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This article argues that some of the newspapers of late Spanish colonial Manila should be considered as being politically contentious, and instruments of propaganda, along with La Solidaridad. Specifically, the article documents Isabelo de los Reyes’s participation in the press of this period, particularly though not exclusively in bilingual newspapers, and argues that this fact has not been fully recognized, in part because of his many pseudonyms and in part because of the political imperative to propagate about censorship in the colonial press. The article identifies several of de los Reyes’s pseudonyms, and reviews a sample of the content of his newspapers.
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La Solidaridad has long been recognized as a central text of the “Propaganda Movement” of the 1880s and 1890s. John N. Schumacher, S.J., derived his name for the movement from the “Comité de Propaganda” of Manila, a group that generally supported the political projects undertaken by the Filipinos living, working, organizing, and writing mostly in the Spanish peninsula; financially supported del Pilar’s work in the Peninsula as well as La Solidaridad; and distributed that newspaper and other works of “propaganda” in the colony.¹ Less attention has been paid to La Solidaridad’s many contemporaries that were published under the nose of the colonial censors in the Philippines. Newspapers published in the colony were subject to censorship, and clearly this limited the possible scope and strength of their political content and commentary; however,
one can find in many of these newspapers some of the same concerns as those found in *La Solidaridad*. Several of these papers were bilingual, each publishing in both the peninsular language of Castilian, and in either Tagalog (usually), or Ilocano. I contend that *La Solidaridad* should be read as part of a wider propaganda project, which was carried out both in the peninsular *La Solidaridad* and in its contemporaries in the Philippines.

This article argues that some newspapers of late Spanish colonial Manila were more politically contentious than has been generally recognized, and that they were also instruments of propaganda, and should be considered as such along with the writings more commonly associated with the "Propaganda Movement." More specifically, this article focuses on the newspapers of the Philippines in which Isabelo de los Reyes played an important role. First, we will briefly review the history of the periodical press in the Philippines during the nineteenth century. Then, we will reconstruct de los Reyes’s participation in it, first by piecing together the evidence that can tell us for which newspapers, and under what pseudonyms, he wrote, and then by considering some of the content of the articles he wrote and papers in which he had a hand.

**The Philippine Periodical Press of the Nineteenth Century**

De los Reyes’s work was part of a boom in publishing in the Philippines, particularly in Manila, during the 1880s and early 1890s. To appreciate the novelty and import of this rush of periodicals, and the significance of de los Reyes’s contributions, it may be helpful to review the history of the periodical press in the Philippines. Prior to the 1840s, the Philippines was home to few periodicals (Retana 1895). Manila became the first port in the archipelago to be formally opened to foreign trade in 1834, which inaugurated an era in which print culture expanded in the Philippines. However, it was not until around 1860 that the periodical press became a significant institution in the colony (Blanco 2001, chap. 4). From the 1860s until around 1880, newspapers in Manila, with one exception, were printed only in the metropolitan language of Castilian. Primarily commercial and administrative in nature rather than religious, the newspaper’s readers, we can presume, generally must have been peninsular Spaniards,
foreign businessmen, and those members of the local elite who, as mer-
chants or large-scale agriculturalists, had both a command of the lan-
guage and an interest in the content of these publications (Retana 1895).

During this early period of Philippine newspapers, the only newspa-
per to have been printed in any language other than Castilian was a
multilingual newspaper by the name of *El Pasig* (after Manila’s river), a
fortnightly that had a brief life from July 1862 to January 1863.\(^2\) The
pages of *El Pasig* reveal that most of its articles were printed only in
Castilian; however, a few pieces in its short run appeared in Tagalog and
very occasionally translations appeared in other indigenous languages
(Ilocano, Pangasinan, or Bicolano). Often those articles that appeared in
languages native to the Philippines were the work of the newspaper’s
readers, who submitted their own translations of the newspaper’s
Castilian-language articles for publication in future issues. The short life
of *El Pasig* might have been caused by any number of reasons: a pro-
hibitive price, a small potential readership, unappealing content, or pres-
sure from authorities might each have had a hand—although, without
records that could shed specific light on the reasons for the newspaper’s
fate, we do not know. What we know is that the failure of *El Pasig*
provided an important service for future bilingual periodicals in the Philip-
pines; as we shall see below, decades later the authorities would look back
upon the unremarkable, unthreatening precedent set by *El Pasig* when
considering whether to grant permission for bilingual newspapers to be
published.

In 1882, the board of censors considered an application to publish a
new bilingual Tagalog-Castilian paper, *El Diario Tagalog/Ang Diaryong
Tagalog*. After some discussion of the benefits of publishing a bilingual
paper, the board decided to allow the new publication, in part on the
precedent that they believed *El Pasig* had set. Oddly, the documents re-
veal that the board of censors believed *El Pasig* to have been much more
thoroughly bilingual, even trilingual, than it actually was (PNA 1882).
Like its predecessor, *El Diario Tagalog* was short-lived; it was forced to
close after only a few months of publication due to low subscriptions,
which the publisher blamed largely on the cholera epidemic that devas-
tated Manila during those months.\(^3\) The paper was an early project of
Marcelo H. del Pilar, and included an article by José Rizal.\(^4\)
If *El Diario Tagalo* was a forerunner of later bilingual periodicals in the Philippines, as well as *La Solidaridad* in Spain, it was also part of the general boom in publishing that the 1880s brought to Manila—and, indeed, the same decade saw the first newspapers printed outside of Manila, in Vigan (1884), Iloilo (1884), and Cebu (1886). At the beginning of the decade, hopeful publishers, having endured years of supervision by administrations made skittish by Cavite (1872), might have been encouraged by the era ushered in by Governor-General Fernando Primo de Rivera (1880–1883), who carried out censorship with significant leniency (Schumacher 1997, 106). During later years of the decade, 1885–1888, a more liberal press was cultivated under the administration of Governor-General Emilio Terrero and his influential and liberal subordinates José Centeno and Beningo Quiroga.

However, the application of censorship under Terrero’s administration grew contentious and, to some degree, uneven. Under Terrero, and the influence of his secular-leaning subordinates Centeno and Quiroga, Rizal’s *Noli me tangere* was allowed to circulate despite the efforts of the Dominican censors to ban it (Anderson 2005, 92; Guerrero 1963/1998, 181; Schumacher 1997, 93–94). One of the important newspapers to emerge during this period—the daily *La Opinión*—was considered to be an organ of the liberal administration, particularly of Quiroga, and its readership, according to Retana (1906, 1630), was composed largely of *progresistas* (progressives). These “progressives” might have been among those organizing around political reforms and challenges to the Catholic Church’s control, including the 1888 petition and demonstration calling for the expulsion of friar orders from the colony.

Although Terrero’s administration might have been sympathetic to criticisms of the friar orders’ influence, it was not, or perhaps could not afford to be, uniformly liberal and permissive. Under Terrero, for example, a new censorship law was promulgated that required provincial periodicals to be subject to Manila’s approval, after a particularly controversial set of articles had appeared in Iloilo, subject at that time only to local censorship (Scott 1982, 247, 272). Furthermore, the possibilities for antifriar activity under Terrero’s administration reached their limit, and perhaps their demise, with the 1888 demonstration for the expulsion of the orders. Friar interests effectively launched a counter-effort to the
petition and demonstration that eventually forced the resignation of Centeno, and marked the end of Terrero's term (Guerrero 1963/1998, 188; Schumacher 1997, 114–19).

Shortly thereafter, Terrero was replaced by Governor-General Valeriano Weyler (1888–1891), and Quiroga, finding himself without allies in the new administration, was more or less forced to resign his post and leave for the Peninsula, where he was feted by the Filipino colony of Barcelona (Anderson 2005, 93–94; Schumacher 1997, 117–18). Under Weyler many of the secularist and liberal policies of the previous administration were rolled back, and, in the atmosphere of repression, some "progressives" set their sights on the political work that could be done remotely from the Peninsula. Del Pilar, for one, took the opportunity to leave the Philippines and went to Barcelona, as the "official delegate" of the Manila-based Comité de Propaganda, where he joined the Filipino colony and its political projects, including, but not limited to, *La Solidaridad* (Schumacher 1997, 122–26, 147–48).

However, the more repressive atmosphere under Weyler did not immediately slow the pace of periodical publishing. Indeed, in 1889, the second year of Weyler's administration, nine new periodicals began to publish, a record number that was broken the following year when the number rose to thirteen. From 1890 until the end of 1896, more than ten new periodicals started each year, except 1891 (when only three new publications appeared) and 1896 (the year the revolution began, when the number of new publications dipped slightly to seven) (Retana 1895, 627–39; 1906, 1713–60). Weyler's rule ended toward the end of 1891, when Governor-General Eulogio Despujol arrived, bringing again a more relaxed approach to censorship of the press (Schumacher 1997, 275).

During the turbulent years of the 1880s and early 1890s, while periodicals were subject to censorship, the authority of the censor was, if not tenuous, at least contested. As surviving records show, occasionally newspapers' editors failed to pass their copy by the censors in advance of publication, as was required by law; an offence typically punished with a fine and, less often, with an order to cease publication for a certain number of days (PNA 1884, 1887, 1888–1890; 1884–1886, 1888–1895; 1886). Given the frequency with which we know infractions were noted (and that surviving records are likely incomplete), we can judge that what
was read by the public in the newspapers of the Philippines had not always passed the censor's view. One reason why this might have happened might simply have been how quickly the numbers of newspapers were growing: simply put, it was difficult for the censors to keep up.

Given this general sketch of the growth of periodical publishing in the Philippines, we will now turn our attention to uncovering the extent to which de los Reyes was a part of that growth, and to some of the content of his contributions.

De los Reyes's Pseudonyms and Newspaper Work

Born in 1864 in Vigan, de los Reyes identified himself in his writings as Ilocano, although there is some indication that he, like his famous compatriot José Rizal, was from a family that had been classified as Chinese mestizo.7 His mother was a poet, who wrote primarily in Ilocano but also in Castilian, and whose works would be anthologized at her son's initiative in a collection of women's writing compiled for the Paris Exposition in 1889 (de los Reyes 1994, 274). Her love for writing seems to have been passed on to her son; his interest in folklore seems to have been received in a different way from a friar-schoolteacher at the seminary in Vigan, who had his students record local superstitions in order to show them to be ridiculous (Scott 1982, 249-50). In 1880 de los Reyes left his Ilocano patria for Manila, enrolling in the college of San Juan de Letrán. His first article was published in 1881, while he was still in school; when his father died shortly thereafter, he continued his schooling, in part through the pay he received for his newspaper articles. Although he finished the courses for Notary at the University of Santo Tomás in 1887, it seems that he made his living from journalism for several years—as contributing writer as well as editor for various periodicals—later becoming a printer and publisher as well as a merchant.8 Even when he practiced another trade, journalism was his main endeavor, judging from the volume of his output.

De los Reyes entered the newspaper world in 1881, with an article about the attack on Manila by a sixteenth-century Chinese pirate (Scott 1982, 266–67). Titled "The loyalty of the Ilocanos to Spain," the article championed the valiant Ilocano fighters who, under the command of a
Spaniard, defended the city of Manila against the pirate’s threat, and noted the apparent ingratitude of the city for not memorializing its saviors. As William Henry Scott phrased it, the “impertinent” article “seemed to suggest that Spaniards wouldn’t have been able to retain Manila without... Ilocano assistance... The implications must... have annoyed the capital’s Tagalog reading public, which tended to regard Ilocanos as tight-fisted provincianos at best, household menials at worst” (ibid., 267).9

In 1884 the director of La Oceania Española (José Felipe del Pan, a peninsular Spaniard and newspaperman in Manila) encouraged de los Reyes to write about Ilocano folklore.10 At this point de los Reyes began his long-standing and prolific interest in folklore, beginning with articles in that newspaper and in El Comercio on the folklore of Malabón, Zambales, and the Ilocos. His studies in folklore encouraged three of his compatriots to try their hand: Pío Mondragon began to contribute to La Oceania Española writing on the folklore of Tayabas; Mariano Ponce on that of Bulacan; and Pedro Serrano Laktaw on that of Pampanga.11 Their works on folklore were all later collected and published as the second volume of El Folk-Lore Filipino (de los Reyes 1890a). These may be the earliest published pieces of two of La Solidaridad’s contributors: Ponce was to become one of its main writers, and Pedro Serrano Laktaw would contribute to “letters” by “D. A. Murgas.”12

By 1888 de los Reyes had already published three books that had their origins in newspapers; one (Filipinas: Artículos Varios de Isabelo de los Reyes y Florentino sobre Etnografía, Historia y Costumbres del País) was a collection of articles that had appeared first in La Oceania Española and El Eco de Panay, and two others (Las Islas Visayas en la Época de la Conquista and Ilocanadas) were both first published in folletín in Eco de Panay between 1887 and 1888.13 His collected folklore writings had already won an award at the Exposition in Madrid, and he was a contributor to various Castilian-language newspapers in Manila (El Diario de Manila, La Oceania Española, El Comercio, and La España Oriental) and in Iloilo (El Eco de Panay).14 By 1889 he was an editor for the Castilian-language newspapers Diario de Manila and España Oriental, and during 1890 he was hired to write for La Opinión.15 In the Castilian-language press of Manila during these years, he used at least two pseudonyms: “Plátanos” in the Diario de Manila, and “Deloserre” in El Comercio.16
By 1889, well established in the Castilian-language press, he began writing for a different kind of newspaper, immersing himself in various bilingual newspapers that emerged between 1888 and 1890. Specifically, it seems that he wrote for the Revista Popular de Filipinas (1888–1889), and he both wrote for and edited the Revista Católica de Filipinas (1888–1889). Each of these newspapers published in parallel columns of Castilian and Tagalog, and professed religious aims. In the same year he started two other bilingual newspapers. The first was a bilingual edition of La España Oriental (the sister to the Castilian-language paper that he had already written for); although the two editions shared their name, each had its own staff and content, and in fact it seems that de los Reyes not only edited the bilingual edition, but wrote most of the articles himself (La España Oriental 1889). In this newspaper, as in others, one can trace his authorship in part because pieces are reprinted from elsewhere where he is clearly identified as the author. One of the clues about his authorship comes toward the end of the run of the paper, when the name of a frequent contributor, “J. Simon,” is revealed in the final installment of one of the series of articles to be de los Reyes’s pseudonym (Simon 1889). Oddly, La España Oriental and La Revista Católica de Filipinas, both bilingual Castilian-Tagalog newspapers that de los Reyes edited, became embroiled in a disagreement over the question of orthography. Sharp words were exchanged in the pages of the two papers, but by the end of the year they merged to form La Lectura Popular (1890–1891), another of de los Reyes’s bilingual Castilian-Tagalog newspapers, about which we will hear more below.

Also in 1889, de los Reyes began another bilingual newspaper, El Ilocano, this one in Castilian and his mother tongue of Ilocano. The newspaper shares several pieces that appeared in the bilingual edition of La España Oriental, sometimes unsigned in one or the other of the papers, and sometimes signed with one of his pseudonyms: “José Simon” and “Angel Benito.” This newspaper is sometimes thought to be the first Filipino newspaper printed in a Filipino vernacular; as we have seen, it was neither the first bilingual newspaper, nor was it printed entirely in a vernacular. The origin of the confusion seems to be Retana’s judgment that it was the “[p]rimer periódico genuinamente filipino. Fundado,
dirigido y redactado casi íntegramente por D. Isabela de los Reyes, ilocano de pura raza” [first genuinely Filipino periodical. Founded, directed and edited almost entirely by Isabela de los Reyes, purebred Ilocano] (Retana 1906, 1653).

During the years 1889–1891, much of de los Reyes’s effort went toward his bilingual newspapers. Soon after, his writing began to crowd the pages of a new Castilian-language periodical: La Ilustración Filipina (1891–1894). The name of the newspaper can be read in two distinct ways: while it was literally an “illustrated” publication, in the sense that it reproduced in its pages drawings and lithographs to illustrate the subjects of its articles, the Ilustración of the title might also be read as “Enlightenment,” and thus the newspaper’s name, “Filipino Enlightenment” or perhaps “Enlightenment of the Philippines,” might declare it to be a vehicle or a record of the education and enlightenment of the Philippines and of Filipinos. De los Reyes’s contributions to the paper were particularly heavy during the year or so between the end of February 1892 and the middle of March the following year. Among the fifty-one issues of the newspaper that were printed during this time frame, pieces that we know with certainty belong to de los Reyes appeared eighty times. In at least one issue, 28 February 1893, we can ascertain that more than half of all of the text was written by de los Reyes. Rarely, however, were two of his articles in the same issue signed in the same way: instead they were published anonymously, or with one or more initials, or with one of the pseudonyms that he used in this newspaper: “Toning,” “Ángel Benito,” and “José Simón.”

The final Manila-based newspaper of de los Reyes that I will note here is El Municipio Filipino, which began publishing in 1894, in which legal codes were published in a form and with commentary to make them more accessible to the public. Its stated aim was to “Vulgarizar el conocimiento de nuestras leyes, explicarlas, comentarlas y hacerlas asequibles á todas las inteligencias, aún las más vulgares” [popularize knowledge of our laws, to explain them, to discuss them, and make them accessible to every mind, even the most ordinary] (Retana 1906, 1726). To this end, the newspaper appeared in two editions—one Castilian-only, and the other bilingual Castilian-Tagalog. From Retana’s description of
the paper, it would seem that some of its projects were prefigured in his earlier *Lectura Popular*, to which I will turn in some detail in the sections that follows.

Up to this point, we have seen only the extent of de los Reyes's writings and little of their content. The sheer volume of his production is itself impressive. De los Reyes wrote for, and edited, many kinds of newspapers in the Philippines during these years, from the Castilian-language dailies of Manila (*Diario de Manila, El Comercio, La Opinión*), more marginal Castilian-language papers (*Eco de Panay, La España Oriental, La Oceania Española, La Ilustración Filipina, El Municipio Filipino*), and bilingual newspapers, both of Catholic bent (*La Revista Popular, La Revista Católica de Filipinas*), and those which, while often giving space to Catholic themes, also notably promoted secular kinds of knowledge (*La España Oriental, La Lectura Popular, El Ilocano, El Municipio Filipino*). De los Reyes's contributions to the periodical press were not geographically limited in his period to the Philippines; he also published in periodicals in Spain and elsewhere in Europe. Many of his articles on folklore were published in scholarly journals, some in German translation, but for the purposes of this study I will focus on a different set of articles that he published outside of the Philippines: those that appeared in *La Solidaridad*. By considering some of the concerns that he raised in these articles, alongside some of the projects that he promoted through newspapers published in the Philippines, we begin to piece together a picture of de los Reyes's propaganda of this period.

**Content of de los Reyes's Newspapers**

De los Reyes wrote several articles for *La Solidaridad*, the newspaper of propaganda for the Philippines that began publishing in 1889, first in Barcelona, and later in Madrid. The first article of de los Reyes's to appear in *La Solidaridad*, however, was a piece that he wrote for, and first published in, a periodical in Manila. In June 1889 *La España Oriental* (the Castilian-language edition) published his "Diputados á Cortes por Filipinas" [Representatives to the Cortes for the Philippines] (de los Reyes 1889b). De los Reyes had written the piece in response to an article of a different Manila newspaper. That article had proposed that a
new representational chamber be established in Spain, separate from the Cortes and specifically for colonies, in which the Philippines could be represented. De los Reyes criticized that idea, arguing that peninsular Spaniards would dominate such an institution; instead, he advocated for representation for the Philippines in the Cortes itself. The article was considered bold for the Manila press (de los Reyes 1889a); _La Solidaridad_ (1889b) both decried the response that the article had received from more conservative corners of the Manila press, and republished the article in its own pages. Although de los Reyes did endure criticism, and although, as we shall see, he himself complained about the oppressive atmosphere of newspaper censorship in the Philippines, we should note that he _first_ published this political piece in the Manila press, notwithstanding the conditions of censorship.

In 1890 de los Reyes contributed several new articles to _La Solidaridad_: one appeared in April, and two more followed in the next two months, all published under the pen name of “Kasalo” (Kasalo 1890a, 1890b, 1890c).22 In the first of these articles, “La Unidad de Fueros” [The Equality of Privileges (Rights?)], de los Reyes argued that, although existing Spanish law considered members of the clergy to be subject to the same criminal legal codes as other citizens, in the Philippines this was not enforced (Kasalo 1890c). In this “tierra de los viceversas” [land of vice-versas], he complained, friars were given privileges that they were denied in the peninsula (including, importantly, that if accused of a crime a friar’s case did not proceed along normal lines, but was instead usually handled by his superiors in his own order). Spanish law, de los Reyes argued, subjected friars to the same laws and courts to which others were subject. In effect, he was arguing in favor of extending Spanish law to the Philippines integrally, rather than with exceptions, as was the practice. Subsequent issues of _La Solidaridad_ carried articles of his with similar themes: “El Registro Civil” [Civil Registration] treated the civil registration reform that had been passed but suspended under pressure from friar interests, and “El Matrimonio Canónico y el Civil” [Canonical and Civil Marriage] advocated civil marriages (Kasalo 1890a, 1890b). These political concerns that he expressed pseudonymously in the pages of _La Solidaridad_ were echoed bilingually in some of his newspapers in Manila during the same time.
Since most of the political articles in the newspapers to which he was a heavy contributor have no author listed (or give only a pseudonym that I have not identified with certainty), it is difficult at this point to say how many of them are likely the work of de los Reyes. In the political climate of the Manila of Governors-General Weyler and Despujol, he might have chosen to remain an anonymous author of any articles he suspected would catch the attention of the authorities and other antagonists—as we have already seen, one of the few political articles that he did sign with his name earned him some public criticism. In *La Lectura Popular*, for example, most articles have no author indicated. However, some of those articles echo de los Reyes’s writings for *La Solidaridad*, and that newspaper’s agenda, more generally. Regardless of whether or not we know that they are de los Reyes’s own writing, we will see that they take up some of the same issues, and thus can be considered in the same frame.

For example, among the first issues of *La Lectura Popular* was a series of articles that dealt with “The New Civil Code.” The articles focused on the question of who had the legal status of “Spaniard,” or (in the original Castilian and Tagalog, with an English translation):

\[
\text{la distinción que existe entre los individuos que forman parte de la gran familia española y los que, por el contrario, son súbditos de otra nación/ang pagcacaiba ng manga tauong nasasacop ng capisanang castilla at ng taga ibang nacion o lupá}
\]

[the distinction that exists between those individuals that form part of the great Spanish family and those that, on the contrary, are subjects of another nation]. (*La Lectura Popular* 1890a)

This bifurcated world was one in which there was no difference in status between a citizen in peninsular Spain and a colonial subject in Manila. Instead, the article asserted that under Spanish law, “nuestras leyes/ating manga ley” [our laws], everyone born in Spanish territory was Spanish, and

\[
\text{Por este razon, en todo tiempo han sido considerados españoles é hijos de España, al igual que los que nacen en la Península española, los nacidos en este suelo. . . / Caya cailan para,í, quinilalang castila at anac ng España, parsíng inianac sa Península, ang manga tubo rito. . . .}
\]
Since most of the political articles in the newspapers to which he was a heavy contributor have no author listed (or give only a pseudonym that I have not identified with certainty), it is difficult at this point to say how many of them are likely the work of de los Reyes. In the political climate of the Manila of Governors-General Weyler and Despujol, he might have chosen to remain an anonymous author of any articles he suspected would catch the attention of the authorities and other antagonists—as we have already seen, one of the few political articles that he did sign with his name earned him some public criticism. In *La Lectura Popular*, for example, most articles have no author indicated. However, some of those articles echo de los Reyes’s writings for *La Solidaridad*, and that newspaper’s agenda, more generally. Regardless of whether or not we know that they are de los Reyes’s own writing, we will see that they take up some of the same issues, and thus can be considered in the same frame.

For example, among the first issues of *La Lectura Popular* was a series of articles that dealt with “The New Civil Code.” The articles focused on the question of who had the legal status of “Spaniard,” or (in the original Castilian and Tagalog, with an English translation):

> la distinción que existe entre los individuos que forman parte de la gran familia española y los que, por el contrario, son súbditos de otra nación/ang pagcacaiba ng manga tauong nasasacop ng capisanang castilla at ng taga ibang nacion o lupá

[the distinction that exists between those individuals that form part of the great Spanish family and those that, on the contrary, are subjects of another nation]. (*La Lectura Popular* 1890a)

This bifurcated world was one in which there was no difference in status between a citizen in peninsular Spain and a colonial subject in Manila. Instead, the article asserted that under Spanish law, “nuestras leyes/ating manga ley” [our laws], everyone born in Spanish territory was Spanish, and

> Por este razón, en todo tiempo han sido considerados españoles é hijos de España, al igual que los que nacen en la Península española, los nacidos en este suelo... / Caya cailan pamá, quinilalang castila at anac ng España, paríng inianac sa Península, ang manga tubo ríto...
[thus those born here (on this soil) have always been considered Spanish and children of Spain, the same as those born in the Spanish Peninsula . . .]. (Ibid.)

Another article, titled “Popular Schools,” advocated for secular and vocational education to be made available to those below the most elite stratum of Philippine society. The article argued that:

El vigor, el poder, el verdadero patriotismo, la civilización, las costumbres, el predominio de las virtudes, todo nace y este en relación del saber . . . y por eso, todo lo que á la instrucción pública toca, toca a la vitalidad del Estado. En una palabra, la enseñanza popular es la verdadera redención de los pueblos./Ang lacas, ang capangyarihan, ang tunay na pag ibig sa sariiling lupa, ang civilización ang caugalian, ang pananaig ng mga gauang magaling ay nagmumulang lahat at na-aalinsunod sa pinag-aralan . . . cayà tungcol nahihinguíl sa pagtuturò sa tauo ay sa icagagaling ng Estado nahihinguíl. Sa isang pangungusap: ang pagtuturò sa tauo ay pang bihis guinhaua sa mga bayan.

[Strength, power, true patriotism, civilization, customs, predominance of virtue, all is born of and is related to knowledge . . . and thus, all that affects public instruction, also affects the vitality of the State. In a word, popular teaching is the true redemption of nations.] (La Lectura Popular 1890b)

The author very carefully, perhaps too carefully, specified that he did not argue for an end to the religious and moral instruction then prevalent in schools (ibid.):

somos de los que opinamos y creemos que á la juventud no puede encaminarse por la verdadera senda del progreso sin que vaya precedida de los conocimientos de religión y moral necesarios. . . . / nababagay sa canila, at camí ang nagsasabing hindi maipapatnugot ang manga bata sa tunay na landas ng pagsulong cung di macaquilala muna ng sa P. Dios at ng maganda caugalian. . . .

[we are of those who profess the opinion, and we believe, that youth cannot be set off on the true path of progress unless it proceeds from the necessary religious and moral knowledge . . .]
Nevertheless, the article called for additional education—secular education—that would train youth for professions in agriculture and related industries. This secular education would include subjects specific to those trades, as well as geography, math, geometry, and Castilian grammar, and it was a kind of education particularly needed for

los jóvenes que por efecto de su escasa posición social, ó sea la clase pobre que no puede pasar á Manila para frecuentar las aulas de nuestra Universidad/ang mga batang timauá ó mahirap na hindi macalipat ng Maynila sa pagpasoc sa clase ng ating Universidad

[the youth who on account of their low social position or being from the poor class cannot go to Manila to attend the classrooms of our University]. (Ibid.)

The article closed by claiming that “[h]agamos hombres útiles para el trabajo material/pagsicapan nating maguwing mga tauong dapat sa trabajo ng camay” [we seek to make men fit for material labor], since this is what produces “la riqueza y por consiguiente la felicidad de los pueblos/ng cayamanan at ng caguinhauahan, cung sa bagay, nang mga bayan” [wealth and as a consequence the happiness of nations]. The author expressed the hope that “nuestro débil voz/ang aming hamac na pangungusap” [our humble voice] would be echoed by those in the highest government circles, who were considering a plan to reform education. He concluded, confident that by promoting this secular education, “habremos hecho algo por este pedazo de tierra española á quien tanto y tanto amamos/nacagaua cami cahi,t, bahagya sa icagagaliing [sic] nitong caputol na lupang castilang aming minamahal” [we will have done something for this piece of Spanish soil that we love so much] (ibid.).

Here the author embraced the local, proclaiming the object of his love for his native land, his patriotism, to be “this piece of Spanish soil that we love so much.” It was the local that was adored, but that local land was Spanish. In the previous article, we saw how the author wrote to inform those born in the Philippines that they had a legal basis to claim the same rights as those born in the Peninsula—or, at least, to encourage them to think that they did have those rights. The proclamations of
love for native land, and claims to rights as Spaniards—and the confident assumption that the two are perfectly commensurate with each other—resonate with the themes of *La Solidaridad*. In these articles, however, they were expressed quite specifically to a local audience. In this bilingual newspaper of Manila, a modern, secular world was claimed for some in the Philippines who could not access it through Castilian. De los Reyes devoted much of the space of *La Lectura Popular* to his gloss of the Spanish Civil Code, to the text of the penal code, and to other laws and regulations—including full Tagalog translations, as per the format of the newspaper. In *Lectura Popular*, then, he publicized the letter of the law, to show those in “this piece of Spanish soil that we love so much” (who might be literate in Tagalog but not Castilian) how different that law was from how it was practiced in the Philippines. If in *La Solidaridad* de los Reyes promoted a secular administration for the Philippines to those who could read that peninsular Castilian-language newspaper, he also thought it important to conduct a popular education—or perhaps propaganda—in the Philippines, promoting awareness of political rights of the people and laws to which their rulers were subject.

Perhaps in part because of the political views that his newspapers promoted, de los Reyes got in trouble with the censors more than once. The first incident has already been mentioned: in 1887, a new procedure was put in place for censoring periodicals printed outside of Manila, because of de los Reyes's controversial articles that had appeared in *El Eco de Panay*. He also was confronted by the authorities for publishing sections of his bilingual papers with only the local language (Ilocano, in the case of *El Ilocano*; Tagalog, in the case of *La Lectura Popular*). Although the author of the Tagalog-only text of *La Lectura Popular* may not have been him, it was de los Reyes who was held legally responsible for it. In his appeal of one of these cases, de los Reyes argued that he only published a few things in the local language without a Spanish version, that he did it to save space, and that the content of such pieces was “puro de sobre Religion, conocimientos útiles, disposiciones oficiales, y los literario [sic] que no puedan ofender a nadie” [purely about religion, useful knowledge (helpful tips), official decrees, and literary pieces that
could not offend anyone] (PNA 1891). In fact, if we take one of the examples named in the complaint, from *La Lectura Popular* in July 1891, we find that his appeal is more or less true—most of the Tagalog-only text that appears in the newspaper is devoid of politics, even broadly construed. What is of note is that in the same issue (but printed both in Castilian and Tagalog) de los Reyes published the first piece that José Rizal had published in *La Solidaridad*—the poem “Me Piden Versos”—giving the author’s name simply as “L. L.,” an abbreviation for the pseudonym, Laong Laan, with which Rizal had signed the piece in *La Solidaridad* (L. L. 1891). The publication of the piece stands as a good indication that the censors were not perfect; the poem is not political in its content, but the fact that the poem was printed would not have been lost on those who were sympathetic to Rizal, who by this time was well known for his sensational *Noli me tangere*. Rizal’s poem directly precedes the long section of the paper (six pages) where de los Reyes printed nothing but Tagalog.

Although most of this Tagalog-only content seems (as de los Reyes claimed) banal enough, an interesting notice from Madrid was quietly tucked in the middle of the last page of brief miscellaneous news items: it announced the elections for the Asociación Hispano-Filipina of Madrid, or, as stated in the newspaper’s Tagalog, the Catipunang España,t, Filipinas. The paper gave news of who was elected to which positions, names that included those of several prominent propagandists: Eduardo de Lete, Marcelo H. del Pilar, Manuel Labra, and Mariano Ponce. The notice also quoted the aims of the association, among them “hinihing ibalik sa Filipinas ang canyang catuiran na magcaroon ng Diputado na iayos sa calagayan ng metropoli at ng caniyang mga provincia sa ibayong dagat Cuba at Puerto-Rico” [asking to restore to the Philippines its right of getting a Deputy (to the Cortes) to rectify the distance between the metropole and its provinces across the sea, Cuba and Puerto Rico] (*La Lectura Popular* 1891). We have seen that de los Reyes sent material to *La Solidaridad* to be published in Spain; in at least this instance, he published *La Solidaridad*’s news in Manila, bypassing the legally-required Castilian more accessible to peninsular Spaniards, and printing only in Tagalog.
De los Reyes’s *La Lectura Popular* was generally in line with his political propaganda of *La Solidaridad*, in the sense that in both venues he promoted a secular administration of peninsular law in the Philippines. His vision of what would contribute to the advancement of people of the Philippines included other matters, however, and he used *La Lectura Popular*, as he did other secularly-oriented bilingual newspapers such as *La España Oriental* and *El Ilocano*, to instruct his readers on matters such as hygiene, the importance of education, agriculture, and other practical kinds of knowledge, which he promoted as tools that his countrymen could use to improve their economic and social condition. However, his propaganda work in the Philippines sometimes accommodated itself to a Catholic social world. As we have already noted, he worked on the *Revista Popular* and the *Revista Católica*, both of which had religious themes, and de los Reyes’s willingness to work for and with them should not be seen simply as a strategic concession. His later work with the *Iglesia Filipina* would suggest that his interests were not purely for secular government; they also included the presence of a reformed and nationalized church. A more thorough investigation of his work for Catholic-themed newspapers during this time might yield rich insight into his later work with *Iglesia Filipina*. We might also note that his interest in religion is not disconnected from his interest in folklore: one of the pieces that appeared in *Revista Católica*, “La Virgen de Antipolo,” could also be considered to be part of his historical and folkloristic work (de los Reyes 1889d).

Unlike de los Reyes’s bilingual papers, *La Ilustración Filipina* was written only in Castilian, and was clearly aimed at a more highly educated, elite audience. It reported on political and technological developments in the Philippines and around the world; it also contained ethnographic and historical articles. Many of the issues of this newspaper lauded the achievements of the Luna brothers, young Ilocanos who lived for some time in Europe, and central figures in the propagandista circle. The paper particularly celebrated the success of Juan Luna as a talented painter, but it also followed his brother Antonio, a chemist, who eventually wrote a series of articles for the newspaper reflecting his training (Luna 1894). Like some of de los Reyes’s earlier newspapers, it shared its news, and to some extent its personnel, with *La Solidaridad*. 
Propaganda Across Languages and Seas

De los Reyes was certainly not the only person contributing to more than one newspaper, and contributing to the general activity of the periodical press during this time. During the late 1880s and early 1890s, Pascual Poblete was a moving force, particularly among bilingual Castilian-Tagalog publications. He and de los Reyes were often collaborators; Poblete ran *La Revista Popular*, worked with de los Reyes also on *Revista Católica de Filipinas*, and is credited as the Tagalog translator of much of the content of *La Lectura Popular*. Poblete also wrote Tagalog poetry, and would later become the first translator of Rizal’s *Noli me tangere*. After the revolution, he would, with de los Reyes, cofound the Aglipayan *Iglesia Filipina Independiente*. Poblete also worked independently of de los Reyes, so far as we know, on *El Resumen*, which began publication in 1890 and which Retana (1906, 1667) describes tantalizingly as the “‘[p]rimer periódico genuinamente popular, de tendencia nacionalista’ [first genuinely popular periodical, of a nationalist tendency].

Evidently, de los Reyes was not the only person publishing bilingual newspapers, nor was he the only author publishing both in *La Solidaridad* and in its insular contemporaries: Mariano Ponce, then busy at work in Barcelona on *La Solidaridad*, sent de los Reyes studies on folklore of peninsular Spain, thus enlarging the project begun with their earlier writings on *Folklore Filipino*. These were published in *La Lectura Popular* under the pseudonym of “Calipulaco,” one of the many pseudonyms that he used in *La Solidaridad* (where, however, it was spelled with a k as “Kalipulako”). As we have seen, Antonio Luna wrote at least one serialized article in *La Ilustración Filipina*, and there may be other interesting examples of young Filipinos traveling as authors between *La Solidaridad* and Manila’s periodicals.

*La Solidaridad* has long been recognized as the heart of the “propaganda movement,” the project of the Comité de Propaganda of Manila to promote political reforms in the Philippines by appealing to a Spanish government in the peninsula that was more liberal and secular than that in the Philippines (Schumacher 1997). While *La Solidaridad* is clearly the central vehicle of this particular propaganda project—the project of
propaganda aimed in large part at potential allies in the Peninsula—the periodicals of the Manila press during this period suggest that a broader project of propaganda was also being undertaken by some writing from the Philippines and for a Filipino audience. Indeed, we should read along with La Solidaridad the Manila newspapers that de los Reyes produced during the same period, particularly La Ilustración Filipina, the Ilocano-Castilian bilingual El Ilocano, and the Tagalog-Castilian bilinguals La España Oriental and La Lectura Popular. In particular, de los Reyes’s bilingual newspapers seem to constitute a kind of “popular” propaganda movement.

**Why has this Propaganda been Overlooked?**

That de los Reyes was behind much of the content of this newspapers—and La Ilustración Filipina in particular—has been overlooked, first by Retana himself (who mistakenly names “Ángel Benito” as a significant contributor, rather than identifying this as one of de los Reyes’s pseudonyms), and then by subsequent scholars. It is easy to understand why: de los Reyes’s articles are usually anonymous or attributed only to initials or one of his pseudonyms, which included “Toning,” “Ángel Benito,” “José Simón” (sometimes just “J. Simon”), “Kasalo,” “Plátanos,” and “Deloserre.” Why did de los Reyes use these pseudonyms? From whom was he hiding his identity? One obvious answer is, of course, that he was hiding from the authorities. We might doubt how effective this would have been, given how simple it would have been for anyone familiar with his other papers to trace the origins of his articles, and that we would expect him to be on the censors’ radar. However, his pseudonyms apparently misled as seasoned a Manila newspaperman as Retana on at least one occasion, as we have seen. But there is another reason to doubt that pseudonyms were only and always about hiding from the authorities or other antagonists: many of the articles that he signed pseudonymously were not among the most politically sensitive. Instead, they were articles that had already been published elsewhere under his name. Another possible explanation to consider is that misleading Retana may have been itself a satisfying end for de los Reyes.
Since many of these pseudonyms appear during the period when his writing heavily dominated *La Ilustración Filipina*, we might wonder whether he—or his editor—was trying to hide from the readership the fact that the newspaper was largely the product of his pen. Perhaps he or his editor was self-conscious about whether it looked bad for the newspaper to rely so heavily on a single author, who had been belittled by such an eminent newspaperman as Retana, for example. The effort might have been to give the newspaper the appearance of being more of a group effort than it actually was.

It might also have been another kind of propaganda work, one that inflated the size of the body of people holding the kinds of views expressed in *La Ilustración Filipina*, *La Lectura Popular*, and other papers. If we consider how many newspapers de los Reyes was contributing to during these years, and under how many different pseudonyms he published, we might say that his voice was amplified into the sound of a chorus. Whether fact or fiction, de los Reyes’s newspapers appeared to be the products of a group of those who stood in judgment of the colony’s government. By displaying that society—a display made possible in part by keeping authors’ identities secret—these newspapers of the Philippines engaged in another tactic of propaganda.

Neither the extent of de los Reyes’s contributions, nor the interest that the periodical press of Manila holds, has been fully acknowledged in secondary literature about Philippine newspapers of this period. De los Reyes’s own efforts to hide his identity as an author are in no small part to blame; as we have seen, even Retana failed to recognize all of de los Reyes’s pseudonyms. Retana’s clear dislike of, and prejudice against, de los Reyes also might have something to do with his particular under-accounting of de los Reyes’s contributions. In fact, for the peninsular Spaniard Retana, to say that de los Reyes “contributed” to the periodical press of the Philippines during this time would be too great a compliment. Perhaps nowhere is Retana’s dislike of de los Reyes made more plain than in the rhyming couplet that begins one of his accountings of de los Reyes’s journalism: “Libre Reyes, feliz y independiente, se entregó al periodismo . . . bestialmente” [Free Reyes, happy and independent, he abandoned himself to journalism . . . like a beast] (Retana 1890, 21). In this polemical piece, Retana (ibid., 22–23) wrote that:
Isabelo de los Reyes, aunque mil años viva, no podrá ser nunca periodista: faltale meollo, faltanle nociones de muchas cosas; faltale ingenio; faltale saber escribir en castellano.

[even if he lived a thousand years, Isabelo de los Reyes could never be a journalist: he lacks judgment, as understandings of many things escape him; he lacks mental powers; (and) he doesn’t know how to write in Castilian. . . .]

Moreover, Retana attacked de los Reyes in the pages of Manila newspapers. In the 1889 issues of *La Opinión*, a Castilian-language daily, one often finds snide remarks about de los Reyes, and also more extended obnoxious and disdainful commentary about de los Reyes and his writings—only some of these are signed with Retana’s pseudonym, Desengaños, but almost certainly he is the author of those unsigned as well (*La Opinión* 1889a, 1889b, 1889c, 1889d, 1889e; Desengaños 1889a, 1889b, 1889c, 1889d, 1889e).

Despite Retana’s bias against de los Reyes, researchers remain tethered to him as a source. Retana’s bibliographical works, which cover the history of the periodical press in the Philippines during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, remain the most comprehensive and detailed accounting available (Retana 1895, 1898, 1906). Although researchers have written to amend and add to the foundation laid by Retana, and to correct his bias, no one has been able to replace the comprehensive reference tool that his work provides (Fernandez 1998; Valenzuela 1933).

However, perhaps more importantly, and more problematically for contemporary scholars, de los Reyes’s contributions to this popular propaganda may have been marginalized in part because he remained in the Philippines until the revolution. Those who lived in and wrote from Europe or Hong Kong were free of the shadow of colonial authorities; they could write explicitly political articles with less fear of colonial authorities’ reprisals, and their publications—particularly Rizal’s novels as well as the writings contained in *La Solidaridad*—have since become widely available, through the availability of reprintings and translations. De los Reyes, on the other hand, who wrote and lived in the Philippines, more often hid his identity as a newspaper writer, and wrote in ways that are often less politically explicit than the writings in *La Solidaridad*. Fur-
thermore, in contrast to *La Solidaridad*, many issues of the newspapers to which de los Reyes might have contributed are not available for consultation; most of the newspapers that he published in Manila are available in only a few libraries and archives; some of those that survive in libraries have never been microfilmed, making their preservation more tenuous and their circulation more difficult, and none has been systematically reprinted or translated.

But there is also a more interesting reason that Philippine newspapers of this period (and so de los Reyes’s contributions to them) have been overlooked. *La Solidaridad* itself, as part of its propaganda against the influence of the friars in the Philippines and the lack of liberties there, emphasized the restrictions of the press in the Philippines; to acknowledge any propaganda work in the press of Manila would have been to soften their complaints against the injustices of the then-current colonial rule. For example, when Retana published a series of attacks against de los Reyes in *La Opinión*, specifically about his article on representation in the Cortes (*Desengaños 1889a, 1889b, 1889c, 1889d*), *La Solidaridad* (1889b) complained about the lack of substance in these attacks, and wrote that:

[N]os consta que es refractario a escribir artículos políticos, tanto por sus poca afición á este género, cuanto porque las circunstancias de ser indio y residir en Filipinas, donde es libre la opresion de la prensa y todo género de opresiones, no le permitiría explayar sus convicciones

[It is clear to us that he is opposed to writing political articles, as much because of his little love of this genre, as because the circumstances of being a native and residing in the Philippines—where the oppression of the press and all kinds of oppressions are free—would not permit him to elaborate on his convictions].

For the writers of *La Solidaridad*, it was important to link Retana’s attacks on de los Reyes to the problem of censorship in the Philippines; in contrast, for example, one might characterize the attacks as a form of argument in a public space created by the press, rather than as a form of censorship.

It is also in the pages of *La Solidaridad* that de los Reyes himself, in one of his pseudonymously published articles, emphasized the repressive
atmosphere of Manila for its press. He began this piece by writing that the press of the Peninsula, of which *La Solidaridad* was a part, was “libre de las ligaduras de la censura previa que coarta los vuelos más inocentes de la prensa filipina” [free from the binds of advance censorship that restrain the most innocent heights (of discourse) of the Philippine press] (Kasalo 1890c). De los Reyes, and other writers of *La Solidaridad*, proclaimed loudly how oppressive censorship in the Philippines was—this proclamation was itself a part of the propaganda, not in the sense that it was untrue, but in the sense that it was politically important to publicize and emphasize. The newspaper warned that “estos males fermentan la desesperación del pueblo filipino, y un pueblo desesperado sin tribuna, sin prensa que refleje sus quejas, no puede ofrecer lisonjero porvenir á los intereses de España” [these ills ferment the desperation of the Filipino people, and a desperate people without a platform from which to speak, without a press that reflects its complaints, can not offer a pleasing future to Spanish interests] (*La Solidaridad* 1889a). Thus, if one takes one’s cues from *La Solidaridad*, for whom the Philippine press was first and foremost “amordazada” [gagged], one would not think to look for politically challenging writing in the Philippine press—even though one of the writers who propagated this view in the pages of *La Solidaridad* was a prolific writer, of great political interest, in insular periodicals of the day. Researchers who rely primarily either on Retana or on *La Solidaridad*, then, would not anticipate the nature and extent of de los Reyes’s propaganda in the Philippines, or the interest that Philippine newspapers of the period contained. In an ironic twist, the contributions that de los Reyes made to an emerging Philippine and Filipino nationalism, contributions made largely in the pages of Manila newspapers, have been underestimated inadvertently in part because of his physical location in the Philippines, rather than in Spain, during these years.

**Notes**

I owe many people thanks for their help with this article: Ben Anderson, for reading an earlier version of this article, as well as for his guidance during my research and comments on my dissertation, which includes some of the same information that I treat here; Mark Anderson, for reading more than one ver-
sion of this article; and Jun Aguilar and two anonymous reviewers, some of whose excellent questions remain as yet unanswered. I presented an earlier version at the Conference for Southeast Asian Studies, University of California at Berkeley, March 2004; I owe thanks to Annette Clear for her helpful comments on that paper, and to Jeffrey Hadler for conversation that followed about pseudonyms. The research for this paper was conducted during the years of 1999–2001 in Manila while hosted by the Institute for Popular Culture; I also owe thanks to the staffs of the Ateneo de Manila University Library, the Lopez Museum, the archives of the University of Santo Tomás, the National Library, and the National Archives, where I conducted research. More particularly I am grateful to Fidel Villarroel, O.P., of the UST archives, and Adoracion Mendoza of the National Library, for granting me permission to make copies of rare periodicals, and to the staff members who made the copies for me.

1. Schumacher's book on the propaganda movement set the standard. First published in 1973, it was revised and reissued in 1997, and augmented by another book with several essays related to that work (Schumacher 1991, 1997). A number of recent works have given exciting new treatment to the lives and writings of ilustrados (Aguilar 2005; Anderson 2005; Kramer 2006; Rafael 2005). While I argue that what is associated with the "Propaganda Movement" should include more personnel and publications than has been generally the case, I may be more narrowly interested in certain kinds of publications (as propaganda) than any of these other recent works, each of which innovatively puts material from La Solidaridad in conversation with other sources and contexts. La Solidaridad is most readily available in the edition reprinted in 1996, with English translations by Guadalupe Flores Ganzon and Luis Mañeru.

2. Retana incorrectly dated the paper in his earlier accounting, but his later work gives the correct dates (Retana 1895, 1906). Much but not all of the material in his 1895 work has recently become more widely available, thanks to an English translation (1991).


4. See Schumacher (1997, 38). Rizal was in touch with one of the organizers, and contributed the piece "El Amor Patrio" for which he was complemented by his peers. See letters to Rizal from: his brother Paciano, dated 26 May 1882; José M. Cecilio, dated 28 Aug. 1882; and Basilio Teodoro Moran, dated 12 and 27 Sept. 1882 and 15 Jan. 1883 (Rizal 1930).

5. El Eco de Vigan (1884), El Porvenir de Bisayas (Iloilo, 1884), El Boletín de Cebu (1886), El Eco de Panay (Iloilo, 1886), and Anunciador Ilongo (Iloilo, 1889) (Retana 1895, 1898, 1906). When there are differences among the three volumes, I have used the dates given in 1906.

6. In addition to the demonstration calling for friar expulsion, these political struggles included those of new civil governors and justices of the peace against
the traditional influence of the friars in local administration, that between the Binondo neighborhood associations (the Chinese and mestizo organizations backed by the church, against the organization of naturales, backed by the secular administration), and that over burial law and procedures (Guerrero 1963/1998, 180, 188; Schumacher 1997, 108–19).

7. Among his many documents in the National Archives, the only one that I found with a racial designation indicated that he was “mestizo de sangley,” or Chinese mestizo (PNA 1890). Accounts of de los Reyes’s life and works are available in Anderson (2005), Reyes (1947), and Scott (1982), and the biographical introduction to Dizon and Imson’s translation and reprinting of *Folk-Lore Filipino* (1994). This paragraph is drawn from these sources.

8. One document dated 1889 notes that he was “de profesion Notario, sin ejercicio” [notary by profession, but not practicing], and gave his profession as editor (of the *Diario de Manila, Revista Católica*, and *España Oriental*). By 1893 he gave his profession as “industrial,” and by 1895 his stationary indicated that he was a trader and printer (PNA 1889, 1893, 1895).

9. His biographer (Reyes 1947) dates his earliest article to 1882; however, Scott (1982, 267) gives 29 Mar. 1881 as the original publication date. I have not seen the original article; the translation of its title is Scott’s.

10. For more on José Felipe del Pan, see his entry in Retana (1895). José Felipe’s insular son Rafael (*español filipino*, or born in the Philippines of peninsular Spaniards) was among the circle of youth from the colony who lived in Madrid; later, when his father died, he returned to the Philippines and took over his father’s business. For more on de los Reyes’s folklore writings, see Anderson (2005) and Scott (1982).

11. De los Reyes gives his own account of the origin of folklore studies in the Philippines, and his and others’ writings for *La Oceánia Española*, in de los Reyes (1994, 10–18). The earliest issue of the newspaper that I have seen is 11 Jan. 1885 (vol. 9, no. 8), at which point de los Reyes was already publishing “number 32” of his “Folk-Lore Ilocano,” and Mariano Ponce (signed “M.P.”) was publishing his seventh installment of “El Folk-Lore Bulaqueño.” By January 1886, Serrano Laktaw was publishing his “Folk-Lore Pampango,” signing simply “S”. De los Reyes was a frequent contributor from the beginning of 1885 until at least mid-1887 (*La Oceánia Española* 1885–1887). De los Reyes also published folklore in *El Comercio*, at least during 1885 (*El Comercio* 1885). “J. Simon,” identified below as a pseudonym of de los Reyes, also contributed to *La Oceánia Española*, writing from Malabon, starting in April 1885. The previous year de los Reyes had married Josefa Sevilla of Malabon—a closer look at these articles is warranted.

12. Schumacher (1997, 137) wrote that “D. A. Murgas” was Del Pilar when writing “letters” based on data from Serrano Laktaw. Because *La Solidaridad* identifies “D. A. Murgas” as a correspondent in Manila, we might consider the
pseudonym to be Serrano Laktaw's (*La Solidaridad* 1889c). Garcia (1965) identified the pseudonym as Serrano Laktaw's.

13. In *Artículos Varios* de los Reyes and Cesareo Blanco y Sierra (the author of the prologue) identify the newspapers where several of the articles first appeared individually, and de los Reyes, toward the end of the book, seems to imply that they all originated from one of the two newspapers (de los Reyes 1887a, ii–iii, 41, 89, 201). For the original date and publisher of *Islas Visayas* (de los Reyes 1889c), see de los Reyes (1887a, 180) and Retana (1906, 1086). As for *Ilokanadas*, the copy in the British Library shows the year 1888 on its title page, but the hand-annotated clipping gives 1887 as the original publication date; the copy of the book in the Pardo de Tavera collection in the Rizal Library at the Ateneo de Manila University indicates that publication began in 1887, but finished in 1888, which seems to explain the difference between the two dates found in the British Library copy (de los Reyes 1887b). Retana (1906, 1115) affirms this.

14. The earliest piece of his in *La España Oriental* (Castilian edition) that I have identified is “Mitología ilocana” (de los Reyes 1888). He published many articles in that newspaper until at least December 1889, most but not all of them serialized re-editions of pieces he had already published elsewhere. Some of his writing continued to appear in the folletín until at least June of 1890 (*La España Oriental* 1888–1890). De los Reyes appears as a named contributor to *El Comercio* at least by 1885. See also note 11 above. For his writing in *Eso de Panay*, see note 13 above. For his writing in *La Oceania Española*, see notes 11 and 13 above. Biographies routinely refer to his writing for the *Diario de Manila* and, although I have not been able to confirm independently that he was doing so by 1888, by 1889 he was already an editor of the newspaper, according to his petition to publish *El Ilocano* (PNA 1889).

15. His positions as editor were cited in his permission to publish *El Ilocano* (PNA 1889); Retana tells us that he wrote for *La Opinión* beginning in 1890, and de los Reyes is identified as the author, and *La Opinión* the original venue, of a few articles reprinted in *La Lectura Popular* in June of that year (de los Reyes 1890b; Retana 1906, 1631).

16. His pseudonym “Plátanos” was identified in the first of a series of articles that he published under that name in *La Lectura Popular*. “ang nangangalang Plátanos na sumusulat lingo lingo sa Diario de Manila ay si Isabelo de los Reyes” (Plátanos 1890). He revealed himself as “Deloserre” in *Folk-Lore Filipino* (de los Reyes 1994, 90). See also “J. Simon” in note 11 above.

17. That he wrote for *Revista Popular de Filipinas* is given in the biographical introduction to the 1994 edition of *Folk-Lore Filipino*; however, I have been unable to verify this independently or to identify which of the articles were written by him (Dizon and Imson 1994). Few authors' names are specified in the short run of the paper, and de los Reyes does not appear among them. One
brief pair of articles on the origins and development of agriculture, written with comparative reference to mythologies, seems to fit with de los Reyes's interests and methods, but they lack any specific indication that they were written in the Philippines (such indications were characteristic of de los Reyes's writings); they might be simply reprinted from another source. Only two articles in the Revista Católica de Filipinas are clearly his: “Las Mujeres y las Flores” (vol. 2, no. 19; 17 Feb. 1889), and “La Virgen de Antipolo” (vol. 2, no. 32; 19 May 1889). However, he and his publications are frequently mentioned in the final miscellanea section of each issue. His position as editor is given in his petition to publish El Ilocano (PNA 1889).

18. For more on the controversy over orthography and its significance, see my forthcoming article, “K is for De-Kolonization.”

19. The source for the identity of “Ángel Benito” is found below, in the section on La Ilustración Filipina.

20. An earlier newspaper published in Manila under the same name, though it was quite a different enterprise. However, the earlier newspaper has been the subject of Blanco’s very interesting analysis (Blanco 2001, 180–201), which pursues both the ambiguity of the word “ilustración,” as well as the newspaper’s project of imagining civil society.

21. As with his other newspapers, one can trace his authorship because many of the articles are either from his published books, or appeared first in a different periodical under his signature. However, more straightforwardly, some of his anonymous articles for La Ilustración Filipina, and his pseudonyms, are also identified in the index prepared by José Zaragoza at the end of 1892.

22. The authors of the biographical sketch preceding Folk-Lore Filipino identify the pseudonym (Dizon and Imson 1994). They do not identify their source for this information, nor any works written with this pseudonym; as far as I have been able to determine, he used it only in La Solidaridad.

23. I have preserved the original Tagalog orthography, with the exception that I use an italicized g to substitute for a regular g with a tild mark over it. All English translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own, and they derive primarily from the Castilian, although occasionally I include alternative wordings in brackets as suggested by differences between the two versions readers may want to consider. Readers familiar with both Castilian and Tagalog will note other differences in the two versions.

24. The question of how much more accessible written Tagalog was, to native Tagalog speakers, than written Spanish, is difficult to answer with certainty. The only statistics I have seen for literacy in the nineteenth century seem to be for literacy in Castilian. The Philippine Commission to the President of the U.S., in 1900, reported that, although “it is . . . persistently charged that the instruction in Spanish was in many cases purely imaginary, because the local friars, who were formerly ex officio school inspectors, . . . prohibited it. . . . Ability to read
and write a little of the local native language was comparatively common" (Philippine Commission 1900, 31-32). This is, of course, ten years after de los Reyes's bilingual newspapers, but it is consistent with both the complaints about how Spanish was rarely taught, and also with the justification sometimes cited in petitions for permission to publish bilingual newspapers: the utility of such a paper as a tool for learning Spanish.

25. Retana credits de los Reyes with having printed excerpts of the civil code—with his commentary—in the Revista Popular (Retana 1895, 336-38), but I have not seen this in the issues of the Revista Popular de Filipinas that I have consulted. Perhaps Retana confused the Lectura with the Revista?

26. Given the numbers of articles for which Tagalog translators are credited, it seems that de los Reyes wrote in Spanish almost exclusively in the press, and that others translated his writing into the vernacular. Even in El Ilocano, translators are often credited for the Ilocano versions of de los Reyes's writing.
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