

Friendship and Networks of Propaganda, 1889-1895

Rhodalyn C. Wani-Obias

Abstract

Works on the Propaganda Movement have given us many examples of individuals whose lasting friendship with each other transcended geographical and ethnic boundaries. We know of the deep friendship between Jose Rizal and the Austrian scholar, Ferdinand Blumentritt. Another example can be seen in the close working partnership between Marcelo del Pilar and Mariano Ponce as the two province mates worked tirelessly over the newspaper, *La Solidaridad*. On the other hand, history also speaks of the friendship that dissolved between two of the movement's leading individuals, Jose Rizal and Marcelo del Pilar.

Despite all these examples, we know little of what friendship actually meant for the propagandists themselves. How did they define friendship? What qualities constituted a friend for these young Filipino men? More importantly, how did they utilize these friendships in their struggle for reforms in the country? In this paper, I explore the concept of friendship from the points of view of the propagandists. I maintain that friendship for these young men was linked intimately with their love for the Philippines, and subsequently, it became an integral component in their work for reforms. I argue that if not for the networks of friendships that the propagandists established across transnational boundaries, the whole business of propaganda may not have even been possible in the first place.

Keywords: *Friendship, History of Emotions, Propaganda Movement, 19th century Philippines*

In a letter to Jose Rizal dated 2 June 1890, Mariano Ponce (1933) introduced a housemate named Ramon Riego de Dios, a young Tagalog man from Marogondon who was studying medicine and painting. Not knowing Rizal personally, De Dios had reached out, sent respects, and offered friendship through Ponce. A few days later, Rizal (1933, p. 55) replied with his own greetings and welcomed the offer of friendship, claiming that “*ako’y kaibigan ng lahat na kababayan, kasing-isip man o kaaway kaya, ngunit lubos at lalo sa mga kababayang marunong magmahal sa sarili* (I am a friend to all our countrymen, whether like-minded or an enemy, but all the more to countrymen who know how to love our selves).”

The exchange above provides an interesting glimpse, albeit a fleeting one for now, of the intersection between friendship and patriotism. Works on the Propaganda Movement have certainly given us many examples of individuals whose lasting friendship with each other transcended geographical and ethnic boundaries. We know of the deep friendship between Jose Rizal and the Austrian scholar Ferdinand Blumentritt, which lasted until the end of Rizal’s life in December 1896. Another example can be seen in the close working partnership between Marcelo del Pilar and Mariano Ponce as the two province-mates worked tirelessly over the newspaper *La Solidaridad*.

Yet, we know very little of what friendship meant for the propagandists themselves. How did they define friendship? What qualities constituted a friend for these young Filipino men? More importantly, how did they utilize these friendships in their struggle for reforms in the country? In this paper, I explore the concept of friendship from the points of view of the propagandists. I maintain that friendship for these young men was linked intimately with their love for the Philippines, and it became an integral component in their work for reforms. I argue that if not for the networks of friendships that the propagandists established across transnational boundaries, the whole business of propaganda may not have even been possible in the first place.

Ties That Bind

In the Philippines, studies that explore the concept of friendship have remained few. In fact, the past six decades witnessed only three works published with friendship as its subject. Thomas Kiefer’s article on friendship among the Tausug in Jolo, published in 1968, aimed to describe the structure of institutionalized friendship within this Filipino ethnic group. The American anthropologist provided interesting claims, among which included the fact that the Tausug distinguished clearly between *kabagayan* (friendship) and *kalahasiaan* (kinship). Furthermore, Kiefer identified nine primary terms for friendship,

all with varying degrees of intimacy and solidarity. These included *Bagay magtaymañghud* (ritual friends sworn on the Koran), *Bagay* (very close friends bonded over a semi-formal promise), *Bagay-bagay* (casual friends or acquaintances), *Tau hansipak* (individuals that one was in a semi-permanent state of warfare with), *Bantah* (personal enemies held responsible for the killing of a kinsman or friend), *Tindug* (follower), *Bata'an* (a follower who served as a bodyguard), *Gapi'* (allies in warfare), and *Tau ha'ut* (individuals who remained neutral in the face of conflict). Of these, the first five implied relationships between social equals. Two implied vertical relationships, and the final two implied involvement, non-involvement, and neutrality. Ultimately, by establishing how these different forms of friendship were utilized in confronting or resolving conflict, Kiefer asserted that Tausug society was "wholly dependent on the system of institutionalized friendship, complicated systems of alliance, and the prolific 'web of group affiliations'."

Like Kiefer, the importance placed on friendship as a basis for social institutions was also reiterated in Robert J. Morais's study (1981) on friendship among residents in Tanay, Rizal. He identified three levels of friendship: close and true friendship (*matalik na kaibigan at tunay na kaibigan*), social friendship, which revolved around a *barkada* engaged in different kinds of social activities, and fake or superficial friendship, which occurred when an individual failed to exhibit "trust, loyalty, and understanding." Another type of friendship, which he termed as "idealized friendship," described the type of relationship between old friends that became estranged by distance or other obligations. Morais (1981) contended that friendship was an integral element in interpersonal bonds and provided a solid basis for market exchange partnerships, ritual kinship bonds, and *utang na loob* reciprocity. So important was friendship that Morais (1981) claimed, "If we are to grasp the complexities of rural Philippine social organization, we must begin to appreciate the role of friendship (p. 76)."

A final monograph by Bomen G. Guillermo, Atoy M. Navarro, and Mary Jane B. Rodriguez (1998) interrogated love within the revolutionary movement Katipunan. While friendship is not dealt with exclusively in this article, it does provide insights that are more grounded in history, rather than ethnography as in the previous works. Under the category of *pag-ibig sa kapwa* (love for fellow beings), the authors distinguish *pag-ibig sa kaibigan* (love for friends) alongside *pag-ibig sa kapatid* (love for a sibling) and *pag-ibig sa kabiyak* (love for a spouse). Interestingly, *pag-ibig sa kaibigan* was distinguished from the other two as it emphasized the idea of two individuals who were *magkapalagayang-loob* (at ease with each other) and treated one another as a person one can rely on whether as a *kaagapay* (a person at your side), *karamay* (a sympathetic companion), or *kasandigan* (a person to

lean on). More than this, in friendship, what stands out is the emotional element, and while it is similar to one's love for a spouse, friendship does not contain any romantic elements. Ultimately, the authors argued that rather than considering the revolution as borne out of bitterness and hate, it was love for God, for the native land, and for others that truly gave reason and rationale to the movement.

Even if there have only been three known studies about friendship in the Philippines, there exist an abundance of works interrogating interpersonal relationships in the Philippines. Stemming primarily from the works of Virgilio Enriquez (1986) and his theory of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, these works center on the concept of *kapwa* and lay down the groundwork for understanding not only how Filipinos interacted with one another, but also what values determined or guided such relationships. While loosely translated in English as "both," "fellow-being," or "others," *kapwa* is a culturally-bound concept adhering more closely to the notion of the unity of the "self" and "others." The *kapwa* theory posits two basic points. Firstly, in Filipino interactions, we recognize categories of *hindi ibang tao* and *ibang tao* (in-group and out-group). Secondly, our interactions are guided by twelve values that Enriquez enumerated as *hiya* (propriety/dignity), *utang na loob* (gratitude/solidarity), *pakikisama* (companionship/esteem), *bahala na* (determination), *sama/lakas ng loob* (resentment/guts), *pakikibaka* (resistance), *pakiramdam* (shared inner perception), *kapwa* (shared identity), *kagandahang-loob* (shared humanity), *karangalan* (dignity), *katarungan* (justice), and *kalayaan* (freedom).

Further, these values not only represent conceptual representations of what Filipinos perceived to be important in social relations, but the values themselves manifest into differing behavioral characteristics, which Carmen Santiago and Virgilio Enriquez (2018) identify into eight levels of increasing degrees of familiarity and solidarity. These are *pakikitungo* (transaction/civility with), *pakikisalimuha* (interaction with), *pakikilahok* (joining/participating with), *pakikibagay* (in conformity with/in accord with), *pakikisama* (being along with), *pakikipagpalagayan/pakikipagpalagayang-loob* (being in rapport/understanding/acceptance of), *pakikisangkot* (getting involved), and *pakikiisa* (being one with).

These levels not only express culturally accepted views of distance and intimacy in social relations, but they also indicate different behaviors in accordance to the in-group and out-group categories. For instance, the out-group category includes the levels of *pakikitungo* (amenities), *pakikibagay* (conforming), and *pakikisama* (adjusting). In the category of the in-group, the levels include *pakikipagpalagayang-loob* (mutual trust), and *pakikiisa* (fusion, oneness, and full trust) (see Table 1).

Table 1.
*Behaviorally Recognizable Levels Under the Categories of
 Ibang-Tao and Hindi Ibang-Tao.*

Ibang-tao or “Outsider” Category	
Levels	<i>Pakikitungo</i> (level of amenities)
	<i>Pakikibagay</i> (level of conforming)
	<i>Pakikisama</i> (level of adjusting)
Hindi ibang-tao or “One of us” Category	
Levels	<i>Pakikipagpalagayang-loob</i> (level of mutual trust)
	<i>Pakikiisa</i> (level of fusion, oneness and full trust)

Note: Adapted from Enriquez, V. G. (1986). *Kapwa: A core concept in Filipino social psychology*. In V. G. Enriquez (Ed.), *Philippine world-view* (p. 10). Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Since the publication of Enriquez’s work on *kapwa* in 1978, criticisms against the theory have pointed out two main weaknesses. The first has to do with the theory’s inability to define concepts clearly and operationalize its elements. To illustrate, for all that Enriquez enumerates values in Filipino interpersonal relationships, he does not actually define clearly what it is exactly that a “value” is. Nor does he distinguish this from attitudes, traits, norms, or needs. Another perceived weakness has to do with the lack of suggested methods to further develop the theory. As a whole, the *kapwa* theory has been criticized for its lack of empirical grounding (Clemente et al., 2018). Despite all the criticisms, it has remained an enduring theory of how Filipinos interact with one another.

In this present research dealing with friendship, such models nevertheless provide a helpful, if not at least a preliminary, guide in understanding concepts that are deeply rooted in Filipino consciousness. Kiefer and Morais’s studies pave the way to understanding the different types of friendship in a Philippine setting, and they allow us to ask whether the propagandists, too, experienced such nuances in friendship. The study conducted by Guillermo, et. al. (1998) also links the investigation of friendship to social movements and underscores the importance of friendships amidst social struggles, a situation somewhat akin to the propagandists’ fight for reforms. Most importantly, however, Enriquez’s work on *kapwa* permits us to view the connections made by the propagandists in terms of the Filipino categories of in-group and out-group. All these studies, then, have made it possible for us to situate the experience of the propagandists in a Filipino setting and to view the propagandists as not only a product of their time, but also of their culture.

Friendship Terms

Dictionaries compiled during the Spanish period provide a fascinating glimpse into native representations of the concept of friendship. The first is *Vocabulario de la lengua tagala*, published by the Franciscan Pedro de San Buenaventura. Published in 1612, the *Vocabulario* is impressive in content and has led at least one scholar to claim it as “the finest dictionary of any colonial language to be published in pre-modern times” (Wolff, 2011, p. 33). Following Buenaventura’s work, the Franciscan Domingo de los Santos compiled and expanded on the previous work, and his own dictionary was published after his death in 1703. Later editions were published in 1794 and 1835 (Bowring, 1859) Another dictionary was compiled around the same time, in 1754, by the Jesuits Juan Noceda and Pedro Sanlucar. So influential was this dictionary that it was reissued in 1860 (Wolff, 2011). By the end of the 19th century, Filipinos themselves wrote dictionaries. The prime example would be the father-son lexicographers Rosalio Serrano and Pedro Serrano Laktaw (MacKinley, 1905, pp. 11-12). While drawing from the earlier dictionaries written by the Spanish priests, the dictionaries produced by the Serranos were helpful in documenting 19th century Tagalog usage.

From these dictionaries, we find various listings for words related to friendship. For instance, San Buenaventura’s *Vocabulario* listed 20 Tagalog translations for the Spanish word *amigo*. Noceda and Sanlucar listed 22 total friendship words. A few decades later, in 1794, the Dominican Domingo de los Santos published *Vocabulario de la lengua tagala* and listed 17 words in Tagalog. Towards the end of the 19th century, Rosalio Serrano’s 1854 and 1872 dictionaries only listed six and nine, respectively. Finally, Pedro Serrano Laktaw’s dictionary, published in 1889, enumerated nine words (see Table 2). At first glance, what the listings tell us is that there was no lack of native words to express the idea of friendship. Indeed, the existence of so many Tagalog words stand testament to the fact that friendship itself was a highly nuanced concept in our culture.

From the six dictionaries consulted above, a total of 29 distinct Tagalog friendship words were gleaned: *abay*, *balavis*, *bavas*, *caagolo*, *caalam*, *cabati*, *calaguma*, *calaguyo*, *calaro*, *calogoran*, *calunia*, *camalaya*, *caosap*, *capahayagan*, *capanitolot*, *casamaya*, *casaobat*, *casi*, *casongdo*, *casoyo*, *catiuala*, *catoto*, *caybigan*, *pag-iibigan*, *pasiya*, *payo*, *sandugo*, *tiap*. These words not only label a relationship between at least two individuals but also illustrate three significant themes about friendship in terms of affective qualities, rules of behavior, and special dyadic relationships.

The most common of the friendship words, which appeared in all six dictionaries under study, were the three terms: (1) *catoto*,

(2) *casi*, and (3) *caybigan*. San Buenaventura (1613, p. 52) described *catoto* as a relationship where there was “*que conciertan en voluntades* (an agreement on intentions),” and De los Santos (1794, p. 92) agreed with his definition that there certainly existed “*conciertan en todo* (an agreement on everything).” The term *casi*, on the other hand, showed a more intimate picture, as it was defined as “*del corazon* (from the heart)” by San Buenaventura (1613, p. 52), “*intimo* (intimate)” by Serrano (1854, p. 25), and “*del alma* (of the soul)” by Serrano Laktaw (1914, p. 38). The modern word *kaibigan* can also be found in the dictionaries and was commonly attributed to the root word, *ibig*, meaning “want, desire, or loved one” (Santos, 1978, pp. 260, 676). Indeed, Serrano’s 1854 dictionary defined the word as, “*amigo, amado, querido, amable* (p. 25).”

Other terms in the dictionary also served to affirm this notion that friends were individuals we felt affection and love for. The term *soyo*, for instance, was defined by both San Buenaventura (1613, p. 52) and De los Santos (1794, p. 92) as “*querido*.” Similarly, Noceda and Sanlucar (1754, p. 140) defined the word *capanitolot* as a friend that one loved. Another term, *bawas*, which only appeared in Noceda and Sanlucar’s dictionary (1754) was also defined as “*amigo intimo*” (p. 71). The same can be said about the word, *casaobat*, which appeared in the dictionaries of San Buenaventura (1613), Noceda and Sanlucar (1754), and De los Santos (1794). They applied the term to a relationship between two or more individuals who were “*amigos de corazon* (friends of the heart)” that was “*buenos y queridos* (good and dear)” (San Buenaventura, 1613, p. 52; Noceda and Sanlucar, 1754, p. 488; De los Santos, 1794, p. 93). Based on these definitions, then, friendship was generally perceived to be a relationship between two or more individuals who were bound harmoniously together by mutual love or affection.

More than love and affection, there was also the strong notion that a friend was a companion who remained steadfast at your side. Noceda and Sanlucar (1754, p. 1) defined the term, *abay*, as “*compañero de respect* (respected companion)” or a friend of such accompaniments (*amigo de tales acompañamientos*). Elsewhere, Maria Bernadette Abrera’s (2005) study on boats (*bangka*) and souls (*kaluluwa*) had already pointed out the deeper, spiritual underpinnings of the term, *abay*, within the context of a maritime culture such as the Philippines. On the one hand, *abay* was used to refer to a group of boats sailing together and accompanying each other. On the other hand, *abay*, too, signified an individual’s companion upon their death as their souls made the journey to the afterlife. In this sense, then, an *abay* was more than a life-long companion, he or she remained a friend even in the afterlife.

Table 2.
Tagalog words for the Spanish terms, amigo and amistad.

DICTIONAR- IES	San Buenaventura (1612)	Noceda and Sanlucar (1754)	De los Santos, (1794)	Serrano (1854)	Serrano (1872)	Serrano Laktaw (1889)
TAGALOG						
SPAN.	amigo	abay	catoto sang- dugo	caibigan	caibigan	kaibigan
	camalala	caalam	cabati	calagoyo	catoto	katoto
	sandugo	balavis	casoyo	casi	calaguyo	kalaguyo
	bati	bati	casi	casondo	calaguma	hilig o mahilig sa anomang bagay nauukol sa pag-iibigan
amigo	casi	bavas	casongdo	casuyo	casi	kalunya
	soyo	bihasa	caibigan	catoto	capahaya-gan	kasi
	songdo	calaguma	calogoran	calogoran	calogoran	kapahaya-gan
	tiap	calaguyo	caagolo	balauis	balauis	kaluguran
	toto	caluniya	calunya	calunya	calunya	
	caybigan	calogoran	cabihasa			

calogoran	caosap	caosap
caagolo	capanitolot	calaro
calunia	casi	catiuala
cabihasa	catoto	payo
caosap	capahaya-gan	casaobat
calaro	lagoyo	casamaya
catiuala	pasiya	
payo	sandugo	
casaobat	saobat	
	tiuala	
	tiyap	
	toto	
	(ca)ybig(an)	
saobat	saop	saobat
hiualan	hivalan	saop
saop	agoyor	
pag aamigos		
amistad		
		pag-iibigan
		paganga-lunya
		pagaampo

Note: The data in this table is drawn from the following dictionaries: San Buenaventura, P. de. (1613). *Vocabulario de lengua tagala: El romance castellano puesto primero*. Thomas Pinpin and Domingo Loag; Noceda, J., & Sanlucar, P. (1754). *Vocabulario de la lengua tagala*. Imprenta de la Compañía de Jesús; De los Santos, D. (1794). *Vocabulario de la lengua tagala primera y segunda parte*. N. S. de Loreto; Serrano, R. (1854). *Diccionario de Términos Comunes Tagalo-Castellano*. Imprenta del Colegio de Santos Tomás. Serrano, R. (1872). *Nuevo diccionario manual español-tagalo*. Establecimiento Tipográfico “Ciudad Condal” de Plana y Compañía; and Serrano Laktaw, P. (1914). *Diccionario hispano-tagalog*. Imprenta y Litografía de Santos y Bernal.

Aside from *abay*, the term *songdo* in San Buenaventura’s and De los Santos’ dictionaries also expressed this idea of a friend whose lasting companionship endured time. The former described *songdo* as one “*que siempre anda con otro* (who is always with another)” and to be a *songdo* meant that they would never leave each other’s side (*nunca se apartan*) (San Buenaventura, 1613, p. 52). Likewise, De los Santos (1794) defined *songdo* as friends who walked together because their intentions were in agreement (*por que conciertan en voluntades*). Even more poignant is his example sentence, “*Somos amigos, por tanto no nos dividimos* (We are friends, therefore we are not divided)” (De los Santos, 1794, p. 92).

Another term used for companion was *calaguyo* (Noceda and Sanlucar, 1754, p. 279; Serrano, 1872, p. 25; Serrano Laktaw, 1889, p. 38). Noceda and Sanlucar (1754, p. 124) provide a quaint proverb to illustrate the usage of the word and to express the importance of such companions:

<i>Isda acong gaga sapsap,</i>	I am a slipmouth fish,
<i>Gagataliptip calapad,</i>	With barnacles all over,
<i>Caya naquikipagpusag,</i>	So I am breaking loose,
<i>Ang calaguyo’y apahap.</i>	The silver bass as my companion.

As depicted in the proverb, friends aided one another, and Noceda and Sanlucar (1754, p. 125) elaborated that it is with the help of friends that “*se puede animar el pequeño á cosas grandes* (the little one can be encouraged to do great things).”

Naturally, to be a friend, one must share a degree of familiarity with one another. This is what was meant by the terms *cabihasa* and *caalam*, two words that can also be found in the dictionaries as definitions of the Spanish word, *amigo*. For San Buenaventura (1612, p.

52), *cabihasa* was a friend “*de buena o mala conversación* (of good or bad conversation)” while De los Santos (1794, p. 93) described the term as a friend “*de buena ò mala costumbre* (of good or bad habits).” Noceda and Sanlucar (1754, p. 78), on the other hand, explained the word *caalam* as an intimate friend who is acquainted with the *loob* (*conocerse los interiores*). More than this familiarity, friends also shared common views, as illustrated by the word, *balavis*, which both Noceda and Sanlucar (1754, p. 47) and Serrano (1854, p. 25) defined as “*amigo de sus parecer* (friend of your opinion).” In addition, Noceda and Sanlucar (1754, p. 123) pinpointed the term *calaguma* as a person who shares in another’s experiences (*caramayan sa anomang gaua*). Even the term, *capahayagan*, ran along these lines when Noceda and Sanlucar (1754, p. 234), Serrano (1854, p. 25), and Serrano Laktaw (1889, p. 38) described a friend as someone who manifested their shared interests mutually. Indeed, as Serrano Laktaw (1889, p. 38) so aptly stated, friends shared a “*hilig, o mahilig sa anomang bagay* (propensity for any thing).”

Trust was another inherent quality found amongst friends, and one particular term found in the dictionaries underscored this. The word, *catiuala*, pertained to an individual that one entrusted “good or bad” secrets to (San Buenaventura, 1612, p. 52; Noceda and Sanlucar, 1754, p. 588; De los Santos, 1794, p. 93). A *catiuala* could even be trusted to engage in even nefarious deeds (De los Santos, 1794, p. 93).

Additionally, friends were persons whose company we derived happiness and entertainment from. It is interesting that the Spanish dictionaries noted this when they listed down the words *calogoran*, *calaro*, and *caosap*. San Buenaventura (1612, p. 52), Noceda and Sanlucar (1754, p. 130), and Serrano (1872, p. 25) defined *calogoran* as a friend in bad or good times. More than this, they recognized, too, that the term came from the root word, *logor*, meaning “happy” (San Buenaventura, 1612, p. 52) or “inner joy” (Noceda and Sanlucar, 1754, p. 130; De los Santos, 1794, p. 93). The term *calaro* was used as well to refer to a friend that one played with, for, as San Buenaventura succinctly put it, “*por qué los amigos juegan* (because friends play) (San Buenaventura, 1612, p. 52; De los Santos, 1794, p. 93).” *Caosap* also figured in the dictionaries and portrayed a friend as someone we engaged in conversations with (San Buenaventura, 1612, p. 52; Noceda and Sanlucar, 1754, p. 138; De los Santos, 1794, p. 93).

Interestingly, the dictionary definitions about friendship in the Philippines also made no distinction between female or male friends. Unlike in the West where friendship has had a long history of being recognized as a relationship only among males,¹ no such exclusivity

1 See Dick Baltzly and Nick Eliopoulos, “The Classical Ideals of Friendship,” Constant J. Mews, “Cicero on Friendship,” and Constant J. News and Neville Chiavaroli,

existed in our culture. Noceda and Sanlucar (1754, p. 143) as well as Serrano (1854, p. 30), in fact, defined *casi* as both “amigo, ó amiga.” The example sentences provided in the dictionaries, too, use female friends interchangeably with male friends. San Buenaventura’s (1612, p. 52) dictionary states, “*May caybigan cang babayi?* (Do you have a female friend?)” while De Los Santos’ (1794, pp. 92-93) dictionary provides the example, “*Caybigan co yaring babaye.* (My female friend)” Even more interesting is the inclusion of romantic and sexual elements in the definition of a friend, as exemplified by the terms *caagolo* and *caluniya*. While both terms are described by the dictionaries as concubines, it is only with the latter word that the Latin “*in malam partem*” is often attached (San Buenaventura, 1612, p. 52; Noceda and Sanlucar, 1754, p. 132; De los Santos, 1794, p. 93; Serrano, 1872, p. 25). What these tell us is that at least within the indigenous culture observed by the Spaniards, not only were lines between male and female friendships blurred, but little distinction was also made between romantic and platonic notions of friendship.

Thus far, the discussions above have focused on the definitions of friends in terms of affective qualities such as love, affection, happiness, and trust as well as rules of behavior such as solidarity and reciprocity. Yet, other friendship terms in the Spanish dictionaries, in fact, give more weight to dyadic relationships. For instance, the word, *casamaya*, was defined by De los Santos (1794,) as a friend having the same will as another; he emphasized that a *casamaya* was a participant. He illustrated this further with the example sentence, “*Ang magnanacao, at ang casamaya niya magcacasingdusarin* (The thief and his accomplice have the same punishment)” (De los Santos, 1794, p. 626).

With the exception of *casamaya*, which expressed a vertical relationship between a leader and a follower, other words such as *bati*, *payo*, and *sandugo* underscored relationships of reconciliation and alliances. For example, *bati* was defined as individuals who had reconciled or who were at peace (San Buenaventura, 1612, p. 52; Noceda and Sanlucar, 1754, p. 68). San Buenaventura (1612, p. 52) illustrated this further with the sentence, “*Hoag mo acong panganlang cabati at dili pa quita nagcabati* (Do not call me a friend when we have not yet reconciled).” On the other hand, while the modern meaning of the word *payo* is to advise or counsel (Santos, 1978, p. 2083), its meaning in the seventeenth and eighteenth century meant to advise individuals to reconcile with each other, or in San Buenaventura’s definition, to make those who disagreed come together (1612). A century later, De los Santos made the same observation when he, too, defined *payo* as reconciling those who had fought (1794). Finally, the last term, *sandugo*, is found only in the early Spanish vocabularies, and it is interesting to note that it

“The Latin West” in Barbara Caine, ed., *Friendship: A History* (2009).

is absent in the nineteenth-century dictionaries. San Buenaventura, Noceda and Sanlucar, and De los Santos all define *sangdugo* as a friendship forged by the drinking of each other's blood. De los Santos, in fact, specifically mentioned Aetas who used the practice of taking and sucking blood to make friends (1794, p. 93). More importantly, the three vocabularies recognized that such practice rendered the friendship closer and stronger (San Buenaventura, 1612, p. 52; Noceda and Sanlucar, 1754, p. 483; De los Santos, 1794, p. 92). When Pedro Paterno wrote *El Cristianismo en la Antigua Civilización Tagálog* in 1892, he further elaborated on this term by stating that this type of friendship was so close "*que por ella se suspendían las guerras y hostilidades, y amábase en consecuencia a los prisioneros y a los contrarios* (that wars and hostilities were suspended by it, and prisoners and opponents were loved as a result) (XXXIII)."

Thus far, the words analyzed in this paper relate to the Spanish terms *amigo* and *amistad*. What about the terms *fraternidad* and *kapatiran*, two concepts that we know figure prominently in historical works about Masonry (Kalaw, 1956; Schumacher, 1966) and the Katipunan (Salazar, 1997; Rodriguez, 1999)? The entries on these two words are sparse, especially for the earlier centuries. For instance, San Buenaventura does not mention *fraternidad* and *kapatiran*. He has an entry for *kapatid*, but this is in relation to familial ties. This pattern can also be seen in the dictionaries written by De los Santos and Noceda and Sanlucar. There is no reference to *fraternidad* or *kapatiran* in the sense that it was understood in the 19th century. While Serrano's 1872 dictionary does not mention *kapatiran*, he does mention *fraternidad* to convey the relationship between siblings. His definition, however, does not make any reference to the meanings attached to *fraternidad*, a term whose meaning is attached closely to the French Revolution. It is the final dictionary of Serrano Laktaw that provides a meaning closest to our modern understanding of the terms. He defines *fraternidad* as "*pagkakaisa at pagkakasundo nang magkakapatid; o pagsasamang para nang sa magkakapatid*" (Serrano Laktaw, 1889, p. 267). In this case, no longer is the idea of *fraternidad* restricted to familial ties. Serrano Laktaw alludes to a relationship that is brother-like. What this brief survey tells us is that at least for the earlier centuries, *fraternidad* and *kapatiran* pertained to relationships between siblings. It was only towards the end of the 19th century when these words began to apply to relationships, akin to friendships, that brought together sibling-like individuals. The ties were clearly no longer constricted to blood.

Based on the Spanish dictionaries, then, several important points about friendship can be drawn. Friendship occurred between two or more individuals, regardless of sex, and manifested the affective qualities of love, affection, happiness, and trust. We also saw that rules

of behavior related to solidarity and reciprocity dictated the nature of friendship shared between individuals. Yet, more than this, the Tagalog words for friendship also emphasized the importance placed on dyadic relationships, especially those that deal with reconciliation and alliances. Whether we still see these qualities of friendship manifested amongst the propagandists of the nineteenth century will comprise the succeeding parts of this paper.

Piling Kaibigan, Querido Amigo

In order to understand how the propagandists experienced friendship, I analyzed a total of 770 letters from the years 1877 to 1896. These letters, typically exchanged among the young Filipino men living and studying in Europe, were primarily written in Spanish, but a few others were also written in Tagalog, German, and French. While the correspondence provided a rich trove of information on the more professional aspect of propaganda work, they also showed personal glimpses of emotional attachments that the propagandists cultivated toward not only fellow individuals, but the nation as well. From the epistolaries, several observations about how the propagandists experienced friendship can be drawn.

On the surface, the salutations used in the letters quickly reveal the levels of intimacy. The most frequently used greeting for those one constantly communicated with or grew up with was *querido amigo*. Juan Luna, one of Rizal's closest friends, often addressed the latter as "*querido amigo*" in his letters (1931, pp. 9-10; 1933, pp. 86-87; 1936, pp. 220-21). Along with his brother, Antonio, they also called Rizal endearingly as "*chico*" and their letters expressed a clear fondness for each other borne out of time spent together in Europe (1933, pp. 25-26; Rizal, 1931b, pp. 73-74). For correspondence with professional acquaintances, a more formal tone was employed, and the terms *distinguido señor*, *respetable doctor*, or a combination of all these were used more often. For instance, in Rizal's correspondence with Napoleon Kheil, a Czech zoologist and entomologist, "*distinguido señor*" was more prominent than "*querido amigo*" (1936, pp. 217-19). The use of the term *señor* marked correspondence between two individuals who remained acquaintances in the formal and professional sphere. The transition to the use of *amigo* occurred only later when both parties had established and sustained a more pronounced degree of familiarity. While these were certainly established standards used in letter-writing at the time and were in no way unique in these epistolaries, the salutations are nevertheless helpful in initially revealing who the propagandists were close to.

In addition to the salutations, the use of the *tú* and *usted* forms of the personal pronoun "you" also indicated the degree of affinity between individuals. Usual practice has taught us that the former

form indicated informality, while the latter was considered to be more formal. However, as Spanish philologist Diego Marín pointed out, the difference between the two forms cannot be explained simply as a difference in intimacy and courtesy. Rather, he emphasized the idea of solidarity, or as he cautiously termed it “*pronombre de solidaridad* (1972, p. 905).” In using the term *tú*, the parties concerned recognize something common (*la amistad, el parentesco, la juventud, la profesión, la causa política, etc.*) to each other that is valuable enough to supersede their differences. The absence of this sense of equality, on the other hand, allows for the use of the *usted* form instead (Marín, 1972).

With this view in mind, the letters exchanged by the propagandists become even more interesting. The *usted* form was often used in letters exchanged between professional acquaintances, persons of authority, or older individuals. When the Spanish book dealer and photographer Manuel Arias wrote Rizal on 25 February 1890, he used the *usted* form and spoke strictly of matters pertaining to the shipment and distribution of the propagandist’s edition of Antonio Morga’s *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* in the archipelago (1931). In contrast, the *tú* form was utilized in letters that reflected an affinity and closeness between the individuals concerned as can be seen between family members and close friends. Del Pilar’s letters to his brother-in-law Deodato Arellano were always written in the *tú* form and frequently related a range of topics from political viewpoints to more intimate feelings of homesickness (1955b; 1955c).

The growing intimacy between friends is also reflected in the transition of the use of the *usted* and *tú* forms and is best illustrated in a set of letters between Mariano Ponce and Jose Rizal. This correspondence began when Rizal first wrote Ponce on 30 April 1888. He had heard from Maximo Viola that Ponce had taken charge of distributing his works. This first letter along, with succeeding letters exchanged between the two propagandists, was cordial and friendly and was noticeably written in *usted* form (1931a). After nearly two-dozen letters exchanged between them during the months of May until November, Ponce finally wrote Rizal a post-script on 17 November 1888 and specifically asked permission to use the *tú* form. He said, “*Me permite pedirle y no lo tome por un atrevimiento que dejemos de usar el embarazoso usted, [sustítu]yéndolo con el cariñoso tú. [Re]pito me perdone este atrevimien[to]* (Allow me to ask, and do not take it as impudence, that we stop using the embarrassing *usted*, substituting it with the affectionate *tú*. I repeat, pardon my impudence) (1931a, pp. 84-85).” Rizal’s reply a few weeks later considered Ponce’s letter as “*tu cariñosa carta*” and was markedly phrased using the *tú* form (1931c, pp. 87-88).

Aside from letters, the propagandists often also exchanged

photographs, books, or other physical tokens. This practice conveyed intimacies, as photographs were often personalized and evoked relationships, emotions, and memories. As can be seen in a letter Rizal wrote to Blumentritt on 9 December 1886, photographs were highly valued amongst friends:

I have placed your photograph, which I value highly, among those of my relatives and friends in my album of Filipinos. The inclusion of your photograph in this album would have no value for you, but for me it is of utmost importance, because, if I want to *refresh my pleasant memories, I will always find you among them* [emphasis mine] (2011, p. 29).

Other tokens of friendship included books and sculptures. On 2 December 1889, Rizal sent Ponce two books through Trinidad Pardo de Tavera. He explained the significance of the books with, "*Ito'y alay ko naman sa iyo, dahil sa totoo nang marami ang tinanggap kong utang na loob sa iyo. Huag mong akalaing ito'y ganti; kung бага may ito'y patubo lamang ng aking hiram* (I offer you this, because truthfully, I have obtained many personal debts from you. Do not think of this as a return [of a favor], but rather the interest of all that I have borrowed) (1931p, pp. 254-55)." In all the years of friendship between Rizal and Blumentritt, the older professor was recipient of several sculptures from the young Filipino as well. On 28 September 1889, Blumentritt gave thanks to Rizal for sending two sculptures and he claimed, "*Me haces de nuevo deudor... los filipinos tienen un corazón tan generoso* (You make me indebted to you once again... Filipinos have such generous hearts) (1931, pp. 227-28)."

More than the physical tokens of friendship, the exchange of favors also figured prominently between friends. In Del Pilar's case, as early as 20 March 1889—only a few months since he arrived in Spain—he sought means to raise funds for his return trip. Writing to his close friend and brother-in-law, Deodato Arellano, he instructed the latter to sell his properties in Bulacan so that he might receive \$300 for his fare home. He declared, "*Quiero retirarme ya a ese país, pues prefiero tomar parte en vuestras desgracias, a gozar de infecunda libertad aquí lejos de vosotros* (I want to retire to that country now for I would prefer to share in your misfortunes rather than enjoy barren freedom here far away from you)" (1955d, pp. 69-70).

The letters left behind by the ilustrados reveal much about how they experienced friendship. Their letters speak of degrees of intimacy from formal relationships to intimate friends. Beyond the exchange of letters, there was as well the accepted practice of exchanging photographs, tokens, and favors. Yet, there is one friendship from this period, that of between Rizal and Del Pilar, that has caught the attention

of historians for decades. I turn to this particular relationship in the next section and demonstrate how language and intimacy are intertwined.

Language and Intimacy

While the majority of the letters exchanged by the propagandists were written in Spanish, a select few were also written in Tagalog. Was language choice a matter of random preference, or did language also reflect degrees of intimacy between the writer and recipient? In this section, I illustrate how language choice in the letters exchanged between Rizal and Del Pilar reflected the changes in their friendship. Much has already been written about the famous fall-out between these two famous propagandists (Schumacher, 1997; Quibuyen, 1998; Anderson, 2005), but going back to the beginning of this relationship reveals much about how friendships between the propagandists took root, flourished, and sometimes, declined.

Rizal's earliest known letter to Del Pilar was dated January 1889 where he claimed Piping Dilat's article as beautiful (Rizal, 1931d). Letters between the two often talked about the content of articles for *La Solidaridad*. By 20 May 1889, Rizal (1931i, pp. 176-177) wrote Del Pilar, "*Aunque soy el más joven de nosotros dos, me permitiré sin embargo, en vista de nuestra amistad y concordancia de sentimientos, proponerle nos tuteemos como entre hermanos, destinados tal vez á participar de una misma suerte* (Although I am the younger of the two of us, I will nevertheless allow myself, in view of our friendship and shared feelings, to suggest that we address each other informally, as brothers, destined perhaps to participate in the same fate)." This letter marked a significant change in their friendship because there was finally an explicitly-stated recognition of fraternal-like bonds and a shared purpose.

Following this correspondence, two changes became evident. The first was a shift from the use of the *usted* form to the *tú* form, an indicator of a closer affinity between the two. The second shift came a few months later when the two propagandists also began corresponding in Tagalog. From this point forward, the correspondence between Rizal and Del Pilar becomes easy and comfortable with the two often addressing each other as "*mahal na kaibigan* (dear friend)" or "*piling kaibigan/piling abay* (favorite friend)."

In at least one letter, Del Pilar, being the older one of the two, even fondly called Rizal "*anakin*" or adopted son (1931c, pp. 288-89)." Propaganda work still took up much of their letters, of course, with many conversations revolving around the solicitation of funds, the expansion of circulation, the delivery of the periodicals, and editing concerns regarding the collection and cleaning up of articles to print. But, interspersed among these conversations were those of the more

personal kind. For instance, Rizal (1933a, pp. 7-9) commiserated with Del Pilar after finding out that the latter's house had burned down:

*Dumadamay ako sa sakit mo bagay sa pagkasunog ng iyong bahay.
Singil mo sa kanila ang baling pawid, lapat, sahi at pako; isipin
mong magaling na maibayad nila ang isa man lamang convento.
Tayo'y para ng kuitib, hindi na tayo dapat umasa sa kapayapaan:
o tayo o sila!*

I commiserate with you on the pain brought by the burning of your house. Charge them for every nipa, flooring, and nail. Consider it good that they pay you at least one convent. We are like ants, we should no longer hope for peace: us or them!

In the meantime, while Rizal's superb scholarship and impressive writings were recognized by the Filipino colony in Madrid, he remained unpopular amongst other Filipinos, as he was perceived to be sanctimonious and despotic in his ways (Schumacher). When the Filipino community held their annual New Year's Eve banquet on 31 December 1890, it was agreed upon that elections were to be held in order to choose a leader who would unite the Filipino colony (Anderson, 2005).

A proposed constitution was drawn up with one particular point of contention between Rizal and Del Pilar. A provision was made that the periodical *La Solidaridad* be under the authority of the leader of the Filipino colony and his policies. Rizal agreed with this provision, wanting the periodical to be independent in choosing the direction it wished to take. Del Pilar, on the other hand, disagreed and insisted that while the periodical served the interests of the Philippines, the Colony and its elected leader belonged to an independent and respectable entity, the *Comité de Propaganda*² in Manila, whose instructions and authorization dictated the direction of the paper (Del Pilar, 1955f).

When voting commenced, three inconclusive ballots revealed that a clear divide had been drawn between the *Pilaristas* and the *Rizalistas*. Voting continued the next day, again with inconclusive results, which led Rizal to walk out. Finally, Del Pilar manipulated those in his camp to vote for Rizal, which eventually led to him winning the election. His victory was shallow, however, and Rizal would ultimately withdraw

2 The *Comité de Propaganda* was composed of individuals who supported propaganda in pursuit of reforms. At one time, its head was Pedro Serrano Laktaw, a school teacher from Bulacan. Other known members were Doroteo Cortés, José A. Ramos, Gregorio Santillan, Basilio Teodoro, and Ambrosio Rianzares Bautista. While the group was small, it was supported by a larger group of sympathizers who lent help financially and distributed propaganda materials clandestinely. See John N. Schumacher, *The Propaganda Movement* (123-24).

from politics, citing that he was leaving Spain anyway. Del Pilar was voted as leader in his place (Schumacher, 1997; Anderson, 2005).

At this point, the friendship between Rizal and Del Pilar degenerated into a state of formal and distant civility. Rizal insisted that Del Pilar had allowed himself to be manipulated by those against him (1933f) while Del Pilar, on the other hand, maintained that he had no hand in the events that transpired (1955f). A few months later, after having read a review of his newly published novel *El filibusterismo* that *La Solidaridad* released, Rizal thanked Del Pilar for the kind words. He, however, declined the older man's invitation to contribute again to the periodical, stating that he could not work for a periodical whose independence was tied to a separate enterprise, the Comité de Propaganda. He believed that the Filipinos in Madrid must dictate the direction of the paper instead. Rizal (1933h, 242-44) admitted that he was perhaps being overly sensitive, but:

Quando uno solo ha abrigado buena voluntad, amor y abnegación por sus amigos, y en cambio se encuentra con recriminaciones y ataques, créeme que debe variar de conducta y modificar su manera de obrar. Los arañazos del amigo lastiman más que las heridas del enemigo.

When you have harbored only goodwill, love, and selflessness towards your friends, and in return you are met with recriminations and attacks, I believe one must change their behavior and modify their manner of acting. The scratches of a friend hurt more than the wounds inflicted by the enemy.

More than a testament of a friendship turning sour, what is even more interesting in the letters exchanged between Rizal and Del Pilar is that after January 1891, both reverted to using Spanish once again. The next letter documented between the two was one penned by Del Pilar to Rizal on 7 August 1891, where Del Pilar (1933, pp. 206-207) attempted to mend things between them:

Lo que me dicen de Manila es que nos reconciliemos; y como entiendo que no existe resentimiento entre nosotros, no sé cómo empezar. Muchas veces he tenido la pluma para escribirte sobre esto, pero otras tantas tuve que desistir, pesaroso y hasta desalentado con la idea de resultar en disidencia con mi mejor amigo... tú sí tienes resentimientos, te suplico los depongas; si me consideras en falta y esta falta es perdonable, perdóname.

What they tell me from Manila is that we should reconcile, and since I understand that there is no resentment between

us, I do not know how to begin. Many times I have picked up my pen to write to you about this, but just as many times I had to desist, saddened and even disheartened by the thought of ending up at odds with my best friend... if you have resentments, I ask that you lay them aside; if you consider me at fault and this fault is pardonable, forgive me.

Rizal's answer came a few weeks later, on 12 August 1891, and like Del Pilar's letter, his reply was also written in Spanish and his tone noticeably cold and aloof. He initially denied the existence of any sort of animosity between the two, even feigning surprise. Rizal then brushed the whole matter aside, stating that there was no need to talk about things that did not exist in the first place (1933g, pp. 208-209). Yet, the return to using Spanish in the letters in so sudden and abrupt a manner, reveals a dissolving friendship. Where once Rizal and Del Pilar fondly addressed each other as "*piling kaibigan*," the shift back to a foreign language now seemed like a cloak used to shield broken sentiments and hurt feelings.

The language used in the letters, therefore, indicated the degrees of intimacy between two individuals. The shifts from the Spanish *usted* form to *tú* form and from Spanish to Tagalog illustrated increasing intimacy between individuals. The form *tú* is often used between individuals who were considered more than mere acquaintances, just as the use of Tagalog indicated a closeness that went beyond that. In Enriquez's *kapwa* theory, the closeness that characterizes friendship can be seen as the highest level of interaction of the in-group relationships or *pakikiisa*. It is identified with oneness and informed by full trust or *buong tiwala*.

Taking this into account, we can now better understand the growth and subsequent decline of friendship between the two leading Filipino propagandists. They first began exchanging letters in January 1889 and became increasingly close by July of that year. For Rizal and Del Pilar to begin addressing each other in July 1889 as "*piling kaibigan*" reflected perhaps the highest point in their relationship where they were bound as "one" by a deep and mutual trust for each other, such as that described by Enriquez's *pakikiisa*. The politicking and disagreements during the elections that followed in January 1891 can be understood as the event that broke down the mutual trust. Not long after this, Rizal and Del Pilar reverted to writing to each other in Spanish, because their friendship had devolved into the lower categories of Filipino levels of interaction. The whole process can also explain why the hurt feelings ran deeper, because to be at one point in absolute affinity and complete trust with each other and then break away months later, was indeed a painful experience.

It may, at first, seem that there was nothing extraordinary about the growth and decline of the friendship between Rizal and Del Pilar as it reflected a natural course so often taken by many friends. Yet, Rizal and Del Pilar's friendship exemplifies ties forged and dismantled by the politics of their time. While they were brought together by the same struggle for reforms as articulated in the newspaper they worked on, it was political disagreements over whose authority the Filipino community would follow that also broke them apart. At the root of the fascination that scholars have over the fallout between the movement's two leading propagandists is also a recognition of the nuances found in individuals who are involved in social struggles. Not all Filipino propagandists were alike.

Finally, one more particular difference may be pointed out with regard to the friendship experienced by the propagandists in the nineteenth century. If friendship in earlier centuries can be understood to have encompassed personal concerns, the nineteenth-century friendship seen amongst the propagandists was bound to problems relating to the nation itself. The circle of concern, therefore, had expanded well beyond the individual self. While this section demonstrated how the correspondence of the propagandists reflected their experience of friendships, the final part of this paper will look into how their friendships were utilized for propaganda and for goals that were now directed towards a larger entity, the nation itself.

Friendship and Nationalism

In perusing the lives of the ilustrados, we find the common ties, or affinities, that closely bound them together as friends. While not surprising even today, we find that among the most prominent ties were kinship, educational background, and home province. In the case of the propagandists, another obvious connection that also bound them together was Masonry.

Although classic works on friendship in the West have often separated friendship and kinship (Aristotle, 2004, pp. 151-52), no such distinction can be made for the propagandists. In fact, among their closest friends were those who were also related to them as family. For instance, Rizal's most intimate circle of friends included his brothers-in-law Antonino Lopez, Manuel Hidalgo, and Silvestre Ubaldo, who not only supported Rizal in his propaganda endeavors, but were also persecuted for it, having been banished to Mindoro in 1891 as a result of the conflict in Calamba. Another relative in Rizal's circle of friends was his cousin, Galicano Apacible, who was also in Spain pursuing further studies in medicine. He, too, took part in propaganda by sitting as a member in the board of directors of the association, *La Solidaridad* (Ponce, 1931b). Similarly, one of Del Pilar's closest confidantes was

his brother-in-law, Deodato Arellano, who was also actively engaged in propaganda as a member of the Comité de Propaganda, and later became a member of the revolutionary movement, Katipunan.

In addition to kinship, another commonality that drew these young men together was their educational background. Many of the propagandists came from the same schools where some shared the same areas of study. Apart from Rizal, those who graduated from Ateneo de Manila included Galicano Apacible, Ariston Bautista, Dominador Gómez, Enrique Rogers Matti, Baldomero Roxas and Julio Llorente. Once in Spain, the two universities that became centers for Filipino students studying law and medicine were the University of Barcelona (Universitat de Barcelona) and the Universidad Central de Madrid. Gómez, Rogers, and Ponce pursued medical degrees in Barcelona. Rizal and another propagandist, Francisco Liongson, both studied medicine in the Universidad Central de Madrid (Santiago, 1994).

One's hometown or province was another feature that brought these propagandists closer. A significant number of notable propagandists came from Bulacan. These included Marcelo Del Pilar, Mariano Ponce, Deodato Arellano, Santiago Icasiano, Pedro Serrano Laktaw, and Maximo Viola. Though not a native of Bulacan, Teodoro Sandiko lived for an extended period in the area and was instrumental in encouraging the women of Malolos in their endeavors to learn the Spanish language. Similarly, another substantial group came from the southern Tagalog area, namely the areas of Laguna and Batangas. Most famous of these, of course, was Rizal whom we know came from Calamba, Laguna. Aside from Rizal, those who hailed from Laguna also included Fernando Canon, Pablo Rianzares and Ambrosio Rianzares Bautista. On the other hand, those from Batangas included Galicano and Leon Apacible (Rizal's cousins) and Baldomero Roxas. Within Manila itself, there also existed an important group of propagandists, among which included Antonio Ma. Regidor, Jose Ma. Basa, Ariston Bautista, Enrique Rogers, Salvador Vivencio Del Rosario and Rafael del Pan. While there were propagandists, too, who hailed from other provinces such as the Luna brothers from Ilocos, the Lete brothers from La Union, Simplicio Jugo from Capiz, Graciana Lopez Jaena from Iloilo, and Julio Llorente from Cebu, they were few in comparison to the other regional groups (Santiago, 1994).

Finally, membership in Masonry brought these young men together, too, and while Schumacher (1966) himself declared that "it is a fact that almost every Filipino nationalist leader of the Propaganda Period was at one time or another a Mason (p. 328)," he also cautioned against exaggerating and misinterpreting the role of Masonry in the nationalist movement. It is nevertheless worth noting that a large

number of Filipino propagandists were Masons as well. Those who belonged to the Masonic lodge *Solidaridad* (established sometime in 1886) included Evaristo Aguirre, Rafael del Pan, Julio Llorente, Graciano Lopez Jaena, and Jose Rizal. Later, when the predominantly Filipino lodge *Revolución* was established in 1889, among its members were Galicano Apacible, Ariston Bautista, Marcelo del Pilar, Santiago Icasiano, Jose Ma. Panganiban, Mariano Ponce, and Teodoro Sandiko (Schumacher, 1966).

These friendships initially bound by affinities of kinship, education, hometown, and masonry became the basis for the networks that the propagandists utilized in their work. Yet, what exactly constituted propaganda work? While writing and publishing materials were, of course, the most obvious activities the propagandists were engaged in, these were not the only ones. Many of their letters also reveal day-to-day concerns about editorial matters, soliciting funds, and shipping propaganda materials to other areas in Europe, Asia, and in the Philippines.

Journalism lay at the heart of all this propaganda work. In 1882, the early Spanish-Filipino organization *Circulo Hispano-Filipino* put up its own bi-weekly known as the *Revista del Circulo Hispano-Filipino*, but the organization and its newspaper did not even last a year. Other attempts at journalism witnessed the propagandists contributing articles to periodicals in Spain such as *Los Dos Mundos*, *El Progreso*, *El Porvenir*, *El Imparcial*, *El Globo*, and *La Publicidad*. By 1887, the Filipino colony in Madrid set up its own newspaper, *España en Filipinas*, with Eduardo de Lete as its editor. The periodical only lasted a few months, as financial difficulties and internal fighting within the Filipino community eventually led to its demise. Despite attempts to resolve the problems that plagued *España en Filipinas*, the Filipino colony in Madrid remained divided. Hence, by 1889, the Filipino colony in Barcelona, primarily led by Mariano Ponce, decided to come out with their own newspaper, *La Solidaridad*, with Graciano Lopez Jaena as its editor. Del Pilar increasingly became more active in the production of the paper, and when the periodical's base was transferred to Madrid in November 1889, the transfer of its editorship from Lopez Jaena to Del Pilar followed a month later (Schumacher, 1997, pp. 32, 40-82, 128-146).

In its seven-year publication history, *La Solidaridad* featured writings from numerous propagandists, who often wrote at the invitation of their fellows. Rizal's famous letter to the women of Malolos, for instance, was written following an invitation by Del Pilar (1931a, pp. 119-21), who requested, "If you could write them a letter in Tagalog, it would be a great help to our champions there and in Manila (*Si pudiese V. dirigirles una carta en tagalo, sería un auxilio más para*

nuestros campeones de allí y de Manila)." Rizal himself actively engaged in soliciting articles from various individuals. On March 1889, he told Graciano Lopez Jaena that Antonio Regidor had promised to send in articles for the periodical (Rizal, 1931h). In the same manner, on 18 June 1889, he also informed Del Pilar that Trinidad Pardo de Tavera had promised to submit scientific articles, but was still too busy with the preparation of the 1889 Paris Exposition (Rizal, 1931j). News from the Philippines was also a result of correspondence with friends and family living in the archipelago. Sustaining the articles in the periodical would not have been possible if not for the extensive network of friends the propagandists had not only in Europe, but in the Philippines as well.

Editorial matters regarding the styling of the paper also took up a significant portion of propaganda work. Rizal was particularly meticulous about such matters, as can be seen in his numerous instructions to Del Pilar and Ponce. When the newspaper first came out in February 1889, Rizal informed Del Pilar that they needed to accept advertisements to earn more, since contributions from supporters might not be enough. He also suggested that the number of pages be increased, advice which Del Pilar and the staff of *La Solidaridad* heeded (Rizal, 1931f; Ponce, 1931c). A few months later, Rizal again provided advice to the men behind the fortnightly, conveying that the use of pseudonyms should be avoided, since the writers themselves must embody the kind of courage their countrymen would find inspiring (1931j). At one point, Rizal might have felt that he was overstepping with all his zealotry, because he explained, "*Dispensa que me ponga á dar consejos, pero la existencia de ese periódico me es tan cara que salto por encima ele todas las conveniencias* (Excuse me for giving advices, but the existence of that newspaper is so dear to me that I skip all over conveniences)" (1931h, 150-152).

Copy-editing essays to be published in the periodical also took up much of their attention, as they volleyed articles back and forth along with their usual correspondence. For example, Rizal's renowned letter to the women of Malolos was the result of an editing process that occurred over geographical boundaries. At this time, the newspaper was based in Barcelona while Rizal was at London doing research and writing for his annotations of Antonio Morga's *Sucesos de las islas filipinas*. Del Pilar (1931a) had invited him to write a letter in Tagalog to the women in a letter dated 17 February 1889. Rizal (1931f, 121-22) replied and sent proofs of his article less than a week later on 22 February with the instruction that Del Pilar read and correct the letter "*porque como aquí no hablo con nadie el tagalo, se me va olvidando algo* (because I do not speak Tagalog with anyone here, I am starting to forget some things)." Approximately two weeks later, Rizal's letter to the women of Malolos was published in the 15 March issue of *La*

Solidaridad. After having read the issue, Rizal commented four days later that the issue was better than previous ones, but pointed out that his contribution contained some typographical errors. Nonetheless, he (1931g, pp. 148-149) expressed in Latin, “Those who read well, many faults are not seen (*qui bene legit multa mala tegit*).”

Another example of the editing process in *La Solidaridad* can also be demonstrated by Rizal’s other essay “Filipinas dentro de cien años,” which was published in four installments from 1889 to 1890. Like the letter to the women of Malolos, the editing of this essay was done at a distance, with Rizal in Paris and the staff of *La Solidaridad* based in Barcelona. The first mention of this article appears in a letter dated 23 September 1889 from Mariano Ponce, reminding Rizal to send in an article for the next *La Solidaridad* issue (1931d). Rizal seemed to have done so, because the first installment of “Filipinas dentro” was published on 30 September, while its second installment followed a month later, on 31 October. By 11 November, Rizal had sent corrected proofs and expressed his intention to lengthen and elaborate the essay. He (1931m, pp. 237-38) claimed in Tagalog, “*Ilalabas ko ang aking galing; bahala na kaming maghulaan at maghulihan ng salamangka* (I will unleash my brilliance; it is up to us to guess and chase the magic).” A week later, the proofs seemed to have gotten lost in the mail, because Rizal (1931) asked Ponce to send again the available proofs so that he might correct them using his own manuscript. Finally, by 22 November, Rizal was informed that the third installment would be published in *La Solidaridad*’s December 15th issue, to which Rizal (1931n, p. 243) declared, “*Ang nasa ko’y sumulong ng sumulong ngunit huwag magbitaw ng sandata at huwag magpakita ng sama* (My wish is to continue pushing forward without letting go of the arms and without showing ill).” Finally, on 5 December, Rizal sent his last installment of the essay and it graced the pages of *La Solidaridad* on 4 February 1890, bringing a process that lasted nearly five months to a close.

Propaganda work, then, in the form of writing and editing, not only took up much of the time and attention of the Filipino men in Spain, but more importantly, traversed geographical distances. Letters exchanged within Europe often took a few days, or up to about a week, to reach their destination, making it possible for *La Solidaridad* to consistently and regularly print new materials twice monthly.

Another task that propaganda work entailed had to do with raising funds, most especially for *La Solidaridad*. While funds came primarily from the Manila-based organization Comité de Propaganda, there were three other sources of funding as well. First, there were newspaper subscriptions – which in 1889 cost 0.75 pesetas for a subscription of three months, and were later categorized into 0.75

pesetas for subscribers in Spain and 1.25 pesetas for those abroad in 1895—that helped bring in funds. On 18 February 1889, Justo Trinidad (1955) congratulated Del Pilar on the first issue of *La Solidaridad* and informed him that they had received the copies sent to Paris. Along with Abarca, Ramirez, and Fernandez, they were subscribers to the new paper. In another letter, Rizal (1933b), forwarded to Ponce a total amount of 166.50 pesetas as payment for his own subscription, as well as those of Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera, Felix Pardo de Tavera, Valentín Ventura, and Ramón Abarca.

Advertisements that cost 15 centavos each also helped defray expenses. However, advertisements remained not only rare, but also inconsistent. Interestingly, it is towards the end of *La Solidaridad's* life in 1895 when we find more advertisements, denoting that the need for funds at this time became increasingly urgent. In the newspaper's 15 February 1895 issue, three advertisements were published, a stark contrast to other issues that often contained none (“Cronica,” 1996, 80).

Donations, which often came from sympathizers to the cause, significantly aided propaganda work. During *La Solidaridad's* first year of publication, Rizal proudly proclaimed that he had successfully convinced Antonio Regidor to donate five pesos each month to the newspaper (1931). A few months later, Del Pilar received two hundred pesetas from Rizal, who informed him that the money had come from his townmates in Calamba (1931f). Again, as with editorial matters, funding the newspaper and other related works depended on the networks established amongst the propagandists. In fact, a larger amount of financing was drawn from individuals outside Spain who sympathized with the Filipino cause. Without friends, the newspaper and other related propaganda work would not have been possible.

One final but crucial component of propaganda work was the shipment of propaganda materials. In the case of *La Solidaridad*, shipping copies to various destinations was in itself an enterprise that relied on networks of friends. After printing, the issues were wrapped, addressed, and distributed by the newspaper's administrator, Ponce (Del Pilar, 1931a). Typically, there were no serious problems when sending copies of the newspaper within Europe or elsewhere in Asia, such as Hong Kong or Singapore. Challenges only arose when they sent copies to the Philippines, where censorship was much stricter.

When *La Solidaridad* was first published on 15 February 1889, Del Pilar had sent 100 copies to the renowned 1872 exile Jose Ma. Basa in Hong Kong to facilitate its successful shipment into the Philippines. Del Pilar expressed some apprehension when he admitted that he did not know whether the copies would even be allowed entry into

the country (1955a). Basa's integral role in this network was again confirmed by Rizal in a letter dated a few months later, on 21 September 1889, where he gave specific instructions on labeling their packages with code to convey their utmost importance. He called Basa their "correspondent (*corresponsal*)" in Hong Kong, just as they were his in Europe. Further, Basa was the perfect candidate, as he had at his disposal "*chino, marineros, criados, etc... para favorecer los fines de nuestra sociedad* (Chinese, sailors, servants, etc... to further the aims of our society)" (Rizal, 1931, 223).

Aside from courting the distribution of the newspaper via Hong Kong courtesy of Basa, the management of *La Solidaridad* also sent copies to the Philippines via Singapore and Jolo. Pedro Serrano Laktaw (1955, pp. 66-67), who at that time was the head of the Comité de Propaganda, gave specific instructions on how to ship copies to the country:

Ang mga efectos na galing diyari ay sinabi ko na sa dalawa kong sulat, na upang makapasok na bigla dini, ay ipadala sa Singapur, casa Uy-Bin y Compania, at isuplicar dito na ipadala sa Jolo, casa de Se-Ga o Tiana, at ang marca ay P.F./T at dito namin ipapakuha. Mangyari lamang iparticipar sa akin ng aparte, pagtulak diyari at ng maibabala sa aming propio. Kailangan ay paminsang pagpapadala, sapagkat sa kalakhan ngayon ng kalat, ay hindi makasiya ang kaunti. Para na nga ng huling dating na tigatlo lamang balang jepe ay kinulang pa. Tunay nga't ang lahat ng ito'y di na pinakikinabangan, datapwa't balang araw ay pakikinabangan rin. Mailalagay sa cajang sinlaki o maliit sa caja de ginebra: malaki sa rito ay huwag na, sapagkat eskandaloso.

I already mentioned in my two letters the items coming from there. For them to enter here swiftly, send them to Singapore to the establishment of Uy-Bin & Company with instructions that these then be remitted to Jolo to the establishment of Se-Ga or Tiana. The label should be marked P.F./T and we shall have the shipment picked up from there. Kindly inform me in a separate letter when the package has been departed from there so that we can advise our messenger. It is necessary that all they be sent at the same time because with the current greater demand, the few copies are not sufficient. Just like the last shipment you sent, three copies for each chief, which were too few. It is true that all this may not do much good now, but the day will come when we will benefit greatly. The newspapers can be packed in a box of the same size as the carton of Ginebra, or smaller. Do not use a larger box as it will be too conspicuous.

The first few shipments of the newspaper seemed to have reached the Philippines without a hitch, as Del Pilar only received a request from Pedro Serrano Laktaw (1955a) to send more copies in March 1889. By May 1889, however, Del Pilar began to think it strange that copies went missing once they reached the Philippines. He noted that Pedro Icasiano had received only 272 copies out of the 400 total that they had sent, leaving 128 copies unaccounted for. At this point, he did not seem to hold the authorities accountable for this lack, though, because he instructed Icasiano to find the culprit and charge him triple the number of subscriptions (Del Pilar, 1955e). Serrano Laktaw, on the other hand, expressed more anxiety when he informed Del Pilar on 24 May 1889 that upon the arrival of the most recent mail ship, he did not receive the fourth issue of *La Solidaridad*, nor any letters. He admitted, “*Esto me preocupa mucho y me pone muy nervioso* (This worries me greatly and makes me very nervous) (1955b, p. 152).” He implored Del Pilar to find out whether the cause was simply the usual delay or whether the government was impeding its distribution in the islands. Either way, it was integral that Del Pilar ensured the regularity of the paper’s circulation so that the reading public remained interested and invested (Serrano Laktaw, 1955b).

This process of distribution of *La Solidaridad* illustrates a wide array of networks of propagandists who lived in various parts of Europe, as well as in Asian countries such as Hong Kong and Singapore. Even more importantly, it reveals that the propagandists had a strong sympathetic base in the Philippines composed of individuals who worked under clandestine conditions to ensure the successful distribution of the paper. Much of propaganda work, whether in the form of writing, soliciting funds, and distributing copies, relied heavily on these networks of friendship that transcended time and crossed geographical distances. Mobilization was key in propaganda work, and while the larger picture tells us that they ultimately failed in attaining the reforms that they sought, sustaining the publication and distribution of *La Solidaridad* for a period of seven years was a feat of success not easily ignored.

Mobilization in propaganda work, too, requires the kind of trust accorded only to one’s insider group. Enriquez’s levels of interaction again come to mind, where the levels of *pakikipagpalagayang-loob* (level of mutual trust) and *pakikiisa* (level of fusion, oneness, and full trust) describe aptly the kind of friendly relations the propagandists had with each other. That trust was needed to engage in propaganda work, most especially in oppressive colonial conditions, is a given; and the propagandists’ success in mobilization for propaganda work is clearly a result of the kind of all-encompassing trust that existed amongst friends.

The experience of friendship, then, amongst the Filipino

propagandists in the nineteenth century not only encompassed feelings of familiarity and intimacy, but more importantly, also took into account a common political cause. While the web of friendships at the heart of propaganda work was nothing unusual and may perhaps even be applied to other social movements in and out of the Philippines, a look at their friendships allows us to see the intricacies of propaganda work. We begin to understand propaganda work beyond newspaper writing and political soirees. Propaganda work entailed establishing contacts, touching base, and maintaining relationships that traversed geographical boundaries. In the case of the Filipino propagandists, what tied their friendship together was a shared desire to see a better future for a nation that was slowly taking shape. In this sense, *pakikiisa*, the highest level of interaction between friends, not only meant “oneness” with each other, but “oneness” with the nation as well.

Bionote

Rhodalyne C. Wani-Obias is Assistant Professor at the Department of History, University of the Philippines, Diliman where she obtained her PhD in History. She serves as the Chair of the Ethics Review Board and the External Affairs Officer of the College of Social Sciences and Philosophy. Her research interests include 19th century Philippines, Philippine Propaganda Movement, history of emotions, and women’s history.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

- Arias y Rodriquez, M. (1931). Letter to Jose Rizal, 25 February 1890. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 309-10). Bureau of Printing.
- Blumentritt, F. (1931). Letter to Jose Rizal, 28 September 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 227-28). Bureau of Printing.
- Bowring, J. (1859). *A Visit to the Philippine Islands*. Smith, Elder, & Co. Crónica (Section). (1996). In L. Mañeru (Trans.), *La Solidaridad, Vol. VII* (p. 80). Fundacion Santiago. (Original work published 1895, February 15)
- De los Santos, D. (1794). *Vocabulario de la lengua tagala primera y segunda parte*. N. S. de Loreto.
- Del Pilar, M. (1931a). Letter to Jose Rizal, 17 February 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 119-21). Bureau of Printing.
- Del Pilar, M. (1931b). Letter to Jose Rizal, 24 May 1889. In *Epistolario*

- Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 180-82). Bureau of Printing.
- Del Pilar, M. (1931c). Letter to Jose Rizal, 10 February 1890. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 288-89). Bureau of Printing.
- Del Pilar, M. (1933). Letter to Jose Rizal, 7 August 1891. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892) (pp. 206-07). Bureau of Printing.
- Del Pilar, M. (1955a). Letter to Jose Ma. Basa, 19 February 1889. In *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, vol. 1 (pp. 30-31). National Historical Commission of the Philippines.
- Del Pilar, M. (1955b). Letter to Deodato Arellano, 19 February 1889. In *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, vol. 1 (pp. 32-33). National Historical Commission of the Philippines.
- Del Pilar, M. (1955c). Letter to Deodato Arellano, 7 March 1889. In *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, vol. 1 (pp. 48-49). National Historical Commission of the Philippines.
- Del Pilar, M. (1955d). Letter to Deodato Arellano, 20 March 1889. In *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, vol. 1 (pp. 69-70). National Historical Commission of the Philippines.
- Del Pilar, M. (1955e). Letter to Pedro Icasiano, 16 May 1889. In *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, vol. 1 (pp. 123-25). National Historical Commission of the Philippines.
- Del Pilar, M. (1955f). Letter to Deodato Arellano, 31 March 1891. In *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, vol. 1 (pp. 239-46). National Historical Commission of the Philippines.
- Kheil, N. (1936). Letter to Jose Rizal, 3 November 1894. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 4 (1892-1896) (pp. 217-19). Bureau of Printing.
- Luna, J. (1931). Letter to Jose Rizal, 30 May 1888. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 9-10). Bureau of Printing.
- Luna, J. (1933). Letter to Jose Rizal, 24 July 1890. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892) (pp. 86-87). Bureau of Printing.
- Luna, J. (1936). Letter to Jose Rizal, 17 November 1894. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 4 (1892-1896) (pp. 220-21). Bureau of Printing.
- Luna, A. (1933). Letter to Jose Rizal, 3 May 1890. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892) (pp. 25-26). Bureau of Printing.
- Noceda, J., & Sanlucar, P. (1754). *Vocabulario de la lengua tagala*. Imprenta de la Compañía de Jesús.
- Paterno, P. (1892). *El cristianismo en la antigua civilización tagalog*. Imprenta Moderna.
- Ponce, M. (1931a). Letter to Jose Rizal. 17 November 1888. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 84-85). Bureau of

Printing.

- Ponce, M. (1931b). Letter to Jose Rizal. 8 January 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 102-03). Bureau of Printing.
- Ponce, M. (1931c). Letter to Jose Rizal. 12 March 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (p. 147). Bureau of Printing.
- Ponce, M. (1931d). Letter to Jose Rizal. 23 September 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (p. 225). Bureau of Printing.
- Ponce, M. (1933). Letter to Jose Rizal. 2 June 1890. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892) (pp. 52-53). Bureau of Printing.
- Retana, W. (1907). *Vida y escritos del Dr. Jose Rizal*. Librería General de Victoriano Suárez.
- Rizal, J. (1931a). Letter to Mariano Ponce, 30 April 1888. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 7-8). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931b). Letter to Antonio Luna, 8 November 1888. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 73-74). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931c). Letter to Mariano Ponce, 3 December 1888. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 87-88). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931d). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, January 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 96-97). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931e). Letter to Jose Ma. Basa, January 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 109-11). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931f). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 22 February 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 121-22). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931g). Letter to Mariano Ponce, 19 March 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 148-49). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931h). Letter to Graciano Lopez Jaena, March 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 151-52). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931i). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 20 May 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 176-77). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931j). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 18 June 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 198-99). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931k). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 12 July 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 208-11). Bureau of Printing.

- Rizal, J. (1931l). Letter to Jose Ma. Basa, 21 September 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (p. 223). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931m). Letter to Mariano Ponce, 11 November 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 237-38). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931n). Letter to Mariano Ponce, 18 November 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 240-41). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931o). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 22 November 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (p. 243). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1931p). Letter to Mariano Ponce, 2 December 1889. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 2 (1887-1890) (pp. 254-55). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1933a). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 4 April 1890. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892) (pp. 7-9). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1933b). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, no date. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892) (p. 30). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1933c). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 4 June 1890. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892) (pp. 54-55). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1933d). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 18 July 1890. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892) (pp. 83-84). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1933e). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 20 July 1890. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892) (pp. 84-85). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1933f). Letter to Jose Ma. Basa, 21 January 1891. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892) (p. 143). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1933g). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 12 August 1891. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892), (pp. 208-09). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (1933h). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 7 October 1891. In *Epistolario Rizalino*, vol. 3 (1890-1892) (pp. 242-44). Bureau of Printing.
- Rizal, J. (2011). Letter to Ferdinand Blumentritt, 9 December 1886. In *Jose Rizal: Correspondence with Blumentritt*, vol. 1 (p. 29). National Historical Commission of the Philippines.
- San Buenaventura, P. de. (1613). *Vocabulario de lengua tagala: El romance castellano puesto primero*. Thomas Pinpin and Domingo Loag.
- Santos, V. C. (1978). *Vicassan's Pilipino-English dictionary*. Philippine Graphic Arts, Inc.

- Serrano, R. (1854). *Diccionario de Términos Comunes Tagalo-Castellano*. Imprenta del Colegio de Santos Tomás.
- Serrano, R. (1872). *Nuevo diccionario manual español-tagalo*. Establecimiento Tipográfico “Ciudad Condal” de Plana y Compañía.
- Serrano Laktaw, P. (1914). *Diccionario hispano-tagalog*. Imprenta y Litografía de Santos y Bernal.
- Serrano Laktaw, P. (P. Dore). (1955a). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 14 March 1889. In *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, vol. 1 (pp. 66-69). National Historical Commission of the Philippines.
- Serrano Laktaw, P. (1955b). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 24 May 1889. In *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, vol. 1 (pp. 152-53). National Historical Commission of the Philippines.
- Trinidad, Justo. (1955). Letter to Marcelo del Pilar, 18 February 1889. In *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*, vol. 1 (pp. 29-30). National Historical Commission of the Philippines.

Secondary Sources

- Abrera, M. B. L. (2005). Bangka, kaluluwa at katutubong paniniwala. *Philippine Social Science Review*, 57(1-4), 43-46.
- Anderson, B. (2005). *The Age of Globalization: Anarchists and the Anticolonial Imagination*. Verso.
- Aristotle. (2004). *Nicomachean ethics* (R. Crisp, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published ca. ___)
- Caine, B. (Ed.). (2009). *Friendship: A history*. Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- Clemente, J. A., Delia Belleza, Angela Yu, Effie Vinia Diane Catibog, Goyena Solis, and Jason Laguerta. (2018). Revisiting the Kapwa theory: Applying alternative methodologies and gaining new insights. In R. Pe-Pua (Ed.), *Handbuk ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino Bolyum 1: Perspektibo at Metodolohiya* (pp. 294-307). University of the Philippines Press.
- Craig, A. (1913). *Lineage, life and labors of Jose Rizal: Philippine patriot*. Philippine Education Company.
- Enriquez, V. G. (1986). Kapwa: A core concept in Filipino social psychology. In V. G. Enriquez (Ed.), *Philippine world-view* (pp. 9-16). Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Enriquez, V. G. (1992). *From colonial to liberation psychology: The Philippine experience*. University of the Philippines Press.
- Guillermo, B. G., Navarro, A. M., & Rodriguez, M. J. B. (1998). *Pag-iibigan sa Katipunan: Isang paglingon sa panitikan*

- ng himagsikan. In A. M. Navarro & R. A. G. Abejo (Eds.), *Wika, panitikan, sining at himagsikan* (pp. 94–106). Limbagang Pangkasaysayan.
- Kiefer, T. M. (1968). Institutionalized friendship and warfare among the Tausug of Jolo. *Ethnology*, 7(3), 227–231, 243.
- MacKinley, W.E.W. (1905). *A Handbook and Grammar of the Tagalog Language*. United States Government Printing Office.
- Marín, D. (1972). El uso de “tú” y “usted” en el español actual. *Hispania*, 55(4), 904–905.
- Morais, R. J. (1981). Friendship in the rural Philippines. *Philippine Studies*, 29(1), 67–76.
- Quibuyen, F. (1998). Towards a Radical Rizal. *Philippine Studies*, 46(2), 151–183.
- Rodriguez, Mary Jane B. (1999). Ang Kababaihan sa Himagsikang Pilipino. *Bagong Kasaysayan* 7. Palimbagan ng Lahi.
- Salazar, Zeus A. (1997). Si Andres Bonifacio at ang Kabayanihang Pilipino. *Bagong Kasaysayan* 2. Palimbagan Kalawakan.
- Santiago, C. E., & Enriquez, V. G. (2018). Tungo sa maka-Pilipinong pananaliksik. In R. Pe-Pua (Ed.), *Handbuk ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino Bolyum 1: Perspektibo at Metodolohiya* (pp. 413–414). University of the Philippines Press.
- Santiago, L. P. R. (1994). The first Filipino doctors of medicine and surgery (1878–97). *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society*, 22(2), 103–140.
- Schumacher, J. N. (1966). Philippine masonry to 1890. *Asian Studies Journal*, 4(2), 328–341.
- Schumacher, J. N.. (1997). *The propaganda movement 1880–1895: The creation of a Filipino consciousness, the making of the revolution*. Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Wolff, J. (2011). The *Vocabulario de Lengua Tagala* of Fr. Pedro de San Buenaventura (1613). In L. Reid, E. Ridruejo & T. Stolz (Eds.), *Philippine and Chamorro Linguistics Before the Advent of Structuralism* (pp. 33–48). Akademie Verlag.