

## Imperial Endnotes: The First Filipino and Boricua Historians

Ernest Rafael Hartwell, PhD  
*College of the Holy Cross*

**ABSTRACT:** The Philippines and Puerto Rico are part of a transoceanic archipelago of colonies that continued under Spanish rule throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century, long after the Latin American wars of independence. This article examines parallel projects in anticolonial historiography from these two regions through the prism of converging and diverging articulations of authority. Specifically, two late 19<sup>th</sup>-century intellectuals, José Julián Acosta of Puerto Rico and José Rizal of the Philippines, dust off 17<sup>th</sup>- and 18<sup>th</sup>-century tomes of official Spanish colonial history, publishing critical editions of these histories. Acosta and Rizal insert their own voices into discussions over the past, present, and future of their colonies through the annotations that they append to the original texts. While scholars often affirm that the work of Latin American 19<sup>th</sup>-century writing is to facilitate the forgetting of differences in the service of community consolidation, I argue that these experiments in marginal historiography constitute a contentious and continual revisiting of difference at the root of the authors' assertion of their own authority: difference from Spain, from the popular classes, and from other colonies. These projects of annotation expose the racialized nature of the colonial intellectuals' constructions of authority, pointing to diverging understandings of the work of doubt in anticolonial historiography. The Philippines and Puerto Rico, often overlooked in studies of Latin American literature and history, are endnotes to Spain's imperial saga. Acosta's and Rizal's annotations show why we have to pay attention to these kinds of endnotes; they destabilize certainties and pursue contentious and divergent forms of truth.

**KEYWORDS:** José Rizal, José Julián Acosta, Philippines, Puerto Rico, Spain, Authority, Appropriation, Race, Historiography, Anticolonial literature, Transoceanic Hispanic Studies, Postcolonial studies

Nacido y criado en el desconocimiento de nuestro Ayer, como casi todos vosotros; sin voz ni autoridad para hablar de lo que no vimos ni estudiamos, consideré necesario invocar el testimonio de un ilustre español que rigió los destinos de Filipinas en los principios de su nueva era y presenció los últimos momentos de nuestra antigua nacionalidad.

-José Rizal

### Claims to Authority

Histories of Spanish conquest in the Philippines and the Caribbean chronicle the establishment of imperial authority. Such is the case with two Spaniards, Antonio Morga, lieutenant governor of the Philippines from 1595-1603, who wrote the 1609 *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, and Íñigo Abbad y Lasierra, the Aragonese friar and scholar who lived in Puerto Rico from 1771-78 and wrote the 1788 *Historia geográfica, civil y natural de la isla de San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico*. Both Spaniards narrate the distribution of 'encomiendas,' recognizing such distributions as pivotal moments in the foundation of Spanish authority in the Philippine and Caribbean archipelagos.

Such an 'entrustment' speaks to the right that the Spanish crown granted the *conquistadores* to appropriate the land and labor of native peoples in reward for their campaigns of conquest. It should not come as a complete surprise, therefore, that colonial intellectuals of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century would appropriate the same histories of conquest, and specifically, the same term, 'encomienda,' to forge their own claims to authority.

Puerto Rican José Julián Acosta and Filipino José Rizal republish and annotate the above-mentioned histories, contesting the claims made by the imperial historians, commenting on 19<sup>th</sup>-century colonial politics, and reflecting on the national prospects of their islands. This article examines Rizal's and Acosta's annotations to these two imperial histories, reading the paratexts against the grain to retrace their rhetorical frameworks, which point to the anticolonial intellectuals' converging and diverging notions of authority, as well as certain 19<sup>th</sup>-century ideas about the politics of history and the processes of nationalization and racialization.<sup>1</sup>

Acosta, of Spanish ancestry, was the renowned Puerto Rican naturalist, education advocate, and political commentator, who studied in Europe in the 1850's, where he discovered Abbad's history in Cuban luminary Domingo del Monte's book collections in Madrid. Acosta wrote extensive articles on the abolition of slavery,

ran a printing company that distributed important works of science, history, and literature throughout Puerto Rico, struggled for educational reforms and abolition in the *Junta de Reformas* in Madrid in 1865, and was incarcerated by the colonial government in 1868 for suspicion of subversion. Acosta was an 'autonomista,' which implied that his anticolonial writing critiqued the empire, but he did not support either a violent revolution or full Puerto Rican independence. He sought autonomy for Puerto Rico from within a reformed Spanish state.<sup>2</sup>

José Rizal was the writer and Philippine national hero of Malay and Chinese ancestry, who discovered and transcribed Morga's manuscript at the British Museum in the 1880's. Rizal, a 19<sup>th</sup>-century "Renaissance man," wrote novels, poetry, and political commentary, practiced ophthalmology, opened an elementary school, and collaborated with European orientalist and botanists, before being executed by the Spanish for inspiring a revolution that he never fully endorsed. Rizal's political platform was less defined than Acosta's with regards to reform versus revolution. Rizal doubted the prospects of revolution due to his perception of his compatriots as not yet fit to rule, fearing their reign might end up bloodier than the Spanish one. However, he insisted that the Philippines could not continue under Spanish rule; through their cruelty and corruption, the Spanish were forcing the Filipinos toward a revolution that they were not yet ready to execute.<sup>3</sup>

Acosta republishes Abbad's 1788 history in 1866, while Rizal republishes Morga's 1609 chronicle of discovery and conquest in 1889. Acosta's endnotes are frequently longer than the chapter they comment, and incorporate scientific specification, correction, and extrapolation of Abbad's history.<sup>4</sup> Unlike Acosta's endnotes, which follow each chapter, Rizal's footnotes divide the page in two, interrupting the reading and promoting a visual and verbal struggle over the content and page space of the history text. Both Acosta's and Rizal's annotations engage in strategic and contentious interactions with the words and ideas contained in the histories they reprint and recirculate.

Acosta and Rizal both take issue, for example, with the historical practice of *encomienda* and also the word itself, which Acosta and Rizal find misleading, even perhaps violently so. Acosta, on the one hand, resorts to quotes from a Spanish contemporary of his, the quotes asserting that the term is disingenuous and that such a duplicity embodies the violence and greed at the core of the project of conquest. Rizal, on the other hand, claims that the verb *encomendar* works like the verb 'to pacify,' both have an ironic function. To entrust means to sack and exploit, while to pacify means to wage war. Through these pithy annotations and many others like them, Acosta and Rizal comment on the violent foundations of imperialism, critique imperial historiography as a disingenuous device of fabricating power, and above all, assert their capability and duty to make such comments and critiques. Through the footnotes, they assert their own authority to weigh in on the history of imperialism, to enact changes on the colonial status quo, and to participate in the designing of their future nations.

This article subtly, yet definitively diverges from previous historical and literary analyses of these two projects in anticolonial historiography, the two of which have not yet been compared in any published study. Gervasio García and María Teresa Cortés Zavala are fundamental scholars of Acosta's historiographical notes. García argues that Acosta's project implied writing history to evade censorship; Acosta uses Abbad's voice, reframed and resignified through the endnotes, to express Acosta's own political views, his annotated text thus being the 'first history of Boricua authorship' (9).<sup>5</sup> Cortés Zavala builds off García's argument and asserts that through his annotations, Acosta constructs a 'Puerto Rican memory,' that combats forms of determinism, or the idea that Puerto Ricans are lazy and stupid due to the climate and topography of their island. Acosta's Puerto Rican memory emphasizes, according to Cortés Zavala, that crises of economics and education are the sources of Puerto Rican hardship, and that reforms in economics and education will bring Puerto Rico toward modernity and development (139).

Ambeth Ocampo and Christopher Schmidt-Nowara offer similarly important insights on Rizal's annotations of Morga's *Sucesos*. Ocampo, who called the republished version of the *Sucesos*, the 'first Philippine history from the viewpoint of a Filipino,' stresses that Rizal uses history as a weapon against friar abuses and imperial corruption. Ocampo concludes that Rizal stretches the truth and relies more on imagination than historical evidence (186-9). Schmidt-Nowara, however, finds that the value of Rizal's project outweighs its shortcomings; it represents an effort to assert Filipinos' authority over their own history, which Spaniards had tried to monopolize (180-1).

Rizal's and Acosta's annotations highlight their takes on authority and how authority can be constructed through historiography. García and Ocampo argue that Rizal's and Acosta's notes are authoritative in that they are 'first histories from Puerto Rican/Filipino writers.' The challenge of this article is to question each term of these parallel assertions. The first subsection, 'Appropriation of Authority,' asks what does it mean to be first, and are Acosta and Rizal in fact 'first'? The second section 'Racialization and Authority' asks the question, how do they construct Puerto Rican and Filipino identities, and what is the relationship between nation and race within these constructions? And, the third and final section, 'Historiographies of Doubt,' poses the question, how does one write a history of a people left out of traditional forms of history? Understanding these contentious and continuous processes—appropriation, racialization, and historiography—allows us to identify Acosta and Rizal's take on authority, how it can be claimed, whom they have authority over, and the ethical stakes of claiming such authority.

'What is authority?' Hannah Arendt asks in an essay with which Jacques Rancière dialogues through his concept of the 'distribution of the sensible.' On the one hand, Arendt asserts that authority speaks to a stable and necessarily hierarchical distribution of agency within a certain community, within which persuasion is impossible and coercion is unnecessary (2). Arendt's notion inspires one

to ask, in order to critique authoritarian forms of rule, must anticolonial writers act in an authoritarian manner? Must they perpetuate some forms of hierarchy to critique other forms of it? Jacques Rancière dialogues with this idea with his concept of the 'distribution of the sensible,' which asserts that within a given community, the ability to sense, say, and do is finite, and therefore unevenly distributed among those who live in the community. This expounds upon the idea from Plato's *Republic* that the peasant cannot participate in politics because he does not have enough time to do so. Rancière notes that certain events—including technological advances, war, art, and literature—can intervene and, in a sense 'redistribute' the predetermined shares (from French '*partage*' or 'share' which Rancière uses in the text's original French) of aesthetic capability and authority to say and do within a specific socio-political order or hierarchy (12).

The issues of authority, its distribution, its transformations, and its permanence are of utmost importance when analyzing 19<sup>th</sup>-century anticolonial writing of the Caribbean and the Philippines, which considered the possible directions of these frustrated countries, the contours of their communities, and the political and social structures that should govern them. Thus arise some central questions of this article: in dialogue with Foucault's concepts of 'race war' and 'counterhistory,' can annotations to history act as a catalyst for such a redistribution of authority? How? And, at the cost of whom? That is to say—and here I implicitly dialogue with Angel Rama's concept of "the lettered city"—when authority is or is not redistributed through the written commenting of history, who gains a voice and who remains without one? What is the relationship between these historiographical processes and the prospects of nationhood? Do Acosta's and Rizal's annotations call for the conjuring of community and/or nation through the forgetting of alterity, through the constant revisiting of dissimilarity, or through the violent elimination of difference?

In the pages that follow, I underline and examine seminal connections and divergences in intellectual production between Spain's remaining colonies of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century while contributing to the growing field of transoceanic studies of the Spanish colony.<sup>6</sup> In the process, I posit nuanced forms of considering postcolonial historiography, in the context of regions not frequently examined in postcolonial studies. This allows the article to propose conclusions about interplay of race and authority in early nationalist writings of the Philippines and Puerto Rico, while extending invitations to further study with regards to these transoceanic networks of anti-colonial agency.

In the end, I argue that Acosta insists on bringing the history closer to a notion of truth through his annotations, while Rizal asserts the need to destabilize history, by planting doubt in the discourses it disseminates, gestures informed by diverging takes on the role race plays in colonial politics. I conclude that in both projects, authority manifests itself in the ability to use supplementation to transform and preserve a text, community, law, or idea.

By adding extra, dangerous information to a text or concept that had previously been considered to be whole, one exerts control, asserts one's expertise, and dislodges fixed relations. By doing so, these supplementary notes promote contentious preservation, as opposed to complete upheaval. This affinity towards contentious preservation illustrates paradoxically both Rizal's and Acosta's wariness toward violence, as well as some of their most violent and exclusive forms of thinking.

### Context: Transoceanic *desencuentros*<sup>7</sup>

Before proceeding to the textual analysis, we must establish the basis for comparison, the transoceanic historical proximities and divergences between Puerto Rico and the Philippines. These colonies were two of Spain's last three remaining major overseas colonies after the Latin American wars of independence, before being shuttled into the United States' sphere of neocolonial governance in 1898. That said, they are marked by decisively differing economic, linguistic, and racial realities, which inform the content, structure, and strategic approach of the annotations.

The differences in linguistic and racial realities between the Philippines and the Caribbean cannot be fully understood without first addressing the diverging economic systems that developed in both regions. The Caribbean was conquered and settled by Spaniards in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries in large part due to the economic opportunities it offered them through agriculture and mining. These industries were sustained centrally through the forced labor of *Indio* populations, and later African slavery. In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the success of the Latin American wars of independence led Spain, newly depleted in territorial expanse and economic strength, to prioritize its economic apparatus in Cuban and Puerto Rican agriculture. This led to a dramatic uptick in the African slave trade, aimed at buffering Spain's losses of economic growth and trade partners as a result of the Wars of Independence (Schmidt-Nowara 1999, 4). Puerto Rican intellectuals in large part pushed for the abolition of slavery and the push for a free and educated work force. In economic terms, these creole elites believed 'that an immediate transition to free labor would benefit the island's sugar sector' (Schmidt-Nowara 1999, 7). In social terms, they identified the practice of slavery as cruel and hindering the process of educating and modernizing Puerto Rico (Cortés Zavala 18-21). On the other hand, they also feared that the growing Afro-Caribbean population could lead to slave uprisings like those of Haiti, Barbados, and Guyana among others, fresh in their Caribbean memory from a few decades earlier (Schmidt-Nowara 1999, 41).

The economic system that involved the Philippines was dramatically different. For centuries, the Philippines had served Spain as a gateway to the East, a site where Asian spices and silk could be exchanged for Mexican gold.<sup>8</sup> Broadly, the Philippines was not exploited agriculturally, which led to both its native populations and languages surviving, as opposed to those of the Caribbean.

Spanish friars, subsequently, learned local languages and spread throughout the archipelago, gaining an inordinate amount of power (Rafael 2005, 7). The intellectuals of the Philippines centrally protested the corruption of the friars, who extorted their parishioners and sabotaged the education system, promoting a language dynamic within the Philippine colony that was dramatically different from that of Puerto Rico (Schumacher 24). In Puerto Rico both rich and poor spoke Spanish, due in part to the devastation of native populations in the early years of the Spanish colony. On the other hand, in the Philippines, there remained more than 100 mutually unintelligible Philippine languages. In turn, the friars limited Filipinos' verbal skills in Spanish, situating themselves as the translators between the people and the government, always ensuring the permanence of the friars' own power (Rafael 2005, 24-5). Therefore, at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, less than 10% of the country could understand Spanish (Rafael 1988, 56). Nonetheless, the *Ilustrados*, the late 19<sup>th</sup>-century group of Filipinos who were fortunate enough to travel and study in Europe, eventually composed an extensive body of Filipino literature, political critique, and social scientific writing in Spanish.<sup>9</sup>

The economic realities of these colonies also impacted the racial breakdowns of Puerto Rico and the Philippines. In Puerto Rico, the *Indio* population was greatly reduced, both through violence and through racial mixing with black and creole communities, to a point where they were declared 'extinct' in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Compared to the Philippines, therefore, the creole population of Puerto Rico, the people of Spanish ancestry born in the Americas, was greater and more distributed throughout the island. Furthermore, black slaves and their mixed descendants had a visible presence on the island. This led to the development of shifting and elaborate systems of racial categorization throughout the colonial era (Schwartz 5-7). The native populations of the Philippines continued to thrive, albeit without much political power, throughout the colonial era. These largely consisted of people of the Malay races. Another important racial group of the Philippines were the Chinese who had lived in the Philippines for centuries, acquiring for themselves a measure of economic stability, while integrating themselves into the culture of the Philippine regions where they lived. The Europeans who lived in the Philippines consisted of a small ruling class that mostly remained in Manila, and specifically in the walled city, Intramuros. These were the 'Filipinos,' the Spaniards who lived in the Philippines, up until the era of the *Ilustrados*, who wrested the term from the Spaniards, and along with such a gesture, sought to define their national community through their studies and writings (Constantino 147-8).

What, then, connects Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines: heritages of imperial violence, the desire for authority, ambivalence toward change, ineradicable social divisions? While the "chains of empire" bound Spain's last major colonies of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century to each other, certain intellectuals from the colonies traced alternative networks of anticolonial communication and organization.<sup>10</sup> Illustrating the chains of empire, many Spanish governors ruled in both

archipelagos; Eulogio Despujol served as governor of Puerto Rico, before serving at the same rank in the Philippines. Valeriano Weyler started his military career in Santo Domingo, then fine-tuned the art of violent suppression as Governor of the Philippines, before returning to the Caribbean and becoming famous for his callous ferocity during the Cuban revolutionary struggles of 1898 (Anderson 2004, 109). With these rulers, strategies of governance, vocabularies with which they spoke about subversion, and methods of suppression were exchanged between the distant colonies (Anderson 2005, 59n-60n).<sup>11</sup>

Subsequently, the networks of anticolonial communication and organization fully blossomed in the 1890s. Filipino editor Mariano Ponce exchanged extensive correspondence with the Cuban lawyer José Alberto Izquierdo, in which they, in Koichi Hagimoto's terms, 'highlight their mutual concern against Spanish imperialism and... articulate the urgent call for national independence in both colonial contexts' (134). This camaraderie was facilitated by Ramón Emeterio Betances, a Puerto Rican nationalist who maintained correspondence with Cuban leaders Máximo Gómez and José Martí, as well as Mariano Ponce from the Philippines, letters in which these men foster solidarity through reflections on freedom, race, revolutionary spirit, and indignation against the Spanish empire (Hagimoto 141-5). Such solidarity further materialized itself in anticolonial periodicals of the time, like *La Solidaridad*, a late 1880s Philippine fortnightly out of Madrid which featured articles such as '¿Se vende Cuba?' and *La República Cubana*, a 1890s Cuban newspaper out of New York that published articles such as '¡Viva Filipinas Libre!' (Hagimoto 146).<sup>12</sup> That said, before any correspondence was exchanged between the Philippines and Puerto Rico, Acosta and Rizal coincided in their complaint about being left out of history, as well as in their strikingly similar strategies for responding to and repairing such glaring omissions.

### Appropriation of Authority

Acosta's and Rizal's experiments with annotations inscribe themselves into a long and winding history of annotation that dates back to the medieval era of the Western world. In fact, footnotes and endnotes are the modern printer's boring domestication of medieval gloss (Hauptman 112). In many medieval European texts, disorderly and multi-vocal commentaries, or glosses, were handwritten in the margins of canonical texts, representing diverging interpretations (81). Footnotes, on the other hand, are the product of technological advances that allow for the tidying and taming of marginal commentary. As we know them, footnotes are intellectually responsible at best, and ignorable much of the time.<sup>13</sup>

Acosta's and Rizal's republished official Spanish histories, however, recover some of the chaos and contentiousness of medieval gloss. Their notes inject multiple voices into history, dialogizing the texts and challenging their implicit power dynamics. The annotations novelize the histories, re-narrating and re-imagining the lega-

cy of empire in order to take control of it. By appropriating history, Rizal and Acosta also preserve the original text and its narrations of empire, which they compel to serve their purposes. The following section is dedicated to discerning how Acosta and Rizal use the strategy of appropriation to articulate—that is both to pronounce and to assemble—their own authority, while also postulating on what ‘authority’ is for these anticolonial thinkers.

Postcolonial theorists, like Partha Chatterjee, declare that Indian colonial intellectuals asserted the legitimacy of their voice and subverted English authority by appropriating and radically redirecting English intellectual traditions (Chatterjee 42). On the other hand, Megan Thomas, who studies orientalist thought in the Philippines, demands a more nuanced understanding of appropriation. Thomas argues that the Spaniards did not have grounding in the intellectual traditions engaged by Filipinos; these forms of knowledge—folklore, linguistics, anthropology, and historiography from France, Germany, England, and local Philippine traditions—traveled to the Philippines and within the archipelago on the Filipinos’ terms. Even through republishing, Filipino writers, like Puerto Rican intellectuals, did not repeat and reframe only Spanish forms of knowledge. They used the republished texts as a pretext for appropriating other forms of knowledge to talk about themselves, thus choosing their own patrimonies and writing their own stories.<sup>14</sup>

Acosta’s and Rizal’s prologues to these histories outline the annotators’ strategy of appropriation as a form of asserting their intellectual advantage. Acosta begins his prologue lamenting how difficult it is to learn about Puerto Rico’s history: ‘generalmente no encuentran donde satisfacer su justa curiosidad o adquirir la provechosa instrucción que solicitan’ (33). Acosta insists that Abbad’s text provides a perfect framework for a national education, an effort to fill this ‘lamentable void,’ not because of its comprehensive nature, but rather due to its hollow spots and incompleteness. Acosta feigns a self-effacing tone in the process of critiquing Abbad:

No obstante sus vacíos, creemos que el texto de Fray Ñígo con sus comentarios ofrecerá un cuerpo de obra en que el lector podrá seguir cronológicamente, desde los primeros días de la colonización del país en 1508 hasta los actuales...la historia de la extinción de la raza indígena y la del nacimiento, desarrollo y principales crisis y evoluciones porque han pasado nuestra población, nuestra agricultura y comercio y las rentas públicas. (36)

Acosta demurely refers to the endnotes as ‘its commentaries’ as opposed to ‘my commentaries,’ and yet insists that such commentaries redeem the ‘hollow spots’ in Abbad’s original text, a text that Acosta claims also needs ‘rectification’ and ‘enrichment.’ The appropriation of a faulty text allows for the annotator and reader to rectify and enrich the original text and promotes a kind of historical thinking not previously available in the colony, Acosta argues.

What allows these commentaries the capacity to supplement

the original text’s lack? The fact that as appropriations, they have come late:

Perteneciendo nosotros a una época muy posterior y por lo mismo colocados en un punto de vista más extenso, nos ha sido dado ampliar bajo ambos conceptos la narración del autor, así como también hemos mejorado los capítulos relativos a las enfermedades epidémicas y a la organización actual de la administración de justicia... (34).

Acosta reframes belated cultural development, a common prejudice against colonized peoples, as his advantage; he is not tied down to old ways of thinking about the world, but has access to the latest advances in science and politics. For example, Acosta quotes Frenchmen Guillaume Raynal (in French) and paraphrases Moreau de Jonnés, to disprove Abbad’s assertion that the Antilles were once a land bridge that broke apart due to violent waves (43). Later on, Acosta refers to the German naturalist Humboldt, the French ethnologist D’Orbigny and Scottish historian Robertson to problematize Abbad’s emasculating claim that the ‘new world *Indios*’ couldn’t grow a beard (95). While Spain prevents the achievement of development and modernity for Puerto Rico (as opposed to Cuba, which many Puerto Ricans viewed as the favored Antilles colony), the supposed belated development of the colonials is their advantage because their intellectuals have come of age in an era when they can appropriate and wield more advanced sciences. They are not tied down by any one tradition.

Appropriation allows Acosta to smuggle his voice through the words of Spanish historians, including Abbad. This demonstrates both discursive dexterity and caution, as he risked being censored. We can see this in Acosta’s gloss of Abbad’s Chapter Three discussion of Ponce de León’s ‘settling’ of the island. Abbad states: ‘[La corona] resolvió repartir una encomienda á los indios de Puerto-Rico entre los Españoles\*...’ (70). In his endnotes, Acosta says nothing directly critical about Abbad’s passage, but quotes a Spanish poet and historian—Manuel José Quintana—who *is* critical of Spain. In part of this long quotation, Quintana says, ‘De aquí vino darse el nombre de encomiendas á los repartimientos, y el de encomendadores á los agraciados; los cuales, como quiera que su objeto principal era enriquecerse, cuidaban poco de la doctrina, y menos del buen tratamiento...’ (79). Critics coincide on the point that here, Acosta is trying to ‘put the censor to sleep’ (García 22). This is key to Acosta’s literary strategy: to smuggle his voice through the phrases and judgments expressed by somewhat likeminded Spanish historians (Vásquez 267).

Through the words of Quintana, Acosta indirectly expresses his own opinion. He identifies and critiques the convoluted language upon which the imperial projects of pacification and economic exploitation are structured and defended, highlighting the intertwined relationship of language and violence in the establishment of imperial entitlement.

Additionally, Acosta links this critique of a historical moment and mindset to a contemporary debate, using key words that trace the roots of contemporary corruptions back to these same seminal moments of imperial power. Acosta quotes Quintana, who proceeds to use the words that also belong to Acosta's vocabulary of abolitionism: 'freedom,' 'work,' 'contradiction,' and 'slave.' Such words are ubiquitous in essays such as Acosta's 'Cuestión de brazos para el cultivo actual de tierras en Puerto Rico' (1853). By using this vocabulary, Acosta infuses a declaration of imperial power with a supplementary perspective that redirects the apparent permanence of the historical declaration. What is permanent is not Spanish power, but Spanish coercive behavior embodied in the same words that are used to categorize both their 16<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century actions. Acosta's form of appropriation allows him to articulate new intellectual patrimonies, smuggle his messages through the voice of like-minded Spaniards, and articulate indirectly a series of trans-temporal political critiques. By doing so he aims to rearrange the implicit, hierarchical, colonial distributions of agency between those who can and cannot observe, interpret, and express knowledge in and about Spain and Puerto Rico.

Rizal's preface to *Sucesos*, titled 'A los Filipinos,' builds off of Acosta's challenge of primacy; coming later allows you the authority to appropriate that which had been there first. Like Acosta, Rizal laments the lack of knowledge in the Philippines about the region's past in the preface:

Nacido y criado en el desconocimiento de nuestro Ayer, como casi todos vosotros; sin voz ni autoridad para hablar de lo que no vimos ni estudiamos, consideré necesario invocar el testimonio de un ilustre español que rigió los destinos de Filipinas en los principios de su nueva era y presencié los últimos momentos de nuestra antigua nacionalidad. (v)

According to Rizal, authority is linked to one's voice, that is one's ability to talk about 'our Yesterday,' as well as the category of 'us.' This knowledge of the past allows Filipinos to know themselves and to 'study their future' (vi). Authority blends temporal categories; in order to comment on the colonial status quo and to design the Philippine future, Rizal sets out to systematically argue that the Filipinos' past was great, and that their greatness and progress had been corrupted and arrested by the so-called civilizing project of the Spanish Empire.

Rizal's historiographical contribution inverts and works against the function of imperial appropriation that his annotations critique. The logic of imperial appropriation, present in the verb *encomendar*, allows latecomers to the Americas and the Philippines to take what they found and claim it as their own. Rizal's logic of appropriation becomes evident in the copyright notes on the page opposite 'A los Filipinos,' which simply states 'Es propiedad del anotador' (iv). Upon annotating the historical text, he takes intellectual and economic

ownership of it. As annotator, he 'discovers' the history text well after its publication, but like the conquistadores did with 'discovered' land, he claims that his discovery now belongs to him. In the process of annotating the imperially endorsed document, the Filipino writer appropriates both the "voice" and the "authority" that he was born without.

The first chapter of Morga's original 1609 text is dedicated to the 'discovery,' conquest, and supposed 'pacification' of the Philippines on behalf of the Spaniards. With regards to what to do with the Philippine land, Morga asserts the following: 'Encomendóse la tierra á los que la han pacificado y poblado\*... ' (12). Rizal attacks the contradictions implicit in such language more directly than Acosta had, stating: '\*Esto es, repartióse. Esta palabra encomendar como la de pacificar, tuvo después una significación irónica: encomendar una provincia, era como decir: entregarla al saqueo, á la crueldad y á la codicia de alguien...' (12). The phrase 'like to pacify' refers to a previous note he included on the verb 'pacificar,' in which he ironically asks if it means to wage war: 'Acaso el verbo pacificar significase meter la guerra?' (xxxiv). Like Acosta, Rizal also links his critique of a historical moment to a contemporary debate through his vocabulary. Rizal uses the words 'sacking,' 'cruelty,' and 'greed,' which are nouns he frequently uses in novels and articles that critique friar abuses.

In terms of authorizing his voice, Rizal shows that not only can he identify irony in official imperial discourse, but he also can wield it with mastery and with a sharp sense of humor, an element that is notably absent from Acosta's annotation. The incisive work of humor is most evident in Rizal's ironic question about the verb *pacificar*. Rizal challenges his exclusion from the practice of history by showing himself to be an excellent reader, a master of historical codes, and a suggestive writer. His appropriation of historical discourse radically changes the signification of the appropriated material. His witty interjection adds extra information that destabilizes the original text he annotates, infusing it with ironic and impertinent difference, a dangerous supplement. Through such a slippery addition, Rizal reveals the logic of the entire history to be violent and volatile and his use of humor solicits the readers' perplexed pleasure and empathetic agreement.

Ultimately, Rizal aims to prove the success of this gesture of authorization by elevating himself to the level of quoted historians. Like Acosta, Rizal makes references to authoritative Spanish and European writers in his footnotes, including Friar Francisco Colin, Antonio Pigafetta, and Ferdinand Blumentritt. Subsequently, when he uses the phrase, 'like to pacify,' or when he cites his novel—*Noli me tangere*—in the preface, he makes reference to his own writing. By inserting himself into his own academic bibliography, Rizal elevates himself into the canon that he studies and defies.

Acosta also places himself in his annotations, but with subtly different objectives. Referring to himself as 'el editor' and 'él que esto escribe' (386), Acosta vaunts his collection of *cemí* statues of the Taínos and other pre-Hispanic peoples of the Caribbean (95).

These cryptically suggest stories and anthropological material that he has the privilege of being able to decipher and recount. Acosta likewise boasts about having opposed immigration from China and India to Puerto Rico (386). This braggadocio reveals a conception of community consolidation rooted in a strictly regimented distribution of cultural capital between different races.

Rizal's and Acosta's annotations function through an authority specifically derived from appropriation, as opposed to having come first. They arrive subsequently and take control of what was already there, Acosta through erudition and Rizal through irony and contempt. Their delayed development and blossoming as intellectuals in an age of science and irony gave Acosta and Rizal the tools necessary to authorize themselves by subversively supplementing official documents. The appropriation of historical texts and discourses allows Acosta and Rizal to craft their own historical voices in tense and continuous dialogue with established forces of political and intellectual clout. A central question remains, as suggested by Acosta's racialized view of community consolidation: does considering authority as a continuous dialogue point to potential departures from structures of exclusion that characterized the colony, or does it underline the inevitable perpetuation of such structures?

### Racialization and Authority

Two main theories of the relationship between writing and nation building in studies of Latin America in the 19<sup>th</sup> century revolve around the reconciliation of difference in the articulation of a coherent national community. In *Imagined Communities* (1983), Benedict Anderson asserts that the modern nation represents a grouping of heterogeneous peoples who look past their differences through a process of communication and sharing spurred by the development of print technologies. Doris Sommer's *Foundational Fictions* (1991) rereads 19<sup>th</sup>-century Latin American sentimental novels as amorous allegories that desire the reconciliation of irreconcilable differences within the national communities: the differences between blacks and whites, federalists and unitarians, rich and poor. Both theories take root in the assertion of French philosopher Ernest Renan, who asserts that nationhood entails a process of forgetting the differences between members of the heterogeneous community the nation aims to encompass (3).

On the contrary, Acosta and Rizal's footnotes seem incapable of forgetting differences. They preserve the documents that disenfranchise the people of Puerto Rico and the Philippines. They add divisive footnotes that underline fractures in the Spanish identity and politics, as well as fissures in their own potentially national communities. Through the footnotes, Acosta and Rizal recognize themselves as different, left out of official history, but show ambivalence to other forms of difference.

This ambivalence toward difference becomes evident in Acosta's recounting of his collection of *cemí* statuettes from the Taíno peoples. While bragging about his *cemí* collection in the endnotes

to Abbad's fourth chapter, Acosta tells the story of how one of his statuettes was found:

Sembraban caña cierto día algunos esclavos en la fértil llanura de Ponce (hacienda de Don Juan de Dios Conde) cuando al golpe de azada de un pobre negro, saltó de entre la tierra una piedra labrada que no pudo menos que llamar su atención. ¡Cuadro singular por cierto, el fetiche indio en manos del salvaje africano transportado a América! (95)

Acosta's reaction to the 'singular' juxtaposition of *Indios* and black slaves was fascinated and panicked, because, in his recounting of history, the extinction of the *Indios* led to the importation of African enslaved peoples. Acosta uses three descriptive terms to further emphasize the divergence. He calls black slaves 'poor' and 'savage,' furthermore appending the participle 'transported' to his description of them. This participle emphasizes their passivity and lack of agency. The triad of descriptive terms works in counterpoint to the *Indios'* artisanal sophistication the *Indios'* work being so sophisticated that some figurines have European noses, as though Roman artisans had crafted them.

Black slaves are poorer and more passive than the *Indio* craftsmen, Acosta argues, but what does he make of the *Indios*? Why does he favor them within the political hierarchy constructed by his annotations? In response to these questions, Acosta laments, 'desgraciadamente aquel pueblo que... se hallaba en la edad de piedra, no pudo legar su testimonio á las generaciones futuras,' (66). Acosta also describes the *cemí* figurines, 'Todos estos objetos, reliquias de aquella raza desventurada, son páginas de un libro que está por escribirse,' (97). This complex gesture, Acosta's assignment of the *Indios* to the second stage of the Stone Age, must be unpacked.

On the one hand, he counters Spaniards like Emilio Castelar's claims of the cultural emptiness of the *Indios*, asserting that they belong to a second period of the Stone Age, which 'was indicated by the ornate nature of the *zemís* and other carved stone' (Schmidt-Nowara 2006, 113). The *Indios* did not belong to the most advanced stage of civilization, like Europeans, but they had advanced notably and were not savages. On the other hand, he notes that this status in the Stone Age prohibited them from writing their history, simultaneously demonstrating their relatively primitive aspect and authorizing him to tell their story.

Paradoxically, Acosta ends up silencing *Indio* voices through the same commentaries which lament such a silence, as well as in moments when he refuses to comment. In Chapter 4, the Spanish historian Abbad examines traditional Borinquen songs: 'Los cantares eran graves y materiales... eran sus historias que referían los sucesos más serios é importantes de su país, la serie y la genealogía de sus Caciques, la época de sus muertes, sus hazañas... todo se refería y contenía en estos cánticos,' (92-93). This observation, conspicuously un-annotated by Acosta, identifies forms of *Indio* histori-

cal consciousness. Acosta's silence with regards to *Indio* voices illustrates how in this annotated history, a lack of comment may be a commentary in itself. Raquel Reyes affirms as much with regards to Rizal's annotated edition of Morga's history, saying, "Rizal's silences in the Morga are rare occasions but important ones. They indicate an opinion" (216).<sup>15</sup>

Perhaps the biggest clue to this mystery lies in the following fact: despite Abbad's text being published just 78 years prior to Acosta's republication, the friar Abbad proclaims that much can be learned about pre-Hispanic *Indios* from their descendants, even though racial mixing has rendered these contemporary *Indios* quite different from their ancestors (94). On the contrary, Acosta performs a silencing gesture common during his time; he declares all *Indios* extinct and laments their not having left any written record.<sup>16</sup> The *Indios* he studies are peaceful, cautious, timid, and, perhaps most importantly, silent. Their silence allows Acosta to tell their story, and through theirs, his own. Acosta allegorizes the *Indios'* plight using the same terms he uses in his economic critiques of underdeveloped Puerto Rico. He says '¡Desgraciados de los pueblos que no saben poner á su servicio todas las producciones y fuerzas del mundo físico!' (97). In so doing, he compares the backwardness of the *Indios* with that of his island's economy, held back from the potential of technological and societal progress by the imperially supported institution of slavery. By allegorizing the *Indios*, Acosta casts light on his interest in *Indio* cultures and *cemíes*. They are more powerful as political symbols that reflect the dichotomies of foreign v. native, slavery v. free labor, that underpin Puerto Rican social and economic problems, than as historical agents with a voice and story of their own.

As implied by the scene of the slave who discovers the *cemí*, Acosta favors *Indios* in his history of Puerto Rico over black slaves; the *Indios* are victims of historical and economic injustices, while he speaks implicitly about the black slaves as part of the problem he sets out to fix through his political involvement and historiographical project, as examined below. While *Indios* are silent and can be allegorized, within his version of history, black slaves are less advantageous because they live, they potentially could speak, and their version of abolitionism could stray from his. They represent multiple forms of potential uprisings, through the violent retaking of either a historical voice or agency over their lives in the colony.

In unison with Acosta's project, Rizal investigates a previously great Filipino race through ciphers opaquely registered in Morga's history. Before the Spanish came, the *Indios* were a literate and industrious race. Rizal pays homage through his historiographical project to the traditions of literacy that proliferated in the pre-Hispanic Philippines, in which the natives' sophisticated methods of writing, Rizal affirms, were quashed by the colony (291).<sup>17</sup> The pre-Hispanic Filipinos even had an extensive library of literary works, Rizal claims, works that have been all destroyed through the process of conquest.

Rizal asserts his pre-Hispanic peoples' industriousness while

extrapolating upon Morga's reference to large boats built by natives and his off-hand mention of an old cannon maker. Rizal claims that the boats made by natives of the Philippines were even bigger than the large crafts Morga describes.<sup>18</sup> Rizal also asserts that Filipinos once fabricated big war cannons, a technology that they have lost since colonization caused them to 'fall behind' (267). With regards to metallurgy, Morga explains about Governor Santiago de Vera: '...edificó de piedra la fortaleza de Nuestra Señora de Guña, dentro de la Ciudad de Manila, a la parte de tierra, y hizo (sic) fundir alguna artillería para su guarnición, por mano de un Indio antiguo, llamado Pandapira, natural de la provincia de la Pampanga' (267). Rizal's footnote extrapolates upon this brief mention of Panday Pira, writing a long biographical footnote that reads a complex story into the adjective 'antiguo,' which could be translated as 'old-world.' Rizal says, 'Esto es, un Indio que ya sabría fundir cañones aun antes de la llegada de los Españoles, por eso el epíteto antiguo. En este difícil ramo de la metalurgia, como en otros, se han atrasado los actuales Filipinos o los Indios nuevos' (22-3). 'Fall behind' is a phrase he repeatedly uses to describe his contemporaries, pointing to the failure or absurdity of the 'civilizing' nature of Spain's imperial project. These three examples—literacy, cannon making, and boat building—illustrate Rizal's theory that Spanish colonization had not commenced the process of civilizing the Philippines. Rather, colonization had quashed a previously great Philippine society, producing in the Filipinos forms of savagery that the Spaniards claimed to combat.

Complicating these assertions, research has revealed that the Philippines had a rich culture of oral literary traditions, but nothing points to the extensive libraries of written work that Rizal makes reference to. In fact, as avows Ocampo, 'no full document written in pre-Hispanic Philippine script has ever been found' (200). While friars in general were guilty of miseducating Filipinos, some worked to preserve these oral traditions through proto-ethnographic transcriptions. The large boats that Morga describes are supported by the archaeological evidence, but not the titanic vessels that Rizal depicts. Archaeological research by Eusebio Dizón has illustrated that Filipinos were adept at metal work and the fabrication of small cannon-like *lantakas*, but these were not used in battle as Rizal asserts.<sup>19</sup> Nonetheless, the famous cannon maker, Panday Pira, referred to by Morga and expounded upon by Rizal has made his way into the realm of national mythology, despite there being not much evidence to support this enshrinement. Among the dioramas in the Ayala museum of Manila, which tell the history of the Philippines, there is an entire display of Panday Pira making large cannons as a representation of pre-Hispanic native craftsmanship. Rizal's fabrication of an obscure and fleeting figure in Morga's chronicle has become a cornerstone of official Philippine history, 'despite historical and archeological evidence to the contrary' (Ocampo 198).

These contradictions do not erode at the importance of Rizal's annotations of the Morga, as some critics including Ocampo and John Schumacher have suggested.<sup>20</sup> Rather, like Schmidt-Nowara



claims, Rizal's historical intervention is important in that it demonstrates the terms through which Rizal and other *Ilustrados* construct their claims to authority: through appropriation, identification, invention, debate, ridicule, erudition, critique, among many other processes.<sup>21</sup> The process most evident in Rizal's reconstruction of pre-Hispanic Philippine greatness is racialization, which diverges from Acosta's representation of both pre-Hispanic *Indios* of the Caribbean and Afro-Puerto Rican peoples.

Rizal's reflections on the previously great Philippine community, which are frequently structured more upon imagination, exaggeration, contempt, and desire, than on historically precise details, call into question his relationship with his countrymen, a contemporary group that pales in comparison to its former greatness. Rizal calls this community he conjures through his footnotes the Philippine 'race' as opposed to 'nation.' What is this race? Curiously, Rizal appears uninterested in moments of racial discrimination in Morga's history. Certain passages in which Morga dismisses subjugated *Indio* ethnic groups, like the Aetas, go conspicuously unannotated in Rizal's republished version, suggesting complicity or indifference on the annotator's part. This shows how Rizal's interest in the Philippine race is neither strictly scientific nor organized centrally around the notion of racially informed social discrimination or ostracism.

Rizal structures this race in opposition to communities that threaten his vision for the future of the Philippines. One of these is Spain. From the beginning of the text, his hostility toward Spanish authority is clear; the race he sketches through his annotations is a clear foil to imperial projects of civilization and Spanish forms of corruption and coercion. However, these annotated exaggerations and historical desires underline a superficially less evident dissatisfaction with his own people. Rizal repeats that the Philippine people have fallen behind, pointing to an assertion he makes in other texts such as 'Filipinas dentro de cien años,' that they are not ready for self-government.

Rizal's idealized Philippine race, which blurs the lines between history and fiction, also blurs the lines between what people of the Philippines are—a not perfectly coherent body of ethnically, linguistically, and ideologically diverse peoples—and what he wants them to be: a unified, literate, and industrious group, capable of fashioning a productive country. Rizal's indignation before injustice and desire for freedom clash with his suspicion that his people are not yet ready for power. Through such racialization, Rizal asserts his authority over Filipinos who have fallen behind, perpetuating hints of the same types of hierarchies that had excluded him from participation in colonial politics.

Rizal bases this category of 'race' not mainly on skin color or appearance, but on his 'enlightened' desires about a future Filipino's practices and capacities. This form of 'race' is not descriptive, but rather 'prescriptive,' describing not how people are, but how they should be. This prescriptive aspect offers insights about the generic function of racialization, or the assignation of racial meaning upon practices not previously understood as racial by the practitioners.

Rizal's annotations suggest that racialization stems from biopolitical desires and social projects: visions of how society should be, how different groups should act within society, and regimens of social control that aim to make such visions real.

This aspect of racialization becomes even more evident in Acosta's notes on race and literacy in Puerto Rico and Cuba. Acosta appends a 21-page endnote to Abbad's eight-page Chapter 26 on the 'Estado actual de la población.' In these pages, Acosta makes little reference to Abbad's notes on 1788 statistics about Puerto Rico, taking such figures as a pretext to elaborate extensive comparative demographic analysis about Puerto Rico and Cuba in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Acosta's divergent demographics analyze the Cuban and Puerto Rican populations of 'blancos,' 'esclavos,' and 'libres de color' alongside the literacy rates and economic output of the two colonies. The stats undeniably illustrate, according to Acosta's conclusion to this note, that Cuba is more literate due to their 'excess of... white population... and in their greater intellectual culture' (390). In these notes, Acosta illustrates apparently irreparable fractures between colonies and within the same colony, both an intense and ongoing intercolonial rivalry with Cuba and the interplay of racialization and literacy within abolitionist politics.

Acosta advocates for literacy as a core objective of abolitionist politics; the end of slavery and education will promote a modern, economically sound, and progress-oriented country. In the process, Acosta racializes literacy, assigning it to white populations and implicitly identifying blacks as inevitably illiterate. Instead of making room in education for the slaves who would be freed through abolition, Acosta uses rhetoric and statistics to dress up these exclusionary racial views. He implies that these slaves, even freed, still inhibit the country's capacity to modernize itself.

Acosta's views on race and literacy illustrate how the abolition of slavery does not necessarily include the empowerment of slaves. In fact, with the Haitian Revolution fresh in the memory of the creole elites of the Caribbean, many supported abolition in part because, as historian Christopher Schmidt-Nowara asserts, 'fear of Haiti and pan-Caribbean race war persisted' (1999, 41). Acosta shies away from making clear statements about what should be done with freed black peoples in Puerto Rico. Acosta simply insists on the immigration of 'gente blanca de calidad' (García 27), and on fighting all forms of non-European immigration.<sup>22</sup> This form of immigration policy will help lift up Puerto Rico's literacy and economy, Acosta argues, perhaps insinuating that he favored a program of whitening miscegenation, a popular biopolitical theory at the time. These notes complicate traditional understandings of literacy, including Benedict Anderson's idea that the proliferation of print media promoted the formation of national identities in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Literacy and its promoters also assume divisive and exclusionary forms in the 19<sup>th</sup>-century Caribbean, where such platforms frequently functioned alongside and through discourses of white supremacy.

Acosta's complex political positions embody one of the key contradictions of liberalist politics of the moment. Acosta op-

poses imperial absolutism in favor of liberalist practices, such as the welcoming of foreign capital and immigration that will bolster the Puerto Rican economy. He trusts that this, in addition to better funded public education in Puerto Rico, will invite an era of political modernization that will benefit the country through the expansion of educated, paid labor, and the opening of free trade, rendering the institution of slavery unnecessary. However, Acosta's seizure of an authorial voice repeatedly manifests itself as a desire to preserve his own power and the power of landed white elites. While he protests his own exclusion from full incorporation into modernity, within Acosta's annotations there remain insinuations of totalitarian systems of racial exclusion. Acosta's notes serve as stage for the perpetual struggle between the Puerto Rican intellectual's demand for freedom and his desire for power, a struggle which resonated with forms of liberalism throughout the Caribbean, in the Philippines, in Spain, and beyond.

Acosta and Rizal use their annotations to redistribute authority among those in the colony, leveraging their delayed development as a form of authority over imperial historians. However, they are not so generous with many of their potential compatriots, whose belated education impedes progress. This suggests that more than 'national histories,' as assert Ocampo and García, the annotations represent histories of racialization, which document the desires and frustrations of anticolonial thinkers. Racialization points to the writers' process of asserting their own authority and incapability of forgetting differences. It is not a coincidence that these ambivalent reflections are articulated in racial terms. In these texts and in Foucault's writings on 'counterhistory,' which we will touch on in the next section, racial discourse prescribes divisions between the groups that it inventively defines.

### Historiographies of Doubt

While both Acosta's and Rizal's appropriations of historical text promote a redistribution of authority within the colony that is expressed in racialized terms, these processes underline diverging notions of how the history of those left out of history should be written. Foucault's lectures in *Society must be defended* (2003), offer two terms with which these diverging notions can be explored: 'race war' and 'counterhistory.'

'Counterhistory' is rooted in Foucault's concept of 'race war.' In modern society, Foucault argues, 'the social body is basically articulated around... [a] clash between two races [that] runs through society from top to bottom... and... forms the matrix for all the forms beneath which we can find the face and mechanisms of social warfare' (60). The clash of races is omnipresent, affects all aspects of society, and engraves itself into all objects, documents, and events of history. History, therefore, is a divisive register through which the 'glorious' light of power illuminates some races, while leaving the other races in the dark. Racial discourse captures these clashes and the violently limited scope of History. It underscores counterhistory,

the excluded yet preserved voices that speak, in Foucault's terms, 'from the shadows' (62).

Acosta's and Rizal's ambivalent reflections on race and nation engage with this dichotomy of light and shadow by relying on different notions of knowledge. Both annotators challenge the fixity of history and seek to restore in history the stories of those left out of history, but differ with regards to the best practice of doing so. Should the annotator 'complete the history' or 'hollow history out,' a dichotomy proposed by John Blanco (249-51)? These notions of knowledge dialogue with Foucault's contrasting forces of history: light and dark. The light represents the belief that all can and should be known. Darkness speaks to the power and permanence of doubt and uncertainty in history. In general, Acosta aligns his 'rectification' of Abbad's history with light, and Rizal populates Morga's history with unsettling doubt.

With regards to demographics and literacy, Acosta attributes Cuba's greater literacy than Puerto Rico's to its greater white population; population, as a science, does not lie:

Doloroso es consignarlo, pero estas cifras nos están diciendo que la población blanca de Cuba que sabe leer es próximamente dos veces mayor que la de nuestra isla... la población, como todos los hechos físicos y morales, está sometida á leyes indeclinables. (389-390).

Acosta reveals a certain degree of consciousness about the problematic and exclusive aspect of his demographic interpretation about race and literacy, when prefacing the statement with a lament about how painful the truth is. Yet, he must proceed. According to the logic of his writing, while science is unavoidable and inevitable, knowledge is distributed unevenly among people.

Acosta, as a firm believer that science reveals truth, furthermore asserts that he has a privileged access to truth shared by neither his colonizers nor black people. He has access both to non-Spanish European sciences and forms of local knowledge, access to *Indio* artifacts, and the discursive flexibility of a traveler. Moreover, he is white and thus has 'greater intellectual culture.' The purpose of his annotations and of the stories he recuperates of lost *Indio* cultures is to bring the original text closer to the truth. Just like the light in Foucault's conception of 'race war,' which inevitably obscures the stories of vanquished races, Acosta's notion of truth perpetuates structures of racial superiority and inferiority, even as it aims to 'cast light' on the lost histories of non-European races.

Contrarily, Rizal takes refuge in the shadow of doubt. In the preface, he claims that Morga's history contained the 'sombra de la civilización de nuestros antepasados' (v). Furthermore, in a comment, he longingly describes—in proto-environmentalist terms—how lovely the Philippines was before its trees were cut down to make boats; it was covered in shadows, a term he relates to the Spanish word for surprised, 'asombrado' (268). On the one hand, Rizal looks to extrapolate these shadows, allowing their

stories to challenge traditional narratives of empire and civilization. On the other hand, Rizal sets out to let the shadows of 'prehistory' reconquer the light of conquest in the official history; he wields doubt as a weapon against imperial entitlement and irresponsible historiography.

Acosta explains the value of a different form of doubt when discussing prehistoric transcontinental migrations of Indios from Asia along the Behring Strait. He says 'es preciso convenir en que reinan acerca de tan importante asunto sombras y misterios que la ciencia no ha logrado disipar y que aconsejan á la historia ser circunspecto en sus afirmaciones, porque la incertidumbre es preferible al error' (369). Here doubt invites further scientific investigation; doubt is a challenge to make one's claims even more error-proof, even truer. While doubt performs an occasional cameo in Acosta's annotations, it is always in the service of science. The best way to write the history of those excluded from history is through science, Acosta asserts; the truth of science will bring their stories to the surface and their stories will provide even more material for the advancement of science.

Inversely, Rizal uses science in the service of doubt and to undermine claims of Filipino superstition, using doubt to recuperate the lost voices of history. Rizal uses science to disprove the miracles included in friar histories, casting doubt on the friars' authority and showing them to be purveyors of superstition and unenlightened thought.<sup>23</sup> In these moments, Rizal uses Morga's history and contemporary science to undermine with doubt both friar histories and racist preconceptions of Filipinos as superstitious.<sup>24</sup>

While Rizal uses doubt in conjunction with Morga's text against friar histories, he also wields doubt against Morga, as seen in the briefest comment of the history. This comment responds to Morga's report of a mutiny of hired Chinese rowers against a Spanish captain, Dasmariñas. Morga laments the fact that the captain was not able to handcuff the rowers before they embarked, as though the captain had known that they would rise up in mutiny against him. Rizal inserts a terse and incredulous three-word footnote to the account saying '¿Con qué derecho?' (30). Rizal doesn't affirm a truth that counters or corrects Morga's truth; he does not replace one form of intellectual authority with another. Rather, Rizal indirectly recognizes and questions imperial entitlement and irresponsible anachronistic historiography. The imperial entitlement is apparent when Morga implicitly condones inhumane measures, handcuffing rowers in defense of the empire. The irresponsible anachronistic historiography is evident through the implicit assertion that contemporary knowledge that the paid rowers would mutiny should retroactively justify their previously unwarranted shackling.<sup>25</sup>

Rizal illustrates how these two compartments, imperial entitlement and biased historiography, are linked in that both set out to assign power through the violent ordering of incoherent and complex encounters and populations. This can be understood as the violent practice of truth making at the core of both the imperial project and its historiographical apparatus, what Foucault calls the 'light.'

Thus, Rizal's footnote succinctly embodies the politics of his project of annotation, writing doubt into history's content and form. While Acosta uses the 'light' of reason to establish his superiority over Spanish authorities, Rizal draws his advantage from the cultivation of doubt and darkness on the pages of history.

Doubt both identifies and sidesteps the violent task of truth making, constantly renewing and translating history with every re-reading.<sup>26</sup> Rizal's articulation of an idealized pre-Hispanic Philippine race is a byproduct of doubt, which liberates history from the grasp of any individual or tradition, allowing it to be reinterpreted, dislodging its adhesion to previous fixed meanings. By 'hollowing out history' with doubt, Rizal makes room for alternative histories and for his own voice.<sup>27</sup> Doubt makes space for this potential to translate, underlining the volatile nature of language and knowledge.

How does doubt engage with authority? Acosta's uses doubt to assert his scientific authority and to structurally weaken the empire's grasp on history. Rizal uses doubt to undermine the historical rigidity which figures of authority traditionally have used to justify their power. During its moments of greatest political effectiveness, doubt highlights and questions that which is taken for granted, including the hierarchies that structure colonial society and the truths of history. Infusing a historical text with doubtful commentaries can turn it into a radical history, a register of what we do not know, a champion of vanquished races. Doubt can come in the form of a sharp question, or in the form of extra information that unleashes floods of destabilizing knowledge within the history. This practice of counterhistory does not eliminate authority or attack it frontally. It identifies and mimics how this authority expresses and perpetuates itself. It undercuts the common ground that such authority rests on, and illustrates how such common ground is not common to everyone.

### Conclusion: Imperial Endnotes

Acosta and Rizal explore the notes as a space to assert their authority while under an authoritarian regime. They smuggle their voices into debates over the past and future of their countries, and assert that arriving tardy to the banquet of culture gave them an advantage over those who supposedly arrived first. In the process, these annotations reveal reservations toward the formation of a national community, framing their complex desires through processes of racialization. They coincide in that imperial histories need remediation, but they diverge with regards to the remedy. Acosta insists on bringing the History closer to a notion of truth and Rizal asserts the need to destabilize History, the intellectual apparatus of violent imperial entitlement, by planting dangerous doubt in the discourses it disseminates.

These processes through which Acosta and Rizal assert their voice as authors—appropriation, racialization, and historiography—demonstrate a shared belief that authority is not achieved through destruction. Rather, authority manifests itself in the ability to supplement a text, community, law, or idea with their own

voice, transforming it at the same time that they preserve it. By adding dangerous, extra information to a category that had previously been considered to be whole, one exerts control, asserts one's expertise, dislodges fixed relations, and carves out a space for incremental change. Hence, while the contents of Rizal's and Acosta's notes do not offer a final verdict for the debate between reform and revolution with regards to the best future path for their islands, a debate which raged between anticolonial agents in the Philippines, the Caribbean, and Spain, the graphic form of their anticolonial annotations is rooted in an aversion to the upheaval that revolution would entail. This form of asserting their voice as authors shows how these colonial intellectuals seek to realize authority through contentious preservation, as opposed to the coercion and tyranny that they resist. The strategy of contentious preservation highlights both Acosta's and Rizal's aversion to violence, while also pointing to their most violent and exclusive moments. Through contentious preservation, Acosta and Rizal desire and design new procedures of building knowledge that they understand as crucial preliminary steps before they even consider building nations.

In turn, this essay forms an invitation to build knowledge about these transoceanic networks of anticolonial writing and thinking in the "colony after the empire." When former Spanish colonies developed national identities, writers of Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines explored their identities in tense dialogue with the Spanish who continued to rule and to censor their voices. These annotations are synecdoches of such contentious negotiations and can be used as a manual for studying the complexities of anticolonial writing of the era. Through its exploration of these annotations, this article

offers an embryonic list of key terms for similar investigations of Caribbean and Philippine anti-colonial writing: appropriation, race, historiography, authority, voice, language, economics, religion, literacy, education, modernity. Furthermore, these writings illustrate a form of postcolonial thought from within the colony, a welcome addition to postcolonial studies which has been dominated by writings from South Asia. Joining Latin American postcolonial scholars such as Mary Louise Pratt, José Rabasa, and Lorgia García Peña, as well scholars of colonial and postcolonial history in the Philippines, like Vicente Rafael, Tatiana Seijas, and Ricardo Padrón, the study of the transoceanic Hispanic will contribute to and challenge the established terms of postcolonial debate: subaltern, voice, reading against the grain, marginalization, discourse, and inversion, among others.

The Philippines and Puerto Rico, often overlooked in studies of Latin American literature and history, are endnotes to Spain's colonial saga. Acosta's and Rizal's republications show that paying attention to the notes destabilizes accepted notions of truth, and sculpts particular truths that break free from *some* of empire's oppressive structures. For the colonies that remained the longest under Spanish rule, writing about the possible directions of nationhood represents neither a process of reconciliation between different communities, nor a radical schism. These imperial endnotes draw out political and demographic differences via dialogical approaches to historiography. Foregrounding the transition from the colony into the postcolony, anticolonial intellectuals transform the disparities of empire from permanent declarations into perpetual debates.

---

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The concept 'paratext' was coined by the literary theoretician Gérard Genette, speaking about all that a book contains, beyond the main text. The paratext includes cover matter, end matter, the table of contents, information about the publisher, and the annotations. The paratext is often not written by the author whose name appears on the cover of the book. For Genette's theories on the paratext, see *Paratexts. Thresholds of interpretation* (1997).

<sup>2</sup>For more information on Acosta, see María Teresa Cortés Zavala's chapter 'José Julián Acosta: agente del progreso y constructor de la memoria histórica de Puerto Rico,' in her book *Los hombres de la nación: Itinerarios del progreso económico y el desarrollo intelectual* (2012), or the biography *José Julián Acosta y su tiempo*, by Ángel Acosta Quintero.

<sup>3</sup>For more information on Rizal, see *The First Filipino* (2007) by Leon María Guerrero, or *Rizal Without the Overcoat* (1990) by Ambeth Ocampo.

<sup>4</sup>In the original edition, which contains 508 pages, 170 come from Abbad and 338 from Acosta (Cortés Zavala 136).

<sup>5</sup>'Boricua' is an alternative demonym for Puerto Ricans modeled after pre-Hispanic first nations populations of the island the Spaniards came to call 'San Juan de Puerto Rico.'

<sup>6</sup>Other studies of transoceanic Hispanic studies include Koichi Hagimoto's *Between Empires* (2013), Irma Rivera Nieves's *Cambio de Cielo* (1999), John Blanco's 'Bastards of the Unfinished Revolution' (2004), Josep Fradera's *Colonias para después de un imperio* (2005), and Christopher Schmidt-Nowara's *The Conquest of History* (2006). While 'transpacific studies' is an exciting field, this article fits better under the category of 'transoceanic.' Transpacific works when discussing the connections between Latin America and the Philippines during the years of the Manila Galleon (1565-1815), when economic, cultural, and linguistic exchange between the Philippines and Latin America was strong. During this period, Spain even attempted cartographic campaigns to transform 'East' Asia into the 'Indias del poniente,' the Indies of the West, or in Ricardo Padrón's terms 'The Indies of the Setting Sun.' The network of Philippine and Caribbean anticolonial writing of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, however, is connected through Europe. Puerto Ricans traveled to Europe by way of the Atlantic, while Filipinos went to Europe (after the 1869 opening of the Suez Canal) via the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea. This shift in trajectory represents a shift in circuits of cultural exchange: the transpacific exchange was a more contained circuit, while the transoceanic period represents a series of movements that are more global in character, involving Catalan and French anarchist move-

ments, for example. For more information on the global aspect of trans-oceanic anticolonial writing, see Benedict Anderson's *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination* (2007).

<sup>7</sup> This term, '*desencuentros*,' comes from Julio Ramos's book *Desencuentros de la modernidad: Literatura y política en el siglo XIX* (2003). It conjures a simultaneous convergence and divergence, a resonance that underlines distance, the effect of ships crossing in the night.

<sup>8</sup> This lasted until the early 19<sup>th</sup>-century, when the headquarters of the Philippine colony, Mexico, achieved independence.

<sup>9</sup> The *Ilustrados* wrote mostly in Spanish, for four interrelated reasons. 1) Spanish served as a lingua franca between anticolonial Filipino intellectuals coming from diverse language groups. 2) It allowed for international dialogue with European sympathizers. 3) It undermined the system of power established by the friars that the *Ilustrados* protested. 4) It represented a path toward the education, enlightenment, and liberation of the people of the Philippines, which could be achieved, according to different Filipino thinkers, through their full integration into Spanish citizenship, the deliberate articulation of independence through education, or, finally, revolution. For more information on this 'foreign' code for self-invention, see Vicente Rafael's *The Promise of the Foreign: Nationalism and the Technics of Translation in the Spanish Philippines* (2005). And to further investigate 'Ilustrado' culture in the Philippines, see Caroline Hau's *Elites and Ilustrados in Philippine Culture* (2017).

<sup>10</sup> I adopt and adapt the term 'chains of empire' from Julian Go's study of US rule in Puerto Rico and the Philippines in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. It speaks to the interconnected, yet divergent conditions of distant colonies under the same empire. Focusing specifically on 'political education' in the Philippines and Puerto Rico, the US project of supposedly promoting an advancement of the colonies from a rudimentary stage to a point where they could achieve self-rule, Go argues that similar educational projects play out in dramatically divergent ways in these distant colonies. The 'chains' represent a form of connectivity and an unbreachable divider, a paradox which plays out also in the context of Spanish rule in these same regions.

<sup>11</sup> For example, 'filibustero' or freebooter or pirate was a term coined in the Caribbean and popularized in the Philippines, without the people of the Philippines understanding what it meant beyond indicating that whoever received such an epithet was in trouble (Anderson 2005, 59n-60n). The phenomenon of Filipinos not understanding or being able to pronounce the word 'filibustero' is humorously chronicled in José Rizal's first novel *Noli me tangere*, while also taking on a nebulous and powerful form in Rizal's second and final novel, aptly titled *El filibusterismo*.

<sup>12</sup> During 1860s to the 1880s, disparate sparks of inter-colonial dialogue emerged among colonial expatriates in Europe. For example, Cuban autonomist Rafael María de Labra met with various Filipinos, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans to discuss reforms, strategies, and the possibilities of inter-colonial organization. Labra met with Puerto Ricans Román Baldorioty de Castro and José Julián Acosta as president of the 'Sociedad Abolicionista Española' in 1865 (Cortés Zavala 29 and Hagimoto 132). Subsequently, in the 1880s, Labra counseled Filipinos living in Europe including Evaristo Aguirre and José Rizal on the merits of autonomism: seeking reform and self-rule from within Spain as opposed to a revolutionary break from Spain (Morillo Alicea 34).

<sup>13</sup> The English playwright Noel Coward compared footnotes to 'hav-

ing to go downstairs to answer the door while in the midst of making love' (quoted in Grafton 70).

<sup>14</sup> Acosta's and Rizal's annotations are not the first unruly commentaries of this kind in the colonial literature of the Spanish empire. They dialogue with intellectual heritage of 17<sup>th</sup>-century masterpieces of disruption, Inca Garcilaso's *Comentarios reales* and Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz's '*Respuesta a Sor Filotea*.' Like el Inca's commentary on Spanish colonization and Inca culture, published in 1609 the same year as Morga's history on the Philippines, Acosta and Rizal do not reassure the reader about the things that he or she already knows; they destabilize both the imperial account and the logic upon which imperial power is structured (Sommer 75). Like Sor Juana's '*Respuesta*,' Acosta's and Rizal's responses to authority mimic conventions 'to the point of parody,' thus aiming to disassociate the 'natural associations' of power implicit in the discourses of the texts in which they engage and the time in which they live (Franco 29).

<sup>15</sup> In a similar vein, one of Acosta's students, Julio Vizcarrondo translates and comments French naturalist scientist André Pierre Ledru's 18<sup>th</sup>-century travel chronicle to Puerto Rico, in which Vizcarrondo inversely asserts that an annotator's silence reveals his agreement with the original text. Vizcarrondo takes issue with Ledru's claim that the people of Puerto Rico are lazy, pointing the blame for any of the island's productivity problems on unenlightened and unenlightening, protracted Spanish imperialism. He says that if he were not to speak up to this claim of laziness, the translator would act as an accomplice to such discursive violence (109).

<sup>16</sup> The *Indios* as a category were also scientifically buried in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century when the term was effaced from the national census in favor of the term '*pardo libre*.' While the original justification for the switch was that there were no more 'pure' *Indios*, such logic seems marked more by social Darwinism than by a desire to register the demographic breakdown of Puerto Rico more subtly. By eliminating the category, government officials paved the way to speak of *Indio* extinction, as opposed to considering different forms of 'mixing' or other more complex racial breakdowns, common when considering African descendants (Castanha 94).

<sup>17</sup> Rizal's footnote: '*...escribían de arriba abajo... la dirección horizontal se adaptó después de la llegada de los Españoles*' (291).

<sup>18</sup> Rizal's footnote: '*...Los Filipinos... célebres y diestros en la navegación, lejos de progresar, se han atrasado, pues si bien se construyen en las Islas barcos, podemos decir que son casi todos de modelo europeo. Desaparecieron los navíos que contenían cien remeros por banda y treinta soldados de combate; el país que un tiempo con medios primitivos fabricaba naos cerca de 2,000 toneladas, hoy tiene que acudir a puertos extraños, como Hong-Kong, para dar el oro arrancado a los pobres en cambio de inservibles cruceros...*' (267)

<sup>19</sup> Historian Ambeth Ocampo clarifies that boats discovered in recent digs in the Philippines match Morga's description, but do not come close to Rizal's enormous 2000-ton boats (Ocampo 200). The archeological work of Eusebio Dizón suggests that 'the *Indios* were a metal using people, but did not possess the metallurgical knowledge attributed to them by Rizal... it is possible that the *Indios* were capable of forging the small cannons, or *lantakas*... although they are not used for warfare, but as ornaments for interior decoration' (quoted in Ocampo 199).

<sup>20</sup> These moments of imprecision or loose extrapolation have led some historians like Ambeth Ocampo and John Schumacher to question the his-

torical merit of Rizal's annotations. In a moment of ethnocentric, intellectual condescension, Schumacher, who is not typically associated with the imperial apologists, echoed critiques frequently directed at Rizal by his Spanish detractors; Schumacher claimed that Rizal's notes illustrate how he is not trained in historiography and the immensity of the task before him 'proves too much' (22).

<sup>21</sup> Schmidt-Nowara affirms the Rizal's annotations to Morga's *Sucesos* represent a 'crucial work in the struggle for historical authority in the Philippines... Through this work of scholarship, Rizal confronted contemporary Spanish Historians on their own ground, refusing to acquiesce to the desire of Retana and others to monopolize authority over the colony's, or nation's, history. Rizal claimed his place in his nation's archive by reading, interpreting, and publishing the Morga. If his historical scholarship was not as incandescent as his fiction, it was still an important affirmation of the right and capacity of Filipino patriots to know their own history' (*Conquest* 180-1).

<sup>22</sup> Acosta puts his Eurocentric notions of progress that necessarily exclude non-white races on clear display when talking about immigration: 'Por fortuna, no conocemos, cual sucede en Cuba y en otras Antillas, ni á los hijos degradados de la India oriental ni a los viciosos súbditos del celeste imperio. En 1853, se intentó introducirlos; pero el que esto escribe mirará siempre como un honor el haber levantado su humilde voz contra una inmigración tan funesta' (386). Acosta 'humbly' boasts, seeing himself as protagonist of history, a defender of geopolitical borders from the penetration of immoral and vice-ridden immigrants.

<sup>23</sup> In Chapter Eight of Morga's history, Rizal responds to claims of Indio superstitions by pointing out that contemporary priests repeatedly commit the same crimes committed by Indio religious three centuries before. He subsequently enumerates Catholic superstitions that go against science

while lining friars' pockets: '¿Qué se diría ahora de los que mueren, á pesar de todas las misas á las diferentes vírgenes, á pesar de las figuras de cera, de plata y otros ofrecimientos más llamativos y tentadores?' (313).

<sup>24</sup> This combines well with *Ilustrado* Isabelo de los Reyes's collection of Filipino folk-lore, which argues that Filipinos learned their superstitions from Spaniards. Benedict Anderson's chapter 'The Rooster's Egg: Pioneering World Folklore in the Philippines' in *Under Three Flags* (2005), examines Isabelo de los Reyes's experiments in folklore, showing how such efforts represent both a challenge of Spanish intellectual and political authority, as well as a seed of global scientific disciplinary exchange.

<sup>25</sup> This passage also points to a further divergence between Acosta's and Rizal's annotations. While the fear of uprising informs Acosta's abolitionist views and platform with regards to literacy and immigration, Rizal identifies a similar fear, that which permeates Morga's passage about Chinese indentured rowers, as a source of violent policy and irrational historiography.

<sup>26</sup> Here, translation implies, in Vicente Rafael's terms, 'a sense of futurity harbored and kept in reserve, of the radical otherness of language surviving and producing effects beyond the moment of its articulation... [It] gives rise to the possibility of historical thought as the opening to that which is new and therefore always yet to come' (15).

<sup>27</sup> On how such an 'evacuation of history' makes room for alternative histories, John Blanco says, 'The hollowing out of Morga's authority fulfills the rhetorical function of creating spaces in the interstices of the text, "cracks in the parchment curtain," as a contemporary Philippine historian once said, in which the continuity of Spanish sovereignty, its essential right and glory, have to give way to the ghostly presence of *other continuities*' (251).

## WORKS CITED

- Abbad y Lasierra, Íñigo. *Historia Geográfica, Civil y Natural de la Isla de San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico*. Ed. José Julián de Acosta y Calvo. San Juan: Ediciones Doce Calles, 2002. Print.
- Acosta Quintero, Ángel. *José Julián Acosta y su tiempo*. San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña, 1965. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 2006. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination*. New York: Verso, 2005. Print.
- Arendt, Hannah. 'What is authority? (1954)' <http://pevpat-ugent.be/wpcontent/uploads/2016/09/H-Arendt-what-is-authority.pdf>. Visited on 9/13/2017.
- Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Tr. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. Print.
- Blanco, John D. *Frontier Constitutions: Christianity and Colonial Empire in the Nineteenth-Century Philippines*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 2009. Digital.
- Castanha, Tony. *The Myth of Indigenous Extinction: Continuity and Reclamation in Borinken*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.
- Chatterjee, Partha. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*. London: Zed Books, 1993. Online.
- Constantino, Renato and Leticia. *A History of the Philippines: From the Spanish Colonization to the Second World War*. Quezon City: Monthly Review Press, 1975. Print.
- Cortés Zavala, María Teresa. *Los hombres de la nación: Itinerarios del progreso económico y el desarrollo intelectual, Puerto Rico en el siglo XIX*. México: Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo (Doce Calles), 2012. Print.
- Díaz Quiñones, Arcadio. *El arte de bregar*. San Juan: Ediciones Callejón, 2000. Print.
- 'Encomienda.' Entry to the online edition of Oxford English Dictionary. <http://ow.ly/Mc2nL>. Accessed 27 April 2014.
- Fradera, Josep M. *Colonias para después de un imperio*. Barcelona: Edicions Bellaterra, 2005. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *Society Must be Defended*. New York: Picador, 2003. Digital.
- Franco, Jean. *Plotting Women: Gender & Representation in Mexico*. New York: Colombia University Press, 1989. Digital.
- García, Gervasio L. 'Estudio Introductorio: Historiar bajo censura, La primera historia puertorriqueña.' In: Abbad y Lasierra, Íñigo. *Historia Geográfica, Civil y Natural de la Isla de San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico*. Ed. José Julián de Acosta y Calvo. San Juan: Ediciones Doce Calles, 2002. Print.

- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.
- Grafton, Anthony. *The Footnote: A curious history*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999. Print.
- Hagimoto, Koichi. *Between Empires: Martí, Rizal, and the Intercolonial Alliance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Print.
- Hauptman, Robert. *Documentation: A History and Critique of Attribution, Commentary, Glosses, Marginalia, Notes, Bibliographies, Works-Cited Lists, and Citation Indexing and Analysis*. Jefferson: McFarland and Co, Inc. Publishers, 2008. Print.
- Luna y Novicio, Antonio. *Impresiones*. Madrid: El Progreso Tipográfico, 1891. Digital.
- Morga, Antonio. *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (1609). Ed. José Rizal (1889). Quezon City: R. Martínez and Sons, 1958. Print.
- Morillo-Alicea, Javier. 'Uncharted Landscapes of "Latin America": The Philippines in the Spanish Imperial Archipelago.' In *Interpreting Spanish Colonialism: Empires, Nations, and Legends*. Ed. Christopher Schmidt-Nowara and John M. Nieto-Philipp. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005. Print.
- Ocampo, Ambeth. 'Rizal's Morga and Views of Philippine History.' *Philippine Studies* vol. 46, no. 2 (1998): 184–214. Digital
- Ocampo, Ambeth. *Rizal Without the Overcoat*. Manila: Anvil Publishing, 2008. Print.
- Rafael, Vicente. *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1988. Print.
- Rafael, Vicente. *The Promise of the Foreign: Nationalism and the Technics of Translation in the Spanish Philippines*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005. Print
- Rama, Ángel. *The Lettered City*. Ed. and tr. by John Charles Chasteen. Durham: Duke University Press, 1996. Print.
- Ramos, Julio. *Desencuentros de la modernidad en América Latina: Literatura y política en el siglo XIX*. Santiago: Editorial Cuarto Propio (San Juan: Ediciones Callejón), 2003. Print.
- Rancière, Jacques. *The Politics of Aesthetics*. New York: Continuum, 2006. Print.
- Renan, Ernest "What is a Nation?" text of a conference delivered at the Sorbonne on March 11th, 1882, in Ernest Renan, *Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?* Tr. Ethan Rundell Paris: Presses-Pocket, 1992. Print.
- Reyes, Isabelo de los. *El Folklore Filipino*. Quezón City: University of Philippines Press, 1994. Print.
- Rivera Nieves, Irma. *Cambio de cielo: Viaje, sujeto y ley en Ledru, Hostos y Rizal*. San Juan: Postdata, 1999. Print.
- Rizal, José. 'Filipinas dentro de cien años.' <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/14839/14839-8.txt>. Accessed 9/14/16.
- Schmidt-Nowara, Christopher. *The Conquest of History: Spanish Colonialism and National Histories in the Nineteenth Century*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2006.
- Schmidt-Nowara, Christopher. *Empire and Antisavery: Spain, Puerto Rico and Cuba 1833-1874*. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1999. Print.
- Schumacher, S.J., John N. *The Propaganda Movement: 1880-1895: The Creation of a Filipino Consciousness, The Making of the Revolution*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1997. Print.
- Schwartz, Stuart B. 'Spaniards, Pardos, and the Missing Mestizos: Identities and Racial Categories in the Early Hispanic Caribbean.' *New West Indian Guide*, No. 1/2 (1997).
- Sommer, Doris. 'Foundational Fictions: When History Was Romance in Latin America.' *Salmagundi*: no. 82-83, (Spring-Summer 1989), 111-41. Digital.
- Sommer, Doris. *Proceed with Caution: When Engaged by Minority Writing in the Americas*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999. Print.
- Thomas, Megan C. *Orientalists, Propagandists and Ilustrados: Filipino Scholarship and the End of Spanish Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012. Print.
- Vásquez, Carmen. 'José Julián Acosta, Abolicionista.' In *Anuario de Estudios Americanos*, XLVIII (1986): 259-274. Print.