial in Barcelona.) Reading the documents of the nineteenth century under this regimen one gets the impression that often the friar comisarios-procuradores carried out policies not approved by the more observant friars in the Philippines, but that they continued to hold that relatively powerful position because of their political contacts, most often with the intermediate officials of the bureaucracy of the Overseas Ministry. This seems certainly to have been the case with the long-tenured Recollect comisario-procurador, Fr. Guillermo Agudo. (I owe much of the information here, at least as regards the Dominicans, to a personal communication of Fr. Fidel Villarroel, O.P. Though there were some differences in the government of the other orders, they may be gathered from what I have further said above.)

64. One can see clearly in this brief statement of Cuartero that it was recognized even by Spaniards that the secular clergy were the "Filipinos"—criollos, mestizos, indios. The "Spanish" clergy were the religious orders. Though we have not investigated the lawyers to the same extent as the clergy, the participation of one or more lawyers in the manifiesto and the simultaneous appearance and argumentation of the lawyers' protest to Aguirre Miramón with the manifiesto of the clergy, discussed below, indicates that a similar self-identification was to be found among them also.

A few days later he returned to the topic, declaring: “Everyone is censuring the conduct of the archbishop” (*ibid.*).

Yet not all the Recollects, or other friars, felt the same way. The leading contemporary Recollect historian correctly attributes the persecution the friars suffered from many revolutionary leaders not to religious hatred, except in rare cases, but to the friars’ increasing identification of themselves more as Spaniards than as friars. He cites the eloquent laments of Fr. Fernando Mayandía, provincial in 1892, of the excessive *españolismo* of the orders, identifying themselves with the interests of Spain. The provincial wrote:

Brothers, if the religious orders here do not wish to perish, they should leave aside as much as they can that motto “Everything for Spain” [“Todo para España”], and take up this other one: “Friars before anything else” [“Antes frailes que nada”]. (Martínez Cuesta 1998–1999, 30)

But Agudo and Mayordomo had no such reservations. Their subsidized newspapers mercilessly and mendaciously attacked the archbishop as an enemy of the religious orders and as the promoter of a native clergy unfit and disloyal to Spain.⁶⁵ In all this, they deliberately ignored the fact that the archbishop had also proposed that the government allow the friars more houses in Spain for novitiates to prepare missionaries for the Philippines. The bishops met with the provincials of the friar orders and presented their plans, for a time seeming to gain the goodwill of at least some. In the end, the Dominican bishops, seeing the proposals being given a distorted interpretation—one of hostility to Spanish sovereignty—they had never intended, withdrew their signatures from the proposals, and the archbishop was left isolated (Uy 1984, 139–49). As we will see, he did not cease to make his case to Madrid on his own in succeeding years in spite of this abandonment.

65. All this is amply documented in the correspondence of the nuncio with Peláez, the archbishop, and Bishop Gaínza (even before his being named bishop). There are many examples in Uy 1984, *passim*, but my own research has confirmed these and many more.

Response of Peláez and the Filipino Clergy

Inasmuch as one of the major strategies of the two commissary-procurators was to debase the Filipino clergy, as well as cast doubt on their loyalty to Spain, Father Peláez had published various letters defending the secular clergy in Madrid periodicals, especially *El Clamor Público*, through his intermediaries there. His efforts were especially promoted by the lawyer Juan Francisco Lecaros, likewise a criollo, and one of the Philippine representatives to the Cortes of 1837, the last in which the Philippines was represented. His earlier position in the Cortes, however, no doubt gave him acquaintance and influence with other political figures of importance in the 1860s, after he had definitively returned to Spain, apparently for health reasons. Evidently they were not such as to prevent him from considerable activity on behalf of the Filipino clergy, whose agent he was known to be. Pardo de Tavera says that the Spaniards considered him a *filibustero* (Blanco Andrés 2005a; Manuel 1955–1986, 243–46; Pardo de Tavera 1903, 231, no. 1508).

In addition to the subsidized newspaper attacks, the two commissary-procurators launched a major assault on the archbishop and the proposed reforms in a pamphlet entitled *Importantísima cuestión que puede afectar gravemente a la existencia de las Islas Filipinas* (1863). Since their strategy also involved continuous attacks on the Filipino clergy, Peláez countered with an anonymous pamphlet, gathering his earlier articles contesting the rights of the friars to the parishes, and heading them with the violent denunciations of that eighteenth-century bitter enemy of the religious orders, Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Sta. Justa y Rufina (1767–1787). The pamphlet, entitled *Documentos importantes para la cuestión pendiente sobre la provisión de curatos en Filipinas*, was likewise published through the agency of Lecaros.⁶⁶ Although published only after Peláez's

66. Marcelino Gomez, the nephew of Fr. Mariano Gómez, Peláez's chief cooperator, attests the role of Lecaros in aiding Gómez and Peláez even in 1851 (Gomez 1922/1972, 115). Since Lecaros seems to have been in the Philippines at this time, such assistance must have been financial, or putting the clergy in contact with some friend of his in Madrid who could act as their agent. It may well have been D. José Tuazon, head of a prominent merchant firm in Manila, whom Marcelino mentions together with Lecaros as having aided Father Gómez.

death in the earthquake of 1863, it was a harsh but well-informed rejoinder to the earlier friar book.⁶⁷ Alarmed no doubt by Peláez's posthumous pamphlet, which Agudo came to know of by chance during a visit to the press where Lecaros was having *El Clamor Público* printed, the two commissaries published in the same year a supplementary series of documents with the same publisher under the title, *Complemento de los documentos del folleto de 14 de noviembre de este año de 1863*. The two friar pamphlets together formed in fact one book.

In the meantime, though Peláez had been among the members of the cathedral chapter who died with the cathedral's collapse in the June 1863 earthquake, the polemic continued. Among the survivors of the cathedral chapter was a former Mercedarian, Fr. Manuel Peralta, a peninsular Spaniard, who after the suppression of the religious orders in

The business affairs of Tuazon's flourishing merchant house may well have necessitated trips to the Peninsula, in which he could act on the priests' behalf. Lecaros's role is discussed at length by Blanco, basing himself on the correspondence of Agudo in the AM. The latter was well informed about Lecaros's activity through his contacts with the publishers as well as with bureaucrats in the Overseas Ministry (Blanco Andrés 2005a). Others, who sometimes aided Peláez in Madrid, were peninsular members of the *cabildo*, who for some reason were in the Peninsula, as appears to have been frequently the case.

67. To Dr. Blanco Andrés I owe the information, coming from Agudo's correspondence, that Peláez's compilation, probably sent from Manila in March or April 1863, arrived in Madrid in June, shortly after the earthquake. Lecaros had 1,900 copies printed, which were completed some time during the summer of 1863, so that the Recollect Juan Felix de la Encarnación already knew the pamphlet in Manila in late October. It is not clear whether the documents were sent by Peláez himself or by an unidentified nephew, whom Agudo knew to be handling dealings with Peláez's agents in Madrid after his uncle's death, at least by December 1863 (Blanco Andrés 2005e). Though undoubtedly a large portion of the print run went to the hands of influential individuals in Madrid, and the rest to Manila, it is striking how rare the pamphlet is today, at least in the Philippines. Not a single copy is recorded in the compilation of Ferrer 1970, the most extensive effort at that time to form a union catalogue of Filipiniana. However, being only a pamphlet, it is possible that it may be found in some archives or private collections. The copy listed by Retana 1906, which ought to be in the PNL, but does not appear in Medina 1972, was probably in that part of the collection destroyed in 1945.

Spain (the *exclaustración* of 1836) had come to the Philippines, where he had been appointed to various prebends in the cathedral chapter, eventually becoming its dean.⁶⁸ In refutation of the Mayordomo/Agudo pamphlets, Peralta published his *Juicio sobre el folleto titulado "Importantísima cuestión que puede afectar gravemente a la existencia de las Islas Filipinas."* The principal bibliographies give more details of all these compilations, some judgments being less objective than others, but agreeing on the substance and giving a summary of their contents (Pardo de Tavera 1903, nos. 873–75, 1348, 681, 1962; Retana 1906, 2: nos. 1030, 1037, 1027, 1070; Rodríguez 1968, 4:68–75, no. 434). Retana adds the interesting observation that Peláez's pamphlet was financed by Fr. Agustín Mendoza, who, as noted above, would later be the principal financier of the newspaper that Burgos and his companions, through Manuel Regidor, were trying to found in Madrid to advance their cause in 1871 (Tormo 1973, 113–14, 133).

The two friar *comisarios-procuradores* in turn replied with a series of attacks on the Filipino clergy in the newspapers they subsidized. These

68. The *exclaustración* was a unilateral act of the government under Juan Mendizábal in 1836. Although thus denied civil existence within Spain, the priest members of the orders remained canonically religious in the eyes of the Church. Nonetheless, the Holy See had ruled that the exclaustated religious could accept benefices ordinarily reserved for the secular clergy in order to support themselves (since the government of Mendizábal had confiscated all property of the religious orders). Peralta had received his first prebend in the 1840s through appointment by the government, perhaps because of his previous service as an army chaplain. Shortly after entering the cathedral chapter, he obtained a dispensation from the Holy See by which he effectively became a secular priest (PNA 1846–1855, ff. 152–59). From here, he rose to the highest positions in the cathedral chapter by dubious means, since he was certainly not particularly academically qualified, nor was he, according to those who knew him, a good priest. Undoubtedly, the fact that he was a peninsular helped. When the nuncio asked Gaínza for possible candidates to succeed Archbishop Aranguren in 1861, he "warn[ed] the Nuncio of episcopal candidate Peralta's suspected indiscretions with the young Spanish ladies of Santa Isabel College" (letter of 5 May 1861, in ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 447; cited in Uy 1984, 119–20). Moreover, when in 1863 Peralta sought testimonials from the archbishop for his retirement, he was quite displeased to find that the archbishop did not give him the favorable recommendation he felt he deserved (Blanco Andrés 2005d).

reached their most vicious in an article in *La Verdad*, the newspaper of Agudo, in which appeared a scarcely veiled attack on the alleged treasonous plans of long-deceased Peláez. In turn, it would give occasion for the article we have published and translated in Part One of the present essay, the assumed manifesto of Burgos.

Contemporary External Evidence for the Authorship of the Article

The first mention of the manifesto is found in a letter of Gov.-Gen. Rafael Echagüe to the Overseas Minister, dated 18 August 1864, some six weeks after the date of the document (AHN, Ultramar, leg. 2206, exp. 41; as cited in Uy 1984, 161). As noted earlier, he asserts that he knows the author, who is one of the clergy, and has informed the archbishop concerning him.⁶⁹ Evidently, he had known of this for some time before writing to the Overseas Minister, whom he wished to reassure that there was no truth to the supposed Peláez conspiracy, since the article would appear in *La América* on 12 September 1864. Prior to the completion of the Suez Canal in 1869, mail took at least two months or more, and hence the article had been written in Manila much earlier, at the very latest near the end of June. In fact, the date, 27 June, is on the 1889 version. Inasmuch as it would take some negotiations to obtain its publication, and time to set the type, it appeared at the earliest possible date, 12 September, since the journal was published on the twelfth and twenty-seventh of each month.

The Recollects in Manila, however, also had knowledge of the manifesto before it was sent to Madrid, at least by the beginning of August, for somehow they were able to have the documents copied in Manila

69. It should be noted that Echagüe did not specify a priest as author, but merely spoke of having mentioned the man to his ordinary (i.e., bishop). This would indicate that he was a member of the clergy. Burgos, however, who was at this time not yet a priest, is not excluded by Echagüe's statement. For, as a deacon, he was indeed a member of the clergy, a term which encompassed all those who had received any of the degrees of Holy Orders, even the tonsure, and were therefore subject to their ordinary, the archbishop in this case.

and reach the hands of Agudo by the end of September. They do not say how they obtained them, but a likely conjecture is that, since the governor-general had a copy, they had obtained the manifesto and the accompanying letters referred to in the same dispatch, perhaps through some connection of theirs in a government office in Manila (Blanco Andrés 2005a). Although Governor-General Echagüe was no patron of theirs, the offices of the government bureaucracy were notorious for their corruption, and it would not have been difficult to find an agent over whose desk the governor's letter had passed. In Madrid, this use of paid agents in government and in journalistic circles was certainly common with Agudo, who was well known for his informants in the Overseas Ministry as well as in the newspapers. Given these connections and the dubious ethical principles the commissary repeatedly manifested, he was the man most able to thwart each attempt of the Filipino clergy to defend their rights—in 1849–1851, 1863–1864, and 1870–1872. Thus, it was no coincidence that he was retained or reelected to hold the post at the time of each crisis—1847–1867; 1871–75 (Santiago Vela 1913–1931, 1:36).

In a letter of 3 October 1864 from Agudo in Madrid to the provincial in Manila, Fr. Agustín Olmedillas, the former acknowledges having received on 30 September two notebooks (*cartapacios*), sent from Manila on 4 August.

The one [*cartapacio*] with letters of those (*esos*) Doctors and Licenciates there to *Señor* Miramón,⁷⁰ which are like the ones of those (*esos*) Filipinos there; the other with the manifesto to the Nation by

70. José Manuel de Aguirre Miramón (1813–1887), a lawyer, held important offices in the Philippines as well as in the Peninsula, and was the author of numerous reports and projects for the overseas provinces of Spain. He was, therefore, well known to leading lawyers and clergy of Manila, where he had held an official post earlier (*Espasa* 1907a; Blanco Andrés 2005a). Some time after his return to the Peninsula, a series of his articles in *La América* on the state of education in the Philippines would be the occasion for a defense of the University of Santo Tomás by the *catedrático* of Roman Law, Dr. José de Arrieta, mentioned below. Bishop Gaínza sent to Nuncio Barili in 1864 copies of Miramón's letters to himself, supporting the reforms Gaínza was promoting (Uy 1984, 120). Though there were also doctors and licenciates in ecclesiastical

the Filipinos; which, as Your Reverence will already know by what [my] previous mail said, I already possess in print. For the periodical or review, *La América*, published it on the 12th of the month just past [September]. I brought a copy to the Overseas Ministry so that they might amuse themselves with such a pretty and exceedingly sweet piece of reading. What I have done still leaves open the way for the other things we plan to do. (AM, leg. 88, num. 4, quoted in Blanco Andrés 2004, 646)

It seems likely that both the lawyers' letters to Miramón and the manifesto dealt in some way with the struggle of the secular clergy against the Recollects for their rights, and it was for that reason that the Recollects had sought copies of both in Manila. This becomes clearer on seeing the Recollect letter from Manila, this time from Fr. Juan Felix de la Encarnación, former provincial, and at this time prior of the Recollect headquarters in Manila, the monastery of San Sebastian.⁷¹ In a revealing letter to Agudo of 18 September 1864 (that is, before receiving Agudo's letter of 3 October, just cited), apparently written in the name of the provincial who was absent on visitation of his subjects in their parishes, he stated:

I agree that we should be quiet for a while, in spite of the fact that our enemies (*los inimici homines*) are not silent, as you will have seen from the article directed to "La Nación" that our Father Provincial has sent to you already, and from what the periodical *La América*

disciplines, it would seem likely that the ones addressing letters to Miramón rather held degrees in law, while the manifesto would presumably come, at least primarily, from the clergy. Miramón was at this time *diputado* to the Cortes (*ibid.*), which would account for so much attention being given to him by the clergy and persons connected with the university.

71. The Recollects had traditionally added a religious name to their family surname, a practice that was apparently falling into disuse in the nineteenth century. Fr. Guillermo Agudo de San Antonio de Padua, for example, signs himself, both in the public and the private documents we have, simply as Fr. Guillermo Agudo. Fr. Juan Felix, however, perhaps because his family surname could be taken for an additional baptismal name, though sometimes in a personal letter writing Juan Felix, in other documents signs his full religious name, or even J. F. de la Encarnación.

says in volume VIII, no. 12.⁷² Give them time to vent their grievances (*para que se desahoguen*). When an opportune occasion comes, we will return to the attack. (AM, Convento de San Sebastián, leg. 6, num. 3, quoted in Blanco Andrés 2005a)

The next letter of Felix to Agudo was written on 23 November 1864 when the issue of *La América* of 12 September would have arrived just recently in Manila. Though somewhat confusing, it is important for determining the author of the 1864 manifesto. He says:

I suppose that for some time now the copy of the article of *La América* [the article, “A la Nación”] has been in your possession. I call it a *plagiarism (plagio)*, because it is. N.P. [Nuestro Padre—i.e., the provincial, Father Olmedillas] subscribes to that periodical. When I sent you the copy [from Manila], *one put together by various hands*, of which the one who calls himself the principal compiler (*redactor*) is a Filipino lawyer named Fuentes; there went along with it some letters directed to Señor Miramón, written by another Filipino lawyer, Sordo [*sic*] Arrieta. Therefore the article was written in Manila, as was another production of the renowned Dean [of the cathedral chapter] here, Peralta, a copy of which I have not been able to get hold of, [but] which they say is more insolent and scandalous, about which I have also spoken to you.⁷³ (AM, Manila Provincialato, leg. 6, num. 3, f. 7; quoted in Blanco Andrés 2004, 644–45; italics mine)

A first remark concerning these two cartapacios is that their being sent together from Manila to Agudo gives probable evidence of cooperation between the Filipino lawyers and the clergy. The “Sordo Arrieta” is undoubtedly the *Catedrático de Derecho Romano* of the university, Dr. José de Arrieta, who wrote a letter, dated 6 June 1864, to José Manuel de Aguirre Miramón, mentioned above. Aguirre Miramón had written in *La América* (27 January 1864) an article critical of the university. Among other things, he disparaged the university for not having other than

72. I have not seen this article, but from the number of the journal in which it appeared, and given the periodicity of the journal (published on the twelfth and twentieth-monthly), the reference would be to the number of 27 June.

73. The “other production” refers to Peralta 1864.

ecclesiastical faculties. There is in the AUST a manuscript copy of Arrieta's reply, entitled "Carta al Sor. D. José Manuel Aguirre Miramón, escrita por D. José de Arrieta" (AUST, Folletos 97, ff. 310–25). In it Arrieta asserted that the Dominicans had long desired to introduce a number of faculties, even without the financial support of the government, but from which they had to ask permission. "But no sooner the Dominicans raised the idea of the new *cátedras* than the government officials became apprehensive about the university turning into a cradle of insurgents." He went on to take pride in the fact that the university had never produced an insurgent in the nineteenth-century uprisings that had occurred (Villarroel 1984, 66; 1971, 94).

There is no record of a lawyer from the University with such a name as "Sordo" (deaf) and it must have been a contemptuous epithet used by Felix, a common practice in the letters between these two Recollects in referring to those they considered their enemies, like the archbishop (Blanco Andrés 2005d). Given the tactic of Felix and Agudo of tagging their critics, like Peláez, as "insurgents," the connection between the Arrieta letter, denying the presence of any insurgents in the university, and the 1864 manifesto of "Los Filipinos," written in indignant rejection of such a label of "insurgent" for the dead Peláez, is obvious. It also explains why the two documents are dated within a few weeks of each other (6 June and 27 June), and they had been sent together in the two cartapacios that are found together in the same *legajo* in the APAF, undoubtedly copies sent by Agudo to his collaborator, Celestino Mayordomo, O.S.A.

It may also be noted that, in the first communication from Manila, the Recollects refer to several lawyers writing to Miramón, while in the second reference is made only to Arrieta. It seems he was the principal one, analogously to the case of Echagüe speaking of one cleric, though he recognized in the next sentence that there were other "interesados" involved. This is confirmed by letters by Arrieta and another Filipino lawyer, identified only as Licentiate don N. P., found in the AM (Blanco Andrés 2005c). This may well be the member of the Consejo de Administración, Narciso Padilla, one of the two *consejeros*, both Filipinos, who voted in favor of the bishops' proposal for amovilidad ad nutum. It is quite probable that he was related to the Filipino member of the *cabildo*, Sabino Padilla, though the name is sufficiently common not to be

sure, in spite of his being a prominent lawyer, and possessing a first name corresponding to the “N.” of Arrieta’s companion. But Arrieta’s use of initials is so obvious, and the intrinsic probability of their being associates makes it far more likely. Both would have been known to Aguirre Miramón from his time as a magistrate of the Real Audiencia in Manila (Blanco Andrés 2005c). It would, therefore, seem that the letter of Arrieta found in the AUST is the original of that found in the Recollect archives, though I was not able to verify this by direct comparison. Though the other letter(s) have not been located in the AUST, the most important was that of the *Catedrático*, Arrieta, who was close to the Dominicans (Villarrol 2005b).

In these statements of the Recollects and of Governor Echagüe, there are several apparent contradictions presenting obstacles to identifying the author of the manifesto. Neither statement points to it being Burgos. Echagüe, it appears at first sight, is certain that it was the work of one person, a member of the Manila clergy, and though he gives no name, he claims he knows it. The Recollects, Felix and Agudo, clearly attribute it to a plurality of authors, clergy and lawyers, since Agudo distinguishes “esos Filipinos” from the lawyers who wrote to Miramón, and Felix shows some inclination to believe that the principal editor of the multiauthored manifesto may have been a certain Fuentes, a lawyer.⁷⁴ All three agree that the document was composed in Manila and sent to Madrid for publication. However, as will be seen, Echagüe himself recognized that there were others, “los interesados,” presumably clergy, behind the particular cleric he singled out.

Although it may not seem immediately relevant to the question of authorship, it is pertinent at this point to remark on the kind of men responsible for subverting the Filipino secular clergy, and to indicate their influence in the order. Both Recollects, prominent figures in their order,⁷⁵ indicated their contempt for the Filipino clergy as well as for the

74. I have not been able to identify this lawyer.

75. Juan Felix would twice be provincial of the Recollects, 1849–1852 and 1861–1864, precisely during the first two of the three conflicts between the Recollects and the secular clergy, besides holding the influential position of prior of San Sebastián monastery immediately after his second term as provincial, where he

archbishop, the advocate of his clergy's cause. Both of them intended to continue to attack and calumniate, as they had done already with Fr. Pedro Peláez.⁷⁶ Yet, their own lives both as religious, in the case of Felix, and as political intriguers of dubious ethics, most especially in the case of Agudo, were well known, and justified the eventual harsh attack by an exemplary priest like Peláez. It is also significant, as we have observed, that the two men held the two key decision-making positions simultaneously in the Recollect province of San Nicolás de Tolentino during the conflicts with the Filipino clergy over the parishes, and took a similar line contemptuous of the Filipino clergy. For they were convinced that the existence of the latter was a danger to Spanish

was evidently the right-hand man of the provincial, Father Olmedillas. Another Recollect *Comisario-Procurador*, Fr. Gabino Sánchez, put him at the top of a list of Recollects to be considered for a bishopric, describing him as “a religious of much ability, well-educated, and of blameless moral character.” Fr. Mariano Bernad, later general of the order, is said to have written of him in a parish book of Dumaguete, that when he was working (later) in Dumaguete, “his talent above the ordinary, and his endearing and affable manner made him draw to himself the sympathies of all, so much so that various times he was offered the bishoprics of Cebu and of the archbishopric of Manila; but he took all means possible to get them to desist from putting his name on a terna” (Santiago Vela 1913–1931, 2:299). Sádaba del Carmen (1906, 408), extols Juan Felix in his terms as provincial because “in various matters of vital interest for the Order, he knew how to defend its rights, which, thanks to him, remained intact, with no little distinction and credit to his person”—a description the archbishop and the Filipino clergy would have seen in a different light. Without denying his ability, however, at the time of his second provincialate Bishop Gaínza and Archbishop Melitón Martínez strongly opposed his candidature for any bishopric. Gaínza considered him “worldly, ambitious, extravagant: ‘Nor does he manifest zeal [while provincial] in correcting the misdemeanors of his confreres . . . and I do not see him disposed towards reforms’” (ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 449, Gaínza to Barili, 11 January 1863, in Uy 1984, 175, n. 158). Two years later, on hearing that the governor-general was proposing him for bishop of Nueva Segovia, Archbishop Melitón blocked the nomination, writing to the nuncio that he “does not have an unspotted reputation (*una fama limpia*),” and that “it is public knowledge that when named Provincial he had with him ‘a woman and a 16-year old girl, whom all, without excluding the religious, supposed to be a daughter of said Father (*una mujer y una joven de diez y seis años, a quien todos, sin exceptuar los Religiosos, suponían hija de dno Padre*)’” (ASV, Arch. Nunz.

sovereignty, as well as inimical to the ambitions of the Recollects. (It should be said, however, that, in spite of sufficient support within the order to elect them to positions of power, not all their fellow Recollects approved their attitude, nor believed it necessary, or even right, to continue taking parishes from the Filipino clergy.⁷⁷ Indeed, at the time of the 1849 despoliation of the Cavite clergy brought about by the Recollect procurator, Agudo, Archbishop José Aranguren, himself a Recollect, had written to the governor-general, justifying the complaints of the secular clergy, and emphatically denying any notions of subversion in their protests [copy in APAF, leg. 39, pp. 17–18; in Rodríguez and Álvarez 1998, 253, n. 60]).

Madrid, 449, 21 July 1864, quoted in Uy 1984, 175–76, n. 158). Among Agudo's various positions, in addition to being comisario-procurador in the key times of conflict with the secular clergy, as indicated above, he was rector of the college of Monteagudo where the young Recollects were trained in Spain. During most of his twenty years as comisario-procurador, he was simultaneously *vicario-provincial* for the Recollects in Spain until 1867. He then became comisario-procurador again in 1871–1875, undoubtedly to counteract the new effort, led by Burgos, to obtain the restoration of their parishes to the secular clergy. Apart from his term as rector of Monteagudo, it seems clear from the various times his activities have been mentioned that his principal role was strengthening the power of the Recollects and other friar orders, mostly through political intrigue and defamation of the secular clergy.

76. Even the newly-arrived archbishop believed for a time in the false rumor of Peláez's complicity in a revolt scheduled for the feast of Corpus Christi, frustrated only by the earthquake in which he died (Abp. Gregorio Melitón Martínez to the Ministro de Guerra y Ultramar, 22 June 1863, AHN, Ultramar, leg. 2255, translated in Schumacher 1987, 221). Similarly, the Dominican provincial, Fr. Domingo Treserra, was convinced of the conspiracy, naming as its probable authors, Fathers Peláez and Ignacio Ponce de León (Treserra-Gaínza, 5 July 1863, cited in Uy 1984, 248, n. 197). Bishop Gaínza, far more experienced and more aware of the ecclesiastical intrigues of Manila and Madrid than either of them, declared that the authors of this and other false rumors were known to him, and that they themselves knew that the rumor was totally false (Gaínza 1864, 180–82). More than forty years later the calumny was still being repeated by the official Augustinian historian of that time. See Martínez 1909, 371.

77. Peláez acknowledged as much in his "Breves apuntes" (Flores 2001, 108–9). The Recollect historian, Angel Martínez Cuesta, O.A.R., relates the efforts of Mayordomo and Agudo to slow down the division of large parishes in 1864 by

Moreover, as if spreading, or even creating, the false accusation of treason against Peláez and his colleague and friend, Fr. Ignacio Ponce de León, was not enough, these two Recollects and some of their confreres were planning even stronger attacks on the archbishop and the Filipino clergy. In fact, my own perusal of Agudo's subsidized newspaper, *La Verdad*, in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid showed it continuing to publish attacks of the same nature through much of 1864.

Reconciliation of Echagüe's and the Recollect Versions

This being said, there seem to be several possible explanations for the contradiction between the Recollects and Governor-General Echagüe. First, one might surmise that what the Recollect provincial, Olmedillas, had sent to Agudo was not the actual article that would appear in *La América*, but some kind of draft. However, for Agudo to call it a "plagiarism," it must have been reasonably close to the actual published version. But it is not impossible that passages were inserted later that did not concern Agudo. At least two passages possibly could have been later insertions—one of them lifted almost bodily out of Peláez's "Brebes apuntes," and the other, the emotional and indignant passage refuting the calumnious accusation that Peláez had been plotting a conspiracy to overthrow the government and massacre the Spaniards on the very day he was killed in the earthquake. (Both passages will be considered below.) Unfortunately, the version sent by Olmedillas could not be found by Blanco Andrés in the AM, to compare it with the final

restricting the right of the governor-general in this matter and limiting it to the Overseas Ministry, where Agudo in particular had powerful connections. (The Recollects of Negros did not follow Agudo's policy.) The main reason the two *comisarios-procuradores* alleged for their action was purely political. If the division continued, "inevitably the larger part of the spiritual administration of the Philippines would fall under the control of the native clergy, which is neither politically sound nor useful for the preservation of the power and prestige of Spain in those dominions." For it would be impossible to supply enough friars to fill so many parishes (Martínez Cuesta 1973, 30:288, citing AHN Ultramar, 2210, no. 22). Of course, they had principally in mind those near Manila.

published version. However, in the APAF, there exists a manuscript copy, probably made by Agudo for his Augustinian colleague, Mayor-domo. On examination, Blanco Andrés (2005f) assured me that the APAF copy and the published version were identical, except for a few minor copyists' errors. This, however, still does not negate entirely the possibility that the Recollect draft copy was different from the published version. For many of the APAF copies were made much later and taken from both published and unpublished sources under the direction of Fr. Eduardo Navarro, O.S.A., who was responsible for building up the great Augustinian Philippine collection in Valladolid in his time as comisario-procurador (1893–1897) and even subsequently (Blanco Andrés 2001, 231–47, esp. 235–36). Hence, the APAF copy could just possibly have been made from the published article in *La América*, instead of being made from the draft sent to Agudo by Felix. Nonetheless, the presence of that copy greatly weakens the probability of a divergence between the Recollect copy of Olmedillas and the published article. Moreover, the fact that the copy in the APAF is found in the same *legajo* with the copies of the letters of D. J. de A. [José de Arrieta] and his colleague, “D. [don] N. P.,” that were in the other cartapacio sent to Agudo makes it quite certain that the copy of the manifesto is exactly the same as that spoken of by Felix and Agudo (Blanco Andrés 2006a). (The lawyers' letters were never published, but were personal to Aguirre Miramón; therefore, the copies in the APAF must have been copied from the other cartapacio of Felix.) The possibility of there being copies differing from each other, therefore, may be dismissed in the absence of any corroborating evidence.

Second, it is not clear that both the governor and the Recollects saw the same copy or draft. Although I have suggested that one way the latter may have obtained their copy was through a government office, it need not have been so, and perhaps was not if there were lawyers as well as clergy participating. If Felix was correct in saying that it was the work of several hands, there were many sources from whom the Recollects could have obtained their copy, the most obvious being the various *escribientes* who copied the draft(s), since the lawyers or priests would be unlikely to communicate their project to those whom they were fighting. If the governor's and the Recollects' copies were not the same, it could

be that the governor had a draft, which, in spite of there having been others contributing to it, possibly coordinated by the lawyer Fuentes, was in its final form the work of one of the clergy. But there is no evidence to support this hypothesis except the word of the governor, written in passing.

Third, related to the previous observation, it is difficult to reconcile the governor's assertion that it was the work of *one* of the Manila clergy with Felix's assertion that the lawyer Fuentes was the principal editor. However, Felix's designation of Fuentes as principal editor was evidently hearsay, and even that hearsay was based on a boast of the lawyer himself who might well have exaggerated his own role, as Felix himself implied. It would, then, not necessarily be incompatible with the assertion of the governor, if understood in the sense that either the moving spirit behind the document was one of the clergy, even though this man had other contributors—lawyers and/or clergy. If this should be the case, the governor's use of the term "author" would have to be understood only in a wide sense, and that cleric could not have written the entire document. That hypothesis contains no incompatibility between Echagüe's statement and that of the Recollects.

In fact, the full text of Echagüe's letter (not given in the reference from Uy 1984 above) indicates that this must have been the case, and that his statement can be reconciled with the information of the Recollects. For he claimed to know the author "in spite of the secrecy and confidentiality with which *those concerned* (los interesados) have taken this step" (AHN, Ultramar, leg. 2206, exp. 41; cited in Blanco Andrés 2005c; italics mine). In other words, Echagüe, no less than the Recollects, knew that it was not simply the composition of one man, as Peláez's *Documentos importantes* apparently was. Moreover, it is in accordance with the archbishop's second-hand information that the manifesto came from "the secular clergy."

Finally, given the second-hand nature of the Recollect information, it seems that primary credence should be given to the information of the governor-general. If that should be so, the question remains as to who in the clergy was the likely promoter of the project. Killed in the earthquake together with Peláez was Fr. Ignacio Ponce de León, Peláez's close friend and collaborator, with whom he shared a house, and who was *fiscal*

of the cathedral chapter (Peláez 1862a, unnumbered p. 15). These two Philippine-born capitulars had been the most active of the chapter in supporting the exposition of the bishops, with the intention of pursuing the cause of the secular clergy.⁷⁸ Given that several persons participated in the composition of the article and that the lawyer Fuentes possibly might have been the final editor (*redactor*), it would be strange that more than one cleric would not take part in a manifesto intended to defend their rights, particularly since the archbishop attributed it to the “secular clergy.” We shall see other reasons below.

The “Author” of the Manifesto

With the death of Peláez, the principal position in the cathedral chapter was that of the dean, Fr. Manuel Peralta, more an enemy of the friar orders than an advocate of the Filipino clergy, as he demonstrated in the pamphlet cited above by Felix. The archbishop said of him sarcastically that he called himself the “campeón del clero filipino” (champion of the Filipino clergy) (Blanco Andrés 2005c). This pamphlet, *Juicio*, dated Manila, 27 August 1864, might seem at first glance to belong to the same campaign as the manifesto, “A La Nación,” that had been drawn up two months earlier. However, it is improbable that Peralta could have been the author of the June manifesto, though he might possibly have been behind it, or at least known of it. Though his pamphlet is likewise directed toward the refutation of Mayordomo and Agudo in their publications of 1863, its tone is quite different from that of the manifesto of 27 June 1864. Many of the arguments are similar, but the tone is different. Peralta, secure in his position, had no need to write anonymously, and his name appears openly at the end of his pamphlet. Moreover, had he chosen for some reason to participate in the

78. Ponce de León was, in the opinion of Agudo, the author of another of the anonymous pamphlets supporting the petition of the bishops and defending the rights of the secular clergy ([Ponce de León] 1863). Like the *Documentos importantes* of Peláez 1863, it was published posthumously in Madrid, being dated in Manila, 31 May 1863, just days before Ponce perished with his friend in the earthquake (Blanco 2005c).

anonymous article, it would have been incongruous for him to sign the June manifesto “Los Filipinos,” being a peninsular himself; at most he would write “El Clero Secular de Filipinas,” in which he was in fact included.

Finally, though one should concede some variety of styles represented in the manifesto, there is no trace in Peralta’s pamphlet of the emotion-laden defense of Peláez against the accusation of having been involved in the fictitious conspiracy alleged by *La Verdad* to have been frustrated by the earthquake of 1863. Toward the end of his pamphlet (pages 17 to 19), he does point out the discrimination against the Filipino clergy, in comparison with the lawyers who studied in the same university and even in some cases with the same professors and in the same classes. While the university-educated lawyers could advance into positions in the government bureaucracy and judiciary for which their training had prepared them, their fellow students who belonged to the secular clergy were relegated to being nothing more than coadjutors of the friar parish priests. Although such a situation should arouse indignation, he says, one must reflect on the causes of such a situation *con calma* (17). Though he does say harsh things about the friar orders, particularly the Augustinians and Recollects, and does his best to refute the Agudo-Mayordomo publications, the tone remains that of the concerned but impartial observer, not that of one who identified himself with the clergy he defends. He was an enemy of the friars rather than a defender of the Filipino clergy, much as he liked to pose as one such defender.

At this point it is necessary to make clear just who the “Filipino” clergy were. They were all those who were *hijos del país*, born in the country and identified with it, whether they were criollos, mestizos of Spanish or Chinese fathers, or pure-blooded indios. Thus, a friar-inspired book of 1869 asserted that “their wide knowledge and extraordinary qualities gave luster in the capital to such *curas indígenas* as Fr. [José] Burgos and Fr. José García in the archbishopric, Fr. Vicente García in Camarines, and others” ([Barrantes (?)] 1869, 45; [for author, see Rodríguez 1968, 88-89]; in Schumacher 1972a, 33, n. 60; 1999, n. 33). While, for example, Fr. Vicente García was a Tagalog from Rosario, Batangas, and called an indio by the alcalde-mayor of Camarines (Manuel 1955-1986, 3:259-62; Santiago 1985a, 41, 46; Rafael de Escalada to

governor-general, 14 Nov. 1871, in Tormo 1973, 137–38), Burgos was of seven-eighths Spanish blood, with one Ilocano female ancestor (Schumacher 1999, 33, and n. 65; Villarroel 1871, appendix, [38]). At least among the *ilustrados*, such as the lawyers and the clergy, the hijos del país were “Filipinos,” whatever their ancestry.

There was only one Filipino member of the cathedral chapter who has strong probability of being the cleric responsible. Under the influence of the rumors and anonymous letters concerning the supposed rebellion, three weeks after the earthquake, the archbishop had emphasized in the letter to the overseas minister cited above (AHN, Ultramar, 2255, exp. 2) the necessity that no “dark face” (*cara negra*) appear among the *dignidades* and *canónigos* (the eight principal prebends of the chapter) (Fernández 1979, 29). The only remaining native Filipino among the dignidades was the *chantre* (precentor), Dr. Mariano García, old, sickly, and half-blind (he died in 1871). The only *canónigo* was the doctoral canon, the criollo Dr. Ramón Fernández (though the archbishop apparently thought him a Spanish mestizo).

Since the archbishop goes on to say that there were seven peninsulars and four indios or mestizos at present, and there seem to have been three peninsulars absent in the Peninsula at the time, it is evident that he was asking that in the future the chapter be composed predominantly, at least in its major positions, of peninsulars.⁷⁹ It seems clear that, at this point of time, temporarily shocked by the earthquake and under the influence of the campaign of calumny against Peláez, he had fallen into a political rather than an ecclesial position. Admitting the outstanding priestly character, brilliance, and ability of Peláez, and depending on him greatly in many matters, he feared him for the influence he had had over practically all the chapter, Filipino or peninsular, and perhaps feared that a similar leader might emerge. In fact, the seven vacant positions were

79. He also asked the minister to present to the Queen for a minor position there, his nephew and his secretary, both peninsulars, of course. His only concession to the Filipino clergy was the suggestion that an appointment of *medio-racionero* (the lowest rank among the prebendaries) be given to one of the native clergy to encourage them, a post for which he suggested Fr. Mariano de Sta. Ana, then senior parish priest of the cathedral.

filled essentially in accord with the archbishop's recommendations, and the only Filipino of any stature remaining in the chapter, apart from the aged and half-blind García, was the doctoral canon, Ramón Fernández. From outside the chapter, there was the upcoming figure of Fr. José Burgos, just appointed *cura* of the *Sagrario*, as we will see below.

In the light of these facts, once eliminating Peralta as the author in any real sense of the manifesto, what evidence is there that Fernández was the author, in some sense, if Governor Echagüe is correct in singling out one cleric, at least as inspirer of the document, if not its principal author? Fernández's letter of 4 November 1863 to his former professor, Bishop Gáinza, is significant here. By then a decree of 27 August 1863 had already filled the positions of the deceased in the earthquake almost entirely with peninsulars, with minor exceptions. Fernández did not receive the promotion to the position of Peláez, as he evidently expected, and complained bitterly. Gáinza, forwarding a copy of the letter to the nuncio, likewise enclosed a later letter of Fr. Luis de los Remedios, secretary of the chapter (*secretario capitular*), who, like Fernández, had barely escaped from the ruins of the cathedral but had not received a promotion, at least the one he expected. Fernández's letter is highly critical of the archbishop, maintaining that things would have turned out differently with Gáinza as archbishop.

Remedios's letter seems likewise to have been critical of the archbishop for a similar reason, not that he did not enter the chapter, since he had been appointed as *medio racionero* by the time he wrote Gáinza in January 1864. Fernández lamented that among the four who ought to have been considered favorably, "after having found themselves half-buried amidst the ruins of the cathedral," were Luis [de los] Remedios and [José] Burgos. Had Gáinza been archbishop of Manila in this situation, "we would be happy" (letters of Fernández, 4 Nov. 1863, and Remedios, 27 January 1864; quotes and paraphrase from Uy 1984, 120–21).⁸⁰

80. Having actually received a prebend, a *media ración*, Remedios must have expected more. This prebend is alluded to (disparagingly) in the *La América* article by "Dos Suscritores" of 27 January 1864, which had to have been written some time in November 1863 to appear on this date. Fernández undoubtedly

One point that is notable here is the emergence to minor prominence of Burgos, even though he had not yet been ordained a priest, but was still a deacon. A few months later in that same year, as has been noted above, together with Fr. Jacinto Zamora he obtained through the competitive examinations one of the two positions of parish priest of the Sagrario parish of the cathedral, though only ordained to the priesthood and installed in his new position in January 1865, as explained above. However, he had been a member of the University Claustro since 1860, at whose meetings he was most assiduous. Here he had been in contact with all the principal graduate lawyers and clergy, as well as the Dominican professors (Villarroel 1971, 48–51). Furthermore, he was already the most academically qualified among the clergy, Filipino or Spanish, with a licentiate in both philosophy and theology, and well on his way to doctorates in theology and canon law. Shortly after his taking possession of the post in the Sagrario, he began to be appointed by the archbishop to various positions of responsibility. On 19 December 1865 he was given the interim prebend of medio-rationero; on 2 May 1866 he was named *examinador sinodal*, one of those designated to examine applicants for parishes in the archdiocese; on 24 November he was made secretary

was resentful of the fact that he had remained where he had been, while he clearly expected to have been promoted to Peláez's place, according to the informal custom. This custom is described in the archbishop's letter to the overseas minister. When he arrived in Manila, the system had been that, when one member of the chapter died or resigned, each one would move up the ladder by means of "gifts" sent to agents in Madrid. In this instance, it seems that the archbishop was favored with a sympathetic overseas minister. The only Filipinos who newly entered the chapter were, apart from *rationero* Mariano Sta. Ana, the recommendee of the archbishop, and, as lowest medio racioneros, Remedios and Fr. Simón Ramírez. The latter we may presume to have entered by means of "gifts to agents" in Madrid, since one of these agents, soliciting a canonry for Fr. Mariano Sevilla in 1868 and asking for additional recompense for that purpose, sends his "regards to Father Simón and other friends" (Tormo 1973, 95; see *Guía* 1863, 102–3; 1865, 93–95). Burgos was still trying to obtain a canonry through Manuel Regidor at the time of his execution, though at the recommendation of the archbishop he had been appointed several times as interim canon by the governor-general (APPSJ, II-7-065; Tormo 1973, 131–33; Schumacher 1999, 238–41).

of the archbishop for his archdiocesan visitation, an appointment renewed the following year (AAM, 1.E.15. Libro 1° de Gobierno Ecl. . . . Melitón Martínez, ff. 289v, 290r, 330v). Since 1863 he had been on the board of examiners in the university for theology, and as he advanced in his canon law degrees he became frequent examiner in that discipline as well. In addition, he held a number of minor administrative positions in Church and State (Villaroel 1971, 81–87). Though not yet a permanent member of the cathedral chapter, in the relatively small world of civil lawyers and ecclesiastical academicians and administrators in Manila, he had already achieved a prominent position, even while still a deacon in 1864. It is not as improbable as it might seem at first sight, then, that relatively young as he still was he could have formed part of those who would sign themselves “Los Filipinos.” Internal evidence will make this more probable. At least Burgos appears as another possibility, together with Fernández, as “author” in some sense of the manifesto.

However, a second point may be noted here concerning Fernández. His letter to Gaínza was dated 4 November 1863, just about the time that the new permanent appointments to the cathedral chapter to replace those who had died in the earthquake would have arrived in Manila, since they had been made by a royal decree of 27 August. Since the process of new appointments involved the archbishop first proposing the *terna* of three names to the governor-general as vice-royal patron of the Church in the Philippines, the archbishop must have given his *ternas* to Governor Echagüe almost immediately after the earthquake. Inasmuch as the governor-general normally accepted the archbishop’s *ternas*, designating the first name of the three as his own choice, to be confirmed by the overseas minister who would issue the definitive royal decree, the decree of 27 August would be the normal time, even if more rapid than was usual with government decrees. Similarly, if we allow approximately two months for the appointments to reach Manila, they would have appeared in the official *Gaceta de Manila* just before Fernández’s letter to Gaínza, denouncing the archbishop and naming those he believed to have deserved the new positions. Of course, whether Fernández explicitly said so or not to Gaínza, undoubtedly his having been bypassed by the archbishop in favor of a peninsular to replace Peláez was the

archbishop's culminating insult to the Filipino clergy. Thus he concludes: "There is no doubt whatsoever that *we would be happy* had you been the prelate of this diocese under these circumstances" (Uy 1984, 121; italics mine).

In this light the article of 27 January 1864 cited in passing above, though anonymously signed "Dos Suscritores," takes on a further meaning. Uy (1984, 121), who saw the original letter, paraphrases its main theme, quoting key parts. According to Fernández's letter, four names, among them Luis Remedios and José Burgos, should have been considered favorably "after having found themselves half-buried amidst the ruins of the cathedral. . . . There is no doubt whatsoever that we would be happy had you been the prelate of this diocese under these circumstances" (Uy 1984, 121).

The article of "Dos Suscritores" in *La América*, though much too long to quote, shows clear connections with Fernández's letter to Gaínza.⁸¹ It complains that those survivors, who had received from the vice-royal patron, at the nomination of the archbishop, interim appointments to the positions left vacant after the earthquake, rightly expected that the archbishop would recommend them for permanent appointments, particularly since they had barely escaped with their lives from the collapse of the cathedral. Yet, even in the interim appointments, he had passed

81. The article containing the letter of "Dos Suscritores," dated 24 November 1863, was published in *La América*, 27 January 1864. I owe a photocopy of this article to Dr. Roberto Blanco Andrés, made from a copy in the APAF leg. 839, pp. 217–21. Since the original article in *La América* was not available to either of us, the APAF copy is my only complete source, in spite of its obvious minor copyist's errors, especially in names. Since José Burgos was at that time *Licenciado en Artes* as well as *en Teología*, and no other licentiate named Burgos occurs among the many named in Villarroel 1971, nor among the lists of clergy, it seems safe to conclude that the "licenciado Miguel Burgos" of the APAF copy is one of the copyist's errors, inadvertently taken from the name of Miguel de Laza in the line below in that copy. Moreover, Uy, who saw the copies of the letters of Fernández and Remedios in the ASV, enclosed with the letter of Gaínza to the nuncio, says clearly that the persons named were Luis [de los] Remedios and José Burgos.

over two deserving ones to make place for his favored personal attendants (*pajes*).

[Although] they have no more merits than the fact that the one of them is the nephew of His Illustrious Excellency, only ordained to minor orders, and the other his majordomo, he gave them no less a position than that of *racioneros*. But the truly deserving ones, the choir chaplains, who are miraculously still alive, he was content to propose them for *medio racioneros*. (*ibid.*, 218)

All through the rest of the letter, there are scathing remarks about these *pajes* and the favoritism of the archbishop. But the key passage concerns the dismay of all the survivors at the publication of the permanent appointments from Madrid. Almost all of them turned out to be peninsulars, while the survivors of the earthquake were practically ignored. The archbishop, the article says, has made it appear that no worthy clerics existed among the secular clergy of the archdiocese, ignoring their merits for promotion.

How has it been possible to pass over the Doctoral Canon of this cathedral, Dr. D. Rafael [*sic*] Fernández, who, apart from his outstanding personal qualities and his academic degrees, and his being inscribed in the Colegio de Abogados of this country, is one of those who survived his unfortunate companions, victims of the earthquake? . . . How, finally, have the merits of the *medio racionero*, D. Sabino Padilla, been ignored, those of the Master of Ceremonies, D. Luis de los Remedios, those of the choir chaplains, Licentiate D. Miguel [*sic*] Burgos, D. Pedro Medel, and D. Miguel [de] Laza, who in the tragic night of 3 June saw themselves likewise covered among the ruins of what had been the cathedral, and who, thanks to Divine Providence, escaped . . . ? (APAF, leg. 839, p. 219)

The verbal similarity of Fernández's letter of 4 November 1863 to Gáinza, as well as its general theme, with portions of the letter of 27 November 1863 that appeared in *La América*, makes it clear that at least one of the authors of the letter of "Dos Suscritores" (if in reality there were two) must have been Fernández. This becomes even more convincing if one looks at the extensive encomium the author

gave to himself, while the others who had been bypassed are only mentioned for their having narrowly escaped death in the earthquake.⁸² If there was really a second author of the published letter, it could well have been Peralta, close friend of Fernández and hostile to the archbishop for not receiving higher commendation in the list of merits he had requested to present for his retirement (Blanco Andrés 2005d). It could also possibly be Remedios, likewise active in seeking promotion through Gaínza, and apparently sharing Fernández's criticism of the archbishop, as we have noted above (Uy 1984, 121), who either had not yet received his appointment to a prebend, or, as surmised above, considered it of insufficient importance to his merits. It could even, though quite improbably, be the peninsular Gutiérrez Robles, mentioned above, or one of the others who considered themselves bypassed. What is clear, however, is that Fernández must be the principal, and perhaps even the only, anonymous author. This is what is relevant to identifying one cleric who had a role in composing "Á La Nación," as will appear in the examination of the internal evidence in the following section.⁸³

But, first, we must consider another factor. It seems improbable at first sight that a group of lawyers should take the initiative in protesting the injustice to the Filipino clergy, as might seem to be the case with the assertion of Felix to Agudo that the lawyer Fuentes boasted that he was the principal editor of the document coming from many hands. It is true that both priests and lawyers with graduate degrees were all part of the University Claustro, and if the priests had studied canon law they would have been in the same classes as the lawyers. Thus, they would be in contact with one another. But though an academically active priest like

82. There is one peninsular *raionero*, Francisco Gutiérrez de Robles, who receives a slightly more extensive mention in the omitted section of the above list of names. However, the only quality attributed to him is having remained nine years in the same position without a promotion.

83. It is not clear that the archbishop himself saw this article, though he complains to the nuncio that an article had been published in *El Clamor Público* falsely denouncing him for his nepotism (which seems evident, given the insignificant qualification of his nephew to be appointed even to a *media ración*). It is not possible to determine the author of this article, as *El Clamor Público* seems to have published articles from any of the parties in the dispute, from Peláez to Agudo.

Burgos was assiduous in attending its meetings, one can suspect that most lawyers, apart from a university professor like José de Arrieta, were less interested in academic decisions.

However, Fernández, besides having his doctorate in canon law, was also *abogado de Matricula de la Real Audiencia*, that is, registered as a civil lawyer with the Real Audiencia. In that capacity his connections with secular lawyers must have been much closer than would be true of other priests with graduate degrees. This could make more understandable the involvement of lawyers in what seemed to be primarily a matter for the clergy. It makes it more likely, therefore, that Fernández had some major part in the group that drew up the manifesto. Yet this has to be weighed in with the internal evidence of the document itself.

Internal Evidence of Authorship of the Article

Although the manifesto was written primarily to defend the Filipino secular clergy against the insults of *La Verdad*, the latter had likewise, indeed primarily, attacked the archbishop, both for his proposed reform measures and for his supposed partiality to the allegedly dangerous and incompetent Filipino clergy. Thus, the manifesto cites the Recollect-inspired newspaper saying: "The archbishop of Manila is waging an unjust war against the regular clergy who have rendered such great services to civilization and to our country." It replies: "False accusation! How and when has this archbishop waged an unjust war on the regular clergy? In what regard? All those of us here who know that man and are aware of his acts do not know of any that tended to cause any offense to that clergy."

Having refuted the malevolent interpretation given to the reform measures the archbishop had proposed, which they had used to brand him their enemy, the manifesto's author concludes:

What efforts slander makes to discredit this prelate! And all of it with no more reason than that he is a member of the secular clergy. As soon as his appointment was known here, the friars conspired together against him to such a degree that some of them have been heard to say that the new archbishop will not occupy the archiepiscopal See for long: *intelligenti pauca*.

It is hard to believe that the same Fernández, who wrote the sarcastic and contemptuous article against the archbishop in *La América* under the pseudonym “Dos Suscritores,” could write not only the defense of that same prelate just quoted, but also similar defenses of the archbishop’s actions, all through the manifesto. This makes it quite unlikely that he was the major clerical author of that manifesto. Rather, in the supposition that it was the work of several, one of his collaborators might well have written the sections on the archbishop. For, in fact, the archbishop was under fire from the Recollects chiefly for his desire for justice to the secular clergy as a whole.

But there are other pieces of evidence that in an internal analysis of the manifesto further tend to eliminate Fernández as the principal Filipino priest involved in its composition. As has been remarked above, there are at least two major passages in the manifesto that are almost certainly the work of a cleric. One of them, in addition, points clearly to an authentic earlier treatise of Father Peláez, “Breves [*sic*] apuntes sobre la cuestión de curatos de Filipinas,” written, but not published, sometime before his premature death, probably late in 1862.⁸⁴ Only one

84. In his letter to the nuncio, Peláez says that he had prepared it for an overseas minister whom he thought likely to give it consideration, but had withdrawn the idea when the minister was replaced. However, again persuaded by a friend (Lecaros?) who believed he could get it to the new minister, he had revised and softened it for that purpose. Thus, many months must have passed before he sent a copy of the unrevised original to the nuncio on 22 May 1863. Hence, it seems reasonable to date its composition to late 1862, no doubt spurred by the rejection of the secular priest that he, while acting as vicar-capitular, had installed as parish priest of Antipolo, in favor of a Recollect. In spite of his own protest, the archbishop was compelled by the government to nullify the first and install the latter in a parish to which the Recollects clearly had no right. This unprecedented action came about as the result of a bribe (“*gratificación*”—“a bonus”) of 3,000 pesos, a substantial sum in those times, with an advance of 300 pesos, paid by Agudo to two members of the Consejo de Estado, to withhold their votes from the earlier majority decision in favor of the archbishop’s (and Peláez’s) position. Agudo asked Juan Felix to destroy the letter, but his own copy has been preserved (AM, leg. 88, num. 3, s/n. Carta reservada, 3-XI-1863, G. Agudo a J. F. de la Encarnación). I am grateful to Roberto Blanco Andrés (2006b) for a detailed description of the affair, and the transcription of the key letter.

copy of this essay in its original form apparently exists today, that sent to Nuncio Barili with Peláez's last letter to him before his death (22 May 1863, in ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 447). Another would presumably be Peláez's own copy.⁸⁵ Before sending it to his agent, he had made a new version, correcting certain points and softening certain expressions that might offend. The existence of this milder version or even if it was actually presented to the overseas minister can no longer be determined. (The one who offered to act as intermediary was probably Peláez's principal agent in Madrid, the lawyer Juan Francisco Lecaros, but possibly a peninsular member of the cathedral chapter on leave in Madrid, as not infrequently happened. In the 1863 *Guía*, two are so listed and there seems to have been another later that year.) But since he thought it important that the nuncio be immediately aware of the issues, he was sending the original draft to him, asking his pardon for certain excessively strong language that he had not had time to revise. This undoubtedly also accounts for the misspellings and erratic accentuation of the copyist, which appear already in the first word of the title, "Brebes," hardly an error that such a highly educated criollo as Peláez would have made himself. However, that which is found in the Vatican archives in the files of Nuncio Barili has the advantage of being a frank expression of Peláez's spontaneous sentiments with the unpolished facts. Though I had made use of it earlier (Schumacher

85. Though there is a copy of the covering letter of 22 May 1863 (APPSJ, Peláez-Barili 1861–1863), the "Brebes apuntes," originally enclosed with this letter, is found only in the ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 447. Since this covering letter was the last one Peláez wrote to the nuncio, it would seem clear that either he had lent his own original to someone who kept it on his death or that it remained in his papers, which apparently were taken care of by his nephew. In either case, the possessor used it, or allowed it to be used, for at least one part of the article "A La Nación," as will be seen below in the comparison of the parallel passages from each. If, as seems likely, it was Peláez's nephew who gave Peláez's other documents cited in the bibliography to Father Bertrán, it is likely that he may have decided to hold back the "Brebes apuntes," and given it to the author of the corresponding passages in the "A La Nación" article. For Agudo affirmed that his sources informed him that the nephew was in charge of Peláez's affairs in Manila as late as December 1864.

1972a), as had Fr. Antolin Uy (1984), only recently has it been transcribed in full from the ASV original copy, annotated, and published (Flores 2001, 78–116). For the convenience of the reader, it is the latter transcription that I have used in showing the dependence of “A La Nación” on this work of Peláez.

The question is into whose possession that copy went. It is possible that Peláez had lent it to someone; or, alternatively, someone received it from his nephew after his death, since, as we have noted above, Agudo supplies the information that the nephew was coordinating affairs after Peláez’s death (Blanco Andrés 2005e). Who this nephew was we do not know, but it does not seem to be any cleric. Whatever may have happened to that copy, its possessor after his death will be seen to have been a cleric of Manila. Moreover, it is evident from a comparison of the two texts below, as well as of certain less fully probative passages of the two documents, that this cleric used it for the 1864 manifesto. Let these two texts below serve as a clear example, though other passages, less clearly, likewise seem to support the dependence of the 1864 document on Peláez’s “Brebes apuntes,” as a detailed analysis, such as is not possible here, would indicate.⁸⁶

“Brebes apuntes”

(Flores 2001, 108)

Ya nos ocuparemos después de la ciencia y moralidad de los Curas Religiosos: ahora baste decir que el Clero, a pesar de tener tan pocas Parroquias en este Arzobispado, puede presentar Curas como el de Bacoor y de Naic en la provincia de Cavite, el de la Hermita y Santa Cruz en la de Manila, el del Rosario en Batangas, el de Mariquina en la de Moron, el joven de Calamba en la Laguna, y algunos otros contra los cuales nada halla que decir la calumnia más procaz. ¿Qué se puede decir de ellos? desafío a los P.P. Recoletos . . .

A La Nación

(*La América* 1864, 12, col.1)

Pero así y todo, en medio de ese desaliento, el clero secular de Filipinas ... cuenta en el día con individuos que lo honran, tanto en el

86. I have modernized the accentuation of the original, but retained its spelling.

cumplimiento de sus deberes y abnegación, y contra los cuales nada hallará que decir la calumnia más procaz. Nos referimos a los señores chantre [Mariano García] y doctoral [Ramón Fernández] de esta iglesia catedral, a los dignos provisores de los obispos de Camarines y Cebú, a los párrocos de Santa Cruz y la Ermita en la provincia de Manila, a los de Boac y Mocpog en la de Mindoro, a los de Mariquina y San Mateo en Moron[g], a los de Calamba y Tunazan [Tunasan] en La Laguna, a los de Rosario y Taisan [Taysan] en Batangas, a los de Bacoor y de Naic, de Maragondon y de San Roque, de Rosario (a) Salinas y Bailen en la de Cavite, debiendo llamar la atención este último por su actividad, que con ser no más que interino y su parroquia de creación muy reciente, ha conseguido en medio de la pobreza de aquel nuevo curato levantar y tener concluidas la iglesia y su casa parroquial ... En fin, sería molesto el enumerar los individuos del clero secular que a ejemplo de estos merecen bien de la Iglesia y del Estado ...

Relationship Between the Two Selections

As is evident, even without translating the two selections, the 1864 article in this section is dependent on the text of Peláez. Both give examples of outstanding Filipino priests in such a way that those of "A La Nación" are modeled on Peláez's "Brebes apuntes." The manifesto, of course, does adduce additional examples of outstanding secular priests, as can be seen in the complete text of the 1864 article. All those named in the text of Peláez, however, are present in the 1864 article, and at times whole phrases are transferred, such as "nada halla[rá] la calumnia más procaz" (not even the most insolent calumny will find anything [to reproach in them]). The differences stem from the different purpose of the two documents.

In the earlier document Peláez was trying to present succinctly to the overseas minister the essential points of the dispute over the parishes, and there was no place for rhetorical amplification or emotional appeals. However, the 1864 article directed to the public adds several other names to make the list more impressive. Of the outstanding Filipino priests that were not mentioned by the "Brebes apuntes," the most prominent were, besides Peláez himself, two members of the cathedral chapter mentioned

above, Fr. Mariano García and Fr. Ramón Fernández. The most obvious explanation of this difference was the fact that Peláez himself, besides holding the position of treasurer of the cabildo, was at the time—or just had been—vicar-capitular of the vacant see. He very likely judged it inappropriate for him to mention those of the body to which he belonged and headed in a document to the overseas minister signed by himself. Moreover, positions in the cabildo were theoretically bestowed on priests of outstanding merit and theological competence, even though in fact they were often obtained through political connections, or even bribery, of key officials in the Overseas Ministry, as is clear from Archbishop Melitón's comments on the cabildo as he found it on his arrival in Manila. They were, nonetheless, appointments that the overseas minister himself had approved and had issued in the name of the Queen.

Instead, Peláez was concerned with the *curas*,⁸⁷ the parish priests of the most important parishes of Manila and the provinces, who had obtained their positions through competitive examinations (*oposiciones*), and thus distinguished themselves. (Though the governor-general, as vice-royal patron, made the actual appointment, normally he chose the first of the three names, the *terna*, presented to him by the archbishop on the basis of the results of the *oposiciones*. Thus, there was little room for such bribery or political maneuvering as often took place in the Overseas Ministry for nominations to the cathedral chapter.)

87. I have retained the Spanish term "cura," or used it alternately with "parish priest," to designate the priest in charge of a parish, because there is a discrepancy between some common Filipino terminology in English and that usual in American ecclesiastical terminology. Though Spanish speakers often used the term "curas," especially when speaking in an abusive or joking fashion, to designate priests generally, its correct usage is to designate the priest in charge of a parish, abbreviated from *cura párroco*. Among English-speaking Filipinos, this latter term is, both in normal speech and in official designation, translated as "parish priest." Among non-Filipino English speakers, however, that term is not always understood, and simply taken to be any priest assigned, in whatever capacity, to a parish. Many Filipinos writing history, particularly of this period, simply transliterate the term "cura" into "curate," and "curato" into "curacy." For English-speaking Americans, the "curate," if they use the term anymore, means "assistant [pastor]," or, more recently, "associate pastor." The Spanish

Fr. Mariano Gómez⁸⁸ in Bacoor had been vicar-forane since 1847, and would be such until his death, and had cared for both the spiritual and temporal welfare of his parish and indeed the entire province (Gómez 1922/1972; Quirino 1973, esp. 76–77). Fr. Modesto de Castro, of Naic, was author of the Tagalog classic, *Urbana at Felizá*, and numerous other original and translated devotional works in Tagalog, besides having a record of building up the parishes he had held and opening schools in their barrios, even paying teachers out of his personal funds (Santiago 1985b). Frs. Florentino Ramírez of Ermita and Agustín Mendoza of Sta. Cruz held the two largest parishes of Manila, implying their having surpassed numerous other candidates in the oposiciones for such important parishes. Fr. Faustino Villafranca, the interim parish priest of relatively insignificant Calamba, held a doctorate in theology, the only parish priest possessing such, and would later obtain a prebend in the cabildo. Fr. Pedro Leyba of Rosario held the parish in Batangas second in numbers only to Balayan. Fr. José Ma. Zamora a few months later in 1864 would take first place in the oposiciones conducted to fill the vacant parishes of Manila and emerge first over Jacinto Zamora and José Burgos. However, he chose that of Marikina (Marikina), rather than one of the more prestigious positions of parish priests of the Sagrario of the cathedral, which went to Zamora and Burgos. (Probably he chose Marikina as it was second only to Santa Cruz in Manila for its number of tributes and, therefore, for its income. He had been a coadjutor also in that parish.)

“curato” is in American English simply “parish,” or, rather rarely and now obsoletely, “curacy.” In Filipino usage the term “pastor” is normally reserved for Protestant pastors, while in American Catholic usage, “pastor” is the equivalent of “parish priest,” or the corresponding minister in Protestant churches. The failure to understand these various terms has led to many erroneous conclusions among both Filipino and American history writers dealing with the nineteenth-century struggle between the Filipino secular clergy and the friars. (Anglican terminology and general British terminology differ somewhat from all these, but since correct Filipino English usage is derived from, though different from, American Roman Catholic usage, there is no need to discuss that here.)

88. Carlos Quirino, in the article cited here, has maintained (and unfortunately been followed by certain others, some even attributing it to Gómez’s na-

In citing these parish priests, Peláez evidently was making the point that there were Filipino curas who were not only respected but were presumably of high intellectual ability, inasmuch as these were the most important of the parishes open to the secular clergy, except in the case of Calamba. But this apparent exception possessed another kind of proof of his competence, as noted above. The omission of the important parish of Balayan in both documents must be an indication that its priest was not an unquestionable model for reasons other than his theological competence (Peláez 1851, 27–28; ASV 1866; Manuel 1955–1986, 1:182–84, 473, 490; 3:259–62; Santiago 1985a, 47; Villarroel 1971, 56; Quirino 1973, 76–77).

Fifteen years earlier Peláez had advised Fr. Mariano Gómez, when the Cavite priests were preparing an exposition to the Queen against their being dispossessed of seven parishes in that province to be transferred to the Recollects and Dominicans, “It would be difficult to maintain that the instruction of the [secular] clergy is at the level it should be. Nonetheless, one can say that they have sufficient instruction in the substantial matters,” and more knowledge of moral theology than many young friar priests have at the time of their ordination, even though one must admit their command of Spanish is deficient (Peláez 1851, 24–25).

Thanks largely to the efforts of Peláez himself and the young priests over whom he had so much influence in the university, that situation had already changed among the university-educated Manila clergy. It was

tionalism) that Gómez “always signed his name as ‘Gomes,’” since “there is no ‘z’ in the Tagalog alphabet, and Father Gomes probably preferred to use the ‘s’ . . .” (Quirino 1973, 20). There was, of course, considerable confusion between “z” and “s” in nineteenth-century Philippine documents, especially when copied by *escribientes*. Quirino, however, presents a photograph of Gomez’s signature on the plate following p. 32. But Quirino was deceived by the formation of the “z” in handwritten Spanish documents. At present I have before me a letter of a few years ago, signed by the well-known historian of the Philippines, and former Spanish ambassador to this country, Don Pedro Ortiz Armengol, who signs his name with exactly the same kind of “z” as Gómez. Quirino unfortunately raised a spurious issue based on an erroneous understanding, and others unacquainted with Spanish handwriting have propagated it, even to absurd conclusions.

predominantly these that Peláez held up as examples of the competence of the Filipino clergy (Villaruel 1971, *passim*, esp. the relatively large number of Filipino secular priests obtaining graduate degrees; Schumacher 1981, 9; Santiago 1985a, *passim*). The academic level of the secular clergy would be improved more generally as the Vincentians gradually took over the administration and instruction in the seminaries, as had already begun, though these would not have university degrees (Dela Goza and Cavanna 1985, 69–75).

A second difference in these two passages is that the 1864 article concentrates not so much on the intellectual quality of the secular clergy as on what they had accomplished in projects to improve the parish itself as well as the lives of their parishioners. For some it was in building churches and conventos where the parish was new, or improving their old churches, even when only holding the parish on an interim basis, or contributing from their own resources toward schools of primary instruction and of *latinidad*.⁸⁹ Others had stimulated their people to try new forms of agriculture and to raise livestock, or undertake other projects for the benefit of the town. Though it is probably true that those cited in the article were a minority among the secular clergy as a whole, their efforts were important for the argument of the article. For these accomplishments, indicating a broader understanding of the role of the parish priest, had been an argument traditionally in favor of the clergy of the religious orders, with whom the secular clergy were normally very unfavorably compared. The achievements of the secular priest of

89. The *escuelas de latinidad* were schools founded by private individuals, often by secular priests. They were of varying quality, but sought to bridge the gap between provincial primary education and the Manila secondary schools run by the Dominicans and Jesuits. Prior to the expulsion of the Jesuits and the decline of the friar orders beginning in the latter part of the eighteenth century, it had always been the missionaries who supplied primary education. But due to the precipitous decline in the religious orders in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the schools had fallen into decay or disappeared (Schumacher 1984, 257–64, 270; Blanco Andrés 2003, 169–212; 2004a, 119–43; 2004e, 703–37). Hence the government decree of 1863, creating an official system of primary education. This decree, however, was never completely implemented, even by the end of the Spanish regime.

Antipolo were especially significant to the author's argument. The devious and unethical means used, including bribery of high government officials by the Recollect, Fr. Guillermo Agudo (Blanco Andrés 2006b), in order to obtain the wealthiest parish in the Philippines still burned in the hearts not only of the Filipino secular clergy but of the archbishop (Peláez 1863, 104–19; Blanco Andrés 2004c; Melitón-Barili, 5 Aug. 1864, ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 447, no. 1887).

Possible Priest Authors or Collaborators in the Manifesto

This dependence of the 1864 manifesto on the “Brebes apuntes” raises again the question of the identity of the member of the secular clergy who possessed Peláez's own copy of his treatise. His closest friend in the chapter, Fr. Ignacio Ponce de León, had died with him in the earthquake. It seems quite unlikely that there was any close friendship between Peláez and the dean of the chapter, Manuel Peralta, even apart from the fact that the latter could not be considered one of “Los Filipinos.” The exemplary priestly character of Peláez, to which all gave testimony, makes such a friendship quite improbable. In his lifetime even his mortal enemies, such as the Augustinian and Recollect comisarios-procuradores, Mayordomo and Agudo, for all their lack of scruples, had never ventured to question his outstanding qualities as a priest. It is most unlikely that he would have closely associated himself with a priest of such unsavory reputation as Peralta.

Peláez's other unpublished writings on the question of the parishes all ended up in the Jesuit archives, most likely through his confessor, Fr. Pedro Bertrán, S.J. It is theoretically possible that, to safeguard them from seizure by the authorities (though nothing in any sense subversive may be found in them), Peláez himself might have given them to Bertrán; but the fact that the last letter to the nuncio is among them, written less than two weeks (22 May 1863) before Peláez's unforeseen death, makes it most unlikely. The correspondence with the nuncio was still ongoing, and indeed the last letter expected an answer from him. Though Bertrán had admonished him for his bringing ecclesiastical questions into the public forum (Bertrán-Izquierdo, 24 Dec. 1872, in Schumacher 1972a, 268–69; 1999, 290–93), he continued to be Peláez's

confessor to the last day of his life (Schumacher 1972a, 110–13; 1999, 102–3; “A La Nación” 1864, 13), and more than once gave testimony to Peláez’s personal priestly life.⁹⁰

The fact, however, that the “Brebes apuntes” did not end up with Bertrán, though the letter in which it was enclosed did, leaves us with the question of who possessed Peláez’s personal copy of the essay at the time of his death. It had to be a close confidant, both of Peláez and of Bertrán, since it was the original version, not yet revised, made before sending the more polished and temperate one to the agent in Madrid who had agreed to get it to the overseas minister. Therefore, Peláez would not lightly have given the stronger version of “Brebes apuntes” to anyone in whom he (or more probably his nephew, if it took place after Peláez’s death, as seems most likely) did not have great trust. To find the author of at least the section in the article “A La Nación” we have compared above, one must look for a Filipino cleric, one very close to Peláez, and one who was at the same time in a position to know, for

90. The case of Burgos was different. His confessor was Fr. Magín Ferrando, S.J. However, at the time Burgos began to join his campaign for the Filipino clergy to that of the liberals, such as the Regidor brothers, something Peláez had not done, Fr. Bertrán was the Jesuit superior. According to the latter’s letter to Izquierdo, he had asked Burgos in 1870 not to come to the Jesuit house anymore for confession, as long as he persisted in that course of publicly campaigning through anticlerical newspapers. (*La Discusión*, where his main articles appeared, was known as a Masonic newspaper. The vehicle of Peláez’s articles, *El Clamor Público*, had no such known ideological orientation, and equally published articles of Agudo, for example, and apparently of anyone who wished to subsidize them.) Though Bertrán says that he had similarly admonished Peláez, he does not say that he had refused to be his confessor any longer (Schumacher 1972a, 268–69; 1999, 290–93). Thus, Bertrán glides over the difference between his role in the 1860s as an ordinary priest giving counsel and confession and his role in 1870 as Jesuit superior, with a desire to dissociate Jesuits from the Cavite Mutiny. It is evident from the statement in “A La Nación” that, if Peláez, who certainly had not conceived himself to be in danger of death on the day of the earthquake, had made his confession to Bertrán that day, there had been no break in relations with the Jesuits as there was in the case of Burgos. Burgos had ceased going to the Ateneo Municipal for confession, and only called again on his former confessor, Father Magín Ferrando, on the day before he was executed.

example, the accomplishments and priestly character of the Manila curas, particularly those not mentioned by Peláez.

The first likely place to look is the cathedral chapter, or rather those Filipino capitulars who survived the earthquake. Having eliminated Peralta from consideration, we have singled out Dr. Ramón Fernández as the only likely one. Holding a doctorate in canon law, and being a ranking member of the cabildo, he was presumably familiar with the clergy of the archdiocese so as to be able to pick out priests deserving to be held up as examples of Filipino capability. Based on his position, Fernández, then, can be considered a possible author of the passage on the competence of the Filipino clergy in the manifiesto. However, in the light of that section of the manifiesto's at least partial dependence on the "Breves apuntes," another factor enters in. Would he be one to whom Peláez (or his nephew) would have entrusted that confidential document?

No doubt, Fernández was much influenced by Peláez, like almost all the cabildo, even the peninsulars, as the archbishop asserted. But there is no indication of a relationship such as Peláez had with Ponce de León, with whom he not only shared the work of governing the archdiocese when ruling it as vicar-capitular, but with whom he shared a house and whom he referred to in his report to the archbishop as "my friend" (Peláez 1862a, 15). Rather, if we accept the statement of the archbishop in another context, it was Peralta who had "a very close friendship with the doctoral canon [Fernández]" (*tiene íntima amistad con el Doctoral*) (letter quoted in Blanco Andrés 2005d; italics mine). Obviously, the lack of positive evidence as to the relations of Peláez and Fernández is an argument from silence. However, the close friendship of Fernández with Peralta, a person unlikely to have been on intimate terms with Peláez, gives more force to the argument. In addition, there is no evidence of Fernández having been close to Bertrán or to the Jesuits in general. Together with the strong evidence cited above that Fernández was at least one of the authors of the harsh attack on the archbishop by "Dos Suscritores," his being the principal clerical author of the manifiesto in which the archbishop is defended, and even praised, becomes unlikely, though this is not to deny that he played a part in its composition. Indeed, his membership in the Colegio de los Abogados would have

made him a logical person to solicit the collaboration of Fuentes and any other lawyers who might have been involved in the multiauthored work. But that is a different matter from being a close friend of Peláez and a likely recipient of the confidential "Brebes apuntes."

The Burgos Tradition

The arguments against Fernández as a confidant of Peláez leave the way open for one outside the chapter, but closely related to it, as possible author of one or both passages that we shall consider. This person could be José Burgos, to whom a tradition going back at least to Rizal has attributed the 1864 manifesto, and who has been considered traditionally as the successor of Peláez. That tradition, however, needs to be examined more closely to ascertain its force.

There is evidence, in fact, which has not been marshaled until now, that there is at least as much probability of Burgos's participation, indeed more, as there is for Fernández's. If it be supposed that Fernández, as a capitular, would have a wide knowledge of the outstanding priests of the archdiocese, this would not be a major factor if Burgos possessed the "Brebes apuntes," since, as has been indicated above, every priest named in Peláez's notes is likewise, without exception, reproduced in the 1864 article. As to the additional names added, there is no reason why Burgos, long in clerical circles in spite of his being still a deacon, should not be aware of the other outstanding priests of the archdiocese. The difference between the two documents, as we have noted, is that Peláez was writing a succinct summary for the overseas minister, while the manifesto was written for a wider audience. Hence, it wanted to make the list more impressive by citing other outstanding priests than those who had won the most important parishes through their theological competence in the oposiciones. It was a frequent contention of the friars and their advocates that the friar parish priests not only looked to their ecclesiastical functions but promoted the general welfare of their parishioners. Indeed, especially in an earlier time, not a few spent their income on making the churches splendid temples of the divine services, while the secular clergy often looked to enriching their

families and neglected the towns where they were stationed (examples in Schumacher 1987, 206 [1804]; 213–14 [1827]).

To counteract this frequent, and not totally untrue, friar boast, the author tries to cite other priests who, though they might occupy less important parishes, worked to develop their towns and beautify their churches, even out of their own resources. Burgos, long in clerical circles though still some months away from the priesthood, was no less likely to be well informed on the Manila clergy than was Fernández.

Secondly, there is considerable evidence that Peláez had headed an active movement among the younger Filipino clergy to prove themselves equally or more fit for the parishes and cabildo of Manila. As may be gathered from the research of Dr. Luciano Santiago (1984), the first dozen or more Filipino secular priests obtained their doctorate in one of the ecclesiastical disciplines in some thirty years during the eighteenth century, beginning in the time of Archbishop Sancho de Sta. Justa. There was then a gap of over forty years before the next group of priests, beginning with Frs. Mariano García and Pedro Peláez in 1844, would appear as intellectual leaders.⁹¹

91. My figures differ slightly from those of Santiago because he includes, in accordance with the title of his article (the nineteenth century), Dr. Juan de Dios, who obtained his doctorate in 1801. I have rather considered him to belong to the movement begun in the late eighteenth century than with that of the priests obtaining the doctoral degree from the 1840s on. Likewise, he omits criollos like Dr. Ignacio Salamanca, in which he is no doubt correct for the eighteenth century, since these were generally considered Spaniards, though he includes them, such as Peláez, for the nineteenth century. By the time of Peláez, as we have indicated in several places above, the criollo priests generally considered themselves, and were considered by the authorities, to be "Filipinos" along with other *hijos del país*. Thus, the new generation would begin with Mariano García, a Tagalog, and Peláez, a criollo, who both were awarded their doctoral degrees in 1844, though Peláez had been ordained only in 1838, while García had been ordained in 1822, and did not obtain his doctorate until sixteen years after his ordination. To sum up, the intellectually active new generation was led by Peláez, though García would be a more silent part of it. It is even likely that Peláez may have been the one to persuade the older man to continue for his degree as a part of his plan to create a group of Filipino priests who could

Santiago's articles open the way to a much larger view of the intellectual renaissance among the secular clergy than merely looking at the relatively small numbers holding a doctorate. On reading Villarroel (1971) thoroughly, the careful eye cannot help but note many other Filipino priests who, though they never obtained a doctorate before the opportunity was closed to them after 1871, were obtaining lesser graduate degrees in various ecclesiastical disciplines, some, perhaps most, with an eye to continuing to a higher degree. Moreover, those working toward graduate degrees that can be known from Villarroel's book are only those whose names occur as examiners or examinees of Burgos, in accordance with the purpose of the already large book.⁹² No doubt an extensive search of the AUST would show many more. For those who had some connection with Burgos, and hence appear in Villarroel's book, provide only a sample of what gives every appearance of having been a concerted movement among the Manila secular clergy.

The leader of that movement, from all the information we have on his competence, leadership qualities, personal priestly character, and intelligence, aside from his priority in obtaining a doctorate, was clearly Peláez. Even when aware of Peláez's role in the opposition to the efforts to deprive the secular clergy of their parishes in favor of the Recollects, certainly one Recollect, Archbishop José Aranguren, evidenced his esteem for Peláez by the positions with which he entrusted him.

challenge the derogatory attitude of the friars and others as to their competence. Santiago (1984, 257–70; 1985a, 34–50) likewise, with his usual careful consultation of the archives, corrects the date of García's birth to 1798, rather than the 1778 birth date usually attributed to him. But in 1864, besides being almost blind, he was sickly and had only seven more years before his death in 1871.

92. Santiago (1985a, 45–46, 48, 49) in several places apparently puts the blame on the university for closing the doctorate to the Filipino secular clergy, where in fact, in the reference to my book that he cites, I make it clear that it was by government intervention. The archivist, Fr. Fidel Villarroel, in his communications to me affirmed that, though he could find no such juridical document in the university archives, it was a fact that there is no record of any ecclesiastical or civil doctorates granted to Filipinos after 1871 until the end of the Spanish regime (Schumacher 1981, 35, n. 11). The Dominicans never had full control of the university and its policies as long as the Spanish regime existed.

Explicit testimonies came from Archbishop Melitón Martínez and Bishop Gaínza, both of whom thoroughly admired him, even when at times they feared, for political reasons, his influence on the other clergy. According to the archbishop, even the peninsular members of the chapter, with one exception, looked up to him as their leader. The Jesuits, especially Bertrán, in spite of his disapproval of one aspect of Peláez's activity, had the highest regard for him. Finally, not only was this esteem found in those who held positions of equality or superiority to him, but also even among his enemies who acknowledged his superior talent and competence by making him the target of the calumnious rumors and insinuations by which they tried to destroy him as an alleged *insurgente*, both before, and even after, his death.

It is also significant that the rumor that spread around Manila contained the names of both Peláez and Ponce de León, as is clear from the statements of both the archbishop and of the Dominican provincial, Fr. Domingo Treserra. Bishop Gaínza, moreover, asserted that he knew who were responsible for propagating that rumor, and that these persons themselves knew that it was a calumny (1864, 180–82). As we have noted above, Agudo believed that Ponce was also involved with Peláez in promoting the bishops' reform proposals, and had authored a pamphlet entitled *Papel volante que un sacerdote del clero secular llevó en persona á los miembros del Consejo de administración, para que en su vista fallasen la exposición de los señores diocesanos como se pide*, sent to the publisher shortly before the earthquake. Yet, *La Verdad*, in its provocative article for which Agudo was responsible, did not mention any names. But the fact that in the "A La Nación" article the author of the section defending the memory of Peláez did not mention Ponce de León at all, but presumed Peláez to be the target of the calumny, is another indication that it was Burgos who, in his affection for Peláez, was the author of the section. There is no reason to think that he was unaware that the rumor circulating in Manila named Ponce de León together with Peláez, nor that he was indifferent to Peláez's companion and friend, who was a minor figure compared to Peláez. However, Burgos's devotion was directed toward Peláez. Though not a conclusive argument by itself, it is an additional confirmation of our identification.

In the light of this evidence, it is not hard to believe that the most ardent disciple of Peláez's campaign to build up a Filipino clergy intellectually equal or superior to the majority of friar parish priests was Fr. José Burgos. No other cleric already possessed, or at least had the strong probability, even in 1864, of soon possessing, such high qualifications in all the ecclesiastical disciplines (see Santiago 1985a, 41). Such qualifications showed him to be the one who best understood the intellectual goal of Peláez for the Filipino clergy. Clearly he likewise understood, like Peláez, that academic excellence was not enough, but an excellence accompanied by an exemplary priestly life. Though he would later be falsely accused of being *antiespañol*, as Peláez and Gómez had been, none of his enemies accused him of being an unworthy priest, and the archbishop continued to show him particular favor right up to the Cavite Mutiny, even when he was being denounced as *antiespañol*.

Even in the somewhat understandable weakness Bertrán showed in his deferential reply to Izquierdo's letter to the religious orders,⁹³ no doubt attempting to distance the Jesuits from any connection with the Burgos whom Izquierdo had already condemned and executed, he instinctively compared him to Peláez, "a person of more capability and importance" (Schumacher 1999, 292–93).⁹⁴

93. As Izquierdo's report for his successor shows, though as a man of the revolution of 1868 and a Mason he had a basic contempt for all the religious orders, he considered the friars essential in the parishes as instruments to preserve the Filipinos in loyalty to Spain. Acknowledging the usefulness of the Jesuits for the time being for their work of education, and especially their success in spreading Spanish presence in Mindanao, he nonetheless clearly looked forward to a day when they could be dispensed with, since they lacked the "unshakable devotion to Spain" (*españolismo a toda prueba*) that he found in the friars. See Izquierdo 1872. The relevant section is translated in Schumacher 1987, 226–29 (where, however, the archival reference is incorrect). It contrasts sharply with the laudatory encomium he wrote to Bertrán in 1972 (APPSJ, IV-O-24-1872, in Schumacher 1972a, 260–63; 1999, 284–87).

94. Bertrán, however, did not let himself affirm that Burgos was guilty of the revolt, but rather implied that his fault was in associating with the perpetrators. Such an interpretation was implicit in the reprimand he had given to Burgos: "Even supposing that you will have sufficient strength to turn back, *perhaps you may not be able to prevent a hand doubly criminal from writing your name on a banner waved*

Moreover, elementary prudence cautioned Burgos not to reveal himself publicly as early in his career as 1864 to be the one carrying on Peláez's dedicated commitment to the struggle of the native clergy. But once established in a secure position, as he thought, he would cast that prudence aside in 1869, even at the risk of bringing on himself the fate that in retrospect we can see was being prepared for him, just as it had been for Peláez had he not died in the earthquake.

With all this in mind, one who reads the indignant passage repudiating the Recollect comisario-procurador's deliberately calumnious accusation, set alongside the evidently deep respect it displays for Peláez, finds it hard to think of anyone else among the clergy but his ardent disciple who would author at least this passage as well as the one dependent on the "Breves apuntes." To put it in commonplace terms, Peláez was the hero and model of the younger Burgos, who made himself the older man's disciple. Added to that is the fact that we know of no one else who was so close to the Jesuits at that time as to have sought out Bertrán after Peláez's death and been the recipient of Bertrán's simple but eloquent tribute to the priest to whom he had been confessor. Undoubtedly, Fernández admired Peláez's competence, and was influenced

by deluded men and traitors. . . ." (Schumacher 1972, 268–69; 1999, 292–93; italics mine). In other words, the true conspirator(s) had used Burgos's name to give strength to their cause. That his name was in fact so used is repeatedly asserted in the confessions of those who were involved with the mutiny, such as the soldier Bonifacio Octavo whose lengthy testimony Izquierdo made a major proof justifying his draconian actions (Tormo 1973, 164–68). Bertrán thus tacitly accepted the reality of the conspiracy, blaming Burgos for associating his cause with those who had other goals, but it was difficult for him to say less without accusing an already hostile Izquierdo. Yet in the private manuscript history of the Ateneo Municipal Jesuit community, written a year or two later, he apparently wrote more straightforwardly: "Scarcely anyone doubts there were some innocent men among them, or at least ones who deserved to be treated with much greater leniency" (Bertrán [?] 1873, 70–71; cf. Schumacher 1999, 28). His caution did not placate the anticlerical Mason, Izquierdo, who, as seen above, in his "Memoria" expressed nothing but contempt for the Jesuits, in spite of the lofty encomium he had earlier written to Bertrán (APPSJ, IV-O-24-1872, in Schumacher 1999, 284–87).

by him, but there is no sign that their relation went deeper than that. One could hardly call him a disciple of Peláez, if he was an intimate friend of Peralta, as we have noted above. Hence, even apart from the external testimony we will come to shortly, the most likely candidate, at least for these two passages, is Deacon José Burgos.

With regard to the other clearly “clerical” passage discussed above, we conceded a limited probability of its composition by Fernández, as a leading member of the *cabildo*. But we considered it more likely that it was Burgos who received the “Brebis apuntes” on which it depended. Moreover, other reasons lead us to conclude that it was more likely to have been Burgos.

First, something must be said regarding the objection that, contrary to Governor-General Echagüe’s assertion that the author of the article “A La Nación” was a member of the clergy, whose name “is not unknown to me,” he did not name him. One likely answer we have alluded to is that the governor was speaking of the moving spirit behind the article, and one who had taken a significant part in its composition. But this did not necessarily exclude the collaboration of others, even implied it, as is indicated by the fact that, after speaking of one, he mentioned in the following sentence others concerned—*los interesados*. This one the governor named could very well have been Fernández; even possibly, but with less probability, Peralta. But likewise it could possibly have been Burgos, though undoubtedly he would have needed other clerical collaborators, such as Fernández, who, as noted above, held a doctorate in canon law, as well as being an *abogado de matrícula* in civil law and therefore likely to be in contact with the civil lawyer(s) who took part. Burgos, at the time, had completed only his *bachillerato* in canon law. The canonical argumentation in the manifesto, as well as his leading position in the *cabildo*, strongly suggests that Fernández was prominent among those who collaborated in significant parts of the article, and may well have been the moving spirit behind it also.

Second, the letter of Echagüe to the minister is not concerned with giving him the details of the conflict between the Recollects and the Filipino clergy, but with assuring him that, despite the inflammatory articles in the Madrid newspapers, there had been no conspiracy afoot in

Manila and that he was well in control of the situation there. Hence, he relates that he knows, and has informed the archbishop of, the identity of the “author” of the article of the Filipino clergy that would soon appear in Madrid. He even has a copy, “in spite of the reserve and secrecy with which *those involved* have taken this step” (a pesar de la reserva y misterio con que *los interesados* han dado este paso) (AHN, Ultramar, Filipinas, 2205, s/n, Gracia y Justicia. carta 922; reservada; in Blanco Andrés 2004b, 650; italics mine). As may be seen in the quotation, having spoken of the *autor* in the singular, he continues in the same sentence to speak of “those involved” (*los interesados*) in the plural. Hence, his letter would not contradict the Recollects in asserting that the authorship was in some sense multiple, but that it was only the member of the clergy that he was sufficiently concerned with to have informed the archbishop.

Third, if it be argued that, if he really knew which member of the clergy was involved, he would have put the name in what was a confidential (*reservada*) letter to the minister (Blanco Andrés 2005c). However, another possibility is that it was precisely because the name would have meant nothing to the minister that he did not include it, even in this confidential letter. Had the author been Peralta or Fernández, there would be reason to suspect that he did not know the author in his omitting to give the name. However, if the author was not a member of the cabildo (whose members would be known to the minister, who perhaps had even intervened in their appointment), this argument loses its force. Moreover, if that member of the clergy was not yet even a priest, and had not yet even won the position of cura of the Sagrario at this time, the name would have meant nothing to the minister, since he intervened only in the naming of the members of the cabildo. The fact, then, that Echagüe did not give the name, if it has any significance, is more an argument that the member of the clergy referred to was indeed Burgos, a person unknown outside Manila.

To sum up the internal evidence then, first, it makes it sufficiently clear that more than one person was involved in the composition of the article “A La Nación.” How many they were—most probably one or two lawyers and a few members of the Filipino clergy, who took an active,

if not necessarily the principal part—and who were the moving spirits behind the article cannot be established from the available evidence, and probably never will be.

Second, two passages seem certainly to have been written by one or more members of the clergy, of whom the only plausible candidates are Canon Ramon Fernández and Deacon José Burgos. In the abstract, Fernández would seem more probable because of his established position in the chapter, while Burgos was not yet a priest. Moreover, as an “abogado de matrícula,” he would be on familiar terms with the lawyers, both the one(s) who apparently took part in composing the manifesto and those who were behind the almost simultaneous letters of protest to Aguirre Miramón. From the Recollect evidence—namely, their being sent together to Agudo and their being dated at approximately the same time, and their being found in copies today in the same *legajo* in the APAF—the lawyers’ and the clergy’s protests were somehow connected, as we have indicated above. Yet it has been shown that, in spite of his much less important formal position, in reality Burgos too had already established contacts with the lawyers as well as the clergy of the University Claustro, and was evidently in favor with the archbishop. Once he was ordained and installed in the prestigious position of cura of the Sagrario in the succeeding months, he would receive a number of additional appointments from the archbishop, no doubt because of his proven competence and academic distinction. Though not yet of formally prominent stature in the wider circles of the colony, Burgos would have been able to take a major role in that relatively small academic and clerical community.

Third, if Echagüe actually knew of the principal author, as he says in his letter, the very fact that he does not mention the name in a confidential letter to the overseas minister indicates that it was Burgos, someone unknown to the minister. Fernández, whose appointment and promotion were due to the Overseas Ministry, would have had a significance in Madrid that Burgos at this stage would have had only locally in Manila. But this was where the article was composed, the very fact that enhances the probability in his favor.

What we have said of the probabilities in favor of each of the two clerics has been said in general of their significant participation. When

we come to the two individual passages especially attributed to the clergy, the first, the defense of the secular clergy's competence as parish priests, could possibly come from either man. However, its close parallelism with the "Brebis apuntes" shows that the author of the passage was in possession of a copy of that exposition of Peláez, a theoretical possibility for either man, but far more likely to be Burgos.

The second passage, the indignant defense of Peláez's memory against the calumnious rumors circulated, if not in fact invented, by the Recollect officials, is more convincing. It was more likely to have come from the fervent disciple of Peláez that Burgos was, rather than from an associate who undoubtedly shared his ecclesiastical-political goals, being a member of the cathedral chapter, but is not known to have any particular ties of devotion to Peláez.

Finally, though it must remain an argument from silence, we have no evidence of Fernández being especially close to the Jesuits, particularly Peláez's confessor, Fr. Pedro Bertrán. But it is clear that, even at this point in time, Burgos was very close to them and, in a different way from that with Peláez, looked to them as priestly models.⁹⁵

95. Though trivial at first sight, one of the early Jesuits (1867) to come to the Philippines after their restoration in 1859, Bro. Francisco Riera, writing his recollections in old age in Spain, recalled—though not always fully accurately—the scandalous exchange of articles between the Recollects and the Filipino clergy in the peninsular press, particularly after the Recollects took Antipolo. "The canon [*sic*], José Burgos, who up to then was considered by all a very good priest, and made his Confession every week at our house with Father [Magín] Ferrando, and was the only native priest who wore the *manteo* in public from the time of the arrival of our first Fathers, moved by their example, was the principal one who fanned the fire. . . . Father Ferrando tried to calm the spirits, and reprimanded Father Burgos; the latter ceased making his Confession with Ours for some time. . . ." (Riera 1922, 11). Burgos, of course, held an interim canonry at least three times but never succeeded in getting a permanent appointment from Madrid (Schumacher 1999, 238–43; Tormo 1973; 131–32). The *manteo* was a long cape which the clergy, by church regulations, were supposed to wear over their *sotanas* (cassocks) in public. It is curious, and perhaps significant, that all the likenesses we have of Burgos from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, whether photographs or more probably engravings, show him, as is also true of the Jesuits (and of Peláez, whom Riera never knew), wearing the

Origin of the Burgos Tradition

Given the anonymity with which “A La Nación” was published over the signature of “Los Filipinos,” though Governor Echagüe and Fathers Felix and Agudo all claimed to know the source of the article, none of them named any particular person, much less Burgos, as its author. If Echagüe did in fact know the member of the clergy behind it and, as he declared, had he so informed the archbishop, the latter never gave any indication of the author other than “the secular clergy.” The archbishop, however, had been in communication with his clergy, and they [Burgos?] had informed him of their intentions to reply, though not telling him how or where, beforehand (Melitón-Barili, 4 Sept. 1864; ASV Arch. Nunz. Madrid, no. 2046). Not long after the appearance of Peláez’s pamphlet in Manila, he wrote the nuncio, incensed at the insulting articles being published against him through Agudo and Mayordomo in the Madrid newspapers, and threatened to publish a refutation if they continued. Concerning his clergy’s reaction, he said:

The members of the native clergy, offended by the judgments regarding them, tell me that they are preparing to defend themselves. They began the battle with the publication of a pamphlet printed in the offices of *El Clamor Público* . . . It was put together, according to what I have been told, by the unfortunate Peláez. (ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid 447, no. 396, 5 Jan. 1863 [*sic*; should be 1864])

However, he perhaps never saw the published article, “A La Nación,” since, on writing to the nuncio a few weeks before it was published in

manteo, while the other secular clergy pictured do not—for obvious reasons in the tropics! It is difficult today to imagine the importance that some Jesuits of those days attached to such a trivial matter. The very triviality of the detail recalled by Brother Riera after fifty-five years (he arrived in the Philippines in 1867 [and therefore was not present at the time of the Antipolo affair or during the lifetime of Peláez] and wrote his recollections on returning to Spain in 1922) is an indication of the essential veracity of Burgos’s image as an exemplary priest and a disciple of the Jesuits. But Riera errs on events of more importance, like the Antipolo affair, which he knew only by hearsay from Jesuits who had inaugurated the Jesuit mission in the years before his arrival.

Madrid, he told him, evidently relying on Echagüe, that it seemed to be “some kind of manifiesto to the nation” that would appear in *La América* (Martínez-Barili, 4 Sept. 1864, ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 447, no. 2046; in Uy 1984, 161).

If it was Burgos whose name Echagüe had given the archbishop, far from reprimanding him, the archbishop rather showed increasing signs of confidence in his competence and priestly character in the following months and through the first years after his ordination. No doubt he was not displeased to see *La Verdad's* calumnies answered, since almost from the beginning of his episcopate the paper had attacked and calumniated him and his programs for the reform of the Philippine church. Indeed, even before “A La Nación” was written, he had entered into negotiations to subsidize a newspaper to counteract the Recollect- and Augustinian-subsidized Madrid newspapers, and only desisted on the advice of the nuncio (Uy 1984, 101–3). The article is not mentioned further in his correspondence with the nuncio after the latter told him that it was no problem and that not even the procurators of the friar orders had mentioned it to him (Barili-Martínez, 6 Nov. 1864, ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 447, no. 2118; in Uy 1984, 161). Little did the nuncio know of the exchange of letters taking place between Felix and Agudo in those very months, but as has been seen neither ever mentioned to him the article of the Filipino clergy.

Indeed, there is good reason to think that in the face of the enormous power and resources Agudo, and with him Mayordomo, exercised in the Overseas Ministry under various governments, which they used to make further incursions on the parishes belonging to the secular clergy, the archbishop not only attacked them in various expositions he sent directly to different ministers in Madrid in the years 1865–1871, but he was, to say the least, not adverse to any action the secular clergy on their own might take to defend themselves. After 1865 he was continuously in action, urging in both official and private letters the reforms from which the other bishops had withdrawn, especially the amovilidad ad nutum, though he refrained from any public attacks on the two offending orders. Governor-General Echagüe, desirous of the status quo, at one point actually wrote confidentially to Madrid, asking that another archbishop belonging to a religious order relieve Melitón Martínez who

could be transferred to a peninsular see (Blanco Andrés 2004f). It seems that the archbishop had lost the fear that the secular clergy might prove subversive, which had made him hesitate under the impact of the rumor of the pseudoconspiracy and the shock produced by the earthquake that killed Peláez and his companions. In the instability of governments throughout those years, when one overseas minister followed another as the governments changed, he repeated his proposals, hoping that a new minister would give a better hearing. But the strength of Agudo lay in the *Negociado de Ultramar*, the relatively permanent bureaucracy that survived changes of ministers (Blanco Andrés 2005c).

In 1870–1871, after the fall of the monarchy in 1868, which at first left him without influence in Madrid, the archbishop would write two more letters to the regent, Marshal Francisco Serrano the first dated 31 December 1870, the second a week later, asking for reforms in both the regular and secular clergy. With them, he enclosed an undated copy of an exposition of their position by the secular clergy, almost certainly the work of Burgos. Since the second letter of the archbishop and the copy of the secular clergy document are written by the same copyist, it is clear that the clergy had communicated their appeal for the revocation of the decree of 1861 to the archbishop. The presence of all these documents together, as well as the original of the clergy's exposition in the same legajo today, indicates that when the archbishop says, as he does in the letter to the nuncio cited above, that “the members of the native clergy . . . tell me” (ASV, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 447, no. 396, 5 Jan. 1863 [*sic*, should be 1864]) he was not only aware of their activity, but was even to some extent working with them in their struggle for justice, at least from 1864 to early 1871 (AHN, Ultramar, leg. 2255, exp. 2 and 6; Schumacher 1972a, 38–40, 194–246; 1999, 36–37, 193–238; Blanco Andrés 2004f). Although he had expressed concern over the publication of the 1864 manifesto in his letter to the nuncio, he had not desisted from pursuing his reform program quietly, even when the other bishops withdrew their support. Even when Burgos in 1871–1872 would ally himself with the liberals as the only recourse left, it appears either that the archbishop preferred to turn a blind eye or the clergy deliberately kept silent about the more radical aspects of their approach so as not to compromise him.

If we are correct in attributing the secular clergy document of 1870 to Burgos, as all the evidence indicates, it is not surprising that the archbishop did not restrain or reprimand his clergy, even if he knew the leaders of the protest, as he certainly did by 1869, and likely earlier. Moreover, even when Burgos began to be denounced as *antiespañol* in 1869–1870, the archbishop did not cease pursuing the cause of the secular clergy with a regent in power who might be expected to listen to new arguments. (Unfortunately, the regency of Serrano ceased in January 1871, and a new ministry came to power.) No doubt, the archbishop, though so often frustrated in his hopes, had become more embattled by 1871, and the evidence points to his showing at least benign tolerance, and perhaps favor, to these efforts of his clergy, whatever might have been his earlier attitude toward the political question of maintaining the peninsular character of the *cabildo*.

One must ask further, then, how the tradition of Burgos as the author of the 1864 document arose and on what evidence it rests. The first to question his authorship, as far as can be determined, was Fr. Fidel Villaroel (1971, 60–61), correctly pointing out that, though “scores of writers have taken Burgos’s authorship for granted,” it should be noted that “all these writers belong to the present century and . . . none of them has advanced substantial evidence to prove this contention. We would certainly like to believe that Burgos was the real author, because the manifesto’s ideas coincide with the attitude of Burgos in that dispute.”

As Villarroel points out, the first known to have affirmed that authorship in print was Manuel Artigas (1911a, 4), an assertion the latter repeated in his book of the same year (1911b, 86, n. 1) where he says, “It is entirely the work of Dr. Burgos” (“*Todo es obra del Dr. Burgos*”). As we have shown at length in Part One of this article, Artigas almost certainly never saw the 1864 article, and instead used the 1889 interpolated pamphlet from Hong Kong. He is certainly wrong with regard to the 1889 edition being completely the work of Burgos, and, in the light of the evidence from the *Recollects*, he is likewise wrong regarding the 1864 original article, which he never saw.

If then the statement about it being totally the work of Burgos is not merely one of Artigas’s many sweeping, careless, and erroneous state-

ments, he could only have made that assertion on the basis of some oral source, perhaps one of those who had been in contact with Basa, or Rizal, or Marcelo del Pilar. However, as usual, he offers no evidence at all for such a contact. It is safe to say likewise that all other authors up to 1972 simply repeated Artigas, until I had the bad judgment to publish the 1889 pamphlet (wrongly dating it to 1888). I did, however, as I have said earlier, note that evidently it had been interpolated, and that in the absence of the original it was not certain that it was genuinely the work of Burgos (1972a, 22–23, 36–37, 58–115).

Role of Rizal in the Tradition

In publishing the 1889 pamphlet, I did not rely on Artigas at all, but rather on the statement of Rizal in his letter of 1890 cited in the first part of this article. It deserves to be examined again in more detail. Writing from Paris to Ponce in Barcelona on 19 March 1889, Rizal is trying to persuade *La Solidaridad* to speak more of outstanding Filipinos in its articles and to quote from their writings (“citad sus frases”). He continues: “In those books of *Viva España, Viva*, there are articles of Burgos. If you do not have them, here I have plenty” (“En aquellos libros de *Viva España, Viva*, hay artículos de Burgos. Si allí no tenéis, aquí tengo yo una infinidad”) (Rizal 1930–1938, 2:148).

It should be observed that Rizal is writing from memory in general terms to someone who will understand what he means. One would not normally call the pamphlets he refers to, like *Viva España. Viva el Rey. Viva el Ejército. Fuera los Frailes*, “books,” since this and its companion work each have only around forty pages. The companion pamphlet, as the knowledgeable bibliographers agree, is the *Manifiesto que a la noble Nación Española derigen [sic] los leales Filipinos en defensa de su honra y fidelidad gravemente vulneradas por el periódico “La Verdad” de Madrid* (Pardo de Tavera 1903, nos. 2807, 1597–99; Retana 1907, nos. 2625, 2669). Both pamphlets were part of the propaganda campaign around the Manila demonstration demanding the resignation of Archbishop Pedro Payo and the expulsion of the friars. The latter pamphlet must be what Rizal was referring to as “articles of Burgos,” though there is in fact only one article, the one we are discussing in this paper. All the other

parts of these pamphlets deal with alleged antifriar events of 1887–1888. When Rizal tells Ponce that, if the latter does not have a copy in Barcelona, Rizal has an “infinidad” with him in Paris, he is clearly speaking of the 1889 interpolated version, published by Basa, as he could scarcely have “una infinidad” of the 1864 article.

We may then conclude that Rizal knew the 1864 original, had a copy of it, and very likely was the one who either did the interpolations—certainly some, perhaps all—or collaborated with Basa in doing so.⁹⁶ As noted earlier, Marcelo del Pilar seems to have spent a short time in Hong Kong with Basa, but it was some time after the departure of Rizal on his return to Europe by way of the United States. But it is unlikely that del Pilar had the time to do more than to bring the added antifriar documents from Manila and have them included in the pamphlet. Nor, as pointed out in Part One of this article, is there any likelihood of Basa himself having a copy of the original.

A brief excursus seems necessary at this point. Whatever Izquierdo might actually have known or believed, he maintained, both publicly and in his confidential letter to the overseas minister, that all those executed or exiled in 1872 had been part of one multisectoral movement. In this, historians have generally followed him, whether in maintaining the guilt or defending the innocence of these priests, lawyers, merchants, and other civilians. Thus, there has been reference to a “Committee for Reforms” (*Comité de Reformadores*) (Artigas 1911b, 55–57; Manuel 1955–1986, 2:69); a “Liberal Party” (*Partido Liberal*) (Buencamino 1969, 4); and other names presupposing an organized group. Some have distinguished three subsections: one comprising the lawyers, landowners, and merchants; a second, the activist priests; and a third, the *Juventud Escolar Liberal* for the university students (Artigas 1911b, 57). In fact, however, it seems that there was no such formally adopted general designation for all the groups, even though there were some connections

96. Those passages that can be attributed to Rizal with a high degree of certainty are those marked out in the text of the genuine manifesto in Part One by the reference notes 24, 29, 45, 47. This list does not pretend to be exhaustive, and it is very probable that the other interpolations are likewise due to Rizal.

among certain individuals. All the descriptions of later authors once more depend ultimately on Artigas who in turn derived his idea from the documents of Izquierdo, copies of which he had seen in the government archives of Manila (Manuel 1955–1986, 1:315).

The Juventud Escolar Liberal in particular seems to have been primarily concerned with university issues rather than political ones, even if some protonationalist slogans were connected with it (Villaruel 1971, 97–106). Even the passing and somewhat opaque account, written twelve years later by Sancianco (1881, 111), a former member of the Juventud Escolar Liberal, though he errs on dates, correctly rejects any subversive purpose of the student demonstration. Rather, he declares, the anonymous letters or leaflets “expressed clearly the object, or better said, the legitimate aspiration of the students” (*la legítima aspiración de los estudiantes*). To be sure, it is likely that some students had also attached themselves to the “demonstrations” of their elders in honor of Governor-General de la Torre, but there is little evidence to support Artigas’s assertions of a multisectoral organization of which the students formed one branch. There may have been, and probably were, meetings of small groups with common interests, and they may have overlapped other categories, but there is no need to suppose the alleged three branches of a formal organization supposed by Artigas.

Influence of Paciano

The purpose of this digression has been to give a context against which to examine the attitude and possible activity of Paciano Rizal Mercado.⁹⁷ As Leon Ma. Guerrero (1963, 89) said long ago, “The role that Paciano played in José’s life deserves more attention than it has received.” Artigas narrates an anecdote of that time in which Felipe Buencamino, Paciano, and Gregorio Sanciangco (Sancianco) were presented to a group includ-

97. In the letter cited below Rizal stated that the family name was originally Mercado, but that Paciano had advised him to use their other name of Rizal when registering as a student in 1872, “because the Dominicans did not like Paciano.” However, the records in the AUST show clearly that Paciano had registered both at the Colegio de San José and at the University as “Paciano

ing Burgos, Joaquín Pardo de Tavera, Antonio Regidor, and some other older men. In the discussion, Regidor allegedly asked the students whether their textbook was in Latin or Spanish. When they replied that it was the former, Regidor denounced the practice. As a result, the following day in the course of Canon Law, Buencamino recited the lesson of the day in Spanish. After the class, he is said to have been carried to his residence on the shoulders of his fellow students, shouting the slogan: "Viva el Castellano y abajo el Latín" (Artigas, *Galería de Filipinos Ilustres*, 2:485, cited in Villarroel 1971, 98).

Some months later, a series of anonymous leaflets were found scattered around the university, criticizing some Dominican professors and calling for more academic freedom, among them one proclaiming: "We Indios love our country as the foreigners and Spaniards love [their own] and [we want] not to receive insults from them. *Catedráticos* [Professors], open and see the books of history, and all their pages will prove this truth" (quoted in Villarroel 1971, 99). This and a few other expressions of a protonationalist tinge, primarily directed against one or more Dominican professors, soon led to disclaimers by various classes in the university and other manifestations of unrest. Finally, the rector informed Gov.-Gen. Carlos Ma. de la Torre, who took the matter seriously, and ordered an official investigation (PNA 1870–1873, ff. 822–908).

The investigation of the anonymous leaflets, combined with rumors concerning a supposed plan of rebellion, led to the arrest of Felipe Buencamino, who, after some four months of imprisonment, was released and continued his studies in the university. Since he had lost those four months of his courses, he petitioned the university's rector that he be allowed to make them up under private tutoring by competent mentors in these subjects. The Fiscal Promoter of the university, Joaquín Pardo de Tavera, to whose judgment the petition was entrusted, ruled that this was not within the competence of the rector, but needed

Risal [*sic*] Mercado" (Villarroel 1984, 15). The substitution of "s" for "z," so often used interchangeably in the nineteenth century, was undoubtedly the error of a clerk, continued by Paciano in subsequent years to avoid bureaucratic complications.

the approval of the governor-general, a permission granted in due course.⁹⁸

Buencamino then sought out two professors who would tutor him in the next three summers, that of Canon Law being Fr. José Burgos. There is, however, no sign that Burgos had anywhere intervened in the case up to that point, despite unsupported imaginings of later writers, though it is not unlikely that Buencamino chose him, perhaps at the suggestion of his friend Paciano, as one prominent in the university and whom he considered likely to accept him as a student. In the end, the civil authorities absolved Buencamino. After passing his final oral examination, in which one of the examiners was precisely Fr. Benito Corominas, O.P., *catedrático* of the faculty of canon law, the one he had challenged by reciting the lesson in Spanish, as well as, to all appearances, personally insulted by some of the anonymous leaflets, he received his degree of Bachelor of Canon Law at the hands of Corominas. The carefully documented account of the whole series of events in Villarreal (1971, 97–106) shows clearly that very little reliance can be placed on Artigas's undocumented account, and that there is no evidence of Burgos being involved with the student protest.

Even less trust can be given to the account of Buencamino, written half a century or more after the events. In it he reduces the events of 1869 to one sentence, saying that he “was at that time a prisoner in Bilibid for the mere fact that as a student of Canon Law at that time [I] gave a lesson in Spanish instead of in Latin” (Buencamino 1969, 6). The reader can estimate the value of these recollections by the closing words of the memoirs: “With these thoughts gathered during my forty-seven years of experience, I end this work, not without calling attention to possible errors in dates, places, and names which, with the help of the readers, would be corrected” (*ibid.*, 43). Certainly one of such errors is his statement that four companions “used to visit me and

98. It is of interest that, in the hypothesis of the multisectoral organization that we have rejected, Pardo was supposed to be the leading figure among the laymen, while Buencamino was the principal leader of the *Juventud Escolar Liberal*. In that hypothesis one would have expected Pardo to have ruled in favor of Buencamino, as he could have, rather than interpreting the law against him.

to remind me of our voluntary commitment to work for the political emancipation of our country, and above all, of the oath we had taken a few days after the execution of Fathers Burgos, Gómez, and Zamora, to avenge their deaths so unjust and so base." Two of the four he names were Paciano Rizal and Gregorio Sanciango (Sancianco) (*ibid.*, 6–7).⁹⁹ This does lend some probability to the anecdote related by Artigas, at least to the extent that Sancianco, Buencamino, and Paciano Rizal were prominent together in the student movement, but for the rest Buencamino obviously confused events and dates, if the events narrated ever actually took place at all.

Other questions about Paciano, his relationship to Burgos, and the reasons for his leaving the University of Santo Tomás after the execution of the three priests, have led various authors to assert or invent many imaginary or at least improbable events and reasons. Villarroel (1984, 14–22) corrects many of the legends (Craig) or apparently deliberate fabrications (Coates) that biographers of José have introduced into historical literature, checking these assertions against Paciano's records in the University of Santo Tomás archives.

On one important point, however, I must disagree with Villarroel's competent presentation of the facts, namely on whether Paciano lived in the same house as Burgos. José, writing to his friend Blumentritt in an undated German letter (very likely relatively early in their friendship from the context, as he is telling him to use the name Mercado if he writes to Paciano, because only José was known as Rizal). According to Villarroel's translation (1984, 14), José wrote "that Paciano 'had to leave

99. In the absence of the Spanish original of Buencamino's memoirs, it is unclear whether he intended to say that Paciano and his companions visited him in prison—the most obvious meaning of the collocation of the sentences—or that they visited him in his home in Sulipan, Pampanga, a possible but not easily acceptable meaning of the sentence. Why should Paciano frequently visit Pampanga from Manila, or from Calamba? If we take the more probable meaning to be that they visited him in prison, it was impossible that they had made a commitment to avenge the deaths of the three priests at that time. For Buencamino was released from prison on 26 February 1870, two years before the execution of the priests, and some months later had Burgos as his tutor to make up the four months of classes he had missed (Villarroel 1971, 104–5; also 1984, 17). This is typical of the many confusions or falsehoods in Buencamino's account.

the University because he was a liberal and the friars did not like him because he had lived with Burgos' (*por haber vivido con Burgos*)." Leaving aside for the moment Paciano's reason for leaving the university, we can concentrate on whether Paciano lived in the house of Burgos. It is true, as Villarroel (1984, 17; italics in original) points out: "But this phrase can also mean that he *lived in association with* Burgos," which of course is a correct translation of the Spanish, though less probable. He goes on to note the unlikelihood that Burgos would have had time to run a boarding house for students, but properly concedes: "It is not impossible though that he would accept some young boy like Paciano in consideration of some family relation or friendship."

It seems clear that such was the case. For the original German text of the letter says "weil er beim Burgos gewohnt hatte," a phrase which, unlike the official Spanish translation used by Villarroel, can *only* mean "because he had lived in the house of Burgos." It does not mean, of course, that Burgos was running a boarding house for students, a meaning that Villarroel rightly rejects, but it seems not to have been uncommon that a student from the provinces studying in Manila should have lived with a relative or other older man resident there, who, as it were, would act as his guardian. Thus, for example, Marcelo H. del Pilar, as a young law student in the university, lived with Fr. Mariano Sevilla, his province-mate and friend of his elder brother, Father Toribio, both of whom would soon be exiled to the Marianas in 1872 (de los Santos 1907, 5).

There are other evidences of a close relationship between the Rizal family and the Burgos clan. For when Paciano brought young José to the Ateneo Municipal to enroll him, the Father Minister in charge of admissions, Fr. Magín Ferrando, S.J., rejected him. Paciano then had recourse to the mediation of Burgos's nephew, Manuel Xérez y Burgos, and through the latter's intercession the Jesuits received him in spite of the prior refusal (Rizal 1949, 15; Retana 1907, 19; Guerrero 1961, 37–38).¹⁰⁰

100. Rizal was not sure why he was refused. He conjectured that it might have been because he applied after the appointed date, or because of his fragile constitution, or because of his small stature. In any case, "influence won the

Again, the fact that Paciano was living with Burgos in 1870 would also be a likely reason why the former might have advised his friend, Felipe Buencamino, to ask Burgos to be his tutor in making up the four months' classes that he had missed while in prison. The fact that both Paciano and del Pilar shared aspirations analogous to those of the priests with whom they lived, who no doubt communicated to them their own hopes for progressive reforms, would make the link between the students and the priests they lived with in Manila the more likely still.¹⁰¹

As to the reason for Paciano's leaving the university in 1872, we have the rest of the statement of Rizal just cited in his undated letter to Blumentritt with regard to Paciano's having lived with Burgos. José wrote: "After the sad catastrophe (1872), he had to leave the University, for he was a liberal and the friars did not like him, because he had lived

day" (Bernad 1986, 13). The reason that the intercession of Xérez y Burgos was so efficacious was very likely that Father Ferrando had been the confessor of Burgos and assisted him at his execution, as noted above. Another connection of the Rizal family with the Burgos clan.

101. However, there is no truth to the supposed presence of del Pilar at a meeting of various Spanish and Filipino intellectuals in the house of a businessman called Octavio (Octavo). Supposedly, a certain Enrique Genato testified to this at the courts-martial after the Cavite Mutiny. Villaruel (1977, 333-34) incautiously accepted a quotation from that testimony published in the biography of del Pilar by Magno Gatmaitan (1966, 11-12, 147-48, 278-79), purporting to come from the records of the trial (which, in fact, have yet to be found). But he failed to notice that Gatmaitan took the quotation from a supposed reproduction of the testimony at the court martial made by Luciano de la Rosa. The latter was the persistent purveyor of the José Marco forgeries of Burgos, including a spurious account of the latter's trial by a fictitious Francisco de Liñán, all of which were later exposed by Schumacher (1970, 3-51; 1991, 44-70, 216-24, esp. 220, n. 52). The immediate key to the fictitious character of the testimony and the meeting it describes is the alleged presence of the Spanish republican politician, Rafael Labra (frequently mentioned in the Marco-Liñán forgeries), who in fact never set foot on the Philippines. In brief, there is no evidence that del Pilar, who was still a nineteen-year-old secondary student at the Colegio de San José, took part in any such meeting. Nor would he have been a member of the Juventud Escolar Liberal, which was made up of the university students.

in the house of Burgos" ("Nach dem traurigen Katastroph (1872), musste er die Universität verlassen, denn er war liberal und die Frayles hatten ihn nicht gern, weil er beim Burgos gewohnt hatte") (Rizal 1930–1938, 5:464). No doubt Paciano was a liberal and, as far as can be determined, a key member of the *Juventud Escolar Liberal*, but so was—at that time—Felipe Buencamino, apparently its leader, given his imprisonment in 1869–1870. Yet Buencamino went on to get not only a bachelor's degree in law but also the graduate degree of licentiate. In that same year of 1872, when Paciano failed to take the examination in his courses, as did nearly half the other students in these two courses, Buencamino did take the examination (and failed). But he continued in the following years, obtaining his licentiate degree in 1876 (Villarroel 1984, 20–21), and later acted as lawyer for a time for the Rizal family in the Calamba hacienda case (Buencamino 1969, 14–15; Schumacher 1997, 247–48, n. 5).

A look at the scholastic record of Paciano during his years at the university (1866–1867 to 1871–1872) sheds further light on several aspects of the question at hand. The one year that he did not present himself for the examination, apart from 1871–1872, was 1868–1869, very likely because he was not sufficiently prepared, having been much involved in the activities of the *Juventud Escolar Liberal*. Nonetheless, he repeated the course the following year and passed it. The other factor of relevance in his scholastic record is that his grades for all the years were definitely not of the caliber of his younger brother. On a seven-level system of grading, ranging from *sobresaliente* (excellent) to *reprobado* (failed), in the one year for which we have grades from the Colegio de San José and the six for which he presented himself for the examination at the university, he received only two grades of *aprovechado* (very good) and five of *mediano* (fair or poor). It does not seem that philosophy and law were subjects in which Paciano excelled, perhaps for lack of interest. At the time when he studied, there was nothing to be studied in the university, apart from the ecclesiastical faculties, except law, and if he wanted a university degree that had to be his choice, unless he wanted to be a priest. By the time of José, faculties of medicine and pharmacy had been added to the university. Almost all of

the above data on Paciano's academic career are due to Villaroel (1984, 17–21), who concludes convincingly:

What specific reasons moved Paciano to discontinue his legal career is [*sic*] not clear. . . . His non-appearance before the panel of examiners was not a unique case nor a reason for suspecting that the University had a case against him. It was the case of dozens of students leaving the career for a variety of reasons every year. Could it have been that Paciano was afraid of being stigmatized as an old friend of the exiled leaders? How can we interpret Rizal's words . . . ? The interpretation is not easy considering that Buencamino had been more liberal than he, and that a nephew of Father Burgos, Manuel Xérez Burgos, was nearer to the nationalist priest than he, yet both of them continued and finished their respective careers of Law and Medicine totally unmolested. (Ibid., 19–20)

Moreover, as we will see below in the negative advice Paciano gave his younger brother, he did not have much respect for the career of law.

As Villarroel goes on to point out, it was not as if Paciano was a hunted man and did not dare to appear in Manila after 1872. The following year he would accompany José to the Dominican Colegio de San Juan de Letrán, where the official entrance examination for all secondary schools was held, preparatory to José's application to the Ateneo Municipal. Moreover, he frequently went to Manila to visit his younger brother in subsequent years. Being no more than a mediocre student in law, he might well not have found it difficult to drop out of the course, all the more since it was hard to tell after his liberal activities what his reception would be. Very likely he decided to manage the family affairs for his aging father. His younger brother would be the one to obtain a superior education that might enable him to carry out the progressive ideals Paciano had hoped to work for through his higher education, analogous to the Peláez-Burgos ideals of proving Filipino intellectual competence that his stay with Burgos must have strengthened.

This is not to deny completely the reason Rizal gave Blumentritt for Paciano's leaving the University: "[He] was liberal and the friars did not like him." But being "liberal" seems clearly to refer to his prominent role in the Juventud Escolar Filipino, which had called for drastic reforms in

the University, directing itself principally against certain professors. No doubt the Dominican professors, or most of them, were opposed to the demands of these student activists. But as can be seen from Paciano's remarks to José about not offending the order given the favor they had shown to the family in Calamba, he was not hostile to the Dominican order as a whole, nor they to him. José, however, by the time he wrote this letter to Blumentritt, no earlier than 1889, had taken a position against all friars, including the Dominicans in particular, and this perhaps colors his remarks about Paciano. This was an attitude that Burgos had never had.

Shortly after he left the Philippines for the second time in 1888, Rizal had allied himself, though independently, with the Propaganda Movement led by Marcelo del Pilar in its goal of procuring the expulsion of the friar orders, as is clear from the pamphlets he collaborated on with Basa. Moreover, he had joined, if not initiated, the legal contest of leading Calamba tenants against the Dominican hacienda administration. It is quite possible that there is truth in the critical comment of Fr. Pablo Pastells, S.J., that Rizal left the university because of a certain "disagreement (*discusión*) he had with his professor" (Pastells 1916–1917, 3:294). Pastells was in a position to know, at least from other Jesuits (Pastells was in Mindanao as a missionary to the Mandaya at the time), since Rizal kept close contacts with the Jesuits during his years at Santo Tomás. However, he does not say that it was a Dominican professor with whom he disagreed. In fact, the Dominicans taught few of the courses in the Faculty of Medicine, and Villarroel (1984, 169–70) shows that it was most likely a lay professor.

Whatever may have been the reason(s) why José eventually conceived such antipathy toward the Dominicans in general, Paciano did not share it, at least before the conflict with the Calamba hacienda erupted in the late 1880s. Villarroel (*ibid.*, 166) cites the Dominican brothers who administered the hacienda on the good mutual relations with the Rizal family during the time José was at the university, and how the brother administrators had leased new lands in Pansol to them. It was precisely about these new lands that Paciano wrote to his brother when José was already in Madrid, urging him not to do anything that would offend the Dominicans, to whom the family owed this beneficence.

These lands cost us nothing and were given to us by the Order in preference to anyone else. It is proper that we show them a little gratitude for this, since, without having any obligation toward us, they desire the good of our family. . . . It appears as if these Fathers are resolved to bestow on our family all the favor they can. With this in mind, for our part we should avoid any conduct that might offend them in the least, since we do not perform any other services for them. If you happen to meet Fr. Martínez [in Madrid], assure him that these are the sentiments that animate us.¹⁰² (Rizal 1961a, 98)

This same letter provides what may have been the deciding reason why Paciano left the university. In his enthusiasm for study, José, upon arrival in Madrid, had enrolled simultaneously, it seems, in the Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Law. At least by the following year, whether on his own decision or on Paciano's advice, José dropped the courses in law and, while continuing in medicine, enrolled also in the Faculty of Arts and Letters. Apparently just before this, Paciano had written to him:

In regard to your ideas, I believe that the study of law does not suit you, but that of the fine arts. . . . To tell the truth, a lawyer here exercises the office of landlord, of teacher, of farmer, and of government service, that is to say, of all professions except that of lawyer. Moreover, lawyers collect their fees for defending a case, whether it is just or the contrary. Your conscience will never be able to accommodate itself to that. In medicine, on the other hand, and in the study of fine arts, only a few practice these, and here they get ahead and live in tranquility, the only thing we should desire in this world. (Rizal 1961a, 99)

102. The letter is undated, but the editor suggests 1883. Villarroel (1984, 167, n. 11) thinks "it might be of a somewhat earlier date." This may be so, if the letter was early enough for José not yet to have enrolled in law (it is in this letter that Paciano discourages him from studying law), though the other letters of Paciano of 1882 seem to be too late to have arrived before José enrolled for the classes that began in October 1882. In fact, José did enroll, and completed his degree, in the Faculty of Arts and Letters, as well as that of Medicine. But whether that happened in October 1882 (Retana 1907, 63), or, having begun and later dropped law, taking courses rather in the Faculty of Arts and Letters as Paciano advised, is not clear (Guerrero 1963, 104, 511–12, n. 4).

Clearly, Paciano did not think much of the study of law as a career, and probably here was the reason referred to above for giving up his studies at a time when the university had only a faculty of law and those of the ecclesiastical disciplines.¹⁰³

To conclude this section, it is necessary to inquire into the reason(s) why José left the Philippines for abroad. Whether he was alienated from the University of Santo Tomás or not, it was a fact that he could get a better education for his purposes abroad, not only in Spain but even more in France and Germany. In a letter to Paciano, perhaps with some exaggeration, he likewise found the peninsular education deficient. He mentioned four lawyers who had had a great reputation in graduating from the university in Manila, but “in Madrid, they were ‘like country bumpkins in a ballroom.’ The Spaniards themselves could not compare with the French, the Germans, and the English” (Guerrero 1963, 105; citing Rizal 1959, 220). He continues:

Among our countrymen, I am taken as studious and sufficiently able. But, when I compare myself with many young men whom I have known in foreign lands, I confess that I find myself on a much lower level, and I conclude that to reach their standards I would need many years of study, much luck, and much more application; yet those young men were younger than I am.

I do not speak of the young men in this country [Spain], among whom I know many who are really worthy. It is not that they lack ability, no; they have much talent, much determination. But the defects of the educational system have the result that they work harder to less advantage, as happened to us there. (Ibid.)

It is unnecessary to belabor the point; no European country in the nineteenth century was providing a university education in its colonies at par with that of Europe. For the same reason as other colonial countries, Spain, in spite of the Dominicans’ efforts to widen its scope, restricted it in the Philippines—highly educated colonials would be the first ones to conceive the ideal of independence for themselves. Since, in addition,

103. Paciano left the university in 1872. The faculties of medicine and pharmacy were introduced in 1875.

the Spanish educational system even in the Peninsula was backward, compared with the more progressive countries in Europe, it is not surprising that the University of Santo Tomás did not reach the level of peninsular education, not to speak of England, France, and Germany.

This leads to the most important reason for Rizal's departure for Europe, whatever may have been his relations to the University of Santo Tomás. It was one that he shared only with Paciano, who eventually had to explain it to their father, to assuage the latter's grief at José's departure, begging him not to reveal it to anyone else, to which the father gave his promise (Rizal 1930–1938, 1:19). In Rizal's first letter to his family, he gives an insight into the purpose that moves him to go abroad to study. He will again give cryptic hints in his early correspondence with his close friends in Manila. To his family he says:

I too have a mission to fulfill, like alleviating the sufferings of my fellowmen. I know that all this requires sacrifices . . . But I feel something that impels me to leave . . . Some may say that I leave in search for [*sic*] happiness. Absurd. Often, when taking leave and kissing your hands, I tried to tell you about my project. (Lopez Bantug 1982, 68)

His correspondence with Paciano, though still cryptic, is more enlightening. Paciano in a letter of 11 May 1882, after explaining how he had found it necessary to enlighten their father on his purpose, continues:

As far as our friends, whether our acquaintances or others of our town or the neighboring towns are concerned, [your departure] was the topic of conversation for many days; there were conjectures and guesses, *but nobody hit the target*.

Yesterday I was among the skirted ones [the friars]; some approved of your going, others did not. But since we have adopted this measure (because in my opinion it is the best) we should keep to it. . . . (Rizal 1961a, 13–14)

Continuing his letter, he says he has heard that José was thinking of finishing his course in medicine in Barcelona rather than Madrid. "To my way of thinking, the main purpose of your going abroad is not to perfect yourself in that profession but in other *more useful things* or, to put

it another way, in that *for which you have the greater inclination. . .*” (ibid., 14; emphasis in original). In a letter of the following month, José’s close friend, Vicente Gella, one of those who had seen him off at his departure, speaks of the feeling his friends have for him in his absence “in search of the good we all desire. . . . May God help you for the good you are doing *for your countrymen. . .*” (Rizal 1930–1938, 1:22).

Guerrero (1963, 83) comments on these cryptic passages:

It would seem far-fetched to ascribe to the young Rizal any well-defined purpose at this time, connected with a nationalism that was still only latent in his ‘race jealousy’, or even with a desire for reform incredible in a sentimental poet without political learning or experience . . .

That is to oversimplify the “sentimental poet.” It is true that José’s ideas would develop as he studied more and had greater experience. But even in Manila he had had the kind of political experience that cried out for reforms, as may be seen in Gella’s letter to him. Moreover, despite Guerrero’s skepticism, it should be remembered that Rizal went to Europe not only with ideas of his own but with those of his deeply admired elder brother, whose experience too had not been abroad but in the Philippines. As seen in our discussion of Peláez and Burgos, they were continually in touch with the Spanish politics responsible for the abuses in the Philippines that cried out for reforms. Burgos certainly would have passed on his knowledge of that politics, together with his own ideals, to Paciano. This legacy Paciano certainly transmitted to his younger brother, as can be seen in the cryptic references in their correspondence as to the real reason for José’s going abroad.

This is confirmed, at least in its general lines, by a Rizal family tradition. According to her granddaughter, the secret agreement between Paciano and José was revealed only to her Lola Sisa (José’s and Paciano’s sister, Narcisa López Rizal), who revealed it to her son, Leoncio (López-Rizal) in her old age, after Paciano’s death.¹⁰⁴ In substance she says that,

104. Bantug is not quite accurate in saying that the secret was revealed only to Narcisa. At least in the form in which she explains this “mission,” this was evidently known to at least two of Rizal’s friends who saw him off when he left

though both of them wanted to “serve the motherland,” clearly one of the two brothers had to stay behind for the sake of the family, while the other “dedicated himself to the cause of the nation.” What the brothers agreed on in a secret pact, she says, was that Rizal would undertake the patriotic mission and Paciano would take on himself both the service to the family and the support of Rizal in his mission. This secret mission was the exposure of evil conditions in the Philippines and propaganda for their reform (Bantug 1982, 75–76).

Writing to Blumentritt on 23 June 1888 from London, José lamented that he had forgotten to introduce his brother (verbally) to Blumentritt.

You who love to get to know good men, would find in him the noblest of all Filipinos. My friend, Taviel de Andrade, said he is the only real man in the Philippines, the young Filósofo Tasio. When I reflect on him, I find him, even though an Indio, much more magnanimous and noble than all the Spaniards (those of today) put together. (Rizal 1930–1938, 5:257)

From Burgos to Paciano to Jose

In the light of all this, it is difficult not to see as broadly autobiographical, while making allowance for its embellishment by the novelist, that passage of the *Noli* in which Ibarra, shortly after his return to the Philippines, passing Bagumbayan in his tour of Manila, is led to reflections on the significance of that place to him.

the Philippines, Vicente Gella, whose letter is cited above (Rizal 1930–1938, 1:22), and José Cecilio in more vague terms, i.e., reforms for the country, and doing something about the excessive influence of the friars (*ibid.*, 38). More details of the pact between the two brothers may have been communicated to Narcisa, but, apart from saying that only one of them would marry, they do not appear in Bantug’s third-hand version. It may be noted in passing that Rizal did not slip out of the country furtively. There were, besides the uncle with whom he stayed, numerous other people in Manila to whom he went to bid farewell, including the Jesuits, and several of his friends accompanied him the morning of his departure. It was only to his family (apart from Paciano) and those in Calamba that his departure was unknown (Villaruel 1984, 159–60).

though both of them wanted to “serve the motherland,” clearly one of the two brothers had to stay behind for the sake of the family, while the other “dedicated himself to the cause of the nation.” What the brothers agreed on in a secret pact, she says, was that Rizal would undertake the patriotic mission and Paciano would take on himself both the service to the family and the support of Rizal in his mission. This secret mission was the exposure of evil conditions in the Philippines and propaganda for their reform (Bantug 1982, 75–76).

Writing to Blumentritt on 23 June 1888 from London, José lamented that he had forgotten to introduce his brother (verbally) to Blumentritt.

You who love to get to know good men, would find in him the noblest of all Filipinos. My friend, Taviel de Andrade, said he is the only real man in the Philippines, the young Filósofo Tasio. When I reflect on him, I find him, even though an Indio, much more magnanimous and noble than all the Spaniards (those of today) put together. (Rizal 1930–1938, 5:257)

From Burgos to Paciano to Jose

In the light of all this, it is difficult not to see as broadly autobiographical, while making allowance for its embellishment by the novelist, that passage of the *Noli* in which Ibarra, shortly after his return to the Philippines, passing Bagumbayan in his tour of Manila, is led to reflections on the significance of that place to him.

the Philippines, Vicente Gella, whose letter is cited above (Rizal 1930–1938, 1:22), and José Cecilio in more vague terms, i.e., reforms for the country, and doing something about the excessive influence of the friars (*ibid.*, 38). More details of the pact between the two brothers may have been communicated to Narcisa, but, apart from saying that only one of them would marry, they do not appear in Bantug’s third-hand version. It may be noted in passing that Rizal did not slip out of the country furtively. There were, besides the uncle with whom he stayed, numerous other people in Manila to whom he went to bid farewell, including the Jesuits, and several of his friends accompanied him the morning of his departure. It was only to his family (apart from Paciano) and those in Calamba that his departure was unknown (Villaruel 1984, 159–60).

He was thinking of the man who had opened the eyes of his intelligence, had made him understand what was good and what was just. The ideas he had inculcated in him were few, it is true, but they were not vain repetitions. They were convictions that had not grown dim in the light of the greatest centers of Progress. That man was an old priest, and the words he said to him on bidding him farewell still sounded in his ears:

“Do not forget that if knowledge is the patrimony of humanity, only those inherit it that have love for it,” he had reminded him. “I have tried to pass on to you what I received from my teachers; that treasure I have tried to increase as much as I could, and I pass it on to the following generation. You will do the same for the generation succeeding you, and you can increase that treasure threefold, for you go to very rich lands. They [the Spaniards] come here seeking gold; do you then also go to their country to seek another kind of gold that we need. But remember that not all that glitters is gold.” That man had died on that spot. (Rizal 1961b, 43)

The novelist does not pretend to give every historical detail; that is his privilege. José, an eleven-year-old boy in a provincial school at the time of the priests' execution, almost certainly never knew Gómez personally, and if he ever met Burgos as a small boy, even for a short time while visiting Paciano in Manila, his diary shows no sign of it.¹⁰⁵ It seems clear that beneath the novelist's reconstruction there is a factual foundation. The “old priest” is Burgos, and the direct recipient of Burgos's counsels was Paciano. The “teachers” of Burgos were Peláez and, perhaps to a lesser degree, Gómez. The ideal inculcated by Burgos and the wisdom behind it was received by Paciano, who passed them on to the succeeding generation in the person of José. It would be José who

105. Marcelino Gomez (1922/1972, 110–11), the nephew of the martyred priest, maintained that in this passage Rizal obviously meant the old Father Mariano Gómez of whose fame he had heard, even if he never saw him. But this is to take too literally a passage of a novel. Logically then, Rizal would have identified himself with Ibarra in other passages of the novel, where the course taken by Ibarra, definitely a flawed hero in the novel, is quite unlike the ideal of Rizal. Rather, it seems, though often critical of the older generation of Filipinos, Rizal revered the wisdom of those who had begun the struggle before

would go to Europe to gather the “riches” that his studies and experience there could offer, not simply to get a better medical degree.

In the light of the evidence presented above, we can have reasonable certainty that Paciano not only admired but was also inspired by Burgos during the time that he lived with him, not as a boarder but as a protégé of an older close friend of the Rizal family. Given the major role played by Paciano in the student activity of the years of apparent openness and reform of 1869–1870, he was receptive to Burgos’s liberal ideals, those wider than the question of the parishes. Though not of a particularly academic frame of mind, nor possible heir to the brilliance of Burgos, he and his older mentor could hardly have lived in the same house those years without Burgos communicating to his disciple his veneration for Peláez. No alternative appears to the strong likelihood that Burgos had let him copy the anonymous manifesto, thus providing the only link that has shown any signs of probability as to how it came to be republished, even if interpolated, in Hong Kong in 1889, precisely at the time of Rizal’s presence there. Whether we accept that Burgos was author of the entire original manifesto, an unlikely possibility, or that he was merely a secondary collaborating participant in its composition, at least for the passages we have singled out, he surely must have had a copy of it. No one else but Rizal appears even remotely liable to be the link between 1864 and 1889, except one who had direct connections to Burgos, even if mediated by Paciano.

Finally, as pointed out in the footnotes to the 1864 original, specific interpolations in the 1889 version certainly indicate Rizal’s hand. Some of these very probably came from Rizal for various reasons of interest; others have the certainty that comes from the absence of anyone else in

him. Thus, as cited above in connection with Burgos’s article, he urged Ponce to cite men like Peláez, Mariano García, and Burgos to show the greatness of past Filipinos, a recurrent theme in his correspondence with Ponce. When the aged Fr. Vicente García later wrote a nuanced defense of the *Noli*, Rizal was overjoyed, telling Ponce, “. . . the fact that Father Vicente García defends me, moves me deeply, and tells me that I should continue on the path that I have traced. To have an old man at my side like that is to believe that I am not in opposition to the spirit of my country” (Rizal 1930–1938, 2:74–75).

the Hong Kong Filipino colony at the time with the knowledge and competence to have made these additions.¹⁰⁶ Such are those that show a knowledge not only of the old Spanish chronicles, but also of the anthropological and ethnological conclusions in the Europe of that day, especially Germany. When all these factors are combined, Rizal's attribution to Burgos of the *Manifiesto a la noble nación Española*—and, consequently, of at least participation in the “A la Nación” article on which it was based—outweigh any of the objections based on Burgos's relative youth at the time the original was composed.

Conclusions

For the Topic of the Article

Even accepting, as it seems clear we must, the multiple authorship postulated by the correspondence of the Recollects Felix and Agudo, and the strong probability that Fernández played a major part in it, it was as a document associated with Burgos that Rizal had received it from Paciano. Of the many articles in *El Clamor Público*, *La América*, *La Discusión*, and other publications defending the Filipino clergy and attacking those who denigrated it, it was only this one that Rizal singled out to represent Burgos. Though it is impossible to assert that Burgos wrote the entire article, the preponderance of evidence pointing to his participation in key portions of it is precisely what interested Rizal in his letter; namely, the section on the outstanding Filipino priests (whom Rizal wished to be made known in *La Solidaridad*) and the ardent defense of Peláez against the friar calumnies. This justifies our attributing the article to Burgos in those key contexts, as José Rizal did. For, to all appearances, it was the Peláez accusation that was the main reason for the manifesto. Most of the other arguments, true as they were, had been enunciated before, whether by Peláez or even by the archbishop.

106. See notes 24, 29, 45, 47 especially, but also 48, 49, 50. Indeed, there is likelihood that the whole work of interpolation came from Rizal, and that Basa was merely the publisher.

It is, hence, even possible that Burgos was also the inspiration behind the article, however sure it is that he was not its complete composer. Be that as it may, as the direct author of key sections of it, even though the whole was compiled in conjunction with other collaborators, and even possibly under other leadership, it was for Rizal, as for his elder brother, a Burgos document.

Rizal probably did not know all the details of its composition and publication, but he had assurance from Paciano of its intimate connection with Burgos. Hence, he saw its effectiveness for his goal as he envisaged it in 1889, not just to attack the friars but especially to give voice to his passion to show that the best elements of his people's culture had solidly planted roots in previous generations. As *La Solidaridad* was beginning its campaign in 1889, Rizal was almost monotonous in his exhortations to Ponce, del Pilar, and others to bring "our *plana mayor*" ("general staff," or, to use a modern athletic metaphor, "first team") to the fore (Rizal 1930-1938, 2:118, 149, 154). He, for his part, was engaged in his annotation of Antonio de Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, to show what Filipino ability and culture had been before the coming of the Spaniards and, indeed, even in spite of them. His choice of a work of Burgos was a part of that grand strategy he had adopted of rooting the present nationalist struggle in the context of the past, whether recent or remote.

The evidence brought forth here does not support Burgos's sole authorship of the original article, and even admitting a collaborative authorship it cannot determine with any certainty just what part others may have played in its composition. However, if seen in all its complex interconnections, it is justifiable to call it a "Burgos document," precisely because that fervent defense of Peláez against the Recollect calumnies is its most original part and its main purpose. Other friar attacks on the Filipino clergy had been published continually through Agudo's and Mayordomo's subsidized newspapers and ignored. But the attack on the deceased Peláez could not be disregarded. Though the evidence of the 1860s tends to confirm the major participation of other persons, such as the canonist Fernández, in particular, and even allows the more remote possibility of Peralta, neither of these can provide the evident link with Peláez found in the document that Burgos had, the "Brebes

apuntes,” nor was anyone else so close to Peláez as to be personally affected to the extent that his defense of his mentor exhibits.

Much less is there any plausible explanation of how the 1864 manifesto could have become the template for the *Manifiesto* of 1889, with its multiple internal connections with Rizal. Only the links of Burgos with Paciano Rizal Mercado can provide the external connection of Burgos with the younger Rizal and, through him, with the *Manifiesto* of 1889. There is no other plausible alternative for the connection between the 1864 document and the 1889 *Manifiesto*. The 1889 document with its time-determined additions and interpolations should not qualify as one of the classic documents of Filipino nationalism; only the genuine 1864 manifesto can merit that name. As a pamphlet the 1889 version would rank with other antifriar propaganda, produced in large numbers as nationalism became more radical. Few historians will remember the technical arguments of the 1864 document, but the passionate defense of Peláez will remain. The tradition has not been wrong in its central affirmation, even though other factors belonging to the antifriar campaign of the late 1880s may have obscured the original message of Burgos, as he began his efforts to carry on the campaign for justice to the Filipino, inherited from his revered mentor, Fr. Pedro Peláez.

Further Conclusions

Though solidly established, the results of our research may seem exiguous in spite of the amount of research that has been involved. Indeed, they may seem disappointing. We have indeed finally established the text of the genuine document of 1864 and translated it. We have also shown the justification for the tradition of a “Burgos Manifesto,” though it is a justification qualified by restrictions as to the inspiration of the manifesto, as to the sole authorship, and as to the full amount of actual composition on the part of Burgos. Nonetheless, it has made other contributions to the history of the nationalist movement.

Most important is the verification of the generally asserted, but hitherto little documented, continuity from Peláez to Burgos, from Burgos to Paciano Rizal, and from Paciano to his brother José. Elsewhere I have also tried to demonstrate even a certain basic continuity between Rizal

and Bonifacio, especially in conjunction with the latter's trusted and more eloquent and reflective companion, Emilio Jacinto. It was their concern too to root the future of the nation in its past, and their desire to educate the people, in the broad sense of the word, that is, to prepare themselves morally for eventual independence, as I have emphasized in various places (Schumacher 1991, 114–16; 1995, 37–52; Guerrero and Schumacher 1998, 130–32, 143–47; see also Santos 1935).¹⁰⁷ That was never quite achieved, however, due in part to defects in Bonifacio's personality and education, in part to his too narrow view of the nation as *Katagalugan* rather than *Filipinas*,¹⁰⁸ and, most of all, to the discovery of the Katipunan by the Spanish authorities, which forced him prematurely to go to arms.

A further conclusion that may be gathered from this article is that a consciousness of being "Filipino" had already taken root among the educated classes—the priests and the lawyers—even at this time. Indeed, it was perhaps stronger than it would be in the 1880s. Though limited by social class, there was a sense that all hijos del país, all born in the Philippines, considered and called themselves in their manifesto and otherwise "Los Filipinos," whatever terms the peninsulars might use

107. My interpretation of Bonifacio and the Katipunan, linking them directly to Rizal, is radically different from that of my co-author of our *Kasaysayan* volume, where in spite of our agreement that I would treat the nationalist movement up to the Cry of Balintawak/Pugad Lawin, with her section beginning from that point, she begins with 1892 and the traditional account of the Katipunan, based ultimately on Teodoro Agoncillo's *Revolt of the Masses*. Guerrero uses the term "traditional" pejoratively to label those historians who connect Bonifacio with Rizal. Consequently, she would no doubt include my interpretation as a more sophisticated version of the "traditional" historiography, a label to which I would of course not agree. This affects much of her subsequent interpretation of what happened in 1896–1897. See Guerrero and Schumacher 1998, especially 149–83.

108. I am aware of the efforts, particularly of Milagros Guerrero (in Guerrero and Schumacher 1998, 158–60), to show that *Katagalugan* did have a wider signification than the Tagalog provinces alone, and do not reject this contention completely. However, whatever validity this had, in the practical order Bonifacio was not successful, if he even tried, to put that national concept into deeds. Indeed, he failed even to realize that Manila and its suburbs of those days were at odds with the *caviteño* eventually controlled by Aguinaldo.

for them. The old *gremios* used by Spanish officialdom no longer prevailed.¹⁰⁹ However, this “Filipino” imagined community, whatever its theoretical basis, in fact consisted only of the educated, the ilustrados of the 1860s.

Two decades later, in April 1887, Rizal would write to Blumentritt concerning those in Madrid editing *España en Filipinas*, “. . . these friends are all young men, criollos, mestizos, Malays, we call ourselves only Filipinos . . .” (Rizal 1930–1938, 5:111). But, in fact, that self-identification of the ilustrados in Europe, now a much larger and diverse group than in the Manila of the 1860s, was also then showing its fragility when Igorots and Negritos were brought to the *Exposición de Filipinas* in Madrid. Filomeno Aguilar has pointed out that though individuals like Isabelo de los Reyes, or even the criollo Evaristo Aguirre, could speak of them as “brothers,” and Rizal spoke of “my compatriots” and “my countrymen,” the unity was fragile and ambivalent. Aguilar has made this clear in his article showing the relation of Ferdinand Blumentritt’s 1882 *Versuch einer Ethnographie der Philippinen* to the early wave-theory thinking of Rizal and his friends. “. . . [R]are was the *ilustrado* who prized ‘mountain tribes’ in deep comradeship . . .” (Aguilar 2005, 616).

But, at the same time, the limits of identification with the imagined community were likewise being challenged at the other end of the racial

109. One must make an exception for the very few places—Binondo was the only major one, the traditional center of the Chinese mestizos—where the influx of new Chinese immigrants after 1850 preserved in part the old pattern, established in the seventeenth century, that the Chinese mestizos retained their precedence over the indio and Chinese *gremios*. Moreover, many mestizos, still of first generation, retained much of Chinese culture and were closer to the *gremio de chinos* than to that of the *naturales* (*indios*). Here the three *gremios* still remained distinct up to the 1880s, as may be seen in the test confrontation organized by Juan Zulueta and Marcelo del Pilar of a demonstration of *gobernadorcillos* from the wider Manila that took place against the parish priest, Fr. José Heví Campomanes, O.P., in 1888, demanding precedence for the *gremio de naturales*, the “genuine Filipinos.” But this was peculiar to Binondo (Wickberg 1964; Schumacher 1997, 109–11), and, in fact, the conflict was stirred up more to triumph over the friars than anything else.

spectrum. Graciano López Jaena had already written to Rizal in March 1887 concerning the crisis over the Filipino periodical, *España en Filipinas*:

It is not we *genuine or real indios* who are encouraging the dissension but rather the [Spanish] mestizos I am becoming daily more convinced that our countrymen, the mestizos, far from working for the common good, are following the policy of their predecessors, the Azcárragas; I am glad that they [the criollos and Spanish mestizos]¹¹⁰ are bringing about the division and not we. (Rizal 1930–1938, 1:252–53; trans. in Schumacher 1997, 65; italics mine)

The self-identification of the 1860s, limited as it was, would be wider in the 1880s, but would eventually break down. The revolution of 1868 in Spain with its constant rise and fall of governments, extending even into the restored monarchy, together with the facilitating of travel due to the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, had led to massive influxes of politically-appointed peninsulars into the upper ranks of the Philippine administration, displacing the hijos del país. At the same time, it facilitated travel from the Philippines to Spain, for study or other purposes. Henceforth, there would be a split among those of Spanish blood, most identifying themselves with Spain, even marrying and remaining in the Peninsula, while only a minority would see their future with the emerging Filipino nation. This was a further step forward toward a Filipino national identity, but still tenuous. It would take considerable further evolution before a common self-identification would come about, however imperfectly, as we see in the terms “cultural minorities” and “indigenous peoples” or even “natives,” often in use

110. It is clear that in using the term “mestizos” López Jaena had in mind all those of predominantly Spanish descent, for the Azcárragas were criollos, as was Eduardo de Lete, his immediate target, and Pedro de Govantes. Others, like Eduardo Casal, were Spanish mestizos. The criollo, Aguirre, who was close to Lete, was no doubt included in his target, though it was he who insisted that he recognized no fatherland but the Philippines. Indeed, it was Aguirre who had provoked the crisis in the newspaper by his reference to the Igorot woman, who had died of pneumonia in the 1886 exposition, as “Daughter of a people that is rude combat, unconquered resists the foreign yoke.” See Schumacher 1997, 77–79.

among Filipinos today. But a beginning had been made, even in the 1860s, and further advances would come in the last decades before the revolution.

A final conclusion concerns the friars and the Filipino clergy, whatever their ascribed ethnicity. The efforts of the Filipino priests to prevent their extinction by short-sighted friars, not to use a worse term, was the occasion for the struggle discussed here. It was epitomized in the genuine manifesto of 1864 whose authentic text we have established and whose authorship we have attempted to clarify. The Patronato Real, which had made possible the creation of a Christian community, one increasingly moving toward maturity, in spite of obstacles, with its own clergy by the beginning of the eighteenth century, had become by the nineteenth century largely, if not totally, a political instrument exploited by men like Agudo and Mayordomo for maintaining Spanish rule over a subject people. In spite of the many undeniably dedicated and self-sacrificing missionaries still to be found in the most difficult and isolated parts of the country, the work of evangelization was being strangled by a political instrumentalization by the government of large parts of the Spanish regular clergy, an instrumentalization not resisted by many friars seeking the advantage of their own particular orders. Though attacked as unfair by the Recollect historian, Fr. Angel Martínez Cuesta (1986, 369), correctly pointing to the dedicated Recollect missionaries we have more than once referred to above, the statement of Father Uy at the end of his book stands valid in its limited and careful wording. It reads: "The intrigues of the regulars in Manila and at the court of Madrid revealed that their scale of loyalty was something like [:] first, their order; second Spain; third, the church" (Uy 1984, 258). Men like Felix, Agudo, and Mayordomo, to name only the most obvious mentioned in this article, fell into that category. While they sought to preserve their own position by preventing any internal reforms, especially needed in those two orders,¹¹¹ as well as to prove themselves and their orders indispensable

111. The decadence that had come on the friar orders, with the exception of the Dominicans, is not known simply from their enemies in the Propaganda Movement of the years leading to the revolution, or from the novels of Rizal, but from confidential ecclesiastical sources communicating with the nuncio, like

to continued Spanish rule, as they undoubtedly believed, they were in fact bringing about the destruction of both. Two Augustinian authors of the present have commented on a juridical document of the Recollect provincial, Fr. Juan Felix de la Encarnación, attempting to refute the bishops' reform proposals of 1863. Their comment may serve to sum up the ecclesiastical issue.

We accept the weighty judgment of our author, but it was no longer the time to continue proceeding with juridical disputes between the secular clergy and the regular clergy. Rather it was time to give a solution to the problems that were buffeting the Philippine church. For to continue along this path, the Spanish dominion and the privileges of the regulars over the native clergy would have been eternal. This was the thesis lived by all and each one of the Spanish friars who were working in the Islands. The sad result of all this was, that military arms came to resolve what the pens and the Briefs and Bulls of the Roman Pontiffs had not succeeded in achieving. . . . (Rodríguez and Álvarez 1998, 271, n. 104; translation mine)

Abbreviations

AAM	Archives of the Archdiocese of Manila
AHCJC	Arxiu Històric de la Companyia de Jesús a Catalunya, Barcelona (formerly APTCJ, Sant Cugat del Vallès, Barcelona)
AHN	Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid
AM	Archivo de los Recoletos, Marcilla, Navarra
APAF	Archivo de los Padres Agustinos de Filipinas, Valladolid
APPSJ	Archives of the Philippine Province of the Society of Jesus, Quezon City
APTCJ	Archivo de la Provincia de Tarragona de la Compañía de Jesús, Sant Cugat del Vallès, Barcelona (now AHCJC)

the *Comisario Apostólico* of the Dominicans, Fr. Antonio Orge, O.P., and Bishop Jimeno of Cebu, both in communications to Nuncio Barili (Uy 1984, 69, 174). One could justly also cite Peláez and the archbishop with further details in confidential documents, even though their friar opponents might accuse them of partiality.

ASV	Archivo Segreto Vaticano, Vatican City
AUST	Archives of the University of Santo Tomás, Manila
BAH	Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid
BNM	Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid
<i>Espasa</i>	<i>Enciclopedia universal ilustrada europea-americana</i> (Barcelona: Espasa-Calpe, 1907–1933)
PNA	Philippine National Archives, Manila
PNL	Philippine National Library, Manila

References

- A la nación. 1864. *La América*, 12 Sept.:11–13.
- AAM. 1862. Libro 1º de Gobierno Ecl....Melitón Martínez. 1.E.15.
- Abella, Domingo. 1957. Manuel José de Hendaya y Aro—¿fue electo Arzobispo de Méjico? *Revista de Indias* 17:223–34.
- . 1959. Episcopal succession in the Philippines. *Philippine Studies* 7:435–47.
- . 1960. The succession of bishops of Cebu. *Philippine Studies* 8:535–43.
- . 1962. The bishops of Nueva Segobia. *Philippine Studies* 10:577–85.
- . 1963. The bishops of Cáceres and Jaro. *Philippine Studies* 11:548–56.
- Agoncillo, Teodoro A. 1960. *Malolos: The crisis of the republic*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines.
- Agudo, Guillermo, O.A.R., and Celestino Mayordomo, O.S.A. 1863a. *Importantísima cuestión que puede afectar gravemente a la existencia de las Islas Filipinas*. Madrid: Imprenta de El Clamor Público.
- . 1863b. *Complemento de los documentos del folleto de 14 Noviembre de este año de 1863, sobre cuestiones de curatos*. Madrid: Imprenta de El Clamor Público.
- Aguilar, Filomeno V., Jr. 2005. Tracing origins: *Ilustrado* nationalism and the racial science of migration waves. *Journal of Asian Studies* 64:605–37.
- ASV. 1866. Estado general de los pueblos del Arzobispado de Manila con espresión [*sic*] de los nombres de sus Curas Párrocos y Coadjutores, número de tributos y total de almas en el año próximo pasado de 1865 formado según los parciales remitidos a la Secretaría de Cámara en el presente de 1866. Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 447 (A), with Melitón Martínez-Barili, 27 Oct.
- Alaminos y Vivar, Juan de. 1873. Memoria escrita por el Excmo. Sr. D. ... , Gobernador de Filipinas. AHN, Ultramar, legajo 5242.
- Arcilla, Jose S., S.J., ed. 1988. *Understanding the Noli. Its historical context and literary influences*. Manila: Phoenix Publishing House.
- Artigas y Cuerva, Manuel. 1911a. Los sucesos de 1872. *Renacimiento Filipino*, 28 Mar.: 4.

- . 1911b. *Los sucesos de 1872: Reseña histórica-bibliográfica*. Glorias Nacionales, 3. Manila: Imp. de La Vanguardia.
- . 1996. *The events of 1872: A historico-bio-bibliographical account*, trans. and ed. O[nofre] D. Corpuz. National Glories, vol. 3. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Bantug, Asuncion Lopez. 1982. *Lolo José: An intimate portrait of Rizal*. Manila: Ministry of Human Settlements, the Intramuros Administration.
- [Barrantes, Vicente (?)] 1869. *Apuntes interesantes sobre las Islas Filipinas que pueden ser útiles para hacer las reformas convenientes y productivas para el país y para la nación*. Madrid: El Pueblo.
- Bengoa, José Manuel, O.A.R., ed. 1998–1999. Una “memoria” del gobernador general de Filipinas, Juan de Alaminos y Vivar. *Recollectio* 21–22:131–76.
- Bernad, Miguel A., S.J. 1986. *Rizal and Spain. An essay in biographical context*. Manila: National Book Store.
- Blanco Andrés, Roberto. 2001. Eduardo Navarro y la creación de la Biblioteca Filipina del Real Colegio-Seminario de Agustinos de Valladolid. *Investigaciones Históricas* 21:231–47.
- . 2003. La administración parroquial de los agustinos en Filipinas: Escasez de religiosos y secularización de curatos (1776–1820). *Archivo Agustiniiano* 86:169–212.
- . 2004a. El *cabildo* eclesiástico de Manila y la defensa de los derechos del clero secular de Filipinas. *Philippiniana Sacra* 39:119–43.
- . 2004b. Iglesia y Estado en Filipinas: Las órdenes religiosas y la cuestión de curatos (1776–1872). Ph.D. diss., Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Valladolid.
- . 2004c. E-mail to author, 31 Aug.
- . 2004d. Las órdenes religiosas y la crisis de Filipinas (1896–1898). *Hispania Sacra* 56:583–613.
- . 2004e. Tiempos difíciles para los Franciscanos en Filipinas: Escasez de frailes y abandono de pueblos (1776–1823). *Archivo Ibero-Americano* 64:703–37.
- . 2004f. E-mail to author, 13 Dec.
- . 2005a. E-mail to author, 6 Apr.
- . 2005b. E-mail to author, 6 May.
- . 2005c. E-mail to author, 29 June.
- . 2005d. E-mail to author, 24 Aug.
- . 2005e. E-mail to author, 7 Oct.
- . 2005f. E-mail to author, 30 Nov.
- . 2006a. E-mail to author, 12 Feb.

- . 2006b. E-mail to author, 2 Aug.
- Buencamino, Felipe, Sr. 1969. *Sixty years of Philippine history*, trans. Alfonso Lecaros, ed. Mauro Garcia. Manila: Philippine Historical Association.
- Burgos-Gomez-Zamora Centennial Commission, comp. [1972a] Readings on Burgos-Gomez-Zamora: Martyrs of 1872. [Manila]: Burgos-Gomez-Zamora Centennial Commission. Mimeographed.
- , comp. 1972b. Readings on Burgos-Gomes [sic]-Zamora. Part III: For colleges and universities. Manila: Burgos-Gomez-Zamora Centennial Commission. Mimeographed.
- de los Santos, Epifanio. 1907. Marcelo H. del Pilar. *Pláridel* (Malolos), 17 Aug.: 4–10.
- de Veyra, J[aime] C[arlos] and Mariano Ponce. 1914. *Efemérides Filipinas*. Manila: Impr. de I. R. Morales.
- del Pilar, Marcelo H. 1955–1958. *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*. 2 vols. Manila: Imprenta del Gobierno.
- Dela Goza, Rolando S., C.M., and Jesus Ma. Cavanna, C.M. 1985. *Vincentians in the Philippines, 1862–1982*. Manila: n.p.
- Dos Suscritores. 1864. Letter to editor datelined Manila, 24 Nov. 1863. *La América*, 27 Jan. APAF, legajo 839, 217–24.
- Espasa*. 1907a. Aguirre Miramón, (José Manuel de). 3:630–31.
- . 1907b. Labra y Cadrana, (Rafael María de). 29:101–2.
- Fernández, Pablo, O.P. 1979. *History of the church in the Philippines (1521–1898)*. Manila: National Book Store.
- Ferrer, Maxima Magsanoc, comp. and ed. 1970. *Union catalog of Philippine materials*. Vol. 1. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Flores, Albert C. A. 2001. Pedro Peláez' "Brebes [sic] apuntes sobre la cuestión de curatos de Filipinas": A transcription. *Philippinum* 1:78–116.
- Gaínza, Francisco, O.P. 1864. Amovilidad de los Curas Regulares de las Islas Filipinas. APTCJ, E-II-e-1.
- Gatmaitan, Magno S. 1966. *Marcelo H. del Pilar, 1850–1896. A documented biography with Tagalog, English, and Spanish versions*. Quezon City: n.p.
- Gomez, Marcelino. 1922/1972. P. Mariano Gómez, *The Independent*, 4 Feb.:15–22. In Readings on Burgos-Gomes [sic]-Zamora, Part III: For colleges and universities, 99–119. Manila: Burgos-Gomez-Zamora Centennial Commission. Mimeographed.
- Guerrero, Leon Ma. 1963. *The first Filipino*. Manila: National Heroes Commission.
- Guerrero, Milagros C. and John N. Schumacher, S.J. 1998. *Reform and revolution*, vol. 5. *Kasaysayan: The story of the Filipino people*. [Manila]: Asia Publishing.

- Guía de forasteros en Filipinas para el año de 1863*. 1863. Manila: Imprenta de Ramírez y Giraudier.
- Guía de forasteros en Filipinas para el año de 1865*. 1865. Manila: Establecimiento de los Amigos del País.
- Hilario, Vicente M., and Eliseo Quirino. 1928/1985. *Thinking for ourselves: A collection of representative Filipino essays*. 2d ed. Manila: Oriental Commercial Co., 1928. Reprint, Manila: Cacho Hermanos.
- Izquierdo, Rafael. 1872. Memoria escrita por el Excmo. Sr. D... Dec. AHN, Ultramar, legajo 5222.
- Manifiesto que á la noble Nación Española derigen [sic] los leales Filipinos en defensa de su honra, y fidelidad gravemente vulneradas por el periódico, "La Verdad" de Madrid*. [1889] Hong Kong: n.p.
- Manuel, E. Arsenio. 1955–1986. *Dictionary of Philippine biography*. 3 vols. Quezon City: Filipiniana Publications.
- Martínez, Bernardo, O.S.A. 1909. *Apuntes históricos de la provincia agustiniana del Santísimo Nombre de Jesús de Filipinas, recopilados por el P..., secretario de la provincia. Filipinas*. Madrid: Imp. del Asilo de Huérfanos del S. C. de Jesús.
- Martínez Cuesta, Angel, O.A.R. 1973. Evangelización de la Isla de Negros, 1565–1660. *Missionaria Hispanica* 30:49–96, 257–98.
- . 1986. Review of "The state of the church in the Philippines, 1850–1875." *Recollectio* 9:368–71.
- . La iglesia y la revolución Filipina de 1898. 1998–1999. *Recollectio* 21–22:19–82.
- . Correspondencia del Cardenal Rampolla con Religiosos Agustinos Recoletos. 1998–1999. *Recollectio* 21–22: 617–746.
- . Correspondencia del Cardenal Rampolla con Religiosos Agustinos Recoletos. 2000–2001. *Recollectio* 23–24:439–673.
- Medina, Isagani R., comp. and ed. 1972. *Filipiniana materials in the National Library*. Quezon City: National Library and University of the Philippines Press.
- Pardo de Tavera, T[rinidad] H. 1903. *Biblioteca Filipina*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Pastells, Pablo, S.J. 1916–1917. *Misión de la Compañía de Jesús de Filipinas en el siglo XIX*. 3 vols. Barcelona: Editorial Barcelonesa.
- [Peláez, Pedro] 1851. Quejas y exposiciones del clero secular de Cavite contra la Real Orden de 9 de Marzo de 1849, que disponía pasasen al clero regular (Recoletos y Dominicos) la administración espiritual de siete parroquias que el clero indígena poseía en aquella provincia, 1859–1851. APTCJ, E-II-a-12.
- Peláez, Pedro. 1862a. D. Pedro Peláez, Prebendado de la Catedral de Manila, como Gobernador eclesiástico de la Archidiócesis, sede vacante, da cuenta al Sr.

- Arzobispo siguiente, Excmo. Sr. D. Gregorio Melitón Martínez, del estado de Archidiócesis y de la gestión de su gobierno. APPSJ, II-7-024.
- . [1862b (?)] Brebes [*sic*] apuntes sobre la cuestión de curatos de Filipinas. Arch. Nunz. Madrid, 447, enclosed with Peláez-Barili, 22 May 1863. ASV.
- [Peláez, Pedro] 1863. *Documentos importantes para la cuestión pendiente sobre la provisión de curatos en Filipinas*. Madrid: Imprenta de El Clamor Público.
- Peláez, Pedro, and Lorenzo Barili. 1861–1863. Correspondencia epistolar entre el Nuncio de Su Santidad en Madrid y el Prebendado de la Catedral de Manila, Pedro Peláez, por algún tiempo Vicario Capitular, sede vacante, 20 Enero de 1861 á 22 Mayo de 1863. APPSJ, II-7-023.
- Peralta, Manuel. 1864. *Juicio sobre el folleto titulado "Importantísima cuestión que puede afectar gravemente las Islas Filipinas."* Madrid: Imprenta de D. Anselmo Santa Coloma.
- PNA. 1846–1855. Superiores cartas. Expediente 75.
- . 1863. Patronato. Uncatalogued expediente. 22 Apr.
- . 1865. Patronato. Uncatalogued expediente. 4 June.
- . 1870–1873. Sediciones y Rebeliones. "Conspiración contra el orden público—Pampanga."
- [Ponce de León, Ignacio] 1863. *Papel volante que un sacerdote del clero secular llevó en persona á los miembros del Consejo de Administración, para que en su vista fallasen la exposición de los señores diocesanos como se pide*. Madrid: Imp. de La Regeneración.
- Quirino, Carlos. 1973. A checklist of documents on Gomburza from the Archdiocesan Archives of Manila. *Philippine Studies* 21:19–84.
- Retana, Wenceslao E. 1906. *Aparato bibliográfico de la historia general de Filipinas*. 3 vols. Madrid: Minuesa de los Ríos.
- . 1907. *Vida y escritos del Dr. José Rizal*. Madrid: Librería general de Victoriano Suárez.
- Riera, Francisco, S.J. 1922. Pequeños apuntes . . . del H. Riera. APTCJ.
- Rizal y Alonso, José. 1930–1938. *Epistolario Rizalino*. 5 vols. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- . 1949. *Memorias de un estudiante de Manila. Autobiografía escolar inédita del Dr. José Rizal Mercado durante el período 1861–1881*, ed. Alberto y Tomás F. Barretto. Manila: Cacho Hermanos.
- . 1959. *One hundred letters of José Rizal to his parents, brother, sisters, relatives*. Manila: Philippine National Historical Society.
- . 1961a. *Cartas entre Rizal y los miembros de la familia*. Edición del Centenario. Manila: Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal.
- . 1961b. *Noli me tângere*. Impresión al offset de la edición príncipe,

- impresa en Berlin, 1887. Manila: Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal.
- . 1961c. *Reminiscences and travels of José Rizal*. Centennial edition. Manila: José Rizal National Centennial Commission.
- Rodríguez, Isacio R., O.S.A. 1968. *Historia de la provincia Agustiniiana del Smo. Nombre de Jesús de Filipinas.*, vol. 4: *Bibliografía*. Manila: n.p.
- Rodríguez, Isacio, and Jesús Álvarez. 1998. Inquietud en la Iglesia de Filipinas: Amovilidad e inamovilidad del clero regular. *Archivo Agustiniiano* 82:229–98.
- Rodríguez Varela, Luis. 1814. *El parnaso Filipino. Obras poéticas de Don Luis Rodríguez Varela, conde Filipino. Extraídas de la mitología y de toda la erudición de las diosas*. Primera parte. Sampaloc: n.p.
- Sádaba del Carmen, Francisco, O.R.S.A. 1906. *Catálogo de los religiosos agustinos recoletos de la provincia de San Nicolás de Tolentino de Filipinas, desde el año 1606, en que llegó la primera misión a Manila, hasta nuestros días*. Madrid: Imprenta del Asilo de Huérfanos del Sagrado Corazón de Jesús.
- Sánchez Fuertes, Cayetano, O.F.M. 1988. Literary sources of *Noli me tangere*. In *Understanding the Noli. Its historical context and literary influence*, ed. Jose S. Arcilla, S.J., 57–112. Manila: Phoenix Publishing House.
- Sancianco y Goson, Gregorio. 1881. *El progreso de Filipinas. Estudios económicos, administrativos y políticos. Parte económica*. Madrid: Imprenta de la viuda de J. M. Pérez.
- Santiago, Luciano P. R. 1984. The first Filipino priest-doctors of ecclesiastical sciences (1772–1796). *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 12:257–70.
- . 1985a. The Filipino priest doctors in the nineteenth century (1801–1871). *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 13:34–50.
- . 1985b. Of prose and souls: Padre Modesto de Castro (1819–1864). *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 13:51–67.
- Santiago Vela, Gregorio de, O.S.A. 1913–1931. *Ensayo de una biblioteca Ibero-Americana de la Orden de San Agustín*. 8 vols. Madrid: Imprenta del Asilo de Huérfanos del S. C. de Jesús.
- Santos, Jose P. 1935. *Buhay at mga sinulat ni Emilio Jacinto*. [Manila]: n.p.
- Schumacher, John N., S.J. 1970. The authenticity of the writings attributed to Father José Burgos. *Philippine Studies* 18:3–51.
- . 1972a. *Father José Burgos: Priest and nationalist*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1972b. The Cavite mutiny: An essay on the published sources. *Philippine Studies* 20:603–32.
- . 1984. Syncretism in Philippine Catholicism: Its historical causes. *Philippine Studies* 32:251–72.

- . 1987. *Readings in Philippine church history*. 2d ed. Quezon City: Loyola School of Theology, Ateneo de Manila University.
- . 1991. *The making of a nation: Essays in nineteenth-century Filipino nationalism*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1995. The civil and religious ethic of Emilio Jacinto. *Landas: Journal of Loyola School of Theology* 9:37–52.
- . 1997. *The Propaganda Movement: 1880–1895. The creation of a national consciousness, the making of the revolution*. 2d ed. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1999. *Father José Burgos. A documentary history, with Spanish documents and their translation*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 2004. *Burgos and the Cavite mutiny. Documents relating to Father José Burgos and the Cavite mutiny of 1872*. Revised, enlarged ed. published in cooperation with the Geronimo Berenguer de los Reyes Jr. Foundation. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Taylor, John R. M. 1971. *The Philippine insurrection against the United States. A compilation of documents with notes and introduction*. Eugenio Lopez Philippine History Series. 5 volumes. Pasay City: Eugenio Lopez Foundation.
- Tormo Sanz, Leandro. 1973. *1872. Documents compiled and annotated by . . .*, trans. Antonio Molina. Manila: Historical Conservation Society.
- . 1978. *La huelga del arsenal de Cavite en 1872*. In *Anuario de Estudios Americanos*. Sevilla. Reprint from *Anuario de Estudios Americanos* 35 (1978):389–485.
- Uy, Antolin V., S.V.D. 1984. *The state of the church in the Philippines, 1850–1875. The correspondence between the bishops in the Philippines and the nuncio in Madrid*. Tagaytay Studies, 3. Tagaytay City: Divine Word Seminary.
- Villaruel, Fidel, O.P. 1971. *Father José Burgos: University student*. Manila: University of Santo Tomás Press.
- . 1984. *José Rizal and the University of Santo Tomás*. Manila: University of Santo Tomás.
- . 1997. *Marcelo H. del Pilar at the University of Santo Tomás*. Manila: UST Publishing House.
- . 2005a. E-mail to author, 19 Mar.
- . 2005b. E-mail to author, 24 June.
- Viva España. Viva el Rey. Viva el Ejército. Fuera los Frailes*. 1888. [Hong Kong]: n.p.
- Wickberg, Edgar. 1964. The Chinese mestizo in Philippine history. *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 5:62–100.