

# philippine studies

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

---

## **Guillermo Tolentino's Grupo de Filipinos Ilustres and the Making of a National Pantheon**

Resil B. Mojares

*Philippine Studies* vol. 58 nos. 1 & 2 (2010): 169–184

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

---

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at [philstudies@admu.edu.ph](mailto:philstudies@admu.edu.ph). or [info@philippinestudies.net](mailto:info@philippinestudies.net).

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

# Guillermo Tolentino's *Grupo de Filipinos Ilustres* and the Making of a National Pantheon

The essay inquires into the contingencies, gaps, and tensions in the process of "pantheonization," or the canonization of national heroes, by taking up the case of Guillermo Tolentino's *Grupo de Filipinos Ilustres* (1911). From the analysis of a portrait, it widens into a reflection on the formation of civic nationalism in the early twentieth century as Filipino intellectuals and the U.S.-sponsored government sought to create a "nation-space" through projects of defining a "national" history, language, literature, music, theater, dance, art, and others.

**KEYWORDS: PANTHEONIZATION · PRINTMAKING · PORTRAITURE · PHOTOGRAPHY · CIVIC NATIONALISM**

In 1911, a fine arts student at the University of the Philippines, Guillermo Tolentino (1890–1976), drew a composite portrait of “illustrious Filipinos” (*Filipinos ilustres*). The artist’s uncle submitted the portrait for publication to Severino Reyes, editor of *Liwayway*, a popular Tagalog magazine. Reyes thought it was best put out as a poster and offered it to the leading printing house in Manila, Carmelo and Bauermann. The painter Jorge Pineda, who worked for the printing house, transferred the drawing to lithographic stone and, pulled in sepia, *Grupo de Filipinos Ilustres* was printed in a first edition of 1,500 copies and sold at P0.80 a copy.

The first work of Tolentino to be circulated (he would become one of the country’s leading artists), it became the best-known gallery of Filipino heroes. Tolentino later said: “I never made a centavo out of the drawing but I was pleased to see my work in people’s homes everywhere” (Paras-Perez 1976, 27).<sup>1</sup>

### Portraying Heroes

*Filipinos Ilustres* shows thirteen men arranged in some order of precedence (see fig. on pp. 118–19). Seated left to right are Jose Burgos, Antonio Luna, Jose Rizal, Andres Bonifacio, M. H. del Pilar, and Apolinario Mabini. Standing behind them, left to right, are Clemente Jose Zulueta, Jose Ma. Basa, Pedro Paterno, Juan Luna, Graciano Lopez Jaena, Miguel Malvar, and Antonio Ma. Regidor. Except for Burgos (in soutane) and Antonio Luna and Malvar (in *rayadillo*, the uniform of Filipino revolutionary generals), they are all in Western suits. Some are holding what is emblematic of their person: Burgos with a book, Antonio Luna a sword, Mabini a scroll, and Rizal with three books (labeled Morga, El Filibusterismo, Noli me Tangere).

Obviously meant to serve patriotic-pedagogical ends, the portrait is conventional in its symbolic features, composition, and the frontality of the exemplary figures it depicts. Copied from individual portraits and then assembled, the figures are stiff and rather amateurish in execution. The representation was not meant to convey values of subjectivity or interiority; it aimed to create civic icons in a manner not unrelated to the Christian religious tableaux (the Holy Family or the Last Supper, for instance) with which Filipinos were familiar.

In Francisco Goya’s *Junta de la Real Compañía de Filipinas* (1815), a commissioned painting by the celebrated artist of an assembly of the directors

and stockholders of the *Real Compañía de Filipinas*, Goya introduces a “political subtext”—dark, sinister tones, the obscured features of the dignitaries, and other symbolic touches to convey a sense of foreboding surrounding the rise of reactionary forces in Spain (see Miranda-Tchou 1996, 187–215). In Tolentino’s drawing, however, one finds an earnest attempt to create a pantheon of heroes as part of the symbolic armature of a new nation.

It is an invented scene. These men had never gathered as a group but here they inhabit a simultaneous plane (with Paterno looking, oddly, younger than Zulueta), posed in what looks like a wooden stage or a photographic studio with imitation Greco-Roman columns and drapery framing a painted, tree-framed vista of the rising sun with thirteen rays. At top center is a rounded version of the Philippine flag, like a seal hanging from the stage curtain rod. It is a conventional tableaux with the classic details (drapery, columns, landscape) that convey an aura of dignity and timelessness—although, ironically, it is one subverted at the same time by the undisguised artificiality and falsity of the setting.

I have not come across the artist’s explanation for his choice of figures, except that he did a composite out of illustrations available to him in books and magazines. He obviously limited himself to posthumous figures, which would explain the absence of, say, such prominent personalities as T. H. Pardo de Tavera, Mariano Ponce, or Isabelo de los Reyes, who were publicly visible at the time the group portrait was executed.<sup>2</sup>

The scene says something about the precise moment of the portrait’s making. Circumstantiality in the choices of personages would explain the inclusion of relatively “minor” figures like Zulueta (who was much talked about in intellectual circles in the years that followed his sudden death in 1904), Basa (the long-time Hong Kong exile whose remains were brought back to Manila in 1911, four years after his death), and Malvar (who died in 1911). Timing may also explain the inclusion of controversial personalities like Regidor (who died in Nice, France, in 1910) and Paterno (who died in 1911).

Timing, too, explains why these “illustrious Filipinos” are not gathered in the salon of Malacañang Palace (which was then occupied by an American) or the hallowed halls of a public institution but in what looks like a commercial theater or photographic salon. It is a visual comment on the exclusion of Filipinos from the center of power, although I doubt whether it was deliberately meant to be so.<sup>3</sup>



Guillermo Tolentino's *Grupo de Filipinos Ilustres* (1911)

Seated (L-R):  
José Burgos  
Antonio Luna,  
José Rizal,  
Andres Bonifacio,  
M.H. del Pilar,  
and Apolinario Mabini.

Standing (L-R):  
Clemente José Zulueta, José Ma. Basa, Pedro Paterno, Juan Luna, Graciano Lopez Jaena, Miguel Malvar, and Antonio Ma. Regidor



Despite the seeming randomness, the gallery, albeit all-male, seems fairly inclusive in political, racial, ethnic, and occupational terms, at least in so far as the leadership of the nationalist movement was concerned. It is a mixed gallery of intellectuals and military leaders, conservatives and radicals, plebians and plutocrats. Although they form a more or less generational cohort (with the exception of Burgos), it is unlikely in the case of some that in life they would be found in polite conversation in the same room. (Antonio Luna viewed Paterno with contempt and once ordered him arrested. And who would imagine the pro-American Regidor, the most *ilustrado* of ilustrados, and the farmer Malvar, “the last general to surrender,” placidly standing side by side?)

A gallery of national heroes inscribes a dream of glory as well as a desire for coherence. History, of course, is not a studio portrait. While much can be said for the political desire expressed in Tolentino’s work (the desire to hold as much of the nation’s fractious life within a single frame), we must inquire into the contingencies, gaps, and tensions of its making.

### Portraits, Photographs, and Filipino Individuality

In early nineteenth-century Europe, portraiture and biography were popular genres for the construction of professional, scientific, and national identities. These genres held up persons of achievement as objects of emulation and, when the figures were put together in a portrait or book, created the semblance of a canon and embodied a strategic fiction of collectivity or community. In the Philippines, at the turn of the century, projects of this kind were also popular.

Printmaking and portraiture were familiar arts in the Philippines at the beginning of the twentieth century.<sup>4</sup> Yet, the kind of project Tolentino was engaged in was new. Following the appearance of the wooden-block or xylographic press in the sixteenth century, printmaking developed with the introduction of copperplate engravings in the eighteenth century. Monastic and state control of printing, however, meant that the early modern prints were limited to illustrating such works as religious books, *estampitas* (small religious cards), maps, and seals. The first native printer-engravers—like Nicolas de la Cruz Bagay and Juan Correa—worked under the patronage of the colonial state and church, and the earliest portraits were engravings of saints and high Spanish officials.

In colonial portraiture, natives (*indios*) appeared as anonymous types rather than individuals, specimens called *tipos del país* (social types), decorating

books, maps (as in the famous engraving by Nicolas de la Cruz Bagay of Pedro Murillo Velarde’s map of 1734), and albums and catalogues produced for ethnological, commercial, or touristic purposes. The personal identities of the human figures were not important since these figures were meant to document racial or social types and decorate or illustrate the landscapes, occupations, customs, and costumes that were the main object of representation.<sup>5</sup>

Social, economic, and political changes in the nineteenth century secularized public art. The introduction of lithography (printmaking with stone blocks) at the beginning of the nineteenth century raised the level of refinement and efficiency in graphic arts and allowed the reproduction of a larger number of copies than was possible with wood and copper. The printing press also ceased to be a monastic monopoly at this time. With advances in the quality and availability of print technology, the graphic arts were refined and commodified, as shown in the appearance of illustrated newspapers and magazines by the mid-nineteenth century.

Until the close of the nineteenth century, however, it was still rare to find faces of individual Filipinos (excepting prominent Spanish Creoles) circulating in public space. In the colony’s most elegant periodical, *Ilustración Filipina* (1859–1860), the only individual portraits that appear are of eminent Spaniards. Natives and the lowly Chinese are depicted in lithographs of *tipos del país*: rig drivers, cockfighters, bandits, shopkeepers, washerwomen, and milk-sellers. A few are personalized by being given familiar names (*Tasio*, *Quica*) but they are intended to be social specimens. In a series by artist C. W. Andrews, a handsome lithograph shows a *hilot* or midwife (*partera*) named *Nora Goya* (Gregoria). In *baro’t saya* (traditional blouse-and-skirt) and with a large rosary dangling from her neck, an old, bent woman stares at the artist (and viewer) with clear, steady eyes that make her at once autonomous and vaguely sinister. She may be an actual person called *Goya* but the device of familiarization is purely literary since she figures only as a “typical” *hilot*.<sup>6</sup>

Privately commissioned and displayed portraits of Filipino individuals became a vogue only by mid-nineteenth century. The earliest known portrait of this kind is the artist Severino Pablo’s 1836 painting of Don Paterno Molo y San Agustin (Pedro Paterno’s grandfather), a prosperous Chinese-mestizo burgher of Manila. The emergence of a native middle class, conscious of its achievement and status, stimulated a demand for domestic portraits and the appearance of professional portraitists like Antonio Malantic, Juan Arceo,



Justiniano Asuncion, and Severino Pablo. Nick Joaquin relates the appearance of these portraits to the rise of individualism in the wake of capitalist market expansion. In the nineteenth century, Joaquin (1970, 86) says, “the Filipino began to think of himself in the first person singular, it’s during this age that he grew a face.”

The introduction of photography in the nineteenth century revolutionized portraiture. The visual representation of bodies and faces was now quicker, cheaper, and more reproducible and portable for a greater number of people.<sup>7</sup>

Portraits of Filipinos, however, were produced to decorate homes and as family heirlooms, or (in the case of photographs) personal keepsakes, objects to be exchanged as private tokens of affection. Until the last years of the nineteenth century, they did not figure prominently in the books and periodicals of the period, which were mostly Spanish and Creole publications. As individuals, natives largely remained invisible.

The nationalist campaign opened up public space for the appearance of individual Filipino faces. Colonialist discourse depicted the native as an emptiness, an absence; the nationalists used visual and verbal images to establish his presence. It is curious, for instance, how much interest there was among nineteenth-century Filipino propagandists in the production, exchange, and circulation of their photographs. Publicists like Mariano Ponce and Isabelo de los Reyes actively distributed and published portraits of the time’s leading Filipino personalities as part of the Propaganda Movement. Conducting propaganda work in Japan, Mariano Ponce wrote to a Filipino colleague on 5 April 1899:

I have observed that here [in Japan], with the people’s fascination with photography, a picture has more effect than what is said in the newspapers. Whenever they see we have houses of some style, groups of well-dressed students, soldiers in formation, gallant generals, beautiful women with expressive dark eyes, a dignified legislature with representatives dressed in full-dress coat and white tie, instead of loin clothes and feathers in their hair—all these are much more persuasive than any speech. According to reliable sources, even the Emperor was enchanted when he saw our pictures. (Ponce 1932, 319–20)

Thus, Ponce’s *Cuestión Filipina* (1901), one of the most significant works of pro-independence propaganda outside the Philippines, is perhaps less important for its written text than for the thirty-one photographs that dominate the book, displaying portraits of the well-dressed Aguinaldo and leaders of the revolution, units of the Filipino army in formation, and the high ceremonial scenes attending the establishment of Aguinaldo’s republic.<sup>8</sup>

Photographs were deployed to summon Filipinos from their invisibility and counter colonial discourse that misrepresented them as primitives or reduced them to the category of exhibits for science and tourism. In the wake of the revolution and Rizal’s martyrdom, Rizal’s portrait circulated widely as—in Vicente Rafael’s (1995, 153) words—“cult objects, pointing to an alternative realm of power and redemption.” The circulation of images of “modern Filipinos” was more than just publicity or a technological fetish. The posed, formal photographs of Rizal and other heroes were an exemplary claim on *being*, a projection of self, an assertion of presence. They embodied self-possession and laid claim not only on the present but—since, copied and preserved, photographs *live on*—the future as well. These images said: We are not anonymous anthropological specimens but real historical subjects; not a nameless mass but historically-specific individuals capable of rational, autonomous action in the modern world.

Tolentino’s *Filipinos Ilustres* may be the first attempt at constructing a single, framed gallery of the nation’s heroes. While individual portraits of Filipino heroes were already in circulation and attempts were made to present a “gallery” of these heroes on a page or in a book, Tolentino’s work may be the first to put within a single frame, on a simultaneous plane, a selection of these personalities to represent not only themselves or their class but the “nation.” The circulation of photographs by Rizal and his cohort was a form of publicity for the reform movement and independence struggle; *Filipinos Ilustres* belonged to a period of canonization and codification. It appeared at a time when great interest in nation building generated projects in national histories, public monuments, civic commemorations, and biographies of heroes.

### Filipino Nationhood under U.S. Auspices

More than at any other time, the first decades of the twentieth century was when “Filipino nationality,” the shared consciousness of *being Filipino*, was self-consciously formulated and elaborated (cf. Mojares 2006, 11–32). This

seems paradoxical since it was as well the time of American colonial rule. Yet, American occupation stimulated expressions of nationality in ways symbiotic as well as oppositional. On one hand, the occupation and its threat of “Anglo-Saxonization” fueled Filipino assertions of distinctness and difference. On the other hand, Filipino leaders quickly discovered there was a great deal in U.S. colonial policies (“Filipinization,” self-rule, the diffusion of “modernity”) compatible with their own aspirations. Particularly after 1907 (when the all-Filipino Philippine Assembly was inaugurated), the mood for constructive “nation building”—under U.S. colonial auspices—was dominant.

There was much enthusiasm for creating the substance and symbols of a canonical nationalism. The early 1900s witnessed numerous initiatives in organizing language, artistic, and cultural societies as well as local and vernacular publishing. There was much talk among intellectuals about the “Filipino soul” and the imperatives of recovering, defining, and propagating a “national” language, literature, music, theater, dance, art, and architecture.

In historiography, intellectuals like Felipe Calderon and Clemente Zulueta initiated associations, projects, and publications to promote the writing and appreciation of a “national history.” In language, scholars, journalists, and politicians engaged in debates on the need for a “national language,” priming the ground for the creation of the Institute of National Language in 1936. In literature, writers and critics like Lope K. Santos and Epifanio de los Santos defended the vernaculars, launched publications, organized societies, and embarked on the recovery and codification of native poetic traditions in the movement the critic Virgilio Almario (1984) calls *balagtasismo*.<sup>9</sup> In dance, teachers and practitioners (most notably, Francisca Reyes, a teacher of physical education at the University of the Philippines) collected and documented folk dances from the field and popularized them through the public school system, creating a canon of “national dance.” Similar initiatives were taken in music, painting, and architecture, as shown in the careers of artists like Francisco Santiago, Nicanor Abelardo, Fernando Amorsolo, and Juan Arellano.

Crucial in this effort of identity formation was the expansion of state instruments for cultural production, such as the public school system and institutions like the National Archives (1901), the National Library (1908), the National Museum (1928), and the University of the Philippines (1908). The heads of these institutions—Epifanio de los Santos, Rafael Palma,

Teodoro Kalaw, Lope K. Santos, Manuel Artigas, and Jaime de Veyra—were prolific and influential intellectuals who did not only direct institutions but conducted research, built collections of “Filipiniana,” published on Philippine history and culture, and engaged in a public discourse on “Filipino identity.” These shapers of the public memory, makers of the canon of *Filipinism*, were greatly aided by the fact that the media for cultural dissemination had expanded in the twentieth century—schools, theaters, publishing, modern advertising, and the state itself.

National histories were conventionalized, national symbols decreed, and national civic rituals enacted. In schoolhouses, the Philippine flag floated side by side with the Stars and Stripes and the Philippine National Anthem was daily sung. Pictures of Rizal, Mabini, Bonifacio, and other heroes decorated classrooms; newspapers and magazines published their life stories. Such texts as the “Code of Calantiao,” Bonifacio’s “Duties of the Sons of the People,” and Mabini’s “True Decalogue” were invented or sanitized as catechisms for citizenship in the new nation. Rizal monuments were built across the country, many of them modeled after the Rizal statue at the Luneta, designed by Swiss artist Richard Kissling and unveiled on 30 December 1913. American Gov.-Gen. Frank Murphy declared, on 1 February 1934, the sampaguita and narra as national flower and tree, respectively. The *barong Tagalog* (the name first came into popular use in the 1920s) acquired the status of high fashion after Pres. Manuel Quezon wore it on such occasions as the Commonwealth inauguration.

If we trace the genealogy of today’s familiar symbols of what is *Filipino*, it is remarkable how many of them either originated or were first popularized during the U.S. colonial period: *bahay kubo*, *kundiman*, *tinikling*, *rondalla*, *balagtasan*, *Araw ni Balagtas*, National Heroes Day, Juan de la Cruz, *Dalagang Filipina*.<sup>10</sup> The U.S. colonial official Joseph Ralston Hayden (1942/1972, 515) obviously had this in mind when he wrote in 1941: “The Filipino people possess the fundamental basis of nationality in their common blood, but only within the last generation have they become generally conscious of a national history, national heroes, and common aspirations for a national identity.”

What Hayden would claim, with characteristic American triumphalism, as America’s contribution to Philippine development was the handiwork of Filipinos themselves. Yet, Hayden’s remark reminds us as well about how there was so much in the benign civic nationalism of the period that was

complicit in the conditions of profound political, economic, and cultural dependence on America that U.S. rule created.

### Contingencies of Pantheon Making

This is the context in which Tolentino produced *Grupo de Filipinos Ilustres*. Specific inspiration may have come from the fact that in 1908 the Philippine Assembly enacted Act No. 1856 (13 June 1908), authorizing the construction of a national “Pantheon of Illustrious Filipinos” in which the remains of the nation’s illustrious dead would be gathered. Executive Order No. 87, series of 1908, created a committee to establish such a pantheon but I have no information on what became of the project (Philippine Commission 1909, 95, 100).

*Filipinos Ilustres* is not state-sponsored symbolism but a provisional, privately-initiated effort in “pantheonization.” Hence, some of the choices of heroes seem idiosyncratic and time-bound. The Philippine flag, at top center of the portrait, was originally a medallion with a portrait of Francisco Balagtas, interesting for the primacy accorded a literary figure in the national canon. However, Severino Reyes—who arranged the printing of the poster—objected to the choice and had it changed to the national flag. Tolentino’s choice of Balagtas was apparently occasioned not only by personal preference (Tolentino was an avid *Tagalista*) but the fact that at the time Tolentino did his group portrait there was an organized campaign by Tagalog writers to promote the memory of Balagtas as “father” of the national literature.<sup>11</sup> Severino Reyes, although a writer like Balagtas, must have thought the flag more appropriate. (This and the fact that the flag design is incomplete may have been meant as a political statement, or maybe not. While the Flag Law of 1907, which proscribed the public display of the Philippine flag, was not repealed until 1919 it was not strictly enforced after 1910.)

It is relevant to note that this is not Tolentino’s only contribution to public art. Tolentino went on to become the country’s leading sculptor of civic art, producing such landmarks as the Bonifacio Monument (1933) in Caloocan, his masterpiece, as well as hundreds of monuments and busts of heroes and presidents. On the basis of this achievement, he was declared a “National Artist” in 1973.

These reflections on the contingencies of a portrait underscore the artifactual character of canon making. By its nature, a canon or pantheon selects and erects hierarchies and, like Tolentino’s portrait, works by a process of

exclusion and suppression despite its claims to completeness and coherence. Despite Tolentino’s attempt at inclusiveness, there are exclusions that reflect the time’s imagining of the national pantheon. All figures, for instance, are male, heavily Tagalog, Creole and Chinese-mestizo in descent, and metropolitan in character.

It can be said that, in common viewing, group portraits of this kind are rarely disaggregated or deconstructed in the manner I have done. They are less *seen* for the messy specificities of the individuals that compose them as the iconic singleness of an image of group identity. As John Berger (1972, 26) says of painting in relation to film, it is meant to be seen simultaneously. While one can move one’s eyes from part to part, one must see in the end the simultaneity of the whole piece. As in the case of *Grupo*, however, how well the parts cohere, how well the whole *holds* in the viewing, depends on the artist’s execution and the viewer’s position, in its broadest sense.

Like the nation it represents, a canon’s fictive character makes it inherently unstable despite its aura of authority and givenness. Some of the figures in Tolentino’s portrait are now largely forgotten and new ones have been added. This is shown in later imitations of Tolentino’s *Grupo* and other attempts at pantheon making, from the canonical honors bestowed by historical institutes, cultural commissions, the national legislature, and the country’s president, to the instructional posters or galleries of heroes used in classes on civics and history.<sup>16</sup> Changes are occasioned by new historical knowledge, ideological shifts, and the need to represent marginalized sectors (whether as sign of new realities or, more often, the illusion of their inclusion in the national community).

A gallery of the nation’s heroes inscribes a dream of glory as well as a desire for coherence. We must inquire into the empirical ground of its making and judge how much of this dream or desire we can claim as our own or how far we have grown in its fulfillment.

### Notes

- 1 On Tolentino, also see Pope 1966, 34–37; Cruz 1973, 10.
- 2 Restricting the canon to the dead avoids the messiness of the present and the living. This would explain the significant omission of Emilio Aguinaldo, who was at this time maligned for his alleged role in the death of Andres Bonifacio and Antonio Luna and was, moreover, unpopular with the Americans because of his role in the armed resistance. On the controversy over Aguinaldo, see Saulo 1987.



- 3 Compare this with Frenchman Christian Schussele's "Men of Progress" (1862) and British printmaker William Walker's "A Great Historical Engraving, in the Best Style of Stipple and Mezzotinto, Representing by Fifty Most Authentic Portraits, the Distinguished Men of Science of Great Britain, Living in A.D. 1807/8" (1862), in which the setting of the assemblage of great inventors and scientists (the Great Hall of the U.S. Patent Office and the Library of the British Royal Institution) is an essential part of the power of the image. See Petroski 1999, 88–96; Jordanova 1998, 192–211.
- 4 On the history of printmaking and portraiture, see Nick Joaquin (*pseud.*, Quijano de Manila) 1970, 86–87, 110–11; Cajipe-Endaya et al. 1988.
- 5 See, for instance, Salmon 2004, 57–76, for colored plates showing natives tending to the production of abaca and piña cloth, drawn by the Tagalog artist Antonio Malantic for the French commercial mission to China in 1843–1846.
- 6 See Medina 1962; *Ilustración Filipina* 1859, with an accompanying article by Martinez 1859, 37–39.
- 7 On the semiotics of Philippine photography, see Rafael 1995, 133–58; 2000, 76–102.
- 8 Ponce's *Cuestión Filipina: Una exposición histórico-crítica de hechos relativos a la guerra de la independencia* was serialized in Japanese translation in *Keikora Nippo* and published as a book in Tokyo in 1901 and translated into Chinese and published in Shanghai in 1902.
- 9 On the promotion of Balagtas, see *Renacimiento Filipino* 1912, 1279–82; Almario 1992, 159–76.
- 10 The list refers to what have acquired the status of "national" symbols and practices: the traditional nipa hut, a Tagalog love song, a popular folk dance, the native string orchestra, the poetic joust, official celebrations of Balagtas and national heroes, and popular representations of the Filipino/Filipina. See, for instance, Alvina and Santa Maria 1989, 39, 192; Cruz 1992, 6.
- 11 A revised version of Tolentino's work, an anonymous, early twentieth-century colored print entitled *Filipinos Ilustres*, deletes certain features of the original (the trees in the backdrop and the rounded Philippine flag) and turns the heavy drapery gathered at left and right of the stage into representations of the U.S. and Philippine flag, respectively. Two figures from the original are removed (Clemente Zulueta and Pedro Paterno) and four are added (Emilio Jacinto, Cayetano Arellano, Mariano Ponce, and Anacleto del Rosario). While the basic social and political mix of "heroes" in the original is not significantly altered, the print visually locates the group within the explicit frame of U.S.-Philippine "partnership."

Another interesting attempt at pantheonization is a group portrait, captioned *Grupo de Filipinos Ilustres*, in Reyes 1933, page facing 118. It shows fifteen men gathered at a table, posed for the "camera" in the middle of a meeting, before a framed portrait of Rizal draped with a Philippine flag. It is a rather odd mix of characters, with the priests José Burgos, Mariano Gomez, and Jacinto Zamora thrown into the company of industrialists, journalists, and high government officials (Pedro Roxas, Luis Yangco, Rafael del Pan, Benito Legarda, Cayetano Arellano, Antonio Regidor, Macario Adriatico, Enrique Mendiola, Clemente Zulueta, Francisco Liongson, Aguedo Velarde, and Pascual Poblete). Unattributed, this piece may have been done by Fabian de la Rosa (1869–1937), who contributed artwork for the book.

For a postcard version of Tolentino's *Grupo*, see Sta. Maria 1996, 275.

## References

- Almario, Virgilio S. 1984. *Balagtasismo versus modernismo*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1992. *Kung sino ang kumatha kina Bagongbanta, Ossorio, Herrera, Aquino de Belen, Balagtas, atbp*. Metro Manila: Anvil.
- Alvina, Corazon S. and Felice Sta. Maria. 1989. *Halupi: Essays on Philippine culture*. Quezon City: Capitol Pub.
- Ayala Museum. 1988. *Larawan: Immortality and identity in Filipino portraiture*. Makati: Ayala Museum.
- Berger, John. 1972. *Ways of seeing*. London: Penguin Books.
- Cajipe-Endaya, Imelda, Jesus Merino, and Rodolfo Paras-Perez. 1980. *Filipino engraving, 17th to 19th century*. Metro Manila: Ylang-Ylang Graphic Group.
- Cruz, E. Aguilar. 1973. The world of Tolentino. *Expressweek*, 7 June.
- Cruz, Eric V. 1992. *The barong Tagalog: Its development and identity as the Filipino men's national costume*. Quezon City: College of Home Economics, University of the Philippines.
- Hayden, Joseph Ralston. 1942/1972. *The Philippines: A study in national development*. Reprint, New York: Arno Press.
- Joaquin, Nick. 1970. The Filipino portrait and portraying. *Philippines Free Press*, 12 Dec.: 86–87, 110–11.
- Jordanova, Ludmilla. 1998. Science and nationhood: Cultures of imagined communities. In *Imagining nations*, ed. Geoffrey Cubitt, 192–211. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Martinez, F. de P. 1859. La partera. *Ilustración Filipina*, 1 May: 37–39.
- Medina, Isagani R., comp. 1962. *Index to Ilustración Filipina*. Quezon City: The Library, University of the Philippines.
- Miranda-Tchou, Teresita. 1996. Art as political subtext: A Philippine centennial perspective on Francisco Goya's *Junta de la Real Compañía de Filipinas* (1815). *Philippine Quarterly of Culture & Society* 24(3/4): 187–215.
- Mojares, Resil B. 2006. The formation of Filipino nationality under U.S. colonial rule. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture & Society* 34(1): 11–32.
- Paras-Perez, Rodolfo. 1976. *Tolentino*. Manila: National Art Foundation of Malolos.
- Petroski, Henry. 1999. *Remaking the world: Adventures in engineering*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Philippine Commission. 1909. *Report of the Philippine Commission, 1908*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Ponce, Mariano. 1932. *Cartas sobre la revolución, 1897–1900*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Pope, Jean. 1966. Guillermo E. Tolentino: Sculptor and spiritist. *Sunday Times Magazine*, 14 Aug.
- Rafael, Vicente L. 1995. Nationalism, imagery, and the Filipino intelligentsia in the 19th Century. In *Discrepant histories: Translocal essays on Filipino cultures*, ed. Vicente L. Rafael, 133–58. Manila: Anvil.

- . 2000. The undead: Notes on photography in the Philippines, 1898–1920s. In *White love and other events in Filipino history*, 76–102. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Renacimiento Filipino*. 1912. Ang kaarawan ni Balagtas, 28 Mar.: 1279–82.
- Reyes, Jose G. 1933. *Ideales de humanidad*. Manila: n. p.
- Salmon, Claudine. 2004. Les dessins industriels philippins d'Antonio Malantie. *Archipel* 67:57–76.
- Sta. Maria, Felice Prudente. 1996. *In excelsis: The mission of Jose P. Rizal: Humanist and Philippine national hero*. Makati: Studio 5 Designs.
- Saulo, Alfredo B. 1987. *The truth about Aguinaldo and other heroes*. Quezon City: Phoenix Pub.

**Resil B. Mojares** is professor emeritus, Cebuano Studies Center, University of San Carlos, P. del Rosario St., Cebu City, Philippines 6000. He is the author of such books as *Origins and Rise of the Filipino Novel* (1983), *Theater in Society, Society in Theater: Social History of a Cebuano Village, 1840–1940* (1985), *The Man Who Would Be President: Sergio Osmeña and Philippine Politics* (1986), *The War Against the Americans: Resistance and Collaboration in Cebu: 1899–1906* (1999), *Waiting for Mariang Makiling: Essays in Philippine Cultural History* (2002), and *Brains of the Nation: Pedro Paterno, T. H. Pardo de Tavera, Isabelo de los Reyes, and the Production of Modern Knowledge* (2006). <cebstudcntr@usc.edu.ph>