Philippine Quarterly of Culture & Society
Vol. 41 (3/4): 163-194

Jose Rizal in the World of German Anthropology

Resil B. Mojares

ABSTRACT

Jose Rizal's place in the history of Philippine anthropology is under-appreciated. The article tries to correct this by tracking Rizal's sojourn in Imperial Germany in 1886-87; his contacts with some of the most important late nineteenth-century German scientists; his participation in German learned societies; his collaborative work with German scholars in collecting anthropological artifacts; and his readings and attempts to translate works like Theodor Waitz' *Anthropologie der Naturvolker* (1858-71). The article situates all these in relation to Rizal's intellectual development and the history of German anthropology. It explores what Rizal found liberating in German anthropology in his time, and what his views were on issues like race and evolutionism at a time when Germany had began to drift towards the colonialist and anti-humanist ideas that would authorize National Socialism.

In a recently-discovered letter, Jose Rizal writes to Adolf Bastian in Berlin on 3 July 1888 in response to a communication from the ethnologist Wilhelm Joest.[1] Joest had inquired whether the box Rizal had sent to the ethnology museum in Berlin, addressed to Fedor Jagor, was meant for the museum and could thus be opened. Writing in German, Rizal replied that it was indeed for the museum and

Dr. Resil B. Mojares is Professor Emeritus at the University of San Carlos, Cebu. He can be reached at mojares.resil@gmail.com.

apologized it was not directly addressed to Bastian, the museum director, since the arrangements for the donation had been made through Jagor. The letter includes Rizal's list of the twenty-one items in the box, mostly articles of clothing and accessories from Mindanao and the Tagalog region. The other items are a *kalikut, pang-ani, cuerda para atar el gallo, cepillos de diente hechos de corteja (areca buyo), salakot de plata y aeta* (that, Rizal says, *es gehorte mir*, "this was mine"), and *sulpakan*.[2] The *sulpakan* is explained with an accompanying drawing as a piston made of buffalo horn that Philippine natives use for igniting a fire.

There is nothing particularly earthshaking about the letter. It is further reminder however of how deeply involved Rizal was in the world of German anthropology. There are at least two things distinctive about the letter. It is the first reference we have found thus far that Rizal had contact with Adolf Bastian (1826-1903), one of the founding figures of German anthropology, and that he had donated artifacts to Berlin's *Museum fur Volkerkunde* (Ethnological Museum), the world's first free-standing ethnographic museum.

Rizal's sojourn in Germany (or what was then a larger Imperial Germany), from February 1886 to May 1887, was one of the most intellectually intense periods in his life. It was during this time that he finished writing *Noli me Tangere* – which was printed in Berlin in March 1887 – and immersed himself in German intellectual life. The sojourn impressed Rizal so deeply that he would call Germany "my scientific mother country"; dream of devoting his life to scholarship; and, exiled to lonely Dapitan, yearningly recall the mental excitement of Berlin in 1887,

> the incessant and indefatigable scientific life of civilized Europe where everything is discussed, where everything is placed in doubt, and nothing is accepted without previous examination, previous analysis – the life of the societies of linguistics, ethnography, geography, medicine, and archaeology.[3]

Rizal had completed his medical studies in Spain when he traveled to France and Germany to pursue residency training in the best eye clinics and, more important, immerse himself in the life of the world's artistic and scientific meccas, France and Germany. After a

stay in Paris, where he trained under the ophthalmologist Louis de Wecker, he moved to Germany, arriving in Heidelberg on 7 February 1886, where he took up lodgings and trained under Otto Becker, an Austrian eye specialist and professor at the University of Heidelberg.

His trip to Germany was clearly part of a plan. He had started his study of the German language while he was still in Spain and was convinced Germany had the most modern ideas in medicine and these would give him an edge since the medicine taught in Manila was of the "French school."[4] Rizal spent most of his time, however, on an education outside the clinic. He honed his knowledge of German, toured German towns and cities, studiously observed local life, read all he could, and engaged in conversations and correspondence with new German friends.

He left Heidelberg for Leipzig in August 1886, stopping along the way in places like Mannheim, Bonn, Cologne, and Frankfurt, arriving in Leipzig in October. In Leipzig, he met the young scholar-traveler Hans Meyer (1858-1929), who had been to the Philippines, and with Meyer and the famous geographer Friedrich Ratzel (1844-1904) visited the Leipzig museum. (He would, in the course of his travels, meet scholars like Adolf B. Meyer at the Royal Zoological and Anthropological-Ethnographic Museum in Dresden, which Meyer headed, and Heinrich Willkomm, a professor of natural history, in Prague.)

On 30 October 1886, Rizal left Leipzig for Berlin, where he would stay until May 1887. His stay in Berlin was productive and intense. On one hand, the struggle to finish the *Noli* and get it printed was emotionally draining for Rizal. On the other hand, this was the time Rizal found himself at the very center of German scholarship, meeting scholars like the naturalist Fedor Jagor (1817-1900), ethnologist Wilhelm Joest (1852-1897), and Rudolf Virchow (1821-1902), the most influential scientist in Germany at the time. Virchow was a famous man, a member of the *Reichstag*, the Prussian parliament (1880-1893), and a scientist renowned for his work in cellular pathology and public health.

In January 1887, Rizal was invited to be a member of the Berlin Society of Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory (*Verhandlungen*

der Berliner Gesellschaft fur Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte) and was subsequently nominated as fellow of the Berlin Geographical Society (*Gesellschaft fur Erdkunde zu Berlin*). He attended lectures and himself presented a paper, in German, on the Tagalog art of versification in a meeting of the Berlin ethnological society on 23 April 1887.

In this paper, published that same year in the society's journal, *Journal of Ethnology* (*Zeitschrift fur Ethnologie*), Rizal characterized Tagalog poetry as one governed by rules of metrics, stanzaic forms, and rhyme, "as in most languages," at the same time that he distinguished it from certain poetic norms the Spaniards tried to introduce. While it is a presentation biased in favor of European poetic categories, it is clear what Rizal was about: to argue for the parity of Tagalog poetry with that of the 'world'. While Tagalog poetry is distinctly oral, he said that Tagalogs were now rendering it in writing and musical notations, saying at the same time that he was only presenting a sample of a larger body of poetry that the Tagalogs have produced. In effect, the lecture (and his very performance of it) demonstrated that the Tagalogs were not the "primitives" of the anthropologists.[5]

Rizal impressed the German scholars. In the light of his martyrdom and the outbreak of the Philippine Revolution in 1896, tributes and notices appeared in the proceedings and journal of the Berlin anthropological society.[6] At the annual general meeting of the society in 1897, Rudolf Virchow spoke in memory of the "highly esteemed ordinary member, Dr. Jose Rizal from Luzon, Philippines," recalling the lecture on Tagalog poetry Rizal gave at the meeting of the society in 1887. Virchow narrates the life and tragic death of "this highly gifted, noble martyr," extolling his patriotism and abilities, adding that he has received the Spanish text and German translation of Rizal's "last farewell," a poem which was appended to the proceedings of the meeting. The obituary ends thus:

> We are losing in Rizal not only a faithful friend of Germany and German scholarship but also the only man with sufficient knowledge and resolution to open a way for modern thought into that far-off island world.[7]

After his death, Friedrich Ratzel would pay him fulsome tribute:

> Rizal has accumulated the wisdom of three continents, and has acquired that vast scientific horizon which he needed in order to know the true conditions of his country and to plan for her intellectual development.[8]

IN his *Rizal: Filipino Nationalist and Patriot* (1968), Austin Coates says that Rizal's stay in Berlin "may be said to mark a pinnacle in his life."[9] Coates does not quite explain. But he is clearly thinking of two things about the Berlin visit. It was, on one hand, one of the lowest moments in Rizal's life. He was living in a cheap room on Jaegerstrasse, in financial straits, ailing and hungry. He was struggling to finish the *Noli*, and feeling so despondent he thought of throwing the manuscript into the fire. But it was a time of deep exhilaration as well. The *Noli* was finally printed in Berlin in March 1887. That it was finally out filled Rizal with a sense of foreboding – the novel was an open attack against Spanish rule in the Philippines and he was then preparing to leave for home after an absence of five years. He knew that upon his return he would have to face the consequence of what he had written. Yet, the release of the book gave him a sense of peace as well in the knowledge that the logic of what he had done would just have to play itself out.

It was at this critical moment in Berlin that he joined the circle of German scholars, warmed by the fellowship, inspired by the spirited intellectual exchanges about the world. His contact with German scholars, Coates says, bolstered Rizal's confidence in his intellectual powers and affirmed the rightness of what he had done (and would do) as he prepared to return to the Philippines. In Berlin, he rose from the pit of despair to the clear heights of purpose. As Coates aptly writes: "He is the marksman, aware of the perfect control demanded if his fire is to be accurate.[10]

What was it about German scholarship in the cultural sciences that proved so inspiring to Rizal? It was, as he said in his letter to Blumentritt, the energetic freedom of inquiry and debate among intellectuals, but it was as well the ideas current and dominant in German anthropology at the time.

The late nineteenth century saw the institutionalization of German anthropological studies although anthropology was not viewed as a single discipline at the time. The field was divided into *anthropologie* (physical anthropology) and *ethnologie* (ethnology, or what is equivalent to cultural anthropology). Although Rudolf Virchow could say in 1894 that *anthropologie* had "nothing to do with culture," these were interconnected fields that are (as I am doing in this paper) now commonly referred to as "anthropology."[11]

German anthropology was in exciting ferment when Rizal sojourned in Germany in 1886-1887. Anthropology did not as yet have a standing in German universities. It was only in 1886 that a chair in physical anthropology was established in Munich; it was not until 1908 that a mixed chair in ethnology and anthropology was created in Berlin University. Only in 1920 was a chair created at a German university, in Leipzig, dedicated to ethnology alone. The focal sites in the development of German anthropology, therefore, were not universities but societies and museums.

Owing to the aggregate rather than centralized character of Imperial Germany, societies and museums were largely supported by state and municipal authorities, making for a multicentric, competitive system. Such was the case of the German Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory, which had the Berlin chapter as its base. Founded in 1869 by scholars and scientists led by Rudolf Virchow and Adolf Bastian, it was the leading association of its kind in Central Europe. Such, too, was Berlin's *Museum fur Volkerkunde*. The largest and most important German ethnological museum of its time, it was established through the efforts of Bastian, the leading figure in German ethnology (as Virchow was in physical anthropology). The museum was formally opened in December 1886 while Rizal was in Berlin.

The late nineteenth century was an expansive time for German anthropology. In the quarter century following the founding of Berlin's Society for Anthropology, Ethnology, and Prehistory in 1869, twenty-five anthropological associations were founded across Germany. Ethnological museums were founded not only in Berlin but cities like Munich (1868), Leipzig (1869), Dresden (1876), Hamburg (1879), Stuttgart (1884), and Bremen (1896).

A further fact about the intellectual and institutional formation of Germany anthropology is that since the field was inchoate as a distinct profession and discipline, its rise was driven by scholars trained in the classical disciplines, scientists, collectors, and civic-minded amateurs. Prominent were medical scientists and physicians – as Virchow and Bastian (like Rizal) were – with the knowledge in anatomy and pathology vital in physical anthropology. As H.G. Penny writes, the years that followed the 1848 revolution saw mostly middle-class, liberal-minded citizens organizing associations "in the name of progress, public welfare, and the common good." They "pursued science as one means of obtaining *Bildung* [intellectual and moral self-cultivation] and fostering culture, civic improvement, and public education in their communities." They were eager to "display their self-cultivation" and "exhibit worldliness by supporting new, international sciences and building connections across the globe," aspects that gave to German anthropology a liberal and cosmopolitan character.[12]

A fine product of this civic ethos is Ferdinand Blumentritt (1853-1913), the humble and earnest Austrian schoolmaster who became one of Rizal's closest friends and the most active German contributor to Philippine anthropology and nationalism.

This was the intellectual milieu in Germany at the time of Rizal's visit. But what of German anthropology's governing ideas, and how influential were these in the education of Rizal?

MATTI Bunzl and H.G. Penny question the common association of colonialism and anthropology by pointing out that while the standard narrative traces the shift from a quintessential colonial science to a more progressive, anti-colonial discipline, the case of German anthropology is the reverse. It was in its beginning in the nineteenth century "a self-consciously liberal endeavor, guided by a broadly humanistic agenda and centered on efforts to document the plurality and historical specificity of cultures."[13]

Germany was not a unified state until 1871 but a conglomeration of states and nationalities bound mainly by culture and language, and it did not become a colonial power until the last

quarter of the nineteenth century. These circumstances nourished a tradition of "German Idealism" that, in the study of culture, encouraged a progressivist emphasis on the successive liberation of the human mind or spirit (*Geist*) rather than the development of social institutions or technology ("historical universalism"), yet at the same time a strong interest in the cultural differences between peoples, which were explained mainly in environmental and historical terms ("historical particularism").

German Idealism developed along two lines: on one hand, the universalist construction (as in Kant and Hegel) of universal histories of mankind without regards for the differences between peoples; on the other hand, the particularistic interest in the differences among cultures. It was the latter that would exercise greater influence in German anthropology, particularly through the works of Johann Gottfried Herder, whose theory of the *Volk* and *Volksgeist* (a group of people united by language and culture, and the unique and enduring spirit embodied in that language and culture) encouraged German ethnologists to view culture as something that people everywhere possessed, and human diversity as the result of particular conditions and histories rather than stages on an evolutionary scale.

The two dominant figures in German anthropology at the time of Rizal's visit were Rudolf Virchow and Adolf Bastian. A professor of pathological anatomy at Berlin University, Virchow was an imposing public figure who dominated physical anthropology. Bastian, the director of *Museum fur Volkerkunde*, was Germany's leading ethnologist. It does not appear that Rizal met Bastian.[14] He also missed meeting Franz Boas (1858-1942), Bastian's assistant at the museum in 1885-1886, who left in 1886 to do fieldwork in British Columbia and would subsequently relocate to the United States where he came to be regarded as the father of American anthropology.

Both Virchow and Bastian were opposed to Darwinian evolutionism and racial determinism. Rejecting a biological link between mental faculty and race, they believed (as Herder did) that human nature was the same all over the world and that cultural differences arose due to geographical and historical influences. Both were committed to careful empirical research instead of "speculative theorizing," avoiding debates about race and scales of "progress."

In a large body of work, Bastian pursued his interest in ethnic psychology (*Volkerpsychologie*) and developed his thesis on the "psychic unity of mankind," positing that all human minds worked in the same way and man's cultural development proceeded everywhere in more or less the same way. A vigorous collector and institution-builder, Bastian designed *Museum fur Volkerkunde* as one that would not arrange or display artifacts in evolutionary sequences but geographically, letting viewers make mental connections among the material cultures of diverse times and places. Because of Bastian and Virchow's influence, Penny says: "Geographical arrangements, a focus on collecting, the de-emphasis on narratives and pedagogy, all became standard in Germany's larger museums"; and that "Bastian's views about collecting and his penchant for massive empirical projects influenced ethnologists well into the twentieth century."[16]

German ethnology at this time, William Adams argues, was not "proprietary or hegemonic." It was not driven by the imperatives of colonial expansion; it was not a government-backed enterprise; and it explored all parts of the world. "It was a by-product not of colonial expansion, but of the attempt to define a German Self, on the basis of cultural and linguistic rather than of political criteria." It was driven by an ethnographic particularism that echoed the Kantian insistence on understanding the "thing-in-itself."[16]

All these must have made for an intellectual climate bracing for a 'native' coming from a colony ruled by racism and obscurantism. Rizal, it must be noted however, was already a well-educated, cosmopolitan young man when he arrived in Imperial Germany.

The European-style education he had in Manila before he left the Philippines was (despite the ills Rizal ascribed to the Spanish-colonial school system) remarkable for a colonized native of his time. Moreover, he was in Spain at a time of ascendant liberalism. The "Enlightenment" belatedly arrived in Spain in the mid-nineteenth century, and spread in the wake of the Glorious Revolution of 1868. A vehicle was the Spanish intellectual movement called "Krausism," inspired by Karl Christian Friedrich Krause (1781-1832), an obscure and minor Kantian philosopher whose ideas were popularized by Julian Sanz del Rio, chair of philosophy and history at the Universidad Central de Madrid, who had studied in Germany.

Rizal was a student at the Universidad Central de Madrid in 1882-85, at a time when liberals and conservatives were locked in fierce debates. Giner de los Rios, who was expelled from the university in 1875, was reinstated in 1882, and Rizal participated in a student demonstration in 1884 to protest ecclesiastical pressures for the removal of the anti-clerical professor Miguel Morayta. It was in Spain that Rizal first participated in the open exchange of liberal, rationalist, and scientific ideas.[17]

Educated in Spain, sojourning in France, an assiduous, multilingual reader conversant with the ideas of Voltaire and Rousseau, Rizal was, when he arrived in Germany in 1886, an intellectual who could interact with the Germans as their peer. He was not only familiar with Goethe, Schiller, and Heine, but he already had an idea of German science and letters and had looked towards Germany as an alternative source of knowledge on the Philippines.

THE matter of German anthropological influence on Rizal's ideas is not easy to trace. Rizal's strongest association was with Ferdinand Blumentritt. With Blumentritt, Rizal maintained a correspondence from July 1886 until his death and engaged in spirited conversations during the time Rizal spent in the Blumentritt home of Leitmeritz in May 1887. They exchanged publications and research notes, and interacted as equals. Blumentritt introduced Rizal to leading German scholars and recommended books for him to read.

Perhaps the most important of these books was Theodor Waitz' *Anthropologie der Naturvolker* (1858-71), a six-volume work that surveys the world's 'primitive' cultures from a geographic rather than a historical, evolutionary perspective.[18] Blumentritt recommended the fifth volume of this work, which has a section on the Malays, and Rizal was sufficiently excited that he began translating it from German to Spanish at the end of November 1886. But on 24 April 1887, as he prepared to leave Berlin, he wrote to Blumentritt that his translation remained incomplete, and that since he had to return the book to the library he would ask his bookseller to find him a "loose volume of the work."[19] (Rizal's incomplete translation of Waitz survives.[20])

It is not clear how much of Waitz' work Rizal actually read, whether he had read the first volume of *Anthropologie*, which sets forth Waitz' basic argument that native intelligence is roughly the same for all peoples and that cultural differences are due to the combination of geography and history rather than innate differences in mental ability. This is a Herderian view that Bastian would develop in his theory of the "psychic unity of mankind." This volume may have been the book Rizal initially borrowed from Berlin's Royal Library which, he told Blumentritt, gave him the "impression" that it was about "the unity of the human race."

Rizal may not have read Bastian at all since Rizal makes no reference to Bastian's work, as far as I know.[21] But, as the anthropologist Edward Tylor wrote in 1905, Waitz' conceptions of anthropological psychology were already "in the air" in the second half of the nineteenth century.[22]

Rizal knew of Herder and may have read him. In a letter to Blumentritt from Brusells on 26 May 1890, Rizal wrote that he had the "complete works" of Herder, which he bought for next to nothing, and that if Blumentritt wished he would send his friend the thirty-eight-volume set."[23] He also had a personal copy of Kant's *Critique of Judgment* (*Kritik der Urteilskraft*, 1790).[24] But I have not found Rizal directly citing Kant, Hegel, Herder, or Marx.

At the time of his visit, Rizal was apparently more interested in works that dealt directly with the Philippines rather than extended theoretical speculation. During his German sojourn, he translated Blumentritt's *Bericht uber die Ethnographie der Insel Mindanao* and expressed the desire to translate from the original German Fedor Jagor's *Reisen in den Philippinen* (1873), saying he found the 1875 Spanish translation of the work deficient. He also translated (in part, I imagine, because translation was a way of learning the language) Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* and some stories of Hans Christian Andersen.

Rizal was in Germany for only a little over fifteen months. He traveled all over the country and was incredibly busy: doing his medical *practicum* in the clinics of Dr. Becker in Heidelberg and Dr. Schultzer in Berlin; attending lectures and conferences (including one on physical anthropology by Rudolf Virchow and another on

descriptive anatomy by Rudolf's son, Hans Virchow, also an anatomist); tutoring Maximo Viola in German (Viola joined Rizal in Berlin in December 1886 and stayed with him until they both left Germany); and even taking time to moonlight as a publisher's proofreader and do workouts at a gymnasium.[25] He was, moreover, under a great deal of pressure, living frugally and in poor health, as he struggled to get the *Noli* into print and prepared to return to an uncertain future in the Philippines.

One, therefore, must appreciate the exigencies that attended Rizal's intellectual pursuits in Germany. He relied on a borrowed library copy of Waitz for his translation work (and was apparently unable to get a cheap, loose-leaf copy of the book). An admirer of the work of Wilhelm von Humboldt, he wrote to Blumentritt from Berlin on 28 November 1886 that he had bought a book by the famous linguist, and subsequently told Blumentritt that he could not buy (ostensibly other) works by Humboldt "because they are very costly." "Later, when I earn some money, I'll buy all these good books."[26]

Yet, whether in Germany or subsequently, he managed to survey a wide range of sources. References to German, Austrian, and Dutch works that Rizal cited, owned, borrowed, or read include texts by anthropologists, linguists, geographers, and natural scientists. These include (apart from those already cited) Adelbert von Chamisso, Friedrich Muller, Friedrich Ratzel, Wilhelm Joest, Adolf Meyer, Hendrik Kern, Reinhold Rost, Hans Meyer, Hugo Schuchardt, Richard Andree, Julius Lippert, Friedrich von Hellwald, Oscar Peschel, Friedrich Hirth, J.G.F. Riedel, George Alexander Wilken, Engelbert Kampfer, and Karl Julius Weber. In his sojourn in London in 1888-89, where he worked on *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* at the British Museum, Rizal would widen his knowledge of Philippine source materials as well as his readings in general anthropology (acquiring, for instance, books by Herbert Spencer and John Lubbock).

Apart from what books Rizal may have read, his participation in German scientific life, being recognized by German scholars as a peer, was an exciting experience for Rizal, and strengthened his confidence in his intellectual abilities. It is clearly part of what inspired him to embark on his annotations of Antonio de Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* on his second European sojourn (1888-

91). It stimulated his interest in scholarship, particularly anthropology, writing on topics like folklore and orthography.[27] Writing to Blumentritt from Berlin in April 1887, he said: "If I could only be a professor in my country, I would stimulate these Philippine studies which are like the *nosce te ipsum* [know thyself] that gives the true concept of one's self and drives nations to do great things."[28]

In the space that exile in Mindanao allowed him, he busied himself with investigations in the natural sciences, took time to write studies in Filipino psychopathology, and had plans to do a series of articles on folk superstitions and medical practices.[29] He wrote that he wanted to study races in Mindanao; had plans to write a Tagalog grammar and analyze the related elements of Tagalog and Bisaya; and was anxious to undertake studies on the Subanos and Moros. From Dapitan, he wrote to A.B. Meyer on 31 July 1894: "I await anxiously my liberty so that I can live a few weeks among the Subanos, the mountaineers, and Moros of the island."[30]

The German experience stimulated Rizal's interest in collecting. He became an avid collector who took a scholarly interest in a wide range of specimens and artifacts, from shells to skulls. To A.B. Meyer, he wrote: "I have a good stock of heads for [the study of] anthropology."[31] Apart from the Berlin ethnological museum, he donated natural specimens and ethnological artifacts to museums in Dresden, Frankfurt, and Prague.[32] Rizal was plugged into a European network of scholars who wrote to him for data and opinions as well as specimens and artifacts. It does not appear that he engaged in collecting as a trade; he probably received refunds for costs (since he apparently paid people to do the collecting and spent for preserving specimens, packaging, and shipping), but mostly in the form of books.

One surmises that all this was motivated by the desire to contribute to the advance of scientific knowledge, as well as the wish to make the Philippines visible to the world. One notes how often Rizal complained, with both bemusement and dismay, how in the course of his travels he was often taken by strangers as Japanese or some other but never as Filipino. Visiting the Museum of Artillery in Paris in 1883, he marveled at the exhibits of weapons, armors, and other military paraphernalia. He wrote: "It seems incredible but the costumes and weapons of the savages of the small islands of Borneo

are found there but those of the Philippines are not even remembered."[33]

THE German sojourn affirmed, at a crucial point in Rizal's life, his belief in the fundamental equality of the races. In an 1887 article on Rizal's views on the question of race, Blumentritt wrote that Rizal, growing up in the Philippines, had always been bothered by discrimination in Spanish-*indio* relations, but was convinced early on in his own abilities, and that "seized by a kind of racial jealousy," he even fancied that Filipinos were superior to Spaniards in intelligence.[34] Rizal's European travels expanded Rizal's scientific knowledge, particularly in linguistics and ethnology, fields in which he considered Spanish scholarship on the Philippines biased and backward. He was particularly interested in folk psychology (*volkerpsychologie*), Blumentritt says, "the analysis of the sentiments with which whites and the colored races mutually regard each other," especially as this pertains to the Philippines. Rizal's scientific studies in Europe, Blumentritt says, "brought him great consolation."

> He felt he was now seeing for the first time that his own people were not anthropoids, as the Spaniards claimed, for he saw that the faults and virtues of the Tagalogs were purely human and that the advantages and drawbacks of a race were not mere racial peculiarities but acquired qualities – qualities affected by climate and history.[35]

This overstates Europe's influence but Rizal's experience abroad did clarify and strengthen fundamental notions Rizal already had in the Philippines.

Race was a dominant issue in science and politics at the time. While Rizal has not written on the subject in extended, systematic form, it permeates his writings. In a letter to Blumentritt on 4 July 1895, Rizal writes: "Concerning the *limited intelligence in races*, after a detailed study of the subject, I believe like you do, that there is and there is none (*no las hay y las hay*)."[36] The equivocation has to do with the way in which the issue of racial incapacity is framed.

Rizal holds (in Blumentritt's rendering of Rizal's views) that "the human races differ in their external disposition and skeletal

structure but not in their psyche." They are moved by the same passions but express them in varied forms that are not fixed and constant since these are influenced by "widely differing factors." Rizal believes however that the "races" have not developed their intelligence at the same pace or in the same way. He ascribes this difference to the factors of inheritance and struggle. European nations are "rich in intelligence" because of "centuries of struggle, wise combinations, liberty, laws, thinkers, etc. who bequeathed to them these riches."[37]

What ultimately matters, Rizal believes, is not a question of race but differences in "social strata" since even in early Europe the larger population "make up a class which is on the same intellectual level as the great mass of the Tagalogs." Thus, "races exist only for anthropologists, for the observer of national life only social classes exist." Speaking for Rizal, Blumentritt uses the geological metaphor of strata, saying that it is the ethnologist's task to "mark out the social strata of the human race." "But while mountains do not grow higher peoples do gradually grow up into the higher strata of civilization," but this growth depends not just on innate ability but "the benevolence of fate and other factors, some explicable, some incalculable."

In all these Rizal expressed reigning ideas in German ethnology at the time. He also expressed what was a central argument in the Filipino reform movement, one that reversed the Spanish-colonial argument of *indio* incapacity to that of the colonial suppression and perversion of native potentiality. There are slippages and contradictions however in Rizal's discourse on race. The language at this time was so dominated by race, hierarchy, and classificatory systems that Rizal, one surmises, shifts the terms of discourse from a rigidly determinist, biological conception of "race" to the social category of "strata" ("social classes," "lines of stratification"), shifting from a materialist "physical anthropology" to a more pliable, mentalist "ethnology." Yet, Rizal, who was both poet and scientist, cannot quite escape the language and prejudices of his time. He uses a geological metaphor to explain social divisions, and by comparing the intellectual level of "the majority of the Tagals" to that of the greater numbers of people in "the old established civilizations of France and

Germany," assents to the distinctions of precedence in the language of the *more* or *less* advanced and civilized.

One can put this ambivalence in perspective by noting that the anthropologist Franz Boas was caught in the same contradictions. Only three years older than Rizal, Boas – who was steeped in the works of Waitz and Bastian when he was a student in Germany – rejects biological determinism or racial biology as the determinant of culture and intelligence, asserting that historical and environmental factors are more potent in leading races to civilization, and that it follows that achievements of races do not warrant the assumption that one is more highly gifted than the other. In 1894, he delivered a landmark paper, "Human Faculty as Determined by Race," before the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), in which he eviscerated the racist worldview in American social sciences at the time. (Interestingly, this paper was reviewed by Ferdinand Blumentritt in *La Solidaridad* [April-July 1895], in an article in which Blumentritt presented his own views on the subject of race.)[38]

Yet, as recent scholars have pointed out, Boas (though recognized as one of the intellectual forerunners of the movement for racial emancipation in the U.S.) could not quite escape some of the fundamental biases in racial science.[39] A dedicated empiricist, he deferred to physical anthropology by acknowledging that there are differences in the structure of the brains in some races even as he argued that the effect of these differences on human faculty was either slight or as yet unproved. Like Rizal, he was predisposed by his liberal ideology to reject simple biological explanations and assert the equal potentiality of all races. Yet, like Rizal, he did not (until eventually) rule out the usefulness of "race" as a concept. Like Rizal, he was respectful of diverse cultures, yet assumed or acknowledged that some civilizations (in particular, the European) are more culturally advanced than others.

IN the years that followed Rizal's martyrdom in 1896, and particularly after the death of Virchow in 1902 and Bastian in 1905, German anthropology would turn away from its liberal, cosmopolitan heritage to an increasingly materialist and racist orientation, as Germany

turned towards a more aggressively nationalist and colonialist posture.

"Diffusionism" would gain ascendancy over ideas of "psychic unity" proposed by scholars like Waitz and Bastian. The most prominent diffusionist was Friedrich Ratzel (the geographer Rizal met in Leipzig), who believed in the basic uninventiveness of mankind, attributed cultural differences mainly to the influence of the environment, while cultural similarities were nearly always attributed to diffusion. For its more militant adherents, diffusionism authorized, for instance, a shift away from Bastian's geographically-based museums to more explicit narratives of Darwinian racial-biological hierarchy deployed to validate German nationalism and imperialism. An intellectual groundwork was built that would later support National Socialism and Nazi anthropology.

Andrew Zimmerman argues that antihumanist tendencies were in fact already apparent in the time of Virchow and Bastian. Anthropology, he says, emerged in Germany as a natural scientific challenge to the humanities, by privileging "pure objective observation" over the subjectivism of humanistic scholarship. Its antihumanist worldview is embedded in a resolutely empirical science that denied the *naturvolker* ("natural peoples") full subjectivity. By characterizing 'primitives' as people in a "natural state," existing outside history, it is akin to colonialism in its treatment of the colonized as "pure body, pure objectivity." (This simplifies the ethnological work of Bastian and anthropologists like Blumentritt. As Penny writes, Bastian's *naturvolker* does not literally mean "without history or culture." Bastian was interested in the historical and cultural trajectories among the *naturvolker*, and acknowledged that there were "essentially next to no people left on earth who were without historical influences."[40] But, admittedly, the fixation with racial typologies created an orientation that would eventually give way to more politically charged Darwinian perspectives.)

Moreover, Zimmerman says: "German physical anthropology was not only a science and an ideology but also one of the practical regimes that sustained, and was sustained by, European colonial rule."[41] Zimmerman cites how the insistence in anthropology on objective examinations of body parts and cultural artifacts in

centralized collections fueled aggressive and predatory collecting practices. German anthropologists relied on global imperial networks in travel, research, and collecting activities, and were complicit in colonialism in its practices. Virchow actively urged collecting body parts at executions, hospitals, cemeteries, and battlefields. Conniving with colonial authorities, Fedor Jagor shipped to Virchow forty-one skulls exhumed from a prison cemetery in Rangoon. Adolf Meyer bought 150 skulls in New Guinea and admitted engaging in grave robbery in the Philippines, in an armed, nighttime foray to rob Negrito graves of their content.[42]

Zimmerman's argument also informs Nathaniel Weston's recent study on German anthropology in the Philippines.[43] German ethnographic work in the Philippines characterized natives as *naturvolker* – as Waitz did – in terms of racial categories and levels of civilization. It objectified natives in photographs, artifacts, and human remains sent back to Germany. It produced a form of knowledge that validated and authorized European colonialism and was "a rehearsal of German colonialism" itself. What makes Weston's study important is that it looks at the tripartite relations and interactions among German, Spanish, and Filipino anthropologies, in which one contested, interpreted, and deployed the other according to their national interests. The study thus problematizes the issue by taking into account the multiple and often contradictory uses of knowledge.

When Rizal was in Germany, Otto von Bismarck had already consolidated Imperial Germany and was beginning to extend its power beyond Europe. In 1884-1885 (on the eve of Rizal's visit), Germany annexed colonies in Africa and the Pacific and Bismarck thrust himself into the world stage by organizing the Berlin Conference of 1884, which forged a framework for a more coordinated scramble for territories in Africa among European powers.

Rizal was not unaware of these developments. In fact, when he told his parents of his plans to go to Germany, he cited among his reasons that learning about the country would be useful because of the "Caroline question" (the German claims on the Spanish-held Caroline Islands) and Germany's increasing commercial interest in Asia. Rizal wrote: "It is necessary that we prepare for what may

happen so that we shall not be more exploited than we are now."[44] But still, he tended to take a distant view of German ambitions since, a few years later, he would, in "The Philippines a Century Hence," dismiss Germany as a threat to the Philippines, saying that while he is aware that Germany colonizes, "Germany avoids all foreign entanglements."[45]

Was Rizal blind to the colonialist and antihumanist currents in German intellectual life at the time of his visit? Adolf Meyer was a member of the German Colonial Association, organized to promote German colonialism, from the time of its founding in 1881. Hans Meyer, the young scholar Rizal met in Leipzig, would become an avid advocate of Germany's imperial projects in the years after Rizal's visit.[46]

More important, German anthropology, despite the liberal pronouncements of its practicioners, was very much a racialist science. Virchow, Jagor, and Blumentritt were preoccupied with the question of race, classifying the population of the Philippines according to grades of culture and anatomical differences (such as skin color, hair, and cranial composition). They were fascinated by the "Negritos," low-grade "primitives"; wrestled with the complex biological and mental differences among the numerous "tribes" that made up the Malay population; and, while recognizing the Malays as a more "advanced race" compared to the Negritos, assigned to them a status below the Europeans.[47]

This was not too different from Spanish anthropological writings except that what of these writings were known to Filipinos were usually of the more polemical, patently racist kind. German anthropology, on the other hand, was framed in the discourse of an empirical, disinterested science. Yet, by erecting racial hierarchies, the Germans validated the premises of European colonialism. By advocating a positivist racial science, the leading anthropologists, despite their liberal sympathies, created a body of knowledge that would in time form part of the intellectual basis of National Socialism.

WE can only speculate as to the extent of Rizal's awareness of such tendencies at the time, but we need as well to avoid facile, presentist

judgments. Anthropometry, for instance, is thoroughly discredited today but it was cutting-edge science in the nineteenth century. Rizal was a physician who frequently thought in medico-scientific terms (as his writings show), who admired Virchow's scientific achievements (Rizal had a personal copy of Virchow's *Die Cellularpathologie* [1858]), and lived in a time when race and hierarchy were dominant (and even hegemonic) organizing ideas for knowing the world.

While Rizal is a physician, he does not appear particularly interested in physical anthropology, although again we know that he also collected skulls while he was in Dapitan. He has an interesting account of meeting "the famous Virchow" in Berlin. "The scholar told me jestingly that he would study me *ethnographically.*" Rizal knew exactly what the famous craniometrician meant, and did not miss a beat. "I replied that I was willing to submit to his study for the love of science and I promised to him also another example, my compatriot [Maximo Viola]." It was a companionable meeting, Rizal recounting that he sat beside Virchow at the dinner table and Virchow "understood my German *chabacano* fairly well." Afterwards, they had beer with Baron von Dankelmann and two other gentlemen until past midnight. Rizal writes: "It was a happy and memorable evening that I spent among the German scholars."[48]

In his *El Filibusterismo* (1891), writing of the comic-pathetic character Dona Victorina, who valiantly tries to Europeanize herself, dyed hair, make-up-and-all, Rizal writes (perhaps countering Virchow's jest with his own) that she had transformed herself "in such a way that now [Armand de] Quatrefages and Virchow together would not have known how to classify her among the known races."[49]

It is important to note as well that Rizal and other Filipino nationalists were engaged in a campaign for reforms and greater Filipino participation in the Spanish regime in the Philippines. They were not, at least at this time, against colonialism *per se* but 'bad' colonialism.

Moreover, they assumed a linear, progressivist approach to history that categorized peoples (whether by reasons of race, circumstance, or 'inheritance') as 'higher' and 'lower' or 'more' or 'less' civilized. While critical of some of German anthropology's

findings, they accepted its classification of the native population according to differences in racial types and civilizational levels, with Aetas at the lowest level and highly acculturated, racially mixed and 'improved' Malays (particularly the Tagalogs) at the top. They adopted Blumentritt's theory of the historical basis for racial-civilizational differences in the Philippines (the "migration wave theory"), which sketches the process in which aboriginal, primitive Aetas are marginalized by three successive "invasions" of (progressively better endowed) Malays.[50]

In this scheme, Rizal and his colleagues (well-educated Tagalogs of mixed blood) were the best elements of the indigenous population. They can distance themselves, gloss over, or even endorse the anthropologists' representations of the "primitives," and they can draw from their own achievements the proof of capacity and the authority to speak for a 'nation' that has not progressed because of Spanish misrule.

Rizal was not a disinterested scholar. He was interested in problems of history and culture because he knew it was imperative to begin with the knowledge of the Filipino Self, an understanding of who Filipinos were and how they constituted a distinct nationality, as basis for countering Spanish representation of the *indios* as a people without a "culture" and "history." His knowledge of history and ethnology, particularly of the Malay archipelago, equipped him with 'proof' that Filipinos belonged to a distinct and dynamic civilization, with innate capacities for 'progress' as well as the assimilative powers in their relations to other cultures.

In advancing the argument, Rizal invoked the 'authority' of German science. He countered the Spanish academic Vicente Barrantes' characterization of Filipinos by citing Hans Meyer's statement that they were "hard-working and industrious"; cited Friedrich Hirth's reference to Spanish contact between China and the Philippines and Jagor's mention of "pre-Spanish vases" as proof of Philippine civilization.[51] Using Europe against Europe, Rizal and his colleagues selectively mined German sources to critique both Spanish scientific backwardness and misrule in the Philippines.

Rizal's ideas on the formative influence of the environment, culture contact, and the interplay of independent invention and cultural assimilation are in the tradition of Herder, Waitz, and Bastian. In his reply to Barrantes, Rizal invokes the capacity of a race for independent invention (against colonialist claims that natives are capable only of mimicry), the influence of environment, and the generative potential of contact with other cultures. He says that anyone who studies the culture of a people must engage in the complex task of discerning what is purely indigenous, what is "exotic," and what the product of mixture.[52] In his disquisition on native "indolence," he combines environmental determinism (such as the effect of climate) and, more important, the influence of social and historical circumstances (such as the disincentives for work due to oppression, miseducation, and misgovernment).[53]

Rizal had a revolutionary faith in the inexorability of human advancement in the context of (to use today's word) 'globalizing' forces. Charting the spread of civilizations, he wrote:

> Indicative of the progress of a country and commerce, as it is indicative of the health of man, is to have perfect circulation of blood in the body economy, because without these ways, inter-relations do not exist and without these inter-relations, the ties cannot be appreciated; without ties, there can be no union nor strength, and without either union or strength, no one can attain perfection or progress.[54]

"Man was made cosmopolitan (*cosmopol*)," he wrote. He saw culture contact as a decisive civilizational force but his was not a 'diffusionism' that privileged originating cultures, and divided the world into centers and peripheries, and thus authorized some nations to dominate others, but that of an open circulatory system in which the benefits of progress are the patrimony or 'inheritance' of all. It is a triumphalist view that glosses over the realities of inequality and domination but, given the position of the colonized, it is a bold and emancipatory claim.

In attacking Spanish rule in the Philippines, Rizal invoked Reason and the "laws" governing human societies. In "The Philippines a Century Hence," he writes: "Necessity is the strongest god the world

knows, and necessity is the result of physical laws put into action by moral forces."[55] The development of societies can be weakened, distorted, and blocked by repressive and reactionary forces but the human drive for improvement and progress, history's forward thrust, cannot be stopped.

Rizal's German connection was a source of concern for Spanish colonial authorities. It was used to discredit him as someone sinister and "foreign," a Protestant, a dangerous apostate, perhaps even a "German subject."

To Barrantes' attack that Rizal's was "a spirit twisted by a German education," Rizal replied that his spirit was already formed in the Philippines long before "I had learned a word of German." "My spirit is 'twisted' because I have been reared among injustices and abuses, because since a child I have seen many suffer stupidly and because I too have suffered."[56] To a similar accusation by the Jesuit Pablo Pastells about the German influence on *Noli me Tangere*, Rizal replied that three-fourths of the *Noli* had already been written when he went to Germany and that his German friends did not know about the novel until it came out. He wrote: "The fact is I did read works in German, but this was at the time when I was already engaged in the discussion of things I had earlier found in books." If Germany was an influence, it was that in revising the *Noli* he "had occasion to temper my outbursts, tone down my language and reduce many passages as distance provided me a wider perspective and my imagination cooled off in the atmosphere of calm peculiar to that country." He continued, not without sarcasm: "I do not deny that the environment in which I lived could have influenced me, especially when I called to mind my country among such a people – free, hardworking, studious, well-governed, full of hope in their future and master of their own destinies."[57]

That Rizal visited Germany at the time that he did was deeply consequential. Yet, for all his wanderings, Rizal never lost the sense of his own location, and it was ultimately out of the Philippines, its realities and concerns, that he wrote.

TO return, by way of postscript, to Rizal's letter to Bastian in 1888. It is not clear how or whether the artifacts Rizal donated were displayed in Berlin's *Museum fur Volkerkunde.*

After Bastian's death in 1905, German ethnological museums began to abandon his Humboldtian vision of a geographically-based, non-hierarchic collection of speciments of world cultures, and move towards a more selective, hierarchic, evolutionary orientation in museum displays. It was a move more compatible with institutional demands for museum to function as accessible venues for public education rather than, as Bastian envisioned, scientific laboratories. It was also a shift more congruent with the mood for a more militant, explicitly hierarchizing colonialism in the years after Rizal's visit.

There were sheer practical limits to Bastian's inductive empiricism as well. From a collection of only 15,000 artifacts in 1875, the *Museum fur Volkerkunde* collections had grown to 50,000 by 1883 and would grow even more in the years that followed. The collections sprawled out of bounds, items packed into hundreds of cabinets or packed away in boxes that never made it into the museum hall. Bastian's all-inclusive museum had simply become unmanageable and untenable.[58]

It is ironic if Rizal's artifacts never made it to the display hall. But this is just a little footnote to the story of a man whose life work has made a people visible to the world and to themselves, which is – after all – the ultimate aim of anthropology.

NOTES

I have earlier dealt with aspects of this problem in "Rizal Reading Pigafetta," *Waiting for Mariang Makiling: Essays in Philippine Cultural History* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2002), 52-86, and "Jose Rizal and the Birth of the Social Sciences in the Philippines," *Budhi: Journal of Ideas and Culture*, 16:2 (2012), 30-41. I wish to thank Jose Eleazar Bersales for help with German translation, and Maria Luz Vilches and Michael Cullinane for sources.

[1]I thank Ambeth Ocampo for a copy of the letter. Lucien Spittael, a Rizal scholar, writes that the twenty-one artifacts Rizal donated are still preserved in the Berlin ethnological museum today. See Lucien Spittael, "The discovery of 21

unknown Rizal objects" (June 24, 2011). http://www.philstar.com/letters-editor/699022/discovery-21-unknown-rizal-objects

[2]*Kalikut* is a bamboo tube with a poking rod used for mincing and mixing betel leaves, areca nuts, and lime for a chewing concoction. The other items are what may be a harvesting tool (*pang-ani*), a string for tying a rooster (*cuerda para atar el gallo*), a native toothbrush (*cepillos de diente hechos de corteja*), and a wide-brimmed, silver-lined headgear (*salakot de plata y aeta*). A *sulpakan* was one of the gifts Rizal gave to Blumentritt in 1887. See Rizal to Blumentritt, Calamba, September 26, 1887. In: *The Rizal-Blumentritt Correspondence* (Manila: Jose Rizal National Centennial Commission, 1961), 2:1, 137-138.

[3]*Rizal-Blumentritt Correspondence*, 2:1, 71-72, 76; 2:2, 344, 461.

[4][Jose Rizal], *Reminiscences and Travels* (Manila: Jose Rizal National Centennial Commission, 1961), 97, 99, 258.

[5]Jose Rizal, "Tagalische Verskunst," *Escritos Varios* (Manila: Comision Nacional del Centenario de Rizal, 1961), Pt. 1, 253-60. Originally published in *Zeitschrift fur Ethnologie*, 19 (1887).

[6]Nathaniel P. Weston, "The Philippine Revolution in the *Proceedings of the Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory* from 1897 to 1900: Five Translations," *Philippine Sudies*, 6:3 (2013), 385-410.

[7]Rudolf Virchow, "Obituary of Jose Rizal in 1897," *Jose Rizal in Germany* (Bonn: Inter Nationes, 1986), 49-50. Translated from the German text in *Proceedings of the Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory* (Berlin, 1897).

[8]Quoted in *Dia Filipino* (December 30, 1913).

[9]Austin Coates, *Rizal: Filipino Nationalist and Patriot* (1968; Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House, 1992), 104.

[10]Coates, *Rizal*, 104.

[11]See William Y. Adams, *The Philosophical Roots of Anthropology* (Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 1998), 263-302; Alan Barnard, *History and Theory in Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 47-52; H. Glenn Penny, "Traditions in the German Language," *A New History of Anthropology*, ed. H. Kuklick (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008), 79-95.

[12]Penny, "Traditions in the German Language," 82.

[13]Matti Bunzl & H. Glenn Penny, "Introduction: Rethinking German Anthropology, Colonialism, and Race," *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*, eds. H. Glenn Penny & Matti Bunzl (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003), 1.

[14]It is curious that Rizal makes no reference to Bastian (outside of the 1888 letter). Bastian spent twenty-five years of his life on scientific expeditions all over the world, in the course of which he visited Manila in 1853 and 1861. He wrote about his Philippine visit in 1861 in one of his travel books, *Reisen im indischen Archipel, Singapore, Batavia, Manilla und Japan* (Jena: Hermann Costenoble, 1869), 256-99.

If Rizal did not read Bastian, part of the reason may be the relative inaccessibility of Bastian's works. On Bastian's death, the British anthropologist Edward B. Tylor praised Bastian's contributions but said that his writings are "peculiarly difficult to use, and in later years almost unreadable." See Edward B. Tylor, "Obituary: Adolf Bastian," *Man*, 5 (1903), 138-43. Barnard (*History and Theory*, 49) says that Bastian's writings "were absurdly metaphorical and virtually untranslatable, and have hardly ever been rendered into English."

[15]Penny, "Traditions in the German Language," 87.

[16]Adams, *Philosophical Roots*, 296.

[17]See Raul J. Bonoan, "Rizal: Asia's Enlightenment *Philosophe* in the Age of Colonialism," *Jose Rizal and the Asian Renaissance*, ed. M. Rajaretnam (Kuala Lumpur: Institut Kajian Dasar, 1996), 219-3; Manuel Sarkisyanz, *Rizal and Republican Spain and Other Rizalist Essays* (Manila: National Historical Institute, 1995).

[18]Theodor Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvolker* (Leipzig: Friedrich Fleischer, 1865). The fifth and sixth volumes were posthumously published (Waitz died in 1864); the first section of the fifth volume (dealing with the Malays) bears Waitz's name but the second (on the Polynesians) is already credited to Georg Karl Gerland, who completed Waitz' work, thus the reference to the "Waitz-Gerland" edition.

Writing from Berlin on 22 November 1886, Rizal tells Blumentritt that he had borrowed *Anthropologie der Naturvolker* from Berlin's Royal Library but could not find "Waitz-Gerland." Looking for "the famous chapter" Blumentritt had recommended, Rizal says the volume he had borrowed deals only with "the unity of the human race." Blumentritt clarified the matter, and later that month Rizal had the volume he needed and told Blumentritt he would start translating it to Spanish "tomorrow." See the exchange of letters in *Rizal-Blumentritt Correspondence*, 21-22, 23, 31.

[19]Rizal to Blumentritt, Berlin, April 24, 1887, *Rizal-Blumentritt Correspondence*, 76.

[20]Jose Rizal, "Notes on Melanesia, Malaysia and Polynesia" and "The People of the Indian Archipelago," *Political and Historical Writings* (Manila: National Historical Commission, 1972), are translations of pp. 1-10 and 10-16, respectively, of the fifth volume of *Anthropologie der Naturvolker.* These articles originally appeared in Spanish in *The Independent* (Manila) on April 28 and May 4, 1918. Published in English translation by the National Historical Commission in 1972, these are mistakenly annotated as "a rough draft, or notes taken by Rizal from various books cited therein that he intended perhaps to use in tracing the origins of the inhabitants of the Philippines."

Before I discovered the true nature of these articles, I had taken the NHC annotations at face value, and thus taking the bibliographic citations as Rizal's own overstated (but mainly in detail) Rizal's knowledge of the relevant literature in previous articles I had written.

[21]Blumentritt makes passing mention of Bastian in a letter to Rizal on 14 November 1886, *Rizal-Blumentritt Correspondence*, 19.

[22]Tylor, "Obituary," 142.

[23]Rizal to Blumentritt, Brussels, May 26, 1890, *Epistolario Rizalino* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1938), V:2, 564.

[24] Esteban A. de Ocampo, *Rizal as Bibliophile* (Manila: Unesco National Commission of the Philippines, 1960), 44.

[25]See Maximo Viola, "My Travels with Doctor Rizal," *Reminiscences and Travels*, 311-36.

[26]*Epistolario Rizalino*, V:1, 34, 68. A listing of books in Rizal's library includes Humboldt's *Letters to a Friend* (*Briefe an eine Freundin*, 1850) and *About the Kawi Language on the Island of Java* (*Uber die Kawi Sprache auf der Insel Java*, 1836). See Ocampo, *Rizal as a Bibliophile*, 44.

[27]Jose Rizal, *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas por el Doctor Antonio de Morga* (1890; Manila: Comision Nacional del Centenario de Jose Rizal, 1961); *"Sobre la nueva ortografia de la lengua tagala," La Solidaridad*, trans. Guadalupe Fores-Ganzon & Luis Maneru (Pasig City: Fundacion Santiago, 1996), II:88-92 (April 15, 1890); and "Specimens of Tagalog Folkore" and "Two Eastern Fables" in *Trubner's Records* (May and July 1889).

[28]Rizal to Blumentritt, Berlin, April 13, 1887, *Rizal-Blumentritt Correspondence*, II:1, 71-72.

[29]Luciano P.R. Santiago, "Centennial: The First Psychiatric Article in the Philippines (1895)," *Philippine Quarterly of Culture & Society*, 23:1 (1995), 62-75.

[30]Jose Rizal, *Miscellaneous Correspondence* (Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1963), 303.

[31]Rizal to A.B. Meyer, Dapitan, July 31, 1894, *Epistolario Rizalino*, IV:211.

[32]See Jose P. Bantug, "Rizal: Scholar and Scientist," *Encyclopedia of the Philippines*, ed. Z.M. Galang (Manila: Exequiel Floro, 1951), 57-80.

[33]Rizal, *Reminiscences and Travels*, 244.

[34]Ferdinand Blumentritt, "Jose Rizal's Studies in Ethnic Psychology," *Jose Rizal in Germany*, 35-38. First published in *Internationales Archiv fur Ethnographie* (International Archives of Ethnography), 10 (1897), 88-72. I have not been able to access the German original. English translations appear in Ferdinand Blumentritt, *Biography of Dr. Jose Rizal, The distinguished and talented Philippine scholar and patriot, infamously shot in Manila on December 30, 1896*, trans. Howard W. Bray from the original German (Singapore: P. Kelly and Walsh, 1898); "Views of Dr. Rizal, the Filipino scholar, upon race differences," *Popular Science Monthly* (July 1902), 222-29, translated by R.L. Packard. A Spanish translation by Adolf Spanielberg and Leon Ma. Guerrero is in Rizal, *Escritos Varios*, Pt. 2, 641-54.

See the excellent reading and translation of portions of the German text in Ramon Guillermo, "Rizal and the Problem of *Indio* Inferiority in Science," *Philippine Studies*, 59:4 (2011), 471-93.

[35]Blumentritt, "Jose Rizal's Studies," 42.

[36]Rizal to Blumentritt, Dapitan, July 4, 1895, *Rizal-Blumentritt Correspondence*, Pt. 2, 512.

[37]The quotes in this and the paragraph that follows are drawn from Blumentritt, "Jose Rizal's Studies." Reference has been made to the other English translations cited in fn. 34.

[38]Boas' paper was published in the AAAS *Proceedings*, 43 (1894), 301-27, and reviewed by Ferdinand Blumentritt in "Are There Superior or Inferior Races? (A Social-Ethnographic Study)," *Solidaridad*, VII (April 15; May 15, 31; June 30; July 15, 1895).

[39]For a summation of Boas' views: Herbert S. Lewis, "The Passion of Franz Boas," *American Anthropologist*, 103:2 (2001), 447-67.

[40]H. Glenn Penny, "Bastian's Museum: On the Limits of Empiricism and the Transformation of German Ethnology," *Worldly Provincialism*, 96.

[41]Andrew Zimmerman, "Adventures in the Skin Trade: German Anthropology and Colonial Corporeality," *Worldly Provincialism*, 156 [156-78].

Zimmerman's arguments are more fully developed in his *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

[42]Zimmerman, "Adventures in the Skin Trade," 1168, 171.

[43]Nathaniel Parker Weston, "Scientific Authority, Nationalism, and Colonial Entanglements Between Germany, Spain, and the Philippines, 1850 to 1900" Ph.D. diss., University of Washington, 2012.

[44]Jose Rizal, *Letters Between Rizal and Family Members* (Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1964), 193-94, 202.

[45]Rizal, "The Philippines a Century Hence," *Political and Historical Writings*, 160.

[46]William Henry Scott, ed., *German Travelers on the Cordillera (1860-1900)* (Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1975), 46-48.

[47]See Rudolf Virchow, "The Peopling of the Philippines," trans. O.T. Mason, *The Former Philippines Thru Foreign Eyes*, ed. Austin Craig (Manila: Philippine Education Co., 1916), 536-50. First published in Smithsonian Institution's *1899 Report*. An earlier craniometric study of Philippine inhabitants by Virchow appeared as an appendix in Fedor Jagor's *Reisen in den Philippinen* (Berlin, 1873).

[48]Rizal to Blumentritt, Berlin, January 2, 1887, *Rizal-Blumentritt Correspondence*, 39.

[49]Jose Rizal, *El Filibusterismo*, trans. M.S. Lacson-Locsin (1891; Makati City: Bookmark, 1996), 4.

[50]Ferdinand Blumentritt, *An Attempt at Writing a Philippine Ethnography*, trans. Marcelino N. Maceda (Marawi City: University Research Center, Mindanao State University, 1980). English translation of *Versuch Einer Ethnographie der Philippinen* (1882). On Blumentritt's theory, see Filomeno V. Aguilar, Jr., "Tracing Origins: *Ilustrado* Nationalism and the Racial Science of Migration Waves," *Journal of Asian Studies*, 64:3 (2005), 605-37.

[51]*Solidaridad*, I: (June 15, 1889), 98; (June 30, 1889), 108; II: (July 31, 1890), 168.

[52]Rizal, "Reply to Barrantes' Criticism of the *Noli me Tangere*," *Political and Historical Writings*, 105.

[53]Rizal, "The Indolence of the Filipinos," *Political and Historical Writings*, 227-65.

[54]Jose Rizal [Laong Laan], "Los Viajes / Travels," *Solidaridad*, I:161.

[55]Rizal, "Philippines a Century Hence," 156.

[56]Rizal, "Reply to Barrantes," 188.

[57]Rizal to Pastells, Dapitan, November 11, 1892, in Raul J. Bonoan, S.J., *The Rizal-Pastells Correspondence* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1994), 139-40.

[58]Penny, "Bastian's Museum," 86-126.

REFERENCES CITED

Adams, William Y. 1998. *The Philosophical Roots of Anthropology*. Stanford: CA CSLI Publications.

Aguilar, Filomeno V., Jr. "Tracing Origins: *Ilustrado* Nationalism and the Racial Science of Migration Waves," *Journal of Asian Studies* 64(3): 605-37.

Bantug, Jose P. 1951. "Rizal: Scholar and Scientist." In *Encyclopedia of the Philippines*, ed. Z.M. Galang. Manila: Exequiel Floro.

Barnard, Alan. 2000. *History and Theory in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bastian, Adolf. 1869. *Reisen im indischen Archipel, Singapore, Batavia, Manilla und Japan*. Jena: Hermann Costenoble.

Blumentritt, Ferdinand. 1980. *An Attempt at Writing a Philippine Ethnography*, trans. Marcelino N. Maceda. Marawi City: University Research Center, Mindanao State University.

_____ . 1902. "Views of Dr. Rizal, the Filipino Scholar, upon Race Differences," *Popular Science Monthly* 222-29.

_____ . 1898. *Biography of Dr. Jose Rizal, the distinguished and talented Philippine scholar and patriot, infamously shot in Manila on December 30, 1896*, trans. Howard W. Bray. Singapore: P. Kelly and Walsh.

_____ . 1897. "Jose Rizal's Studies in Ethnic Psychology," *Jose Rizal in Germany* 35-38.

_____ . 1895. "Are There Superior or Inferior Races? A Social-Ethnographic Study," *Solidaridad* VII.

Bonoan, Raul J. 1996. "Rizal: Asia's Enlightenment *Philosophe* in the Age of Colonialism." In *Jose Rizal and the Asian Renaissance*, ed. M. Rajarethan. Kuala Lumpur: Institut Kajian Dasar.

_____ . ed. 1994. *The Rizal-Pastells Correspondence*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Bunzl, Matti, and H. Gleen Penny. 2003. "Introduction: Rethinking German Anthropology, Colonialism, and Race," *Worldly Provincialism: German*

Anthropology in the Age of Empire, eds. Matti Bunzl and H.Gleen Penny. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Coates, Austin. 1992. *Rizal: Filipino Nationalist and Patriot.* Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House.

de Ocampo, Esteban A. 1960. *Rizal as Bibliophile.* Manila: UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines.

Dia Filipino. December 30, 1913.

Guillermo, Ramon. 2011. "Rizal and the Problem of Indio Inferiority in Science," *Philippine Studies* 59(4): 471-93.

Lewis, Herbert S. 2001. "The Passion of Franz Boas," *American Anthropologist* 103(2): 447-67.

Mojares, Resil B. 2012. "Jose Rizal and the Birth of the Social Sciences in the Philippines," *Budhi: Journal of Ideas and Culture* 16(2): 30-41.

_____ . 2002. "Rizal Reading Pigafetta," *Waiting for Mariang Makiling: Essays in Philippine Cultural History*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 52-86.

Penny, Glenn H. 2008. "Traditions in the German Language." In *A New History of Anthropology*, ed. H. Kuklick. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

_____ . n.d. "Bastian's Museum: on the Limits of Empiricism and the Transformation of German Ethnology," *Worldly Provincialism* 96.

Rizal, Jose. 1996. *"Sobre la nueva ortografia de la lengua tagala," La Solidaridad* II: 88-92.

_____ . 1976. *Political and Historical Writings.* Manila: National Historical Institute.

_____ . 1972. "Notes on Melanesia, Malaysia and Polynesia" and "The People of the Indian Archipelago," *Political and Historical Writings* 1-10, 10-16.

_____ . 1964. *Letters Between Rizal and Family Members.* Manila: National Heroes Commission.

_____ . 1963. *Miscellaneous Correspondence.* Manila: National Heroes Commission.

_____ . 1961a. *Reminiscences and Travels.* Manila: Jose Rizal National Centennial Commission.

_____ . 1961b. "Tagalische Verskunst," *Escritos Varios* Pt. 1:253-60.

_____ . 1961c. *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas por el Doctor Antonio de Morga.* Manila Comision Nacional del Centenario de Jose Rizal.

Santiago, Luciano P.R. 1995. "Centennial: The First Psychiatric Article in the Philippines (1895)," *Philippine Quarterly of Culture & Society* 23(1):62-75.

Sarkisyanz, Manuel. 1995. *Rizal and Republican Spain and Other Rizalist Essays.* Manila: National Historical Institute.

Scott, William Henry, ed. 1975. *German Travelers on the Cordillera* (1860-1900) Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild.

Spittael, Lucien. 2011. "The discovery of 21 unknown Rizal objects." http://www.philstar.com/letters-editor/699022/discovery-21-unknown-rizal-objects.

Tylor, Edward B. 1903. "Obituary: Adolf Bastian," *Man* 5: 138-43.

Virchow, Rudolf. 1986. "Obituary of Jose Rizal in 1897," *Jose Rizal in Germany.* Bonn: Inter Nationes.

_____ . 1916. "The Peopling of the Philippines," trans. O.T. Mason, *The Former Philippines thru Foreign Eyes*, ed. Austin Craig. Manila: Philippine Education Co., 536-50.

Waitz, Theodor. 1865. *Anthropologie der Naturvolker*. Leipzig: Friedrich Fliescher.

Weston, Nathiel P. 2013. "The Philippine Revolution in the Proceedings of the Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory from 1897 to 1900: Five Translations," *Philippine Studies* 6(3): 385-410.

_____ . 2012. "Scientific Authority, Nationalism, and Colonial Entanglements Between Germany, Spain, and the Philippines, 1850 to 1900." Ph.D diss., University of Washington.

Zimmerman, Andrew. 2001. *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____ . n.d. "Adventures in the Skin Trade: German Anthropology and Colonial Corporeality," *Worldly Provincialism* 156[156-78].