

PARAPHRASING EUROPE: TRANSLATION IN CONTEMPORARY FILIPINO HISTORY

Portia L. Reyes
National University of Singapore
reyes.portia@hotmail.com

Ramon Guillermo
University of the Philippines (Diliman)
bomen.guillermo@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper studies three annotated translations into Filipino that have been inspired by the controversial historiographical movement called *Pantayong Pananaw* (from us-for us perspective), which argued for the use of the national language in academic study: San Agustin's 1720 letter (by Dedina Lapar), Canseco's 1897 account of Cavite during the Philippine Revolution (by Rhommel Hernandez), and Marx and Engel's 1848 *Communist Manifesto* (by Zeus Salazar). In seeking to understand the translational practices that assist in the production and institutionalization of knowledge today, we ask: what transpires in the Filipinization of an account? In which way is translation significant to indigenization of knowledge? How is indigenization illustrated in translation? What uses do notes and annotations have in translation? On the one hand, foreign sources and theory can be appropriated in historiography through translation as it liberates foreign knowledge for use and application in the Filipino setting. Annotations, on the other hand, examine and validate the translated texts within the realities of Philippine culture.

Keywords

explanatory translation, critical edition, *Pantayong Pananaw* (PP)

About the authors

Portia L. Reyes is a faculty member of the Department of History at the National University of Singapore. Her research interests include Philippine history and historiography, German hermeneutics, and Southeast Asian studies.

Ramon Guillermo is an Associate Professor at the Department of Filipino and Philippine Literature, University of the Philippines in Diliman. He received his undergraduate and graduate degrees from the University of the Philippines and the University of Hamburg, Germany. He is the author of two books, *Pook at Paninindigan: Kritika ng Pantayong Pananaw* (U of the Philippines P, 2009) and *Translation and Revolution: A Study of Jose Rizal's Guillermo Tell* (Ateneo de Manila UP, 2009). He was awarded the Asian Public Intellectual Fellowship (2009) by the Nippon Foundation.

Authors' note

This essay is based on a paper read at the Seventh Annual Graduate Student Symposium, "Translation and the Production of Knowledge in Southeast Asia," at Cornell University on April 15-17, 2005. We are grateful to Jamie S. Davidson and Lily Mendoza for reading and commenting on earlier versions of the work. However, we are responsible for the essay's ensuing mistakes.

Selbst bei dem hoffnungslos scheinenden Verlustgeschäft des Übersetzens gibt es nicht nur ein Mehr oder Weniger an Verlust, es gibt auch mitunter so etwas wie Gewinn, mindestens einen Interpretationsgewinn, einen Zuwachs an Deutlichkeit und mitunter auch an Eindeutigkeit, wo dies ein Gewinn ist.

Even in what appears to be a hopelessly unprofitable business of translation, there is not just a more or less loss. With it, there is also some gain, at least a gain of interpretation, entailing a win in intelligibility that also includes clarity, wherein profit lies.

- Hans-Georg Gadamer, 1989

INTRODUCTION

What transpires in translation has hardly been a serious concern among Filipinos. Having been colonized by different foreign speakers for more than three hundred and fifty years, many are resigned to accept translation as a mechanical—and often exasperating—procedure whose aim is to communicate a message to a speaking/writing counterpart. In the Philippines, the dominant mode of translation occurs from Spanish to English. The Filipino vernacular is typically left out of this equation.

Recently, this norm has undergone change, however. Forging an alternative path by privileging Filipino as the target language, these works characteristically devote significant space to the translator's analysis of and annotations to the source text. Seen in this light, this article scrutinizes three examples of this nascent shift to Filipino translation: 1) Dedina Lapar's Fray Gaspar de San Agustin's 1720 letter about Filipinos; 2) Rhommel Hernandez's Telesforo Canseco's 1897 account of Cavite during the Philippine Revolution; and 3) Zeus Salazar's translation of Marx and Engel's 1848 Manifesto of the Communist Party. Produced to shed light on the discourse surrounding materials and critical philosophy in history-writing, these three translations have been inspired by the controversial historiographical movement called *Pantayong Pananaw* (from us-for us perspective, PP).

Starting in the 1980s, PP has steadily gained influence as a significant historiographical practice and movement. Publication of its journal *Bagong Kasaysayan* (new history, BK) and the frequency of its seminars are illustrative. Though the increasing participation of scholars from the various social science and humanities disciplines have

introduced a growing plurality of opinions on the substance and direction of PP, its theoretical foundation which provided the initial impetus and inspiration for PP as an intellectual movement came from the hand of the University of the Philippines historian Zeus Salazar.

Salazar's ideas regarding PP germinated over many decades of teaching and history-writing. Its first preliminary articulations took shape in essays written in the late 1960s upon Salazar's return home after a lengthy period of study in Europe. Aside from developing distinctive and often controversial nationalist reinterpretations of Philippine history, his contributions must also be understood within the context of efforts to propagate the intellectualization and use of the national language in universities, including at the University of the Philippines (UP). In this way, PP has often been compared with the like-minded *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* (SP) movement in psychology which also pioneered the use of Filipino in research and teaching (see also Enriquez 1995; Enriquez 1990; Salazar 1989; and Sta. Maria). To be sure, many of the ideas behind PP were no doubt influenced by the popular wave of nationalist agitation during the 1960s and 1970s which left deep imprints upon the outlook and engagement of many intellectuals both inside and outside the universities. Salazar's original point of view, however, developed not only as a continuation of this nationalist tradition among intellectuals, but also as a reaction against what he perceived as its shortcomings on the issues of culture and the national language. He thus felt that he had to strongly define his position against the dominant colonial/neo-colonial tradition of scholarship, while also distinguishing himself from the tradition of left-wing nationalism as found in student organizations, trade unions, and peasant organizations in the Philippines. The historical interpretations of such influential writers as Teodoro Agoncillo, Amado Guerrero, and Renato Constantino in fact became canonical for the latter tradition during the Marcos dictatorship (1972-86). Salazar's own ill-fated attempt to propagate his historical perspective through the mechanisms of the state led to the most controversial and troubling phase of his intellectual career as principal writer of the multi-volume history project of the dictatorship entitled *Tadhana* (Destiny) which was published under the name of Marcos (1976).

The immediate period following the downfall of Marcos was characterized by a relatively low-key, though sustained publication of newer writings by Salazar which established PP as the name for the type of historical writing he advocated. It was also during this period that a number of younger scholars, most of them from the UP Department of History, began taking up the cause of PP within the academe. A flurry of publications by Salazar and other like-minded scholars in the Filipino-language journal

Bagong Kasaysayan showed that PP was becoming a real alternative to the “normal” practice of historiography and social science in the Philippines. Aside from the novelty of its interpretations, methods and PP’s use of a highly intellectualized Filipino, the fact that it was taking on the form of a collective effort also differentiated it from the usual mode of intellectual production in the Philippine academe. The latter is generally characterized by a paucity of intellectual exchange and is almost exclusively focused on the sporadic publication of books by scholars working individually. The development of a loose community of scholars committed to developing social scientific languages in Filipino with increasingly overlapping domains of shared discourse contributed in no small measure towards giving a new vitality to what would otherwise have been a lonely and difficult project. PP has undoubtedly served as an important impetus in contemporary efforts to encourage the development of Philippine social scientific discourses in the national language.

Given the longstanding reluctance of the Philippine state to pursue and implement the constitutional substance of the national language policy in the face of local opposition by some sectors of the political elite and what it views as the economic exigencies of globalization, PP undertakes what in Gramsci’s terms would be called a “war of position” or struggle for hegemony in the propagation of the national language. We take a look at examples of how this struggle is being waged as we study the aforementioned annotated translations of San Agustin’s 1720 letter by Dedina Lapar; Canseco’s 1897 account of the Philippine Revolution by Rhommel Hernandez; and Marx and Engel’s 1848 *Communist Manifesto* by Zeus Salazar. We grapple with the translational practices which assist in production and institutionalization of knowledge today. We ask questions like: what transpires in the Filipinization of an account? In which way is translation significant to indigenization of knowledge? How is indigenization illustrated in translation? What uses do notes and annotations have in translation?

Some answers are provided in the two main divisions that comprise the body of this essay. While focusing on the works of Lapar and Hernandez, the first part delves into how translation has been conceptualized in contemporary historiography. Here translation converges with a campaign to promote document discourse and criticism in history-writing; and turns into a tool for clarifying symbols and significations to an intended audience. We will show how the translated texts are interspersed with notes and annotations, which comprise fragments of side narratives and meanings that continually intervene in the translation. It is in these disturbances where the strength of the annotated translations lies. As an enriched context for the translated text, the intervening notes or fragments of

meanings are essentially discontinuities that beg of a reader's completion. Therewith is a reader equally guided and empowered to interpret a translation according to her/his own volition.

The second part analyzes the annotated translation of the *Communist Manifesto* by the PP pioneer Zeus Salazar. The practice of translation is illustrated in this segment. We take a look at how Salazar translates and deals with what he perceives as untranslatable concepts in the text. Annotations convey such untranslatability, relaying the refusal of the translator to smoothly integrate so-called foreign ideas into his language of preference. As such, the untranslatability of concepts is emphasized even as the selfsame untranslatables are accordingly translated. At this juncture readers are informed not only of the intentions of the author of the original text but the goals of the translator as well. It is in what Walter Benjamin terms as the "royal robe with ample folds" (75) of, in this instance, the Filipino language that Salazar envelops the original content of the *Communist Manifesto*. He displaces the original in the target text and articulates therewith the advantage of the target tongue vis-à-vis the source language.

DISCURSIVE DOCUMENT

As PP began ascending as a dominant trend in Filipino historiography in the 1990s, it served as both the method and critical philosophy behind a number of new studies. Two of the most provocative were: Lapar's *Ang Liham ni Fray Gaspar de San Agustin: Isang Mapanuring Pamamatnugot* and Hernandez's *Mapanuring Paglilimbag: Isang Pagsasalin at Pagsusuri ng Historia de la Ensurrección Filipina en Cavite (Kasaysayan ng Himagsikang Filipino sa Cavite) ni Don Telesforo Canseco, 1897*. In a move to establish documentary discourse as a legitimate historiographical exercise, Lapar and Hernandez analyzed and translated two important sources of the country's history. Lapar tackled a controversial, eighteenth century letter by a long-time Augustinian priest in the Philippines to a friend in Spain about the nature of the Filipino personality; and Hernandez, an eyewitness account of the outbreak of the 1896 Philippine Revolution by a caretaker of a Dominican-owned plantation in Cavite, a province south of Manila.

Hernandez interrogated a rare, first-hand narrative of the war for independence, adding to the retinue of primary sources on this pivotal event in national history. His translated account diverged from earlier published sources that tended to dwell either on the politics between the warring parties of Filipinos and Spaniards or the feuding

camps of *Magdalo* and *Magdiwang* (represented by leaders Emilio Aguinaldo and Andres Bonifacio respectively) among the members of the independence movement *Kataastaasang Kagalang-galangang Katipunan ng mga Anak ng Bayan* (Greatest, Most Venerable Union of the Children of the Land). Having been a non-combatant and an intermittent prisoner of the revolutionaries, the plantation (*hacienda*) caretaker (*inquilino*) Canseco has provided rare data about the atrocities and abuse committed by Filipino freedom fighters on imprisoned friars and collaborators. Further, it has given insights on the views of the inevitably implicated elite class, represented by the narrative's author and his family, during the people's revolution.

Accustomed to distrust the poor, the elite tended to turn to the friars for enlightenment and security in the islands. Canseco has not proven to be different. His account is essentially a report to his Dominican benefactors and employers in Cavite. From 1897, the original booklets (*cuadernos*) have remained under the care of the leader of the Dominican order in Manila. Eleven years later, the booklets were handed over to the friar-archivist Malumbres, who, in turn, arranged the report into a manuscript (Hernandez 21). He added a short introduction about Canseco, and then attached the original contents of the booklets that consisted of a prologue, twenty-two chapters, and a post scriptum. Only three copies of this version of the account exist: one at the Dominican archives in Avila; and two (microfiche) transcribed versions at the Dominican archives of the University of Santo Tomas and at the Rizal Library of the Ateneo University in Manila. Portions of the transcribed versions were later used in a few influential books on both the history of Catholicism in the Philippines and the revolution.

Hernandez had to acquire a photocopy of the Malumbres version of the Canseco account from Spain before he could proceed with its translation and annotation. He produced a book of 295 pages, consisting of 43 pages of document interrogation and 252 pages of transcription, translation, and notes. Hernandez called his historiographical work *mapanuring pamamatnugot* (critical edition). He was following Dedina Lapar's example six years prior.

Lapar also had to request first a copy of San Agustin's controversial sixty-one page letter from the Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library in Chicago (Lapar 63) which he attached as an appendix to his study. More than half of Lapar's 245-page volume was devoted to analysis: a 162 pages of interrogation versus 59 pages of transcription and translation, and 16 pages of notes. Long-running debates on the document under scrutiny lent itself to such a lengthy analysis. Before San Agustin's 1720 letter became publicly known, most Spaniards viewed Filipinos positively. Pioneering accounts by Pedro Chirino

(1890), Antonio de Morga (1962), and Francisco Colin (1900-2) featured the archipelago's inhabitants with a modicum of respect of their culture. In contrast, San Agustin's account served to contribute in reversing this trend.

Written to oppose the ordination of Filipinos and the secularization of local parishes, San Agustin's letter illustrated the inhabitants as devoid of meritorious character and of any capacity for development. Through the lens of the medieval philosophy of Galen on the so-called four "humores" that influenced a person's disposition (Lapar 92-3) and the perceived lunar and stellar constellation in Philippine skies, San Agustin depicted the Filipino (or more precisely, "the Tagalog") people as naturally evil, barbaric, slothful, stupid, and the only language they understood were beatings with a cane. Because of San Agustin's forty years of experience on the islands, his account was taken to heart by most of his colleagues and Lapar shows his influence on succeeding scholars. In 1738 Fray Juan Francisco de San Antonio, seconded by Fray Murillo Velarde, quoted San Agustin's letter to demonstrate the simple-mindedness of the Filipino in his *Cronicas de la Apostolica Provincia* (Lapar 65-7). In 1779, eleven years after his travels in the Philippines, the Frenchman Guillaume Le Gentil de la Gelaisiere also cited San Agustin to showcase the Filipino's purported idiocy. Fray Joaquin Martinez de Zuñiga followed this example in 1800. Forty-two years later Sinilbado de Mas used San Agustin's letter to show the evil physical and moral character of Filipinos. Finally, the same document was applied by the Englishman John Bowring in 1859 to support his derogatory claims of Filipinos.

Not all scholars agreed with San Agustin's assertions, however. Lapar also cites scholars who contradicted his observations, these scholars included the Jesuit friar Juan Jose Delgado in his 1754 *Historia General*; the *ilustrado* economist Gregorio Sanciano in his 1881 *El Progreso de Filipinas*; and the national hero Jose Rizal in his 1890 *Sobre la Indolencia de los Filipinos*. Additionally, in the twentieth century, historians like Pedro Paterno, Horacio de la Costa, John Schumacher, and Luciano Santiago discussed San Agustin's letter in their expositions. In all, there is little doubt that the document has been influential throughout the history of Philippine historiography.

Lapar continued this debate, and investigated the controversial text through the historiographical technique of critical edition. By demystifying the Spanish imprint on and undermining the inevitability of the European subject in the Philippines' past, Lapar (seconded by Hernandez) contributed in laying the groundwork for future PP historians to construct what they considered a significant narrative (*kasaysayan* or *salaysay na may saysay*) for Filipinos (Lapar 6; Hernandez 3).

SITUATING CRITICAL EDITION

Lapar and Hernandez divide Philippine *edition* scholarship into four categories. The first refers to editions in Spanish, pioneered by missionaries who reported on happenings in the islands to their religious orders in Spain. Filipinos and non-missionary Spaniards furthered this tradition, whose breadth allows Lapar to sub-divide the category into: a) editions of a document written in Spanish by a Spaniard, b) those written in Spanish by a Filipino, and c) those written in a Filipino-language by a Spaniard. For Lapar, the first and third subdivisions display a distancing *pansilang pananaw* (for-them perspective) that sharpens distinctions between a narrator and putatively foreign subject. Ultimately, the latter is only redeemed if it becomes understandable to the former's I/eye.

The for-them perspective in reverse—Lapar's second sub-category (29-36)—informs such preeminent Filipino propagandists' annotations as Jose Rizal's 1890 work on Antonio de Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*. By defending his countrymen from Morga's critical colonial eye, Rizal deploys a similar distancing perspective Spaniards used. In this context, however, the vantage point is transformed into a *pangkaming pananaw* (for-us perspective). *Pangkaming pananaw* is a reactive stance of one group against another, although both are components of a wider cultural milieu. Quarreling siblings would be an apt analogy.

Lapar's second category of editions, those done in English, like the Spanish accounts before them reported on the islands and inhabitants to home audiences. In this way, these narratives feature a similar *pansilang pananaw*. Foreigners and a few Filipino intellectuals discuss documents on the Philippines in English, thereby excluding ordinary Filipinos from any meaningful dialogue. In contrast to past practice, however, these annotations doubled as translations, for the original Spanish-language texts required repackaging and explanation as they were transformed into English. This practice but reflects the transfer of colonial power in the archipelago from Spaniards to Americans at the turn of the twentieth century. Accordingly, Americans initiated new policies in governance and education, bringing an American way of life to bear on the country. Tellingly, English became the primary medium of exchange.

Embodying this linguistic turn, Lapar's third category features editions done by Filipinos about Filipinos in English. And like Rizal before them, these authors exhibit a reactionary and defensive *pangkaming pananaw* in their texts. Examples of this category include some of the country's preeminent scholars, like Alzona, Zaide, and Agoncillo. To assist (or even surpass) their American mentors in the preservation and publication of historical material, starting in the 1960s, these luminaries copiously translated and

published works by nineteenth-century Filipino propagandists. Such private organizations as the Filipiniana Book Guild and Historical Conservation Society lent great financial and material support to what was essentially a nationalist campaign. Still, these edited translations were all done in English, the language of colonization. By continuing to report and explain the archipelago and its peoples through documentary sources to an English speaking audience, these authors unwittingly prevented the rise of a truly meaningful discourse with the majority of the people in the country, that is, Filipino-speakers.

Comprised of works for and about Filipinos *in* Filipino, Lapar's fourth and final category aims to resolve this impasse. Exemplary are most of Rizal's Spanish-language works. His famous *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo* novels were translated and published in a bid to preserve nationalist writings and exhibit the Philippines as a sovereign nation. This *ilustrado*-centric fascination, however, was slowly undone by a broadening of discussions and themes in national history. In essence, a democratization of history was unfolding.

Inspired by PP, this charge was taken up in the 1990s, most notably by Lapar, then by Rhommel Hernandez. Hernandez drew heavily from Lapar's model, bringing his fourth category up-to-date, and redefined it to encompass editions of (all) foreign and Filipino language-sources in Filipino. Crucially, in relation to his scrutinized document, Hernandez presented a seemingly exhaustive interrogation of other edited eye-witness accounts of the Philippine Revolution. He analyzed their origin, which concerned their period, context, mode of data collection, and author's status. He then classified their contents before finally categorizing their goals as eye-witness narratives (Hernandez 26-30). With this procedure, Hernandez was able to distinguish the uniqueness that the document under his examination has to offer. He concluded that

Kung tutuusin, nagbibigay si Canseco ng isang pananaw na tila matagal nang nalimot ng historiograpiya ng Himagsikan. Ang pananaw na ito ay ang pananaw ng mga taong naka-gitna sa pingkian ng Sistemang Kolonyal at ng Katipunan ... Isa lamang taong hindi pormal (hindi Opisyal ng Hukbong Kastila, hindi fraile bagamat maka-fraile at hindi rin Katipunero) na nakakabit sa alinmang politikal na kaayusan noon ang makagagawa nito.

Upon consideration, Canseco offers a view that seems to be long neglected in the historiography of the Revolution. This perspective embodies that of a person, who lies in the middle of the clash between the Colonial System and

the *Katipunan* ... Only a person, who is formally (not an Official of the Spanish Forces, not a friar although a pro-friar and not a member of the *Katipunan*) unassociated with any political order then can accomplish this.

This does not mean, continued Hernandez, that Canseco did not show any preference between feuding revolutionary leaders Andres Bonifacio and Emilio Aguinaldo. In fact, Canseco tended to favor the latter in his account; not because Aguinaldo was a fellow native of Cavite or because Canseco supported the Aguinaldo faction in the *Katipunan*. According to Hernandez, Canseco preferred Aguinaldo for, like him, this revolutionary leader seemed to revere the friars (35). Canseco's love for the friars, Hernandez surmised, was brought about by his early orphanage and long years of education and service at the Cavite plantation of the Dominican order. Canseco naturally assumed the friars' attitude towards religion and subsequently, their disdain towards Filipinos and the Revolution as well. Hernandez summed up Canseco's personality as:

Relihiyoso siya, malapit sa Simbahan lalu na sa mga fraile. Laban siya sa Himagsikan at may kaunting hinanakit sa mga Kastila dahil sa hindi kaagad pagsugpo ng mga ito sa pag-aalsa. Labas din sa kaniyang Historia na wala siyang tiwala sa kaniyang kapwa Pilipino. Masama rin ang himagsikan sa kaniya dahil ito ay binubuo ng mabababang uri ng tao. (21)

He is religious, devoted to the Church especially to the friars. He is against the Revolution and holds a small grudge against the Spaniards due to their lateness in putting down the uprising. It is also evident in his *Historia* that he does not trust his fellow Filipinos. For him, the revolution is also evil because it is being held through the subordinate class of people.

Canseco's contempt for the poor was not entirely surprising. As a caretaker of a Dominican-owned plantation, Canseco internalized his masters' arrogance and their superior place in the colonial system.

This haughtiness resonated friar San Agustin's arrogance in his letter to a friend almost two hundred years earlier. In this mail San Agustin unwaveringly put Spaniards above and beyond the reach of Filipinos, who were, in turn, purported to be naturally subordinate and incapable of self-betterment. For Lapar, this document was

isang halimbawa ng makasarili at anti-Pilipinong karakter ng mga Kastilang kolonyalista sa kasaysayan ng Pilipinas. Kagaya ng lahi at kapwa niya Kastila, ipinagpatuloy at pinalawak pa ni San Agustin ang mababa at negatibong pagtingin ng mga banyaga sa Pilipino. Dahil siya ay hindi bihasa sa wika at kulturang Kastila, ang Pilipino ay minaltrato, sinaktan, at siniraan ng puri sa salaysay ng Kastila. Mataas ang tingin ng Kastila sa sarili niya at dahil dito, siya ay dapat pagsilbihan, huwag kontrahin at hindi dapat pantayan ng Pilipinong “tinawag” niyang “Indio.” (139-40)

an example that showcases the selfish and anti-Filipino character of the Spanish colonizers in the history of the Philippines. Like (what) his race and fellow Spaniards (did), San Agustin continued and further incited the low and negative view of foreigners against a Filipino. Because s/he could not master the Spanish language and culture, a Filipino was abused, hurt and slandered in the Spanish narrative. As the Spaniard saw her/himself higher, s/he should be served, not contradicted and not to be equaled by any Filipino, whom s/he “called” (Dummy) “Indio.”

While San Agustin’s letter sparked some two centuries of controversy, it was only Lapar who connected the letter to the legacy of Spanish *racism* in the Philippines. Lapar repeatedly points out racist comments made by the friar. Illustrative was his assertion that the people’s fish diet led to their disinterest in work; that Filipinos never voluntarily returned incurred monetary debts, and that they never respected the decorum of silence in the churches. In other words, the Filipino was absolutely incapable of aspiring to the ideal, that is, a Spaniard. He compared a Filipino to a fairy-tale cat, which was transformed into a beautiful woman but ultimately behaved as a feline nonetheless. No amount of training apparently mattered to a Filipino. S/he still broke crystals, woke up too early, untidily folded a winter cape, and asked too many personal questions. S/he was gossipy, coarse, and insolent (*curiosos, inurbanos e impertinentes*) (Lapar 171), besides being changeable, malicious, suspicious, sleepy, and stupid (*inconstantes, maliciosos, desconfiados, dormilones, perezosos*) (168).

In her notes, Lapar countered by negating San Agustin’s discriminatory remarks against Filipinos. She alternately associated their supposed faults to most cultures and so, not unique to Filipinos alone; or used historical analogy to put San Agustin’s accusations in their proper place. For example, in reply to San Agustin’s attack on a Filipino’s believed habit of scratching her/his head while talking to a friar, Lapar said:

Ang pagkakamot at pagkabalisa ng Pilipino tuwing kaharap ang Kastila ay maaaring ipaliwanag sa konteksto ng kolonyal na sitwasyon. Hindi alam ng katutubo kung sino ang dapat sundin. Nahihila sila sa magkasalungat na direksyon ng makabago at sinaunang kultura. Ang kolonyal na pagkalito ay hindi ganap na mauunawaan ng mga mananakop na Kastila. (225)

The scratching and anxiousness of a Filipino in the face of a Spaniard could be explained in the context of the colonial situation. The native does not know whom to follow. S/he is torn between the opposing pulls of the new and early culture. Colonial confusion could never be completely comprehended by Spanish colonizers.

Variedly, Lapar annotated San Agustin's derogatory observations with: "*Hindi ito katangi-tangi sa Pilipino. Maaaring makita sa ibang grupo ng tao.*" (This is not unique to the Filipino. [This trait] could be seen in other groups of people) (225). Lapar insisted that the Filipino culture should not be compared with that of the Spaniards, insinuating that the former merited a study on its own. She poked at San Agustin's self-positioning as a knowledgeable religious by either correcting or questioning the sources of his Latin quotations. In all, the strength Lapar's annotations lay in her repeated use of *hindi* (not, no) and *wala* (none, no). She contradicted and destabilized San Agustin, thereby exposing how he "abused, hurt, and slandered" (*minaltrato, sinaktan, at siniraan ng puri*) the personhood of Filipinos in his narrative.

Indeed the Spaniards and their Filipino elite collaborators have frequently injured Filipinos in their histories. In his account of the revolution, Canseco has also displayed this tendency. He intermittently viewed the revolutionaries as either disturbers of the peace or personifications of evil. Canseco was bitterly disappointed with the townspeople (*la gente del pueblo*), who thrived and took advantage of the chaos brought about by the revolution. In Canseco's text they were reprimanded like children for violating the colonial order but also eventually praised for wishing the general restoration of peace. Canseco took the role of the colonizer, even as he personified the epitome of the colonized. In his account he conveyed a code of equation between submission and domination in the colonial system. Essentially, he relayed that his authority over the townspeople was a reward for his compliance to the colonial masters of the archipelago. As such Canseco unwittingly absolved the colonizer of the burden of colonization and revamped the image of colonial Philippines to represent a system of rewards and punishment that the colonized should

constantly heed.

The colonized have taken arms against this imposition, however. Hernandez illuminated on this event in his notes, therewith intervening Canseco's Spanish account with Filipino narratives. Thirteen biographies of Filipino revolutionaries were incorporated as annotations. Moreover, Hernandez introduced what he perceived as Filipino significations to Canseco's pro-Spanish perspective. For example, to counter Canseco's belittling remark on the Filipino revolutionaries' tendency to rely on amulets or charms, he wrote

Isang laganap na paniniwala ang paggamit ng anting-anting sa Himagsikan. Si Santiago Alvarez, mismo, sa kaniyang memoirs ay nagpakilala sa isang nagnangalang Eusebio Di-Mabunggo na nagbibigay ng maliliit na piraso ng puting papel sa mga Katipunero upang kainin at ipag-adya sila mula sa mga bala ng kalaban. May ibang paraan din ng pagkuha ng anting-anting ... Sa alinmang uri ay kailangan naman ang isang malinis na kalooban ng gumagamit upang matiyak ang bisa nito sa labanan. (167)

The use of charms was a prevalent practice among the revolutionaries. Santiago Alvarez himself, in his memoirs, talked about somebody called Eusebio Di-Mabunggo, who gave members of the Katipunan small pieces of white paper that should be ingested in order to be invulnerable to the enemy's bullets. There were also other means of securing charms ... In whichever way, it was necessary that a user had a pure heart so that her/his charm could work during battles.

Hernandez called attention to Canseco's routine misunderstanding of Filipinos and the revolution. He noted, "*Makikita pa rin dito ang masamang pagtingin ni Canseco sa mga naghihimagsik*" (Here we again witness Canseco's bad image of the revolutionaries) (145), and so, signaled that Canseco's significations were dominant vis-à-vis those of Filipinos in the document under scrutiny. For Hernandez, there were two parallel meanings existing within the text—the prevailing viewpoint of Canseco and the overridden mindset of the Filipino fighters. Hernandez pursued to resolve this imbalance by interceding for the revolutionaries and their world view; and ultimately, by re-presenting Canseco's Spanish account in Filipino. Hernandez therewith liberated a document from its foreignness and offered it to the Filipino-reading public for its own taking.

In sum, with their categorization, Lapar and Hernandez firmly established the history of critical edition in the Philippines. They have shown an attention to detail and

documentation that has characterized PP-inspired works. Importantly, they have elevated the discourse around a document as an essential part of translation in the new Filipino historiography. In their annotations, Lapar and Hernandez have put across fragments of other narratives that intervened with the smooth flow of the text under their scrutiny. What these fragments have accomplished was to introduce discontinuities, which heartened readers to think beyond the Spanish meanings overtly relayed in the documents and contemplate on the other (namely, Filipino) undermined significations therein.

PRIVILEGING A LANGUAGE

That Lapar and Hernandez wrote in the national language indicates a people-centered ideology and allegiance to PP in their work. They translated foreign sources so they can be used by Filipinos, scholars and non-scholars alike. Such a method drains elitism from historiography by making it more accessible to the masses. It promotes dialogue and participation. Lapar thinks that her work will be understandable (*makabuluhan*), just as Hernandez believes that his work will make more sense (*may saysay*) to Filipinos. This is because between English and Filipino, the latter still unmistakably prevails as a language of comprehension and expression among most of the country's population. As such, the use of Filipino in history implies an author's desire to communicate with and sensitivity to her/his domestic audience.

Their translations underscore this intention. In their works, Lapar and Hernandez prioritize communicative translation over its semantic counterpart. The former aims to stimulate similar effects among readers in a target language as it would do in a source language. In contrast, semantic translation, according to Newmark, seeks to follow literally the semantic and syntactic structures a target language allows (38-89). Compared to communicative translation, semantic translation maintains a stricter adherence to the interrelations of signs in a source language. It assists readers in a target language only to the extent that they can understand the text's original message, whereas communicative translation's assiduity lies with readers in a target language.

In the target text Lapar repeatedly uses Filipino concepts that illustrates but not necessarily equates with the Spanish words in the source text. She translates San Agustin's "*ingratitude*" (ingratitude) with *kawalan ng utang na loob* (lack of debt of the internal). For Filipinos, *kawalan ng utang na loob* is a serious accusation that nearly amounts to absence of personhood. A derivative of highly complex word *loob* (roughly translating to either

internal, inside, heart), *utang na loob* means

pagkilala sa kagandahang-loob na ipinakita ng kapwa; malalim na pananagutan bunga ng isang pabuya o biyaya ng ipinagkaloob sa isang nangangailangan, lalo na sa panahon ng kagipitan na sa mata ng tumatanggap ay hindi mababayaran; pagtanaw sa pakitang-loob o pagdamay ng isang kapwa at tahimik na paghahandang magpakitang-loob din sa ibang paraan sa tamang panahon; pagkakatali sa taong nagbigay ng pabuya. (Alejo 156-57)

recognition of the goodness of the heart that a fellowman has shown; deep commitment to a benefactor, whose donation or reward was given during the time of need hence unreturnable to a beneficiary; appreciation of the gratitude and consolation that a fellowman has shown and a silent readiness to return the favor in other ways at an appropriate hour; attachment to a person, who contributed.

When one has no *utang na loob*, then one ceases to be an upstanding party in a social relation. S/he either becomes a lowly, or an other, who is considered as an outsider in the society's system of values and orientation. Hence, with Lapar's use of *kawalan ng utang na loob* in the target text, Filipino readers are offered with interpretations that are particularly meaningful to them as a specific group.

Indeed Lapar shows thoughtful consideration to her audience's reception of her translated text. She equates San Agustin's "*porque luego por solo el contacto Phisico, le desconciertan, quiebran y descomponen*" with "*dahil saglit lamang na madaplisan ang mga ito ng daliri nila ay natataranta sila at nababasag ito*" (175). What is interesting in this equation is that in the Spanish original discomfiture and breakage of glass are caused by any physical contact; in the translation, by a fleeting touch of a finger. The phrase "physical contact" cannot be appropriated easily in the target text because it would translate to *ugnayang pisikal*, which corresponds with "physical intimacy" in Filipino. To avoid relaying this incorrect meaning, hence, Lapar resorts to specification in her translation. She describes what she thought to be the appropriate physical contact (touch of a finger) that could be meaningful in Filipino: a situation of being rattled or breaking fragile items. What this entails is that when Lapar translates, she also draws a new context that makes her text more meaningful to an intended audience. Instead of a replication, hence, she produces a re-presentation (*Darstellung*) of San Agustin's account in Filipino. We argue that such a re-presentation is distinguished with a privileging of the target language in the translation equation and a marked consideration of the translation to reception of a text among an

audience.

Hernandez follows a similar tract in his translation. He also describes; and so, re-presents a holistic version of his source text, Canseco's account of the Philippine Revolution, in Filipino. Hernandez displays therewith a good grasp not only of nineteenth century Spanish, but importantly, of rhetoric, contemporary writing in the national language. A good example of this is his translation of Canseco's "*Era un jugador perdido*" (He is a losing gambler.) with "*Siya ay isang talunang sugarol*" (He is a defeated gambler) (76, 78). The translation brings to mind a number of images. In Filipino a *talunang sugarol* is a person or a personality trait, associated with chronic addiction to gambling, misfortune and irresponsibility. A *talunang sugarol* is defeated in the games and, figuratively, in the battle with the addiction as well.

It should be noted, however, that Hernandez's translation is not entirely rhetorical. He also transliterates, pursuing to semantically match his Filipino target text with the Spanish source text. For example, he corresponds

encontramos que todas la calles, todas las casas y la plaza del pueblo estaban llenas de gente de los pueblos cercanos a Imus que, juyendo de la guerra se dirigian hacia Maragondon, hablando cada cual de la guerra en tonos muy tristes. (222)

with

Natagpuan namin na ang lahat ng kalye, lahat ng bahay at ang liwasan ng bayan ay puno ng taong mula sa mga bayan sa paligid ng Imus. Tumakas sila mula sa digmaan at nagtungo sa Maragondon na bawat oras ay nagkukuwento tungkol dito sa mga tonong labis na nakalulungkot. (223)

Transliteration is evident in the second sentence of the translation. In English, this would have read: "They fled the war and went to Maragondon with every hour narrating about this in a very saddening tone." There are naturally several ways to correct the translation in Filipino. The sentence could be divided into two: *Tumakas sila mula sa digmaan at nagtungo sa Maragondon. Bawat oras nagkukuwento sila hinggil sa giyera sa nakalulungkot na tono* (They fled the war and went to Maragondon. Every hour they spoke of the war in a very saddening tone).

Literal translation could also be observed in Hernandez's habit of using the Filipino auxiliary verb '*ay*' to equate with the Spanish '*ser*' throughout his text. This is a writing

pattern that a number of Filipinos came to internalize due to imposition of some aspects of the language engineering program by the Marcos Regime. In correspondence with the English help verb 'to be,' '*ay*' is designed to assist Filipinos in speaking and writing formally. Just like English language-speakers. Although this imposition has not been successful orally, it has been effective in written speech. What has transpired, hence, has been a divide between oral and literary forms of communication. Writers today are still pursuing a resolution of this impasse by minimizing the use of the said auxiliary verb in their works.

Hernandez's intermittent literal translation does not tarnish what his work accomplished, however. A primary source on the Philippine Revolution has been published, enriching available literature on a pivotal event in the country's history. Hernandez's translation shows a thoughtful consideration to apt use of Filipino concepts, while not necessarily sacrificing consistency with the original Spanish account. His product is a re-presentation of the original, a narrative in Filipino that supports an academic tradition in the national speech and not in (the now traditional) purportedly more intellectual English.

Behind the privileging of Filipino by Lapar and Hernandez lies their acquiescence to what in PP is called *pook* (location, space, standpoint) and *materya* (materials) of knowledge construction and institutionalization. *Pook* connotes a dual reference. It is both the point where a culture or civilization of a particular period stands and one's place in that spatio-temporal continuum. It is from *pook* that one explains and understands oneself through the use of *materya*. *Materya* can run from language and memory to material culture. For a scholar, it pertains to his/her synchronic view of an available reservoir of knowledge and understanding of history and culture across time. *Pook*, used in conjunction with its *materya*, brings about narration. Salazar, in a lecture entitled "Pagsasakatubo ng Teorya: Posible ba o Hindi?" names narration as *pook's* concrete manifestation of itself, its dominant present in the face of its past. A historian at the same time possesses and functions as *pook* in the practice of history; *pook* constitutes her/his being that gives shape to a narrative, through which *pook* takes form through the body of text and its language.

For PP, a historian's *pook* is intimately related to the Filipino people, culture, geography, history, and so on. Their location in this cultural milieu determines her/his motivation and goals; it influences the course and language of her/his work and expression. Because s/he communicates with Filipinos, their language must be prioritized in her/his text. Language is what bonds a historian to the people, communing and facilitating a productive exchange of meanings (*salaysayan nang may saysay*) with her/his Filipino

audience. Matters concerning themselves are discussed using their own concepts and standards in their own language (Salazar “Ang Pantayong Pananaw” 48), encompassed by Filipino in an intelligible yet closed circuit. As conceptual barriers are thereby greatly reduced, understanding among constituents is enhanced. Their own exchange of ideas generates collaborated meanings (*pagpapakahulugan*) of phenomenon that affect (*tumatalab*) their Being.

Privileging Filipino has pitfalls, however. Encouraging ethnocentrism is one (Connor; Horowitz), blinding a people to their misgivings, leading them to sever communication with or even act rashly against opposition. Glorifying a pre-colonial, authentically Filipino past is another. In the end, it can reek of primordialism and risk essentializing Filipinos. Disconcerting for a historian is that it tends to downplay the country’s colonial history, which, in fact, requires further engagement, not an ideologically-inspired whitewashing.

While acknowledging these pitfalls, PP proponents have taken measures to prevent their realization. For them, privileging Filipino promotes their wider project of invigorating a collaborative school of Filipino scholars, strengthening a body of academic literature in the national language, and engaging readers in a discourse about themselves. Stimulating a certain amount of nationalist response is viewed positively in the face of constant reminders of incapacity, lack, ineptness, and an innate incapacity to deal with themselves and their surroundings. Rather PP histories strive to represent and shed light on Filipino values, means of coping, variegated ways of living over time. In so doing, readers are informed of the historical basis of their *Dasein* (Being), subliminally encouraging them to again trust themselves to be.

Lapar and Hernandez have given expression to this *Dasein* in their studies. Their translations have appropriated foreign sources, providing fellow historians ready-for-use materials of Filipino history. Moreover, their annotations have proven that outside knowledge can be incorporated into a Filipino discourse. Through a Filipino I/eye in a critical edition, such appropriation and critique emphasized the foreign-ness of an appropriated source while reinforcing Filipino-ness in Filipino culture at the same time. The eye/I recognizes an outside knowledge as a *pansilang pananaw* or *pangkaming pananaw*, and exercised *pantayong pananaw* therewith.

Such tags as *pansilang*, *pangkaming* or *pantayong pananaw* assist in defining the location and reach of Self as the I/eye in a narrative. The Self is the composite that looks back, experiences a present, and imagines (or re-imagines) a future—changing in order to master its environment. Despite these changes, however, a basis continuously characterizes

the Self and shapes the spatiality and temporality of its *Dasein*. The existence of this *Dasein* is attested to in sources of history. Sources account for a people's thoughts, experiences, aspirations, deviations, identity. But sources merely provide details about a nation; sources do not make its history. To constitute a people's history, sources need to be woven into an intelligible narrative. A historian weaves sources into a narrative through her/his preferred philosophy of (change and development in) history. Such a theory organizes facts from historical materials and shape their interpretation and meaning, determining the flow of an exposition. It follows that every theory brings about a different history, for it provides a specific reading of a people's *Dasein* and development. Just as sources, theories of history are tools, which can come from different contexts and cultures. As such, just as the former, the latter needs appropriation and Filipinization in PP.

TRANSLATING MARXISM

This section of the paper will discuss an example of an annotated translation, no longer of a Philippine historical source, but of a work of European thought which is especially significant for the problem of the interpretation and theoretical comprehension of history. This is a particularly interesting case because the work in question, Marx and Engels's *Communist Manifesto*, exerted and continues to exert an influence not only in Philippine historiographical practice but also in the unfolding of history itself in the various peasant and labor movements and organizations.

Initially the most striking aspect of Zeus Salazar's translation of *Manifesto* is its thickness. Though the text of the translation and the original (facsimile of the 1848 edition with captioned pictures added) on facing-pages make up a reasonable one hundred and twelve pages in all, the endnotes added to the translation make up an additional length of 36 pages in smaller type. The total is finally rounded out with a 128-page explanatory essay on the significance of the text in the Filipino historical context. The translation is based on the earliest 1848 edition (Kuczynski) and also does away with Engels's explanatory footnotes to the 1888 English edition which have later been included in succeeding German editions. Curiously, although the UNESCO website devoted to translational statistics lists 222 translations of the *Manifesto* since 1979 up to 2003 in dozens of languages, Salazar's translation does not appear among the entries. It however turns up in the website of the International Institute of Social History (IISH) in Amsterdam as one of the more "exotic" and "rare" among the existing specimens. Indeed, such may well be the general fate of

literary and cultural productions which occur at the boundaries of the Eurocentric vision: either to be ignored or exocitized.

The particular form of this translation by Salazar has here been stressed because of the problem of determining the relationship of the commentary of the translator to what may be considered the translation “itself.” Indeed, some theorists of translation object to the inclusion of footnotes or explanatory additions to the text of a translation. Peter Newmark states, for example, that “the text should be self-sufficient” (qtd. in Koller 271). Koller himself, on the contrary, considers the addition of commentary and explanations by the translator as part of the task of translation itself,

Geht man von einem alltagssprachlichen und-sachlichen Verständnis der Funktion der Übersetzer aus, nämlich das, was in einer Sprache gesagt ist, Lesern in einer anderen Sprache zu vermitteln, so kann diese Funktion oft nur durch den Einsatz kommentierender Übersetzungsverfahren erfüllt werden, mit denen insbesondere im Fall von 1:0-Entsprechungen (Lücken) oder 1: Teil-Entsprechungen das, was zunächst nicht oder unzulänglich übersetzt werden kann, recht eigentlich übersetzbar gemacht wird.
(267)

Assuming that one starts out from an everyday and matter of fact understanding of a translator’s function, namely that what has been said in one language should be communicated to readers in another language, it often happens that this function can only be fulfilled by employing an *explanatory translation method*. By means of this method, cases where there is a lack of corresponding terms or where there is only a partial correspondence between terms, which at first cannot or can only unsatisfactorily be translated, can be made translatable.

Koller’s balanced position seems to be the most reasonable one. So that at least in the particular case here being analyzed, Salazar’s footnotes shall be considered as an integral part of the experience of reading the translated text “itself.” In other words, the footnotes and extended commentary shall be considered as part of the body of the translated text rather than as some extraneous and dispensable addition. Salazar’s comments on particular words/concepts in the *Manifiesto* as elaborated in his footnotes and long explanatory essay are particularly indicative of his attitude towards the translation of this particular text, the *Manifiesto*, and of translation in general. Salazar’s explanatory “re-definition” of the terms “bourgeois” and “proletariat” can serve here as initial examples. He at first reproaches

Marx and Engels for equating “civilization”/“sibilisasyon” (*Zivilisation*) with “bourgeois culture” and of then implicitly using both as codes/ciphers for “European culture” in general. According to Salazar,

Sa lubos na pagkatuon ng kaisipan sa “Burgis” at sa ekonomiyang pandaigdig na lubusang ipinapalagay na “nilikha” nito, nakaligtaan nina Marx at Engels ang pagkakaiba-iba ng mga sibilisasyon, kabihasnan, kultura, at kalinangan sa daigdig. Bunga nito, ang “sibilisasyon” at “kultura” ay Burgis at hindi Europeo at Ingles o Pranses. Kung gayon, hindi kataka-taka na mga “barbaro” ang Intsik at ang mga “Burgis” (i.e., Europeo) ay “sibilisado.” (119-20)

In their obsession with the idea of the “bourgeois” and the world economy which they think was completely a creation of the former, Marx and Engels overlooked the differences between civilizations, *kabihasanan*, culture and *kalinangan* in the world. Because of this, “civilization” and “culture” became bourgeois and not European, English, or French. Given this, it was not surprising that the Chinese were “barbarians” and the “bourgeois” (i.e. European) was “civilized.”

Because of their “obsession” (*lubos na pagkatuon ng isipan*) with the world economy, Marx and Engels simply “overlooked” (*nakaligtaan*) the cultural origins in Europe of the “bourgeoisie.” However, the real score, as Salazar sees it, is that the terms “bourgeois,” “European,” and “civilized” (as serially juxtaposed by Salazar) are actually terms closely related to each other. Salazar then asserts that this series of semi-equivalences give Marx and Engels the opportunity to categorize all non-European cultures as “barbaric” or at best “half-civilized” depending on how “backward” they appear from the European point of view. Though many writers have objected to the Eurocentric and prejudicial use of such words as “civilization” in the *Manifesto* (and also of their appearance in Engels’s *Origin of the Family*), the criticism is actually somewhat misplaced. It is well known that *Kultur* and *Zivilisation* are actually very different concepts in the German language, which are sometimes even pitted against one another. There is much evidence to show, especially in their writings on India, that Marx and Engels employed “*Zivilisation*” in its conventional German sense as pertaining only to the level of technical development or “progress.” (For instance, the MP3 player can be said to be “more civilized” than the tape recorder. Those still using tape recorders could therefore be dubbed hopeless “barbarians”!) It was

due to this circumstance that the title of Samuel Huntington's well-known book, *Clash of Civilizations* (1996), was translated as *Kampf der Kulturen* (1996) against the author's wishes because *Kampf der Zivilisationen* had a totally different sense. Salazar's charge that the use of this term in the *Manifesto* demonstrates that Marx and Engels were proponents of the usual European sense of cultural superiority does not seem to hold water. They may well have indeed been guilty of such an attitude in their other writings but not because of this particular usage of "Zivilisation" in the *Manifesto*. The concept of "technical progress" is certainly not uncontroversial, as Markus has noted, but it has undeniably quite a different sense when compared to the meaning of "civilization" in the English or French languages. A perusal of Marx's studies on pre-capitalist economic formations and Engels's enthusiasm for the anthropological studies of Lewis Henry Morgan would also seem to belie Salazar's speculation in this same endnote that Marx and Engels "especially [Laluna], knew less than most Europeans of the civilizations and historical processes of different countries and socio-political totalities." Despite having had no direct acquaintance with these matters (unlike their countrymen Georg Forster [1754-1794] or Alexander von Humboldt [1769-1859]), they had at least what may be considered for their time an above average knowledge of "non-European" cultures.

Setting aside the problem of translating "Zivilisation" without the connotations of "civilisation" (or of "sibilisasyon"), Salazar's main point is that the term "bourgeois" actually refers to/and is a product of "European culture/civilization" except that it is disguised as a purely economic concept. (It may therefore be fitting to write this here as "culture-bourgeoisie" rather than just "bourgeoisie.") This European "culture-bourgeoisie," according to Salazar, provided the conditions necessary within the European context for the subsequent appearance of the what may also be termed the "culture-proletariat" (*Manifesto* 139). "European culture/civilization" therefore produces not only the "culture-bourgeoisie" out of itself but also the antithetical "culture-proletariat" opposing it. These "classes" and the alleged "dialectical contradiction" between them is considered by Salazar to be unique products of the singular development of "European culture/civilization" and therefore can have no meaning/significance outside of it. According to Salazar, "this conflict takes place within European civilization" (*Manifesto* 120). Or to put it in an alternative fashion, these entities could only actually attain universal significance if European culture itself becomes universalized. That is to say, capitalism could only become widespread if the whole world becomes "Protestant" — as Weber argued, or "Jewish" according to Sombart, or whatever the case may be, at least Judaeo-Christian (as Weber and Sombart ironically agree). Given this particular set of assertions, the "replication" of

this “culture-bourgeoisie” and the accompanying “culture-proletariat” in the different parts of the formerly “barbaric” non-Western world can only imply their thoroughgoing “Europeanization” in the sense of finally attaining “civilization.” This is only fitting since the “bourgeoisie” and the “proletariat” are conceived of as historically “progressive” classes. Salazar thinks that it is “implicit in the Manifesto that both the bourgeois and the proletariat are rooted/within/originating from the culture, civilization and history of Europe or of the whole ‘West’ before they are replicated (*mareplika*) in the other parts of the ‘barbarian’ world” (*Manifesto* 151). This whole conceptual system as formulated by Marx and Engels is therefore revealed by Salazar as being only a particularly rigorous intellectual rationalization of the European “civilizing” mission. By means of this chain of reasoning, Salazar could easily draw the conclusion that the application of these two class labels in the Philippine context would only result in the total theoretical and practical negation of the complex internal cultural dynamic within which actual living, breathing Filipino workers labor. Once Filipino workers are *falsely labeled* as belonging to the “proletarian” classes, they become symbolically caught up in the all-encompassing Eurocentric narrative and, as such, are apprehended as mere passive instruments/victims in the fulfillment of its unrelenting and unstoppable universal project. These universal class concepts of the West only falsely conflate Filipino workers (the *sigarera* and *manlulubid*) with the European “culture-proletariat,” when they actually ought to be understood within a cultural frame from which they cannot so easily be extricated. A “pure cash nexus” (*ein reines Geldverhältnis*) abstracted from culture and the whole surrounding social ethos as it is portrayed in the *Manifesto* thus becomes an inconceivable concept or a strange fiction.

Bilang “epekto”/bunga ng paglaganap ng Burgesya at ng mga taglay nitong sibilisasyong Europeo, hindi esensyal sa mga “manlulubid” at “sigarera” ang kanilang pagsulong at kaunlaran sa loob ng sariling kalinangan, tanggapin mang mayroon sila nito. Sumusulong lamang sila bilang mga manggagawang ginagamit/pinagsasamantalahan ng, at samakatuwid ay sumasalungat laban sa, dambuhalang paglaganap ng Kaburgisan sa kanilang piling. Hindi sila umiiral at sumusulong ayon sa maaaring naririyang dinamiko/dinamismo ng kanilang sariling kalinangan at kabuuan. (“Ang Pantayong Pananaw” 151)

As a mere “effect”/result of the spread of the bourgeoisie and the accompanying European civilization, the development and progress within their own culture, assuming that they do have such a thing, becomes inessential to the “rope

makers" and "cigar makers." They move forward only as workers used/ exploited by, and therefore also struggling against, the massive dissemination of the bourgeoisness in their midst. They do not exist or progress according to the already present dynamic/dynamism of their own culture and society.

The words "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" are therefore, in the particular sense which Salazar understands them, *untranslatable* since their inextricably European referents simply *do not exist*, as such, in the Philippine context. These phenomena would thus be much better "explained" in footnotes to a Filipino readership than "translated." It would be useful at this point to contrast Salazar's culturally-bound "thick description" of "bourgeois" and "proletariat" with the "thin descriptions" employed by Engels in one of his notes to the 1888 English edition of the *Manifesto*:

By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage labor. By proletariat, the class of modern wage laborers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labor power in order to live. (98-137)

Crucial to Engels's clarification of the concept of "class" is therefore the related concept of "*Eigenthums-Verhältnisse*" or "property relations." Salazar himself translates the latter concept as "*ugnayan ng pagmamay-ari*" (*Manifesto* 121). Assuming that the concepts "owner," "means of social production," "employer," "wage labor," "labor power" could also be defined "thinly" and with a minimum degree of contentiousness, one could come to the conclusion (at least if one were disposed to do so), that on the one hand, there are such people in the Philippines who "own means of social production" and "employ wage labor" and that on, the other hand, there are actually people who "do not own any means of social production" and must therefore sell their capacity to labor or "labor power" (*Arbeitskraft*, a newer terminological invention not found in the *Manifesto* itself) in order to survive. In the latter category would indeed fall even the *sigareras* (cigar-makers) and *manlulubid* (rope-makers) of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries whom Salazar often mentions. Statistics from various government agencies would also verify the fact that a good number of Filipinos today do not legally own "means of social production" and must therefore sell their labor in the "labor market" on pain of starvation. Such a "de-culturalized" definition of "bourgeois" and "proletariat" does therefore seem to have a material *referent* in the Philippine context. But it must be stressed that the possibility of making

such a categorization of the Philippine population is not actually Salazar's main point of argument. (Indeed, he himself points out that "Proletariat" and "*uring manggagawa*," the usual Filipino translation of "working class" which originates from the beginning of the twentieth century are actually synonyms [*Manifesto* 117].) It is just that, in the first place, he has great reservations on methodological and philosophical grounds whether such "isolating" and "abstracting" concepts can provide the most essential understanding of the complex and dynamic totality which is Philippine Culture. (This of course depends on what is meant by "most essential understanding.") In the second place, it may be presumed that he fears that such a generalizing approach may foreclose a further specification of the historic and cultural determinants which exert their own influences within this totality. In the third place, and most importantly, such universalizing concepts seem to commit the researcher, whether consciously or unconsciously, to the diffusionist and unilinear predilections of the Eurocentric "Western" social sciences. Regarding this third point, Salazar is obviously reluctant to consider "external" economic factors as providing the primary explanations for the rise of sizeable segment of Filipino workers who are employed to produce goods for export to the "world market."

This third point is actually the gist of this issue of "untranslatability." This "resistance to translation" in fact represents a refusal to be integrated into the history of *another*. It is an "anti-translational" practice in the midst of translation itself. The central proposition of Salazar's historical outlook is most striking in Salazar's vigorous rejection of the utility of the concept of "feudalism" in the understanding of Philippine history (or at least up until the sixteenth century). However interesting it is in itself, this "claim to historical difference" would actually have been more intelligible had he directed his criticisms against Eurocentrism at the definitions of Marx and Engels of "feudalism," which are to be found, for instance, in *The German Ideology*, rather than confusingly refuting the application to Philippine economic history of Marc Bloch's definition of "feudal society" (who here remains unacknowledged despite the variety of conflicting definitions of "feudalism" in currency). Salazar defines "feudalism" somewhat apodictically as follows,

Ang tawag sa lupain o katungkulan ay feudum, kung kaya't ang ugnayan ng naggawad at ginawaran ay piyudal. Ito ang "piyudalismo" na tumutukoy sa mga relasyon—higit sa lahat, pulitiko-militar—ng mga panginoon sa isa't isa. Ang relasyon naman ng panginoong ginawaran ng lupain (o panginoong may lupa na talaga, tulad ng hari o alin pa mang malaki at nakatataas na pinuno) at ng mga nagbubungkal ng lupa sa kanyang lupain (na maaaring "nakatali" sa lupa o serf, medyo katulad ng ating

“aliping sagigilid”) ay tinataguriang “manoryalismo.” Mula ito sa katagang “manor,” ang tirahan o kuta ng panginoon mismo at ng kanyang buong lupaing gatwad na naipamahagi niya sa kanyang mga serf. Mangyari pa, nagkakataon na ang isang panginoon ay magkaroon ng maraming manor. Ang manoryalismo at piyudalismo ang siyang bumubuo ng “sistemang piyudal.” (Manifesto 116)

The land or office is called *feudum*, so that the relationship of the giver to the receiver is feudal. This is the “feudalism” that pertains, above all, to the politico-military relation of the lords to each other. On the other hand, the relationship of the lord who has been awarded land (or a lord who already owns land, like a king or any other leader of high rank) to those who work his land (who may be serfs “tied” to the land similar to our *“aliping sagigilid”*) is called “manorialism.” This comes from the word “manor,” which refers to the residence or fortress of the lord and the entire land under his supervision that he has parcelled out to his serfs. It may happen that one lord may have many manors. The “*feudal system*” is made up of manorialism and feudalism.

The above Blochian definition can be contrasted with a typical example of a Marxist definition of “feudalism”:

Sozialökonomische Gesellschaftsformation, deren Grundlage die feudalen Eigentumsverhältnisse bilden. Hauptproduktionsmittel ist der Grund und Boden, der Eigentum der weltlichen und geistlichen Feudalherren ist, während die unmittelbaren Produzenten, die Bauern, den entscheidenden Anteil des Bodens mit eigenen Produktionsinstrumenten selbstständig bewirtschaften und durch außerökonomischen Zwang zur Leistung der Feudalrente veranlaßt werden. Der F. entstand zwischen dem 3. und 7. Jh., zuerst in einzelnen Gebieten Asiens, dann Europas; die meisten Länder der Welt sind durch diese Entwicklungsstufe gegangen. (qtd. in Wunder 185)

Socioeconomic social formation, the foundation of which is made up of the feudal property relations. On the one hand, the main means of production is the land and earth which are properties of the worldly and spiritual feudal lord. On the other hand, the direct producers, the farmers, work single-handedly on the better part of the land. They are made to produce feudal rent by means of extra-economic coercion. Feudalism arose, at first in some parts of Asia, between the

third and seventh century, and then in Europa. Most countries in the world have passed through this level of development.

Indeed, the usual Marxist elaborations on the concept of “feudalism” have much more to do with the conceptual pair of “relations” and “forces” of production than with Bloch’s combination of “feudalism” and “manorialism” as outlined by Salazar above. Though Bloch also showed much interest in comparative history, his notion of “feudalism,” was, unlike that of Marx and Engels’s, not specifically conceived within the framework of a general, universalizing history but was on the contrary, directed towards explaining the important characteristics of a particularly European social organization. According to Bloch, “the social type that is called feudalism was born in Europe of conditions peculiar to the society from which it sprang” (qtd. in Wunder 126). Salazar’s appeal against the universalizing abuse of concepts, could naturally only make sense when directed at the allegedly empty and useless abstraction of “general concepts” rather than concepts designed to elaborate on the uniqueness of a particular type of historical phenomena such as Bloch’s “feudalism.” It is true that Salazar has successfully “proved” that Bloch’s “feudalism” had not ever existed in the Philippines. It is therefore also an “untranslatable” concept. But it is doubtful whether he had succeeded in showing the *untranslatability* along the same lines of Marx’s and Engel’s *differing* conceptualization.

Sa katunayan, iba ang ating kaayusang panlipunan at pang-ekonomiya noong ika-16 na dantaon, kung kaya’t abusado ang alinmang paghahambing nito sa isang di-umano’y baitang na “piyudal” ng pag-unlad patungo sa alinmang “pormasyon” o kaayusang sosyo-pulitikal. (Manifesto 116)

In truth, our social and economic structure was different in the 16th century, it is therefore inappropriate to make any kind of comparison with it to any so-called “feudal” stage of development towards whatever “formation” or socio-political order.

Had Salazar undertaken such a critique of the Marxist concept of “feudalism” in the Philippine context, it could conceivably have taken the following forms, among others: 1) that it is not general enough (too *European*) and thus fails as a concept capable of containing multifarious phenomena; 2) that it is too general and abstract such that it ends up generating platitudes of no or little scientific interest; 3) that such a concept

is intrinsically bound up ideologically with an imperialistic and eurocentric narrative of historical evolution; 4) that the writing of a “universal human history” is *in itself* an impossible, absurd, and meaningless task. (In contrast to the last mentioned, first three criticisms would not necessarily have anything in principle against the legitimacy or future possibility of drafting a “universal human history.”) If conceptual “abuse” consisted in using particularizing concepts as generalizing concepts, it would be hard to see Bloch being guilty of it. But despite the confusing detour to Bloch, Salazar’s main position is clear, and his view is that Philippine history just cannot be *translated* into the universalizing schemas (so far) produced by Western scholarship.

The positively demystifying *intent* of this “resistant” position must be recognized. Nevertheless, Salazar’s translational as well as general historical approach, faces several unresolved issues. The emphasis on what has been here called “thick description” (Geertz) of “economic” phenomena certainly has much to commend it, but it is highly doubtful if the scientific approach to cultural, historical, and societal phenomena could do completely without the “thin descriptions” (themselves derived from thick descriptions) which would allow for a more general and comparative understanding of human societies. His attempt to refute the applicability/translatability of such concepts as “bourgeois,” “proletariat,” and “feudalism” by re-immersing them in Western culture seems to force an interpretation upon the *Manifesto* that does not recognize its roots in the intellectual tradition of classical political economy which was viewed already in the nineteenth century as being specifically opposed to such a “culturalization” of economic concepts. Indeed, one suspects that Salazar would have done better by translating more like-minded writers like Max Weber or even Proudhon, rather than Marx, into Filipino. But then he would have lost the opportunity to launch polemics against Filipino Marxists.

Salazar’s insistence on the inextricable “embeddedness” of the economy in an encompassing societal “ethos” indeed bears comparison with the doctrines of Gustav Schmoller (1838-1917), leader of the so-called German Historical School of Economics (*Historische Schule der Nationalökonomie*) which dominated German universities until the middle of the twentieth century. The *laissez-faire* capitalism depicted in the main works of classical political economy from Adam Smith to Marx had appeared to Schmoller so unsatisfactory when applied to the German conditions of his time that he could confidently pronounce these doctrines dead in the famous 1883 controversy on method (*Methodenstreit*) with Carl Menger (1841-1921), a leading representative of the so-called Austrian School of Economics. According to Schmoller, “After the old, abstract political economy attained greatness, the spring of its life ran dry, because its results evaporated in too abstract

schemas which dispensed with all reality" (1998: 163). Ironically, the intellectual legacy of the Historical School itself would be virtually forgotten and erased from the economic departments by the ensuing hegemony of the neo-classical Anglo-American economic tradition. This occurred despite the overbearing influence it exerted in the universities of Germany for a half century and its international reach, most notably in Japan. Recently however, renewed interest in it has developed because of the burgeoning literature on the so-called New Institutional Economics. The basic position of Schmoller, according to Japanese writer Yuichi Shionoya, is that "the basic condition of human culture, of which economy is a part, is a religious and moral system and that economic life cannot be understood without the knowledge of the historical development of three norms: customs, laws and morals" (60). Heino Heinrich Nau summarizes the general methodological aims of Schmoller's "*Volkswirtschaftslehre*"² as follows,

Die Entstehungsgeschichte verschiedener ökonomischer Institutionen (Organisationsformen) zu skizzieren, die gesellschaftliche Konstellation dieser Organisationsformen in bestimmten Wirtschaftsordnungen zu typologisieren (Wirtschaftsstile), und schließlich die historische Aufeinanderfolge verschiedener Wirtschaftsordnungen in Wirtschaftsstufen darzulegen. Der Ökonom mußte hierbei die natürlichen – d.h. geographische, anthropologische und biologische – im Zusammenhang mit den kulturellen – d.h. gesellschaftshistorischen, politisch-moralischen und psychologischen – Gegebenheiten verschiedener Epochen sehen. (29)

To sketch the history of formation of different economic institutions (forms of organization), to typologize the societal constellation of these forms of organization (style of economy) in definite economic systems, and finally, to set forth the historical sequence of different economic systems in economic stages. The economist must be able to see the natural givens (e.g., geographical, anthropological and biological) in relation to the cultural realities (e.g., socio-historical, politico-moral and psychological) of different epochs.

Setting aside some of the more questionable aspects associated with the method of the Historical School such as its essentialist organicism and frequent utilization of racial concepts coupled with now dubious psychological theories, the above research program would still have much to recommend to economists and economic historians. Such a recognition of the economy as culturally embedded could not however imply a simple

return to Schmoller's nineteenth century position against all contemporary theoretical and generalizing efforts in the field of a more narrowly defined "modern economics." This would neither be possible nor desirable. Shionoya neatly lays out the gist of the matter:

The *Methodenstreit* was a misnomer; the real issue was over the scope of economic science. The difference in method only reflected the difference in the scope of the subject matter. Historical science dealing with concrete individuality of socioeconomic phenomena at large and theoretical science dealing with general concepts for limited, isolated economic phenomena demand completely different methods. It is crucial to find a field where cooperation between history and theory is necessary and feasible. (165)

It must be admitted that a rigorous methodological purism intent on abandoning and discrediting investigations into the broader patterns of regularity in economic and other socio-cultural phenomena in the interest of preserving their "concrete individuality" no longer seems a reasonable option in contemporary social scientific practice. "Thin" and "thick" descriptions of socioeconomic and cultural phenomena have their indispensable functions in the process of deepening the knowledge and understanding of society and culture. The absolute refusal of "thin descriptions" on the basis of these being inherently "abstracting," false and one-sided, or because these are considered premature in light of the relative paucity of thick descriptions do not seem to be compelling. Furthermore, a theoretical and practical impasse would certainly be approached were it seriously asserted that all thin descriptions were essentially complicit with universalizing Eurocentric history and rationality and therefore must be given up as a mode of intellectual production. Such an assertion should be differentiated from legitimate efforts to develop non-unilinear, non-diffusionist but generalizing approaches and points of view in the social sciences (see Chakrabarty).

The two types of description mentioned above would, in turn, also have their analogues in "thick translation" (Appiah 417-29) and "thin translation." A thin translation, would not need to foreground the otherness of the originating context, but would have a rather transparent and ideally "unproblematic" character in relation to the receiving context. A thick translation, on the other hand, would have to transmit as much of the original context of the source text to the target reader and would therefore necessarily take on a "foreignizing" or "alienating" character. One important variant of a "thick translation" is the annotated translation. Such a "thickness" may reflect not so much the "resistance" of

the text to translation as it does the willful resistance of the translator/receiver to the text. The translator rubs the originating text against the grain in order to bring about something altogether new. Like Salazar's translation, in which "quarrelsome" footnotes are used deliberately to disrupt the "fluency" of the translation, it may also take the form of a protest against translation, even as translation itself takes place. Whatever the shortcomings and political predilections of Salazar's resistant translation of the *Manifesto*, the method which he employed and its resolute "claim to difference" in the face of homogenizing unilineal and diffusionist histories represents one legitimate and vital strategy in the struggle to escape the formidable grip of Eurocentric thought by means of *translating* it.

CLOSING REMARKS

As we have seen above, the practices of translation and annotation are central to the production of critical editions in PP. On the one hand, as Lapar, Hernandez, and Salazar demonstrate in their studies, foreign sources and theory can be appropriated in historiography through translation. Translation liberates foreign knowledge for use and application in the Filipino setting. Texts are thus re-produced by means of translation to become portions of Filipino scholarship. Annotations, in turn, examine and validate the translated texts within the realities of Philippine culture. The foreign-ness of the documents under scrutiny is inevitably emphasized by these critical editions in the same way that Filipino-ness is celebrated in the scrutinizing culture. For PP, appropriating foreign theory is all about initiating productive discursive exchanges regarding the interpretation and significance of history. The historian comes to know other perspectives and historiographical traditions, as s/he practices and invigorates her/his own mode of historical understanding and investigation. Crucially, hence, the integration of foreign knowledges also pertains to a critical identification with/of oneself within the relevant narrative of selfhood.

On the other hand, PP also significantly contributes to the intellectualization³ of Filipino by its firm adherence to the use and development of the Filipino language in the Philippine academic setting. The production of more works in the genre of annotated translation involving the translation of historical sources and theories relevant to the Philippine context can contribute in no small measure to this important process of intellectualization. It is indeed true that even a successful Filipinization of the social sciences cannot completely overcome a certain distance between scientific discourses and

everyday speech because of the need to develop and elaborate specialized terminologies in the various domains of scientific research. But such a progressive Filipinization would nonetheless contribute much to making the social sciences more approachable and accessible to a greater section of the Filipino reading public, especially if the goals of democratization and popular participation are themselves integrated into the process of shaping of these social scientific discourses. Such an expanding sphere of discussion involving a broader public will have important implications not only for the furtherance of democratic ideals but also for the propagation and strengthening of the Filipino national language.

ENDNOTES

- 1 International Institute of Social History website at: <<http://www.iisg.nl/index.php>> (accessed 21 Mar. 2005).
- 2 According to Schmoller: "In der Volkswirtschaftslehre oder Nationalökonomie sollte sich ein 'socialtheoretisches Grunddogma' mit einem 'socialpraktischen Postulat' zu einer Wissenschaft verbinden, die Normen zur Gestaltung des Wirtschaftslebens aufstellte, um den Besonderheiten der kulturellen Individualität eines Volkes oder einer Nation gerecht werden zu können." Heino Heinrich Nau, "Politisches Ethos und sozialökonomisches Telos. Gustav Schmollers Konzept einer historisch-ethischen Nationalökonomie als Kulturwissenschaft" (1998: 19).
- 3 Scholars have yet to seriously consider the unstated assumptions behind this term. We use it here sparingly. For us, "intellectualization" can be narrowly employed to mean the use and promotion of Filipino as a language of intellectual production within academic institutions. However, this should not be understood as implying that such "intellectual production" is exclusively confined to these institutions. On the contrary, a process of "intellectualization" could mitigate the existing divide between the domains of so-called "formalized" (academic) and "non-formalized" knowledges.

WORKS CITED

- Achutegui, Pedro, S. J., and Miguel Bernad, S. J. *Aguinaldo and the Revolution: A Documentary History*. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila UP, 1972.
- Agoncillo, Teodoro. *The Revolt of the Masses*. Quezon City: U of the Philippines P, 1956.
- Alejo, A. E. *Tao po! Tuloy! Isang Landas ng Pag-unawa sa Loob ng Tao*. Quezon City, Philippines: ORP-SAS, Ateneo de Manila UP, 1990.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Aufklärung und Dialog der Kulturen." *Zukunftsstreit*. Ed. Wilhelm Krull. Weilerswist: Velbrück Wissenschaft, 2000. 305-28.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London, Routledge, 2000.
- Bloch, Marc. *Land and Work in Mediaeval Europe: Selected Papers*. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1967.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 2000.
- Chirino, Pedro. *Relacion de las Islas Filipinas: y de lo que en ellas han trabajado: los padres de las compania de Jesus*. 2nd ed. Manila, Philippines: P. Esteban Balbas, 1890.
- Connor, Walker. *Ethno-nationalism: The Quest for Understanding*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1994.
- Constantino, Renato. *The Philippines: A Past Revisited*. Quezon City, Philippines: Tala, 1978.
- De la Costa, Horacio. *The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581-1768*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1961.
- De Morga, Antonio. *Historical Events of the Philippine Islands*. Manila, Philippines: Jose Rizal National Centennial Commission, 1962.
- Enriquez, Virgilio. *From Colonial to Liberation Psychology*. Manila, Philippines: De La Salle UP, 1995.
- , ed. *Indigenous Psychology: A Book of Readings*. Manila, Philippines: Akademya ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino, 1990.
- Gadamer, Hans Georg. *Truth and Method*. Revised ed. Trans. D. G. Marshall and J. Weinsheimer. New York: Crossroad, 1989.
- Geertz, Clifford. *El Antropologo Como Autor*. Barcelona, Spain: Paidos Iberica, 1989.
- Guerrero, Amado. *Philippine Society and Revolution*. 3rd ed. California, USA: International Association of Filipino Patriots, 1979.
- Hernandez, Rhommel. "Mapanuring Paglilimbag: Isang Pagsasalin at Pagsusuri ng 'Historia de la Ensurrecion Filipina en Cavite' ni Don Telesforo Canseco, 1897." MA thesis. University of the Philippines, 1982.
- Horowitz, Donald. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985.
- Ileto, Reynaldo. *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910*. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila UP, 1979.

- Kimmuel-Gabriel, Nancy. "Ang Timawa sa Kasaysayang Pilipino." *Bagong Kasaysayan: Mga Pag-aaral sa Kasaysayan ng Pilipinas*. No. 3. Quezon City, Philippines: Palimbagan ng Lahi, 1999.
- Koller, Werner. *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Stuttgart: UtB, 2001.
- Kucynski, Thomas, ed. *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Das Kommunistische Manifesto*. Trier, Karl Marx-Hans, 1995.
- Lapar, Dedina. "Ang Liham ni Fray Gaspar de San Agustin: Isang Mapanuring Pamamatnugot" (Fray Gaspar de San Agustin's 1720 letter about Filipinos). MA thesis. National Library of the Philippines, 1992.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. New York: Norton, 1888.
- Navarro, Atoy. "Ang Bagong Kasaysayan sa Wikang Filipino: Kalikasan, Kaparaanan, Pagsasakasaysayan." *Bagong Kasaysayan: Mga Pag-aaral sa Kasaysayan ng Pilipinas*. No. 11. Quezon City, Philippines: Palimbagan ng Lahi, 2000.
- Navarro, Atoy M., Mary Jane Rodriguez, and Vicente Villan, eds. *Pantayong Pananaw: Ugat at Kabuluhan*. Mandaluyong, Philippines: Palimbagan Kalawakan, 1997.
- Newmark, Peter. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1982.
- Paterno, Pedro. *Los Itas*. 2nd ed. Manila: Tip. linotype del Colegio de Santo Tomas, 1915. Southeast Asian publications on microfiche.
- Rodriguez, Mary Jane. "Ang Kababaihan at ang Himagsikang Pilipino." *Bagong Kasaysayan: Mga Pag-aaral sa Kasaysayan ng Pilipinas*. No. 7. Quezon City, Philippines: Palimbagan ng Lahi, 1999.
- Salazar, Zeus. "Ang Pantayong Pananaw Bilang Diskursong Pangkabihasnan." *Pilipinolohiya: Kasaysayan, Pilosopiya at Pananaliksik*. Eds. Violeta Bautista and Rogelia Pe-Pua. Manila, Philippines: Kalikakasan, 1991.
- , trans. "The Communist Manifesto." By Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.
- . *Bagong Kasaysayan: Mga Pag-aaral sa Kasaysayan ng Pilipinas*. No. 10. Quezon City, Philippines: Palimbagan ng Lahi, 2000.
- . "Ilang Batayan para sa isang Sikolohiyang Pilipino." *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Teorya, Metodo at Gamit*. Ed. Rogelia Pe-Pua. Quezon City: U of the Philippines P, 1989.
- . "Paunang Salita." *Pilipinolohiya: Kasaysayan, Pilosopiya at Pananaliksik*. Eds. Violeta Bautista and Rogelia Pe-Pua. Manila, Philippines: Kalikasan, 1991.
- . "Pagsasakatubo ng Teorya: Posible ba o Hindi." 6 July 1994.
- Santa Maria, Madeleine. "Die Indigenisierungskrise in den Sozialwissenschaften und der Versuch einer Resolution in Sikolohiyang Pilipino." Diss. Universität Köln, 1993.
- Schumacher, John. "Early Filipino Jesuits, 1593-1930." *Philippine Studies*. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila UP, 1981.
- . *Readings in Philippine Church History*. Quezon City, Philippines: Loyola School of Theology, Ateneo de Manila UP, 1979.

Shionoya, Yuichi. *The Soul of the German Historical School: Methodological Essays on Schmoller, Weber and Schumpeter*. New York: Springer, 2005.

Wunder, Heide, ed. "Feudalismus." *Nymphenburger Texte zur Wissenschaft* 17. Munich: Nymphenburger, 1974.