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CHAPTER 2

The Uses of Ethnology

Thinking Filipino with "Race" and "Civilization"

In 1887, Evaresto Aguirre wrote from Madrid to José Rizal, who was then traveling elsewhere in Europe, about the embarrassing behavior of one of the other prominent young Filipinos living in the Spanish capital. Pedro Paterno had, Aguirre complained, resurrected the title of "Maginoo," an ancient Tagalog title of nobility that the friar chronicles documented but that was neither officially recognized nor commonly used by the late nineteenth-century elite. Adorning himself with this title, Paterno had taken on outward signs of royalty that his chagrined compatriot considered both pretentious and ridiculous:

The "Maginoo" [pronounced mah-ghee-no] says that this is a... high filipino title that belongs to his family; and on the body of his coat, the harnesses of his horses, his traveling cloak, his business card, and other things, has a coat of arms painted, worked in silver, embroidered, and lithographed... [The coat of arms looks] like this:

A sun, as if half French and half Japanese, and above it a sala-kot crowned with a ducal or royal crown, that has a bird on its crest, and beneath, tied by the chin-strap—that is, the ties of the sala-kot—are two machetes. This [behavior] is putting on airs, and acting a fool [Esto se llama lucirse y hacer el tonto también].

Aguirre mocked Paterno for claiming nobility and cloaking himself, literally, with its sign. The sign on Paterno's carriage, cloak, and card—all the trappings that would announce him on the streets and in the foyers of high society—was one that Aguirre thought could be recognized by all as a crude counterfeit, for the model was a European coat of arms and
Paterno's creative version (Figure 2.1) was a hodgepodge of generic components; some European, some Filipino substitutes, and some not clearly identifiable as either: the salakot (a wide hat, usually worn by peasants but here in a style sometimes worn by petty officials) in place of a European helmet; the folos (machetes) where swords might be used as supports; a bird of indeterminate species; the sun, which Aguirre thought suffered from a confused identity ("half French and half Japanese"); and the crown derived from European, not Philippine, models. Aguirre wrote with some relief that Paterno was "unique in such sublime extravagances." 26

Paterno expressed his royal aspirations in more scholarly trappings as well, and some of them inspired similarly derisive reactions. The same year that Aguirre complained of his pretensions, Paterno published Ancient Tagalog Civilization, a book extolling the accomplishments of the civilization of its title. 27 The book was not particularly well received among fellow illustrators and scholars. Rizal, for example, warned Ferdinand Blumenzentr to "pay no attention to what Paterno says . . . in his work. P. A. Paterno is [here the manuscript has a scribble]. I can't find a word for it, but only a sign like this [another scribble]." 28 Paterno was probably more concerned, however, with his image among Madrid's elite. Ancient Tagalog Civilization was published the same year as Madrid's Philippine Exposition, and Paterno might have hoped that both the exhibition and his book—the title page of which (Figure 2.2) included a reproduction of the coat of arms belonging to its author, the "Magnífico Paterno"—would raise his profile as Tagalog prince in fashionable circles. But the buzz surrounding the exposition largely centered on a living display of Filipinos, many of them members of ethnolinguistic groups on the political margins of the Philippines, who were supposed to represent their "type" or "race." 29 It seems that notoriety of the "primitive" peoples dominated Madrid's perceptions of the Filipinos. Paterno might have written Ancient Tagalog Civilization hoping that the exposition's hype would highlight the newly revealed sophistication of the ancient Tagalog culture, and its modern-day heir and prince, in his own person. Instead, Paterno's ancient civilization was upstaged by contemporary "primitives.

Members of the Filipino colony of Madrid—as they referred to themselves—responded to this part of the exhibition with indignation that expressed both humanitarian protest as well as their anxieties about racial and cultural status. On the one hand, many of their writings, both public and private, reveal outrage over the inhumanity of the display, both in principle for displaying humans as artifacts and in practice for the conditions in which these individuals were forced to live (and as a result of which, several died). Graciano López Jaena, in particular, wrote articles for the Madrid press complaining that these people's housing was unsanitary and cold and that they were effectively prisoners in their compound. At the same time, López Jaena's articles called attention to the discrepancy between the "civilised" Filipinos and those who represented the country at the exposition, and argued that it was the former that should have been included as planners of the exhibition, not the latter as specimens in it. 30 Those illustrative reactions reveal at least as much concern about the bad image of the Filipinos that they feared these "uncivilised" people would project to the "civilised" world, as they revealed concern for the
people themselves. The display of such "primitives" undermined the propagandists’ claims that Filipinos should be recognized as politically equal to Europeans. Further, some of the Filipinos living in Madrid found that Madridetas equated them with the "uncivilized" people on display, and this heightened their sense of alienation from the racial society in which they sought recognition. They were dismayed and outraged that the Filipinos was being presented as a primitive and exotic colony, rather than as a part of the modern world.

Paterno’s pretensions, the exhibition, and the Filipino colony’s reactions to both illustrate some of the consequences of the combined focus on racial origins, on the one hand, and civilizational progress, on the other, that underwrote much of the scholarship in whose idiom Filipinos wrote about pre-Hispanic history. In their attention to reconstructing an era that predated the imposition of foreign rule, illustrados’ efforts were like those of nineteenth-century intellectuals of other would-be nations emerging from other established empires. Greeks, Armenians, Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, Magyars, Romanians, Czechs, Germans, Poles, and others were emerging from the Prussian, Austrian, Russian, and Ottoman empires, often bolstering their national claims with writings that documented the nation’s existence before its imperial subjugation. Those writings would typically stress elements of their people’s culture or history that distinguished it from those who ruled over it or from neighboring peoples, such as the practice of religion, the written or oral literature of a language, or the legitimacy of an earlier political regime. In a parallel way, some intellectuals in nineteenth-century South Asia highlighted the pre-British (and also often pre-Mughal) Hindu past, invoking the authority of textual and scholarly traditions even while often reforming them.

For young educated elites of the Philippines, such stories were available only in modified form. The politics that preceded Spanish rule in the Philippines were numerous and small scale, its many native tongues diverse. For the same reasons, however, the Filipinos was of obvious interest to ethnological sciences. The diversity of the peoples of the Philippines—diverse languages, practices, and physiologies—made it a rich resource for studying historical relationships among human groupings. Emerging ethnological sciences, in turn, provided tools, presumptions, and even sometimes political associations that were of interest to these young educated elites.
This chapter investigates how ethnological ideas were employed in scholarly discourse about the Philippines in the 1880s and early 1890s, focusing on T. H. Paro de Quezada's *Sanskrit in the Tagalog Language, Pedro Paterno's Ancient Tagalog Civilization and The Ilang, and the "pre-history" section of Isahelo de los Reyes's *History of Ilocos.* It examines these works in the context of, and in comparison with, other ethnological works from which they drew and to which they spoke. The methods and presumptions of ethnological sciences worked to find commonalities across some of the numerous ethnolinguistic boundaries in the Philippines, commonalities that suggested the existence of a cohesive "people" that predated and was independent of their Spanish civilization and so was proto-national, as some *ilustrado* writings demonstrate. However, *ilustrado* writings reveal even more strongly that ethnological sciences were sometimes laden with a hierarchical politics that reinforced established narratives of civilization, even while translating those narratives into new terms. Whereas established narratives of "civilization" conceived its limits along the lines of universal religion, in the idiom of ethnological sciences the same abstractions were reimagined along lines of plural ethnicities, peoples, or "races."

The methods of ethnological sciences were able to recover and reconstitute elements of what appeared to be a pre-Hispanic history and culture, making it possible to see value in what had hitherto appeared as a dark past. This idea of a unified pre-Hispanic past of diverse contemporary peoples was expressed in part through the language of race, a language that naturalized commonalities, as well as difference. Race discourse "has a great ability to circulate, a great aptitude for metamorphosis, or a sort of strategic polyvalence," by which it can be and has been taken up in quite markedly divergent and often opposed political projects. As we will see, the different nuances of "race" and of related conceptions of "people," "civilization," and "culture" reveal how various were the meanings and associations of "race" at this time, and more particularly, how these variations contained both opportunities as well as challenges for those who wrote about the Philippines.

While the idea that "race" marks difference and hierarchy is more familiar in a twenty-first-century idiom, we need to understand, too, how it marked commonalities and equivalence in order to see its use and operation in this case. On the one hand, "race" as a category, like "people" or "nation," could have what Anthony Milner has described in the context of colonial Malaya as "egalitarian overtones," in that "concern about the condition of the race is a concern not for an aristocratic elite but rather an entire community." In this mode of thinking, members of a race were of equal status in relation to that race, in a way that members of a nation were in principle of equal status with respect to that nation. As Milner argues, the formal equivalence of members of a "race" was reflected in how "race" concerned "the interests of the common people" and "possessed[d] no necessary hierarchical implications." In this sense, the history of races was a kind of effort at history from below: the subject was collective and common, not individual or exceptional. This history of races, as divisions of human groupings, was the science of ethnology.

Of course, ideas about "race" were not universally democratic, as is well known. The vocabulary of race was often employed with a grammar of hierarchy, according to which some races were taken to be more advanced than others. But such racial difference could be drawn around the Philippines but also within it, marking some peoples of the Philippines as more advanced than others. The hierarchical grammar that was often employed with the vocabulary of race worked both for and against these intellectuals in their efforts to authorize the common and advanced civilization of some peoples of the Philippines. On the one hand, some elite Filipinos could claim rights and status for a broader multilingual group on the basis that this "people" or "race" was distinct from but approaching the level of advanced European peoples, and distinct from and leaving behind others deemed more barbaric. Yet employing the vocabulary of race with the grammar of hierarchy brought liabilities as well, for the *ilustrados* were sometimes on the receiving end of racial discrimination and depraction, and their claims to advancement were not always accepted by those invested in racialized thinking.

A third set of questions revolves around the term "Filipino" and the story of the transformation of its meaning from "of the Philippines" to a conception of a people with a common past, present, and political future. A grouping of "Filipino" emerges in some of the ethnological works of *ilustrados* that deal most explicitly with ethnology and race. "Filipino" was not the only or even predominant grouping of these texts, but its meaning was changing and its content contested. We know that before the 1880s the term "Filipino," when used in a sense more narrow than the general adjective "of the Philippines," referred specifically to people of Spanish parentage born in the Philippines (equivalent with the term used across the Spanish
colonial world, criollo). Thus it was a political distinction as much as it was racial, for it identified those in the insular polity who had certain privileges and obligations, distinct from those of the peninsulares (Spaniards, born in the peninsula); the indio or indígena ("native" of the Philippines, which could be any of many different ethnolinguistic groups); the mestizo (of mixed parentage, sometimes Spanish and native, but more often mestizo chino or mestizo de sangley, Spanish and Chinese); the chino or sangley (Chinese); and, on the edges of Spanish sovereignty, the muh (Muslim) and the infiel ("infidel," often referred to in groupings of "tribes," referring to ethnolinguistic groups generally living outside of Spanish sovereignty and that were neither Christian, Muslim, nor Chinese).

By the late 1880s and 1890s, the meaning of "Filipino" was changing. First, it came to be used in a "metropolitan sense" as a way to refer rather simply to "people from the Philippines," regardless of their location in colonial law and society. That sense emerged both from peninsular Spaniards' failure to distinguish between mestizo or indio, for example, and also from the young men who, when called filipino by others, took on that collective identity, both because the distinctions that separated them in colonial society became less meaningful to them when they found themselves collectively alone across the oceans, and also because in this metropolitan context they referred to themselves as those around them did. So, as Rizal wrote to a friend, "we call ourselves simply filipinos" when in Madrid.66

However, some of these same people—Paterno and Pardo de Tavera in particular—were also beginning to think in more ethnological terms when they employed "Filipino" in scholarly writings of the 1880s. In fact it is these authors from the Philippines who first use "Filipino" in an ethnological sense. To be sure, they draw on German and French scholarly ideas that identify peoples in terms of such ethnological categories, but no previous scholars had used "Filipino" in particular to mark an ethnological grouping. In illustrado writings, the ethnological sense of "Filipino transcended some linguistic divisions but also either clearly excluded, or only ambiguously and marginally included, those who were "of the Philippines" and also Chinese, mestizo, Muslim, or infiel. To the extent that "Filipino" emerged in illustrado scholarly works via the science of ethnology, it was in its origin also a term that denoted race, with all its attendant political ambivalence.67

The idea of "Filipinos," then, has origins as both an ethnological and a political term. It first emerged in this post-croceo sense during the 1880s both through elites' common experience of pilgrimage and exile and through their engagements with the scholarly world of ethnology. It was based both on assertions of natural existence and on the contextual lived experience of exile. That it would come to have a broader political meaning for people in the Philippines—for Filipinos, beyond these few elites—it is not explained in these pages. However, to make political claims in the name of the "Filipino nation" depended on establishing that that nation was natural. "Filipino," as a national category, was a new concept, yet in its inception, it conjured its own distinct past. This work was already done in scholarly terms by these illustrado writings, when "Filipino" came to be widely accepted in its modern political sense.

But the meaning of "Filipino" was far from apparent or fixed in these early illustrado writings. This chapter investigates a few different examples, then, of how "race," "civilization," "people," "culture," and "nation" were configured in writings about the pre-Hispanic Philippines and how they were used to draw boundaries and fill in the shapes they outlined. These terms were widely and variously used because in Europe, too—not just in the colonies—emperors ruled over different "peoples" in the name of "civilization." So while the terms had particular resonances in and for the Philippines, their slipperiness in that context is also part of a more general story of how these terms were overlapping and in flux.

People, Nation, Race

To begin to understand what some of these contested terms meant in the writings of illustrados, consider how Rizal clarified the meanings of the Spanish words for "race," "tribe," and "nation" for Blumenritt in 1886. Rizal was responding to Blumenritt's query about how to translate the German word for "tribe" (Stamm) and whether "race" (in Spanish, raza) would be an appropriate translation. Rizal replied, "I looked up the word 'race' in my Dominguez dictionary [of the Spanish language] and I believe its meaning is not [the same as the German word for] 'tribe' [Stamm]."

He went on to explain two related but distinct meanings for the Spanish word for "race." First, he referred to a conception of races as the most basic types of humans. "We call 'race' the Caucasian, Mongolian, Malay, and the Black," which were considered the most general types, and any more particular group was thought to be traceable to one of them, or a combination.68 Scholars who subscribed to such a racial typology might disagree
over whether the races descended from a single source or from different sources (monogenism versus polygenism), and they might disagree about which races were the most basic and which were derivative. For example, some thought "Malay" or "Malayan" was not one of the three basic races but was instead the result of a mixture of "Mongolian" and "Black." Most scholars held that there were at least three races, and some held that there were five or more. Despite these scholarly arguments, the existence of such discrete types was widely accepted, and the work of ethnology was in part to trace the origins of any of the world's present peoples back to one or more of these original types. This work was known as investigating the "Ethnos," or blood relationships, between human groups across space and time, after the manner of a great family tree for all of human-kind. Though traits that we might call "cultural" (language, for example) could be relevant to making such large-scale racial distinctions, physiological traits were often invoked as the distinctive ones at this level of racial organization. In this usage, most Christian groups in the Philippines were considered to be primarily of the "Malayan race," which distinguished them from other peoples in the Philippines who had ancestry either of the "Mongolian race" (Chinese) or of the "Black race" (peoples in the Philippines who were referred to generically, in the Spanish of the time, as negritos, meaning literally "little Blacks").

But Rizal went on to clarify that Spanish also used the word "race" in a different way, to indicate subdivisions of these more general categorizations: "We also use [in Spanish] this word ['race' or raza] to refer to peoples [Volk] which are significantly large [in population], around half a million souls, which you call [in German] 'nations,' but we don't call peoples that are not independent 'nations,' e.g. the Tagalog and Visayan ['race'] but not the Tagalog and Visayan 'nation,' on the other hand, the Spanish ['race'] and 'nation.'" Rizal's distinction emphasized the political significance of these terms in the Spanish context: not all razas were also politically independent nations. But more to the point, these smaller-unit raza (whether Tagalog, Visayan, or Spanish) were of course much more numerous than what were supposed to be the original discrete physiological types from which they were thought to have been derived (the Tagalog and Visayan raza, for example, were considered different branches of the more general "Malayan" raza.) This sense of "race" carried with it a stronger conception of shared habits or customs, for Rizal noted that it was like the German Volks that carried with it a sense of being a "people."
a common origin in the larger "Malayan race," but they also indicated a more significantly emotive bond that could allow a "race" to approach the German sense of "nación" or "people" (Volk).

"Malay" or "Malayan" was, however, a troublesome way to denote affiliations among peoples of the Philippines, and between those and others. "Malay" clearly excluded Negritos and Chinese. However, it did not distinguish Christians from Muslims in the Philippines nor did it distinguish between those peoples of the Philippines and peoples of the Malay peninsula. The "Malay" category seems to cut off peoples in the Dutch East Indies in favor of an association with those to the west of the Malayan peninsula. We will encounter significant disagreement about whether and how peoples to the south were related to those in the Philippines, which reflects anxieties about the ways that "race" could cross old "civilizational" boundaries between Christian and Muslim. Those possible crossings were usually cut off in illustrado writings.

In different writings, we will see sometimes awkward connections and distinctions drawn among "Malayan," "Filipino," "native" (indígena), "india," and terms that specify more particular ethnolinguistic groups like Tagalog, Ilocano, Visayan, and so on. Any of these groupings may be referred to as a raza, pueblo, civilización, or even nación. We have already seen how Rizal delineated some of the ambiguities of raza and nación. Pueblo, which could mean simply "town," "township," or "townsfolk," more commonly in those writings meant "a people," specifically in the sense of a large-scale group, similar to the Spanish raza or nación or German Volk. Both pueblo and nación can be translated into English as "nation." Pueblo was often used in illustrado writings with this sense of "a people," perhaps to selectively bridge certain ethnolinguistic divides while maintaining others. Nación was less often used, perhaps because, as Rizal wrote, it usually indicated political independence.

Civilización had a different kind of meaning, one that indicated a relatively high level of refinement and sophistication, in contrast to rudeza natural (natural rough manners). We see "civilización" used in illustrado texts in a plural sense (Tagalog civilization, Hindu civilization, and so on), and so we will witness here how a newer conception of the term emerged. This kind of plural usage was only first accepted by the conservative Royal Spanish Academy in 1915. Before then, "civilización" was, according to the academy, strictly singular: a person or a people could partake in or acquire it, but there were not many different civilizations. It was precisely this quality of "civilización," its pretense to universality, that made it useful for empires within Europe, and those that extended beyond Europe, because in the name of civilization (a common civilization because universal) a diverse set of peoples could be ruled over. This sense of civilization is both Catholic (in that it could accommodate anyone, in principle, who is willing and able to become civilized) and also Catholic (in that such a universal mission describes the Church's characteristic holding-together of a broad array of cultures, political structures, languages, and practices). We will see in some illustrado writings that "civilización" was used both to indicate a certain level of sophistication or advancement—the version that is not specific because, in principle, it is universal—and also in a plural sense in which each civilization can have its own specific context (like "cultures"). This combination—of the singular-universal and plural-specific senses of "civilización"—allowed for some peoples of the Philippines to be elevated over others. Finally, we should note here that the word for "culture" (cultura) is noticeably absent. Like the Spanish civilización, cultura only took on a plural sense much later (in this case, officially in 1915), when it came to signify the "collection of modes of life and customs." Before this, the word referred to what one could gain by cultivating one's intellectual faculties according to the collective wisdom of human knowledge. Though the German Kultur had a meaning much closer to how illustrado sometimes used "civilización" during this period, the Spanish cultura never appeared in their texts, and its use in this sense was still far off.

Ethnography and ethnology invited speculation about the relationship between the different peoples of the Philippines who were thought to be related—that is, the peoples (raza, Volker) or "race" who were thought to be part of the larger Malayan race that had made the islands their home and then, at some pre-Hispanic moment, split into different branches. As we will see, the term "Filipino" was offered to stand for that grouping, at moments and tentatively. However, the pre-Hispanic "Filipino" of illustrado writings generally referred to those who shared a history of Spanish colonization, and so the term reproduced the inductions and exclusions of Catholicism's "civilization," even though ethnological data could cut across such civilizational distinctions. More specifically, illustrado ethnologists delineated not only distinctions between the Malayan peoples of the Philippines and those thought to be either wholly or significantly "Mongoloid" (Chinese) or "Black" (Negrito) but also sometimes points of connection.
Others peoples, such as Muslims in the south, were clearly excluded from the pre-Hispanic unity, even while their race was sometimes marked “Malay.” Some of these texts incorporate “Malay” as a descent for all groups or peoples as having origins in the Americas or as contemporary ancestors. Finally, the manifest fact of Chinese parentage among Christian “natives” is minimized in these writings, sometimes via imagining races or peoples as having originary moments rather than thinking in terms of ongoing processes of interrelation. While the main focus of this chapter is on illustra
tive ethnographic writings, we must first consider how some of these different kinds of terms—those denoting race, religion, or civilizational or legal status—overlapped in other writings about Philippine ethology.

“Race” and “Civilization” in Philippine Ethology

Though earlier chroniclers had speculated about how the islands had come to be populated, illustra authors responded to the newer wave of interest in this question brought by ethnologists concerned with racial differentiation. The Philippines’ rich ethnographic diversity—diversity mapped on religious, linguistic, and physical lines—provided both questions about the human and the culture with which they could be answered. How had the present-day peoples of the Philippines come to be where they are, looking, believing, practicing, dressing, and speaking as they do? What was the history, predating written records, of the movements, meetings, confrontations, combinations, dominations, expulsions, conversions, divisions, and flights of peoples to and among the islands? Both Christianity and Islam had arrived within the preceding several hundreds of years—relatively recently in terms of the history of human settlement in the area—so those variations were not as interesting to ethnologists as those that predated the arrival of the Spanish by unknown hundreds of years. Linguistic variation, variation in habits and customs not attributed to Christianity or Islam, and also variation in materials and techniques of cultural transmission were the data that were thought to reveal that more distant era. Because the islands were so ethnographically diverse, they were thought to hold rich resources for studying complexities of human interaction. For the most part, it was not the Spanish who had exploited these resources.

Blumenrett was one of the figures who devoted significant attention to these questions and who attempted a serious scholarly appraisal of others’ theories and data. His 1885 German-language Toward an Ethnography of the Philippines was aimed toward the goal of a systematic, encyclopedic guide to ethnographic groups of the Philippines. The organization of Blumenrett’s text reflects his engagement with racial theories. The work identifies fifty-seven different groups, all but six of which are categorized as sub-groups of the general racial category “Malay.” The remainder are grouped in the major categories of “Negritos,” “Chinese, Chinese Mestizos and Japanese,” and finally, “Whites and other Population Groups” (Weisse und andere Bevölkerungsbestandteile). This very neatly corresponds with the structure of the four most basic racial groups into which Blumenrett and others thought the world’s peoples could be divided (“Malay,” “Black,” “Mongoloid,” and “White”). Blumenrett outlined an ethnological puzzle in this work that fascinated many of his German-language colleagues: What was the parentage of the “Igorot”? “Igorot” was an imprecise term, as many who used it explained, that comprised a number of different non-Christian groups (inclusus infelix) in the mountains of northern Luzon. The ethnological puzzle was whether they were properly speaking “Malay” or of a different race. Blumenrett answered this question via his version of a theory of racial migration that had come to dominate the field.

This general theory of racial migration held that the diversity of the Philippines could in part be explained by discrete waves of past immigration. It had long been speculated that the dark-skinned “Negritos” of the Philippines represented an earlier era of human settlement, having from Australia or New Guinea, and that they had been pushed to the interior by later arriving peoples from the Malay peninsula, whose descendents the Spanish found on the islands’ shores and called indios. Such a narrative had by 1885 made it into the Compendium of the History of the Filipinos, a textbook for use in the Ateneo, the Jesuit secondary school in Manila, by Father Francisco Baranera who had even adopted the term “Malay” as an ethnographic, racial term to describe the later inhabitants. The ethnolo
gists, however, attempted to work out more precisely than did Baranera the origins and histories of the peoples of the Philippines, and Blumenrett and other scholars produced detailed versions of the theory of racial migration, citing and synthesizing as much ethnological data as they could gather. Ethnologists agreed that the first people to arrive on the islands were the “Negritos” and that they were followed by later waves of migra
tion, which pushed the Negritos off the coasts, into the interior, and up the interior mountains of the islands. However, scholars disagreed about whether there were two or more waves of migration and whether all the
waves after the original Negrito were "Malay" or whether one or more were of another race.

In his 1882 "Toward an Ethnography," Blumentritt held that there were three distinct waves but that both the second and third were Malay. Joseph Montano, a French scholar who had traveled to the region from 1879 to 1881, proposed in his 1885 "Report to the Minister of Public Education [of France] on a Scientific Mission to the Philippine Islands and Malaya" that there had been three waves of three distinct races. The first wave brought "Negritos." A second wave of migration brought a race that he called "Indonesian," using a term and racial distinction proposed by a German ethnologist but whose validity was debated (the term was not taken up in any but ethnographic circles until much later). Finally, the third wave brought "Malay." Descendants of each of those original migration waves, Montano reported, could be found in concentric circles in the Philippine islands: In his terms, "Negritos" had been pushed into the interior by the "Indonesians," and in turn, when the "Malay" arrived on the coasts, both earlier groups were pushed yet further inland. Blumentritt and Montano were among a much broader group of European scholars that attended to the Philippines, which included particularly prominent German scholars. Blumentritt dedicated his 1882 work to A. B. Meyer, the director of the Dresden ethnographic museum, who traveled to the region and published significant studies in the 1880s and 1890s. While in the Philippines, Meyer had collected skulls—mostly stolen—and sent them back to Virchow, who had used them to settle what was called the "Negrito question" (Negritfrage): whether the dark-skinned peoples of the Philippines and New Guinea were related to sub-Saharan Africans. The ethnological data of the Philippines were worth studying, both for what they could say about the history of the peopling of the Philippines and also for what they could show about human filiation more generally. While the Philippines was of interest to German ethnologists for its valuable data that could serve in the study of scientific questions, such scholarly attention carried with it political significance in the context of the late nineteenth century. The 1880s were a decade of turbulence and conflict in the Spanish empire, especially with regards to relations with Germany. German-language scholarship in the realms of anthropology far preceded Germany's political unification in 1871. By the beginning of the 1880s, the young nation-state of Germany was on the verge of engaging in overseas colonial ventures (1884). The Spanish empire, meanwhile, had been bleeding for years. When Germany challenged Spanish sovereignty in the Carolinas, the response was not only military and diplomatic but also epistemological and exhibitional: the 1887 Philippine Exposition of Madrid was supposed to demonstrate and literally exhibit Spanish mastery over its colony. Spain used the exhibition model to tie more tightly the strings of empire binding the islands with the peninsula, not just by confirming military or administrative sovereignty, but also by demonstrating Spain's competency to properly represent the islands in the terms of modern knowledges. Though the exhibition attempted to solidify Spain's position as colonizer, its ethnological report shows that Spain's representatives only ambivalently embraced the terms of ethnological science. The main ethnological writing that came out of the exposition was the report relating to the section on "Population." The report, edited by the Dominican José María Ruiz, a professor at the University of Santo Tomás, was the work of the four friar orders and the Jesuits, testament to the involvement of the Catholic Church in educational institutions of the islands, in government administration, and in the organization of the exposition. Much of the data about the "habits, customs, rituals," and "character" of peoples in the Philippines was gathered from parish priests, always peninsular Spaniards and members of religious orders. These friars were, in a sense, being presented as the on-the-ground data gatherers of modern Spanish science—the Church's equivalent to the bureaucratically ethnographers of other colonial empires, perhaps—with compiler Ruiz performing the theoretical and integrative work of the ethnological scholar. The friar orders, here, laid claim to modern scientific discourse, as articulated by Ruiz: "In an attempt to describe the variety of customs of the extensive islands of the Archipelago, with the diverse races and multiple mixings of them that have occurred, we will follow the most recent ethnographic studies." In addition to using data from his fellow friars, he relied heavily on data gathered by secular agents of the state (e.g., Ramón Jordan y Moreira, whose 1883 "Geographical and Natural-Historical Sketch of the Philippine Islands" had been extracted by Blumentritt for Globus). Though Ruiz and another contributor (the Jesuit Francisco Sánchez) referred to Montano's idea of three distinct races in the Philippines—Negrito, Indonesian, and Malay—the report's organization shows that Ruiz could not, or would not, fully integrate a racialised approach to human classification. Instead, the report is structured by classifications of religion, of what was understood as degrees of relative civilisation, of legal
category, and of social and economic class. Overall, for example, the report is divided into two sections. The first, "ethnology," classifies, describes, and locates races; while the second, "ethnology," treats the different races' "religion, habits and customs." One might expect the two sections to have parallel structures, but this is not the case. The first section, written by the Jesuit Sánchez, is predictably organized into three headings that correspond to Montano's racial groups of Negrito, Indonesian, and Malay. The second section, however, organizes the "races" into two major headings: "infidel tribes" and "Christian peoples." Only the "infidel tribes" are broken down into the racial subdivisions of Negrito, Indonesian, and Malay, with a small part of the "Malay" section devoted to "Moro," or Muslim, peoples. In other words, the primary "racial" point of distinction, for Ruiz, was religious: Christians versus all others (including Muslims).

Though Ruiz treated (some) individual groups of "infidels" separately, those differences were for him relatively unimportant. As he wrote, "Although there are notable differences in the habits and customs of the different tribes of infidels of the Malayan race, they are all in agreement on their wildness. There is a little difference, and though it can not always be rightly called entirely savage, neither does it merit the label of rational and civilized." This overall convergence of the pagan and Muslim peoples is duplicated where Ruiz treated the "Christian peoples," which he introduced by noting their difference from the "infidels":

Having described the characteristics of the different races and infidel tribes that populate the Philippine Archipelago, we now proceed to indicate those of the peoples brought into [reducidos d, i.e., "reduced to"] social and political life, which is to say the Christians, subjected to the Government of Spain. They are commonly called "indios filipinos," and are found spread among the coasts and plains, distinguished from each other by some minor differences in their clothing, habits, and customs according to the provinces in which they live and the dialect that is particular to them.

Ruiz almost completely discarded the kind of ethnographic divisions that were commonly used—such as Tagalog, Ilocano, and so on, which he only briefly referred to as linguistic and possible physiological types—and instead described a generalized indio. Thus, though he claimed to follow recent ethnographic studies organized along lines of race, in practice Ruiz's overarching classifications were between Christians and non-Christians, and he saw far more affiliations among the groups in each of those categories that he saw among the various peoples of any given racial group (e.g., "Malyan") that were thought to span those categories.

Where he did divide the category "Christians" into different peoples or types, he did so not according to "races" or ethnolinguistic groups but instead according to what he called "social classes": "peasant indio," "plebeian indio," "middle-class indio," "rich indio," "mestizos," "the Chinese," and "Spaniards" (in which he wrote of peninsulares and filipino Spaniards, in turn). Civilization and class, in other words, were the significant differences among Christian peoples of the Philippines; race was a salient category before Christianity (i.e., among non-Christians), or to the extent that it dictated class, but not in and of itself. Once peoples were "reduced" (incorporated into the religious, civil, and political life of Christian and Spanish dominion) their "racial" or "filial" attributes became less relevant.

Ruiz's "Chinese" are oddly placed in this overarching "Christian" category, since, according to his own account, only some had converted to Catholicism. He dwells on the vices of the Chinese—their aviance, sexual perversions, and opium addiction—and laments that they played an indispensable commercial role in the islands. It is their important position in commercial and urban life, not their religion, that places the Chinese in this section of Ruiz's study. The overlap between racial, legal, and class categories in Ruiz's text—and the effacement of racial difference among indios—reveals that the section on "Christians" was less about the science of ethnology than it was an opportunity to comment on the state of peoples of the Filipinos, and their relative level of (Catholic) civilization, and so to identify the proper work of colonial institutions such as governmental administration and education, and underscore the indispensability of the Church.

In some respects, we find similarly productive ambiguities in the racial, legal, and civilizational categorizations in the works of diastem ethnologists. These ambiguities can be productive in the sense that they allow for the terms that define certain categories, such as "Filipino," to accumulate new meanings. Pedro de la Reina, Patero, and de los Reyes were each interested by the possibility that ethnological science held for discovering pre-Hispanic unity among different peoples of the islands, though they drew such entities in different ways and with differing political
In Pardo de Tavera’s linguistic writings—first in *Contribución a la Study of Ancient Filipino Alphabets* (1854) and then in *Sanskrit in the Tagalog Language* (1887)—he treated language and its elements, specifically alphabets and vocabulary, as evidence that could reveal historical events. Quoting "the celebrated French Orientalist Rémyart," Pardo de Tavera wrote that "the language of a people is the most faithful mirror of its civilization, the most complete picture of the social revolutions that have marked its existence." His first linguistic work focused specifically on peoples of the Malayan race, called "Indios [de raza malaya llamados Indios]" who "had their own alphabets and manner of writing" when the Spanish arrived. Though no pre-Hispanic writings survived, Pardo de Tavera could use the alphabets themselves, as recorded in early Espanol chronicles, to study "the history of those islands, a history so neglected and so little known, despite or perhaps because much has been written about it, that it still remains to be studied and written." Although the library shelf might be filled with histories of the Philippines by Spanish authors, these books were "generally laden with miraculous events and stories of divine punishments" and failed to treat the history of the peoples of the islands before the Spanish arrival, a history that could be uncovered through ethnographic data and methods. Thus his linguistic writings took as their premise ethnographic categories, including those of race, but he specifically limited himself to the groups in the Philippines of the "Malayan race" that had their own alphabets, methodologically excluding from his view not only groups of other races (such as the "Negritos") but also those of the "Malayan race" whose languages did not have a documented pre-Hispanic alphabet.

He compiled twelve different alphabets from the sources at his disposal, which included both Espanol chronicles from the early years of Spanish colonization and works from more recent ethnologists and linguists who had worked with those older texts as sources. The alphabets that he compiled represented, he deduced, five different languages of the Philippines (Tagalog, Ilocano, Visayan, Pangasinan, and Pampangan [Kapampangan]). These alphabets, however, he understood not as distinct from each other but as variations of a single alphabet: "Immediately one can see that the difference that exists among these alphabets is not fundamental; it can be said that they are one and the same, their differences consisting in the manner of drawing them, as is the case with English, French, or Spanish writing." While some of these alphabets appeared to have minor differences in the way that they drew characters, and some alphabets even
appeared to have characters that were missing from others, he argued that the former differences were minor, and the latter "depended, as is easy to understand, on the phonetical exigencies of each [spoken] language," rather than on any differences between the alphabets as such. In sum, he was able to describe "the alphabet (or alphabets, if you like), adopted by the Filipinos [los Filipinos]," using linguistic evidence of commonality to refer to the peoples as one in the neologism "Filipinos." Yet precisely to whom did he refer with this appellation? The "Filipinos" in this work seem to have existed almost always but not exclusively in the past. Generally, he situated them in pre-Hispanic time, or as the people who the Spanish first encountered. These "Filipinos" are ancestors about whom little is known, except that they were there, in what is now called the Philippines, and so were "of the Philippines." Filipinos, in other words, serves as a kind of nonspecific placeholder for the ancient (collective) ancestors about whom little is properly known; and therefore, perhaps, no more specific or accurate name can be given. Pardo de Tavera closed the piece with thoughts that emphasized the distance between these people—ancient "Filipinos" who wrote in the "Tagalog" alphabet, and his own chronological contemporaries. These present-day "natives of the Philippines [indigenas de Filipinas] have [now] completely forgotten the characters with which their ancestors wrote, upon banana and palm leaves, their poems...and perhaps their chronicles and traditions.

To the contemporary natives, however, "those characters now say absolutely nothing, and they are even unaware that they may have existed." This distinction between "Filipinos" (the ancients) and their present-day descendents is nearly consistently made in the piece, but there is an important exception that suggests that Pardo de Tavera's conception of "Filipinos" could indeed transcend historical time and include his contemporaries: in one place in the text, "Filipinos" act in the present as speakers who "confuse" (in the present tense) the sounds of "o" and "u," and "e" and "i." Here, the meaning of "Filipinos" is more likely close to "people from the Philippines" than it is a sense of unified peoplehood. However, by demonstrating the unity of the ancient "Filipinos," he established a basis for their present-day descendents to be, in common, "Filipinos."

Though Pardo de Tavera argued that the pre-Hispanic alphabets of the Philippines "are one and the same" and though he casually referred to the speakers of the languages associated with those alphabets as all being "Filipino," he located the origins of those alphabets outside of the Philippines in ancient India. Other scholars had speculated that the alphabets of the Filipinos had Indian origins and had traveled via neighboring islands of Oceania or the Malay peninsula. Pardo de Tavera argued that "the Indian origin of those alphabets cannot be put in doubt," for "Filipino alphabets [alfabetos Filipinos] have a greater resemblance" to third-century BCE Pali inscriptions of India "than to any other alphabet of India or Oceania," derive directly from the Pali inscriptions, and "have conserved very faithfully their primitive [primitive as in 'original'] form." The significance of this thesis lies in its ability to unify different Malay peoples of the Philippines while distancing them from other Malay neighbors, both those of the mainland and those of islands lying farther to the south. These particular Malaysians were "Filipinos," thus, not just through the coincidence of having been encountered by the Spanish and named indios but because they shared a particular pre-Hispanic history. More details of this pre-Hispanic history were forthcoming in Sanskrit in the Tagalog Language, where Pardo de Tavera took up the question of how the Indic alphabet had traveled to the Philippines. In this week, which cataloged Tagalog words that he believed derived from Sanskrit, he theorized a past era of Hindu civilization in the Philippines, concluding that because of "the number and kind of words" of Sanskrit origin in Tagalog, the realms of "the military, religion, literature, industry and agriculture were at one time in the hands of the Hindus [los hindus], and that this race [raza] indeed ruled in the Philippines." Drawing on conclusions from his earlier work on alphabets, Pardo de Tavera concluded that Hindus had dominated in those parts of the archipelago "in which today the most cultured [cultura] languages are spoken, like Tagalog, Visayan, Pamapangan and Bocano, and the greater refinement [mayor cultura] of these languages originates precisely from the influence of that race of Hindus on the Filipinos [aquella raza de hindus sobre los filipinos];" for, from the language of the Hindus, Filipino languages had obtained words with which they could express "more elevated concepts" and "abstract ideas without using circumlocations." Pardo de Tavera deliberately avoided extending his theory of cultural origins to conjecture about racial origins, for he wrote that since he was coming from "the linguistic point of view," he limited himself to noting only "those [historical consequences] which, seeming obvious to me, I could not pass over without mention, without being accused of negligence." As we have seen from his writing elsewhere, he understood that his research spoke to ethnological and specifically 'racial' questions.
but he hesitated to draw a conclusion about racial origins on the basis of this linguistic data, focusing instead on the question of civilization.

That the civilization of the Hindus was admirable was beyond question, and Pardo de Tavera appealed to the Orientalist veneration of ancient Hindu civilization when he lauded the effects that it had brought both the Javanese and the ancient Tagalogs, noting that the Tagalog language "took new forms and acquired vigor under the influence of the Hindus [los hindus]." Pardo de Tavera stressed that in adopting foreign elements, the culture of Tagalogs had not become less authentically Tagalog but instead had gained something through a process of cultural adaptation.

But what could be gained or borrowed depended on the context and content of the loaning language, and not all civilizations were created equal. In contrast to the laudatory effects of Sanskrit in Java or the Philippines, Pardo de Tavera alleged that the Chinese language added nothing of value to the Tagalog language or culture, for it was merely a language of trade. Noticeably derivative of Chinese culture and people, Pardo de Tavera remarked of the Chinese in the Philippines that they had contributed no words having to do with "religion, morals, political institutions, or social life. And this can be easily understood, since the Chinese man [el chino] came to buy and sell, pure and simple, nothing more than to do business, without any thought of religious propaganda or introducing customs, which on the contrary he carefully hides as he does his religion, fearing that no other of [all mankind should imitate and avail themselves of what his race [raza] holds solely for itself."

In shifting from the Chinese trader of the past who "came to buy and sell, pure and simple," to the contemporary who jealously guards "what his race holds solely for itself," Pardo de Tavera linked the contemporary Chinese of the Philippines to their ancestors, accentuating their difference from the Filipinos (in this case, Tagalogs), while refusing the possibility of their cultural influence.

Pardo de Tavera's linguistic works, then, used the specificity of the general racial category of "Malay" in combination with methods that could identify "Sanskritic" linguistic origins, to theorize a particular grouping of "Filipinos" whose unity predated the arrival of the Spaniards and could be distinguished from other neighboring "Malayan" peoples. At the same time, this unity was broken internally along civilization lines, according to which some "Filipinos" partook of the great ancient Hindu civilization, while others had missed out on this culturally beneficent subjugation. Though he framed his writings in terms of "the ethnological question" and employed racial categories, he also often used "race," "civilization," and "people" interchangeably. His "Filipinos" by assumption were racially part of the more general "Malayan" race, but what interested him more was the civilization that they had developed, in part through their shared history of subjection to a pre-Hispanic colonizer.

The core of his "Filipinos" was clearly delineated and excluded both the "Negroid" peoples of the Philippines as well as the avaricious Chinese. Its boundaries in the south, however, were less distinct. For it was precisely in the Muslim south where the racial lines of European ethnographers often blurred and where Pardo de Tavera's great ancient Hindus had been succeeded not by the glorious Catholic civilization of the Spanish but by the Islamic civilization of "the Arabs." He explained that while the Philippine archipelago had felt the influence of both the Arab and the Hindu civilizations, "she" had felt them only superficially, "as if she had wanted to keep herself a virgin not only to be able to adopt... the civilization of the Christian world, but also to be able to contribute to its further development in science, arts, industry and commerce." And though Arabic and Persian words were significant in the languages of neighboring Malay peoples to the south and west, Pardo de Tavera noted that "the Spanish arrived on the island of Luzon just as Islamism [el islamismo] was beginning to be introduced there." He thus dismissed any relevance of Islamic Malayans to his subject.

Pardo de Tavera limited his attention to certain groups, in part because his methodology used written language. He was interested in "the ethnographic question" more generally—or the question of the origins of and blood relationships between different peoples—and saw linguistic data as one way to approach that question. His linguistic data led him to identify connections between some groups in the Filipinos as well as between these peoples and other conquerors, invaders, or inductors (e.g., Hindus, Arabs, Chinese, and Spanish). The Hindus and Spanish, in his reading, had a particularly beneficent influence on the Malayan "Filipinos" who they had conquered. Pardo de Tavera's writings did not, however, address the question of the relationship of these Malayan "Filipinos" to the peoples that were supposed to have preceded their arrival in the islands: the "Negritos," whose dark skin and kinky hair provided German ethnologists with so much grist for the mill of ethnological theory.

The question of delineating this relationship drove Pedro Paterno's writing about the ancient history of the Filipinos, in which he found
a glorious Tagalog civilization that had usurped an earlier and more primitive culture but also had taken the best from it. Paterno’s ethnological writings were both more ambitious and more fanciful than Pardo de Tavera’s, but we will see that both authors charted successive eras of civilizations in the Philippines. Pardo de Tavera was little concerned with the categories of race per se, though he articulated his “prehisotry” using then-current ethnological terms. Paterno’s writings on “prehistorical” civilizations, on the other hand, would have been impossible without the vocabulary of race and some presumptions of racial ordering in history; the very logic of his history hinged on a tight relationship between a people’s race—understood broadly in a physiological-cum-cultural way—and its historical actions. Paterno responded to a different kind of discourse about race, one that emphasized physical difference and correlated physical type with political destiny and civilizational achievement. Moreover, while Pardo de Tavera outlined a series of civilizations in the Philippines and clearly articulated the Spanish as the pinnacle of those, his series did not represent a clear upward progression. Pedro Paterno, on the other hand, adopted an European formulations of “universal” history as teleological model, in which each succeeding era improved upon the last. In producing that teleological history and distinguishing the great ancient society of the Tagalogs (to which he claimed to be a royal heir), he constructed a story of a race destined for greatness, whose strengths lies not in its purity but precisely in its mixed origin.

Paterno’s Ancient Tagalogs, Ancient Ita, and Contemporary Primitives

Pedro Paterno was born the same year as Pardo de Tavera to a similarly prominent family, though his family was Tagalog-Chinese mestizo rather than espatiel filipino. While the Pardo de Taveras were known as lawyers, the Paternos were a business family with interests in shipping, retail, agriculture, and trade. The young Paterno was educated at the esteemed Jesuit Ateneo of Manila before leaving for Madrid to pursue higher education, completing a law doctorate in 1880 at Madrid’s Central University. Like Pardo de Tavera, Paterno’s family was caught in the repressions of the early 1870s when Pedro was already in Spain, his father was deported for alleged complicity, though he returned to Manila in 1874. With the exception of one year’s return to the Philippines and then a brief round-the-world tour, Paterno spent the 1870s through 1890s in Spain, practicing law, living well off of the pension his family sent to support him, and generally promoting himself in social circles to the exasperation of some of his compatriots.

Paterno’s Ancient Tagalog Civilization (1887) and The Ita (1890) engaged in complicated and innovative appropriations of scholarly and theoretical discourses, combining ideas from quite distinct traditions in novel ways. He used frameworks of “universal” history (invoking at least two different formulations: one Catholic and another secularist), borrowed from French debates about how the biological theory of evolution explains human society and politics, invoked Orientalist research (especially emphasizing spiritualist and mystical readings), and referenced social psychology. He brought these scholarly discourses into conversation with migration-wave theories of pre-Hispanic Philippine history, performing a complicated act of intellectual appropriation and innovation to theorize the relationship between peoples of the Philippines and their respective places in history.

Paterno confidently cited “the law of progress,” confirmed by “the Philosophy of History,” “ethological theory,” and “geographical theory” in support of his outline of Philippine—and Filipino—history. He used the outlines of “universal” history, a concept and practice by which all of the world’s peoples were placed within a grand historical schema that marked the rise and fall of successively advanced civilizations, to interpret ethnological data of Philippine history. Whereas the richly named “universal” history was typically written from a particular perspective quite clearly European (the writings of G. W. F. Hegel come to mind), Paterno sought to rewrite universal history to include the Philippines. His universal history sometimes sounded quite Catholic—as when he wrote that the study of Philippine “prehisotry” could show “the progressive march of that Archipelago in the ways of Providence”—yet sometimes sounded secular. In searching for the data of “prehisotry,” he wrote, “it is necessary, in addition to having refined them, to study them one and a hundred times, searching for their relations, similarities, and union amongst themselves or with those characteristic of other peoples, as the modern sciences demand; since in this mode there is no data, etc. will rise to the heights where only Universal History is written, to the parent regions where only the spirit of Humanity lives and works. It matters a great deal to us that the Philippines is not excluded from the Universe.” While others might see
in the Philippines valuable data for studying the history of human filiation, Paterno craved a history that was more normative, a history that described not just descent and relation but progress and advance.

He used the outlines of universal history, and explicitly racial theories, to ennable and also manage a connection between the primitives and his own advanced contemporaries, especially focusing on the Ita (now generally called "Aetas," who are "Negrito" people of the highlands of Luzon) and Tagalogs. Paterno placed the Ita at the center of Filipino history, though he distinctly differentiated contemporary Ita from "advanced" Filipinos, and predicted the Ita's future extinction. He treated the Tagalogs as having incorporated but also overcome the ancient Ita because as a "civilization" and "race," the former were inclined toward progress. The "Tagalog" for Paterno was characteristically Filipino (as in "of the Philippines" but also ambiguously marked as the ontological center of a broader "Filipino" civilization-race, as addressed later in the chapter), and this greater Tagalog was both the culmination of pre-Hispanic Philippine history as well as the agent of future Philippine advance. Paterno told a story in which the Ita were racially and culturally both other to and like the Ita peoples of the Philippines, and of them; the Tagalog people, in turn, were the epiphenomena of the Malayans peoples of the Philippines, and inherently progressive.24

Writing in a speculative mode, Paterno conceived of three eras of Philippine history, characterized in turn by "the aboriginals," "the Tagalog civilization," and finally "the Catholic civilization."25 Though in general terms Paterno followed the widely accepted theory of migration waves, his telling was distinct. Paterno distinguished the Ita (first wave, Negrito) from the later Tagalog (second wave, Malay) by characterizing the latter as those who had first achieved an actual "civilization," while the former had only a historical era. For Paterno, inspired by French formulations, it was via civilization and culture that a race was superior or inferior, and so thrived or languished as a result.26 Paterno dedicated the bulk of The Ancient Tagalog Civilization to interpreting the secrets of the titular civilization, the second epoch of Philippine history. The Tagalog epoch—like the civilization—was a general one. While the "Tagalog civilization" was (not coincidentally) named for the ethnolinguistic group to which Paterno himself belonged, which was considered by many to be the most advanced in the Philippines, for Paterno it stood broadly for a civilization that he thought was common to different groups. Contrary to the practices of ethnological science, he
did little to document the relationship between what might appear to be distinct groupings, and instead made broad claims about the Tagalog civilization, which had dominated the Philippines during this era.27 Though he clearly excluded Negritos from this civilization (more on this later), he otherwise used it to unite the ancestors of Filipinos, notwithstanding manifest ethnological diversity; and so his ancient Tagalog civilization, though it might seem to have a more specific and narrow name, might have been more broad than Pardo's ancient "Filipinos" (who were primarily those colored by the Hindus). The descendants of this ancient civilizational ancestry, however, were not always clearly identifiable; Paterno did not make clear precisely where the boundaries between those included and those excluded lie.

Most of his focus was on a rich and somewhat fanciful explication of that civilization and, in particular, its religion, which he called alternatively "Tagalism" (Tagalismo) or "Bathalism" (Bathalismo), the latter deriving from Bathala, the pre-Hispanic Tagalog divinity.28 Arguing that pre-Hispanic Tagalog religion was neither animist, spiritist, nor pantheistic, he wrote that Bathalism was a religion on par with Catholicism, equally inspired by truth. He proved this by finding in Bathalism institutions, concepts, and figures that paralleled those of Catholicism, including the Catholic idea of God (Bathala) but also equivalents for Catholic saints, priests, cathedrals, heavens, bells, bishops, confession, friar orders, and even the virgin mother.29 Paterno's attempts to show the equivalence between Catholicism and Bathalism (or Tagalism) went so far as to argue not just that Bathalism was as good as Catholicism; he said that Bathalism was Catholicism. Catholicism, he wrote, was present in the Philippines before the arrival of the Spaniards, albeit in a subtle, Oriental form.30 Though he noted that Spaniards had, "with arms in hand, brought to us knowledge of the True God," he posited that the seeds of Catholicism had indeed already been planted in the Tagalogs.31 In arguing that Bathalism looked like Catholicism, Paterno drew on similar arguments made by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Jesuit missionaries in China who thought they found in Confucianism concepts similar to Catholicism's; some even saw evidence of ancient Christianity, of which contemporary practices were thought to be perversion.32 These interpretations, meant to show the great potential for Jesuit success converting in their Asian territories, were strongly disputed by Dominicans and Franciscans. Whereas Jesuits had claimed to be uniquely
positioned to bring Catholic truth to China, Paterno positioned himself as uniquely able to translate the ancient (Balthasar-Tagalog) concepts for his modern (Catholic-Tagalog) time.

But it was not only Catholicism that Paterno found in Philippine prehistory; he likewise associated other grand traditions with the Tagalog civilization, further ennobling it and placing it at the center of universal history. In fact he explained the presence of pre-Hispanic proto-Catholicism by assuming evidence of the influence of Catholicism in other Asian cultures, and the influence of other Asian cultures in the Philippines. So, for instance, he wrote sections on Brahman in the Tagalog civilization, Buddhism in Tagalism, China in Tagalism, Christian doctrines in China before the Christian era, Persia in Tagalog, and Egypt in Tagalog. His sources here were largely French, of the Orientalist tradition of which he partook, a tradition both scholarly and more broadly diffused in Parisian parlors. He positioned the Philippines, more specifically the pre-Hispanic Tagalog civilization, as a kind of missing link between the great civilizations of the West and the ancient ones of the East, and as the culmination of all of them.

The ancient Tagalog civilization in Paterno’s 1880 work was central to the unfolding of the world’s ancient history. By his later The Ita (1890), the ancient Tagalog civilization had taken on a distinctly racial character, and was thoroughly idealized and venerated as a complicated historical relationship to the “first settlers” of the Philippines: the “primitive” and physiologically other Negritos, or Ita. For Paterno, the “aborigines” of the Philippines were the “Attas, Ibas or Itas, or as the Spanish call them, the Negritos,” who, of all “the diverse races that are found in the Archipelago,” seemed to be “the first settlers of the country.” In the 1890 work, Paterno’s version of the familiar migration-wave theory imagined the migrations as a series of cultural-civilizational interactions and transformations, in which each succeeding wave of immigrants gratefully and enthusiastically received the hospitality of those they encountered and in turn raised their level of civilization. Before later migration waves arrived, the original Ita “lived happy in their fortunate islands . . . in their state, primitive though it may have been, but with a free and independent life.” The invading immigration waves disrupted the status, but not violently. The invaders “learned the language and the habits of the country on which they set foot, with enthusiasm and the desire to please; they solicited [its] women, and acquired family and friendships with the result that they ‘quickly blended among the diverse established tribes’; and thus a new race that was mixed in peace with the ancient settlers [antiguos pobladores]” was begun. For Paterno, the Ita were racial and cultural ancestors of the Tagalog, which was itself a mixed race of the Ita and invading peoples.

In this story, the Ita’s language, habits, customs, and so on were initially adopted by the invaders but were eventually overwhelmed by the latter’s superiority. Indeed, the indigenous initially survived only because of the “characteristic tenacity of the women of the country” in whom “ancient habits [antiguos usos]” were deeply engrained. Despite women’s tenacity, however, progress (and so, implicitly, men) eventually prevailed, for “with time, as things seek their proper place [or natural level, nivel natural], the superior language [as well as beliefs, habits, and customs] . . . succeeded in absorbing the inferior.” Elsewhere, Paterno borrowed the exact language of a Jesuit textbook of Philippine history, which held that the aboriginal Ita had been “conquered by invaders of more robust constitution and endowed with a higher degree of culture.” Paterno’s innovation was to explain this conquering not simply as the domination of one at the expense of the other but as a peaceful process engendering a new race: the Tagalog (more about this later). Contemporary Tagalogs’ ancient Ita ancestors had been “vanquished . . . by culture [cultura];” giving way to the superior civilization and language, thus being incorporated (by cultural extermination) in the new progressive mixed race. The Ita were the historical ancestors of both the ancient and contemporary Tagalogs, but what of contemporary Ita?

The ancient Ita also had a distinct contemporary legacy, for living Ita were the descendents of other ancient Ita, those who had “retreated, appealing to arms,” and who, “vanquished . . . took refuge in the harshness of the mountains.” This Ita people, “abhorring union or mixing with others, wastes its existence in the most degenerate isolation,” making it unique among peoples of the Philippines. By emphasizing the ancient and above all the static quality of contemporary Ita, Paterno excluded them from the contemporary Filipino-Christian civilization. In contrast to the dynamism of the mixed-race legacy, which had its apex in the Tagalog language and culture, “the pure Ita race [la raza ita pura] has remained resting in its path, and its language has remained stationary.” Contemporary Ita were not “the surviving remains of cultured ancestors [antepasados cultos],” but rather peoples who have fallen behind [pueblos rezagados], who, because of particular circumstances, have remained arrested in one of those stages through which humanity passed in the infancy of its life, a ship
of civilization that dropped anchor in the ocean of life, but has not moved backward." Contemporary Ita were unlike the ancestral Ita, for the former had preserved their traditions and so remained stuck in the past, whereas the latter had embraced progress brought by superior invaders. Contemporary Ita, like primitive Negro peoples elsewhere in the world, represented an ailing, decaying body whose natural death approached: 

By continuous isolation during long centuries...[this people has] not felt the necessity of modifying its type of life, has not acquired the aptitude of transforming itself; has become accustomed to sloth, stupefied inaction, petrifaction, in other words, to not progressing in the moral order, to perishing in the physical order; it is a people that has nourished itself for a long time with a few unchanging and poor ideas, leaving it very weak, and now it is difficult for it to move, to work; to carry out any effort or regenerative project, and is therefore condemned to disappear before the peoples that know how to progress, that live, work, and march forward. 

The Ita were condemned not by their contemporaries (be they Tagalog or Spanish) but by their cultural inability to transform themselves, by their atrophy as a people.

This story, in which progress and evolution were conceptualized in terms of the use and discard of organs and abilities, derives from the particularly Lamarckian version of evolutionary ideas (stressing environmental adaptation) that remained strong in France even among those who embraced Darwin's ideas (which stressed natural selection). Ideas of racial hierarchy were long established in France, but they had become complicated and internally contested over questions such as which kinds of markers were the significant "racial" ones (biological or cultural, civilizational) and whether racial "purity" was itself a benefit or liability. In these debates, one of the most prominent and controversial figures was Vacher de Lapouge, who drew on Lamarckian ideas of adaptation in 1886 to predict the future extermination of entire races (since "superior races will substitute themselves by force for the human groups retarded in evolution") and advocated eugenics as a framework for thinking about the relative value of races and their struggle for existence. For Paterno, the Ita were one of those inferior races doomed to extinction; the Tagalog, the superior, was capable of adaptation.

However, Paterno also drew from Lapouge's critique, such as Yves Guyot, to argue that racial purity was a liability rather than a source of strength. For Paterno, the Ita's pure lineage made their culture static and explained their contemporary degeneracy and future obsolescence, for "it is known that races that do not mix degenerate in the course of time, and then disappear. On the contrary, mixed origins begat dynamism, for "those that mix—the motizo races, like the Spanish, the French, the German, the English, in general 'those of the western countries of Europe'—that... are found to be so intermingled that none could claim an authentic genealogy..." [those races] live [to be] robust and powerful." Quoting Guyot, he continued: "The most complicated organs are perfected through the accumulation of innumerable variations, slight though they may be; the same thing happens in social organisms. Heterogeneity is one of the causes of the strength of France, and the men that work to destroy it, take on not only an impossible task, but also a retrograde one. No doubt they seek to take us [back] to the static civilizations of Asia. It is a disgrace for the Chinese, the Arabs, and the sects inhabiting Indostan, to have conserved their hegemony." Published just the previous year in French, Guyot's prefacing to Problems of History referred critically to Joseph-Arthur de Gobineau (who conceived of human history as a series of conflicts between races in which the victor was always diminished by mixing with the vanquished). But Guyot also referenced the language of French controversies about whether racial "purity" was itself a good (Lapouge said yes, Guyot, no). While Guyot questioned the idea that races had destinies (instead emphasizing adaptation via mixing), Paterno turned Guyot's words to support such a position (some peoples advance, and others decay), while connecting racial progress to openness to intermixtures. Yet Paterno, like Guyot, also drew on the classic Orientalist conception of Asian societies as "static," contrasting them with the dynamic "western countries of Europe," to pit one mode of racialized and racist thought against another. Here, the image of "static" Asian societies was used to cast aspersions on an ideal of racial purity. Paterno, in turn, used this quotation to distance the Ita, a static race, from the more dynamic or "intermixed" races of the Philippines, of which Tagalog was exemplary. Unlike their "diseased" Oriental neighbors, "Tagalogs had not "conserved their hegemony"—they were a "robust and powerful" race like the French, German, English, or Spanish. Tagalogs were, perhaps, the best of both worlds; they were distinguished ancients, but they were also robust and mixed."
As we have seen, Paterno stressed the difference between the ancient ancestral Ita and contemporary Negritos. Yet he thought that the study of the latter could reveal something about the former, and so about the Tagalog's own past. It was important for contemporary advanced peoples to understand the contemporary primitive, for "the condition and customs of savage life [vida salvaje] are similar in many aspects ... to those of our own ancestors in an age now very distant [and] the studies of stationary peoples illustrate and explain many customs and ideas, particularly those nebulous and occult, encrusted in the spirits of advanced peoples like fossils in rock." The Ita were analogous to an inanimate specimen for the study of natural history, which could be studied "as a geological medal with the date rubbed out, buried among the evolutions of humanity, and its study will awaken us, as if it were the Prehistory of the Filipino people [pueblo filipino]." The living Ita, then, were not exactly the "Prehistory of the Filipino people," but they were something like that: isolated elements of their "customs and ideas" remained buried deep in the "spirit" of advanced Tagalogs, the "Filipino people." Paterno used here a narrative of progress and the metaphors of archaeology both to lay claim to a past and also to affirm its distance from the present.

However, Paterno sometimes wrote in more relativistic terms about the ancient Ita's value. Though progress was the overall shape of history, every stage in that history had its own particular contribution (a conception common to Hegel and Johann Gottfried Herder). Like other "simple and first civilizations," Paterno wrote, the Ita had, like "all civilisation[s], ... something of value in itself, and always something new that is not found in any other." For the sake of their contributions to human history as a whole, Paterno enjoined his reader to appreciate primitive peoples:

"[F]ar from disdaining inferior civilizations in view of the superior ones, we look at them with interest and we study them with love, as new and original examples of human activity, following the steps of the learned naturalist, who does not disdain moss and lichen in view of the slender palm or the sturdy pine; since true History does not consist so much in the succession of facts, as in the manifestation of human activity, in the universality of the investigations, extending to all thought, all language, all tradition of man, or rather his beliefs, customs, laws, sciences, arts, letters, in all places and all times."
to understand though not accept its point of view, he adopted the superior
city of the truly "civilized."

Finally, the study of the Ila was valuable for the progress of the advanced peoples of the Philippines because it would help them recognize what they needed to change or leave behind. For the advanced Filipinos to fulfill their promise, they had to "know to adapt their ancient traditions [antiguas tradiciones] to Progress" and "succeed in harmoniz-
ing their ancient habits and customs [antiguas usos y costumbres] with new ideas."109 The Philippines was well suited to this, not only because it had "the faculty of adapting itself to the new conditions of existence with which it is presented," but because—and here Paterno called on theories of racial strength through mixing—"ancient races [razas antiguas] are gathered in its bosom, like races rejuvenated by active and hardworking blood," which have a "powerful action of advance."110 In order for those active agents to complete the natural progress against the "hereditary influences of the ancient races," that work in the contrary sense, "advanced peoples of the Philippines needed knowledge of their traditions [tradiciones], in obeying them and knowing when to get rid of them in time, when they have become useless or prejudicial, lies the secret of giving life and advance[ment] to that numerous people [pueblo]."111 This art or skill, of knowing when to obey tradition and when to abandon it, was precisely what the people who had descended from the mixed race had demonstrated. Through study of their own primitive past, the advanced people of the Philippines could ensure that their trajectory continued upward, and ultimately they could arrive at the "brilliant, glorious future" to which they were "called."112 The story of the Tagalog-Filipino people is one of historical and future triumph, with the present marked as a key and urgent moment in which the correct decisions must be made to hasten the (right) future. It is tempting to attribute Paterno's praise for racial mixing to his own family's mestizo status. However, in his own writing he never referred to Chinese patrimony in the Philippines, the most prominent manifestation of mestizaje in contemporary Manila. Whether one reads this as a lack of interest or as a studious avoidance of an uncomfortable subject, it is a notable absence. Yet to read mestizaje in Paterno's text too exclusively in contemporary Manila's terms would be reductive, for Paterno was also responding to and using French scholarly arguments that were infused with political significance, in addition to the outlines of "universal his-
tory" and its attendant validation of colonial rule.

Paterno took debates in French anthropology, sociology, and economics and used them to make an argument about the Tagalog "race," which accommodated the idea of its ancestry and overcame any sense of that primitive ("Negrito" or "Black") ancestry being a liability. Here, then, is an example of how "universal" principles (of natural selection and racial strength), articulated in and out of local political configurations (ideas of race and fitness in late nineteenth-century France), became available, precisely through their articulation as universal, to quite different and dis-
tinct local arguments (about race and fitness in the Philippines). While the model was the idea of the French as a race of mixed-race origins yet superior in civilization to its ancestors, France needed not be referred to in order for Paterno to use the model: the idea, stated in general terms, could be applied by Paterno to the Tagalog.

What is significant about Paterno is that he embraced the concept of race-as-culture, that is, a version of how evolutionary biology was thought to apply to social and political life in which "race" was the unit of analy-
sis, but it was a race's cultural features—its civilization—that were most meaningful. These features were mutable and adaptable, yet they signifi-
cantly belonged to a race.113

What impresses the reader about Paterno's writings is the eclectic com-
bination of approaches, sources, and arguments. His writings harnessed the possibilities of various scholarly discourses—of race, history, civi-
lization, and progress—in the service of promoting the Filipinos, not necessarily against Spain but as a location of advancing history. Though self-aggrandizing in manner, his writings constructed a productively vogue unity among some pre-Hispanic peoples of the Philippines. Pater-
nio kept aloof from the more political arguments of La solidaridad and of the propagandists in Spain and was privately and even sometimes in print criticized by his peers for his fervid imagination, yet his writing about the glories of the pre-Hispanic Tagalog civilization was published in that periodical. It served as a kind of propaganda, which was both to promote the Filipino as scholar of his own country and to promote an idea of pre-
Hispanic accomplishment.

Thus far, we have considered how two illustres reconstructed pre-
Hispanic history in terms of a series of civilizations. Pardo de Tavera found the tools of linguistic research useful for uncovering that history and theorized an era of Hindu colonization hitherto unknown by mod-
ern scholars. In contrast, Paterno explained the succession of civilizational
epochs as part of a greater law of historical progress, which he read back into the series of eras to reconstruct their value and meaning. Paterno's work, while it employed ethnological terms and followed an ethnological account of the history of the peoples of the islands, largely encumbered systematic analysis of linguistic, physiological, or cultural evidence to make his case. We will turn now to consider some of the writings of Isabelo de los Reyes. As we will see, his writings engaged more directly in some of the questions of ethnological research, and in particular, he was interested in finding in ethnographic data evidence of the filiation among the peoples of the Philippines—in other words, to posit a kind of unity among different groups. While he accepted some of the normative terms that Paterno had used to describe "primitive" peoples, he rejected the racial destiny that Paterno had accorded them.

Living Ancients? De los Reyes's Racial Ethnology against Racial Determinism

In contrast to Paterno and Porfiro de Taveras, each of whom grew up in Manila and its environs, Isabelo de los Reyes was born in Vigan, a provincial port city on the northwestern coast of Luzon, and lived there until he was sixteen years old. He identified himself in his writings as Ilocano—one of the Christian, "advanced" peoples—though there is some indication that his family had been classified as Chinese mestizo.123 His mother was a poet, and she apparently passed on to her son a love of writing. Isabelo moved from Vigan to Manila in 1880, enrolling in San Juan de Letran, and shortly thereafter began his extraordinary and prolific journalistic career.124 In 1881 he began to publish works on the folklore and history of the Philippines in local newspapers; these caught the attention of Blumentritt. We will hear more about his folklore writings in the next chapter. Unlike many of the ilustrado who lived, studied, and wrote from Europe, de los Reyes did not leave the Philippines until he was deported after his arrest during the Revolution, and so he was distanced from many of the ilustrados by his Ilocano native tongue and birthplace, and his location in the islands. Though he often referred to Ilocos, not the Philippines, as his patria, in his work and writings he aimed to bridge divisions of language and educational class in native society in the Philippines.

De los Reyes's attention to race and racialized thinking stemmed partially from his general interest in the newly developing anthropological fields, and this interest grew out of his affectionate curiosity about the beliefs, rational or otherwise, of his countrymen. But his attention to ethnology's conception of race went beyond merely accepting it as the language in which folkloristic research could be written. Ethnology, for de los Reyes, was a way of thinking that held the potential of uniting peoples of the Philippines across divisions of language, geography, and civilization, according to a principle that predated Spanish arrival in the islands.125 Ethnological race (or raza), in other words, held the promise of naturalizing a "people" of the Philippines. De los Reyes had already learned the ethnological language of racialized thinking by the time he wrote his piece "The Tinguian" in 1889, in which he considered his data in terms of what it could reveal about his subjects' racial origins. We can also see an increasing focus on race in the transition from his Vigan Islands in the Age of the Conquist (1886) to The History of the Philippines, Part I: Pre-History (1886) to The History of Ilocos (1890), each successive work containing more detail about the relationships between different pre-Hispanic peoples of the Philippines, drawn from ethnological works and data.126

The ethnography section of the volume on "Pre-History" of The History of Ilocos is almost identical to the chapters on "Filipinos" in Vigan Islands and in The History of the Philippines, which indicates that, for de los Reyes, to study the question of the origin of one of these groups was to study the question of filiation of all of them. The version in The History of Ilocos contains some data particular to Ilocos that has no equivalent in the other two works, but for the most part he treated the same material in these three chapters and often simply changed particular phrases: "of the Visayas" became "of the Philippines" and then "of Ilocos," for example.127 Though he did not think that the "Ilocanos," "Visayans," and "Philipinos" were all simply the same, the overlapping content of these three works reflects his conviction that "prehistory" traced the "common origin" of these peoples. More specifically, for de los Reyes, all "Malayan Filipinos" shared a common ancestry.

These chapters on filiation and ancestry followed Montano's 1885 Report, which, it will be remembered, had largely followed Blumen- tritt's theory of three migration waves except that it theorized a racial distinction—"Indonesian" versus "Malay"—between the second and third waves. De los Reyes noted his disagreements with Montano's premises and conclusions and brought in data from other sources, but the organizing questions were the same: What were the distinct "races" that originally
De los Reyes doubted Montano's proposal that there was a distinct wave of "Indonesian" migration and even doubted that there was such a thing as a general "Indonesian" race. Explaining his skepticism, he noted that "there is no country called 'Indonesia,'" referring to the absence not of a state but of any geographic area known as such. This ethnographic division is founded in new data and is not yet well confirmed. It is not adopted by the majority of ethnographers, and among its own supporters there is no unanimity about what races should belong to the "Indonesians." De los Reyes likely relied here on counsel of Illustremit, with whom he corresponded and whose theory (of there being two root races of the Philippines, the Negrito and the Malay) he accepted. That Montano classified de los Reyes's own people, the Ilocanos, as a mix of "pure Malayas" and "Indonesians" helped condemn the legitimacy of the distinction. If "Indonesian" was distinct from "Malay," the Ilocanos—as mixed descendants of both—were not quite "Malay" (i.e., their difference from other indios had biological roots associated with the Muslim south). However, if "Indonesian" was not a distinct race, then Ilocanos were "Malay." De los Reyes preferred to explain Ilocanos' difference from other indios with the theory that the former had, in fact, better preserved some ancient Malayan cultural traits.

He fully accepted, however, the distinction between "Malay" and "Negrito" races and, like others, believed that the "Negrito" or "Aetas" (Pateros's ita) were "the aborigines" of the Philippines and were racially other to the "Malays." Though he referred to himself elsewhere as "brother of the Aetas of the forest (los selváticos aetas)" when modestly introducing himself in a piece of writing addressed to Spanish folklorists, here he described the Negritos or Aetas as having a "shy, misanthropic, and nomadic" character, and much of the evidence that he cited as revealing their origins and isolation was of the kind used by racist physical anthropologists, especially hair color and type. He embraced highly racialized classifications of peoples and even accepted that one could describe the character of a people or race; this racial data, however, was significant for him insofar as it helped to reveal the origins of peoples and their historical relationships to each other. As we will see, he believed that character traits were not biologically given, but mutable.

De los Reyes then moved from treating the "Negrito" to the subject of "the Malayan race," focusing largely on whether the Malay "type" in the Philippines had Chinese filiation. He argued vehemently against those (including Montano) who believed that the "Malay type" in the Philippines was often a mestizo (with Chinese ancestry). For de los Reyes, it was only after the arrival of the Spaniards that Malay and Chinese mixed in any significant way, thus the peoples that the Spaniards encountered in the islands were neither Chinese nor of Chinese heritage. He aligned himself with those who traced the Malay presence in the Philippines to Bornean ancestry, citing a chronicler who had described a community in Borneo who spoke a language of the Philippines ("Pampango," or Kapampangan) and identified themselves as descendants of those who came from elsewhere. Apparently concerned that his readers might doubt this data, de los Reyes reassured them that "it is found to be confirmed by respectable modern ethnologists.

Concluding his chapter on ethnography, he summed up his findings: in present-day Ilocos, there were to be found four racial "types," two of them at least relatively "pure" (Malay and Negrito) and two markedly "mixed." Noting each type and where examples of it were to be found, he attempted to understand contemporary complexity in general racial categories that specified origins. The "Malay" type, he wrote, was only "relatively pure, since the Malay type in the Philippines is actually disfigured by crossbreeding. Belonging in this category are the Ilocanos, almost all the Tinguians, the subjegated Igroots and the 'rebellious' ones of Abra." The two mestizo types derived from Malay, mixed either with Chineses (clearly marked exogenous) or with Negrito; the first, the "markedly Malay-Chinese mestizos, like the Chinese mestizos of Vigan, [and] the Igroots and Tinguians of southeast Ilocos Sur, who have Chinese-sired eyes," and the second, the "markedly Malay-Negrito mestizos," found "not only among their close neighbors the Negritos, but also among the Ilocanos, especially in the North." The final type (apparently the only truly pure one) was that of the "Negritos, neither more nor less than those of Mariveles." Note that these racial "types" were not the equivalent of races in a cultural-civilizational sense—the Chinese mestizos of the old colonial town of Vigan could hardly be confused with the Tinguians of southeast Ilocos Sur, though both were for him Chinese mestizo "types."
The Chinese were, for de los Reyes, decidedly not an "original" race in the Philippines. De los Reyes acknowledged that Chinese traded in the islands before the Spanish arrived but used racist logic in arguing that "the avaricious and sullen character of the Chinese [being] well known, it would be wrong to say that they had abandoned" the islands if they had ever settled there; therefore, because chronicles made no mention of Chinese settlements, they must never have existed, and so Chinese could not have mixed significantly with the locals before the Spanish arrived. Thus the only two root races were the Malay and the Negrito. Establishing the relatively late arrival of Chinese immigration was significant in establishing the Malay core of both his own Ilocanos and also the Tinguan. Each of these groups played a key part in his theorization of the underlying unity of (many) peoples of the Philippines, both historically and in a progressive future.

It was the "Malayan race" that de los Reyes was most interested in and whose parameters he used to argue against ideas of innate racial ability. Like Pardo de Tavera's conception of the "Filipinos" (who had been ruled by Hindus in ancient times), de los Reyes believed that "Filipino-Malay" (malayos filipinos) constituted a large and multilingual group, united across the great linguistic divides and geographical distances of the archipelago: "The Ilocanos are of the same origin as the Tagalogs, Bicolanos and other civilized Filipinos, and I believe they are Malayans with Negrito blood." De los Reyes attempted to demonstrate the underlying unity of these peoples through studying and comparing their habits, religious beliefs and practices, styles of dress, forms of government, practices surrounding pregnancy, birth, marriage, death, and so on. He argued that these practices all derived from a common origin, and thus collectively provided evidence of a single cultural and racial origin of the people who practiced them.

While he believed that "Filipino-Malay," as he often referred to them, were a distinct race, he noted the difficulty of using that as a term of reference. Musing about the possibility of adopting a broader sense of the word "Tagalog," he wrote,

Authors call "Tagalog" only those that populate the central coasts of Luzon; but for those [people], this denomination ['Tagalog'] is common to all Filipino-Malayas [malayos filipinos] including Ilocanos, Bicolanos, etc. And in truth this denomination would be more proper than that of "Indios" (because they are not from India), "indigenous" (because this word means "natives" and is applicable to any child of a resident), and "Filipinos" (because this word does not distinguish between races and can be given to a child of a European born in the Philippines, just as to an Aeta of Ilocos)."
Tinguian and the Bathalism of ancient natives: "The deity whom the Tinguian worship, respect, and fear is Anito, who according to Tinguian beliefs is like the ancient Batula mayscal of the natives [indigenous]." and he wrote that while "[t]he Tinguian maintains that he is a monothetist, ... it is likely that, if not still to this day, in the past he was rendered talbata to second-order deities, like the animus of the ancient natives [antiquis indigenous]. ... [T]he Tinguian is very close to the ancient natives in their religious practices." Put succinctly, "the Tinguian and the native are of the same race: the Malayian [a malay]," and "[t]he civilized of Alban" he wrote, "were in the beginning Tinguian."

For de los Reyes, the Tinguian were the "primitive" Malay type: "physiologically of the same family as the Ilocanos, Tagalogs, and Visayans but civilationally distinct. As Paterno had treated the Iba, de los Reyes found these "primitives" to be like living ancestors of the more modern malayos filipinos. Quite unlike Paterno, however, de los Reyes used racial categories as a way to undermine ideas of innate racial civilization (or lack of it). Civilization was acquired, and the varying degrees of civilization evident among different branches of malayos filipinos provided the evidence:

The insignificant differences that exist—between the relatively civilized Ilocanos, the Tinguian that now wears pants and jacket, the subjugated Igorot that although still nearly naked has already lost his shy and cuddle character, and the rebellious one with cannibalistic practices—these differences are effects of where they live and one sees that they are civilized or savage according to whether they are near or far from places frequented by Spanish or by civilized Ilocanos. Even among these latter, that have already acquired a considerable degree of culture, at times human sacrifice is practiced, ... and in the beginning they were neither more nor less than the cannibals of Alban."

Embracing the language of progress, de los Reyes argued against an idea of innate racial ability—or inability—by appealing precisely to the broad civilizational variety of a single race (his own). De los Reyes was unworried about the potential political liabilities of associating the civilized Ilocanos with their "savage" ancestors and brethren, and even impugned to his own "civilized Ilocanos" an occasional "savage" practice. What struck de los Reyes was the possibility—perhaps inevitability—of cultural change, a change that occurred not through racial mixture but through civilizational contact. Among the three authors we have considered, de los Reyes attended most closely to biological conceptions of race and racial difference, yet he used such evidence to argue for the possibility of a people acquiring civilization, and against ideas of innate racial ability.

As the following chapter shows, de los Reyes's conviction that civilization could be acquired was combined with his affection for the incredulous, superstitious peasant and the particularities of local culture. He delighted in detailing superstitious practices, perhaps even more lovingly because he believed that they were going to disappear. His writings on folklore and his indefatigable work publishing bilingual newspapers show both his confidence that common people could be educated and a conviction that they must be.

Thus far, we have seen how de los Reyes used racial categories to argue precisely that race need not dictate what a people could achieve. As we have briefly noted, however, his comments about Negritos and Chinese show less generosity toward those peoples' potential. Another group of peoples notably absent from de los Reyes's view are the Muslims in the south; while technically he thought that these peoples, too, were Malay, he did not include them in his studies. Such exclusion, while in part dictated by sources, was probably not coincidental. Blumentritt—with whom we began this chapter and with whom both Pablo de Taveras and de los Reyes corresponded—strive to compile what was known about these peoples and to add it to the ethno-chronological map of the Philippines. As we turn briefly to Blumentritt's work, we see yet another way that the confusion of racial and civilizational terms could produce unities, as well as divisions, among the peoples of the Philippines.

Other Malayan: Blumentritt's Moros

Blumentritt's "Indigenous Races of the Philippines" (1889) updated his 1883 work Toward an Ethnography, emphasizing recent works that treated the southern and western parts of the archipelago. "Until now the islands of Luzon and the Visayas were the main object to which the studies of scholars and both domestic and foreign travelers were dedicated, without the islands of Mindanao and Paragua [Palawan] ... drawing the attention of Philippiptologists."

Exciting new data from the vast areas of Mindanao and Palawan, brought to light by new missionary activities of the
Jesuits and contributions by the Frenchman Montano and the German Alexander Schadenberg, confirmed for him that there were "only two indigenous races in the Philippine archipelago, the Malay (la malaya) and the Negrito (la negrita)," in contrast to "ethnographic fashions of the day (that distinguished "Indonesian" from "Malay")." What he wrote, however, about the peoples and races of significantly Muslim Mindanao and Palawan is instructive.

"Indigenous Races of the Philippines" is organized as a series of brief descriptive entries about individual peoples of the Philippines, alphabetically ordered by name. Typically, the entries begin by identifying the racial origin of the people—whether Malay, Negrito, or a mix of these two. Sometimes, he identified a people’s race by noting that it was a subtype of a larger general group (which was in its own entry racially identified, most as "Malay"). Among those general groups is "moro," the generic Spanish term for Muslim peoples of the Philippines, whom he designated as "Muslim Malayans." Other such general groups were indios and "infidels" (infieles), whose subtypes he almost always presumed to be racially Malay, unless specified otherwise (as Negrito-mestizo, for example). Though nearly every entry in Blumentritt's piece is eventually traceable to a racial category (Negrito, Malay, or a mixture of these), he used the terms more, indio, and "infidel" so commonly as general references that they take on a racial sense themselves, as if ethnological branches of the greater "Malaysian race." Their ethnological-racial sense is bolstered by some telling exceptions: while indio usually refers to Christian peoples, and "infidel" to pagan peoples, occasionally the phrase "infidel indios" or "savage indios" reveals that, for Blumentritt, indio indicated something besides just "Christian" (Figure 2.3). The term more, on the other hand, was never used with either "infidel" or indio. So while "infidel" and indio sometimes overlapped, more was its own quite separate category. Moro, for Blumentritt, formed their own group—distinct from indios—within the larger Malayasian race. Moros were distinct from all other peoples of the Philippines, whether Malay or Negrito, Christian or pagan. Blumentritt followed, in effect, the medieval Spanish convention by which all Muslims were moros: after the Spaniards had driven the Moors (muros) from the peninsula in the fifteenth century, they traveled around the globe only to encounter them again in Magellan's islands. While it is not clear that any moros thought of themselves as such when Blumentritt
written, the appellation "Moro" would become something close to an ethnic identity in the twentieth century. In contrast with the _ilustrado_ authors, Blumentritt included them in his account of Philippine races, noting their Malay-ness. What was less clear, however, in Blumentritt's work was whether they were _filipino_ as they were always marked as separate from _indio_. In a sense, Blumentritt's work highlights the core tensions in _ilustrado_ works between a sense of _filipino-malay_ as a biological-racial family, _filipino_ as a cultural-racial grouping, and _filipino_ as a type of (advanced) civilization.

**Conclusion**

Questions of race and civilization were particularly productive both for recovering the history of the pre-Hispanic Filipinos and for some kinds of political claims, even at the same time that they haunted those claims to civilizational and political equality. Anthropological concepts and methods could provide a natural pre-Hispanic basis for unity among some peoples of the islands and rescue the pre-Hispanic Filipinos from obscurity or from an image of disgraceful barbarity by picturing a common ancient society. For those seeking to promote the recognition of Filipinos' rights to political representation and legal equality with peninsula Spaniards, the methods of racialized sciences brought opportunities but also risks.

In racialized studies of human history, in principle every human society had its place in the great scheme that traversed both spatial and temporal dimensions. As has been the subject of much reflection, in many versions of these schemes, some peoples were thought to belong, properly speaking, to the past, rendering their present-day representatives as primitive or out of time. To the extent that contemporary civilized peoples of the Filipinos were the source of ethnological data for reconstructing the past, they were linked—perhaps too closely for political comfort—to those thought to be both historically prior and primitive. The risk, in other words, was that contemporary Filipinos would be seen as present-day incarnations of a primitive past rather than as moderns with ancient ancestors.

Sometimes contemporary " primitives" were specifically invoked as the modern-day equivalent of " civilized" Filipinos' ancestors. Here, these authors not only engaged in scholarly techniques of racial theorizing to try to reconstruct past societies of the Filipinos; they also characterized as primitive the contemporary peoples from whom they considered their own to be distant. When explaining the distance between contemporary Filipinos and their primitive "others," these authors often participated in prejudicial formulations of race and civilization, similar to those of which they complained when they were on the receiving end. But the racial science of ethnology also traced a different kind of relationship between " civilized" and " primitive." Because it searched for common origins, it pointed toward connections between peoples—in particular, between non-Christian mountain tribes and lowland Christian Filipinos, as we have seen evidenced in los Reyes's writings. Racial sciences, then, offered a double action—distinction from but also relation to. Racial sciences also employed different kinds of scales along which this double action could be measured or traced: sometimes the scale was of civilizational degree, sometimes of physiological-racial difference, sometimes of cultural-racial difference, and sometimes a combination of these. These combinations and contradictions can help explain how, despite the fact that the imagined core of the "Filipino" grouping remains roughly consistent, the meaning of its political boundaries can vary greatly.

We can read each of these authors' use of ethnological science against a background of their personal biography and the political projects with which he was associated. Pardo de Tavera, for example, was known particularly in later years for his assimilationist and collaborationist politics. Though he and Paterno both came from families that had been exiled as subversives following the Cavite mutiny of 1873, and though he was part of the Filipino colony of Madrid, he took pains to avoid associating himself with controversy. Paterno, on the other hand, was a sophisticated Tagalog prince but also Chinese mestizo, found opportunities in racialized theories of mestizo vigor. Promoting his own importance in a variety of political environments, he "had an untroubled view of his location between colony and empire," as Molina has put it, and was able to reconcile patriotism for Spain and the Philippines.

Likewise, he employed both racialized ethnological science and an older discourse of civilizations, showing both racial and cultural continuity between different eras of " civilization" in the Philippines, but also distinct moments of cultural-civilizational advance. De los Reyes spent his early years in a provincial center rather than Manila, and he never left the Philippines during this period. In comparison with both Paterno and Pardo de Tavera, he was more interested in the relationship...
between Christian Filipinos and their highland non-Christian “brothers,” and, while he, too, used ethnological theory to argue for a historical relationship between Christians and non-Christians of the Philippines, he also saw contemporary connections between the groups. Though his association with the institutions of the revolution is unclear, many of his writings during this period were clearly propagandist.

These contexts are significant in considering why each of the authors might have made the choices that he did in taking up, molding, and expressing ethnological theory. However, this chapter, in considering these authors’ works together, and against other ethnological writings, has shifted the weight of attention from each author’s political involvements to the overarching question of what was understood by “race” and why it was a concept more easily adopted by each of these Filipino authors than it was for the Dominicans whose account of the ethnology section of the 1887 exposition began our chapter. “Race” was a category each of these thinkers found useful; for them, “race” stood more for a possibility of drawing connections between different people of the Philippines—albeit unevenly and with exclusions—than it did for distinguishing between “Spaniards” and “Filipinos.” This is not to say that a distinction between “Spaniards” and “Filipinos” could not be made, was not understood, or was not often accompanied by prejudice and chauvinism. But the category of “race” held a good deal more promise for these Filipinos than the subsequent history of racism might allow us to understand. We see in this chapter a tension between different ways of categorizing peoples—by “race” and by “civilization”—and, while the latter could be accommodated easily within a Catholic framework, the former could not. The universalism of Catholicism’s quest ran up against the pluralism enabled by a partially physiological sense of human difference.

Each author used contemporary sciences of man to highlight the civilizational potential of the populations he took to be at the center of the emerging ethnological category of “Filipino.” A muddled discourse of race and civilization, haunted by their Eurocentric attributes, nonetheless facilitated the production of filial connections and marked differences and hierarchy among the Filipinos’ peoples.

---

CHAPTER 3

Practicing Folklore

Universal Science, Local Authenticity, and Political Critique

writing from his corner of late nineteenth-century Bohemia, Ferdinand Blumentritt lamented that his age was bringing about the homogenization of human life via “progress, which tends to level all the races [races] with its steamships, trains, commercial activity and the telegraph.” For Blumentritt, the object of “folkloric science” was to preserve cultural artifacts—including superstitions, legends, architecture, painting, clothes, and language—of both “civilized and savage peoples” from that inevitable “progress” whose relentless uniformity would devour them. The aim was not necessarily to preserve folklore in living form—for that would be to deny progress itself—but instead to preserve for posterity specimens in the form of folkloric data. Like other European folklorists, Blumentritt articulated the urgency of collecting folklore by noting how quickly it was disappearing with the spread of industrialism. The apt comparison in the Philippines, as both Blumentritt and Isabelo de los Reyes noted, was with the cultural transformations brought by Spanish colonialism and Catholic conversion. De los Reyes, however, emphasized that indigenous folklore had not been obliterated by centuries of Catholic missionary efforts but instead had been remarkably resilient. “As beliefs are not changed like a suit of clothes,” he wrote, “the apostles of the Christianity had to take years and centuries to banish the remains of the Malayum Mythology [Mitología malaya], which is still preserved in all of the Philippine Mythology [Mitología filipina].” Still, in his opinion, However, the study of folklore was still urgent, for “[t]his country [país] is in more need than European nations of someone or many who would record traditions, customs, fables, superstitions etc., so that learned men [doctores] would have something to work on.”
can later make comparisons that would have as their object to scrutinize the thousand mysteries that the past of these peoples [pueblos] contain." Folklore was a particularly precious resource for the Philippines, which had otherwise relatively few sources with which to reconstruct its own past, especially the pre-Hispanic Filipino and Philippine.

De los Reyes's folklore works in ways common to folklore projects elsewhere: it legitimizes an idea of a nation by seeking commonality and history in the practices and beliefs of the VoF, or the rural, the peasant, the figure supposedly untainted by modern cosmopolitan capitalism with its urban-metropolitan cores and provincial-territorial tentacles. De los Reyes, however, put folklore to the service of other projects. Most significantly, he used folklore's methodological focus on contemporary people's practices to comment on contemporary society and politics.

This chapter considers how folklore was written in the 1880s in the Philippines—what it was about, how and where it appeared, who took it up and for what ends, what kinds of data it used, and what and whose authority it invoked and established. Isabelo de los Reyes's writings on folklore have recently been the subject of much deserved attention to which this chapter contributes. This chapter also considers the lesser-known second volume of the two-volume El Folk-Lore Filipino, which de los Reyes edited but to which other authors contributed. Included in the collections are folktales; poems; riddles; beliefs about and practices of pregnancy, marriage, childbirth, food, agricultural techniques, and medicine; and religious beliefs and practices of both Catholic and pre-Hispanic origins. Much of that two-volume work was written by de los Reyes himself, and so he is rightly the central figure in the field of folklore and also the central figure of this chapter. Significantly, however, other authors contributed to the project of documenting folklore in the Philippines. Pedro Serrano Lakaw and Mariano Ponce, both avid propagandists and later contributors to La solidaridad, wrote pieces about folklore (of Pampanga and Bulacan, respectively) at de los Reyes's instigation, which were published in a Manila newspaper before appearing as part of this collection. Pedro Serrano Lakaw (1855–1928), a Tagalog-speaking Bulakeño, moved to Manila at age fourteen to study, obtaining a teaching certificate, and taught in elementary schools in Pampanga, Malolos, Bulacan, and Manila. In the late 1880s, he headed the Propaganda Committee of Manila, raising funds, writing, and helping to distribute clandestine pamphlets and other propagandists' literature. Mariano Ponce (1869–1918) was, like Serrano Lakaw, a native of Bulacan. He studied in Manila before leaving in 1887 for Spain to continue his studies, where he became a central figure in propagandistic work. His labors are evident in the pages of La solidaridad, and he also was a close friend of José Rizal, helping to distribute the latter's publications. We know little about Pio Mondragón, apart from this work (on Tayabas). This chapter also considers Pedro Paterno's 1885 novel Ninoy as well as a scholarly piece by José Rizal comparing a Tagalog folklore with a similar Japanese one, published in Triâmero's Record, a London periodical with a masthead that declared it was "Devoted to the Literature of the East." These writings drew from a number of distinct genres and accomplished different kinds of work. First, we will see that much of this folklore was written in the ethnological terms that then informed relationships and classification, complementing the themes and writings treated in the previous chapter. Folklore was used as a tool to recover knowledge about the pre-Hispanic peoples of the Philippines and establish their unity on the basis of shared pre-Hispanic cultural patrimony, one version of the nationalist bent of folklore studies elsewhere. The beliefs and practices of peoples of the Philippines were studied in comparison with each other and with those of Spain in order to discern single pre-Hispanic cultural influences known from Spanish ones. Ultimately, however, the pre-Hispanic was difficult to completely isolate, and much of the writing also shows great attention to Catholic syncretic practices and beliefs.

Folklore's methods and aims also led it to concerns distinct from those of ethnological filiation. One of these was its penchant to collect data in the spirit of preservation—not so much to preserve living practices as to document practices being obliterated or changing via global transformations of colonialism and industrialism. In this vein, folklore was data to be preserved via documentation, rather like specimens, to be available to the science of what was called "universal folklore." De los Reyes's El Folk-Lore Filipino was, as Anderson has shown, startlingly up to date and pathbreaking as the work of a colonial subject that contributed to international scholarly circles. To understand the innovations of his works and others, we will consider the practices and attributes of folklore in the peninsula and elsewhere.

Folklore scholarship appeared in the Philippines in the 1880s after having followed different paths from those of ethnology and linguistics. Unlike those sister disciplines in which Spanish scholars lagged far behind the European sciences, folklore flourished independently in the Philippines in the 1880s and 1890s. This was thanks to many efforts of some men of letters and to the dedication of others. A very important corpus of work was put together by Abanico de la Cruz (1825–1900), who was both an essayist and a teacher at the University of the Philippines. He was a man of letters and a scholar, and his writings have been collected into a book called El Folclore Filipino. In this book, he published works by other writers, including José Rizal, and wrote about the history of folklore in the Philippines. Another important work was published by José Rizal in 1887, called Noli Me Tangere. In this book, he explored the history and culture of the Philippines, focusing on the struggle between the indigenous people and the Spanish colonizers. Rizal's work was widely read and helped to raise awareness about the plight of the Filipino people. Folklore in the Philippines was seen as a way to understand the culture and history of the country, and it was studied by many scholars, including Rizal himself.
behind their German or French counterparts, folklore was enthusiastically embraced in Spain. Like Spanish folklore, some folklore of the Philippines took a newer ethnographic-scientific approach, and some followed an earlier literary amateur model, which was oriented more toward preserving or lauding practices than documenting them in the face of change or theorizing their transformation.

Folklore presumed commensurability, and this had particular significance in the Philippines, in the process of identifying Spanish origins, folklore studies highlighted the superstitious and backward nature of Spanish friars. Filipino folklore was compared to that of peoples from around the world, sometimes establishing the authority of the folklorist as capable of such cosmopolitan comparisons, sometimes establishing equivalency of Filipinos with peoples from the most "advanced" nations of the world. In this vein, some Filipino folklore emphasized, via comparison, the rich, lustrous "Oriental" patrimony of the Philippines' folklore. These folklore writings reveal discomfort with whether Filipino folklore revealed civilization, or its lack, among people of the Philippines.

By picking up the folklorist's pen, young colonial subjects followed the lead of peninsular scholars, and in some quite direct ways the lines of influence are traceable from colony to metropole. The two places, despite the unequal relationship between them, had shared reasons for finding in folklore a fruitful "national" science. In both Spain and the Philippines, folklore was an imperfect but precious tool that could root an idea of a nation when its boundaries were both politically and culturally ill defined. Despite many commonalities and direct lines of influence between peninsular and insular folklore, however, the Filipino practitioners produced material that only partially resembled the studies of the peninsula. In the Philippines, the pre-Hispanic (and pre-Catholic) was the obvious point of focus for folklore studies, and so these studies resonated with contested accounts of colonial rule's legacy and effects. Second, Filipino folklore could be read as a subsidiary of Spanish folklore but also as its equivalent, an ambiguity that underscored the politically ambiguous strategy of claiming rights for Filipinos as Spanish citizens by claiming parity between the Philippines and Spain.

The third significant difference between Filipino and Spanish folklore studies was that the "native informant" of Filipino folklore had to grapple with different parameters for establishing authority than did peninsular folklorists because he had to negotiate the position of being both a folklorist and a colonial subject. Filipinos characterized their relation to their subjects in different ways, in some cases establishing their authority on the basis of their proximity with "the folk" that they describe, and in other cases assuming a more distant perspective. Folklorists' standards of authenticity put these young colonial subjects in an unusual position as folklorists, for their authority as folklorists depended on their proximity with and access to the "untainted" common people, yet their authority as colonial subjects writing in a cosmopolitan scholarly world also depended on their ability to distance themselves from their (backward) subjects.

And finally, especially in de los Reyes's writings, we will see that folklore studies in the Philippines differed from Spanish practice in that the former was quite pointedly a vehicle for criticism of contemporary society and politics. De los Reyes routinely found opportunities not only to document popular beliefs but also to satirically criticize the ineptitude and corruption of government officials. The data of folklore—that it treated contemporary events and beliefs—let it to this use. These kinds of folklore writings were the most significantly innovative and politically engaged.

El Folk-Lore Filipino and El Folk-Lore Español

In the world of folklore scholarship, Spanish scholars were reasonably up to date, and Filipino folklore writing followed the Spanish literature more closely than did Filipino ethnology or linguistics. What is notable about the story of folklore's translation from Spain to the Philippines is, in fact, how much could and did translate and how these translations challenged, rather than affirmed, the politically subordinate relationship of the Philippines to Spain. The extent of this debt has not been acknowledged. By exploring some of the ways in which the two projects reinforced and borrowed from each other, some of the different and even potentially conflicting work of folklore in the Philippines comes into focus.

As other scholars have explained, folklore got its start in the Philippines when the Manila newspaper La ocianía española (Spanish Oceania) published an article "inviting its readers to contribute" to the project "Folk-Lore of the Filipinos [Folk-Lore de Filipinos]." De los Reyes responded with enthusiasm. By his own account, his interest in folklore predated his involvement in the project. He was raised in Vigan by servants from the countryside, "where everything is shadow and superstition," who told him "many fantastical and superstitious stories, and
I believed in them as in dogmas of faith. William Henry Scott tells us that one of his schoolteachers (a friar) organized a competition among the schoolboys to collect superstitions in order to highlight their absurdity and error. De los Reyes easily won the competition, presenting a list of superstitions longer than even all of those of my rivals put together, and so began one of the most remarkable folklore collections of the era, inadvertently stimulated by a friar’s efforts to promote Catholic truth against local error. De los Reyes’s early interest in and intimate connection with superstitions, and his love of Ilocano poetry (inspired by his mother, herself a poet), flowered in the venue and structure of the study of folklore. His newspaper articles were enthusiastically noted by Blumentritt, who would also translate some of his work into German and publish it in the journals Aalands (Almada) and Globus. De los Reyes’s folklore work was also enthusiastically received by peninsular folklorists Antonio Machado y Alvarez (1846–91) and Alejandro Guichot y Sierra; they had called for regionally based folklore studies (a call articulated in the Spanish Oviedo article). The peninsular folklorists sent him “all the folkloric works that were published in Spain,” which constituted a vibrant and somewhat eclectic practice of multilingual scholarship, arguably at the forefront of a newly defined field of study, an unusual position for Spanish scholars in the nineteenth century. The relatively new study of folklore was taken up in Spain in part because it allowed for regional and local specificity, which as we will see was significant for the work of both El Folk-Lore Español and El Folk-Lore Filipino.

The emergence of folklore as a field of study and its connections to nationalist thought are generally considered to belong to the era of European, especially central European, nationalism. The roots of folklore studies are often understood to be found in German Romanticism, which turned to the German language, and the Volk who spoke its variants, as a source of wisdom and spirit to counter the cold rationality of some versions of Enlightenment thought, and the political domination of the French empire. But “folklore” as a term was an English coinage (William J. Thomas, 1846), and late nineteenth-century folklore aimed to scientifically study peoples and the past via comparison. Folklore became data that ethnology could use to study the remains of the past in the present.

The study of “folklore” as such in Spain got its start when the Andalusian Machado learned in 1880 that the (first ever) Folk-Lore Society had been established in London in 1878. As his collaborator Guichot would later write, Machado “[i]nmediately got in touch with Mr. Gomme, the general secretary of [the Folk-Lore Society in London], and decided to plan to establish a Folklore Association in Spain,” promoting its study in Spain and beyond. Machado himself had begun by collecting popular songs and publishing them in periodicals as early as the late 1860s, but it was a decade later, when he became the director of the “Popular Literature” section of a scholarly society, that his particularly scientific bent becomes apparent. Though the genre of popular literature might seem to lend itself to humanistic methods and aims, Machado was already, in 1879, making reference to E. B. Tyler, Herbert Spencer, and the German brothers, as he explained the use of popular literature and its value for scientific knowledge of cultural survival. Machado’s work in this periodical was noticed at least as far away as Vienna, where it was praised in the scholarly Auland as an “indispensable reference for those dedicated in Europe to the study of popular literature.” Folklore studies in Spain, then, at Machado’s direction, followed major scientific trends of English and German scholarship, which adopted evolution and cultural survival as frameworks for understanding present-day rural and “primitive” peoples as living ancestors of more “advanced” societies. At the same time, however, romanticism was another pole of Machado’s work, reinforced by other collectors of Spanish folklore, Machado’s great-uncle, Agustín Durán, had authored a five-volume collection of Castilian romances (ballads) and believed that “the emancipation of thought in literature is the dawning of independence and the most expressive indication of nationality.” Luís Montoto y Rautenstrauch (who contributed to one of the Spanish regional folklore projects, El Folk-Lore Andaluz; and who was along with Guichot more given to the literary and costumbries traditions) later described Machado as a lover of nature, the countryside, and the common folk, and reported that Machado had advised him to “study the people [pueblo], who, without grammar and without rhetoric, speak better than you, because they express entirely their thought, without adulteration or chicanery; and they sing better than you do, because they say what they feel. The people, not the academies, are the true conservers of the language and the true national poet.” Such Herderian sentiments were quite at home among the more literary-romantic folklorists in Spain, whose humanistic interests and sometimes costumbres style predated Machado’s more scientific approach to folklore and constituted...
a counterweight to the scientific sensibility of El Folk-lore Español whose strength varied according to region.\textsuperscript{23}

Costumbriismo, an earlier literary mode important in nineteenth-century Spain, prefigured some of folklore's forms and interests and came to be associated with the more literary-romantic strands of Spanish folklore practices. Costumbriismo of nineteenth-century Spain portrayed literary and visual portraits of people as "types" engaging in activities, set in places, and dressed in clothing taken to be quintessential or characteristic of that type. Nineteenth-century Spanish costumbriismo had two tendencies of particular interest for our purposes. First, Spanish costumbriistas writers used the genre in part to defend their patria against the mischaracterizations of foreign observers.\textsuperscript{24} Second, costumbriismo was also a genre that could convey critical satire of a society whose failures were only too apparent to one of its critical, yet sympathetic, members.\textsuperscript{25} These features were characteristic, too, of the costumbriista writings of peninsular Spaniards in Manila, which, as John Blanco has argued, constituted a kind of colonial costumbriismo.\textsuperscript{26} In peninsular folklore circles, however, costumbriismo was associated with the literary-romantic, rather than the scientific, pole of folklore studies, and was oriented toward the recuperation of a pure past, rather than representing the complex contemporary world.\textsuperscript{27}

For some Spanish folklorists, including Machado, the literary-romantic and scientifcio-evolutionary poles were reconcilable via the positivist and romantic philosophical-ethical movement of Krausism. Krausism, a particularly Spanish phenomenon, drew its inspiration from German idealist philosophy and sought the perfectibility of man through popular education and enlightenment.\textsuperscript{28} Some of the earliest folklore in Spain had been published in the Boletín de la Institución Libre de Ensenanza (Bulletin of the Free Institution of Teaching), a Krausist venue in which appeared de los Reyes's contribution to the "international discussion to fix the true definition of Folk-Lore" and that continued to publish works of folklore after other venues ceased publication in the mid-1880s.\textsuperscript{29} The Free Institution of Teaching was dedicated to furthering modern science and promoting education conceived of as popular and "free"—that is, breaking away from the structures, institutions, traditions, and restrictions of traditional university teaching.\textsuperscript{30}

From its inception, then, the study of folklore in Spain was part of a project to Reconcieve knowledge and modernize it and, at the same time, to spread it among the people via new routes and institutions. De los Reyes shared Machado's interest in promoting learning outside of the traditional and elite institutions of higher education. He was among the most prolific newspapermen of Manila during the 1880s and founded a number of bilingual newspapers with political and educational content, aimed at a more popular readership than that of the Spanish-language press.\textsuperscript{31}

Though Machado never completely abandoned a romantic sensibility, when he adopted the term "folk-lore" to describe his work his approach became more methodical, comparative, and theoretical. He explained that the "love that we profess of our people" was related to his "desire that literature and poetry, breaking the old molds of its narrow and artificial conventionalism, rise to the category of science."\textsuperscript{32} This new science he called a "buddy science, called to vindicate the right of the people, until now unknown, to be considered as an important factor in the culture and civilization of humanity."\textsuperscript{33} The scientific turn of folklore brought with it a broad field of interest. In the founding principles of the Andaluzian folklore society El Folk-Lore Andaluz, Machado and his associates agreed that they aimed to collect all of the knowledges of our people in the various branches of science (medicine, hygiene, botany, politics, moral science), agriculture, etc.), proverbs, songs, riddles, traditions and other poetic and literary forms; local, national, and familiar habits, customs, ceremonies, spectacles and ceremonies; rituals, beliefs, superstitions, myths and childhood games in which most essentially the vestiges of past civilizations are conserved; the expressions, turns of phrase, tongue-twisters, expressions, nicknames, idioms, provincialisms, and children's words [voces infantiles], the names of places and towns, of rocks, animals and plants, and in sum, all of the constitutive elements of genius, knowledge, and language of the country.\textsuperscript{34}

This list would be modified only slightly by de los Reyes when he introduced his own folklore collection.\textsuperscript{35}

One of the most important aspects of Spanish folklore was precisely its regionalism: Spanish folklore was conceived of as a collective project of relatively autonomous regional centers, each documenting the local contribution to the heterogeneous Spanish whole. Whereas the English Folk-Lore Society was structured along national lines and oriented more to the archaeological and the antiquarian, folklore in Spain was strongly
regional and oriented toward contemporary practices. 36 El Folk-Lore Español was composed of "as many centers as there are regions that constitute the Spanish nationality [nacionalidad española]," including, in addition to the eleven peninsular regions, the Balearic Islands, the Canary Islands, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, "all of these regions [being] true members of the Folk-Lore Español," in Machado's words. 37 The regional structure for folklore studies in Spain reflected the strong regionalism in the peninsula more generally (a regionalism strongly supported by linguistic diversity, political structures, and political traditions) that distinguished Spain from many of her European neighbors. The Spanish folklore association "was first constituted in order to try to encourage all Spanish regions to carry out their work. Thus this [national] organism will only hold the aim of coordinating the different groups that appear, but never in a centralizing sense." 38 Some of the most important centers and journals of folklore research were specific to a region, such as El Folk-Lore Andaluz and El Folk-Lore Frances, and regional centers were free both to further subdivide themselves or to combine with other regional centers, "because of the homogeneity of their dialect, analogy of customs, geographical conditions, or any other analogous reason." 39 This strong regionalism was also reflected in Library of Spanish Popular Traditions (Figure 3.4.), an organ of El Folk-Lore Español, which contained many articles on the folklore of a particular locale and even deferred to the authority of local languages while most of its articles were in Castilian, it also published articles and literature in Galician, Catalan, and Portuguese. 40

The folklore of the Philippines was both part of a larger project of Spanish folklore and its own entity. El Folk-Lore Filipino (Figure 3.5.) could be seen as part of El Folk-Lore Español, in which Andalucia, Francia, Extremadura, and so on also participated, reflecting the structure of the propagandists' strategy of full integration for the Philippines into the Spanish polity. On the other hand, El Folk-Lore Filipino also reproduced the multilocality structure of El Folk-Lore Español in a way that might suggest it to be the latter's equal, rather than its subsidiary. That is, just as El Folk-Lore Español was a composite whole, so was El Folk-Lore Filipino (of Tagalog, Ilocano, Bulaqueno, etc.). De los Reyes found in Spanish folklore a useful vehicle—not just a model—for negotiating the relationship between region and nation, between a people (pueblo) and the broader groups of people with which they were in historical or contemporary relation. Because Spanish folklore was strongly regional, with a gravitational center
in the southern regions of Andalusia and Extremadura, and because Span-
ish folklore was in languages other than Castilian, the Filipino was in a sense
equivalent to the peninsular. Machado credited de los Reyes with being the
head of the Filipino folklore association; an "indigenous" of the Philippines was
being imagined to be heading a regional Spanish association (though the
association was never formalized beyond the pages of its collections).
Filipino folklore was officially a component of Spanish folklore, but it
is not always clear what "Spanish" meant. Machado himself at times
took a broad view, but he also was ambivalent about the significance of
that classification. On the one hand, he promoted a nationalist vision,
for while he emphasized the autonomous nature and equivalent status of
each regional center, he also phrased the overall aims of the association
in nationalist terms. For example, the society's goal was "to collect, com-
pile and publish all of the knowledges of our people" (not in the plural),
and the data collected was "indispensable for the knowledge and scientific
reconstruction of Spanish history and culture." 69 (This was word for word
what de los Reyes would write in his introduction to El Folk-Lore Filipino,
though he would drop the modifier "Spanish.") Elsewhere in the same
document, he wrote that the objective of the society was "the scientific
reconstitution of the national history, language, and culture." 70 Further,
though Machado noted regional differences, he seemed to underplay the
significance of differences more radical than those between his own (Cas-
tilian-speaking) Andalusia and Castile. The Basque Provinces, Galicia, and
Catalonia, for example, did not so easily share the "national" language, and
indeed folklore studies in these provinces followed a markedly different
lead from Machado's. Emphasizing the differences of these peoples from
Castilian-speaking Spain, and employing a more literary-romantic mode
that emphasized the essence of a people to be found in its literature over
the value that popular literature had for a scientific comparison of peoples'
origins and development. 71

Though Machado's rhetorical moves sometimes erased more radical
regional difference, his understanding of "Spanish" could be surprising-
ly broad. For example, he published a piece on Spanish popular stories,
comparing them with stories collected elsewhere (primarily Portugal, Sic-
ily, and the Lorraine region). The "Spanish" stories, however, hailed from
Santa Justa, Chile, and, in the peninsular, Seville and Huelva in Andalusia,
and Zafra in Extremadura. 72 Introducing the work, he advised his read-
ers that "I call the stories in [the collection] Spanish popular stories...
because they are written in the Spanish language, and for no other rea-
sion. The vast majority of them, if not all, are not native to Spain and have
a remote ancestry."104 Here, though, Machado found himself in some-
thing of a bind and again revealed his Castilian-centered sense of the Spanish
nation: "notwithstanding this [the stories' foreign origins], as they circu-
late on the lips of our people or of the nations and lands that speak our
language, they receive a Spanish stamp, whose historical value it is very
important to study and understand."105 Machado's ambivalence on the
question of the Spanish nation, reflected more generally in the structure
and internal tensions of El Folk-Lore Español, is reflected in the ways that
de los Reyes and other practitioners of El Folk-Lore Filipino characterized
the Philippines both as Spanish and as its own nation.

De los Reyes borrowed much from peninsular folklore. His footnotes
and references frequently cite two major peninsular folklore publications
that Machado and Guichot likely sent him, El Folk-Lore Andaluz and the
Library of Spanish Popular Traditions of El Folk-Lore Español, both of which
ran in the early and mid 1800s.106 El Folk-Lore Andaluz carried a number
of pieces by Machado that reflected on the practice and meaning of "folk-
lore," including the introductory piece that de los Reyes quoted, and
Guichot's work on Andalusian popular superstitions, which de los Reyes
used to theorize the Spanish origins of some Filipino traditions. To theo-
rize peninsular origins of Filipino beliefs, de los Reyes also drew from the
pages of the Library of Spanish Popular Traditions, using the work of Mon-
toto (on Andalusian popular customs and his translation and commentary
of a fifteenth-century Dominican's "De los Maleficios y los demonios" [Of
Curses and Demons]), Eugenio Olavarría y Huarte (under the pseudo-
nym Luis Giner Artuau, on folklore of Madrid and of Asturias), and
José Pérez Ballesteros (on Galician superstitions). El Folk-Lore Español
was also part of an international scientific project of "universal folklore,"
and though de los Reyes's footnotes and citations suggest a familiar-
ity with scholarship of England, Italy, and France, his sources were likely
the peninsular folklorists. For example, de los Reyes refers to Consiglieri
Pedroso's Tradiciones populares portuguesas (Portuguese Popular Traditions)
and Walter Gregor's Notes on the Folk-Lore of the North-East of Scotland,
and these are also referred to by the Library of Spanish Popular Traditions
of los Reyes refers to Eugène Rolland's Faune populaire de la France (Popu-
lar Fauna of France), and this is also referred to by El Folk-Lore Andaluz. In
this instance, then, the peninsular connection was one that brought with it

a relatively cosmopolitan scholarly world, accessible through the Spanish
language and peninsular publications.

It is important not to underestimate the debt that de los Reyes, in
particular, owed to peninsular folklore, in order to see his own specific
contributions and innovations, and the work folklore did for him and other
politically minded young Filipinos. In one sense, El Folk-Lore Filipino
can be seen to be an extension of the federated El Folk-Lore Español.
Folklore provided an illustration of the place of the Philippines in the
Spanish republic, as the propagandists would have it: the Philippines were
properly understood, a fully "Spanish" region, simply located across the
sea rather than in the peninsulas. While distinct culturally and linguisti-
cally from other (peninsular) Spanish provinces, in this it was precisely
"Spanish." For Spanish provinces retained their own distinct local tradi-
tions and identities, and they were united in Spanish-ness by a history of
political association and accompanying sentiment of common patriotism,
rather than by any "natural" commonalities among the people.

However, to see Filipino folklore in this light is only part of the picture.
The theory and practice of El Folk-Lore Filipino diverge from the Spanish
model. First, "Filipino" was itself a multicultural, multiprovincional denomina-
tion, and so, while Filipino folklore could be considered in some sense
to be a subset of Spanish folklore, it was at least as complex a conglomer-
ation as was peninsular Spanish folklore. The regional diversity of Filipino
folklore suggested that it might better be seen as a peer to, rather than subset of, Spanish folklore. Within the structures of folklore, comparison
with Spain made the Philippines' diversity seem not a liability but, per-
haps, an asset. Second, and significantly, Filipino folklore—precisely as
part of Spanish folklore—was a project not of peninsularism but of indigen-
ousness. Here the "natives" of the Philippines were working in tandem with penin-
sular scientists. Filipino folklorists claimed authority both as natives and
as Spaniards, both as subjects and as scientists. These roles were compati-
bles ones to negotiate, and peninsular folklorists did not face the same
challenges. An Andalusian folklorist, for example, need not have feared
that his status as scholarly expert would be compromised among Spanish
readers by his being Andalusian; indis of the Philippines did not have the
same assurance. As we will see, different authors approached this problem
differently, which reveals in part just how fraught, yet central, it was. The
narrative voice employed by some practitioners, or gatherings of folklore,
claimed an intimacy that was missing from perennials folklorists, and that positioned them as both colonialists and as scientists.

Untangling Origins, Comparing Peoples

As other scholars have argued, El Folk-Lore Filipino often worked toward drawing together the disparate peoples of the Philippines through noting similarities as evidence of a common pre-Hispanic origin. Like ethnology, linguistics, and some kinds of history, one aim of these folklore writings was to recover the wreckages of the past of the Philippines and its inhabitants from the shores of Spanish colonization. One of the mysteries was "which of the peoples of the Philippines were the aborigines [aborigenes] of this archipelago?" De los Reyes concluded that the islands' aborigines were no single contemporary group but instead a common ancestor of various contemporary peoples. He wrote that "[i]nitially I thought that the Ilocanos were of a race [rasa] distinct from the Tagalog, because some differences between them exist, such that many times I distinguish the one from the other at first glance by appearance alone. But after having thoroughly studied the customs, superstitions, and traditions of both, I changed my opinion." Thus folklore—a study of the customs, superstitions, and traditions—could reveal a deep commonality among various peoples of the Philippines, one that he conceived of as racial, in the ethnological sense, but that might be hidden by both physiological and linguistic differences.

The data of folklore could trace the outlines of that common ancestor. For example, when Rizal found that the folk tale of the monkey and the tortoise "is known everywhere in the Philippines, in every island, province, village, and dialect," he concluded that "it must be the inheritance of an extinct civilization, common to all the races which ever lived in that region." That common civilization was not necessarily limited to the Philippines. As Rizal suggested in comparing a Tagalog folk tale with a Japanese one, the Philippines shared some kind of common ancestry even with Japan. More commonly—and closer to home—Rizal, de los Reyes, Paterno, and T. H. P. de M. R. de la Vega often linked peoples of the Philippines to the greater "Malayan" race and more specifically to peoples of the Malay peninsula. Folklore was one of the ethnological tools that could be used to theorize the relationships between peoples of the Philippines and others.

Typically, however, the writings of El Folk-Lore Filipino used folklore as an ethnological tool to show common ancestry among peoples of the Philippines, rather than to emphasize ties that linked them to others beyond the Philippines' borders. By "collecting folkloristic articles about the Philippines," folklorists were both documenting and publicizing the common inheritance, "in order to tighten the bond that unites all Filipinos [indos filipinos]," as Serrano Laktan put it. That common inheritance was derived from the ancestral peoples (or race, or civilization) from which all contemporary indigenous of the Philippines, in all of their diversity, sprung. That original people's religion remained in bits and pieces in present-day beliefs and practices. Folklore could recover those remnants and use them in the scientific pursuit of the study of mythology, which, as de los Reyes put it, "endeavors to determine whether [the material folklore has gathered] are native or exotic, to study them in the light of history and in a word, to use them to reconstruct a Religion that is now completely lost or in part extinct." Much of de los Reyes's focus was on identifying the elements of this ancestral religion. For example, he told his readers that while traveling with other passengers on a vessel between Ilocos and Manila in 1886, "at the indication of my countrymen [paisanos], we knelt together to pray in front of a rock formation in the shape of an oven [kurna], and they told me that we did not comply with this obligation, we would have been continuously sick in Manila." De los Reyes interpreted this obligation as a modification of an earlier practice and speculated that "[i]n view of all of this, it should be clear that Ilocanos worshipped in promontories and rock formations." The practices and beliefs of his contemporary paisanos (countrymen), then, bore the traces of those of their ancestors, the ancients. Similarly, de los Reyes wrote about contemporary Ilocano beliefs—in spirit possession, visits by ghosts of the dead, and "an incorporeal thing called kurkarni innate to man," which could be lost and whose loss made one crazy—which all suggested to him that "the ancient Ilocanos [antiguos Ilocanos] knew a kind of soul." De los Reyes also found in the data of other contributors to El Folk-Lore Filipino material that he believed showed that different Filipino peoples shared pre-Hispanic origins. For example, commenting on Mondragón's account of superstitions of Tayabas, he noted, "Many or almost all of these superstitions are also observed in the Folklores of Ilocos, Pangasinan, Bataan and other places of the Philippines, which indicates the community [comunidad] of their origin and that of those who harbor [those superstitions]."

Though he built the case that many peoples of the Philippines shared a common ancestral people, de los Reyes cautioned against assuming that...
all "civilized indigenous [indígenas civilizados]" peoples were the same, a habit of other authors who took as a given that Tagalog "qualities and customs" would also be those of the "Bicolanos, Ilocanos, Pangasinans [pangasinenses], Kapampangans [pampanggos], Cagayanos [cagayanos], and Zambaleños [zambales], [as if] no differences at all existed [among them]."66 Instead, he thought that "in those distant provinces [where Ilocanos live] one finds many precious materials for Folk-Lore, as Ilocano customs, practices and beliefs are among the few of the country that are conserved most purely and most similarly to those of the age of the Conquest."67 Ilocanos' difference from other peoples was not a result of different origins; rather, it indicated that they were closer to what they had all at one point shared, and so their folklore was particularly valuable. Others sometimes complained of de los Reyes's Ilocano-centric writings, as Rizal did when he wrote to Blumentritt in 1888: "As I see, many folklorists and future anthropologists are appearing in Ilocos. There is [or such is] a Mr. Deloserre [Isabelo de los Reyes], with whom you correspond. I note one thing: Since most Filipino folklorists are Ilocanos, and because they use the epithet Ilocano, anthropologists will designate traditions and customs that are properly Filipino as being Ilocano."68 Rizal claimed here in one respect just what de los Reyes had written—that Ilocano customs were in some way rightly and more broadly "Filipino," though it is probably in part the prominence of de los Reyes's writings about Ilocano folklore in the world of Filipino folklore that made Rizal fear Ilocanos would be unduly prominent in foreign folklorists' eyes. Though de los Reyes and Rizal disagreed about the meaning of the relationship between Ilocano folklore and the folklore of other "Filipinos," they agreed that they shared common origins and ancestry.

For de los Reyes, reconstructing the ancient religion of the Philippines by investigating current beliefs required careful comparison with Catholicism and other beliefs and practices with origins in Spain or elsewhere. Once those foreign impurities were identified, the scientist could remove them to distill the ancient religion of the Philippines, for "without doubt, the superstitious beliefs of today's Ilocanos which were not introduced by the Spanish and Asiatics [asiáticos], are inherited from the ancient Ilocanos [antiguos ilocanos], their ancestors."69 He identified, for example, a pre-Hispanic origin of a now-Christian practice, noting that a belief that one is not to behe during days around the feast day of San Lorenzo had its origins in "a [certain] time of the year that the primitive Ilocanos [ilocanos primitive] had."69 But determining which beliefs were from the ancients and which were introduced by others often proved to be difficult. Only a few and vague notes about that primitive [primitiva] religion are conserved in the annals of the country, and in the memory of the indigenous, indefinable remains enveloped in superstitions and fables [supersticiones, fablas], of which some are vitiated with many European beliefs [that have been] introduced, some diminished or mixed with the sacred ideas of Christianity. In order to be able to distinguish the genuine Filipino superstitions [supersticiones filipinas], it is necessary to possess profound knowledge of Universal Folklore, and of the prehistory of the country. Otherwise we risk accepting as a Filipino belief [creencia filipina] one that is of Chinese, Portuguese, Spanish, American, or... even German filiation.69

To this end, de los Reyes, both in his own writings on folklore and in editorial notes to others' contributions to El Folk-Lore Filipino, compared the data of any particular group or locality in the Philippines to folkloric data of other peoples of the Philippines (both past, as was sometimes recorded in early chronicles, and present, as he or other folklorists had gathered) as well as to folkloric data of Spain and beyond. As part of this work, de los Reyes devoted a chapter in his El Folk-Lore Filipino to "Ilocano superstitions that are found in Europe," and he introduced the chapter by saying that it was a list "of superstitions that I suppose the Spanish introduced in past centuries" that he had compiled by reading folklore of the peninsula.69 He traced Ilocano superstitions to Galicia, Castile (including Madrid specifically), Andalucía, Portugal, and Asturias. Elsewhere, too, he pointed out when he thought that an Ilocano belief had Spanish origins or, more specifically, when Jesuit missionaries had introduced it.69 As others have noted, the comparisons between folklore in the Philippines and folklore in the peninsula, and especially the implication that superstitions of the Philippines originated in the peninsula, poked fun at the Spaniards—and at friars in particular, who held their forbearers' superstitions strongly enough to pass them on to their flocks in the Philippines.69 This allowed de los Reyes to note that "the most absurd beliefs were in fashion in the [Iberian] Peninsulas during the first days of Spanish domination," adding that his "long literary sketch, titled "The Devil in the Philippines, As Stated in Our Chronicles," which he had
already published, showed through its readings of early friar accounts that the friars were superstitious and that they were likely the origin of many superstitions in the Philippines.28

That piece took the form of a story in which two young friends recount to each other passages documenting supernatural phenomena from early friar chronicles. De los Reyes pointedly wrote that in this piece, "no foreign authors speak," just (Spanish) friars of various parts of Luzon and the Visayas, "and I, with my limited knowledge, will speak of the Ilocano territory (comarca ilocana), including Abra.29 To frame the readings of friar chronicles, de los Reyes contrived a story in which two friends at a funeral gathering look for a book in the dead man's library. When one of them becomes worried that the ghost of the deceased might be watching them, the two become engrossed in a debate over whether such things as ghosts exist (in the Philippines), citing evidence from the books in the man's library. The debate itself, and the bulk of the story, is constituted almost exclusively by long quotations from friar chronicles, with brief editorial comments from the two young men, and comments about Ilocano beliefs as related by the narrator.

Ostensibly to prove that ghosts and spirits exist in the Philippines, one friend quotes from a seventeenth-century Franciscan chronicle, which documents that the ghost of a prominent indio appeared to a Franciscan. In the Franciscan's account, the man appeared with a heavy chain around his neck, "a sign of his eternal condemnation," was carried by two "terrific blacks [fuegos negros];" and could only answer the Franciscan's questions "between belches of fire and furious groans."28 De los Reyes used the chronicles to document the superstitions of their authors—friars—who believed that Apolaki (Apolaqui, the "god of war") had appeared before people, that people had received messages (oracles) from the devil during a magmafit (sacrifice or ceremony), and that an anitara (a "priestess" of the pre-Hispanic religion) had been made by the devil to do many things.30 "The Devil in the Philippines" and El Folk Lore Filipino both point out that peninsular Spanish beliefs and those of contemporary Filipinos—sometimes it was not possible to simply subtract the former from the latter in order to arrive at the original Filipino. For example, he found that the pugot (a frightening supernatural being), eluded easy categorization. On the one hand, he thought that the pugot was native to the Philippines, a version of "one of the household anims [spirits] of antiquity," as evidenced by where he dwelled: "in unoccupied habitations, in houses under construction, or in the ruins of an old building."31 But if the pugot was native to the Philippines, the descendent of an anim (spirit) of old, it had become, in some sense, Spanish. De los Reyes noted, for instance, that "some of the Spaniards call him [the pugot] capre [Sp., derived from Arabic kafr or " unbeliever, from whence also the offensive English word,"32 and that in an old Dominican account, the devil appeared to a (peninsular) friar in forms that were according to de los Reyes "neither more nor less than the pugot of the Ilocanos."33 Though the pugot contained important clues about the pre-Hispanic religion, it was itself a hybrid being. De los Reyes also found that mangkukalam, people with magical powers—who could harm or heal others, had hybrid origins that he could not completely untangle. In one place, de los Reyes likened the mangkukalam to Spanish soresnesses, noting that a Dominican chronicler documented that sorceries (hechizos), confirmed as such by the ecclesiastical authority, had made the devil appear to a prominent townsman, made a woman sick, and caused other evils.34 De los Reyes's narrator then asks, "And don't these malevolent [women, mulatas] seem like mangkukalam ... ?"35 But elsewhere he had written that Tagalog mangkukalam were "neither more nor less than" the Asturian brujas (witches) described by a peninsular folklorist.36 To further complicate matters, though Tagalog mangkukalam were Spanish witches (brujas), the Ilocanos called by the name brusa a "fabulous being, very similar to the asswang [asswang, another supernatural being, like a vampire] of other Filipinos, which, like the bruja of the Spaniards, has a fear of salt, and roams at night."37 De los Reyes also noted that the asswang's actions in harming fetuses resembled those of an inquisitorial confesseur (mulata, male witch) of fifteenth-century Laosanne.38 It was impossible to disentangle completely the origins of the mangkukalam, brujas, and asswangs: what was clear was that there were relationships among them and that neither indigenas nor peninsulars (nor others of Europe), neither friars nor pre-Hispanic Filipinos, were clearly more or less superstitious than the other. De los Reyes's interest in superstitions as evidenced in friar chronicles was in part about recovering the pre-Hispanic and in part about poking fun at Peninsular friars, but the connections he drew between peninsular
and Filipino folklore extended beyond these projects. Both de los Reyes and Mariano Ponce showed interest in detailing syncretic Catholic folklore that was distinctly local. Syncretism in such works produced meanings beyond indicating mixed origins; it indicated contested understandings. De los Reyes, for example, explained that "re-baptism" (rebautizar), which he called "this new Hispano-Filipino term," was carried out explicitly outside the structures of the Catholic Church and with reference to anima and gods of "the ancient Ilocanos." Yet knowledge that this practice—called fusing in Ilocano—was named for the ancient Ilocano god Itus, was the reason, according to de los Reyes, that a church council prohibited the word fusing from being used for a Catholic baptism. Thus, even though the practice itself had distinctively pre-Hispanic roots, for de los Reyes, its significance lay partially in its articulation with the Catholic Church.

In Ponce’s work, we also see a distinctly indigenous Catholicism described, for biblical and Catholic figures were often found to be the subjects of particularly local lore. The Bible itself became a subject of folklore; or, rather, Ponce found biblical characters and events to be part of the folklore, folk-medicines, and folk-technologies of Bulacan, as when he wrote that "the weapon with which Cain killed his brother Abel, since in those times neither the sword nor any other sharp weapon was known, was a piece of wood of the tree called sapang, whose bark is very useful for drying things red, and whose coloring property was due to the blood of Abel. At the same time, a medication for consumptives that are vomiting or spitting blood is giving them an infusion of the bark to drink. The red that is extracted from this plant is 'blessed' (bendito), since it is the red of the blood of Abel." Here the Bible was a source for place-specific lore, as Ponce reported its understanding. The medicinal and physical qualities of the bark of a local tree were understood through reference to a biblical tale, its association either untranslatable or without need of translation from the Castilian (bendito, blessed). The Bible was thus quietly transported to Philippine soil via association with the sapang tree, indigenized through association with the local natural world, and the local was given universal significance through its presence and role in biblical time. Ponce’s and especially de los Reyes’s attention to syncretic Catholicism in the Philippines can only be partially explained by the projects of recovering pre-Hispanic Filipinos.

El Folk-Lore Filipino, as Anderson has noted, refers to beliefs and practices from the peninsula but also beyond, and this broader world of folklore comparisons does two kinds of work: it both contributes to a broader world of "universal folklore" and also suggests equivalences between the peoples of the Philippines and those from other, and particularly from Cordillera, countries. Comparisons with mythologies and folklore from "Cordilleran" countries also suggest this work’s linkage to de los Reyes’s sections and his focus on others. By noting when the Filipinos participated in the universal variability of folklore, the Philippines and its peoples were brought into the broader picture of knowable and known man. De los Reyes did this work when he speculated that while the dumag (a mythical creature) seemed to be of prehistoric origin, it also "seems to me true, what various authors have said about how in Universal Folklore it is true that all peoples have an idea of child-demons," proceeding to note the names for "child-demons" in Austronesian and Catalan, Irish, Breton, ancient Greek, Ilocano, and Tagalog mythologies. Elsewhere, de los Reyes compared folklore of the Philippines with Nordic mythology, Greek mythology, and the beliefs of ancient and contemporary peoples from around the globe, including those in the Cordillera.

Ponce, in "Bulacano Folklore," also noted the similarities between Bulaqueno beliefs and practices and those of other parts of the world. He noted similarities between a practice of Bulaqueno lovers and their counterparts of sixteenth-century Scotland and noted that in France (as documented in one of Emile Zola’s novels), as in Bulacan, men influenced the sex of a woman’s fetus by arranging the bed in a certain way and unerringly hiding sprigs of a certain plant beneath her pillow or bed. Ancient Greek mythology and beliefs about Mount Aetna were compared to a Bulaqueno belief about earthquakes, and a Bulaqueno forest spirit was likened to "Pan and Sybaris . . . of mythological times." Such comparisons were drawn in part in the spirit of the comparative and universal study of folklore, which required that similarities be noted, regardless of whether an explanation for those similarities was already known.

Comparison could also be used to highlight the exotic, Paterno’s Ninay (1873), a novel that self-consciously documented Manila and environs in a cosmopolitan mode, occupied a curious position in this literature, using comparison and compatibility to emphasize the uniqueness of the local. On the one hand, it was addressed to folklorists of Europe; "Europeans who had come there just to study Tagalog customs [costumbres tagales]" appeared in a nonspeaking role as a collective minor character of the
novel, part of the audience that listened, along with the narrator, to the story of the heroine’s life.¹⁸ Both Ninay’s story and the story in which it is contained (the nine-day wake following her death) became occasions to educate the novel’s readers about the Philippines, including the customs and beliefs of its peoples (mostly Tagalog), and their history before Spanish colonization. Paterno explained every local reference to the reader, who was clearly presumed to be Spanish (and European), neither familiar with nor from the Philippines. The readers were invited to think of themselves as being there, along with the group of curious Europeans. The guide through this exotic world was the narrator, a highly educated local recently returned from Europe, whose liminal position—as an upper-class, highly educated, and worldly Tagalog—highlighted the exoticism of the local, even while he translated it into terms and frameworks intelligible to the foreign reader.¹⁹

While Ninay addressed European folklorists, however, it departed from folkloristic scholarship in a number of significant ways. The book contained a story within a story, but neither of these were themselves folklore—they are clearly fictional narratives, not folk narratives. Paterno referred to folklore in the text, but that was one of the many kinds of data about the Philippines that was explained to the reader via footnotes: flowers, trees, fruits, birds, fish, towns, rivers, products, boats, and food of the Filipinos were also explained in footnotes, which often quoted extensively from Spanish and foreign published sources—usually contemporary, but sometimes old chronicles. The novel treated folklore as one of the many Philippine subjects about which the reader might be curious, but it did not present itself as a contribution to scientific knowledge, either by presenting data or by engaging in theoretical debates. Like other pieces of Filipino folklore, however, the text performs the authority of the native intellectual, carefully balancing its claim to nativeness with a self-consciously European perspective.

The exoticism of the local that Ninay performs has some counterpart in El Folk-Lore Filipino, where the Filipino was figured as Oriental via comparisons made between stories and figures of the Filipinos and those contained in The Thousand and One Nights, better known to English-speakers as The Arabian Nights. The Arabian Nights stories were widely popular in nineteenth-century Europe and beyond, as bowdlerized children’s stories, bawdy adult literature, and theatrical productions.²⁰ But the collection was also, significantly, treated as folklore, as Richard Burton’s 1885 preface and notes to his translation made clear.²¹ Ponce explained that the fuggubia (a mythical creature), had a tendency to be enslaved; he likened it to a genie, “similar to those of which The Thousand and One Nights speak.”²² When Ponce described being told of a magical cave, which opened only for the folk hero who knew the magic words, he wrote, “With which you can see, dear reader, that we in our province have also had a cave similar to the famous one of Ali Baba, of which The Thousand and One Night speaks, and which like those, could not be opened except under the influence of certain words that would serve as the open sesame [abbare sa-ba-nes] of the latter.”²³ With these notes, Ponce not only tied the glamorous exoticism of the Arabian Nights tales to the folklore of the Filipinos but also demonstrated his familiarity with current literary fashion and folklore studies. Mondragón also burnished the prestige of folklore of the Filipinos by comparing it to the stories of the better-known Arabian Nights: “Let the intrinsist Orientals come now and say if through my pale and sparse laconic style, and my awkward and babbling manner of speaking, they cannot make out a picture filled with entertainment [galar], vigor, and richness of invention, worthy of The Thousand and One Nights.”²⁴ As the folklorist of a people was supposed to indicate something of their nature, their potential, and their being, Mondragón’s writing expressed a challenge to, but also anxiety about, the idea of Filipinos as “laconic” and instead put them on par with an “Oriental lore that was heralded as full of vigor” and “richness.” At the same time, with his reference to “intrinsi-
ist Orientals,” he jabbed at the snobbery and exclusivity of the genre. Comparison could also express anxiety about the status of Filipinos and other peoples. Mondragón began his piece by comparing the peoples of the Philippines with those of Europe, but in a way that belies an anxiety about whether the Filipinos and its peoples would be considered civilized. “What people [pueblo],” he asked rhetorically, “is free of beliefs [preocupaciones]? Education leads us to hold instinctively as false that which is contrary to it. And in the ‘brain of the world,’ Paris, do not the most enlightened people kill time dressing up as animals, . . . and in the most cultured [cultizadas] palmistry and fortune-telling?”²⁵ In asserting this equivalence and mocking the supposedly sophisticated Parisians, Mondragón nevertheless proceeded from the premise that the Filipinos was behind, retrograde, or somehow had regressed. Mondragón began his work with a long list of the reasons why the Filipinos was backward, reasons he thought his readers should keep in mind before tackling the
question of religious beliefs in the Philippines, writing, "It would offend the intelligence [abstrusis] of readers if I would proceed to demonstrate that the English used to be Visayan or pintados [painted ones, referring to conquest-era Visayans, who were tattooed]; that the Gauls and Germans, as well as all of Europe in the most distant past, lived like the Aetas, in the style of the barbarians of the north." For Mondragón, the Philippines had to be compared to ancient (barbarian) Europe or, better yet, to ancient Greece and Rome, for

[1] The Tagalog Rathala is the supreme Jupiter, the katalasa a priestess like the vestals, . . . druidesses and sibyls; the oracles were the haruspices, diviners, and horoscopes; the nymphs and nereids are the tianak and the tang dawad (forest men) and satyrs, the pygmies: Lastly, the magicians and witches that were banished by Cervantes and immortalized him, are the awang and manggawa; our galing, mutsa and anting-anting being the talismans, patawa [knife blades], and amulets. In a word, perhaps fewer superstitions exist among the Tagalogs today than among the Europeans five hundred years ago, and among these and those, is there a common origin?"88

Mondragón's preface suggests that he felt the need to contextualize the beliefs of the Tagalogs that he was about to describe by indicating both that other countries had irrational beliefs and that there were external reasons, not having to do with the Tagalogs' own potential or essential characteristics, that explain why the Tagalogs had the beliefs that they did. Implicitly, the beliefs were seen to be retrograde, but only if out of time—that is, only if they were seen to linger too long in the advance of history, outlasting their use. Thus the fact that a country or people had its superstitions was not in itself a mark of backwardness—if anything, the dandies of Paris were more superstitious—and so to be documenting the superstitions of Tagalogs was not and should not have been seen as indicating the backwardness of Tagalogs as a people.

Authority and Authenticity

It is significant that folklore in the Philippines was not led by a peninsular Spaniard; instead, de los Reyes was indisputably its foremost representative, with Ponce, Serrano Lakawon, Mondragón, and in a separate venue, Rizal, its contributors. Folklore allowed for a kind of "native informant" role that each of them took up, at the same time, each invoked his authority as a folklorist and established the authenticity of his data. In what follows, I examine how "native" scholars approached the tension between native informant and analytic scientist or scholar.

These indigenous scientists were in a uniquely privileged position to gather data that was authentic according to the accepted practices of folkloric science. As we have seen and others have noted, many of the scholarly parasitic writings of the propagandists and illustration found opportunities to correct the misunderstandings and misrepresentations of earlier authors, through their access to language or firsthand knowledge about material objects, practices, or beliefs.89 Even when praising Blumenritt's work, for example, de los Reyes noted its limitations and suggested that because Blumenritt "has not been here, I could have multiplied [the number of] his terms and corrected some of his definitions and descriptions."90 Folklore studies invited an intimate acquaintance with "culture" and thus validated a "native informant's" position. Though the "native informant" was distinguished from and subordinate to the person who actually analyzed the data (the true "scientist"), folklore as a practice emphasized authenticity as a standard, and so the appeal to "native" knowledge that illustration made in other works, too, could be even more strongly wielded in folkloristic writings. Folklore writings of the Philippines often were more intimate in tone and less formal than the writings of illustration in other genres. While the Filipino folklorist was a scientist and literateur, participating in the latest scholarly debates and invoking well-worn literary tropes, he also wrote of his subjects with ambiguous intimacy. The Filipino folklorists' position as native scholars created opportunities as well as risks: their proximity to the people was a source of potential scholarly authority, but the closer they were to the irrational people that they described, the more suspect their status as scientist might appear. On one side of this complex picture, the Filipino folklorists established their authority as objective scientists—that is, as equals of European folklorists. This authority, which might have been easily assumed by peninsular (or other European) writers of similar educational levels, was something that these colonial subjects, and especially "natives," could not so easily assume their readers would grant them. By demonstrating their familiarity with European folklore and with its scholarly and scientific
De los Reyes demonstrated his mastery of the literature of folklore—and, in particular, of the theoretical literature that addressed what the science of folklore was, how it should be practiced, and what it could do—in his introductory chapter to the collection *El Folc-Lore Filipino*. In this piece, part of which was written at the behest of Machado and first published in *the Bulletin of the Free Institution of Teaching of Madrid*, de los Reyes both reviewed current debates about the aims and methods of folklore as a field and suggested revisions and additions based on his own observations and conclusions about folklore in the Philippines. But he also closed this introduction with sentences that called attention to his unusual location as both scientist and native: "Such is my humble opinion. Now show the modest native of the Philippines [indígena de Filipinas] if he is in error." On the one hand, the closing reveals his confidence, such that he could boast such a challenge to his readers; on the other, the passage acknowledges his outsider status and how unusual or out of place it might seem for a "native" of the Philippines to speak to such scholarly and theoretical questions. Though he usually referred to Ilocanos as "they" in the third person, he sometimes spoke of Ilocanos as "we" and of Ilocano folklore as what "we" do, believe, or say, what happens to "us" or "our" things. He sometimes invoked his authority as an *indígena* and his access to authentic sources, prefacing some of his data with phrases like "according to my countrymen [paíanaos]." His *indígena* status was thus both a source of authority as well as a source of buttressing authority. He bore this contradiction self-consciously, but lightly.

Of the contributors to *El Folc-Lore Filipino*, de los Reyes was not only the most prolific but also the most immersed in contemporary folklore practice and theory. Yet other contributors demonstrated their authority, or their familiarity with the science's method, by using the same techniques that were practiced among folklore gatherers elsewhere. The science of folklore privileged data whose sources were demonstrably old (e.g., oral data from old people or texts that recorded the oral accounts of people no longer living). Filipino folklorists sometimes emphasized the authenticity of their data in these terms. One of the sources that *Ponse* cited most often, for example, he first described as "a Tagalog manuscript (none could assure me of having seen it) that an educated native [ilustrado indígena] of the province, who was one of the first students of the University of Santo Tomás de Manila, had..." It is of note that the elders that supply me with these data only know this by tradition, transmitted from..."
narrator invited his reader to imaginatively enter the world of Bulaqueño folklore, entertaining, "If the reader would imagine a tall and skinny man, skin and bones, like a skeleton covered with skin; imagine further that as the ancient Egyptian god Anubis is represented by the body of a man with a dog's head... so [the tighbalang] has [the head] of a horse... imagine all of this, repeat, and you will have an idea of the embodiment (personification) of this being that we describe." The reader could have been from either the Philippines or Europe, but must have been formally educated in order to follow the lead that Ponce provided when describing the tighbalang in terms of Egyptian mythology. Serrano Lakjaw's Kampangan folklore, like Ponce's of Bulacan, took on a familiar, storytelling narrative voice when he told folktales. His narrator often addressed "the reader" in a familiar way, but also referred to the story's protagonist as "our youth" and "our hero" and invited the reader to imagine how the hero must have felt. Serrano Lakjaw opened his stories by telling his readers how he came to know them, weaving himself into the narrative. Yet Serrano Lakjaw was not technically of the people, in the sense that he wrote of Kampangan folklore but was himself a Tagalog speaker native to Bulacan.

In some respects, then, these folklorists affirmed their data's authenticity by employing the same strategies as those of European folklorists and taking an "objective" approach to their data. In other respects, however, they authenticated their data by emphasizing their more intimate knowledge of the people, highlighting their position as "native" informants. Ponce invoked his authority as a "native," introducing the pieces as a set of observations about "my natal province," referring at times to "my town," and even relating something that happened near "our house." His status as native strengthened his standing not so much because he positioned himself a specimen (i.e., as a Bulaqueño whose own beliefs, customs, and practices were up for review) but because as a Bulaqueño himself he was in a better position to collect from other Bulaqueños data on their beliefs, customs, techniques, and stories. His proximity was both physical—he was there—and also something more social or intellectual than that. Perhaps even more importantly, we are meant to trust what others have said to him because we know him to be one of them—that is, of Bulacan and recognized as such by others of Bulacan. He closed a section of the work, a local story related in storytelling fashion, by writing, "And I end this story saying to you, reader. As they told it to me, I tell it to you," invoking an intimacy not only with the reader but with the source of the story as
well. His reader, whom he addressed in Spanish with the familiar form for “you” (tú), was invited to trust him because he pledged that he related the story faithfully and because, having established himself as Bulaqueno, the reader would trust that the story, “as they told it” to him, was as they would tell it to each other.

At times, Ponce demonstrated his intimacy with the material by noting how contemporary his information was, as, for example, when he wrote that “I have here what they say” about what happened “in April of 1683, … in the town of Balaweg.” As he proceeded to tell the story, however, he brought himself closer to it by noting that “a friend of mine” had tried to determine what was happening. In other words, the “they” here is suddenly brought into a close embrace rather than kept at the arm's length of an objective observer. Ponce's work makes worldy comparisons (Gods of ancient Egypt and the world of The Arabian Nights, for example) that establish the narrator's familiarity with the world of an educated, well-read reader; it also draws from the more intimate, local world of Bulaqueno folklore. This combination works to establish the voice of the narrator—the folklorist Ponce—as one that is both of the people, a native informant, and of the audience, a scientist.

Serrano Lakaw, Ponce, and de los Reyes all established a kind of ambivalent authority, intimate and objective, invoking both conventions of European folklorists as well as rhetoric that placed them among, if not completely of, their subjects. The ambiguity of their authoritative claims is part of what distinguishes their texts from peninsular folklore. While Rizal’s folkloric took a more objective and distanced approach and treated the content as particularly relevant to ethnological questions, Mondragón distanced himself in a different way from his material, writing consistent ly in a tone that seemed to disapprove of the very practices about which he wrote. For instance, in beginning the section headed “Superstitions” (Supersticiones), he wrote that he was “making mention here only of [the practice of] attributing supernatural importance to purely physical things, leaving the work of speaking about other erroneous beliefs (creencias) for the articles on ‘Preoccupations’ (Preocupaciones) and ‘Dull Practices (Prácticas vagas).” On the other hand, he later noted more playfully that though what he was describing might sound odd, “the dear reader should not think these events … are common, since then we would be savages [salvajes].” The apology suggests the anxiety of self-consciousness, even while protesting that there is no reason for being so.

Folklore as Contemporary Critique

De los Reyes used folklore not just to write about the past and its persistence in the present but also to critique the present. Practiced by de los Reyes, folklore analysis was a form of social and political critique; this sort of folklore writing had no equivalent in the peninsula, but it anticipated the kinds of critique prevalent a few years later in the propagandistas’ La solidaridad and in other private and public ilustrado writings. Other scholars have noted that de los Reyes’s folklore served the purposes of social commentary, whether generally as propaganda critical of Spaniards or the Catholic Church, or as critical commentary on the incredulity and lack of education among his compatriots. I argue here that folklore held particular opportunities that de los Reyes used to comment on institutions of government, both existing and potential. That is, as a method, folklore offered more opportunity for contemporary commentary than did other scholarly forms. Folklore was especially well suited to this kind of critique because the raw data that it used was gathered from the present. In contrast to ethnology, history, or even linguistics, folklore required no conquest-era archives in order to assemble data on the pre-Hispanic Philippines. Though it might refer to those historical texts, its primary data was drawn from contemporary peoples: their stories, their beliefs, and their practices. Because folklore’s data were contemporary, it could treat unscrupulous or corrupt practices—for example, de los Reyes decried charlatans who practiced as healers and government officials who abused their positions. Often, the practices that he exposed were those that took advantage of what de los Reyes portrayed as the credulity of the common people. By calling attention to their credibility, de los Reyes portrayed common folk as ignorant and therefore vulnerable to abuse, from which education could protect them. Among his frequent targets were the charlatans who, he alleged, pretended to have healing skills or powers but in fact simply duped the common people for their own benefit. Usually, these con men and women
got material goods from their victim, as did curanderas (healers) who pretended to be friends of supernatural beings and then ate the food and drink left for the latter by those who had sought their help. De los Reyes named a series of mystic leaders from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, commending that "as happens in all times and places, there was no lack of ingenious or wicked people who would exploit the credulity of the superstitious" people and who were able to "make business of religion." These contemporary fake healers were hustlers, "soundless [calls] that live and enjoy themselves at the expense of the ignorance and credulity of those around them," quite unlike the ancient babalans and kutalosan (healers, priests or priestesses, or shamans) who were authentic figures of the ancient religion.

Unscrupulous, inauthentic curanderas were not the only targets of his commentary. Church and government practices and officials came under harsh scrutiny. One of the more interesting chapters of his El Folk-Lore Filipino, called "The Popular Calendar and Christian Celebrations," began by invoking a presumed contrast between the "backward" ancient religion of the pre-Hispanic Filipinos and "enlightened" Catholicism. De los Reyes noted that the previous section had treated "the remains of an uncultured and prehistoric Religion (not extinct), that owing to its great antiquity and the backwardness that it reveals, has descended to the category of Mythology, which is to say, a tall tale or invention, sanctioned by the ignorance of the ancients and by the long stretch of time in which it was believed." Rather than present Christianity as a contrast, however, he wrote of it in similar terms and with sarcasm: "Now, we proceed to speak of Christianity, which today too, is beginning to seem incompatible with the intellectual progress of the day to those that attempt to monopolize love of the light of intelligence and the liberty of thought." While he voiced this criticism of Catholicism as superstitious and out of time, he also (perhaps strategically) distanced himself from that claim by referring to "those unnamed others who make it.

The practice of government in the Philippines and its relationship with the Church turn out to be the subjects of the "Popular calendar and Christian celebrations" named in the chapter's title. The vast bulk of what he documented here were practices of the state functionaries that took place on Sunday, practices involving much pomp (processions of various office holders, complete with musical bands) but that also constituted some of the business of government. He described how all

the gobernadorcillos (lit. "little governor," a position often occupied by members of the "native" elite) along with their retinues processed to the residence of their superior, the provincial head (gobernador), to receive their orders. Each gobernadorcillo then held a meeting (announced with drums and fireworks) of his subordinates, the cabezas de barangay (neighborhood or village head, also members of the native elite) who in turn communicated orders to their subordinates in another meeting. In describing the seemingly absurd series of meetings, de los Reyes advised ridiculed the ceremony and pomp of governance. He also found opportunity to comment on corruption, noting the graft and abuses of privilege practiced by "[the cabezas de barangay who] is in the habit of exploiting his taxpayers [tributarios], who help him to construct his house and anytime that there be need for their labor; and they give him here, fruits, etc., whether spontaneously or not." All these aspects of de los Reyes's critique of government practices are contained within the rubric of comments on "Christian" practices. Very little in this chapter describes anything other than the workings, and performance, of administration. When he did describe Catholic ceremonies or practices, he noted how the Church benefited both financially and in prestige at local people's expense, describing, for example, how the expensive Catholic celebrations were often paid for by individuals rather than the Church and that those expenses included sermon fees. In the coming years, the pages of La Solidaridad would also complain that the Church benefited from such ceremonies at the expense of the people, both financially and politically.

Another critique of government administration is found in the chapter "Celebrations of the Authorities," which treats the "traditional celebrations [fiestas] with which the Locosos royally entertain the provincial heads [gobernador] and governors [alcaldes mayores] who were feted on their birthdays by "all the gobernadorcillos of the province." The gobernadorcillos would arrive at the residence of their superior with their bands of musicians, the "attractive young women [pelotinas, lit. chicas] (usually the most beautiful of the town)" and the elite [capitanes], along with lavish gifts of birds, embroidery, dice, sweets, and fruits. He described such officials' birthday parties within the framework of the universal science of folklore, but his editorial voice was clear and critical of the graft, the opulence, and the decadence that they revealed. "On the eve of the celebration," he noted, "the crème de la crème of the province rushes to the Casa Real [Royal House], as the residence of the alcalde [governor]"
is called, in order to greet him in an event complete with coronation, children's choirs, speeches, and fireworks. In the evening, the principalitas and the women without daughters retire, leaving the church full of people [politzas] with their mothers for the dance that then commences among the [public] employees, functionaries, and other persons. Overall, the picture is one where vacuous flattery and self-serving rule the day, when young women are paraded by their mothers, while dandies try to outdo each other in sycophantic speeches, and where schoolboys make fools of themselves by forgetting the lines of their speeches even though they had asked "I don't know how many weeks of vacation from classes" to prepare for them. Seeming to relish rendering the absurdity of the event, de las Reyes wrote of these events that "several of them become confused in the performance and often they forget the speech upon arrival at certain periods: they took them to the gobernadorcillos, as if they wanted to ask them something; they forget the words, and... thus went Troy." De las Reyes related that the absurdity of the event was not lost on the crowd: "Blender! Flag! is heard on all sides, a noisy storm erupts of guffawing and cries of Out! Out! Out!" The veneer of folklore data here is thin: this was pure social critique that reflected badly on government practices and that likely got past the censor's pen because it was located within a work on "folklore."

While folklore had other kinds of value, as de los Reyes had outlined in the prelude to the work, this kind of use of the genre had value for what it could reveal about the nature of Spanish administration, the practice of government, and society's moral state. These kinds of critiques were made in La solidaridad, but in El Folk-Lore Filipino they were painted vividly, with humor, by portraying administration as it was practiced and showing in a relatively lighthearted way how some aspects of government looked not on paper but in town streets and in the ballrooms of officials' residences.

The section of El Folk-Lore Filipino that most clearly operated as a piece of social commentary is titled "Administrative Folklore." This section may have been included as "folklore" to avoid a censor's close attention, for it is a work of fiction in which a character manipulates the folklore of others in his efforts to escape the corrupt colonial state. The story is about a young man with good intentions and admirable goals who, compelled to accept a low-ranking position of authority in the colonial government, is personally ruined and morally corrupted by the financial obligations of the position and demands of corrupt superiors. The protagonist, Iasio (short for Dionisio), begins the story as a conscientious and

well-intentioned youth full of promise. As the story unfolds, however, Iasio finds himself unable to carry out the supposed obligations of his role. He instead becomes a tool of a corrupt bureaucracy that demands that he perform the very corrupt acts that he despises.

One of the first facts that the hero finds himself in is the problem of tax collection, an issue that La solidaridad repeatedly treated and an issue emblematic of the corruption of the Spanish administration and of the friars who benefited from it. When an official tells Iasio that he has been appointed cabeza de barangay, Iasio replies with words that confirm his moral character and respect for government service: "Sir, I have no objection to serving the State, because I recognize in it the most perfect right to demand of each and every one of its citizens some service, without which, neither would there be a State, but neither would there be society for which we were raised [criados], as demonstrated by our natural weakness and the indispensable necessity that we feel for another's aid." Iasio adds what seems like a small request of the official who has "honored" him with the position:

In a word, I accept enthusiastically the cabeza [the position],... but for the peace of my conscience and satisfaction of my honor, I demand as a condition that you surrender the accounts to me clearly which is to say, that you convince me that those that figure in the register or list of taxpayers [tributantes] that you have to hand over to me, truly exist, or that there is the possibility of collecting from them here, because I neither consent that my fortune, acquired at the effort of great works, be lost by paying what those absent owe, nor can I go to look for them in other provinces, nor..."

At which point, our hero is interrupted by the official who explains that he has no option: Iasio has already been appointed, and his personal property and wealth has been made collateral for the financial accounts of the government position.

Here de los Reyes explored in fiction a common subject of La solidaridad: how the tax system, manipulated by greedy parish priests, forced cabezas de barangay to become either financially ruined or corrupt. Under this system, cabezas de barangay were held accountable for the taxes owed by each person on the official list of taxpayers: the cabeza de barangay paid the entire sum up front and then collected from taxpayers. Yet
many of those whose names appeared on the official list either could not pay, did not live in the area, or were not living at all. The discrepancy arose due to the role of the parish priest. The parish priest was paid a percentage of the tax officially collectible according to the list of taxpayers, but it was also he who determined the list itself; thus the list was often inflated, and it was the cabeza de barangay who had to make up the difference by paying out of his own pocket, rendering him prone to other kinds of graft in order to make up for the deficit.

In de los Reyes's story, Iiao consults an ex-gobernadorcillo friend about his predicament. Iiao's friend tells him that it is possible neither to refuse the post nor to demand that the list of taxpayers be accurate nor to carry out the role with integrity (for that would ruin him financially). The ex-gobernadorcillo explains to Iiao how he had himself handled the role by abusing his power over his subordinates such that he could cover his obligations to his superiors. Iiao cannot stomach the advice.

Despite his good intentions, Iiao falls victim to the corruption inherent in the system. Forced to cover the difference between what he can collect and what he officially owes, Iiao is financially ruined. Broke and with broken spirit, Iiao turns to drink but still cannot bring himself to abuse his authority as his friend had advised. As a result, he is thrown into jail for his debts, and his properties are auctioned. Here, the narrator intercedes: “My readers will not understand, as I do, the reason for this procedure, common in the provinces; and note that it is not because the provincial authorities arbitrarily arrange it in order to avoid overwhelming files [expedientes], aiming that the cabeza, even if out of embarrassment, would look for money elsewhere in order to save his accounts; no it is not arbitrary, therefore it must be some higher [administrative] order, poorly understood, whose mistaken application has been sanctioned by routine.”

The narrator’s voice is strongly critical of government administration, unusual for a work published from within the colony’s censored press. If it were a piece of nonfiction, the words would probably have been more difficult to pass by the censor. But the critique was articulated in the language of fiction, and the story was wrapped within a book on folklore, which might have looked to the censors like a collection of Ignatian superstitions of the indios. The words might have been subject to less scrutiny because they were contained within these layers that deflected a censor’s close attention.

The narrator’s political and critical voice is heard repeatedly throughout the piece, often noting how the fictional events compare with the usual practice of politics in the Philippines. At one point in the story, having noted that backstabbing among members of competing parties often happens during the election of the gobernadorcillo, the narrator analyzes the reasons for and solution to this problem, citing the authority of the Italian historian of the nineteenth century, Cesare Cantu, whose work on “universal history” constituted the basis of the curriculum for history classes in institutions of higher education in the Philippines. “Cantu has already proven, with the universal history of humanity in his hand, that insouciance or indifference is often the effect of tyranny. ... Concede to them [the people], then, more rights [derechos]; do not limit those that they have, and only then can you judge their exaggerated inertia.”

Using the authority of the text familiar to readers—indigenas and Spaniards, insular and peninsular—the narrator makes a direct appeal to political reform, a subject supposedly banned from the pages of Manila’s newspapers.

But how does the story relate to folklore? Iiao eventually comes up with a plan to get out of his impossible situation when he happens to gaze at the mountains and sees in them a possible refuge. His patron and friend responds to his plan by saying, “[Y]ou cannot imagine the sadness that would be your exile, always in perpetual danger of being surprised by agents of justice or by the cannibals, and without the ability to return to this life in good society [humanidad].” Iiao’s reply reveals a dark, bleak view: “And how good is [society] is!” answered Iiao with disdain. No, I prefer savagery [salvajismo]. Gossip, error, the oppression of the inferior by the superior, the enmity between rich and poor, in short, the horrors of inequality: are those the enchanments of society? ... What attractions does it have?” Here Iiao shows just how much his bad experience as a government official has changed his earlier well-intentioned and optimistic approach to the idea of government service. He goes on, describing the ideals he once cherished as a woman who can only be “adopted” far from the meddlers and distractions of society. “If treating love, is it not better, indefinitely more gratifying, to carry to the depths of the forest the object of our affection, and adore her there without obstacles, making jealousies impossible and proclaiming her as queen of brute Nature [Naturaleza feral]?”

Hearing him speak in such terms, Iiao’s alarmed friend fear[s], that [Iiao] is losing his reason.” At this moment, Iiao receives news that he is being sentenced to labor for his supposed crimes, and flees to the mountains.
There, armed with his magic tricks (courtesy of time he spent in
Manila's amusements), Isto becomes one of the charlatans of which de los
Reyes has written: he tricks the Ignorot tribespeople into believing that he
is a spirit of their ancestors, and he rules for some time as a sort of benevo-
 lent despot, taking only what he can use, promoting useful knowledge
like medicine and agriculture, and managing "to civilize [civilizar], rela-
tively, those people [gente]; with the liberty and justice that he obtained
for his inferiors, they were stimulated to work zealously; with the sincere
brotherhood [fraternidad], forgetting of grievances, and mutual aid that
he preached, he abolished the daily fights of village against village." He is
also briefly successful in leading the people to resist the authorities. Even-
tually, however, Isto's forces are overwhelmed by the Spanish, and as the
story ends we are told that they returned to their prior mode of living.

Toward the end of the story—when Spanish authorities learn of Isto's
little mountain republic and attack it—the tone of the story shifts. Here, the
narrator gives dates of military operations and the name of a Spanish cap-
tain, seeming to link the fictional story even more clearly to actual fact. But
another voice warns the reader in a footnote: "As the historical truth relat-
ing to those names and dates cannot harm [perjudice] the administrative
problems that constitute the object of this article, we'll thank our readers
not to check it [the historical truth], because it could have been disfigured
by the imagination [loca de cosa]." This voice simultaneously reinforces
that the problems of government are "the object of this article," having just
tied the fictional story to concrete places, dates, and names, and yet deefly
reminds the reader that the story comes from his imagination—that is, it is
fictional. The statement, with its seemingly conflicting messages, simulta-
neously affirms the story's basis in fact, and also its status as fiction.

The story about Isto is at one level a story about folklore, for while it is
a fictionalized account of how even a well-intentioned, morally
upstanding young man might fall prey to inequitable and corrupt govern-
ment structures, it is also a fictionalized account of how a messianic leader
can come to power among uneducated people by articulating himself and
his aims through their folklore. Though the Ignorot's lives are improved
by Isto's benevolent despotism, Isto ultimately fails to permanently transform
their lives. Isto's rule, furthermore, depends on his ability to manipulate
the Ignorot because he understands their superstitions and beliefs—their
religion—and uses this knowledge to gain prestige and to trick them into
thinking that he has supernatural powers and abilities. The story calls for

popular education, for unmasking superstition, and for educational prog-
ness. At the same time, it marks the failures of colonial government, and the
people's vulnerability to leaders who manipulate their religious beliefs. This
story stands out clearly from the rest of de los Reyes' work for its manifest political commentary; but, as such, it can help to illuminate
other aspects of de los Reyes' folklore. A few examples will suffice.

In relating beliefs that spirits sometimes throw stones on houses, de los Reyes
wrote that "[r]ecently the same thing happened in Alba, where the house
of a peninsular Spaniard [espafiol peninsular] was stoned and despite all
attempts, they were not able to catch or frighten off whoever threw the
stones... [e]ven taking into account that in the provinces Spaniards are
very respected and feared by the natives [malignos]." The unspoken sugges-
tion, of course, was that if one did not believe in spirits, one would have
to come up with a different explanation for stones having been thrown on
a peninsular Spaniard's house. In a section titled "Meteorological Tales" (Consejos Meteorologicos), de los Reyes recorded the "belief among Ilcox-
nos that fire produced by thunderbolts and strokes of lightning cannot be
put out with water, but only with vinegar," noting that this explains why,"
when the Government House [Casas-Gobiereros] of Abarra burned down, all
of the houses of Bangued suffered a complete lack of vinegar." Did the
people of Bangued give up their vinegar trying to extinguish the fire, or
did they claim to be without this common staple when hearing that it was
the Government House that was burning?

As a final example, consider how de los Reyes explained that "[i]n Ilo-
cos Norte, it is said that lightning is initially a pig or white rooster, and a
man [man] sweats to have seen with his own eyes (?) a white rooster before
an electric spark was released above the courthouse of the town of Sar-
at, the rooster, running quickly, changed into a bolt of lightning that later
reduced the said courthouse to ashes." Following procedures outlined
by practitioners of the new science of folklore for collecting its data, de
los Reyes gave a specific example of the belief by citing the account of a
rural peasant (whose status is marked by the use of "man [man]") instead of
the Spanish hound (and recording the name of the town (Sarat)). But
de los Reyes clearly questioned the man's account, for he inserted a ques-
tion mark in it and invited the reader to speculate along with him what
really happened, or in his words, "how is this explained?" He began by
exploring how it could have been possible, according to a modern sci-
tific perspective, for a man to have seen what he thought was a rooster
converted into lightning. "Perhaps an electric spark would have burnt the rooster, reduced it to ashes, and made it disappear in a horrific way? Many meteorologists attest that lightning can reduce its victim to ashes," the author writes.

But de los Reyes did not give this modern scientific explanation the last word, counteracting with another illocano belief that itself he implied, had an empirical basis: "Ilocanos say that lighting absorbs only the brains of its animal victims, basing this on the fact that those killed by an electric charge have no other lesion than some holes in the head, and have no brains," the author reports. According to this superstitious belief, lightning could not have consumed the rooster. The taot's explanation could not be easily accepted, for de los Reyes' question mark suggests that he doubted whether the man actually saw the white rooster "with his own eyes." The unresolved puzzle might be answered another way, then: We might wonder whether the object that everyone agrees was burnt to the ground—the courthouse—was a victim of lightning or whether perhaps the tribunal burnt at the hand of someone else, in which case the taot's story of the white rooster might itself be a kind of smoke screen. If the latter were the case, then the peasant used folklore to divert the authorities' attention away from the saboteur. This admitted speculative cover-up could have functioned regardless of whether the listener shared the epistemology that was being invoked: that is, if a meteorologist heard this story from the taot, he might well have doubted whether the lightning began as a rooster, but his belief that peasants had such irrational beliefs might have supported the idea that the town hall was the victim of lightning rather than human action. In other words, beliefs about folklore—or folklore about folklore—might be what were documented in this account.

Conclusion

The complicated relationship of Filipino folklorists to their subjects, on the one hand, and audiences, on the other, calls to mind the tension in some of the ethnological works of the previous century between claiming "primitive" as ancestors of, but also distancing them from, contemporary "civilized" Filipinos. Both of these dynamics suggest the difficulty for educated, cosmopolitan Filipinos to link themselves and their contemporaries to the past in the intellectual and political climate that emphasized a natural relationship of power and governance between the modern and the antiquated, the civilized and the primitive, the European and the "other." The methodological aim of ethnology—tracing origins—underlay some interest in folklore in the Philippines, the peninsula, and beyond. As we have seen, Rizal framed his folklore study in these terms quite clearly: de los Reyes employed more varied frames, but the question of racial origins was among them. For de los Reyes, however, the difficulties of tracing the origins of the cultural practices contained in folklore also raised different possibilities and liabilities. The question of descent, when applied to the cultural practices of contemporary Filipinos, led both to Spain and to the pre-Hispanic Philippines. As we have seen, sometimes de los Reyes delicately characterized "superstitions" as alternatively remnants of a pre-Hispanic religion, or Spanish-Catholic imports. Sometimes he emphasized the hybrid nature of beliefs without settling on origins. The hybridity of contemporary practices and those helped to indigenize Catholicism; this would later become significant for his work on the Philippine independent Church.

Folklore's subjects and methods, however, also lent it to contemporary critique and to imagining possible future formations. de los Reyes exploited this opportunity presented by folklore's data, and he paid particular attention to administrative formations. In de los Reyes' writings, folklore was something that could be used, for good or ill, by existing and would-be political authorities and leaders. We will see these themes taken up again when we treat in a later chapter de los Reyes' telling of the history of Diego Silang.

Unlike the racial science of ethnology, folklore was well established in the Spanish peninsula. Its particular formation, however—as a strongly regional practice—allowed for its Filipino practitioners to take it up in ways that could support both assimilationist and also more confrontational and revolutionary political visions. Different authors and pieces of Filipino folklore studies treated their subject in quite distinct and sometimes contradictory ways. Mondragón, for example, treated the value of Filipino folklore in its exotic, wondrous, and elaborate nature. Akin to the grand fables of other "Oriental" peoples, folklore was for Mondragón an opportunity to cast Filipino culture in a rich and deeply historical, if exotic, light. He had to distance that folklore from what he characterized as more ignorant superstitions, in which he showed little interest. In quite stark contrast, de los Reyes found precisely in "superstitions" not only evidence of pre-Hispanic religion but also opportunities to critique hierarchical order, contemporary government, and popular society.
The writings of Filipino folklorists, especially those of de los Reyes, spoke in multiple voices. One voice spoke from the past, recreating the pre-Hispanic Philippines; another spoke in the language of ethnology, tracing racial relationships between the peoples of the Philippines and others; another spoke to the project of "Universal Folklore," which sought to record as accurately as possible folklore data; another spoke critically of the contemporary Philippines, calling out the credulity of the people, the wickedness of those who hoodwinked them, and the corrupt practices and arrangements of government administration, including the Church's role in it. The criticism that de los Reyes's writings contained was the most original part of his work, and the way in which it deployed most strongly from what was in some respects its parent project of El Folk-Lore Español.

Though this aspect is perhaps the most interesting of de los Reyes's work, we should note, too, just how much of de los Reyes's and other folklorists' work depended on Spanish models. That they did so does not detract from the significance of their work. If they had merely reproduced the Philippines what had already been done in Spain, their work would nevertheless have a different meaning from that of the peninsular folklorists, and the process of translation is itself creative and rarely straightforward. Their work did not merely reproduce a copy of peninsular folklore, however, and so both the similarities and differences are instructive.

In the following chapter, we will consider how the philological science of linguistics—which we have already seen was used to reconstruct the past—led its practitioners to consider the present in a new way, and to seek to alter it. Linguistics might seem a less likely candidate for political argument than folklore, which was focused on behavior and the contemporary in ways that lent it to commentary on practices of government. But as we will see, linguistic science opened up a quite virulent debate in Manila newspapers. Though de los Reyes successfully printed what we might consider to be straightforward propaganda in Manila under the guise of folklore, the debate that we will see carried out in Manila newspapers over orthography far surpassed any Manila-based printed public debate about government practices that de los Reyes's folklore might have inspired. Part of the reason for this might, as we will see, lay in formal qualities of written language and its function as iconography.

From Ethnology to Orthography

In April of 1888, the peninsular journalist Pablo Feced, under the pseudonym Quiroqui, published an article in the Diario de Manila (Manila Daily) claiming that Tagalog, a "Malay language [lengua malaya]," was "vile, plain, rudimentary, and inflexible," incapable of innovation.1 This attack on the Tagalog language—in part through its association with the family of "Malay" languages more generally—prompted Ferdinand Blumenritt to respond in the press with a defense of the richness, sophistication, and dignity of the language family to which Tagalog and other languages of the Philippines belonged. Blumenritt compared Malay languages to the languages of Europe derived from local vulgar Latin, noting that "many Malay dialects have a literature so grand and rich that certain Romance nations [naciones romanizas] do not possess its equal, like, for example the Romans [nativos de la Romanza kingdom]," referring perhaps pointedly to this marginal and relatively young European kingdom (united in 1869) that until 1875 had been part of the Ottoman Empire. Continuing, he asked, "How can this ignorant [man] speak with disdain of the Malay languages [lenguas malayas], if he knows (or does he not know . . . ?) that the majority of the branches of the Malay race [raza malaya] had their own alphabets? Where are the Spanish, French, English, or German alphabets? Were not the Malays superior in this respect to the majority of the European nations that now march à l'âte [at the head] of civilization?" Blumenritt chided Feced for his ignorance and prejudice—saying that Feced knew less than his own Bohemian secondary-school pupils did—and cited an international body of distinguished Orientalist and linguistic scholarship on Malay languages, in German (Wilhelm von Humboldt),
French (Émile Jaquet, Edouard Dalaurier, the Abbé Pierre Perro, Aristide Marre), Dutch (G. K. Niemann, J. G. F. Riedel), and scientific societies in both Batavia and Holland), and Spanish by a "learned [superior] Filipino," the distinguished linguist T. H. Pardo de Viera. The linguistic scholarship of Pardo de Viera, the only Spanish-language scholarship that Blumenritt saw fit to note, represented a pioneering application of Orientalist methods to analyze the data of the Philippines and was part of the broader scholarly effort of the 1880s to reconstruct the islands' pre-Hispanic past. It also became the basis of an orthographic reform that, as we will see, would come to have political associations far more radical than those embraced by Pardo de Viera himself.

We saw in an earlier chapter how Pardo de Viera, who was trained at France's School of Oriental Languages, used philological and linguistic techniques to reconstruct the pre-Hispanic past of the Philippines, first in his work comparing pre-Hispanic alphabets of Philippine languages and subsequently in his Sanscrit en la Lengua Tagalog (Sanscrit in the Tagalog Language). In the latter study, he identified the Sanskrit roots of many Tagalog words and concluded that there had been an era of Hindu civilization in parts of the Philippines, which had brought with it a higher level of culture. In the same work, he also described transformations brought by Spanish language and culture during the era of Spanish colonization. More particularly, he identified two ways that Spanish influence had changed the Tagalog language. Both of these transformations would become the subject of some contention in the Manila press.

The first result of the colonial interactions of the Spanish and Tagalog languages was what Pardo de Viera described as effectively the birth of a new language that "has been formed in the Philippines, called 'kitchen Spanish' (español de la cocina) in Manilla, a language that has a Tagalog grammar and a Spanish vocabulary." This language of street, market, and household, also known as "parid Spanish" (español del Parian, parian referring to part of the city where Chinese were obliged to live, but also meaning simply the market area), was a medium of communication between people of different native tongues. As was commonly the case for pidgin languages, kitchen Spanish was considered vulgar, impure, and inauthentic. For example, it was derided by Pascual Pobelete, a native speaker of Tagalog, newspaper writer, editor, and translator, as being "confused gibberish," neither "the sweet and poetic Tagalog language" nor "the rich and sonorous Castilian language." Pardo de Viera did not place the
the sixteenth century, but its appearance has changed dramatically.¹⁴ As we have already seen from Pardo de Tavega’s study of pre-Hispanic alphabets, Tagalog was one of the languages of the Philippines that had had its own script before the arrival of the Spaniards in the sixteenth century.¹⁵ When the Spanish arrived, they recorded the sounds of Tagalog in the Roman alphabet, using Spanish rules of spelling and pronunciation, and this Spanish, romanized orthography became standard for printed texts while the older, pre-Hispanic alphabet fell into disuse. Thus late nineteenth-century Tagalog was spelled like Spanish languages.

For example, in hispanized Tagalog orthography, the fricative glottal stop (pronounced more or less as “k” is in English) was spelled with either a “c” or “q” (the former before an “a,” “o,” or “u” and the latter before an “e” or “i”). The new orthography used by Pardo de Tavega represented this sound always with a “k.” A few other regularizations were also part of the proposed reformed orthography. For example, whereas the Spanish hard “g” sound was sometimes spelled “go” (when preceding “i” or “e,” to differentiate it from the soft “g” sound of “gi” and “ge”), Tagalog had only the hard “g” sound, which was represented in the new orthography always with the single letter “g.” And the “w” was introduced to represent a consonant sound that had alternatively been represented by “z” or “z” in the old orthography, to distinguish this sound from the proper vowel sounds “o” and “u” in Tagalog.

Though Castilian and many other European languages conjugate verbs by changing their endings, in comparison with them, Tagalog conveys much more of its grammatical information by using prefixes and suffixes as well as infixes (particles that are added in the middle of a root rather than at its beginning or end). The result of the combination of Spanish orthography with Tagalog grammar was a plethora of spelling irregularities. As an example, if we use the letter “k,” we can represent the common Tagalog verb root “kain” (to eat) and its relative “kain” (was eaten) with the same initial letter, the latter being exactly the former with the addition of the infix “in.” Using Spanish orthography, the root “cain” had to exchange its first letter to become “quinain” (my emphasis, see Figure 4.1). This was the sort of confusion that led Pardo de Tavega to write that the Spanish orthography “disguise[d] the physiognomy of many words.”¹⁶ The new orthography rationalized and regularized Tagalog spelling in a way that would make it easier to identify the root and the grammatical insertions or appendages of Tagalog words. Though Pardo de Tavega’s orthography is now in standard use for Tagalog and many other Filipino languages, we will see in the pages that follow that it received widely differing responses and initially seemed more likely to be a passing experiment than the beginning of the national standard that it became in the twentieth century.

Pardo de Tavega first noticed the difficulties of the hispanized orthography, and considered alternatives to it, while studying the ancient alphabets of the Philippines as part of his 1584 work. He saw in the old syllabic alphabets a way of spelling that more naturally fitted the languages of the Philippines than the hispanized Roman orthography then in use. Reverting to the pre-Hispanic script, however, would have been impractical, whereas the Roman alphabet had clear advantages: it was already in use in type sets in the Philippines (for Castillian and native languages of the islands), was familiar to literate Filipinos, and was the alphabet shared not only by Castilian but with other important European languages.

The way forward, then, seemed to be to reform the system for romanizing Tagalog, and so Pardo de Tavega developed a system “with Latin characters that correspond more accurately to the orthography of the word,” according to the ancient Tagalog characters, than the letters now used according to Spanish orthography.¹⁷ Pardo de Tavega publicly introduced his new “more logical, more scientific, and easier” orthographic system in one of the introductory chapters of his Sanskrit Language.¹⁸ He used the new orthography throughout this work, offering the new spelling of all Tagalog words in parentheses after the then-standard hispanized spelling (if there was a difference between the two). Each Tagalog word (in both spellings where appropriate) was followed by its Sanskrit root.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Spelling</th>
<th>New Spelling</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r or ru</td>
<td>kin</td>
<td>(to eat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>quinan</td>
<td>(ate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can</td>
<td>kain</td>
<td>(was eaten)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quinan</td>
<td>kinan</td>
<td>(to eat)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(romanized according to the standard convention), the reader can easily recognize the regularity of the Sanskrit spellings and of the new Tagalog orthography when compared to the old (Figure 4.2). Both Sanskrit and Tagalog had been written with syllabic scripts before Europeans encountered the languages.39 Romanization of Sanskrit was a way of recording Sanskrit syllables for people familiar with the Roman alphabet but not with Sanskritic writing systems; likewise, the new romanization of Tagalog proposed by Pardo de Tavera provided a way of representing Tagalog syllables for those who were not familiar with the original Tagalog script. The Orientalist science of linguistics allowed Pardo de Tavera to see a new possibility for representing the Tagalog syllable with the Roman alphabet, in a process parallel to how Orientalist scholars of Sanskrit had developed a way to represent the Sanskrit syllable with Roman characters. Pardo de Tavera was able to recognize the structure of Tagalog and suggest a new orthography for it, then, precisely because he studied Tagalog in comparison with other languages. That his spellings originated in his knowledge of other languages made them, for Pardo de Tavera, no less natural for Tagalog; instead, because they accorded to the linguistic principle of one letter for one sound, and followed more closely the ancient alphabet of the Philippines, they were more accurate or true to Tagalog's internal logic. He was so confident about the accuracy and logic of the new orthography that he judged the Spanish romanization to be in 'error.'40

Undoubtedly to Pardo de Tavera, his 1684 book on ancient alphabets of the Philippines had inspired similar study and conclusions by José Rizal. When Rizal first read the book, he, too, was inspired to work out and promote a new orthography that would be "more rational and logical" than that then in use; and, independently of Pardo de Tavera, he developed some of the same spelling reforms, later writing that "I thought I was the first to introduce this reform.... I was, however, mistaken."41 When he found out about the new orthography proposed by Pardo de Tavera, an orthography "more perfect than" the one he had developed, he "rejoiced because I saw that I was not the only one with that idea, that it had appeared almost simultaneously in our minds... and because the authority of Dr. Pardo de Tavera made my aspirations considerably stronger. The great proof that both attempts emerged independently and almost simultaneously in our minds, without any consultations or explanations passing between us, is the practice by Dr. Pardo de Tavera of using the 'i' which had not occurred to me in my works, a practice that I adopted
as soon as I saw it, because I understood its perfect utility."29 For Rizal, the new orthography had a scientific validity that was confirmed by the fact that the same or similar conclusions had been independently reached.

Rizal used the new orthography in 1886 when he translated into Tagalog Friedrich Schiller's Wilhelm Tell, introducing the new orthography, with reference to Pardo de Taveras' work, in a note at the end of the work.30 By translating the German piece into Tagalog using a new orthography, Rizal was responding to a number of needs. The first was for an example that this great work of German literature might provide because "of the relatively small number of Tagalog works [obras tagalas]."31 For Rizal it was important that Tagalog have a literature, even if at first this would be Tagalog translations of other languages' great works. Wilhelm Tell's nationalistic themes of resistance to tyranny were, Rizal thought, "translatable" to the context and language of the Philippines, as Ramon Guerrero has shown.32 Rizal's brother Paciano also thought that foreign works could, via translation, provide examples for Tagalog literature. At the same time that Rizal was working on Guillermo Tell, Paciano began translating into Tagalog Schiller's Maria Stuart about the life and death of the Catholic queen of Scotland.33 This Tagalog literature was oriented to the young; Rizal wanted children to have a literature in their own language to learn from, to be fascinated by, and to be inspired by. To this end, he also translated the children's stories of Hans Christian Andersen into Tagalog around the same time.

But Tagalog youth needed not only to have works written in Tagalog; they also needed a new way of spelling the language, "more rational and logical, that would be, at the same time, in harmony with the spirit of the language and of its siblings [related languages]."34 The reform was inspired in part, as he later explained, by "the study that I was making at that time of the primary schools in Saxony where I saw the efforts of the teachers to simplify and facilitate the education of the children."35 Rizal hoped that his own efforts to develop a simpler orthography would improve children's schooling, because he believed that the future success of the country lay in education. He had admired the educational system and progress of the German nation, where he spent much of 1886 and the first part of 1887, and he hoped Germany's successes could be duplicated in the Philippines.36

Rizal first published the new orthography in Noli me tangere (1887, the same year as Pardo de Taveras' Sanskrit in the Tagalog Language), capturing in this Castilian-language novel, set in the contemporary Philippines, the occasional interruptions of Tagalog into the Castilian spoken by some native Tagalog speakers. Rizal later wrote that he used the new orthography, "hoping that the Filipino public [publico filipino] would adopt it after a reasonable discussion of its convenience and opportuneness."37 That Rizal used a new orthography in this novel is often invisible to its students of today, because the spelling that was new at the time has since become standard, its novelty disappears before the eyes of the modern reader.

Rizal introduced his friends and family to his new orthography and encouraged them to adopt it. When he sent his brother Paciano the manuscript of the Tagalog Guillermo Tell at the end of 1886—apparently the first time that Paciano had seen the new orthography—Paciano echoed his brother's sense that the orthography was an improvement, but he remained skeptical of its prospects. Paciano wrote, "I dare not do it [use it]. Will one's name be enough to establish it, like the authority of an Academy does? Will it be accepted universally? I doubt it, but if this change can be introduced, now is the time to do so, because Tagalog still lacks good books."38 Rizal later wrote that by 1887 he had urged his friends to adopt the new orthography, and apparently at least some of them had already done so.39 We know that in July of 1888 Rizal sent a postcard to Mariano Ponce from London, written in Tagalog and in the new orthography, and in August he wrote again to Ponce that "the new Tagalog orthography that we are using is perfectly in harmony [de acuerdo] with the ancient writing according to what I find out from some books that I find in the British Museum, and according to the Sanskrit origin of many Tagalog words. Adopt it! Pedro Serrano [Laktaw] has already published a pamphlet in this new orthography and a dictionary will be published."40 Ponce replied to reassure Rizal that he and his family had already adopted the new orthography and that his friends were adopting it as well.41 Through Rizal's efforts, the new orthography came to be used and advocated by many of the propagandists; and one can see, scattered throughout the pages of La solidaridad as well as other propagandist and illustrated texts, remnants of this early effort to reform orthography, in the k's and w's in Tagalog words and those of other indigenous languages.

The New Orthography in Manila Publications

The dictionary that Rizal mentioned to Ponce in 1888 was the Spanish-Tagalog dictionary of the schoolteacher Pedro Serrano Laktaw who, it will be remembered, contributed to Isabelo de los Reyes's El Folk-Lore Filipino.
The dictionary's first volume was published in Manila in 1889, the same year that La solidaridad appeared in the peninsula (to which Serrano Lakt- taw contributed articles) and just a couple of years after Rizal's Noli me tangere and Pardo de Tavera's Sarswít in the Tagalog Language.25 Pardo de Tavera later noted that this was the first dictionary to be published using the new orthography, and it was also pathbreaking in that it was the first book ever published in which whole sentences of Tagalog prose appeared in the new orthography, rather than just single words or short phrases.26 As Pardo de Tavera later wrote, "even the second last name of the author, that was written in a way that is imperfect (Lactao), presented an opportunity to apply the two newly-introduced consonants that he did not pass up."27 Indeed, the book was by Pedro Serrano "Laktaw" (according to the new orthography, rather than "Lactao" as in the old).28 It is possible that the pamphlet to which Rizal referred was this work or a part of it; more likely, Serrano Laktaw had already written something else in this orthography (perhaps a clandestine political pamphlet for circulation in the Philippines), which has since been lost.29

Serrano Laktaw's dictionary began with preliminary notices to the reader, some in Tagalog and others in Castilian. The last notice to the reader of Castilian announced that the author would employ the new orthography for Tagalog with which "it is easy to distinguish the root and the affixes which compose each word, writing is less complicated, and the spoken word is represented more accurately, which is not true with the orthogra- phy which has been used until now."30 While he mentioned the "accuracy" of the orthography, Serrano Laktaw emphasized that it made reading and writing Tagalog easier and so thus could improve primary education in the Philippines. These themes were echoed in the book's dedications: to BenignoQuiroga L. Ballesteros, who served in Manila under the liberal government as director of the civil administration, and to the "development of education" in the Philippines.31 These dedications highlight how this dictionary functioned simultaneously as what it purported to be—a dictionary useful to students and teachers—and as a piece of propagan- da, in the sense that it was a venue for political opinion and critique to be published in the Philippines, for an insular audience. These propagandistic qualities were echoed in the book's preface.

Written by Marcelo H. del Pilar y Guimayta (formerly del Pilar y Guim- maitan), the preface emphasized the importance of teaching Castilian to students in the Philippines. Del Pilar (1830–96) was an intensely active propagandist, both in the Philippines and later in the peninsula where he directed La solidaridad.32 Making the link between literacy in Tagalog—which seemed to motivate Serrano Laktaw—and literacy in Spanish, del Pilar wrote that the work was inspired by "the lack of books that teach the Tagalog speaker the equivalent, in his own language, of the Span- ish word."33 Del Pilar praised the "aspirations of the government"—here the liberal administration under which Ballesteros had served—to teach Castilian to all schoolchildren and wrote that he hoped the book would "contribute to the diffusion of Castilian in this archipelago, which [being] a piece of Spain, should be Spanish in its language, just as it is Spanish in its government, Spanish in its religion, in its sentiments, and in its aspirations."34 By complimenting the liberal government, del Pilar point- edly showed his support for a specific set of policies and officials whose reforms had been threatened by the new more conservative regime of Governor-General Valeriano Weyler. Thus while del Pilar professed patrio- tism to Spain and Spanish law, and respect for the Catholic religion (when in its proper sphere, outside of governance), he aligned himself with a lib- eral and reformist Spanish civil administration. These same strategies he commonly pursued in La solidaridad, but here they appeared in the pages of a book published in Manila, whose audience would presumably be schoolteachers and students. Had they appeared in the pages of a newspaper, such comments would likely have fallen victim to the censor's pen.

The new orthography also appeared in another Manila publication of 1889: a new bilingual weekly, La España oriental (Eastern Spain). Eastern Spain printed each of its articles in both Castilian and Tagalog. Other newspapers were printed only in Castilian, with the exception of one other bilingual paper that started six months earlier, La revista católica de Filipinas (The Catholic Review of the Philippines). Though the Cath- olic Review was the first of the two papers, it was part of a much older tradition of printed Tagalog texts that were almost always religious in character. The secular thrust of Eastern Spain, however, was quite unusual for a Tagalog-language publication at this time; in its first issue, it told its readers that it aimed "to transmit to the native people all that which is within the reach of their intelligence and useful to their civil and politi- cal state. We shall bring them up to date on all of the governmental and administrativa regulations that they need to know... We will give them, in short articles, easy lessons to popularize knowledge of the arts and sciences useful for practical life, concentrating above all on agriculture,
industry and commerce, likewise on advice about matters of Medicine and hygiene, and on improvements to their domestic life.\textsuperscript{44} The aims of Eastern Spain, then, were broadly speaking those of secular education and uplift for natives, and we should not be surprised that its primary editor and writer was Isabelo de los Reyes, who also contributed pseudonymously to \textit{La solidaridad} as well as to many Manila newspapers with fiction, serialized works of history, etnography and folklore, and political commentary. Both because of its secular, progressivist content and because of its personnel, we should consider Eastern Spain to be \textit{propaganda}, like \textit{La solidaridad}, but in a different register, in another language, and printed in the colony: it was an effort to propagate enlightenment and education among a class in Manila and its environs that was literate in Tagalog but not necessarily in Castilian.\textsuperscript{45}

Unlike the erudite readers of Pardo de Taveras's linguistic works and the relatively elite readers of \textit{La solidaridad}, Nellie Tengere, and other propagandist and illustrative texts, Eastern Spain's intended audience spanned social classes and educational levels in Manila. The Tagalog-language text of Eastern Spain had the task of introducing the new orthography to a readership that was not only encountering it for the first time, but for whom it must have seemed initially exotic and puzzling. The orthography was introduced in a footnote, telling readers that the paper had decided to use it "because [we] believe that the words of the Tagalog language are thus better composed and represented."\textsuperscript{46} The newspaper then demonstrated the advantages of the new orthography with the following example and commentary: "From the root \textit{ako} ([\textit{a}]) (meaning 'I'), are formed the words \textit{ak-IN} ([\textit{aquin}]) (meaning 'my'), by dropping the final 'a' and substituting for it the suffix 'IN', which is doubled in \textit{ak-IN-IN} ([\textit{aqumin}]), which converts the root into a verb, meaning 'to appropriate something, to make something one's own, etc.' This clarity and simplicity of composition is not achieved with the use of our 'c' which we have been using and which produces difficulties for finding the component affixes and roots of a compound word."\textsuperscript{47} I have added the old spellings in brackets in order to help demonstrate the utility of the new orthography to those not familiar with the old, but Eastern Spain trusted that its readers would be able to immediately recognize \textit{ako}, \textit{akin}, and \textit{akinin} as the words formerly spelled as \textit{aco}, \textit{aquin}, and \textit{aqumin}.\textsuperscript{48} Even in this introductory demonstration, the new orthography was thought to be sufficiently transparent and logical that the reader would not need the old spellings for orientation. The footnote also contained the following disclaimer, which acknowledged the fluidity of Tagalog orthography at the time and anticipated the substance, if not the degree, of the objections that the spelling changes would encounter: "However, if our readers think the other orthography more understandable or convenient, we will comply with their wishes and use the old orthography."\textsuperscript{49}

Both Eastern Spain and Serrano Latkaw's dictionary, when they introduced the new orthography, cited as authoritative its origins in the work of distinguished \textit{Orientalist} scholars, as if its legitimacy and value could be measured in part by the scholarly credentials of those who had previously employed it. Serrano Latkaw's dictionary read, "We hope to make . . . a contribution to philology by adopting the orthography employed by the learned [abate] Orientalistos such as the Abbe Perre, D. Manuel Troyano, Humboldt, Jacquet, Pardo de Taveras, etc., and recently by the M. R. P. Toribio Minguella, Augustinian Recollect, learned philologist, author of various works in Tagalog, and to whom we owe the curious and no less thorough work of \textit{Comparative Studies of Tagalog and Sanskrit.}\textsuperscript{50} Eastern Spain similarly introduced the new orthography by noting that it would "use the orthography recently [\textit{modernamente}] introduced by the learned Orientalists Humbold [sic], Dr. T. H. Pando de Taveras, Fr. Toribio Minguella, Moyano, and others.\textsuperscript{51} The similarity of these citations, and the fact that the second is an abbreviated version of the first, suggests that Eastern Spain may have been directly borrowing from Serrano Latkaw's dictionary without naming him or his work as a source.\textsuperscript{52}

Who were these \textit{learned Orientalists}, and how had they used and promoted the new orthography for Tagalog? Humboldt's work on languages was of course broadly influential; the Abbe Favre was Pardo de Taveras's teacher at the Parisian School of Oriental Languages; and Jacquet, whose work Pardo de Taveras had studied, was published in one of the leading Orientalist journals of Europe.\textsuperscript{53} All three of these Orientalists used the \textit{k} when transcribing Sanskrit and Malay languages using Latin letters, and Jacquet had transliterated the Tagalog letters of the pre-Hispanic alphabet as \textit{ka} and \textit{wa}; but none had used or promoted a particular orthography for the contemporary Tagalog language. Neither of the peninsular Spaniards was in remotely the same class as the Prussian and French Orientalists. Minguella had authored a textbook intended to help teach Tagalog students the Castilian language, and both he and Manuel Moyano had written articles about Philippine languages for the Madrid paper \textit{El...}
globo, which were republished in a collection commemorating the Filipino Exposition of 1884. Though each wrote specifically about the Filipino languages, their use of the new orthography was distinctly limited, and neither merits nor achieved broad recognition as Orientalist or linguistic scholars. In fact, then, Pardo de Tavera was the only scholar named who had used the new orthography in any comprehensive way, and only he had written about it and advocated its use.

Why cite these authorities when most of them had used the orthography only marginally for Tagalog if at all? First, these references to Orientalist authority were to those who had used any aspect of the orthography, either or both of the letters "k" and "w," in transliterating any of a number of languages related to and including Tagalog (but not necessarily Tagalog itself). While Pardo de Tavera had specifically proposed the orthography for use in Tagalog, the others had employed the orthography for other languages; its use for those languages established the validity of its use for Tagalog. The orthography itself was, in other words, treated as something generally accepted in scholarly circles, with Tagalog being one of the languages that could be written in it. These references to Orientalist authority were probably also attempts to try to introduce the new orthography as being impartial, scientific, and apolitical. For while Pardo de Tavera was cited as an Orientalist scholar who had used and promoted the orthography, Rizal was not—he was already a controversial figure, and his name would not have been permitted by the censors to appear in the press in Manila. Despite the care that its promoters took to introduce it as logical, useful, easy, and politically uncontroversial, the new orthography inspired a reaction from the writers of the Catholic Review, who accused it of being precisely the opposite of all of these things.

Is "k" a Foreign Agent?

Soon after this first issue of the bilingual Eastern Spain hit the streets of Manila with the new orthography the Catholic Review ran a series of articles attacking the orthography, to which Eastern Spain replied with a series of articles in its defense. Pascual Poblete, a key writer for the Catholic Review, questioned the credentials of those who developed the new orthography, writing that "I am not a philologist, but I am a Tagalog, by which I mean to say that, with respect to my native language, I can say, without bragging, that I know Tagalog better, simply much better than any Orientalist gentleman who, on the continent, had used the new orthography for the purpose of providing a reliably phonetic transcription of it. As none of the cited Orientalists were native Tagalog speakers, the Catholic Review's arguments have been fairly effective in raising questions about the newly introduced orthography. Indeed, the issues and controversies surrounding the adoption of the new orthography continue to this day.
Baltazar's text was the classic text, and his Tagalog, for Tecson, was the authoritative literary language: to tamper with his language was to insult the great poet and all Tagalogs.

Tecson defended Tagalog from insults that the Orientalists had not made, but that others had. Feced's denigration of Tagalog had prompted Blumentritt, it will be recalled, to cite Orientalist scholarship in defense of Tagalog's dignity. In a linguistic world in which rationality and therefore status were often accorded to European languages but less so to languages of other places, a rationalized orthography for Tagalog might highlight what was thought by many linguists of the era, including Pardo de Taveras, to be Tagalog's highly developed state, one that was close to perfection as a language and thought to accompany a comparatively high state of civilization. Tecson, however, either did not see or ignored the acclaim that linguistics had brought Tagalog; instead, he suggested that these Orientalists had attacked the language's dignity and that he was coming to its defense.

Perhaps more significantly, the Catholic Review appealed to its readers' patriotism toward the Tagalog language in a way that rendered that patriotism as also directed toward Spain and the Spanish language. The new orthography was both impractical and unpatriotic because Tagalog was, the paper argued, a Spanish language, and so must be spelled accordingly. Certain letters—the "K" and the "w"—were singled out for criticism as being "foreign," specifically, "German." Poblete posited that Tagalogs did not know letters foreign to Castilian and thus would not be able to read their own language when spelled with the "foreign" letters. Not knowing the letter "w," he said, Tagalogs would think that it was either a double "u" sound or like a "v" and a "w" together, and since the Castilian "v" sounds like "b," he ventured that Tagalogs "would read [karamuan] as karam-u-ba, [jawa] as tawo-ba, [kaganuan] as kaga-u-yan, [gili] as gili-u, and [wika] as u-tico . . . because their first teachers in the reading and writing of the Phoenician alphabet . . . were the Spanish, and not the English or the Germans." The interloping letter "K" became, in the Catholic Review, the focus of especially strong criticism. The writers repeatedly claimed that "K" was particularly German and definitely not Spanish (and therefore not Tagalog). They gleefully reminded their readers of the supposed German origins of the new orthography, signing one of the articles with a pseudonym hindi alemán (not German) and demonstrating a point about the conjugation of Tagalog verbs by using the Castilian word for "German" (alemán) as if it were a Tagalog verb root, coining words for "to do German" (amule-alemán), "was made German" (inulamán), and "to be made German" (alemánar). Poblete directly appealed to his readers' patriotic feelings both for Tagalog and for Spain:

Furthermore, Tagalog compatriots. If our religion, our laws, our customs and our entire mode of being are Spanish, why do we have to use some letters that are not genuinely Spanish, and pronounce the syllables gc and gl like the Germans do and not like our brothers across the sea? Are the letters that have been taught to us not enough for us to express our ideas and thoughts? Then let us invent those that would be necessary: better yet, let us revive our primitive alphabet, before we use a letter of origin foreign to our Mother country.

In Poblete's rendition, his "Tagalog compatriots" were profoundly Spanish, and Tagalog was a Spanish language. If this claim was not as absurd as it might seem, as it was made in the context of multilingual Spain. Castilian was the language of the state, but the nation of Spain was multilingual, and so to the list of Castilian, Asturian, Basque, Galician, and Catalan, one might conceivably add Tagalog, just as El Folk Lore Espanol might include El Folk Lore Filipino.

The Catholic Review writers Poblete and Tecson, then, attacked the "foreign"—that is, non-Tagalog and non-Spanish—origns of the new orthography. They claimed the orthography was suspect both because the people who developed it were not authentically Tagalog and because the spellings that it employed—particularly the use of "K"—were "German" and thus traitors to Tagalog and to Spanish. Against this inauthentic, unpatriotic orthography, these writers invoked the authorities of the native speaker and classic poet's text, as well as patriots toward both Tagalog and Spanish. But the Catholic Review's vitriolic attacks on the new orthography, and more particularly the emphasis on Germany in those attacks, requires a different kind of explanation.

Orthographic Reform as Political Reform

As we already know, Tecson and Poblete were in a sense correct about the foreign origins of the new orthography, for it derived in part from Pardo
de Taverna's Orientalist linguistic training. Though that training was itself French, French scholarship in this field was heavily influenced by the preeminence of German scholars. It seems doubtful, however, that Pardo de Taverna's linguistic training, or indeed the Orientalsists so maligned, could fully account for the intense response of the Catholic Review, particularly the virulence against the supposed German qualities of the orthography.

Most obviously, by labeling the letter "k" as "German," the Catholic Review marked it as politically subversive to Spain by appealing to anxieties about the declining status and power of Spain as a global empire in contrast to the ascendant Germany that had recently challenged Spain in the Americas. As noted in chapter 2, the Philippine Exposition of 1887 had been inspired by Madrid's anxiety over Germany's colonial appetites. Perhaps linking the orthography to Spain's enemy, Germany, was simply a strategic choice made by those whose real objections to the orthography lay elsewhere.

Accusations of being "German" or under "foreign" influence also carried more particular associations, however. Rizal's associations with Germany were infamous, if often misrepresented. Just around the time of the argument over the orthography, Vicente Benitez, a Spanish official of the civil administration of the Philippines and a conservative occasional contributor to Manila's press, accused Rizal of having a soul that had been "twisted" by the Germans, in reply to which Rizal wrote in an open letter that if his soul was "twisted" it had happened in the atmosphere of Manila, not Germany.84 Rizal had compared Germany favorably to both Spain and the Philippines in some respects, and he openly admired the people and progress of the German nation.85 The writers of the Catholic Review, knowing that Rizal was one of those who had used the new orthography, were likely making reference to him with their references to Germany. Either they sought to discredit the orthography by associating it with the controversial Rizal or they attacked the orthography symbolically attack Rizal himself. La solidaridad reported that those who supported Rizal and his family in the controversy over land struggles in Calamba, ongoing during this period, were called "German," and so the orthography controversy might have been a stand-in for this content over land.86 Censors would likely have struck Rizal's name, and so Germany and German-ness stood as a ready reference that escaped the censor's cuts. It is also possible that connections between Isidoro de los Reyes, who edited and wrote much of Eastern Spain's content, and those who were more visible propagandists, including Ponce, Rizal, and Blumentritt, were either known or suspected and that the Catholic Review wanted to overtly push the political implications of their position perhaps because of the
censorship of the Manila press. Rizal had more room to advocate certain political positions, however, in _La solidaridad_.

Rizal opened his appeal with a picture of a classroom in the Philippines, painted to accentuate problems that he thought were holding back the country:

When you were attending the town's school to learn your first letters, or when you had to teach them to the younger ones, your attention must have been drawn, as mine was, to the great difficulty that the children encountered when they got to the syllables ca, ce, ci, co, gu, gu, go, gui, etc., because they did not understand the cause for these irregularities or the reason that the sounds of some consonants change. Whips raised down, punishments abounded, canes broke when the little hands did not become cracked, the first pages fell to pieces, the children cried, and sometimes even the _deanius_ [head students] had to pay, but these terrible Thermopylas could not be passed.99

Emphasizing the futility of the prevailing system—and the brutality of the classroom—he invited his readers to identify both with the suffering boys and with him. He reminded his "countrymen [miyutang]" that he was a native Tagalog speaker, asserting the authority of authenticity that _Catholic Review_ had denied Pardo de Taveras and other Orientalists.100

After a long section where he detailed the technical features of the old and new orthographies, he came to the question of patriotism and what spelling had (and had not) to do with it. Again, he invoked his readers' sympathy for their former selves, as boys struggling in the classroom, and for their own sons, actual or imaginary, who would till continually up this mountain unless a new orthography was adopted:

Why torture the boys into learning [Spanish syllables] when they have to speak nothing other than Tagalog, because Castilian is completely forbidden to them? If later they have occasion to learn this latter language, then they will study these combinations, as we all do when we begin to study French, English, German, Dutch, etc. No one in Spain learns from childhood the French or English syllabary. Why, then, do the children of the towns have to kill themselves in learning the syllabary of a language that they will never have to speak? The only thing that they can gain is a hatred of their studies, seeing that they are difficult and useless.101

In contrast to del Pilar's claim that the new orthography would help Tagalog speakers learn Castilian, Rizal made it clear that reforms should be introduced not primarily for the sake of the privileged few who studied the Spanish language and who went on to study other languages. Instead, it was for the sake of most Tagalog children, who would likely never become literate in Castilian. What he proposed, he stressed, was that Tagalog should be made easier for Tagalog children to learn to read and write, and learning Tagalog in the Philippines should be more like learning Castilian in Spain. In other words, Tagalog should be treated as its own language, rather than as a strange local version of Castilian. Tagalog was linguistically distinct from, but equal to, Castilian, and the logic of orthography dictated that it follow that distinct nature.

Rizal rebuked the provincialism of Tecson and Poblano, who objected to the supposed foreignness of the letters "k" and "q" arguing via analogy the absurdity of basing patriotism for a country on the supposed origin of a letter:

It is, then, exceedingly childish . . . to reject the use [of the letter "k"] saying that it is of "German origin" and taking up the issue in order to make boasts of patriotism, as if patriotism consisted of letters of the alphabet.102 "We are Spanish above all!” says its opponents, and with this they think that they have performed an act of heroism; “We are Spanish above all! And we reject the 'k' of German origin!” Rarely nine-tenths of these patriots of my country's alphabet wear hats that are authentically German and perhaps authentically German boots, too! What? Then where is their patriotism? Do Germany's exports rise when we use the "k", more than when we import and wear German things? Why not wear a guineo [a wide-ribbed Spanish hat], a salakot [a wide Filipino hat worn by peasants, or fancier versions, by petty officials], or a hat made of buntal [palm fibers], if they are such protectionists? Will the "k" impoverish us? Is the "c" a product of our country? It is very easy to be a patriot thus.103

Mocking the shallowness of his opponents' professed patriotism, Rizal teased that even the absurd suggestion of a millinery patriotism would
be more logically sound than an alphabetic patriotism—though such patriots might look ridiculous in their unfashionable hats, at least their hats would be material products of Spanish or Philippine manufacture; letters of the alphabet had no such significance. Pardo de Tavera, too, had cuttingly referred to the chauvinism of the Catholic Review writers, remarking sarcastically that “I was unaware that the K was German national property, though even if it were, I do not see why we would not use it when we need it. In Paris we are hardly friends of Germansians, but it has occurred to no one, up to now, to wage a war against beer for being of German origin!”

Rizal closed his piece with an invitation to those who were skeptical of the new orthography, inviting them to join those who were interested in “the free sphere of scientific facts.” He was confident that “in the end [the reform] will be widespread . . . we are sure that, convinced of its advantages, [the skeptics] will have to consider it to be nothing but the rational, rational, and easy writing of our harmonious language.”

Although heated exchanges between Eastern Spain and the Catholic Review continued for several months, in January of the following year (1890), the two papers merged, apparently because neither could afford to continue publishing in competition with the other. This merger represented a failure of the bilingual publications to the extent that the reading public could not support both papers, but it also indicated that, despite the fierce debate in these publications about Tagalog orthography and the differences between the two papers’ positions on the role of religion, some of their main goals were similar. Both papers considered themselves advocates of Tagalog education and vehicles for uplifting the Tagalog people. The argument about orthography underscored a deep rift in how they believed these goals could best be achieved, but the fact that they could merge into one bilingual paper is testament to the urgency that both camps felt for the project of having a bilingual paper. Indeed, the staffs of the papers had overlapped with each other, despite the fact that certain members of each had attacked the other so virulently. The new bilingual publication, La lectura popular (The Popular Reader or Popular Reading), was run by de los Reyes, the moving force behind Eastern Spain but who had also worked on the Catholic Review. The major figures from the Catholic Review became contributors to the Popular Reader as well. In the pages of the new paper, some of the Tagalog articles used at least some aspect of the new orthography, and some used the old. The inconsistency in its own pages seemed not to trouble the editors.

Whether the fight had been the occasion for personal rivalries that then resolved themselves, whether the respective parties simply tired of polemics, or whether those concerned became focused on other more pressing projects, I do not know. In this brief period, however, the orthography had been introduced and fought over, in terms of its political and patriotic merits. While all of those involved in the debate agreed that there was political significance to orthography, they differed over that significance. Noticeably, however, the new orthography would resurface in the Philippines a few years later as a different kind of symbol, one that was distinctly not German but also and primarily distinctly not Spanish.

“K” for Katipunan

The new orthography was not immediately adopted more broadly. In the months following the controversy described previously, the letter “K” was not consistently used by bilingual periodicals in Manila, not even by papers associated with de los Reyes. By 1892, however, two years after Rizal wrote about the orthography in the pages of La solidaridad, the “K” reemerged as a symbol of the secret revolutionary brotherhood, the Katipunan, the organization that began the Philippine Revolution. As early as its first year, official Katipunan documents appear to have been written using “K”; and once the Katipunan get their own press, purchased from de los Reyes, they went to great lengths to acquire enough of the right letters to print Tagalog, including the letter “K.” Sometime in 1896, just before the society was discovered by the authorities (a discovery that sparked the revolution), the Katipunan was using membership forms printed with the letter “K.” A copy of this form reveals that this letter’s typeface is a different typeface from others used—the “K” was apparently not common enough in type sets in Manila to easily produce a page of Tagalog writing using it, and as Teodoro Agoncillo confirms, the Katipunan press had difficulty getting enough of these letters. Apparently, using the then-standard “C” and “Q” was not an option! This deliberate and inconvenient use of “K” underscores its significance. Even more telling is the way that the letter “K” itself came to symbolize the Katipunan, which we can see by briefly looking at a few different versions of the flags (Figure 4.3). The Katipunan commonly used as a symbol the initials of the first three words of the
name: "Kataastaasan Kagaling-galing Katipunan," or "K.K.K." Not every Katipunan flag used the letter "k," but many did, and notably, on some flags, "k" was the only figure.66

The prominence of the letter "k" in Katipunan imagery and documents has at least two important implications. First, while the Katipunan is generally taken to be the movement of the people, or the masses, as opposed to the elite nationalist movement of the propagandists, its orthographic choices suggest a continuity between those who advocated the new orthography in 1889 and those influential in the new society of the Katipunan a few years later.67 This continuity suggests that the ideology of the Katipunan, at least at the higher levels of the popular and hierarchical organization, was at least in some way quite directly related to the work of the propagandists and illustrados, not divorced from it.68

Second, that the Katipunan did adopt the letter "k" and that they used it emblematically suggests that the imagery or visual difference from written Spanish might have been part of the reason it was adopted. While the pedagogical benefits of using "k" may well have been embraced by this revolutionary organization, the use of the figure of the "L" as an emblem exploited its symbolic significance. In other words, contrary to the protestations of those who advocated the orthographic shift to the letter "k," in fact the "k" did and does become a sign of difference, a marker that distinguished visually the local language from the language of the colonizers: the Tagalog language, rendered according to Castilian orthography, was filled with "qu" and "c," whereas in the reformed orthography, it is riddled with "k." Even more particularly, however, the shift to the letter "k" not only changed the shape of Tagalog words, but it helped obscure the Spanish origins of some Tagalog words.69

A New "National" Language?

As with most languages, the origins of many of Tagalog's root words can be traced to other languages. In addition to the Samirmitic roots that Pardo de Viera identified, the Tagalog spoken today includes vocabulary borrowed from Malay, Arabic, Chinese (Hokkien and Cantonese), and increasingly English, but the greatest number of Tagalog's exotic roots are Castilian.61 These are sometimes terms that have no pre-Hispanic Tagalog equivalent (such as relé or relais for "watch," from the Castilian relaj), but newer technological terms were not the only Castilian words that became
Tagalog roots. It is difficult to distinguish visually the Spanish origins of some of the most common words of informal spoken Tagalog, thanks to the eventual success of the new orthography: the Castilian *kawit* (kitchenSpanish), the boundaries between these languages were already permeable in the stiles.

It is instructive to look at how Castilian words were treated in the Tagalog text of *Eastern Spain*. Many of those for which there were no Tagalog equivalents were printed in italics, which had the effect of marking them as foreign. To take examples from the first page of the first issue, we find *premisa* (press), *Evangelio* (gospel), *gobierno* (government), *administracion* (administration), and *ciencia* (science). But there were other Castilian words and words of Castilian derivation in the Tagalog column of the same page of text that the translators chose not to italicize: *kastilang* (meaning "Castilian," or more generally "Spanish," from "Castilla"), *arte* (meaning "arts," from *arte*), and *industria* (meaning "industry"). In contrast to the italicized words, these Castilian words blend into that text—some of them with suffixes added according to rules of Tagalog grammar—in a way that suggests that they could already be considered to be Tagalog. The first of these examples is the most instructive: the new orthography changed Castilla to *kastilla*. While the new orthography might have made it easier to identify the Tagalog root of a Tagalog word (to paraphrase *Pablo de Lara's* characterization of its utility), it did not make it easier to identify the Castilian root of a Tagalog word. Instead, the "k" worked to mask the Spanish origins of Tagalog words: Spanish roots, rendered with the "k" in the new orthography, no longer *looked* Spanish. The new orthography accepted Castilian words, but it accepted them as Tagalog words, hiding their Spanish origin. It made it easier for Tagalog, a language that borrowed words from Castilian, to have its own vocabulary, different from the Castilian (in spelling, at least) and equal to it. By severing the very real links between Castilian and Tagalog that had been visible in the shapes of words, the new orthography enacted a separation between the two languages. In this sense, the new orthography was indeed a "traitor" orthography, a traitor to Spain and to the Spanish language.

The writers of the *Catholic Review* protested that the new orthography was disloyal to Spain; but they never complained about this kind of separation. They complained that under the rules of the new orthography, the language became more like the foreign languages of German, French, or English; but perhaps the bigger threat was that Tagalog itself became a language foreign to Spain—not more like German, French, or English but just less like a Spanish language. Why did the writers of the *Catholic Review* urge to Spanish and the Spanishness of the Tagalog language and eager to question their competitor's loyalty, not lodge this complaint? Perhaps they simply felt that it would be more devastating to impute German connections to their rivals—those who advocated the new orthography—than simply to call them anti-Spanish.

But a different possibility is worth considering: perhaps it was their patriotism to Tagalog that kept them from calling attention to how the "k" disguised the Castilian words that were increasingly part of the vocabulary of Tagalog. Though languages are rarely if ever "pure," in the sense of unaffected by other languages, they are often considered so by their speakers. To complain that Spanish words would no longer be recognizable as Spanish would, then, acknowledge that Spanish words were an important part of the Tagalog language. It would be to acknowledge that "pure" Tagalog did not express the range of terms that one would need as an educated person in the advanced and cosmopolitan city of Manila, that Tagalog was no longer "pure," and that it would never again be so in a world of technological change and economic development. The Tagalog so loved by the writers of the *Catholic Review* was the Tagalog of Baltazar's "Florante at Laura." This classical Tagalog was fit for metrical romance poetry but not for describing the new penal code for the Philippines or the latest agricultural techniques. To dwell upon the depersonalization of loan words in Tagalog, then, might be to call attention to the limitations of "pure" or classical Tagalog: if a language was the essence of its speakers, then Tagalogs might also be marked as premodern, simple, or unadulterated.

Indeed, the purity of Tagalog—and of Spanish—was an explicit concern of Pobléte and Tecson, and it is here that we finally return to the question of kitchen Spanish, about which *Pablo de Tavares* had written. Pobléte had closed one of his articles against the new orthography with a plea specifically against the "impure" language—like but not quite Tagalog, like but not quite Spanish—that was spoken in the streets of Manila at the time. And so I invite my countrymen, the Tagalog translators of Eastern Spain, to stop introducing innovations that do nothing but disturb, and to endeavor with us to restore in all its primitive richness the poetic and sweet Tagalog
between market Malay ("Revolutionary Malay") and kitchen Spanish is instructive. Writing about Malay in Indonesia in 1966, Anderson noted that "passer (market) Malay had long been the lingua franca of the archipelago, and this became the basis of an essentially political language, Indonesian (Revolutionary Malay). It was a language simple and flexible enough to be rapidly developed into a modern political language, analogous but, as it were, veer to Dutch... This was all the more possible because Malay as an "inter-ethnic" language, or lingua franca, had into fact an almost statusless character, like Esperanto, and was tied to no particular regional social structure. It has thus a few, almost "democratic" characters from the outset, which had its own appeal to an intellectual class, which at one level (the desire to be on equal terms with the colonial elite) aspired to egalitarian norms."

Market Malay had been in wide use across a broad region as a language of trade, while kitchen Spanish was not regional in the same way, for its grammatical structure was derived from Tagalog, as were some of its root words. Despite this, the language did function as a lingua franca in Manila and elsewhere among native speakers of different languages. It was free of the preciousness around the supposed purity of language. This is precisely what Pobeite found objectionable about it when he wrote that anything would be preferable—even giving Tagalog up completely to adopt Castilian—to the "confused glibberish," or mixed language, that he heard on the streets."

Conclusion: Orientalist Sciences, Decolonizing Practices

We have seen in this chapter how the comparative science of philology, its methods and standard practices, inspired the orthographic reform that would become so politically potent in the years leading up to, and the first years of, the Philippine Revolution. While linguistic science could and did posit a pre-Hispanic unity among indigenous languages of the Philippines, and thus among their speakers, the problem of a unifying language in this polyglot, modernizing, and increasingly cosmopolitan archipelago remained. The struggles over Tagalog orthography in the Manila press indicate one of the axes on which this problem turned. While some prosessed a preference for a pure Tagalog against the contamination of foreign letters...
and the meddling of foreign science, others advocated a new orthography, in the name of science and education, which effectively hid the degree to which Tagalog was already a language contaminated by Spanish words.

In comparison with ethnology and folklore, the science of philology (or linguistics) became entangled in, and a subject of, a political battle fought on multiple fronts. Like folklore, linguistic science was a tool in reconstructing a pre-Hispanic past, but it was also a source of data, and even more particularly a method, for looking toward future progress in the Philippines. The future of the Philippines was also a subtext of illustrous writings about the history of Spanish colonization in the Philippines. In the following chapter, we will see how these works gestured toward possible futures for the Philippines, using the data and methods of linguistics, ethnology, and folklore to challenge Spanish colonial history.

CHAPTER 5

Lessons in History

The Decline of Spanish Rule, and Revolutionary Strategy

In 1885, the Spanish government commissioned a painting from Juan Luna, a young painter who had won prizes for earlier canvases in major competitions. The result, Pasión de sangre (Blood Compact), depicted what was understood to be the founding moment of Spanish sovereignty in the Philippines, in which the indigenous ruler Sikatuna and the Spaniard Miguel López de Legazpi sealed their pledge to mutual aid by ceremonially drinking each other’s blood. The painting shows Legazpi in the center (flanked by others of his party), looking at Sikatuna, whose hand holds the raised glass of ceremonial drink, but who faces away from the viewer, inviting speculation about his facial expression. Luna’s Blood Compact is one of many illustrous representations of the subject. Spanish histories took the event to be the glorious inauguration of Spanish sovereignty and tutelage in the islands, and symbolic of the legal basis and moral legitimacy of Spanish rule—moral because won by goodwill and cooperation. Illustrous also cited the blood compact as a founding moment of Spanish sovereignty, but instead of emphasizing a connection between Legazpi and the current institutions of the state, they noted difference. La solidaridad, for example, called the Blood Compact the “sole legal historical foundation of the Spanish intervention in the Government of the Archipelago of that era,” challenging the legality of any Spanish sovereignty that exceeded the terms of that particular contract. José Rizal also used the blood compact to question the strength of Spain’s power, noting that to call that early era of Spanish presence “the conquest” inaccurately suggested that Spain overpowered local people and institutions. Writing in his annotations to an early seventeenth-century Spanish account, Rizal deemed that “Conquest” can only be accepted for a few islands and only in a very broad sense: Cerbu, [Sibuy], Panay, Luzon [Luzón], Mindoro, etc., can not be called conquered.