

philippine studies

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

The Cavite Mutiny: An Essay On The Published Sources

John N. Schumacher

Philippine Studies vol. 20, no. 4 (1972): 603–632

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 Cavite Mutiny: An Essay on the Published Sources

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER

In a previous article in this journal I have attempted to establish definitely the inauthenticity of various manuscripts and published works concerning, or attributed to, Father José Burgos, but actually written in the twentieth century.¹ Likewise in preparation for the centenary of the martyrdom of Fathers Burgos, Gómez, and Zamora, various scholars have published documentation concerning Father Burgos in particular, and in my recent book I have edited and translated some genuine works of Burgos in part hitherto unknown.² The fact remains, however, that we still possess no definitive account of the Cavite Mutiny, nor a satisfactory biography of any of the three priests. Not only are primary source materials still lacking however, but there is considerable confusion as to the worth of the various published accounts of the events of 1872 both as to primary and to secondary sources. It will therefore be the pur-

¹ See "The Authenticity of the Writings Attributed to Father José Burgos," *Philippine Studies* (PS) 18 (January 1970), 3-51.

² Nicholas P. Cushner, "British Consular Dispatches and the Philippine Independence Movement, 1872-1901," PS 16 (July 1968), 501-534, especially 501-6; John N. Schumacher and Nicholas P. Cushner, "Documents Relating to Father José Burgos and the Cavite Mutiny of 1872," PS 17 (July 1969), 457-529; Carlos Quirino, "More Documents on Burgos," PS 18 (January 1970), 161-77; John N. Schumacher, *Father José Burgos, Priest and Nationalist* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1972); Fidel Villarroel, O.P. *Father José Burgos, University Student* (Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press, 1971).

pose of this essay to analyze and give some indication of the value of the published primary sources, all of them in Spanish. This will provide a basis for a critique of modern secondary accounts based on them.

FIRST-HAND ACCOUNTS

There were several men who appear to have been living in Manila at the time of the events which culminated in the Cavite Mutiny who wrote accounts of the events. The account of José Montero y Vidal, a Spanish official in Manila at the time, is the fullest account of the mutiny itself.³ It embodies the official interpretation of the mutiny in Cavite as part of a general revolt directed by the three priests and their lay and clerical colleagues in Manila and Cavite, having as its aim the assassination of the Governor-General and a general massacre of all Spaniards. Published only in 1895, at the height of the Filipino nationalist campaign, Montero's account is strongly hostile to Filipino reformist aspirations, has no doubt of the guilt of those executed or exiled, and places much of the blame for the revolt of 1872 on the alleged tolerance of Governor-General Carlos Maria de la Torre in the period 1869-1871.

In a lengthy appendix to his own account⁴ Montero reproduces selections from that given by Edmond Plauchut, a Frenchman resident in Manila for some years, indignantly or sarcastically denying various allegations of the latter. The narrative of Plauchut is actually only a part of a series of articles on the Philippines published in the internationally known French journal, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, in Paris in 1877.⁵ His account of the events of 1872 has often been called "the Filipino version" of the events, having been translated

³ José Montero y Vidal, *Historia general de Filipinas* (Madrid: Tello, 1887-1895), III, 498-602, especially 566-602 on the mutiny itself.

⁴Pp. 595-601.

⁵ "L'archipel des Philippines," *Revue des Deux Mondes* 232 (1877), 447-64; 896-913; 233 (1877), 885-924. The section on the events of Cavite is in the last of these installments, pp. 910-24. The earlier sections deal with such matters as climate, races, customs, education, trade and industry.

into Spanish and published in *La Solidaridad* in 1892 and afterwards republished more than once from this version.⁶

The version of Plauchut presents several difficulties, even if we ignore the xenophobic attacks of Montero y Vidal. On the one hand, for example, he implies the innocence of the three priests as to any part in the mutiny. On the other, he asserts that "from several accounts worthy of belief, the plot of the conspirators was known to many in the capital as well as in the province." Similarly he refers to the three priests on their way to execution as being cheered by the Filipinos as ". . . those who were going to die for having dreamed of the independence of their country. . . ."

The account of the execution itself, though apparently that of an eyewitness, agreeing on substantial points with that of Montero y Vidal, likewise contains numerous melodramatic details which do not inspire great confidence in the historian. It is, for example, difficult to believe that in the atmosphere of terror created by Izquierdo's harsh repressive measures—an atmosphere emphasized by Plauchut—thousands of people would have flocked in from the provinces to visit the condemned priests in their cell or that this would have been permitted in any way, or that the crowds would have ventured to cheer the priests on triumphantly as they made their way to the place of execution. One need not accept totally the version of Montero to be able to agree in part with his characterization of Plauchut's account as *novelesco*. No doubt the author wished to liven up his articles with some dramatic items of human interest for the delectation of his French readers to whom the Philippines was a far-away, exotic country.

⁶ *La Solidaridad* IV (15 Febrero 1892), 629-35; also reprinted in pamphlet form as *La algarada caviteña de 1872* (Manila: Imp. "Manila Filatélica," 1916), pp. 3-32. A Tagalog translation by Patricio Mariano is in the same pamphlet, pp. 3-37. There is an English translation by Dalmacio Martin in the *Historical Bulletin* of the Philippine Historical Association, IV (December 1960), 1-16; apparently made from the Spanish. The Spanish is also said to have been reprinted in the Manila newspaper *La Patria*, February 1, 1900.

For the rest of Plauchut's account, however, there is a further problem—namely the source of his knowledge of the events prior to the execution, to which he could not have been eyewitness. As remarked above, he is notably deficient in his knowledge of the more remote background of events in the Philippines and has numerous glaring historical errors, e.g., with regard to Simón de Anda and his career. On the other hand, he clearly had some knowledge of the then secret letter of Archbishop Melitón Martínez to the Spanish Regent, written in 1870.⁷ It is true that though he purports to quote from it, the quotation is badly garbled, and is rather a mere summary of the ideas of the Archbishop. On the other hand, it contains sufficient genuine and distinctive elements in it to have certainly come eventually from one who had at some time seen the original. This fact, together with other details which Plauchut could hardly have known by himself,⁸ points to the fundamental accuracy of Montero's assertion that Plauchut's account had been inspired by the "separatistas antiespañoles de Filipinas." Prescinding from whether or not they were separatists, among those exiled as a result of the Cavite Mutiny, probably Joaquín Pardo de Tavera and almost certainly Antonio Regidor were in contact with Plauchut in Paris at the time he was writing, and either or both must have served as a source for the events prior to the execution. For after their escape from the Marianas in 1874 both Pardo de Tavera and Regidor made their way from Hong Kong to Europe. The former settled permanently in Paris until his death in 1884, and Regidor lived there for some time before moving to London.⁹ When Rizal was planning his *Association Internationale des Philippinistes* to meet in Paris in 1889, while he was still in London in almost daily contact with Regidor, it was Plauchut who was named vice-presi-

⁷ The original of the Archbishop's letter is reproduced in my book cited in n. 2, pp. 194-219.

⁸ E.g., the letter of loyalty to Spain, later used against Burgos; the details of the reform movement in Manila and Madrid, 1869-1871; the speech of Rafael Labra in the Cortes, etc. All of these details are found in the major article of Regidor discussed below, and are reproduced in almost the same language at times.

⁹ E. Arsenio Manuel, *Dictionary of Philippine Biography* (Quezon City: Filipiniana Publications, 1955), I, 313-17, 367-71.

dent of the association and Regidor one of the counsellors.¹⁰ It must have been either Regidor or Trinidad Pardo de Tavera, nephew of the now-deceased Joaquín, who put Rizal in contact with Plauchut, most likely the former; given the evident contacts between Plauchut and Regidor in their writings. Hence Regidor and possibly also Pardo de Tavera would have been what Plauchut refers to in speaking of his source having been "several accounts worthy of belief."¹¹

The third major account, and in many ways the most important of all in spite of its discrepancies with known facts, is that which appeared in 1900 in the Madrid newspaper *Filipinas ante Europa* edited by Isabelo de los Reyes.¹² Though the article appeared anonymously, there can be no doubt that it was the work of Antonio Regidor. Manuel Artigas y Cuerva, who was in close contact with De los Reyes at the time in the activities of the Filipino Revolutionary Committee in Spain and

¹⁰ *Epistolario Rizalino* (5 vols.; Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1930-1938), V, 375-80, 383-89.

¹¹ That Plauchut was actually an eyewitness of any event he relates is by no means certain, and though generally assumed by historians is nowhere actually stated by himself. He had been in the Philippines for 10 years in his youth (b. 1824), according to an account of an apparently later visit to southern Philippines which he published as part of a book *Le tour du monde en cent vingt jours* (Paris: Michel Levy Frères, 1872), pp. 259-338, in which, however, no mention is made of the events of 1869-1872. Moreover, inasmuch as the trip seems to have proceeded around the Cape of Good Hope instead of the Suez Canal (he was shipwrecked in the Cape Verde Islands in the Atlantic), for this reason also it almost certainly took place before the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869. He also published another brief article of almost the same title on the Philippines in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (15 Juin 1869), 933-64; which possibly was soon after this second trip. The rest of the original French articles of 1877 make no mention of just when he had been in the Philippines. Hence, in the absence of any positive evidence of still another trip between 1869 and 1872, it seems likely that these articles were based solely on his earlier experiences, and that the narrative of the Mutiny comes from the "accounts worthy of belief" he speaks of (*Revue des Deux Mondes* 233 [1877], 919), principally if not solely Regidor.

¹² "A los mártires de la Patria, Burgos, Gómez y Zamora," *Filipinas ante Europa* II (28 Febrero 1900), 67-78.

was therefore in a position to know, explicitly states that De los Reyes affirmed to him the authorship of Regidor.¹³ Obviously an account from one of those most involved in the reformist movement prior to 1872 is of the greatest value from the point of view of the knowledge possessed by its author. It also, of course, has the disadvantages of one-sidedness which are prominent in the bitter anti-friar position of Regidor, who loses no opportunity to paint the friars in the worst possible colors. It must be remembered that the article was written at the height of the effort to procure the expulsion of all Spanish friars from the Philippines. Be that as it may, Regidor's account deserves the most careful attention, particularly in the light of his having been at the very least a major source of Plauchut.

With regard to the events of the execution itself, however, Regidor could not have been an eyewitness, since he himself was at the time a prisoner of the Spanish authorities. And yet his account is far more detailed and circumstantial than that of either Montero or Plauchut. An obvious connection with the account of the latter is the words addressed to Comandante Boscasa attributed to Gómez: "May God forgive you, as we forgive you." In Plauchut's account, however, exactly the same words are put in the mouth of Burgos.¹⁴ However, the authenticity of the statement is in any case suspect, since it is difficult to imagine how anyone except the Spanish soldiers guarding the prisoners or the Spanish priests who accompanied them could have approached close enough to hear the words. Indeed all the dialogue attributed to the prisoners, generally directed in Regidor's account toward showing the responsibility of the various friar orders for the execution, is similarly suspect, precisely because of the detailed description he gives of the intense security measures which surrounded the prisoners,

¹³ Manuel Artigas y Cuerva, *Los sucesos de 1872. Reseña bibliográfica* (Manila: Imp. de La Vanguardia, 1911), pp. 112-13. Though I erred in my book *Father José Burgos* in saying Artigas was editor of *Filipinas ante Europa* (p. 25, n. 44), he was closely associated with De los Reyes in the Filipino Revolutionary Committee.

¹⁴ Regidor, *Filipinas ante Europa*, p. 68; Plauchut, *Revue des Deux Mondes* 233 (1877), 923-24.

guarded by soldiers with fixed bayonets and drawn swords on every side.

The second part of Regidor's narrative deals with the trial of the three priests. Inasmuch as there exists no other account of the trial, there is no way to check its accuracy, though some of its melodramatic details seem somewhat improbable. It may be noted here also that there are various clear errors of fact throughout the entire article, beginning from the date of the execution given in the title—February 28 instead of February 17—other dates being correspondingly incorrect.¹⁵ However, this type of error, like the errors in the ages assigned to the three priests, do not necessarily invalidate that account as a whole, evidently written from memory, but warn against accepting otherwise unverified details, much less drawing any conclusions from them.

Something similar must be said about the rest of the article, which treats separately each of the three priests and their activities which led them to be accused at the time of the Cavite Mutiny, and then explains the background and course of the mutiny itself. Here again Regidor's is the only contemporary account apart from Montero y Vidal's, though he himself had given a somewhat different version in an earlier pseudonymous work on Masonry.¹⁶ Hence there is little to corroborate or disprove his narrative, though its general outline may be said to give a probable explanation of principal events. The tenor of it is to deny the official version propounded by Montero y Vidal of an organized revolt aiming at the massacre of all Spaniards and the proclamation of an independent republic. Regidor goes on, however, to attribute the mutiny to the instigation of friars. It was the result, he says, of a plan ori-

¹⁵ This incorrect date is also used by Rizal in the dedication of his *El Filibusterismo* to the three priests. Rizal similarly errs in the ages of the priests, though differing somewhat from Regidor.

¹⁶ Francisco-Engracio Vergara, *La Masonería en Filipinas. Estudio de la actualidad* (Paris, 1896), pp. 14-15. The treatment of the events of 1872 here is very brief and aimed at showing that Peninsulars rather than Filipinos were responsible for the revolt in Cavite. For Regidor's authorship see Artigas, *Los sucesos de 1872*, p. 240; though the internal evidence by itself is quite indicative of Regidor's authorship.

ginating from a meeting of leading friars of all the orders, at which it was decided to create such an occasion so as to bring about the elimination of the anti-friar reformists, particularly the leaders of the Filipino secular clergy. The plot is attributed by Regidor to Fathers Castro and Treserra of the Dominicans, Father Huertas [*sic*; undoubtedly Huerta is meant] of the Franciscans, Father Herrero of the Augustinians, and Father Cuartero of the Recoletos. Such an assertion is demonstrably not based on facts. For Father Casimiro Herrero, the Augustinian procurator, was in Spain during this period of 1869-1872 during which the plot was supposedly being hatched, while the others were in the Philippines.¹⁷ Father Domingo Treserra was indeed Rector of the University of Santo Tomas at this time, but Father Rafael Castro, O.P., had finished his term as Provincial of the Dominicans in 1863, shortly after which he suffered a stroke which left him completely paralyzed, and some time before his death (1873), left him blind as well.¹⁸ The alleged representative of the Recoletos, Father Mariano Cuartero, is said by Regidor to have subsequently been the bishop of Jaro. However, the bishop of Jaro was, and had been for some years, Father Mariano Cuartero y Medina, O.P., while the Recoleta Provincial, Father Mariano Cuartero del Pilar, was later to become bishop of Nueva Segovia.¹⁹ Finally, the assertion that the appointment of Izquierdo as Governor-General was due to his being a foster-brother of the newly elected Dominican Provincial is certainly incorrect. For whether or not it be true that he was a foster-brother of General Izquierdo, Father Pedro Vilanova, O.P., was elected Provincial of the Dominicans on April 29, 1871, while Izquierdo had al-

¹⁷ Gregorio de Santiago Vela, O.S.A., *Ensayo de una biblioteca ibero-americana de la Orden de San Agustín* (Madrid: Imp. del Asilo de Huérfanos, 1913-1931), III, 632.

¹⁸ Hilario María Ocio y Viana, O.P., *Compendio de la Reseña biográfica de la Provincia del Santísimo Rosario de Filipinas desde su fundación hasta nuestros días* (Manila: Colegio de Santo Tomás, 1895), pp. 681-2; Pablo Fernández, O.P., *Dominicos donde nace el sol* (Barcelona, 1958), pp. 377, 683.

¹⁹ Domingo Abella, "The Bishops of Nueva Segobia," *PS* 10 (1962), 584; "The Bishops of Caceres and Jaro," *PS* 11 (1963), 555.

ready arrived in Manila on April 4, 1871, having been appointed months before.²⁰

In short, unless some further proof is forthcoming, the entire story of a friar plot to eliminate their enemies must be considered to be an invention, Regidor having simply selected the names of prominent friars known to him as the supposed perpetrators of the plot. However, this need not mean that the broader assertion of Regidor—that the Cavite mutiny was used by certain Spaniards, possibly including friars, to eliminate the liberal reformist Filipino group—is necessarily without basis. As I have pointed out elsewhere, other evidence points to the Cavite revolt as having been used as a pretext for such elimination, though the evidence rather points to Izquierdo than any group of friars as directly responsible for the execution of the three priests.²¹

To sum up, Regidor's account would seem to be the most informative of any we have, particularly on the general background of events. It is certainly not, however, an eyewitness account for all the events it relates, particularly the revolt itself or the execution of the three priests. Moreover it seems clearly to have employed false data to make the friars appear as the instigators of the revolt and of the punishments meted out to the Filipino reformists. Even apart from this anti-friar construction of the data, however, Regidor is not to be depended on for accuracy of detail, and seems evidently to have been narrating from a rather faulty memory. The account is therefore indeed valuable, but needs to be checked continually against other sources for corroboration.

Two other contemporary residents of Manila who wrote on the subject of the Cavite Mutiny offer little in the way of factual information. Despite the title, *Reseña que demuestra el fundamento y causas de la insurrección del 20 de enero en Filipinas*,²² the book of Casimiro Herrero, O.S.A., is philosophical rather than historical in nature. Moreover, though its au-

²⁰ Fernández, p. 683; Montero y Vidal, III, 554.

²¹ *Father José Burgos, Priest and Nationalist*, pp. 28-32.

²² Madrid: Imp. de Segundo Martínez, 1872. The preface is signed by Herrero.

thor was perhaps present in the early days of the term of Governor-General Carlos de la Torre, he returned to Spain in 1869 as Procurator in Madrid of the Philippine Augustinians, as mentioned above, and hence was not an eyewitness. The small part of his pamphlet which is devoted to the narrative of the revolt simply accepts the official version and condemns strongly the individuals involved, most particularly the three executed priests.²³ It is therefore of no independent historical value.

The other contemporary writer is Felipe M. de Govantes in his *Compendio Histórico de Filipinas*.²⁴ Govantes was a long-time Peninsular Spaniard resident of the Philippines, where he held various positions in the bureaucracy. His account of the regime of Governor de la Torre, though disapproving the latter's democratic methods, has nothing of the scorn and indignation of Montero y Vidal, nor does he mention any names in connection with the manifestation held at that time. With similar caution he narrates the revolt of Cavite, not making clear to whom he attributes the responsibility. Though he mentions that almost all those who took part in the manifestation at the time of De la Torre were condemned by the military tribunals in 1872, he hints that not all were actually guilty, noting that opinion in Manila was divided with respect to Izquierdo's actuations during his term.

One further apparently contemporary account remains, whose author cannot be determined with certainty, and which has been published only indirectly. The published version is that contained in Father Pablo Pastells' history of the Jesuit Philippine mission in the nineteenth century.²⁵ Pastells arrived

²³ The narrative portion is pp. 87-111. The first of these two chapters (pp. 87-100) was reprinted in *La Política de España en Filipinas* 2 (1 Marzo 1892), 58-61, as an answer to *La Solidaridad's* publication of the translation of Plauchut's account, cited in n. 6 above.

²⁴ Manila: Imprenta Amigos del País, 1888. The relevant sections are pp. 448-9 and 465-68.

²⁵ Pablo Pastells, S.J., *Misión de la Compañía de Jesús de Filipinas en el siglo XIX* (3 vols.; Barcelona: Editorial Barcelonesa, 1916-1917), I, 127-8.

in Manila only in 1875, hence was not himself a contemporary witness. But a comparison of the account to be found in his book with a manuscript history of the Ateneo Municipal extant in Jesuit archives in Spain, entitled "*Historia del Colegio de la Inmaculada Concepción que tiene la Misión de la Compañía de Jesús de las Islas Filipinas en Manila*," shows that Pastells has copied it almost word for word from the manuscript history. This latter account was written by a Jesuit resident in the Ateneo, and completed by 1874 at the latest.²⁶ The account of the revolt adds nothing to the facts established from the general agreement of the other contemporary accounts, except to add some details on the role of the Jesuits in assisting the condemned priests. The account of the "Christian resignation" with which the three priests went to their execution, though couched in general terms, would seem to support Montero y Vidal's rejection of the dramatic incidents related by Plauchut. Unlike Montero, however, the narrator (and Father Pastells) express the general conviction of Manileños that many of those condemned were unjustly or at least excessively punished and did not receive a fair trial. Since the original account was apparently not written for publication and its eventual publication took place only in 1916, long after the period in which any political considerations might have influenced the narrator, the account possesses a reliability—for the limited area covered—superior to that of others that have been treated here.

SECOND-HAND ACCOUNTS

In this group may be included those who assert that they had received their information from contemporaries of the events or who, because of their relationship to such men, may be legitimately supposed to have done so.

²⁶ The MS history is to be found in the Archivo de la Provincia de Tarragona de la Compañía de Jesús, in San Cugat del Vallés (Barcelona), Spain, E-II-c-2. The history suddenly comes to an end in mid-1874, hence the terminal date. Very possibly the author was Father Pedro Bertrán, S.J., who was active in reconstructing the history of the Philippine Jesuits. If so, it would be of greater value, because of the close relationship between Bertrán and Burgos. See my book cited in n. 21 above, pp. 35-36, 110-11, 268-69.

In the first category fall two documents which, though they remain unpublished as a whole, seem to have been circulated in copies to a considerable degree and thus to have entered into later accounts. The two documents in question were written by Father Agapito Echegoyen, a Recoleta, and Father Antonio Piernavieja, an Augustinian, both of whom were taken prisoners by the revolutionary forces in Cavite in 1896.²⁷ Both documents confess to and condemn various crimes and abuses allegedly committed by the friars, beginning with the period just prior to the Cavite Mutiny. Both accounts agree in attributing the execution of the three priests to friar intrigues. Allegedly the four friar Provincials met to decide on how to eliminate their opponents, and for this purpose, knowing that a revolt was in the offing in Cavite, sent a friar similar in appearance to Burgos, to stir up the prospective rebels under the name of the latter, and to distribute money among them. Likewise the Provincials are alleged to have bribed Izquierdo heavily so as to bring him to execute the three priests when the revolt did break out and they were implicated by the captured rebels. Piernavieja did not give the source of his knowledge, but Echegoyen, who came to the Philippines a few months after the events, alleged that his account came from a fellow-friar, Father Cipriano Navarro. The account of Echegoyen does not name the supposed impersonator of Burgos, but declares him to have been a Franciscan (though he later adds that others say he was a Recoleta). The account of Piernavieja, on the other hand, attributes the deed to a Father Claudio del Arco²⁸ whom he does

²⁷ The copies used for this article are to be found in the Archives of the Philippine Province of the Society of Jesus, Loyola House of Studies, Ateneo de Manila (APP) I-3/Ja/5/97. To judge from the notation at the bottom of each document, they must have come to the Jesuits from Felipe Calderón, who is said there to possess the originals. A copy may also be found in the National Library, coming from the Ronquillo collection, and no doubt in other collections as well. There is likewise a similar "confession" from Father Domingo Candenás, O.S.A., who was a prisoner with the other two priests, but since he makes no mention of the events in 1872, it has not been considered here.

²⁸ The reading in the APP copy is Arceo; likewise in the book of Artigas as in n. 50 below. But since no such name appears in the catalogue of Philippine Recoletos, it seems clear that it must have

not further identify, but who was actually a Recoleta parish priest of Santa Cruz, Zambales.

Though it is most probable that the documents were actually written by the individuals whose names are appended to them, since they contain accurate data which only the persons named could have known—e.g., the various parishes the writers had held and the dates in which they had arrived in each of their assignments²⁹—they can scarcely be accepted as reliable documents, given the facts that both men were prisoners, and are known to have been tortured by the Magdiwang leader Mariano Alvarez before being finally executed at the orders of Andres Bonifacio.³⁰ The very profuseness with which they repeatedly insist that everything they say is said with perfect freedom from coercion, and out of pure love for the truth and to honor these martyrs, make them worthless to a critical historian, as being evidently confessions extorted by torture. They were, however, to have considerable subsequent influence, as will be seen below.

Apart from these accounts allegedly based on information received from contemporaries of the events, there are those which, though not explicitly stating that they were such, have a reasonable possibility of such an origin, since their authors

been a copyist's mistake for Claudio del Arco, who was actually parish priest of Santa Cruz, Zambales in these years. See Francisco Sádaba del Carmen, O.R.S.A., *Catálogo de los Religiosos Agustinos Recoletos de la Provincia de San Nicolás de Filipinas* (Madrid: Imprenta del Asilo de Huérfanos, 1908), p. 449.

²⁹ As shown by checking them against the catalogues of the respective orders. e.g., Sádaba.

³⁰ An account of the sufferings of these friars when prisoners of Alvarez is found in the unpublished history by Telesforo Canseco, "Historia de la Insurrección Filipina en Cavite, 1896." A copy is in the Archives of the Philippine Dominican Province, Santo Domingo Convent, Quezon City; section HCF, tomo VII, pp. 68-70. Canseco, himself a Caviteño, relates how the priests had been well-treated when prisoners of Aguinaldo, but after the latter turned them over to Alvarez, they were tortured by one of the Bonifacio brothers so severely that "they would have preferred that they shoot them." Finally Andres Bonifacio had them executed in spite of the efforts of Aguinaldo to prevent it. See Aguinaldo's memoirs, *Mga gunita ng Himagsikan* (n. p., 1964), pp. 117-18, 156.

were close relatives of participants. The two principal ones are those by Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera, nephew of Joaquín Pardo de Tavera, and brought up in his household; and that of Pedro Paterno, son of Máximo Paterno, another of those exiled to the Marianas in 1872.

The account of Pardo de Tavera was originally written for the official report of the census of 1903, as part of a general survey of Philippine history.³¹ Pardo denies that there was any plot to overthrow Spanish rule, and sees the Cavite Mutiny simply as an uprising due to the disaffection of the arsenal workers who had been deprived of their traditional exemption from tribute and the Filipino troops who sympathized with them. This event the conservative elements in Manila, including the friars, took as proof that those who had expressed reformist or anti-friar sentiments under the governorship of De la Torre were plotting to overthrow Spanish sovereignty. Hence they persuaded the government to inflict severe and exemplary punishments on all kinds of people without inquiring carefully into their guilt. Though Pardo makes no direct mention of any friar conspiracy³² to bring about the Cavite affair after the fashion of Regidor, he sees the punishments meted out as the result of a false conviction on the part of the government that all opponents of the friars were enemies of Spanish rule, and attributes the disaffection of the Filipinos with Spain which led to the Revolution of 1896 to this identification of Spanish interests with friar interests beginning from 1872.

³¹ T.H. Pardo de Tavera, *Reseña histórica de Filipinas desde su descubrimiento hasta 1903* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1906), pp. 66-71. This is Pardo's original. The version published in *Census of the Philippine Islands, 1903* (Washington, 1905), I, 374-9, is a not very accurate translation, and that of the Spanish edition of the census is an even more inaccurate retranslation from the English back into Spanish. Due to the protests of Pardo, the Philippine Commission then published his original Spanish as a separate book.

³² He does say on p. 70: "Un estudio histórico de más extensión que este, acompañado de documentos, demostraría de una manera indiscutible la parte que tomaron en aquella triste ocurrencia las órdenes religiosas..." but does not further explicitate what that part might have been.

In spite of the antecedent probability that Pardo might have had detailed knowledge of the events of 1872 from his uncle, the account shows little evidence of this. Besides the incorrect interpretation of the attitude of De la Torre, there are several errors of detail as to the identity of the men who were executed or exiled as a result of the mutiny, and one can only conclude that Pardo de Tavera either had no detailed knowledge of the facts, or did not find place to publish them in this brief account. Hence he simply gave a general picture of events in a sense perhaps unnecessarily unfavorable to the friars. Though consequently too general to offer any reliable information beyond what was contained in earlier accounts, his picture of the broad lines of events and his general interpretation are coherent in a way which others are not.

The anti-friar bias which pervades much of Pardo de Tavera's summary of Philippine history provoked an indignant and equally pugnacious refutation from Father Serapio Tamayo, O.P.³³ Though Tamayo himself came to the Philippines only in 1891, it might be expected that since his was a quasi-official defense of the friars against Pardo de Tavera, he might have derived the information on which he based his own version from older colleagues who had been contemporary to the events in Manila. But an examination of the section devoted to the events of 1869-1872 shows a narration—or rather an interpretation of events—which adds nothing to that of Montero y Vidal, on which it principally, if not wholly, depends, even to lengthy quotations from that source. It therefore likewise has no independent value.

The last author who deserves attention by reason of the possibility of his possessing information from an immediate contemporary of the events is Pedro Paterno, whose father Máximo had been deported to the Marianas in 1872, though young Pedro himself at that time was a student in Spain. During the Spanish era Pedro Paterno published many works purporting to be historical, but the great majority of them

³³ *Sobre una "Reseña histórica de Filipinas"* (Manila: Imprenta de Santo Tomás, 1906). The section on the events of 1869-1872 comprises pp. 175-91.

dealt rather with the pre-Hispanic period of Philippine history.³⁴ They are, moreover, mere compilations characterized by a great lack of critical historical sense, and were even then generally considered rather as somewhat inept and historically valueless works of propaganda by his fellow-Filipinos in Spain as well as by Spaniards.³⁵ In his later years the various multi-volumed works which by their titles would appear to be comprehensive histories of the Philippines turn out on examination to be chiefly compilations from his earlier works.³⁶ In the year of his death, however, he published a two-part *Synopsis de la Historia de Filipinas*, in which he does give some brief mention to the events of 1872 while treating the revolts of the nineteenth century.³⁷ The treatment, however, is limited to a few scattered paragraphs in support of his assertion that all the revolts of the nineteenth century were reformist, not separatist in nature, aiming at recovering for Filipinos control of their own affairs within the wider framework of Spanish sovereignty. With regard to the revolt of 1872 in particular, ". . . the friars conjured up [*simularon*] an insurrection in Cavite, when in reality it was nothing more than a military mutiny. . . ." Whatever may be the correctness of the assertion, it is not substantiated by any facts. Indeed, the entire account of Paterno in the succeeding pages is a thinly veiled panegyric of himself and his accomplishments, in which he appears as the true inspiration of Rizal and the soul of the late nineteenth-century nationalist movement. In addition, there are numerous glaring factual errors which destroy any confidence one could have in Paterno's reliability. In brief,

³⁴ E.g., *La antigua civilización tagálog* (Madrid, 1887); *Los itas* (Madrid, 1890); *El Cristianismo en la antigua civilización tagálog* (Madrid, 1892); *La familia tagálog en la historia universal* (Madrid, 1892); etc.

³⁵ E.g., Rizal to Blumentritt, *Epistolario Rizalino* V, 105; and Isabelo de los Reyes, *Historia de Ilocos* (Manila: La Opinión, 1890), I, 151, 153-54; Pardo de Tavera, *Biblioteca Filipina*, pp. 301-2.

³⁶ *Historia crítica de Filipinas* (3 vols.; Manila: Imprenta "La República," 1908); *Historia de Filipinas* (7 vols.; Manila: Imprenta "La República," 1912).

³⁷ Manila: Imprenta República, 1911. The sections dealing with the events of 1872 are I, 38; II, 121-22.

Paterno adds nothing to previous accounts, and if he possessed any personal knowledge of the events, it does not appear in his writings, which therefore have no value as independent sources.

One further document perhaps stemming in part from one of the participants or victims of the Cavite revolt, José M. Basa, survives, though it is not precisely a historical document. It is a printed pamphlet addressed to the American Consul-General in Hong Kong, signed by José M. Basa, Doroteo Cortés, and A. G. Medina and dated January 29, 1897.³⁸ The pamphlet attacks Spanish abuses and misgovernment in the Philippines, and asks the Consul to request American intervention to force Spanish withdrawal from the Philippines, promising any concessions which the Americans may desire in return. Among the Spanish crimes narrated is that of the executions and exiles of 1872, said to be due to friar intrigues and bribery of the government. Concretely, the alleged incident found in the Piernavieja account of the impersonation of Burgos by a Recoleta friar (here not named but said to be from Zambales), who distributed money to stir up the revolt, is repeated. Given the nature of the pamphlet and its purpose, whether to persuade the American consul or, as seems more likely, to serve as propaganda,³⁹ the name of Basa gives the historian little more reason to accept the story than the extorted account of Piernavieja. Indeed, given the widespread use of untruths by Basa in his anti-friar propaganda, amply attested to by various Filipino nationalists of the Propaganda Movement, even less credit should be given to the story.⁴⁰ The use and amplification of

³⁸ The whole pamphlet is reproduced in English translation in the compilation of John R. M. Taylor, *The Philippine Insurrection against the United States* (Pasay City: Eugenio Lopez Foundation, 1971), I, 289-294. The relevant passage is on pp. 290-92. Basa and Cortés later petitioned President McKinley for American annexation of the Philippines.

³⁹ The fact that it was printed, and in Spanish, makes it fairly obvious that it was intended for more than the American consul to whom it was addressed, especially since Basa could well have written in English, as he did in Hong Kong newspapers on Philippine affairs.

⁴⁰ E.g., Rizal to Basa, *Epistolario Rizalino*, II, 221-22; R. O. Serna [Pedro Serrano Laktaw] to Del Pilar, *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar* (2 vols.; Manila: Imprenta del Gobierno, 1955-1958), I, 137. See also *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, I, 176; W. E.

this story, however, may be seen in its reappearance in an anti-friar pamphlet of 1900, where the alleged Recoleta impersonator is now said to have been found some days after the executions "hanged from a bar in his cell in the provincial convent of the walled city, and apparently a suicide."⁴¹ As a matter of fact, the supposed impersonator, identified in the Piernavieja account as Father Claudio del Arco, was actually still very much alive then and for many years, and returned to Spain eventually as Commissary of his order.⁴²

OTHER CONTEMPORARIES

Two other figures of approximately the same generation as those just treated but without known direct contacts with contemporaries of the events were Father Salvador Pons and Apolinario Mabini. Both spoke briefly about the events of 1872 in connection with their other writings.

Pons was an Augustinian friar who first came to the Philippines in 1884, left his order in 1899 in Manila, and for the next decade spent much of his time in writing against the friars, and cooperating with the founders of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente.⁴³ Finally being reconciled with the Catholic Church, he re-entered the Augustinians and spent the rest of his life in a monastery in Germany. Since he retracted his anti-friar and anti-Catholic writings as a whole, and spent much of the rest of his life in refuting them, all of his writings must be used with some caution, particularly since those which may in some sense be qualified as historical were composed in great haste, and comparable carelessness and exaggeration.

Retana, *Vida y escritos del Dr. José Rizal* (Madrid: Victoriano Suárez, 1907), pp. 149, 229, etc., for the implacable and active hatred of Basa against the friars, attested by Regidor and other friends.

⁴¹ "Causes of the Dislike of the Filipino for the Friars" by I.M., February 1900; translated from the Spanish in Taylor, *The Philippine Insurrection*, I, 168-87. The pertinent passage is on pp. 179-80.

⁴² Sádaba, p. 449.

⁴³ See Leon Ma. Guerrero, "Nozaleda and Pons: Two Spanish Friars in Exodus," *Studies in Philippine Church History*, Gerald H. Anderson, ed. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), pp. 172-202.

The two works in question here are *Defensa del clero filipino*, and *El clero filipino*.⁴⁴ The first of these reproduces Plauchut's account, and for the rest contains no facts that could not be found in Montero y Vidal, and indeed, it is in general short on facts. The second book contains a series of biographies and bibliographies of outstanding Filipino secular priests, among them Burgos and Gómez. In his account of Burgos' academic career (which is replete with factual errors in the matter of dates) he attributes the revolt of 1872 to the friars, "as was said almost publicly." The reason given is that Burgos had incurred the ire of the Recoletos by his defense of the rights of the Filipino clergy, and of the Dominicans by his just severity in refusing to give a passing grade to incapable friars when he acted as a member of the board of examiners for candidates for degrees at the University of Santo Tomas. (No explanation is given how such a motive would have brought about the execution of Zamora or Gómez.) Given the many factual errors and open contradictions in the account, it may be safely ignored as an independent source, and is dependent on Plauchut and/or Regidor. The biography of Gómez is similarly dependent on Regidor, as would seem to be shown by the erroneous statement that the former founded the Madrid newspaper *La Verdad*, "exclusively dedicated to the defense of Filipino interests. . . ." *La Verdad* was, of course, the newspaper in which the attacks on the Filipino clergy by the Recolecto procurator in Madrid, Father Guillermo Agudo, were published, provoking the *Manifiesto* of Burgos in 1864.

Mabini devotes one chapter of his posthumously published work *La Revolución Filipina* to our subject, "Causa y efecto de la ejecución de los Padres Burgos, Gómez y Zamora."⁴⁵ Mabini makes no claim to have had first-hand knowledge of the events, but without taking any position on the cause of

⁴⁴ Both books were published in Manila in the press of *La Democracia* in 1900. The pertinent passage of the *Defensa* is pp. 44-49. Those of *El clero filipino* are pp. 16-17 and 97-100 for Burgos, and p. 120 for Gómez. The two sections on Burgos give two distinct years for his birth, apparently unconscious of the contradiction.

⁴⁵ *La Revolución Filipina (con otros documentos de la época)* (2 vols.; Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1931), II, 282-84.

the revolt, states clearly that the three priests were innocent of it. It was used by their enemies—principally the friars, from the context, but supported by the government—to bring about the execution of those three men who were martyrs to justice. Mabini's chapter is not a narrative, but rather a discussion of the place of the martyr-priests in the Revolution. Hence factual details are almost completely lacking, but from his reference to Burgos' protest of his innocence on the scaffold, it would seem that he is dependent on the account of Plauchut, whose translation was published in *La Solidaridad* while Mabini was intimately involved with the newspaper's support in Manila.

The works of one final author deserve special examination, even though he cannot be considered a source in the strict sense. Manuel Artigas y Cuerva wrote extensively on Philippine history, more so perhaps than any other person in the first three decades after the Revolution.⁴⁶ Though he treated the events of 1872 in various periodical publications and as part of books on broader subjects, his major work was *Los sucesos de 1872*.⁴⁷ This book, though somewhat unsystematic

⁴⁶ Wenceslao E. Retana might perhaps share the place with Artigas, both as regards fecundity as a writer, and as regards access to sources and personal acquaintance with contemporaries of the events. His only treatment of the Cavite Mutiny, however, is a few paragraphs in his prologue to a third edition of Rizal's *El filibusterismo* (Barcelona: Henrich, 1908), pp. v-vi. Though the general tone of the prologue is anti-friar, and though he points to the struggle of the three Filipino priests against transferral of the parishes to the friars as the reason for their execution, he says clearly that it was the Government who took advantage of the occasion of the Mutiny to silence all liberal tendencies in the Philippines. Given the strongly anti-friar character of all of Retana's writings in this period, this seems significant, since he would hardly have missed the opportunity to say so if he had had any reliable evidence for a role of the friars in the execution of the three priests.

⁴⁷ For a biographical account and bibliography of Artigas, see Manuel, *Dictionary*, I, 68-79. He had earlier published much of the material of *Los sucesos de 1872* in the review *Renacimiento Filipino*. His treatment of the events in his *Historia de Filipinas* (Manila: "La Pilarica," 1916) is identical with *Los sucesos* except for a recasting of the material. His other relevant work, *Las revoluciones filipinas*

in organization, is the fullest account of the Cavite mutiny and its background which has appeared up to the present. Moreover, Artigas reproduces in full a number of documents of the period not then previously published. Though unfortunately he gives no sources for these documents, some at least are certainly genuine,⁴⁸ which creates a strong probability that Artigas, who worked in the National Archives collection,⁴⁹ had access to documents which have since disappeared or been destroyed, so that they remain only in his volume.

Apart from these documents, Artigas has depended principally on the accounts of Regidor, together with the alleged confessions of Fathers Piernavieja and Echegoyen, which are reproduced in part in his book. Though he accepts all of them as authentic accounts in general, he vacillates in various places in his book as to the degree of confidence to be placed in them. Thus he quotes the Piernavieja-Echegoyen accounts of the friar-impersonator of Burgos and asserts that this should be accepted, " . . . since we are dealing with an *authentic docu-*

(Manila: Imp. de "La Vanguardia," 1913) gives a great deal more of the background to the period 1869-1872, but in spite of frequent allusions to subjects to be treated later, never does so. This book had begun as a serial publication in Artigas' review *Biblioteca Nacional Filipina* (1908-1911), but was apparently never completed, when the review ceased publication; hence the book remained incomplete as well.

⁴⁸ E.g., the letter of the Archbishop (pp. 14-31), though marred by errors in transcription, is substantially the same as the original, which is found in the Archivo Histórico Nacional in Madrid, and has been published in Schumacher and Cushner *PS* 17 (1969), 462-87; the letter to the friar Provincials from Izquierdo (pp. 174-193) can be found in the Dominican provincial archives, "Com. oficiales," tomo 611, ff. 1-9 (copy given me by Fr. José Arcilla, S.J.); the attestation of the reading of the sentence to the condemned men (pp. 130-34) is likewise a defective copy of the original in the Philippine National Archives, published by Schumacher and Cushner, *PS* 17 (1969), 522-29. Though Artigas' copies are carelessly done, even omitting words and phrases, at least those cited are from genuine documents.

⁴⁹ As head of the Filipiniana division and later Acting Director of the National Library, Artigas apparently was able to borrow documents from the Archives, since slips of paper authorizing him and others in the pre-War period to do such borrowing are still to be found in certain bundles in the Archives. Perhaps this practice accounts for the fact that some of these documents can no longer be found.

ment of indisputable veracity"⁵⁰ In a succeeding chapter on the other hand, he cites Regidor for the assertion that the promoters of the mutiny were the two Peninsular officers Montesinos and Morquecho, the lay-brother of the Order of San Juan de Dios, Fray Antonio Rufián, and Father Juan Gómez, Prior of the Recoleta Convento of Cavite, the latter being the principal instigator among the workers and soldiers of the arsenal, persuading them to revolt. In support of this assertion Artigas continues:

Everything mentioned by Señor Regidor is rigorously exact, according to the testimony we have gathered on our trips for some years past from several of those who were involved in the events of 1872. What is more, it is said *with all the signs of probability*,—for all are in agreement on those details and we make mention of this elsewhere in this book,—that a person in the garb of a secular priest, with a strong resemblance to Dr. Burgos, went about various houses of Manila and Kawit. This person tried to convince people of the need of support from all social classes to bring about a revolt in the near future.⁵¹

Artigas is apparently not aware that the role he attributes to Father Juan Gómez, on confirmation of Regidor, is in contradiction with the rest of Piernavieja account which attributes the role of impersonator to Father Claudio del Arco.⁵² Moreover, the document which in one context he declares to be *authentic and of indisputable veracity*, is later cited as merely giving *all signs of probability*. Shortly before this Artigas had made a judgment which comes much closer to being an accurate picture of the true measure of Regidor's trustworthiness. He says:

. . . If we were to prescind from certain inaccuracies and deficiencies

⁵⁰ *Los sucesos de 1872*, p. 197. Italics mine.

⁵¹ *Los sucesos de 1872*, pp. 240-41. Italics mine. This version, in the form in which it is stated, appears to be taken from *La masonería en Filipinas* rather than from Regidor's article in *Filipinas ante Europa*, though the two accounts, in spite of their differences, are not totally incompatible.

⁵² Like the Jesuit copy, Artigas uses the name Arceo instead of Arco. Very likely Artigas too used the original possessed by Felipe Calderón.

which are noticeable, it can be said that in general he brings forth interesting information.

Señor Regidor had this disadvantage as a writer, that he was not a researcher. He did not search for authentic data, and relied much on that beautiful memory which Providence granted him, but which on occasions was unfaithful. This is the reason for the deficiencies which can be found in his writings.⁵³

The verdict seems to be in accord with our previous remarks on Regidor—that he had access to much information, but cannot be relied on for details, whether this be because of failures of memory, as Artigas judges, or from a tendency to dramatize his account, and tendentiously to paint the role of the friars in the darkest colors.

Being heavily dependent on Regidor, Artigas of course shares some of the former's weaknesses. It could not be said of him, however, that he was not a researcher; rather the great value of his works is that he has gathered testimonies and documents from many sources. His great weakness, however, is that he does not cite the sources of his documents, so that the reader might evaluate their reliability. Secondly, the tendency of his works is to accumulate information of all kinds without giving much evidence of critical evaluation on his own part. The remark cited from Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera, that Artigas was a "cajón de sastre,"⁵⁴ is not completely unfair. Though he did attempt to apply historical criticism to his sources at times, as in the case of some of the extravagances and inconsistencies of Regidor, he cannot be termed a critical historian, as appears clearly from the contradictions mentioned above. His work, however, remains valuable for the information and documentation it brought together, and though it does contain errors and inconsistencies, there is no evidence of conscious distortion of facts on the part of Artigas.

With Artigas the published histories of the events of 1872 based on immediate knowledge or direct information come to

⁵³ *Los sucesos de 1872*, p. 240, n. 1.

⁵⁴ Manuel, *Dictionary*, I, 73; i.e., one who gathers everything indiscriminately.

an end. All subsequent books and articles on the subject were based on the sources which have been treated in this article, apart from those making use of the pseudo-Burgos forgeries which began to appear shortly before the last war, and which further complicated the already difficult problem of the contradictions in the published accounts of the four decades after the events.

The presumption of this article has been that it is impossible to write any satisfactory account of the Cavite Mutiny without a critical reappraisal of these published contemporary or quasi-contemporary accounts, for none of them alone offers a fully satisfactory narrative or explanation of the events. The publication of various archival sources in the last few years, and the proximate publication of others, gives a new basis on which to reconstruct the history, but these documents have only a supplementary value thus far, and must be used in conjunction with the earlier accounts. Given the unlikelihood of locating the original records of the court-martials of those condemned in 1872,⁵⁵ these earlier accounts must provide the basic framework on which the reconstruction of events can take place. For this reason it has seemed important to attempt a critique of them and to show relations among them, so as to make their evaluation more exact and to make clear the extent to which they depend on one another.

One example may help to make this clear—the genesis and development of the story of the Recoleta friar alleged to have impersonated Burgos in inciting the revolt in Cavite. For the critical historian there is, of course, great inverosimilitude in people presumably being sufficiently well-acquainted with Burgos to know him at least by sight—otherwise why choose a friar resembling him closely?—not being able in any single case to recognize the impostor when engaged in prolonged dis-

⁵⁵ According to the note from the Spanish government made public by Foreign Secretary Carlos P. Romulo on August 22, 1972, despite extensive search in the military archives the Spanish government has been unable to locate the documents and concludes that they may have been lost in the Spanish civil war of 1936-1939. See "Gomburza Papers" in *The Philippines Herald*, August 24, 1972.

cussions with him. But leaving this point aside for the moment, the story first appears as coming from Father Antonio Piernavieja with Father Claudio del Arco (who at the time was the Recoleta parish priest of Santa Cruz, Zambales, though Piernavieja does not say so) in the role of impostor. In the almost simultaneous account from the Recoleta Father Agapito Echegoyen, the impostor is made out to be an unknown Franciscan. Presumably under further prodding from his captors who saw the contradiction, Echegoyen concedes that it could have been a Recoleta, but still thinks it was a Franciscan.⁵⁶ In the Hong Kong propaganda pamphlet a few weeks later, the impostor is identified as the Recoleta parish priest of Santa Cruz, Zambales, though not named.⁵⁷ The slightly subsequent account by Regidor, published in Paris in the same year and hence very likely without knowledge of the Cavite or Hong Kong accounts, makes no mention of any impersonation of Father Burgos, but makes the Peninsular lieutenants Morquecho and Montesinos, the Recoleta Father Juan Gómez, and the lay-brother of San Juan de Dios, Fray Antonio Rufián, the instigators of the revolt. In Regidor's fuller account of 1900, Father Juan Gómez is rather said to have used Zaldua to stir up the workers of the arsenal to resist the removal of their privileges, and to have used Rufián to incite Lieutenants Morquecho and Montesino to lead the artillerymen in support of the arsenal workers "if

⁵⁶ Both accounts are dated 5 de Enero de 1897. The concession that the impostor might have been a Recoleta rather than a Franciscan is made in a note at the end of the entire "confession," subsequent to the narrative of alleged events of the succeeding years. It is evidently an afterthought on someone's part.

⁵⁷ Taylor, I, 291. The document is dated January 29, 1897. It was certainly possible for copies of the documents to have been sent to Hong Kong in time for printing in the interval of 24 days, but obviously it would not have been done too easily. What seems more likely is that the story had circulated in some form among anti-friar elements beforehand, possibly in one of the many ephemeral anti-friar leaflets which Basa was accustomed to print in Hong Kong and circulate through his contacts in Manila since at least 1888. The captors of the friars, being aware of the accusation already, would then have procured the confessions to confirm it, as appears to have been done with regard to various other alleged crimes of the friars during the period of the 1890's, which appear likewise in these confessions.

there should be need to make use of force."⁵⁸ In this latter version, not only is there no question of any friar impersonator of Father Burgos, but the supposed role of the Recoleta Father Juan Gómez⁵⁹ does not even have any clear connection with the alleged plot of the Provincials to provoke a revolt, since the armed forces were only supposed to go to use force in case needed to support the resistance of the arsenal workers to the abolition of their privileges, a resistance which is conceived as not necessarily leading to any use of armed force. His own inconsistency seems to have escaped Regidor, or perhaps he ignored it inasmuch as neither account was published under his own name.

Finally Artigas takes up both the Regidor version on the one hand and selections from the Piernavieja and the Echegoyen versions on the other, and combines them into one account. In his selection, either the contradictions between Regidor's accounts and those of the excerpted documents escaped him, or he simply chose to ignore them.⁶⁰

CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing analysis of these early accounts of the Cavite Mutiny would seem to lead to the following conclusions as to the reliability of these sources and the relationships existing among them:

- (1) There are only three certainly independent major

⁵⁸ Regidor, *Filipinas ante Europa*, p. 76.

⁵⁹ It appears that Father Juan Gómez was not even Prior of the Recoleta convento of Cavite in this period, as Regidor alleges. According to Sádaba (pp. 492-93), he was Sub-Prior in Manila and Master of Novices in 1870 and became Secretary of the Recoleta Province in 1871, hence likewise in Manila. It was he, according to Montero y Vidal, who assisted Fr. Mariano Gómez at his execution, and the following month he took the latter's place as parish priest of Bacoar.

⁶⁰ He does, on the other hand, note the contradiction between Regidor's version of the role of the friars and the letter from Izquierdo to the friar provincials he had reproduced from official sources in the preceding chapter (p. 202). Rather unconvincingly, he explains it away by attributing it to the letter being the product of a later, unexplained, moment of frankness.

versions of the events which deserve serious consideration—those of Montero y Vidal, of Regidor, and of Pardo de Tavera. If it could be shown that Plauchut was actually present in Manila in 1872, perhaps his account could be included for the little it might contain independent of Regidor. But there is nothing to indicate that he actually was in Manila in 1872, and everything solidly reliable in his account can be found in Regidor.

(2) Only Montero maintains fully the official thesis that the mutiny was part of a larger revolt aimed at independence; the others deny it, though Regidor and Plauchut have certain apparent contradictions in their explanations, as well as numerous highly improbable details and dialogue.

(3) The partial account reproduced in Pastells, and less clearly, that of Govantes, reject Montero's full position without clearly giving complete support to the contention that nothing more than a local mutiny was involved.

(4) The account of Pardo de Tavera, prescinding from the emotional anti-friar tone that pervades it, gives evidence of being the most reliable, even though fairly general, account except for its failure to recognize that De la Torre had also been suspicious of the Filipino reformists. That of Montero, apart from its anti-Filipino tone and its supposition of a revolutionary conspiracy, contains the most details and, to all appearances, most reliable account of the actual course of the revolt itself, as well as of the execution of the three priests.

(5) The notion of a deliberate and concerted friar conspiracy to provoke a revolt which would enable them to eliminate their enemies comes solely from Regidor, whose description contains clearly false assertions. The story that such a provocation was carried out by means of a friar impersonating Burgos is first found in the torture-extorted confessions of the friars executed at the orders of Bonifacio in 1897. These latter "confessions" are clearly in contradiction with Regidor at several points. The lack of a reliable basis for these allegations against the friars does not, however, necessarily invalidate the more general assertion of Pardo de Tavera that a large group

of conservative Manila Spaniards, including many or most friars, were suspicious of the Filipino priests and other liberal reformists from the time of De la Torre, and were quick to make of the Cavite Mutiny a revolution aimed at independence, and even to favor the drastic punishments meted out.

(6) Of all those existing, the account of Artigas combines the maximum of information, documentation, and detail with at least a minimum of critical treatment of his sources. However, depending as heavily as he does on Regidor, and having made use of such other unreliable sources as the Piernavieja-Echegoyen accounts, it falls far short of providing a fully reliable treatment of the events of 1872. Useful as it is in the absence of any satisfactory account, it can only be employed with any surety by the historian who is aware of Artigas' own sources and their value.

The evaluations and indications of this article are intended as aids to the use of these published sources. But as is obvious, even after evaluating them, they must be used in conjunction with documentary archival sources to arrive at any more complete and reliable historical picture. If the failure to locate the records of the trials is a serious loss, still there remains a rather large amount of documentary material which has either been published in recent times or the existence of which is known or hinted at in various publications, which should make it possible to obtain a more critical and satisfactory synthesis than has hitherto been made available.

APPENDIX

In the light of the evaluation of the primary sources attempted in the foregoing article, it may be useful to annotate briefly as to their sources the later books and major articles of some importance. Textbooks and occasional popular articles have been generally omitted. Miss Dolores Origeneza and Miss Rachel Abanil gave me research assistance in the preparation of the list, and the mimeographed bibliography prepared by the Burgos-Gómez-Zamora Centennial Commission was also helpful. I am grateful for this assistance.

- Cruz, Hermenegildo. *El P. Burgos, precursor de Rizal*. Manila: Librería "Manila Filatélica," 1941. 94 pp. Based on the pseudo-Burgos works of José Marco. Of no historical value.
- Daroy, Petronilo Bn. "Burgos and Rizal," in *Rizal: Contrary Essays*, Petronilo Bn. Daroy and Dolores S. Feria, eds. Quezon City: Guro Books, 1968. Pp. 51-56. Based on the pseudo-Burgos *La loba negra*; hence of no historical value.
- Foreman, John. *The Philippine Islands*. New York: Charles Scribner, 1899. Pp. 114-15. Though alleging Regidor as one of his sources, contains numerous factual errors not in Regidor. Valueless.
- Lopez, Honorio. *Ang tunay na buhay ni P. Dr. José Burgos at nang manga Nacasama Niya na sina P. Jacinto Zamora, P. Mariano Gómez at ang nadayang Miguel Zaldúa*. Icalawang Pagkahayag. Maynila: Imp. J. Martinez, 1912. 62 pp. A narrative in Tagalog verse, accompanied with footnotes. Depends on Regidor principally, though also on the Pons and the Piernavieja accounts, probably through Artigas.
- Manuel, E. Arsenio. "Burgos, Jose A.," *Dictionary of Philippine Biography*. Quezon City: Filipiniana Publications, 1955-1970. Vol II, pp. 62-97. Makes a generally critical use of the sources cited in this article, supplemented by interviews and other sources for the establishment of genealogy and correct dates. However, the account of the trial and certain other details are based on the apocryphal Liñan work by Marco, which he accepts as genuine. He also cites as works of Burgos the numerous other Marco compositions, though advertng to some of the difficulties and improbabilities which they contain, and inviting scholarly investigation. (This biography was published prior to the appearance of my PS article on the pseudo-Burgos apocrypha cited in n. 1.)
- "Gómez, Mariano." *Dictionary of Philippine Biography*, I, 195-99. Principally based on Regidor and Pardo de Tavera, but with additional information from surviving relatives, etc. The best account existing up until now, though recently published documentation can supplement and correct it.
- "Zamora, Jacinto." *Dictionary of Philippine Biography*, I, 489-490. Brief account, based chiefly on Regidor. Morales, 1914. Vol. I, pp. 139-143. Largely a literal transcription rector of the Cathedral.
- Ponce, Mariano. "El Padre José Burgos," *Efemérides filipinas*, by Jaime C. de Veyra and Mariano Ponce. Manila: Imp. de I. R. Errs on the date of Zamora's taking possession of his post as of Regidor, perhaps by way of Artigas, from whose work the letter of Father Pedro Bertrán, S.J., is reproduced.

Quijano de Manila [Nick Joaquin]. "How Filipino Was Burgos?" *Philippines Free Press*, 8 June 1968, pp. 2-3, 70.

"The 'Precursor of Rizal'?" *Philippines Free Press*, 15 June 1968, pp. 4, 84-87. Though offering interesting and provocative insights into the background of Burgos and the movement of which he was a part, especially in the first of these two articles, the articles make considerable use of the Marco apocrypha, and hence base their conclusions on inauthentic data.

Quirino, Carlos, "Father Gomes the Immortal," *Sunday Times Magazine*, 30 July 1972, pp. 26-27. Principally based on Manuel and his sources, but adding some further biographical details from recent research in the Manila Archdiocesan Archives.

Santamaria, Alberto, O.P. "El P. Burgos y la Universidad de Santo Tomás," *Unitas* 16 (1937-1938), 257-66.

"Más datos sobre el P. Burgos y Santo Tomás," *Unitas* 16 (1937-1938), 309-14. Useful data for the early life of Burgos and his academic career, from the University archives. Now superseded by Villarroel.

Villarroel, Fidel, O.P. *Father José Burgos, University Student*. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press, 1971. xvii, 121, (127) pp. Though not dealing with the Cavite Mutiny, this thorough study of the University career of Burgos clarifies and corrects on the basis of the University archives many erroneous details of earlier accounts.

Zafra, Nicolas. *Philippine History through Selected Sources*. Quezon City: Alemar-Phoenix, 1967. Pp. 148-69. Most judicious textbook account, based on critical use of the then available sources.