

philippine studies

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

The Religious Thought of Rizal

John N. Schumacher

Philippine Studies vol. 13, no. 3 (1965): 707–720

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

Review Articles

The Religious Thought of Rizal

IN spite of the multitude of writings on Rizal and the greatly increased accessibility of his own writings and of information on his life, largely due to the efforts of the José Rizal National Centennial Commission in its publications, relatively little has yet been done on his thought, and, in particular, on his religious thought. The subject, no doubt, lends itself to controversy, and much of what has been written on it has been done from strongly polemical points of view. It is time then for a scholarly and objective study, aimed, not primarily at judging and evaluating Rizal's religious thought, but at determining, as far as may be, precisely what the content of that thought was. This the author of the book under consideration¹ has attempted to do in a dissertation originally presented as partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree of Doctor in Theology at the San Francisco Theological Seminary. The author, a Protestant minister presently professor at Union Theological Seminary in Dasmariñas, Cavite, has made great efforts to be fair and objective in his treatment of the Catholic Church and its doctrines. This, of course, is not at all easy when dealing sympathetically with Rizal, for it is a truism to say that Rizal's religious thought developed in the context of the Catholicism in which he was born and brought up, and consequently, his criticisms and attacks in

¹ Eugene A. Hessel, *The Religious Thought of José Rizal. Its Context and Theological Significance*. Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1961. Pp. 289.

religious matters were directed primarily against Catholicism, at least as it then existed in the Philippines.

Rizal, of course, neither was nor claimed to be a professional theologian. Yet he was a man who thought rather deeply on many subjects, certainly not least of which was religion. This was certainly inevitable in the Philippine situation, where the colonial regime against which the nationalist struggle was directed, was so closely bound up with the Catholic Church in many ways, and where the priests of the Church herself at times scarcely permitted a distinction between opposition to Spanish rule and opposition to Catholicism. In his study, Doctor Hessel proposes to examine systematically Rizal's religious views as contained "...in those writings which have views on religion running through them as a major theme..." (p. 2). This he does in chapters two to six, giving separate chapters each to the *Noli* and to the *Fili*, to six minor writings of Rizal, to two unfinished manuscripts, and to Rizal's correspondence with Father Pastells. Chapter seven treats separately Rizal's attitude to the Bible in all these writings, and chapter eight summarizes Rizal's religious thought, concluding with extensive tables in which specific reference is given to the place in Rizal's works where each of his positive religious views may be found developed. A number of other methodical tables tabulate each of these views for each work considered. Chapter nine attempts a comparison of these religious views of Rizal with Catholic doctrine and with Protestant, while chapter ten sketches the intellectual climate of Europe in the nineteenth century, so as to discern influences and relationships with Rizal's religious thought and its continuing significance for today.

The ambitiousness of the project should be clear from this outline, and a reading of the book makes obvious the diligence and painstaking work expended on the investigation. But I regret to say that there are basic and grave defects in the methodology, which I am afraid seriously affect the value of the work. The most serious of these are concerned with: (1) the selection of sources; (2) the use made of the sources selected; and (3), the systematic presupposition with which Rizal's thought is approached. I should like to give each

of these some extended comment, since I feel that no valid synthesis of Rizal's religious thought is attainable unless the problem of methodology is first solved.

In his introduction Doctor Hessel notes that his emphasis in this study is ". . . theological, in the sense that it deals with Rizal's views concerning God, man, Jesus Christ, the Church, etc., rather than with his sense of personal relationship to or personal dependence upon God, Jesus Christ, the Church, or other 'divine' beings or institutions" (p. 2). Though conceding that ". . . the views of a religious person cannot be too arbitrarily separated from his personal devotions. . .," he has limited himself to what might be termed the literary expression of Rizal's religious thought in his writings, published or assumed to be intended for publication, with the exception of the letters to Father Pastells. Presumably with this distinction in mind, he has made only very occasional use of the letters of Rizal, and practically no use of his diaries or other autobiographical and contemporary biographical material. Yet, for knowing the real personal thought of Rizal on religious matters, it seems to me, these should be precisely the primary sources of information, rather than those works meant for publication, in which the author could have any number of reasons for expressing or implying ideas which are not his personal beliefs. Nor is it possible to separate, even to the limited extent acknowledged, a man's personal religious life from his intellectual convictions. Certainly, men do not always fully live up to their religious convictions, but in a thinking man, his religious actions are ordinarily an expression of intellectually held convictions, and particularly ought this to be supposed in Rizal, who was so bitter an enemy of religious hypocrisy. A couple of examples might illustrate my point. The author concludes, on the basis of certain phrases in *La Vision de Fray Rodríguez* and Rizal's letter to the young women of Malolos, that Rizal considers the Mass unnecessary or irrelevant to religion (pp. 91, 104). This may or may not be true, though a closer look at the phrases in question would seem to indicate that what is actually being condemned is the superstitious belief that paying to have Masses said has a religious value, even without any interior dispositions on the part of

the person offering the money. But even apart from the interpretation of the phrases themselves, surely one must take into account in some way the fact that Rizal himself used to attend Mass regularly in his later years, not only when he was in Dapitan from 1892 to 1896,² but, at least at times, when he was still in perfect freedom, and openly attacking the Church-State regime in the Philippines.³ A second example might be the statement (p. 130) that the unfinished manuscript, entitled by translator Juan Collas, *Friars and Filipinos*, probably remained unpublished because Rizal recognized how dangerous it would be for him to publish it. Certainly everything we know of Rizal from his letters would seem to negate this conclusion. That he desisted from publishing it for strategic reasons, or because on reflection he felt it objectively too harsh a picture — these or other possible reasons might be accepted. But it is hard to believe, first of all, that Rizal could have put himself in any further danger than he already was as a result of his earlier writings, or that even if such had been possible, that this would have deterred him if he considered it a proper and useful thing to do.⁴

The second point of methodology concerns the use of the sources selected by the author. The question of the literary genre of each of these writings, so different in character from one another, seems to be of capital importance here if

² See the testimony of Father Francisco Sánchez in my article "Some Notes on Rizal in Dapitan," *Philippine Studies* XI (1963), 313.

³ See Rizal's travel diary for his trip from Marseilles to Hong Kong in 1891, in *Diarios y memorias* ("Publicaciones de la Comisión Nacional del Centenario de Jose Rizal: Escritos de José Rizal," tomo I; Manila: Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal, 1961), pp. 241, 246.

⁴ See, for example, his exhortation to the other Filipinos of *La Solidaridad* always to sign their own names to their articles, and the more compromising these may be, the more openly should they proclaim their authorship. "... El que quiera tomar parte en esta cruzada, debe haber renunciado antes a todo, a la vida y a la fortuna..." Rizal—Del Pilar, 22 Junio 1889, *Epistolario Rizalino* (5 vols.; Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1930-1938), II, 200. Though it is true that Rizal himself had earlier written under a pseudonym, he refused to do so from this time on, though few followed his example.

one is to ascertain what Rizal's real thoughts were. Let us consider what that literary genre is in each case. In the matter of the two novels, Dr. Hessel himself raises the question (p. 16) as to what extent the novelist may be presumed to speak through his characters, or whether only the narrative portions may be assumed to present his personal views. He concludes that "... more weight should be given to the narrative portions of the novel when there is a difference of view, however, not to the exclusion of evidence furnished in the statements made by the characters of the novel. . ." (p. 44). Yet in his summary he feels that considerable weight ought to be given to the statements of Elias and Tasio, as being really the views of Rizal (pp. 41, 44-46, 205-215). But Rizal himself explicitly repudiates responsibility for the statements of Tasio, not only in the propaganda pamphlet *La visión de Fray Rodríguez*,⁵ where this repudiation may be merely a polemic device, but in a private letter to Ponce where he had no reason to hide his real sentiments, commenting on Father Font's critique of the *Noli* as an anti-Catholic book:

... If the author of a novel had to be responsible for the sayings of his characters, good heavens! to what conclusion should we have to come?... It is clear that the author is only responsible for the words which he says as his own, and the facts and the circumstances will supply the justification for the statements of the characters...⁶

This is not to say that Rizal actually would repudiate every statement of Tasio, and it may well be that some of them express at least doubts personal to Rizal, but this ought to be shown from other evidence. The mere fact of his sympathetic portrayal of Tasio may mean nothing more than the desire to show that a man's life of virtue is more important than the correctness of his religious opinions, especially when the orthodox make use of such inept and even false arguments for their position.

Of even less value, it seems to me, for determining the religious thought of Rizal, are the propaganda pamphlets, *Por teléfono* and *La visión de Fray Rodríguez*. Far from being

⁵ Juan Collas (ed.), *Rizal's Unknown Writings* (Manila, 1953), p. 53.

⁶ 18 Agosto 1888, *Epistolario Rizalino*, II, 45-46.

" . . . closest to being a theological dissertation . . ." (p. 81), the latter writing is only a satiric propaganda pamphlet, aiming at holding Father Rodríguez up to ridicule for his pamphlet *¿Porqué no los he de leer?* attacking the *Noli*.⁷ A reading of this pamphlet of Father Rodríguez would show how exaggerated and ridiculous he makes himself in his hyperbolic condemnations of the *Noli*, and Rizal takes full advantage of this ingenuous fanaticism to discredit him with a witty and biting satire. There is no doubt that Rizal is attacking the Friars, but it seems quite incredible to me that one can take every statement made in a work such as this, or in his *Por teléfono*,⁸ written against the equally exaggerated pamphlet of Father Salvador Font, to be an expression of Rizal's religious thought.

The other minor writings of Rizal, *Filipinas dentro de cien años*, *Sobre la indolencia de los filipinos*, the annotations to Antonio de Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, and the letter to the young women of Malolos, have much more claim to be valid expressions of Rizal's personal religious views, though only the last named letter has anything which might be called an extended treatment of religious questions. The same value as expressions of Rizal's religious thought, however, can certainly not be claimed for the two unfinished manuscripts used in the fifth chapter. The first, entitled *Estado de religiosidad de los pueblos en Filipinas*, is an exposition of the religious state of the Philippines, apparently written about 1884.⁹ Certainly there is nothing in it to which

⁷ José Rodríguez, O.S.A. *¿Porqué no los he de leer?* (*Cuestiones de sumo interés*, I). Manila: Pequeña imp. del Asilo de Huérfanos, [1888]. Apparently the author was not able to see Father Rodríguez' pamphlet, which provides a key to the understanding of Rizal's counter-attack.

⁸ Dimas Alang, *Por teléfono*. [Barcelona], 1889. This was an answer to the critique of the official censor, Father Salvador Font, which the latter had printed in a limited, semi-clandestine edition, and later re-printed in his *Filipinas: problema fundamental*, por un español de larga residencia en aquellas islas. Madrid: Aguado, 1891.

⁹ In *Escritos varios por José Rizal* ("Publicaciones de la Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal: Escritos de José Rizal," tomo VIII; Manila: Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal, 1961), I, 238-252. Rizal's introduction gives the impression that the piece was

an orthodox Catholic need object on doctrinal grounds, even if some might question certain points of factual interpretation of the Philippine situation. Actually there is very little of value-judgment in it at all, though there is implied disapproval of a number of superstitious practices and abuses, which most intelligent Catholics would similarly disapprove. But all this tells us relatively little about Rizal's religious opinions, except that he seems to have written precisely as a sincere Catholic, disapproving these practices because "... they cause the holy doctrine of the Catholic Religion to lose prestige in the eyes of foreigners."¹⁰ The second unfinished manuscript, entitled by translator Juan Collas, *Friars and Filipinos*,¹¹ is nothing but another satire of similar nature, though more caustic in tone, to *La visión de Fray Rodríguez*. As such, it has the same limitations as the latter pamphlet when used as a source of Rizal's religious thought. But its validity is lessened further still by the fact that it was never published, or even finished, by Rizal. We are therefore left in doubt as to whether he abandoned it because of its ideas, because of its inopportuneness, or for some other reason.¹²

Of much greater value, it seems to me, than any of the sources used, are the letters of Rizal to Father Pastells, on which the author bases his sixth chapter. Here Rizal expresses his religious ideas, particularly on the key subjects of the

written perhaps for the Filipinos in Madrid, and not intended for publication. In consideration of the Catholic tone in which it is written, it would seem to be not later than 1884.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 246-247. Also in Hessel, p. 119.

¹¹ To be found in Juan Collas (ed.), *Rizal's Unread Legacy* (Manila: Bookman, 1957), only in English translation. It has since been published in the original Spanish under the title "Una visita del Señor a las Filipinas", in *Prosa por José Rizal* ("Publicaciones de la Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal: Escritos de José Rizal," tomo III; "Obras literarias," libro II), pp. 125-152.

¹² One possible reason, at least partial, would be his unwillingness to attack Archbishop Payo after the latter's death on January 1, 1889. (The passage attacking Payo is that cited by Hessel, p. 122). See Rizal's letter to Ponce on January 6, 1889, urging that if *La visión de Fray Rodríguez* had not yet been printed, that the reference there to the Archbishop should be *lambut lambutan*, or even removed. (*Epistolario Rizalino*, II, 102).

validity of supernatural revelation, the authority of the Church, and the divinity of Christ, in clear and relatively systematic fashion. These letters, moreover, are significant, as Dr. Hessel observes, because they represent the latest, and presumably the mature expression of Rizal's views.

But precisely here, I believe, is the third methodological defect in this book. For Rizal's religious views were certainly not static during this period from 1884 to 1893, a period during which he was reading widely, and making contacts with men of widely differing ideological and religious backgrounds, in many nations. This, of course, Dr. Hessel is aware of, and notes it on more than one occasion. But his attempt to summarize Rizal's religious beliefs systematically after studying the individual writings would seem to ignore this process of evolution in Rizal's religious ideas, for the conclusions from all the various chapters are gathered together into one set of principles. It is possible that Rizal held all these beliefs at one and the same time and in mutual relationship to one another, but I do not believe this has been demonstrated. Furthermore, for this reason, as well as for the other methodological objections raised above, I do not think that it has been shown that Rizal can in any real sense be said to have developed a systematic body of religious thought.

There seems to be little doubt that by the time Rizal wrote the *Noli* he no longer considered himself a Catholic, not because of any particular doctrine he may or may not have called into question in his novel, but because he no longer accepted the Church as the organ of supernatural revelation, nor even the existence of supernatural revelation as such.¹³ No doubt Rizal drew a number of logical conclusions from this premise, denying the authority of the Bible, for example, and consequently, the divinity of Jesus Christ. But I find no evidence that he systematically developed the conclusions of his position. This seems to be demonstrated by the fact, mentioned by Dr. Hessel, of his silence on many points of religious

¹³ See, for example, *Epistolario Rizalino*, V, 11-12, 370-371, 534-535; also Rizal's letter to his mother from sometime in 1885, in *One Hundred Letters of José Rizal to his Parents, Brother, Sisters, Relatives* (Manila: Philippine National Historical Society, 1959), 224.

doctrine (pp. 96, 204). I think it is significant that the creed into which Dr. Hessel tries to sum up Rizal's main religious views (pp. 176-177) could be accepted as it stands, with the exception of the implicit denial of the divinity of Christ and the uniqueness of His revelation, by any orthodox Catholic. In other words, once Rizal had rejected the Church and her authority in favor of reason as supreme arbiter of religious truth, he did not work out systematically all the logical conclusions of this position, but only as need occurred, through the exigencies of polemic or for purposes of attacking abuses connected with a particular doctrine. It is my own belief that though Rizal could in no sense be called a Catholic, certainly after 1886, the *material content* of his beliefs remained largely Catholic, partly out of rational conviction, partly simply because he never found occasion to question them. This is, of course, only a working hypothesis, which my own reading of Rizal makes seem well-founded, but which is in need of further verification.

This point of the Catholic content of much of Rizal's thought brings us to Dr. Hessel's comparison of Rizal's thought with Catholicism in his ninth chapter, and from time to time throughout the book. To prevent misunderstanding, I would like to reiterate what I said at the beginning of this article about the efforts Dr. Hessel evidently made to be fair and objective in his presentation of Catholicism. But I am afraid that at times his unfamiliarity with Catholic theological thought and an exaggerated concept of its rigidity has led him to misinterpret both the orthodoxy in Catholic terms of much of Rizal's thought, and even at times Rizal's meaning itself. No instructed Catholic, for example could object to the statement that it is presumptuous, even blasphemous, for a person "...to ascribe to God every movement of his lips, to present every whim of his as God's will, and to brand his own enemy as God's enemy"; nor is this to call the Sacrament of Order into question (pp. 90, 105). Nor can any Catholic fail to affirm that interior repentance is "...the *sine qua non* for the forgiveness of sins..." and that even if "...all the priests on earth mumbled prayers and sprinkled oceans of holy water, still all this would not purify a rogue or forgive his sin if he

himself did not repent" (p. 105). No less than Rizal, any Catholic must "...react strongly against the notion that the Sacrament of Penance... is as important as the attitude of the penitent..." (pp. 227). There is a complete misunderstanding of the idea of indulgences (pp. 95, 101, etc.), and none of the abuses and superstitions connected with them which Rizal ridicules need find any approval from Catholics. It is certainly misleading to say that "... all of the practices which the novel mentions...conform to her [the Church's] doctrine..." (p. 27), when some of them are certainly reprobated completely by the Church, others merely tolerated, and none of them are obligatory on any Catholic, even if perhaps they may be promoted by some priests. The interpretation of the Council of Trent on grace (pp. 226-227) is incorrect, and there is a complete misunderstanding of the sense in which the Church interprets Scripture (p. 151). No Catholic theologian would find fault with Rizal for rejecting the quotation from Matthew 12:32 as a proof of the existence of Purgatory; in fact, most modern Catholic exegetes would insist that no idea of Purgatory is implied at all in that particular verse.¹⁴ Dr. Hessel is very ill-served with regard to Catholic doctrine on miracles by the passage quoted from Professor Langella, which is both historically and theologically a caricature (pp. 220-221). Likewise, fully to accept Dr. Mackay's notoriously hostile interpretation of Spanish Catholicism (p. 257), would demand some empirical verification for nineteenth-century Philippines. The mere fact of the widespread devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, (indicated among other ways by the statue of the Sacred Heart carved by Rizal as an Ateneo student), even if it often took an overly sentimental and theologically dubious form, would at least modify the distortions of Mackay and Unamuno. Even in his use of Catholic sources such as Bellarmine or Canon Smith's popularization (p. 220), Dr. Hessel fails to realize that Bellarmine and much of Smith's textbook represent a presentation of Catholicism which, if orthodox, certainly does not represent all of Catholic thinking,

¹⁴ See, e.g. David Michael Stanley, S.J. *New Testament Reading Guide: The Gospel of St. Matthew* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1960), p. 43.

nor by any means the best and most modern. These examples could be multiplied to a considerable number, much as I regret having had to mention them, for they are certainly due to lack of familiarity with Catholic thought rather than to any conscious misrepresentation. But the unfortunate effect, besides propagating a false view of Catholicism, is to distort the religious position of Rizal, which can only be fully understood by knowing what he was revolting against in taking many of the positions which he did.¹⁵

I would certainly agree that Rizal (in his later years at least) was neither a Catholic nor a Protestant, though I cannot see what substantive meaning can be given to calling him "... Christian, interpreted broadly" (p. 255). For if one does not believe in the revelation made by God through Jesus Christ, the Son of God, it does not seem that he can be called Christian in any proper sense of the word, Catholic or Protestant, no matter how orthodox, or how lofty his other religious beliefs may be. Nor can I see any justification for saying that Rizal had an affinity in spirit with Catholicism because its "... pageantry... appealed to his poetic soul..." (p. 235). Rather, on the showing of this book (pp. 124-25, 214-215, etc.), much of this "pageantry" was precisely what repelled him. Even less do I think we can find an unconsciously Protestant tendency in Rizal "... subjecting all aspects of religious truth to free evaluation through the guidance of the Holy Spirit..." (p. 235). Apart from the fact that many Catholics would wish to claim the same tendency for themselves, Rizal, though he indeed wished to subject all as-

¹⁵ Without wishing to enter into the increasingly sterile controversy on Rizal's retraction (see my remarks in my review of Guerrero's biography of Rizal in *PS XII* (1964), 537-538), I find a most extraordinary confusion of issues in the statement that "... In stressing Rizal's recantation, one is at the same time destroying the historically significant Rizal, the Philippine patriot..." (p. 259). Only misunderstanding Catholic doctrine completely can explain this confusion of Rizal's acceptance of the authority of the Church with a repudiation of his patriotism and his struggle for freedom. Even the wording of the retraction itself makes clear its purely religious character, in contrast to those of many others who sought pardon in 1896 by making retractions which were both political and religious.

pects of religious truth to free evaluation, did not wish to do it under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, but rather under the light of human reason alone, as this book has likewise shown (pp. 132-135, etc.).

Finally, there is the question of the intellectual influences in Europe which helped to shape Rizal's religious thought. A great deal of patient research is necessary before it can be said what European thinkers influenced Rizal. The fact of coincidences of tendency means little in this connection, unless Rizal can be shown to have had some contact with the thinker in question. Clearly he did with Renan's *Vie de Jésus* and with the works of Voltaire. But rather than in German Protestant thought, among men such as Ritschl, Schleiermacher, Strauss, it seems to me that the primary forces in Rizal's religious thinking are likely to be found in the readings of his student days in Spain, in the thought of Pi y Margall, of the *krausistas*, etc. There are undoubtedly others as well, but I think that research for the intellectual influences on Rizal must begin along these lines.

If I have devoted considerable space to pointing out defects in the book of Doctor Hessel, it is because I consider the subject of Rizal's religious thought of some importance, and because this is the first attempt to make an extended scholarly study of that thought, one done with considerable diligence and sincere efforts at objectivity. In spite of the criticisms I have made, the book contains solid contributions towards any future study. Among them might be mentioned his treatment of Rizal's thought on non-violence in chapter three, and in general, his tabulation of passages in the writings considered which are related to Rizal's religious thought in some way. Whether or not one gives them the same interpretation, the signalling out of such passages will be of considerable value for any further study.

To supplement the remarks I have made on methodology, I should like to add something on the lines of approach I believe a complete study of Rizal's religious thought must take. The investigation into the content of this thought, must first of all, as I have said, be based primarily on the biographical

materials available for Rizal, particularly his letters and other autobiographical writings. Besides the primary value of these writings for knowing Rizal's real mind, the knowledge of the circumstances and intention of his other writings, seen in the context of Rizal's situation and attitudes at the time they were written, will help to interpret these published works properly as a source for Rizal's own personal views. These writings must, moreover, be studied in terms of the literary genre proper to each if they are to give valid conclusions. Further, the investigation should be a genetic study, basing itself on the hypothesis—rather solidly supported, I think,—that there was considerable evolution in Rizal's religious (as well as political) ideas through the years, and attempting to trace that evolution stage by stage. This certainly can only be done with constant reference to Rizal's personal life.

Besides the mere content of Rizal's thought, it seems important to know why he came to think that way. Clearly, his Catholicism forms the point of departure for his religious thinking. The positions which he would later take would generally be in terms of that Catholicism, whether retaining what he had learned as a boy, or reacting against it. What kind of Catholicism was Rizal acquainted with? The evidence we have points to a rather narrow and intransigent presentation of Catholic doctrine, hardly calculated to meet the difficulties of an independent and inquiring mind like Rizal's, as much of what Father Pastells wrote bears witness. But further research is needed, for example, into the textbooks used in religion and philosophy at the Ateneo Municipal and at Santo Tomás. My own researches into Spanish Traditionalist and Integrism thought¹⁶ and Jesuit history make me think that in some respects, notably the question of Liberalism and Catholicism, the Jesuits of the Ateneo may have been representatives of the most intransigent currents of Spanish Catholic thought, and certainly Spanish Catholic thought itself was in the nineteenth century far more narrow and intransigent than French and German Catholicism generally were. There

¹⁶ See my "Integrism: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Spanish Politico-Religious Thought," *Catholic Historical Review* XLVIII, 3 (1962), 343-364.

never was any true Liberal Catholic movement in nineteenth-century Spain, where Liberalism meant anti-clericalism if not anti-Catholicism. There is little or no evidence that Rizal had any contact with Catholic thought outside Spain, and one cannot help wondering what difference it might have made in his thinking if he had, though this is speculation rather than history.

Finally there is the question of the influences Rizal's thought underwent in the years after 1882. My own impression is that most of the influences on his religious and philosophical thought date from the years 1882-1885, while he was still a student at the University of Madrid, though of course his intellectual development did not stop at this point. But after he left Spain he was largely occupied with his novel, and what reading he did outside his medical and linguistic studies, seems to have been more in ethnology, anthropology, and philology, particularly after he went to Germany and began to correspond with Blumentritt. On his return to Europe in 1888, he directed his attention chiefly to the history of the Philippines for his edition of Morga, and his collaboration with *La Solidaridad* and the work of the Propaganda.¹⁷ We have an extensive list of the books known to have formed part of Rizal's library, or to have been read by him, and a study of his letters may reveal even more.¹⁸ Considerable light on the intellectual milieu in late nineteenth-century Spain is promised by the new full-length study of the *krausistas* and the *Institución Libre de Enseñanza*.¹⁹ The first volume, though

¹⁷ In 1888 he seems to have been reading a few books on religion, but they apparently confirmed rather than changed his ideas. That which made most impression on him seems to have been *Die Religion und die Religionen* of Karl Julius Weber. See *Epistolario Rizalino*, V, 287, 291-292.

¹⁸ For a listing of all the bibliographical cards made by Rizal, and considerable information on other books he is known to have read, see Esteban A. de Ocampo, *Rizal as a Bibliophile* (Manila: The Bibliographical Society of the Philippines, 1960; Occasional Papers, no. 2).

¹⁹ Vicente Cacho Viu, *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, Tomo I: *Orígenes y etapa universitaria* (1860-1881), (Madrid: Rialp, 1962). 574 pp.

stopping short of the years which interest us directly, is enlightening not only on this group which occupied the center of the intellectual stage in Spanish liberal circles, but likewise on the other intellectual currents of that period in Spain.

There may be, and probably are, other lines of investigation which ought to be undertaken for a profound study of Rizal's religious thought and the influences which contributed to its formation. But I have offered these suggestions as lines of approach which I think will certainly be fruitful for such an investigation, and many of which will contribute not only to understanding Rizal's religious thought, but also to a further knowledge of his philosophical and political thinking. It is a task which demands a great deal of research and patient study, but one whose accomplishment could be fruitful not only for a deeper understanding of the man Rizal, but for further insight into the entire history of Filipino nationalism in the nineteenth century and its contemporary relevance.

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER, S.J.

"*Sacra Doctrina*" in St. Thomas Aquinas

THE English-speaking Dominican Fathers have begun to provide the learned world with a new English version of St. Thomas's *Summa Theologiae*. This new work, a contribution of extraordinary worth to theology, will be completed in sixty volumes, and will end where its author left it, unfinished, with his presentation of the sacrament of penance.

Up to now only three of the projected sixty volumes* have reached this reviewer, the first, the second and the thirteenth.

* This is a review of the projected series, plus a few examples from the three volumes received.

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY (*Ia, 1*). By Saint Thomas Aquinas. Latin text, English translation, introduction, notes appendices and glossary by Thomas Gilby, O.P. New York: Blackfriars in conjunction with McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1964. xxiii, 2-165 pp. (*Summa Theologiae*, v. 1).