

philippine studies

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

The Eighteenth Century Filipino Clergy: A Footnote to De la Costa

John N. Schumacher

Philippine Studies vol. 26, no. 1 and 2 (1978) 157–173

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 Eighteenth Century Filipino Clergy: A Footnote to De la Costa

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER

The magistral article of Horacio de la Costa, written thirty years ago, and at a time when he had not yet begun formal graduate studies in history, has remained our only reasonably satisfactory overall account of the creation and early development of a native Filipino clergy.¹ Yet, this belated and twisted development provides a key to the understanding of various aspects of eighteenth and nineteenth century Philippine society as a whole, as well as to the shape of the Catholic Church in the Philippines even till today. Considerable research has been done in recent years on the nineteenth century clergy and their role in the emergence and evolution of nationalism,² but relatively less has appeared on the period of origins in the eighteenth century. Nonetheless, some recent research enables us to fill out somewhat the more obscure points in the outline of the development of a Filipino clergy so masterfully sketched by De la Costa. Moreover, apart from church history altogether, clearer notions on the origin and development

1. The original article was "The Development of the Native Clergy in the Philippines," *Theological Studies* 8 (1947): 219-250. A slightly revised version is found in *Studies in Philippine Church History*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), pp. 65-104. (All citations in this article are from the latter version). It was likewise frequently reprinted in mimeographed form, in whole or in part, in various textbooks, collections, etc. in the Philippines. The original was written as a thesis for the licentiate in theology (S.T.L.) at Woodstock College, Woodstock, Maryland.

2. John N. Schumacher, S.J., and Nicholas P. Cushner, S.J., "Documents Relating to Father José Burgos and the Cavite Mutiny," *Philippine Studies* 17 (1969): 457-529; and my own writings, "The Authenticity of the Writings Attributed to Father Jose Burgos," *ibid.*, 18 (1970): 3-51; "The Cavite Mutiny: an Essay on the Published Sources," *ibid.*, 20 (1972): 603-32; *Father Jose Burgos, Priest and Nationalist* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1972); also Carlos Quirino, "More Documents on Burgos," *Philippine Studies* 18 (1970): 161-77; "A Checklist of Documents on Gomburza in the Archdiocesan Archives of Manila," *ibid.*, 21 (1973): 19-84; Leo A. Cullum, S.J., "Diocesan Seminaries in the Philippines," *ibid.* 20 (1972): 65-92; Fidel Villarroel, O.P., *Father José Burgos, University Student* (Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press, 1971).

of the clergy will provide an index to the degree of Hispanization and penetration into Hispanic society achieved by eighteenth-century Filipinos. In the present state of historiography there has been little to bridge the gap between the newly-subjected *cabezas de barangay* and *gobernadorcillos* of the seventeenth century, serving chiefly as instruments of Spanish indirect rule, and the consciously nationalist, modernizing, Spanish-speaking *ilustrados* of the latter half of the nineteenth century. As we will try to indicate, it was the Filipino clergy who provided the bridge, achieving a place in society hitherto reserved for Spaniards, where, even though they still suffered from discrimination, they had to be recognized as priests of the universal church.

De la Costa's study fixed the 1720s as the period in which the first Indio priests were ordained, though acknowledging that a more precise date could not be given, much less the designation of a first individual priest. The "Filipino" priests and even bishops whom history textbooks and apologetic works spoke of as having existed prior to this, De la Costa indicated were Philippine-born Spaniards or *criollos*.³ The subsequent writings of Domingo Abella have demonstrated this assertion abundantly, and showed that even the Spanish term *natural* (native) did not signify anything more than the place of birth, without determining whether the person so denominated was of Spanish or Indio blood.⁴ The

3. De la Costa argued to the first ordinations having taken place shortly after 1725, as deduced from the letter of Fray Gaspar de San Agustín decrying the imminence of such ordinations. However, the date of 1725 given to San Agustín's letter (taken by De la Costa from Sinibaldo de Mas, *Informe sobre el estado de las Islas Filipinas en 1842* [Madrid, 1843], 3:33) should rather be 1720. Jesus Cavanna, C.M., in some of the articles cited in n. 4 below, argues that though the terminology used in the seventeenth century concerning "Filipino" priests does not necessarily signify Indios, it may include some such. I have also been told that there exist entries in late seventeenth-century baptismal books in some parishes in Ilocos where the surname of the priest performing the baptism is an Ilocano surname. I have not been able personally to verify this, nor obtain exact data. One cannot deny the possibility that there may have been one or other Indio priest in the seventeenth century, since the documents cited by De la Costa and those to be cited here concern themselves rather with a new policy of ordaining Indio priests, without specifically stating that there had never been any at all. Nonetheless, in their obvious sense, they do imply that none had yet been ordained, at least in the archdiocese of Manila, with which they are primarily concerned, and it is difficult to see in the context why reference was not made to earlier Indio priests, if there were known to have been any.

4. For the argumentation of Abella, see his series of articles on the Philippine hierarchy in *Philippine Studies* (1959-1962); also "Una consulta a la Real Academia Española: en torno a la palabra 'natural' y su acepción en Filipinas," *Revista de Indias* 20 (1960): 115-22.

meticulousness with which the two lists of Manila clergy from the second half of the eighteenth century cited below in this article specify not only whether the individual priest was Indio or Spanish, but also the ethnolinguistic group to which he belonged, even distinguishing Portuguese and Portuguese mestizos from their Spanish counterparts, makes it quite unlikely that anyone designated simply as *Filipino* in the seventeenth century would have been an Indio.

Though it would seem that the date in the 1720s should stand as the period when a formal policy of admitting Indios to the priesthood was adopted, some recent publications have given indications that there were actually a few ordained somewhat earlier in the eighteenth century.⁵ A key figure was Archbishop Diego Camacho y Avila, who ruled the archdiocese of Manila from 1697 to 1706. An extensive study of his career as bishop has made clear that it was his efforts which led to the renewal of interest on the part

Jesus Ma. Cavanna, C.M., in a series of articles entitled "The Filipino Clergy during the Spanish Regime" (*Boletín Eclesiástico* 38 [1964]: 283-300; 465-76, 767-88; 40 [1966]: 355-63, 439-48, 510-15, 580-86; 42 [1969]: 153-61), has endeavored to defend the Spanish clergy against the charge of not having created a native clergy on the juridical grounds that the documents of the Holy See insisting on such refer only to a *local* clergy, that is, one born in the place, and do not distinguish their ethnic origin. Whatever may be the force of the argumentation (which seems to me at times to go against the obvious context of the documents), the question of juridical culpability on the part of the Spanish religious orders is irrelevant to the question of whether in fact there was a retarded development of an indigenous clergy and a bias against them once they came into existence.

5. The instances cited from the seventeenth century are based on erroneous data or interpretations. Juan B. Olachea Labayen, "Incidencias políticas en la cuestión del clero indígena en Filipinas," *Revista Internacional de Sociología* (1972): 155, cites a petition of the Fiscal of the Audiencia of Manila to the King for a prohibition of granting prebends to Indios and mestizos as evidence of the existence of Indio priests. A reading of the original makes clear that there is no necessary implication that any such priests already existed. The reason why the Fiscal thought it necessary to make such a petition may be simply that Indians had been ordained in Mexico, or that some Spanish mestizos had been admitted to study in San Juan de Letrán about that time. It is probable, however, that some Spanish mestizos, at least *cuarterones* (those of one-fourth Indio blood), were ordained in the seventeenth century, to judge from the discussion concerning the Seminary of San Felipe in the early eighteenth century. The other assertion of Olachea concerning 60 Indio priests in 1655, taken from Brow (i.e., Brou), actually refers to 60 *secular* priests, who were in fact criollos, as De la Costa had indicated.

Leandro Tormo Sanz, "El Clero nativo en Filipinas durante el período español," *Misionaria Hispanica* 23 (1967): 270, speaks of a letter of the archbishop of Manila of 1587 requesting scholarships for Indio seminarians in Letran. Besides the fact that there is no evidence that any were granted, the date is clearly erroneous, since Letran was not yet even in existence.

of the Crown in a seminary for Filipino priests in Manila.⁶ Not only the archbishop put forth strenuous efforts to see that the seminary come into being, but it likewise appears to have found considerable enthusiasm among the Filipinos themselves, particularly the Panglosses, who offered to supply all the lumber necessary for the new building, and the Tagalogs, who supplied the stone and limestone.⁷ Though the Archbishop's seminary became absorbed in the larger project of a seminary for all of Asia envisaged by the Abbé Sidotti and thus fell victim to the jealousy of the Patronato Real, it appears that, wisely or not, he did ordain some Indio priests, even without the seminary having been finished. Two years after the transfer of Camacho to Guadalajara in Mexico, his successor, Archbishop Francisco Cuesta, wrote disapprovingly to the King concerning his predecessor's effort to open the seminary to Indios:

He ordained some in his time, and 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. Rather, it is the fact that the majority are of evil customs, and have so little good upbringing and culture that because of their natural rusticity, even after they have been brought up among Spaniards, they remain incapable of being dealt with in a civilized manner. Moreover, after ordination they preserve among their own people that same manner of acting that they had when they used to go about naked and barefoot, treating one another in such unbecoming and unworthy fashion that they are an object of scorn and jokes among the Spaniards.⁸

Whatever weight one should give to the opinions of Archbishop Cuesta — he had only been in Manila some ten months when he wrote this letter — it is clear that some Indio priests were ordained in the first decade of the century, and that this policy was then reversed. For in the same letter Cuesta announces that none but sons of Spaniards (at least *cuarterones*) will be admitted henceforth

6. Pedro Rubio Merino, *Don Diego Camacho y Avila, Arzobispo de Manila y de Guadalajara de México (1695-1712)* (Sevilla: Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos, 1958), especially pp. 401-34.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 421, 524.

8. Olaechea, "Incidencias," p. 167, citing a letter of 20 June 1708, in the Archivo General de Indias (Seville) [AGI], *Filipinas*, 308.

to the seminary. It would appear, however, that he himself came to be of another opinion after some years as archbishop, since it was during the latter part of his term of office that the 1720 letter of Gaspar de San Agustín warned against the imminent creation of an Indio clergy, which must have taken place shortly thereafter. Hence, though a few priests were ordained earlier in the eighteenth century, the 1720s remain the period when a definitive policy of ordaining Filipinos to the priesthood was adopted.

NUMBERS OF THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY INDIO CLERGY

Nineteenth-century sources were almost universal in their condemnation of the quality, both moral and intellectual, of the Filipino clergy, whether the sources be Spanish governors or friars, European travellers, or Spanish residents in the Philippines.⁹ There seems little reason to question the substantial correctness of that universal evaluation, prejudice-laden though its expression may be, at least for the first half of the nineteenth century. De la Costa had pointed out, however, relying on Juan Delgado's refutation of Gaspar de San Agustín, that the evidence was that after the first beginnings there had been a gradual but steadily increasing number of Filipino priests up to mid-eighteenth century, who had acquitted themselves, by and large, worthily of the priesthood. Then had come the regalist measures of Governors Raón and Anda, aided by Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Sta. Justa, which had forced large numbers of friars from the parishes. To fill these vacancies, together with those left by the Jesuits expelled from the Philippines in 1768, Archbishop Sancho had hastily ordained large numbers of Filipinos with little or no preparation. The result had been a disastrous blow to the Filipino clergy, as these hastily-ordained priests not only proved unworthy themselves, as attested by the denunciations of the archbishop who ordained them, but also left a stain on the name of Filipino priest, so that all the Spanish prejudices found confirmation in these examples. Henceforth, low

9. Besides Spaniards like Governor Rafael de Aguilar (1804), and foreign travellers, like the anonymous English Protestant writing in 1822, and the German Fedor Jagor in the 1860s, a whole series of derogatory evaluations assembled with polemic intent by the friar apologists Fathers Guillermo Agudo, O.A.R., and Celestino Mayordomo, O.S.A., bear testimony to the fact. See *Importantísima cuestión que puede afectar gravemente a la existencia de las Islas Filipinas* [Madrid, 1863]; also Emma H. Blair and James A. Robertson, *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898* [Cleveland, 1903-1909], 51:116-17, etc.

expectations produced low-quality candidates, whose inadequacy was further reinforced by the perfunctory training given them by ill-prepared professors in the seminaries. Thus Archbishop Sancho's pretensions to create a clergy worthy of the name had ended in permanently stunting its proper growth.¹⁰

A recent study by Salvador Escoto has questioned both the drastic increase in the number of Filipino priests attributed to the ordinations by Archbishop Sancho, and the low quality of priests coming from these alleged mass ordinations.¹¹ He correctly points out that De la Costa misunderstood Delgado's figures, so that there were not 142 parishes under *native* parish priests in 1750, but only 51 parishes (which included 142 *pueblos* or towns) under the *secular* clergy (both native and Spanish), and only 16 parishes in Manila.¹² As a matter of fact, records show that in late 1768, there were only 123 secular priests in the archdiocese, and in 1773 there were 164, of whom only 95 were engaged in parish work, either as parish priests or coadjutors. Hence the "mass ordinations" decried by the friars, Escoto argues, would refer to the average of 8 per year for the period 1768-1773, a number which seemed excessive to the friars who had been accustomed to one or two ordinations a year in the period prior to Sancho's incumbency.¹³

Though Escoto does not pursue the point, it ought to be emphasized that Delgado's figures (and most of Escoto's) deal with the *secular* clergy, not necessarily restricted to the native Filipino or Indio clergy. Moreover, the number of secular priests holding parishes would have been considerably less than the total number of secular priests in the archdiocese. This becomes evident in examining a catalogue of the total clergy of the archdiocese of Manila from the year 1760.¹⁴ Of the 111 secular priests listed as belonging to the archdiocese of Manila, only 34 were formally

10. De la Costa, in Anderson, *Studies*, pp. 86-103.

11. Salvador P. Escoto, "The Ecclesiastical Controversy of 1767-1776: a Catalyst of Philippine Nationalism," *Journal of Asian History* 10 (1976): 97-133, especially 124-33.

12. De la Costa cited the figure not directly from Delgado, but from Alexandre Brou, "Notes sur les origines du clergé philippin," *Revue d'histoire missionnaire* 4 (1927): 546-47. Delgado spoke of 53 parishes, but his list actually contains only 51 (Escoto, "The Ecclesiastical Controversy," pp. 125-26).

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 128-29.

14. "Razón individual de la Clerecía del Arzobispado de Manila. Fecho en 3 de Jullio de 1760 años," AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 304. A microfilm copy of this is in the Rizal Library of the Ateneo de Manila University. I am grateful to Mr. Edilberto Santos, my student, who first pointed it out to me.

attached to the 16 parishes and the chaplaincies of four haciendas. Nineteen of these 34 were Indios, eight were Spaniards (no distinction being made between peninsular Spaniards and criollos), three, Spanish mestizos and four, Chinese mestizos. If we look at the total number of secular priests in the archdiocese, however, it is seen that 51 were Spaniards, 33 Indios, 5 Portuguese, 2 Portuguese mestizos, 6 Spanish mestizos, 13 Chinese mestizos, and one Japanese mestizo. Of the 77 non-parish clergy, 15 held positions in the cathedral chapter and/or the episcopal curia, 15 were chaplains or officials of various institutions, and a striking 47 are noted as "sin empleo" — without any assignment. Of these, 16 held *capellanías*, i.e., chaplaincies, but not in the sense of being responsible for the spiritual care of any institution; rather these chaplaincies were simply a source of support for the priest, whose duties as chaplain consisted merely in offering Mass at stated intervals for some deceased person in whose name the chaplaincy had been established, for which he received the income from the foundation. The other priests, ordained under the canonical title of *operario*, that is, supposed to be supported by their ministry, may perhaps, at least in part, have been coadjutors to some of the parish priests of the religious orders. For Archbishop Sancho would speak in 1768 about Indio priests acting as coadjutors to the religious parish priests,¹⁵ yet none are so designated in this list. Presumably the list only recorded the appointments of the archbishop and the Patronato. Since episcopal jurisdiction would only be extended to the religious parishes later, it may be that the service of secular priests as coadjutors in such parishes depended on an arrangement between the individual secular priest and the religious in charge of the parishes belonging to the religious orders.

As may be seen from the above figures, the figure for the Indio clergy was modest indeed. If the first Indio ordinations took place shortly after 1720, they had not averaged much more than one a year, even if we assume some had died by 1760, as Father Delgado

15. Sancho, cited by De la Costa, "The Development of the Native Clergy," pp. 93-94. Escoto (p. 127), is not completely accurate in his interpretation of the technical term *operario*. According to canon law, a cleric had to have a "Title" under which he was ordained, i.e., a source of income assuring his support. This might be a *capellanía*, from the revenues of which the cleric was supported, or it could be his work in the care of souls, whether in the parishes or otherwise, from which he would be entitled to receive a stipend or stole fee.

indicates.¹⁶ With this more solid base from which to judge the eventual increase under Archbishop Sancho than that provided by De la Costa or Escoto, we may more accurately determine the justice of the complaint against the archbishop for his "mass ordinations." Escoto, who apparently had not seen the document just cited, gives some figures for successive dates during Sancho's episcopate, which, combined with those for 1760, give the picture of the development of the secular clergy which appears in the table below.¹⁷

Table 1. Distribution of archdiocesan clergy in Manila in selected years.

Year	Total Priests	Cabildo and Curia	Assigned to parishes	Chaplains	Others
1760	111	15	34	15	47
1768	123	— ^a	— ^a	— ^a	— ^a
1773	164	17	95	15	37
1782	159(176) ^b	(17) ^b	92	16	51

^a No breakdown of total number available.

^b Numbers in parentheses represent the conjectured number (based on 1773) in the Cabildo and Curia and the total resulting from that, since the original list does not include the Cabildo and Curia.

The great increase clearly took place in the period 1768-1773, though perhaps the year 1767 should also be included. Escoto observes that the average of eight per year for those years is not deserving of the appellation "mass ordination," though it may have seemed so to the friars who were accustomed to one or two new priests yearly.¹⁸ The point is arguable, but in any case it rests

16. Juan J. Delgado, *Historia General Sacro-profana, Política y Natural de las Islas del Poniente llamadas Filipinas* (Manila: El Eco de Manila, 1892), p. 293: "dejando otros muchos, dignos de ponerse en esta historia sus nombres, vivos y muertos."

17. The figures for 1768 and 1773 are taken from Escoto, "The Ecclesiastical Controversy," pp. 128-29, citing lists taken from AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 1039 and 635. The 1782 figures are taken from another list which has been published: Salvador P. Escoto and John N. Schumacher, "Filipino Priests of the Archdiocese of Manila, 1782," *Philippine Studies* 24 (1976): 326-43. This latter list does not include the priests belonging to the cathedral chapter or the episcopal curia, but since the latter figure may be supposed to be relatively constant, the number, 17, for 1773 has been added to those actually listed, in order to obtain the total number of priests in the archdiocese (the figure in parentheses) for purposes of comparison. The 1760 figures are taken from the catalogue cited in n. 14.

18. Escoto, "The Ecclesiastical Controversy," p. 128.

on two assumptions: that there was not also a large ordination in 1767, Sancho's first year as archbishop; and that the ordinations of the period 1768-1773 were more or less evenly spaced. There could have been a "mass ordination" in 1767-68 accounting for the larger part of the increase since 1760 (which was certainly greater, perhaps considerably greater than the *net* increase appearing in the table); there could likewise have been a single large ordination in one of the years between 1768 and 1773, accounting for the larger portion of the total increase.¹⁹

COMPOSITION OF THE CLERGY

Be that as it may, if the composition, rather than the simple number, of the clergy in 1760 and that in 1782 are compared, a rather different picture emerges. Not only is there a rather small degree of continuity between the two lists, but even more striking is the radical change in the racial and ethnolinguistic divisions among the clergy (see table 2). Omitting the cathedral chapter and the episcopal curia from the 1760 list, since they do not occur in that of 1782, several points may be noted. The first is the near disappearance of Europeans from among the parish clergy, and to a large extent, of *criollos* as well.²⁰ Not only the Portuguese, who very probably had come from a small number of Portuguese families accidentally settled in Manila in an earlier age, but

19. Sancho became archbishop in July 1767. He opened his seminary on 25 January 1768 (P. Campo, C.M., *El Seminario Conciliar de Manila: Guión histórico* [Mandaluyong: Seminario de San Carlos, 1950], no. 10). It is not clear, however, when he ordained his first priests. Since there had been no bishop since the death of Archbishop Rojo in January 1764, it seems probable that he may have ordained in 1767 some candidates who had studied in the Manila *colegios* previously. It is also true that the difference in the total numbers of priests between 1760 and 1768 is not extraordinarily large, but as will be pointed out below, apart from the deaths which must have occurred, a probably substantial number of Spanish secular priests departed from the Philippines after the British occupation of 1762-64. Moreover, it is likely that few, if any, ordinations took place between 1762 and 1767. The net difference, therefore, seen in the table represents only a portion of the priests ordained, and does not say anything about whether a large number of this total may have all been ordained in the one year 1767.

20. The 1760 list does not distinguish between peninsular Spaniards and *criollos*. I have therefore made the assumption that those were *criollos* who are listed as speaking a Philippine language. This assumption probably underestimates the number of *criollos*, since it is possible, even probable, that some *criollos* never learned a Philippine language. It is unlikely, on the other hand, that any of the European Spaniards, who had come to the Philippines as adults, would have done so.

Table 2. Ethnic Composition of the Manila Clergy in 1760 and 1782.

	1760		1782	
	No.	%	No.	%
Spanish (Criollo) ^a	39 (25)	40.2 (25.8)	10 (9)	6.3 (5.7)
Spanish Mestizo	6	6.2	19	11.9
Chinese Mestizo	13	13.4	47	29.1
Tagalog	25	25.8	51	32.1
Pampango	7	7.2	25	16.7
Other Indio ^b			3	1.9
Other ^c	7	7.2	4	2.5
Total	97	100.0	159	100.5 ^d

^a The figure for criollos is part of that for Spaniards. It is an estimate based on the criteria explained in n. 20.

^b One Ilocano, two Camarinos (Bicolanos).

^c Four Portuguese, two Portuguese mestizos, and one Japanese mestizo in 1760; two Japanese mestizos and two Chinese in 1782. (One listed as Japanese mestizo in 1760 appears as Chinese mestizo in 1782).

^d Percentage tally adds to more than a hundred because certain categories have been rounded off.

likewise the peninsular Spaniards, who had been almost as numerous as the criollos in 1760, are practically gone, though it is likely there were several among the cathedral chapter, which is not included in the 1782 list. One reason for this decline in Spanish priests is the decrease in Spaniards which seems to have taken place after the British occupation of Manila in 1762-64.²¹ Possibly too, the beginnings of economic development in the latter half of the eighteenth century had begun to make themselves felt, so that those who had been attracted to the priesthood at least in part by economic security no longer found the capellanías, which had been largely reserved for the Spaniards in 1760, so attractive in comparison with other opportunities which now offered themselves. The drop in criollos would be due not only to the second reason, but likewise to the first, to the extent that the departure of peninsular families would have meant that their young criollo sons would

21. Governor Anda wrote back to Spain in 1772 that "never before has the number of Spaniards fallen to so low a figure." (Quoted in María Lourdes Díaz-Trechuelo, "The Economic Development of the Philippines in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century," *Philippine Studies* 11 [1963]:211.)

have accompanied them to Spain, and hence fewer would have been available as candidates for the priesthood.

Another point of note is the increase of Chinese mestizos, which confirms Wickberg's conclusions on the rise of the Chinese mestizo class to socioeconomic prominence during the period after 1750.²² By 1782 they had become the second largest ethnic group among the clergy, barely second to the Tagalogs. In the minds of those Spaniards opposed to, or suspicious of, the ordination of natives, Chinese mestizos would have been regarded similarly to Indios, as would the others without Spanish blood. By 1782 then, the parish clergy was substantially native — 83 percent. If one were to include the Spanish mestizos, a somewhat less arguable assumption in the context of the eighteenth century,²³ the percentage would rise to over 94.

It would appear that it is in the proportion, even more than in the absolute numbers, of native priests ordained that the term of Archbishop Sancho de Sta. Justa can be said to have indigenized the clergy, and very likely this is what impressed his contemporaries. Nonetheless, the absolute numbers ordained were substantial as well, and large ordinations must have taken place, as may be seen by specifying, as far as possible, when the increases recorded in table 1 took place. The net increase recorded after 1760 and before Archbishop Sancho is modest — the difference is only 12 between 1760 and 1768. This must have been, in all probability, the result of ordinations in 1760-62, unless it was also the result of an ordination in 1767 by Sancho. For the seminary was closed and the seminarians dispersed during the British occu-

22. Edgar Wickberg, "The Chinese Mestizo in Philippine History," *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 5 (1964): 62-100; also *The Chinese in Philippine Life, 1850-1898* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), pp. 25-36. John Larkin has likewise showed how the Chinese mestizos in Pampanga had intermarried with or replaced the principales class in this period (*The Pampangans* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972], pp. 48-62). Several of Larkin's statements about the Pampanga clergy (p. 58), however, are erroneous.

23. It would appear that Spanish mestizos before the nineteenth century generally attempted to identify themselves with the criollos, as also being "hijos de españoles," a condition, for example, for holding the *becas* in the Colegio de San José and the Colegio de Santo Tomás. Even in mid-nineteenth century, a Spanish mestizo (or at least *carterón*) like Father José Burgos appears in many records as being "español." Only with the rise of nationalism in the late nineteenth century did some Spanish mestizos identify, to some extent at least, with the Indios and Chinese mestizos as "Filipinos." Wickberg notes that when the term "mestizo" is used without further qualification, it almost always signifies a Chinese mestizo ("The Chinese Mestizo," p. 63).

pation of 1762-64, and there was no bishop in Manila after the death of Rojo in January 1764. Hence the resumption of ordinations by Sancho de Sta. Justa in 1767 or 1768 would have been the starting-point for the period when the immense majority of ordinations between 1760 and 1782 took place. Moreover, from the other end, ordinations must have decreased after 1777 when the decree of the King reversing secularization arrived and a visitation of the seminary was ordered.²⁴ This would mean that the average number ordained per year was substantially higher for the early years of Sancho than appears if one merely averages out the net increase between the figure of 1760 and that of 1782, since the great increases would have taken place between 1767 or 1768 and 1778.

In addition to this, an examination of the names on the two lists shows that a maximum of only 19 of the priests on the list of 1760 appear on that of 1782;²⁵ in other words, 140 of the 159 priests, or 88 percent, had been ordained after 1760, almost all of them after 1767 (see table 3). Though a part of this lack of continuity must be attributed to what appears to be a rather high death rate (about 65% in 22 years) among the Filipinos,²⁶ the larger part is due to the complete disappearance of all peninsular Spanish priests from the ranks of the parish clergy, whether by death, by promotion to the cathedral chapter, or by departure from the Philippines. Hence, of the ordinations which took place in this period (repeating the inference that almost all were due to Archbishop Sancho), 82 percent were of non-Spaniards (93 percent if the Spanish mestizos are included under that denomination).

24. For the dispersal of the seminary in 1762, see P. Campo, *El Seminario Conciliar*, no. 9. For the decrees of 1776 and the visitation of the seminary, see *ibid.*, no. 10; and Escoto, "The Ecclesiastical Controversy," pp. 122-30. The decrease in ordinations may have come sooner, since the king had already cautioned the archbishop in 1772 (*ibid.*, p. 130).

Though the closing of the seminary after 1762 does not absolutely exclude any ordinations during those two years, since some trained in the colleges could possibly have been ordained, it confirms the unlikelihood of any substantial number, even before Rojo's death.

25. The number may be even less, since, in spite of the identity of names, at times there is some inconsistency in the corresponding ages given in the two lists for what appears to be the same person. My assumption, nonetheless, has been that they were the same person in fact.

26. Not all of this disappearance of names would have been due to death, since Cebu received seven priests from Manila in 1776. However it does not seem that there were any other such transfers of priests, even though the suffragan bishops requested help from Manila (Escoto, "The Ecclesiastical Controversy," pp. 129-30).

Table 3. Continuity in the Manila Clergy between 1760 and 1782.

	Both Lists		Only 1782	
	No.	%	No.	%
Spanish	0	0.0	10	6.3
(Criollo) ^a	(0)	(0.0)	(9)	(5.7)
Spanish Mestizo	4	2.5	15	9.4
Chinese Mestizo	3	1.9	44	27.7
Tagalog	8	5.0	43	27.0
Pampango	3	1.9	22	13.8
Other Indio	0	0.0	3 ^c	1.9
Other	1 ^b	0.6	3 ^d	1.9
Total	19	11.9	140	88.0

^a The figure for criollos is part of that for Spaniards. It is an estimate based on the criteria explained in n. 20.

^b One Japanese mestizo; appears, however, as Chinese mestizo on list of 1782.

^c One Ilocano, two Camarinos (Bicolanos).

^d One Japanese mestizo and two Chinese.

To sum up then, not only did Sancho ordain a very substantial absolute number, higher than that inferred by Escoto, but almost all of them were non-Spaniards. Where other discussions of Archbishop Sancho and his clergy have argued simply from the number of *secular* clergy, without indicating whether these were Spaniards or Filipinos, and hence have not backed up with factual evidence the assertions of Sancho's opponents concerning his mass ordinations of Indios, the analysis of these lists makes clear that almost all of Sancho's ordinations were of non-Spaniards, and gives substance to the charges of hasty and excessive ordinations of Filipinos, done with the intention of replacing the religious in the parishes.

QUALITY OF THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY FILIPINO CLERGY

There remains the question of the quality of these priests. The sudden increase in numbers ordained is, of course, confirmatory, though not in itself probative, of the accusations made by Sancho's opponents, as well as of the denunciations of his own clergy made by

Sancho himself, cited at length by De la Costa.²⁷ Escoto has, however, cited a letter of Sancho defending himself and his clergy, written in answer to the King's inquiries raised by Sancho's earlier lurid pastoral letter to the clergy, denouncing their vices. In his reply to the King, Sancho now declared that the denunciations were based on reports which he found to be untrue, but that he incorporated them into his letter in order to prevent his priests from doing such things(!) Escoto concludes:

Thus, with the archbishop's vehement denial, there still remains some doubt as to what extent the secular priests were ill-trained and immoral. It is a question of whom to believe—the friars or the archbishop. The king or—to be more precise—the Council of the Indies opted for the former, and presumably the Council knew better.²⁸

Perhaps it should be added that rather than opting to believe the friars, it was Governor Anda by whom the Council was influenced. It is Anda's abandonment of the cause of secularization of the parishes he had so long championed at the expense of the friars, that convinces one of the failure of Sancho's clergy, despite the Archbishop's shifting stances and excuses. By the end of 1775 Anda had seen enough to convince him that the widespread handing over of the parishes to Filipino clergy had been a mistake. He suggested sending Spanish secular priests to take over the parishes; if this were not a practical possibility, then it would be better to have the friars back in the parishes, only subject to episcopal visitation and the royal patronage. Seven months later, and just three months before his death, he again wrote to the King in the same sense, avowing that "now that his days were numbered, he did not like to carry to his grave the crime of hiding from the King the truth on which depended the salvation of many souls."²⁹ By the time his second letter arrived, the King, on the recommendation of the Council of the Indies, had already decreed the suspension of

27. "The Development of the Native Clergy," pp. 95-97.

28. "The Ecclesiastical Controversy," p. 133. The letter of the Archbishop to the King was dated 7 January 1775, and is to be found in AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 1044. Escoto, however, does not make clear as to whether he accepts the truth of the accusations against Sancho's clergy or not (see notes 74 and 75, pp. 132-33). His citation of Larkin (*The Pampangans*, p. 59) as to the high quality of the clergy in Pampanga at that time is unconvincing, since Larkin offers no evidence for his statement as to the quality of the Pampanga clergy except the silence of his own sources, ignoring the numerous contrary reports elsewhere.

29. Escoto, "The Ecclesiastical Controversy," pp. 122-23, citing letters of Anda to the King of 3 January 1776 and 1 August 1776, in AGI, *Ultramar*, leg. 691 and 640.

the 1774 decree secularizing the parishes. In the end, it appears that the promotion of a Filipino clergy had never been Anda's purpose nor that of the Council of the Indies at all, but rather a clergy subject to the control of the Crown. When that was achieved, the Filipino clergy were cast aside, for they had only been pawns in the struggle between Bourbon regalism and the independence of the friar orders. This reversal on the part of Anda is the most convincing proof of the failure of Sancho's clergy, and of the rashness with which the Archbishop had carried out his mass ordinations.

There are abundant evidences also of the lowering of intellectual standards by Sancho. In the list of 1760, including not only the priests, but all clerics, only one man, a seminarian aged 20, not yet in minor orders, was without at least the degree of *bachiller*, obtained in one of the colleges of Manila. In the 1782 list, there is no indication of what academic degrees might be possessed, but among the clerics not yet priests, less than half were studying in the colleges; the others apparently studied only in the seminary, where they received no degrees. A further indication is the number of apparently newly-ordained priests who remained in the seminary. Though their occupation is not noted, it may perhaps be inferred from the Archbishop's statement that those of his priests who were deficient in Latin, liturgy, or theology, when examined by the diocesan board of examiners, were not appointed to the parishes, but were sent back to study further,³⁰ presumably in the seminary. At least many of these priests in the seminary must have been such. As Escoto notes, the Archbishop as much as admitted the low intellectual standard of his new clergy when he protested: "Better to ordain a clergy not as qualified as the regulars provided they are subject to the Ordinary and thus have legitimate jurisdiction."³¹

One final point appears from the 1760 list, which seems to confirm Father Delgado's assertion that the Filipino clergy ordained up to his time were a select group, and mostly of the *principales* class. Twenty of the 33 *Indio* priests were listed as *principales*. It is possible that a change was already taking place by 1760, since though eight of ten clerics in lower orders, but not yet priests, were also *principales*, only one of the nine who had not yet

30. *Ibid.*, p. 131.

31. *Ibid.*

received minor orders was of the *principales* class. The 1782 list no longer provides such detail on social background; that fact itself may be indicative of a change.

SUMMARY

To sum up then, more recent writing and documents have corrected and supplemented some of the factual data used by De la Costa in his original article. We are able to have a more exact idea of the number of Filipino clergy before the term of Sancho de Sta. Justa; we are better informed on the probable number of ordinations done by him; and we know with certainty that it was under his rule as archbishop that the Philippine secular clergy was changed from one predominantly made up of those of Spanish blood to a body in which the Spaniards formed only a small minority. The stage was thus set for the future development of the age-old controversy between the secular and the regular clergy into a struggle between the *Filipino* secular clergy and the *Spanish* friars, thus giving rise to the first stages of nineteenth-century nationalism. But the essential lines of the picture traced by De la Costa remain intact. Some of the documents uncovered by Escoto, however, point to some other areas of research — the effects of the secularization movement on the provincial dioceses, the pace and extent of the *de facto* secularization of the parishes which continued in spite of the decree of 1776, because of the rapidly decreasing number of friars.

Likewise, of more general interest would be further study of the social origins of the Filipino clergy, the extent to which they continued to be recruited from the *principales* class, the increasing role of the Chinese mestizos and the degree to which these as a class interacted with, replaced, or were amalgamated into the traditional *principallía*, socially and economically. John Leddy Phelan remarked twenty years ago about the vast reservoir of documents in the Archivo General de Indias dealing with eighteenth century Philippines which still remained untouched; María Lourdes Díaz-Trechuelo and her students have begun to open light on the century as far as the political and economic history of the period is concerned; new light on the economic history and that of the Muslim south has appeared from the works of Cushner, Roth, Majul; but the exploitation of the resources of the AGI for social

history, in particular for the history of the Filipinos, remains in large part still to be done.