

philippine studies

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

The Authenticity of the Writings Attributed to Father Jose Burgos

John N. Schumacher

Philippine Studies vol. 18, no. 1 (1970): 3–51

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

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

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 30 13:30:20 2008

The Authenticity of the Writings Attributed To Father Jose Burgos

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER

THE publication — or re-publication — of several documents from the Philippine National Archives and other depositories recently¹ has made it possible to take another look at a number of writings about, or attributed to, Father José Burgos. There are in circulation various editions of what purports to be a contemporary narrative of 1872, including excerpts from the record of the court-martial of Fathers Burgos, Gómez and Zamora. Moreover, an alleged novel of Burgos, *La Loba Negra*, has appeared in various printed editions over the last thirty years, as well as in an offset reproduction of the “original manuscript.” Finally, there exist a large number of other works attributed to Burgos, some in manuscript form with the alleged signature of Burgos, others in typescript, and a few actually published in limited editions. Doubts have been expressed at different times and in various quarters as to the authenticity of some or all of these documents, but there seems to be no categorical agreement among historians as to their genuinity or falsity. *La Loba Negra* in particular has been the subject of several literary essays, and various authors have made use of some of the Burgos documents in their accounts of the events of 1872. Moreover, the

¹ John N. Schumacher, S.J., and Nicholas P. Cushner, S.J., “Documents Relating to Father José Burgos and the Cavite Mutiny of 1872,” *Philippine Studies*, 17, 3 (July 1969), 457-529.

approaching centenary of the death of the three martyred priests will undoubtedly lead to other studies and essays on the events of 1872, and if these are to be of any value, it is necessary that the reliability of the sources be thoroughly studied, so as to arrive at a definitive verdict on them, as far as that is possible. The aim of this article will be to assemble the evidence on each of these categories of documents, so as to draw conclusions as to their origin and authenticity.

I. THE DOCUMENTS IN QUESTION

The documents — in the wide sense of the word: printed books, manuscripts, typescript copies — which come under consideration here are the following:

(1) A narrative of the events immediately preceding and following the Cavite mutiny of 1872, allegedly written in 1873 by a Spaniard who was a witness to many of the events, by name, Francisco de Liñán. Included in this work are excerpts from the interrogation of various witnesses at the court-martial of the three priests, and a copy of the sentence passed on them. This work has appeared in at least three editions, as will be described below, each accompanied by further biographical material on Burgos by the respective editors.

(2) The novel written by Burgos, *La Loba Negra*. This has appeared in at least four different editions, perhaps more. One of these, as mentioned above, is an offset reproduction of what is alleged to be the original manuscript, signed by Father Burgos himself, and by Governor-General Carlos Ma. de la Torre.

(3) A series of miscellaneous works of Burgos on the most varied subjects — Philippine history, ethnology, religious as well as anti-religious works, etc. The most complete list of these works is to be found in an article in this quarterly by Mr. Luis Araneta,² who possesses a considerable number of them in manuscript form, signed by Burgos. Others exist in

² Luis Ma. Araneta, "The Works of Father José Burgos," *Philippine Studies*, 7, 2 (April 1959), 187-193. The list is on pp. 189-190, taken from one of the typescript copies in his possession. Mr. Araneta has been most kind in allowing me to examine these manuscripts.

typescript form in the Rizal library of the Ateneo de Manila University,³ and two of them have been published in a single volume in 1941 by anonymous editors.⁴ It is quite probable that other manuscripts or typescript copies are in existence in other private collections. It should be noted also that the various lists of Burgos' writings which exist, e.g., in the printed editions of *La Loba Negra*, and even in the manuscript writings, differ considerably among themselves at times, not only as to the number of items included, but also as to the dates, number of pages, and exact titles of these writings. They also differ from the actual titles to be found on the MSS in the Araneta collection.⁵

II. THE HISTORIA VERIDICA... OF FRANCISCO DE LIÑAN

The first edition of this work known to this writer⁶ is entitled *A la memoria de los tres mártires del clero filipino*,

³ There are six works, bound together under the title of the first in the volume, "Como se forman las religiones." They are numbers 22, 7, 28, 25, 31, and 43 in the Araneta list, though as will be seen below in other cases, there are considerable variations in the exact wording of the titles, and in the dates.

⁴ P. Dr. José A. Burgos *martir filipino. Obras escogidas. Tomo primero.* Cebu: Barba Press, 1941. This volume contains a brief introduction signed "Los editores," dated May 1941, but says nothing of the provenance of the works. The two works included are "La vida del Filipino Pre-histórico," and "Estado de Filipinas antes de la llegada de los Españoles," nos. 8 and 5 in the Araneta list. There is a copy of this book in the Far Eastern University Library, to whose librarian I am grateful for the opportunity to examine the book. It seems that no further volumes were published in this series, whether due to the outbreak of the War or other reasons.

⁵ There is a list in the Luciano de la Rosa edition of *La Loba Negra*, which the editor says he has taken from one published by Melecio Gargueña in *Nueva Era*, June 1951 (pp. xvi-xvii); there is a briefer list in the book of Hermenegildo Cruz referred to in note 32 below (pp. 27-28).

⁶ Mention is sometimes made of a 1931 edition published by Luzuriaga, like the one mentioned in note 7 below. But the 1933 edition by Luzuriaga precisely calls itself "primera edición," and it would seem likely that the attribution of an edition to 1931 rests merely on the prologue to the 1933 work by José E. Marco, which is dated "1° de enero de 1931."

Padres Dr. José Apolonio Burgos, Feliciano Gómez y Jacinto Zamora. Leg. 117 — Causa Esp. 1455. Historia verídica de la sangrienta algarada de Cavite (1872) recopilada por su autor Dn. Francisco de Liñán (1873) con la biografía de algunos, apéndice y anécdotas, recopilado para su publicación. It is said to be “primera edición”, printed in Bacolod, with the date of February 17, 1933, by A. R. de L., who is identified by the signature on the title page as Augusto R. de Luzuriaga.⁷ The second edition of this work is substantially identical with the first, except that there is no indication of place, date, or publisher, nor of the number of copies printed.⁸ A third edition was published in 1963 with a prologue by Luciano de la Rosa, in apparent ignorance of the second edition just mentioned, for the editor in his second prologue⁹ speaks of it as being the second edition of a work first published in Bacolod in 1933. Preceding the contents, which are substantially identical with the first two editions, there are two prologues by de la Rosa and equivalently three title-pages. The first of these, the cover, bears the title *El infame proceso incoado contra los presbíteros filipinos Padres Dr. José Apolonio Burgos, Mariano Gómez y Jacinto Zamora*, followed by the second part of the original title. The title-page itself bears the title *El proceso de los Padres José P. [sic] Burgos, Mariano Gómez y Jacinto Zamora. Reseña virídica [sic] de la algarada caviteña que culminó en el infame proceso y la ejecución en garrote vil de los presbíteros filipinos Doctor P. José P. [sic]*

⁷ There is a copy in the Philippine National Library, originally from the Ronquillo collection. The edition is said to be one of 500 copies.

⁸ The copy in the Rizal Library of the Ateneo de Manila University has a handwritten dedication on the flyleaf from Bishop Isabelo de los Reyes, Jr. to the Honorable Simeon Mandac, dated June 14, 1952, which thus sets a terminal date for its publication. Luciano de la Rosa, on the other hand, in one of his prologues to his 1963 edition (p. iv), cites an article of Teodoro M. Kalaw in *La Vanguardia* for October 1, 1938, in which the latter speaks of the Liñán work as having appeared shortly before (“Hace poco...”). However, no such article of Kalaw’s could be found in the issue cited, and very likely the date is error, possibly for 1933, which therefore is of no help in dating this second edition.

⁹ Fifth unnumbered page following p. xii.

Burgos, Mariano Gómez y Jacinto Zamora el día 17 de Febrero de 1872 en Bagumbayan, Manila. After a prologue citing articles of earlier year by Jaime de Veyra and Teodoro M. Kalaw relevant to the trial, and reproducing a list of Burgos' writings, the title page of the earlier second edition follows, but with the substitution "Segunda edición editada por Luciano de la Rosa." This is followed by another prologue, dated May 15, 1963, in turn succeeded by the prologue of Marco from the original edition.¹⁰

Though this third edition of de la Rosa adds certain further information about Burgos, its substance remains the original Luzuriaga-Marco edition of 1933, and it is this substantial nucleus which will be the subject of discussion here. Thus taken, the work consists essentially of four parts. These are as follows: (1) a prologue, signed, as has been mentioned above, by José E. Marco, and dated in Bacolod 1^o Enero 1931 with the title "Cosas del destino"; (2) "Biografía de P. J. A. Burgos y anécdotas históricas", apparently also the work of Marco, though unsigned; (3) the "Historia Verídica..." of Francisco de Liñán, dated Balabac, 1873, in which are narrated certain events leading up to the outbreak of the Cavite Mutiny and the subsequent arrest and trial of Father Burgos and his colleagues; (4) attached to this account and forming part of it are alleged excerpts from the records of the trial of Burgos. Certain relevant facts may be pointed out with regard to each of these sections.

(1) In his prologue, Marco relates the origin of his work, which, he declares, had been written by Francisco de Liñán, a "Spaniard of pure blood", resident in Manila in 1872, who had set down his account the following year. These papers had somehow been hidden away or lost until 1911, "... the date in which the present writer found the mysterious documents

¹⁰ The "primera edición" of de la Rosa's first title-page perhaps refers to his expanded edition, containing the added prologues. The second prologue, following the original title page where the "segunda edición" is spoken of, is dated May 15, 1963, while the first is dated July 6, 1963.

which had disappeared. . . ."¹¹ It was a chance find, happened upon while engaged in a search for historical documents, working "in combination with" Dr. James Alexander Robertson, then Director of the Philippine National Library. Marco, however, gives no indication of the place of his discovery, nor of the contemporary location of the documents, except to say that "...these documents are now safe in good hands. . . ." There is no indication that Marco himself was in the National Library at this time, nor that he ever made known his discovery to Robertson.¹²

(2) The biography which follows (pp. 5-11) relating what purport to be the principal details of Fr. Burgos' life, is unsigned, but presumably is the work of Marco, since it is not part of the account of Liñán and precedes the facsimile title-page of the latter. The biography is a mixture of fact and fancy, combining what are presumably accurate dates for Burgos' birth, education, etc., with highly improbable, not to say fantastic anecdotes, as well as demonstrably false statements. A few samples will suffice. Father Mariano García, "a renowned Dominican educator" is said to have been his

¹¹ P. 2. This citation and others to this work are given according to the pagination of the second edition, unless otherwise indicated, simply because this edition was most accessible to me. All of them, unless noted otherwise, may likewise be found, however, in the other editions.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2. If the date of 1911 is correct, this is just a year before Marco began supplying Robertson and the Philippine National Library with various Povedano and Pavón manuscripts on pre-Hispanic Philippines, including the so-called Code of Kalantiyaw. These have recently been shown quite conclusively to be forgeries by William Henry Scott in his book, *A Critical Study of the Prehispanic Source Materials for the Study of Philippine History* (Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press, 1968), pp. 104-136. As appears from Dr. Scott's account, all of these documents were sent from Negros through intermediaries to Robertson. When I myself checked with Dr. Scott, he assured me that he was not aware, either from the information he had gathered from those who knew Marco, nor from his own research, that Marco had ever actually worked in the National Library. Moreover, though Robertson was to be unfortunately responsible for making widely known the alleged pre-Hispanic "finds" of Marco, he never gave any indication of being aware of the existence of any Burgos documents.

professor at Letran, when there is no record of any Dominican of that name ever having been in the Philippines.¹³ Governor-General Carlos Ma. de la Torre is pictured as immediately seeking out Burgos on disembarking from the ship which brought him to Manila, ignoring the greetings of the Archbishop who invited him to ride in the archepiscopal carriage, and going off to Malacañan accompanied by Burgos instead.¹⁴ Apart from the improbability of such a public affront to the Archbishop in favor of a priest with whom de la Torre had no previous acquaintance, the simple fact is that Archbishop Gregorio Melitón Martínez was not even in the Philippines at the time of the arrival of de la Torre, having left Manila some days earlier for Rome to take part in the first Vatican Council.¹⁵ The "biography" goes on to relate Burgos' toast to de la Torre at the Malacañan banquet that evening, to which the latter not only replies "Viva Filipinas para los Filipinos", but goes on to ask Burgos to pronounce a lengthy prayer before continuing the rejoicing. On the following day, Burgos, having presided over a Mass of "Te Deum laudamus" [sic] in the Cathedral, "...sang [cantó] a beautiful allocution of his own composition to the Virgin Mother, since he had a privileged

¹³Pp. 5-6. No such person is listed in the exhaustive compilation of Father Hilario Ocio y Viana, O.P., *Compendio de la Reseña biográfica de los religiosos de la provincia del Santísimo Rosario de Filipinas desde su fundación hasta nuestros días* (2 vols.; Manila: Imprenta de la Universidad de Santo Tomás, 1895). It is likely that Marco got the name from the well-known Filipino diocesan priest, Father Mariano García, who was for many years professor and later Rector of the Colegio de San José.

¹⁴Pp. 8-9.

¹⁵Governor-General de la Torre arrived in Manila on June 23, 1869 [José Montero y Vidal, *Historia general de Filipinas desde el descubrimiento de dichas islas hasta nuestros días* (3 vols.; Madrid: Tello, 1887-1895), III, 499]. Archbishop Melitón Martínez left Manila for Hong Kong en route to Europe on the ship *Marqués de Victoria* five days earlier, June 18, 1869 (*Diario de Avisos* [Manila], 18 de Junio 1869). See also de la Torre's *Manifiesto al país sobre los sucesos de Cavite y Memoria sobre la Administración y Gobierno de las Islas Filipinas* (Madrid: Gregorio Hernando, 1872), p. 26 where he mentions in passing that when he arrived in Manila, the Archbishop had already left the Philippines.

voice and a perfect command of Sacred Music."¹⁶ So ridiculous does the biography become at some points that it would not be worth attention, were it not for its relation with other writings attributed to Burgos himself, which will receive consideration below.

(3) The narrative of Liñán is of much the same quality. Burgos is pictured as holding the non-existent office of "Visitador general de las órdenes religiosas",¹⁷ making a mortal enemy of the Archbishop by his efforts to give equal rights to Spanish and Filipino priests in the parishes. He is said to have been seconded by Father Jacinto Zamora, parish priest of Bacoor,

¹⁶ *A la memoria*, pp. 10-11. The *Manifiesto* of de la Torre cited in note 15 was published by him after the Cavite Mutiny to defend himself against having caused the latter by his imprudent policies during his term as Governor-General. Though the first part of the book (pp. i-xix) might be discounted as being an apologia written when he was under attack, the *Memoria* itself (pp. 1-99) was written confidentially for his successor by de la Torre before leaving the Philippines, is dated March 24, 1871, and was already deposited in the archives of the Ministerio de Ultramar in Madrid, so that what is said in this part cannot be interpreted as a later attempt to cover up an earlier policy now under attack. A reading of de la Torre's warnings to his successor on the political unreliability of the Filipino secular clergy, and the necessity of opposing any anti-Friar movement as being essentially anti-Spanish, make clear how totally improbable any such actions as are narrated in the Marco work would have been. See also the documents referred to in n. 1 above, especially pp. 488-490 and 516-517. Finally, had he uttered any such phrase as "Viva Filipinas para los Filipinos," such imprudence would not have failed to be emphasized by the chief source of the attacks on de la Torre, Pedro Gutiérrez y Salazar, *Las proscripciones de Sila (remedo de) en Filipinas por el Excmo. Sr. D. Carlos María de la Torre, Capitán General y Gobernador de estas Islas, bosquejadas a la ligera...* (Madrid: Florencio Gamayo, 1870), since one of Gutiérrez' main points is the politically dangerous conduct of his enemy. Since de la Torre, in the introduction to his *Manifiesto* cited above, tries to show even these milder accusations as calumnious, (pp. x-xi) it is unlikely that Gutiérrez would have let so imprudent a statement pass unnoticed, if it had any semblance of truth. Cf. the bitter attack of Gutiérrez on de la Torre's political actuations, *passim*, e.g., pp. 12-13.

¹⁷ *A la memoria*, p. 14. Other similar instances of ignorance of ecclesiastical organization are to be found scattered through pp. 12-15.

and aided by the wealth of Father Feliciano Gómez.¹⁸ The parish priest of Bacoor was actually Father Gómez, whose surname was, of course, Mariano, and who did actually make substantial financial contributions to the campaign for the rights of the Filipino secular clergy. The dramatic scene of the narrative is the supposed interview witnessed by Liñán from an alcove from which he could hear all, in which the Archbishop demanded from Governor-General Izquierdo that the latter do away with the group of Filipino priests led by Burgos, and offered him manufactured proofs against the priests, prepared in the press of the Augustinian Asilo de Huérfanos.¹⁹ Besides the anachronism of the forged "proofs" being prepared in a printing press not yet in existence then,²⁰ the whole episode is in contradiction not only to the letter of the Archbishop to the Regent, protesting against the suspicions being levelled against Filipino priests,²¹ but likewise to his plea for clemency in February 1872 for any who might be found guilty, and his refusal to defrock the three priests

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 15. This error of the first name of Father Gómez occurs all through the book, including the supposed transcript from the records of the trial. Though the name was corrected to Mariano in the title-page of the de la Rosa edition, even the latter was not consistent in correcting it all through his edition. The error comes from Montero y Vidal, *op. cit.*, p. 579, where the latter inadvertently confuses Feliciano, the nephew, with Mariano, his uncle. The fact that this was a momentary inadvertence is clear, however, since everywhere else in his account, Montero correctly speaks of Fr. Mariano Gómez. Fr. Feliciano Gómez was actually arrested with his uncle, and apparently sentenced to deportation to the Marianas for two years. See Manuel Artigas y Cuerva, *Los sucesos de 1872* (Manila: Imp. de "La Vanguardia," 1911), pp. 115, 162, and the letter of the Archbishop to the Governor General in the documents published in *Philippine Studies*, 17, 3 (July 1969), 516-517. The error of "Liñán" making Zamora parish priest of Bacoor comes from a careless reading of a somewhat complicated sentence in Montero, p. 579, as comparison will show. Zamora was actually acting parish priest of the Manila Cathedral alternating with Burgos, who had been named interim canon of the Cathedral Chapter. See the *Philippine Studies* documents cited above, pp. 524-525.

¹⁹ *A la memoria*, pp. 26-28.

²⁰ It was founded in 1886. See W. E. Retana, *Tablas cronológica y alfabética de imprentas y impresores de Filipinas (1593-1898)*. (Madrid: Suárez, 1908) p. 73, no. 252.

²¹ *Philippine Studies*, 17 (1969), 516-521.

condemned to the garrote.²²

(4) The clearest fabrication of all, however, is the alleged excerpts from the court-martial of the three priests, included in Liñán's supposed account. As early as 1908, Wenceslao E. Retana, the Spanish biographer of Rizal, had called attention to the disappearance of the records of the court-martial of the three priests, affirming that they were not to be found in the archives or offices of the Spanish Ministry of War.²³ A few years later, however, without claiming to have found the full record of the court-martial, Manuel Artigas y Cuerva published in his *Los sucesos de 1872*, a transcription of the sentence passed on those non-military figures who received severe penalties from the court-martial—Fathers Burgos, Gómez, and Zamora, and the laymen Francisco Zaldua, Maximo Inocencio, Crisanto de los Reyes, and Enrique Paraiso.²⁴ He likewise included certain brief excerpts from the testimony given by Zaldua and some others.²⁵ Artigas mentioned no source for his documents, and since his account is clearly incompatible with that given by Liñán-Marco, the question of which author is giving an authentic account naturally arises. According to the Liñán-Marco account, the tribunal was composed of Horacio Sawa, F. O. Esguerra, and J. M. Oreu, and the defense attorney of Burgos was Captain Fontviel [sic]. According to

²² Artigas, p. 135. The original letter of the Archbishop refusing the demand of Izquierdo that the three priests be defrocked, though not yet published, is in the archive of the Servicio Histórico Militar in Madrid (Negociado de Ultramar, Filipinas, Arm. 14, Tab. I, Leg. 4). In it he demands to be shown the evidence of their guilt before he could take such a step. Since Izquierdo refused to do so, the Archbishop in his turn refused to take action against the priests.

²³ See J. Rizal, *El Filibusterismo: Novela Filipina*. Tercera edición prologada y anotada por W. E. Retana (Barcelona: Henrich, 1908), p. 4.

²⁴ Artigas, pp. 130-134. Jaime C. de Veyra, "¿Dónde ha ido a parar la causa del P. Burgos?" *Voz de Manila*, 16 de Febrero de 1953, p. 8, refers to Retana's statement and consequently questions Artigas' version of the sentence. As we have indicated in the article referred to in n. 1 above, the publication of the document from the Philippine National Archives establishes the substantial genuinity of Artigas' version, in spite of its errors of transcription.

²⁵ Artigas, pp. 126-128.

Artigas' account, the tribunal was presided over by Lieutenant-Colonel D. Francisco Moscoso y Lara, and had as its members the officers D. Jose Cañizares, D. Enrique Tobar, D. Eustacio Gijon, D. Federico Novellas, D. Francisco Salado, and D. Jose Montalbo. The texts of the sentence in the two accounts completely differ from each other, to say nothing of numerous other contradictions between the two. The genuinity of at least the sentence in Artigas' account, and the consequent falsity of the Liñán-Marco document, has been made clear by the location of a signed document containing the sentence and the presiding trial officers as published in the article of note 1 above.²⁶

The evidence assembled here leads to only one conclusion, that the *Historia verídica* of Francisco de Liñán, together with its annexes and "documents", is a forgery and of no historical value. A careful comparison of the account given by Montero y Vidal in his *Historia general de Filipinas*²⁷ with the work of Liñán will show the ineptness with which the latter work was composed, selecting random names from Montero's account, e.g., of the battle in Cavite, for the presiding officer of the court-martial and the defender of Burgos; repeating the inadvertence of Montero at one point (but corrected everywhere else in his account) in confusing Fathers Mariano and Feliciano Gómez; misunderstanding a sentence in Montero's account, so as to make Fr. Zamora parish priest of Bacoor; etc.²⁸ It is significant that in spite of the fact that Marco claimed to have found the Liñán document in 1911, just at the time when Artigas was first beginning to publish his account,²⁹ he did not venture to publish it until 1931. By then Artigas was already dead,³⁰ and unable to give the source for his genuine, if some-

²⁶ *Philippine Studies*, 17 (1969), 522-529.

²⁷ See especially Montero, pp. 570-574.

²⁸ See note 18 above.

²⁹ The book was first published in serial form in *Renacimiento Filipino* (Manila), from vol. I, no. 30 (14 de Febrero de 1911) to no. 45, (7 de Junio de 1911). There are certain further revisions in the book later published, but not of a substantial nature.

³⁰ Artigas died in 1925. See E. Arsenio Manuel, *Dictionary of Philippine Biography* (Quezon City: Filipiniana Publications, 1955-), I, 68.

what carelessly published, account, which would have demonstrated the non-genuinity of the Liñán document.³¹

III. LA LOBA NEGRA

The novel attributed to Burgos, *La Loba Negra*, is closely related to other unpublished works alleged to have been authored by him, as will be seen below, and likewise has certain obvious points of contact with the apocryphal Liñán account. But for clarity's sake, it can perhaps best be treated separately, judging it on its own merits, before investigating its relationship to other works. Unpublished during the lifetime of Burgos, it seems first to have appeared publicly in 1938 when it is said to have been published in a limited edition of one hundred copies by Augusto R. de Luzuriaga, the earlier publisher of Liñán's *Historia verídica*. This edition is unknown to the present writer and its existence is inferred from its mention by Hermenegildo Cruz in his biographical essay on Burgos in 1941.³² Referring to the copyright by Luzuriaga, Cruz says:

³¹ The latter part of the book pp. 80-84—whether purporting to come from Liñán or not, it is not clear—contains absurd correspondence between Burgos and a supposed Franciscan, Father Gerónimo de Santa Olalla, O. de S.F.F. (a meaningless designation, for a Franciscan, whose name would be followed by the initials O.F.M. as any ecclesiastic like Burgos would know). In the course of the supposed correspondence, the Franciscan is mysteriously transmuted into a Dominican—O.P. There then follows an apocryphal Royal Order of 18 Agosto 1872 commuting the penalties of those condemned by the court-martial, including such names as Rafael María Labra (Republican deputy for Cuba, who was never even in the Philippines) and Manuel Regidor (who had left the Philippines for Spain in 1869, and who at the time of the supposed Royal Order, was working for the revision of the sentence on his brother Antonio and others exiled to the Marianas). The alleged Father de Santa Olalla exists in neither the Dominican nor Franciscan biographical dictionaries. The names of Labra and Regidor, who were undoubtedly supporting the liberal movement in the Philippines from Spain, were apparently selected at random by Marco from Montero y Vidal's history of the period, with the same carelessness remarked in note 18 above.

³² Hermenegildo Cruz, *El P. Burgos, precursor de Rizal. Breve ensayo acerca del gran patriota agarrotado cuyos sacrificios fueron la inspiración del Héroe Nacional* (Manila: Librería "Manila Filatélica," 1941), p. 29. There is in the National Library a typescript copy of this Luzuriaga edition mentioned by Cruz, except that, in this copy,

... This gentleman, now deceased, is in no way related to the author [Burgos]. In his application for registration of the above-mentioned work, presented to the National Library, he has not included any document which might certify his right to the literary ownership of the book except for his own declaration in the printed form claiming ownership. But no one knows by what right, since he does not affirm that he is the author, nor even that he is the heir of the author. . . . Yet when the book was printed, the following words appeared on the title-page: "Literary rights are reserved by the publisher, in accordance with a legal agreement with the owners of the original."³³

Cruz himself published large excerpts from the novel in his book on Burgos, but again without indicating their provenance, though he mentions the existence of a large number of other Burgos manuscripts.³⁴ A few weeks after the publication of the original article of Cruz on which his later book was based,³⁵ Pio Brun, editor of the review *Democracia*, began the publication of the novel by installments, as the first volume of a proposed collection entitled "Escritores Filipinos del siglo XIX".³⁶ The volume seems to have remained incomplete, due to the outbreak of the War, and the death of Brun at the hands of the Japanese.³⁷

The edition commonly in use today is that published in following the statement that this edition is limited to one hundred numbered copies, it declares itself to be "No. Extra." In the failure to locate any printed copy of the alleged 1938 edition of Luzuriaga, one can only speculate about its actual relation to such an edition.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

³⁵ According to the prefatory note of Guillermo Masangkay (*ibid.*, pp. 11-22) dated in August 1941, the original article had appeared in *La Vanguardia* for June 18, 1941. It was Masangkay who had offered to republish it in the book form which has been consulted here. In it there had been made some additions, according to Masangkay.

³⁶ The Brun edition was apparently distributed by separate fascicles together with *Democracia*, since the bound volume of the latter for 1941, though announcing that it would publish it in succeeding numbers, does not contain it within the text itself. There is a bound copy of the Brun edition in the National Library, ending on p. 80 in the middle of a sentence, thus leaving a section amounting to about 12 pages in the de la Rosa edition unfinished. The publication of the Brun edition began, it would seem from its preface, in July 1941.

³⁷ See note 36, and the preface by Luciano de la Rosa in the edition described in note 38, p. 1.

1958 by Luciano de la Rosa,³⁸ who denominated it "Primera edición", referring in his prologue to the incomplete edition of Brun, but making no mention of any prior publication by Luzuriaga. Two years later, perhaps spurred on by doubts expressed as to the authenticity of the edition of de la Rosa, there appeared an offset reproduction of "the original manuscript" of the novel, again without indication of its location or provenance.³⁹

Before considering the internal evidence with regard to the authorship of the novel, common to all its editions, it will simplify our task to give prior attention to this "original manuscript". For there is clear evidence that, whatever may be the relation of this manuscript to the published printed editions, and whatever may be said of the genuinity of these latter, the so-called "original manuscript" is in fact a forgery. This assertion rests principally on two facts: (1) the evidences in the manuscript text itself that it has been copied from some other source, be that other source printed or manuscript; (2) the false signatures of Father Burgos and Governor-General de la Torre contained in the manuscript. Certain other points, not by themselves perhaps probative, confirm the evidence under the first two headings.

Before treating these points, a brief description of the "original manuscript" edition is in order. It consists of 276 pages, written in a generally legible hand, on official stamped paper of 2 reales, such as was required for official documents

³⁸ *La Loba Negra. Novela verídica (histórica)*, por el Dr. Padre José A. Burgos. Prólogo por Luciano de la Rosa. (Manila, 1958). Pp. i-xix, 9-99.

³⁹ *La Loba Negra. (Novela histórica)*, por Dr. José A. Burgos, miembro del clero filipino, 1869. Primera reproducción al "offset printing" del manuscrito original. (Quezon City: R. Martinez and Sons, 1960 [copyright]). Pp. 273. The 273 pages are the actual number in this edition, since the "original manuscript" reproduced is erratic in its pagination, sometimes skipping a number while continuing the text; in fact the final page which should be, according to the copyist's numeration 276, is actually written as 176. References will be given below to the correct numeration of the Martinez edition, rather than to the erratic numbers of the manuscript.

during the Spanish regime.⁴⁰ Every second page is authenticated in the margin with the initials "J.A.B." (i.e., José Apolonio Burgos). The text of the novel, as found in the printed editions ends on page 268 with the words "Consumatum [sic] est." This, however, is followed by a kind of epilogue, summarizing the story, closing on page 275 with the signature, "José Apolonio Burgos", and the date "18 dias Julio [sic] de 1869". This in turn is followed by a certification continuing on to the next page, signed by the "Archivero de la Real Audiencia, Antonio de Guzmán", to the effect that he had received the manuscript totalling 176 [sic] pages initialled by their author, and that he had been reimbursed for the cost of the stamped paper by Governor-General de la Torre to the amount of 136 *reales fuertes*. This certification is in turn countersigned by Governor de la Torre himself, as may be seen in the accompanying photographic reproductions of the pages.⁴¹

When one turns to examine the text itself, a careful reading of certain sections reveals unfinished words, or omissions of words, and even of whole lines and paragraphs. All of these, of course, clearly show that this "original manuscript" has been copied from another source. A few examples will illustrate this. Thus the sentence quoted below from the manuscript edition makes no sense, because in starting page 44, the copyist lost sight of the point at which he had ended page 43, and thus omitted essential words:

Usia (contestó uno); está ausente con motivo de [p. 44] en el puerto de Cavite del galeón Sto. Cristo de Burgos...

A comparison with the corresponding passage in the printed edition of 1958 shows (along with other verbal variations) that the writer of the "original manuscript" missed the words "la llegada" in the text he was copying from, as he turned the page in his manuscript:

⁴⁰ Since the stamped paper would be folded, each sheet would contain four pages for writing; thus only every fourth page bears the official stamp (if it be genuine) for the years 1838 and 1839, but validated by a further stamped notation for the years 1840 and 1841.

⁴¹ See plate 1, below. I am grateful to Brother William Yam, S.J. for the photographs of the signatures reproduced in the plates here.

Usia, ese señor se halla ausente con motivo de *la llegada* al puerto de Cavite del galeón Santo Cristo de Burgos...⁴²

Another similar instance of this type of copyist's error may be seen in the passage which reads as follows in the two versions:

1960 "original manuscript"	1958 printed edition
...tres sacos de onzas de oro y dos cajas que son en total 12 mil reales fuertes...	...tres sacos de onzas de oro y dos cajas <i>de plata</i> que son en total 12 mil reales fuertes...

The omission in the manuscript of the phrase "de plata" of the printed edition deprives the sentence of good sense.⁴³

Neither of these examples, nor other similar ones which could be multiplied here, necessarily proves, of course, that the 1960 "original manuscript" was copied directly from the 1958 printed edition, and the considerable verbal variations could even be used as an argument that it was not, at least not carefully. It could have been based on one of the printed editions, however, roughly paraphrasing the sense at some points, attempting to copy it literally at others. Or, if one wishes, it could have been copied from another source. But what is clear in any explanation, is that it is a *copy*, and not the original manuscript of Burgos it purports to be, in spite of the alleged certifications and signatures.

The detection of forged signatures is a rather delicate and uncertain task for one who is not a professional handwriting expert, as the controversies surrounding the authenticity of Rizal's signature on his retraction of Masonry should make clear. Even the intelligent and observant amateur can scarcely have great certainty in distinguishing between a genuine signature and a skillful attempt to copy it. But in the case at hand there are several factors which allow us to come to more certain

⁴² MS ed. (1960), pp. 44-45; de la Rosa edition (1958), p. 22. Italics supplied. The Brun edition (p. 21) and the typescript edition attributed to Luzuriaga (p. 11), have the same text as de la Rosa.

⁴³ MS (1960), p. 52; de la Rosa, p. 24. The Brun edition (p. 23) and the typescript edition attributed to Luzuriaga (p. 14), have the same text as de la Rosa. Italics supplied.

conclusions. The first of these is that in the extant, and certainly genuine, signatures which we possess of Father Burgos, he always signs himself simply "Jose Burgos". This is true of all the documents which have been examined in the archives of the Archdiocese of Manila; it is likewise true of those from the Philippine National Archives.⁴⁴ The only place, as far as this writer is aware, that the signatures "José Apolonio Burgos" or "José A. Burgos" or the initials "J.A.B." appear is in this "original manuscript" whose authenticity is here in question, and in the other manuscripts to be considered in the next section of this article, which are themselves even more obviously forgeries, as we hope to show.

The second factor is that since the presumed forger did not have at hand authentic signatures of Burgos nor of de la Torre, he had no models to imitate, so that the great discrepancy between the certainly genuine signatures and those on the alleged "original manuscript" seems obvious to the most untrained eye. Particularly notable is the absence of the characteristic *rubrica* or intricate flourish beneath the signatures on the "original manuscript". No educated Spaniard, at least in the nineteenth century, signed his name without the characteristic *rubrica*.⁴⁵

Given the evidence which has been outlined here, it will perhaps not be necessary to do more than indicate a few other implausibilities of the "original manuscript", limiting ourselves to the sections which do not appear in the printed versions. Can any plausible reason be given why a novel should be written on the stamped paper demanded for official documents? Or is there any probable reason why the Governor-General would himself authorize the disbursement of funds necessary to pay for such paper, which, incidentally, was of a date thirty years earlier than the supposed date of composition, and there-

⁴⁴ For a specimen of Burgos' certainly genuine signature see the signature in Plate 2, from the archives of the Archdiocese of Manila. I am grateful to Mr. Thomas O'Brien for this and other signatures of Father Burgos. For a reproduction of Burgos' alleged signature in the "original manuscript" being questioned here, see Plate 2a.

⁴⁵ See Plate 3 for a reproduction of Governor-General de la Torre's genuine signature.

to. De 176 fajos utiles;
 De las cuales, yo el
 el Archivero de la R.^a
 Audiencia me remito.
 Manila a 2 dias
 del mes de Agosto del
 Año del Sr. de 1869.
 El Archivero.
 Auto de Su Magestad.
 P. J. J.
 Testiguados:
 Carlos M. de Salazar.
 J. J. J.

matrimonio de Don Manuel Joaquín de Alar
 de la Frontera y Doña Francisca de los Ríos
 de esta Ciudad. Fueron sus Padrinos Don Die-
 go Borde y Doña Carmen y Doña Ana
 na, a quienes se advirtió el parentesco espiritual
 - D. Julián de Castro -
 La cual partida está firmada en el original a
 veinte y siete de Agosto de 1780 de Milán
 y
 José Burgos

las y finas.
 Ojala que Dios en su
 infinita sabiduría y
 justicia haga perdona-
 do las culpas de estas
 desdichadas ya que el
 error es humano.

Manila a 18 días
 del mes de Julio de 1869.

Lanus Deo.

El Autor.

José M. Burgos.

Certifico por el pre-
 sente como Archivero de
 la Real Audiencia que ha
 sido reintegrada por el
 capitán y Gobern. Genl. D.
 Carlos M. de Force y va
 encerrada la suma de R⁴

fore invalid? Is it likely that Governor-General de la Torre, some six weeks after his arrival, would have ordered that a mediocre, and from a Spanish point of view, subversive novel, written by a Filipino priest previously unknown to him, be filed in the Archive of the Royal Audiencia (if there was such an archive), particularly since the Audiencia was by this period a purely judicial body?⁴⁶ Is it likely on the other hand, that this same Governor-General who collaborates in the preservation of the manuscript in the archives is the one who put Burgos under surveillance and warned the Archbishop that this priest was among those suspect of disloyalty to Spain?⁴⁷

What has been said to this point discredits only the alleged "original manuscript" edition of *La Loba Negra*. The fact of the inauthenticity of this manuscript, however, does not necessarily exclude that the printed editions may have been based on some other authentic manuscript, and therefore be a genuine work of Burgos. This is especially true since, as will be pointed out below, the relationships of dependence between the different existing editions of the novel are quite complicated, and if it cannot be said that the printed editions are dependent on this so-called manuscript edition, neither can it be established with certainty that the latter is clearly dependent on any particular one of them.⁴⁸

Before analyzing the internal evidence of the printed editions of the novel, however, a few words should be said concerning its structure and plot, as they exist in all editions substantially. As a matter of fact, it can scarcely be called a novel, but is rather a rambling chronicle, interspersed with comments, reflections, and amplifications by the novelist. Allegedly it is based on the book of a Spaniard called Pedro Alejo de Mendoza, entitled *Las Crónicas de los Acontecimientos de Manila*, written in 1793.⁴⁹ So confused is the mixture that it is sometimes difficult to know whether at a particular point one is reading the "historical" data of Mendoza or the novelist's

⁴⁶ MS (1960), pp. 272-273.

⁴⁷ See the documents referred to in note 1, pp. 488-489, 516-517.

⁴⁸ See the discussion in the Appendix on the inter-relation of the various editions.

⁴⁹ *La Loba Negra*, ed. de la Rosa, p. 15.

reconstruction of it, particularly since the sub-title of the work insists that it is a "*novela histórica (verídica)*."

The story revolves around the assassination of Governor-General Fernando de Bustamante y Bustillo in 1719 by a mob led, or instigated, by Friars. After the death of her husband, the story relates, the widow of Bustamante resolved to avenge his death. Making herself the leader of a band of *tulisanes* or bandits, "La Loba Negra" strikes terror into the countryside, above all concentrating on the assassination of various Friars responsible for her husband's death. After her death in battle, she is succeeded by her daughter, known as "Sargenta Betay." Chapter eight ends dramatically, referring to the latter:

Who is this mysterious woman? Did the authorities succeed in capturing her alive? Let us see what this true narrative relates further on, and let us see if this unfortunate woman had the right or not to take revenge on certain ones.⁵⁰

Having thus prepared the reader for exciting episodes in the life of Sargenta Betay, the novel suddenly breaks off the narrative, and concludes in the following chapter with reflections of the author on the future of the Philippines.⁵¹ It is almost as if the novelist had forgotten what he had written, and merely inserted this independent essay at the end of his book.

Apart from the plot and structure, a second characteristic which strikes the reader familiar with Spanish, is the notably deficient grasp of the language, scarcely credible in one whose father was a peninsular Spaniard, who was educated in the Spanish-speaking college and university of Manila, was reputed to be of the most superior talent, and was promoted to high positions in the Church.⁵² The strange inability of Burgos to express himself coherently in Spanish becomes even more strange if one compares the language of *La Loba Negra* with that of the undoubtedly genuine, though anonymous, pamphlet of Burgos written to defend the memory of Father Peláez after

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 81-88.

⁵² See Artigas, pp. 119-122 for biographical details.

the latter's death.⁵³ The deficiency of the novel in this respect is so glaring that when republishing it in 1958, Luciano de la Rosa was moved to apologize for it:

The reader will have remarked in the novel not a few stylistic faults [incorrecciones de estilo] in the expression of the thoughts. All this, however, can be attributed to the situation of the days in which it was written and prepared by Father Burgos, and does not diminish as a whole the historical foundation of the novel.⁵⁴

To another reader, however, the stylistic incorrectness may seem rather the effect of a lack of command of the Spanish language than merely the fruit of hurried composition, especially if he keeps in mind the example of the *Manifiesto* cited above, itself composed in some haste for journalistic purposes, but without the incorrectness of style and language.

Related to the matter of language is the resemblance in style and language in a number of instances between the *La Loba Negra* and the works of Rizal, especially his novels. Hermenegildo Cruz made this the theme of his small book published in 1941, *El P. Burgos, precursor de Rizal*,⁵⁵ and attention has been called to various passages of marked similarity by

⁵³ *Manifiesto que a la Noble Nación Española dirigen los leales filipinos en defensa de su honra y fidelidad gravemente vulneradas por el periodico "La Verdad" de Madrid* (Manila, 1864). For Burgos's authorship of this pamphlet, see Artigas, pp. 85-86, 123. It was reprinted by the Propaganda movement in 1888.

⁵⁴ "Post Scriptum," *La Loba Negra*, p. 89. In an article which only came to my notice after this paper was substantially completed, an anonymous writer who signs himself "E.F.L." writing in *El Debate*, 16 de Agosto de 1958, has called attention to the series of articles written in the same newspaper in 1941 by Professor Jaime C. de Veyra, in which the latter refuted the authenticity of the novel on various grounds. The 1958 writer quotes at length Professor de Veyra's detailed critique of the "novel" on account of its deplorable use of Spanish, its historical errors, and its anti-religious sentiments, as published in the article of 31 de Agosto de 1941. Unfortunately I have not been able to locate the 1941 articles of de Veyra, undoubtedly written as a result of the publication by Brun, but the article of E.F.L., entitled "'La Loba Negra' no se ha escrita por el P. Burgos como se afirma," reproduces the one mentioned above at considerable length. I am grateful to Mrs. L. de Veyra Sevilla and Mother Rosario de Veyra, R.A, for making this article available to me, together with others cited in notes 66 and 110.

⁵⁵ See notes 32 and 35 above.

other writers since. There can be little doubt of the influence of Burgos, or at least of Burgos' tragic fate, on Rizal and his thought, but a closer look at some of the supposed echoes of Burgos in Rizal's works might suggest that it was rather Rizal's writings which influenced certain passages in *La Loba Negra*. A comparison of the similar passages will likewise show the limited command of the Spanish language possessed by the author of the latter work in comparison to Rizal whom he attempted to imitate. An example may be found in the words pronounced by Father Florentino in the closing paragraph of the *El Filibusterismo* after hurling Simoun's casket of jewels into the ocean depths, and those pronounced by the widow of Bustamante, "Loba Negra", in the presence of the Friar whom she is about to have executed by her band of *tulisanes*.⁵⁶

El Filibusterismo

—¡Que la naturaleza te guarde en los profundos abismos, entre los corales y perlas de sus eternos mares! Cuando para un fin santo y sublime los hombres te necesitan, Dios sabrá sacarte del seno de las olas. . . . Mientras tanto, allí no harás el mal, no torcerás el derecho, no fomentarás avaricias!

La Loba Negra

Allí en el cementerio descansa [the body of her husband] . . . Con él quedan también sepultados en el archivo de este país los anales. Para cuando la humanidad y la justicia de estos naturales lo necesitan para un fin sagrado ya sabrán sacarlos de sus polvorientos cajones con un espíritu de imparcialidad y justicia y hacerla conocer al mundo.

The inter-relation of the two passages with their reference to a treasure lying hidden until needed by men for a sacred end, is evident. But it is hard to conceive Rizal having been inspired to his poetic conception by the prosaic and forced image of *La Loba Negra*; it is rather the latter which is a clumsy attempt to imitate the image created by Rizal.

The same clumsiness in the use of images may be seen in the echoes of Rizal's *Ultimo Adios* to be found in Burgos' supposed apostrophe to his fellow countrymen.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ The quotation from *El Filibusterismo* is taken from the off-set reproduction of the original edition (Quezon City: R. Martinez & Sons, 1958), p. 286. The quotation from *La Loba Negra* is from the de la Rosa edition, p. 56; it is likewise found in Cruz, pp. 83-84, with certain grammatical variations or errors.

⁵⁷ *Escritos de José Rizal*, Tomo III: *Obras literarias*, Libro

Ultimo Adios

Y cuando en noche oscura, se
 envuelva el cementerio,
 Y solos sólo muertos queden
 velando allí;
 No turbes su reposo, no turbes el
 misterio;
 Tal vez acordes oigas de cítara o
 salterio:
 Soy yo, querida Patria, yo que te
 canto a ti.

* * *

Entonces nada importa me pongas
 en olvido;

* * *

Voy donde no hay esclavos,
 verdugos ni opresores;
 Donde la fe no mata, donde el
 que reina es Dios.

La Loba Negra

Entonces olvidadme...mas si
 algun dia oyeras en su [sic]
 silencio el sencillo cantico de un
 pajarillo, soy yo, yo que te ruego
 a ti, querido hermano, defiendas
 tu tierra querida, tus hermosos
 valles... entonces solamente estaré
 tranquilo en aquel reino de verdad,
 donde la injusticia no pone sus
 pies, el verdadero reino de bon-
 dad...

One final example which might be pointed out among others is the similiarity of theme and details between Don Emilio M. Melgar and his wife of *La Loba Negra* and Rizal's *Simoun*.⁵⁸ Like *Simoun*, Melgar is a fabulously wealthy jeweler-merchant, who goes about the provinces under this guise for months at time. Again like *Simoun*, his origin is unknown, some thinking him from New Spain, others, the Antilles or the British Indies, etc. But whereas *Simoun's* disguise serves his purpose of being able to stir up discontent in different parts of the country without his travels falling under suspicion, the disguise adopted by Sargenta Betay, the daughter of Bustamante, and her husband, a leader of the *tulisanes*, which serves to bring them down from the mountains into the walled city of Manila, (presumably so as to ascertain the condition of its defenses), culminates in nothing more than an attack on the *outlying suburb* of Dilao. The entire episode seems pointless in *La Loba Negra*, whereas the assumed role of *Simoun* as portrayed in *El Filibusterismo* is essential to the plot of the

primero: *Poesias por José Rizal* (Manila: Comisión Nacional del Centenario de José Rizal, 1961), p. 139; de la Rosa, p. 86; Cruz, pp. 85-86. Similar echoes of Rizal may be found in de la Rosa, p. 70, in the words of Magpantay over the dying "Loba Negra."

⁵⁸ The section on D. Emilio M. Melgar and his wife is in de la Rosa, pp. 72-76.

entire novel. It seems difficult to assume that Rizal would have conceived such a figure from the fleeting episode of the Melgars in a supposed Burgos manuscript to which he had access, but on the other hand, the interdependence of the two figures seems clear. One should conclude then that it is *La Loba Negra* which depends on *El Filibusterismo*, rather than the contrary.

Further analysis of the text of the novel reveals that if one accepts it as a genuine work of Father Burgos, the supposed priest-novelist is so unfamiliar with ecclesiastical terminology as to speak of "administering confession" ("le administrara la confesión,"),⁵⁹ a priest holding a high position in Church administration so unfamiliar with the division of ecclesiastical territories as to put a Dominican in an Augustinian parish and a Recoleta in a Franciscan parish.⁶⁰ Accepting the Burgos authorship, one will have to suppose a resident of Manila who thought that the then suburban district of Manila known as Dilao in the eighteenth century was the Ermita of his own day, rather than Paco.⁶¹ Stranger still for an inhabitant of Manila, he is under the illusion that the chapel in the district of Ermita he identifies with Dilao could be three *leguas* (over eleven kilometers) from one in Malate.⁶² Finally, a priest who is not known ever to have been accused even by his enemies of being anything but an exemplary priest, and who was praised for his religious spirit by some who disagreed with his

⁵⁹ de la Rosa, p. 62.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63. Hagonoy, which is given a Dominican priest, was Augustinian; Umingan, given a Recoleta, was Franciscan. Both of these parishes were such from their foundation to the time of Burgos.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 77. The suburban village, known officially as San Fernando de Dilao, by the latter part of the nineteenth century was commonly being called even by the Spaniards by the common name of Paco, which became the official name in the 20th century. See the article on "Paco" in the *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada Europeo-Americana*, tomo 40, p. 1351. Also *Atlas of the Philippine Islands*, ed. by José Algué, S.J. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900) map no. 29.

⁶² de la Rosa, p. 78. The actual distance from one extreme of Ermita to the other extreme of Malate is nearer to 3 *kilometers*.

activity in the secularization controversy,⁶³ must have been all the while a consummate hypocrite, secretly holding such a contempt for the religion whose priest he was, as to hold up to Filipino mothers the following ideal for their daughters:

Do not permit that they be for a moment under the sway of religious fanaticism; see to it that they learn the great achievements of their companions in foreign countries, where they have substituted the book of sciences for the rosary, the classrooms for the church and their room in their own homes for the confessional.⁶⁴

Some explanation might perhaps be excogitated to give a possible reconciliation of one or other of such inconsistencies as have been pointed out here. To explain them all, would seem clearly to require more ingenuity than can be demanded of a serious historian. Not only is the supposed "original manuscript" reproduced by offset printing in 1960 a forgery, but so is the novel itself in all its editions, no less than the apocryphal account of Francisco de Liñán.

IV. OTHER WORKS ATTRIBUTED TO BURGOS

Were further confirmation needed of the fact that *La Loba Negra* is not the work of Burgos, such a confirmation can be found in the other published and unpublished works attributed to him. An analysis of them points to their all having proceeded from the same source, and likewise indicates that the ultimate source is the same as that of the novel. Our procedure will be to examine individual works or homogeneous groups of works one by one, to establish in each case that none of them was actually written by Burgos. In the process, it will be possible to indicate their source, and something of the history of their composition.

⁶³ Cf. Pablo Pastells, S.J., *Misión de la Compañía de Jesús en Filipinas en el siglo XIX* (3 vols.; Barcelona: Henrich, 1916-1917), III, 439 for the letter of the Jesuit Superior, Father Pedro Bertrán to Governor-General Izquierdo in October 1872, in which he tells how he admonished Burgos against carrying on the secularization campaign in the public forum. There is other testimony to the religious spirit of Burgos by contemporary Jesuits, in the Archivo de la Provincia de Tarragona de la Compañía de Jesús, in San Cugat del Vallés, (Barcelona) Spain.

⁶⁴ de la Rosa, pp. 86-87.

The first of these writings to emerge into public notice was that mentioned above, entitled *P. Dr. José A. Burgos, martir filipino. Obras escogidas*.⁶⁵ Volume I, the only one known to have been published in this series, contains the two works mentioned in note 4 above, each part being preceded by a photograph of the title-page of the "original manuscript", signed by "José A. Burgos", with the respective dates 1864 and 1866. The book contains an introduction by "Los Editores" (anonymous), which, however, gives no hint as to where these alleged writings of Burgos may have come from, or why they came to light only at this late date. The alleged prologue of Burgos mentions the "Archivo de la Real Audiencia de S.M." (so often referred to as a source in *La Loba Negra*) as the depository from which he has culled so much information concerning details of pre-Hispanic Filipino society,⁶⁶ and throughout the book there are specific references to exact *legajos*, *cajones*, and *estantes* in which these documents are to be found. But inasmuch as no indication of how Burgos was admitted to such extensive and detailed examination of the archive of the Audiencia is given, anyone having any notion of the jealous relations existing between the Audiencia and either civil or Church authorities, will be more than a little incredulous. Such incredulity can only increase when one reflects on the enormous mass of documentation of the Spanish bureaucracy (what remains of it today in the Philippine National Archives is estimated at over eleven million pages), and tries to imagine how a man like Burgos, holding various posts in the Church, could have had time in these few years to have searched

⁶⁵ See note 4 above.

⁶⁶ *Obras escogidas*, p. xv. E. F. L., "Como 'La Loba Negra', Otras Obras Más, Erroneamente Atribuidas Al P. Burgos," *El Debate*, 30 de Agosto de 1958, cites Msgr. Gabriel M. Reyes, writing in *Lungsuranon* (Cebu, 25 de Junio de 1941), mentioning Sr. P. D. Delfin as one of the publishers. In this article and one of 2 de Julio de 1941, Msgr. Reyes went on to show the inauthenticity of these works, both on the ground of their poor Spanish, especially the use of Anglicisms, and their un-Catholic content, unbelievable in a Doctor of Theology like Father Burgos. He likewise points to the incredibility of Burgos having written the 42 works attributed to him in so few years.

through all this vast material culling out occasional stray references to pre-Hispanic Philippines.

Even a cursory examination of the contents of the book will confirm the historian's incredulity. Chapter VI, for example, goes on at great length describing the gradual awakening of the Philippines in the period between the middle of the 18th and the middle of the 19th centuries in terms which are actually a description of the last two or three decades of the 19th century — e.g., demonstrations against the priests, the spread of the liberal ideas of Europe and a knowledge of events in other parts of the world in Manila "and other principal towns."⁶⁷ The author continues by "prophesying" that Religion will in the future ally itself with opposition to the movement for reform, so that priests will become "objects of scorn, ill-will, and distrust among our own fellow-countrymen." As a result of this, the author "foresees" even into the twentieth century when perhaps "...our own fellow-countrymen may come to form in our beloved country new religious groups, perhaps another more liberal nation may bring them into this country...."⁶⁸ Even more remarkably for a book allegedly written in 1866, he goes on to quote (calling him a writer of the 18th century) the book of Jagor, which was published in German in 1873 and translated into Spanish in 1875.⁶⁹ A somewhat different manifestation of the author's carelessness with time periods is the seventh chapter of this book, supposedly dealing with the pre-Hispanic Filipino, which is devoted to a description of a fiesta at which Burgos and his father were present, replete with characters, ideas, and expressions taken from the description of the supper at the house of Capitán Tiago in the opening chapters of Rizal's *Noli me tângere*.⁷⁰

After this, it would seem superfluous to attempt any detailed analysis of the second work in the same volume beyond

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 50 ff.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 40 See Fedor Jagor, *Reisen in den Philippinen* (Berlin, 1873), translated into Spanish by Sebastián Vidal y Soler as *Viajes por Filipinas* (Madrid, 1875).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 57-67.

noting that its title-page is similarly graced with a "signature" of Burgos, and proclaims that its data have been "...extracted from the Museums of Great Britain, France and Portugal..."⁷¹ though no indication is given of how Burgos, who never left the Philippines, was able to explore the contents of these European museums. Though the book is replete with citations of such standard chroniclers as Zúniga, San Agustin, San Antonio, etc. (never, however supplying page numbers), it somewhat over-reaches itself when it cites "...Ferrando and Fonseca in their modern *Historia de Filipinas*, Madrid, 1870..."⁷², quite unaware, it would seem, that a work allegedly written in 1864 is citing from a book published six years later.⁷²

Some indications of its real author may be gathered from a few random details which are clearly related to the so-called "Povedano manuscript of 1578," a spurious work which has been shown to have its source in the same José E. Marco responsible for the *Historia veridica* of Liñan.⁷³ For example, we learn that the primitive name of the Philippines was Iraya (p.73), that the island of Negros had as one of its rulers the "reyesuelo Manapolá" (p. 97), that the primitive Negritos had practiced trepanation of skulls (p. 7), etc. All of these details are unknown to historians except from the spurious Povedano manuscript, and would thus indicate that likewise these spurious Burgos manuscripts proceeded from the same sources.⁷⁴

Unfortunately, these two forgeries were only the beginning of a series of "Burgos manuscripts" which continued to come to light in that year of 1941. The month following the appear-

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 164. No such book exists, of course, but the author undoubtedly had in mind the work by Juan Ferrando, O.P., *Historia de los pp. Dominicos en las Islas Filipinas y en sus misiones del Japón, China, Tung-kin y Formosa*, ed. by Joaquín Fonseca, O.P. (6 vols.; Madrid, 1870-1872).

⁷³ Scott, pp. 125-128,136.

⁷⁴ Cf. Rebecca Ignacio, (ed), *The Povedano Manuscript of 1578* ("Philippine Studies Program Transcript No. 3"; Chicago, 1954), pp. 2, 39, 49.

ance of the above works there appeared in the June 18th number of *La Vanguardia* the lengthy article by Hermenegildo Cruz referred to earlier, which was published in book form the following November under the title *El P. Burgos, precursor de Rizal*.⁷⁵ In this book Cruz mentions that Burgos had left more than forty other manuscripts, in addition to the novel *La Loba Negra*, of which two had recently been published, those discussed above.⁷⁶ A few weeks later the complete text of the *La Loba Negra* began to appear in serial form in connection with the review *Democracia*, under the editorship of Pio Brun. In Brun's preface appears the following statement, which casts some light on the relation between the various "Burgos manuscripts":

[Burgos] left an enormous number of unpublished books and essays, which are completely unknown to his countrymen. . . . He himself already says in the prologue to his work "Mis Últimas Memorias," foreseeing the persecution of which he would be the object after the departure of Governor de la Torre, "May it come to pass in some future day that a loving hand, perhaps a beloved countryman, may publish these notes, as humble as they are sincere. . . ."

This request of his, we, take up. . . .⁷⁷

It is clear from this passage that Brun had in his possession not only *La Loba Negra*, but also *Maremagnum ó sea Mis últimas memorias*. This work purports to be Burgos' account of the years of de la Torre's term as Governor-General, 1869-1871, and exists today in a typescript copy, with an introduc-

⁷⁵ See notes 32 and 35 above. For the date, see p. 94.

⁷⁶ Cruz, pp. 27, 37. It may be noted that Cruz does not cite the titles in the form in which they actually appear in the published book, nor as they appear on the MSS in the Araneta collection, but rather in the altered form in which they appear in the list appended to his typescript edition of *Maremagnum* described below. He may then have had only the latter list at his disposal, and not have seen the other works at all, either as MSS or in published form.

⁷⁷ Dr. Padre José A. Burgos, *La Loba Negra, Novela verídica (histórica)*. Palabras preliminares por Pio Brun. (Colección: "Escritores Filipinos del siglo XIX," Tomo I; Manila: *Democracia*, 1941). These "Palabras preliminares" are dated July 1941.

tion by Hermenegildo Cruz.⁷⁸ Since Cruz, as has been seen, also had a copy of *La Loba Negra*, and also mentions a large number of other Burgos manuscripts, it seems reasonable to suppose that the two men were working together to publish these works, Brun perhaps making available the facilities of *Democracia* for the publication of the manuscripts which were in the possession of Cruz, or to which the latter at least had access. A beginning was made with *La Loba Negra*, and had the War not intervened, other works too would perhaps have appeared in print in Brun's announced series, "Escritores Filipinos del Siglo XIX."⁷⁹ This would explain the existence of the typescript copy of *Maremagnum*, with its introduction by Cruz, though he speaks in the introduction only of circulating it among friends. It is possible that the typescript works in the Ateneo collection may have been produced with the same purpose, since almost all of them exist among the manuscripts in the Araneta collection, though none of them has any preface by Cruz.⁸⁰

Suffice it to say that the internal evidence from all these typescript works shows that not only are they not genuine works of Burgos, but that they proceeded from the same source as Liñán's *Historia verídica*. It will be sufficient here to mention only a few of the more striking historical falsehoods and anachronisms, even apart from the extravagant and even fantastic character of the narration, so similar to that of Liñán. Not only do Rafael Ma. Labra and Manuel Regidor appear at various points in the narrative as being in Manila rather than in Spain, but Burgos is made to fight a duel with canes against Labra over the latter's pamphlet *La cuestión colonial* because

⁷⁸ This is to be found in the Araneta collection, and there is a microfilm copy in the Ateneo library. The introduction, dated November 1941, says that the copy has been made from a manuscript "...que ha llegado a nuestras manos..."

⁷⁹ At the end of his introduction, Brun adds: "...The favor shown by the reader to this book will determine in great part our carrying out of the task we propose—to publish the 'Colección de Escritores Filipinos del Siglo XIX' which is begun with this work."

⁸⁰ It may well be, however, that these typescript copies were made merely for sale by someone else, since they are carelessly done, unlike the *Maremagnum* typescript of Cruz.

of the accusations of disloyalty against Filipinos contained there.⁸¹ As a matter of fact, this latter work was a plea for the rights of Spain's overseas provinces, and its possession was later made grounds for the arrest of some of the Filipino reformists by Izquierdo.⁸² There again appear various confrontations between Archbishop Melitón Martínez on the one hand, and both Burgos and de la Torre on the other, at a time when the Archbishop was in Rome for the First Vatican Council.⁸³ Governor de la Torre is pictured as arriving (and leaving) on the ship *Reina Regente*, at a time when there had been no Queen Regent in Spain for thirty years,⁸⁴ and is described as inviting Burgos on board for breakfast with him, and later refusing the Archbishop's carriage, to go off accompanied by Burgos.⁸⁵ Not only does a non-existent Dominican named Fray Miguel de Ostaeza appear in the pages of the story,⁸⁶ but likewise the fictitious Francisco de Liñan.⁸⁷ Finally, to omit further unnecessary details, there is even a note allegedly signed by Rizal attesting to the authenticity of a speech of Burgos. Though the signature is not of course to be found in the typescript copy, its date of Madrid, 26 de Junio de 1887, is enough to judge its genuinity, since on that date Rizal was not in Madrid, but in Rome, preparing to return to the Philippines.⁸⁸

⁸¹ Pp. 9-12, 128, etc. See n. 31 above.

⁸² Artigas, pp. 227-228.

⁸³ *Maremagnum*, pp. 1-8, 16-18, 40 ff. etc. See n. 15 above.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 37, 131. Queen Maria Cristina had been expelled from Spain in 1840, and her daughter Isabela II declared of age three years, later.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 37-40. Cf. Liñan, *Historia verídica*, 2nd ed., p. 8.

⁸⁶ *Maremagnum*, p. 16. The name does not appear in the official list of Dominicans in Ocio y Viana's *Compendio* which is especially authoritative for this period, since Ocio came to the Philippines in 1867 (*ibid.*, p. 970).

⁸⁷ *Maremagnum*, p. 17.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. ii-iv. There is a letter of Rizal to his father, written from Rome (where he says he had been for several days, after traveling through cities in Italy), dated June 29, 1887, in the *Epistolario Rizalino* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1930-1938), I, 287. The editors of the centenary edition of Rizal's works reproduce the alleged annotation of Rizal from the copy made by Cruz, and comment significantly:

The typescript works in the Ateneo collection equally betray not only their inauthenticity, but their real author, in common with the *Maremagnum*. The first of these, *Como se forman las religiones*, has a reference to the "...fancido [sic] continente Lemuriano..."⁸⁹ which, as Scott has pointed out in connection with the appearance of the same term in the Marco forgery of the Pavon manuscript, is a term first coined in 1879.⁹⁰ The alleged collection of letters between Burgos and de la Torre which is sixth in this volume largely reproduces in different form the episodes of *Maremagnum*, including the supposed confrontations with the absent Archbishop, and the speeches of Burgos likewise found there. The dates given for the relief of de la Torre, his departure from the Philippines and the arrival of Izquierdo are not only widely different from the correct dates, but contradictory to one another.⁹¹ Finally, as if unable to resist giving the unwary reader a clue to the real author, there appears among the priests meeting with Fathers Burgos, Gómez, and Zamora, to defend the rights of the secular clergy, an otherwise unknown Father Marcó.⁹²

Just as further proofs of the non-genuinity of these typescript copies could be given, particularly the anti-Catholicism of those concerned with religion, so too could similar indications be multiplied concerning the individual manuscripts in the Araneta collection. But since all are written on similar paper, with similar handwriting and signatures, they evidently come from a common source. We will limit ourselves therefore to observing that the alleged signature of Burgos in these manuscripts is again quite unlike the genuine signature re-

"No comprendemos el lugar y la fecha de esta nota, pues Rizal no estaba al parecer en Madrid en junio de 1887" (*Escritos de José Rizal*: Tomo VII: *Escritos políticos e históricos*, p. 32.)

⁸⁹ *Como se forman las religiones*, p. 7.

⁹⁰ Scott, pp. 123-124.

⁹¹ *Carpeta, Copiador de comunicaciones habidas entre el Exelentísimo [sic] Capitan y Gobernador Carlos Ma. de la Torre y Navan-cerrada [sic] y el que suscribe desde los años de 1869 al 1871 [sic]*, pp. 69-71.

⁹² *Carpeta*, p. 3, and *passim*. No such name appears among the priests involved in the secularization controversy prior to 1872 in any account, or in any of the documents.

produced here,⁹³ and with pointing out a few random examples of their likewise being the work of Marco. Most significant is the passage in *Leyendas y Cuentos Filipinos* in which the author lists among the manuscripts which he was grateful for having been able to use in the "Librería de la Real Audiencia" two works of Diego Lope de Povedano, entitled respectively "Mi Xornada y Peregrinacion en las Islas de Philipinas de 1577" and "Las antiguas Leyendas de la Ysla Bugtas..." of 1578.⁹⁴ Both of these have been shown by Scott to be forgeries coming from Marco.⁹⁵

The other example may be taken from the *Carpeta* alleged to contain the Burgos-de la Torre correspondence, which has been mentioned among the typescripts in the Ateneo collection. As in the latter, the final entry tells of the failure of Burgos' attempt to see Izquierdo on his arrival. This is followed by the supposed signature of Burgos, dated 11 de Enero de 1870, more than a year *before* the arrival of Izquierdo.⁹⁶ Likewise revealing is the rubber stamp on this manuscript found also on the Ateneo typescripts: "A. Vindel/Librero/Madrid."⁹⁷ This attempt to give substance to the story of the Burgos MSS' having been carried off to Spain by de la Torre, fails in both cases because the bookseller of Madrid whose interest in Filipiniana brought him into dealings with Rizal, Pedro Paterno, W. E. Retana, and the Tabacalera (which acquired from him much of the collection later sold to the Philippine National

⁹³ See the genuine signature in plate 2 above, taken from official documents in the archives of the Archdiocese of Manila and in the Philippine National Archives.

⁹⁴ *Leyendas y cuentos Filipinos*, MS, Manila, 1860, pp. 10-12.

⁹⁵ Scott, p. 128.

⁹⁶ *Carpeta*, p. 160 [sic; should be 260]. The title of the MS as well as the text, consistently misspells de la Torre's *segundo apellido* as *Navancerrada* instead of Navacerrada, the correct form. This recurs through all the alleged Burgos MSS and typescripts.

⁹⁷ To be found on the title page of *Nol Basio y Tia Nila*, typescript, Manila, 1866, and several others among the Ateneo typescripts. Governor de la Torre left for Spain on April 4, 1871, shortly after the arrival of Izquierdo (Montero y Vidal, III, 551).

Library), was named *Pedro Vindel*.⁹⁸ The use of a false rubber stamp is a technique likewise used by Marco in the alleged documents on the pre-Hispanic period attributed to Pavon.⁹⁹

V. COMMON SOURCE OF ALL PSEUDO-BURGOS WORKS

It would seem that what has been discussed here shows quite clearly not only the spuriousness of the various works attributed to Burgos from 1941 onward, but likewise their common origin in José E. Marco. The evidence for the non-genuinity of *La Loba Negra* seems likewise to be conclusive. It remains only to summarize the evidence which has been touched on incidentally in the course of our exposition, which confirms the novel's common origin with the rest of the spurious works of Burgos, namely that it likewise comes from Marco. These are principally three: the common style; the allusions to *La Loba Negra* in the other spurious works for which Marco is responsible; and, the absence of any other author, given the close association in time and editors in the appearance of the various works.

To grasp the fact of a common style in the various works treated in this paper, there is, of course, no other way than to read all of them extensively and intensively. Obviously then, the impression of a common author for both the novel and the other pseudo-Burgos works is necessarily somewhat subjective and cannot be totally communicated on paper. This writer can only state his judgment from his own study of these works that such a common style is present — there is the same carelessness in composition, the introduction of passages, or even chapters, quite extraneous to what has preceded, the awkward and often ungrammatical use of Spanish, the clumsy imitations of Rizal. The prologue to the *Mare-*

⁹⁸ See Paul Cid Noé [Francisco Vindel], (ed.), *Pedro Vindel. Historia de un librería (1865-1921)*. (Madrid, 1945). In this book the editor, son of the original owner, has edited his father's day-book, which contains many interesting comments about his customers, including those named in the text here. He is frequently mentioned in the works of Retana, who assisted in the publication of Vindel's catalogues, and sold much of his own personal collection to him.

⁹⁹ Scott, p. 127.

magnum re-echoes the theme of "...this valley of tears, made to cause man to suffer..."¹⁰⁰ which recurs so frequently in *La Loba Negra*.¹⁰¹ In *La Loba Negra* as in all the other pseudo-Burgos works due to Marco there occurs repeatedly the appeal to the "Archivo de la Real Audiencia" as the supposed source of the historical data contained in the works.¹⁰² One final detail, though no doubt a minute analysis of the text might discover others: is it purely coincidental that the *legua* of *La Loba Negra* appears to be roughly equivalent to a kilometer, just as the *leuea* of the pseudo-Povedano map of Negros stemming from Marco likewise turned out to be exactly equivalent to a kilometer?¹⁰³

The *Maremagnum* and the collection of supposed correspondence between Burgos and Governor de la Torre based on it give further evidence of the common origin of all these pseudo-Burgos works by their allusions to *La Loba Negra*. To mention only a few obvious ones, there is first of all the inclusion of *La Loba Negra* in the alleged list of Burgos' works appended to the *Maremagnum*.¹⁰⁴ Further, the summary of contents at the beginning of chapter 16 contains the following clear allusions: "...Saqueos de tulisanes en plena Ermita. La 'Sargenta Betay' en acción. Algunas reflexiones. Conclusión. Adios para siempre, adios."¹⁰⁵ Similarly in the *Carpeta*, a supposed letter to Burgos from de la Torre says: "As for the cost of the stamped State paper, which you can use, do not worry about this; it will all go on my account."¹⁰⁶ The reference, of course, is to the so-called "original manuscript" of the *La Loba Negra*, written on stamped paper, with its alleged signature of de la Torre at the end taking re-

¹⁰⁰ *Maremagnum*, p. vi.

¹⁰¹ Cf. de la Rosa ed., pp. 11, 12-13, 87, etc.

¹⁰² Cf. footnotes, *ibid.*, p. 99 and text to note 66 above.

¹⁰³ See note 62 above and Scott, pp. 112-113.

¹⁰⁴ *Maremagnum*, p. 138.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. *La Loba Negra*, ed. de la Rosa, pp. 70, 77-80. "Sargenta Betay" is the daughter of "La Loba Negra," who leads the attack on Ermita, with which the author of the novel mistakenly identifies Dilao. Cf. note 61 above.

¹⁰⁶ *Carpeta*, Ateneo typescript ed., p. 16.

sponsibility for the cost of the paper.¹⁰⁷ It may be noted in passing that some of the MSS in the Araneta collection are likewise written on similar facsimiles of stamped State paper.

Such allusions by themselves, of course, could be explained away by supposing that Marco had deliberately incorporated them into the MSS in imitation of a *La Loba Negra* already in existence, namely, the 1938 edition attributed to Augusto de Luzuriaga.¹⁰⁸ Such a possibility cannot perhaps be apodictically excluded, but in the light of the fact that the earlier *Historia verídica* supposedly published by Luzuriaga, had its origin in Marco, and all the subsequent works of Burgos as well, the simplest and most probable explanation, particularly in the light of the evidence in the earlier part of this section, is to assume that *La Loba Negra*, no less than the other pseudo-Burgos writings, likewise had its source in Marco, from the very beginning.

Certainly none of the other men who are connected with the publication of these works can be held responsible for their production. One need only read Cruz' book, or his "Nota explicativa" to the introduction to the typescript *Maremagnum* to see the obvious difference between the correct Spanish of Cruz and that of the work he is introducing. Even less could the Spaniard Brun be thought to be guilty of the awkward and unidiomatic Spanish to be found even in *La Loba Negra*, and as a matter of fact, the comparison of his edition with that of 1938, makes clear that he had made numerous corrections in the more egregious blunders of the earlier edition.¹⁰⁹ There is no positive indication that Cruz any more than Brun, Luzuriaga, or de la Rosa were aware of the spuriousness of the various MSS, and their part in the publication of those which appeared is sufficiently explained in their receiving them in good faith either directly or indirectly from Marco, just as James Alexan-

¹⁰⁷ *La Loba Negra*, MS ed., (1960), pp. 272-273.

¹⁰⁸ I have not seen the printed 1938 edition, but only the typescript copy existing in the National Library. Mr. Mauro Garcia, who had occasion to examine many of the pseudo-Burgos works coming from Marco, has expressed to me his doubts as to whether the 1938 edition was really published by Luzuriaga, but rather by Marco.

¹⁰⁹ See the Appendix.

der Robertson had uncritically accepted the spurious Pavon and Povedano MSS some thirty years earlier.¹¹⁰

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This article has been perhaps inordinately lengthy, particularly since the writer is aware that he is not the first to suspect the inauthenticity of at least some of the documents discussed here. But it has seemed worthwhile to go into what might seem excessive detail in order to make the evidence once for all available in one place for the public before further legendary elements obscure the real figure of Father José Burgos. The immediate conclusions of the study are as follows:

(1) The *Historia verídica* attributed to Francisco de Liñán is a wholly apocryphal work, which has its origin in José E. Marco.

(2) All the extant writings attributed to Burgos, whether in manuscript in the Araneta collection, or in the various typescript copies in the Ateneo collection, or published in the 1941 Cebu edition of the *Obras escogidas* of Burgos, are similarly, and with equal certainty, spurious, and similarly have their source in Marco.

(3) *La Loba Negra* is certainly not a genuine work of Father Burgos.

(4) In all probability it too has Marco as its source.

¹¹⁰ See Scott, pp. 104, 107-110. It may be noted, however, that Luciano de la Rosa, writing in *La Nueva Era*, 23 de Agosto de 1958, "‘La Loba Negra’ Novela Verídica Ha Sido Escrito Por El P. Burgos," attacks the article of E.F.L. cited in note 54, and cites as proof of genuinity the original MS, which he describes as being of 176 pages, on stamped paper of 1838-39, with the initials of Fr. Burgos, and the signatures of the Archivero Antonio de Guzmán and Governor-General Carlos Ma. de la Torre, as well as that of Fr. Burgos affixed to the dedication. This is evidently the edition reproduced by photo-offset in 1960 by Martinez. De la Rosa adds that the cover of the MS contains the signature of Rizal, dated 3 de Agosto de 1888. This signature was not reproduced in the Martinez edition, but is another indication of the common paternity of *La Loba Negra* with the other pseudo-Burgos MSS coming from Marco.

(5) Though there are many indications that Marco himself was the actual composer of these pseudo-Burgos works, if it were to be supposed that some other anonymous individual was responsible for the actual composition, it was Marco who was responsible for their being put into circulation. With regard to *La Loba Negra*, the evidence is quite convincing; with regard to the other works, it seems indisputable.

Such conclusions may seem disappointing to some. Is our knowledge of Burgos and his literary heritage to be reduced to nothing?¹¹¹ Obviously, of course, the elimination of works wrongly attributed to Burgos does not increase our knowledge of the man and his role in the development of Filipino nationalism in a positive way. On the other hand, one can scarcely count it a loss to eliminate from consideration works which present a wholly fictitious and rather unpleasant picture of the man. The purpose of this article has been not merely to eliminate these spurious sources for the life and thought of Burgos, but to clear the way for positive research into the genuine sources of his life and work. Such sources are not totally lacking, and it is to be hoped that serious research in preparation for the centenary in 1972 will bring further ones to light. Of the genuine literary heritage of Burgos, we have already mentioned the *Manifiesto* of 1864, written in defense of Father Peláez.¹¹² It seems also to be established that Burgos wrote for the Filipino-sponsored newspaper published in Madrid in 1871-1872, *El Eco Filipino*.¹¹³ Though the articles in

¹¹¹ Such historical forgeries are, of course, not rare. Every national history can count more than a few. For a recent study of a famous forgery by a European, George Psalmanazar, who, without ever having set foot in Formosa, published an account of that island in the 18th century, which deceived European scholars all through the century, see Frederic J. Foley, S.J., *The Great Formosan Impostor* (St. Louis: St. Louis University, 1968). There are other documents purporting to relate events connected with the Philippine Revolution which likewise deserve a critical study to determine their genuinity, including some items contained in the printed editions of Rizal's letters.

¹¹² See note 53 above.

¹¹³ See Retana, *Aparato*, II, 777, no. 1288; and Manuel Artigas y Cuerva, *Los periódicos filipinos* (Manila: Biblioteca Nacional Filipina, 1908), pp. 117-118.

this paper were necessarily anonymous, it may perhaps be possible to identify some of them as coming from the pen of Burgos. There is further material on Burgos and his colleagues in the secularization controversy in both ecclesiastical and civil archives here and in Spain. It may well be that the literary heritage of Burgos is minimal, but there is much which can yet be done to bring to life the person and work of him whom Hermenegildo Cruz rightly called the precursor of Rizal, and to clarify his role in the awakening of Filipino nationalism in the second half of the nineteenth century. If this task can be achieved, the discarding of a literary heritage of dubious value, will be amply compensated for.¹¹⁴

APPENDIX

The fact of the inauthenticity of the supposed Burgos writings, including the novel *La Loba Negra*, deprives them of all historical value, and of any real importance they could have for historians. The exact relation between the various forms in which the novel has appeared is therefore of only minor interest and has been for this reason relegated to this appendix. It is true that a careful and detailed comparison of the various texts known to us could no doubt establish with considerable certainty the inter-relationships existing among them. Given their inauthenticity, however, the time and effort required for such a detailed comparison would scarcely be

¹¹⁴ As this article was going to press, there came to my attention an English translation of *La Loba Negra*, by Hilario A. Lim, edited with notes by Teodoro A. Agoncillo, and with an introduction by E. San Juan, Jr. (Quezon City: Malaya Books, c. 1970), pp. xxxv and 67. Professor Lim adverts to the strong doubts expressed by Professor Agoncillo in his notes as to the authenticity of the Martinez "original manuscript" (on which Lim bases himself, filling in the missing portions from de la Rosa). Agoncillo had noted the similarity of the handwriting to that of other writings of Jose E. Marco, and alludes to certain of the anachronisms in the novel which had been pointed out here, but makes no mention of the other pseudo-Burgos works of Marco. To one who has examined the confused inconsistencies of Marco in his various productions, the lengthy philosophico-literary essay of Professor San Juan (who apparently accepts the novel as a genuine Burgos work), can only evoke the reflection that Marco himself would have been the most surprised to see such meaning read into his production.

worthwhile. This appendix will therefore limit itself to presenting the evidence which has been a by-product of the investigation into the authenticity of the novel. This limited investigation does show a definite line of dependence, and the probable sequence of origin of the different versions, but naturally does not claim to have the certainty which the main body of the article has manifested.

In the course of the paper, we have shown that the 1960 photo-offset edition of an alleged original manuscript (M) could certainly not be what it claimed, since it showed clear evidence of having been copied from some previous source. Prescinding then for the moment what that source may have been, we may turn to the next most recent edition, which is the 1958 publication of Luciano de la Rosa (R). In his introduction, de la Rosa mentions the previous attempt to publish the novel in 1941 in the review *Democracia* by Pio Brun (B), thus intimating that he had made use of the Brun edition. A comparison of R with B makes clear that this is indeed true, since the former reproduces the latter exactly, with a few slight variations, obviously explicable as printer's errors. However, since B was only completed to page 80 before its publication was interrupted, R would have had to use another source for the final pages. Contemporaneous with B are the substantial portions of the novel to be found in Cruz' *El Padre Burgos* (C). Though C itself cannot be the source of R (nor of B), since it is not a complete text, a likely hypothesis might be that there was one common source for all three of these. The most logical choice for such a source would of course be the Luzuriaga edition of 1938 (L), to which Cruz himself alludes in his introduction to C. Since, however, it has not been possible to locate a copy of this, we are reduced to referring to the typescript "N.^o Extra" (L-T), which professes to reproduce the 1938 L, and to accepting the assertion that it actually does so, in the absence of contrary evidence.

Testing this hypothesis, however, it is quickly obvious that whatever may be said of L, it is not possible that L-T was the total source of B and R, for the end of chapter one and the beginning of chapter two, as found in B and R, are

missing in L-T, evidently due to the oversight of a careless copyist in turning a page. This becomes clear from a comparison of the following passage:

L-T (pp.6-7): "...habiendo perecido en manos de su difunta Madre los culpables directos [p. 7] tengas mas prudencia en tus actos, mira que tienes hijos, y si pasa algo, no se que va a ser de nosotros."

At the point where the copyist responsible for L-T turned from p. 6 to p. 7, the rest of chapter one drops out, as does the first part of chapter two, since these sections are contained in B and R (as well as in C, to the extent that its citation begins with the beginning of the second chapter). Thus without reproducing the latter part of the first chapter following the word "directos" and the whole early section of chapter two, the section immediately preceding that found on p. 7 of L-T reads as follows in B, R, and C, on pp. 17-18, 18, and 46-47, respectively:

"...en fin, te vuelvo a pedir tengas mas prudencia en [C, p. 47] tus actos, mira que tienes hijos y si pasa algo, no se que va [B, p. 18] a ser de nosotros." [End of p. 18 in R].

The glaring omission of several pages which shows L-T not to have been the source of C, B, or R, is likewise to be found in M, though the text of the latter contains some rather garbled and unintelligible intervening lines, apparently an attempt to fill the obvious gap in the text of L-T, before linking up once more with the part of the text common to L-T, B, C, and R.

Nonetheless, though it is clear that L-T cannot be the total source of C, B, and R, there are other passages which show that L-T is related to C in a way in which it is not to B and R. The following passage will illustrate this:

C (pp. 80-81) and L-T (pp. 62-63): Una mano suavemente
la levantaba; este
R (p. 70) and B (p. 74): Una mano suavemente
la levantaba. *Esta*
C & L-T: era el de su protector; Magpantay o Magtatanga
como otros lo

- R & B: era *la* de su protector, *Magpangay* o Magtatanga como otros lo
- C & L-T: llamaban, y le indicaba los primeros albores del sol que alumbraba
- R & B: llamaban, *que indicaba* los primeros albores del sol que alumbraba
- C & L-T: aquel triste lugar, como diciendola: — Alli te dejo, mas no
- R & B: aquel triste lugar, *mientras decía: Ahí* te dejo, mas no
- C & L-T: para siempre, para unirnos en la eternidad y nunca jamas separarnos,
- R & B: para siempre, para unirnos en la eternidad y nunca jamas separarnos,
- C & L-T: mas no por ahora sino hasta que vea[s] la aurora de tu patria
- R & B: mas no *hasta que* vea la aurora de tu patria
- C & L-T: redimirte y colocarte en el pilar de sus heroes. Adios madre
- R & B: redimirte y colocarte en el pilar de sus heroes. Adios madre
- C & L-T: querida, adios por ahora.” [C has *veas*; L-T has *vea* above].
- R B: querida! *Adios!* [*Magpangay* is perhaps a misprint].

The italicized words and phrases of R and B are clearly grammatical corrections and stylistic modifications of some of the errors common to C and L-T. Since it has already been demonstrated above that neither C nor L-T can be the source of each other, and yet they are shown here to repeat exactly the same grammatical and stylistic incorrections, they evidently must both copy some prior source. The substantial omission of L-T indicated earlier, would simply show that L-T had at that point copied carelessly, while C had done so accurately.

On the other hand, the fact that in the earlier passage cited, B and R were shown to agree with C against L-T finds its logical and adequate explanation in the hypothesis that B (copied by R), though sharing a common ultimate source with L-T and C, made an attempt to correct the grammatical errors

of the source, and to polish somewhat its Spanish style. This is the more likely when we recall that Brun was himself a Spaniard and perhaps felt more keenly the need to polish the Spanish of the novel. Cruz, on the other hand, although his writings show that he too had a grasp of the Spanish language superior to that of the pseudo-Burgos, may have felt that the text which he assumed to be genuine ought to be presented to the public in its integrity, as he found it in his source.

One can then conclude to a common source for all of these versions, which would be the missing Luzuriaga printed edition of 1938, or ultimately perhaps, a manuscript from which the latter was produced, similarly unavailable to us today. If, as inferred in the beginning of this appendix, R depended directly on B, which in turn was a corrected version of L or L's manuscript, then at least the latter part of R which is not found in the incomplete B (pp. 76-87), would seem to have been taken from L (or its source) directly, perhaps correcting somewhat the language, as B had done. It would seem that it could not have depended on L-T from the evidence of such passages as the following:

L-T (p. 70): "Habiendole salido al encuentro aquella esposa
le contó todo

R (p. 76): "Habiendole salido al encuentro aquella esposa
le contó todo

L-T: lo había en horas mas tempranas aquella misma tarde."

R: lo *que* había *pasado* en horas mas tempranas aquella
misma tarde."

Similarly on the following page:

L-T (p. 71): Habia muchos ricos allá y la poca y escasa
tropa que habia

R (p. 77): Habia muchos ricos allá y la poca y escasa
tropa que habia

L-T: para cualquier golpe formal de un

R: para *defenderla* era *inadecuada* para cualquier golpe
formal de un

L-T: nutrido grupo de estos ultimos, y para este objeto
prepararon

R: nutrido grupo de estos ultimos, y para este objeto prepararon

L-T: desde la ciudad de Manila el golpe...

R: desde la ciudad de Manila el golpe...

The L-T version evidently does not make sense in either of these cases, so that R must either have supplied the missing words, or more likely, copied from L, or the ultimate source of L.

One final point concerns the source of M, the last of these versions to appear publicly. That it does not totally depend on any of the editions here cited — L-T, C, B, R — is clear from the fact that it contains sections, notably the additional eight pages culminating in the forged signatures of Burgos and de la Torre, which appear in none of the above. In many places, it seems to follow closely the ungrammatical version found in L-T, and contains the same major omission of the end of chapter 1 and the beginning of chapter 2 referred to above, which could scarcely be coincidental. On the other hand, its text often differs considerably from that of L-T, occasionally dropping out words — e.g. "...los adelantos de S.M..." (p. 38), where all the other versions have "...los *buenos* adelantos de S.M..." More frequently, however, M will reproduce the general sense of the passage in L-T, but in different language, and even with the addition of phrases. Thus where all the other versions have: "...desde donde se veia la residencia del Capitan general", we find in M (p. 90): "...desde donde se divisaba el cuarto que ocupaba el Capitan General." Or again a passage where B, R, and L-T likewise agree:

L-T (p. iii): ...aquella misma que fué agradable compañera de

M (p. 10): ...aquella misma que le fué agradable compañera de

L-T: fatigas ve en su decadencia, empieza a pensar en su prole y aquel que

M: fatigas *va en sus decaimiento; comienza* a pensar en su prole *aunque*

L-T: en un tiempo fue su sostén, amparo y ayuda, es poco a poco tenido

M: en un tiempo fue su sosten, amparo y ayuda, es poco a poco tenido

L-T: como trasto inservible...

M: como trasto inservible...

Such comparisons could be multiplied indefinitely, but it seems clear that though M depended directly on L-T, the copyist did not work with care, but freely re-cast the language as he copied, as well as adding further to the grammatical and stylistic deficiencies of his model. Finally, he added not only an epilogue, but additional forged signatures to certify to the authenticity of this "original manuscript."

To sum up this appendix, all editions known would seem clearly to derive from the 1938 edition attributed to Luzuriaga, but undoubtedly stemming, at least ultimately, from Marco. Assuming that the printed edition of 1938 (L) did actually exist, either it or its original draft were the source copied by Cruz (C) and by the copyist who made the typescript copy in the National Library (L-T). At approximately the same time, 1941, Pio Brun began his serial publication of the novel, likewise making use of L or its original draft, but modifying and correcting its style and grammar. The edition published in 1958 by Luciano de la Rosa (R) apparently used B as far as it went, and completed it from L (or the latter's original draft); or, less likely, working from L-T, made further corrections in this himself. Though de la Rosa had knowledge of the MS which in 1960 appeared as M sometime during the year 1958, it was most likely only after his own printed edition appeared, for he did not make use of it for R. M was derived from L-T by a copyist who made little effort to reproduce it accurately, and who made substantial additions to it in the effort further to authenticate it. The fact that it contains signatures and certifications added to the basic text which are alluded to in *Maremagnum* and other documents in the Araneta and Ateneo collections, makes it likely that it dates from the same period as these.

This appendix is a probable reconstruction of the genesis of the various editions of *La Loba Negra*. In it some elements are more certain than others, and some have been demonstrated here with greater fulness than others. This should not, however, be permitted to distract from the solidly established conclusions of the main part of the article, the chief of which is that none of the works discussed in this paper have any relation to Burgos, but that all of them are forgeries of the twentieth century and without historical value.