

philippine studies

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

Rizal and Blumentritt

John N. Schumacher

Philippine Studies vol. 2, no. 2 (1954): 85–101

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>

Rízal and Blumentritt

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER

Of the three hundred or so letters written by Rizal himself and preserved in the *Epistolario Rizalino*, more than one-third were sent to "my dearest friend and brother" Ferdinand Blumentritt; and among the other letters of the *Epistolario* written to Rizal, a large number are those of Blumentritt. It is not surprising then that much of the information available on the life and ideas of Rizal has come from the correspondence of these two men. Most of Rizal's biographers agree, besides, that the influence of Blumentritt on Rizal was very great in many respects. Yet in spite of this, little or nothing has been yet written on Blumentritt himself, and few Filipinos today who are not students of Philippine history even know who he was.

One respect in which the influence of Blumentritt on Rizal deserves to be studied is that which regards his attitude toward the Church. This essay, therefore, will attempt to trace the religious attitude of Blumentritt from his own writings and from those of Rizal, and, as far as possible, to indicate the influence of that attitude on the religious ideas of Rizal.

WHO WAS BLUMENTRITT ?

Blumentritt was an Austrian scholar, director of the Athenaeum of Leitmeritz in Bohemia, then part of

the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In common with many other German and Austrian scholars of his day, he was studying and writing a good deal on the ethnology, geography, and linguistics of the Far East, and, in particular, of the Philippines. One of his works on Tagalog fell into the hands of Rizal while he was studying at the University of Heidelberg, and, overjoyed at finding such interest in his homeland there in Germany, Rizal immediately wrote to Blumentritt, sending him a Tagalog arithmetic book. Thus began the correspondence from which developed a friendship that was to grow ever stronger up to Rizal's death, in spite of the fact that the only time that the two friends ever saw each other in all those years was the week Rizal spent with the Blumentritts in Leitmeritz in May, 1887.

FRIENDSHIP OF RIZAL AND BLUMENTRITT

The warmth of the friendship between the middle-aged German scholar and the young Rizal springs forth from almost every letter in the correspondence between these two men, manifesting very humanly "the intimate brotherhood we both have and feel for each other."¹ Rizal's letters especially are full of such expressions and show the deep affection he felt, and the influence Blumentritt must have had on him. Time and again he tells him, "You understand me completely; you read my innermost thoughts, and that gives me great joy . . ." ²; ". . . from you I have no secret."³ And there are other such demonstrations of affection and trust. The most striking proof of their warm affection, however, is the fact that of the four letters written by Rizal on the day before his execution, three were to his family—to his mother, his father, and his brother, Paciano—and the fourth was addressed to "My dear brother . . . my best and dearest friend. . . ." ⁴

As might be expected from such a deep friendship, Blumentritt seems to have had an influence on Rizal

in many respects. At the publication of each of his books, it was to Blumentritt that Rizal looked for approval, and it was his judgment that he valued most, as he told him in a letter after receiving his praise for the *Noli Me Tangere*.⁵ And after receiving Blumentritt's comment on the *El Filibusterismo*, Rizal wrote,

At last I breathe freely and happily; I was waiting fearfully for your judgment. It has come, and though I must believe that there is much kindness in it, still I look to the future consoled. . . .⁶

Again when he came to publish his annotated edition of the *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* of Antonio de Morga, it was Blumentritt he asked to write the prologue.

Write the prologue as if I were not dear to you, as if you had never made my acquaintance. Find fault with whatever does not please you, praise what you find right. . . .⁷

Blumentritt did not hesitate to find fault with what did not seem right to him, and pointed out that Rizal was inclined to judge the past too much by present standards, and that he was unjust at times in attacking Catholicism rather than those ministers of religion who had abused their position and dignity.⁸ Rizal deferred to the judgment of his friend and had Blumentritt's criticism printed with his book.

At another time Rizal wrote to Blumentritt:

In the following letters I will describe some happenings of my life in the Philippines. Do you be the cold-blooded judge; forget that I am your friend, and tell me whether I am right or not. *Your judgment I will honor as the judgment of posterity.*⁹

Such examples of Rizal's esteem of Blumentritt's judgment could be multiplied, but these should suffice

to show that Blumentritt did exercise great influence on Rizal's ideas. With this in mind, it is reasonable to suppose that Blumentritt's religious ideas and attitudes must have had their influence on the religious ideas of Rizal. In order to trace this influence, therefore, it is necessary first to examine what the religious ideas of Blumentritt were.

RELIGIOUS BELIEF OF BLUMENTRITT

About the Catholicism of Blumentritt, there can be no doubt. In his pamphlet written in defense of Rizal's *Noli Me Tangere*, he speaks of having been baptized by an Augustinian friar. In the foreword to the same pamphlet Rizal speaks of Blumentritt in the following words: "Professor Blumentritt is a fervent Catholic, a submissive son of the Roman Catholic Church, which he considers to be the only true Church, and the only one bringing salvation."¹⁰

That he remained a Catholic is declared by Father Pablo Pastells, S.J., the Superior of the Jesuits in the Philippines in the latter part of Rizal's life. Pastells was frequently in correspondence with Rizal and much admired by him. In his history of the work of the Jesuits in the Philippines in the 19th century he writes:

... although his [Blumentritt's] ideals were separatist, he always made profession of the Catholic Faith, and never could it be said of him that he had lost it; rather, on various occasions he found fault with Rizal, according to the latter's own avowal, for having abandoned it.¹¹

Of course it is very possible for a man to be a baptized Catholic, and yet have little of Catholic ideas. Was Blumentritt, then, a Catholic in fact as well as in name? There seems to be good evidence for concluding that he was.

His letter of condolence on the death of Rizal's sister Olympia clearly shows Catholic ideas on life

after death and on the saints, and God's reward of the good.

. . . God grant her eternal rest! The most lofty sentiment that religion can inspire in one is that one can console himself at the death of a loved one that he will someday meet him again in that place of Heaven where God and the saints dwell. When the good Creator someday calls me forth from this world into that glorious one, I hope that there I [may meet those whom on earth] it was not granted me to know, all your parents, brothers, sisters, nephews, nieces. . . .¹²

An even more significant letter is to be found later when Rizal was deported to Dapitan in 1892. On hearing of this misfortune, Blumentritt wrote to console him and finished his letter by saying, "we are begging the Most Holy Virgin that she may favor you with her protection."¹³ The manly devotion of a true Catholic, turning to our Lady in time of need, a devotion far from the minds of free-thinkers and rationalists, stands out clearly here. Not only did Blumentritt believe in our Lady's power, but he assured Rizal that he and his family were praying to our Lady for the safety of their friend.

As a sincere Catholic, he lamented Rizal's loss of his Catholic Faith, and, as may be seen from various sources, tried to bring him back to his religion. Shortly after the two men first became acquainted, Blumentritt wrote his second letter to Rizal, admonishing him about the remarks made in a previous letter of Rizal's against the Friars and the Church. The letter of Blumentritt, however, is unfortunately not among those preserved in the *Epistolario Rizalino*, but the answer of Rizal gives some indication of the contents of the admonitions.

Your good and friendly admonitions about religion make me very grateful, and I shall not forget them. With reference to the Friars, I also acknowledge and admit that they have brought much good,—at least they have wished to do so. . . .¹⁴

Likewise, in his letters to the Jesuits of the Ateneo, Blumentritt often spoke of Rizal's loss of his Faith. Blumentritt corresponded with several of the Fathers at the Ateneo on scientific matters concerned with the Philippines, for example, with Father Faura, the famous meteorologist, Father Ricart, Father Sanchez, and other former professors of Rizal. In *Rizal y su Obra*, a collection of articles written for the magazine *La Juventud* in Barcelona, Father Balaguer,¹⁵ the Jesuit who assisted Rizal in making his retraction from Masonry, tells of Rizal's return to the Philippines from Europe in 1887.

... The young man presented himself at the Ateneo Municipal to visit its Rector, Reverend Father Ramon, and his former professor, Reverend Father Faura. These men, knowing even more from the writings of Rizal than from the information received from Blumentritt the change in the young man, and the great ravages wrought in his soul by impiety, attempted to draw him back to the right path.¹⁶

In another passage in the same work the author writes:

... he [Rizal] then began some journeys through Europe, in one of which he met in Leitmeritz the renowned philologist, Ferdinand Blumentritt, who appreciated at once the talents of Rizal. Even then he suspected that Rizal had fallen into the snares of the abominable sect of Masons; a fear which he communicated to Reverend Father Faura in a letter which he wrote to him, lavish with praise for the former pupil of the learned and worthy Jesuit.¹⁷

The statement of Father Pastells previously quoted mentions that Rizal himself told the Jesuits of the efforts of Blumentritt to bring him back to the true Faith. "... on various occasions he found fault with Rizal, according to the latter's own avowal, for having abandoned it."¹⁸

Again in the prologue which Blumentritt wrote in

1890 when Rizal published his annotated edition of Antonio de Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, he found fault with Rizal's attitude toward the Church.

. . . The second thing with which I am not in agreement is some of your grievances against Catholicism; I believe that not in religion, but in the harsh methods and abuses of many priests should we look for the origin of many events lamentable for religion. . . .¹⁹

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE FRIARS

The evidence put forth so far shows Blumentritt to have been a Catholic, not merely in name, but apparently a sincere one, who felt deeply the defection of his friend from the Church. Yet Father Pastells speaks of him as being an ". . . open enemy of the Friars. . . ." ²⁰ Some explanation seems necessary.

If we look back to the time when Blumentritt first met Rizal and other Filipinos in Europe, it is clear that he was at that time a staunch defender of the Friars, and was then even in correspondence with some Augustinians in the Philippines on scientific matters. In the early letter to Rizal mentioned above, in which Blumentritt admonished Rizal about his attacks on the Church, he specifically spoke about how much good the Friars had brought to the Philippines. Rizal replied, admitting that the Friars had brought much good, but went on to assert,

. . . they have been all too well and richly paid for it; they receive for these Christian efforts riches on earth and in Heaven.

Dear sir; You know our homeland only through the books which the Friars and Spaniards and foreigners have written; they copy from one another. If you had been born and brought up as I have, in the midst of our villages; if you had heard what our farmers believe, say, think, and suffer, you would surely think differently of Catholicism in the Philippines. . . .²¹

As time went on, Blumentritt, no doubt under the

influence of Rizal, seems to have been brought to the side of those who opposed the Friars. For example, in a letter of October 15, 1890 to Rizal, he speaks of a second article he is writing for *La Solidaridad* (the newspaper of the Filipino Propaganda in Barcelona), entitled "Frailes y Clerigos" (Friars and Secular Clergy), which "... will please the Friars even less [than the first article], for there also I tear the mask off their faces."²²

Certain factors should be taken into consideration which throw light on this attitude of Blumentritt. First of all, he did not condemn all Friars. In his monograph in defense of the *Noli Me Tangere* he writes:

... Let me, however, call to the minds of all the Friars as final the words of a good German Catholic (Reinhold Baumstark):

"Unjust in every respect is the common belief that right is found clearly and unconditionally on one side, while wrong is completely on the other side. Just as surely as there can exist only one single and unique divine truth, so also it is undeniable that its earthly leaders, even though they desire to serve, and actually are serving a good cause, nonetheless *give their adversaries reason to believe that these adversaries have right on their side* by their injustices, by the harshness and cruelty of their proceedings, by their passions and sins of all kinds. . . ."²³

In other words, the idea of Blumentritt seems to have been that he could with all respect to his Catholic Faith attack the Friars of the Philippines because of the abuses he sincerely believed some of them had committed and were committing. It was certain men that he was attacking, and not the Church. That this is the way Rizal understood his attitude is clear from what Rizal says in the brief commendation of Blumentritt which is found prefixed to the fifth volume of the *Epistolario Rizalino*—"En Elogio de Blumentritt": "Although the author is a good Catholic and

submissive to the Roman Catholic Church, *he does not, however, confuse dogma with fanaticism, or man with God. . . .*"²⁴ By which Rizal meant that Blumentritt did not think that Catholic orthodoxy required him to espouse unconditionally the cause of the religious in the Philippines or to defend their whole program.

An even clearer confirmation of this is to be found in a letter written by Rizal to Blumentritt on his final return from Europe to the Philippines in 1891. Writing on the ship, he tells Blumentritt:

There are coming with us many missionaries, Franciscans, Jesuits, and a bishop, Monsignor Volenter, who was in the Philippines twenty-three years ago. This holy old man had deep pity for the conditions in my fatherland; he spoke against the riches and abuses of the Friars in the Philippines. I would have wished that you might have heard him speak. *He thought exactly as you do.* He described the Philippines as a paradise, only mistreated and exploited.²⁵

If Monsignor Volenter, a Catholic bishop, "thought exactly as you do," Blumentritt's idea must have been that it was the abuses which deserved to be attacked and those who committed them, not the Church; for it can hardly be conceived that a bishop would think that the Church should be attacked.

The second point to be considered is Blumentritt's knowledge of the situation of the Friars in the Philippines. That there were abuses among the Friars is undoubtedly true, as it is of any group of men anywhere and at any period. The number of these abuses and their greatness, however, have certainly been exaggerated by enemies of the Church, particularly by the Masons. Even those who were undoubtedly sincere, like Rizal, seem often to have lost perspective in their struggle for the good of their country, and tended to put forth views which did not completely correspond to reality. The picture of the Friars in the *Noli Me*

Tangere, for instance, might give the impression that all Friars were of the types there represented, which was certainly not true, as Rizal himself admitted. In a letter to Blumentritt, telling how his former professor at the Ateneo, Father Sanchez, had said that he would have done better to write a book about the ideal priests so as to show a contrast with the bad ones, Rizal tells how he answered him.

... I answered him that I did not write for the thinking readers, but rather for the public, who do not think; that there are many books which picture the ideal priests, and which the bad ones use to clothe themselves with lambs' skins like wolves. I told him that I wished to awaken my countrymen from their slumber, and that one who wishes to wake someone does not use soft and low sounds, but loud ones and explosions.²⁶

Rizal thus admits that all Friars are not like the Padre Damaso or Padre Salvi of his novel, but he felt that only by such vivid pictures of such types, which did exist in a few cases, would he be able to arouse his countrymen. Though he did not deny that there were good Friars, he felt that he could not correct the abuses by fine distinctions and nicely balanced shades. It was necessary to stir men up; therefore he would paint the bad side of the picture in its most vivid colors.

So too, undoubtedly, others of Blumentritt's friends gave him similar pictures, telling him of abuses from which they had suffered. Since on the other hand Blumentritt's friends among the Friars soon ceased to correspond with him, his idea of the situation may have become rather one-sided.

All this does not imply bad faith on the part of anyone, and particularly on the part of Rizal, for he was usually careful to check the truth of reports which reached him of happenings back in the Philippines. If the reports could not be verified, he would not make

use of them. None the less, Rizal, and his associates were moved by an ardent desire to see their country free, which the Friars, being Spaniards, naturally opposed, and thus politics and religion frequently were mixed in those times. It is difficult to get a completely objective picture even now. How much more so then!

With regard to the attitude of Blumentritt toward the Friars, then, his intention was only to attack the individuals who were guilty of abuses, and by no means to attack the Church; and secondly, he accepted substantially the picture of those abuses which Rizal and his friends painted for him. But he did not think that this position was incompatible with a profession of sincere Catholicity.

BLUMENTRITT'S DEFENSE OF THE *Noli*

Another objection to his Catholicism might be the fact that he wrote in defense of the *Noli Me Tangere*. How could he have ignored the theological errors which are certainly contained there?

First of all, Blumentritt did not defend the errors against the Catholic Faith, nor was he ignorant of them. In his monograph written to defend the *Noli* he says, "I repeat once more that I regret that Rizal has included in his book some theological considerations, thus giving arms to his enemies to attack him."²⁷ It is true that he does not make any effort to refute them, but he does not agree with them in any way.

Moreover, Blumentritt was not alone in defending the *Noli Me Tangere*. Others of much more respectable theological stature did. One of the Filipino secular priests of the Archdiocese of Manila, a canon of the Cathedral, who had translated the *Imitation of Christ* into Tagalog, also wrote a defense of the *Noli*, trying to show that the novel did not necessarily deny Catholic doctrine. Rizal wrote of him to Blumentritt:

I have good news to give you. An old priest to whom I am personally unknown, a doctor in theology and philosophy, and holding a high position in the Cathedral at Manila, has undertaken my defense against Father Rodriguez [an Augustinian who had written against the *Noli*], in which he interprets the *Noli Me Tangere* as being very Christian. . . . his name is Father Vicente García. I have read an extract from the letter; it is printed. He is an Indian [*Indio*], of course! Ask the Jesuits about him. . . . Is it not good news? It makes me almost weep for joy! ²⁸

And in a letter to Rizal from Mariano Ponce, another of the Filipinos in Europe in the work of the Propaganda, the contents of the defense of Father García may be seen. In it, Father García rejects the charges of heresy, attempting to show that only the interpretations of ignorant people and fanatics are ridiculed, and not the true Catholic doctrines.²⁹ Whatever may be said of the validity of this defense, and it certainly seems to be rather tenuous on some points, interpreting things in a way in which it seems from Rizal's letters elsewhere, he himself did not intend them, nevertheless it helps to make clear how a Catholic layman like Blumentritt could have defended the novel as a whole without surrendering his Catholic loyalty.

In another letter Rizal tells Blumentritt, speaking of the Jesuits at the Ateneo,

. . . Father Sanchez, my rhetoric teacher, dared to defend me in public, and to praise my book, and yet in secret he told me I could have done better to write an ideal book where I could have sketched a completely ideal picture of the ideal priests, etc., and thus brought to light the contrast. . . .³⁰

Certainly Father Sanchez did not praise the errors in the book, but he did defend it as a whole, just as Blumentritt did.

If, moreover, one reads the contemporary attacks on the book, it is clear how inextricably the feelings of men were mixed on the questions of Spanish rule

and the Catholic religion. Many of the condemnations of the book were easily open to dispute by a sincere Catholic, because they did not condemn it on theological grounds only, but mingled in political reasons. It was easy for apologists to fall into the same confusion, defending the novel against the political arguments and ignoring the theological difficulties.

RELIGIOUS INFLUENCE ON RIZAL

To trace the exact influence of one man's ideas on another's is often a difficult task. There may be a certain amount of conscious influence, when one is directly persuaded by another to change his ideas, but often enough the influence may be a less easily perceptible and gradual change of attitudes. Such in general seems to have been the case with Blumentritt and Rizal. A few instances, however, can be pointed out where there is reason to think that Blumentritt did exercise a discernible influence on the religious ideas of Rizal.

One of these may be in connection with the writing of the *Noli Me Tangere*. When he was in Dapitan after his deportation in 1892, Rizal carried on a lengthy correspondence with Father Pastells, the Superior of the Jesuits in the Philippines at that time, and his former friend at the Ateneo, discussing various points of Catholic doctrine. In one of his letters, Father Pastells attributed Rizal's loss of his Faith and the doctrinal errors in his books to his stay in Germany.

. . . That took place which could hardly be prevented from happening, and which a certain Austrian professor, a close friend of yours [Blumentritt], had already predicted, namely, you were taken possession of by the Protestants, and a little later by the Freemasons. The result of the first capture was the Rizal of the *Noli Me Tangere*, and of the second, the Rizal of the *El Filibusterismo*. . . .³¹

To this Rizal replied, saying that most of the *Noli*

had been written before he came to Germany, and adding,

In honor to the truth, however, I will say that correcting my work in Germany, I retouched it a good deal, and reduced it more, but also that I tempered my impetuosity, softening many phrases, and reducing many things to more just proportions, according to the broader vision I had acquired of things seen from afar, as my imagination cooled in the midst of the calmness peculiar to that people. . . . I can add this besides: no German had knowledge of my book before it was published: not Blumentritt, who always praised the Catholic religion to me in his letters, nor Virchow, nor Jagor, nor Joest.

. . .³²

Rizal had written half of the *Noli* in Spain, and one-fourth in Paris before he arrived in Germany in February, 1886, as he tells Father Pastells earlier in the same letter. During his time in Germany he completed the book, and then worked on its revision, finally finishing it about February, 1887. His first letter to Blumentritt was in July 1886, and in early August Blumentritt wrote to him, and began admonishing him about his attacks on religion and the Friars. It seems then that the period of the revision of his book must have come after he began to hear from Blumentritt, and to be admonished by him about the Catholic religion.

In the light of this, it is reasonable to think that it was the moderating counsel of Blumentritt which was mainly responsible for his tempering of his work and the softening of some of his attacks on religion. It is certain, of course, as can be seen from the last sentence of the above quotation, that Blumentritt did not advise him on the *Noli* itself, since he did not even know of it at that time, but the admonitions which he had given Rizal about his letters were surely not lost on the author in the revision of his novel.

An even more important instance of the probable influence of Blumentritt on Rizal's religious attitude

is his retraction of Masonry. Among those who refuse to accept the authenticity of the retraction, some, like Palma, claim that such an act was psychologically impossible, that Rizal could not, in one day, have turned from disbelief in so many Catholic doctrines to entire and perfect submission to the Church. As Father J. Cavanna, C.M., points out in his thorough study of the retraction, *Rizal's Unfading Glory*,³³ such an act would seem impossible only to one who disbelieves in the grace of God. Yet, there were other preceding natural causes which helped to prepare Rizal for the final step of retraction. The letters of Father Pastells, the discussions with Father Sanchez and other Jesuits in Dapitan, did not, it is true, succeed in winning Rizal over at the time, but they did have their effect in preparing his soul. The same may be said of Blumentritt's efforts to bring him back to the Church. They may not have always produced an immediately observable effect, but in the course of the years, like water falling on a stone and gradually wearing it away, Rizal was helped to see the light again.

CONCLUSIONS

Perhaps the keynote of the religious attitude of Blumentritt is to be found in a letter of Rizal's to him in May, 1895, a little over a year before their correspondence was terminated by the death of Rizal. Rizal had just received word of the death of Anacleto del Rosario, his close friend and fellow Sodalist at the Ateneo. Because of Rizal's estrangement from the Church, the two had gradually drifted apart, though there is a letter extant as late as 1892 in which del Rosario reminded Rizal of their student days and their devotion to our Lady in her Sodality. Rizal had never lost his affection for him, and felt his death very deeply. Writing of him to Blumentritt, he says

... In the affections of my heart, Don Anacleto represented my student friendships, as you my present

friendship—that of free investigation. Your spirit, more tolerant, if possible, even than my own, alone can follow without quarrelling with my way of thinking.³⁴

Rizal knew that Blumentritt did not agree with him fully and so his friendship was always a silent admonition. Yet tolerance was the ideal of Blumentritt, an ideal which caused him to keep silence at times when perhaps he would better have spoken. Nevertheless his was not a tolerance that believed all opinions equally true, but one that could live in peace and amity with others whose opinions were simply rejected as false. The source of this attitude of mind is not hard to find. Being a German by race, living among many Protestants as well as Catholics, and accustomed to deal with many non-Catholics in every phase of life, especially in his association with so many of the German scholars of his time who frequently were Protestants, he had learned to work with them irrespective of religious beliefs. Rizal himself had often remarked about the difference in the relationships between Catholics and Protestants in Germany as compared with those relationships in his homeland.

Blumentritt was a Catholic, a sincere Catholic, who believed in the teachings of the Church, and who wished earnestly that his dear friend, Rizal, would return to the Church. But if, in spite of his efforts, he could not persuade him, he would not quarrel, he would not break off their friendship, but would respect Rizal's opinions. When the opportunity arose, he did try to bring Rizal back, but on seeing that he could not do so it seems that he did not press him any further. He was perhaps too ready to accept Rizal's estimate of the Philippine Church, but on the whole he gives every evidence of having been most sincere in his religion. This picture of Blumentritt and his religious attitude can help throw new light for a fuller picture of Rizal and his ideas.

- ¹ Teodoro M. Kalaw, Editor, *Epistolario Rizalino* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1930-1938) Tomo 5, no. 83, p. 505.
- ² *Ibid.*, tomo 5, no. 32, p. 178.
- ³ *Ibid.*, tomo 5, no. 91, p. 565.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, tomo 5, no. 121, p. 711.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, tomo 5, no. 18, pp. 98-99.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, tomo 5, no. 99, p. 603.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, tomo 5, no. 82, p. 499.
- ⁸ See Antonio de Morga, *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, obra publicada en Méjico en año de 1609, nuevamente sacada a luz y anotada por José Rizal y precedida de un prólogo del Prof. Fernando Blumentritt (Paris: Garnier, 1890), p. XII.
- ⁹ *Epistolario*, tomo 5, no. 43, pp. 252-253. Italics supplied.
- ¹⁰ F. Blumentritt, *El Noli Me Tangere de Rizal Juzgado por el Profesor F. Blumentritt* (Barcelona: Imprenta Ibérica de Francisco Fossas, 1889) Advertencia del Editor, p. 3.
- ¹¹ Pablo Pastells, S.J., *Misión de la Compañía de Jesús de Filipinas en el Siglo XIX* (Barcelona: Tip. y Lib. Editorial Barcelonesa, 1916) tomo 2, p. 211.
- ¹² *Epistolario*, tomo 1, no. 163, p. 314.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, tomo 4, no. 560, p. 17.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, tomo 5, no. 3, p. 10.
- ¹⁵ See J. Ma. Cavanna, C.M., *Rizal's Unfading Glory* (Manila, 1952), pp. 35-36.
- ¹⁶ *El Doctor Rizal y su Obra*, reprinted by W. E. Retana, *Archivo del Bibliófilo Filipino* (Madrid: Minuesa de los Rios, 1898), tomo 4, pp. 116-118.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 107-108.
- ¹⁸ Pastells, *op. cit.*, tomo 2, p. 211.
- ¹⁹ Morga, *loc. cit.*
- ²⁰ Pastells, *loc. cit.*
- ²¹ *Epistolario*, tomo 5, no. 3, pp. 10-13.
- ²² *Ibid.*, tomo 3, no. 419, p. 116.
- ²³ Blumentritt, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
- ²⁴ *Epistolario*, tomo 5, p. V.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, tomo 5, no. 101, p. 618. Italics supplied.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, tomo 5, no. 86, pp. 531-532.
- ²⁷ Blumentritt, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
- ²⁸ *Epistolario*, tomo 5, pp. 331-333.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, tomo 2, no. 195, pp. 51-54.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, tomo 5, no. 86, pp. 530-531.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, tomo 4, no. 569, p. 44.
- ³² *Ibid.*, tomo 4, no. 575, pp. 63-64.
- ³³ Cavanna, *op. cit.*, chapter 12.
- ³⁴ *Epistolario*, tomo 5, no. 115, p. 679.