

philippine studies

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

The Early Filipino Clergy: 1698-1762

John N. Schumacher, S.J.

Philippine Studies vol. 51, no. 1 (2003): 7–62

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

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

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

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

The Early Filipino Clergy: 1698–1762

John N. Schumacher, S.J.

The birth of a Filipino clergy (those who in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by birth and by culture, can rightly be called Filipinos in our modern sense—Indios and Chinese mestizos) has long been a subject of varying and even contradictory studies. In the light of the evidence uncovered and understood in recent years, this article attempts to resolve the contradictions and to present a coherent account of the emergence of Filipino priests, in spite of the obstacles placed by Spanish legalisms and prejudice. It particularly distinguishes between those Spaniards who were promoters of a specifically Filipino clergy and those whose concern, for other motives, was to have a secular clergy.

KEYWORDS: *prejudice; higher education; episcopal power; Sidotti; Patronato Real*

The fact that at no period in the history of the Philippine Church has there been a sufficient number of Filipino priests in proportion to the Catholic population has multiple causes, and it would be simplistic to fix on a single one of them. Moreover, during some of these periods, not only has the Filipino clergy been insufficient in number, but likewise deficient either intellectually or morally or both. Sound methodology demands that the historian seeking the causes of such deficiencies look back to the origins—particularly the attitudes and policies of the missionaries whose task it was, once the native population had been substantially converted to Catholicism—to promote an indigenous clergy that would gradually supplant the missionaries who first brought the Faith. This theological principle, in modern times at the heart of Christian

mission theology and scarcely denied by anyone, at least in theory, was never fully accepted under the conditions of colonialism. This was most especially true in the late-nineteenth century, when the promotion of an indigenous clergy took on political overtones, intensified by the role of the native clergy in the emancipation of many of Spain's American colonies.

Previous Historiography

In the earliest discussion of the question, apologists of the Spanish ecclesiastical system or historians unaware of the ambiguity of such Spanish terms as *naturales* and *Indios*, long held that early on there had been a Filipino clergy under the Spanish regime, even Filipino bishops.¹ No respectable historian would make that claim today.

The first constructive step in clarifying the beginnings of a Filipino clergy was the path-breaking article of Horacio de la Costa, S.J. (1947), originally done as a thesis for the licentiate in theology at Woodstock College, Maryland, with limited sources at hand, and before he had had any professional training in history. This soon became the classic work on the subject and in part remains so, especially after he published a partially revised and expanded edition (Anderson 1969, 65–104). In the memorial volume published after his death, I made a few further corrections and some additions, based on the researches of Salvador P. Escoto and myself, and extended de la Costa's work further into the eighteenth century (Schumacher 1978, 157–73; later republished in de la Costa and Schumacher 1979, 60–78). Together with these corrections and additions, I consider de la Costa's article still a classic, at least up to the beginning of the eighteenth century, and it has set the basic framework for studying the whole question.

A whole new perspective, however, was opened up by the research of Luciano P. R. Santiago (1987). A few of us had come to realize that there were indications that some Filipino priests in fact had been ordained before the 1720s, where de la Costa put the start; and hence we began to look at Gaspar de San Agustín's dire predictions about a Filipino clergy as merely indicating that a *policy* of ordaining Filipino priests was about to be put into action in the 1720s, in addition to

some possible isolated individuals being ordained earlier (Schumacher 1978, 161). No one, however, had investigated the archdiocesan archives of Manila (AAM) to find out just who had been the presumed occasional exceptions. Santiago's research not only examined the "Libros de Gobierno" for ordinations and assignments, but ranged widely over the AAM and other primary sources to construct his account of the period from the first proven ordination of an Indio priest in 1698 to approximately 1725, when a major gap in the archdiocesan archives made further extensive research on individual priests impracticable. The first third of his book treats the process by which a Filipino clergy came into being, centering on the attempt to provide the Philippines with its first conciliar seminary, as mandated by the Council of Trent. The most important contribution here is the demonstration that San Agustín's diatribe of 1720 was occasioned, not by the first ordinations, nor even by a policy of ordaining Filipino priests, but by a policy of making Indios proprietary parish priests instead of merely coadjutors. The other two-thirds of the book, in many ways even more valuable to the historian, in my opinion, is the series of biographical sketches of individual priests. Using these, it is possible to dissent from some of the interpretations of the first part, but the basic data are solidly established.

The more recent book of Hernando M. Coronel (1998) attempts to cover a much wider period, practically speaking up to the present, with the glorification of the San Carlos Major Seminary of Manila, where it was originally an M.A. thesis, apparently as a key purpose. Though he brings forward much data on priests of later periods from the AAM, his focus on the period we are considering here, namely, the first quarter of the eighteenth century, is more on the vicissitudes of the various attempts at founding a seminary.² For this he is heavily dependent on Santiago and on an unpublished doctoral dissertation in canon law by Edmundo A. Surban (1965), presented to the Pontificia Universidad de Salamanca in Spain. Surban, alone among those who have studied the early Filipino clergy, worked in the AGI, thus providing Coronel with additional data, but without essentially changing Santiago's picture.³

Finally, I will venture to say, leaving the judgment on the present article to the reader, that each of these secondary sources has a perceptible viewpoint. The older authors, especially the Hispanophile writ-

ers, were intent on showing that there had not been Spanish bias against Indios. All modern historians reject this idea. De la Costa pointed out the real anti-Indio bias, but did not emphasize it, and sought rather to explain why the very structure of the Spanish Patronato as well as individual Spanish biases frustrated the emergence of an adequate clergy. Santiago and Coronel condemn the bias, even overstate it, picturing practically all the Filipino priests as exemplary and/or distinguished for their intellectual talents, thus again exaggerating.

Rubio Merino's book is primarily a biography of Archbishop Diego Camacho, and devotes only a small, but valuable, section to the Filipino clergy, more with the intent of extolling Camacho's accomplishments than of telling the Philippine story. His treatment of the religious orders with whom Camacho came into conflict in his efforts to create a seminary for the *secular* clergy (not necessarily Filipino), however, is unrelievedly hostile, and shows no understanding of the Philippine situation in which the conflict arose. That Santiago and Coronel can picture Camacho as the champion of the Filipino clergy is only credible at first glance because the Filipino clergy were all secular priests; and they fail to understand that the real concern of Rubio Merino is to exalt the secular archbishop and the secular clergy in general, not specifically the Indios.⁴

Higher Education for Non-Spaniards

Accepting de la Costa's framework, with the corrections brought by Santiago, we may take the first quarter of the "long eighteenth century" as the period of the real beginnings of the Filipino clergy.⁵ By this time a number of converging factors had brought about a much more positive attitude toward a native clergy, though not necessarily favorable to the idea of a seminary for them. There had been a gradual evolution since the 1670s when Archbishop Pardo gave his dismissive rejection of Indios and even criollos, prevailing over the advocacy by Diego de la Viga, fiscal of the Audiencia in favor of the admission of Indios to the priesthood (de la Costa 1969, 81–84).

For in the meantime, higher education—i.e., grammar and *artes* (philosophy)—ordinarily a necessary prerequisite for admission to the priest-

hood, had been partially opened to Indios. (This does not mean, at least necessarily, that all of those seeking these degrees were candidates for the priesthood. The courses were identical for priests or laymen. Those who wished to become priests needed at least a modicum of theology, though most did not get a degree in it at this period.) Significantly, even Archbishop Pardo seems to have modified his earlier harsh judgment, though without concrete results, in the last year of his life. A few months before his death he submitted to the Dominican provincial chapter a proposal to set up an endowment by which Santo Tomás would effectively become a full-fledged university with additional faculties, thus increasing the number of Spaniards and Spanish mestizos studying there, while the Colegio de San Juan de Letrán would admit Indios and other nationalities for humanistic studies, which would prepare them for the professions needed in the country.⁶ "The door will thus be opened . . . so that many other Indios will leave off their pusillanimity and may raise their hearts to the service of God and the commonwealth." Thus prepared, there will be no danger to the faith, "as might happen if Indios were forthwith put to study sacred theology with a view to ordination to the priesthood" (Cummins 1969, 110). Though because of alleged conflict with the statutes of Letrán, as well as the perceived unreliability of the endowment, the Dominican chapter objected to the plan, but it did present a plan for a college for native boys ("niños indios") on the grounds of Letrán, which would eventually fulfill the royal wishes.⁷ Nothing came of the plan, however, with the death of the archbishop before he was able to reply to their counterproposal. The important point is that apparently neither the archbishop nor Dominicans raised any objections to the eventual ordination of Indios to the priesthood, provided they were properly prepared by being admitted to higher studies. Moreover, in the years prior to the arrival of Archbishop Camacho, not only San Juan de Letrán, but apparently also the Universidad de Santo Tomás, and perhaps San Ignacio, had begun to admit Indio students to higher studies, thus removing a major obstacle to a native clergy (Santiago 1987, 33).⁸ One has to be careful, however, of terminology to determine precisely what happened.

Becarios and Capistas/Porcionistas in Dominican Institutions

Of Letrán we know that by the 1640s there were Indio students, though it is clear that almost all received no more than a primary education—like the sons of Pampango principales in San José in the 1660s (de la Costa 1961, 505)—or very occasionally a secondary education (Bazaco 1933, 48; also the list on 216 ff. *passim*). We do not find any Indios receiving studies that would fit them for the priesthood till the end of the century, and then it was at the Universidad de Santo Tomás rather than at Letrán. It seems that the Dominicans, at least by this time, kept Letrán as a teaching institution for the lower levels of grammar, from which those students who wished to work for higher degrees, such as would prepare them for the priesthood, moved to the Universidad de Santo Tomás (Gemelli Careri 1963, 13–14; Santiago 1987, 136). Bazaco (1953, 92–93) explains the arrangement more fully. Though there were students registered as scholars of Letrán who were studying philosophy or theology, this does not mean that those disciplines were taught in Letrán, but that the scholars (*becarios*) resided in and were supported by Letrán, though they took their courses under the Universidad (not the Colegio, reserved for Spaniards) de Santo Tomás. Conversely, perhaps, some scholars of Santo Tomás took preliminary courses in Letrán. “The professors were common in both institutions.” Of all the priests whose academic background Santiago is able to supply, none is recorded as having been ordained from Letrán in the period covered by his book, i.e., up to 1725.⁹

The original founders of the Colegio de San José, like those of the Colegio de Santo Tomás, had specified that their endowments were for *hijos de españoles*, and hence the *becas de fundación*, or scholarships coming from the endowment, were only for such. Similarly, those who later set up *becas de donación* specified their recipients, almost always Spaniards, though we find four *becas* in existence in 1768 specified for Chinese mestizos (de la Costa 1961, 571). There were also at San José *becas de gracia*, which were granted by the rector from the income of the colegio coming from other sources. It is possible that this number eventually included Spanish mestizos (*ibid.*).¹⁰ De la Costa also mentions

in passing that there were *becas* for Spanish mestizos in 1690, according to Fr. Alejo López, S.J. If so, they apparently did not survive until 1768, when there were thirty-seven Spaniards and four Chinese mestizos, for a total of forty-one (*ibid.*, 585–86). In fact, the evidence for the Spanish mestizos as *becarios* is somewhat shaky.¹¹

According to Gemelli Careri (1963, 14) only sons of Spaniards were admitted to the Colegio de Santo Tomás, whereas sons of mestizos were admitted at San José. Since he says that all were admitted *gratis*, if his observations were accurate, those at San José must have been *becarios de gracia*, and therefore de la Costa would be correct in saying that by 1690 there were *becas* for Spanish mestizos. Gemelli Careri, however, is not a very reliable source, considering the short time, a little over a month, he spent in Manila. Moreover, he is known for copying from other sources, which he may not have understood correctly (Garcia 1963, xvi–xxii).

Santiago, however, unfortunately includes Spanish mestizos as Filipinos, though in fact, by self-identification and culture, as we have noted, they were considered Spaniards—even though with a minimal discrimination—in the seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries. Rather, the category of Filipino should be limited in this period to *Indios*, and there is no evidence that there were *Indio becarios* in San José right up to 1768.

Though there is no extant evidence of *becas* specifically for *Indios* in any institution, this is not to say that there were no *Indio* students in higher education, though the evidence is not always easy to interpret. There is evidence that there were some *Indios*, perhaps many, who received higher degrees from the Universidad de Santo Tomás (not the Colegio within the university), who must have begun their studies before 1700 (Santiago 1987, e.g., 81, 88, 116). Just when this began is difficult to say with any exactness. Santiago (1991, 139) believes that the decree of 20 June 1686, ordering that the Spanish language be used for education, was the cause. "It was apparently as a result of this edict that the Universidad de Santo Tomás opened its doors to *Indios* just before the turn of the seventeenth century." The reasoning is dubious, since the decree on the Spanish language does not mention anything about admitting *Indios* to higher education.¹² Moreover, considering

that the priests ordained beginning in 1698 had to have been admitted to the college several years sooner in order to already possess the degree of *bachiller*, the first admissions to higher education ought not to be said to have taken place "just before the turn of the seventeenth century"; "a decade or more before" would be more likely. In fact, Santiago himself cites those he considers to have been the first two Indio *bachilleres* as receiving their degrees in 1690, which means they were admitted to begin studies several years earlier (*ibid.*).¹³

In the eighteenth century the Universidad de Santo Tomás is the most common source of known degrees for Indios, at least. Though these are all named *capistas*, that is, domestics who performed some tasks in the chapel, library, classrooms, and others, they did get actual university degrees, unlike the Kapampangan "domestics" spoken of at San José in the 1660s (Santiago 1991, 139; de la Costa 1961, 505).¹⁴ Santiago (1987, 167) refers to a law of the *Recopilación* (lib. 1, tit. 7, ley 7), as having ordered "the promotion of Indios [and] mestizos to the priesthood" in 1691. There was indeed such a law in the *Recopilación*, but its date was 1588, and its author Felipe II. Perhaps it was repeated in 1691, but Santiago gives no source (perhaps Manaligod?) for such a rare assertion.

All the Indio priests whose biographies are given by Santiago and noted as having studied at the Universidad de Santo Tomás, were designated *capistas*. In various other institutions, however, we also find mention of *porcionistas*, full-fledged students, but not numbered among the scholars supported by the endowments. Instead they paid a fee for their board and lodging. The revised statutes of 1707 for the Colegio-Seminario de San Felipe provided for sixteen *porcionistas* in addition to the eight royal scholars (Rubio Merino 1958, 542).

Becarios and Capistas/Porcionistas in Jesuit Institutions

Similarly, the number of Spanish students holding *becas* at the Colegio de San José varied according to the income received from the foundation and from the *becas de donación*. The best figures show a range from a low of twelve to a high of forty-nine (de la Costa 1961, 571). A document of 1740 indicates eight *becas de fundación* (originally twelve, but some of the property of the foundation was destroyed in

the earthquake of 1645), seven *becas de donación* (all specified for Spaniards, sometimes born in the donor's native town or province in the Peninsula, others at the discretion of the rector) and up to nineteen *becas de gracia*, a number which seems to have included some capistas and porcionistas, who paid at least part of their costs.¹⁵ Others, who may have included Spanish mestizos, paid a fee for board and lodging and should be considered porcionistas.¹⁶ The Italian traveler Gemelli Careri (1963, 13) put the fee at P150 in 1696. De la Costa (1961, 570), more trustworthily, and speaking of the eighteenth century, said that the yearly fee "remained pretty constant at between 100 and 125 pesos a year until 1768." It may be noted that Archbishop de la Cuesta, in the revised statutes for the Colegio-Seminario de San Felipe in 1707, put the fee at P100 for porcionistas (Coronel 1998, 60).

As to whether, and if so, when, there were Indios residing at San José as porcionistas, the primary sources, including the most thorough—Repetti (1946)—are simply silent. There were day scholars, however, at San Ignacio, who, in view of the small Spanish population at this time, probably included a number of Indios as they certainly did by the mid-eighteenth century (Delgado 1892, 293–95). For, given the small number of Spanish families by the end of the seventeenth century, there were among the endowed colleges providing *becas* of different kinds for *hijos de españoles*, probably a sufficient number of *becas* for all those of Spanish blood (de la Costa 1961, 572; Repetti 1946, ch. 15). In fact, by the end of the century, the statutes prescribing that all the collegians be Spaniards were modified to admit Spanish mestizos whose fathers were Spaniards (de los Arcos 1988, 94). The number of Spanish candidates even for the Colegio de Santo Tomás was insufficient for the thirty to forty normally admitted. This whole period sees a dilution of the requirements of what precisely made someone "a Spaniard," as we have seen in connection with San Juan de Letrán. Though prejudice was still present, it was less and less effective or widespread.

There is, however, a great deal of confusion between the Colegio de San Ignacio and the Colegio de San José, not only among modern authors, but also in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and even de la Costa does not totally clarify it. It seems that we may say, in a general way, that it resembled the system of interdependence between

the Colegio de San Juan de Letrán and the Universidad de Santo Tomás. San José was a residential college, whose collegians took their classes at San Ignacio within the same compound. A varying number of professors of San Ignacio lived in San José, to conduct the repetitions of what had been heard in the lectures at San Ignacio and to assist in spiritual formation. Though the numbers of its resident students varied according to the yearly financial resources (which determined the possible number of *becas de gracia*, as well as the number of *porcionistas*), apparently the maximum ever reached was forty-nine in 1753. Yet, according to admittedly incomplete statistics, it was usually a good bit fewer than that (de la Costa 1961, 571). In a building that normally housed only such limited numbers, surely there might be room for some *porcionistas*, but a very limited number, to be resident. The number of *porcionistas* at San José, therefore, if there were such at this time, would probably vary inversely with the number of *becarios* whom the funds of the institution could support in a particular year. In any case, whether the *porcionistas* were *Indios*, we do not know, though it seems probable from what has been said above concerning the small number of Spaniards, which forced the Colegio de Santo Tomás to modify its statutes.

Perhaps at least part of the solution to the whole question of the number of students at San Ignacio and San José lies in the fact that, according to the Franciscan chronicler Juan de San Antonio (1977, 198), writing in 1738, by a royal order of 1653 the Jesuits were authorized to graduate their students either in the Colegio de San Ignacio or the Colegio de San José.¹⁷ It is not unlikely then that many, or most, of those who were day scholars at San Ignacio, together with the actual resident collegians of San José, particularly those intending to be secular priests, chose to take their degree from San José, while mostly, or perhaps only, the Jesuit graduates took theirs from San Ignacio. Spiritual formation was given, of course, at San José, though it is hard to see how this would be achieved systematically at San Ignacio, except for the Jesuit students, who lived there. Since the Jesuits were forbidden by their constitutions at that time to take tuition for their teaching, they would have been allowed to take payment for board and lodging only from *porcionistas* who might have lived in the Colegio de San José,

while the purely day students at San Ignacio would not pay anything, as teaching was gratis.

What other evidence do we have for Indio students, particularly candidates for the priesthood, at San José? Though the list of students of the Colegio de San José, which is said by Repetti to have been still in existence at the beginning of the twentieth century, is now lost, among all those alumni—mostly secular or religious priests—whom Repetti was able to identify, none gives any indication of being Indio. De la Costa (1961, 576), however, quoting the famous refutation by Fr. Juan José Delgado, S.J., of Fray Gaspar de San Agustín's anti-Indio diatribe, speaks of the two men Delgado names as examples of outstanding Indio priests, Fr. Eugenio de Santa Cruz and Fr. Bartolomé Saguinsin, as being "alumni of San José." As regards Santa Cruz, de la Costa clearly errs, since Santiago (1987, 143) has now shown him to be a graduate of Santo Tomás. Santiago (*ibid.*, 140, 145; 1991, 140) speculates that several of the priests ordained by 1723, perhaps, probably or presumably, studied at San José. His argument is principally from silence—they do not appear on the *Graduate Listing* of Santo Tomás—though in one case (Fr. Bartolomé Saguinsin) he points to his having come from the Jesuit parish of Antipolo, not a very convincing argument by itself. The argument from silence—there was no other institution where they could have obtained their degrees—has good probative force in this case.¹⁸

Yet we know that by the 1750s (Delgado finished his book in 1754) there were Indio priests from all four colleges. Hence they certainly must have begun to study there some years sooner. There were Indio students from San José and San Ignacio, as well as from San Juan de Letrán and Santo Tomás. For Delgado, having mentioned Saguinsin and Santa Cruz as "esteemed for their talents and venerated for their virtues," adds that he "leaves aside many others, living and dead, who deserve to have their names placed in this history, because the need for brevity urges me to do so." He then continues:

Besides these, those [Indios] who are being trained in one of the four colleges¹⁹ for the clerical state existing in Manila are all sons of *principales*, people of distinction among the Indios themselves. . . . These boys are being trained by the Reverend Fathers of Saint

Dominic or of the Society. They instruct them in virtue and letters, and if they have any bad habits of Indios, these are corrected and removed by their education and their association with the Fathers. (Delgado 1892, 293–94)

We have already given ample proofs from Santiago that Indios had been admitted to Letrán and Santo Tomás since the late-seventeenth century, even if only as capistas or porcionistas. As to San José and San Ignacio, whether the admission of Indios goes back that far, Delgado's defense of Indio priests makes clear that they were also admitted to San José and San Ignacio as well, at some point considerably earlier than his defense, even if perhaps not as becarios. Can a date be fixed? De la Costa suggested, with considerable probability, that this occurred around 1725, since in 1724 the Jesuits at their provincial congregation had discussed (and rejected by only one vote of those present, principally for lack of financial resources) a proposal of Fr. Diego Otazo to gradually give up most Jesuit parishes to the secular clergy, while maintaining eight or nine provincial colleges in key places, in addition to San José and San Ignacio. All these were to be principally for Indios, and with no discrimination in favor of such Spanish mestizos or Spaniards as might also enroll in them (de la Costa 1961, 575–76).²⁰ Therefore, though the proposal of Otazo for a network of colleges was not implemented, a logical feasible step would have been to admit Indios into San José and San Ignacio. The proposal then would have served as the catalyst for this step, which no one opposed. (De la Costa seems to presume that Indios were not admitted as day scholars to San Ignacio before this time. Because of the complex relation between the two institutions, I cannot show that he is incorrect, but neither has he given any positive proof of their prior exclusion. I have given my reasons above for thinking that there probably were at least some Indios in San Ignacio earlier than this, studying as porcionistas.)

The Primary Role of the Universidad de Santo Tomás

Though this does not answer all possible questions concerning the Indios who, at least by the mid-eighteenth century, undoubtedly studied

at San Ignacio and perhaps even boarded at San José, without other evidence one must conclude that the number of Filipino priests who came from the Jesuit college and university was probably smaller than the number who completed their studies at the Universidad de Santo Tomás. There are certain facts that confirm this. One is that of the Filipino priests whose educational background could be identified with certainty by Santiago for the period up to 1725, all (and these are the majority of the total) studied at Santo Tomás. None can be positively identified as coming from San José or San Ignacio.²¹

Second, though the abortive seminary of San Clemente was intended to provide all studies leading to the priesthood, it does not seem to have actually produced any priests who did not do at least part of their studies at Santo Tomás.²² With the closing of San Clemente and its replacement by San Felipe, all the becarios, according to the new statutes, had to be Spaniards, at least *cuarterones*. Hence any of the Indios must have come from among the capistas or porcionistas. Though the course of arts was inaugurated in 1712 and that of theology in 1714, it seems improbable that anyone obtained such degrees there in so brief a time, since in 1720 both those professorships were abolished and the seminarians who wished to go beyond grammar were sent to the Universidad de Santo Tomás (San Antonio 1977, 193; BR 28:123).²³

The First Filipino Priests

In 1998, several dioceses celebrated the third centenary of the ordination of Indios to the diocesan priesthood. No doubt the moving force behind this was the research of Santiago (1987, 34) in which he established Fr. Francisco Baluyot, ordained in December 1698 as “the first definitely known Filipino priest.”

Doubtful Seventeenth-Century Filipino Priests

Even while making this statement in his third chapter, Santiago devoted some pages (23–26) in an earlier chapter to certain men who were, with greater or less evidence, possibilities for being the first priests. The

first recorded is *licenciado* Agustín Tabuyo Baldecañas, ordained a deacon in Manila in September 1621 by Archbishop Miguel García Serrano, O.S.A., and raised to the priesthood in December of the same year.²⁴ He evidently had been some kind of assistant to García Serrano when the latter was bishop of that diocese (1616–19), and perhaps for the lack of any secular priests to assist the bishop in a diocese staffed by Augustinians and Dominicans, the archbishop ordained him. There is no evidence of “Tabuyo” being a Spanish surname, but it is found both in Mexico and the Philippines (Santiago 1987, 24–25, 177 n. 8). Santiago speculates that he might have been an Indio from Cagayan province, and that Tabuyo is a Hispanization of an Ibanag word, *tabbuyut*. This is certainly an erroneous supposition, since at that time no higher education was available in the Philippines for anyone not of Spanish blood. Hence, he must have acquired his licentiate degree in Mexico before coming to the Philippines, and could not have been privately educated by the archbishop, as Santiago postulates. Moreover, the surname of his mother was Baldecañas, and it was, as Santiago himself notes, “a social taboo” for a Spanish woman to marry an Indio at any time, above all in the last part of the sixteenth century, when Cagayan had barely begun to be evangelized. One can only surmise that his father had been a Mexican, married to a woman of Spanish surname, probably a Mexican mestiza, and that Augustin, after his education in Mexico, had at some point come to the Philippines. Here he would have become an assistant to the bishop of Nueva Segovia (i.e., Lal-lo in Cagayan), probably because in that remote area he was one of the few educated men, if not the only one, as well as having some Spanish blood. All evidence is against his being of “pure Malay blood,” in spite of the assertion of Santiago (*ibid.*, 25).

Two others whom Santiago mentions as possibilities were Juan Lorenzo and Miguel Jerónimo. Both names appear in a 1655 list of priests and religious who had studied at Letrán (Bazaco 1933, 55–57). One of Santiago’s (1987, 26) grounds for considering them Indios is that it was common for Indios to “prefer second [saints’] names to surnames. This assertion, however, ignores the fact that these second names are also used by Spaniards as surnames. A glance at the *Espasa* encyclopedia shows this to be true for both the present and the past.

Moreover, Lorenzo, even if he was a Filipino, simply had the notation *salíó para clérigo*. Though this could, in some contexts, mean that he became a secular priest, by itself it simply means that he left to take minor orders, or even merely the tonsure, by which one became a cleric without even the promise of celibacy. It does not necessarily connote his being a priest. It is even less likely to mean a priest here, since others in the list are denominated *clérigo presbítero*, *sacerdote presbítero*, or simply *sacerdote*. Either those simply called *clérigo* had not yet reached the priesthood when the list was drawn up in 1655 or they remained in minor orders with the privileges a cleric then had; or, whatever their original intention, they left the clerical state later on because they married or simply renounced it, according to the Church laws of the time, as may be seen in the well-known example of Ignatius Loyola who, before his conversion, was declared to have forfeited his status of cleric, in spite of having received the tonsure, because of his scandalous way of life.²⁵ The probability of Lorenzo being a Filipino priest is almost nil.

The case of Miguel Jerónimo has somewhat more *prima facie* probability (Santiago 1987, 26). On 23 September 1653, Archbishop Miguel de Poblete ordained to first tonsure and minor orders Michael Hyeronimus [sic] de Morales (the misspelled Latin form of his name). Though the name does not further appear in either form in Poblete's roll of ordinations, Santiago postulates, without any documentation and against the normal practice (which demanded fixed intervals between minor and major orders, and between each of three major orders then existing), that Jerónimo was nonetheless ordained to the priesthood in 1655, at most a year and a few months after minor orders. This, of course, makes it possible for his inclusion in the 1655 Letrán list. Yet, again with no further documentation, in his latest book, Santiago (2002, 25) puts Jerónimo's ordination to the priesthood in 1654, and without further qualification calls him "The First Filipino Priest," something that he had ventured to declare only probable in his earlier book (Santiago 1987, 26). The unsupported date of 1654 for Jerónimo's ordination to the priesthood is even less credible than 1655, when we have the documentary evidence noted above that he only received the first tonsure on 23 September 1653—hence only months between the time of

the first tonsure and of the priesthood.²⁶ The absence of any evidence for his ordination to the priesthood in the list of Archbishop Poblete's ordinations gives rise to further doubt. It is a fact, however, that Poblete, as administrator of the vacant diocese of Nueva Cáceres, appointed a Bachiller Miguel Jerónimo in 1666 as interim parish priest of Payo in Catanduanes. No assignment appears in the years between the supposed ordination to the priesthood of the first Miguel Jerónimo (whichever year it was) and this appointment. Since there was no consecrated bishop in Nueva Cáceres during all this time by whom he might have been ordained, and he does not appear in Poblete's book of ordinations, there is a problem as to how and when the Miguel Jerónimo of 1666 was ordained a priest, as the second assignment indicates he was.

The real problem, however, is whether he really was Filipino. The only evidence is that Bazaco lists him as "Pampango," in a random list of graduates of Letrán. Further, though Santiago fails to give any academic title, such as bachiller to the Miguel Jerónimo who was ordained in 1654 or 1655, presumably because he is not so named in the sources on which he depends, he gives that title to the priest appointed to Payo in 1666. If, therefore, Santiago is correct in calling bachiller the second Miguel Jerónimo, and no Filipino is known to have received the necessary studies in the period before 1654 or for several decades afterward (Santiago [1991, 139] himself says that the first Filipino *bachilleres* date from 1690), we must conclude he was not Filipino. Bazaco's (1933, 216–64) random list of early students at Letrán mentions no Filipino of the seventeenth century who went beyond "segunda enseñanza," i.e., grammar and possibly humanities, whereas the bachiller en artes degree demanded philosophy. We again find an inconsistency if the two names mentioned are simply variations, or even, as is more likely, not the same person. The name of Miguel Jerónimo de Morales, moreover, though admittedly designating a priest, indicates a Spanish (or Mexican) mestizo, whose Spanish or Mexican mother's name was Morales. It seems quite certain in the light of all these facts that the Miguel Jerónimo noted as "Pampango" in the Letrán list—if Bazaco is accurate (besides the ordinary dangers of an error in such early documents, Pampanga was the most likely province in which to find a Mexican living)—was not a priest at all, and that the Miguel

Jerónimo de Morales, though a priest, was a Mexican or Spanish mestizo, not an Indio. Though Santiago would consider that Spanish or Mexican mestizos of Indio mothers were Indios, we have rejected that idea above for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Finally, even without the difficulties raised here, we would have the case highly unlikely unless proved by direct evidence rather than a series of inferences, of the only Filipino priest, almost half a century before the definite ordination of Indios to the priesthood began. Without denying the absolute possibility, such a Filipino priest remains quite unlikely, and Santiago would have done better to retain him as an inexplicable possible exception than to assert him definitively as the first Filipino priest, as he does in his new book without offering any evidence on why he contradicts his earlier book.²⁷

The First Definite Filipino Priests

The fact that Camacho ordained the first definitely known Indio priest, Bachiller Francisco Baluyot, in December 1698, a little more than a year after his arrival in Manila (Santiago 1987, 34), clearly confirms that at least some Manila colleges had already begun quite a while earlier to admit Indios to higher degrees that had been originally the preserve of sons of Spaniards.²⁸ Further confirmation comes from the ordination a few months later of licentiate Joseph de Ocampo, a Chinese mestizo, who certainly must have studied at the Universidad de Santo Tomás long before 1698, since he obtained his licentiate and master's degree there in 1699 and 1700 (*ibid.*).²⁹ Four years later Camacho would ordain two more Indio secular priests (*ibid.*, 34–35).³⁰ There is no indication of any opposition to the ordination of Indio priests, which would in fact not have been possible had not at least some colleges of the religious orders earlier opened their doors to all those born in the Philippines, and not only to those of Spanish parents.³¹ Far from preventing the ordination of Indio priests, the colleges of the religious were making it possible. Fundamentally, the problem with the approach of both Santiago and Coronel is rooted in their confusion of the question whether Indio priests should be ordained at all, with the other very different, though connected, question of whether there should be an endowed seminary to train them, and how large it should be.

These latter two questions, for example, were the reason for the opposition of Governor Zabálburu, who felt that the colleges ran and financed by the religious orders were enough, and there was no reason to further burden the impecunious royal treasury. The logical implication of Camacho and his supporters' position must be that the Spanish secular priests, religious, and bishops who had come out of the Manila colleges in the seventeenth century, when there was no seminary at all, were unfit to be ordained, which is absurd. To speak of San José alone, the manuscript history of Repetti (1946, ch. 14) has positively identified numerous bishops, religious, and secular priests among its alumni in the seventeenth century. Bazaco has analogous figures for Letran in his various lists. Probably the other colleges could present similar figures. Though it is arguable that the priestly spiritual formation could be better attained in a seminary, even in Europe during the Catholic Reformation, many bishops considered they had fulfilled the demands of the Council of Trent if they had a Jesuit college in their diocese. If one looks at the severe, even rigid, disciplinary and religious regimen to which the students of the Colegio de San José, whether or not they intended to be priests, were subject, modern seminaries seem very lax in comparison (see, e.g., de la Costa 1961, 197, 359.) No doubt the other residential colleges were similar in their discipline and religious training

These facts show that the basic reason for Indios' not being ordained to the priesthood was quite other than mere racial prejudice, though undoubtedly that contributed on the part of some. Santiago (1987, 19–22) admits that there were Spaniards favorable to the ordination of Indios, but tends to portray them as a small minority. Coronel shares this view, and particularly emphasizes the religious orders as the ones responsible, forgetting that the religious orders made possible the first ordinations by opening their doors to students of every ethnic group. Undoubtedly, there was opposition on the part of some religious, especially when they saw the ordination of Indio secular priests being promoted as a tool for subjecting them to episcopal visitation or replacing them in their parishes (de la Costa 1965, 86–87; Rubio Merino 1958, 408, 417). In spite of Camacho's diatribes against the religious orders, however, it was to the Dominican rector of San Juan de

Letrán that he turned for advice on aspects of the organization of his seminary, shortly after he received the royal cedula authorizing it (Coronel 1998, 48–49).

The colleges of Manila, though they had even then a number of Indio students, and had in fact—at least Letrán and the Universidad de Santo Tomás—educated those very men whom Camacho had ordained, did not, it seemed to the archbishop, produce a sufficient number of Filipino graduates who were interested in becoming secular priests. In this he was partially correct. For one thing, the great majority of becas, whether of the original foundation or of subsequent donation, were specified by the donors for particular categories of persons, among whom Indios, if any, could have formed only a small part. This was the will of the donors, however, not of the religious who ran the colleges.

Even at Letran, which was less ethnically restricted, most of the graduates, Spanish or Indio, gravitated toward military life or some other secular occupation, judging from the incomplete lists of Bazaco and from his summary survey. It is notable, however, that substantial numbers of students, mostly Spanish, did go on to the priesthood in all the religious orders. Others, both Spanish and Indio, joined some orders as lay brothers. The number of secular priests was small in comparison (Repetti, 1933, 54–56, 216–54; Bazaco 1933, 54–57). This is a fact, but that was the personal choice of the students, and not due to any obstacle put by the religious orders.

In the course of the eighteenth century, as Indio priests became more widespread and respected, the situation changed. Writing in 1738, Juan de San Antonio (1977, 202) says of Letrán: “Today most of the students go into the priesthood, studying in the Faculties of Philosophy and Theology. Most of the secular clergy of the diocese of Camarines [Nueva Cáceres] and many of the other dioceses come from this college.” Probably the reason for the specific mention of “Camarines” was that this was the territory of the Franciscans, and was that with which the Franciscan San Antonio would be most acquainted. There were only two other suffragan dioceses, Cebu and Nueva Segovia, and there is no reason to think that the situation would be different there. The archdiocese, of course, had several colleges besides Letrán.

It should not be forgotten, moreover, that apart from the collegians who held becas, at San José there were, at least in the eighteenth century, a considerable number of day scholars, who paid “a yearly fee which remained pretty constant at between 100 and 125 pesos a year until 1768” (de la Costa 1961, 570). These would certainly include Indios; probably even the majority were such. At the Universidad de Santo Tomás we know of a number of Indio capistas, even in the late-seventeenth century, who followed the regular courses for the priesthood and were ordained by Camacho in the early-eighteenth century (e.g., Santiago 1987, 109, 111, 114).

The Real Policy of Archbishop Camacho

The archbishop would complain in a 1705 letter to the king—tendentially, and with the type of wild exaggerations and unproven accusations that characterize practically all his statements concerning the religious after he had failed to impose episcopal visitation on them—that [the colleges] “have given hardly any priests to the diocese, since those who run them use for their own luxurious comfort all their revenues, and the collegians scarcely get any share of them” (Rubio Merino 1958, 404). Such an accusation was demonstrably false, as can be seen in the case both of the Dominicans and the Jesuits. The history of San José by Repetti, for example, shows clearly that it admitted as many students as the economic vicissitudes of its foundation allowed in a particular year. Dominican documents of Bazaco show the same.

Similarly, and with equal reckless oversimplification, he had asserted in a 1704 letter to the king that the religious opposed the increase of secular priests “out of fear of losing their parishes with their immense material wealth and lack of restrictions.” In another paragraph he continues to attribute to them a single-minded and hypocritical desire for wealth and comfort (Rubio Merino 1958, 408). One is led to ask whether Camacho ever had to live under the conditions that many, probably most, religious parish priests had to live, especially in the Visayas, exposed to Moro raids, or in northern Luzon, with its lack of communications, raids from hostile mountain people, and others. No

doubt many parishes in the archdiocese, even those outside Manila, were more comfortable than those in the Visayas. It is significant, nevertheless, that his attempts at visitation were only to Tondo and Binondo, very prosperous urban parishes. There is no evidence that he attempted to visit Mindoro, Bataan, or Zambales, equally part of his archdiocese, where life was far less comfortable and far more dangerous than in Manila. Camacho, like many of his predecessors and successors, was little inclined to share the "luxurious comforts" of such places, even in his very own diocese, not to speak of those in the majority of the parishes in the suffragan provincial dioceses.

Why So Few Priests from the Colleges of the Religious

There were various reasons why a large proportion of the alumni of the colleges became priests of religious orders rather than secular priests. The religious who administered the colleges could not force their students to become secular priests contrary to the individual's personal choice and vocation. Large numbers of their graduates, as we have noted, did become priests in the religious orders. Should the orders have refused those qualified candidates who applied to become religious in their order? Further, as noted above, most of the places in the colleges, except to some extent for Letrán, had, according to their statutes, been reserved for the limited number of Spaniards in the country until a decade before Camacho's time, something that their administrators could not change arbitrarily.

In the light of all these facts showing the lack of basis for Camacho's false and even absurd allegations, one comes back to the point made earlier: that Camacho's main preoccupation was the creation of a secular clergy, of whatever race, that would be subject to himself, and all that as quickly as possible. It is the same mentality that would animate Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Santas Justa y Rufina in the last decades of the century and lead to the mass ordinations of fit and unfit candidates for the secular clergy, thus destroying their reputation far into the twentieth century. Without defending every position taken by the religious orders, we can see that ultimately, consciously or unconsciously, the issue was principally one of power rather than of race.

The Royal Authorization for a Seminary

The arrival in 1704 of the royal *cédula* authorizing a seminary for eight seminarians set the stage for at least a token favorable response to Archbishop Camacho's long-desired project. Yet, the new governor-general, Domingo Zabálburu, raised difficulties, particularly about the finances. It would be only in 1707 that he would move to execute the royal cedula, a delay Camacho attributed to the governor's friendly relations with the religious orders (Rubio Merino 1958, 407–8). In fact, before the implementation of the royal cedula, other financial assistance would come to the archbishop from an unexpected source—the accidental arrival in Manila of the papal legate *a latere* and official visitor of the China missions, the titular patriarch of Antioch, Archbishop Charles-Thomas Maillard de Tournon.³² A confirmed enemy of the religious orders in general, and highly confident of his own rank, he soon inquired of the archbishop if there was a seminary for the secular clergy. Learning that as yet there was not, he undertook in his visits to the governor to spur the latter's interest in the matter.³³ Much more effective was a visionary charismatic Sicilian priest, generally known to historians as the Abbé Gianbattista Sidotti, accompanying him, spurred on by the fantastic purpose of reopening Japan to Christianity.³⁴

The Projected Seminary of Sidotti

Sidotti's missionary enthusiasm turned to his well-meaning, but somewhat naïve, project of a mission seminary for all Asia. He not only quickly won over the governor and archbishop as well, but also persuaded them both to embark on this project far exceeding the bounds of the royally sanctioned seminary for eight. His proposal was to make Manila the missionary center of Asia, by opening a seminary for seventy-two seminarians (in honor of the seventy-two disciples!) from all Asian countries, to whom would be added the eight already authorized by the king, for a total of eighty. Unlike the archbishop, Sidotti was moved not by the desire to have a secular clergy, but by the desire that this secular clergy be Indios and other Asians. Thus he assigned in his statutes the order of preference to be given to each ethnic group: primarily Indios of each region, and then each of the other Asian peoples.

Notably, no Spaniards were included, thus directly affronting the Patronato Real (Rubio Merino 1958, 524–25). Whether due to the more favorable attitude of Manila to a native clergy or to his own persuasive charisma, accompanied by a personal austerity and infectious zeal, he resolved the financial difficulties by raising money from the ninety leading Spaniards of Manila. What was more, he brought to the surface the latent desire of Indios for an indigenous priesthood, as the Kapampangans offered to contribute the lumber for the seminary, and the Tagalogs, the stones and lime (*ibid.*, 421 nn. 61, 62, 524).³⁵

While waiting for the construction of a new building, the archbishop was able to persuade Governor Zabáburu and the Audiencia to make available for the meantime a large house that had been confiscated by the government, and the seminary apparently began to function temporarily with the royal-stipulated number of eight. At the suggestion of Sidotti, who drew up its statutes, it was named San Clemente, in honor of the reigning pope, Clement XI. Meanwhile, the archbishop bought a suitable piece of land for the permanent new seminary, and construction began. It proceeded slowly, however, and little more than the foundations had been laid by the time Camacho was ready to leave for Guadalajara in 1706. Once the archbishop had departed, construction was suspended, an action which the archbishop, now in Mexico, attributed to the loss of a galleon at this time (*ibid.*, 415).

In retrospect, the real reasons seem clear. Zabáburu, though caught up for a time in the enthusiasm aroused by Sidotti, was uneasy about the measures that were being taken beyond what had been prescribed in the royal *cédula*. He referred every point to relevant royal officials in Manila, whose approval, however, was likewise tentative, questioning whether there might be a transgression of the Patronato Real. In all cases he was careful to reserve final approval to the king, lest he be implicated in a venture likely to be judged contrary to the Patronato (Rubio Merino 1958, 411–12). Even then he continued to delay; after the departure of Camacho when the *Cabildo* of the cathedral put forward Sidotti's statutes, he had them submitted to further examination by the fiscal of the Audiencia, and then gave only a conditional approval (*ibid.*, 427–29).

Downfall of the San Clemente Seminary

Nevertheless, the end of the Sidotti-Camacho seminary was already at hand. Informed both by Camacho and Sidotti of what they had accomplished, Clement XI sent a congratulatory brief to the king through the papal nuncio in Spain, urging him to continue to promote this mission seminary for all Asia. The result was disastrous. Among the grave violations of the Patronato the royal council denounced was the direct communication of the archbishop with the Holy See (instead of securing the *pase regio* from the Consejo de Indias), the intervention of foreign ecclesiastics in Spanish ecclesiastical affairs, the admission of foreign seminarians into a royal seminary, and, no doubt, the change of name from San Felipe to San Clemente. All of it appeared to them much like a plot of the Roman Curia, to intervene in or infringe upon the Patronato Real; severe reprehensions went to Governor Zabálburu, the Audiencia, and Archbishop Camacho.

The latter defended himself vigorously from Guadalajara against what he considered exaggerated or untrue accusations made against him, and eventually a few of his explanations were accepted. He was not acquitted, however, for having allowed Tournon to exercise jurisdiction contrary to the Patronato, nor of having allowed Sidotti to create a seminary quite different from that authorized by the king. Nonetheless, in insisting on these faults, the king softened the harsh reprimand by assuring him that "in consideration of his conduct on other occasions, this [reprehension] is not an obstacle to my cherishing gratitude to him for his zeal [in other matters]" (ibid., 394–400; quotation on 400).³⁶

The royal command was stern and explicit. The foreign seminarians, as well as those from the Philippines exceeding the prescribed number, were to be expelled. The foundations of the offending seminary under construction were to be destroyed, and the money raised by Sidotti applied to the new seminary prescribed by the king, limited to eight scholars and a maximum of sixteen paying students (porcionistas) (Rubio Merino 1958, 429–33).³⁷ Sidotti, having departed Manila a few months after Camacho, had long since gotten to Japan after many travails, there immediately to find himself in a harsh imprisonment (Tollini 1979, 1980, 1982).

Much has been made of the episode of the San Clemente seminary, but in actual fact it neither brought about the first ordinations of Indios to the priesthood nor did its destruction more than momentarily delay the slow but steady increase in Indio priests. Camacho had ordained his first Indio priests when Sidotti had not yet set foot in the Philippines, and a decade before the final rejection of Sidotti's seminary. Bishop Andrés González, O.P., of Nueva Cáceres, moreover, ordained at least two priests in 1705–1706, apparently without their having gone through any seminary or college. He would give dimissorial letters for the ordination of another nonseminarian to Archbishop Francisco de la Cuesta, shortly before his own death in 1709 (Santiago 1987, 41–42, 44, 52–53). Similarly Bishop Diego de Gorospe Irala, O.P., of Nueva Segovia, apparently initially moved like Camacho by his struggles to impose visitation on the friar parish priests in his diocese, is known to have ordained at least two or three Indio priests before his death in 1715, none of whom is known to have spent any significant time in the aborted temporary seminary (*ibid.*, 56, 106–11). The truth is that, though it cannot be denied that prejudice against Indio priests still existed among some Spaniards, others—both government officials concerned for royal finances, and Dominicans and Jesuits, who had their own schools for Indios—were opposed, not to the ordination of Indios to the priesthood, but to a new, and it seemed to them, superfluous seminary. Race was not the main issue, but finances, competence, and control.

A structural bias, of course, did exist, and officially so, *in favor of* those of Spanish blood. The Colegio de Santo Tomás (not the university) and the Colegio de San José—at least as far as the *becas de fundación* or *becas de donación* were concerned—were limited to sons of Spaniards by the intention of their original donors. Over these stipulations the institutions had no power. The limited number of Spanish *becarios* was rapidly exceeded by the number of day scholars, the majority of whom were undoubtedly Indios, who attended the same classes as Spaniards in the universities of Santo Tomás and of San Ignacio, as *capistas* in some cases, and as paying *porcionistas* in other cases.

As a matter of fact, the statutes of the college-seminary of San Clemente drawn up by Abbé Sidotti show that this college, too, would depend, first on an endowment—only for the original eight seminarians, ordered by the king, who received royal support—and secondly, on whatever, if anything, of the funds he had been able to raise that remained after the completion of the construction of the building. Only this uncertain amount would serve as support for the rest of the seminarians (Rubio Merino 1958, 524). Hence, no differently than the Manila colleges of the religious, the last of his statutes provided for *porcionistas*: “If in addition to the collegians, anyone of any nation, inspired by God, should wish to enter this college . . . [he can be admitted by the archbishop] if he promises to live under the same rules and to pay punctually the stipend for his annual support” (*ibid.*, 542).

In fact, to judge by Sidotti's statutes, San Clemente would have been little different from the other Manila colleges, except greatly inferior, given the rigidity, eccentricities, and impracticality of certain of its statutes. Sidotti himself called it a “colegio” and its students “colegiales” (Rubio Merino 1958, 542 *passim*), and elsewhere provided that “those who do not have any inclination toward the ecclesiastical estate, should be applied, according to the inclination they have, to the ‘mechanical arts,’ such as painting, music, medicine, so that no one is to be dismissed for incapacity in studies” (*ibid.*, 526). Thus, in fact, not only was it no more exclusively an ecclesiastical seminary than any of the other Manila colleges, but it did not even demand any specifically religious motivation for entrance, nor even a minimum academic capacity not only to enter but to remain till one had finished his secular studies. Indeed, one may say that it was just the opposite of a conciliar seminary such as was stipulated by the Council of Trent. As conceived by Sidotti, it would have spent the resources for the education of Filipino priests on boys who were not even considering the priesthood, and the priests it produced would not even be for the Philippines.

The Ordinations of Archbishop Francisco de la Cuesta

It is in this light that we must look at the attitude and actions of Camacho's successor, Archbishop Francisco de la Cuesta, O.S.H., a

member of the Hieronymite religious order, one that had no parishes in the Philippines and therefore no desire to keep their parishes from the secular clergy. Much attention has been given by myself in my earlier article (Schumacher 1978, 160–61; 1979b, 64), and even more by Santiago (1987, 53–54) and Coronel (1998, 52–53), to interpreting his attitude toward Indio priests, particularly in the light of his letter of 20 June 1708, criticizing Camacho's ordinees and the group from which they came. He is quoted as saying:

I found *them* so unfit that even the most capable of them I could not manage to put on a list of those proposed for the position of sacristan in a church (to my great sorrow) because of his lack of capacity. For the synodal examiners excluded him as being unworthy. And though this is bad enough, it is not the principal reason on which I have formed my conscience in determining not to ordain them. (Schumacher 1979b, 64; italics mine; original Spanish in Olacoea 1972, 167)³⁸

He goes on to assert that "the majority"—he does not say "all"—are "of evil customs" and so lacking in dignity and culture when ordained as to be "an object of scorn and jokes among the Spaniards" (*ibid.*).

The whole passage raises puzzling questions. For, in fact, the same archbishop had himself already ordained two Indios to the priesthood and one to the subdiaconate in the seven months after his arrival, the latter only three weeks prior to his 1708 letter to the king. It is true that, as Santiago says (Schumacher 1979b, 52), he could not easily refuse to do so in the case of B. D. Sebastián Polintan, since Archbishop Camacho had already appointed him, though still only a deacon, as proprietary parish priest of the town of Santo Tomás. The other priest, B. D. Tomás Valdes Solit, ordained by de la Cuesta after a synodal examination for competency, to the subdiaconate, was not for his own diocese, but ordained for Nueva Cáceres at the request of the sickly Bishop Andrés González. There was no reason for him, however, to ordain Solit to the subdiaconate, a major order at that time, unless he intended to ordain him to the priesthood. Even having bestowed it on him, he did not have to ordain him to the priesthood for his own archdiocese, as he in fact eventually did. There would have been other

provincial dioceses that would have been glad to have a Manila-educated priest if de la Cuesta had not wanted him for Manila. It is untrue, therefore, that he was totally against ordaining Indios, even in the beginning of his episcopate. He would ordain this subdeacon, B. D. Tomás Solit, to the priesthood between two and four years later, and then no others until 1716, an interval of between four and six years. In the seven following years before his transfer to Mexico, he would ordain thirty-one priests, whether for his own or for suffragan dioceses.³⁹

The Role of Bishop-Elect Domingo de Valencia

For the assertion that de la Cuesta experienced a *metanoia*, or conversion, as Santiago and Coronel both say, or he changed his policy due to the influence of Bishop-elect Domingo de Valencia of Nueva Cáceres, they present no real evidence. Santiago (1987, 51) calls de la Cuesta an "ambivalent revisionist," whatever that may mean. Santiago also places Valencia, together with Tournon and Sidotti, as "co-founders" of the Filipino clergy, alongside Camacho (1987, 38), an assertion we will show is incorrect. There is no doubt that he attracted nine Indio candidates for the priesthood to Nueva Cáceres, where it seems he was desperate for priests because of the lack of Franciscans, and later gave those who were not priests dismissorial letters to Archbishop de la Cuesta, for ordination to the priesthood. After his presentation to the Holy See by the king, he had taken possession of the diocese as administrator on 28 August 1715, in accordance with an unsanctioned custom introduced by the Patronato. Lacking the papal bulls of appointment, however, he could not be consecrated. Though he received consistorial promotion in Rome in 1718, by the time the papal bulls authorizing his consecration arrived, he had already died in 1719 (*ibid.*, 59–60, 160). Though it is true, therefore, that he consented to the ordination of Indio priests, he had no other choice for the empty parishes of his diocese. Few, if any, Spanish secular priests, educated in the Manila colleges, would have volunteered to leave Manila for a poor provincial diocese. We can see this even in Indio priests like B. D. Tomás Solit. Though he was ordained to the subdiaconate for Nueva Cáceres with the support of Bishop Andrés González, once

having thus achieved major orders from Archbishop de la Cuesta, after the death of González he transferred to the archdiocese of Manila, and it was for Manila that he was ordained a priest.

What we can say of Valencia is that it is true that he was a promoter of a secular clergy, probably one composed of criollos, Spanish priests born in the Philippines. Yet it is quite another thing to assert that he favored an Indio clergy, for which there is no clear evidence; rather, contrary indications. More indicative of his real sentiments are the two becas he founded in the Colegio de San José (of which he was an alumnus) in 1717, funded by the profits from various shops he owned in the Parián. Both were explicitly designated for "Spaniards born in Manila," like himself (de los Arcos 1988, 99; BR 45:122). It would seem then that this preference for Spaniards to Indios is an indication that his real concern in promoting ordinations in Nueva Cáceres was a need to create a *secular*, rather than necessarily an *Indio*, clergy. The only other possibility, unsupported by any evidence, is that he would have preferred to set up becas for Indios in his alma mater, but could not, because San José was probably not yet open to Indios, even for becas de donación.

In any case, none of these factors explain either the interval between de la Cuesta's letter to the king and his next ordinations in 1716, nor give a reason for his change of policy, if in fact there was such a change.⁴⁰

The "Delay" in Ordinations under Archbishop de la Cuesta

In spite of the archbishop's strong words about Camacho's ordinees, there was only a four- to six-year interval between de la Cuesta's ordinations. This hardly needs much explanation when it was only twelve years since Camacho had ordained the first Indio priest. Moreover, of the total of seven Indios Camacho ordained in the eight years before departing from the Philippines, only five were for his own diocese. (These figures on the number of Indios, on ordinations, and on priests ordained for the archdiocese, are all maximum figures, since several depend on merely probable, though likely, conclusions of Santiago on one or more of these qualifications.) Santiago gives the impression that Indios were immediately clamoring to be ordained priests, a supposition

for which there is no evidence beyond the fact that they brought lumber from Pampanga and lime and stone from Parañaque for Sidotti's ill-fated San Clemente. That there was a general desire that the priesthood be open to Indios is probably true, just as there was by the latter part of the seventeenth century a desire that higher education be opened to them. But they did not flock into the colleges immediately, nor much less to the priesthood, where there were usually lengthy periods of trial imposed on them by conscientious bishops, and stringent demands on their future behavior, not least of them celibacy.

Santiago also gives the impression that as soon as a young man finished his bachelor of arts, he was ready to be ordained. That has not been the practice of the Church. Today another four years of theology, as well as varying periods of probation or internship are prescribed before the ordination to the priesthood. There was nothing in the curriculum of bachiller which prepared directly for the priesthood; simply it made one an educated person. From the available records as found in Santiago and Coronel, very few went on to get a degree in theology; hence Archbishop de la Cuesta's abolition of the chairs of philosophy and theology, which were intended for those getting higher degrees than bachiller, something that could be done more satisfactorily at the Universidad de Santo Tomás. They must have at least spent some time in studying moral theology, liturgy, and other practical matters which would prepare them for their priestly duties, even though they did not receive any degree for such practical studies. This may be seen in the seminary of San Felipe, where when the chairs for higher degrees were abolished by Archbishop de la Cuesta and those aiming at those degrees were sent to the Universidad de Santo Tomás, the seminarians remaining at San Felipe continued to study not only grammar in the seminary, but also liturgy and moral theology. Others studied these nondegree subjects at the university itself (see Coronel 1998, 25–26; Bazaco 1953, 130, 192–93).

Thus the sometimes long periods between the conferral of minor orders, often done after the bachelor's degree, need not be attributed to prejudice on the part of the archbishops, as Santiago and Coronel often suppose, but to the need for fulfilling nondegree, but necessary, requirements for fit priests. Most conscientious bishops today often

require a period of trial and exercise of nonpriestly ministries before ordaining men who have completed their studies to the priesthood. Certainly, the reason could also be the conduct of the aspirant to the priesthood, which made it necessary to give him a longer period of trial in minor orders (which could easily be dispensed) to see if he improved, again a procedure often used today. In the light of de la Cuesta's unfavorable impression of the products of San Clemente, it is not surprising that he waited some years, depending on the man, before ordaining him; and we know of at least one of the original eight who was not ordained for Manila, and another apparently not at all (Santiago 1987, 59).

In this connection we should also note that obtaining a *capellanía* of which Santiago makes so much, had little to do with the excellence in conduct or in academic achievement on the part of the one receiving it. He might be the only one who fulfilled such accidental qualifications as being from a certain province, being a blood relative of the founder, or other qualifications which the founder of the *capellanía* might stipulate founding it. If these accidental qualifications were found in more than one candidate, its bestowal might be due not only to merit, but also to favoritism, or other less admirable reasons. The main point is that it was not an ecclesiastical dignity, but a source of income for a priest, in exchange for which he offered stipulated masses.

The Supposed Anti-Filipino Prejudices of Archbishop de la Cuesta

The archbishop gives as the immediate reason for his policy the fact that one of those Indios ordained by Camacho (from the context, one of the Indio becarios of San Clemente), who was "the most advanced of them" and whom he had wished to put on the terna (*nómina*) for the position of priest-sacristan, was unable to be included because the synodal examiners "excluded him as unworthy" (*lo excluyeron por indigno*).⁴¹ The obvious meaning of the words is that though he was the most advanced—in some respect—for certain reason(s)—ignorance? morals in his priestly life?—his lack of qualification was such that the synodal examiners, who were asked to approve his appointment, found him too unworthy.

Santiago (1987, 54, 83–86) argues that the priest so stigmatized was B. D. Juan Crisostomo, whose record shows him to be far from being the most capable of those ordained by Camacho; but he was the only one about this time who had applied for the dignity of priest-sacristan—that of Lubang.⁴² The argument fails immediately on the fact that the archbishop was talking about an Indio priest, and Crisostomo was a Spanish mestizo. Moreover, the sacristanship of Lubang was not the only one vacant at this time.⁴³ By Santiago's own account, there was vacant at the same time (1708) the far more desirable one of the Spanish parish of Santiago Extramuros (ibid., 94).⁴⁴ In the synodal examinations for this post, Fr. Pedro Pasqual (probably an Indio, according to Santiago) took part on 27 March 1708, but failed to win the position. He was clearly the “most advanced,” since he was already a priest, while the other candidates were still doing their studies and not yet ordained priests (ibid., 94).

Santiago (1987, 94), apparently oblivious of what he himself later recounts about the sacristanship of the Santiago Extramuros parish, thinks he finds inconsistencies in Archbishop de la Cuesta's statement that in fact do not exist. Hence he argues that the archbishop mistakenly generalized from the case of a priest who was indeed unworthy, i.e., Crisostomo, to all Indio priests being such (ibid., 54–55).⁴⁵ Moreover, as noted, Crisostomo was not an Indio but a Spanish mestizo. The most probable conclusion is that it was not Crisostomo but Pasqual who was rejected by the synodal examiners, since only he fits the description *más aventajado*. The archbishop's negative attitude depended on this one case of the man he had proposed for the post of sacristan being rejected, as he says himself. No doubt he was frustrated that there was no one else qualified who wished to compete for the post. It seems more likely, however, that this was a derogatory comment on the improvised studies at San Clemente rather than on the quality of Indio priests in general.

He goes on to speak of the bad qualities that often made Indios unfit, or at least not yet fit, for ordination to the priesthood. For this we have to look at the second half of the letter where he speaks of the conduct and decorum of Indio priests. Who is he talking about? In other words, who is the “them” he was resolved no longer to ordain?

Not those whom he had just ordained, but rather the ordinees, or some of them, of Camacho, who had come out of the abortive San Clemente Seminary. This would account for his apparent delay until 1716 to ordain a priest—that he did not have any confidence in the competence of the training at San Clemente, and therefore demanded a period of trial from them before he would consider ordaining them to the priesthood. His own seminary on which he could rely would be San Felipe.

As noted above, depending on Santiago's (1987, 103) own facts, de la Cuesta actually ordained another Indio, B. D. Tomás Solit in 1710 or 1712 at the latest. During the period of three to five years before the next ordination—(to minor orders in 1715, and four to six to the priesthood in 1716)—there were Indios preparing for the priesthood by getting their degrees at the Universidad de Santo Tomás, and at least two were admitted to San Felipe seminary as *capistas* or *porcionistas* during these years (*ibid.*, 57–59). By 1714, according to the archbishop himself, some who had finished their bachelor of arts degree were beginning their theological studies (*ibid.*). None of this would have happened if it had been the declared policy of the archbishop not to ordain Indios to the priesthood, since he had to approve all candidates for the seminary, not just the *becarios*. So it seems untrue to say that he had resolved at any time not to ordain Indios in general, but rather the products of San Clemente.⁴⁶ My original interpretation being erroneous for lack of the data that Santiago later unearthed, Santiago (and Coronel), unperceiving of their implications, went on to draw erroneous conclusions, for which I think I have given a more likely explanation here.

In fact, nothing would have been more sensible and prudent, especially after the troubles caused by the rashness of Sidotti and of Camacho, than to move gradually. When the first Filipino priest had only been ordained so few years earlier, one would not expect several, or necessarily even one, each year or two.⁴⁷ Even Camacho had only ordained five Indio priests (excluding one Spanish *mestizo*) in his first five years, and all of them seem to have completed their studies with the Dominicans some time before that. It would seem that Santiago, followed by Coronel, has concocted a whole explanation out of an excerpt with unknown context, from a document never seen by either

man except in my earlier version. There is no need to postulate either a conversion or an ambivalent or revisionist policy, where simple prudence, or even the lack of candidates who were fully prepared, could more likely be the explanation.

The Change from San Clemente to San Felipe Seminary

One of de la Cuesta's earliest acts as archbishop was to revise the statutes Sidotti had composed for his seminary and Camacho had approved.⁴⁸ Rather than seeing this as showing that he was "not at all sympathetic to the Filipino cause" (Coronel 1998, 53), it was, as the archbishop himself said, because the statutes were fit to "serve to preserve in a state of perfection religious orders of the most reformed observance," rather than adapted to beginning young seminarians. He declared them impractical "according to the judgment of prudent and experienced men" (Rubio Merino 1958, 424). Though Camacho's biographer considers this a proof of Camacho's high standards for the priesthood, one is rather compelled to agree with Archbishop de la Cuesta on reading in these statutes such absurdities as the rule that the age for admission was between eight and twelve years old (Coronel 1998, 58; Rubio Merino, 525). Apart from the lack of common sense involved in thinking one could take eight-year old boys and separate them from their families and culture, what would be the medium of communication in a seminary for all Asia for seminarians of totally different nationalities, cultures, and languages? (De la Cuesta changed the minimum age to twelve, and of course the royal order limited the seminary to inhabitants of the Philippines.)

The kind of students Sidotti had intended to recruit may be judged from the plan of studies. Their first task as students was "to learn the Doctrina Cristiana and Spanish, and then to learn to read the *cartilla* [primer], and to write and count"—in other words, primary education, not preparation for the priesthood (Rubio Merino 1958, 536). These are just examples of what an unrealistic project these statutes envisioned and how far Sidotti's dream was from being a seminary in the modern sense, or even in the eighteenth-century sense. In revising the statutes,

Archbishop de la Cuesta did not destroy anything of value, but tried to create a sensible seminary. Far from Camacho being the champion of the native clergy, if he had remained he might have done as much damage as that other so-called champion, Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Santos Justa y Rufina, or as Archbishop de la Cuesta more charitably suggests, "he would certainly have reformed his judgment" (Olaechea 1971, 167). What de la Cuesta did was to delay ordinations a few years in order for prospective candidates to get the necessary education in San Felipe or if they had already finished at the inferior San Clemente, to put them through a period of trial. Yet the very fact that he provided for that education, whether in the religious colleges or as *porcionistas* in the seminary of San Felipe, shows that he was fully committed to ordaining Indio priests in significant numbers, but wanted them well-prepared. Far more than Camacho, he deserves the title of promoter of a native clergy.

Had Sidotti's statutes been followed, on another count Camacho's purposes would certainly not have been achieved. For according to the statutes, though Indios were freely admitted in large numbers, all except the eight provided for in the original royal cedula were to oblige themselves by oath to work for the conversion of non-Christians, not to be parish priests in the archdiocese of Manila. "The principal and only purpose of the seminary was the conversion of infidels in the mountains of the Philippine Islands and in all of the Orient" (Coronel 1998, 58; cf. Rubio Merino 1958, 521). And as we have noted above, they were not even necessarily to study for the priesthood.

If one looks at the whole selection from the letter of de la Cuesta, the context seems to show, as his actions demonstrated, that he was not rejecting Indios as persons, but the Sidotti seminary and those Indios who were made its *becarios* by Camacho. There is one point, however, from which it could possibly be argued that de la Cuesta's changes seemed to be anti-Indio—that is, his admission policy in the revised statutes by which all the *becarios* were to be Spaniards or at least *cuarterones*. His reasoning, however, was perfectly logical and the only sensible course of action, seeing how severely the king had reprimanded Camacho and Zabálburu for the slightest deviation from his orders in a matter connected with his Patronato.

The king's cedula had provided for eight seminarians, whom he never specified should be Indios. Santiago (1987, 37 *passim*) in contradiction to all the evidence, has him "creating the Manila seminary for eight *native* candidates" (*italics mine*).⁴⁹ The italicized word or its equivalent does not appear in the royal cedula, nor is there anything in the context that would justify Santiago's arbitrary insertion. Archbishop de la Cuesta, no doubt doubly warned by the king's reaction to any deviation from the wording of his cedulas, adhered strictly to the law that, in the absence of any royal provision concerning the ethnicity of the eight seminarians of San Felipe Seminary, the general laws of the Indies should be followed. A law of the *Recopilación* (1943, lib. 1, tit. 23, ley 3) provided: "in choosing the persons for collegians of the seminaries, as the prelates have to do, given equal merits, *preference* (*italics mine*) should be given to the sons and descendants of the first discoverers, pacifiers, and *colonists* (*italics mine*) of those provinces."⁵⁰ He therefore appointed eight sons of Spaniards as the becarios, a decision approved by the Audiencia and the governor-general (Olaechea 1971, 167; Coronel 1998, 59–60 [who, however, does not appreciate the obligatory nature of the archbishop's decision]). The incident proves nothing about the anti-Indio attitudes of Archbishop de la Cuesta; he could not legally do anything else, contrary to the assertion of Santiago (1987, 53). His decision was that:

Inasmuch as there was no explicit royal order that the eight seminarians be Indios, the laws of the Indies . . . should prevail Those who were to be admitted should precisely be sons of a Spanish father and a mestiza mother, or those commonly known as *quaterones* [*sic*] who had three parts Spanish blood and one part Indio. (Coronel 1998, 59–60)

Moreover, if we look further, the policy was in fact the same as that at the Colegio de San José and the Colegio de Santo Tomás: the limitations were for the becarios, which was in accord with the royal decree setting up the seminary. There was provision for capistas and porcionistas, and these would be mostly Indios. De la Cuesta's prescriptions also provided that:

The seminary was to be open to boys other than those ordered by the king. They should possess the same qualifications, go through the same admission process, and wear the same uniform. However, the royal treasury would not support them. Their parents or benefactors should pay their tuition. The annual fee was one hundred pesos. (Coronel 1998, 60)

In other words, he did not oppose at all the entrance of Indios into the priesthood, but as in all the other institutions with royal statutes he gave preference to Spaniards. And here, no doubt, is the reason why the provincial bishops or administrators were more generous in ordaining Indios, or in giving dismissorial letters so that the two archbishops could ordain them. It was a rare Spanish priest who would aspire to a post in the provinces when there were more comfortable (and more lucrative) parishes in Manila, where they would be part of the Spanish community.

On this basis of entering as a *porcionista*, there was similar access to the colleges of Manila and, in the end, it was in them rather than in the seminary that the San Clemente-San Felipe seminarians received most, or all, of their academic training for the priesthood.⁵¹ It is perhaps a key to the languid life of the seminary, its entanglement with the short-lived, so-called Universidad de San Felipe,⁵² and eventual death of San Felipe Seminary.⁵³ Why should an Indio go there as a *porcionista* or *capista* when by paying approximately the same amount he could go to one of the Dominican or Jesuit colleges, where he would do his higher studies anyhow and where there were better professors and libraries than at San Felipe (if it even had a library)?

After Archbishop de la Cuesta

It does not appear that the archdiocesan archives contain supplementary data on San Felipe in the decades after de la Cuesta, at least not enough to establish any clear facts concerning ordinations. Santiago stops his series of ordinations with the departure of Archbishop de la Cuesta in 1723. De la Cuesta left Manila for the See of Valladolid de Mechoacán (Michoacán) in Mexico in July 1723, dying there the following year.

Archbishop Carlos Bermúdez de Castro, who only took possession of his See on 25 August 1728, succeeded him in Manila; but by October 1729 had fallen sick, dying in November. The five-year vacancy before his taking possession was followed by an eight-year vacancy until Archbishop Juan Angel Rodríguez took possession in 1737 (Santiago 1987, 160–61). One cannot be sure of specific ordinations, however, since, as Santiago (1998, 89) points out, most documents that would indicate ordinations are missing for the period 1725 to 1736. Coronel likewise records no ordinations, but skips to the time of Archbishop Rojo in 1759, when he is able to give numbers and, in some cases, names and the ethnic background of secular priests then existing; but he has no names or dates for any ordinations after 1723. Juan de la Concepción (1788–1792, 10:169), writing sixty years later, says that in his one year before he came down with the sickness that led to his death Archbishop Carlos Bermúdez performed “many confirmations and ordinations.” The brevity of his episcopacy, however, and the fact that he was engaged in fierce controversies with the governor-general over who should have authority to admit seminarians to San Felipe (*ibid.*, 170–72), makes one wonder about several points: (1) How accurate was this vague statement of Concepción, since he did not come to the Philippines until twenty-five years after the death of Bermúdez? (2) Were the “many” he performed confirmations or were they ordinations? (3) If they were ordinations, were these ordinations to the priesthood or to lesser orders? (4) Where had the priests (if any) studied, since there were no studies beyond grammar at San Felipe at this time? Though one might think there were many waiting for ordination after the long vacancy between de la Cuesta and Bermúdez and between the latter and his successor, this was not necessarily so, since, if given dimissorial letters by the cathedral chapter, any who were ready for the priesthood could have been ordained by one of the suffragan bishops in the provinces, of whom there was always at least one, and much of the time three, during the vacancies of Manila.

What is surprising is that there were many Indio secular priests (fifty to sixty) in the archdiocese of Manila by 1762.⁵⁴ Since the total number of ordinations from San Felipe in its whole history was so few as Coronel, using Surban and Santiago, is able to show,⁵⁵ one must conclude

that most came from the four colleges of Manila: San Ignacio, San José, Santo Tomás, and San Juan de Letrán.⁵⁶

This number does not include the undoubtedly smaller, but perhaps significant, numbers in the three suffragan dioceses. Since the British invasion took place in 1762, and Archbishop Rojo died in 1764, it is probably more or less the same number, allowing for deaths and unknowable additional ordinations, as there was by the time that Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Santas Justa y Rufina took possession of the Archdiocese of Manila in 1767. (The controverted discussion of his mass ordinations would require another article. In this matter Coronel and I differ drastically.)

In the sixty-nine years since the ordination of the first definitely Filipino priest by Archbishop Camacho in 1698, at least one to three dioceses were without consecrated bishops, and more than once the interval between the death of the last survivor and the arrival of a new appointee for some diocese was so brief that the Philippines was almost left without any consecrated bishop at all. In those sixty-nine years, the total vacancies in the four dioceses amount to well over 150 years, a rough average of one-third of the time (Santiago 1987, 160–64; Abella 1959, 445–46). Moreover, of course, it is unlikely that any prudent bishop immediately began ordaining as soon as he was consecrated and took possession of his See. Finally, during this entire period, not only were the provincial dioceses the most frequently vacant, but there was no institution to train priests anywhere except in Manila.

Conclusions

To conclude, all those who have tried to treat the origins and early history of the Filipino clergy—de la Costa, Cullum, Santiago, Coronel, and myself—have erred on one or more major points. Yet all have advanced, to a greater or less extent, our knowledge. We now know that the first definitely Indio priest was ordained in 1698. We know that, though those of Spanish blood always had the preference, strong bias against Indios had largely disappeared by the beginning of the eighteenth century. We know that Archbishop Camacho was only in a secondary and subordinate sense the “champion of a Filipino clergy”; he

was rather an advocate of a secular clergy, whether it be Spanish or native, dependent on the archbishop, who was determined to break the unwillingness of the religious orders to be subject to his visitation. In the face of their unanimous solidarity on this point, circumstances obliged him to seek out natives, though there is no indication that this was ever his primary purpose. We know that Archbishop Francisco de la Cuesta was not the enemy of a Filipino clergy at any time, but a prudent man who promoted both Spanish and native clergy, but not at the expense of their quality, at least for the archdiocese for which he was responsible. Taught by the strong reprimands given to his predecessor, he was careful to observe the regulations of the Patronato Real. We know, finally, that in the midst of these various jurisdictional struggles and displays of prejudice, a Filipino clergy was gradually being formed, educated together with, and at the level of, their Spanish counterparts. There is every evidence that, had not Bourbon regalism, ecclesiastical ambition, and impetuous action intervened in the person of Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Santas Justa y Rufina, there is good reason to think that there would have been a normal evolution of the Filipino clergy, as Fr. Juan José Delgado saw happening by the mid-eighteenth century. Had that been the case, the bitter struggles of the nineteenth century, which led to contempt as well as fear in the face of an indigenous clergy, might have been mitigated, if not avoided.

Notes

Abbreviations Used

AAM – Archives of the Archdiocese of Manila

AFIO – Archivo Franciscano Ibero-Oriental, Madrid

AGI – Archivo General de las Indias, Seville

ARSI – Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, Rome

BR – Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, eds., *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898* (Cleveland, OH: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1903–1909).

1. Some of the earlier textbooks of Gregorio F. Zaide, Louis La Ravoire Morrow, Antonio Molina; also other works cited in nn. 2–5 in Schumacher 1979b, 61–63. See also Abella 1971, 1–34, esp. 34, and other writings of his for the demolition of this idea. At the same time, in speaking of “Filipinos,” unlike Santiago and Coronel, I signify Indios and Chinese mestizos, who shared a cul-

ture, especially on the upper levels, that would eventually be called "Filipino," and do not include Spanish mestizos. To avoid the clumsy repetition of "Indio and Chinese mestizo" so frequently in this article, we will speak simply of "Indios," for whatever privilege was open to Indios was likewise open to Chinese mestizos, and in time the distinction would fade away, except for fiscal purposes. Spanish mestizos, on the other hand, as *hijos de Españoles* were by the eighteenth century really Spaniards—in language, in culture, and in self-identification, even though there remained a certain sense of superiority on the part of pure-blooded Spaniards. This identification of Spanish mestizos as Spaniards steadily increased from the latter part of the seventeenth through the eighteenth century, as the number of Spaniards permanently residing in the Philippines steadily decreased. One may see the process exemplified in the Colegio de San Juan de Letrán, originally founded for Spanish orphans. Gradually it admitted any boy with some Spanish blood, even sons of a Spanish mestizo father and Indio mother; then occasional Indios, especially if orphans; and eventually all ethnic groups without distinction. (The nineteenth century would see something of a reversal of the process of self-identification—e.g., Frs. Pedro Peláez and José Burgos being considered as, and identifying themselves with, the Indio clergy, in spite of Peláez being of pure Spanish blood, and Burgos of seven-eighths Spanish blood. But that is outside the scope of this article.)

2. I have major difficulties with the latter part of the book, but this article will limit itself to the first quarter of the eighteenth century, where Santiago made his contribution.

3. Santiago, however, and I myself in this article, have made use of Rubio Merino (1958), who worked principally in the AGI, and had thus also made indirect use of that invaluable archive. Escoto (1976) used the AGI extensively also, but his article deals with a different period from that being considered here.

4. The general failure to admit Indios to full membership in the religious orders under the Patronato, in some friar orders right up to the mid-twentieth century, is a topic that has as yet received little scholarly study, as opposed to polemics. The most thorough inquiry for one order may be found in de la Rosa (1990); also in Schumacher (1981), and, for a later order, Scharpf (1975–76). The question on the exclusion of Indios from the religious orders is outside the scope of this article.

5. By the term "long eighteenth century," as commonly used by historians, we mean to include the few years before 1700 when the preparatory steps were taken. Important historical shifts do not ordinarily occur on exact dates, but gradually.

6. Though Santo Tomás received its permanent charter in 1645, this made it what was technically known as an *academia*—capable of giving university degrees in the faculties that it possessed. Since, however, it lacked the traditional faculties of law and medicine, it was not a university in the full sense—*publica studii generalis universitas*—nor was San Ignacio, which also gave university degrees, but by papal

and royal privilege. Nonetheless both institutions called themselves universities in the late-seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Schumacher 1987, 147–48). The lengthy discussion of Bazaco ignores these distinctions and omits mention of the crucial points (1953, 157–64, 180–86).

7. Cummins (1969, 107) speculates, on good grounds, that this may have been a belated acknowledgment of the royal order of 1677. The text of the archbishop's proposal is found in Cummins (*ibid.*, 108–12).

8. Santiago gives as his source for this information the *Graduate Listing* of the University of Santo Tomas Alumni Association (1972). I have not seen this book, and he gives no indication of how or by whom it was compiled. Given the accessibility and extent of the Dominican archives, it seems likely that it was based on them for the early years. Villarroel (1988, 86–87), though not explicitly referring to this *Graduate Listing*, would appear to show that it was so based and worthy of credence, though incomplete for some years, apparently the early years of the seventeenth century, and therefore not relevant here. Of course this list gives no information on San Ignacio, and the Jesuit archives were confiscated by the government at their expulsion in 1768 and, in large part, lost. If, as it seems, the information about Santo Tomás is reliable, it is likely, though not certain, that a similar policy applied at San Ignacio around the same time.

9. He records one doubtful case, where a *colegial* of Letrán was named to a *capellanía*. Such a nomination normally came after, or shortly preceded, ordination to the priesthood, since the income from the capellanía entailed the obligation to celebrate Mass for the donor. (It was possible, in the short term, for the titular holder of the capellanía to get someone who was a priest and had no capellanía to fulfill this obligation on an interim basis and receive the income.) Since the interval before the date of the man's ordination to the priesthood is unknown, he can still be presumed to have received his degree from the Universidad de Santo Tomás in that intervening period, though continuing to be a *colegial* of Letrán, residing there.

10. De la Costa (1961, 571) makes this assertion concerning Spanish mestizo becarios in passing, citing—without giving his source—Archbishop Benavides as saying in 1599: “the Fathers of the Society of Jesus admit into their classes mulattoes and mestizos.” This, however, is a confusion between two different institutions. The Colegio de San José known to historians was founded in 1601 and refounded as an *obra pía* by the benefaction of Esteban Rodríguez de Figueroa in 1610. This residential college was for the sons of Spaniards. The Jesuits had, however, in 1595 founded their “Colegio de Manila” (after 1622, Colegio de San Ignacio, out of which developed the university of that name) with a government subsidy of a thousand pesos a year. When this was made unnecessary by a generous 1595 benefaction of Rodríguez de Figueroa, the government subsidy was applied to a school for Indios. By 1599 the government subsidy was no longer forthcoming, and the college for Indios, who had been temporarily attending the

Colegio de Manila, ceased to be. If Archbishop Benavides spoke of the admission of mestizos and mulattoes by the Jesuit fathers, he did not mean into the as yet nonexistent Colegio de San José, but into the Colegio de Manila, a day school, which evidently did not have the exclusive ethnic character of the later San José. I know of no other evidence (nor does de la Costa, with two dubious exceptions which we will see below, repeat this assertion) that San José admitted mestizos as becarios, even *becarios de donación*, before the end of the seventeenth century. See the following note.

11. De la Costa (1961, 571) cites for this assertion Fr. Alejo López, who is presumably the one elsewhere identified as having "died at sea near Puerto Rico, 18 September 1693" (*ibid.*, 613), and who wrote a lengthy "Parecer del P. Alexo López sobre si conviene o no el que la provincia de Philipinas dexe las doctrinas que tiene a su cargo en aquel reino" in 1690, located in ARSI 12, 138–150v. There is a copy of this in the de la Costa transcripts at the Pulong Institute of Loyola School of Theology, but it does not mention San José, which is not its subject. (Two folios, however, are missing in the transcript.) It is possible that there was another letter of Fr. Alejo López to Rome in 1690, on the colegio; but I have not been able to locate it. One would wish to know more exactly how many such bursaries were and when they began, especially since they were not in existence in 1768. One should also take into consideration the fact that, as noted above, given the small number of pure-blooded Spaniards in all this period, Spanish mestizos, especially those whose mothers were Spanish mestizo (*cuarterones*) were rather easily accepted as Spaniards, which is what they were culturally. After all, they were in fact *hijos de españoles*, at least on their father's side.

12. The text of the decree is in BR 45:184–86. In fact it basically repeats various decrees for the entire Indies going back to Carlos V in 1550, a good indication that it was not implemented, and least of all in the Philippines. Cf. *Recopilación* 1943, lib. vi, tit. 1, ley 193 (1550); lib. 1, tit. 13, ley 5 (1634, 1636); lib. 6, tit. 1, ley 18.

13. Santiago also cites from the manuscript of dubious historical value by Ambrosio Manaligod a decree of 1697 declaring all Indios to have "purity of blood" (*limpieza de sangre*), as removing the final obstacle to higher education. Besides the fact that in his earlier work Santiago (1987, 36) had declared that this decree was "apparently set aside by the governor-general," he fails to explain how those who already had obtained higher degrees had done so before the alleged decree of the king. Manaligod apparently gave no source for his unpublished polemical assertions or at least Santiago does not name such, having been loaned a manuscript copy by Manaligod. Without further evidence, one must consider this an unreliable source.

14. The term *capista*, at least in its origin, came from the *capa* worn by those students who were not *becarios*, and hence did not wear the *beca*, or hood worn over the gown, which distinguished the limited number of full collegians. See Santiago (1987, 187), who, however, does not fully understand *beca*. Also

Villarroel (1971, 39, 43) for the presumably similar relationship in the nineteenth century.

15. One notable donation was the two *becas* financed by the bishop-elect of Nueva Cáceres, Don Domingo Valencia, himself an alumnus of San José and a criollo, both of which bursaries were specified to be granted only to criollos born in Manila. This fits ill with Santiago and Coronel's effort to exalt Valencia as a second founder of the native Filipino clergy, on the grounds that when he was bishop-elect of Nueva Cáceres he sent several Indios to Manila to be ordained for his diocese, since he could not ordain them himself, not yet having received episcopal ordination. Nothing is said of their having studied, since no place to do so existed outside Manila, and this lack of formal studies appears to have been common in ordinands from the provincial dioceses. It is evident, therefore, that this so-called champion of a Filipino clergy rather preferred criollos like himself, as is shown in the *becas* he donated. Being in need of priests immediately, however, as a bishop he felt the obligation to provide at least some in the meantime, even if they were Indios and without much, if any, formal education. At best he can be called a champion of a secular clergy.

16. Perhaps, too, the *becas de gracia* would have provided for Spanish mestizos. Those *becas de donación* which were designated for Chinese mestizos by 1768 must have been given subsequent to the 1740 date of the document cited here. See Repetti (1946, ch. 15) and Colín (1900, 2:482-92). In addition, though the term *porcionista* does not appear in the San José documents, at least some of the students were paying part of their fees in 1768, and hence should be qualified as such.

17. This was the same year, and probably part of the same process, by which the right of San Ignacio to give university degrees was confirmed by the king, as well as San José's precedence over Santo Tomás (de la Costa 1961, 410-11).

18. One or two could possibly have studied at the Seminario de San Felipe and been ordained in 1720, just before the archbishop suppressed the chairs of philosophy and theology, and sent these students to the Universidad de Santo Tomás to complete their studies. It is unlikely, however, since one of the reasons for the suppression of the chairs was the lack of students to attend their lectures.

19. Cullum names these four colleges as Santo Tomás, San José, Letrán, and San Felipe. He gives no reason for eliminating San Ignacio, nor does he attempt to explain why Delgado speaks only of Dominicans and Jesuits as teachers, if San Felipe were included. Since Archbishop de la Cuesta suppressed the chairs of philosophy and theology in 1720, only grammar, liturgy, and morals were being taught at San Felipe. By itself, this could hardly be considered as preparing them for the priesthood.

20. De la Costa connects this favorable disposition of the Jesuit congregation with what he considered to be the beginning of the ordination of Filipino priests, based on his misinterpretation of the occasion for the diatribe of Gaspar de San Agustín. Many Filipino priests were ordained before that, as has been indi-

cated, and Santiago has clarified the reason behind San Agustín's cranky tirade, which de la Costa did not know. De la Costa's most important point, however, remains intact—that the Jesuit representatives, even those who considered that Otazo's project as a whole was not feasible, were open to, and even anxious for, the ordination of Filipino priests without discrimination.

21. Of course this is at least partly, if not solely, because most of those whose educational background Santiago has determined are known by the presence of their names on the *Graduate Listing* of Santo Tomás. Still, they are the majority with any educational identification, with a couple of exceptions to be considered below.

22. At its provisional inauguration in 1707, it had only eight seminarians. Santiago has identified all of them, of whom six Indios and one criollo were ordained (the eighth must either have left or died by the time Archbishop de la Cuesta began regularly ordaining to the priesthood in 1716). Two early ordinations to the priesthood, B. D. Sebastián Polintán and B. D. Tomás Valdes Solit, were ordained after having spent approximately a year in the seminary (Santiago 1987, 96–99, 102–5). Hence their degree of *bachiller* must have been earned previously elsewhere. The other Indio seminarians finally ordained to the priesthood by Archbishop de la Cuesta in 1716 all had prior degrees from Santo Tomás (*ibid.*, 58–59). Indeed there is no evidence that the Seminary of San Clemente (as distinct from San Felipe) ever had any authorization to grant degrees, even *bachiller*, much less licentiate or master's degrees, for power to offer these would come from the Royal Patronato and/or the pope.

23. The exact date when higher studies *de facto* ceased is difficult to determine, but it was certainly by 1720, when the archbishop suppressed the chairs of philosophy and theology. Bazaco (1953, 111–12), followed by Cullum (1972, 71), says that it was the need for rooms for the so-called University of San Felipe that brought about the suppression of these chairs, and that in 1730, when the university was closed, “the seminary was restored to normal.” Concepción (1788–92, 8:336–37), more accurately, tells how Archbishop de la Cuesta “made representation to the government that the two posts of professors of philosophy and theology be eliminated, since he considered these chairs useless” and a financial burden to the government. In this Concepción was expanding on the earlier concise remark of San Antonio, who said the two chairs were suspended “for the convenience of the royal treasury” (1977, 193). The government officials concerned gladly agreed. Only afterwards, when authorities were looking for a place for the professorial chairs of the University of San Felipe, did they investigate the seminary as a possible place. Elsewhere, however, Concepción (1788–92, 10: 177–78) says that later the seminary was overcrowded, apparently when officials tried to put the entire university there, and consequently they had to rent an additional house. Cullum (1972, 71) likewise says in passing, again following Bazaco, that the students of philosophy and theology were sent to Santo Tomás and San José, in which he is followed by Coronel (1998, 25). If they are correct in saying that the

former seminarians of San Felipe (who must have been rather few at that upper level) were sent to San José as well as to Santo Tomás, they would have had to be from among the becarios of Spanish blood, since we have no clear indication that Indios were as yet students at San José. San Antonio (1977, 193) says taxingly that the seminarians who wished to continue in philosophy and theology “were instructed to take these subjects at the Universidad de Santo Tomás.”

24. The “Licenciado Agustín Tabuyo” ordained by García Serrano for Nueva Segovia is certainly the “Licenciado Agustín Tabuyo y Baldecañas,” who is mentioned elsewhere two years later as being appointed by Bishop Juan Rentería as chaplain of the forces of Sargento-Mayor Alonso Martín Quirante in an expedition to the Igorot gold mines. Despite the lack of the additional surname in the first mention, it would strain the utmost credulity to have two priests in the same diocese at the same time with an extremely rare (at that time) licentiate degree and the same principal surname.

25. Schumacher (2002a, 181 n. 21), and the references to primary sources there.

26. The 1654 date is apparently based on the desire to make him a fellow-ordinand of Gregorio Lo [López, as the Spaniards called him], the first Chinese Dominican priest, and later, bishop. Though different reference books give different dates for Lo’s ordination, vacillating between 1654 and 1656, Fernández (1958, 157), however, on the more sure basis of the Philippine Dominican archives and chronicles, includes him, already a Dominican and a priest, perhaps ordained in 1654, in the expedition that went to China in 1655.

27. In an earlier article, I recorded the somewhat vague recollection, given to me in a personal communication by that diligent researcher in Ilocano parish books, Fr. Frederick Scharpf, S.V.D., that he had seen seventeenth-century entries in baptismal books signed by a priest with an Ilocano name (Schumacher 1978, 158 n.3; 1979b, 61 n. 3). Such vague information, however, while not denying it all probability, cannot change our general conclusion, especially given the tricks that memory plays on all historians, and given the fact that Scharpf was not attempting to investigate our particular problem. The only factor in its possible favor is that, occasionally, in the priestless suffragan dioceses, some less conscientious bishops, even in the early-eighteenth century, seem to have ordained priests with merely a minimum of practical training and no academic instruction. We must also record in this connection a passing reference in a manuscript treatise of 1703 by the Franciscan, Juan de Jesús, “Instrucciones para nuestros misioneros de Filipinas acerca de la predicación y confesión de los indios” (AFIO 68/8) to a Pampango, D. Nicolás de Herrera, who had been [recently?] secretary of the Audiencia, and other Indios now being admitted to the lesser posts in the *Contaduría*. Though Herrera was not a priest, of course, it is an indication that minor offices and even an occasional higher post were being opened to Indios by the end of the seventeenth century. Though exact dates are not given, it makes the admission of some Filipino(s) to the priesthood not totally improbable. I am grateful to Fr. Pedro Gil, OFM, and Fr. Cayetano

Sánchez, OFM, for locating and furnishing me a copy of this manuscript defense of Filipino ability, though my attention was first called to it by its citation by Santiago from a published article of Father Sánchez.

28. Even if any of the doubtful Filipino priests were to be shown to be certain, none of them possessed an academic degree (except *licenciado* Tabuyo and *bachiller* Miguel Jerónimo de Morales); but it is precisely these advanced degrees received at a time when Indios were certainly not admitted to higher studies, that makes it clear they were not Filipinos. Almost all those recorded as ordained in Manila beginning with 1698 possessed at least the degree of *bachiller*, but rarely any higher degree till much later.

29. At the University of San Ignacio, presuming five years of grammar and humanities after an indeterminate time learning "first letters," another year and a half were required for the degree of bachelor of arts, another year and a half for the *licentiate*, and another year for the master's degree (de la Costa 1956, 143-48). Since all these degrees were in *Artes*, i.e., philosophy, some indeterminate time must also have been spent by candidates for the priesthood in studying theology, even without obtaining a degree in it. Presumably the same amount of time would have been required at the Universidad de Santo Tomás, since the basic curriculum at that time was general to all university studies; hence, about nine years after learning one's first letters. Thus *licentiate* Joseph de Ocampo must have begun his higher studies, at the very latest, shortly after 1690.

30. He would also ordain *bachiller* Ignacio Gregorio Manesay, a Chinese mestizo, whom he had brought with him from Mexico, but Manesay had made his studies in Mexico according to Santiago (1987, 76-78).

31. One of the major contributions of Santiago has been to explain why the notorious anti-Indio diatribe of Fray Gaspar de San Agustín was not an indication that the ordination of the first Indio priests took place in the 1720s, as both de la Costa and I had supposed, at least seeing it as the beginning of a *policy* of ordaining Indios. Santiago makes clear, however, that San Agustín in 1720 was indeed opposing a new policy, but it was a policy of appointing Filipino secular priests as full-fledged parish priests rather than mere coadjutors or priest-sacristans. In appointing a Filipino secular parish priest, Fr. Agustín Baluyot (Santiago 1987, 63-66) to a parish long held by the Augustinians on an interim basis, de la Cuesta was not only appointing a secular priest instead of a friar, but a Filipino secular priest. To do this, Archbishop de la Cuesta had skipped over the first three names on the *terna* (the first three on the list of episcopal nominees, from whom the governor-general normally named his choice) all of Spanish blood, and chosen the fourth, a Kapampangan. He was able to make such a choice because he was both archbishop and acting governor-general at the time after the assassination of Governor-General Fernando de Bustamante y Bustillo in 1719. As archbishop, he would have prepared the *terna* from the competitive examinations (*oposiciones*); as acting governor-general, he ignored it!

32. Maillard de Tournon had been sent by Rome to resolve the controversy among the missionaries in China over the so-called Chinese Rites—the acceptance by missionaries, particularly the Jesuits, of certain traditional Chinese customs in the Catholic community. By accident his ship was driven by a storm to Manila.

33. It is not correct that, as Santiago (1987, 39) says, he was able to persuade the governor through “the enormous dignity of his office which combined papal and royal sanctions.” In fact, he totally lacked royal sanctions, and it would be precisely their having allowed the interference of a papal representative in affairs which the crown considered to belong solely to the Patronato, that the governor, the Audiencia, and especially Camacho would later suffer from. Nor, in fact, did he have any papal sanctions for the Philippines, though the Holy See was always happy for an opportunity to restrict the many privileges in ecclesiastical affairs granted to, or usurped by, the Patronato Real. The governor continued to delay long after Tournon had left the Philippines, and each step that he took was carefully consulted with the corresponding royal officials (Rubio Merino 1958, 411–13). Even then, he was compelled to confess to the king later that he had transgressed certain points of the Patronato.

34. Though his name is usually spelled Sidotti, as it would be in Italian, at least in Manila he signed himself “Sidoti” (signature in Santiago 1987, xvi). Rubio Merino strangely Hispanizes his name to Abad Juan Bautista Cidoti, but the title of “abbot” is a misunderstanding of the common French manner of referring to secular priests as *Abbé*, which he no doubt adopted traveling in the entourage of the Frenchman, Maillard de Tournon. We will use here the traditional form of his name as found in the generality of historians. He would not finally leave Manila until 1708, when after two shipwrecks he eventually was able to land in Japan, only to be immediately captured, tortured, and imprisoned for years before his death in 1715. Maillard de Tournon left him behind in Manila in 1705 and, on his second attempt to cross the sea, arrived in China, where he managed to insult the emperor, destroy the China missions, and end up, having meanwhile been created a cardinal, imprisoned nonetheless by the Portuguese in Macao for having violated the *Padroado* by entering China without Portuguese royal permission. Here he died.

35. Camacho, in a 1705 letter to the king accused the Augustinian parish priests of harassing the Kapampangan volunteer woodcutters under the pretext of the common good, and even of forbidding the priest who was directing the woodcutting to celebrate Mass (Rubio Merino 1958, 413–14). Though he gives no source, Coronel improbably identifies the priest as Sidotti. Further, he specifies that the Tagalogs were the people of Parañaque, apparently depending on a document in Surban 1965, though the reference is unclear (*ibid.*, 47, 165, n. 59).

36. Coronel (1998, 52 n. 72) gives a rather free translation of the same passage, whether his or Surban’s, in which the word “falsely” is inserted in parentheses, between “faults” and “attributed,” thus implying that the king considered

Camacho free of fault in all respects. This is a totally unjustified distortion of the passage, if the author read the whole context in Rubio Merino or in the AGI. Rather, as is clear there, the king without a doubt did wish the archbishop to be severely reprehended for his violations of the Patronato, though he would pardon, but not overlook, these violations, in consideration of the gratitude Camacho had merited in other matters in which he had shown his zeal for the service of the king. This distortion seeks again to make Camacho a champion of the "Filipino cause" (Coronel 1998, 53). His "cause," in fact, was a *secular* clergy, whatever its ethnic composition, sufficient to back his efforts to bring the religious parish priests under his jurisdiction. In the concrete situation, the secular clergy had to be mostly Filipino, but he was not a champion of Filipino priests for their own sake.

37. To the command to limit the number to eight collegians and sixteen *porcionistas*, Ambrosio Manaligod, in his manuscript cited by Santiago, added the phrase "it is not advisable to allow the entry of too many Indio priests in a territory inhabited by few Spaniards." Since there is no evidence that either of them ever saw the document of the king in AGI, as Rubio Merino did, the addition of this anachronistic political caution appears to be a concoction of Manaligod, uncritically taken up by Santiago. As the rest of the quotation in Rubio Merino shows, it was the lack of people capable of filling civil offices that the king was concerned about, not a potential revolution.

38. Both Santiago and Coronel are supposedly citing Olaechea (1972), but in fact it would seem certain that neither of them ever saw the Spanish quote cited, much less the rest of the quotation from the archbishop's letter there. Since neither author gives the volume number of Olaechea's article, an omission inadvertently made by myself in my original article, it seems clear that we hardly have a scarcely credible double coincidence; but rather both men simply copied the translated paragraph from my article, thus making the same inadvertent omission I had. I had read Olaechea's original article, however, which they had never seen. I must admit that I could not at that time explain Archbishop de la Cuesta's apparent contradictory attitude and behavior, and it was only after reading further facts in Santiago and the rest of de la Cuesta's letter that I arrived at the solution proposed below. (I was also influenced by Olaechea, who erroneously interpreted the archbishop as resolved not to ordain any Indios.) Not having read the whole article, both are unaware that Olaechea—and the archbishop—have more to say than this excerpt from the archbishop's letter. Because of the incompleteness of their source, therefore, as well as misunderstanding ecclesiastical procedures, their conclusions cannot stand.

39. During much of Archbishop de la Cuesta's term, from 1715 to 1723, he was the only consecrated bishop in the Philippines. Hence a number of these priests were ordained for suffragan dioceses at the request of an unconsecrated bishop-elect or administrator. Besides the priest mentioned as ordained for the old and feeble Bishop Andrés González of Nueva Cáceres, later he ordained others, perhaps nine, for González's successor, Bishop-elect Domingo de Valencia, a Phil-

ippine-born Spaniard, who actively promoted the ordination of secular clergy, but died before he could receive episcopal consecration to do so himself. There were also other priests ordained for Cebu and Nueva Segovia (Santiago 1987, 61–62).

40. Coronel (1998, 53) says: “His letter also informed the king of his decision not to ordain Indios and mestizos,” but this assertion is untrue, and is another indication that Coronel never saw the original letter he alleges to quote from. For in it the archbishop nowhere uses either of those words, but simply “them,” whose identity we will have to clarify. No doubt Coronel takes this conclusion from Santiago (1987, 53) who has himself arbitrarily added the word “mestizos” (which shows he also never saw the original letter) to the words of the archbishop. This, of course, fits in with his mistakenly classifying Spanish mestizos as Filipinos throughout his book, a supposition which no one in the seventeenth and eighteenth century accepted, as we have shown repeatedly. This arbitrary supposition is also one reason for the mistaken deductions Santiago makes later concerning the Spanish mestizo, Fr. Juan Crisostomo.

41. The priest-sacristans held an ecclesiastical dignity, second to the parish priest (*cura párroco*), but superior to that of coadjutors or assistant priests. The term “sacristan” should not be confused with its modern usage to designate a lay person who takes care of the material needs of the church, nor much less (in Philippine usage) with the boys who assist the priest at the altar—i.e., acolytes. It is defined by the Real Academia Española as: “Dignidad eclesiástica a cuyo cargo estaba la custodia y guarda de los vasos, vestiduras, y libros sagrados” (Real Academia Española 1927, s.v.). Only important churches like cathedrals and shrines had such, and it was a real ecclesiastical office (*dignidad*), with a salary attached to it.

42. I have to take responsibility for an error in translation, which may have been a partial reason for the erroneous conclusions of Santiago (and Coronel). I translated *aventajado* as “capable,” a possible meaning, but one that is excluded by the fact that the archbishop speaks elsewhere of his “*incapacidad*” (Olaechea 1971, 167). The term “*aventajado*” must therefore mean something like he was most advanced in the course of studies, or most advanced by reason of seniority, or other reasons. The fact remains that he was, for whatever reason, found “unworthy.”

43. Indeed it was extraordinary that such a miserable parish as Lubang island should even have had a priest-sacristan. Its miserable status may be inferred from the fact that, according to Santiago himself (1987, 84), Crisostomo was the only one who sought it. (This fact shows also that Santiago is quite mistaken in supposing that the person in question was Crisostomo. For if he was the only applicant, then there was no *terna* or *nómina* at all, such as the archbishop mentions, which required three names.) In fact the position had just been created in 1705, together with other parishes recommended for creation to the king by Camacho, perhaps on the grounds that it was the chief (and only) town on the small island, a fact probably unknown to the Consejo de Indias (*ibid.*, 84). It seems likely that Camacho wanted the creation of new posts for the secular priests he was begin-

ning to ordain, since he had been unsuccessful in removing the religious orders from the old parishes.

44. Santiago Extramuros was the parish for Spaniards who lived outside the Walled City, and very likely to have a priest-sacristan, both for reasons of prestige and of wealth.

45. For Crisostomo's highly checkered and scandalous career, see Santiago 1987, 83–87.

46. He did later ordain most of them, but only after the lengthy periods of trial, which gave reason for Santiago to think that he had resolved not to ordain any Indio, but later experienced a *metanoia*, or conversion, and changed his attitude.

47. Within quite recent times there was one year when the wealthy and prestigious Archdiocese of Manila, with some eight million nominal Catholics, ordained only two diocesan priests from the three major seminaries for the diocesan clergy.

48. The statutes may be found in Rubio Merino (1958, 520–45). An indication of the naiveté of Sidotti is that the first paragraph attributes the seminary for eight students (not only unwisely but untruly) to the benevolence of Carlos II, last king of the Habsburg dynasty, against which the Bourbon dynasty, as represented by Felipe V, waged war for thirteen years (1700–1713) to obtain his own succession. Of course the war was not yet over, and Sidotti picked the wrong winner.

49. Coronel (1998, 43 *passim*) is careful not to repeat the error. De la Costa likewise never makes the erroneous statement, though the tenor of his article, with its ignorance of the early ordinations by Camacho and de la Cuesta give that impression. Though he never said that the eight seminarians were to be Indios, the fact that he made the seminary part of an article on the development of a “native” clergy would lead one to think he had Indios in mind. Nevertheless, as Santiago himself has shown, though he often forgets it, the ordination of Indios was already a fact, and in no way depended on there being a seminary.

50. Though there may not have been many, or even any, of the descendants of the “first discoverers” or “pacifiers,” all the permanently residing Spaniards would be considered “colonists.”

51. This is clear from reading the biographies contained in Santiago (1987), wherever he is able to provide data on the particular priest's studies. In all cases cited, the seminary priests studied only grammar in the seminary, which was primarily therefore simply a place to live and a source from whose revenues to receive support. Sidotti's statutes had envisioned everything from first letters to theology being taught in the seminary, but gave no indication where the professors and library would come from (Rubio Merino 1958, 526–27). Presumably they would be the same as the king provided for his eight, hardly a feasible solution. In 1720 the archbishop closed the faculties of philosophy and theology, and the seminary taught simply morals, liturgy, and grammar (Bazaco 1953, 111–12; Coronel 1998, 25).

52. De la Costa (1969, 86), being ignorant of the events of Archbishop de la Cuesta's term, cites a “royal letter of 1720 [which] inquires of the governor

whether it would not be a good idea if the site of the proposed seminary [i.e., San Clemente] were to be used instead for 'the erection of a building for the Royal Exchequer, the Royal Treasury, and an armory with lodging for the infantry.'" De la Costa, however, is confusing the unfinished foundations of the abortive Seminary of San Clemente with the entirely new building the king had ordered to be built for his seminary of San Felipe (Bazaco 1953, 111), which, whenever it actually began, was in operation till 1720, when the archbishop abolished the chairs of philosophy and theology. After that it still continued to teach grammar, liturgy, and moral theology, as has been noted, and was equipped with a new building (even if it may have been half-empty with the closure of the higher faculties). The new San Felipe Seminary became the so-called Universidad de San Felipe, when two chairs of law were established in place of the abolished chairs of philosophy and theology, on the basis of an ambiguous royal cedula. This lasted only until 1726 or, at the latest, 1730, when the building reverted to being a seminary (ibid., 112). Bazaco gives the terminal date of the "university" as 1726 in one place (ibid., 190) and 1730 in another (ibid., 112). Coronel, following Bazaco and Cullum (1972, 71), gives 1730. Cullum gives an exact date of 30 June 1730, but does not indicate his source.

53. Exactly when the seminary actually ceased to exist is unclear. Cullum (1972, 71) speaks of the dispersal of the seminarians with the British invasion of 1762, but talks of its being "revived" by Archbishop Sancho in 1768. Bazaco (1953, 112) considers Sancho's institution to be a "new seminary," but adds in a footnote: "Or the continuation—for many historians—of the Seminary of San Felipe." Coronel speaks of Fr. Vicente Máximo Gutiérrez as "the last rector of San Felipe Seminary," implying that it did come to a definite end, though not supplying any date except that this rector received his doctorate in sacred theology from the Universidad de Santo Tomás in 1734, and that he successfully petitioned the king for four more *becas* for San Felipe in 1755. He was in his thirteenth year as rector under Archbishop Rojo in 1760 (Coronel 1998, 63, 67, 72). Since he was one of the *becarios*, and almost certainly having begun his period as a collegian of San Felipe in the time of Archbishop de la Cuesta, we may take it for granted that he was a Spaniard. The opinion of Bazaco and Coronel seems the correct one. Just as there was no continuity between San Clemente and San Felipe (they had different purposes, different buildings, greatly altered statutes, new rectors), even less was there continuity between San Felipe and the San Carlos Seminary of Archbishop Sancho. First of all, there was a new building (presumably the British had destroyed the one of San Felipe). The archbishop appropriated the Colegio de San José, after the expulsion of the Jesuits, to use it for his seminary. For this the king reprimanded him, on the grounds that San José had been founded for *hijos de españoles*, and it continued as such under the secular clergy, the first rector after the expulsion of the Jesuits being alumnus Fr. Ignacio Salamanca. Sancho was then given by the king the former Jesuit university of San Ignacio, since as Jesuit

property (unlike San José) it had been confiscated by the government. Besides the new building, there had been a gap of six years when there was no seminary. Archbishop Sancho should then be called the founder of San Carlos Seminary, as the new institution was called, in honor of the king. Moreover, the archbishop not only appointed his own rector, but also wrote entirely new—not just revised, as in the case of San Felipe—statutes, greatly enlarged the number of students, and embarked on a formation program more based on regalist and Jansenistic ideas than had ever occurred to any of his predecessors. Finally, the financial basis for the seminary was entirely different—it received no subsidy from the king, nor had it any endowment, but was supported by a 3 percent tax on the income of the parish priests. Hence there would be no more becarios, since what Anda had not confiscated, legitimately or illegitimately, for the war against the British, the British certainly appropriated as part of the enormous ransom they exacted from the city, not to speak of the perhaps greater amount they looted—in both cases primarily from ecclesiastical funds and treasures. Finally it is almost certain that there would have been no Spaniards among the seminarians; they would take the becas of the Colegio de Santo Tomás and those of San José. Where San Felipe had somewhat grudgingly admitted a certain number of Indios, Sancho's seminary would be only for Indios—of whatever quality they might be!

54. This approximation is my own, though based on the data assembled by Coronel (1998, 70–75) from the catalogs of 1759, 1760, and 1762. Our methods for computing the number of Indios differ, however, principally on whether to consider Spanish or Portuguese mestizos to be Indios.

55. Only twelve can be identified by my calculations as certainly having been ordained priests, though there may have been a few more, since for the most part Coronel simply lists those who studied at San Felipe. It is probable that there may have been a few others on whom he simply has further information, but were actually ordained. Most of the students listed studied only grammar (Coronel 1998, 62–67).

56. Cullum includes San Felipe among the four rather than San Ignacio, but this seems erroneous, since Fr. Juan José Delgado (1892, 293–94), writing in the 1750s, speaks of the four colleges for the clerical state in which Indios were “being educated by the Reverend Fathers of Saint Dominic or of the Society [of Jesus],” naturally in their own colleges, not in San Felipe, which was always administered by secular priests.

References

- Abella, Domingo. 1959. Episcopal succession in the Philippines. *Philippine Studies* 7:435–47.
- . 1971. From *Indio* to Filipino. *Philippine Historical Review* 4:1–34.

- Anderson, Gerald H., ed. 1969. *Studies in Philippine church history*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Bazaco, E[vergisto], O.P. 1933. *Historia documentada del Real Colegio de San Juan de Letrán*. Manila: Imprenta de la Universidad de Santo Tomás.
- . 1953. *History of education in the Philippines (Spanish period, 1565–1898)*. 2d ed. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press.
- Blair, Emma Helen and James Alexander Robertson, eds. 1903–1909. *The Philippine islands, 1493–1898*. [BR]. Cleveland, OH: The Arthur H. Clark Co.
- Colín, Francisco, S.J. 1900. *Labor evangélica*. 2d ed. Edited by Pablo Pastells, S.J. Barcelona: Henrich.
- Concepción, Juan de la, O.A.R. 1788–92. *Historia general de Philipinas*. 14 vols. Sampaloc: Convento de Nuestra Señora de Loreto.
- Coronel, Hernando M. 1998. *The early Filipino priests: Boatmen for Christ. A chronicle of the history of the Filipino diocesan priesthood and the role of the seminary in forming the first Filipino clergy*. [Manila]: Reyes Publishing Inc. for Catholic Book Center.
- Cullum, Leo A., S.J. 1972. Diocesan seminaries in the Philippines. *Philippine Studies* 20:65–91.
- Cummins, James S. 1969. Archbishop Felipe Pardo's "last will." In *Studies in Philippine church history*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson, 105–12. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- de la Costa, H[oracio], S.J. 1947. The development of the native clergy in the Philippines. *Theological Studies* 8:219–50.
- . 1956. Jesuit education in the Philippines to 1768. *Philippine Studies* 4:127–55.
- . 1961. *The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581–1768*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- , ed. 1965. *Readings in Philippine history: Selected historical texts presented with a commentary*. Manila: Bookmark.
- . 1969. The development of the native clergy in the Philippines. In *Studies in Philippine church history*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson. 65–104. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- de la Costa, Horacio, S.J. and John N. Schumacher, S.J. 1979. *The Filipino clergy: Historical studies and future perspectives*. Loyola Papers 12. Manila: Loyola School of Theology.
- de la Rosa, Rolando V., O.P. 1990. *Beginnings of the Filipino Dominicans: A critical inquiry into the late emergence of native Dominicans in the Philippines and their self-government*. Quezon City: Dominican Province of the Philippines.
- de los Arcos, Ma. Fernanda G. 1988. *Estado y clero en las Filipinas del siglo xviii*. Cuadernos Universitarios, 46. Mexico, D. F.: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Iztapalapa, División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades.

- Delgado, Juan J., S.J. 1892. *Historia general sacro-profana, política y natural de las Islas del Poniente llamadas Filipinas*. Biblioteca histórica filipina. Manila: Juan Atayde.
- Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada Europeo Americana* [henceforth Espasa]. 1924 ed.
- Escoto, Salvador P. 1976. The ecclesiastical controversy of 1767–1776: A catalyst of Filipino nationalism. *Journal of Asian History* 10:97–133.
- Fernández, Pablo, O.P. 1958. *Dominicos donde nace el sol*. Barcelona: N.p.
- Garcia, Mauro. 1963. Introduction. In *A voyage to the Philippines*, by Giovanni Francesco Gemelli Careni, xv–xxv. Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild.
- Gemelli Careni, Giovanni Francesco. 1963. *A voyage to the Philippines*, ed. Mauro Garcia. Publications of the Filipiniana Book Guild II. Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild.
- Manaligod, Ambrosio. N. d. “The early secular clergy in the Philippines.” Ms. N. p.
- Olaechea, Juan B. 1972. Incidencias políticas en la cuestión del clero indígena en Filipinas. *Revista Internacional de Sociología*, 2a época, 30:153–86.
- Real Academia Española. 1927. *Diccionario manual e ilustrado de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Recopilación de Leyes de los Reynos de las Indias*. 1943. 3 vols. [Madrid]: Consejo de Hispanidad. Reprint of 1691 edition.
- Repetti, William C., S.J. 1946. “The College of San Jose of Manila. P.I.” Typescript. Manila. In Archives of the Philippine Province of the Society of Jesus, V-19-001-a.
- Rubio Merino, Pedro. 1958. *Don Diego Camacho y Avila, Arzobispo de Manila y de Guadalajara de México, 1695–1712*. Sevilla: Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos.
- San Antonio, Juan Francisco, O.F.M. 1977. *The Philippine chronicles of Fray San Antonio*, trans. Pedro Picornell. Manila: Historical Conservation Society, the Franciscan Fathers.
- Sánchez Fuertes, Cayetano, O.F.M. 2002. Letter of 28 September to John N. Schumacher, S.J.
- Santiago, Luciano P. R. 1987. *The hidden light: The first Filipino priests*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- . 1991. The beginnings of higher education in the Philippines (1601–1772). *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 19:135–45.
- . 2002. *Laying the foundations: Kapampangan pioneers in the Philippine church, 1592–2001*. Kapampangan Studies, Book Series No. 2. Angeles City: The Juan D. Nepomuceno Center for Kapampangan Studies, Holy Angel University.
- Scharpf, Frederick, SVD. 1975–76. “Why did we not do this much earlier!” A position paper of the house council of the Vigan Major Seminary, 1930. *The Ilocos Review* 7–8:75–86.

- Schumacher, John N., S.J. 1978. The eighteenth-century Filipino clergy: A footnote to de la Costa. *Philippine Studies* 26:157–73.
- . 1979a. The Filipino secular clergy yesterday and tomorrow. In *The Filipino clergy: Historical studies and future perspectives*, ed. Horacio de la Costa, S.J., and John N. Schumacher, S.J., 79–118.
- . 1979b. The eighteenth-century Filipino clergy: A footnote to de la Costa. In *The Filipino clergy: Historical studies and future perspectives*, ed. Horacio de la Costa, S.J., and John N. Schumacher, S.J., 60–78.
- . 1981. Early Filipino Jesuits, 1583–1930. *Philippine Studies* 29:271–308.
- . 1987. *Readings in Philippine church history*. 2d ed. Quezon City: Loyola School of Theology, Ateneo de Manila University.
- . 2002. Return to the charism of the founder: A case study of St. Ignatius and the Jesuits. *Landas: Journal of Loyola School of Theology* 16:167–209.
- Surban, Edmundo A. 1965. The first conciliar seminary in the Philippines: A historico-juridical study of its erection and development. J.C.D. diss., Universidad de Salamanca.
- Tollini, Aldo. 1979. The adventurous landing in Japan of Abbé Sidotti in 1708. *Philippiniana Sacra* 14:496–508.
- . 1980. Sidotti in Japan. *Philippiniana Sacra* 15:471–75.
- . 1982. Sidotti in Manila (1704–1708). *Philippiniana Sacra* 17:129–34.
- Villarreal, Fidel, O.P. 1971. *Father José Burgos, university student*. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press.
- . 1988. The University of Santo Tomas, 1611–1987. *Philippiniana Sacra* 22:86–87.