

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University · Loyola Heights, Quezon City · 1108 Philippines

Social and Spiritual Kinship in Early-Eighteenth-Century Missions on the Caraballo Mountains

Mark Dizon

Philippine Studies vol. 59 no. 3 (2011): 367–398

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

MARK DIZON

Social and Spiritual Kinship in Early-Eighteenth-Century Missions on the Caraballo Mountains

This article studies social relationships in the early-eighteenth-century missions on the Caraballo Mountains in Luzon. Actors in the region interpreted these relationships in terms of kinship in the wider indigenous sense of the word. Nonconsanguineous persons could become and stay kindred through everyday practices in friendship and *maguino*, baptismal godparenthood and *compadrazgo*, Christian catechism, community leadership, and ancestor worship. Instead of resorting to cultural generalizations based on present-day anthropological studies or precolonial accounts, this article adopts an inductive approach and focuses on the social interactions themselves, especially on how the actors described how they lived and constructed these affective experiences on a day-to-day basis.

KEYWORDS: KINSHIP · *MAGUINO* · CONVERSION · CATHOLIC MISSIONS · *COMPADRAZGO*

Kinship and social relationships play an important part in history, especially at the micro level where human interaction is central. Historical actors understand their world and interpret its dynamics through the prism of human relationships. The actors in the early-eighteenth-century missions on the Caraballo Mountains in Luzon were in large part going about their normal, everyday activity of establishing (or breaking)¹ kinship ties with one another. In the conventional sense of the word, kinship is established by blood or affinity. Shared ancestry determines biological kinship, while traditionally marriage expands the kin group to include affines. However, the historical actors on the Caraballo Mountains had kinship practices and discourses that did not fit with this conventional definition of kinship. The formation of kin groups and their expansion were not limited to blood relations or marriage; boundaries between kinship and friendship were blurred; kinship branched out through networks of relatives and friends; kindred manifested and strengthened their affective ties in particular ways.

In many ways the very diffuse, open sense of kinship among the actors in the early-eighteenth-century Caraballo missions, regardless of ethnicity, tallies with current trends in anthropological and sociological studies where scholars have questioned the conventional academic notion of kinship that is based on the biological and have offered alternative frameworks. Compared with the conventional concept of kinship wherein the range of relationships is biologically predetermined, cultures of relatedness pay particular attention to indigenous ways of conceptualizing relations (Carsten 2000; Carsten 1995; Aguilar 2009, 128–44). Relatedness is processual and continuously constructed through everyday acts, such as sharing food and living together. This approach opens up studies to how different communities construct relationships differently. The notion of cultures of relatedness captures this article's approach where the term kinship refers to this more flexible notion of cultures of relatedness and in no way implies an understanding of kinship in a strictly biological sense. In order to tease out how persons on the Caraballo Mountains constructed their kinship ties, the overall approach in this article is inductive rather than deductive, microscopic rather than macroscopic, with the focus on individual strategies acted out historically rather than on abstract descriptions of monolithic cultures (Imízcoz 2009). The relationships themselves—in other words, how the actors actually related to one another—are the focal point rather than some cultural



Map of Central Luzon.

generalizations. In fact, the situation of the Caraballo Mountains as a frontier region with various ethnic groups interacting with one another, such as the Italon, Abaca, Isinay, Aeta, Irapi, Ilongot, Castilian, *sangle* (Chinese), mestizos, Kapampangan, Tagalog, and Cagayan, makes it an ideal case study for social interaction,² although the main focus is not the groupings per se but the personal interaction among the inhabitants. Because there are enough primary sources to reconstruct some aspects of kinship ties among the inhabitants of the Caraballo Mountains 300 years ago, this article will refrain from using present-day ethnographic studies, which might be useful but also fraught with complications due to the time gap that potentially can lead to cultural essentialism and reinforce the traditional portrayal of upland tribes as ahistorical.

The Caraballo Mountains refer to the small chain of mountains in Central Luzon that connects the Cordilleras on the west and the Sierra Madre on the east. In present-day terms, it straddles the borders of the

provinces of Nueva Ecija, Nueva Vizcaya, and Aurora (see page 369). Besides the foundation of Gapan in the late sixteenth century and of a few nearby settlements like Santor throughout the seventeenth century, the religious orders and the royal government were not too successful in permanently penetrating beyond the Central Luzon plain and into the Caraballo Mountains (McLennan 1982, 62–63; Keesing 1962, 267–97). However, in the early part of the eighteenth century there was a renewed effort among the religious orders, with the open support of the royal government, to conquer the mountainous frontier. The Augustinians moved northward from Carranglan and Pantangan in the south, the Franciscans moved northward from Baler in the east, and the Dominicans famously settled in the valley of Ituy (Bayombong and Bambang) in the north, expanding from their bases in Pangasinan and Cagayan. While these missions were not all mountainous since they included plains and valleys and might not strictly pertain to the geographical Caraballo Mountains, for the purposes of this article the term Caraballo Mountains is used as a shorthand to refer to the missions in this region.

In terms of its sheer presence in the popular imagination and of the quantity of ethnohistorical studies, the Caraballo Mountains is the less popular sister of the Cordilleras (Reyes-Boquiren 1998; Scott 1974; 1982). Ironically, the colonial construction of the Cordilleras, especially during the first part of the twentieth century (Florendo 2008), contributed to its popularity and regional identity. In contrast, the Caraballo Mountains, adjacent to the Cordilleras but without any special state-dictated regional status, did not receive the same attention. Apart from studies that survey the ethnic groups in Luzon (Keesing 1962), historical studies specifically on the area of the Caraballo Mountains are thin on the ground. In the popular nationalist interpretation, upland communities on the Caraballo Mountains are usually portrayed as the bastion of anticolonial resistance in the face of Spanish hegemony (Salgado 1994). Otherwise, they are merely the background setting to the hagiographic achievements of missionaries in their biographies (Villoria Prieto 1997b, 1999; González Cuellas 1988).

Although the social dimension of relationships is the main focus of this article, the religious nature of the primary sources provides the inescapable context in which one must analyze these social relationships. Inevitably the relationships studied here were those observed and described by missionaries, which in large part were inextricably linked to the process of

conversion. In general, conversion or colonial contact studies of lowland communities (Phelan 1959; Aguilar 1998; Rafael 1988) provide a more nuanced interpretation of the process than similar studies of upland communities. But in contrast to these studies, which tend to emphasize a dichotomy between the Spaniard and the native or the colonizer and the colonized, this article attempts to situate these interactions in the wider context of relatedness among the various historical actors on the Caraballo Mountains. Although some aspects of the relationships between Christians and animists with regard to the conversion of the latter might have certain unique characteristics, they still formed a part of the larger social interaction in the region, regardless of belief.

The inhabitants of the Caraballo Mountains manifested their kinship ties in particular ways. The first section of this article discusses the practice of *maguino*. Previous studies interpret *maguino* in the context of class structure (Scott 1994, 219–21) or patron-client relations (Rafael 1988, 138–42) in Tagalog society. For William Henry Scott (1994), *maguino* referred to the aristocracy or upper class of noble descent without any personal following because *datus* were the aristocracy with followers. On the other hand, Vicente Rafael questions Scott's interpretation of *maguino* as a lineage-based class and argues that any Tagalog could achieve *maguino* status through their prowess in controlling debt transactions and their concomitant obligations. Although Rafael (1988, 142) sees *maguino* in terms of social relations, he sees it as very parochial: "The ranks of *datu* and *maguino*, as highly localized designations, did not fall back on an outside source that might have sustained their privileges, perpetuated their rule, and expanded their claims to other villages" and "the position of *datu* represented an instance . . . of social relations within the *barangay* rather than the sum total of those relations." In contrast, in this article, *maguino* is interpreted as a way of relating among the actors in the Caraballo missions. The starting point for this argument is to reconstruct the meaning of *maguino* as it was used in its everyday context, going beyond the abstract *maguino* found in dictionary definitions and name appellations. *Maguino* as a way of relating was intimately tied with notions of kinship that were not limited to a single village and not tied to debt obligations. In fact, idioms of kinship in *maguino* not only tightened bonds but also expanded the scope of one's relations. Besides kinship terms, visits and affective gestures solidified these web-like connections in everyday practice.

The second, third, and fourth sections of the article discuss kinship ties within the context of Christian conversion, which provided additional opportunities for actors to consolidate and expand their kin group. The second section focuses on the kinship aspects of baptism. Baptismal godparenthood and *compadrazgo* created additional kinship ties among old and new Christians. But contrary to John Leddy Phelan's (1959, 72–78) treatment of *compadrazgo*, at least in the Caraballo missions, kinship relations in godparenthood and *compadrazgo* were highly limited compared with kinship ties in *maguino* due to restrictions in the number of godparents. Furthermore, the ritual coparenthood in baptism between persons of unequal social standing that Phelan claims provided stability in colonial Philippine society was highly circumstantial among the Christians on the Caraballo Mountains. The third section discusses the relocation of old Christians to new Christian settlements as catechists. In light of *maguino*, the neighborly proximity among them opened up possibilities of creating and even intensifying kinship relations that went beyond temporary visits all the way to permanent physical presence among kindred. The fourth section of this article tries to reconcile the different meanings of *maguino* as it referred to persons, social status, and a way of relating. *Maguino* as a way of relating was perhaps related as well to the social interests of *maguino*, or village chiefs,³ in the conversion of other communities. As the examples in the other sections show, conversion provided further opportunities for the consolidation and expansion of their intervillage kin group.

The fifth and final section analyzes how animists interpreted the Christian discourse on hell in light of kinship ties. Animists maintained continuing relationships with dead ancestors through spirit propitiation and ancestor worship, and they had to reframe these kinship ties in light of missionary preaching on hell and Christian conversion. Conversion amounted to breaking their kinship ties with their unbaptized ancestors in hell.

***Maguino* and the Formation of Friendship and Kinship**

Writing about his missionary experience in 1746, the Franciscan Fr. Bernardo de Santa Rosa described the customs of the Aeta in the mountains inward from Baler. The Aeta and *indios* in general had a practice called *maguino*, which was their way of establishing relationships with one another:

Gastan mucho de *Maguino*, y por aqui les emos entrado; se hacen parientes y se llaman hermanos con los del pueblo, y assi con el que es su amigo, ya le dizen cuándo has de visitar a nuestra madre, a nuestro padre, &, y los indios les dizen lo mesmo, quando vienen al pueblo, cómo está nuestra madre, hermana o &, y a otros que son avn muchachos, como sean hijos de sus amigos, los llaman con el nombre de hijos, &, y todo esto es por vanidad, que tienen, por enparentar con los del pueblo, como si fueran o se hizieran parientes del gran Tamberlan. (Santa Rosa 1928, 94)

They spend a lot on *maguino*, and we have entered by this means. They become relatives of the townspeople and call them siblings. Similarly with their friend, they ask him when you'll visit our mother, our father, etc. The indios say the same thing when they come to town: how is our mother, sister, or etc. To those who are still young, being their friends' sons and daughters, they call them sons, daughters, etc. All of this is due to their vanity of relating with the townspeople as if they became or were relatives of the great Tamerlane.

Among the Aeta and indios, friendship and kinship were related and in fact inseparable. But in anthropological studies, a distinction is usually made between the two. On the one hand, kinship is ascribed to and based on birth; on the other hand, friendship is acquired and based on choice (Beer 2001, 5805). This goes back to what Carsten says about the distinction being made between the biological and the social. Kinship is associated with consanguinity, so that only persons who share ancestors can be considered kin. Although kinship does include affinity, it is affinity by marriage and not by friendship. But in *maguino*, friendship was a sufficient condition for two persons to consider themselves to be kin. Although one could say that this was merely rhetorical, it still remains that *maguino* was a recognition of kinship between two friends in such a way that they shared the same set of relatives (or at the very least it evoked notions of kinship).⁴ In the village of Santa Cruz in the Augustinian mission, for example, the Isinay had “such unity among themselves that they called one another siblings” (*tanta unión entre sí que todos se llaman hermanos*) (Cacho 1997c, 333). To consider oneself as someone's sibling was a sign of kinship.

When Father Bernardo says that they spend a lot on maguino, one could interpret it in terms of the mutual exchange in ritual feasting and prestige goods (Junker 2000, 313–25). It is true that there were constant feasts and exchanges of prestige goods mentioned in the primary sources of the Caraballo missions. However, there is no evidence that there was any ritual that turned persons into “blood brothers” (Aguilar 2010) in the missionary sources. Kinship was processual. In the quote above, it was constructed through visits, greetings, and the use of kinship idioms. Spending a lot on maguino boiled down to constant, everyday practices in building affective ties. Although the spending of prestige goods was important in ritual feasts that were celebrated periodically, kinship cannot be reduced to a socioeconomic transaction. As Fr. Alejandro Cacho (1997b, 362) notes,

y así sucede muchas veces, que aunque se les da mucho no mostrándoles agrado, es perder lo que se gasta; y por el contrario, aunque se les dé poco, y aún algunas veces nada, se suele conseguir con ellos con buenas palabras, y agrado, lo que se intenta.

and so it happens many times that although they are given a lot, without being shown any good treatment, what is spent is lost; and on the contrary, although they are given little, and sometimes even nothing, what is intended is usually achieved with kind words and good treatment.

Most likely the gift of prestige goods and good treatment went hand-in-hand. But Father Alejandro places more emphasis on the good treatment of natives. Affective strategies underpinned socioeconomic transactions. Again, we go back to the affective power of words, whether these be kinship idioms or nice words. The quote from Father Bernardo above on maguino captures this same tone of good treatment. Since there was hardly any distinction between kinship and friendship, the formation of friendship followed the same process of being constructed in everyday practices of visits, greetings, good treatment, and kind words.

Visits were vital in the formation of maguino not only because they made personal interaction possible but also because they allowed village access only to certain persons. Visits were generally coordinated beforehand. Permission was asked before someone could enter a village. When

permission was granted, the date of the visit was arranged by both parties. In the beginning, missionaries had to wait before they were granted permission to enter villages. In these cases, local intermediaries communicated the messages between the parties. Entrance to a village was not granted to just anyone; hence the significance of visits in the establishment of kinship. Visits were steps toward the development of social relations. In maguino, friends invited one another to visit their respective villages. It manifested a certain level of acceptance. During these visits, friends greeted one another, inquired about the well-being of their relatives, and extended an invitation to reciprocate the visit. When it is said that a lot is spent in maguino, it had to do with the energy spent in building affective ties, in this case, through the constant exercise of mutual interaction (visits) and the establishment of good rapport (kinship idioms).

When missionaries entered the frontier region, they did not enter a social vacuum. Social ties already existed across the frontier settlements. On one hand, because missionaries were foreigners to the land and could not get married, their available kinship options to strengthen social ties with natives were restricted. On the other hand, in the context of eighteenth-century indigenous social relationships, the missionaries could still take part in friendly exchanges, which for all intents and purposes signified kinship for the natives. In fact, the Franciscan missionary of the lengthy quote above acknowledged that they had entered communities through the practice of maguino. The image of the lone missionary who trailblazes his way through the forest to convert isolated pagan communities has no basis in the Caraballo missions. The missionaries had local guides and intermediaries who were already Christian to help them contact communities that they wanted to convert. Most of the time these local Christian intermediaries were friends and even relatives of the animists. In line with the practice of maguino, missionaries were already part of a network of Christian friends/kin through whom they attempted to reach the network’s animist branches.

Rhetorically, missionaries always used words related to kinship whenever they addressed natives and tried to explain Christian doctrine. In the conversion of the village of Buhay,⁵ Fr. Alejandro Cacho “explained to them by interpreter the creation of the world and the fall of our first parents” (les expliqué por interprete la creación del mundo, y de nuestros primeros padres su caída) (1904, 92–93).⁶ In his very first opportunity to preach to the Isinay in their own village of Buhay, Father Alejandro established shared ancestry

with his listeners. Of course, it relied on the discourse of the Christian history of human redemption that starts with the fall in the commission of the first sin and promises the path to salvation in Christian baptism. Even then, by using the phrase “our first parents,” Father Alejandro opened the door to his Isinay listeners to interpret a possible kinship with the missionary.⁷ As discussed above, the use of kinship idioms was important in the construction of kinship ties. Both missionary and natives relied on the same strategy of acknowledging the same set of relatives in order to evoke and create affective connections, although they had different motives for doing so. When Fr. Antolín de Alzaga first set foot on the Caraballo Mountains, one of his first tasks was to explain to the pagans that to be baptized meant to become members of “our Mother Church” (la Iglesia nuestra madre).⁸ Although to call an institution like the Church “our mother” has almost nothing to do with kinship apart from affiliation to the same religious group, we can only imagine how native interpreters translated the expression.

The most obvious rhetorical device in the kinship between missionaries and natives in the missions was the use of terms such as “father” and “brother” in reference to the missionaries. While it is true that these designations come from a completely different Christian context from the indigenous sense of kinship on the Caraballo Mountains, even then it does not eliminate the fact that missionaries in the field had this coincidence at their disposal. A Franciscan Father called the pagans in his mission “my children” (manga anac co) (Santa Rosa 1928, 98, 102). Father-child ties were not limited to the converted natives, for even unbaptized natives were considered to be children of the priest. Taking into account how natives used a similar strategy of appropriating someone else’s relatives in order to tighten social ties, we suppose the natives themselves understood the same attempts by the Fathers to foster affective kinship ties with them. Likewise, in a quote attributed to an animist Ituy who did not want to convert, the unconverted called the missionaries “Fathers” (Río 1739, 15). Kinship idioms and relations between natives and missionaries did not hinge on religious conversion since just because the setting was a mission frontier did not mean that all relationships were reduced to religion. While natives valued kinship in their relationships, coincidentally or not the first two missionaries sent by the Augustinian Order in 1702 to the Caraballo Mountains were related to each other as uncle and nephew. When Father Alejandro gave advice to a missionary who was having difficulty with the natives, he told him “don’t use punishment; use paternal corrections, exhortations, etc.” (no usar de castigos,

sino correcciones paternas, exhortaciones, etc.) (Cacho 1997a, 325). The paternal relationship of the missionary with natives was not only a rhetorical strategy to get their attention because they valued kinship so much; the long missionary experience of Father Alejandro taught him that paternal rapport with natives was more beneficial than a cold, officious stance whenever reprimanding them. In the 1730s, when Dominican Fathers from Cagayan tried to establish communication with the Augustinians in Pampanga to construct a road that linked the two provinces, Father Alejandro explained to the Kalinga—who had threatened one of the guides of the Dominicans’ expeditionary party—their social ties with the strangers coming from the north:

diciendo que los Padres que venían de Cagayán eran hermanos de los de Bujay y que la gente que traían consigo eran hermanos de los isinays, por ser todos cristianos, y así que tuviesen entendido que si hacían algún daño sacarían la cara todos los cristianos de la misión de Bujay. (Cacho 1997c, 354)

saying that the [Dominican] Fathers who were coming from Cagayan were the siblings of those from Buhay and that the people they were bringing with them were siblings of the Isinay because they were all Christians. If harm were inflicted on them, all the Christians in the mission of Buhay would come to their defense.

Father Alejandro could have used the terms *compañeros* (colleagues) or *amigos* (friends), but he chose to use *hermanos* (siblings). His explanation of this social relationship should not be surprising since the notion of a brotherhood among all Christians is a normal part of Christian rhetoric. The priest is the father, while believers are the children. But in another sense, Father Alejandro knew how to make himself understood to the Kalinga because he presented the arrival of the strangers in the understandable terms of maguinoo where kinship ties in the wider indigenous sense of the term determined social relationships. In a way, the use of *hermanos* expressed the power of siblingship to transform affinal ties into kinship bonds (Peletz 1988, 15–53).

When the Franciscan Father Bernardo mentioned the practice of maguinoo, he placed it in the context of visits, greetings to friends, and inquiries about the well-being of the friend’s relatives. In another part of his

account, he relates his experience with the natives in his mission that fits exactly his description of *maguino*, although he does not explicitly call it as such:

El modo es, y parece rediculo; les manoseo las barbas, les abrazo, y aunque fingido, me rio con ellos, y otros juguetes que ellos estiman mucho, y lo publican luego, diciendo: el Padre le tentó las barbas, le abrazó, le dio tabaco, abalorios, & ellos me hazen mas pobre de lo que soy, pues todo se ha de componer con tabaco, abalorios y comida y mostrarles buena cara, y á sucedido dezir, si enquentran alguno armado: oye, no me mates, que é visto al Padre y le besé la mano, que es dezir: soy vuestro amigo, en buen romance. (Santa Rosa 1928, 105)

The way [to resolve conflicts] seems and is ridiculous. I stroke their beards, I hug them, and, although faked, I laugh with them, and other playthings that they hold in high esteem. Later they announce saying: the Father touched their beard, hugged them, gave them tobacco, glass beads, etc. They make me poorer since everything needs to be fixed with tobacco, glass beads, and food and putting on a brave face. If they meet someone armed, they say: hey, don't kill me, I just saw the Father and kissed his hand. In simple terms, it means I am your friend.

Although the indigenous strategy of kinship formation is not as explicit as in the previous quotes, the account shows with concrete examples how affective ties played out between natives and priest and also among the natives themselves in a very similar way to how *maguino* played out. Actions that may seem insignificant at first glance like greetings to a friend's relatives, hugs, or the stroking of beards were not merely rhetorical or exaggerated fussiness, but rather they were the basis of social relationships. These affective actions manifested their friendship, but it was not just a friendship between two persons. The native and the priest were friends; however, the friendship also extended beyond and encompassed the other's friends in much the same way that kinship in *maguino* expanded through the friend's kin group. When the native met an armed person (possibly a stranger or an enemy), he would tell him that he had just seen the Father and that he

had just kissed his hand. In theory, they were reasons sufficient enough for him to avoid any harm because the established good relationship with the Father was enough to convert the native not just into the Father's friend but also into the armed person's friend. (It is assumed that the Father and the armed person were friends.) In the region of the Caraballo Mountains, kinship and friendship were fluid and expanded easily through networks of friends' relatives, friends' friends, and hands kissed and beards stroked by friends. Friendship with a single person was enough to open the gates to wider kinship ties and further friendships. This relationship was not just an abstract concept but an experience lived in mutual visits, greetings, gifts, laughter, hugs, and caresses.

Baptismal God- and Coparenthood among Old and New Christians

Another manifestation of social relationships in the missions was godparenthood and coparenthood (*compadrazgo*) in baptism, which mirrored *maguino* in the sense that they both potentially established kinship between nonconsanguineous persons. Due to the familiar use of kinship idioms in this Christian ritual, most likely natives framed godparenthood and *compadrazgo* forged in the ritual of baptism within the framework of local kinship ties. While the link in relationships of *maguino* was the common friend, in baptism it was the godchild. In godparenthood, the godchild and the godparent formed kinship ties between them. However, if the godchild had parents, which usually happened with baptized children, the parents and the godparents also formed a *compadrazgo* relationship with one another. John Leddy Phelan (1959, 72–78) says that the social aspect played an important role in Filipinos' conversion to Christianity as can be seen in the popularity of confraternities and ritual coparenthood. Because the documentary sources of the Caraballo missions do not mention confraternities and other social groupings, this section focuses on godparenthood and *compadrazgo*.

According to Phelan (*ibid.*, 77), ritual coparenthood was an indigenous strategy to “bring kinship relations into the circle of Christianity.” From a religious point of view, the baptismal bond between godchild and godparent was more relevant than the baptismal bond between parents and godparents. As the eighteenth-century Augustinian Fr. Tomás Ortiz says, the godparents contracted spiritual kinship with the godchild and his parents, and had the obligation to teach the godchild in the ways of Christianity (Villoria Prieto

1999, 131). The spiritual kinship in baptism was primarily for the godparent to help the baptized grow up in Christian life. However, in the social practice in the Philippines, the relationship between parents and godparents was more important because it gave stability to society, especially when one considers how parents usually chose godparents who belonged to a superior social group (Phelan 1959, 77). In present-day Philippines, the number of godparents in baptism, confirmation, and marriage usually surpasses the two godparents recommended by the Catholic Church in baptism and confirmation. Although Phelan does not support his arguments with much historical evidence because he merely relies on contemporary sociological studies due to the lack of historical sources that talk specifically about *compadrazgo*, his extrapolation of twentieth-century data to reconstruct the past at first glance seems convincing. But at least based on the primary sources of the Caraballo missions, it can only be said that godparenthood and *compadrazgo* in baptism merely offered further opportunities of establishing kinship relations among old and new Christians. The high number of godparents who were chiefs was largely circumstantial.

The baptismal rolls in the Augustinian mission on the Caraballo Mountains indicate who were the godparents of the newly baptized. Although these rolls are very helpful in some ways, they are also limited because they do not describe the various relationships besides godparenthood and because, in spite of the enumerated names of the godchildren and their godparents, they do not elucidate who they were exactly. Even then, it is still possible to reach a few observations based on the baptismal rolls. Each baptized only had one godparent. A baptized male would have a godfather, while a baptized female a godmother. The present-day practice of multiple godparents did not exist in the Augustinian mission because the missionaries strictly enforced the rule that restricted the number of godparents in baptism to one or two. According to Tomás Ortiz,

para no multiplicar parentescos, se procurara que en el bautismo de varon solo haya un padrino, y en el mujer una madrina. Pero si los padres del bautizado instaren en pedir padrino y madrina, se les concedera. (cited in Villoria Prieto 1999, 131)

to prevent the multiplication of kinship ties, baptized males will only have a godfather, and baptized females a godmother. If the baptized's

parents ask for a godfather and a godmother, it will be granted to them.

This quote from Ortiz is practically lifted straight from Canon Law No. 873. The restriction on the number of allowed godparents was a rule applied to all Catholics; it was not a special law implemented in the Philippine Islands. The number of godparents permitted was fixed in the Council of Trent (Phelan 1959, 77). With the missionaries following the law, we can assume that no one in the Augustinian mission asked for a pair of godfather and godmother because everyone in the baptismal rolls only had one godparent. In contrast to the ease with which one could expand one's circle of friends and kin group in *maguino*, godparenthood and *compadrazgo* offered limited opportunities in the sense that each Christian could only be baptized once and with a single godparent at that. Besides the other sacraments, the only other Christian occasion to form spiritual kinship would be participation in the baptism of various children or godchildren, the former in the role of parent and the latter in the role of godparent. We do not know if baptismal relations in the missions were simply limited to the parents and the godchild on one hand and the godparents on the other, or if this kinship extended to their other relatives and friends just like in the case of *maguino*.

Even without analyzing the baptismal rolls, we can say that in theory a large part of the godparenthood and *compadrazgo* in baptism should be between old and new Christians. If the godparent had the task of teaching the godchild Christian doctrine, it's almost a certainty that the godparent had to be an old, long-standing Christian. In the context of the mission, godparenthood and *compadrazgo* united not only old and new Christians at an individual level, but also whole villages of old and new Christians by the very nature of missionary expansion from old, established Christian towns to newly converted mission villages. The formation of spiritual kinship in baptism generally between old Christians from lowland towns and new Christians from highland villages tightened the relationship between these two distinct types of settlement.

The Augustinian mission's baptismal rolls from January 1704 to February 1707 showed that the friars baptized 758 natives who had 548 godparents in total.⁹ There were more godchildren than godparents because a fifth of the godparents had two or more godchildren.¹⁰ In fact, some godparents

had a lot of godchildren. The following godparents were the most popular: Don Andrés Calibat and Don Juan de la Concepción, who had fifteen godsons each; Magdalena Quiamio, ten goddaughters; María Bilid, seven goddaughters; and Don Andrés Lanao, Doña Juana Méndez, Don Marcos Malalbón, Doña María Malit, and Doña Nicolasa Galantea each had six godchildren. Of these nine godparents with the most number of godchildren, seven were *principales* or chiefs based on their title of Don or Doña. At first glance, it seems that in general godparents belonged to a superior social group than their godchildren's family, confirming what Phelan and twentieth-century sociologists describe as the formation of kinship relations between persons of unequal social standing in Filipino ritual coparenthood. A total of 185 godparents were chiefs, which represented 34 percent of all godparents. In contrast, even with the very well-known missionary method of starting conversion with pagan leaders and considering that the baptismal rolls covered the initial years of the Augustinian mission, members of the chiefly group comprised only 4 percent of all the baptized. The difference between 34 percent for chiefly godparents and 4 percent for chiefly godchildren is large. One factor that could account for the difference was age. All godparents were adults, while many of the baptized were babies and children who were perhaps not old enough to be considered chiefs. In the baptismal rolls, the youngest baptized chief was a 16-year-old female. Even if we remove all the baptized who were under the age of 16 in calculating for the percentage of chiefs among the recently baptized, the percentage of chiefly (adult) godchildren would climb to only 6 percent, which would still be far off from the 34 percent for chiefly godparents.

A comparison with the 1713 Christian population lists in the Augustinian mission might put the previous percentages of *principalía* godparenthood in a better context.¹¹ Based on these lists, chiefs accounted for 17 percent of the mission's Christian population. In this context, 34 percent for chiefly godparents in baptism is still significantly higher than the 17 percent average for the whole mission. In contrast, the 4 or 6 percent for chiefly godchildren is still low compared with the total population average. However, the 17 percent average for all chiefly Christians encompasses all the villages of the mission; we can still break this down between old, established Christian towns and newly baptized Christian villages because the difference of percentages of chiefs between the two types of settlement is significant. In the 1713 Christian population lists, chiefs comprised 27 percent of old

Christian towns, a figure not far off from the 34 percent for chiefly godparents, especially if we consider that the former figure was calculated from the total population of old Christian towns, which included babies and children who were not usually considered chiefly. On the other hand, chiefs comprised 7 percent of the total population of new Christian villages,¹² a figure that comes close to the 4 percent for chiefly godchildren.

In summary, although one could still explain the higher percentage of chiefly godparents compared with that of chiefly godchildren as a manifestation of an indigenous practice of forming ritual coparenthood between persons of unequal social standing, a simpler explanation is that the percentages merely reflect the chiefly composition of the settlements from where the godparents and godchildren came because their percentages match. The percentage of chiefly godparents, who were generally old Christians who lived in established towns, mirrored the percentage of chiefs in established towns of old Christians. At the same time, the percentage of chiefly godchildren, who were new Christians who lived in newly baptized villages, simply reflected the percentage of chiefs in these newly converted mission settlements. At the core of the different percentages of chiefly godparents and godchildren were the different percentages of chiefs between old and new Christians.

Furthermore, there is a tendency to view kinship as enclosed within a community. Although not explicitly stated, Phelan's (1959, 77) analysis of *compadrazgo* is set within the confines of a single abstract community. However, the dynamics of kinship among the Caraballo inhabitants had an expansive potential. In maguino, kinship ties spread through intervillage networks of friends and relatives. Similarly in godparenthood and *compadrazgo*, inhabitants of the Caraballo Mountains established kin relations across the mission frontier. One could say that godparenthood and *compadrazgo* relations were simply a specific and new instance of intervillage kin expansion.

It is difficult to evaluate the quality of the interaction in this spiritual kinship due to the scarcity of historical sources. It is assumed that potential godparents were initially either of the following: guides and escorts who accompanied the missionaries whenever the latter visited the catechumens for baptism, or later on old Christian catechists who moved to the new Christian settlements. They formed the pool of possible godparents. Don Marcos Malalbón, a chief from the old Christian town of Carranglan and

godfather to six newly baptized natives in the mission, was a known guide and intermediary of the Augustinian missionaries. Another concrete but perhaps unusual example is the case of Captain Don Domingo Dayao, governor of Arayat.¹³ Don Domingo was the godfather of several chiefs' sons from Buhay, but he had never visited the place. Perhaps his Isinay godsons traveled to Arayat or some mission settlement close to Arayat to be baptized. It is an unusual case because the town of Arayat did not even belong to the mission and the village of Buhay was all the way on the Caraballo Mountains' northwestern side. It was a case of long-distance spiritual kinship. While we do know that Don Domingo never set foot in Buhay, we do not know if he maintained relations with his godsons and their parents. In cases of long-distance baptismal kinship (Mozo 1763, 76, 83), the baptized and their parents could have gained prestige more than anything else from having chiefly godparents. Nevertheless, it seems that short-distance baptismal kinship in the Caraballo missions was common because of the frequent mention of old Christian natives from the surrounding area as the escorts, intermediaries, catechists, guides, and interpreters of missionaries whenever they made the rounds of the mission, which was when they performed baptisms. These old Christians who accompanied the missionaries were the ideal candidates to be godparents of the new Christians.

Catechists and their Relocation to Mission Settlements

Although there is relatively little information about kinship relations among godparents, godchildren, and their parents, we know that another way relationships between old and new Christians were established was through the relocation of old Christian catechists to villages of new Christians. The catechist was a clear link that brought together old and new Christians. Even before missionary efforts started in earnest, animists and Christians already maintained relationships with one another for various reasons. Some animists, for example, lived in lowland Christian towns in order to facilitate lowland–highland trade with Christian natives and mestizos. But the relocation of native catechists to new Christian settlements in the mountains was an unusual movement in the sense that normally apostates or fugitives were the only natives who relocated to the interior mountains populated by animists. Due to the scarcity of ministers, the religious orders had to rely on native catechists in the evangelization of distant villages and *visitas* (hamlets). The Augustinian Fr. Casimiro Díaz describes the steps that the parish priest must follow in his attempt to govern distant *visitas* with the help of native guardians:

En caso de que en la Visita no halle el Parrocho personas de satisfacion, en quienes poder confiar este cuydado, escogerà de la Cavezera algunas familias honestas, y de Authoridad, y procurará se trasladen à dicha Visita; para su gobierno. (Díaz 1745, 142v)

In case the parish priest does not find any satisfactory persons in the outlying village who can be trusted with this responsibility, he will choose some families from the main town who are honorable and of authority, and he will have them relocate to and govern the said village.

In reality, Díaz was talking about the governance of old Christian towns, in particular, how to better manage their far-flung *visitas* with the aid of chiefly guardians. But the same logic applied to the relocation of old Christian, native catechists to the mission *visitas*. Don Bartolomé Dandán, his brother, and their families transferred to the *visita* of San José in order to teach civilized Christian living to the Baluga who wanted to convert (Cacho 1997c, 339). Don Bartolomé was a chief of the town of Bongabon, so it can be assumed that his family was honorable and of authority. As indicated in the extract from Díaz, it was not the transfer of one individual guardian or catechist but the relocation of whole families of respectable old Christians. In the case of San José, the families of Don Bartolomé and his brother fulfilled this role. We do not know if they received anything for their labor, but it was common practice by the religious orders to intercede for royal titles, honors, and privileges on behalf of the natives who helped them in their mission work.

From a religious perspective, old Christians who lived with catechumens were important in the mission because they were the representatives of the missionaries in the *visitas*. An old Christian from Bongabon said that conversion would not have been possible without recourse to catechists.¹⁴ The governor of Arayat described in detail the tasks accomplished by the native catechists, which were to review Christian prayers and doctrine with the new Christians and to prepare catechumens for baptism before the missionary's arrival.¹⁵ Father Alejandro even praised the missionary work of the indio Luis Pigu:

quien no tiene igual para interpretar, y predica más que el Padre, cuando está en compañía de sus iguales, y no se adelanta diciendo

disparates, sino lo que debe. Tiene grande fe; y por fin digo que *ceteris paribus* tanto debe aquella misión en la fe que ha adquirido de las cosas de Dios a dicho Pigó, como a los Padres, hasta que ellos no supieron bien lengua. (Cacho 1997b, 384)

who has no equal in interpretation and who preaches more than the Father. When he is in the company of his equals, he does not get ahead of himself saying nonsense, only what he should. He has great faith, and finally I can say that *ceteris paribus* that mission owes its faith in God's things as much to said Pigu as to the Fathers until they knew the language well.

Especially during the initial years of the mission when the Augustinians still did not know the local languages, native interpreters and catechists played a role as vital as the missionaries, if not more so.

When catechumens did not relocate themselves to settlements of old Christians, the presence of catechists in new Christian settlements is an example of how the relationship between old and new Christians became closer through conversion. In the context of visits as discussed earlier in this article, sharing a living space within the same settlement was a further step in the process of building kinship ties. In the same way that not just anyone was permitted to enter their villages, it can be assumed that not just anyone was permitted to live in their villages. With the relocation of catechists, the process of kinship formation moved from visits to shared community living. The opportunities for personal kinship interaction increased massively due to their constant, permanent presence. Missionaries also had to get the willing consent and participation of the natives in the construction of a church and house for the priest. Although the construction of a church and house served practical purposes since the former enabled Christians to fulfill the Sunday mass obligation and the latter provided shelter for the priest, they were manifestations of the intensification of the kinship process. They were not just visiting their kin; they were living with them. The increasing density of relations in the relocation of catechists can be seen in the case of Don Bartolomé. From the very beginning, he had been a friend of the Baluga, but after their conversion he also became their catechist, godfather, and close neighbor. Conversion only added to the existing movement between settlements with the relocation of families of catechists.

In several Christian population lists made by the Augustinian missionaries in 1713,¹⁶ we can see who were old and new Christians in the various towns and visitas. Eight settlements of new Christians had practically no old Christian population, while four had old Christian populations that varied from 17 to 33 percent of the total village population. We do not know whether the settlements with no old Christians listed really did not have them or the missionaries simply did not bother to make the distinction for these settlements. In any case, it is highly probable that part of the old Christian population living among new Christians in the visitas were families of catechists.

Conversion was an opportunity for Christians and animists to tighten their relationships with one another. The transfer of catechists to settlements of catechumens was a basis for the intensification of relations between old and new Christians. Studies of Christian missions usually emphasize the importance of convincing pagan chiefs in the success of conversion, but already Christian natives in their roles of friend, intermediary, chief, godparent, neighbor, guardian, and catechist were very important not only in converting them but also in bringing about greater kinship in the mission.

Chiefly Interests in Conversion

Old Christian natives, especially the chiefs, who helped the missionaries in the conversion of animists in the mountains, contributed a lot to the expansion of the missions. The missionaries suspected vested interests at work in some natives' willing participation in expanding the mission, such as better control of frontier trade, the granting of military titles, and exemption from tribute. In his eighteenth-century guide for parish priests, Casimiro Díaz warned them of the dangers in choosing guardians for the visitas:

Pero es preciso que en la Eleccion de estos sujetos proceda el Parrocho con gran cautela; porque es muy ordinario en estos lances solicitar algunos Principales esta encomienda, llevados de la codicia de las gracias, que se les concede, y otras vezes (aun sin haver este cebo) inclinandose à vivir en dicha Visita por sus intereses particulares. Vnas vezes por dominar à los que habitan en dicha Visita, y valerse de ellos para el trafico de la Cera, Azeyte, Maderas, &c. Otras para levantarse poco à poco, con las tierras; y hacer feudatarios suyos, en governando estas vtilidades. (Díaz 1745, 142v)

But it's necessary that the parish priest proceeds with caution in the selection of these subjects because it is very common on these occasions that some chiefs ask for this assignment driven by greed for the favors granted and other times (even without having this incentive) inclined to live in said visita due to their vested interests. Sometimes in order to dominate the inhabitants of said visita and take advantage of them in the trade of wax, oil, wood, etc. Others to start little by little with the lands and make them their own vassals in managing these resources.

Although commercial trade was involved, social relationships still provided the framework for the interaction. Díaz deduced a lord–vassal relationship between native guardians and the Christians in the visitas. An observation from a Dominican missionary supplies a different social context to the willing participation of native chiefs in converting other communities. In describing his native intermediaries in the conversion of the Ituy, Fr. Francisco de la Maza stated that Don Marcos and his people “wanted to gain the honor of being tamers” (*quieren ganar honra de amansadores*) (cited in Villoria Prieto 1997a, 14). Although this observation was related to lowland–highland trade wherein the Dominicans suspected that the old Christians took economic advantage of the animists and new Christians in the mountains, noneconomic factors such as honor were still at play. While Díaz warned of chiefs in visitas who wanted to dominate the Christians there as some sort of feudal lord, Father Francisco thought that the chiefs wanted recognition for being the tamers of the newly converted communities. At the core of the two priests' observations, conversion opened up opportunities for natives, especially the chiefs, to consolidate their social relationships with others and consequently gain access to all the socioeconomic benefits that entailed.

In the conversion of the area of Buhay, the recently baptized natives who already knew the required Christian prayers piously insisted that they be the catechists of the still unbaptized surrounding settlements (Cacho 1997b, 388). Whether this persistence to be the first to teach Christian prayers to catechumens was due to the honor of being their tamers or to a not-to-be-missed opportunity to be their “feudal lords” or to an honest-to-goodness piousness to spread Christianity, conversion was another dimension of building relationships. It was a form of social interaction among communities;

even the simple act of teaching memorized prayers elicited such passion. In fact, the participation of Christian natives in the conversion of pagans could be tied to the concept of *maguinoo* in the region.

The word *maguinoo* did not only refer to relationships of friendship and kinship; it also referred to the chiefs themselves (Scott 1994, 219–21; Rafael 1988, 141–42). In the eighteenth-century Tagalog–Spanish dictionary of the Jesuits Noceda and Sanlúcar (1860, 198), *maguinoo* meant noble, chief, and lord, while *magmaguinoo* was for somebody to become one. Although today the word only refers to the gentlemanliness of men, its older and more expansive meaning can be seen in the Tagalog version of the prayer Hail Mary the first line of which declares, “Aba, Ginoong Maria.” On the one hand, according to the dictionary, to be *maguinoo* is to be chiefly and noble; on the other hand, in Bernardo de Santa Rosa's definition, which was mentioned at the outset, *maguinoo* was a way of creating kinship. We can say that the two meanings were related in the sense that a chief was someone who could establish kinship ties with others well. This interpretation coincides with the importance of personal allegiance in power relations in early modern Southeast Asia where the relative scarcity of people put the emphasis on people rather than on land. If indigenous chiefs based their chiefly status on relationships of friendship, kinship, and *maguinoo*, the conversion of pagan natives would simply be another dimension of their great ability to establish relationships with others. In other words, to be a chief was to form kinship ties with others, whether they be Christians or animists. Perhaps the “feudal” relations and prestige of being tamers described by the priests were manifestations of *maguinoo*.

Chiefs also affected aspects of the social configuration of the missions. In 1705 Father Baltasar told the inhabitants of the village of San Agustín that they could possibly be asked to move to San Pablo, but they answered back that “they must not live in San Pablo, but on a level ground near San Pablo on the way to San Jose in order not to lose their chiefs” (*no han de vivir en S. Pablo, sino en una llanada cerca de S. Pablo, camino de S. José, y es por no perder su principalía*) (Isasigana 1904b, 297). Transferring people among mission settlements altered the position of their chiefs. At least in this case, the relocation of San Agustín implied the loss of their chiefs. We can only imagine the detailed effects of the contrary movement where chiefly families of Christian catechists relocated to the mission visitas, but it seems that the visitas of catechumens merely absorbed the chiefly catechists in their

existing roster of chiefs as can be seen in extant Christian population lists. In fact, the previous quotes cited above confirm that chiefs could potentially control economic trade, gain followers, and attain prestige in the conversion of surrounding villages and their administration as *visitas*.

Christian population lists confirm the coexistence of old and new Christian chiefs in the *visitas*.¹⁷ In the *visita* of San Agustín, nine chiefs were new Christians and three were old Christians; in San José, one chief was a new Christian and four were old; in Santa María de Anunciación, twenty-eight chiefs were new Christians and one was old; in Santa Mónica, three chiefs were new Christians and also three were old; and lastly in Santiago, one chief was a new Christian and three were old. Although we do not know how the social dynamic among new and old Christian chiefs worked exactly in the *visitas*, at least we know that they lived together and most probably found a feasible living arrangement.

Administrative units also reflected the importance of chiefs in the dynamics of the missions. For example, the old Christian towns of Santor and Bongabon were composed of *barangays*, each governed by a chief.¹⁸ In fact, in the population lists each *barangay* was named after its chief or captain, not after a saint. Another example of the importance of being chief is the case of an exiled chief from Pampanga who wanted to found a new town in the Caraballo missions for the purpose of having followers and regaining his lost chiefly status (Zamora 1904, 325). It is an unusual case in the missionary sources, but it highlights how the creation or sometimes just the conversion of settlements presented the opportunity to old Christians to continue to be or to become chief or *maguino* in the missions.

Spiritual Kinship with Dead Ancestors in Hell

Kinship sustained many aspects of social relationships in the missions. Conversion, *maguino*, godparenthood, and chiefly status manifested in one way or another kinship relations in the widest sense of the term. Natives who converted became part of an expanding kin group that extended from Father missionaries and Christian siblings to godparents and chiefs from nearby villages. Missionary expansion brought along Christian institutions and practices that had to adjust to indigenous kinship beliefs and dynamics, which stretched all the way to the afterlife. In the animist and polytheist world of the inhabitants of the Caraballo Mountains, the spirits of dead ancestors and relatives determined the fortune of the living. Proper propitiation of

the spirits ensured that they did not exact reprisals in the form of diseases and misfortune on their living relatives. The well-being of the kin group depended on the intervention of relatives in the afterlife. The Christian concept of hell had to contend with these local beliefs tied to notions of kinship. The cosmological scheme in missionary discourse that separated the living from the dead was different from the local belief system wherein living and dead relatives continued to interact with one another in spite of death.

Before conversion to Christianity was considered, one of the most frequent questions that piqued the interest of nonbelievers was who went to heaven and who went to hell. Preaching about the salvation of the soul in heaven and its eternal damnation in hell was common in missionary discourse, and the answer to the question of who went where was that Christians went to heaven and infidels went to hell. In the New World and even in China, natives, especially those who practiced ancestor worship, always wanted to know what happened to their dead ancestors (Cummins 1978, 89–91). For example, the Chinese would ask if Confucius was saved in heaven or if he was damned in hell. The missionary discourse on heaven and hell raised questions among them on the condition of their dead ancestors from Confucius and great kings to ordinary persons. The then Christian teaching that only the baptized could go to heaven meant that all those not baptized—in other words, all their ancestors—went to hell. As a result, missionaries in China tried to evade answering the question whenever possible, especially if it would jeopardize their missionary work.

In the Caraballo missions, the missionaries used the same strategy of introducing the concept of heaven and hell to persuade the natives to convert, the latter reconfiguring their beliefs to accommodate the new Christian ideas while still continuing to be grounded on indigenous notions of kinship. When Frs. Baltasar de Isasigana and Antolín de Alzaga bumped into some female pagan natives while traveling and asked them if they knew the path to heaven, the latter all calmly replied that what they knew was the path to hell (Isasigana 1904a, 310). We can assume that the animists understood the Christian concepts of heaven and hell due to current and previous preaching by missionaries and Christian natives on the Caraballo Mountains. The pagan women answered that they knew the path to hell because they understood the Christian teaching that nonbelievers had to go to hell. With the strong connection between pagan living and hell

established in Christian evangelization, natives who heard this preaching saw the same connection and believed they would be going to hell if they did not convert to Christianity.

In spite of the very real possibility of going to hell, some natives still decided not to convert to Christianity. A main reason was the rupture of relationships with dead relatives who determined the fortune of the living. In one of his discourses to the animist Aeta of Dilalongan, the Franciscan missionary Fr. Bernardo de Santa Rosa (1928, 102) clarified the exclusivity that faith in God implied: “the baptized who believes and obeys the true God has no *anito*, *tigbalang*, *dwende* and other gods” (ang binin yagan na sung masang palataya at somonor sa Dios na totoo, navalan anito, valan tigvalang, valan duende, at valan yban Dios). With a one, true God to believe and obey, Christians had to abandon anitos and spirits who were the dead relatives and chiefs of the living. In other words, conversion broke the spiritual kinship between the living and the dead, especially in recently converted communities whose dead ancestors were all unbaptized.

In dialogues attributed to them, animist natives repeated several times that they wanted to go to hell because all their ancestors were there (Río 1739, 15; Ferrando 1871, 376; González Cuellas 1988, 70). In the Dominican evangelization of the valley of Ituy, some of the people replied:

hablándoles de la necesidad de la religion para salvarse, decian á los misioneros: «Sabemos que hay mucho fuego en el infierno; pero queremos ir á él, porque allí están nuestros mayores; no nos habléis de religion, porque no queremos dejar nuestras costumbres de tener *anito* (diablo) y sacrificios á la usanza de estos pueblos.[»] (Ferrando 1871, 376)

having been told about the necessity of religion for their salvation, they told the missionaries, “We know that there's much fire in hell, but we want to go there because our elders are there. Don't talk to us about religion because we don't want to leave behind our custom of having *anito* (devil) and these towns' customary sacrifices.[”]

The animist Ituy's disdain toward conversion was due to their reluctance to make the necessary abandonment of valued traditions such as ancestor worship. Although Christianity offered a gamut of alternative spirits in the

form of saints to cure the sick, avoid misfortune, and achieve prosperity, some indigenes still decided to stick to their accustomed beliefs. A plausible explanation is that, in spite of the power of God and the saints to cure and save, kinship and affective ties did not exist between them and the natives. Although in theory natives could create new kinship relations with God, saints, and Father missionaries through *maguinoos*, some animists did not take this option and continued treading the known path to hell where all their ancestors resided.

In the same mission of Ituy, an infidel and some Dominican missionaries discussed if the Christian God was better than his idols. After hearing the Fathers' position (we can assume they argued the Christian God was better), the infidel answered back:

Callad, Padres, que no sabeis lo que hablais, y vivis engañados. Nuestro Idolo, ò Anito nos dice quando nos havemos de morir, y nos dà remedios para curar nuestras enfermedades; pero vuestro Dios no os dice quando os haveis de morir, y assi, vosotros siempre estais con ay; no sabeis si ireis al Cielo, ò al Infierno; pero nosotros sabemos ciertamente, que hemos de ir al Infierno, que aunque allà hay mucho fuego, segun decis vosotros, tambien estàn allà nuestros antepassados. (Río 1739, 15)

Be quiet, Fathers, you don't know what you're talking about and live deceived. Our idol or *anito* tells us when we must die and gives us remedies to cure our illnesses, but your God does not tell you when you must die, so you are always with your ohs, never knowing if you'll go to heaven or hell, but we certainly know that we must go to hell and that our ancestors are also there, even though as you say there is much fire there.

Uncertainty hung over the Christian afterlife because believers never knew whether they were going to heaven or hell. Being Christian was not a sufficient condition to guarantee the path to heaven because other conditions such as good Christian living were required. Conversion was not an automatic access pass to the joys of heaven. In contrast, animism offered certainty over death: idols could predict one's time of death and a pagan life ensured one went to hell. In spite of the fires of hell that awaited the

unbaptized in their death, the infidel in the quote preferred the path to hell because at least all his ancestors were there. Despite the new concept of a fiery hell, natives still framed the afterlife in terms of kinship. For some, maintaining existing kinship ties with dead ancestors was the right choice. For others, creating new relationships, or even strengthening old ones, with Father missionaries, old Christians, royal officials, other new Christians, saints, and God was the right choice.

In theory, converting to Christianity and breaking ties with dead ancestors in hell were more of an obstacle for the first generation of converts. Although the theme of conversion seems central in missionary writing and colonial studies, it is still just one relationship among many that actors maintained with one another. In line with this article's approach, to fully explain why some converted while others did not will require a case-by-case study based on the dynamics of each individual's web of social relations, which requires a level of minute detail the sources almost always do not have. In the end, the stark distinction between conversion and nonconversion portrayed by missionaries might have been diluted in actual practices of maguinoos where fluid, web-like connections were the norm.

Conclusion

Social relationships constituted one of the most important aspects of life on the Caraballo Mountains. Missionaries and natives, even natives among themselves, lived in constantly shifting networks of social relationships. Chiefs relied on social alliances and kinship relations with their communities and with strangers. Godparents, catechists, and chiefs were examples of bridges that tightened relationships between old and new Christians. Idioms of kinship in the widest sense of the term underpinned most, if not all, of these social relationships. Even in animist beliefs, indigenes interpreted fortune and misfortune in terms of maintaining good kinship ties with the spirits of dead relatives. Although conversion seemed to present itself as a stark black-and-white choice for the natives between old and new relationships, this could be due mainly to the religious character of missionary sources, which made blunt distinctions between Christian and pagan life. In the end, actors in the region maintained (and also broke) kinship ties with everyone across the board regardless of belief and ethnicity. For instance, it was not unusual for someone to have Christian and animist friends and even relatives at the same time. This situation reflected the diffuse, fluid, and ever-expanding and contracting kinship relations in maguinoos.

Notes

The research for this article was conducted while the author was on a study grant from the Basque Government and Universidad del País Vasco. Ana de Zaballa and José María Imízcoz were particularly influential in the shaping of this research; Fr. Carlos Alonso facilitated access to the Augustinian Archives; and comments from Jun Aguilar and the two anonymous reviewers were helpful in getting to the final version of the article.

- 1 Carlos Villoria Prieto (1997a) gives a detailed account of a specific instance when missionary excursions into the region did not always lead to friendly relations. Nevertheless, creating and breaking ties follow the same pattern and strategies but just in opposite directions.
- 2 I am using the ethnic groupings used by the primary sources. Present-day ethnolinguistic groupings place the Italon and the Abaca under the umbrella group of the Ilongot (Peralta 2000).
- 3 For the purposes of this article, chief in English, *principal* in Spanish, and *maguinoo* (the person, not the way of relating) in Tagalog are understood to be more or less similar terms. In order to avoid confusion and excessive italicization, chief is the term used to designate the community's noble members. With the word chief, in no way is it implied that each community has only one chief. No distinction is made between chiefs with and without followers since the primary sources on the Caraballo missions do not make the distinction.
- 4 In the Philippines today, it is not an unusual practice for children to call parents or friends or friends of parents as uncle (*tito*) or aunt (*tita*). But it does not seem to be a unique practice since I have heard Americans using the same strategy. At least in these settings, on face value they seem more like designations to evoke affective respect to an older generation. Among the inhabitants of the Caraballo mountains, idioms of kinship appeared to be less constrained by a direction toward older persons since siblings and children of friends in general were also considered brother/sister and son/daughter respectively.
- 5 The village name appears as Bujay and Buhay in the primary sources. The latter is used as it is closer to current spelling conventions and easier to read.
- 6 Carta del P. Fr. Alejandro Cacho, Religioso del Orden N. P. S. Agustín, Misionero en los Montes de Pantabangan y Carranglan en la provincia de la Pampanga, escrita al Maestro R. P. Lector, Fr. Tomás Ortiz, Provincial de dicho Orden. Alejandro Cacho, Pantabangan, 30 May 1717, Document 97/1, f. 193, Archivo Padres Agustinos Filipinos (APAF), Valladolid.
- 7 At least among the Malays of Rembau, the assumption or fiction of common descent was sufficient to establish sibingship (Peletz 1988, 22).
- 8 Despacho que se dio al P. Fr. Antolin de Alzaga para la Misión de los Italones, Joseph Lopez, Macabebe, 30 June 1702, Document 35-A, f. 51v, APAF.
- 9 These and succeeding figures are derived from the baptismal rolls and Christian population lists in Carta del P. Fr. Alejandro Cacho . . . , Document 97/1, APAF.
- 10 When the names of godparents are repeated in the rolls, it is assumed that they refer to the same person. Although I recognize that two or more godparents might have the same name and that there is no way of verifying each individual case based on existing sources, contextual evidence suggests that being a godparent to several godchildren was a common practice. Although errors could have occurred, it is assumed that names of baptized godchildren when repeated in the rolls refer to different persons because a person can only be baptized once. When names are almost the

same except for some minor spelling differences, especially in the case of godparents, I assume that they refer to different persons because of the impossibility of verifying whether or not they were spelling mistakes based on the varying orthographies used in the region.

- 11 Some of these lists from Document 97/1, APAF, are not dated, but the dated ones are from 1713.
- 12 The new Christian villages of Santa María and Santa Mónica were not included in the figure because they also do not appear in the baptismal rolls.
- 13 Dos copias simples de los authos que se comenzaron a formar en Manila el año de 1722 sobre añadir tres misioneros mas a la Mission de Italones para asistir a la nueva de Bujay. Y añadidos fue confirmado por zedula del Rey de 29 de julio de 1727 la que se hallará a la buelta del fol. 22 de esta copia de authos. Los originales se hallaron en el consejo junto con los otros formados por la donacion y entrega a los padres dominicos que se efectuó el año del 1740 y la confirmó el Rey por zedula de 19 de diciembre de 1742 que todo se hallará tambien en este legajo y numero, Document 374/2-a, ff. 14v-15r, APAF.
- 14 Ibid., f. 13.
- 15 Ibid., f. 15r.
- 16 Carta del P. Fr. Alejandro Cacho . . . , Document 97/1, APAF.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Ibid., ff. 49-64.

References

- Aguilar, Filomeno V. Jr. 1998. *Clash of spirits: The history of power and sugar planter hegemony on a Visayan island*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 2010. The *Pacto de Sangre* in the late nineteenth-century nationalist emplotment of Philippine history. *Philippine Studies* 58 (1-2): 79-109.
- Aguilar, Filomeno V. Jr., with John Estanley Z. Peñalosa, Tania Belen T. Liwanag, Resto S. Cruz I, and Jimmy M. Melendrez. 2009. *Maalwang buhay: Family, overseas migration, and cultures of relatedness in Barangay Paraiso*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Beer, Bettina. 2001. Anthropology of friendship. In *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences*, ed. N. J. Smelser and P. B. Baltes, 5805-8. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Cacho, Alejandro. 1904. Manifiesto compendioso del principio y progresos de la misión de italones que los religiosos de N. P. San Agustín de la Provincia del Santísimo Nombre de Jesús de Filipinas mantienen en los montes de la Pampanga, hacia el oriente de dicha provincia. In *Relaciones agustinianas de las razas del norte de Luzon*, ed. Angel Pérez, 60-97. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
- . 1997a. Archivo de la Provincia del Santísimo Rosario, Sec. Cagayán, tomo 29, f258. In *Un berciano en Filipinas: Alejandro Cacho de Villegas*, ed. Carlos Villoria Prieto, 324-25. León: Universidad de León.
- . 1997b. Compendioso manifiesto del principio y progreso de la misión de italones que los religiosos de nuestro padre San Agustín de la Provincia del Santísimo Nombre de Jesús de Filipinas mantienen en los montes de la Pampanga, así al oriente de dicha provincia. In *Un berciano en Filipinas: Alejandro Cacho de Villegas*, ed. Carlos Villoria Prieto, 360-99. León: Universidad de León.
- . 1997c. Conquistas espirituales de los Religiosos Agustinos Calzados de la Provincia del Santísimo Nombre de Jesús de Filipinas, hecha en estos cuarenta años, y sólo dentro de una Alcaldía que es la de Provincia de la Pampanga. In *Un berciano en Filipinas: Alejandro Cacho de Villegas*, ed. Carlos Villoria Prieto, 327-59. León: Universidad de León.
- Carsten, Janet. 1995. The substance of kinship and the heat of the hearth: Feeding, personhood, and relatedness among Malays in Pulau Langkawi. *American Ethnologist* 22 (May): 223-41.
- . 2000. Introduction: Cultures of relatedness. In *Cultures of relatedness: New approaches to the study of kinship*, ed. Janet Carsten, 1-36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, James S. 1978. Two missionary methods in China: Mendicants and Jesuits. *Archivo Ibero-Americano* 38:33-108.
- Díaz, Casimiro. 1745. *Parrocho de indios instruido*. Manila: Imprenta de la Compañía de Jesús.
- Ferrando, Juan. 1871. *Historia de los PP. Dominicos en las Islas Filipinas y en sus misiones del Japon, China, Tung-kin, y Formosa*, vol. 4. Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra.
- Florendo, Maria Nela B. 2008. History, space and ethnicity: Re-visiting Felix M. Keesing's *The Ethnohistory of Northern Luzon*. *Journal of History* 54:75-96.
- González Cuellas, Tomás. 1988. *Presencia berciana en Filipinas*. Valladolid: Ed. Estudio Agustiniano.
- Imízcoz, José María. 2009. Las redes sociales de las élites: Conceptos, fuentes y aplicaciones. In *Las élites en la época moderna: La monarquía española*, vol. 1, ed. Enrique Soria Mesa, Juan Jesús Bravo Caro, and José Miguel Delgado Barrado, 77-112. Córdoba: Universidad de Córdoba.
- Isasigana, Baltasar de Santa María. 1904a. Carta del P. Fr. Baltasar Isasigana misionero de Caranglán. In *Relaciones agustinianas de las razas del norte de Luzon*, ed. Angel Pérez, 309-12. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
- . 1904b. Cartas del P. Fr. Baltasar Isasigana. In *Relaciones agustinianas de las razas del norte de Luzon*, ed. Angel Pérez, 296-99. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
- Junker, Laura Lee. 2000. *Raiding, trading, and feasting: The political economy of Philippine chiefdoms*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Keesing, Felix M. 1962. *The ethnohistory of Northern Luzon*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- McLennan, Marshall S. 1982. Changing human ecology in the Central Luzon Plain: Nueva Ecija, 1705-1939. In *Philippine social history: Global trade and local transformations*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Ed. C. de Jesus, 57-90. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Mozo, Antonio. 1763. *Noticia historico natural de los gloriosos triumphos y felices adelantamientos conseguidos en el presente siglo por los religiosos del Orden de N. P. S. Agustin en las Misiones que tienen à su cargo en las Islas Philipinas, y en el grande Imperio de la China*. Madrid: Andrés Ortega.
- Noceda, Juan de and Pedro de Sanlúcar. 1860. *Vocabulario de la lengua tagala*. Manila: Imprenta de Ramirez y Giraudier.
- Peletz, Michael Gates. 1988. *A share of the harvest: Kinship, property and social history among the Malays of Rembau*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Peralta, Jesus T. 2000. *Glimpses: Peoples of the Philippines*. Manila: National Commission for Culture and the Arts. Online, <http://www.ncca.gov.ph/about-culture-and-arts/e-books/e-books-page.php#ebook1>, accessed 7 July 2009.

- Pérez, Angel, ed. 1904. *Relaciones agustinianas de las razas del norte de Luzon*. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
- Pérez, Lorenzo, ed. 1928. Los Aetas e Ilongotes de Filipinas. *Archivo Ibero-Americano* 15(88): 71–106.
- Phelan, John Leddy. 1959. *The hispanization of the Philippines: Spanish aims and Filipino responses, 1565–1700*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Rafael, Vicente L. 1988. *Contracting colonialism: Translation and Christian conversion in Tagalog society under early Spanish rule*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Reyes-Boquiren, Rowena. 1998. Issues and prospects in Cordillera historiography. Online, <http://www.geocities.com/rowenareyesboquiren/index.html>, accessed 30 April 2009.
- Río, Manuel del. 1739. Relación de los sucessos de la Mission de Santa Cruz de Ituy, en la Provincia de Paniqui; media entre las de Pangasinan, y Cagayan, en las Philipinas. N.p.: n.p. (Available at the Biblioteca del Estudio Teológico Agustiniiano de Valladolid.)
- Salgado, Pedro V. 1994. *The Ilongots: 1591–1994*. Manila: Lucky Press.
- Santa Rosa, Bernardo de. 1928. Carta-relación escrita por el P. Fr. Bernardo de Santa Rosa en la cual describe las costumbres de los Aetas que habitan en los montes de Casiguran y Baler. In Los Aetas e Ilongotes de Filipinas, ed. Lorenzo Pérez. *Archivo Ibero-Americano* 15(88): 86–106.
- Scott, William Henry. 1982. The Spanish occupation of the Cordillera in the 19th century. In *Philippine social history: Global trade and local transformations*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Ed. C. de Jesus, 39–56. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1974. *The discovery of the Igorots: Spanish contacts with the pagans of northern Luzon*. Quezon City: New Day.
- . 1994. *Barangay: Sixteenth-century Philippine culture and society*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Villoria Prieto, Carlos. 1997a. Los agustinos y la misión de Buhay a principios del siglo XVIII. *Archivo Agustiniiano* 81(199): 3–34.
- . 1997b. *Un berciano en Filipinas: Alejandro Cacho de Villegas*. León: Universidad de León.
- . 1999. Fray Antolín de Alzaga: Un modelo de misionero en Filipinas en el siglo XVIII. *Archivo Agustiniiano* 83(201): 115–35.
- Zamora, Francisco de. 1904. Memorial que al gobernador de Manila dió el M. R. P. Fr. Francisco de Zamora. In *Relaciones agustinianas de las razas del norte de Luzon*, ed. Angel Pérez, 324–26. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.

Mark Dizon is an independent history researcher who lives in Quezon City, Philippines. He has two Master's degrees in history from Ateneo de Manila University (2005) and Universidad del País Vasco (2010). His research interest is in cultural history. <madizon001@ikasle.ehu.es>