

philippine studies

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

Blessed Pedro Calungsod, Martyr: An Historian's Comments on His Philippine Background

John N. Schumacher, S.J.

Philippine Studies vol. 49, no. 3 (2001): 287–336

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 27 13:30:20 2008

Blessed Pedro Calungsod, Martyr: An Historian's Comments on His Philippine Background

John N. Schumacher, S.J.

Two serious accounts of the life and martyrdom of Blessed Pedro Calungsod have appeared, and both are having, as I understand, wide circulation. One of them, a substantial pamphlet by Father C. G. Arévalo, S.J., has gone through several printings, amounting to many thousands of copies (Arévalo 1998),¹ and has already been translated into Tagalog by Father Fernando Macalinao, S.J. (Arévalo 2000). In his pamphlet, Arévalo has based himself for the facts of the martyrdom principally on the Deposition presented to the Congregation of Saints by the Archdiocese of Cebu ([Leyson]1993). This in turn depended, apart from its introduction, on the *Positio* prepared for the beatification of Blessed Diego de San Vitores ([Ledesma]1981) for the dioceses of Manila and Agaña,² since the martyrdom of the latter was practically simultaneous with that of his companion. Indeed, as I have remarked elsewhere (Schumacher 1999, 115), with even greater reason can one be sure of the martyrdom of Blessed Pedro, since, though unarmed in

1. As of 27 November 2000, under various publishers, including one unauthorized, some 30,000 copies have been printed since this first one. (Information kindly given by Fr. C. G. Arévalo, S.J., 27 November 2000). I am also grateful to Father Arévalo for lending me his copy of the *Deposition* for Pedro Calungsod presented by the Archdiocese of Cebu, under the direction of the vice-postulator, Fr. Ildebrando Leyson.

2. The spelling in the original documents was Agaña, which was soon transformed into the Spanish form Agaña. Since the Americans took the island of Guam, the spelling Agaña is used. I have adopted that in this article. Likewise, I have adopted the name San Vitores, that under which he was beatified. Though many, perhaps most, accounts, even from the seventeenth century, use the one-word form Sanvitores, his baptismal certificate and all the catalogs and other documents of the Society of Jesus use the form San Vitores. Moreover, he always signed himself San Vitores or S. Vitores ([Ledesma] 1981, 10, 11, 14, 46, 185, etc.; and for his signature, 189, 195, etc.). Fr. Juan M. H. Ledesma, S.J., was the vice-postulator of the cause of San Vitores, and the original

accordance with San Vitores's policy for the companions of the priests, he was a young man and could likely have escaped from his assassins, as contemporary Jesuits asserted,³ while Blessed Diego, being half-blind, as all the sources emphasize, was helpless without his faithful companion and guide, who led him by a rope around his waist.⁴ Be that as it may, there is no doubt that both of them died as witnesses to their Faith.

This will be the first of two articles on Blessed Pedro. In this first article, we shall try to reconstruct, as far as that is possible, the life of the young Pedro in the Philippines, which would have prepared him to offer himself as a volunteer for the mission led by Fr. Diego de San Vitores for the evangelization of the Marianas. A subsequent article will deal with the Marianas mission itself, and the likely role that Pedro would have played in it, prior to his martyrdom.

The Sources

In the effort to portray what the life of young Pedro must have been like in the Philippines, since practically no direct information exists, Arévalo's chief source has been Father H. de la Costa's authoritative work, *The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581-1768*, surely the best account we have of the mission methods of the Jesuits, or indeed of any religious order, for that period. De la Costa, however, made only passing mention of the Marianas mission itself, principally in connection with the extensive work done by San Vitores in Mindoro and elsewhere in the Philippines, before setting out for the Marianas.

documents translated into English by Fr. Ildebrando Jesus Aliño Leyson, the vice-postulator of the cause of Pedro Calungsod ([Leyson] 1993) are from Ledesma's *Positio* for San Vitores. I am grateful to Father Ledesma for giving me a copy of the meticulously organized published *Positio* of San Vitores, and for lending me his typescript copy of the indispensable first biography of San Vitores by Fr. Francisco García (1683).

3. E.g., García 1683, 293; [Ledesma] 1981, 303; etc.

4. His problem was nearsightedness, since he did copious writing. He is pictured wearing glasses in an engraving of 1682, printed in his first biography by Francisco García, S.J., (García 1683), reproduced in [Ledesma] 1981, unnumbered plate 12. Also in Abella 1962, 10. Some sources claimed that he would not wear them because of not wishing to appear better off than the poor Chamorros; others assert that he lost his regular pair in the Marianas. Since in spite of his extreme observance of poverty and austerity, he was eminently practical when it came to dealing with the apostolate, the latter seems more probable. Moreover, he wrote to Fr. Vidal, the procurator for the mission in Mexico for six pairs of glasses of different magnifications in his list of 1669 ([Ledesma] 1981, 211).

The other published account, naturally far more extensive, is the semipopular one of Father Ildebrando Leyson, Pedro Calonsor Bissaya. Prospects of a Teenage Filipino. Here, in less technical form than in the *Deposition* presented to the Congregation for Saints, Father Leyson has provided not only a reconstruction of the life and martyrdom of Pedro, with an exhaustive bibliography, but also interesting appendices on favors granted through his intercession, well-developed reflections on Pedro for ordinary Christians accompanied by biblical themes, and even music composed in honor of Blessed Pedro. None of the latter material, of course, adds to the historical picture; it is largely devotional in character. In his attempt to provide the historical Philippine background of Pedro, Leyson likewise makes considerable use of De la Costa's book, since he considers it likely that Pedro came from a Jesuit parish.⁵ One of the major features of Father Leyson's book is his

5. Leyson (1999, 18–19) is not accurate in saying that the Jesuits were the only missionaries of the Visayas and Mindanao. By 1655 northern Mindanao was divided between Jesuits and Recoletos; Augustinians had two parishes in Cebu, and were in complete charge of Panay, except for the Jesuit college in Iloilo and the parish in Oton. The Jesuits had only a college in Cebu and the parish of Mandaue attached to it (Phelan 1959, 167–76; De la Costa 1961, 604–5). Resil B. Mojares, in an article with a different purpose, "The Epiphany of Pedro Calungsod," evidently written before the beatification but acquainted with the *Deposition* and with the process of encouraging a cult to Pedro which took place in the 1990s, rightly criticizes the assertion that Pedro was Cebuano, even with the qualification "at least in the sense that he was under the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Cebu" ([Leyson] 1993, 5; Mojares 2000, 46–47). In that definition, I might observe, even the Chamorros would be Cebuanos, since the Marianas was considered part of the diocese of Cebu. There is not the slightest evidence that he was or was not from the island of Cebu. No one knows. But geographically speaking, one can certainly say he was a Visayan, that is, from the islands of central Philippines between Luzon and Mindanao. There is no minimal evidence for anything else. All the early sources call him *Bissaya*, *Bisaya*, *natural de Bisayas*, *natural de la provincia de Bisayas*, *natural de Bisayas en Filipinas*, and in Latin, *Philippinus natione Bisaya*, and *casta bisaya* ([Ledesma] 1981, 275–348 *passim*). Though Mojares is correct in rejecting Cebuano, he apparently did not look carefully at the sources, since he habitually uses the term *bisayo*, which is his own creation, and never appears in the documents. Moreover, with the varied terminology cited above, it is clear from some of the cited expressions that what is meant is what we mean by "the Visayas" today, and Mojares's passing reference to Bisayans of Borneo is simply a red herring. In fairness to Mojares, his article does not pretend to give the life of Pedro Calungsod, but rather to discuss the process of "saint-making" in the Church and in the Philippines in particular (St. Lorenzo Ruiz, Mother Ignacia del Espiritu Santo, etc.). His analysis and methodology deserve discussion, which I hope to give them in the future, but I only became aware of the article as I was finishing this one. I will attempt here to correct a number of factual errors I have noted, but cannot now discuss the article and its approach.

exhaustive investigation into the possible birthplaces of his subject, based on where the name Calungsod is common today and on local oral traditions.⁶ In the end, however, he cannot arrive at any certain conclusions.

The present article and its sequel do not aim at supplanting these accounts of Pedro completely, least of all for his martyrdom, but to supplement them and suggest alternatives to their reconstructions, which both authors agree must necessarily be based primarily on conjectures as far as the pre-martyrdom period of Pedro's life is concerned. Since neither of them claims to be a professional historian, it is hoped that the comments of a historian may give a better basis for such conjectures or suggest more likely alternatives. At the same time, I would hope that this might provide correction to some of the distorted accounts in newspapers or popular magazines, which have taken statements, often carefully qualified by Arévalo or Leyson, but extrapolated them to anachronistic journalistic statements, sometimes verging on the fantastic. Thus our two authors speak of catechetical schools, and boarding schools of a wider curriculum, from which one popular writer spoke of "the Jesuit catechetical center in the Visayas," as if there were some large boarding school where Jesuits from all over the Visayas sent prospective catechists, an achievement far beyond the possibilities of the seventeenth century with their limited number of

6. Given the problems of Spanish missionaries in pronouncing Filipino languages, the name first appears as Calonsor (as used in Leyson's title, since this is the form employed by Father Francisco Solano, S.J., in the first written account of Pedro's martyrdom). It also appears thus in the canonical process held in the Marianas by those who knew him ([Ledesma 1981, 291-95, *passim*). Elsewhere it appears as Calonsor, Calangsor, Calongsor, etc., all of which are clearly equivalent, for one who understands the exchange and corruption of consonants and vowels between Spanish and Visayan, to the common contemporary Visayan name Calungsod. For further details, see Leyson 1999, 3-5. Mojares's statement that Pedro had "an invented surname (surnames did not exist in indigenous Filipino society)" is misleading (44). It is no doubt true that they did not exist—certainly not as a general rule—in pre-Hispanic society, but untrue that "[i]t was not until the Clavería decree of 1849 that the use of surnames became a norm in the Philippines" (58, n. 16). All of the Filipinos who appear in the San Vitores-Calungsod story (except for the Malabar Lorenzo, very likely an ex-slave) had surnames—De la Cruz, Jiménez, Bernal, Figueroa, etc. The purpose of the Clavería decree was to *standardize* surnames, and to have parents pass them on to their children, instead of each one arbitrarily selecting another saint's name as a surname in addition to the saint's name given in baptism. (Though it is not capable of proof, my own impression is that the practice of taking another saint's name in addition to the baptismal name, as a quasi-surname, is more characteristic of the late 17th and 18th centuries, when the so-called "pagan" names had been forgotten or rejected). Church

men and immense territory to care for. Similarly where Arévalo gave as the probable age for Pedro's departure for the Marianas thirteen or fourteen, at least one popular writer seized on the age thirteen, and presented an unofficial image that looks almost like a child. It likewise presents him with short curly hair. But Visayan men in the seventeenth century normally wore their hair long and straight down over the shoulders, perhaps held in place by a *putong* (Alcina 1974, *parte primera*, lib. I, cap. 2, f. 6).⁷ Worst of all, and most evidently senseless, the otherwise respected British Catholic weekly, *The Tablet*, in report-

law demanded that every Christian be given the name of a saint (and therefore a "Spanish" name in its form), whatever other names might be added. As Cullinane suggests (1998, 294) the surnames that we find in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are most probably the pre-Christian single name of the person, and therefore in the pre-1847 period would not necessarily be passed on to the son or daughter, or given to the wife of a man. [I have witnessed an analogous transitional process in the early American trusteeship in parts of Micronesia, where Micronesians with a Hispanic baptismal name, when coming to study in the Philippines in the 1950s, used their father's indigenous single name as their own surname, in order to conform to Philippine and American norms]. But even in the seventeenth century surnames were used by a whole family, as shown in the case of Felipe Sonson [Songsong] whose brother was Don Agustín Sonson. Similarly the brother of the martyred companion of Fr. Luís Medina, Hipólito de la Cruz, was called Agustín de la Cruz. Though it could be argued that this last example was that both brothers were moved by an identical religious motive, that could not be said of the Songsongs. Moreover, in spite of the skepticism shown by Cullinane as to the lists of *gobernadorcillos* assembled by John Larkin from the twentieth century Luther Parker Collection (Larkin 1972, 36), the fact that there were fourteen Songsongs who were *gobernadorcillos* in Macabebe, cannot be so easily dismissed, especially since there are thirteen other families with multiple occurrences of the same name in successive generations. It would take a forger of considerable skill and knowledge to have constructed all those *principales* families taken from Parker by Larkin. Particularly in Pampanga, where Hispanization occurred more rapidly than in most other places in the Philippines, it is not improbable that such records could have been kept down to the twentieth century in oral or written form between 1630 and 1685, together with the similar figures from one generation to the next—e.g., the Sonsons of Macabebe, Hipólito and Agustín de la Cruz, who were brothers, though other De la Cruzes were unrelated. There is no reason to believe that the name Calungsod, even if mangled by Spaniards, was not a genuine surname. If one wishes to say it was "invented," so were all such English names as Jackson, Johnson, etc., as well as those taken from some ancestor's occupation, such as Schumacher (shoemaker), Taylor (tailor), etc. It does seem certain that there was considerable variation in times and regions, as Cullinane's reference to the extreme case of a woman who changed her name nine times in the isolated Bikol town of Tigaon, mentioned in Owen 1998, 232, n. 79. Owen, however, also cautions against being sure that Tigaon was typical (244).

7. In some manuscripts of Alcina, whose original was written in 1668, there are drawings of objects mentioned, and more important, some of typical Visayans. Three

ing the beatifications of 5 March 2000 says that Pedro had worked as a catechist from 1668 to 1672, "and was martyred at the age of 14," which would have made him nine years old at the time the missionary expedition departed from the Philippines!⁸

Age

Both Arévalo and Leyson opt for a younger age, the latter basing himself on a note in the English translation of the early life of San Vitores by Francisco García, S.J., to the effect that the boys who assisted him at the start of the mission were usually between twelve and fifteen years old (García 1985, 108, n.1; in Leyson 1999, 17, n. 60).⁹ Arévalo, on the other hand, suggests thirteen or fourteen (1998, 7). Both are inconsistent as well as incorrect. Both have been influenced by the two boys whose exact age is, or is alleged to be, known, namely Diego Bazán, born in Mexico of Spanish parentage, who was fourteen¹⁰ when he joined the expedition, and Ambrosio Hagman, a Chamorro who gave testimony as to what he heard said by the assassin and

pairs, each taken from different manuscripts, which substantiate what I have written above, are in Alcina 1974, xlii and xliii, lxxviii and lxxix, lxxx and lxxxi. There is as yet no critical edition of the various more or less complete manuscripts of Alcina's unpublished work of the seventeenth century, though the project has been underway for a half-century under various auspices. I have used here, for convenience's sake, the Museo Naval facsimile edition. Though this is one of the late eighteenth century copies, the references to part, book, and chapter are the same in all manuscripts. Its advantage is that it contains in its introduction in an accessible form the drawings from the other manuscripts.

8. "Pope honours heroic witness of Church's martyrs," *The Tablet*, 11 March 2000, 362. The mission left Cavite on 7 August 1667, and having to stop first in Mexico, arrived in Guam only on 16 June 1668, almost a year later. Hence approximately five years passed between Pedro's volunteering for the mission and his martyrdom.

9. Though I have not seen this translation and used only the original Spanish for this article, of course the translator is not in any sense an authority for a historical fact. The original of García (1683) nowhere says this of *all* the young men who accompanied San Vitores in 1667. Indeed, there were some, as will be seen below, men of middle or old age, not boys in any sense. There was also one of "a little more than twelve years old," whom we will explain below. No doubt Higgins's note as to the boys being twelve to fifteen is based on him, together with the two persons cited by Leyson and Arévalo.

10. Arévalo gives his age as "thirteen or fourteen" (1998, 7). It is true that Risco (1970, 189) says that he was thirteen, but gives no source for such a statement. García (1683, 289), on whom Risco for the most part depends in his novelistic account, clearly says fourteen.

others. He is reported by Arévalo to have been fourteen, and by Leyson to have been fourteen or fifteen (Arévalo 1998, 7; Leyson 1999, 17). This, of course, would be his age a year after the martyrdom, for he gave his official testimony in 1673, and not his age at the time of the martyrdom, as Arévalo and Leyson say or imply. However, in his official deposition for the Congregation for the Causes of Saints, though Leyson says "fourteen or fifteen" in introducing the documents of the Guam process, and practically repeats the same, quoting the notary's description of Hagman—"it would seem, of fourteen or fifteen years of age"; in another document of this series, he translates it elsewhere as "about fifteen years of age" ([Leyson] 1993, 52, 56, 63). Though Leyson does not give the Spanish, his translations in the first two cases are accurate, as may be seen from the Spanish originals ([Ledesma] 1981, 291, 296). The third testimony, however, in the original Spanish says: "un niño . . . de hasta 16 años," ([Ledesma] 1981, 303), which literally should be translated as: "of up to sixteen years old." It could be translated more freely as "fifteen to sixteen years old," or "about sixteen years old." But Leyson's translation of "about fifteen" is not accurate, and what is worse, in the bibliography of his popular work he says he was "fourteen or fifteen when he made his testimony" ([Leyson] 1999, 161). Arévalo, depending on the least reliable of Leyson's selections, further minimizes the age by calling Hagman "a boy" who "was only fourteen years old when his deposition was taken down" (1998, 7). One senses in all the conjectures on the age of the volunteers a tendency to minimize the age in these popular works, so as to make Pedro Calungsod a more effective model for teen-age Filipinos.¹¹

Apart from these inconsistencies and errors, however, neither of these non-Filipinos can be determinant for the age of the Filipinos. In this period, Filipinos normally were not easily allowed to move from their own village to another, least of all young people. No such restriction applied to Mexicans, at least *criollos*, as Bazan was.¹² Hagman, of

11. Leyson's source for the third account is that written from Guam by the Jesuit Fathers Francisco Ezquerria, Gerard Bouwens, and Pierre Coemans [or Coomans, or Comano in its Hispanized version], "Relación de los sucesos de las Islas Marianas en el año de 1672 y 1673." One may also note here that the use of "niño" for a Hagman aged about sixteen years eliminates any argument for Pedro Calungsod having arrived in the Marianas at twelve or thirteen, just because a single hearsay source calls him "niño," as will be seen below.

12. Francisco García, S.J., in his fundamental biography, the first one to be written of San Vitores and based on the documents of the latter's witnesses and contemporaries, calls Bazán "español" and "españolito," and speaks of him as a

course, being a native inhabitant of Guam, cannot be taken as a norm for young Filipinos who had come with the Jesuit missionaries.¹³ In any case, those who had supposedly been fourteen in 1667, when the mission departed Manila, would have been nineteen or twenty by the time Hagman testified in 1673, or eighteen or nineteen at the time of Pedro's martyrdom.

Moreover, Father Pedro Murillo Velarde, writing close to a century later, implies that even that late the ordinary village life in Jesuit missions still provided that the boys [and girls] (*pueri [puellae]* in the Jesuit records) went to school every day until they became *baguntao* (*adolescentes* or *ephebi* in the Jesuit records),¹⁴ that is, unmarried young men aged fourteen or above, but not yet having reached the tribute-paying age of eighteen. Even the *baguntao*, though finished with school, was not free from all special religious obligations, for, in addition to Sunday observance during which the *Doctrina* was recited with the whole community, he had also to go to Mass every Saturday, as did the *dalaga* of the same age. Before or after the Mass they recited in unison the entire *Doctrina cristiana*, so that they might not forget it (Murillo Velarde 1749, ff. 347r–348v; Schumacher 1987, 169–72).¹⁵ The *prima facie* conclusion from this, then, would be that a young man under the age of eighteen would not ordinarily have left his native village, especially in the Visayas.¹⁶ The evidence is not apodictic, but

"natural de Méjico," that is, born in Mexico of Spanish parents (García 1683, e.g., 221, 241, 260, 289). The last reference tells the story of his vocation and death. This book is quite rare, and I owe my being able to use a typescript of it to the kindness of Fr. Juan M.H. Ledesma, S.J. The only original copies in the Philippines are those in the Lopez Memorial Museum and the National Library (Ferrer 1970, 47, no. 6234; Medina 1972, 280, no. 2202).

13. Though Arévalo is careful to say of Hagman "who (*it appears*) stayed with the Filipino helpers" (1998, 7; italics mine), Leyson without any such reserve simply asserts that he was one of the "boys who assisted Padre Diego" (1999, 17). In fact, all that we have evidence for is that he *heard* about the killing from other Chamorros and from Matapang, the murderer, himself. This certainly does not make it seem likely that he was part of the mission. Rather, he lived among its enemies, however well disposed he may have been himself, perhaps as a student in the school for young Chamorros founded by San Vitores.

14. This terminology is contained in the Jesuit catalogues, preserved in the Jesuit Archives in Rome and transcribed by Father de la Costa in his notes in my possession.

15. The Franciscan chronicler, Juan Francisco de San Antonio, gives a very similar description for Franciscan parishes at the beginning of the eighteenth century (*Chronicas*, 2:14–15, translated by H. de la Costa 1965, 28–29).

16. Nonetheless, we must admit that there is one other youth about whom we know nothing more than that he was a Pampango named Andrés de la Cruz, who in

should make one assured that Pedro was at the very least fourteen when he left the Visayas for Manila, and that eighteen, or just possibly sixteen, would more likely be his age.¹⁷

As to the terms used by various early sources to describe Pedro—*mozo*, *mocito*, *mancebo*, *mancebito*, *iuvenis*, *jeune homme*, *muchacho*, *niño*—all listed by Leyson (1999, 16–17), all of them except the last one could naturally be translated as *youth*, *young man*, or as the dictionaries also

repelling the attack on San Vitores's men in 1670, gave the *coup de grace* with a spear to the principal Chamorro responsible for the attack, after the latter had been wounded by the Spanish artillery-piece. García (1683, 260) says that he was "a little older than twelve" (*de poco más de doce años*). However, the fact that he was a Pampango, who would have been close to Manila and might even go there for a time and thus possibly have been recruited by San Vitores, and also the fact that the Pampangos always formed the bulk of the Spanish-led military before the nineteenth century, are both possible reasons for his presence at such an early age. It is possible also that he was the servant of some Spaniard, as we will see below in the case of Gabriel de la Cruz. This suggestion is reinforced by the fact of his apparently jumping to kill the wounded Chamorro, an act quite in dissonance with San Vitores's instructions to his lay missionary companions.

17. Norman Owen, in his study of the somewhat isolated Bikol town of Tigaon, founded in 1701, has done yeoman's work to construct from a rather complete set of parish records, the demographic profile of the town, and concludes that reality was often different than laws or idealized descriptions. "[W]ell over a century after the founding of the mission, many of the inhabitants of Tigaon skipped the sacraments as often as they partook of them, appeared and disappeared almost at random from parish *padrones* (which probably also served as the basis for civil tax rolls), and seemingly did not even know precisely how old they were or what they were legally named" (Owen 1998, 244). This should warn us against being too sure that laws were actually fulfilled. I would add three remarks however. The first is that, as Owen notes from my article on the subject, the latter part of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century were a disastrous time for the Church, its lowest point in the Spanish regime, whereas I would consider, as will be seen below, that the latter part of the seventeenth century and early eighteenth were a "golden age." Secondly, Tigaon was quite isolated. Whether Pedro and his companions came from a densely-populated and well-evangelized town in Panay, or a remote corner of underpopulated and not intensively evangelized portion of Cebu island (see the sobering article of Cullinane and Xenos on demography and religious centers in Cebu island (Cullinane and Xenos 1998, especially 80–94), or from Cebu city, we have no idea, and hence no possibility of comparing it with Tigaon. Third, Tigaon was a rural area with apparently little contact with the Bikol ports. If our conjecture on Pedro being a sailor is acceptable, this might provide an opportunity to escape from his home village for Manila/Cavite at an earlier age than eighteen, but one old enough to be fit to be a sailor. In general the restrictions on the mobility of Filipinos were more likely to be urged on fourteen-year old *baguntao* than on older men, and perhaps less if they were sailors, though a certain maturity was necessary for such an occupation. Hence, in the end, though maintaining eighteen as the normal minimum age, and fourteen as the absolute minimum, I would be willing

suggest, "a young unmarried man."¹⁸ However, considering his role as a helper of the missionaries, none of these terms designate more than that he was younger than the missionaries. Moreover, all the Spanish words were used of servants or workers within a family or quasi-family like the mission. It is even now not many years since Filipinos referred to their male servants as *muchacho* in Spanish or Tagalog, or as "houseboy" or even "boy" in English, even though some might be married and of adult years. Today the more polite and proper term *katulong* or "househelp" is used, with no connotation of age involved. The term "*niño*," used only by Fr. Pedro de Casanova, S.J. in his hearsay evidence in the process in Manila (Leyson 1999, 166), cannot be given any weight. He had returned to the Philippines before the martyrdom, and though both he and Pedro Calungsod had been companions of San Vitores since Mexico, he had been thirty himself when he left the Marianas. Moreover, the point of his testimony was not the age, but what he had *heard* about the *martyrdom*, and his testimony is from five years after his own departure from Guam. In any case, as we have seen above, the term could be used of someone fifteen to sixteen years old, as in the case of Ambrosio Hagman.

These considerations, of course, would affect the presumed age of Pedro's martyrdom, which, if he had already been eighteen when he left the Philippines, would make him at least twenty-two or twenty-three at the time of his martyrdom.¹⁹ This, however, need not necessar-

to possibly modify the age to sixteen. But Owen's and other articles in the same volume caution us to be tentative, as well as to recognize that different regions of the Philippines might greatly differ in many respects, religious and civil.

18. Leyson's translation "youngster," though possible for some of these terms, is not the most likely one; and not at all for *jeune homme* or *juvenis*. "Lad" (*ibid.*) is hardly used in English for someone sixteen to eighteen years old. *Mozo* and *mancebo* are also used at times for adults, as in "buen mozo" for "a man of superior physical stature" ("hombre de aventajada estatura") or simply for a more or less young man house servant (Real Academia Española 1927, 1320, 1228). García himself, in fact, speaks of a friendly Chamorro chief called Caysa, who refused to take any part in plots against the Fathers, considering it the grossest ingratitude, since his parents and grandparents, being old men, had welcomed the Fathers to the islands. "How then could he, being a *muchacho* (he was twenty-eight years old) kill them?" (García 1683, 454). All these terms generally connote being unmarried, and some degree of youth, but this latter was largely a matter of perception. For example, a well-recognized bilingual dictionary dating from 1852, in its most recent edition defines *mancebo* as "a young person, under forty years of age" (Velásquez 1957, 454).

19. It must not be forgotten that almost a full year elapsed between the time the galleon left Cavite and when it arrived in Guam. To say, therefore, that, e.g., Pedro was

ily take away from his being a model for teen-age Filipinos today, since he would have been still a teenager at the time he volunteered to join San Vitores for a mission which any intelligent person would have known might end in death, if not by assassins, then through the ever-present danger of shipwreck, to both of which a number of Jesuit missionaries to the Marianas and their lay companions succumbed in the succeeding decades. In fact, as we will see, besides those killed in battle or for not clearly religious reasons, a good number of those whose cause for beatification has never been taken up were killed as they were bringing messages or doing other errands for San Vitores or accompanying priests who were baptizing, or were even baptizing infants or dying adults themselves.²⁰ These suppositions concerning Pedro's age will also be corroborated in the discussion of his occupational status, as treated below. That in turn will depend, at least in part, on the education he is likely to have received.

Education

There is considerable confusion as to what type of education Pedro would have gotten in a typical (presumably Jesuit) Visayan town.²¹ Allied to this is his possible role as a catechist. Arévalo speaks of "something like a minor seminary" or an "apostolic school," where the Jesuits educated young boys. In support of this, he cites De la Costa concerning the boarding school founded by the Jesuits in Tigbauan,

martyred in 1672 means that he spent *five*, not four years with San Vitores. Four years in the Marianas, yes; as a companion of San Vitores, five.

20. Among the former would be the Spaniard Manuel Rangel, the Mexican Spaniard, Diego Bazán, and the Filipinos, Damián Bernal and Nicolás de Figueroa. Among the latter would be especially Hipólito de la Cruz, accompanying Fr. Luís de Medina, who was about to baptize a child, and Francisco Maunahun and his unnamed companion. See Arévalo 1998, 15, and Leyson 1999, 101–10, who gives a list of several men of different nationalities who were killed in one way or another both before and after the martyrdom of Blessed Diego and Blessed Pedro. Some of them certainly deserve to be named martyrs, and a canonical process was actually opened in Cebu for Hipólito de la Cruz in the seventeenth century, though nothing is known of what came of it (Leyson 1999, 102).

21. It should be noted that this is a presumption, with no supporting evidence. The fact that Pedro later worked with the Jesuits does not of itself imply that he came from one of their parishes; it depends on how he came to know San Vitores. And, as we have seen, the Augustinians had a considerable number of Visayan parishes, especially in Panay. Though it is true that the Jesuits were more associated with education, at least on the post-primary level, and in the beginning experimented more with different models of primary education, Augustinians as well as the Jesuits had primary schools in all their parishes.

near the Spanish town of Arévalo in Panay, where they taught “not only catechism, but reading, writing, Spanish and liturgical music” (Arévalo 1998, 9, citing De la Costa 1961, 143).

It is true that such a school existed in Tigbauan, but only for two years; that is, while Father Pedro Chirino was there at the request of the great Jesuit benefactor, Esteban Rodríguez de Figueroa, to whose *encomienda* Tigbauan belonged. But it was essentially a parish elementary day school for Visayans, and it was only when the Spaniards of Arévalo town asked that their sons also might be educated by the Jesuits that Chirino built a small residence for the Spanish boys next to the Jesuit house, thus bringing into existence the first Jesuit “boarding-school” in the Philippines, small as it was. But it was only for the Spanish boys that it was a boarding school; the Visayan boys were from Tigbauan itself. Unfortunately, Chirino was there only from 1593 to 1595, since the assignment of the entire islands of Samar and Leyte to the Jesuits in the latter year made it impossible for them to continue to provide so lavishly for a single town in Panay. With the departure of the Jesuits, a single secular priest was given charge of the town, and the boarding school disappeared, since he had more than enough to do to take the place of the several Jesuits who had previously been in charge (De la Costa 1961, 145–46).

Moreover, the fact that Spanish was taught here would seem most likely due to the presence of the Spanish boys, and we do not find it in the other parish schools which the religious orders founded in every town they ministered to. It is true that in the enthusiasm of the early years, not only did the Jesuits have a few boarding schools like Dulag and Antipolo, as we will see below, where Spanish does seem to have been taught, but the Franciscans also, in the relatively densely populated Bikol region, took boys into their conventos in the very early years of evangelization and had them share to some extent in the monastic life of the friars. Thus Marcelo de Ribadeneira, in his 1599 history of the Franciscans, speaks of boys “who have such retentive memories that they learn anything with great facility, whether in their own language, or in Spanish or in Latin.” However, from the context it is clear that he is speaking only of pronunciation, not understanding, as he says they read so well “that it seems as if they know Latin” (Ribadeneira 1947, 67). It would only be after 1865, with the foundation of the Jesuit Escuela Normal in Manila, that village or town teachers would begin to be prepared to teach in Spanish, a process not even completed by the Revolution.

Leyson goes further and speculates that Pedro may have been “recruited by the Jesuits and trained by them to be a catechist for their missions.” Assuming, without evidence, that Pedro was in fact a trained catechist, he continues:

It was the strategy of the Jesuits, who were evangelizing the Visayas in particular, to train young boys as catechists to help them in the missions. The training was done in boarding schools for boys organized by the Jesuits themselves or, if not, in the different Jesuit residences. (Leyson 1999, 19)

However, the passage he cites is from Father Alonso Sánchez, who was only in the Philippines from 1581 to 1586, when he returned to Europe as agent of the colony and never returned. Moreover, he had never seen anything outside the vicinity of Manila, much less the Visayas, which the Jesuits had not yet taken up as their mission when he departed for good. Sánchez was a persuasive man of grandiose schemes, including one to conquer China with sixty men, who for a time charmed both governor-general and bishop, though both were later to regret the confidence they had placed in him. What is quoted here from De la Costa was never implemented as Sánchez conceived it, for the simple reason that there were only a handful of Jesuits in Manila and its environs. In fact they would have to wait several years before obtaining personnel to begin the evangelization of the Visayas at even its most basic level, not to speak of such boarding schools.

The short-lived school in Tigbauan had no connection with such a plan, though the *seminario de Indios* or boarding school for Filipino boys in Dulag, Leyte, was a more modest version of what Sánchez—who never learned a Filipino language, and as far as we know, dealt only with Spaniards—so pretentiously conceived. Those schools mentioned by Leyson (1999, 23–24) as existing in Paranas and in Loboc, administered as they were by Filipinos, would not have taught Spanish, and certainly the harassed missionaries would not have been able to take time for that, even if they had been regularly present in the place. The school in Dulag, from the description we have, would seem to have been a great success, teaching the boys in both Visayan and Spanish, and accustoming them to Christian life.

However, two facts should give us pause in supposing that Pedro Calungsod attended such a boarding school to be trained as a catechist. Father Francisco de Otazo, the superior of Dulag, wrote in 1602 of how he had made an experiment in taking some boys with him to

assist in the *postbaptismal* [italics mine] instruction of neophytes, and of their success. But there is no mention of their being regular catechists, teaching Christian doctrine; indeed they could not have been Christian for more than a few years themselves, as the Jesuits began the mission only in 1596, and the school five years later. What they did in helping with postbaptismal instructions was to lead the people in recalling the *Doctrina Cristiana* that all had supposedly memorized before baptism. There were as yet no printed books of any kind in Visayan, but the retentive memories of the boys from their daily recitation could enable them to recall and recite the *Doctrina* orally, as was done every week before Sunday Mass by the whole town for at least the next century and longer (De la Costa 1961, 289). Another factor to consider is that schools such as Dulag could only touch a small percentage of the boys in the vicinity, nor did they exist except in a very few key parishes of the Jesuits. The only one we are sure of was that of Antipolo. There were indeed proposals that where such boarding schools could not exist, provision should be made in the budget to have at least two or three boys living in the houses of the Jesuits, as Leyson presumes to have been the norm. Whether this was carried out, or remained just a proposal, we do not know, but we do not have any positive evidence for it. Given the fact that the Jesuits expanded their mission into Mindanao during that same period and lost several men to death or capture by the Moros in the process, it is very doubtful (De la Costa 1961, 188–89, 266–71).²²

The second point is that at the time of the boarding school in Dulag, we were precisely in the very early stages of evangelization in Leyte, about thirty years after the beginnings in Luzon and Cebu, and a large part of the people were still not Christian. This becomes eminently clear at the time of the Magindanao raid on Dulag in 1603, under Bwisan. Though the boys in the school joined the Fathers and the rest of the community in making for the hills, large numbers were captured, including Fr. Melchor Hurtado, S.J. Later a number of datus

22. Leyson seems to take the Jesuit term "residence" to refer to each town with a resident priest. This is not correct. Since according to their constitutions the Jesuits were not permitted to be parish priests in the full canonical sense, they solved their problem by setting up a few centers under a superior with a number of Jesuits under him who might take charge of several parishes, but all came periodically to live their religious life together in the main center or "residence." Even at the time of the Jesuit expulsion in 1768, they had only three "residences" for all of Leyte (and none located at Dulag), though they were caring for seventeen towns from those three centers. See De la Costa 1961, 606.

made a blood-compact with Bwisan, and paid him substantial tribute in accordance with his proposal that they should join together the following year and drive the Spaniards out.

Moreover, a good number of people whose families had been taken captive joined the Magindanaos when they left (Schumacher 1987, 102–3). Whether these were Christians, or at least catechumens, who apostatized, we do not know, but if so, their Christian convictions were still shallow. The point to be made is that these boarding schools, though greatly successful in forming good Christians, were a very few small islands, as it were, among the mass of Visayans who were not yet Christians, or were only superficially so at this early stage in evangelization. It was hoped that these boys would serve as “a kind of catechist” among the older catechumens, in the sense of helping them to memorize the prayers and Christian doctrine, or would help lead the communal recitation of the *Doctrina* for postbaptismal deepening, but they were not full-time trained catechists in the sense in which the word would be understood today. They did not have the competence to explain the faith themselves; rather it was the priests who gave the initial instruction, and who came out after the communal recitation of the *Doctrina*, sometimes led by the boys, to ask individual questions to see if the people—adults as well as children—understood what they had memorized. Once the initial evangelization was completed, and the people gathered more or less into towns, the boarding schools were no longer needed. The boys simply went to the elementary schools established in each parish, but these were not schools for training full-time or professional catechists (De la Costa 1961, 575; Schumacher 1987, 169–75).

By the 1640s or 1650s when Pedro was born, the old boarding schools would have been replaced by these parish day schools.²³ We know, for example, that at least by 1682, and undoubtedly earlier, in an unnamed town in the Visayas where an Austrian Jesuit by the name of Andreas Mancker was parish priest, everyone came to Sunday Mass (or they were beaten with rods by the *principales* the following Sunday!), and recited the catechism together, answering questions raised by the priest. Though Mancker says there were schools for boys and girls under Filipino teachers, De la Costa adds: “Mancker makes no mention of boarding schools, which seem to have been discontin-

23. Hence the speculations of Leyson (1999, 260) as to what school Pedro might have attended to become a catechist are without any foundation. There were no such schools by this time, if ever.

ued when their original purpose, that of training catechists to instruct adult converts, had been outgrown" (De la Costa 1961, 468).

Again here, one must take the word "catechist," as above, in a very different sense than today. The boys certainly did not explain the Faith to the adult catechumens; the missionaries did this, and it was they who asked questions of the Sunday assembly. What the "catechists" did, as explained above, was to help them memorize the *Doctrina Cristiana*, a prerequisite for baptism, which the boys themselves knew by heart. After a generation or two, this was no longer necessary, since the adults of the second or third generation would have daily recited the *Doctrina* during their years in school, as well as continuing to do so on Saturdays as *baguntao* or *dalaga* until marriage, and then, with the whole Christian community, every Sunday. Pedro should not therefore be considered to have been trained as a catechist in the Philippines, and did not in any sense go to the Marianas already prepared to catechize Chamorros.

The designation of Pedro Calungsod as a catechist is not to be found in any of the primary sources on the Marianas, though it is true that other companions are occasionally spoken of as "catechizing and baptizing infants" *in the absence of a Jesuit* (italics mine).²⁴ It is significant that when Leyson describes the mission of Pedro in the Marianas in his second chapter, he entitles it "A Mission for a *Vertueuse Catechiste*" (1999, 27–65). The reason for retaining the French term is presumably that it is only in the French book of Charles Le Gobien, S.J., that this explicit designation of Pedro as catechist is found. Leyson quotes in support of Le Gobien's authoritative character from the author's declaration in the prologue of the book:

It is on the basis of the reports [*memoires*] of these apostolic men . . . that I have written the history that I present to the public. I have not advanced anything but what I have found in the letters and in the reports of these missionaries, which have been sent to me from Rome, from Spain, and from the Low Countries." (Le Govien 1700, in Leyson 1999, 158, no. 10)²⁵

24. As will be seen below, when these emergency situations occurred in the Marianas, there are always qualifications to indicate that all they did was to help memorize the *Doctrina* and take care of emergency baptisms.

25. Leyson spells the name as Le Gobien, as do Blair and Robertson. It seems to be more common in modern usage. Translation from the French is mine.

However, in spite of this apodictic declaration of Le Gobien, Retana, the bibliographer, comments: “[The book] contains curious information on the first Jesuit missionaries, among which the most outstanding is that relative to Father Sanvitores, *which had already been related by Father García*” (Retana 1906, 1:163–64; italics mine). Blair and Robertson are more explicitly critical of Le Gobien as an independent source of information, at least as far as San Vitores and his companions are concerned. As regards his claim quoted above, they comment: “Much of it is a translation of García’s *Vida y martirio . . . de Diego Luis de Sanvitores*.” They also note: “Eduardo Navarro, O.S.A. of Valladolid, claims that Le Gobien is not accurate in all essentials” (1903–9, 53:123). It would seem clear that it was García, not Le Gobien, who went through all the reports from the Marianas. He may have gone through reports for other missions (the scope of his book is much larger than the Marianas), but for the Marianas he translated—and interpreted, as in the case of “catechist”—what García had compiled.

We need add here, that whatever may have been the religious enthusiasm and generosity of San Vitores’s Filipino volunteers, there is evidence that some at least had only a basic, or even defective, knowledge of catechism in their own language, which would have precluded their being trained catechists. Among the testimonies to San Vitores’s supposedly supernatural gift of tongues, that of General Antonio Nieto at the canonical process in Manila after his martyrdom is significant. He affirmed that on the voyage to Acapulco:

[San Vitores] not only assisted the Tagalog Filipinos who were embarked, but also the Servant of God used to ask the other nations of distinct languages, like the Pampangos, Bisayas, and Cagayanes [Ibanags], [to recite] their prayers. When sometimes they made a mistake with some words in their prayers, the Servant of God corrected them without having learned these languages. He [the General] knows this because he has seen it in this Servant of God. ([Ledesma] 1981, 144; García 1683, 179)

Whether Pedro was included in those who had so forgotten their *Doctrina* as to make errors in his prayers, is of course impossible to say. In any case, there were other ways of teaching the faith than being a full-time catechist, and if it is highly unlikely that he would have been such in the Philippines, there would be ample scope in the Marianas, once he had learned the language, for quasi-catechetical activity, since the work of conversion was only beginning. The example of Felipe

Sonson, the *donado*, who was closest to the missionaries, and to his spiritual father, San Vitores, in particular, is significant. He was praised after his death in 1686 by his biographer, Fr. Lorenzo Bustillos, S.J., for such an informal conversational evangelization:

And if on some days he had no occupation . . . he was . . . occupied . . . in giving good advice to those of his nation [Filipinos] that they might employ their time well and accomplish the tasks they were doing, so as to do their best in serving God. In passing, in his ordinary conversations he instructed them in the mysteries of our Faith. These were his ordinary conversations when he spoke with those of his nation or with Spaniards, in the one language or the other. (Schumacher 1995, 273)

If Sonson did this not only with his fellow-Filipinos, all of whom had undoubtedly received at least elementary instruction in their religion, but even with Spaniards in their own language, he certainly must have done even more of this with the Chamorros, for whose conversion he offered himself to help in any way he could, "even to giving the blood of his veins for the salvation of these islanders" (Schumacher 1995, 274).²⁶ It would be logical then to presume that one who also gave the blood of his veins in a more dramatic way, as did Pedro, engaged in similar informal teaching in his daily dealings with the Chamorros, and thus can rightly be spoken of in a certain sense as

26. Sonson, of course, was extraordinary in that he came from a prominent family of *principales* in Macabebe, Pampanga, had raised a family and seen them married. He then offered himself to assist the Augustinians of Pampanga, who later sent him to a Dominican engaged in rebuilding a church and convento in the Parian of Manila, destroyed in the Chinese uprising. When the Dominican, a friend of San Vitores, heard of his search for recruits, he sent Sonson to him, who begged to be accepted as a missionary. He was principally occupied as a carpenter, building houses and churches, and in his old age as a tailor in Guam, though also as a soldier entrusted with one of the few muskets in the sieges of the mission in Agana. He lived with the Jesuits and was received as a *donado* by San Vitores in 1669, and his name is listed with those of the Jesuit priests in the catalogue of the Philippine Province of the Jesuits for 1681–82. His obituary shows that he was widely read in Spanish spiritual books far beyond the catechism. At the time he left Manila for Acapulco he was already 56 years old, and died at the age of 75 in 1686, of wounds received several months earlier in the uprising of 1685, when the Chamorros left him for dead. There is no evidence that Pedro Calungsood was a *donado* and it is unlikely that he would not have been mentioned as such if he were. For example, Brother Marcos Cruz, a Tagalog, is always spoken of as a *donado* of the Society of Jesus. He taught San Vitores Tagalog, and then accompanied him on his missions among the Mangyans and *Cinarrones* of Mindoro. See Garcia 1683, 116–17, 136, 159–61, etc.

catechizing, even if this was not his principal function. But it is misleading to call him a catechist.

Indeed, from the fact that Sonson felt compelled to instruct his fellow-Filipinos "in the mysteries of our faith," it would seem that many or most of them were not qualified to be catechists in the proper sense of the word, since their own knowledge, even in their own language, was weak, a fact further supported by their errors in the common prayers that San Vitores is said to have corrected. Indeed, we will see below that San Vitores did not send all the companions out to "catechize," but only those whom he considered to be "advanced and trustworthy," and this only in emergency situations. Perhaps Pedro Calungsod was one of them, but his name does not occur among those in the sources. If he was really young, even less would he have been so entrusted.

Rather the situation in the Marianas must have been very much like the initial evangelization of the Philippines in the sixteenth century, indeed more difficult. That is to say, that normally only the missionary would have had a copy of the handwritten catechism, and not the catechumens—who of course could not read and had no written language of their own—nor even the missionary's lay assistants, at least some of whom apparently also could not read.²⁷ The Filipinos of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries had learned the *Doctrina Cristiana* by oral/aural repetition; hence the key role of the children with their retentive memories in helping the adults to learn.²⁸ Much more would this have been true in the Marianas, and San Vitores would use the same method with children who had shown talent and fervor after he had in 1669 established his Colegio de San Juan de

27. For example, the Tagalog interpreter of San Vitores on the ship, according to the latter's own testimony. See the quotation from San Vitores concerning him below.

28. It is true that the first *Doctrina Cristiana*, printed in 1593 in Tagalog by Father Francisco Blancas de San José, O.P., had the text not only in Spanish and in the romanized form of the Tagalog, but likewise in the Tagalog syllabary, which might seem to argue that it was meant to be given to the catechumens. This is remotely possible, though there is no evidence for that, and given the fact that only one original copy survives today (in the Library of Congress in Washington) it hardly seems that there was a large distribution, even apart from the costs of such a procedure. An alternative explanation for the printing of the syllabary was that it was to help the missionaries understand a writing which was then still in use. As far as I am aware, the only other catechism, which made use of the Tagalog syllabary, with modifications, was the Ilocano translation of the Bellarmine catechism in 1621, done by Fr. Francisco Lopez, OSA, with the assistance of Don Pedro Bukaneg. See Quirino 1973, iii-xi.

Letrán in Agana for boys, with its later corresponding girls' school. But this was still far in the future.²⁹

San Vitores's assistants, like Pedro, would have learned the Chamorro catechism by heart, whether on the ship or, more likely, on their arrival in Guam, as they learned the Chamorro language by listening to and conversing with the natives. Thus it is highly unlikely that any except for a few mature men, as will be seen below, did any independent catechizing. Even those older men who are said to have "catechized" are always noted as having done so "in accordance with their state," "according to their capacity," or with some similar qualification. It was the priests who catechized in the proper sense of the word. However, Pedro and others probably drilled the Chamorro catechumens or neophytes, in accordance with the practice in the early Christianization of the Philippines.³⁰ To conclude, Pedro should not be called a catechist, as if he were specially trained for that, nor was that his principal function either in the Philippines or in the Marianas. He was rather a missionary with varied, though limited, functions, or to use the apt words of Arévalo's title, "young Filipino mission-volunteer."³¹ As appears in the life of Felipe Sonson, the notion of being a missionary—whatever functions one might be called to carry out—had an appeal among the more devout Filipinos of the late seventeenth century,³² when Filipino religious sentiments were evolving from the

29. It would seem that the beginning of the school for boys dates from mid-1669, though the Queen-Regent, who ruled after the death of Philip IV, only provided for an endowment in a decree of 1673, after the death of San Vitores (García 1683, 239–41).

30. Of the older and far better-instructed man, the donado, Felipe Sonson, Fr. Lorenzo Bustillos, who had known him since both accompanied San Vitores from Mexico in 1668, wrote after Sonson's death, "He helped the preachers of our holy faith untiringly in all that his state permitted" (Schumacher 1995, 274. Italics mine).

31. Hence we cannot say, "It is quite probable that Pedro Calungsod was chosen to be among the first missionaries for the Ladrones because he was found to possess the ideal qualities of an exemplary missionary. There may not have been any problem on the part of Pedro Calungsod for he was trained for the missions" (Leyson 1999, 32). The former sentence is improbable; the latter certainly untrue. No such formal training existed.

32. As far as one can judge from his biography, Sonson, who was so ardent in his desire to go to the Marianas as a missionary, was principally occupied there in his former trade as a carpenter, and learned to mend clothes for the Jesuits and their companions, as well as to sew clothes for the naked Chamorros. But he had a highly developed spirituality of missionary zeal for the pagans and for the saving of their souls, very similar to that of San Vitores, and explicitly saw his material tasks as a contribution to the missionary task of saving souls from the devil. See Schumacher 1995, especially 272–75.

more simple understanding and acceptance of the faith by new converts to a mature and apostolic Catholicism.³³

Learning of Spanish and Latin

The regular parish schools, taught by adult Filipinos, were certainly taught in the local vernacular. The Jesuit colleges of San Ignacio and San José in Manila (and the Dominican colleges of Santo Tomás and San Juan de Letrán) certainly taught Spanish, but they were only for Spaniards. In the second half of the seventeenth century—too late certainly for Pedro—sons of some Pampango principales were admitted as *capistas* at San Jose, domestics rather than regular students, and received an elementary education, probably in Spanish, but there are no indications of any Visayans, or even Tagalogs, at San José until the end of the century (Schumacher 1987, 150).³⁴ The only other Jesuit college in any real sense—that is, supplying secondary education—was that of Cebu, founded in 1595, likewise primarily, or even solely, for Spaniards (De la Costa 1961, 166). But soon almost all the Spaniards in Cebu moved to Manila to take part in the galleon trade, so the secondary education was closed down and only a primary school for Visayan boys remained. Thus the “college” became simply an endowed apostolic center with a primary school attached, supporting missionaries learning the language, and from which missionaries went out to carry on the work of evangelization in the surrounding territory. It is not impossible that Spanish may have been taught here at the elementary level, but we have no evidence for it, and given that in 1656 there were only two Jesuits there to carry on all the ministries, it is highly doubtful. As to the other Jesuit “colleges,” so-called in the documents, they were such “only in the sense that they were supported at least in part by an endowment which carried with it the obligation either of

33. Symptomatic of this religious growth is the emergence of religious life for women in the Beaterio of Mother Ignacia del Espíritu Santo in 1684, the ordination of the first Filipino priests in 1698, the publication of the *Pasyon* of Gaspar Aquino de Belen in 1703, and the use of (paid) Filipino lay assistants by the Dominicans in the evangelization of the Zambals in the 1680s, and later of other mountain peoples. See Schumacher 1987, 165–68, 179, 183–85, 188; Santiago 1987, especially 32–36.

34. There are two Filipinos who apparently received secondary education in Letran in mid-17th century, but one was a Pampango and the other a Manileño. See the list of a hundred prominent alumni in Bazaco 1933, 217–54. It is possible there were more whom Father Bazaco did not see fit to include, but these two who are included seem to be so only because they were native Filipinos, whereas others in the list are there for some particular achievement.

maintaining an elementary school or of supporting missionaries engaged in the study of the native languages" (De la Costa 1956, 150). Even if it were possibly true that the college of Cebu taught Spanish at the elementary level, at least after the first decade or two, it was not a boarding school of the type described in Dulag.

This is not to say that it was impossible for Pedro to have obtained a working grasp of Spanish, even if he did not live in the city of Cebu (for which we have no evidence anyway), but if, as may have been the case, he lived and worked with some Jesuits or Augustinians elsewhere in the Visayas. In 1686 a typically unrealistic royal decree ordered that Spanish be taught in all the schools (though they were supported by the missionaries and the parents, not by the government). A Jesuit commenting on the impossibility of implementing the decree for lack of relations between Spaniards and Filipinos, says that only "the houseboys of the parish priest acquire familiarity with the language; because of this there is hardly any town today where Spanish is totally unknown" (Schumacher 1987, 153). In other words, there were some Filipinos who knew Spanish, generally merely a working knowledge, and not one obtained in the schools. A similar factor would be operative and even more so, if, as we shall see below, Pedro were a Visayan sailor in the trade with Manila, where he would necessarily have picked up at the very least a working knowledge of Spanish and probably of Tagalog as well. Moreover, as we will also see below, San Vitores took for granted that his lay missionary companions knew enough Spanish so that they could understand the formula for emergency baptism that he prepared for them in Spanish and Chamorro, so he must have chosen them from men who had some such experiential knowledge of the Spanish language.

As for Latin, however, there would have been no opportunity for Pedro to learn it in such a way as to be able to read and understand it. No doubt he, like hundreds of other Visayan boys of his age (and as those of us who grew up in devout Catholic families before Vatican II), memorized the Latin responses for serving Mass, with little or no understanding of the meaning of the words. But Latin was taught as a subject only at the secondary level, and after the early closing of secondary education in Cebu, only to Spaniards in the Manila colleges.³⁵ Hence it is not possible that Pedro "mastered the Chamorro

35. In a report of 1656 the college of Cebu is reported as having only a "colegio de niños" and there is no indication that the Jesuits had anything to do in it, nor even mention of there having once been secondary education there. In that same report

Grammar and Catechism prepared by Padre Diego" in Latin and Chamorro" (Leyson 1999, 43), and it is difficult to see how Leyson could make such a statement if he actually read the work.³⁶ We may ignore the whole question of Latin among the Filipinos.

San Vitores gives us some evidence as to how the linguistic situation resolved itself, both as regards Spanish, Tagalog, and Visayan on the one hand, and Chamorro on the other. In his memorial to the Manila authorities in 1665, urging that the mission should begin soon, he says of the prospective interpreters:

With the four Filipinos who came from there [the Marianas] this past year of 1664 . . . I have spoken at great length both in Spanish, which they know sufficiently well, and in their own native Tagalog, which they say also resembles in many ways the language of the people of the Ladrones, which they have learned very well in the twenty-five years that they have lived with them. ([Ledesma] 1981, 161)

The passage is of interest for several reasons. It indicates, first, that sailors on the galleons, even at an early date (these Filipinos had been on the galleon *Concepción*, which was shipwrecked in the Marianas in 1638) came to possess a reasonable grasp of Spanish, at least enough to communicate with their officers, with the Mexicans who often made up a good part of the crew, and with the Spanish officials of the shipyards of Acapulco and Cavite. Moreover, they had retained it, at least to a reasonable extent, over the twenty-six years they had been isolated from Spaniards.

Second, though we know that at least one of the rescued sailors who became an interpreter for San Vitores, Esteban, was a Visayan, all apparently also spoke Tagalog sufficiently well that San Vitores could

Dulag is mentioned merely as one of nine stations dependent on Dagami, with only six priests for the nine stations. There is no mention of a boarding school here or anywhere else, even in the formerly major one of Antipolo. It is clear that by Pedro's time there were no Jesuit personnel for such enterprises, and that they were unable even to take adequate pastoral care of the towns under their jurisdiction (Colín 1902, 791, 793).

36. Even a cursory reading of the so-called "grammar and catechism" shows that even a graduate of one of the Manila colleges—which Pedro and his companions were not— would have had an extremely difficult, not to say impossible, time in understanding it, since it is not in the classical Latin learned in the colleges, but filled with technical terms and coined phrases, and would have only been intelligible to the Jesuits (or other religious) who had been trained to speak Latin from their earliest years of religious life, and for whom it was a conversational language. This internal evidence is apart from the explicit statement of San Vitores that it was meant for the priests and that he hoped to prepare another in Spanish for the use of laymen.

conclude in the beginning that all were native Tagalogs, and spoke to them in that language as well as in Spanish. It seems likely that among themselves, whatever their native language might be, the Filipinos on the galleons, or those who came to Manila for whatever purpose, would pick up Tagalog, which would become the common medium for different linguistic groups, as happens today. Keeping these facts in mind, it is clear that Pedro and his Visayan companions came to speak not only a fair amount of Spanish but very likely also Tagalog. Thus he was able to communicate not only with San Vitores but with the other Jesuits, including the four who only joined the mission in Mexico and therefore had no knowledge of Visayan or Tagalog. Moreover, as we have already mentioned and will see further when discussing the so-called "grammar and catechism" below, in his accompanying letter San Vitores clearly presupposed that all his lay companions at least understood Spanish; otherwise he would not have planned to make for the lay companions a Spanish-Chamorro version of his Latin-Chamorro grammar, done for the Jesuits.

Recruitment of Pedro and His Companions

This brings us to the question of how Pedro (and the other companions) came to know of the mission to the Marianas, and how they joined or were recruited to it. In 1665 San Vitores had sent to the King the certification of Admiral Esteban Ramos, who had been among those shipwrecked on Saipan in 1638 in the galleon *Nuestra Señora de la Concepción*, but had after some time, with the help of some friendly Chamorros, made his way with a group of survivors to Guam and then back to the Philippines. The admiral had evidently learned something of the Chamorro language in his time in the islands, and had visited them again on subsequent galleon voyages. The previous year, as admiral of another galleon, he had rescued four Filipinos who had also survived the 1638 shipwreck and lived on in the Marianas for the intervening twenty-six years. He asserted that he "considered it certain that if [the Chamorros] had Ministers of the Holy Gospel and some Spaniards and natives [of the Philippines] who would accompany them to give them an example, these islanders would easily be converted to our Holy Catholic Faith." For this purpose, he said:

It would be sufficient that with the religious there should go the number of twenty Spaniards and as many more natives of these Islands to give them an example of Christian life, and so that they may see the obedience and reverence owed to the ministers of the holy Gospel. There

would not be need of any other escort or garrison, since that people are very peaceful and well disposed.³⁷ ([Ledesma]1981, 162–63, 26 May 1665. Italics mine)³⁷

If San Vitores had needed any recommendation on how the mission should be conducted, this was it. The principal means of evangelization was a Christian life on the part of missionaries, Jesuit or lay. Moreover, the rejection of any military protection was to be an integral part of this conversion by example, and it was evidently the basis of what he wrote to the King.

For the preservation of this Christian community, there would not be need of much expense . . . Fifteen or twenty Filipinos of the oldest and most God-fearing Christians of these Islands, and some of those who have come from there [Marianas], fluent in their language and ours), *without any more escort or garrison to accompany the Fathers* [would suffice]. (García 1683, 164; [Ledesma]1981, 164; italics mine)³⁸

It is noteworthy that, unlike the Admiral, he made no mention of lay Spaniards, though as we shall see later, a few of these would also volunteer to join him. Probably only Captain Juan de Santa Cruz and the interpreter, Don Francisco de Mendoza, joined from the very beginning in Manila, the former, precisely to be a missionary, though he would be thrust by events into the position of military commander.³⁹ Moreover, it is clear that these were all volunteers, not sent by the government, as may be seen from the fact that San Vitores not only exhorted them as to what was expected of them, but urged anyone who was not ready to accept the conditions of the missionary apostolate to remain behind.

37. Ramos was apparently one of those of whom the classic historian of the galleon trade speaks in recounting the fate of the survivors of the wreck of the *Cochepción*: "The twenty-eight survivors went from island to island till they came to Guam . . . From here six of them, accompanied by two friendly natives, set out in a couple of open boats in use among the Ladrones and finally reached the Philippines, where they arrived 'almost' dead from hunger, thirst, and lack of sleep" (Schurz 1959, 259).

38. The word "oldest" [*los más antiguos*] (not "older" as Leyson translates it [29]) does not refer to the age of the laymen who were to accompany the missionaries, but to their (or their families) having been Christians from long past, not new converts.

39. Santa Cruz is spoken of in various places as baptizing infants or dying adults, or as companion of San Vitores (García 1683, 179, 225, 227). As we will see below, there would eventually be four Spaniards, including the Mexican youth Diego Bazán, who would remain behind when the *San Diego* continued its journey to Manila.

So that they might not be an obstacle but a help to the conversion of the pagans, the Servant of God saw to it that all should live a Christian life, and that their deeds might not be contrary to the words of the preachers. They were also by his advice to take a firm determination not to take wine, nor to extract *tuba*, which is the liquor of the coconut palms, from which in the Philippines a wine is made for drinking sprees [*borracheras*]. The Venerable Father begs that no one go to the Marianas, who did not feel himself with strength to do without wine, because if the custom of drinking sprees should take root in those islands, which do not have it as yet, that man would do more harm than good (García 1683, 219).⁴⁰

This care in choosing companions and the demands he made on them make it the more remarkable that so many Visayans were found among them, in spite of his having no contact with the Visayas. Despite the fact that it can only be a conjecture, though well-founded enough, the fact that Pedro Calungsod must have spent some time in Cavite and/or Manila in order to be recruited as a volunteer by San Vitores, gives a hint as to how he, and other Visayans like Hipólito de la Cruz, martyred with Fr. Luis Medina on Saipan on 27 January 1670, and Hipólito's brother Agustín, who escaped, might have come from the Visayas to Cavite and Manila.⁴¹ For as Leyson points out, there is no evidence, indeed quite the contrary, that San Vitores was ever in the Visayas.

The Jesuit, Fr. Juan José Delgado, in his book of 1754 provides a hint when he makes an impassioned refutation of the ill-tempered caricatures of the *Indio* written by Fr. Pedro Murillo Velarde, S.J., and Fray Gaspar de San Agustín, O.S.A., in their publications of the early eighteenth century. He points out at length, especially in his biting retort to his fellow-Jesuit Murillo, that it was the Indio, not the Spaniard, who did so many things without which the Spaniards would not be able to exist in the Philippines. Delgado had spent his life as a missionary in Cebu, Samar, Leyte, and Bohol, and it is evident from his writings that these were the places and the people, rather than

40. The question of whether there was really abstinence from tuba will be discussed in appendix 2 of the sequel to this article.

41. The number of lay companions who were identified as Visayans (not all were identified at all) is notable, and is an argument for the probability that Pedro Calungsod was among a group who had come as sailors to Cavite. In general the early Spaniards considered that the Visayans were the best seamen, just as the Pampangos were considered the best soldiers.

Spanish-dominated Manila, which were close to his heart.⁴² In a long refutation, he singles out, among other things, the fact that it was the Filipinos who crewed the galleons which provided the lifeblood of Spanish Manila. Moreover, he asks rhetorically, "Who provide Manila and the Spaniards with [coconut] oil? Is it not the Visayan Indios, who bring it to them every year in their ships?" (Delgado 1892, 300-1).

It seems likely that the situation was the same in the second half of the seventeenth century, and it was in such trade that Visayans might be likely to come to Cavite. Once there, they were often recruited for the galleons, as the example of Esteban, the Visayan interpreter who had been in the shipwreck of the *Concepción* in 1638, shows. Whether Pedro Calungsod was in Cavite or Manila, waiting to return in his ship to the Visayas, or was thinking of joining a galleon crew, he would have been a likely recruit for San Vitores, once he had shown himself ready to accept the conditions the latter laid down for his lay companions. Though this cannot be more than a suggestion, no alternative has been offered. It certainly seems a more likely one than that Pedro was sent by the bishop of Cebu, or selected by the Jesuits in the Visayas [if he knew them!], suggestions made (and deemed unlikely, but unknowable) by Leyson (1999, 32).⁴³ Rather, since he and the other lay companions were all volunteers, he had to have been in Cavite or Manila when San Vitores was recruiting, and this seems the most plausible reason for him to have been there. Of course this too would make it extremely unlikely that he was as young as fourteen when recruited.

The Missionary Companions of San Vitores in General

There is considerable confusion about the number and character of the companions (all companions, not just the lay) of San Vitores, among whom was Pedro Calungsod. Some of them were with him from Manila; others joined them in Mexico. For in the early years, before a special Manila-Marianas *patache*⁴⁴ was constructed, the only

42. It would seem that he began his book in Guiuan, Samar, in 1751, and finished it shortly before he died in Carigara, Leyte in 1755 (De la Costa 1961, 611; Delgado 1892, xi). Though only published in 1892, the manuscript was finished in 1754.

43. Though generally assumed by Leyson, there is no evidence that Pedro had any contact with Jesuits before coming to Cavite. If in fact he was from Cebu (or much more, from Panay), it would not be very likely as they were so few in those places. Their activity in the Visayas was rather concentrated in Samar, Leyte, and Bohol.

44. A *patache* was a much smaller vessel than the galleons, which were built to carry as much cargo as possible. In the case of the Marianas a ship that would bring the

way to go from Manila to the Marianas was to go first to Mexico by the northern route to Acapulco on the annual galleon. There the cargo was sold for Mexican silver, and then, after taking on the supplies for the Marianas and often some passengers, proceeding by the southern route the galleon stopped at Guam on the way to Manila. This route was the discovery of the great Augustinian friar and navigator, Andrés de Urdaneta, which made Legazpi's successful voyage to the Philippines first possible.

In describing the original group that left Cavite in 1667, Leyson (1999, 30) speaks of Fr. Tomás Cardeñoso, "a complement of soldiers and a couple of survivors of the 1638 sinking of the *Concepción* in the Ladrones, among who [sic] was a Tagalog and the Visayan named Esteban." He adds "some boys" who "were also trained missionary catechists."⁴⁵ This is incorrect. We will show that in the first mission which arrived in Agaña in 1668 there were *none* who went specifically as soldiers (see appendix 1 in the sequel to this article). We have, moreover, already demonstrated that the Filipino companions were neither trained catechists, nor all boys, but were volunteer missionary assistants of various ages.

When the San Diego left Manila, the only priests were Fathers Diego de San Vitores and Tomás Cardeñoso. In Mexico, however, they met a group of Jesuits on their way to the Philippines, and in accord with the permission he had from the Philippine provincial, San Vitores selected four of them—Fathers Luís de Medina, Luís de Morales, and Pedro de Casanova, together with the Jesuit scholastic, Brother Lorenzo Bustillos—thus bringing the total of Jesuits to six.⁴⁶

mission supplies and men was all that was needed, since it was not a trading ship like the galleons. Because of its different construction and size, it was able (though not always successfully!) to take the direct route from Manila to Guam, and had no motive for going to Mexico, since it did not carry any trade goods, only the supplies needed in the Marianas.

45. He also speaks of the "boys" as being "varones virtuosos y pacientes del trabajo." The term *varón* is used of an adult man; one dictionary speaks of a man of thirty years old or more (Velásquez 1957, 647). This of course would completely negate the idea that Pedro and his companions were boys from twelve to fifteen years old. However, in the context of the whole paragraph, it is clear that San Vitores is speaking not of lay companions, young or old, but of the Jesuits who might in the future join him in the Marianas. See his letter of 1665 to the authorities in Manila, apparently also sent to the Father General of the Jesuits ([Ledesma] 1981, 160–61).

46. Mojares inexplicably gives the number of Jesuits as five (2000, 43) Though he evidently did not use García, he did use Hezel 1982, which clearly says five priests and one scholastic (118), as do all other sources.

Brother Marcelo Ansaldo, S.J., who had traveled on the same ship leaving Acapulco but remained on it when it continued to the Philippines after its stopover in Guam, wrote in 1669 from Manila to the Queen that Sanvitores had brought with him from Cavite “some” [*algunos*] Filipinos. Among the Filipinos, but not one of those chosen by San Vitores, would be Gabriel de la Cruz, the servant of Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos, mentioned below. There would also be two interpreters, survivors of the shipwreck of the *Concepción* in 1638, rescued in 1664.

Ansaldo likewise added that “three Spaniards also remained behind [in 1668] to help in this work of conversion.” One of these was certainly Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, who, as we shall see, accompanied San Vitores from Manila, precisely as a missionary, and went baptizing infants and dying people, and accompanying the priests just like the Filipinos, until he was obliged, presumably because of his earlier military career, to take charge of the defense of the mission in September 1671 (García 1683, 225).

Another Spaniard must have been Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos, who, being a good sailor, would later accompany Fr. Luis de Morales on his trip to Tinian. For reasons which neither San Vitores nor García make clear, though they connect his death in some way with the wounding of Morales for having baptized an infant, and they likewise seem to approve him as a person, five days after the wounding of Father Morales in August 1668, the Chamorros killed Castellanos in the sea, together with his servant [*criado*], a Tagalog named Gabriel de la Cruz. Concerning the latter San Vitores is quoted: “. . . at least Gabriel de la Cruz died innocent of the cause they imputed to the sergeant” ([Ledesma] 1981, 204; García 1683, 232).

A third Spaniard must have been “the principal interpreter from Manila,” Don Francisco de Mendoza, of whom we shall say more below. Yet another Spaniard, whose omission from the number of Spaniards we cannot explain with certainty, should have been the fourteen-year old youth, Diego Bazán, recruited by San Vitores in Mexico, whom García always calls *Español* or *Españolito*, as has been seen above.⁴⁷ The question then is, how many of the “algunos” Filipinos in 1668 were missionary companions.

47. Possibly Ansaldo, who was coming from Spain to the Philippines for the first time, and only three years a Jesuit, did not think of Diego Bazán as a Spaniard, either because of his having been born in Mexico, or perhaps just because of his youth in comparison to the three older Spaniards—Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, Sergeant

The Filipino Lay Interpreters

We place the interpreters in a special category because they were mostly not among San Vitores's original volunteer missionary companions. Some of them, though not belonging to the first voyage, were truly missionary volunteers, and well-motivated, since they had come forward to join the mission when they found it—or it found them—in the Marianas. These were mature men, since they had been in the Marianas for thirty years, ever since the shipwreck of 1638. Several indeed proved themselves to be ardent apostles to the Chamorros, even martyrs, and these older ones were often the men in whom San Vitores put much trust, putting them in charge of churches which lacked priests.

It appears to have been somewhat different for the two "official" Filipino interpreters, who now returned to the Marianas after having been rescued by Admiral Esteban Ramos in 1664 ([Ledesma] 1981,163). Since their presence was due only to their necessary function of being interpreters, it would seem that they lacked the missionary zeal that inspired the other volunteer lay companions from Manila. Hence it seems best to consider both groups of "interpreters" separately from those we have called the "missionary companions."

Among those mentioned by Leyson as being the only interpreters from Manila, there were two, one the unnamed Tagalog, mentioned by San Vitores in his introductory letter to his *Arte* (the so-called "grammar and catechism"), and the other, Esteban, a Visayan. Presumably they came voluntarily, since their two companions are not mentioned as having accompanied San Vitores in 1667. As we will see, though they apparently fulfilled their functions as interpreters satisfactorily, there is no indication that either of them was particularly ardent in the work of conversion. It would be different with the others, both those mentioned previously as having joined the mission in the Marianas, and the others we will mention below.

Another man is said to have come on the galleon of 1669 "with the desire to aid the *Marianos*, a task he accomplished at the cost of many hardships and dangers" (García 1683, 456). Since he is one of the two whom San Vitores put in charge of the islands of Gani for two years

Lorenzo Castellanos, and Don Francisco de Mendoza. It would have been natural for Bazán to have associated more with the Filipino companions nearer his own age, and in this way he may have escaped the notice of Ansaldo, particularly since the latter did not set down his recollections in the letter to the Queen until a few months later in Manila.

in the inability of the Jesuits to get there, he must have had a previous knowledge of the language, and therefore have lived in the islands before, undoubtedly as a survivor of the shipwreck of the *Concepción*. This is further supported by the fact that he is mentioned as having married in the Gani islands (*ibid.*). He was therefore an interpreter, but much more. It is possible, therefore, that he was another of the original four survivors interviewed by San Vitores, who for some reason had not been included in the first expedition. Though García confessed to not having been able to find his name in the documents, he asserted that he was *Filipino*. This is unusual, since otherwise García ordinarily designates Filipinos by their *nación*—Visayan, Pampango, Tagalog, Cagayan, etc., rather than calling them *Filipino*. The term *Indio* is most generally—though not always—reserved in García and most other documents of the time for the Chamorros. Those of Spanish blood, whether they be peninsulars, criollos, or Mexican mestizos, are normally referred to as *Españoles*. It is therefore unlikely that he was a Philippine-born Spaniard, though the term *Filipino* would be used for such in the nineteenth century. Moreover, he cannot be Don Francisco de Mendoza, since the latter went from Manila with San Vitores in 1667. It is therefore likely that he was a Filipino in the modern sense of the term, and called such since, not even knowing his name, García would even less know from where in the Philippines he had come. The fact that he took a Chamorro wife would likewise make it likely that he was a Filipino, since this was uncommon among Spaniards until much later.

As noted above, there were other interpreters mentioned in several places, all of whom joined San Vitores only after his arrival in Guam, like Lorenzo, a Malabar, who had settled in the Marianas after the shipwreck of 1638, but on hearing of the arrival of San Vitores and his mission, immediately joined the group. While baptizing an infant, he would be killed by Chamorros (García 1683, 250–51). Again we may say he was useful as an interpreter, but much more of a missionary apostle—and martyr.

Another who had remained in the Marianas from the *Concepción*, and also joined San Vitores only in Guam, was Francisco Maunahun, a native of Indang, Cavite, who had long lived among the Chamorros.⁴⁸ He had met Fr. Luis de Morales in the northern island of

48. Leyson, making use of the English translation of García, calls him a Visayan from *Indan*, and speculates—on the basis of the Spanish tendency to mispronounce the final *ng* in Filipino names, such as Malacañan or Indan—that he may have come from

Alamagan, and “was for four years the faithful companion of the Fathers, baptizing in their absence, and teaching *according to his capacity* [italics mine]. He was in his last two years alone in taking care of the island and church of San Francisco Javier [Agrigan], attending to the baptisms and *Doctrinas*” (García 1683, 455–56). Maunahun, together with the unnamed Filipino interpreter who arrived in 1669, and who was one of those whom San Vitores put in charge of the islands of Gani, would be killed together in June 1672. The unnamed companion’s having been one of those shipwrecked on the *Concepción* would explain his apparently close friendship with Maunahun, as well as his ability to carry on alone on the islands of Gani for a long period.

There were at least two other interpreters, specifically designated as such—Pedro Jiménez and Don Francisco de Mendoza. Pedro Jiménez, who was the interpreter in 1670 at the interrogation of the two men responsible for the death of Fr. Luis de Medina and Hipólito de la Cruz (García 1683, 429), is not further identified, except in the later casual remark about his being the only companion left with San Vitores after the baptism of Choco, so that it was necessary to send another man, because he “could scarcely help him in anything because of being so old” (García 1683, 230). It is clear from the context—though nothing is said of his native place—and from the fact that the honorific *Don* does not precede his name in either passage, that he was a Filipino. Given his advanced age, and the fact that he had a fluent command of Chamorro, such that even though the Jesuits, after two years in the Marianas, could more or less follow the interrogation, used him as official interpreter, makes it seem most probable that he was another survivor of the shipwreck of the *Concepción* thirty years earlier. This could of course explain his age. But we have no indication that he had been one of the four San Vitores had interviewed in Manila, and it seems he had settled in the Marianas after the shipwreck and only joined the mission after its arrival. With these facts in mind, particularly that no indication of his birthplace is given, it is just possible that he was the Filipino named Pedro from the *Concepción*

Hindang in Southern Leyte or Jamindan in Capiz. These suggestions seem far-fetched. It seems much more probable to suppose that García—ignorant of the Philippines—erred in calling him a Visayan, and that he really did come from Indang, the town in Cavite province, which, being close to the shipyard of Cavite town, would be a much more likely place for a sailor on the galleons to have come from as early as the 1630s, when the Visayas had not yet even been fully evangelized (Leyson 1999, 107–8, n. 26; citing García 1985, 174).

shipwreck who brought his two-year-old daughter to be baptized on the day after the arrival of San Vitores. (Risco [1970, 118] calls him a Spaniard, but there is no basis for that in García's text). For we never hear anything further of this specific man, though he is said by García to have been much esteemed by the Chamorros, and it would seem likely then that he would have played an important role. To have been one of the interpreters would therefore be a probable explanation of his importance, while the relatively little activity recorded of him was no doubt due to his age (García 1683, 192).

Mendoza's nationality is not identified, but the fact that he was called *Don Francisco* by San Vitores would indicate that he was a Spaniard, and not one of the four Filipinos rescued in 1664. This is further confirmed by the fact that García identifies him as *natural de Filipinas*, that is, born in the Philippines. All Filipinos are identified according to their *nación*, as has been noted above, and there was no need to say of what country they were *natural*. Being a Spaniard, and being designated by San Vitores and his Jesuit companions in their 1669 report of the first year as "the principal interpreter we had from Manila," he must have been one of the group of Admiral Esteban Ramos, who had managed to reach the Philippines shortly after the wreck of 1638 in a small boat, helped by some friendly Chamorros. In the report, dated 26 April 1669, he is cited as having taken testimony of two miraculous cures ([Ledesma] 1981, 206). In view of the date and the fact that he was from Manila, he must have accompanied San Vitores from Manila in 1667. For the 1669 galleon did not arrive in Guam until 14 June 1669, and it is clear that he had been active long before that. He is spoken of in 1670 as having come to warn San Vitores of the dangerous situation in Tinian and found him raised in an ecstasy (García 1683, 262). García likewise records a conversation between the two men that sounds more like one between two mature and educated Spaniards. If then, as seems certain, he was a Spaniard, we must certainly revise what was reported by Brother Ansaldo in the citation above, that there were only *three* Spaniards who remained behind.

The Lay Missionary Companions: Their Numbers

This leaves us with the problem of how many of the "*algunos*" Filipinos of whom Brother Ansaldo speaks, were in the strict sense missionary companions, as Pedro Calungsod was. Leyson accepts a much

larger total figure for the group that disembarked in Guam in 1668 than that of which we have so far indicated the elements, but does so only from a secondary source. However, his assertion can hardly be reconciled with the eyewitness account of Brother Ansaldo. When the *San Diego* left Agana for the Philippines, Leyson says it left behind:

the little mission of approximately fifty men: five Jesuit priests, one Jesuit student, three Spanish officers and about forty-one non-Spaniards. These latter were mostly Filipinos but included some Mexican mestizos of Spanish and Indian descent. Thirty-one of the non-Spaniards were soldiers and the remainder either catechists or servants. (Leyson 1999, 38; citing Rogers 1995, 47)⁴⁹

The figure for Jesuits is correct, as is that for three Spaniards, if we admit that Bazán was overlooked because of his youth. But as we have seen, the three Spaniards whom Brother Ansaldo mentions were not all officers—only Captain Juan de Santa Cruz and Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos. Moreover Santa Cruz and Don Francisco de Mendoza (and Bazán) were there primarily as missionaries, and probably so was Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos.⁵⁰ The first “soldiers” in the proper sense of the word would be the six who would arrive on the galleon *San José* in 1669. Since they came from Mexico, all were most probably Spaniards or Mexicans. The figure of thirty-one non-Spaniards as soldiers is probably a confusion of the thirty-one mostly provisional “soldiers” of the much later siege of September-October 1671 (spoken of in appendix 1 of the sequel article to this) which included all the laymen present in Agana—Spaniards, lay Filipino missionaries and interpreters, soldiers of the 1669 and June 1671 galleons. Furthermore there were no Mexican mestizos in 1668—Bazán was a criollo, a Mexican-born Spaniard. Other Mexicans, whether criollo or mestizo, would come only on the galleons of 1669 or 1671.

The total number of men in the Marianas mission at the time of the 1671 siege of Agana, out of which the thirty-one must be deducted,

49. Since I do not have a copy of Rogers’ book, which is in any case merely a secondary source, I cannot say on what grounds he makes this statement. Be that as it may, whatever may be the value of his general history of Guam, when elsewhere cited by Leyson he seems to have made a very superficial study of the primary sources on the San Vitores mission, confusing data from different periods or making unwarranted suppositions.

50. Ansaldo speaks of the three Spaniards who remained in Agana in 1668 as having done so “to help in this work of conversion” ([Ledesma] 1981, 200). Bazán, of course, had been invited by San Vitores “to come and be a martyr.”

includes the lay missionary from the Philippines who arrived in 1669. He (and perhaps Maunahun), however, would have been absent in the islands of Gani at this time, since he is said to have spent four years taking care of the church there before his martyrdom. In addition, there were the first six regular soldiers, who also arrived on the galleon *San José* in 1669, among whom must have been Sergeant Major Juan de Santiago,⁵¹ and the probable three or four soldiers who arrived in 1671. Moreover, we know of one Filipino, Pedro Basijan of the Visayan village of Salug,⁵² who had accompanied Fr. Francisco Solano in 1671, and took part in the defense of Agana (García 1683, 451).⁵³ (Also part of the mission, though not included in the thirty-one besieged in Agana, were four lay companions, who were in Tinian with

51. The name of Don Juan de Santiago first appears in the documents when, apart from the commander, Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, he was the only Spanish soldier in the *Armada Naval*, or *Escuadrón Mariano*, that San Vitores brought to Tinian to pacify the two warring factions there. Since this was in 1670, he must have arrived as one of the six soldiers who came on the galleon of 1669, probably as their commander. In 1671, now called Sergeant Major, he ordered the arrest of those suspected in the murder of the Mexican José Peralta, all followers of one of the most powerful chiefs in Agana, Hurao, whom Santiago also arrested. His intention was to put them on trial, releasing those who appeared innocent, as he began to do. In an act typical of San Vitores, but no doubt infuriating to a military man like Santiago, and seen as a sign of weakness by Hurao himself, the latter's followers persuaded San Vitores to order Hurao released, after which he immediately became the principal instigator of the siege of September-October 1671 (García 1683, 275-76; Murillo Velarde 1749, f. 297). After the death of San Vitores, when new fortifications were being built in May 1672, now Captain, Santiago was the new commander. He is also spoken of as now commanding the *Escuadrón Mariano*, which formerly had been commanded by Captain Juan de Santa Cruz. Since it was up to the Jesuit superior to make such an appointment, it was probably done at the request of Santa Cruz himself. It should be remembered that Santa Cruz originally came as a missionary, and it was only out of necessity that he took military command in crises. Santa Cruz was still in the Marianas in 1673, when he testified at the canonical process in Agana on the martyrdom of San Vitores, but that same year returned to Manila, where he again testified in 1677 ([Ledesma] 1981, 221, 295, 331]).

52. Though it is impossible to be certain of the location of this town today, Leyson tentatively suggests Salong in Negros Occidental, or Salug "in Zamboanga del Norte which was also considered at that time as part of the Visayas." I do not know on what fact he bases the latter statement. There is, however, a municipality by the name of Salong, listed under Cavancalan [Kabankalan] in the Census of 1903. Kabankalan was one of the three Jesuit residences in Negros in the seventeenth century, and Father Solano had worked there for several years before being sent to the Subanon and eventually to the Marianas. It is therefore not unlikely that he recruited Basijan there, but of course this remains a conjecture.

53. Besides taking part in the defense of Agana in 1671, he later joined an expedition under Captain Juan de Santiago to punish the killers of San Vitores and Pedro

Fr. Alonso López and could not be called back in time when danger seemed to threaten [García 1683, 277]). On the other hand, those killed between 1669 and 1671 must be added to the result to ascertain the original number of 1668. But the only ones who had come from outside the Marianas—apart from Fr. Luís de Medina—were the Visayan Hipólito de la Cruz and the Tagalog Gabriel de la Cruz among the Filipinos; and Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos and the Mexican (one of the six soldiers who arrived in 1669), José Peralta, among those designated as Spaniards. (The latter was killed while working alone, cutting wood for crosses, by Chamorros who coveted his machete). It is impossible therefore that the number of persons who had arrived in 1668 comprised anywhere near fifty.⁵⁴ Summing up the evidence for 1668, the laymen included no active soldiers, and apart from the three Spaniards, Diego Bazán, the two interpreters from the 1638 shipwreck, and the servant of Sergeant Castellanos, all others were Filipino lay missionaries, among whom the fifty-six year old soon-to-become *donado*, Brother Felipe Sonson, should be included. Inasmuch as all the sources say that there were among the “soldiers” of the siege twelve Spaniards (including Mexicans, whether criollos or mestizos, since the accounts divide the “soldiers” into the two categories of “Spaniards” and “Filipinos”), there were nineteen (or seventeen) Filipinos acting as soldiers, depending on which source one uses for the total number of besieged in 1671 (García 1683, 278; Leyson 1999, 60, citing Fr. Andres de

Calungsod, but died of an infected wound received in an ambush (García 1683, 451). García praises him and judges that God rewarded him “for the work he had done in this mission without having any temporal interest” (ibid.). Basijan’s life and death is an indication of how difficult it is to differentiate the motivation of some of the soldiers of these early years from that of the volunteer companions of San Vitores like Pedro Calungsod. Similarly a Mexican named Juan Beltrán, from “the province of Cinaloa [Sinaloa], died of his wound on this occasion. “He had come to these islands at over fifty years old, with the desire to serve God, and died with the hope of enjoying Him for all eternity” (ibid., 451–52).

54. Four new Jesuit missionaries came on the 1671 galleon, but three of the original 1668 contingent went on to the Philippines to complete their studies, and Fr. Luís de Medina had already been killed, so there was no increase of missionaries. It is curious that all the sources concerning the siege of 1671 speak of six priests, which was, of course, the total number in the mission. But, as we have noted above, they explicitly say also that one of the priests was away on another island with four of the lay companions. Hence, the correct number of Jesuits among those being besieged would have been only five. This only gives further evidence that it is impossible to give exact numbers either for 1668 or for 1671. My approximations only show the impossibility of the numbers cited by Leyson from Rogers.

Ledesma). The total of Filipino lay missionary companions in 1668, then, with the subtraction from the 1671 figure of the two original interpreters, of Pedro Basijan, and of Gabriel de la Cruz, and with the addition of the four with Fr. Alonso López in 1671, and of the martyred Hipólito de la Cruz, must then have been (and it can only be an educated guess) no more than twenty. This is, of course, the number San Vitores had set as a target when he was recruiting. Some of them were quite young, like the Pampango, Andrés de la Cruz, others quite old. It is very unlikely there were any further servants of Spaniards besides Gabriel de la Cruz, unless possibly Andrés de la Cruz might have been one—which would account more satisfactorily for his tender age of over twelve, as well as his readiness to kill the wounded enemy, so unlike the attitude San Vitores inculcated in his lay missionary companions.

The Quality of the Filipino Lay Missionaries

This much being said about the numbers, it seems necessary to look also at the *quality* of San Vitores's lay companions, particularly those who formed his first volunteers and arrived with him in Guam in 1668, among whom was Pedro Calungsod. We have already said what can be known of the four Spaniards, including the ardent and courageous Diego Bazán. Of the Filipinos, we have already spoken of the donado Brother Felipe Sonson, who lived with the Jesuits themselves in Agana, a man of deep spirituality, who in reality merited the palm of martyrdom, even though he took several months to die of the wounds inflicted on him in late 1684. The very fact that he received the honor of a lengthy biography in the Jesuit Annual Letter of 1686 from Fr. Lorenzo Bustillos, who had known him for almost twenty years, shows that he was more a Jesuit than a lay assistant, especially after he took his vows before San Vitores in 1669 (Schumacher 1995, 266–85; esp. 276–77).

A second category was composed of those who had been sailors on the galleon *Concepción* when it was shipwrecked in the Marianas in 1638. All of the survivors, including the Spaniard, Don Francisco de Mendoza,⁵⁵ were linguistically qualified to become interpreters for the

55. The Jesuit report of the first year relates a supposed apparition of the Blessed Virgin in the 1630s to a Chamorro named Taga in the village of Tinian called Chiro, in which she exhorted Taga to receive baptism and to help the shipwrecked Spaniards with a boat to reach the Philippines. One of the Spaniards, named Marcos Fernández,

missionaries because of their stay in the islands.⁵⁶ Even more would this be true of those who had spent the full intervening thirty years in the islands. Such would be Lorenzo, the Malabar (probably a former slave of a Spaniard in Manila, where the Portuguese habitually sold non-Filipino slaves, allegedly made prisoners in a just war, taken from the Malabar coast in India), and Francisco de Maunahun. These two, of course, joined fully in the work of the mission when they found San Vitores, and died for their faith.

Also among these shipwrecked sailors were the four Filipinos rescued in 1664 by Admiral Esteban Ramos from the Marianas, who, as we have seen, were presented to San Vitores in 1665. To what extent these were anxious to return as part of the missionary enterprise is not at all clear, but from the fact that at least two of the Filipinos accompanied San Vitores, and presumably the other two did not, it seems clear they went voluntarily, whatever may have been their motives. If the interpreter who came on the galleon of 1669 was one of the four

baptized Taga, and through the latter's brother in Guam they were able to get a boat, so that they might return to the Philippines and send Fathers to the Marianas. Whatever one may think of the apparition, Taga was baptized "Corcuera" in honor of the current governor of the Philippines, and not only the legend but also the name still persisted in Chiro when the Jesuits arrived there. It seems sure that the "chief interpreter from Manila," Don Francisco de Mendoza, must have been one of these Spaniards, as we have said.

56. Even Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, who, as far as is known, was not among the Spaniards of the *Concepción*, must have achieved a fair amount of aptitude in the language, for he is spoken of as conversing with a Chamorro woman in difficult labor, over whom he prayed, and then baptized her new-born infant in danger of death. He then taught her the sign of the cross and prayers to drive away the *anitos*, giving her a profession of faith written by San Vitores and promising that when San Vitores came back he would baptize her and her family (García 1683, 225). The ordinary non-Spanish crew members who survived in 1638 appear to have blended into the local population. For the Filipinos, the Chamorro language, being cognate to Tagalog and Visayan, would have been easy to learn. García says: "Their language is easy to pronounce and to learn, especially for those who know Tagalog and Visayan" (1683, 198). Probably they had taken wives for themselves, at least in some cases, though there is rarely a mention of a wife in the sources. Only the Pedro [Jiménez?] who presented his two-year-old daughter to San Vitores for baptism on the day of his arrival in Agana, and the unnamed interpreter who took his wife with him to the Gani islands, are so mentioned, as far as I have been able to determine. However, it is probable that some had entered into stable marriages, what would today be called common-law marriages, but valid ones, given the impossibility of reaching a priest. Or perhaps they had blended into the culture of *Urritaos*, the young unmarried men who, according to Chamorro custom, bought or rented daughters of families for sexual services in a kind of institutionalized prostitution in the so-called bachelors' houses in the villages. This, according to

rescued Filipinos, he would be a third.⁵⁷ In any case his motivation was primarily and explicitly religious, since García tells us that he came “with the desire to help the Marianos, which he fulfilled with many trials and dangers” (1683, 456). Though he married a native woman, this did not interrupt his missionary vocation, for he brought her with him, “to keep himself from the occasion of offending God, to whom he offered many souls.” He remained, as we have noted above, carrying on an apostolate to the best of his ability in the islands of Gani, until his death when he was trying to bring priests there to make more effective his efforts. Rather than merely an interpreter, though he was qualified for that, he became an apparently highly effective missionary apostle.

Certainly a part of the same shipwrecked group were the two “professional” interpreters, who definitely were in the first mission with San Vitores, but who have left uncertain religious records. The one who helped San Vitores in the task of compiling his vocabulary was the unnamed Tagalog. San Vitores wrote of him:

At the time that I am writing this aboard the ship, we have the oral explanation of a certain interpreter—a Tagalog both by nation and by language. He possesses good enough talent and ability to express himself, but cannot write even in our [Spanish] letters.⁵⁸ He was left behind from the wreck of the ship named after the Immaculate Conception, which by lucky chance occurred in the Marianas Islands, where he spent seventeen years [*sic*] living and dealing with the natives of those islands. Now through the great generosity of God and the most blessed Virgin we use him as an interpreter. (Preface to “*Grammaticae Institutiones Marianae Linguae*,” in Burrus 1954, 941)⁵⁹

Chamorro custom, would not preclude later marriage, which was generally stable, according to the missionaries. Nor would it prevent their returning to a Christian way of life, even if not as missionaries, once the priests arrived.

57. Pedro Basijan, mentioned above as coming from Salug in companionship with Fr. Francisco Solano, could be another (not the same one since they were killed at different dates and places), though it is difficult to know whether he came as a missionary or a soldier. Perhaps that distinction is artificial here. On the other hand, there is no indication that he came specifically as an interpreter.

58. The implication is that, though not knowing the Spanish alphabet, he knew the pre-Hispanic Tagalog syllabary, which was still in use to some degree in the 1630s when he had been shipwrecked, as the existence of signatures of Filipinos from that period still to be found in the Dominican and other religious order archives attests (Scott 1994, 210–13).

59. The translation from the Latin is mine, and differs on a few important points from that of Burrus (936) and from the almost similar one of Leyson (1999, 30, n. 12).

However, after that, nothing more is heard of him in the Marianas, as far as the documents go, and we do not even know his name.⁶⁰

His companion, the Visayan Esteban, is said to have served the mission laudably for some time as interpreter after their arrival. However, as the chronicler puts it, "tired of such a hard life, and desirous of freedom [*libertad*], he went off to live in the licentiousness of the natives" (García 1683, 291-92). One might surmise that having lived so long a life among the young Chamorro men (the *urritaos*) whose way of life was seen as nothing but licentiousness by the missionaries, once having left the Philippines again and then lived under the strict regime of San Vitores, he reverted to the way in which he had undoubtedly spent most of his adult life before being "rescued" by Admiral Esteban Ramos. He did not have the motivation to continue to live a life which was not only to be Christian and an example to the Chamorros, according to the ideals of San Vitores, but which involved considerable sacrifices for the rest of his life due to the precarious state of the mission in the face of considerable Chamorro hostility. It is notable that there is no mention of his having previously married a Chamorro woman or settled down to have a family. Most probably then he had lived the licentious life of the *urritaos* in the so-called "bachelors'

These give the impression that the "grammar and catechism" were actually composed on the ship, rather than before San Vitores left the Philippines. In fact, a few lines later in his own text, Leyson actually asserts this error. A semifinal version of this *preface* may have been composed on the ship, but not the substance of the work, as will be seen in the subsequent article. It was rather the *vocabulario* that was done on the ship. The seventeen [*decem et septem*] years is, of course, erroneous, since the shipwreck took place in 1638 and the rescue in 1664, hence twenty-six or twenty-seven years. Probably a slip or oversight by San Vitores, who in fact elsewhere gives the figure twenty-five.

60. Though it can only be a conjecture, one possibility is that, having fulfilled his function of interpreter on the ship, by the time he reached Guam he had decided to give up and return to the Philippines. This conjecture would offer a plausible explanation for an otherwise inexplicable remark of García in his account of the life of Fr. Francisco Solano, a devoted friend of San Vitores, whom he assisted when the latter was preparing for the mission to the Marianas. After finishing his studies, he was assigned to work in Negros and later among the Subanon in Mindanao. Then assigned to Manila, he handled the affairs of the Marianas mission, and again asked to be sent there. While waiting, "with the *Arte* of the language composed by San Vitores and sent to Manila, and with the teaching of a *Mariano* who passed to Manila on the ship which left Father Sanvitores in the Marianas, whom he put in charge of instructing him, he made progress in learning the language . . ." Since it seems incredible that San Vitores would have sent an unbaptized Chamorro to Manila two days after his arrival, when the work of evangelization had not even begun, much less the baptisms of adults in good health, it seems most likely that the *Mariano* spoken of was a Filipino who had

houses" of the villages).⁶¹ It was in seeking him out (unsuccessfully) that San Vitores and Pedro Calungsod would instead encounter martyrdom.

A third category of the Filipinos was the *compañeros seculares*, including of course Pedro Calungsod, who formed the volunteer group of lay missionaries in Manila or Cavite. At the time of the three-day debate between San Vitores and the Chinese pagan castaway Choco, who had caused the missionaries so much trouble with his lying stories that the water of baptism or the oil of anointing were poisonous means of killing all Chamorros, Choco finally agreed to be baptized (although, as events proved, he was totally insincere). Just before the baptism, two of San Vitores's four Filipino companions suddenly began to act in a hysterical fashion, and while one named Bautista fled to the mountains, the other turned on San Vitores with a knife. In an effort to quiet the agitated Chamorro spectators, San Vitores turned to him and smilingly said: "What are you doing, my son?" When Captain Juan de Santa Cruz attempted to stop him, he stabbed the latter three times in one arm (García 1683, 227–28).

San Vitores's reaction was typical of him, although—or perhaps because—he saw the event as a direct intervention of the devil. As he laughingly told the amazed Chamorros in an effort to quiet their unrest, they should not be scandalized, since it was the devil, not the two Filipino renegades who did what they did. He sent the frustrated assassin as a prisoner to Agana, "not to punish him as guilty, but so that he might not lose him as a fugitive out of fear of being punished" (García 1683, 230). Similarly, he made efforts to locate Bautista until—as he said—it was revealed to him in a dream that the fugitive was in great danger of losing his soul, hiding with Choco. He sent another Filipino named Torres to bring back "this poor fellow [*mozo*] who had worked laudably from the beginning of the mission, and continued to

lived in the Marianas for many years as one of the shipwrecked sailors. This would account for Fr. Solano finding an interpreter in Manila, as well as the disappearance from the records of San Vitores's Tagalog interpreter. The argument is certainly plausible, and it solves several mysteries, but it can only be a conjecture. When San Vitores did send three Chamorro "nobles" back to Manila with the three Jesuits in 1671 with the idea that they be impressed by Manila and Mexico and thus be persuasive supporters of the mission when they returned, they were already Christian, and there was great excitement around them. Moreover, García gives the better part of a chapter to this "embassy" (1683, 267–72). In fact, none of them succeeded in returning, either dying of disease or of shipwreck.

61. The Spaniards only succeeded in abolishing these around 1680 (Hazel, 1989, 24).

do so afterwards." San Vitores, however, prudently "did not occupy him anymore in accompanying the Fathers, in order to keep him from any occasions [of temptation], and kept him in Agana exercising the office of carpenter, of which he had a reasonable knowledge"(ibid.).⁶²

This was not the only desertion among the chosen companions. In January 1671, since the missionary of Santa Ana [Zarpana; today Rota] was sick, and there was unrest among the leading men, San Vitores spent some weeks in revivifying the island and pacifying the unrest. On his return to Agana, however, he found that

some [*algunos*] of the lay companions, who formerly had helped him in the cultivation of the vineyard of the Lord, in their desire for freedom [*libertad*], had fled to some apostate villages which had rebelled in his absence. He was much afflicted by this because of the soldiers he was losing, and much more, because they were going to perdition and could lead others that way. (García 1683, 265)

One may observe that here and elsewhere in García's account, presumably reflecting the feelings of his sources, for the missionaries *libertad*, a word often used and always in a derogatory sense, was not a good but an evil. It meant "freeing" themselves from the restraints of an exemplary Christian life, and from the implicit promises they had made in volunteering for the mission, just as the Jesuits had bound themselves by their vows and their missionary vocation. *Libertad* was therefore the equivalent of betrayal of their missionary vocation, and inevitably connoted licentiousness at the *urritaos'* public houses.

San Vitores was a man of great personal austerity, though equally or more noted for his kindness to those who were weaker than he. It is significant that when he was martyred, he was out risking his life in search of one who had abandoned him and fled to *libertad*. Nonetheless, for the sake of the mission he made stringent demands on those who were to carry it out with him, and in spite of his original difficulty in finding volunteers, he was quite ready, even insistent, that those who could not find in themselves the strength to live according to the needs of a successful evangelization, would do better to stay behind. Thus, as we have seen, all the lay volunteers were informed that they must abstain wholly from alcoholic beverages, such as tuba,

62. Here one can see again that at least some of the *compañeros* were not boys, or even youths, since this man had learned the trade of carpenter, presumably while still in the Philippines.

because a failure in this matter would only do harm among a people whose culture did not yet include drinking sprees. He himself, when he reached Agana, made up his mind no longer to take *chocolate*, the ordinary drink of Spaniards in the Philippines, and though he did not impose his mortification on anyone else, all the Jesuits followed his example.

Though we do not have any detailed account of what daily life was like in the main mission compound in Agana, there is no doubt that it was often demanding, particularly on the young. They had to be ready for different tasks around the mission compound, to have their schedule of work and prayer carefully determined for them (they joined the Jesuits for Litanies, the rosary, and other prayers in the evening), to accompany the missionary in good weather or bad, always going unarmed when with a priest, whether the situation was dangerous or not, traveling from island to island in fragile canoes. Some, at least, were relatively young men, living and working among a people who in the beginning went completely naked, for lack of any cloth on the islands, only the women wearing a little bark covering of some kind, called *tifis*, over their private parts. Even if San Vitores in one of his letters says that this no longer disturbed the Jesuit missionaries, though he was trying to supply as many Chamorros as he could with some clothing, it is unlikely that the situation was the same for the lay companions, especially the young ([Ledesma]1981, 205).

After all, none of them, with the exception of the older Felipe Sonson, had taken a vow of chastity like the Jesuits. But if they were to be examples to the Chamorros of exemplary Christianity, in the circumstances they were obliged in fact to live such a vow. There is no mention (with the possible exception of the Tagalog interpreter we have conjectured) of San Vitores having sent any of the companions back to the Philippines—even when that was a possibility with the yearly galleon, which often did not arrive. But one can be sure that he did not tolerate any scandal among the lay missionaries. Though we have narrated more than one example of truly heroic virtue among them, it would be against all probability that some, not only like the interpreter Esteban, but even among the volunteers, would not at times find the life irksome, and go off, like those narrated above, in search of libertad amid the licencias of the Chamorros.

Here we see the enormous moral ascendancy that San Vitores had, not only among those of the Chamorros who were well disposed, but much more among the long-Catholic Filipinos. When he heard of the

compañeros who had escaped from their commitments, he showed no anger, nor did he even send reliable persons like Captain Juan de Santa Cruz with a force of men to bring them back. Rather, after personal prayer and penance, and asking the same from the other Jesuits, he sent a messenger with letters for each.

[These were] full of affection, persuading them that they should return to the camp of Jesus Christ, whose soldiers they were, and not cast a stain on their honor and conscience, which in this life could be removed with tears, but in the next would have to be paid for with eternal fire. He was not so unmindful of human weakness as not to pardon them, nor did he lack the charity of God, to receive them back within his heart if they should return repentant. (García 1683, 265)⁶³

Persuaded by his charity, they did return repentant, and he received them as he had said with an affectionate embrace of each one, rejoicing at their repentance. But conscious as he was that this repentance might be short-lived under the pressures that would continue and that they would again be tempted to take a similar flight, he reinforced his words with an action that one can only imagine in a man like San Vitores.

But in order that such gentleness might not make them take the seriousness of their fault lightly, he bared his own shoulders, and began to lay blows on them with a scourge of small steel disks, which bathed his shoulders with blood, until the culprits, ashamed and filled with pity, took it from his hands. He said to them: "My sons, between you and myself we have to satisfy God for this fault. Repentance and confession is your part, and I will make the satisfaction and penance for the fault." (García 1683, 266)

Alien as his action seems today, and based on a theology of placating God's anger for sin that we can no longer share, not only its heroism but also its effectiveness cannot be denied. Again, characteristically, he was not content with making a deeply emotional, but in the end transitory, impression, but showed the sound psychology with which he handled his companions and kept them loyal under difficult conditions.

63. The themes of the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius—the knight of Christ, who must not stain his honor, sworn to show his loyalty to the eternal King, whose camp was the contrary of that of Satan—are quite evident here, no doubt part of the religious formation he had given them on their arrival in the Marianas.

Knowing that idleness was the occasion of their fault, he placed them as apprentices to other soldiers who had particular tasks, so that their being occupied would restrain their thoughts and keep them from vices. At the same time they would be of profit to the [Chamorro] nation, which was lacking in all crafts, teaching them by example and by the practice of useful occupations, necessary to the commonwealth. (Ibid.)

The point of relating these various incidents among the lay companions of San Vitores is to show that there were great differences among them as to their understanding of the mission, and their commitment to it. It is clear from the biography of Brother Felipe Sonson that he had the highest spiritual motivation, and was deeply devoted to the idea of working for those who had not yet heard of God. His missionary zeal could easily stand comparison with that of the Jesuits themselves, to whom he attached himself, though with great humility. We can gather from the way that the fidelity of Pedro Calungsod is praised that he shared such a zeal and loyalty.

The Nature of the Entire Mission as it Arrived in the Marianas

To put the lay *compañeros'* commitment, or failure of it, in context, we may take an analogy from the Jesuits themselves. It is evident from the list of Jesuits in the Marianas from 1668 to 1769, when they were expelled by the decree of Carlos III, that though it would appear that all were eager volunteers for the mission, and in the first decades often eager for martyrdom, once in the Marianas not all were able to adjust, physically, psychologically and/or spiritually, to the conditions in which they had to live and work.⁶⁴ Not a few returned to the Philippines. Of the first six Jesuits, three went back to the Philippines after three years of the mission to complete their studies, but of these three, only Lorenzo Bustillo returned after his three years of studies, to remain as a missionary for another forty-one years.⁶⁵ Of those who

64. One clear example of the physical incompatibility is Fr. Diego Noriega, S.J., who, though already having tuberculosis, was sent from Mexico to the Marianas "because of the great lack of personnel," and because superiors thought the change of climate would do him good [!]. Sick from the time of his arrival, especially after a voyage on which there was always high mortality even among the healthy, he died within five months (García 1683, 287).

65. Hezel, 1989, appendix 2, 89. Though there are several presumably typographical errors in this list, it is accurate (except for one error regarding Fr. Alonso López, who is listed as arriving in 1673 rather than the correct date of 1671). It is based on the Philippine Province catalogues on microfilm from the Jesuit Roman Archives, at the Rizal Library of the Ateneo de Manila University. Some Jesuits, for whom no nationality is noted, are clearly non-Spaniards to judge from their Germanic names.

arrived in the first two decades, a few died of natural causes, but the great majority died at the hands of the Chamorros. Of those who did not, most left the Marianas after one to three years. However, there were notable exceptions. Fr. Tomás Cardeñoso, San Vitores's original companion, remained there till his death in 1715, a total of forty-seven years.⁶⁶

If this is true of the highly-trained and generally strongly-motivated Jesuits, it evidently would be likely to be more so among the companions chosen by San Vitores, no matter how careful he was to lay down the conditions for joining the mission. Pedro Calungsod had to live among others, not only of different ages, but also of varying degrees of spiritual commitment and fidelity to Christian life. Just as it is incorrect to suppose that all the lay missionary companions were of approximately the same age, it would be equally incorrect to think that all had the same sense of missionary vocation as, for example, Felipe Sonson, the only one of whom we have a concrete description of his spiritual and moral life from such an authoritative source as Fr. Lorenzo Bustillos.⁶⁷ It would also not be surprising if some of the young ones volunteered out of a sense of adventure, without a mature realization of the sacrifices they should be prepared for.

In attempting to give a realistic picture of the lay volunteers by a perhaps enlightening, though in many respects inadequate, illustration

66. Of course, other factors also intervened besides spiritual or psychological or physical incompatibility with life in the mission. The mission always remained a subordinate part of the Philippine Jesuit Province, and undoubtedly some were appointed to more important positions in the Philippines for which they were particularly fitted, like Fr. Luis de Morales, who had left the mission in 1671 to complete his studies, but who was kept on in the Philippines (for which he had originally volunteered) for other work, where he became provincial superior in 1699. We may surmise too from examining the list that, given the large number of volunteers, in the eighteenth century Spaniards were more likely to be sent to the increasingly sophisticated Hispanic Philippines, particularly the University of San Ignacio and other apostolates in Manila, while the large number of non-Spaniards from various countries, for whom Spanish was only a second language, could work as well or better in the more primitive Marianas. Beginning as early as 1678 (though there had been some non-Spaniards before that) some sixty percent of the missionaries were Dutch [i.e., Spanish Netherlands, today Belgium], Austrian, Bohemian, Italian, Maltese, Sicilian, Neapolitan, and German.

67. Bustillos has to be read critically. Especially in his early years as a scholastic, he showed a propensity for believing in visions, miracles, and prophecies even beyond the ordinary rhetoric of his times. This is especially true when writing of San Vitores, clearly his idol, who in turn seems to have confided to his fellow-*Burgalés* much of his personal mystical experience in his paternal attitude toward the youngest of the mission. Nonetheless, his knowledge of both the mission and its leader were unsurpassed.

from the differences of fitness for mission life among the Jesuits, we have advanced into the period of the sequel to this article, and even beyond. Even more so have we had to enter, at least partially, into the Marianas stage of the mission, to get an idea of the varied character and commitment of Pedro's companions, so as to indicate the strengths and weaknesses of those with whom he would live and work—some heroes and martyrs like himself; others of lesser caliber. In the sequel which is closely connected with this article, we will concentrate on the apostolic ministry itself, though there also we will have to look backward again to this article to appreciate properly what was being accomplished by these men, and to understand more fully the conditions under which they carried out their missionary activity. We will terminate our study, however, with the martyrdom of Fr. Diego de San Vitores, whose spiritual and psychological personality marks in such gigantic fashion this whole history, and his faithful companion, Pedro Calungsod. The decades following would bring great changes—a more aggressive attitude of the Spanish-Filipino forces in the face of periodic insurrections, a decimation of the Chamorro population through new diseases to which they had no immunity, a settling down of the native population to something resembling peasant life in the Philippines, as widespread intermarriage began to take place between Filipino soldiers and Chamorro women, the immigration of married Filipino couples into the community once it was at peace, and the gradual formation of a Hispanic-Filipino-Chamorro Christian community, eventually limited, more or less willingly, to the larger islands.

References

- Abella, Domingo, trans. and ed. 1962. *Vignettes of Philippines-Marianas colonial history*. Vol. 1. Manila: International Association of Historians of Asia.
- Alcina, Francisco Ignacio, S.J. 1974. Historia natural del sitio, fertilidad y calidad de las Islas e Indios de Visayas compuesto por el P.^e Fran.^{co} Ign.^o Alcina de la Compañía de Jesus despues de mas de treinta y tres años en ellas y entre ellos de Ministerio. In *La historia de las Islas e Indios Visayas del Padre Alcina. 1668*, ed. M.^a Luisa Martín-Meras and M.^a Dolores Higuera. Madrid: Instituto Histórico de Marina, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Arévalo, C. G., S.J. 1998. *Pedro Calungsod: Young Filipino mission-volunteer, Visayan Proto Martyr martyred at Tumhon, Guam, 2 April 1672*. Manila: Office for Publications, the Archdiocese of Manila.

- _____. 2000. *Pedro Calungsod. Kabataang Pilipino na kusang nag-alay ng sarili para sa misyón. Tagá-Bisayang karapat-dapat hirangin martir. Nagpakámartir sa Tumhon, Guam*. Translated by Fernando Macalinao, S.J. Pasay City: Paulines Publishing House.
- Bazaco, Evergisto, O.P. 1933. *Historia documentada del Real Colegio de San Juan de Letrán*. Manila: Impr. de la Universidad de Santo Tomás.
- Blair, Emma Helen, and James Alexander Robertson, eds. 1908. *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898*. Vol. 53. Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark.
- Burrus, E[rnest] J., S.J. 1954. San Vitores' grammar and catechism in the Mariana (or Chamorro) language (1668). *Anthropos* 49: 934–59.
- Colín, Francisco, S.J. 1902. *Labor evangélica . . . de la Compañía de Jesús*. Nueva edición . . . por el P. Pablo Pastells, S.J. Vol. 3. Barcelona: Henrich.
- Cullinane, Michael. 1998. Accounting for souls: Ecclesiastical sources for the study of Philippine demographic history. In *Population and history. The demographic origins of the modern Philippines*, eds. Daniel F. Doeppers and Peter Xenos, 281–346. Published in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin-Madison Center for Southeast Asian Studies. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Cullinane, Michael, and Peter Xenos. 1998. The growth of population in Cebu during the Spanish era: Constructing a regional demography from local sources. In *Population and history: The demographic origins of the modern Philippines*, eds. by Daniel F. Doeppers and Peter Xenos, 71–138. Published in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin-Madison Center for Southeast Asian Studies. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- De la Costa, H., S.J. 1956. Jesuit education in the Philippines to 1768. *Philippine Studies* 4:127–55.
- _____. 1961. *The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581–1768*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1965. *Readings in Philippine history*. Manila: Bookmark.
- Delgado, Juan José, S.J. 1892. *Historia general sacro-profana, política y natural de las Islas del Poniente llamadas Filipinas*. Manila: Imp. de El Eco de Filipinas.
- Ferrer, Maxima Magsanoc, comp. and ed. 1970. *Union catalogue of Philippine materials*. Vol. 1. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press and National Library.
- García, Francisco, S.J. 1683. *Vida y martirio de el Venerable Padre Diego Luis de Sanvitores de la Compañía de Jesús, primer apostol de las Islas Marianas y sucesos de estas Islas desde el año mil seiscientos sesenta y ocho, hasta el de mil seiscientos ochenta y uno*. Madrid: Ivan García Infanzon.
- _____. 1985. *The life and martyrdom of the venerable Father Diego Luis de Sanvitores*. Translated by Margaret Higgins. Agana, Guam: n.p.
- Hezel, Francis X. 1982. From conversion to conquest. *The Journal of Pacific History* 17: 115–37.
- _____. 1989. *From conquest to colonization: Spain in the Mariana Islands, 1690 to 1740*. Saipan, M. P.: Department of Historic Preservation.

- Larkin, John A. 1972. *The Pampangans: Colonial society in a Philippine province*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [Ledesma, Andrés de, S.J.]. 1898. *Relación del martirio del Venerable Padre Diego Luis de San Vitores de la Compañía de Jesús, escrita por un misionero de la Isla de Goan (San Juan), también jesuita. Sevilla, 1674. Ahora reimpressa por primera vez*. In *Archivo del bibliófilo filipino*. Compiled by W. E. Retana. Vol. 4. Madrid: Minuesa de los Ríos.
- [Ledesma, Juan M. H., S.J.]. 1981. *Manilen. seu Aganien. Beatificationis seu Declarationis Martyrii Servi Dei Didaci Aloisii de San Vitores, Sacerdotis Professi Societatis Jesu (+1672), Positio Super Vita et Martyrio Ex Officio Concinnata*. Romae: Sacra Congregatio Pro Causis Sanctorum, Officium Historicum.
- Le Govien, Charles, S.J. 1700. *Histoire des Isles Mariannes nouvellement converties à la Religion Chrestienne, & de la mort glorieuse des premiers missionnaires qui y ont prêché la Foy*. Paris: Nicolas Pepie.
- [Leyson, Ildebrando Jesus Aliño]. 1993. *Deposition on the martyrdom of the servant of God, Lay Catechist in Guam, Visayan-Cebuano Pedro Calungsod, + 2 April 1672*. Cebu City: Archdiocese of Cebu.
- Leyson, Ildebrando Jesus Aliño. 1999. *Pedro Calonsor Bissaya. Prospects of a teenage Filipino*. Quezon City: Claretian Publications.
- Medina, Isagani, comp. and ed. 1972. *Filipiniana materials in the National Library*. Quezon City: National Library and University of the Philippines Press.
- Mojares, Resil B. 2000. The Epiphany of Pedro Calungsod, Seventeenth-Century Visayan Martyr. In *Lives at the margin. Biography of Filipinos obscure, ordinary, and heroic*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy. Published in cooperation with Center for Southeast Asian Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Murillo Velarde, Pedro, S.J. 1749. *Historia de la provincia de Philipinas de la Compañía de Jesús*. Manila: Imprenta de la Compañía de Jesús, por Nicolás de la Cruz Bagay.
- Owen, Norman G. 1998. *Life, death, and the sacraments in a nineteenth-century Bikol parish*. In *Population and history. The demographic origins of the modern Philippines*, eds. Daniel F. Doepfers and Peter Xenos, 225–52. Published in cooperation with University of Wisconsin-Madison Center for Southeast Asian Studies. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Phelan, John Leddy. 1959. *The Hispanization of the Philippines: Spanish aims and Filipino responses, 1565–1700*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Quirino, Carlos. 1973. "Foreword: The first Philippine imprints," in the facsimile edition: *Doctrina Christiana: The first book printed in the Philippines, Manila 1593*. Manila: National Historical Commission.
- Real Academia Española. 1927. *Diccionario Manual e ilustrado de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Retana, W. E. 1906. *Aparato bibliográfico de la historia general de Filipinas*. Vol. 1. Madrid: M. Minuesa de los Ríos.

- Ribadeneira, Marcelo de, O.F.M. 1947. *Historia de las islas del archipiélago filipino y reinos de la Gran China, Tartaria, Cochinchina, Malaca, Siam, Cambodge y Japon*. Edited by Juan R. de Legisima, O.F.M. Madrid: La Editorial Católica.
- Risco, Alberto, S.J. 1970. *The apostle of the Marianas: The life, labors and martyrdom of Ven. Luis de San Vitores, 1627–1672*. Translated by Juan M. H. Ledesma, S.J. Edited by Oscar L. Calvo. Guam: Diocese of Agana; and Manila: Arnoldus Press.
- Rogers, Robert. 1995. *Destiny's landfall. A history of Guam*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Santiago, Luciano P.R. 1987. *The hidden light: The first Filipino priests*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- Schumacher, John N., S.J. 1987. *Readings in Philippine Church history*. 2nd edition. Quezon City: Loyola School of Theology.
- _____. 1995. Felipe Sonson: Seventeenth Century Filipino Jesuit Missionary to the Marianas. *Landas: Journal of Loyola School of Theology*. 9: 266–85.
- _____. 1999. Review of: Ildebrando Jesus Aliño Leyson, *Pedro Calonsor Bissaya: Prospects of a teenage Filipino*. *Landas: Journal of Loyola School of Theology* 13, 2: 114–16.
- Schurhammer, Georg, S.J. 1977. *Francis Xavier, his life, his times*. Translated by M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J. Vol. 2. Rome: The Jesuit Historical Institute.
- Schurz, William Lytle. 1939. *The Manila Galleon*. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Scott, William Henry. 1994. *Barangay: Sixteenth century Philippine culture and society*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Velásquez de la Cadena, Mariano. 1957. *A new pronouncing dictionary of the Spanish and English languages*. Chicago: Follett.