

Disciplinary Cases of Filipino Teachers in the Late 19th Century

Grace Liza Y. Concepcion

University of Asia and the Pacific

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses a number of archival records of disciplinary cases involving Filipino teachers in the 19th century. These cases were handled by the Spanish Superior Commission on Primary Education. The study of these documents sheds light not only on the government's concerns about educational reform but also shows the relationships among the community members and their stake in primary education. The study yields abundant information on how Filipino teachers negotiated the colonial system. It is thus a window that gives a view of Philippine social history.

The researcher examined 41 records dating from 1877 to 1893. These records are found in the Philippine Province Archive of the Society of Jesus. Other related records are filed among the digitized documents of the Philippine National Archives housed at present in the Unidad de Tratamientos Archivísticos in the offices of the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas in Madrid. The author consulted both archives. Some records contain only summaries of the disciplinary cases based on the teachers' dossiers. Others include the teachers' full records and proceedings of the disciplinary cases. Although the records that were studied for this research are incomplete, they are so varied and voluminous that the handling of disciplinary cases of teachers can be reconstructed. They are an eloquent evidence of the challenges that the colonial government faced in the implementation of the ideals that supported the Royal Decree on Primary Education of 1863, the law that aimed to provide elementary education on a nationwide scale. In a way, these cases also indicate Filipinos' attitudes towards these educational reforms.

Keywords: Spanish period, 19th century, 1863 Royal Decree, primary schools, education, teachers, social history

In the first half of the 19th century, Spain lost almost all her colonies except Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. In order to keep the remaining Caribbean and Pacific islands within the empire, the Spanish government resolved to undertake some reforms in these territories. One very important reform that has not received sufficient attention in Philippine historiography was the Royal Decree on Primary Education approved on December 20, 1863.¹

A survey of works will show that any discussion on public education focuses on developments during the American period, so much so that Spanish attempts in this area have become insignificant. Still, there are a few works that discuss this reform and the existence of the Filipino primary school teachers in the 19th century. Evergisto Bazaco's *History of Education in the Philippines* (1939) and Encarnacion Alzona's *A History of Education in the Philippines: 1565-1930* (1932) are considered major reference texts. Although Bazaco's work does not discuss particular teachers, he provides substantial material that helps in understanding the educational system in the Philippines under the Spanish regime. Alzona extends her history up to the American period. She includes a novel addition to her work consisting of short biographies of primary school teachers during the late Spanish era. Her biographical notes demonstrate that the first Filipino primary school teachers came from different social backgrounds and ethnic origins. Some of them also filled posts in the local government, as *cabezas de barangay*, *directorcillos*, and *gubernadorcillos*.² Camilo Osias' work, *Education in the Philippine Islands under the Spanish Regime* (1917), is both descriptive and carefully researched.

Joseph Meany's "Escuela Normal de Maestros," published in *Philippine Studies* (1982) discusses the history of the first normal school for men, which was established by the 1863 decree. More recently, Ma. Luisa T. Camagay published *Working Women of Manila in the 19th Century* (1995), which includes a chapter on the Filipina *maestras*. These were public school teachers who were appointed following the 1863 law. Finally, Charita de los Reyes' M.A. thesis, *Women's Education in the Philippines, 1565-1898* (2004), completes the body of relevant works that deal with the 1863 law. The present study hopes to add to the existing literature on this particular educational reform in the late Spanish period.

The predominant idea that buttressed the 1863 education decree was Hispanization, which Phelan (1959) understood as the process in which the Spanish colonial program sought to transform all areas of indigenous society with the aim of inculcating Spanish civilization in the natives.³ Hispanization and the teaching of Spanish in schools were the overriding concerns of the liberals in Spain. Both Spanish liberals and Filipino *ilustrados* believed that a common language and culture

would create more secure links between the government and the governed. To achieve these objectives, the government aimed to give free public instruction under state control.

Contrary to popularly held belief about the backwardness of colonial education, public education in Spanish Philippines kept pace with the progress of mass education in Europe, of which Prussia was the forerunner. In France and England, public education developed also at the time when the French and the English governments passed laws that promoted mass education in 1833 and 1868, respectively. Russia lagged behind other European countries because of internal problems. Although the czars reluctantly acknowledged the need for primary education, only in the early 20th century did the Russian government seriously implement mass education (Meyer, 1965).

Despite the political upheavals in Spain caused by internal strife between republicans and monarchists resulting in endless changes in government, primary education and the training of teachers remained a concern of legislators. In 1857, the Spanish government passed the Moyano Law, which advocated primary education for boys and girls, and established the normal schools for men and women. Normal schools were teacher-training institutions that aimed to educate men and women who would eventually teach in the primary schools. By 1865 several normal schools were already running in Spain. Teacher-training schools in Spain began at the time when normal schools in France, England, and Italy were also burgeoning (Bazaco, 1953).

The trends in education in Spain were felt in the Philippines. The 1863 Royal Decree and the succeeding education laws for the Pacific colony insisted on the “civilizing and cultural” mission of the Spanish government. It was a pressing concern because the Spaniards claimed that the civilization they had wished for the Philippines had not spread throughout the country. In the introduction to the Royal Decree of 1863, then Overseas Minister José de la Concha explained the reason for this:

... la extensión de tan vasto territorio, el carácter y costumbres de una parte de su población, y la falta de un sistema organizado de instrucción primaria (Grifol, 1894, p.1).

(...the extent of so vast a territory, the character and customs of a portion of its population, and the lack of an organized system of primary instruction.) (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p.77)

There had been other education laws in the Spanish era prior to the 1863 decree, but they were not comprehensive in their attempt to legislate on mass education. Still, it is undeniable that the Spanish monarchs took an interest in the education of the natives. The laws they promulgated attest to this. One such law was the Decree Concerning Native Schools, proclaimed in 1686 by Charles II. It encouraged the bishops to teach the natives catechism and Spanish. It reiterated the provisions of earlier laws and added that the knowledge of reading and writing was essential for the welfare of the natives (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 45, p. 184-186). Unfortunately, these laws failed to offer education on a massive scale. Alzona (1932) enumerates insurmountable challenges to the spread of primary education, one of which was the lack of trained teachers. Despite this, the missionaries tried to address the problem of education by setting up parochial schools in the parishes they founded. Although these schools primarily aimed to teach catechism, subjects like reading and writing in Spanish and the native languages were also taught (Bazaco, 1939). The brighter students were appointed to teach the others. Thus, from the beginning of the Spanish era, some native Filipinos entered the colonial structure as teachers.

The 19th century saw major legislative reforms concerning education. In November 1839, a royal cedula decreed the creation of a body to come up with an educational plan following the Spanish School Law of 1838. However, it was only in February 1855 that this board was appointed in the Philippines. This educational board produced the plan that would form the basis of the 1863 decree (Fox, 1965). The 1863 decree was a milestone because it not only made primary education compulsory for boys and girls, but it also standardized the curricula for primary schools. More importantly, it clearly articulated the rights and duties of the “maestros.” In the introduction to the decree, the Overseas Minister pointed to the lack of teachers as the root of the problem of civilization (Grifol, 1894, p. 2). To increase the number of teachers, Article 1 of the Royal Decree of 1863 provided for teacher training by declaring the establishment of a normal school for men under the management of the Jesuits (Grifol, 1894, p. 3). Article 27 of the Rules for Schools and Teachers of Primary Instruction also provided for the creation of a normal school for women (Grifol, 1894, p.125). Finally, in order to meet the requirements of compulsory primary education, the colonial government, in Article 3 of the Royal Decree, mandated the establishment of a school, one for girls and another for boys, in every town (Grifol, 1894, p. 3). Between 1865 and 1896, 13 private and public normal schools were founded. Twelve of these normal schools were for women, most of them located in Manila. There was only one for men, the Jesuit-run *Escuela Normal de Maestros* in Manila (De los Reyes, 2006). This school

was the first teacher-training institution established by the Royal Decree of 1863. It was subsequently raised to the status of Superior Normal School in 1893.

Article 15 of the 1863 decree created the *Comisión Superior de Instrucción Primaria* (Superior Commission) to oversee the fulfillment of the provisions of the Royal Decree:

La inspección superior de primera enseñanza se ejercerá por el Gobernador Superior civil de la Isla, con el auxilio de una Junta que se establecerá en la capital con el nombre de Comisión superior de Instrucción primaria, y que se compondrá del Gobernador Superior Presidente; del M. R. Arzobispo de Manila, y de siete Vocales de reconocida competencia, nombrados por el primero. (Grifol, 1894, p. 6)

(The superior inspection of primary education shall be exercised by the superior civil governor of the islands, with the aid of a commission which shall be established in the capital under the name of "Superior Commission of Primary Instruction". Said commission shall be composed of the superior governor as president, of the right reverend archbishop of Manila, and of seven members of recognized ability appointed by the first named.) (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 84)

Although the portfolio of this commission changed over time, the management and discipline of teachers remained its duty. The Superior Commission consulted with the Director of the Normal School, who sat as a member of the same commission, about issues related to primary education in the Philippines, such as the opening of new schools, and matters concerning the discipline of teachers (Meany, 1982). Sometimes the Director of the Normal School recommended the dismissal of teachers. At other times, he suggested the transfer or temporary suspension of erring teachers. The Superior Commission examined the conduct of teachers against the provisions of the Royal Decree and the accompanying Rules for Schools and Teachers of Primary Instruction and the Internal Rules of Schools of Primary Schools for Natives (Grifol, 1894). The former spelled out the rights and obligations of teachers, while the latter provided guidelines for teachers' duties within the school premises.

This paper will discuss the records of teachers' disciplinary cases that the Superior Commission handled. The study of these cases does not only shed light on the government's concerns regarding primary education, but also shows the relationships among the community members and their stake in the education of children. Likewise, it provides a more nuanced picture of the 19th-century parish priest, who

was not always the antagonist in the story of public education towards the end of the Spanish regime in the Philippines. Furthermore, these disciplinary records give us a glimpse of how Filipino communities negotiated the colonial structure in which they were inscribed.

The archival documents examined date from 1877 to 1893. These official records, found at the Philippine National Archives and the Philippine Province Archive of the Society of Jesus, can be classified into three types.⁴ The first category includes copies of reports of the *Comisión Superior de Instrucción Primaria* to the Civil Governor. The second consists of the replies of the Director of the Normal School to the consultations that the *Comisión Superior* submitted to him. Neither of these categories includes the personal records of the teachers involved. The reports only relate summaries of the disciplinary cases based on the teachers' dossiers. The third set of documents, found in the Philippine National Archives, includes the teachers' full records and proceedings of the disciplinary cases, but excludes the reports of the *Comisión Superior* or the statements of the Director of the Normal School. This paper will focus largely on the *informes* or reports on disciplinary cases compiled in the Jesuit Archives simply because the *Libro Copiador* of these archives has a better system of listing and cataloguing the cases. In contrast, the National Archives compile the records of teachers in bundles that are segregated according to province, which makes the search for specific disciplinary cases more difficult.

Although the records consulted are incomplete, they are so varied that the handling of disciplinary cases of teachers can be reconstructed. They are an eloquent evidence of the challenges that the colonial government faced in the implementation of the ideals that supported the 1863 decree. In a way, these cases also indicate Filipinos' attitudes towards these educational reforms. These cases exemplify the challenges to the educational system in the Philippines in the late 19th century.

WHO WERE THE TEACHERS?

The 1863 decree and its attendant laws set requirements for those who wanted to be appointed as public school teachers. The Regulations for the Schools and Teachers of Primary Instruction decreed the basic criteria in Articles 11 and 20. Article 11 states that aspirants to the position should have obtained a certificate from the normal school and should be 20-years-old (Grifol, 1894). Article 20 of the same regulation specifies the following:

Art. 20. Para ser Maestro, Ayudante ó sustituto, será preciso, además de las circunstancias respectivamente expresadas en los artículos anteriores:

- 1º Ser natural de los dominios españoles.
- 2º Justificar buena conducta religiosa y moral.
- 3º Tener la edad competente.

Los Ayudantes podrán entrar en el ejercicio de la Ayudantía de Escuelas á la edad de 17 años. (p. 123)

(Article 20. In order to be a teacher, assistant, or substitute, in addition to the qualifications respectively expressed in the preceding articles:

1. Be a native of the Spanish domains.
2. Prove his good religious and moral deportment.
3. Be of suitable age.

The assistants may begin teaching in the capacity of such in the schools at the age of seventeen). (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 105)

The majority of teachers whose cases were studied for this paper were natives. Only one was known to be of a “different race” (Informe, Rufino Segueria, 1888). Their ethnicity is known based on the case proceedings and other supporting documents. For instance, in their correspondence with government agencies like the *Dirección General de Administración Civil* or the Office of Civil Administration, teachers normally identified themselves as *indio*, *mestizo*, or *español*. Erring teachers, regardless of race, were subjected to the same disciplinary proceedings.

Even though the implementation of the decree was far from perfect, the law was a watershed in the history of education because it signaled the professionalization of the teaching role. It established rules on the appointment of teachers and created categories of teachers based on their educational attainment. The Rules for Schools and Teachers of Primary Instruction classify teachers under different categories (Grifol, 1894, pp. 117-128). The *maestro titular* or titular teacher and the *ayudante* or assistant teacher obtained their diploma from the Normal Schools. There were also assistants who received their title after passing an examination given by the Provincial Commission of Primary Instruction of their respective provinces. An assistant in this category was called a *maestro habilitado* or authorized teacher. Like the assistant teachers, the *sustitutos* or substitute teachers received their certificates after passing an examination given by their Provincial Commission. These substitutes were hired if there were no titular or assistant teachers available. On April 26,

1868, the regulations for the examination of substitute teachers and specific rules for their conduct were passed by decree of the Superior Civil Government (Grifol, 1894, pp. 165-169). It is interesting to note that this decree aimed not only to address the need for teachers, but also to accommodate those individuals who had been working as teachers in the parish schools before 1863. Despite this provision, however, the lack of teachers remained a pressing concern. In order to solve this problem, some individuals who did not possess any title were appointed as teachers. This last category of teachers filled the vacancies for substitutes or assistants (Grifol, 1894, pp. 121-122).

Regardless of their positions, all teachers had to comply with the same rules of conduct according to the 1863 decree. The basic requirements of the law seemed rather easy to fulfill. However, couched in the straightforward language of these provisions were the high ideals of the 1863 law: Teachers should be agents of Hispanization and paragons of moral and religious virtues (Concepcion, 2012). If teachers were suspected of violating any of these provisions, a disciplinary process was initiated.

TEACHERS AS AGENTS OF HISPANIZATION

As mentioned earlier, prior to the 1863 education law, the monarchs of Spain had passed decrees concerning the education of natives. Philip IV in 1634 and 1636, and Charles II in 1792 proclaimed laws regarding the foundation of schools and the teaching of Spanish to the natives (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 45, pp. 184-186). The colonial government understood Hispanization as a tool of civilization. If the earlier laws envisioned the missionaries to be the agents of Hispanization, the 1863 decree assigned native teachers to be agents of this civilization. Hence, the Filipino teacher became the servant of the colonial government to serve its goals. Although the law set very high expectations of teachers, the application of its provisions was plagued by problems. The lofty ambition of a widespread assimilation of Spanish language and culture, and religious and moral values was not completely attained. The challenges were multifarious, not easily attributable to any single cause. Problems like funding, and teacher and student absenteeism were common. At times, both the government and local communities viewed the teachers as responsible for the failure of the educational project.

The 1863 decree and the related laws gave a premium to the teaching of Spanish. It was one of the most daunting tasks the teachers had to perform. Teachers who did not teach the language effectively had their salaries forfeited and were dismissed.⁵ The decree set Spanish as a requirement for gaining access to privileges. Those

who did not learn to speak, read, and write in Spanish could not obtain such benefits as being appointed heads of municipalities, forming part of the upper class, or being exempted from personal service tax, as stipulated in Article 16:

A los 15 años de establecida una escuela en el pueblo respectivo, no serán admisibles á los cargos de: Gobernadorcillos y Tenientes de los mismos, ni podrán formar parte de la principalía, salvo si la gozasen por juro de heredad, los indígenas que no supiesen hablar, leer y escribir el idioma castellano. A los 30 años de establecida la Escuela sólo podrán gozar de exención de la prestación personal, salvo en caso de enfermedad, los que reúnan la expresada condición. (Grifol, 1894, pp. 6-7)

(Art. 16. After a school has been established in any village for fifteen years, no natives who cannot talk, read and write the Castilian language shall form a part of the principalía unless they enjoy that distinction by right of inheritance. After the school has been established for thirty years, only those who possess the abovementioned condition shall enjoy exemption from the personal service tax, except in the case of sickness.) (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 85)

Furthermore, the Regulations for School and Teachers of Primary Instruction include the following provision in Article 3:

Los maestros cuidarán especialmente de que los alumnos se ejerciten prácticamente en hablar la lengua castellana. A medida que la comprendan, se les harán las explicaciones en este idioma, y se les prohibirá comunicarse durante el tiempo de clase en el suyo respectivo (Grifol, 1894, p.118).

(The teachers shall have special care that the scholars have practical exercise in speaking the Castilian language. In proportion as they become conversant with it, explanations shall be made to them in that language, and they shall be forbidden to communicate with one another during class in their own language.) (Blair & Robertson, 1903, 2000, vol. 46, p. 97)

If teachers did not fulfill the above criteria, they could be subjected to a disciplinary process.

TEACHERS AS EXAMPLES OF MORAL AND RELIGIOUS VIRTUES

The 1863 decree viewed the teacher as another authority within the local sphere. Teachers could be appointed as *directorcillos* or secretaries, as Article 8 of the 1863 decree declares:

En los pueblos donde el Gobernador Superior civil lo decreta por permitirlo su corto vecindario, desempeñarán los Maestros las funciones de Secretarios de los Gobernadorcillos, disfrutando por este concepto un sobresueldo proporcionado á los recursos locales (Grifol, 1894, p. 5).

(In the villages where the superior civil governor so decrees, as its small population so allows, the teachers shall fulfill the duties of secretaries to the gobernadorcillos, enjoying for such duties [*concepto*] and additional pay proportioned to the local resources.) (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 82)

The above law is indicative of the colonial government's belief that teachers would really fulfill their mission. Consequently, it was important for the formation of the teacher's identity to uphold the value system of the Spanish government, especially religiousness, observance of good customs and education, as Article 1 of the Regulations for the Normal School for Teachers stipulated (Grifol, 1894, p. 11; Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 86). However, the decrees on paper differed from reality. Upon surveying the end of the 19th century and seeing the results of the Spanish attempts at bringing public education to the farthest regions of the country, one draws the impression that the 1863 law remained a dead letter. For all its lofty ideas, the 1863 law could be understood as one more tool of domination in a colonial society. Foucault (1977) has argued that the ideology in power does not usually rule by violence but by law. Bankoff (1996, p. 7) cites Michael Weisser who claims that "the legal system always functions as a 'crucial mechanism' for reinforcing and extending the ideology of the dominant power." Yet when one looks at the cases of teachers who engaged the colonial government to advance their interests, obtain a promotion, lodge their complaints, or appeal their case, one realizes that these teachers were able use the law to articulate their message. Owensby (2008, p. 9) cites Cover who highlights the idea of law as a medium of expression, as it allows people to

submit, rejoice, struggle, pervert, mock, disgrace, humiliate, or dignify... Yet, the written trace of law – the text of legislation, the treatises that expound legal principles, the cases that record the process of litigation – are barely adequate to convey this vast expressive range and its tangled meaning.

It is undeniable that these laws and the disciplinary proceedings based on them can throw light on the interaction between the colonial government and the natives. These disciplinary cases likewise provide a lens through which one can view colonial life in the 19th century.

THE DISCIPLINING OF TEACHERS

Provisions for the Disciplining of the Teachers

A circular issued by the Superior Civil Government on the Good Discharge of School Supervision indicates that the suspension of teachers as a disciplinary measure must be used moderately. The grounds for the opening of disciplinary cases were limited to “faults of religion, public or private morals, or of zeal in the fulfillment of one’s duties” (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 131). Likewise, “the abandonment of the Castilian language in the explanations or in the material ceremonies of the school will also be considered as one of the most serious faults of the teacher” (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 131).

The regulation of teachers’ conduct followed a process. The 1863 Regulations for the Schools and Teachers of Primary Instruction include several articles on the disciplining of public school teachers, whether official, assistant, or substitute. At first glance, the laws reveal the significant role that the local inspector or supervisor (parish priest) played in the discipline of teachers. Aside from ensuring the smooth running of the school in his parish and *visitas*, he also needed to check on the teachers. Article 32, no. 2 of these Regulations stipulates that the local inspector should

Amonestar á los Maestros que cometan alguna falta, y suspenderlos en caso de incurrir en exceso que á su juicio no les permita continuar regentando la Escuela, dando parte al Inspector provincial (Grifol, 1894, p.127).

(Admonish those teachers who commit fault, and suspend them in case they commit any excess which, in their judgment, does not permit them to continue in charge of the school, and to give information thereof to the provincial supervisor.) (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 110)

Although the disciplining of teachers was the parish priest’s responsibility, he was still accountable to the provincial supervisor, a position assigned to the chief of province (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 109). It was the task of the chief of province to oversee the schools in his territory and “to approve or disapprove the suspension of teachers imposed by the local supervisors” (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 111). The documents examined show that the disciplinary cases that reached the Superior Commission passed through the provincial supervisor first. A close reading of the cases can provide nuance to the image of “frailocracy” or the “reign” of the parish priest in every fabric of society, including education, because

the cases reveal that the parish priest's decision about a teacher's suspension was not always upheld.

The disciplinary cases can be categorized according to grievances: neglect of duty, maltreatment of children, incompetence, and serious fault against religious observance and moral virtues. The procedure for handling the disciplinary cases of teachers who graduated from the Normal School was indicated in Article 9 of the Royal Decree:

Los Maestros procedentes de la Escuela Normal no podrán ser separados sino por causa legítima y resolución del Gobernador Superior civil, previo expediente gubernativo instruido con las formalidades expresadas en el art. 6º y audiencia del interesado (Grifol, 1894, p. 5).

(The teachers appointed from the normal school cannot be discharged except for legitimate cause and by resolution of the superior civil governor, after a governmental measure drawn up with the formality set forth in article 6, and after hearing the interested party.) (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 82)

Although this was a privilege of Normal School graduates, even those teachers who did not attend the school but obtained their certificate through a public examination also enjoyed this right. Based on the cases that will be discussed, complaints against teachers were dealt with individually and judgments were not arbitrarily passed.

The disciplinary process usually began with a complaint. The sources of these complaints varied. They could come from the local inspector or parish priest, the *principalía*, the townsfolk, or the provincial inspector himself. The local inspector, armed by the law with the power to suspend the teacher, sometimes suspended the *maestro* or *maestra*, but not without giving the teacher prior warning. At other times, the complaint came from the townspeople. There were cases of parents lodging their grievances to the local *principalía* against teachers who maltreated their children or those who were incompetent. Again, these complaints were not enough to warrant the teacher's suspension. Usually, the teacher was summoned to present himself or herself to the *gobernadorcillo* and other members of the *principalía* to answer the accusations. Other witnesses were called to give their statement, either for or against the teacher. Minutes of these hearings were duly noted, signed by the *principalía* with the endorsement of the parish priest. However, there were times when the parish priest and the *principalía* did not agree. In this case the Superior Commission had to mediate and endorse either the parish priest's or the *principalía*'s view of the case. What happened when the declaration of a teacher's suspension

came from the *alcalde mayor* or the chief of province himself? The official who ruled the suspension was required to report it to the *Dirección General de Administración Civil* or the General Office of Civil Administration with the pertinent documents that would justify the suspension.

Regardless of the grounds for suspension, teachers were always given the chance to appeal in writing to the Office of Civil Administration and present evidence in their defense. The teacher's appeal was then passed to the Superior Commission for assessment. The Commission sometimes advised the granting of the appeal, thus overruling the suspension. At other times, the Commission's advice only mitigated the punishment such that a dismissal was reduced to a temporary suspension or to a transfer of destination. A brief look at some examples will help elucidate the points discussed thus far.

Types of Cases

Neglect of duty. This category of offenses included engagement in trade or any other work outside school, absenteeism, neglect of school facilities, and tardiness. It should be noted that the schedule of classes did not leave the teachers any free period to engage continually in any other form of business. The Internal Rules of Primary Schools mandated the schedule of classes, which were held from 7:00 to 10:00 in the morning and from 2:30 to 5:00 in the afternoon, Mondays to Fridays. On Saturday afternoons, students attended more classes on Catholic doctrine, morals, sacred history, and vocal music. They also prayed the rosary. School was in session throughout the year except for some short breaks like the Christmas season, Holy Week, and some feast days. From April to June there were no classes in the afternoon, but the morning classes ended at 11:00 instead of the usual 10:00 (Grifol, 1894, p. 130).

There were several complaints against teachers who were found working in their fields and stalls in the market. This was a cause of annoyance among the parents of students, presumably because the teachers were not able to fulfil their obligations in school. Why did teachers engage in other business? Then as now, teachers' salaries were meager. Delays in payment were frequent as evidenced by teachers' records requesting the Director of Civil Administration for settlement of salaries in arrears. It was therefore not unusual for teachers to find other sources of income.

The case of Andres Soriano cited in the report of the Superior Commission is significant because it shows how the Commission attempted to moderate the actions of the local inspector, i.e., the parish priest, in a way that favored the teacher. The

parish priest suspended Soriano on various grounds, including engagement in trade, and absenteeism. Since the statements of the principalía and Soriano did not corroborate the parish priest's, the Commission suggested that there were no sufficient grounds for Soriano's removal. They even surmised that the teacher must be caught between two irreconcilable camps: the parish priest and the gobernadorcillo, which resulted in his position being compromised (Informe, Andres Soriano, 1888).

Another case was that of Mariano Gatmaitan who was a teacher in Quingua [now Plaridel], Bulacan (Informe, Mariano Gatmaitan, 1884). He was accused of neglecting his duties. The report noted that the provincial governor visited the school to which Gatmaitan was assigned on October 19, 1883. During the visit, the governor discovered that the students did not even know their catechism in either Castilian or Tagalog. The parish priest thought this was because of Gatmaitan's negligence. However, the gobernadorcillo and the principalía reported that the teacher responsibly fulfilled all his obligations. Gatmaitan's explanatory statement is interesting because it shows the challenges that public primary education meant to everyone. Gatmaitan cited four factors to be considered. First, the governor visited the place when he (Gatmaitan) had been in charge of the school for only six-and-a-half months. This period included the month of July, when the students did not come to school, and April, May, and June, during which months there were no classes in the afternoon. Second, the parents did not provide their children the necessary books. Third, he had to hold classes in his own house for want of a school building. Fourth, the children did not attend school regularly.

It is not clear why Gatmaitan's students did not attend school in July when it was supposed to be a regular school month. Like many school children in the 19th century, Gatmaitan's students might have missed school in order to work in the rice fields. Student absenteeism was a major problem which the government and the teachers recognized (Sevilla, 1896). The Director of the Normal School, de facto head of the Superior Commission, recommended that Gatmaitan be reinstated because his excuses were reasonable. The records are silent as to other motivations for the favorable decision.

Absenteeism was also common among teachers. There were several complaints lodged against teachers who abandoned their schools. Reasons for absenteeism varied. Some teachers claimed to be ill, while others gave family responsibilities as an excuse. The *Comisión* and the Director of the Normal School, as usual, looked into each case carefully before passing any judgment. What is striking among the cases studied are the social dynamics that emerge from these records.

Carmen Genoveva, titular teacher of Piat in Cagayan, presents a striking case (Informe, Carmen Genoveva, 1891). She abandoned her school several times for periods of two to seven months each. What is extraordinary is that Genoveva, who received only eight days' leave from the parish priest, obtained authorization for her long disappearance from the provincial inspector.⁶ Since the parish priest was directly in charge of the school in his parish, it was in his purview to grant leaves to teachers.⁷ After Genoveva first disappeared for six months without looking for a suitable substitute, the parish priest decided to suspend her. However, Genoveva did not heed the suspension and always took up her position after she returned from long absences. In her defense, Genoveva declared she was sick and had obtained proper leaves of absence from the provincial inspector. The *Comisión* suggested that there were grounds for her separation from the school in Cagayan. However, this separation would not preclude her from being assigned to another school once her condition improved.

Questions arise from this document, for which there are no ready answers. For instance, was Genoveva's case unique? Was the parish priest too inconsiderate to prohibit Genoveva from taking a long leave to recover from illness? Why did the Commission not deal with her severely considering that she did not dutifully comply with the *Reglamento*? The document is inconclusive but it can be understood in the context of the conditions of teachers at that time. Many of them resigned or asked for a change of destination because of poor health.⁸

Maltreatment of children. The maltreatment of children was a subject of a number of disciplinary cases. This was a strong accusation that merited serious investigation. Although corporal punishment was a measure for disciplining students, the law regulated it. Article 12 of the Interior Regulations of Schools for Primary Instructions stipulates the following:

Los castigos serán en proporción á la entidad de las faltas, y consistirán: 1º en estando plantón ó arrodillados hasta el máximo de una hora; 2º en recargo de lección ó de escritura; 3º en quedarse en la Escuela escribiendo ó estudiando después de terminada la clase hasta una hora; 4º en cualquiera otra corrección moderada y proporcionada, á juicio del Párroco Inspector, á la entidad de la falta. En ningún caso se impondrá castigo alguno no comprendido en el artículo anterior, y el Maestro que infringiese esta regla será amonestado dos veces por el Párroco Inspector, y si no se corrigiese, suspendido de empleo. (Grifol, 1894, p.131)

(Punishments will be in proportion to the degree of fault, and shall consist: 1—to remain standing or kneeling for the maximum of one hour; 2—to do

additional reading or writing; 3—to remain in the school writing or studying one hour after the end of the class; 4—in any other moderate and proportionate correction, at the judgment of the parish priest supervisor, in accordance with the degree of the fault. In no case shall any punishment not comprehended in the preceding article be imposed. The teacher who infringes this rule shall be admonished twice by the parish priest supervisor, and if he does not correct himself shall be suspended from his employment.) (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, pp. 117-118)

It is interesting to note that parents at that time lodged complaints about teachers who abused these provisions. Based on the archival documents reviewed, the judgment of the *Comisión* on these cases did not follow any specific trend. Teachers were either dismissed or retained depending on the evidence they presented.

Fermina Alcala, a teacher in Namayracan, was accused of mistreating her students (Informe, Fermina Alcala, 1889).⁹ Twenty townswomen filed their complaint against her on June 4, 1889. These women claimed that Alcala made her students perform household chores like fetching water, cleaning the rice, and washing clothes. More women filed additional complaints about the teacher and her husband's physical abuse of the students. Alcala confessed in August 1889 that she did not go to school daily because she was indisposed. She also admitted that she made the students do different tasks. Alcala, already suspended in 1885, was again suspended in 1889. The grounds for these penalties are not known. It is also unclear how Alcala managed to be reinstated after these suspensions.

Cases of teachers being rehabilitated were not unique. A certain Marcelino Faz de Leon from Bantay, Ilocos Sur was suspended in 1878 due to absenteeism. According to the report on his case, he appealed to the General Office of Civil Administration to lift his suspension. De Leon justified his absences by saying he needed to recover from illness. The Superior Commission recommended his rehabilitation (Informe, Marcelino Faz de Leon, 1883).

Rufino Seguerra of Binangonan in La Infanta was also accused of abusing his students. His case was opened in August 1888. Aside from being faulted for the slow progress of the school and having an irascible and quarrelsome character, Seguerra was also accused of maltreating the children. However, no particular form of abuse was cited. The parish priest thought that resentment and rebellion lay at the root of these complaints, because the community had previously lodged similar complaints but these were not entertained by the former head of the district. The Commission, speculating that the root of the accusation arose from the principalía's hatred of Seguerra and his being of a different race, recommended his transfer to another

school (Informe, Rufino Seguerra, 1888). Seguerra's racial identity was not specified in the document.

Incompetence. Although the decrees from 1863 onwards stipulated that persons who obtained their teaching license should be deserving individuals, incompetence was still among the usual complaints against teachers. Article 13 of the Interior Rules of Primary Schools prescribed a criterion for teacher competence in terms of student performance in the yearly public examinations (Grifol, 1894, pp. 131-132). Moreover, students' performance in the periodic school visitations by the local and provincial inspector was also a basis for assessing teacher competence. If the students did not demonstrate their ability to answer questions that the local or provincial inspector posed to them, the teacher received the blame. This was the case of Ambrosio Lazaro, similar to Gatmaitan's discussed above.

Lazaro was a teacher in Meycauyan, Bulacan. According to his letter to the *alcalde mayor*, he was suspended on October 11, 1883 and was then asked to answer the charges against him (Exp. Ambrosio Lazaro, 1884). Lazaro was held responsible for the alleged incompetence of a pupil who was not able to answer the *alcalde mayor*'s question on the latter's school visit. In his letter, Lazaro raised relevant issues to explain his case. He stated that the fate of the teacher should not depend on the aptitude of the pupils because rural children were naturally inhibited in the presence of people in authority. Lazaro stated:

V.S. sabe mas que nadie que gentes de provincia aun cuando fuesen mayores de edad y que ya están á su juicio propio al presentarse á autoridades y personas de mucha consideración...quedan muy tímidos, atontados y llenos de mil presunciones (Exp. Ambrosio Lazaro, 1884).

(Your Honor knows better than anyone that peoples from the province, though they have reached the age of majority and are in full possession of their faculties, whenever they face the authorities and people of high standing... they become very shy, silly and full of affectation.)

Lazaro remarked that if the performance of teachers were judged according to students' abilities, then teachers would choose pupils who were known for their brilliance, a practice that would not be in accord with the provisions of the law that advocated education for all. On December 19, 1884, Lazaro was reinstated (Exp. Ambrosio Lazaro, 1884).

Like Lazaro, Salustiano Tocayan and Antonio Negado, teacher and assistant teacher, respectively, in Calbayog, Samar, were accused of incompetence (Informe, Tocayan

y Negado, 1883). Their students performed poorly in the public examination held on April 15, 1882. Nine parents declared to the *governadorcillo* that their children were held back in school. According to the report of the director of the Normal School, the cause of this delay was not directly attributable to the teacher because the results of the previous year's examinations were favorable. Furthermore, there were no negative reports from the *principalía* or the parish priest regarding the teachers. In absence of these, the accusation of incompetence was dismissed. The Normal School director recommended that the teachers keep their positions. This case exemplifies how the Director of the Normal School and the Superior Commission moderated the judgment of teachers' cases.

Ignorance of Spanish was one unpardonable offense. Teachers were obliged to use Spanish as the medium of instruction as Article 3 of the Regulations for Schools and Teachers of Primary Instruction indicated (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 97; Grifol, 1894, p. 118). Other decrees followed suit, implying that the 1863 mandate was not being fulfilled. Some teachers were dismissed because they did not comply with this requirement. James LeRoy observed that Spanish was "quite commonly not taught, because the teacher knew little or nothing of it" (Blair & Robertson, 2000, vol. 46, p. 99). Still, the cases of teachers who underwent disciplinary action for not knowing the language signify some effort to address this concern, albeit inadequately. Melitona Peñalosa, a substitute teacher of Luisiana, Laguna, was permanently removed because she neither spoke nor understood Spanish, according to the local inspector's report (Informe, Peñalosa, 1888). Peñalosa did not provide any counterstatement, refusing to use her right according to Article 9 of the 1863. If she were younger, things would have looked brighter, as implied by the report on her case, which reads: "neither does her advanced age allow her to attain the conditions she lacks in order to take charge of schools" (Informe, Peñalosa, 1888).

Serious fault against religious observance and moral virtues. The offenses that fall under this category are of different types. One type included grievances related to religious observance, a feature that was very much part of the daily schedule of primary schools. Article 10 of the Interior Rules of Schools of Primary Instruction obliged the teacher to accompany the children to church daily in the morning and in the afternoon. On Sundays and religious feast days, the teacher should accompany the students to mass and to visit the parish priest. Every three months, the teacher should accompany the students to confession and communion (Grifol, 1894, p. 130). Teachers were not automatically separated if they were accused of violating these provisions. There was still a need for evidence that would warrant the teachers' dismissal. In the following examples, both teachers were accused of neglecting

religious duties. One of them was retained while the other was dismissed. From the two cases it can be inferred that the parish priest's statement bore significant weight owing to the religious question involved.

Antonio Dacon was a teacher in Barrio Tulugan in Sta. Cruz, Cavite (Informe, Antonio Dacon, 1887). The provincial governor accused him of neglecting his duties including that of accompanying the children to church on Sundays. However, the *principalía* and the parish priest only had praises for the teacher. The parish priest even explained that Dacon did not accompany the children to mass on Sundays because of the distance between Tulugan and the parish church. The children went to mass instead with their own families. The statements of the *principalía* and the parish priest cleared Dacon. The *Comisión* was convinced that there were no grounds for the teacher's dismissal.

Segundo Damoc, a teacher in Cava, La Union, was suspended by the parish priest during the first half of October 1882 on various grounds (Informe, Segundo Damoc, 1883). First, he did not heed the priest's warnings. Second, there were complaints from local residents, though unspecified. Third, he gave an immoral example to the people when he missed mass even on feast days. He also entrusted the school to his assistant. However, according to two members of the *principalía*, Damoc was not remiss in his duties. When Damoc appeared before the governor, he contradicted the parish priest's statement. According to him, he only received one warning (not warnings, as the priest indicated) because he did not respond to the priest's request for help in a particular issue. Despite conflicting statements, however, the *Comisión Superior* still recommended Damoc's separation from teaching considering that he was accused of grave faults against religion and morality, and a notable neglect of his duties as a teacher.

The other type of grievances in this category includes offenses like gambling, drunkenness, and faults against chastity and patriotism. Of these cases, gambling and drunkenness seemed to be the least serious since not all teachers who were accused of these vices were dismissed. There is a Commission report of a certain Segundo Domuc, a teacher in Bani, Zambales who was suspended by the parish priest because of "serious faults in his teaching and disobedience to the parish priest and working in the fields" (Informe, Segundo Domuc, 1889). The provincial governor did not authorize the suspension because there were no sufficient grounds for it. The parish priest initiated the process again compounding the original grievance with gambling, playing card games, cultivating the field, cockfighting, and inflicting severe punishments on the children. The statements of the *principalía*,

the parents of the students, and Segundo Domuc contradicted the declaration of the parish priest. The Commission decided to reinstate him. This case thus presents a nuanced frailocracy, as the priest appeared powerless against the testimonies of the accused and the other members of the community. Domuc's disciplinary case shows how the community could negotiate the colonial system and undermine the position of the parish priest in his capacity as local inspector of schools.

Censurable conduct and immorality were frequent complaints. These offenses referred to relationships like extramarital unions. The government ordinarily dismissed teachers who were found guilty of such charges because such offenses directly undermined the teaching position. Of the cases examined, one teacher, Pio Ramirez, a licensed teacher of Camarines Norte, was able to circumvent his dismissal and was reappointed in another town (Exp. Pio Ramirez, 1890). Balbuina Lagatus, from Labo, also in Camarines, was found to have had children out of wedlock, possibly of different fathers. When she asked to be readmitted to teach, the Civil Governor did not grant her petition (Exp. Balbuina Lagatus, 1885-1886). A similar case was Juan Vizco's. Vizco was a teacher from Bustos, Bulacan who was accused of cohabiting with a married woman (Informe, Juan Vizco, 1890). He had also completely abandoned the school. The Superior Commission recommended his suspension because of his grave misconduct. Although the results of these cases were different, it is interesting to note that all three teachers obtained endorsements of good conduct from the *principalía*. Despite their alleged offenses, there were people in the community who judged the teachers' conduct favorably.

Although the cases examined in the Archive of the Jesuit Province did not include alleged involvement in subversive activities, this accusation became frequent in the late 1890s. This was counted among serious faults against moral virtue. Teachers accused of inciting rebellion were dealt with severely. The Articles of the 1863 decree and the accompanying regulations did not envision offenses against the colonial government. However, the succeeding decrees put a high premium on the teachers' mission as links between the government and the people. Therefore, any activity that detracted from their position as agents of government was punishable. In the wake of the 1896 Revolution, several teachers suspected of involvement in subversive activities were dismissed. Due process was no longer observed as the country entered a state of unrest. In view of the Governor General's proclamation of martial rule on August 30, 1896, the Director of the Office of Civil Administration issued the following circular to the provincial governors, which was printed in the *Boletín Oficial del Magisterio Filipino* (1896, p. 186):

A fin de que esta Dirección General pueda acordar lo que sea procedente, se servirá V.S. enviarme con urgencia una relación de los Maestros y Ayudantes de las escuelas públicas de esa provincia de que tenga V.S. noticia o sospecha de que han tomado parte en las conspiraciones ó rebelión contra la Patria, ó se hallen afiliados á asociaciones antipatrióticas y antirreligiosas, teniendo en cuenta que entre las mismas deben incluirse las logias masónicas.

(So that this General Office can ascertain what would be legitimate, Your Honor should send me urgently a list of Teachers and Assistants of the public schools of that province whom Your Honor might have news or suspect of being involved in the conspiracies or rebellion against the Fatherland, or are affiliated to antipatriotic and anti-religious associations, bearing in mind that Masonic lodges should be included among these.)

The issues of the *Boletín* in November 1896 and the succeeding months published lists of teachers who were dismissed for alleged involvement in treasonous activities. In the latter issues, however, there were announcements about teachers who were subsequently reinstated. Camagay (1995) writes about the situation of teachers in the final years of the Spanish era:

The decreasing number of teachers was most evident during the year 1896—the year of the Revolution. Seventy-nine male teachers, mostly coming from Nueva Ecija and Cavite, were removed from their posts during the months of September, October and November because of their involvement in the Revolution. Included were names of Artemio Ricarte, the *maestro propietario* of San Francisco, Cavite, Juan Cailles also from Cavite and Pedro Serrano of Quiapo.

The list of those dismissed included 12 women teachers, most of whom came from the province of Nueva Ecija...These women could have abandoned their posts out of fear for their lives or possible involvement in the Revolution. Women and women teachers for that matter were used as couriers and informers during the revolution of 1896. (Camagay, 1995, pp. 73-74)

The increased involvement of teachers in the Revolution was blamed on the Normal School, which was accused of fomenting a spirit of rebellion among their students. To the public it seemed that “hundreds of the graduate teachers from the school were revolutionaries” (Meany, 1982, p. 498). Fr. Hermenigildo Jacas, then Director of the Normal School, investigated the matter and claimed that after going through a list of 1,813 teachers and 326 assistant teachers, all graduates of the Normal School since 1866, “only 33 teachers and 50 assistants could have been revolutionaries” (Meany, 1982, p. 498). Indeed, this was a vexing denouement for

the story of public education in the Spanish period. The Normal School that was supposed to uphold the ideals of the 1863 decree and assess the disciplinary cases of public school teachers, and the teachers who were cast in their role as agents of the Spanish government, were suspected of undermining those very ideals.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing examination of disciplinary cases of primary school teachers in the late 19th century has considered various dimensions of the procedure for dealing with teachers accused of misconduct. The discussion focused on four categories of offenses: neglect of duties, maltreatment of children, incompetence, and serious faults against religion and moral virtues. Several issues have surfaced in the discussion. Firstly, there were systems in place to moderate accusations against teachers. The documents demonstrate that the parish priest, though he was the local inspector of the school, did not always have the final statement on the teacher's case. Secondly, any breach of religious and moral norms was grave. Teachers who were guilty of these offenses were generally dismissed, but some managed to retain their position. Thirdly, the poor performance of students and student absenteeism were not automatically attributed to teachers. Finally, in a disciplinary case, the statements of teachers and the *principalía* were normally heeded, as prescribed by the royal decree.

It is too early to draw definite conclusions regarding this research. To do so requires a more in-depth look at a larger number of cases. Nonetheless, we can venture some preliminary conclusions on the more salient features that these cases had in common. Foremost is the importance that the law accorded to the teaching position and to the teachers themselves. Their position gave the teachers rights and privileges. Accusations from different parties – the chief of the province, the parish priest, the *principalía* or the parents of students – were not enough to remove teachers from their position.

The second feature is the knowledge that all the cases provide on the teachers and their social context, and the community in which they worked. The cases depict the web of relationships that characterized community life. Relationships between the *principalía* and the parish priest were not always smooth. Neither were the ties between the parish priest and the teacher. The cases show that Filipinos had their way of challenging the authority established by the colonial government. Ironically, it was this same government that granted them the power to do so by declaring laws that Filipinos could use to their advantage. With the exception of teachers who revolted against the Spanish government, the rest of the teachers challenged

colonial government in a way that Norman Owen (2001) has classified as “peaceful” (p. 106). This nonaggressive yet powerful challenge made it difficult for the Spanish authorities to attain the ideals of the 1863 decree. Looking into the disciplinary cases, it is easy to realize how simplistic it would be to pit the Filipino teachers and the local communities against the colonial government and the parish priest. The archival material examined showed that this kind of relationship was not always the case. Many times the conflict was between the teachers and the communities they served. There were other occasions when the community and even the parish priest were ready to defend the teachers from allegations of misconduct despite the gravity of the accusations. These documents indeed exhibit the complex dynamics reigning in the colonial society of the 19th century.

Finally, the discussion has given an idea of the serious obstacles that hindered the Spanish government's attempts to establish a nationwide public education program. The study of the various disciplinary cases has also provided an in-depth look at individual teachers and their social milieu. It has given space for considering individual histories in the broader context of the history of education in the Spanish period. More importantly, through these cases, we get a glimpse of daily life in the Philippines in the 19th century. By looking at individual cases, this study hopes to contribute to broadening research in the field of social history.

ABBREVIATIONS

CSIC	Comisión Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, Spain
PNA	Philippine National Archives, Manila
UTAD	Unidad de Tratamiento Archivístico y Documentación, CSIC, Madrid, Spain
APP	Archives of the Philippine Province of the Society of Jesus, Quezon City
exp.	Expediente
mf.	Microfilm

MANUSCRIPTS

Libro Copiador de los Oficios y demás Escritos Remitidos a las Autoridades y Centros Oficiales por el Director de la Escuela Normal, 1864-1894. Archive of the Philippine Province (APP) of the Society of Jesus, Manila:

- Informe, Matias Plaza. (1882).
- Informe, Diego Tuazon. (1882).
- Informe, Segundo Damoc. (1883, Julio 15).

Informe, Salustiano Tocayan y Antonio Negado. (1883, Julio 16).
Informe, Michaela Romano. (1883).
Informe, Marcelino Faz de Leon. (1883).
Informe, Segundo Ramos. (1883).
Informe, Mariano Gatmaitan. (1884, Agosto 2).
Informe, Juana Velarde. (1884).
Informe, Antonio Dacon. (1887).
Informe, Andres Soriano. (1888, Septiembre 11).
Informe, Melitona Peñalosa. (1888, Agosto 30).
Informe, Rufino Seguerra. (1888, Agosto 20).
Informe, Ariston Ramos. (1888).
Informe, Gabriel Cipriano. (1888).
Informe, Hilario Bautista. (1888).
Informe, Luis Calimutin. (1888).
Informe, Pablo Briones. (1888).
Informe, Fermina Alcala. (1889).
Informe, Segundo Domuc. (1889).
Informe, Antonio Pereira. (1889).
Informe, Maria Bordas. (1889).
Informe, Martina Braganza. (1889).
Informe, Demetrio Rodriguez. (1889).
Informe, Juan Vizco. (1890).
Informe, Carmen Genoveva. (1891, Diciembre).
Informe, Pantaleona Asis. (1891).
Informe, Norberto Lucas y Felipe Sarmiento. (1892).
Informe, Joaquin Canals. (1892).
Informe, Antonio Bello. (1892).
Informe, Inocencio Hilvano. (1892).
Informe, Antonio Sanchez. (1892).
Informe, Segunda Cabrera. (1893).
Informe, Maria Parro. (1893).
Informe, Trineo Sanson. (1893).
Informe, Francisca Batol. (1893).
Informe, Vicente Gacutan. (1893).

Philippine National Archives (PNA). Unidad de Tratamiento Archivístico y Documentación (UTAD). Comisión Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, Spain:

Expediente Ambrosio Lazaro. (1884). *Escuelas* (Mf roll 1627355).
Expediente Balbuina Lagatus. (1885-1886). *Escuelas* (Mf roll 1627112).
Expediente Pio Ramirez. (1890). *Escuelas* (Mf roll 1627112).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to acknowledge Dr. Alma Bamero for her suggestions on the first draft of this article. The author would also like to thank the reviewers for their helpful insights and constructive critique of the manuscript.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ The full text of the *Real Decreto* and related laws are found in Daniel Grifol, *La Instrucción Primaria en Filipinas Compilación de lo Legislado Sobre Este Ramo, Comentada, Anotada y Concordada*. Manila: Tipo-Litografía de Chofre y Compañía, 1894. The translation is in Emma Blair and James Alexander Robertson, *The Philippine Islands 1493-1898* (CD-ROM edition ed., Vol. 46). Manila: Bank of the Philippine Islands, (2000).
- ² Directorcillos were secretaries to the gobernadorcillos.
- ³ Cf. Phelan (1959).
- ⁴ The researcher consulted the holdings of the Philippine National Archives both in Manila and in Madrid. The documents in Madrid are in digital format and are at present in the custody of the *Comisión Superior de Investigaciones Científicas* (CSIC). The Jesuit Provincial Archives at the Ateneo de Manila University in Quezon City were also consulted. The documents from these archives consist of the reports of cases recorded in the *Libro Copiador de los oficios y demás escritos remitidos a las autoridades y centros oficiales por el Director de la Escuela Normal, 1864-1894*. APP V-14-048.
- ⁵ See footnote to the *Decreto del Gobierno General del 30 Junio 1887* (Grifol, 1894, pp. 283-284). This decree reiterated the importance of teaching Spanish and reinforced preceding laws. It lamented the dismal state of Spanish teaching in the islands.
- ⁶ *Real Decreto del 20 diciembre 1863*, Article 15 appoints the provincial head as Provincial Inspector. Cf. Grifol, 1894, p. 6.
- ⁷ *Reglamento para las escuelas y maestros de instrucción primaria*, Article 32 specifies the tasks of the local inspector. Although it does not explicitly indicate that granting leaves is the local inspector's duty, the rules stipulate that he should ensure the fulfilment of the rules for schools and teachers. Cf. Grifol, 1894, pp. 126-27.
- ⁸ Examples of such records can be found in PNA Escuelas Camarines, Tayabas, Bulacan.
- ⁹ The writing is unclear. It could be Namatacan in Zambales.

REFERENCES

- Alzona, E. (1932). *A history of education in the Philippines: 1565-1930*. Manila: University of the Philippines Press.
- Bankoff, G. (1996). *Crime, society, and the state in the nineteenth century Philippines*. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

- Bazaco, E. (1939). *History of education in the Philippines: Spanish period, 1565-1898*. Manila, Philippines: University of Sto. Tomas.
- Bazaco, E. (1953). *Escuelas normales y de enseñanza media en Filipinas*. Manila, Philippines: Imprenta de la Universidad de Santo Tomas.
- Blair, E. H., & Robertson, J. A. (2000). *The Philippine islands, 1493-1898* (CD-ROM edition, Vols. 45 and 46). Manila: Bank of the Philippine Islands. (Original work published 1903)
- Boletin oficial del magisterio Filipino, II* (22). (1896, Octubre 1). Manila, Philippines.
- Camagay, M. L. (1995). *Working women of Manila in the 19th century*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press and the University Center for Women's Studies.
- Concepcion, G. L. Y. (2012). The Filipino primary school teacher and the shaping of colonial society in 19th century Luzon. *International Journal of the Humanities*, 9(6), 233-244.
- Corpuz, O. (1989). *The roots of the Filipino nation* (Vol. I). Quezon City, Philippines: Aklahi Foundation.
- De los Reyes, C. A. (2004). *Women's education in the Philippines, 1565-1898*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of the Philippines Diliman.
- De los Reyes, C. A. (November 22-25, 2006). Migration in the professions: The case of Cordillera teachers in 19th century Philippines. 19th International Association of Historians of Asia Conference, Manila.
- Escuelas*. [Microfilm rolls 1627112 and 1627112]. Philippine National Archives (PNA). Unidad de Tratamiento Archivístico y Documentación (UTAD). Comisión Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, Spain.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (A. Sheridan, Ed.) New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Fox, H. F. (1965). Primary education in the Philippines, 1565-1863. *Philippine Studies*, 13(2), 207-231.
- Gerona, D. M. (1998). Text and politics: Transactions of power in the early provincial Philippines. In S.D. Blanco (Ed.), *Cuadernos de historia*, pp. 235-254. Manila: Instituto Cervantes.
- Grifol y Aliaga, D. (Ed.). (1894). *La instrucción primaria en Filipinas, compilación de lo legislado sobre este ramo, comentada, anotada y concordada*. Manila: Tipo-Litografía de Chofre.
- Libro copiador de los oficios y demás escritos remitidos a las autoridades y centros oficiales por el director de la Escuela Normal*. (1864-1894). Archive of the Philippine Province of the Society of Jesus, Quezon City.
- Meany, J. S. (1982). Escuela normal de maestros. *Philippine Studies*, 30(4), 493-511.
- Meyer, A. E. (1965). *An educational history of the western world*. New York, St. Louis, San Francisco: McGraw-Hill.

- Owen, N.G. (2001). Challenging colonial authority: Principalía vs. priest in 19th-century Kabikolan. *The Journal of History, XLVII*, 102-127.
- Owensby, B.P. (2008). *Empire of law and Indian justice in colonial Mexico*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Osias, C. (1917). *Education in the Philippine Islands under the Spanish regime*. Manila: Philippine Education Company.
- Phelan, J. L. (1959). *The Hispanization of the Philippines: Spanish aims and Filipino responses, 1565-1700*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Scanlon, G. M. (1987). La mujer y la instrucción pública: De la Ley Moyano a la II^a República. *Historia de la educación: Revista interuniversitaria*, 6(1987), 193-208. Retrieved 28 April 2014, http://gredos.usal.es/jspui/bitstream/10366/79441/1/La_mujer_y_la_instruccion_publica_de_la_.pdf
- Sevilla, C. (1896). Memoria sobre los medios que deben ponerse en juego en Filipinas para atraer los niños a las escuelas. *Primer Certamen Pedagógico*. Manila: Academia Pedagógica de Manila.

Grace Liza Y. Concepcion <grace.concepcion@uap.asia> is an instructor at the Department of History, University of Asia and the Pacific (UA&P). She holds a BA Humanities (UA&P) and a BA (Honours) in English (Witwatersrand, South Africa). She finished her Master of Arts in History at the University of Navarre (Spain) in 2010. She is pursuing her doctoral studies at the University of the Philippines Diliman. Her area of interest is history of education in the Spanish colonial period.