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Two serious accounts of the life and martyrdom of Blessed Pedro Calungsod have appeared, and both are having, as I understand, wide circulation. One of them, a substantial pamphlet by Father C. G. Arévalo, S.J., has gone through several printings, amounting to many thousands of copies (Arévalo 1998),¹ and has already been translated into Tagalog by Father Fernando Macalinao, S.J. (Arévalo, 2000). In his pamphlet, Arévalo has based himself for the facts of the martyrdom principally on the deposition presented to the Congregation of Saints by the Archdiocese of Cebu ([Leyson] 1993). This in turn depended almost completely on the Positio prepared for the beatification of Blessed Diego de San Vitores ([Ledesma 1981]) for the dioceses of Manila and Agana,² since the martyrdom of the latter was practically simultaneous with that of his companion. Indeed, as I have remarked elsewhere (Schumacher 1999, 115), with even greater reason can one be sure of the martyrdom of Blessed Pedro, since, though unarmed in accordance with San Vitores’s policy for the companions of the priests, he was a young man and could likely have escaped from his assassins, as contemporary Jesuits asserted,³ while Blessed Diego, being half-blind, as all the sources emphasize, was helpless without his faithful companion and guide, who led him by a rope around his waist.⁴ Be that as it may, there is no doubt that both of them died as witnesses to their Faith.
In the effort to portray what the life of young Pedro must have been like in the Philippines, since practically no direct information exists, Atévalo’s chief source has been Father H. de la Costa’s authoritative work, The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581-1768, surely the best account we have of the mission methods of the Jesuits, or indeed of any religious order, for that period. De la Costa, however, made only passing mention of the Marianas mission itself, principally in connection with the extensive work done by San Vitores in Mindoro and elsewhere in the Philippines, before setting out for the Marianas.

The other published account, naturally far more extensive, is the semipopular one of Father Ildebrando Leyson, Pedro Calonson Bissaya. Prospects of a Teenage Filipino. Here, in less technical form than in the Deposition presented to the Congregation for Saints, Father Leyson has provided not only a reconstruction of the life and martyrdom of Pedro, with an exhaustive bibliography, but interesting appendices on favors granted through his intercession, well-developed reflections on Pedro for ordinary Christians accompanied by biblical themes, and even music composed in honor of Blessed Pedro. None of the latter material, of course, adds to the historical picture, but is largely devotional in character. In his attempt to provide the historical Philippine background of Pedro, Leyson likewise makes considerable use of De la Costa’s book, since he considers it likely that Pedro came from a Jesuit parish. One of the major features of Father Leyson’s book is his exhaustive investigation into the possible birthplaces of his subject, based on where the name Calungsod is common today and on local oral traditions. In the end, however, he cannot arrive at any certain conclusions.

The present article does not aim to supplant these accounts of Pedro completely, least of all for his martyrdom, but to supplement them and suggest more likely alternatives to their reconstructions, which both authors agree must necessarily be based primarily on conjectures as far as the pre-martyrdom period of Pedro’s life is concerned. Since neither of them claims to be a professional historian, it is hoped that the comments of a historian may give a better basis
for such conjectures and suggest more likely alternatives. At the same time, I would hope that this might provide correction to some of the distorted accounts in newspapers or popular magazines, which have taken statements, often carefully qualified by Arévalo or Leyson, but extrapolated them to anachronistic journalistic statements, sometimes verging on the fantastic. Thus our two authors speak of catechetical schools, and boarding schools of a wider curriculum, from which one popular writer spoke of "the Jesuit catechetical center in the Visayas," as if there were some large boarding school where Jesuits from all over the Visayas sent prospective catechists, an achievement far beyond the possibilities of the seventeenth century with their limited number of men and immense territory to care for. Similarly where Arévalo gave as the probable age for Pedro's departure for the Marianas as 13 or 14, at least one popular writer seized on the age 13, and presented an unofficial image that looks almost like a child. It likewise presents him with short curly hair. But Visayan men in the seventeenth century normally wore their hair long and straight down over the shoulders, perhaps held in place by a putong (Alcina 1974, parte primera, lib. I, cap. 2, f. 6).\(^7\) Worst of all, and most evidently senseless, the otherwise respected British Catholic weekly, The Tablet, in reporting the beatifications of 5 March 2000 says that Pedro had worked as a catechist from 1668 to 1672, "and was martyred at the age of 14," which would have made him nine years old at the time the missionary expedition departed from the Philippines!\(^8\)

**AGE**

Both Arévalo and Leyson opt for a younger age, the latter basing himself on a note in the English translation of the early life of San Vitores by Francisco García, S.J., to the effect that the boys who assisted him at the start of the mission were usually between twelve and fifteen years old (García 1985, 108, n.1; in Leyson 1999, 17, n. 60).\(^9\) Arévalo, on the other hand, suggests thirteen or fourteen (Arévalo 1998, 7). Both are inconsistent as well as incorrect. Both have been influenced by the two boys whose exact age is, or is al-
leged to be, known, namely Diego Bazán, born in Mexico of Spanish parentage, who was fourteen\textsuperscript{10} when he joined the expedition, and Ambrosio Hagman, a Chamorro who gave testimony as to what he heard said by the assassin and others. He is reported by Arévalo to have been fourteen, and by Leyson to have been fourteen or fifteen (Arévalo 1998, 7; Leyson 1999, 17). This, of course, would be his age a year after the martyrdom, for he gave his official testimony in 1673, and not his age at the time of the martyrdom, as Arévalo and Leyson say or imply. However, in his official deposition for the Congregation for the Causes of Saints, though Leyson says “fourteen or fifteen” in his introduction to the documents of the Guam process, and practically repeats the same, quoting the notary’s description of Hagman—“it would seem, of fourteen or fifteen years of age”; in another document of this series, he translates it as “about fifteen years of age” ([Leyson] 1993, 52, 56, 63). Though Leyson does not give the Spanish, his translations in the first two cases are accurate, as may be seen from the Spanish originals ([Ledesma] 1981, 291, 296). The third testimony, however, in the original Spanish says: “un niño . . . de hasta 16 años,” ([Ledesma] 1981, 303), which literally should be translated as: “up to sixteen years old.” It could be translated more freely as “fifteen to sixteen years old,” or “about sixteen years old.” But Leyson’s translation of “about fifteen” is not accurate, and what is worse, in the bibliography of his popular work he says he was “fourteen or fifteen when he made his testimony” (Leyson 1999, 161). Arévalo, depending on the least reliable of Leyson’s selections, further minimizes the age by calling Hagman “a boy” who “was only fourteen years old when his deposition was taken down” (Arévalo 1998, 7). One senses in all the conjectures on the age of the volunteers a tendency to minimize the age in these popular works, so as to make Pedro Calungasod a more effective model for teen-age Filipinos.\textsuperscript{11}

Apart from these inconsistencies and errors, however, neither of these non-Filipinos can be determinant for the age of the Filipinos. In this period, Filipinos normally were not easily allowed to move from their own village to another, least of all young people. No such restriction applied to Mexicans, at least criollos, as Bazan
was.\textsuperscript{12} Hagman, of course, being a native inhabitant of Guam, cannot be taken as a norm for young Filipinos who had come with the Jesuit missionaries.\textsuperscript{13} In any case, those who had supposedly been fourteen in 1667, when the mission departed Manila, would have been nineteen or twenty by the time Hagman testified in 1673, or eighteen or nineteen at the time of Pedro’s martyrdom.

Moreover, Father Pedro Murillo Velarde, writing close to a century later, implies that even then the ordinary village life in Jesuit missions still provided that the boys [and girls] (\textit{pueri [puellae] in the Jesuit records}) went to school every day until they became \textit{baguntao} (\textit{adolescentes or ephebi in the Jesuit records}),\textsuperscript{14} that is, unmarried young men aged fourteen or above, but not yet having reached the tribute-paying age of eighteen. Even the \textit{baguntao}, though finished with school, was not free from all special religious obligations, for, in addition to Sunday observance during which the \textit{Doctrina} was recited with the whole community, he had also to go to Mass every Saturday, as did the \textit{dalaga} of the same age. Before or after the Mass they recited in unison the entire \textit{Doctrina cristiana}, so that they might not forget it (Murillo Velarde 1749, ff. 347r-348v; Schumacher 1987, 169-72).\textsuperscript{15} The \textit{prima facie} conclusion from this, then, would be that a young man under the age of eighteen would not ordinarily have left his native village, especially in the Visayas.\textsuperscript{16} The evidence is not apodictic, but should make one assured that Pedro was at the very least fourteen when he left the Visayas for Manila, and that eighteen, or just possibly sixteen, would more likely be his age.\textsuperscript{17}

As to the terms used by various early sources to describe Pedro—\textit{mozo, mocito, mancebo, mancebito, iuvenis, jeune homme, muchacho, niño}—all listed by Leyson (1999, 16-17), all of them except the last one could naturally be translated as \textit{youth, young man}, or as the dictionaries also suggest, “a young unmarried man.”\textsuperscript{18} However, considering his role as a helper of the missionaries, none of these terms designate more than that he was younger than the missionaries. Moreover, all the Spanish words were used of servants or workers within a family or quasi-family like the mission. It is even now not many years since Filipinos referred to their male servants as \textit{muchacho} in Spanish or
Tagalog, or as "houseboy" or even "boy" in English, even though some might be married and of adult years. Today the more polite and proper term katulong or "househelp" is used, with no connotation of age involved. The term "niño," used only by Fr. Pedro de Casanova, S.J. in his hearsay evidence in the process in Manila (Leyson 1999, 166), cannot be given any weight. He had returned to the Philippines before the martyrdom, though both he and Pedro Calungsod had been companions of San Vitores since Mexico. But the point of his testimony was not the age, but what he had heard about the martyrdom, and his testimony is from five years after his own departure from Guam. In any case, as we have seen above, the term could be used of someone fifteen to sixteen years old, as in the case of Ambrosio Hagman.

These considerations, of course, would affect the presumed age of Pedro’s martyrdom, which, if he had already been eighteen when he left the Philippines, would make him at least twenty-two or twenty-three at the time of his martyrdom.¹⁹ This, however, need not necessarily take away from his being a model for teen-age Filipinos today, since he would have been still a teenager at the time he volunteered to join San Vitores for a mission which any intelligent person would have known might end in death, if not by assassins, then through the ever-present danger of shipwreck, to both of which a number of Jesuit missionaries to the Marianas and their lay companions succumbed in the succeeding decades. In fact, as we will see, besides those killed in battle or for not clearly religious reasons, a good number of those whose cause for beatification has never been taken up were killed as they were bringing messages or doing other errands for San Vitores or accompanying priests who were baptizing, or were even baptizing infants or dying adults themselves.²⁰ These suppositions concerning Pedro’s age will also be corroborated in the discussion of his occupational status, as treated below. That in turn will depend, at least in part, on the education he is likely to have received.
EDUCATION

There is considerable confusion as to what type of education Pedro would have gotten in a typical (presumably Jesuit) Visayan town.²¹ Allied to this is his possible role as a catechist. Arévalo speaks of "something like a minor seminary" or an "apostolic school," where the Jesuits educated young boys. In support of this, he cites De la Costa concerning the boarding school founded by the Jesuits in Tigbauan, near the Spanish town of Arévalo in Panay, where they taught "not only catechism, but reading, writing, Spanish and liturgical music" (Arévalo 1998, 9, citing De la Costa 1961, 143).

It is true that such a school existed in Tigbauan, but only for two years; that is, while Father Pedro Chirino was there at the request of the great Jesuit benefactor, Esteban Rodríguez de Figueroa, to whose encomienda Tigbauan belonged. But it was essentially a parish elementary day school for Visayans, and it was only when the Spaniards of Arévalo town asked that their sons also might be educated by the Jesuits that Chirino built a small residence for the Spanish boys next to the Jesuit house, thus bringing into existence the first Jesuit "boarding-school" in the Philippines, small as it was. But it was only for the Spanish boys that it was a boarding school; the Visayan boys were from Tigbauan itself. Unfortunately, Chirino was there only from 1593 to 1595, since the assignment of the entire islands of Samar and Leyte to the Jesuits in the latter year made it impossible for them to continue to provide so lavishly for a single town in Panay. With the departure of the Jesuits, a single secular priest was given charge of the town, and the boarding school disappeared, since he had more than enough to do to take the place of the several Jesuits who had previously been in charge (De la Costa 1961, 145-46).

Moreover, the fact that Spanish was taught here would seem most likely due to the presence of the Spanish boys, and we do not find it in the other parish schools which the religious orders founded in every town they ministered to. It is true that in the enthusiasm of the early years, not only did the Jesuits have a few boarding schools like Dulag and Antipolo, as we will see below, where Spanish does seem to have been taught, but the Franciscans also, in the relatively
densely populated Bikol region, took boys into their conventos in the very early years of evangelization and had them share to some extent in the monastic life of the friars. Thus Marcelo de Ribadeneira, in his 1599 history of the Franciscans, speaks of boys “who have such retentive memories that they learn anything with great facility, whether in their own language, or in Spanish or in Latin.” However, from the context it is clear that he is speaking only of pronunciation, not understanding, as he says they read so well “that it seems as if they know Latin” (Ribadeneira 1947, 67). It would only be after 1865, with the foundation of the Jesuit Escuela Normal in Manila, that village or town teachers would begin to be prepared to teach in Spanish, a process not even completed by the Revolution.

Leyson goes further and speculates that Pedro may have been “recruited by the Jesuits and trained by them to be a catechist for their missions.” Assuming, without evidence, that Pedro was in fact a trained catechist, he continues:

It was the strategy of the Jesuits, who were evangelizing the Visayas in particular, to train young boys as catechists to help them in the missions. The training was done in boarding schools for boys organized by the Jesuits themselves or, if not, in the different Jesuit residences (Leyson 1999, 19).

However, the passage he cites is from Father Alonso Sánchez, who was only in the Philippines from 1581 to 1586, when he returned to Europe as agent of the colony and never returned. Moreover, he had never seen anything outside the vicinity of Manila, much less the Visayas, which the Jesuits had not yet taken up as their mission when he departed for good. Sánchez was a persuasive man of grandiose schemes, including one to conquer China with sixty men, who for a time charmed both governor-general and bishop, though both were later to regret the confidence they had placed in him. What is quoted here from De la Costa was never implemented as Sánchez conceived it, for the simple reason that there were only a handful of Jesuits in Manila and its environs. In fact they would have to wait several years before obtaining personnel to begin the evangelization
of the Visayas at even its most basic level, not to speak of such boarding schools.

As pointed out above, the short-lived school in Tigbauan had no connection with such a plan, though the seminario de Indios or boarding school for Filipino boys in Dulag, Leyte, was a more modest version of what Sánchez—who never learned a Filipino language, and as far as we know, dealt only with Spaniards—so pretentiously conceived. The school in Dulag, from the description we have, would seem to have been a great success, teaching the boys in both Visayan and Spanish, and accustoming them to Christian life.

However, two facts should give us pause in supposing that Pedro Calungsod attended such a boarding school to be trained as a catechist. Father Diego Otazo, the superior of Dulag, cited here, wrote of how he had made an experiment in taking some boys with him to assist in the postbaptismal instruction of neophytes, and of their success. But there is no mention of their being regular catechists, teaching Christian doctrine; indeed they could not have been Christian for more than a few years themselves, as the Jesuits began the mission only in 1596, and the school five years later. What they did in helping with postbaptismal instructions was to lead the people in recalling the Doctrina Cristiana all had supposedly memorized before baptism. There were as yet no printed books of any kind in Visayan, but the retentive memories of the boys from their daily recitation could enable them to recall and recite the Doctrina orally, as was done every week before Sunday Mass by the whole town for at least the next century and longer. Another factor to consider is that schools such as Dulag could only touch a small percentage of the boys in the vicinity, nor did they exist except in a very few key parishes of the Jesuits. There were indeed proposals that where such boarding schools could not exist, provision should be made in the budget to have at least two or three boys living in the houses of the Jesuits, as Leyson presumes to have been the norm. Whether this was carried out, or remained just a proposal, we do not know, but we do not have any positive evidence for it. Given the fact that the Jesuits expanded their mission into Mindanao during that same period and lost several
men to death or capture by the Moros in the process, it is very doubt-
ful (De la Costa 1961, 170, 266-71).22

The second point is that at the time of the boarding school in Dulag, we were precisely in the very early stages of evangelization in Leyte, about thirty years after the beginnings in Luzon and Cebu. This becomes eminently clear at the time of the Magindanao raid on Dulag in 1603, under Bwisan. Though the boys in the school joined the Fathers and the rest of the community in making for the hills, large numbers were captured, including Fr. Melchor Hurtado, S.J. Later a number of datus made a blood-compact with Bwisan, and paid him substantial tribute in accordance with his proposal that they should join together the following year and drive the Spaniards out.

Moreover, a good number of people whose families had been taken captive joined the Magindanaos when they left (Schumacher 1987,102-3). Whether these were Christians who apostatized, or at least catechumens, we do not know, but if so, their Christian convictions were still shallow. The point to be made is that these boarding schools, though greatly successful in forming good Christians, were small islands, as it were, among the mass of Visayans who were not yet Christians, or were only superficially so at this early stage in evangelization. It was hoped that these boys would serve as "a kind of catechist" among the older catechumens, in the sense of helping them to memorize the prayers and Christian doctrine, or would help lead the communal recitation of the Doctrina for postbaptismal deepening, but they were not full-time trained catechists in the sense in which the word would be understood today. They did not have the competence to explain the faith themselves; rather it was the priests who gave the initial instruction, and who came out after the communal recitation of the Doctrina, sometimes led by the boys, to ask individual questions to see if the people—adults as well as children—understood what they had memorized. Once the initial evangelization was completed, and the people gathered more or less into towns, the boarding schools were no longer needed. The boys simply went to the elementary schools established in each parish, but these were not schools for training full-time or professional catechists (De la Costa 1961, 575; Schumacher 1987, 169-75).
By the 1640s or 1650’s when Pedro was born, the old boarding schools would have been replaced by these parish day schools. We know, for example, that at least by 1682, and undoubtedly earlier, in an unnamed town in the Visayas where an Austrian Jesuit by the name of Andreas Mancker was parish priest, everyone came to Sunday Mass (or they were beaten with rods by the principales the following Sunday!), and recited the catechism together, answering questions raised by the priest. Though Mancker says there were schools for boys and girls under Filipino teachers, De la Costa adds: “Mancker makes no mention of boarding schools, which seem to have been discontinued when their original purpose, that of training catechists to instruct adult converts, had been outgrown” (De la Costa 1961, 468).

Again here, one must take the word “catechist,” as above, in a very different sense than today. The boys certainly did not explain the Faith to the adult catechumens; the missionaries did this, and it was they who asked questions of the Sunday assembly. What the “catechists” did, as explained above, was to help them memorize the Doctrina Cristiana, a prerequisite for baptism, which the boys themselves knew by heart. After a generation or two, this was no longer necessary, since the adults of the second or third generation would have daily recited the Doctrina during their years in school, as well as continuing to do so on Saturdays as baguntao or dalaga until marriage, and then, with the whole Christian community, every Sunday. The real catechesis was that done by the priest in his instructions and in his questioning adults as well as children on the meaning of what they had memorized and recited. Pedro should not therefore be considered to have been trained as a catechist in the Philippines, and did not in any way go already prepared to catechize Chamorros.

The designation of Pedro Calungsod as a catechist is not to be found in any of the primary sources on the Marianas, though it is true that other companions are occasionally spoken of as “catechizing and baptizing infants” in the absence of a Jesuit (italics mine). It is significant that when Leyson describes the mission of Pedro in the Marianas in his second chapter, he entitles it “A Mission for a Virtuose
"Catechiste" (1999, 27-65). The reason for retaining the French term is presumably that it is only in the French book of Charles Le Gobien, S.J., that this explicit designation of Pedro as catechist is found. Leyson quotes in support of Le Gobien's authoritative character from the author's declaration in the prologue of the book:

It is on the basis of the reports [memoires] of these apostolic men . . . that I have written the history that I present to the public. I have not advanced anything but what I have found in the letters and in the reports of these missionaries, which have been sent to me from Rome, from Spain, and from the Low Countries.” (Le Govien, 1700, in Leyson, 1999, 158, no.10)²⁵

However, in spite of this apodictic declaration of Le Gobien, Retana, the bibliographer, comments: “[The book] contains curious information on the first Jesuit missionaries, among which the most outstanding is that relative to Father Sanvitores, which had already been related by Father García” (Retana 1906, 1:163-64; italics mine). Blair and Robertson are more explicitly critical of Le Gobien as an independent source of information, at least as far as San Vitores and his companions are concerned. As regards his claim quoted above, they comment: “Much of it is a translation of García’s Vida y martyrio . . . de Diego Luis de Sanvitores.” They also note: “Eduardo Navarro, O.S.A. of Valladolid, claims that Le Gobien is not accurate in all essentials” (1903-9, 53:123). It would seem clear that it was García, not Le Gobien, who went through all the reports from the Marianas. The latter may have gone through reports for other missions (the scope of the book is much larger than the Marianas), but for the Marianas he translated—and interpreted, as in the case of “catechist”—what García had compiled.

We need add here, that whatever may have been the religious enthusiasm and generosity of San Vitores’s Filipino volunteers, there is evidence that some at least had only a basic, or even defective, knowledge of catechism in their own language, which would have precluded their being trained catechists. Among the testimonies to
San Vitores's supposedly supernatural gift of tongues, that of General Antonio Nieto at the canonical process in Manila after his martyrdom is significant. He affirmed that on the voyage to Acapulco:

[San Vitores] not only assisted the Tagalog Filipinos who were embarked, but also the Servant of God used to ask the other nations of distinct languages, like the Pampangos, Bisayas, and Cagayanes [Ibanags], [to recite] their prayers. When sometimes they made a mistake with some words in their prayers, the Servant of God corrected them without having learned these languages. He [the General] knows this because he has seen it in this Servant of God ([Ledesma] 1981, 144; García 1683, 179).

Whether Pedro was included in those who had so forgotten their Doctrina as to make errors in his prayers, is of course impossible to say. In any case, there were other ways of teaching the faith than being a full-time catechist, and if it is highly unlikely that he would have been such in the Philippines, there would be ample scope in the Marianas, once he had learned the language, for quasi-catechetical activity, since the work of conversion was only beginning. The example of Felipe Sonson, the donado, who was closest to the missionaries, and to his spiritual father, San Vitores, in particular, is significant. He was praised after his death in 1686 by his biographer, Fr. Lorenzo Bustillos, S.J., for such an informal conversational evangelization:

And if on some days he had no occupation . . . he was . . . occupied . . . in giving good advice to those of his nation [Filipinos] that they might employ their time well and accomplish the tasks they were doing, so as to do their best in serving God. In passing, in his ordinary conversations he instructed them in the mysteries of our Faith. These were his ordinary conversations when he spoke with those of his nation or with Spaniards, in the one language or the other (Schumacher 1995, 273).
If Sonson did this not only with his fellow-Filipinos, all of whom had undoubtedly received at least elementary instruction in their religion, but even with Spaniards in their own language, he certainly must have done even more of this with the Chamorros, for whose conversion he offered himself to help in any way he could, “even to giving the blood of his veins for the salvation of these islanders” (Schumacher 1995, 274). It would be logical then to presume that one who also gave the blood of his veins in a more dramatic way, as did Pedro, engaged in a similar informal catechesis in his daily dealings with the Chamorros, and thus can rightly be spoken of in a certain sense as catechizing, even if this was not his principal function. But it is misleading to call him a catechist.

Indeed, from the fact that Sonson felt compelled to instruct his fellow-Filipinos “in the mysteries of our faith,” it would seem that many or most of them were not qualified to be catechists in the proper sense of the word, since their own knowledge, even in their own language, was weak, a fact further supported by their errors in the common prayers that San Vitores is said to have corrected. Indeed, we will see below that San Vitores did not send all the companions out to “catechize,” but only those whom he considered to be “advanced and trustworthy,” and this only in emergency situations. Perhaps Pedro Calungsod was one of them, but his name does not occur among those in the sources. If he was really young, even less would he have been so entrusted.

Rather the situation in the Marianas must have been very much like the initial evangelization of the Philippines in the sixteenth century, indeed more difficult. That is to say, that normally only the missionary would have had a copy of the handwritten catechism, and not the catechumens—who of course could not read and had no written language of their own—not even the missionary’s lay assistants, at least some of whom apparently also could not read. The Filipinos of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries had learned the *Doctrina cristiana*, by oral/aural repetition; hence the key role of the children with their retentive memories in helping the adults to learn. Much more would this have been true in the Marianas, and San Vitores would use the same method with children who had shown
talent and fervor after he had in 1669 established his Colegio de San Juan de Letrán in Agana for boys, with its later corresponding girls’ school. But this was still far in the future.29

San Vitores’s assistants, like Pedro, would have learned the Chamorro catechism by heart, whether on the ship or, more likely, on their arrival in Guam, as they learned the Chamorro language by listening to and conversing with the natives. Thus it is highly unlikely that any except for a few mature men, as will be seen below, did any independent catechizing. Even those older men who are said to have “catechized” are always noted as having done so “in accordance with their state,” “according to their capacity,” or with some similar qualification. It was the priests who catechized in the proper sense of the word. However, Pedro and others probably drilled the Chamorro catechumens or neophytes, in accordance with the practice in the early Christianization of the Philippines.30 To conclude, Pedro should not be called a catechist, as if he were specially trained for that, nor was that his principal function either in the Philippines or in the Marianas. He was rather a missionary with varied, though limited, functions, or to use the apt words of Arévalo’s title, “young Filipino mission-volunteer.”31 As appears in the life of Felipe Sonson, the notion of being a missionary—whatever functions one might be called to carry out—had an appeal among the more devout Filipinos of the late seventeenth century,32 when Filipino religious sentiments were evolving from the more simple understanding and acceptance of the faith by new converts to a mature and apostolic Catholicism.33

LEARNING OF SPANISH AND LATIN

The regular parish schools, taught by adult Filipinos, were certainly taught in the local vernacular. The Jesuit colleges of San Ignacio and San José in Manila (and the Dominican colleges of Santo Tomás and San Juan de Letrán) certainly taught Spanish, but they were only for Spaniards. In the second half of the seventeenth century—too late certainly for Pedro—sons of some Pampango principales were admitted as captistas at San José, domestics rather than regular stu-
dents, and received an elementary education, probably in Spanish, but there are no indications of any Visayans or even Tagalogs at San José until the end of the century (Schumacher 1987, 150). The only other Jesuit college in any real sense—that is, supplying secondary education—was that of Cebu, founded in 1595, likewise primarily, or even solely, for Spaniards (De la Costa 1961, 166). But soon almost all the Spaniards in Cebu moved to Manila to take part in the galleon trade, so the secondary education was closed down and only a primary school for Visayan boys remained. Thus the “college” became simply an endowed apostolic center with a primary school attached, supporting missionaries learning the language, and from which missionaries went out to carry on the work of evangelization in the surrounding territory. It is not impossible that Spanish may have been taught here at the elementary level, but we have no evidence for it, and given the fact that in 1656 there were only two Jesuits there to carry on all the ministries, it is highly doubtful. As to the other Jesuit “colleges,” so-called in the documents, they were such “only in the sense that they were supported at least in part by an endowment which carried with it the obligation either of maintaining an elementary school or of supporting missionaries engaged in the study of the native languages” (De la Costa 1956, 150). Even if it were possibly true that the college of Cebu taught Spanish at the elementary level, at least after the first decade or two, it was not a boarding school of the type described in Dulag.

This is not to say that it was impossible for Pedro to have obtained a working grasp of Spanish, even if he did not live in the city of Cebu (for which we have no evidence anyway), but if, as may have been the case, he lived and worked with some Jesuits or Augustinians elsewhere in the Visayas. In 1686 a typically unrealistic royal decree ordered that Spanish be taught in all the schools (though they were supported by the missionaries and the parents, not by the government). A Jesuit commenting on the impossibility of implementing the decree for lack of relations between Spaniards and Filipinos, says that only “the houseboys of the parish priest acquire familiarity with the language; because of this there is hardly any town today where Spanish is totally unknown” (Schumacher 1987,
153). In other words, there were some Filipinos who knew Spanish, generally merely a working knowledge, and not one obtained in the schools. A similar factor would be operative, if, as we shall see below, Pedro were a Visayan sailor in the trade with Manila, where he would necessarily have picked up at the very least a working knowledge of Spanish and probably of Tagalog as well. Moreover, as we will also see below, San Vitores took for granted that his lay missionary companions knew enough Spanish so that they could understand the formula for emergency baptism that he prepared for them in Spanish and Chamorro, so he must have chosen them from men who had some such experiential knowledge.

As for Latin, however, there would have been no opportunity for Pedro to learn it in such a way as to be able to read and understand it. No doubt he, like hundreds of other Visayan boys of his age (and as those of us who grew up in devout Catholic families before Vatican II), memorized the Latin responses for serving Mass, with little or no understanding of the meaning of the words. But Latin was taught as a subject only at the secondary level, and after the early closing of secondary education in Cebu, only to Spaniards in the Manila colleges. Hence it is not possible that Pedro "mastered the Chamorro Grammar and Catechism prepared by Padre Diego" in Latin and Chamorro" (Leyson 1999, 43), and it is difficult to see how Leyson could make such a statement if he actually read the work. We may ignore the whole question of Latin among the Filipinos.

San Vitores gives us some evidence as to how the linguistic situation resolved itself, both as regards Spanish, Tagalog, and Visayan on the one hand, and Chamorro on the other. In his memorial to the Manila authorities in 1665, urging that the mission should begin soon, he says of the prospective interpreters:

With the four Filipinos who came from there [the Marianas] this past year of 1664 . . . I have spoken at great length both in Spanish, which they know sufficiently well, and in their own native Tagalog, which they say also resembles in many ways the language of the people of the Ladrones, which they have learned
very well in the twenty-five years that they have lived with them ([Ledesma] 1981, 161).

The passage is of interest for several reasons. It indicates, first, that sailors on the galleons, even at an early date (these Filipinos had been on the galleon Concepción, which was shipwrecked in the Marianas in 1638) came to possess a reasonable grasp of Spanish, at least enough to communicate with their officers, with the Mexicans who often made up a good part of the crew, and with the Spanish officials of the shipyards of Acapulco and Cavite. Moreover, they had retained it, at least to a reasonable extent, over the twenty-six years they had been isolated from Spaniards.

Second, though we know that at least one of the rescued sailors who became an interpreter for San Vitores, Esteban, was a Visayan, all apparently also spoke Tagalog sufficiently well that San Vitores could conclude in the beginning that all were native Tagalogs, and spoke to them in that language as well as in Spanish. It seems likely that among themselves, whatever their native language might be, the Filipinos on the galleons, or those who came to Manila for whatever purpose, would pick up Tagalog, which would become the common medium for different linguistic groups, as happens today. Keeping these facts in mind, it is clear that Pedro and his Visayan companions came to speak not only a fair amount of Spanish but very likely also Tagalog. Thus he was able to communicate not only with San Vitores but also with the other Jesuits, including the four who only joined the mission in Mexico and therefore had no knowledge of Filipino languages. Moreover, as we have already mentioned and will see further when discussing the so-called “grammar and catechism” below, in his accompanying letter San Vitores clearly presupposed that all his lay companions at least understood Spanish; otherwise he would not have planned to make for the lay companions a Spanish-Chamorro version of his Latin-Chamorro grammar, done for the Jesuits.
RECRUITMENT OF PEDRO AND HIS COMPANIONS

This brings us to the question of how Pedro (and the other companions) came to know of the mission to the Marianas and how they joined or were recruited to it. In 1665 San Vitores had sent to the King the certification of Admiral Esteban Ramos, who had been among those shipwrecked on Saipan in 1638 in the galleon Nuestra Señora de la Concepción, but had after some time, with the help of some friendly Chamorros, made his way with a group of survivors to Guam and then back to the Philippines. The admiral had evidently learned something of the Chamorro language in his time in the islands, and had visited them again on subsequent galleon voyages. The previous year, as admiral of another galleon, he had rescued four Filipinos who had also survived the 1638 shipwreck and lived on in the Marianas for the intervening twenty-six years. He asserted that he “considered it certain that if [the Chamorros] had Ministers of the Holy Gospel and some Spaniards and natives [of the Philippines] who would accompany them to give them an example, these islanders would easily be converted to our Holy Catholic Faith.” For this purpose, he said:

It would be sufficient that with the religious there should go the number of twenty Spaniards and as many more natives of these Islands to give them an example of Christian life, and so that they may see the obedience and reverence owed to the ministers of the holy Gospel. There would not be need of any other escort or garrison, since that people are very peaceful and well disposed ([Ledesma]1981, 162-63, 26 May 1665. Italics mine).37

If San Vitores had needed any recommendation on how the mission should be conducted, this was it. The principal means of evangelization was a Christian life on the part of missionaries, Jesuit or lay. Moreover, the rejection of any military protection was to be an integral part of this conversion by example, and it was evidently the basis of what he wrote to the King.
For the preservation of this Christian community, there
would not be need of much expense . . . Fifteen or twenty
Filipinos of the oldest and most God-fearing Christians of
these Islands, and some of those who have come from there
[Marianas] (fluent in their language and ours), without any more
escort or garrison to accompany the Fathers [would suffice] (García
1683, 164; [Ledesma] 1981, 164; italics mine). 38

It is noteworthy that, unlike the Admiral, he made no mention
of lay Spaniards, though as we shall see later, a few of these would
also volunteer to join him. Probably only Captain Juan de Santa Cruz
and the interpreter, Don Francisco de Mendoza, joined from the very
beginning in Manila, the former, precisely to be a missionary, though
he would be thrust by events into the position of military com-
mander. 39 Moreover, it is clear that these were all volunteers, not
sent by the government, as may be seen from the fact that San Vitores
not only exhorted them as to what was expected of them, but urged
anyone who was not ready to accept the conditions of the mission-
ary apostolate to remain behind.

So that they might not be an obstacle but a help to the con-
version of the pagans, the Servant of God saw to it that all
should live a Christian life, and that their deeds might not be
contrary to the words of the preachers. They were also by
his advice to take a firm determination not to take wine, nor
to extract tuba, which is the liquor of the coconut palms,
from which in the Philippines a wine is made for drinking
sprees [borracheras]. The Venerable Father begs that no one
go to the Marianas, who did not feel himself with strength to
do without wine, because if the custom of drinking sprees
should take root in those islands, which do not have it as yet,
that man would do more harm than good (García 1683,
219). 40

This care in choosing companions and the demands he made on
them make it the more remarkable that so many Visayans were found
among them, in spite of his having no contact with the Visayas. De-
spite the fact that it can only be a conjecture, though well-founded
enough, the fact that Pedro Calungsod must have spent some time in Cavite and/or Manila in order to be recruited as a volunteer by San Vitores, gives a hint as to how he, and other Visayans like Hipólito de la Cruz, martyred with Fr. Luis Medina on Saipan on 27 January 1670, and Hipólito’s brother Agustín, who escaped, might have come from the Visayas to Cavite and Manila.41 For as Leyson points out, there is no evidence, indeed quite the contrary, that San Vitores was ever in the Visayas.

The Jesuit, Fr. Juan José Delgado, in his book of 1754 provides us a hint when he makes an impassioned refutation of the ill-tempered caricatures of the Indio written by Fr. Pedro Murillo Velarde, S.J., and Fray Gaspar de San Agustín, O.S.A., in their publications of the early eighteenth century. He points out at length, especially in his biting retort to his fellow-Jesuit Murillo, that it was the Indio, not the Spaniard, who did so many things without which the Spaniards would not be able to exist in the Philippines. Delgado had spent his life as a missionary in Cebu, Samar, Leyte, and Bohol, and it is evident from his writings that these were the places and the people, rather than Spanish-dominated Manila, which were close to his heart.42 In a long refutation, he singles out, among other things, the fact that it was the Filipinos who crewed the galleons that provided the life-blood of Spanish Manila. Moreover, he asks rhetorically, “Who provide Manila and the Spaniards with [coconut] oil? Is it not the Visayan Indios, who bring it to them every year in their ships?”(Delgado 1892, 300-1).

It seems likely that the situation was the same in the second half of the seventeenth century, and it was in such trade that Visayans might be likely to come to Cavite. Once there, they were often recruited for the galleons, as the example of Esteban, the Visayan interpreter who had been in the shipwreck of the Concepción in 1638, shows. Whether Pedro Calungsod was in Cavite or Manila, waiting to return in his ship to the Visayas, or was thinking of joining a galleon crew, he would have been a likely recruit for San Vitores, once he had shown himself ready to accept the conditions the latter laid
down for his lay companions. Though this cannot be more than a suggestion, no alternative has been offered. It certainly seems a more likely one than that Pedro was sent by the bishop of Cebu, or selected by the Jesuits in the Visayas [if he knew them!], suggestions made (and deemed unlikely, but unknowable) by Leyson (1999, 32). Rather, since he and the other lay companions were all volunteers, he had to have been in Cavite or Manila when San Vitores was recruiting, and this seems the most plausible reason for him to have been there. Of course this too would make it extremely unlikely that he was as young as fourteen when recruited.

THE LAY COMPANIONS OF SAN VITORES IN GENERAL

There is considerable confusion about the number and character of the companions (all companions, not just the lay missionaries) of San Vitores, among whom was Pedro Calungsod. Some of them were with him from Manila; others joined them in Mexico. For in the early years, before a special Manila-Marianas patache was constructed, the only way to go from Manila to the Marianas was to go first to Mexico by the northern route to Acapulco on the annual galleon. There the cargo was sold for Mexican silver, and then, after taking on the supplies for the Marianas, and often some passengers, proceeding by the southern route the galleon stopped at Guam on the way to Manila. This route was the discovery of the great Augustinian friar and navigator, Andrés de Urdaneta, which made Legazpi's successful voyage to the Philippines first possible.

In describing the original group that left Cavite in 1667, Leyson (1999, 30) speaks of Fr. Tomás Cardeñoso, "a complement of soldiers and a couple of survivors of the 1638 sinking of the Concepción in the Ladrones, among who [sic] was a Tagalog and the Visayan named Esteban." He adds "some boys" who "were also trained missionary catechists." This is incorrect. We will show that in the first mission which arrived in Agana in 1668 there were none who went specifically as soldiers (see Appendix I). We have, moreover, already dem-
onstrated that the Filipino companions were neither trained catechists, nor all boys, but voluntary missionary assistants of various ages.

When the San Diego left Manila, the only priests were Fathers Diego de San Vitores and Tomás Cardeñoso. In Mexico, however, they met a group of Jesuits on their way to the Philippines, and in accord with the permission he had from the Philippine provincial, San Vitores selected four of them—Fathers Luís de Medina, Luís de Morales, and Pedro de Casanova, together with the Jesuit scholastic, Brother Lorenzo Bustillos—thus bringing the total of Jesuits to six.46

Brother Marcelo Ansaldo, S.J., who was on the same ship leaving Acapulco but remained on it when it continued to the Philippines after its stopover in Guam, wrote in 1669 from Manila to the Queen that San Vitores had brought with him from Cavite “some” [algunos] Filipinos. Among the Filipinos, but not one of those chosen by San Vitores, would be Gabriel de la Cruz, the servant of Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos, mentioned below. There would also be two interpreters, survivors of the shipwreck of the Concepción in 1638 rescued in 1664.

Ansaldo likewise added that “three Spaniards also remained behind [in 1668] to help in this work of conversion.” One of these was certainly Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, who, as we have seen, accompanied San Vitores from Manila, precisely as a missionary, and went baptizing infants and dying people, and accompanying the priests just like the Filipinos, until he was obliged, presumably because of his earlier military career, to take charge of the defense of the mission in September 1671 (García 1683, 225).

Another Spaniard must have been Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos, who, being a good sailor, would later accompany Fr. Luis de Morales on his trip to Tinian. For reasons which neither San Vitores nor García make clear, though they connect his death in some way with the wounding of Morales for having baptized an infant, and they likewise seem to approve him as a person, five days after the wounding of Father Morales in August 1668, the Chamorros killed Castellanos in the sea, together with his servant [criado], a Tagalog
named Gabriel de la Cruz. Concerning the latter San Vitores is quoted: “... at least Gabriel de la Cruz died innocent of the cause they imputed to the sergeant” ([Ledesma] 1981, 204; García 1683, 232).

A third Spaniard must have been the “principal interpreter from Manila,” Don Francisco de Mendoza, of whom we shall say more below. Yet another Spaniard, whose omission from the number of three Spaniards we cannot explain with certainty, should have been the fourteen-year old youth, Diego Bazán, recruited by San Vitores in Mexico, whom García always calls Español or Españolito, as has been seen above. The question then is, how many of the “algunos” Filipinos in 1668 were missionary companions.

THE LAY INTERPRETERS

We place the interpreters in a special category because they were mostly not among San Vitores’s original volunteer missionary companions. Some of them, though not belonging to the first voyage, were truly missionary volunteers, and well-motivated, since they had come forward to join the mission when they found it—or it found them—in the Marianas. These were mature men, since they had been in the Marianas for thirty years, ever since the shipwreck of 1638. Several indeed proved themselves to be ardent apostles to the Chamorros, even martyrs, and these older ones were often the men in whom San Vitores put much trust, putting them in charge of churches which lacked priests.

It appears to have been somewhat different for the two “official” Filipino interpreters, who now returned to the Marianas after having been rescued by Admiral Esteban Ramos in 1664 ([Ledesma] 1981, 163). Since their presence was due only to their necessary function of being interpreters, it would seem that they lacked the missionary zeal that inspired the other volunteer lay companions from Manila. Hence it seems best to consider both groups of “interpreters” separately from those we have called the “missionary companions.”
Among those mentioned by Leyson as being the only ones from Manila, and spoken of above, there were two, one the unnamed Tagalog, mentioned by San Vitores in his introductory letter to his Arte, and the other, Esteban, a Visayan. Presumably they came voluntarily at San Vitores's request, since their two companions are not mentioned as having accompanied San Vitores in 1667. As we will see, though they apparently fulfilled their functions as interpreters satisfactorily, there is no indication that either of them was particularly ardent in the work of conversion. It would be different with the others, both those mentioned previously as having joined the mission in the Marianas, and the other companions we will discuss below.

Another man is said to have come on the galleon of 1669 "with the desire to aid the Marianos, a task he accomplished at the cost of many hardships and dangers" (García 1683, 456). Since he is one of the two whom San Vitores put in charge of the islands of Gani for two years in the inability of the Jesuits to get there, he must have had a previous knowledge of the language, and therefore have lived in the islands before, undoubtedly as a survivor of the shipwreck of the Concepción. This is further supported by the fact that he is mentioned as having married in the Gani islands (ibid.). He was therefore an interpreter, but much more. It is possible, therefore, that he was another of the original four survivors interviewed by San Vitores, who for some reason had not been included in the first expedition. Though García confessed to not having been able to find his name in the documents, he asserted that he was Filipino. This is unusual, since otherwise García ordinarily designates Filipinos by their nación—Visayan, Pampango, Tagalog, etc., rather than calling them Filipino. The term Indio is generally—though not always—reserved in García and most other documents of the time for the Chamorros. Those of Spanish blood, whether they be peninsulars, criollos, or Mexican mestizos, are normally referred to as Españoles. It is therefore unlikely that he was a Philippine-born Spaniard, though the term Filipino would be used for such in the nineteenth century. Moreover, he cannot be Don Francisco de Mendoza, since the latter went from Manila with San Vitores in 1667. It is therefore likely that he was a Filipino in
the modern sense of the term, and called such since, not even knowing his name, García would even less know from where in the Philippines he had come. The fact that he took a Chamorro wife would likewise make it likely that he was a Filipino, since this was uncommon among Spaniards until much later.

Other interpreters are mentioned in several places, all of whom joined San Vitores only after his arrival in Guam, like Lorenzo, a Malabar, who had settled in the Marianas after the shipwreck of 1638, but on hearing of the arrival of San Vitores and his mission, immediately joined the group. While baptizing an infant, he would be killed by Chamorros (García 1683, 250-51). Again we may say he was useful as an interpreter, but much more of a missionary apostle—and martyr.

Another who had remained in the Marianas from the Concepción, and also joined San Vitores only in Guam, was Francisco Maunahun, a native of Indang, Cavite, who had long lived among the Chamorros. He had met Fr. Luis de Morales in the northern island of Alamagan, and “was for four years the faithful companion of the Fathers, baptizing in their absence, and teaching according to his capacity (italics mine). He was in his last two years alone in taking care of the island and church of San Francisco Javier [Agrigan], attending to the baptisms and Doctrinas” (García 1683, 455-56). Maunahun, together with the unnamed Filipino interpreter who arrived in 1669 and who was one of those whom San Vitores put in charge of the islands of Gani, would be killed together in June 1672. The unnamed companion’s having been one of those shipwrecked on the Concepción would explain his apparently close friendship with Maunahun, as well as his ability to carry on alone on the islands of Gani for a long period.

There were at least two other interpreters, specifically designated as such—Pedro Jiménez and Don Francisco de Mendoza. Pedro Jiménez, who was the interpreter in 1670 at the interrogation of the two men responsible for the death of Fr. Luis de Medina and Hipólito de la Cruz (García 1683, 429), is not further identified, except in the later casual remark about his being the only companion left with San
Vitores after the baptism of Choco, so that it was necessary to send another man, because he "could scarcely help him in anything because of being so old" (García 1683, 230). It is clear from the context—though nothing is said of his native place—and from the fact that the honorific Don does not precede his name in either passage, that he was a Filipino. Given his advanced age, and the fact that he had a fluent command of Chamorro, such that even though the Jesuits, after two years in the Marianas, could more or less follow the interrogation, he was used as interpreter, makes it seem most probable that he was another survivor of the shipwreck of the Concepción thirty years earlier. This could of course explain his age. But we have no indication that he had been one of the four San Vitores had interviewed in Manila, and it seems he had settled in the Marianas after the shipwreck and only joined the mission after its arrival. With these facts in mind, particularly that no indication of his birthplace is given, it is just possible that he was the Filipino named Pedro from the Concepción shipwreck who brought his two year old daughter to be baptized on the day after the arrival of San Vitores. (Risco [1970, 118] calls him a Spaniard, but there is no basis for that in García’s text). For we never hear anything further of this specific man, though he is said by García to have been much esteemed by the Chamorros, and it would seem likely then that he would have played an important role. To have been one of the interpreters would therefore be a probable explanation of his importance while the relatively little activity recorded of him was no doubt due to his age (García 1683, 192).

Mendoza’s nationality is not identified, but the fact that he was called Don Francisco by San Vitores would indicate that he was a Spaniard, and not one of the four Filipinos rescued in 1664. This is further confirmed by the fact that García identifies him as natural de Filipinas, that is, born in the Philippines. All Filipinos are identified according to their nación, as has been noted above, and there was no need to say of what country they were natural. Being a Spaniard, and being designated by San Vitores and his Jesuit companions in their 1669 report of the first year as “the principal interpreter we had from Manila,” he must have been one of the group of Admiral Esteban
Ramos, who had managed to reach the Philippines shortly after the wreck of 1638 in a small boat, helped by some friendly Chamorros. In the report, dated 26 April 1669, he is cited as having taken testimony of two miraculous cures ([Ledesma] 1981, 206). In view of the date and the fact that he was from Manila, he must have accompanied San Vitores from Manila in 1667. For the 1669 galleon did not arrive in Guam until 14 June 1669, and it is clear that he had been active long before that. He is spoken of in 1670 as having come to warn San Vitores of the dangerous situation in Tinian and found him raised in an ecstasy (García 1683, 262). García likewise records a conversation between the two men that sounds more like one between two mature and educated Spaniards. If then, as seems certain, he was a Spaniard, we must certainly revise what Brother Ansaldo reported in the citation above, that there were only three Spaniards who remained behind.

THE LAY MISSIONARY COMPANIONS: THEIR NUMBERS

This leaves us with the problem of how many of the "algunos" Filipinos of whom Brother Ansaldo speaks, were in the strict sense missionary companions, as Pedro Calungsod was. Leyson accepts a much larger total figure for the group that disembarked in Guam in 1668 than that of which we have so far indicated the elements, but only from a secondary source. However, his assertion can hardly be reconciled with the eyewitness account of Brother Ansaldo. When the San Diego left Agana for the Philippines, Leyson says it left behind:

the little mission of approximately fifty men: five Jesuit priests, one Jesuit student, three Spanish officers and about forty-one non-Spaniards. These latter were mostly Filipinos but included some Mexican mestizos of Spanish and Indian descent. Thirty-one of the non-Spaniards were soldiers and the remainder either catechists or servants (Leyson 1999, 38; citing Rogers 1995, 47). 49
The figure for Jesuits is correct, as is that for three Spaniards, if we admit that Bazán was overlooked because of his youth. But as we have seen, the three Spaniards whom Brother Ansaldo mentions were not all officers—only Captain Juan de Santa Cruz and Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos. Moreover Santa Cruz and Don Francisco de Mendoza (and Bazán) were there primarily as missionaries, and probably so was Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos.50 The first “soldiers” in the proper sense of the word would be the six who would arrive on the galleon San José in 1669. Since they came from Mexico, almost certainly all were Spaniards or Mexicans. The figure of thirty-one non-Spaniards as soldiers is probably a confusion of the thirty-one mostly provisional “soldiers” of the much later siege of September-October 1671, spoken of in Appendix I, which included all the laymen present in Agana—Spaniards, lay Filipino missionaries and interpreters, soldiers of the 1669 and June 1671 galleons. Furthermore there were no Mexican mestizos in 1668—Bazán was a criollo, a Mexican-born Spaniard. Other Mexicans, whether criollo or mestizo, would come only on the galleons of 1669 or 1671.

The total number of men in the Marianas mission at the time of the 1671 siege of Agana, out of which the thirty-one must be deducted, includes the lay missionary from the Philippines who arrived in 1669. He (and perhaps Maunahun), however, would have been absent in the islands of Gani at this time, since he is said to have spent four years taking care of the church there before his martyrdom. In addition, there were the first six regular soldiers, who also arrived on the galleon San José in 1669, among whom must have been Sergeant Major Juan de Santiago,51 and the probable three or four soldiers who arrived in 1671. Moreover, we know of one Filipino, Pedro Basijan of the Visayan village of Salug,52 who had accompanied Fr. Francisco Solano in 1671, and took part in the defense of Agana (García 1683, 451).53 (Also part of the mission, though not included in the thirty-one besieged in Agana, were four lay companions, who were in Tinian with Fr. Alonso López and could not be called back in time when danger seemed to threaten [García 1683, 277]). On the other hand, those killed between 1669 and 1671 must
be added to the result to ascertain the original number of 1668. But the only ones who had come from outside the Marianas—apart from Fr. Luís de Medina—were the Visayan Hipólito de la Cruz and the Tagalog Gabriel de la Cruz among the Filipinos; and Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos and the Mexican (one of the six soldiers who arrived in 1669), José Peralta, among those designated as Spaniards. (The latter was killed while working alone, cutting wood for crosses by Chamorros who coveted his machete). It is impossible therefore that the number of persons who had arrived in 1668 comprised anywhere near fifty. Summing up the evidence for 1668, the laymen included no active soldiers, and apart from the three Spaniards, Diego Bazán, the two interpreters from the 1638 shipwreck, and the servant of Sergeant Castellanos, all others were Filipino lay missionaries, among whom the fifty-six year old soon-to-become donado, Brother Felipe Sonson, should be included. Inasmuch as all the sources say that there were among the “soldiers” of the siege twelve Spaniards (including Mexicans, whether criollos or mestizos, since the accounts divide the “soldiers” into the two categories of “Spaniards” and “Filipinos”), there were nineteen (or seventeen) Filipinos acting as soldiers, depending on which source one uses for the total number of besieged in 1671 (García 1683, 278; Leyson 1999, 60, citing Fr. Andrés de Ledesma). The total of Filipino lay missionary companions in 1668, then, with the subtraction from the 1671 figure of the two original interpreters, Pedro Basijan, and Gabriel de la Cruz, and the addition of the four with Fr. Alonso López in 1671, and of the martyred Hipólito de la Cruz, must then have been (and it can only be an educated guess) no more than twenty. This is, of course, the number San Vitores had set as a target when he was recruiting. Some of them were quite young, like the Pampango, Andrés de la Cruz, others quite old. It is very unlikely there were any further servants of Spaniards besides Gabriel de la Cruz, unless possibly Andrés de la Cruz might have been one—which would account more satisfactorily for his tender age of over twelve, as well as his readiness to kill the wounded enemy, so unlike the attitude San Vitores inculcated in his lay missionary companions.
THE QUALITY OF THE FILIPINO LAY MISSIONARIES

This much being said about the numbers, it seems necessary to look also at the quality of San Vitores's lay companions, particularly those who formed his first volunteers and arrived with him in Guam in 1668, among whom was Pedro Calungsod. We have already said what can be known of the four Spaniards, including the ardent and courageous Diego Bazán. Of the Filipinos, we have already spoken of the donado Brother Felipe Sonson, who lived with the Jesuits themselves in Agana, a man of deep spirituality, who in reality merited the palm of martyrdom, even though he took several months to die of the wounds inflicted on him in late 1684. The very fact that he received the honor of a lengthy biography in the Jesuit Annual Letter of 1686 from Fr. Lorenzo Bustillos, who had known him for almost twenty years, shows that he was more a Jesuit than a lay assistant, especially after he took his vows before San Vitores in 1669 (Schumacher 1995, 266-85; esp. 276-77).

A second category was composed of those who had been sailors on the galleon Concepción when it was shipwrecked in the Marianas in 1638. All of the survivors, including the Spaniard, Don Francisco de Mendoza, were linguistically qualified to become interpreters for the missionaries because of their stay in the islands. Even more would this be true of those who had spent the full intervening thirty years in the islands. Such would be Lorenzo, the Malabar (probably a former slave of a Spaniard in Manila, where the Portuguese habitually sold non-Filipino slaves, allegedly made prisoners in a just war, taken from the Malabar coast in India), and Francisco de Maunahun. These two, of course, joined fully in the work of the mission when they found San Vitores, and died for their faith.

Also among these shipwrecked sailors were the four Filipinos rescued in 1664 by Admiral Esteban Ramos from the Marianas, who, as we have seen, were presented to San Vitores in 1665. To what extent these were anxious to return as part of the missionary enterprise is not at all clear, but from the fact that at least two of the Filipinos accompanied San Vitores, and presumably the other two
did not, it seems clear they went voluntarily, whatever may have been their motives. If the interpreter who came on the galleon of 1669 was one of these Filipinos, he would be a third. In any case his motivation was primarily and explicitly religious, since García tells us that he came “with the desire to help the Marianos, which he fulfilled with many trials and dangers” (1683, 456). Though he married a native woman, this did not interrupt his missionary vocation, for he brought her with him, “to keep himself from the occasion of offending God, to whom he offered many souls.” He remained, as we have noted above, carrying on an apostolate to the best of his ability in the islands of Gani, until his death when he was trying to bring priests there to make more effective his efforts. Rather than an interpreter, though he was qualified for that, he became an apparently highly effective missionary apostle.

Certainly a part of the same shipwrecked group were the two “professional” interpreters, who definitely were in the first mission with San Vitores, but who have left uncertain records. The one who helped San Vitores in the task of compiling his vocabulary was the unnamed Tagalog. San Vitores wrote of him:

At the time that I am writing this aboard the ship, we have the oral explanation of a certain interpreter—a Tagalog both by nation and by language. He possesses good enough talent and ability to express himself, but cannot write even in our [Spanish] letters. He was left behind from the wreck of the ship named after the Immaculate Conception, which by lucky chance occurred in the Marianas Islands, where he spent seventeen years [sic] living and dealing with the natives of those islands. Now through the great generosity of God and the most blessed Virgin we use him as an interpreter (preface to “Grammaticae Institutiones Marianae Linguae,” in Burrus 1954, 941).

However, after that, nothing more is heard of him in the Marianas, as far as the documents go, and we do not even know his name.
His companion, the Visayan Esteban, is said to have served the mission laudably for some time as interpreter after their arrival. However, as the chronicler puts it, “tired of such a hard life, and desirous of freedom [libertad], he went off to live in the licentiousness of the natives” (García 1683, 291-92). One might surmise that having lived so long a life among the young Chamorro men (the urritaos) whose way of life was seen as nothing but licentiousness by the missionaries, once having left the Philippines again and then lived under the strict regime of San Vitores, he reverted to the way in which he had very likely spent most of his adult life before being “rescued” by Admiral Esteban Ramos. He did not have the motivation to continue to live a life which was not only to be Christian and an example to the Chamorros, according to the ideals of San Vitores, but which involved considerable sacrifices for the rest of his life due to the precarious state of the mission in the face of considerable Chamorro hostility. It is notable that there is no mention of his having previously married a Chamorro woman or settled down to have a family. Most probably then he had lived the licentious life of the urritaos in the so-called “bachelors’ houses” of the villages). It was in seeking him out (unsuccessfully) that San Vitores and Pedro Calungsod would instead encounter martyrdom.

A third category of the Filipinos was the compañeros, including of course Pedro Calungsod, who formed the volunteer group of lay missionaries in Manila or Cavite. At the time of the three-day debate between San Vitores and the Chinese pagan castaway Choco, who had caused the missionaries so much trouble with his lying stories that the water of baptism or the oil of anointing were poisonous means of killing all Chamorros, Choco finally agreed to be baptized (although, as events proved, he was totally insincere). Just before the baptism, two of San Vitores’s four Filipino companions suddenly began to act in a hysterical fashion, and while one named Bautista fled to the mountains, the other turned on San Vitores with a knife. In an effort to quiet the agitated Chamorro spectators, San Vitores turned to him and smilingly said: “What are you doing, my son?” When Captain Juan de Santa Cruz attempted to stop him, he stabbed the latter three times in one arm (García 1683, 227-28).
San Vitores’s reaction was typical of him, although—or perhaps because—he saw the event as a direct intervention of the devil. As he laughingly told the amazed Chamorros in an effort to quiet their unrest, they should not be scandalized, since it was the devil, not the two Filipino renegades who did what they did. He sent the frustrated assassin as a prisoner to Agana, “not to punish him as guilty, but so that he might not lose him as a fugitive out of fear of being punished” (García 1683, 230). Similarly, he made efforts to locate Bautista until—as he said—it was revealed to him in a dream that the fugitive was in great danger of losing his soul, hiding with Choco. He sent another Filipino named Torres to bring back “this poor fellow [majo] who had worked laudably from the beginning of the mission, and continued to do so afterwards.” San Vitores, however, prudently “did not occupy him anymore in accompanying the Fathers, in order to keep him from any occasions [of temptation], and kept him in Agana exercising the office of carpenter, of which he had a reasonable knowledge” (ibid.).

This was not the only desertion among the chosen companions. In January 1671, since the missionary of Santa Ana [Zarpana; today Rota] was sick, and there was unrest among the leading men, San Vitores spent some weeks in revivifying the faith in the island and pacifying the unrest. On his return to Agana, however, he found that

some [algunos] of the lay companions, who formerly had helped him in the cultivation of the vineyard of the Lord, in their desire for freedom [libertad], had fled to some apostate villages which had rebelled in his absence. He was much afflicted by this because of the soldiers he was losing, and much more, because they were going to perdition and could lead others that way (García 1683, 265).

One may observe that here and elsewhere in García’s account, presumably reflecting the feelings of his sources, for the missionaries libertad, a word often used and always in a derogatory sense, was not a good but an evil. It meant “freeing” themselves from the restraints of an exemplary Christian life, and from the implicit prom-
ises they had made in volunteering for the mission, just as the Jesuits
had bound themselves by their vows and their missionary vocation.
Libertad was therefore the equivalent of betrayal of their missionary
vocation, and inevitably connoted licentiousness at the urritas's pub-
lic houses.

San Vitores was a man of great personal austerity, though equally
or more noted for his kindness to those who were weaker than he. It
is significant that when he was martyred, he was out risking his life in
search of one who had abandoned him and fled to libertad. Nonethe-
less, for the sake of the mission he made stringent demands on those
who were to carry it out with him, and in spite of his original diffi-
culty in finding volunteers, he was quite ready, even insistent, that
those who could not find in themselves the strength to live according
to the needs of a successful evangelization, would do better to stay
behind. Thus, as we have seen, all the lay volunteers were informed
that they must abstain wholly from alcoholic beverages, such as tuba,
because a failure in this matter would only do harm among a people
whose culture did not yet include drinking sprees. He himself, when
he reached Agana, made up his mind no longer to take chocolate, the
ordinary drink of Spaniards in the Philippines, and though he did not
impose his mortification on anyone else, all the Jesuits followed his
example (see Appendix II).

Though we do not have any detailed account of what daily life
was like in the main mission compound in Agana, there is no doubt
that it was often demanding, particularly on the young men. They
had to be ready for different tasks around the mission compound, to
have their schedule of work and prayer carefully determined for them
(they joined the Jesuits for Litanies, the rosary, and other prayers in
the evening), to accompany the missionary in good weather or bad,
always going unarmed when with a priest, whether the situation was
dangerous or not, traveling from island to island in fragile canoes.
Some, at least, were relatively young men, living and working among
a people who in the beginning went completely naked, for lack of
any cloth on the islands, only the women wearing a little covering of
some kind, called tifis, over their private parts. Even if San Vitores
in one of his letters says that this no longer disturbed the Jesuit missionaries, though he was trying to supply as many Chamorros as he could with some clothing, it is unlikely that the situation was the same for the lay companions, especially the young ([Ledesma] 1981, 205).

After all, none of them, with the exception of the older Felipe Sonson, had taken a vow of chastity like the Jesuits. But if they were to be examples to the Chamorros of exemplary Christianity, in the circumstances they were obliged in fact to live such a vow. There is no mention (with the possible exception of the Tagalog interpreter we have conjectured) of San Vitores having sent any of the companions back to the Philippines—even when that was a possibility with the yearly galleon, which often did not arrive. But one can be sure that he did not tolerate any scandal among the lay missionaries. Though we have narrated more than one example of truly heroic virtue among them, it would be against all probability that some, not only like the interpreter Esteban, but even among the volunteers, would not at times find the life irksome, and go off, like those narrated above, in search of libertad amid the licencias of the Chamorros.

Here we see the enormous moral ascendency that San Vitores had, not only among those of the Chamorros who were well disposed, but much more among the long-Catholic Filipinos. When he heard of the compañeros who had escaped from their commitments, he showed no anger, nor did he even send reliable persons like Captain Juan de Santa Cruz with a force of men to bring them back. Rather, after personal prayer and penance, and asking the same from the other Jesuits, he sent a messenger with letters for each.

[These were] full of affection, persuading them that they should return to the camp of Jesus Christ, whose soldiers they were, and not cast a stain on their honor and conscience, which in this life could be removed with tears, but in the next would have to be paid for with eternal fire. He was not so unmindful of human weakness as not to pardon them, nor did he lack the charity of God, to receive them back within
his heart if they should return repentant (García 1683, 265).63

Persuaded by his charity, they did return repentant, and he received them as he had said with an affectionate embrace of each one, rejoicing at their repentance. But conscious as he was that this repentance might be short-lived under the pressures that would continue and that they would again be tempted to take a similar flight, he reinforced his words with an action that one can only imagine in a man like San Vitores.

But in order that such gentleness might not make them take the seriousness of their fault lightly, he bared his own shoulders, and began to lay blows on them with a scourge of small steel disks, which bathed his shoulders with blood, until the culprits, ashamed and filled with pity, took it from his hands. He said to them: "My sons, between you and myself we have to satisfy God for this fault. Repentance and confession is your part, and I will make the satisfaction and penance for the fault" (García 1683, 266).

Alien as his action seems today, and based on a theology of placating God's anger for sin that we can no longer share, not only its heroicity but also its effectiveness cannot be denied. Again, characteristically, he was not content with making a deeply emotional, but in the end transitory, impression, but showed the sound psychology with which he handled his companions and kept them loyal under difficult conditions.

Knowing that idleness was the occasion of their fault, he placed them as apprentices to other soldiers who had particular tasks, so that their being occupied would restrain their thoughts and keep them from vices. At the same time they would be of profit to the [Chamorro] nation, which was lacking in all crafts, teaching them by example and by the practice of useful occupations, necessary to the commonwealth (ibid.).

The point of relating these various incidents among the lay com-
companions of San Vitores is to show that there were great differences among them as to their understanding of the mission, and their commitment to it. It is clear from the biography of Brother Felipe Sonson that he had the highest spiritual motivation, and was deeply devoted to the idea of working for those who had not yet heard of God. His missionary zeal could easily stand comparison with that of the Jesuits themselves, to whom he attached himself, though with great humility. We can gather from the way that the loyalty of Pedro Calungsod is praised that he shared such a zeal and loyalty.

To put the lay compañeros' commitment, or failure of it, in context, we may take an analogy from the Jesuits themselves. It is evident from the list of Jesuits in the Marianas from 1668 to 1769, when they were expelled by the decree of Carlos III, that though it would appear that all were eager volunteers for the mission, and in the first decades often eager for martyrdom, once in the Marianas not all were able to adjust, physically, psychologically and/or spiritually, to the conditions in which they had to live and work. Not a few returned to the Philippines. Of the first six Jesuits, three went back to the Philippines after three years of the mission to complete their studies, but of these three, only Lorenzo Bustillo returned after his three years of studies, to remain as a missionary for another forty-one years. Of those who arrived in the first two decades, a few died of natural causes, but the great majority died at the hands of the Chamorros. Of those who did not, most left the Marianas after one to three years. However, there were notable exceptions. Fr. Tomás Cardeñoso, San Vitores's original companion, remained there till his death in 1715, a total of forty-seven years.

If this is true of the highly trained and generally strongly-motivated Jesuits, it evidently would be likely to be more so among the companions chosen by San Vitores, no matter how careful he was to lay down the conditions for joining the mission. Pedro Calungsod had to live among others, not only of different ages, but also of varying degrees of spiritual commitment and fidelity to Christian life. Just as it is incorrect to suppose that all the lay missionary companions were of approximately the same age, it would be equally incor-
rect to think that all had the same sense of missionary vocation as, for example, Felipe Sonson, the only one on whom we have a concrete description of his spiritual and moral life from such an authoritative source as Fr. Lorenzo Bustillos. It would also not be surprising if some of the young ones volunteered, sincerely no doubt, but more out of a sense of adventure, without a mature realization of the sacrifices they should be prepared for.

**LEARNING THE CHAMORRO LANGUAGE: SAN VITORES**

If the lay missionaries had not previously been trained as regular catechists, as we have indicated above, what functions did they have, and how were they able to carry them out? Though we have spoken of informal, conversational communication of the Faith, even this raises the question of the language and how the missionaries, Jesuit or lay, learned the language and how to preach and instruct in it. The question was even more acute for the Jesuits who joined the mission in Mexico, since they had no knowledge of cognate Philippine languages to help them, nor would they have been able to communicate well with the interpreters from the shipwreck of the Concepción, at least in a way by which they would be able to learn the Chamorro language. For the lay missionary volunteers, who would presumably learn the language more quickly, there was the problem of how to explain, or give instructions in, Christian doctrine, for which they had no previous preparation. For both needs, San Vitores had already, or would soon, provide.

First we must deal with the language, seeing not only San Vitores’s own linguistic achievements and how well he learned the language, but also how he created the means by which his companions would be able to learn it. All the sources agree that San Vitores himself had an extraordinary capacity for learning languages, so much so that his enthusiastic admirers attributed to him a supernatural gift for learning them, like the commander of the galleon San Diego, General Antonio Nieto, observing him correct the non-Tagalog Filipinos on the ship when they faltered at his questioning them on some words
of their prayers. Father Lorenzo Bustillos, his devoted companion as a scholastic from Mexico onwards, even further exaggerated San Vitores’s ability, speaking of how he had learned Tagalog in the Philippines, something that Bustillos could only have known from hearsay. He is cited for the following claim:

Father Bustillos, besides repeating that Father San Vitores spoke all the languages in Mindoro, says in a letter to Father Guillen, that God had given him a very special gift of tongues, by which he understood and spoke all the languages there are in the Philippines. He knew the Mariana language with total perfection, composing in it a grammar [arte], vocabulary, and catechism. On the voyage from the Philippines to Mexico, before entering the islands, he used to correct those Filipinos whom he was bringing as interpreters of this language, thus becoming teacher of his teachers, and teaching what he had not learned. On the same voyage, as we said, he showed himself to know the languages of all the nations who were coming in the ship (García 1683, 366-67).

Obviously, Father Bustillos must have written that letter when he had very little or no experience of the Philippines, to think that anyone could know, or even demonstrate that he knew supernaturally, all Philippine languages. Either he, or more probably García, confuses the assertion made elsewhere that San Vitores knew all the languages of Mindoro with the idea of his knowing all those of the Philippines. Even with regard to knowing all the languages of Mindoro, the mission which San Vitores conducted in Mindoro—in which Bustillos was not present, of course—resulted in three Christian settlements, two of Mangyans and one of Cimarrones. The latter were, at least in their great majority, native Tagalogs, who for one reason or another had fled to the mountains, a common phenomenon in all parts of the Philippines at that time, whether to flee from justice, or to escape from tribute and forced labor, or because of an unwillingness to settle down in a Christian village. As for the Mangyans, it is possible that San Vitores learned something of one of their languages, but most of them too would have had a familiar-
ity with Tagalog from their trading contacts with the lowlands, as well as from their dealings with the Cimarrones. Indeed, in García’s own account of this mission in Mindoro (1683, 139-55), the only language he ever explicitly mentions San Vitores using is Tagalog, certainly in the hymns and prayers. There is no mention of any other language or of a need for an interpreter by him or his companion and former Tagalog teacher, the donado, Brother Marcos Cruz. The statement about knowing the languages of all the “nations” on the ship is very likely hearsay from General Nieto, as explained above, the “nations” being the different linguistic groups of Filipinos. That there were men of other nationalities on board, who did not speak at least some Spanish, is very unlikely. A truer picture of San Vitores’s linguistic abilities is to be found in his own words to a close friend and fellow-Jesuit in Spain, the Father Guillen mentioned above. Writing from the village of Taytay, where he had gone to study Tagalog full-time, he says:

The language is truly difficult, without any relation to those of Europe, though the languages of the Philippines have a great resemblance to one another, and it is only to Hebrew [!] that it has some resemblance. But since with my little ability, I can already carry on the ministry more or less and speak what is necessary for the salvation of these poor people, who would not be animated, with the grace of Our Lord and the Acto de Contrición? ([Ledesma] 1981, 131).  

Earlier in the same letter, he had explained how he had come to break through the barrier of learning a difficult language. He had started studying it, as most missionaries did, through the prism of Latin.

I had scarcely begun to study the nominative cases of this Tagalog language [...] when to practice the language I had some good Filipinos who knew Spanish translate the Acto de Contrición in the format of the saintly Father Gerónimo López, with all its maxims and Ave Marías [...] 

And so I attribute to the Acto de Contrición the facility
that Our Lord gave me so that before three months of language-study, I could hear confessions ordinarily well, and preach or converse. [...] In my ordinary speaking with the Filipinos, with practice God goes on giving me what is necessary. And when I find myself at a loss for words, I go to my Acto de Contrición, in which we cannot get lost ([Ledesma] 1981, 128).

By the time he met the four survivors of the Concepción in 1664, he had mastered Tagalog, and apparently used a similar method in learning Chamorro with one or more of these prospective interpreters. The editor of his so-called “grammar and catechism,” referring to San Vitores’s supposed supernatural gift of languages, speaks to the point when he says:

More interesting and important than such legends is the sound method that he employed in acquiring a new language: a native instructor to give him the correct pronunciation and vocabulary, a systematic study of the language, accompanied by a comparison with a similar one (Burrus 1954, 935, n. 5).71

This “grammar and catechism” that Burrus published from the Jesuit Roman Archives is undoubtedly the Arte of which Father Bustillos speaks, as becomes evident both from its title and from its contents. It is not really a catechism.72 The first part, the grammar properly so-called, after a few detailed pages on pronunciation, gives an explanation of the language by means of a meticulous explanation of the use of the parts of speech. This is followed by some practice in the phrases necessary to introduce the missionaries to the Chamorros and to explain to them the purpose of their coming. Only in the second part do we find what seem at first glance to be catechetical instructions. Examined more closely, however, this part contains only a fraction of what composed the Tagalog Doctrina Cristiana, but at the same time it contains a good deal more of other religious matters. First, this second part proceeds to the form of interrogating an adult before baptism. Here it becomes evident that this whole catechetical section is intended not for his lay companions, but for the Jesuit priests. For, pleading lack of time, he says he
omits the Latin formula found in the *Manuale Romanum*, evidently presupposing that this would be well known by memory to priests. In place of it, he announces his intention to prepare still another document for the sake of the lay companions. “In another document, more suitable for the use of our mission here and now, a Spanish version will be added, more convenient here and now, so that even our lay companions may supply the lack of priests present by administering sacred baptism even to adults in case of necessity” (Burrus 1954, 953). 

To this he adds a third part, giving a simple profession of faith, an expression of contrition for sins, and the desire of receiving baptism; then the Apostles’ Creed, with a brief explanation of the next life. Finally the Decalogue, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Ave Maria conclude the work. It is evident that this is not modeled on the Tagalog *Doctrina Cristiana*, but is totally oriented toward giving the priest the means to explain the bare essentials of Christian belief and morality to be held by one urgently wishing to receive baptism, with a few of the important prayers added. Though Burrus only summarizes the long letter of San Vitores (twenty-five folios!) to his Jesuit brothers in Manila and Rome who might follow him, he relates that in it he explained the nature of the treatise, how and why he composed it, how he intended to add to it and to perfect it. He had not intended to send any copy of it until he could correct it in the light of long experience in the ministry among the natives, but upon seeing how much even such a rudimentary manual had assisted him in instructing them, he decided to let others benefit by it, inasmuch as with it at hand he has been able to receive sixteen adults and thirty-four children of catechumens into the Faith. Thus, he felt that its practical worth had already been demonstrated (Burrus 1954, 936).

In fact, the letter is dated 18 June 1668, just two days after he had arrived in Agana. He had given his first instructions to the assembled people, and performed the baptisms of old and sick adults and some children whose parents had signified their desire to be-
come Christians. This brief treatise was all that he could manage to have copied because of the early departure of the galleon for Manila, though he had much more to say, especially to urge other Jesuits to come and join his little group.

It seems clear that the "grammar and catechism" itself had been composed before he left the Philippines, as it was a preliminary to any further use of the language. Certainly he also composed at least a first draft of the *Doctrina Cristiana* in the Philippines, or more probably, with the help of an interpreter translated the Tagalog *Doctrina Cristiana*. This would be used for the children in the school, and for the ordinary adult catechumens, not in proximate danger of death. There is frequent mention of such a *Doctrina Cristiana*, but what Burrus published is not it, and no doubt it is lost today. What has survived and was published by Burrus, is his preliminary attempt to provide an instrument for himself and for the other Jesuit priests to learn the basics of the language and be able to begin to preach and instruct in it. It is certain also that this was only one of several compositions by San Vitores, some for himself, some for the Jesuit missionaries, others for his lay missionary companions like Pedro Calungsod. What they were can only be gathered from scattered references in the primary sources and certain deductions, and will be treated below.

Before San Vitores could compose anything to help his companions, he had to learn the language himself. This principally took place back in the Philippines. It seems likely that he devoted himself to this from the time that he met the four Filipinos rescued by Admiral Esteban Ramos in 1665, since he immediately began to press his plea that missionaries be sent to the Marianas. This gave him two years before the mission departed from Cavite, but, of course, he was heavily engaged in other occupations of the ministry. According to the catalogs of the Philippine Jesuit Province for the years 1664 to 1666, he was prefect of studies [dean of faculties] in the University of San Ignacio during all of this time, spiritual director and confessor of the Jesuit community, and engaged in pastoral work among both Spaniards and Filipinos ([Ledesma] 1981, 126-27). At the same time he was engaged in writing to the king (later the queen-
regent), to his father, and to others who would make the mission possible, as well as in negotiating with local authorities in Manila. The grammar studied above, as well as the main part of his introductory letter, must have been composed at this time, even though the early part of the introductory letter, telling of his first success, must have been written in Agana.  

From what we know of his method of learning Tagalog, the grammar was no doubt drawn up on the basis of analysis of certain key texts, which, with the help of one or more of his interpreters, he translated or had them translate. In contrast to his study of Tagalog, however, he had no book of formal grammar and its rules to begin with, but had to create his own. Therefore he had to have some substantial texts that he could analyze for this purpose. Here is where we see his linguistic genius in being able to extract general rules out of a simple text. Most probably the first texts he would have used were what we would expect from him—the two mentioned by García—the *Doctrina Cristiana* and the *Acto de Contricción* (1683, 322). On the basis of the Chamorro translation of these, done with or by the interpreter(s), he would have been able to determine, with his/their help, the rules for pronunciation, and analyze the grammatical structure of the language, the two parts that make up the main grammatical section of the surviving “grammar and catechism.” With these as a basis, he could then proceed to learn the language by conversing with the interpreters.  

On the voyage itself, both before and after the stay in Mexico, San Vitores would have worked on others of his various compositions in the Chamorro language. The so-called “grammar and catechism,” which should be identified with the *Arte*, as well as the *Acto de Contricción*, and at least a first draft of a *Doctrina Cristiana* having been completed in the Philippines, on the voyage, probably even from Cavite onward, and perhaps also on the Acapulco-Guam leg of the trip, he worked on his *Vocabulario*, probably with the help of two or more interpreters. This too was probably principally intended for the use of the Jesuit missionaries, and therefore would have been a Spanish-Chamorro vocabulary, since those Jesuits who joined him
in Mexico would be most in need of such an aid. Moreover, one must keep in mind that all these tools for learning the Chamorro language were written out by hand by San Vitores, and though undoubtedly handwritten copies were made by others, it was hardly likely that these could have been many, certainly not enough for each of the lay missionary companions. Indeed it is not unlikely that some of these would have been unable—like his Tagalog interpreter—to read, much less write, in Spanish letters, though this would be less true in the 1660s than in the time when those shipwrecked in 1638 had gone to sea.

It is not impossible that, as Leyson says, on the voyage Pedro and the other lay missionary companions “were busy learning Chamorro” (1999, 34), though it is highly unlikely that there was anything like a systematic class for them, or even that it kept them busy much of the time. That has never been the way Filipinos learned cognate languages. The interpreters would have been incapable of giving such a class, since they themselves had learned the language unsystematically. It is possible that the Filipino lay missionaries managed to pick up some of the language from the Filipino interpreters, but one ought not expect that there was any regulated learning of the language on their part. For one thing, the Filipino interpreters seem to have been only two, and the companions close to twenty, apart from the Jesuits who had joined in Mexico and knew no Philippine language. This fact further confirms the supposition that the lay Filipinos, many, if not most, of whom would have had only a rough knowledge of Spanish, picked up on shipboard only a rough basic knowledge, at best, of the Chamorro language. They would learn it more fully from the Chamorros themselves when they were already in the Marianas.

The vocabulary was probably substantially finished on the trip from Cavite to Mexico. In any case, work on it would have to be interrupted during the two or more months he spent in Mexico, when San Vitores had many affairs to attend to, particularly the financing of the mission. By this time, however, he must have had more than a fair grasp of the language, since he had begun to compose songs in
it. For on the voyage from Mexico to Guam he already had some of these prepared, and continued to compose similar ones day by day, to fit with the liturgy of the day. It is evident that he had some musical ability, composing and singing songs of his own composition in Chamorro, as he had done in the Philippines in Tagalog. No doubt this too contributed considerably to his proficiency in the language. On the ship itself he conducted a Chamorro liturgy (or paraliturgy).

He celebrated Holy Week with its processions and images [pasos], and the feasts of the principal saints as they occurred, with all the solemnity that the lack of space on the ship permitted; and he composed hymns [villancicos] to the saints in the Mariana language, so that they might help him with their intercession toward the conversion of those natives, whose language was already being employed in their praises. In this way he practiced the Mariana language, of which he began to compose a vocabulary, aiding himself with an interpreter whom he himself corrected when the latter erred. He learned it so perfectly that on the feast of St. John the Baptist in the same year, eight days after having entered the Marianas, on the feast of the Sacrament [Corpus Christi], which was reserved for that day, he preached during it with such elegance and propriety that the natives were in admiration (García 1683, 190). 80

Nor was this the end of his efforts to dominate the language. He put the Doctrina Cristiana to music (probably later)81 to make it more attractive and easy to memorize for the Chamorros as well, and even to attract those less well disposed.

Going through the countryside, during the time that he was not occupied in prayer, he sang in the Mariana language the Doctrina Cristiana, to invite those who were hidden in the thick forests. On entering a village, even if it were of the most hostile, he used to raise his banner, and sing along the road some little couplets he had composed as an invitation to listen to the Doctrina Cristiana. If there was a cross in the vil-
lage, he would go directly to venerate it, and after prayer, he would go through all the houses of the village without exception, baptizing and hearing the confessions of those who had a need and were capable, explaining in all of them the Christian doctrine, and singing some prayers which he had composed in Mariana verse, to ask from God temporal and spiritual benefits for that house and village, and especially that they be delivered from the Anito or devil (García 1683, 236).

This use of songs was continual, and must have helped not only San Vitores, who exercised his ability in composing them, but would have been an aid to his missionary companions, Jesuit and lay, toward learning the language. On seeing the fondness of the Chamorros for singing and dancing, he put forward even more efforts to take advantage of this natural aid to memorizing the essentials of Christianity.

He composed in the verse of the [Chamorro] language a very devout supplication to the Virgin, in order to banish the prayers they make to their Anitos; he put to music the sweet names of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, because the Chamorros are fond of music. And because they are dancers by nature, he used to dance and sing with them, in order to attach them to the Doctrina Cristiana (García 1683, 322).

As in so many other respects, exaggerations and legends grew up around the linguistic ability of San Vitores and his mastery of the Chamorro language, just as they had about his mastery of Tagalog. Devoted admirers of the man, like Admiral Esteban Ramos and Father Lorenzo Bustillos, especially after his martyrdom, often delivered themselves of improbable exaggerations, or spoke more from admiration and affection of this charismatic figure than observable facts warrant. In such exaltation of his allegedly supernatural gifts, they fail to make clear the ingenuity, the careful analysis, and the continual recourse to plain hard work in achieving what he could, leaving the rest to God.

The accounts of his first talks or sermons on arrival in Agana
indicate this, as has already been seen in the account of his sermon for the feast of St. John the Baptist shortly after his arrival. It may well have been highly impressive to the Chamorros—no one else was really in a position to judge—but if so, we can be sure that this was the fruit of diligent preparation, as in all his endeavors. A comparison of the description of his first address to the Chamorros on the morning after the arrival of the San Diego in Agana is an indication. A modern writer, who, however, made use of original documents for his somewhat novelistic presentation of San Vitores’s life says: “Father San Vitores had already mastered the language of the islanders with such perfection that according to one report they marveled at the correctness of his speech, the propriety of the idioms he used and even his pronunciation of the words” (Risco 1970, 121).82 Brother Marcelo Ansaldo, however, is perhaps more realistic. In his letter to the queen, he describes what he saw on the ship on the night before, when many Chamorros came aboard: “All that night there were many natives on the ship, and since the Father had learned a good part of the language of the Ladrones . . . with this he could teach them that night many matters of our Holy Faith ([Ledesma] 1981, 200; italics mine). Nonetheless, his linguistic accomplishment was, in sober fact, quite extraordinary.

**LEARNING CHAMORRO:
THE OTHER MISSIONARIES**

The other Jesuit missionaries, as may be supposed, were in a much more difficult position, at least the four who had joined the mission only in Mexico. (Father Cardeñoso may well have worked along with San Vitores from the Philippines, and most likely knew Tagalog or Visayan). Not only did they have no knowledge of cognate Philippine languages to help them, but they could have begun to study San Vitores’s grammar only on the voyage between Mexico and the Marianas, which, of course, gave them little or no practice in actually speaking.83 Brother Ansaldo indicates their early methods of preaching in the same account of the landing in Agana (199-200):

That very afternoon the pilot, Father Luís de Medina, su-
perior of the mission to the Philippines, and an interpreter who knew the language well, went ashore . . . He found on the shore more than two hundred men with lances made of human bones . . . The Father spoke to them and the interpreter, and they told them how the Fathers who were coming there intended to stay in their lands and intended to teach them the way to Heaven.

It seems clear that Father Medina spoke in his native Spanish, with perhaps a few Chamorro phrases, and the interpreter translated for him. San Vitores did not let this obstacle hold back the mission. Though he himself was, of course, most active in preaching and instructing, he set the other Jesuits to the apostolate very soon.

From the beginning he occupied them in Agana and in the other places in the island [of Guam], not waiting till they knew a great deal of the language, for he said they should not worry about not knowing much of the language, since God and the Blessed Virgin would free them from their difficulties when the occasion came, and would give them words and spirit in time of need (García 1683, 218).

However, he did not leave them without any human means in their work. “He also gave them an explanation of the Creed and the Commandments which he had composed in the Mariana language, so that they might read it to the natives”(ibid.). This apparently was the most common manner of proceeding of the Jesuits, at least in the beginning. Of the scholastic Lorenzo Bustillos we read that on coming with a lay companion to a place called Tarifay, where he was met with hostility as a bringer of the “water of death,” he quieted the people by explaining to them that the water of baptism was a water of life, not of death, and then, to demonstrate the truth of what he was saying, drank some of the water he carried with him. When they had calmed down, “he read them the explanation of the Christian doctrine, which Father San Vitores had composed”(italics mine). Having been won over in this way, they brought forth their infants and he baptized them, promising to bring them later someone
to stay and further instruct the adults so that they too might be baptized (García 1683, 231-32).

San Vitores showed even more care with Pedro Calungsod and his companions, who, though they probably learned the language more quickly than the Jesuits, needed another kind of assistance to do what they were entrusted with.

He instructed them carefully on the manner of baptizing and catechizing, and those whom he saw to be *more advanced and reliable [más aprovechados y seguros]*, he used to send to some mission stations due to the lack of priests and the abundance of the harvest that there was in the beginning. They themselves recognized that the fruit which God reaped by their hands was due to the merits of the one who sent them and helped them with his prayers to do tasks so much above their ability (García 1683, 218; italics mine).

One might get the impression that baptism was given quite freely and that the lay companions acted in almost the same fashion as the priests. However, neither of these is true, as is clear from the case of the Jesuit scholastic Bustillos, who would only baptize infants, but promise the adults a priest for later, even though he himself had already given elementary instruction. Apart from the infants and from the old and sick, prospective Christians had to learn the *Doctrina Cristiana* and show themselves living a Christian life. Thus in spite of the necessary baptisms of the very old and certain infants in the beginning, the fifteen hundred adults who wished to become Christians had to wait at least a month before San Vitores would baptize any of them. Even then he had to struggle to overcome the prejudice of the chiefly class that baptism was too lofty a gift to be given to those of the lower class (García 1683, 219-222). García recounts how he went about building "the spiritual church of living stones, which are the faithful. He used to spend the whole day catechizing the adults, repeating and singing the *Doctrina*, until he became hoarse" (213-14). Once they learned the language, the companions could help in this work, but it was normally San Vitores and later,
the other priests, often with expositions he had written out for them, who gave the explanation of Christian doctrines and the Commandments, which he called "ten steps to Heaven, proving how fitting and according to reason each one was (215-16).

To evaluate his methods of evangelization, one has to understand the theological principles on which San Vitores and his companions worked. For him, as for St. Francis Xavier, all those who died without baptism, even if they were infants, were condemned to Hell, as tainted with original sin. This rather gruesome belief motivated what might otherwise seem to be almost frantic efforts to reach as many infants and old and sick adults in the Marianas as possible, and as quickly as could be. Thus in a letter to his father, to be brought to the king of Spain, he used the words of Xavier in a letter the saint had written a century earlier to Fr. Simão Rodrigues for the king of Portugal. "It is now time . . . to give a warning to the King, for the hour is now nearer than he thinks, in which God our Lord is going to call him to give an account, saying 'Give an account of your stewardship.'" For, San Vitores continues on his own, "the royal cédula . . . to procure the conversions of these Ladrones islands is totally forgotten, to the gravest harm of these poor souls, who are in even greater need than those in Purgatory, since they are in the ultimate need of what is necessary for salvation" (Ledesma 1981, 154-56). And subsequently, writing to the confessor of the Queen, Fr. Everardo Nithard, S.J., he begs her help for "the salvation of so great a multitude of infants, who continue perishing every day (ibid., 156)."

It is in the light of this theology that we find that on the very first day ashore in Agana, as he says in the letter accompanying his "grammar and catechism," he had baptized sixteen adults and thirty-four children of catechumens. In his report at the end of the year, those baptized by the missionaries between their arrival on 16 June 1668 and 21 April 1669 were 13,289, of whom about fifty adults were over one hundred years old, and over a hundred infants had since died. There were also over 20,000 catechumens (Burrus 1954, 936; [Ledesma] 1981, 202). From the different accounts, one can see the method used. Having come to a village and gathered a crowd,
normally the Jesuit would preach the Good News, those other than San Vitores reading the compositions he had written out for them, at least in the beginning. Most likely their primary source would be the Latin text that he had written in the “grammar and catechism.” For those who were old and sick, this would suffice for baptism if they expressed themselves willing, according to the formula of his Arte. Particularly those parents who wished to become Christians might offer their infants to be baptized. For the ordinary adult catechumens, there was in addition “the explanation of the Creed and the Commandments” which San Vitores had given to each missionary to read out (García 1683, 218). Those who expressed the desire to become Christians would then be told to learn the Doctrina Cristiana, and it is here that the lay companions of San Vitores would do their work of “catechizing,” that is, of reciting or singing the Doctrina with the Chamorros until they learned it and understood it. Then if they had showed that they were ready to live a Christian life, it would be the priest who would perform the baptisms, unless some unforeseen sickness or accident made it necessary for one of the lay missionaries to do so in the absence of a priest.

After the founding and progress of the school for boys, San Vitores also made use of the “more advanced in Christian doctrine and behavior” to accompany the priests on their mission journeys, acting as “interpreters and catechists,” in the sense explained above, just as had been done in the early evangelization of the Philippines (García 1683, 240). But the better instructed among the Filipino lay companions were entrusted with more responsibility. No doubt soon after his arrival, San Vitores had composed the Spanish-Chamorro formula for explanation of the fundamentals of the faith in preparation for emergency baptism for the use of laymen that he had promised in his “grammar and catechism.” García records: “He instructed his lay companions in the manner of catechizing, baptizing, and helping to die well, so that they might carry out these ministries in case of necessity, thus supplying for the lack of priests [ministros]” (1683, 321; italics mine).

Though it was, then, normally the Jesuits who explained the
Christian doctrine and baptized, in some cases with the aid of the written instructions that he had composed, San Vitores was compelled to put certain of his lay companions in charge of whole communities, at least for the intervals between the visits of the Jesuit priests. Their functions were limited, but important. Thus in 1669, he passed further north to the new islands of Asonson [Asunción] and Maug, the last of the inhabited ones.

He converted and baptized the inhabitants of these two islands, who till now had no news of the light that had come to the neighboring islands, and had not heard the voice of Choco.86 Hence without any obstacle, he was able to baptize all, or almost all, of them, favored by the grace of the Holy Spirit who had brought him.

Not being able to pass on further in the light boats of those islands, he returned to the island of San Juan [Guam], leaving in the two islands two laymen, well instructed in how to baptize in extreme necessity, to help people to die well, and to take care of the church which he built there (García 1683, 250).87

From the men whose names have come down to us who were put in charge of a whole island it seems clear that normally these were older, mature men, and men fully familiar with the language—"más aprovechados y seguros," as we have noted above—like Francisco Maunahun, who spent two years without a priest in the island of Agrigan, and the unnamed interpreter, killed with him, who had also for two years taken charge of the islands of Gani (García 1683, 455-56).88 Similarly, the one sent to baptize in one village on Anatahan (presumably the cases of necessity) while San Vitores was baptizing in another, was another older man, Lorenzo, the Malabar from the 1638 shipwreck, who was killed while attempting to baptize an infant (García 1683, 219, 250-51). Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, apparently unaccompanied, is reported to have been "going about the island in search of infants [to be baptized]" (García 1683, 225). The younger Filipino companions, like Pedro, would not have had the
same grasp of the language in the beginning as those who had lived in the Marianas since the shipwreck of 1638. Even then, though they undoubtedly had as much of it or more than the Jesuits, apart from San Vitores, and perhaps Cardeñoso, they would not have had the authority which the priests or the older men—at least all those of whom we have knowledge—would have had, both because of their age, and their previous more or less long residence in the islands. Hence, though the younger men are occasionally spoken of as catechists, or catechizing, it was in “[helping] the preachers of our holy faith untiringly in all the [their] state permitted,” as was said concerning the donado, Felipe Sonson, and repeated in different terms even of the more mature men like Francisco Maunahun (“teaching according to his capacity,”) as well as of others (Schumacher 1995, 274; García 1683, 455-56).

A SYNTHETIC PICTURE

The facts and the inferences that we have proffered here do not, as we intimated in the beginning, tell us a great deal more with any certainty about Pedro Calungsod personally. Least of all, do they add anything to what Arévalo and Leyson have said with regard to his actions at the key moment of his life, when he was faced with the choice of saving himself, or being faithful to Father San Vitores and to God. Much of the positive information concerns San Vitores’s lay companions in general, and a good deal of it is by way of being first negative, in showing what they were not, so that we may infer what they were. Only by exclusion can we say what they were like in fact. And when we report the less than exemplary lives of not a few, we are enabled to see how Pedro preserved his sense of commitment in the company of others who had less of it than he. Nonetheless, we can draw together the evidence available to give a composite picture of what the best of Pedro’s companions, and thus he himself, were like.89

Pedro, like the majority of his lay companions who joined the mission in Manila, was a young man, not a boy, certainly fourteen years old at the very least, but more likely eighteen, or at a minimum,
sixteen, particularly if he was a sailor. This would make him probably twenty-one to twenty-three when he was martyred. He was a Visayan, and came possibly, but very doubtfully, from the island of Cebu. He could have come from any other of the Visayan islands. Wherever his home, as a boy he would have received the elementary training given in the parish schools in the Visayan language, or just perhaps, if he were by some chance from the city of Cebu, he might have studied his primary education of religion, reading, and writing in the Jesuit Colegio de San Ildefonso. If that simple possibility were to be a fact, the education may have been, though we have no evidence, conducted in Spanish. He would certainly not have had any secondary education in Spanish, or much less in Latin. If the remote possibility that he was from the city of Cebu were verified, this could account for his knowledge of basic Spanish. But he could also have picked up the language informally, possibly as an assistant to one of the Spanish priests, whether Jesuit or Augustinian. He might also have first—or at least more thoroughly—picked it up as a sailor to Manila.

In any case, he and some other Visayan young men, notably the later martyr Hipólito de la Cruz and the latter’s brother, Agustín de la Cruz, and apparently some other Visayans, had somehow come from the Visayas to Manila and/or Cavite. The only plausible reason I can offer explaining this somewhat unusual transfer from his native place in the largely less developed—religiously and culturally—Visayan provinces to Manila, would be that he and his Visayan companions were sailors on one of the ships plying their trade between the Visayas and Manila. This is particularly suasive from the fact that it was not only Pedro, but apparently a whole group of Visayans who made the transfer. This would also explain his having obtained a fair grasp of Spanish, as apparently all the volunteer companions of San Vitores did. For San Vitores would later prepare (or at least promised to prepare) a formula for baptizing infants and old people, or otherwise aiding the latter in the hour of death, which would be in Spanish with the Chamorro equivalents, thus presuming that Spanish was ordinary among his lay companions.
The plausible occupation of sailor to Manila would likewise give an occasion for learning Tagalog, which was probably the ordinary means of communication among the Filipino volunteers for the mission. In Manila/Cavite too, San Vitores would have tried to ascertain whether Pedro and the other volunteers of various ages he had recruited were really committed to their mission. He also challenged their willingness and ability to live a good Christian life, even to giving up such customs as drinking tuba, so as to present a model for the Chamorros for whom they would work. They were reminded frequently that it was by their model Christian lives, rather than by preaching or even by catechizing, that they would be real missionaries and effective in bringing about the conversion and salvation of the Chamorro people to which they were dedicating themselves. If they could not live up to such standards, they would do more good by staying home.

Undoubtedly some of the younger men would be carried away by the spirit of adventure to volunteer, but we have every reason to think that fundamentally their religious motivation was sincere. Not all of the companions would later prove to be models of fidelity in the long run, however, in spite of the atmosphere of instruction and prayer with which San Vitores surrounded their lives. In the Marianas, they would have a variety of tasks, some material and others more clearly spiritual, such as the drilling of Chamorro catechumens in the Doctrina Cristiana, but San Vitores continued to impress on them the missionary vocation to which they had given themselves. Even when out in small groups with the Jesuits, they not only served their Masses, but joined in the Jesuit evening prayers of the Litany of the Saints, the rosary, and a special prayer of St. Francis Xavier for the conversion of unbelievers. The lives of San Vitores’s missionary companions were so closely linked to his that a large part of this article has actually been devoted to him, since only in the light of his ardent and charismatic personality can we glimpse the lives of his “lay missionary companions,” and thus of Pedro Calungsod.
THE BLESSED MARTYR

What has been said here is independent of the judgment that the Church has made on him by declaring his martyrdom authentic and beatifying him, somewhat later but ultimately for the same reason, as Blessed Diego de San Vitores. We have tried to present facts, where possible, and inferences which seem plausible in the context of the known facts. As the title of the article indicates, these are "the comments of a historian." However, the article would be incomplete if we were not to say something about the all too limited glimpse of his interior life, where, without abandoning the historian's role, we can speak as a fellow-Christian in search of bringing the Good News. Though few, the words of those who knew him well give us some insight into his person, particularly when their purpose was not to exalt Pedro, but rather their cherished Father Diego.

In his testimony in Manila in 1677, Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, who had been five years with Pedro, speaks of him as the "old companion of the Servant of God" [antiguo compañero del Siervo de Dios ([Ledesma] 1981, 332)], referring surely not to his age, but to his having often accompanied San Vitores, and hence one whom the latter trusted to be ready to accompany him on this dangerous mission.

Another of those who were in Guam at the time and knew Pedro, Fr. Alonso López, wrote of his death: "he could have saved himself from death if he had taken flight, but he wished like a good son to die at the side of his father, and not to abandon him. I consider it certain that if he were carrying arms he would first have finished off the two enemies [Matapang and Hirao] and delivered himself and the Father, given his ardent valor. But the pious soul of the Venerable Father never allowed those who accompanied him to carry weapons" ([Ledesma] 1981, 365).

The ardent courage and the unflinching loyalty of Pedro Calungsod had already received their encomium in the first account of the martyrdoms assembled in Manila from the reports coming from the Marianas, through the compiler, probably Fr. Andrés de Ledesma. San Vitores, he says, could not restrain himself on seeing outraged
“the Faith which his fortunate [dichoso] companion had professed with constancy even to his death” ([A. Ledesma] 1898, 11). It is not without reason that García could sum up Pedro’s life by exclaiming: “How happy the man, and how well rewarded were his four years of faithfully serving God in the missions by accompanying the Ministers of the Gospel, to be able to die for the Faith in company with the first Apostle of those islands, thus being the forerunner in Heaven of his martyrdom” (García 1683, 293).

APPENDIX I: MISSIONARIES OR SOLDIERS?

If the designation of Pedro as a trained catechist is without foundation in the documents, and if whatever catechetical functions he may have exercised in the Marianas were only in the very limited and supplementary sense described, what was his role? The sources use various terminology for the companions of San Vitores, the most frequent of which is simply “lay companions” [companeros seglares], which does not distinguish whether they were catechists, soldiers, carpenters, or other lay helpers for such functions as building houses and churches, carrying the baggage of the priests, or otherwise assisting them. Hence above I have called Pedro a “missionary,” just as the donado Felipe Sonson was, or the Mexican volunteer, Diego Bazán, the religious nature of whose calling is well-documented. Though most of Pedro’s and his companions’ functions were material, they were essential parts of the mission team, enabling the Jesuits to devote themselves to preaching, giving the sacraments, and catechizing in the strict sense of the word.

The question arises then, was Pedro a soldier? We know, for example, that when San Vitores went to pacify the two warring Tinian factions in 1670, he formed what he called his Armada Naval Mariana, to help enforce the peace. This was “composed of three or four canoes, and ten soldiers . . . All the soldiers were natives of the Philippines, except one Basque from Vizcaya, Juan de Santiago by name. The captain of all was Don Juan de Santa Cruz” (García 1683, 255-
56). As arms they had one field gun, taken from the shipwreck of the Concepción, and three arquebuses or muskets. Since the total number of Filipinos in the whole of the Marianas was not large at the time—especially after the assassinations of some—and a few were scattered on other islands, the necessary implication is that all, even the donado Felipe Sonson, were soldiers at times. This is further reinforced by the description of the occurrence of January 1671, when on San Vitores’s return from Santa Ana or Zarpana [today Rota], in his absence

some of his lay companions, [Filipinos, from the context] who had earlier helped in the cultivation of the vineyard of the Lord, desirous of liberty, had fled to some apostate villages which had risen in revolt in his absence. He felt very much the soldiers he was losing, and much more because they were going astray and could cause others to go astray” (García 1683, 265; italics mine).

Of these and their return to San Vitores we have spoken in the main text.

On the other hand, at the time of the siege of Agana in September-October 1671 by 2,000 Chamorros, all the sources speak only of twenty-nine to thirty-one soldiers, Spanish and Filipino, together with six [really five] Jesuits. This number, includes all those of the mission except for Fr. Alonso López and four lay companions who could not be contacted when Father San Vitores had called all together in Agana as the situation became dangerous. There is no mention of anyone else. It here becomes evident that those who were spoken of in some places as mere companions, or carpenters, or as baptizing or catechizing in the absence of a priest, also in fact acted as soldiers. Fewer than twelve of the Spaniards (including Mexicans), were regular soldiers, who had mostly arrived in 1669 and 1671, as it became clear that defense was necessary if the missionaries were not to be wiped out completely by hostile factions in Guam. There were no laymen who did not also act as soldiers in times of crisis. The Jesuits, of course, did not take part in the fighting, but did stand watch during the night so that the soldiers could sleep (García 1683, 279).
However, we must not conclude from this that either Pedro or the other lay companions of 1668 (excluding the six soldiers sent in 1669 and the unknown number—probably three or four—sent on the 1671 galleon94) were primarily soldiers and not missionaries. The situation during the lifetime of San Vitores was quite different from later times when a Spanish governor and a Spanish military commander with regular soldiers determined the armed interventions against hostile Chamorros, including burning of houses or villages, and retaliatory as well as defensive military action (Hezel 1982, 126-27).95 The original royal cedula establishing the mission named San Vitores personally, with supreme authority both in religious and temporal matters, with his successors as Jesuit superior to succeed to this authority ([Ledesma]1981,165-66; Hezel 1982, 117).96 But he never saw the spiritual conquest of the Marianas as one to be accomplished by, or—at least in the beginning—even to be protected by, military force.

With the galleon of 1669, besides the soldiers left by Governor de Leon from the San José, he took other steps for the protection of the mission which he had come to see were necessary. One was on the list of needs he sent on, apparently to Father José Vidal, the procurator of the mission living in Mexico. Together with the expected requests for Mass wine, wheat for hosts, candles, and other articles for the churches he was establishing in different places, and other religious articles to give to the Chamorro converts, there are curious requests for “things which we will accept for the love of God, sent to us by that same love”: “eyeglasses of various grades, especially six pairs for old men [he had lost his own on a mission expedition, and thus half-blind, needed to be led by a rope around his waist with a series of knots to designate whether they were going uphill or down!], binoculars to recognize the ships; light and poor clothing like that made of hemp [brocas]97; shoes in sizes [puntos] 10, 11, 12, and 13.” Coming more to our point, he requested:

Firearms for the people who are here: six firelocks [escopetas] and six pistols, which will cause the wicked ones more horror than the cannon with its lanyard, and munitions; shields.
Though we religious have other, better, arms, the lay companions say that they have a real need for them. Since our entrance here has been to such an extent one of peace, the abovementioned safeguards will not cause any injury for the preservation and defense of those already Christians” ([Ledesma] 1981, 211-12).

Whether or not he requested more soldiers directly from Governor de Leon at this time, we do not know, but an undetermined number—which we have calculated to be three or four—did arrive on the next galleon of 1671. By this time the situation had changed drastically for the worse, and would become worse still once the galleon had departed, and the Chamorro enemies saw they had a much weaker force to contend with. Fr. Luís de Medina, Hipólito de la Cruz, Lorenzo the Malabar, Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos, Gabriel de la Cruz, had all been killed before this time. Though moved to joy at the great grace of martyrdom, clearly given at least to the first three, San Vitores saw that such continued martyrdoms, however much he might extol them and pray for the same grace for himself, could end in disaster to the mission, if not its total extinction. Apparently as early as the 1669 galleon, he therefore sent to the Queen-Regent through his father, Don Gerónimo, a request for two hundred Pampango soldiers.98 On 10 November 1671, the Queen-Regent issued such a decree, together other royal cedulas to fulfill other requests of San Vitores. The 1672 galleon, the San Diego, arriving shortly after the death of San Vitores, did bring supplies and some soldiers—most likely the eighteen decided on in Mexico—with good arms, and the San Antonio of 1673 brought to Guam and Manila the royal cedula, ordering that two hundred Pampango soldiers should be sent from Manila (Montero y Vidal 1887, 345; García 1683, 469-70). In spite of this, however, due to opposition in Manila, apparently by Governor-General Manuel de Leon, the Pampango soldiers did not arrive.99 Only in 1675 and 1676 would substantial numbers of troops actually come, though not the two hundred Pampangos that San Vitores had requested (Montero y Vidal 1887, 346).100

While hoping for some military defenders, San Vitores, ardent as he was personally in his desire for martyrdom, recognized that he
must act, and make his companions act, with supernatural prudence. For he had increasingly realized the danger that the entire mission might gradually be wiped out by the hostile factions, or that, because of killings committed by one or a few hostile Chamorros, whole villages would withdraw in fear from even listening to the message of the missionaries.\[101

He told his companions that the ministers of the Gospel should make use of all licit means to plant the faith and the grace of God in the villages. He enjoined them strongly to guard themselves from the dangers of death, as far as that should be possible and licit. For the harm and detriment that would follow for the new Christian community in the loss of many souls of recently baptized children, and of dying adults still in need of baptism, was greater than \[the value of\] any kind of death, no matter how glorious it might be. For, he added, in the villages where these deaths happen, since they consider themselves to be enemies of the Christians, they do not allow missionaries to enter, for fear of the punishment that their crimes deserve (García 1683, 326-27).

Nonetheless, for the first two years, even in spite of the killings we have enumerated, especially Fr. Luis de Medina and his Visayan companion, Hipólito de la Cruz, he would not allow any fortifications around the mission compound, even for defense. His reason was “to show more clearly that our Law is one of peace, and that those did not come to their lands to make war who did not themselves show any fear of it” (García 1683, 277). Only when the 2,000 Chamorros under Hurao began to gather together to drive out all the missionaries did he allow some fortifications to be built and two field-pieces, one salvaged from the shipwreck of the Concepción, and the other from the ship which had cast his Chinese enemy, Choco, on the islands, to be set up, just before the forty-day siege of 1671 began. Even these few weapons, he felt, were to be used only to frighten the enemies by their noise, and not to kill, though of course in the end this proved impossible, as the Chamorros taunted the Spaniards with having thunder, but no lightning! (García, 1681, 261). Even after the siege began, San Vitores again insisted on negotiations, and even
presented many gifts to the attackers, who saw this as a sign of cowardice and even composed chants of their victory over the Spaniards. San Vitores persisted, even as he was showered with stones, much to the disgust of the few Spanish soldiers, who considered the idea of negotiating with the Chamorros for peace rather than winning it from them by force of arms as contrary to their soldier's honor (García 1681, 278-79). But San Vitores had never had the idea of evangelization through military power, even from the first concrete concept of the mission in Manila. Though he would eventually partially modify his views in the face of reality, he never went beyond the idea of military force purely for defense.

APPENDIX II: INTRODUCTION OF TUBA TO THE MARIANAS

San Vitores mentions in several places the advantage of there being no alcoholic beverages among the Chamorros as a reason why they would be easier to convert than other pagan peoples. Even after a year's experience, in the report of 15 May 1669 signed by San Vitores and the other Jesuits, he lists among the good qualities of the Chamorros that they never drink distilled spirits [licor] or anything else which causes drunkenness ([Ledesma] 1981, 205; also García 1683, 198). However, the evidence is ambiguous. García tells elsewhere that in their feasts they had "a drink composed of gruel [atolé], rice and shredded coconut" (1683, 200). Whether it was fermented, he does not say. The modern biography of Risco, though undocumented, quotes a primary source to which he had access and which was evidently the source of García, namely a Jesuit Annual Letter, which says rather ambiguously that "they take no wine nor intoxicating liquor" and comments on the restraint in their fiestas, where they took "a beverage made from rice and shredded coconut, which they drink without any reprehensible excess" (Risco 1970, 111). The statement seems to imply that they did have a fermented drink, otherwise there would not be any point to saying that they did not drink it to excess. But it was certainly not tuba, and it does seem true that the Chamorros were not given to borracheras.
However, it would be surprising if none of the Filipinos who were shipwrecked in 1638 and lived for twenty-six years in Chamorro society, particularly the Visayans, did not teach them the use of tuba, especially since there is evidence that they introduced many innovations into what had been a very primitive society. Among notable indications that the Filipinos made innovations in Chamorro society was that previously they had no animals, until dogs and cats came from the shipwreck of 1638, and even more remarkable, did not know fire, until it was shown them by the Filipino castaways (García 1683, 194, 198). They likewise had no cloth, hence their nakedness, and were amazed when the missionaries in 1668 and 1671 introduced sheep, pigs, cows, doves, a small bull, and a horse.

What is certain is that after San Vitores's death when a regular force of Mexican and Filipino soldiers was established, tuba was evidently introduced and taken up by the Chamorros, however moderately. In any case, a report of 1720 on the sad state of the colony by its former governor and military commander, Don José Quiroga, among other accusations against the incumbent Governor Juan Antonio Pimentel, stated that he set up a store in which he sold “aguardiente, a local fermented drink made from the coconut palm by Chamorros and bought by the governor for a pittance” (Hezel 1989, 41).
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NOTES

1 As of 27 November 2000, under various publishers, including one unauthorized, some 30,000 copies have been printed since the first one. (Information kindly given by Fr. C. G. Arévalo, S.J., 27 November 2000). I am also grateful to Father Arévalo for lending me his copy of the Deposition for Pedro Calungsod presented by the Archdiocese of Cebu, under the direction of the vice-postulator, Fr. Ildebrando Leyson.

2 The spelling in the original documents was Agaña, which was soon transformed into the Spanish form Agaña. Since the Americans took the island of Guam, the spelling Agana is used. I have adopted that in this article. Likewise, I have adopted the name San Vitores, that under which he was beatified. Though many, perhaps most, accounts, even from the seventeenth century, use the one-word form Sanvitores, his baptismal certificate and all the catalogs and other documents of the Society of Jesus use the form San Vitores. Moreover, he always signed himself San Vítor or S. Vitores ([Ledesma] 1981, 10, 11, 14, 46, 185, etc.; and for his signature, 189, 195, etc.). Fr. Juan M. H. Ledesma, S.J., was the vice-postulator of the cause of San Vitores, and the original documents translated into English by Fr. Ildebrando Jesus Aliño Leyson, the vice-postulator of the cause of Pedro Calungsod ([Leyson] 1993) are from Ledesma’s Positio for San Vitores. I am grateful to Father Ledesma for giving me a copy of the meticulously organized published Positio of San Vitores, and for lending me his typescript copy of the indispensable first biography of San Vitores by Fr. Francisco García (1683).

3 E.g., García 1683, 293; [Ledesma] 1981, 303; etc.

4 His problem was nearsightedness, since he did copious writing. He is pictured wearing glasses in an engraving of 1682, printed in his first biography by Francisco García, S.J., (García 1683), reproduced in [Ledesma] 1981, unnumbered plate 12. Also in Abella 1962, 10. Some sources claimed that he would not wear them because of not wishing to appear better off than the poor Chamorros; others assert that he lost his regular pair in the Marianas. Since in spite of his extreme observance of poverty and austerity, he was eminently practical when it came to dealing with the apostolate, the latter seems more probable. Moreover, he wrote to Fr. Vidal, the procurator for the mission in Mexico for six pairs of glasses of different magnifications in his list of 1669 ([Ledesma] 1981, 211).

5 Leyson (1999, 18-19) is not accurate in saying that the Jesuits were the only missionaries of the Visayas and Mindanao. By 1655 northern Mindanao was divided between Jesuits and Recolletos; Augustinians had two parishes in Cebu,
and were in complete charge of Panay, except for the Jesuit college in Iloilo and the parish in Oton. The Jesuits had only a college in Cebu and the parish of Mandaue attached to it (Phelan 1959, 167-76; De la Costa 1961, 604-5). Resil P. Mojares, in an article with a different purpose, "The Epiphany of Pedro Calungsod," evidently written before the beatification but acquainted with the Deposition and with the process of encouraging a cult to Pedro which took place in the 1990s, rightly criticizes the assertion that Pedro was Cebuano, even with the qualification "at least in the sense that he was under the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Cebu" ([Leyson] 1993, 5; Mojares 2000, 46-47). In that definition, I might observe, even the Chamorros would be Cebuanos, since the Marianas was considered part of the diocese of Cebu. There is not the slightest evidence that he was or was not from the island of Cebu. No one knows. But geographically speaking, one can certainly say he was a Visayan, that is, from the islands of central Philippines between Luzon and Mindanao. There is no minimal evidence for anything else. All the early sources call him Bissaya, Bisaya, natural de Bisayas, natural de la provincia de Bisayas, natural de Bisayen Filipinas, and in Latin, Philippinus natione Bisaya, and casta bisaya ([Ledesma] 1981, 275-348 passim. Though Mojares is correct in rejecting Cebuano, he apparently did not look carefully at the sources, since he habitually uses the term bisayo, which is his own creation, and never appears in the documents. Moreover, from the varied terminology cited above, it is clear from some of the cited expressions that what is meant is what we mean by "the Visayas" today, and Mojares's passing reference to Bisayans of Borneo is simply a red herring. In fairness to Mojares, his article does not pretend to give the life of Pedro Calungsod, but rather to discuss the process of "saint-making" in the Church and in the Philippines in particular (St. Lorenzo Ruiz, Mother Ignacia del Espiritu Santo, etc.). His analysis and methodology deserve discussion, as I hope to give them in the future, but I only became aware of the article as I was finishing this one. I will attempt here to correct a number of factual errors I have noted, but cannot now discuss the article and its approach.

6 Given the problems of Spanish missionaries in pronouncing Filipino languages, the name first appears as Calonsor (as used in Leyson's title, since this is the form employed by Father Francisco Solano, S.J., in the first written account of Pedro's martyrdom). It also appears thus as used by those who knew him in the canonical process held in the Marianas ([Ledesma] 1981, 291-95, passim). Elsewhere it appears as Calansor, Calangsr, Calsongor, etc., all of which are clearly equivalent, for one who understands the exchange and corruption of consonants and vowels between Spanish and Visayan, to the common contemporary Visayan name Calungsod. For further details, see Leyson 1999, 3-5. Mojares's statement that Pedro had "an invented surname (surnames did not exist in indigenous Filipino society)" is misleading (44). It is no doubt true that they did not exist—certainly not as a general rule—in pre-
Hispanic society, but untrue that "[i]t was not until the Clavería decree of 1849 that the use of surnames became a norm in the Philippines" (58, n. 16). All of the Filipinos who appear in the San Vitores-Calungsod story (except for the Malabar Lorenzo, very likely an ex-slave) had surnames—De la Cruz, Jiménez, Bernal, Figueroa, etc. The purpose of the Clavería decree was to standardize surnames, and to have parents pass them on to their children, instead of each one arbitrarily selecting another saint's name as a surname in addition to the saint's name given in baptism. Church law demanded that every Christian be given the name of a saint (and therefore a "Spanish" name in its form), whatever other names might be added. As Cullinane suggests (1998, 294) the surnames that we find in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are most probably the pre-Christian single name of the person, and therefore would not necessarily be passed on to the son or daughter, or given to the wife in the pre-1849 period. [I have witnessed an analogous process in the early American trusteeship in parts of Micronesia, where Micronesians with a Hispanic Christian name, when coming to study in the Philippines in the 1950s, added their father's indigenous name to their own baptismal name, in order to conform to Philippine and American norms]. But even in the seventeenth century surnames were used of a whole family, as shown in the case of Felipe Sonson [Songsong] whose brother was Don Agustín Sonson. Similarly the brother of the martyred companion of Fr. Luís Medina, Hipólito de la Cruz, was called Agustín de la Cruz. Though it could be argued that the reason for this last example was that both brothers were moved by an identical religious motive, that could not be said of the Songson. Moreover, in spite of the skepticism shown by Cullinane to the lists of gobernadorcillos assembled from the twentieth century Luther Parker Collection (Larkin 1972, 36), the fact that there were fourteen Songson who were gobernadorcillos in Macabebe, cannot be so easily dismissed, especially since there are thirteen other families with multiple occurrences of the same name. It would take a forger of considerable skill and knowledge to have constructed all those principales families taken from Parker by Larkin. Particularly in Pampanga, where Hispanicization occurred more rapidly than most other places in the Philippines, it is not improbable that such records could have been kept down to the twentieth century in an oral or a written form made between 1630 and 1685, together with the similar figures from one generation to the next—e.g., the Sonsons of Macabebe, Hipólito and Agustín de la Cruz, who were brothers, though other De la Cruzes were unrelated. There is no reason to believe that the name Calungsod, even if mangled by Spaniards, was not a genuine surname. If one wishes to say it was "invented," so were all such English names as Jackson, Johnson, etc., as well as those taken from some ancestor's occupation, such as Schumacher (shoemaker), Taylor (tailor), etc. It does seem certain that there was considerable variation in times and regions, as Cullinane's reference to the extreme case of a woman
who changed her name nine times in the isolated Bikol town of Tigaon, mentioned in Owen 1998, 232, n. 79. Owen, however, also cautions against being sure that Tigaon was typical (244).

7 In some manuscripts of Alcina there are drawings of objects mentioned, and more importantly, some of typical Visayans. Three pairs, each taken from different manuscripts, which substantiate what I have written above, are in Alcina 1668, xlii and xlii, lxxviii and lxxix, lxxx and lxxxi. There is as yet no critical edition of the various more or less complete manuscripts of Alcina's unpublished work of the seventeenth century, though the project has been underway for a half-century under various auspices. I have used here, for convenience's sake, the Museo Naval facsimile edition. Though this is one of the late eighteenth century copies, the references to part, book, and chapter are the same in all manuscripts. Its advantage is that it contains the drawings from other manuscripts in its introduction.

8 "Pope honours heroic witness of Church's martyrs," The Tablet, 11 March 2000, 362. The mission left Cavite on 7 August 1667, and having to stop first in Mexico, arrived in Guam only on 16 June 1668, almost a year later. Hence approximately five years passed between Pedro's volunteering for the mission and his martyrdom.

9 Though I have not seen this translation and used only the original Spanish for this article, of course the translator is not in any sense an authority for a historical fact. The original of García (1683) nowhere says this of all the young men who accompanied San Vitores in 1667. Indeed, there were some, as will be seen below, men of middle or old age, not boys in any sense. There was also one of "a little more than twelve years old," whom we will explain below. No doubt Higgen's note as to the boys being twelve to fifteen is based on him, together with the two persons cited by Leyson and Arévalo.

10 Arévalo gives his age as "thirteen or fourteen" (1998, 7). It is true that Risco (1970, 189) says that he was thirteen, but gives no source for such a statement. García (1683, 289), on whom Risco for the most part depends in his novelistic account, clearly says fourteen.

11 Leyson's source for the third account is that written from Guam by the Jesuit Fathers Francisco Ezquerra, Gerard Bouwens, and Pierre Coemans [or Coomans, or Comano in its Hispanized version], "Relación de los sucesos de las Islas Marianas en el año de 1672 y 1673." One may also note here that the use of "niño" for a Hagman aged about sixteen years eliminates any argument for Pedro Calungsod having arrived in the Marianas at twelve or thirteen, just because a single hearsay source calls him "niño," as will be seen below.

12 Francisco García, S.J., in his fundamental biography, the first one to be written of San Vitores and based on the documents of the latter's witnesses
and contemporaries, calls Bazán “español” and “españolito,” and speaks of
him as a “natural de Méjico,” that is, born in Mexico of Spanish parents (García
1683, e.g., 221, 241, 260, 289). The last reference tells the story of his voca-
tion and death. This book is quite rare, and I owe my being able to use a
typscript of it to the kindness of Fr. Juan M. H. Ledesma, S.J. The only
original copies in the Philippines are those in the Lopez Memorial Museum
and the National Library (Ferrer 1970, 47, no. 6234; Medina 1972, 280, no.
2202).

13 Though Arévalo is careful to say of Hagman “who (it appear) stayed with
the Filipino helpers” (1998, 7; italics mine), Leyson without any such reserve
simply asserts that he was one of the “boys who assisted Padre Diego” (1999,
17). In fact, all that we have evidence for is that he heard about the killing from
other Chamorros and from Matapang, the murderer, himself. This certainly
does not make it seem likely that he was part of the mission. Rather he lived
among its enemies, however well disposed he may have been himself, perhaps
as a student in the school for young Chamorros.

14 This terminology is contained in the Jesuit catalogues, preserved in the
Jesuit Archives in Rome and transcribed by Father de la Costa in his notes in
my possession.

15 The Franciscan chronicler, Juan Francisco de San Antonio, gives a very
similar description for Franciscan parishes at the beginning of the eighteenth

16 Nonetheless, we must admit that there is one other youth about whom we
know nothing more than that he was a Pampango named Andrés de la Cruz,
who in repelling the attack on San Vitores’s men in 1670, gave the coup de grace
with a spear to the principal Chamorro responsible for the attack, after the
latter had been wounded by the Spanish artillery-piece. García 1683 (260) says
that he was “a little older than twelve” (de poco más de doce años). However, the
fact that he was a Pampango, who would have been close to Manila and might
even go there for a time and thus possibly have been recruited by San Vitores,
and also the fact that the Pampangos always formed the bulk of the Spanish-
led military before the nineteenth century, are both possible reasons for his
presence at such an early age. It is possible also that he was the servant of
some Spaniard, as we will see below in the case of Gabriel de la Cruz. This is
reinforced by the fact of his apparently jumping to kill the wounded Chamorro,
an act quite in dissonance with San Vitores’s instructions to his lay missionary
companions.

17 Norman Owen, in his study of the somewhat isolated Bikol town of
Tigaon, founded in 1701, has done yeoman’s work to construct from a rather
complete set of parish records, the demographic profile of the town, and
concludes that reality was often different than laws or idealized descriptions. “[W]ell over a century after the founding of the mission, many of the inhabitants of Tigaon skipped the sacraments as often as they partook of them, appeared and disappeared almost at random from parish padrones (which probably also served as the basis for civil tax rolls), and seemingly did not even know precisely how old they were or what they were legally named” (Owen 1998, 244). This should warn us against being too sure that laws were actually fulfilled. I would add three remarks however. The first is that, as Owen notes from my article on the subject, the latter part of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century were a disastrous time for the Church, its lowest point in the Spanish regime, whereas I would consider, as will be seen below, that the latter part of the seventeenth century and early eighteenth were a “golden age.” Secondly, Tigaon was quite isolated. Whether Pedro and his companions came from a densely-populated and well-evangelized town in Panay, or a remote corner of underpopulated and not intensively evangelized portion of Cebu island (see the sobering article of Cullinane and Xenos on demography and religious centers in Cebu island [Cullinane and Xenos 1998 especially 80-94], or from Cebu city, we have no idea, and hence no possibility of comparing it with Tigaon. Third, Tigaon was a rural area in apparently little contact with the Bikol ports. If our conjecture on Pedro being a sailor is acceptable, this might provide an opportunity to escape from his home village for Manila/Cavite at an earlier age, though in general the restrictions on the mobility of Filipinos were more likely to be urged on fourteen-year old baguntao than on older men, and perhaps less if they were sailors, though a certain maturity was necessary for such an occupation. Hence, in the end, though maintaining eighteen as the normal minimum age, and fourteen as the absolute minimum, I would be willing to possibly modify the age to sixteen. But Owen’s and other articles in the same volume caution us to be tentative, as well as to recognize that different regions of the Philippines might greatly differ in many respects, religious and civil.

\(^{18}\) Leyson’s translation “youngster”, though possible for some of these terms, is not the most likely one; and not at all for jeune homme or juvenis. “Lad” (ibid.) is hardly used in English for someone sixteen to eighteen years old. Mozó and mancebo are also used for adults, as in “buen mozó” for “a man of superior physical stature” (“hombre de aventajada estatura”) or simply for a more or less young house servant (Real Academia Española 1927, 1320, 1228). García himself, in fact, speaks of a friendly Chamorro chief called Caysa, who refused to take any part in plots against the Fathers, considering it the grossest ingratitude, since his parents and grandparents, being old men, had welcomed the Fathers to the islands. “How then could he, being a muchacho (he was twenty-eight years old) kill them?” (García 1683, 454). All these terms gener-
ally connote being unmarried, and some degree of youth, but this latter was largely a matter of perception. For example, a well-recognized bilingual dictionary dating from 1852, in its most recent edition defines *mancebo* as “a young person, under forty years of age (Velásquez 1957, 454).

19 It must not be forgotten that almost a full year elapsed between the time the galleon left Cavite and when it arrived in Guam. To say, therefore, that, e.g., Pedro was martyred in 1672 means that he spent *five*, not four years with San Vitores. Four years in the Marianas, yes; as a companion of San Vitores, five.

20 Among the former would be the Spaniard Manuel Rangel, the Mexican Spaniard, Diego Bazán, and the Filipinos, Damián Bernal and Nicolás de Figueroa. Among the latter would be especially Hipólito de la Cruz, accompanying Fr. Luís de Medina, who was about to baptize a child, and Francisco Maunahun and his unnamed companion. See Arévalo 1998, 15, and Leyson 1999, 101-10, who gives a list of several men of different nationalities who were killed in one way or another both before and after the martyrdom of Blessed Diego and Blessed Pedro. Some of them certainly deserve to be named martyrs, and a canonical process is said to have been actually opened in Cebu for Hipólito de la Cruz in the seventeenth century, though nothing is known of what came of it (Leyson 1999, 102).

21 It should be noted that this is a presumption, with no supporting evidence. The fact that Pedro later worked with the Jesuits does not of itself imply that he came from one of their parishes; it depends on how he came to know San Vitores. And, as we have seen, the Augustinians had a considerable number of Visayan parishes, especially in Panay. Though it is true that the Jesuits were more associated with education, at least on the post-primary level, and in the beginning experimented more with different models of primary education, Augustinians as well as the Jesuits had primary schools in all their parishes.

22 Leyson seems to take the Jesuit term “residence” to refer to each town with a resident priest. This is not correct. Since according to their constitutions the Jesuits were not permitted to be parish priests, they solved their problem by setting up a few centers under a superior with a number of Jesuits under him who might take charge of several parishes, but all came periodically to live their religious life together in the main center or “residence.” Even at the time of the Jesuit expulsion in 1768, they had only three “residences” for all of Leyte (and none located at Dulag), though they were caring for seventeen towns from those three centers. See De la Costa 1961, 606.

23 Hence the speculations of Leyson (1999, 260) as to what school Pedro might have attended to become a catechist are without any foundation. There were none by this time.
As will be seen below, when these emergency situations occurred in the Marianas, there are always qualifications to indicate that all they did was to help memorize the *Doctrina* and take care of emergency baptisms.

Leyson spells the name as Le Gobien, as do Blair and Robertson. It seems to be more common in modern usage. Translation from the French is mine.

Sonson, of course, was extraordinary in that he came from a prominent family of *principales* in Macabebe, Pampanga, had raised a family and seen them married. He then offered himself to assist the Augustinians of Pampanga, who later sent him to a Dominican engaged in rebuilding a church and convento in the Parian of Manila, destroyed in the Chinese uprising. When the Dominican, a friend of San Vitores, heard of his search for recruits, he sent Sonson to him, who begged to be accepted as a missionary. He was principally occupied as a carpenter, building houses and churches, and in his old age as a tailor in Guam, though also as a soldier entrusted with one of the few muskets in the sieges of the mission in Agana. He lived with the Jesuits and was received as a *donado* by San Vitores in 1669, and his name is listed with those of the Jesuit priests in the catalogue of the Philippine Province of the Jesuits for 1681-82. His obituary shows that he was widely read in Spanish spiritual books far beyond the catechism. At the time he left Manila for Acapulco he was already 56 years old, and died at the age of 75 in 1686, of wounds received some months earlier in the uprising of 1684, when the Chamorros left him for dead. There is no evidence that Pedro Calungsod was a *donado* and it is unlikely that he would not have been mentioned as such if he were. For example, Brother Marcos Cruz, a Tagalog, is always spoken of as a *donado* of the Society of Jesus. He taught San Vitores Tagalog, and then accompanied him on his missions among the Mangyans and *Cimarrones* of Mindoro. See García 1683, 116-17, 136, 159-61, etc.

For example, the Tagalog interpreter of San Vitores on the ship, according to the latter's own testimony. See the quotation from San Vitores concerning him below.

It is true that the first *Doctrina cristiana*, printed in 1593 in Tagalog by Father Francisco Blancas de San José, O.P., had the text not only in Spanish and in the romanized form of the Tagalog, but likewise in the Tagalog syllabary, which might seem to argue that it was meant to be given to the catechumens. This is remotely possible, though there is no evidence for that, and given the fact that only one original copy survives today (in the Library of Congress in Washington) it hardly seems that there was a large distribution, even apart from the costs of such a procedure. An alternative explanation for the printing of the syllabary was that it was to help the missionaries understand a writing which was then still in use. As far as I am aware, the only other catechism,
which made use of the Tagalog syllabary, with modifications, was the Ilocano translation of the Bellarmine catechism in 1621, done by Fr. Francisco Lopez, OSA, with the assistance of Don Pedro Bukaneg. See Quirino 1973, iii-xi.

29 It would seem that the beginning of the school for boys dates from mid-1669, though the Queen-Regent, who ruled after the death of Philip IV, only provided for an endowment in a decree of 1673, after the death of San Vitores (García 1683, 239-41).

30 Of the older and far better-instructed man, the donado, Felipe Sonson, Fr. Lorenzo Bustillos, who had known him since both accompanied San Vitores from Mexico in 1668, wrote after Sonson's death, "He helped the preachers of our holy faith untiringly in all that his state permitted." (Schumacher 1995, 274. Italics mine).

31 Hence we cannot say, "It is quite probable that Pedro Calungsod was chosen to be among the first missionaries for the Ladrones because he was found to possess the ideal qualities of an exemplary missionary. There may not have been any problem on the part of Pedro Calungsod for he was trained for the missions." (Leyson 1999, 32). The former sentence is improbable; the latter certainly untrue. No such formal training existed.

32 As far as one can judge from his biography, Sonson, who was so ardent in his desire to go to the Marianas as a missionary, was principally occupied there in his former trade as a carpenter, and learned to mend clothes for the Jesuits and their companions, as well as to sew clothes for the naked Chamorros. But he had a highly developed spirituality of missionary zeal for the pagans and for the saving of their souls, very similar to that of San Vitores, and explicitly saw his material tasks as a contribution to the missionary task of saving souls from the devil. See Schumacher 1995, especially 272-75.

33 Symptomatic of this religious growth is the emergence of religious life for women in the Beaterio of Mother Ignacia del Espíritu Santo in 1684, the ordination of the first Filipino priests in 1698, the publishing of the Pasyon of Gaspar Aquino de Belen in 1703, and the use of (paid) Filipino lay assistants by the Dominicans in the evangelization of the Zambals in the 1680s, and later of other mountain peoples. See Schumacher 1987, 165-68, 179, 183-85, 188; Santiago 1987, especially 32-36.

34 There are two Filipinos who apparently received secondary education in Letran in mid-17th century, but one was a Pampango and the other a Manileño. See the list of a hundred prominent alumni in Bazaco 1933, 217-54. It is possible there were more whom Father Bazaco did not see fit to include, but those who are included seem to be so only because they were native Filipinos.

35 In a report of 1656 the college of Cebu is reported as having only a
"colegio de niños" and there is no indication that the Jesuits had anything to do in it, nor even mention of there having once been secondary education there. In that same report Dulag is mentioned merely as one of nine stations dependent on Dagamí, with only six priests for the nine stations. There is no mention of a boarding school here or anywhere else, even in the formerly major one of Antipolo. It is clear that by Pedro’s time there were no Jesuit personnel for such enterprises, and that they were unable even to take adequate pastoral care of the towns under their jurisdiction (Colín 1902, 791, 793).

36 Even a cursory reading of the so-called “grammar and catechism” shows that even a graduate of one of the Manila colleges—which Pedro and his companions were not—would have had an extremely difficult, not to say impossible, time understanding it, since it is not in the classical Latin learned in the colleges, but filled with technical terms and coined phrases, and would have only been intelligible to the Jesuits (or other religious) who had been trained to speak Latin from their earliest years of religious life, and for whom it was a conversational language. This internal evidence is apart from the explicit statement of San Vitores that it was meant for the priests and that he hoped to prepare another in Spanish for the use of laymen.

37 Ramos was apparently one of those of whom the classic historian of the galleon trade speaks in recounting the fate of the survivors of the wreck of the Concepción: “The twenty-eight survivors went from island to island till they came to Guam . . . From here six of them, accompanied by two friendly natives, set out in a couple of open boats in use among the Ladrones and finally reached the Philippines, where they arrived ‘almost’ dead from hunger, thirst, and lack of sleep” (Schurz 1959, 259).

38 The word “oldest” [los más antiguos] (not “older” as Leyson translates it [29]) does not refer to the age of the laymen who were to accompany the missionaries, but to they (or their families) having been Christians from long past, not new converts.

39 Santa Cruz is spoken of in various places as baptizing infants or dying adults, or as companion of San Vitores (García 1683, 179, 225, 227). As we will see below, there would eventually be four Spaniards, including the Mexican youth Diego Bazán, who would remain behind when the galleon San Diego continued its journey to Manila.

40 The question of whether there really was abstinence from tuba is discussed in Appendix II.

41 The number of lay companions who were identified as Visayans (not all were identified at all) is notable, and is an argument for the probability that Pedro Calungsod was among those who had come as sailors to Cavite. In
general the early Spaniards considered that the Visayans were the best seamen, just as the Pampangos were considered the best soldiers.

42 It would seem that he began his book in Guiuan, Samar, in 1751, and finished it shortly before he died in Carigara, Leyte in 1755. (De la Costa 1961, 611; Delgado 1892, xi). Though only published in 1892, the manuscript was finished in 1754.

43 Though generally assumed by Leyson, there is no evidence that Pedro had any contact with Jesuits before coming to Cavite. If in fact he was from Cebu (or much more, from Panay), it would not be very likely, as they were so few in those places. Their activity in the Visayas was rather concentrated in Samar, Leyte, and Bohol.

44 A <i>patache</i> was a much smaller vessel than the galleons, which were built to carry as much cargo as possible. In the case of the Marianas a ship that would bring the mission supplies and men was all that was needed, since it was not a trading ship like the galleons. Because of its different construction and size, it was able (though not always successfully!) to take the direct route from Manila to Guam, and had no motive for going to Mexico, since it did not carry any trade goods, only the supplies needed in the Marianas.

45 He also speaks of the “boys” as being “varones virtuosos y pacientes del trabajo.” The term <i>virín</i> is used of an adult man; one dictionary speaks of a man of thirty years old or more (Velásquez 1957, 647). This of course would completely negate the idea that Pedro and his companions were boys from twelve to fifteen years old. However, in the context of the whole paragraph, it is clear that San Vitores is speaking not of lay companions, young or old, but of the Jesuits who might in the future join him in the Marianas. See his letter of 1665 to the authorities in Manila, apparently also sent to the Father General of the Jesuits ([Ledesma] 1981, 160-61).

46 Mojarres inexplicably gives the number of Jesuits as five (2000, 43). Though he evidently did not use García, he did use Hezel 1982, which clearly says five priests and one scholastic (118), as do all other sources.

47 Possibly Ansaldo, who was coming from Spain to the Philippines for the first time, and only three years a Jesuit, did not think of Diego Bazán as a Spaniard, either because of his having been born in Mexico, or perhaps just because of his youth in comparison to the three older Spaniards—Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, Sergeant Lorenzo Castellanos, and Don Francisco de Mendoza. It would have been natural for Bazán to have associated more with the Filipino companions nearer his own age, and in this way he may have escaped the notice of Ansaldo, particularly since the latter did not set down his recollections in the letter to the Queen until a few months later in Manila.
Leyson, making use of the English translation of García, calls him a Visayan from Indan, and speculates—on the basis of the Spanish tendency to mispronounce the final ng in Filipino names, such as Malacañan for Malacañang or Indan for Indang—that he may have come from Hindang in Southern Leyte or Jamindan in Capiz. These suggestions seem far-fetched. It seems much more probable to suppose that García—ignorant of the Philippines—erred in calling him a Visayan, and that he really did come from Indang, the town in Cavite province, which, being close to the shipyard of Cavite town, would be a much more likely place for a sailor on the galleons to have come from as early as the 1630s, when the Visayas had not yet even been fully evangelized (Leyson 1999, 107-8, n. 26; citing García 1985, 174).

Since I do not have a copy of Rogers’ book, which is in any case merely a secondary source, I cannot say on what grounds he makes this statement. Be that as it may, whatever may be the value of his general history of Guam, when elsewhere cited by Leyson he seems to have made a very superficial study of the primary sources on the San Vitores mission, confusing data from different periods or making unwarranted suppositions.

Ansaldo speaks of the three Spaniards who remained in Agana in 1668 as having done so “to help in this work of conversion” ([Ledesma] 1981, 200).

The name of Don Juan de Santiago first appears in the documents when, apart from the commander, Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, he was the only Spanish soldier in the Armada Naval, or Escuadrón Mariano, that San Vitores brought to Tinian to pacify the two warring factions there. Since this was in 1670, he must have arrived as one of the six soldiers who came on the galleon of 1669, probably as their commander. In 1671, now called Sergeant Major, he ordered the arrest of those suspected in the murder of the Mexican José Peralta, all followers of one of the most powerful chiefs in Agana, Hurao, whom Santiago also arrested. His intention was to put them on trial, releasing those who appeared innocent, as he began to do. In an act typical of San Vitores, but no doubt infuriating to a military man like Santiago, and seen as a sign of weakness by Hurao himself, the latter’s followers persuaded San Vitores to order Hurao released, after which he immediately became the principal instigator of the siege of September-October 1671 (García 1683, 275-76; Murillo Velarde 1749, f. 297). After the death of San Vitores, when new fortifications were being built in May 1672, now Captain, Santiago was the new commander. He is also spoken of as now commanding the Escuadrón Mariano, which formerly had been commanded by Captain Juan de Santa Cruz. Since it was up to the Jesuit superior to make such an appointment, it was probably done at the request of Santa Cruz himself. It should be remembered that Santa Cruz originally came as a missionary, and it was only out of necessity that he took military command in crises. Santa Cruz was still in the
Marianas in 1673, when he testified at the canonical process in Agana on the martyrdom of San Vitores, but that same year returned to Manila, where he again testified in 1677 ([Ledesma] 1981, 221, 295, 331).

Though it is impossible to be certain of the location of this town today, Leyson tentatively suggests Salong in Negros Occidental, or Salug "in Zamboanga del Norte which was also considered at that time as part of the Visayas." I do not know on what fact he bases the latter statement. There is, however, a municipality by the name of Salong, listed under Cavancalan [Kabankalan] in the Census of 1903. Kabankalan was one of the three Jesuit residences in Negros in the seventeenth century, and Father Solano had worked there for several years before being sent to the Subanon and eventually to the Marianas. It is therefore not unlikely that he recruited Basijan there, but of course this remains a conjecture.

Besides taking part in the defense of Agana in 1671, he later joined an expedition under Captain Juan de Santiago to punish the killers of San Vitores and Pedro Calungsdod, but died of an infected wound received in an ambush (García 1683, 451). García praises him and judges that God rewarded him "for the work he had done in this mission without having any temporal interest" (ibid.). Basijan's life and death is an indication of how difficult it is to differentiate the motivation of some of the soldiers of these early years from that of the volunteer companions of San Vitores like Pedro Calungsdod. Similarly a Mexican named Juan Beltrán, from "the province of Cinaloa [Sinaloa], died of his wound on this occasion. "He had come to these islands at over fifty years old, with the desire to serve God, and died with the hope of enjoying Him for all eternity" (ibid., 451-52).

Four new Jesuit missionaries came on the 1671 galleon, but three of the original 1668 contingent went on to the Philippines to complete their studies, and Fr. Luis de Medina had already been killed, so there was no increase of missionaries. It is curious that all the sources concerning the siege of 1671 speak of six priests, which was, of course, the total number in the mission. But, as we have noted above, they explicitly say also that one of the priests was away on another island with four of the lay companions. Hence, the correct number of Jesuits among those being besieged would have been only five. This only gives further evidence that it is impossible to give exact numbers either for 1668 or for 1671. My approximations only show the impossibility of the numbers cited by Leyson from Rogers.

The Jesuit report of the first year relates a supposed apparition of the Blessed Virgin in the 1630s to a Chamorro named Taga in a village of Tinian called Chiro, in which she exhorted Taga to receive baptism and to help the shipwrecked Spaniards with a boat to reach the Philippines. One of the Span-
iards, named Marcos Fernández, baptized Taga, and through the latter’s brother in Guam they were able to get a boat so that they might return to the Philippines and send Fathers to the Marianas. Whatever one may think of the apparition, Taga was baptized “Corcuerá” in honor of the current governor of the Philippines, and not only the legend but also the name still persisted in Chiro when the Jesuits arrived there. It seems sure that the “chief interpreter from Manila,” Don Francisco de Mendoza, must have been one of these Spaniards.

Even Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, who, as far as is known, was not among the Spaniards of the Concepción, must have achieved a fair amount of aptitude in the language, for he is spoken of as conversing with a Chamorro woman in difficult labor, over whom he prayed, and then baptized her new-born infant in danger of death. He then taught her the sign of the cross and prayers to drive away the anitos, giving her a profession of faith written by San Vitores and promising that when San Vitores came back he would baptize her and her family (García 1683, 225). The ordinary non-Spanish crew members who survived in 1638 appear to have blended into the local population. For the Filipinos, the Chamorro language, being cognate to Tagalog and Visayan, would have been easy to learn. García says: “Their language is easy to pronounce and to learn, especially for those who know Tagalog and Visayan” (1683, 198) Probably they had taken wives for themselves, at least in some cases, though there is rarely a mention of a wife in the sources. Only the Pedro [Jiménez?] who presented his two-year-old daughter to San Vitores for baptism on the day of his arrival in Agana, and the unnamed interpreter who took his wife with him to the Gani islands, are so mentioned, as far as I have been able to determine. However, it is probable that some had entered into stable marriages, what would today be called common-law marriages, but valid ones, given the impossibility of reaching a priest. Or perhaps they had blended into the culture of urritas, the young unmarried men who, according to Chamorro custom, bought or rented daughters of families for sexual services in a kind of institutionalized prostitution in the so-called bachelors’ houses in the villages. This, according to Chamorro custom, would not preclude later marriage, which was generally stable, according to the missionaries. Nor would it prevent their returning to a Christian way of life, even if not as missionaries, once the priests arrived.

Pedro Basijan, mentioned above as coming from Salug in companionship with Fr. Francisco Solano, could be another (not the same one, since they were killed at different dates and places), though it is difficult to know whether he came as a missionary or a soldier. Perhaps that distinction is artificial here. On the other hand, there is no indication that he came specifically as an interpreter.

The implication is that, though not knowing the Spanish alphabet, he knew the pre-Hispanic Tagalog syllabary, which was still in use to some degree in the
1630’s when he had been shipwrecked, as the existence of signatures of Filipinos from that period still to be found in the Dominican and other religious order archives attests (Scott 1994, 210-13).

The translation from the Latin is mine, and differs on a few important points from that of Burrus (936) and from the almost similar one of Leyson (1999, 30, n. 12). These give the impression that the “grammar and catechism” were actually composed on the ship, rather than before San Vitores left the Philippines. In fact, a few lines later in his own text, Leyson actually asserts this error. A semifinal version of the preface to San Vitores’s work may have been composed on the ship, but not the substance of the work. It was rather the vocabulario that was done on the ship. The seventeen [decem et septem] years is, of course, erroneous, since the shipwreck took place in 1638 and the rescue in 1664, hence twenty-six or twenty-seven years. Probably a slip or oversight by San Vitores.

Though it can only be a conjecture, one possibility is that, having fulfilled his function of interpreter on the ship, by the time he reached Guam he had decided to give up and return to the Philippines. This conjecture would offer a plausible explanation for an otherwise inexplicable remark of García in his account of the life of Fr. Francisco Solano, a devoted friend of San Vitores, whom he assisted when the latter was preparing for the mission to the Marianas. After finishing his studies, he was assigned to work in Negros and later among the Subanon in Mindanao, as mentioned above. Then assigned to Manila, he handled the affairs of the Marianas mission, and again asked to be sent there. While waiting, “with the Arte of the language composed by San Vitores and sent to Manila, and with the teaching of a Mariano who passed to Manila on the ship which left Father Sanvitores in the Marianas, whom he put in charge of instructing him, he made progress in learning the language . . .” Since it seems incredible that San Vitores would have sent an unbaptized Chamorro to Manila two days after his arrival, when the work of evangelization had not even begun, much less the baptisms of adults in good health, it seems most likely that the Mariano spoken of was a Filipino who had lived in the Marianas for many years as one of the shipwrecked sailors, had joined the expedition to the Marianas, and then returned to the Philippines. This would account for Fr. Solano finding an interpreter in Manila, as well as the disappearance from the records of San Vitores’s Tagalog interpreter. The argument is certainly plausible, and it solves several mysteries, but it can only be a conjecture. When San Vitores did send three Chamorro “nobles” back to Manila with the three Jesuits in 1671 with the idea that they be impressed by Manila and Mexico and thus be persuasive supporters of the mission when they returned, they were already Christian, and there was great excitement around them. Moreover, García gives the better part of a chapter to this “embassy” (1683, 267-72). In fact, none of them succeeded in returning, dying either of disease or of shipwreck.
The Spaniards only succeeded in abolishing these around 1680 (Hezel, 1989, 24).

Here one can see again that at least some of the compañeros were not boys, or even youths, since this man had learned the trade of carpenter, presumably while still in the Philippines.

The themes of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius—the knight of Christ, who must not stain his honor, sworn to show his loyalty to the eternal King, whose camp was the contrary of that of Satan—are quite evident here, no doubt part of the religious formation he had given them on their arrival in the Marianas.

One clear example of physical incompatibility was Fr. Diego Noriega, S.J., who, though already having tuberculosis, was sent from Mexico to the Marianas “because of the great lack of personnel,” and because superiors thought the change of climate would do him good [l]. Sick from the time of his arrival, he died within five months (Garcia 1683, 287).

Hezel 1989, appendix 2, 89. Though there are several presumably typographical errors in this list, it is accurate (except for one error regarding Fr. Alonso López, who is listed as arriving in 1673 rather than the correct date of 1671). It is based on the Philippine Province catalogues on microfilm from the Jesuit Roman Archives, at the Rizal Library of the Ateneo de Manila University. Some Jesuits, for whom no nationality is noted, are evidently non-Spaniards, to judge from their Germanic names.

Of course, other factors also intervened besides spiritual or psychological or physical incompatibility with life in the mission. The mission always remained a subordinate part of the Philippine Jesuit Province, and undoubtedly some were appointed to more important positions in the Philippines for which they were particularly fitted, like Fr. Luis de Morales, who had left the mission in 1671 to complete his studies, but who was kept on in the Philippines (for which he had originally volunteered) for other work, where he became provincial superior in 1699. We may surmise too from examining the list that, given the large number of volunteers from various countries, in the eighteenth century Spaniards were more likely to go to the increasingly sophisticated Hispanic Philippines, particularly the University of San Ignacio and other apostolates in Manila, while the large number of non-Spaniards, for whom Spanish was only a second language, could work as well or better in the more primitive Marianas. Beginning as early as 1678 (though there had been some non-Spaniards before that) some sixty percent of the missionaries were Dutch [i.e., Spanish Netherlands, today Belgium], Austrian, Bohemian, Italian, Maltese, Sicilian, Neapolitan, and German.
Bustillos has to be read critically. Especially in his early years as a scholastic, he showed a propensity for believing in visions, miracles, and prophecies even beyond the ordinary rhetoric of his times. This is especially true when writing of San Vitores, clearly his idol, who in turn seems to have confided to his fellow-Burgalés much of his personal mystical experience in his paternal attitude toward the youngest of the mission. Nonetheless, Bustillos’s knowledge of both the mission and its leader were unsurpassed.

One can give simpler explanations for this ability, since unfamiliar Spanish words, adopted in all the Filipino languages for religious terms not existing in them, would be most likely to give them trouble to remember accurately. The idea of a gift of tongues is no doubt derived from the similar gift (wrongly) attributed to St. Francis Xavier. It would be especially likely since San Vitores was greatly devoted to Xavier, and consciously modeled himself and his mission methods on those attributed to the Apostle of the Indies. For the dubious reality of Xavier’s supposed gift of tongues, see Schurhammer 1977, 448-49, n. 150.

This is contradicted by San Vitores himself, as may be seen below, where he says that his translation of the Creed and the Lord’s Prayer were only rough translations, which he did not want the Chamorros to be forced to memorize until there would be a more perfect version. There is no doubt, however, that he continued to make progress rapidly, and would have later made a more definitive translation.

The Acto de Contrición was not the simple prayer of sorrow for sin, but a penitential procession with songs and prayers, devised by Fr. Jerónimo Lopez, S.J. for use in rural missions in Spain. It is described as follows by De la Costa (1961, 471): “López had found in the course of giving innumerable missions . . . that one of the most effective means of drawing [people] to a better life was to march through the streets of a town or village carrying a crucifix and crying out the act of contrition in a loud voice, varying this with short extemporaneous ejaculations expressive of sorrow for sin, and wherever a crowd collected, at street corners or in the squares, expanding the formula into passionate exhortations to repentance. Usually people who merely stopped to stare stayed to pray, and soon the missioner was being followed by a vast procession singing hymns and shouting the act of contrition with him, often with sobs and tears. He led them in this manner to the church, where, after a brief instruction on how to make a good confession, he sent them to the priests waiting in the confessional.” San Vitores had accompanied Fr Jerónimo López in his itinerant missions in Spain before coming to the Philippines, and undoubtedly learned its use from him (Astrain 1920, 806-7). In the Philippines he later used this exercise both in Spanish and Tagalog, and in Chamorro in the Marianas, adapting it to the different situations.
Burrus err, however, in saying that San Vitores learned Tagalog in Taytay, Palawan. In San Vitores’s letters he says explicitly that he was in the town of Taytay, “some six leagues” (approximately thirty km.) from Manila ([Ledesma] 1981, 128). Burrus has a number of other minor factual errors with regard to the apostolic activities and trip of San Vitores, being an expert on Latin America rather than the Philippines.

This manuscript is principally intended to give a sketch of the grammar and pronunciation, with a selection of more useful phrases and formulas. For its title is “Grammatical Instructions in the Chamorro Language” (“Grammaticae Institutiones Marianae Linguae”). The so-called catechetical part was apparently primarily intended to illustrate the grammar, and evolved into supplying the necessary basic instructions for administering baptism in emergency situations, such as that of old and sick adults for whom there was no time or opportunity to receive systematic instructions in the Catholic faith. It was not a catechism in the ordinary sense of the word.

As Burrus remarks (953, n. 37), the Manuale Romanum referred to is evidently the Roman Ritual (Rituale Romanum) for the sacraments. Even apart from San Vitores’s explicit declaration, it is hard to see how Leyson, after reading the whole with its difficult and technical Latin, could think that even one educated in the Manila colleges, much less one with the simple education of Pedro Calungsod, could have even understood it. Certainly he could never have used it as a Chamorro catechism.

For example, Francisco Maunahun is reported to have spent his last two years before his martyrdom “alone in the island and church of San Francisco Javier [Agrigan] attending to the baptisms and Doctrinas . . .” (Garcia 1683, 456). That is to say, Maunahun, besides performing emergency baptisms, would drill the people preparing for baptism or already Christians, in the Doctrina. Likewise, in petitioning the king for funds for his boarding school [seminario], San Vitores says he will “choose from all the boys those of more ability, better natural qualities and application to the Doctrina Cristiana.” (Ibid. 241). As in the Philippines this would be recited every day in school, and in the church on Sundays, undoubtedly led by the Filipino companions, at least at first, and later by the boys of the school.

In 1664, the first year after learning Tagalog in Taytay, his pastoral ministry was designated as only to Filipinos. This would be the opportunity for the missions in Mindoro.

According to the summary of this letter by Burrus (1954, 336-38), large sections of the letter are devoted to discussing the opinions of various authors as to the hypothesis that the islands had originally been settled from Japan, and his own opinion that the inhabitants may have come from Egypt, accompanied
by other historical considerations mixed with lengthy Scriptural exegesis in the intellectual fashion of the time. All this would have been impossible without the many books cited, which he could have consulted only in the University of San Ignacio, while still in Manila. Since there would not have been much time before the galleon departed Agana for Manila, some handwritten copies of the grammar itself, as well as the bulk of the introductory letter, must have been made by one of his Jesuit companions, either in Manila or on shipboard.

77 It is clear that he could not simply have given the Doctrina Cristiana or Acto de Contrición to just any of the interpreters to translate, since he says explicitly of the Tagalog interpreter who helped him with the vocabulary on the ship that he was unable to read Spanish letters, i.e., the Roman alphabet. Perhaps Don Francisco de Mendoza (if he knew Tagalog, as is probable) or a group of interpreters helped him.

78 The letter of Bustillos on the linguistic ability of San Vitores cited previously, in spite of its exaggerations and ill-founded suppositions as to San Vitores's supernatural gift of tongues, says definitely that he composed in Chamorro an "Arte, Vocabulario, y Catecismo." He then relates how on the voyage from Mexico to the Marianas, San Vitores corrected the Filipinos whom he had as interpreters, "acting as teacher of his teachers." This clearly supposes that he had already learned the basics of the language in the Philippines, with at least the Arte (i.e., the "grammar and catechism" of Burrus) and the Catecismo (the Doctrina Cristiana)—which, with the Acto de Contrición, would have been the master texts from which he could make the analysis of grammar needed to construct the Arte—having been completed there, as noted above. Though Leyson identifies the grammar and catechism with the manuscript published by Burrus, this is clearly erroneous. The Arte and the Catecismo—that is, the Doctrina Cristiana—were two separate works, both composed in the Philippines. Since Bustillos also says that it was on the voyage from the Philippines to Mexico that he corrected his teacher, this has to refer to the Vocabulario.

79 Leyson (1999, 34-35) supposes that San Vitores was "preparing a grammar and catechism in Chamorro with the help of his Tagalog interpreter." The Filipino survivors from the Ladrones who accompanied the mission were, as he understands, only the Tagalog mentioned on one occasion by San Vitores as working with him, and the Visayan Esteban. However, there is no reason to suppose that only the Tagalog worked with San Vitores all the time; simply that he was the one who happened to be there when San Vitores wrote his introductory letter. It is true that San Vitores knew only Tagalog, not Visayan. But as he makes clear in his description of his first meeting with the four men rescued by Admiral Ramos, all of them understood, at least to some extent, both Tagalog and Spanish. Nonetheless, it is logical that the Tagalog would be the one he would depend on more. However, Leyson shows himself unaware of
the "principal interpreter from Manila," the Spaniard, Don Francisco de Mendoza, whom we have mentioned above. Though he almost certainly was not as fluent in Chamorro as the two Filipino interpreters, having spent less time in the Marianas than they, and perhaps not having a cognate Philippine language as his own, he would presumably have had the advantage of being much better educated and therefore more able to understand the linguistic problems San Vitores faced. Moreover, of course, he was fluent in Spanish, so that San Vitores would more easily communicate with him. In fact there is in the grammar of San Vitores evidence that Mendoza did collaborate on it, since the Chamorro equivalent of his name is used as one of the examples of a noun, together with the words si Dios, si Jesús, si sancta María, si Pedro, si Taypiru, si Pare. With these is included si Mandasay, which, as Burrus noted without being aware of its significance, is evidently, when taken in conjunction with its translation elsewhere, the surname Mendoza (Burrus 1954, 943, n. 26; 945). Whether si Pedro is included because it was the name of the Tagalog interpreter, one can only conjecture, but it is not unlikely. (Not Pedro Calungsod, of course, who was a Visayan). Pare, of course, stands for Padre, but it is impossible for me to say what si Taypiru stands for; it hardly seems to correspond to Esteban, but it is almost certainly also a proper name, like the rest in the enumeration of examples. Thus we say "two or more" interpreters, because we have multiple indications of the Tagalog (Pedro?) and Don Francisco Mendoza, without ruling out Esteban or another unknown to us from the sources.

80 Though this seems to indicate that he only began the vocabulary on the Mexico-Marianas leg of the voyage, the whole passage is rather intended as a summary of his linguistic accomplishments, and need not be taken as a strict chronological account of them. Logically, it would seem that he would make the vocabulary before attending to such extras as the hymns to the saints, or he may have been continuing, rather than beginning, the vocabulary in this part of the voyage. In any case, García was not an eyewitness, but summarized as best he could the primary materials he had access to.

81 We say "probably later" because in the Burrus document, though San Vitores gives the common prayers, he cautions the priest baptizing not to make them memorize "these rough [rudes] translations of ours of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer yet . . . until either they might know well our language or we theirs, or some of us, more fully instructed by the grace of God and our experience of the language, shall have made certainly and safely perfect Chamorro translations" (Burrus 1954, 955).

82 This last sentence is probably a typically overstated elaboration by Risco of the more sober description by García, quoted above.

83 Moreover, there are many comparisons with Tagalog, which, though helpful to one who knew the latter language, must have been unintelligible to those
who had never been in the Philippines. Perhaps Fr. Tomás Cardeñoso was able to help them in this.

84 It would appear that this was different than the "grammar and catechism" of which we have spoken above, which did contain the Creed and the Commandments, but had no explanation, as it was made for adults in danger of death, and required only a general assent for baptism. It seems likely that the other Jesuits would have had the first work as an aid to learning the language, but that he later composed this further explanation that he gave them for actual use in the ministry.

85 This was in reference to the intense devotion, especially in Spain, to helping the souls in Purgatory with Masses, indulgences, and other good works, which was so characteristic of late medieval and especially early modern Catholicism. His point is that the "souls in Purgatory," though in need of proprietary help, were assured of eventual salvation; those without baptism would inevitably be condemned eternally to Hell. Though there were theologians who cast doubt on so grim a doctrine, it remained prevalent through the seventeenth century.

86 That is, they had not been exposed to the rumors the Chinese pagan castaway had spread about the poisonous character of the baptismal water.

87 It would seem likely that these two men were Francisco Maunahun, and his unnamed companion in martyrdom.

88 The "island of Gani" was the collective name for the eight northern islands, beginning with Anatahan and extending north to the last inhabited (at that time) island of Maug (Hezel 1989, 10-13). They included Asonson [Asunción] which San Vitores converted in 1669, and put there and in Maug the "two well-instructed laymen." Alamagan was likewise part of the islands of Gani, as was Agrigan, where Maunahun was put in charge for two years (ibid., 455-56). If these were the same two years, then either there is a second unnamed man, or Maunahun and his companion moved from island to island within the Gani group. For the sizes and distances in relation to one another and to other islands, see the map in Risco 1970, third plate following p. 128. Of course there is also the possibility that García, writing in the two different sections of his book, and being ignorant of the exact geography of the Marianas, has confused his data; it is impossible to know. The point remains that it was the "more advanced and mature" [más aprovenchados y seguros] men that San Vitores entrusted with these priestless islands.

89 The primary sources, especially García, repeatedly make the point that those who were killed for their fidelity to their mission, were being rewarded for their zeal and fidelity with the gift of martyrdom. Of Francisco Maunahun and his unnamed companion: "I do not call tragedy [desgracia] but favor [gracia]
of the Lord the death which the enemies of Christianity gave those two Christians" (1683, 455). And of Lorenzo the Malabar, after praising his zeal in helping the Fathers: "for this he merited to receive before them the crown that all desired" (ibid., 251).

90 San Vitores had originally spoken of bringing fifteen to twenty Filipinos. To judge from the difficulty he was experiencing when Felipe Sonson came to him—he had only four then—they probably scarcely reached twenty by the time of departure in 1667, as we have indicated in the text. Of course, the number was supplemented by six soldiers on the galleon of 1669 (there was no galleon in 1670), but at least one of these—Sergeant Major Juan de Santiago—and probably all, were Spaniards (including Mexicans). Though they did perform certain functions of the lay volunteers, such as accompanying the missionaries (but without carrying any arms, according to San Vitores’s instructions), they could not be considered missionaries in the sense that Pedro Calungsod and his companions were. On the other hand, one who was above all a missionary, Felipe Sonson, who had had military experience when young, "became quite skillful in the use of the musket," during the rebellions, with the permission of his superior (Schumacher 1995, 280). These occasions, of course, were purely for defense, especially during the lifetime of San Vitores.

91 Admittedly, he could also have been, and probably was, using the term "soldiers" in the metaphorical sense of soldiers of the Gospel. But the context implies actual military men.

92 Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, who had accompanied San Vitores from Manila and who led the military force in the siege, in his 1677 testimony at the canonical process on the martyrdom of San Vitores held in Manila, spoke of thirty soldados ([Ledesma] 1981, 221). Probably the captain did not include himself in the thirty, as they were his soldiers, just as in the account of San Vitores’s Armada Naval Mariana above, where he is mentioned outside the ten "soldiers." Other testimonies given at the same time in Manila similarly give the figure thirty ([Ledesma] 1981, 216-25), probably with the same assumption. It is possible too that they were influenced by the captain’s testimony, as chief eyewitness to this particular event, or they were just giving an approximate number. García (1983, 278 and elsewhere) speaks of twelve Spanish and nineteen Filipino soldiers "some with firearms, some with bows and arrows." Leyson (1993, 37-44; 1999, 58-61) quotes a report in the Jesuit Roman Archives, compiled by Fr. Andrés de Ledesma, the Jesuit provincial in the Philippines, from various accounts sent to him from the Marianas. This report to Rome, perhaps precisely because it is a compilation of different accounts, though it gives the figure of twelve Spaniards and seventeen Filipinos in one place, a few pages later speaks of thirty-one soldiers. Though supplying the Spanish original in a footnote, presumably from J. Ledesma (1981, 273-81),
Leyson inadvertently translates "treinta y uno" as "thirty" rather than thirty-one (1993, 41; 1999, 59). This report was later printed with a letter from Fr. José Vidal, S.J., to the father of San Vitories, Don Gerónimo, three times in the seventeenth century under different titles, described by J. Ledesma (1981, 273), the third of them in Seville in 1674. Though unmentioned by either J. Ledesma or Leyson, there was a new edition with a new title in 1898, containing the same contradictory numbers (Ledesma 1898). Murillo Velarde (1749, f. 297r) gives the figure of twelve Spaniards and nineteen Filipinos, almost certainly dependent on García. All things considered, thirty-one seems the most reliable figure for the total, twelve Spaniards, including Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, and nineteen Filipinos. A clear indication that the Filipinos were not regular soldiers is the fact that they had no firearms, but only bows and arrows, and according to another source, machetes or bolos. The bows and arrows were no match for the arrows of the Chamorros, made of human bones, which contained poison.

93 Though García does not identify them in his account of the siege except to speak of one priest with a few [pocos] lay companions, later in his history he speaks of San Vitories having "sent Father Alonso López to [Tinian] with four lay companions, whom he could not advise in time to retire to Guam" when the siege of 1671 threatened (1683, 453). It is evident that these must be the unidentified ones referred to above, and that the "pocos" were four. Since García wrote from many sources, and in this fifth and last book of his work abandons the chronological order to narrate the lives and virtues of the principal ones who had been killed up to 1681, he evidently did not connect his narration here with what he had said earlier, when treating the life and career of San Vitories.

94 The soldiers of 1671 may be deduced to be three or four, since the Mexican, José Peralta, had been killed by now, but Santa Cruz, Don Francisco Mendoza, and Bazán should be included in the twelve Spaniards, though probably Mendoza, as interpreter, and perhaps Bazán, were among the four lay companions absent on Tinian with Fr. Alonso López. Since the latter had only been in the Marianas a few months, he certainly needed a good interpreter, and having come from Mexico rather than from the Philippines, hence knowing no Philippine language, it is likely that San Vitories would give him the Spanish interpreter ([Ledesma] 1981, 216; García 1683, 267). Since all sources agree that there were twelve Spaniards, this number must have included the Mexican criollos or mestizos who had been among the soldiers who arrived on the 1669 or 1671 galleons, of whom Peralta, the punishment of whose murder occasioned the siege, was one. Another Mexican or Spaniard who came as a soldier in 1671 was Don Nicolas de Mendoza, who testified at the process in Manila in 1677 ([Ledesma] 1981, 218-20).
The first “professional” soldiers were the six who came in 1669, though it is not said that San Vitores had asked for them. Risco (1970, 140-42) cites a document from the Jesuit archives of Loyola, hitherto unpublished, relating the visit of the new Governor-General of the Philippines, Don Manuel de Leon, on his way to Manila. It was he who took the initiative to leave these six soldiers behind, in the face of the increasing hostility of those whose minds had been poisoned against the missionaries by the Chinese Choco. The governor attempted to take the latter prisoner to Manila, but was unable to locate him. He also left behind some more muskets and ammunition. It is evident that San Vitores had, in the face of the realities he had encountered, modified to a certain limited extent his original policy of radical pacifism. The soldiers were, however, still subject to his ultimate authority, though at first under the immediate command of Captain Juan de Santa Cruz, who had come as a missionary in 1668, but took command when there was need of military action. In 1672 he was succeeded by the regular military officer, Captain Juan de Santiago, one of those left by Governor de Leon. In 1674 Damian de Esplana arrived as Manila-appointed military commander with more reinforcements after several priests and laymen, including San Vitores and Pedro Calungsod had been killed. In 1676 Francisco de Irrisari came as governor, with full authority over both civil and military matters, displacing the Jesuit superior in this regard, and more reinforcements, thus bringing the garrison to over 100 men. Both these latter commanders pursued a policy of strong force against any violence or revolt (Hezel 1982, 127).

However, Hezel speaks of a “garrison” of “troops,” which we have shown not to be the primary function of San Vitores’s original companions. Mojarres (2000, 43) shares the same error.

This translation is given by Ledesma in Risco (1970, 143). The word is not found in even the best Spanish or Tagalog dictionaries, nor could any Spaniard or Mexican I consulted explain it.

Risco claims that San Vitores sent a letter to his father, dated 6 June 1671, requesting “more soldiers, more firearms and muskets,” to be presented to the Royal Council in Madrid. This he asserts to have arrived in Madrid in September, and that the Queen immediately sent a cédula to the Viceroy of Mexico, which arrived there on 18 November of the same year. On that date it was decided at a meeting to send eighteen well armed men to the Marianas, who arrived there the next year, 1672, when San Vitores was already dead. The chronology of Risco is impossible, and he appears to have confused two different decrees. The galleon Buen Socorro, on which Risco alleges San Vitores’s letter was sent to his father in June 1671, was on its way to Manila. This trip took a month or more. If the yearly galleon had not already left, in which case
another year would pass (it usually left in June or July, though sometimes later) it would wait for the next galleon ready to make the four to eight months' voyage to Acapulco. An indeterminate time would then be needed to get the letter overland, probably via Mexico City, to Vera Cruz, where, if a ship happened to be ready to sail, three weeks to a month might be required before arriving in Sevilla. From there the letter would go overland to the royal court. The Queen could not have received it much before the middle of 1672, perhaps later. Then, of course, there would be bureaucratic consultations in the Consejo de Indias before the royal cedula was sent, by way of Mexico, to Manila. Actually, what was received in Mexico and discussed at a junta of 18 November 1671 was a reply to a letter sent by San Vitores through his father in 1669, asking in a general way for more Spanish troops and arms for defense. The Queen ordered the Viceroy in Mexico to see what could be done. As a result, the Mexican junta resolved to send eighteen soldiers—Spaniards or Mexicans. García (1683, 266) speaks of the Buen Socorro of June 1671 as bringing supplies San Vitores had requested in the list of 1669 cited above, “and soldiers whom Her Majesty sent, by the providence of the Lord, who saw the need.” The implication, which is consistent with San Vitores's list of 1669, is that these had been sent solely at the initiative of the Queen, and perhaps the request of San Vitores's father, and as we have seen, they were only a few—three or four. The eighteen from Mexico, if they were sent at all, would have arrived in May 1672 on the San Diego. García's account of this detachment simply says: “They left some [algunos] soldiers, without it being necessary to oblige anyone; rather there were many who asked for it, with the desire to avenge the death of Father San Vitores, and to cooperate in the great harvest which that land promised, watered as it was with the blood of so many martyrs” (1683, 446). The minutes of the Mexican junta are reproduced from a document from the Archivo de Indias in Astrain 1920, 816. The estimates for the time required for a letter to travel from Guam to Manila to Mexico to Madrid and back to Mexico to Guam and Manila are roughly based on the data in Schurz (1939, chapter seven, passim), and in scattered references in García. Hezel gives a brief summary of the 1669 letter to the Queen, enclosed with her decree of 12 August 1671 to the Viceroy of Mexico, which must be the one discussed in the junta of 18 November 1671, and corresponds to what Astrain says about the latter. However, Hezel specifies two hundred Filipinos, which Astrain's document indicates was never discussed. In any case, the two hundred Pampangos would have had to be sent by the Governor of the Philippines, not by the Viceroy of Mexico. Perhaps Hezel too has taken this detail from the other royal cedula (Hezel 1982, 122). Since to resolve otherwise this passing mention would occasion further insoluble difficulties, I prefer to think it was an inadvertent conflation of two decrees on his part as well as Risco's. It would then be in 1671, after the several priests and
lay companions had been killed, that San Vitores again wrote to the Queen, specifically calling for two hundred Pampangos, coming not from Mexico, as the Spaniards and Mexicans of 1669 and 1671 had come, but from Manila. The answering royal cedulas, the last of which was dated 10 November 1671 (when her previous cedula had not yet even been taken up in Mexico), were directed to the governor of the Philippines, as well to the now dead San Vitores. These cedulas would come on the galleon of 1673, and San Vitores's second successor (the immediate successor, Fr. Francisco Solano, had already died), Fr. Francisco Esquerra, would send Fr. Gerardo Bouvens to Manila to obtain the passage of the Pampangos from the governor, as well as a small boat which could be used for interisland travel (García 1683, 470).

99 Though García does not name the governor explicitly, De León was governor-general 1669-77. García calls him “enemigo declarado de la misión Marian,” which is somewhat difficult to reconcile with the description of De León’s interest and concern for the mission when he passed there in 1669, as recounted in the document from Loyola cited above by Risco (1970, 140-42). However, Manila governors-general were notorious for ignoring orders from Madrid—“se obedece, pero no se cumple.” One possible reason why the Governor-General may have been unwilling to send the requested Pampango troops is that just about this time the prince of the island of Siao (in modern Indonesia) came to request Jesuit missionaries, with troops to defend his kingdom against the Dutch. De Leon sent with the Jesuits twenty Spaniards and an unspecified number of Pampangos to fulfill this request. (All were driven out by the Dutch in 1677). At the same time he was faced with rumors (false, as it turned out) of an invasion by a Chinese corsair from Formosa. It is not surprising then that he felt himself unable to send the requested number of Pampangos to the Marianas (Montero y Vidal 1887, 355, 357, 361).

100 The newly named governor of the Marianas, Francisco Irrissari, (replacing the Jesuit superiors in their civil authority), brought seventy-four troops. With the arrival of these Hezel estimates the total garrison amounted to about one hundred men (1982, 127).

101 It should be emphasized that at no time were the Chamorros as a whole, or even the majority, hostile to the missionaries or to their preaching, as Mojares implies (2000, 49). But Chamorro society was faction-ridden, a fact the Jesuits did not immediately perceive, and even on the major islands where most of the hostility occurred, while one faction attacked or bitterly opposed the missionaries, others welcomed them, and the number of genuine conversions was great. This was especially true on those islands where the calumnies of the Chinese Choco had not reached, such as those of the north, where the missionaries, even the lay ones, were well received and where almost everyone
asked for baptism, and underwent the necessary instruction and memorizing of the *Doctrina Cristiana* in order to receive it. Almost all the killings or other hostile actions took place on Guam, Tinian, Saipan, and Rota, which were, however, the largest and most populous islands, but precisely for that reason most divided. Moreover, after the siege of 1671, hostile groups from Guam traveled to some of these islands to stir up opposition to the missionaries (García 1683, 453-54).
THE JUBILEE INDULGENCES:
Receiving The “Total Gift Of The Mercy Of God”

Daniel Patrick Huang, S.J.

“T he zeal to gain indulgences has certainly declined among Catholics.” This sentence, written by Karl Rahner about thirty years ago, would surely be an understatement if used to describe the situation of Catholics today (Rahner, 150). One of the three major signs of this Jubilee Year according to the Holy Father is the sign of indulgences; yet it is safe to say that not only the faithful, but even majority of the clergy, have no real idea what indulgences are. The Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC) provides a definition of indulgences, quoted from Pope Paul VI's apostolic constitution Indulgentiarum Doctrina; but this definition is hardly illuminating for most people:

“An indulgence is a remission before God of the temporal punishment due to sins whose guilt has already been forgiven, which the faithful Christian who is duly disposed gains under certain prescribed conditions through the action of the Church which, as minister of redemption, dispenses and applies with authority the treasury of the satisfactions of Christ and the saints” (CCC, 1471).

In fact, not only does this definition not clarify matters for many of us; it actually raises problems. Speaking of “temporal punishment” remitted due to the performance of “certain prescribed con-