

**MARIA CLARA AND THE MARKET:
WOMEN AND CHANGE IN THE
19TH CENTURY PHILIPPINES**

*Norman G. Owen**

A recent surge of women's studies in the Philippines has created what might be called a stereotypic pattern of women's history, which echoes, in its broad outlines, the stereotypic pattern of nationalist history. In each, the relative prosperity and equality of the pre-Hispanic era are destroyed by a ruthless and obscurantist Spanish colonialism that exploits local society for generations, until redeemed by the revolutionary fervor of the late 19th century. The cause is then set back again by the American occupation, though conditions are also ameliorated somewhat by more progressive colonialism, eventually leading to independence and ever-growing enlightenment.¹

Many aspects of these stereotypes are, naturally, open to question, not at least the near-utopian vision of the pre-Hispanic Philippines, with no significant gender inequality. Male political dominance, it is claimed, was counterbalanced by female religious dominance, making the complementarity of the sexes not simply a popular cultural myth, but a social reality.² At times, even legends of dubious provenance, such as that of "Princess Urduja," are used as uncritical support for such interpretations.³

It is not necessary to accept this rosy picture fully to acknowledge that from the 16th century onward, the Roman Catholic Spanish state imposed what Charles R. Boxer called "Mary and Misogyny" on the colonial Philippines.⁴ Not only were women formally excluded from any political role, but in the religious sphere, they were replaced by Catholic priests, an office still reserved for men today.⁵ The gender ideology imposed was heavily paternalistic, with women largely deprived of legal personality, prohibited from divorce and abortion

* Norman G. Owen is a Professor of History at the University of Hongkong. He specializes on Southeast Asian history.

(common in the pre-Hispanic era),⁶ and told time and again that they were to be secondary and subordinate to men.

The shining (counter?) example of this was the cult of the Virgin Mary, introduced early and spread widely. From the Virgin of Antipolo to Our Lady of Peñafrancia, manifestations of the mother of Jesus became the most popular and potent religious symbols among Filipinos, to the point where an observer might even suggest that she was regarded as holier than her son. But the essence of her role has always been precisely that she herself is not God, but an intercessor, more approachable than actual divinity. In a culture in which there is a predilection for indirect access to power—asking a relative, friend or colleague to intercede rather than approaching higher authority directly—it is not surprising that the supreme intermediary is highly valued—and a woman.

The focus of this paper, however, is not on the significance of Mary as a role model for femininity—virginal yet maternal, always supportive, always suffering, utterly devoted to her “family” yet accessible to all—in Philippine history.⁷ Neither is it on gender relations in the pre-Hispanic Philippines, nor on the impact of Spanish ideology and institutions on women’s position in that society during the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries.

Instead, I would like to address the question of 19th century change. A major theme in postwar Philippine historiography shows that Spanish rule was not uniform in its intentions and effects over three hundred years. It focuses on the economic and social transformation that began with the “Bourbon Reforms” of the latter 18th century and culminated a hundred years in the rise of a Filipino bourgeoisie, the *ilustrados*, who were capable of articulating a mature nationalism.⁸ It seems impossible that this dynamic process should not have affected, for better or worse, the role of women in the Philippines, but relatively few scholars have tried to examine this process. Only Elizabeth Uy Eviota and Ma. Luisa Camagay have, to my knowledge, paid serious attention to the economic and social roles of the 19th century Filipinas, as distinct from general “Spanish era” stereotypes.⁹

Other scholars of the period have focused on women’s studies as in Philippine historiography generally, almost exclusively on the emergent *ilustrado* class and the nationalist movement at the end of the 19th century. Their efforts to rescue women from historical oblivion and to restore questions of gender into the discourse of nationalism are admirable, and the work they have done in digging

out evidence is quite useful, but often their analysis remains rather unsophisticated. There is, at times, almost a celebratory quality, as if this historic moment was an occasion for the glorious reconciliation of feminism and nationalism. Jose Rizal and other national heroes are sometimes portrayed almost as proto-feminists,¹⁰ and the women who took part in or supported the revolution are seen (in the extreme case) to be reclaiming their pre-Hispanic role as shamans, since “becoming and being *babaylan* is an inherent quality of the Filipino woman.”¹¹

My own research on Philippine history has never focused primarily on gender relations, though I have tried to engage the topic when I found it intersecting other themes.¹² This paper reflects more of an effort to assess the field and suggest questions that might be asked than to put forward new interpretations. In doing this, I depend heavily on earlier scholars in both women’s studies and social history—at times twisting their findings to my own purposes—rather than on any new primary research of my own. First comes a short overview of the evidence for social and economic transformation in (many) women’s lives, to be followed by some observations on gender ideology. The emphasis throughout will be on what we do not know, rather than on what we do know, which is surprisingly little.

Colonialism, Capitalism and Change

The colonial state in the 19th century Philippines became simultaneously more “liberal” and more interventionist, a paradox that has not received the historiographical attention it deserves.¹³ The liberalism consisted primarily of a series of measures removing historic restraints on trade, travel and residence. No longer were foreign vessels officially prohibited from trading in Philippine ports; no longer did provincial governors have the right to monopolize trade; no longer were foreigners (Westerners and Chinese) prohibited from living outside Manila, and thus conduct their regular business there. Although it still appeared woefully restrictive to travelers from more open economies,¹⁴ the Philippine economy was far less constrained than it had been before. Tariffs were lowered (at least until 1890), the market prevailed, and the export trade boomed.¹⁵

The increase in interventionism was rooted not so much in the desire of Spain to control the population and “foment” economic growth—though this can be seen from at least as early as the Bourbon Reforms—as in the greatly expanded bureaucracy. Spurred by the loss of most of its American empire (which had previously provided “places” for ambitious Spaniards) and the greater ease

of travel, especially after the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, Spain created a far larger colonial establishment in the late 19th century Philippines than ever before. Whereas once a province might have only a couple of Spanish officials (usually a military-governor-cum-judge and a treasury administrator), later there would come vaccinators and public scribes, warehousemen and government secretaries, public prosecutors and defenders, “development assistants” and registrars of land, officers of the *Guardia Civil* and the revenue service, even engineers and doctors.¹⁶ Such officials provided the capacity for the state to supervise and control Filipino life much more closely than ever. Once, Filipinos who were at odds with local authorities (including priests) could simply disappear into the hills, out of the effective reach of church and state, but the opportunity for such “avoidance” resistance had clearly diminished by the late 19th century.¹⁷

It is probable that on balance, in spite of commercial liberalization, Filipinos were more affected, even controlled, by the state in the late 19th century than ever before. But what were the gender-specific implications of this? On the negative side, we might surmise that greater supervision weighed more heavily on men, who were likelier to be involved in travel, smuggling and violent crimes (including banditry), than on women, who were “traditionally” confined to home, church, town market and nearby fields, where presumably they were already under surveillance by existing authorities. But such “tradition” can hide a multitude of sins, or at least unauthorized mobility, and greater state control would also have inhibited any surviving non-Christian rituals (often conducted by women) and facilitated a crackdown on “female-specific” offenses, such as prostitution.¹⁸

On the positive side, both men and women would have been able to take advantage of some of the many “development” measures introduced by the late colonial state. Women were able to register property transactions with provincial scribes and notaries, and women were directly affected by the regulation of industrial labor and the professions, though not always favorably. The provision of more (male) doctors presumably made some inroads into the prestige of (female) midwives, though the latter were also “professionalized” under Spanish rule and continued in popular practice throughout the 20th century.¹⁹

Potentially, the state intervention most valuable for women was educational reform. For almost three hundred years, Spain had talked about providing universal primary education in Spanish, but had done nothing about it. At the local level, schooling was left to friars and other parish priests, many of whom had no interest in teaching Spanish (the *indios* might be exposed to subversive ideas), or in

educating girls, or in education at all. But in 1863, Spain finally got serious. There were to be schools for both boys and girls with salaried teachers, in every municipality in the Philippines, and the children were to be taught in Spanish, not just the vernacular. Priests still chaired boards of education and could undermine or sabotage local schools if they chose (as in the famous case of the young women of Malolos²⁰), but they no longer bore sole responsibility for education.

Most commentaries on this reform have focused on its shortcomings: erratic and incomplete implementation; shortages of books, buildings and teachers; the low general quality of education provided; and the separate (inferior?) curriculum for girls, emphasizing needlework, religion and music. Such criticisms are justified and certainly the reforms fell a long way short of what we would expect today, even short of what the Americans were to provide after 1900.²¹ But the simple fact that there were many schools for girls helped to create a new kind of “Filipina,” who would become much more visible in the 20th century. Hundreds of thousands of girls learned to read and write, even if their only textbooks were religious tracts.²² The step from the kitchen to the school, even an inadequate school, was a big one; the road to Filipino feminism passed through the Spanish classroom.

Another gender-specific consequence of state expansion, however, was the enormous growth in the number of official positions available to Filipino men. In principle, this was little different from Spanish policy over the previous 300 years, and in some ways there might have been (from a feminist perspective) actual improvement, in that women were now allowed a few areas of official responsibility, especially in education.²³ But in sheer volume, as well as in absolute rank, these opportunities could not compare with those available to men as municipal and provincial officials, justices of the peace, clerks, doctors, surveyors, etc. To the extent that many of these positions offered not only a regular salary, but also leverage that might be used to reward friends, punish enemies or climb to a higher post, women tended to be left further behind.²⁴

Far more important than direct state action in shaping the 19th century economy, however, was international capitalism, which entered through the doors opened by “liberal” policies. With foreign merchant houses in Manila playing a key entrepreneurial role, capital was mobilized and the production of export crops—especially sugar, abaca (Manila hemp) and tobacco—was enormously increased. In return, by the end of the 19th century, the Philippines was importing large quantities of rice, textiles and other manufactured goods.

Many of the consequences and concomitants of this trade boom are well known, at least in broad outline. With very little change in the technology of production, the growth of exports had to be achieved by the expansion of cultivated land and the reallocation of labor. The former implied considerable population mobility to internal frontiers: from Ilocos to Cagayan Valley and down into Pangasinan, from Panay into Negros, from the central Visayas into Northern Mindanao, and everywhere from older lowland settlements into the surrounding hills.²⁵ The latter must have involved, so far as we can tell, the shift of labor from the cultivation of subsistence crops and from spinning and weaving into cash-cropping and it absorbed much of the rapid population growth of the 19th century (averaging close to 1.5% a year).²⁶

The monetarization of the Philippine economy also accelerated in this period, as shown by, among other things, the near disappearance of tax payments in kind and the commutation of much labor service to cash. Whether or not the Philippines as a whole prospered or was impoverished remains very much in dispute,²⁷ but there is no doubt that the gap between rich and poor widened with the emergence of a class of Filipinos possessing conspicuous wealth that would have been extraordinary by previous standards.²⁸ This new elite was to be found in some provincial municipalities, but as time went by they increasingly gravitated to regional cities (Cebu, Iloilo, etc.) and, ultimately, to Manila.²⁹ With Manila also hosting various industrial and proto-industrial activities (cigar-making, rope-spinning and late in the century, tramways and electricity), urbanization became a major theme of the 19th century, not just in pure demographic terms, but also increased differentiation between city and country.

Thus, we find in the 19th century millions of Filipinos changing what they did, where they lived or how they related to their neighbors (as well as to Spanish colonialists and to Chinese and Western traders), but scarcely any reflection on what this meant in terms of gender. Although both socioeconomic history and women's history have flourished over the last few decades in the Philippines, they are barely speaking to each other.³⁰

There was, of course, no more a single experience for Filipino women in the 19th century, any more than there was for Filipinos in general. Class and region, in particular, should be seen as important variables. The best documented Filipinas of the 19th century would have been members of the new elite, especially in Manila.³¹ Our knowledge of them is mostly impressionistic and anecdotal, rather

than systematic, drawn from the novels of Rizal, the observations of European travellers, the memoirs of *ilustrados*, the nostalgia of Nick Joaquin, and the period illustrations lovingly collected in coffee table books of today.³²

These were families who did not have to worry about going hungry or working with their hands, but who did have to concern themselves with Spanish intrigues and the supervision of servants. Women of this class were largely relieved from physical labor (though many kept up embroidery, almost as a hobby), but often had to replace it with the responsibilities of home management, whether dealing with European guests, Chinese merchants or Filipino chauffeurs and maids. Most had time to cultivate art, or at least the appearance of culture; the imported piano was one of the emblems of this class and time. And a few of them became relatively well-educated, either formally, through attendance at one of the few institutions of higher learning open for women, or informally, through taking advantage of books, newspapers and intelligent conversation.³³

Numerically, of course, they were swamped by the working women of the Philippines, of whom the best known, again, are those of Manila. Daniel F. Doeppers has made excellent use of civil registers and censuses to show that our impression of the capital as a male-dominant city is, in some respects, erroneous. Among the non-Filipino population—mostly Chinese and Spaniards—there was indeed a surplus of 25,000 males, but the Filipino population was almost equally balanced by gender. And although it has been thought that in this period men were much more inclined to urban migration, the data suggest that roughly one quarter of both male and female Manileños in 1893 were immigrants from the provinces. There were some differences between them, however; women were more likely to have come from the Tagalog provinces close to Manila (especially Bulacan and Rizal), which may imply that they remained more closely linked to their provincial homes.³⁴

As for actual occupations, Ma. Luisa Camagay's *Working Women of Manila in the 19th Century* is a valuable pioneering study, based on archival sources. It is, however, primarily descriptive; the author's stated intention is "to document the life of gainfully employed women": cigar-makers, domestic servants, store owners and vendors, seamstresses and embroiderers, schoolteachers, midwives and prostitutes.³⁵ It serves as a salutary reminder that not all Filipinas married and stayed home, confining their labors to the domestic hearth and fields.

Nor were the women all obedient and compliant to authority. Besides the prostitutes, whose very occupation violated the laws of both church and state,³⁶

other Filipinas attempted to assert themselves in petitions for better wages or working conditions, in complaints against abusive employers, even in a strike (of tobacco workers, 1816). There is also considerable evidence of entrepreneurship, especially among female traders and some evidence of what might be seen as “everyday resistance” to exploitation, in the form of chronic absenteeism or other uncooperative behaviors. Yet all of these women remained poorly paid and subject to regular supervision by the state and, in some instances, by the church as well. Qualification as a schoolteacher or midwife, for example, required a letter of reference from the parish priest.

Considered within the Philippines as a whole, the working women of Manila were clearly a minority. Except for cigar-makers (of whom there were around 18,000 in mid-century, representing 90% of that industrial labor force), their recorded numbers were small, though these numbers are misleading, since even the interventionist late-colonial state could not keep track of all the shopkeepers, maids and prostitutes. And Manila itself represented just a fraction of the Philippines (with a population estimated at 200,000-250,000 by the end of the century, out of a total of over seven million). There were no cigar factories elsewhere, and only a few urban centers (chiefly Cebu and Iloilo) sustained large numbers of shopkeepers and prostitutes. Household servants, on the other hand, might be expected to show up everywhere, but in some rural parish registers, 99% of all brides are recorded as either “farmers” or “weavers.” This suggests that for many Filipinas, the range of opportunities for gainful female employment remained far more restricted than it was in Manila, or even in provincial cities.³⁷

The kind of nondomestic work that most rural women did depended to a large extent on the regional economy, and that, in turn, depended on what commodities it specialized in. Tobacco cultivation in the Cagayan Valley, for example, seems to have called for a considerable input of female labor. Men planted the stalks, harvested the leaves and eventually took them to the Monopoly or the market, but the whole family was involved in transplanting, while weeding and the labor-intensive sorting and preparation of the leaves were entirely the responsibility of women and children.³⁸ In this respect, tobacco production may have resembled traditional rice cultivation, with “complementary” labor roles resulting in (roughly) equal shares of the total work.

Abaca and sugar—the predominant cash crops along the eastern and western coasts, respectively, of the central Philippines—both seem to have been

somewhat more “masculine” in their labor demands, perhaps because certain critical tasks (abaca-stripping, cane-cutting) called for sheer physical strength that was believed to be beyond the capacity of most women. This is only an impression, however. What scattered evidence we have is mostly in the form of descriptions of a particular situation that may not be applicable to other places or other times.³⁹ Certainly women (and children) were also involved, however, especially in such wearisome tasks as weeding.

Lumbering, mining, milling, and the transportation of cash crops to the major ports for export (and of rice from the ports and the surplus zones to deficit districts) were, on the other hand, almost exclusively male activities,⁴⁰ as weaving and spinning were almost exclusively female. But the former were expanding throughout the 19th century, while the latter went into sharp decline with the introduction of cheap machine-made textiles from the West.⁴¹ Women were also dominant in local retail trade, which was growing, but here they faced increasing competition from (male) Chinese shopkeepers, whose commercial network was spreading throughout the countryside during the latter half of the 19th century.⁴²

What all of this suggests is a slight shift, country-wide, in the balance of rural gender roles from the (idealized) “complementarity” of traditional subsistence agriculture, plus weaving, hunting, fishing and gathering, to a new calculus based more on cash crops and/or wage employment. In this arrangement, men would have been more likely to engage in cash-producing activities, while women were increasingly relegated to the sphere of subsistence.

We might therefore suspect a subtle alteration in the dynamics of family relationship, with men’s economic role coming to be seen as, in a sense, more important than women’s.⁴³ It is a truism in the Philippines that women are actually harder-working, while men are likely to sit around drinking and gambling away the family income. The historical records certainly suggest that men were more likely to drink and gamble. On the other hand, women were more likely to attend church, an equally nonproductive (and potentially costly) activity, economically speaking.⁴⁴ Whether men or women actually worked harder is a question we have no way of answering, except by invoking presuppositions or prejudices, such as the “myth of the lazy native.”⁴⁵ But it is at least possible that the stereotype of the “lazy Filipino” (male) stems not just from colonial condescension but also in part from an indigenous over-appreciation of his role in the growing cash economy of the 19th century: he brings in the money, so he is entitled to spend it.⁴⁶

Historical demography can provide glimpses into other aspects of women’s role in the 19th century Philippines and challenge some of our concepts of what

was “normal” for women under Spanish rule. There was, for example, a high incidence of illegitimacy; some parishes list up to 25% of all births as “father unknown,” which suggests that the control of the church over women’s lives was considerably less than we have been led to believe.⁴⁷ A significant proportion (20-30% in Tigaon, Camarines Sur) of “families” or “households” are listed as headed by women—widows, single mothers and spinsters living alone—though the category is too shifting and nebulous to draw any strong conclusions from these figures.⁴⁸

Marriage in the 19th century Philippines was usually arranged by the families on both sides, and if there was any change in this pattern (*e.g.* in the direction of more elopements, or “love matches”), it does not show up in the records we have examined so far. We can show, however, some correlation between marriage patterns and economics. In abaca-producing areas, for example, the marriage rate tracks closely with the price of abaca, suggesting that many couples were only able to afford the ceremony in times of prosperity.⁴⁹ The fact that daughters of the *principalia* (municipal elite) apparently married at an age about a year younger (on the average) than ordinary women also suggests that wealth encouraged weddings.⁵⁰ Some evidence points to a general lowering of the age at female first marriage by as much as 2-3 years during the latter half of the century, which, if confirmed, would have had important implications for fertility as well.⁵¹

Preliminary analysis of data on mortality suggests that women were not discriminated against in the ways that have been documented for other parts of Asia. Recorded life expectancy for women is actually higher than that for men, and women’s age-specific death rates appear to be lower, except perhaps for the child-bearing years from 20 to 29.⁵² On the other hand, the data examined so far are of poor quality, and might well conceal some female deaths (especially of infants), that would cause this apparent advantage to disappear, or even be reversed.

Migration, too, has implications for gender roles. High sex ratios in frontier areas, such as Samar,⁵³ draw to our attention the fact that many women were left at home with absent husbands or none, forced to maintain their families and make their own way without male help in the increasingly commercialized economy. The migration of single women from the surrounding provinces to Manila, especially for prostitution, presents a different case. But whether we think of this as arising from the decisions of independent-minded women or, as De Bevoise

suggests, “a culturally sanctioned strategy for families in real need,” it, too, presents a sharp alternative to our image of a tradition-bound rural Filipino family.⁵⁴

Most of the time, however, it was entire families—sometimes extended families—who were involved in migration, as both the sex-ratios and descriptions of newly-founded settlements make clear. Yet we do not know how picking up an entire household and setting out to establish a new community, carving it out of the forest, might have affected the dynamics of gender within families or within the new settlements they formed. Was it possible simply to replicate “complementary” relationships from the old village and household? Did men step forward, as primarily responsible for clearing the forest, hunting game and defending the house against bandits and wildlife? Or, conversely, did women emerge as the essential architects of social cohesion? At this stage we have no evidence, and almost no idea.⁵⁵

Gender Ideology: From Mary to Maria Clara

The economic, social and demographic evidence all points toward a history of women more dynamic and diverse than we might have expected from the “stereotype.” Women were on the move to frontiers and to cities or, if they stayed at home, they were often heads of households. Besides being subsistence farmers, weavers and churchgoers, they were market vendors, nuns, tobacco leaf sorters, domestic helpers, schoolteachers, cigar-makers, washerwomen and commercial sex workers. They married younger, if they married at all; many were single mothers, at least in the eyes of the church. They owned property; sued their debtors, and even went on strike. And when the revolution came, some supported it or even participated in it.

Yet so far as we know, none of this was inspired by, or reflected in, any major shift in gender ideology. Centuries before, Spain had introduced a set of patriarchal values, which erupted at times into outright misogyny:

Woman is the most monstrous animal in the whole of Nature, bad-tempered and worse spoken. To have this animal in the house is asking for trouble....

Casimiro Dias, OSA, 1745⁵⁶

Filipinos had, by and large, adopted and adapted these patriarchal values; the most that can be said (or at least documented) is that they softened them

slightly, emphasizing those aspects of Christianity that stress complementarity, or even equality, between the sexes. A Filipino *pasyon* (popular religious verse) of the early 19th century uses the exemplary marriage of Mary and Joseph to illustrate a lesson (*aral*):

Thus, under one roof, they did live, / the two friends, without pause, night
and day, / praised ceaselessly / the Lord God most wise.

Carpenter was the profession / of this holy man / while the work of the woman
/ was to sew and weave / and to take care of the household.

Thus, the wills of the two / were united as one / peaceful was their existence
/ blessed most lavishly / by God the Lord Father.

Lesson

Christians, it is right / that we should imitate
their good conduct / and gentle spirit / as they lived together.

Every married couple / should always imitate them. / If their companionship
is well / mercy and precious grace / will not abandon them.

But those who quarrel much / those who bicker night and day / those full of
anger / will be abandoned / by the grace most precious.

Therefore, couples whoever they may be / must heed one another. / Imitate
Joseph / and Mary, the comely one, / in their care for their home.⁵⁷

But as Priscelina Patajo-Legasto points out,⁵⁸ this remains a “patriarchal text,” and she attacks its “phallogocentrism,” (sic) which produces “ambivalent, even contradictory, representations of women.” Eve, she notes is depicted as “derivative” from Adam. “Power-hungry, vainglorious and feeble-minded,” Eve is blamed for the Fall, and so deserves her punishment of “suffering beyond compare.” Biological reproduction itself is part of God’s “curse” on her, and is contrasted with Mary’s later chastity, to the point that Mary even balked at Joseph as a husband until God promised her that her “purity should suffer no stain.” But whether as the source of evil or as consecrated to the good, woman remains “man’s Other, the representation of alterity.”

The problem, of course, is that this text was (presumably) written by a male,⁵⁹ as are virtually all other representations of Filipino thought in the Spanish period. Women did not publish,⁶⁰ their letters, by and large, have not survived.⁶¹ What we are left with, for now, is texts produced by (Filipino) men that reflect on

gender relations. Of these, two stand out in the attention they received, both at the time and in subsequent study: *Urbana at Felisa*, a popular Tagalog book of manners written by a secular priest, Modesto de Castro, in the 1860s,⁶² and Jose Rizal's famous novel, *Noli Me Tangere* (with its sequel, *El Filibusterismo*).⁶³ It is beyond the scope of this paper—and beyond my competence—to provide an exhaustive analysis of these texts, but some comment on how they have been interpreted may be in order.

For a start, they, like the *pasyon*, were not only produced by men and censored by priests (with the *Casaysayan* ultimately passing the censor, and *Noli* briefly passed before being prohibited), but they are, almost by definition, the product of the Filipino elite. Despite this, they differed considerably in the class audience for which they were apparently intended. The *pasyon*, as noted, was for the masses, a text for Everyman (and Everywoman). Memorized even by those who could not read, its annual recitation was a major civic-religious ritual in many of the Tagalog provinces. *Urbana at Felisa*, on the other hand, was an etiquette manual clearly aimed at the aspiring bourgeoisie, people who had enough money to buy napkins, but were not quite sure how to use them. It demanded literacy, and among its literate audience it sold well, becoming in effect the “Emily Post” for a whole generation of *ilustrados*. Rizal, finally, was operating at an even higher level. He wrote not just in Spanish (the other works were in Tagalog), but in convoluted literary language, and he tended to satirize those Filipinos whose Spanish was not up to the mark or who had more pretensions than taste—the readers of *Urbana at Felisa*, perhaps?⁶⁴ So, although these texts jointly offer a (male) Filipino image of what gender was and should be in the 19th century, there are differences in how they approach this question.

Eviota sees *Urbana at Felisa* as essentially restricting the sexual behavior of Filipinas, along Hispanic/Western lines:

Daughters should be taught to fear God, to take care of their virginity and to be modest... Women should be taught to keep house and to love the home... Married women were to devote their lives to family and home. A married woman is subservient to the man who is the head of the household. She should serve her husband and look after his needs; she should be self-sacrificing and bear with her husband's faults.⁶⁵

Mina Roces, while not denying any of this, claims that the fact that this book was written for and about women is a sign that women were seen not just as “cultural transmitters” but as “agents of change” and “moral guardians.” *Urbana at Felisa* was not just a restatement of traditional customs, she suggests, but an

attempt to prescribe new rules for the newly Hispanized and urbanized Filipino elite. Castro, in effect, acknowledged women as “the means through which modern values were introduced into society.” Among the values promoted were “duties to one’s town/country” (*katungkulan sa bayan*), which Roces implies is a kind of precursor to both Philippine nationalism and “education for citizenship.”⁶⁶

Did Rizal—hero, martyr and greatest writer of the Propaganda Movement—move beyond this? The question has been at the center of debates within Philippine feminism since at least 1963, when Carmen Guerrero Nakpil described Maria Clara, heroine of Rizal’s novels, as the “greatest misfortune that has befallen the Filipina in the last one hundred years.” Maria Clara, beloved of the protagonist, Crisostomo Ibarra, is beautiful and fragile, humorless and prone to fainting, a perennial victim and a bumbler. She is bullied by her parents and abused by the friars (one of whom turns out to be her real father); she betrays her lover and winds up in a nunnery, only to be further abused there. As Nakpil put it, “she made a talent for unhappiness her greatest virtue.”⁶⁷

Most feminists today are inclined to exonerate Rizal, at least partially, for the feminine (but certainly not feminist) icon Maria Clara became. Lilia Quindoza Santiago points to the wide range of more diverse female characters created by Rizal, some of whom are braver than Maria Clara, and have a better sense of humor.⁶⁸ Violeta Lopez-Gonzaga suggests that Rizal transcended the model of *Urbana at Felisa*, thanks to his mother, Doña Teodora Alonzo, who provided an “alternative role model.” *Noli*, she claims, represents women as they are, not as they should be. “Though commonly thought to be Rizal’s ideal role model for women, Maria Clara actually provides a subtle critique of the predominant mold of women in his time.”⁶⁹

Readers of Rizal’s novels—available in several English translations—will have to decide for themselves whether the portrait of Maria Clara is indeed a satirical social comment or whether the otherwise-perceptive author simply had a blind spot for a certain type of woman (which is my own reading). We can, however, discern other themes in Rizal’s writings on women, particularly as mothers and wives.

Rizal’s strong admiration of, and identification with, his own mother is well known, and the equation of love of mother with love of country is frequently found in his work (e.g. in the “Song of Maria Clara” in *Noli*). Perhaps the most perceptive analysis of this is by Vicente L. Rafael, who explores metaphors of

dreaming, memory, translation and mourning in Rizal's imagining of the "motherland."⁷⁰ The novels are full of mothers, from the tragic peasant Sisa, whose unbearable exploitation eventually drives her insane, to the stoic Capitana Maria, who was able to watch silently as her sons were beaten for a patriotic cause. There are good mothers and bad mothers, but the very worst women, Rizal implies, are those who are never mothers at all.⁷¹

What, in Rizal's view, was a good woman? Here we may refer to his famous 1889 "Letter to the Young Women of Malolos," written when he learned that twenty daughters of that town's *principalia* had petitioned the Spanish Governor General to reverse the priest-inspired decision not to open a school for them.⁷² In it he praises their bravery, especially for standing up to the priests, but his reasons for commending their desire for education have to do not with their own potential, but with their future role as mothers:

Young womanhood, the nursery of fruitful flowers, ought to accumulate riches to bequeath to its descendants. What could the offspring be of a woman whose only virtue is to murmur prayers...? The mother who can teach nothing else but how to kneel and kiss the hand should not expect any other kind of children but stupid ones or oppressed slaves.⁷³

Let us be reasonable and open our eyes, especially you women, because you are the ones who open the minds of men. Consider that a good mother is different from the one created by the friars... The country should not expect honor and prosperity so long as the education of the child is defective, so long as the women who raise the children are enslaved and ignorant. Nothing can be drunk in a turbid and bitter spring.⁷⁴

Everybody knows the power and the prudence of the women in the Philippines. Hence they bind them, chain them, weaken their spirit, so sure are they that so long as the mother is a slave, all her children can be enslaved also.⁷⁵

Teach your children to guard and love their honor, to love their fellowmen, their native land, and to perform their duties. Tell them repeatedly to prefer death with honor to life with dishonor. They should imitate the women of Sparta...⁷⁶

Of the seven points Rizal makes at the end of this open letter, only one applies specifically to women:

Fifth. If Filipino woman will not change, she should not be entrusted with the education of her children. She should only bear them. She should be deprived of her authority in the home; otherwise she may unwittingly betray her husband, children, country and all.⁷⁷

As the last sentence suggests, Rizal also thinks of women as potential wives and helpers (*katulong*) to their patriotic husbands:

Why does not a young woman ask of the man she is going to love for a noble and honorable name, a manly heart that can protect her weakness, a noble mind that will not permit him to be the father of slaves? Instill in his mind activity and industry, noble behavior, worthy sentiments, and do not surrender your young womanhood to a weak and timid heart. When she becomes a wife, she should help her husband in every difficulty, encourage him, share with him all perils, console him and drive away all his woes.⁷⁸

Yet it appears in both his writings and the contours of his own life that to Rizal, the role of wife was considerably less important than that of mother. Although he waxed sentimental about his female friends and lost loves, Rizal was a bit of a butterfly, flitting across the Philippines and Europe from one flirtation to another until he finally married (Josephine Bracken), literally on the eve of his execution.⁷⁹ In the “Letter” he speaks of a vague “longing” for a woman who would be “the partner of our heart, who shares our happiness and our misfortune,”⁸⁰ but he spent most of his adult life without any such soulmate, and in his novels, Ibarra managed to be heroic with only the minimum of aid from hapless Maria Clara. A good wife might, indeed, be a useful and pleasant helpmate, but a good mother was an absolute necessity.

What Rizal and his fellow Propagandists were promoting in the face of Spanish patriarchy, in fact, was not true gender equality, but a rival revolutionary masculinity. These were young men who, when in Spain, enjoyed swordplay and shooting, and after seeing a Wild West show in Paris, formed the “Indios Bravos” (Brave Indians/Filipinos), a sporting club. Many of them were inveterate womanizers and gamblers, but, strong in the old double standard, clung to the belief that a woman’s true virtue lay in her chastity. Even photographs of the Propagandists tend to reflect their masculine stance.⁸¹ It is not surprising that they constantly proclaimed the (male) necessity to protect the (female) motherland.⁸²

Imperialists tended to justify their domination on the grounds that they were more manly, brave and rational than the (implicitly effeminate and irrational) natives.⁸³ The nationalists fought back by contradiction: “We’ll show you who’s manly!”⁸⁴ Rizal proved himself more than a match for most Spaniards in “rational” discourse, as his scholarly edition of Morga’s *Sucesos de Las Islas Filipinas* was

clearly intended to demonstrate. Other Propagandists demonstrated their manliness in other ways; Juan Luna was involved in a celebrated scandal when he defended his honor by killing his allegedly unfaithful wife (and her mother).⁸⁵

In such a context, the role of woman (the motherland) is not to stand up and defend herself, but to choose which masculinity will control and protect her. In his “letter,” Rizal appeals to the young women of Malolos to choose brave young revolutionaries over arrogant and greedy friars. This may be understandable, it may even have been necessary, but it was certainly not feminist. Filipino women have had some difficulty in dealing with this nationalist machismo. Most simply ignore it. Others fault Rizal for leaving women in a subordinate position.⁸⁶ But no feminist scholar, to the best of my knowledge, has come right out and said that the Propagandists may, in some sense, have been promoting the “nation” at the expense of half of its members.⁸⁷

There may be some justice in the claim that Andres Bonifacio and other heroes of the Revolution were more egalitarian. Bonifacio’s wife, Gregorio de Jesus, is said to have regarded him as her “companion in life,” implying genuine equality. Emilio Jacinto, in the “Teachings of the Katipunan,” exhorts, “Do not look at woman as a mere plaything but rather as a partner and one who shares in the difficulties of our life.” Apolinario Mabini actually proposed female suffrage on the same basis as male (*i.e.* with educational and financial qualifications) in the Malolos Constitution of 1899, though his radical draft was defeated in favor of a more conservative version.⁸⁸ There is a certain logic to this, if we take Hispanization to be the core of Filipino patriarchal values, since the *ilustrados* of the Propaganda movement were, by and large, more Hispanized than the leaders of the Katipunan. It may not be accurate to characterize the Revolution as “The Revolt of the Masses,” but its leaders seem to have been somewhat more in touch with indigenous concepts of gender complementarity than their elite predecessors.⁸⁹

When it comes to the Revolution and the Filipino-American War, there has been a great deal of recent celebration of female participation, a useful corrective to the customary “Boys-Own” version of these events. Much of it simply takes the form of cataloging women revolutionaries. Some actually fought, and a few rose to be called “General,” though only one was officially recognized as such.⁹⁰ Many more served as spies and couriers, or provided supplies (especially food) and medical services. Some of the most celebrated heroines of the Revolution, in fact, are chiefly known for their nursing activities, including Trinidad Tecson, “The Mother of Biak-na-Bato,” though she also fought when necessary.⁹¹

Most of this research serves to validate (if validation is necessary) the patriotism of Filipinas, but it tells us little about how gender roles were perceived and altered, except for the obvious fact that in the heat of revolution some women chose to take on the traditionally “male” role of warrior. Mina Roces, however, deliberately sets aside “the intrepid women who fought as men,” and tries to focus instead on “gendered” roles, “the activities identified with the feminine”: running the Red Cross, serving as hostess of (and keeping watch over) meetings of revolutionaries, etc.

Rather than ignoring the implications of the fact that almost all the officials of the women’s chapter of the Katipunan and the Red Cross were the wives or sisters of nationalist leaders, with their rank in these organizations corresponding to their husbands’ or brothers’ standing outside,⁹² Roces sees it as evidence of the empowerment of these women. Nepotism does not disqualify their power, but (in a sense) confirms it, since they are operating within a value system in which power is “held not just by the individual but by the kinship group.” Ideally, the wife is not just her husband’s “helper,” but his partner, even his “alter ego.” Eventually “women worked the levers of power without holding the institutional symbols of office, all the while preserving the male leadership in the public front.”⁹³

Certainly, such perceptions were and are held by many Filipinos, yet it is hard to see where they vary significantly from those of traditional patriarchy, in which a woman’s status is regularly inscribed in terms of the men to whom she belongs. It is interesting that when Gregoria de Jesus herself (according to Roces) wrote her memoirs, “she chose to describe her role using the male yardstick of what constitutes participating in the revolution, for she saw her most important role as the times she performed similar duties as the *katipuneros*.” If women were, indeed, operating in terms of a different value system, they do not seem to have been particularly aware of it.⁹⁴

What Roces seems to be describing is less an alternative to patriarchy than a strategy for manipulating it, and here we have the heart of the paradox of women in the 19th century Philippines. Women’s lives clearly changed, but their perception of them did not—or more precisely, if their perceptions did change, we have not managed to track down evidence of it. We do not, as yet, even know “what women learned when men gave them advice,” in the form of their own contemporary reworking of patriarchal myths, values and structures.⁹⁵

One simple but powerful explanation for his apparent paradox, offered most explicitly by Cristina Blanc-Szanton, is that Filipinos never fully internalized the values of “Mediterranean” gender ideology in the first place. Instead, they adapted Hispanic culture selectively. Latin machismo fitted in nicely with indigenous patterns of male fighting, drinking and bragging or joking about sex, but women did not accept, and were not forced into, the binary evil-unless-totally-pure stereotypes of Spanish Catholicism. Although chastity was encouraged in Visayan women, Blanc-Szanton observes, its absence did not entail total condemnation or ostracism, as it would have in the Mediterranean. “Among (the images) that did not take hold are (those) of Eve and of the Virgin Mary as the Immaculate Conception.”⁹⁶

Her argument is strong, but it leaves us hungry for specific historical evidence that would further illuminate the discrepancy between public gender ideology and daily reality for the Filipinas of the 19th century. There are still many contemporary sources to explore, including literary, theatrical and musical texts—*awit*, *corrido*, *kundiman*, *zarzuela*, *moro-moro*, etc.—though so far as we know, most of these are also composed by men. To hear genuine Filipina voices, we may have to winkle their utterances out of obscure corners of the archives, where women appear as occasional petitioners, witnesses or the accused in criminal cases. We may also be able to hear them in early 20th century texts, when American education and greater press freedom opened the door for more women’s writing, but we will have to use these texts with caution, since the very American presence that made them possible also introduced new gender ideologies (including American feminism, brought over with fervor by Carrie Chapman Catt in 1912).⁹⁷ More recent ethnographic and sociological studies, though they may usefully suggest ongoing themes in Filipino practices and perception of gender, cannot by themselves document the mentalities of the Spanish period.

What we are left with, for now, is women who did not dispute the binary opposition of (bad) Eve and (good) Mary in religious texts, who sought out the self-abnegating advice of *Urbana at Felisa*, and who took Maria Clara as a model of Filipino womanhood, but who at the same time were responding to the challenges that colonialism and capitalism presented to Philippine society. The lives of many of them were transformed by the opportunities and problems they faced, but they did not openly articulate any response, so far as we know. Filipinas made the best of their situation, moved or stayed put as they had to, worked in new industries or in old rice-paddies, married younger (if at all), supported the state (or the revolution) quietly, and kept going to church—when they felt like it. They may have admired Maria Clara as an ideal, but they demonstrated a great deal more resourcefulness than she ever did.⁹⁸

Notes

¹See, for example, Isabel Rojas-Aleta, Teresita L. Silva, Christine P. Eleazar, *A Profile of Filipino Women: Their Status and Role*, prepared for USAID (Manila: Philippine Business for Social Progress, October 1977), 11-17; Aida F. Santos Maranan, "Do Women Really Hold Up Half the Sky?: Notes on the Women's Movement in the Philippines," in *Essays on Women*, ed. Sr. Mary John Mananzan, O.S.B, rev. ed. (Manila: St. Scholastica's College, Institute of Women's Studies, 1989), 39-54; *Women's Role in Philippine History: Selected Essays*, 2nd ed. (Diliman, Q.C.: UP, University Center for Women's Studies, 1996). In most of these works, and in this paper, "the Philippines" refers to those areas brought under control by the Spanish colonial government in Manila; the Muslim south and non-Hispanized uplands are excluded.

The myth of a glorious (Filipino) past, a dismal (Spanish) present, and a glorious (Filipino) future can be traced back at least as far as the late 19th century nationalists; the feminist version no later than the 1920s. See Cristina Blanc-Szanton, "Collision of Cultures: Historical Reformulations of Gender in the Lowland Visayas, Philippines," in *Power and Difference: Gender in Island Southeast Asia*, ed. Jane Monnig Atkinson and Shelly Errington (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 370-71, citing Maria Paz Mendoza-Guanzon, *The Development and Progress of the Filipino Woman* (1928). I am by no means singling out Philippine historiography (nationalist or feminist) as unique in myth-making. It happens everywhere; what is of interest is analyzing the particular patterns that emerge in specific cases.

²Zeus Salazar, "The *Babaylan* in Philippine History," *Women's Role in Philippine History*, 209-222.

In implying that this stereotype may be exaggerated, I do not deny the underlying reality to which it refers. There is no question that by comparison with both later Hispanic norms and with much of East and South Asia, the pre-Hispanic Philippines was (like most of Southeast Asia) **relatively** gender-equal in both ideal and practice; Teresita F. Infante, *The Woman in Early Philippines and Among Cultural Minorities* (Manila: University of Santo Tomas, 1969); Shelly Errington, "Recasting Sex, Gender, and Power: A Theoretical and Regional Overview," in Atkinson and Errington, 1-58 (esp. 1-5); Anthony Reid, *Southeast Asia in the*

Age of Commerce 1450-1680, vol. 1, *The Lands Below the Winds* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 146-72 *passim*.

³Urduja appears in an Arabic text which Jose Rizal thought, on rather slight evidence, might refer to the Philippines; William Henry Scott, *Prehispanic Source Materials for Study of Philippine History*, rev. ed., (Q.C.: New Day, 1984), 82-83. She is taken as a historic example of powerful Filipina womanhood by Rojas-Aleta *et al.*; Myrna S. Feliciano, "The Filipina: A Historical Legal Perspective," in *Women's Role in Philippine History*, 22-51; Rosalinda Pineda-Ofreneo, "Tracing a Hidden Tapestry: Women and Literature in the Philippines," in *Women Reading... Feminist Perspectives on Philippine Literary Texts*, ed. Thelma B. Kintanar (Q.C.: UP Press and University Center for Women's Studies, 1992), 31.

⁴Boxer, *Mary and Misogyny: Women in Iberian Expansion Overseas, 1415-1815: Some Facts, Fancies and Personalities* (London: Duckworth, 1975).

⁵See Jaime B. Veneracion, "From Babaylan to Beata: A Study on the Religiosity of Filipino Women," and Milagros C. Guerrero, "Sources on Women's Role in Philippine History, 1590-1898: Texts and Countertexts," both papers presented at the Fourth International Philippine History Conference, Canberra, July 1992.

Under Spanish rule, even the role of *babaylan* (shaman), traditionally associated with women, came to be played more often by male transvestites; Alfred W. McCoy, "*Baylan: Animist Religion and Philippine Peasant Ideology*," in *Moral Order and the Question of Change: Essays on Southeast Asian Thought*, ed. David K. Wyatt and Alexander Woodside (New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asian Studies, 1982), 338-408; Maria Milagros Geremia-Lachica, "Panay's Babaylan: The Male Takeover," in *Review of Women's Studies* 5/2-6/1 (1996): 53-60.

⁶Ramon Pedrosa, O.S.A, "Abortion and Infanticide in the Philippines during the Spanish Contact," *Philippiniana Sacra* 18 (1983): 7-37.

⁷See Blanc-Szanton, 352, 360-64, 449-52, and sources cited therein.

⁸For a sampling of scholarship on social and economic history, see Benito F. Legarda, Jr., "Foreign Trade, Economic Change, and Entrepreneurship in the Nineteenth Century Philippines" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard, 1955); John A. Larkin, *The Pampangans: Colonial Society in a Philippine Province* (Berkeley:

University of California Press, 1972); Jonathan Fast and Jim Richardson, *Roots of Dependency: Political and Economic Revolution in 19th Century Philippines* (Q.C.: Foundation for Nationalist Studies, 1979); Alfred W. McCoy and Ed. C. de Jesus, eds. *Philippine Social History: Global Trade and Local Transformations* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1982); O.D. Corpuz, *An Economic History of the Philippines* (Q.C.: University of the Philippines Press, 1997). On the state actions that accompanied and facilitated this transformation, see Eliodoro Robles, *The Philippines in the Nineteenth Century* (Quezon City: Malaya Books, 1969); Nicholas P. Cushner, S.J., *Spain in the Philippines: From Conquest to Revolution* (Q.C.: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1971); Corpuz, *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*, 2 vols. (QC: Aklahi Foundation, 1989).

⁹Eviota, *The Political Economy of Gender: Women and the Sexual Division of Labour in the Philippines* (London: Zed Press, 1992), Chapter 6 (“Spain’s Last 150 Years: the development of export crops and the commercialization of the economy”); Camagay, *Working Women of Manila in the 19th Century* (Q.C.: University of the Philippines Press and University Center for Women’s [sic] Studies, 1995). Blanc-Szanton, 359-69, while not focusing on the 19th century in particular, makes perceptive comments on changes between early and late Spanish rule.

¹⁰Violeta Lopez-Gonzaga, “Images of Women and Their Role in Society in Jose Rizal’s Writings,” in *Jose Rizal and the Asian Renaissance*, ed. M. Rajaretnam (Manila: Solidaridad, 1996), 171-189.

¹¹Romeo V. Cruz, “The Filipina at the Time of Fil-American Revolution,” in Mananzan, *Essays on Women*, 55-59, referring to Zeus Salazar’s panegyric to the *babaylan* or *katalonan* in the same volume. For more restrained studies of the female revolutionaries, see Rojas-Aleta *et al.*; Maranan; and “The Centennial Issue: Women in History and Revolution,” *Review of Women’s Studies*, ed. Thelma B. Kintanar. (Quezon City, 5/2-6/1 1996). A subtler appreciation can be found in Mina Roces, “Reflections on Gender and Kinship in the Philippine Revolution 1896-1898” (paper presented to IV Congreso Internacional de la Asociacion Española de Estudios del Pacifico, Valladolid, 26-29 November 1997); I am grateful to Dr. Roces for providing me with a copy of her paper.

Some of the more exuberant conflations of feminism and nationalism have occurred in conjunction with the centennial of the 1896 revolution; this may

exaggerate the apparent “celebratory” quality of women’s studies. Roces (personal communication, 5 March 1998) suggests that I am over-simplifying feminist scholarship, which fully recognized that “national liberation” enjoyed priority over other struggles, so that “at no time would a feminist scholar... see a point in Philippine history where feminism and nationalism were ever reconciled.”

¹²See, in particular, “Textile Displacement and the Status of Women in Southeast Asia,” in *The Past in Southeast Asia’s Present*, ed. Gordon P. Means (Ottawa: Canadian Council for Southeast Asian Studies, 1978), pp. 157-70 (revised and published as *Michigan Occasional Papers in Women’s Studies*, no. 17 [Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, Women’s Studies Program, 1981]); *Prosperity without Progress: Manila Hemp and Material Life in the Colonial Philippines* (Berkeley: University of California Press & Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1984), 149-54 and *passim*; “Life, Death and the Sacraments in a Nineteenth Century Bikol Parish,” *Population and History: The Demographic Origins of the Modern Philippines*, ed. Daniel F. Doepfers and Peter S. Xenos (Madison: University of Wisconsin, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, 1998), 225-52; “Age Statement and Misstatement in the Nineteenth Century Philippines: Some Preliminary Findings,” *Annales de demographie historique* 1988, pp. 327-49.

¹³I use “liberal” here in the classic sense of increasing freedom by removing restrictions (liberalizing), rather than the late 20th century pejorative usage, which is often taken to imply “big government” and other horrors.

¹⁴E.g. Robert MacMicking, *Recollections of Manila and the Philippines: During 1848, 1849 and 1850* (Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1967); Fedor Jagor, *Travels in the Philippines* (Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1965).

¹⁵It should be noted that many of the earlier restrictions were often honored in the breach, with the loopholes and violations affecting foreign trade particularly well documented. For example, not only were American (and British) merchant houses established in Manila well before that port was officially “opened” to foreign trade in 1834, but the USA actually had a consulate there. As we cannot be sure to what extent any Spanish regulations actually governed Philippine practice, there is reason to believe that some of the internal prohibitions were also ignored much of the time. See, for example, Corpuz, *Economic History*, 55-68, 112-19, 146-48, on discrepancies between actuality and the law with regard to land ownership and transfer.

¹⁶Owen, *Prosperity*, 192-97; Robles.

¹⁷Owen, *Prosperity*, 21-24; on “avoidance” as resistance, see Michael Adas, “‘Moral Economy’ or ‘Contest State’?: Elite Demands and the Origins of Peasant Protest in Southeast Asia,” *Journal of Social History* 13 (Summer 1980): 521-46.

In some cases, the growth of the bureaucracy might actually be “liberalizing,” in that it could reduce the arbitrary power that some parish priests and provincial governors previously tried to wield. Astute members of the Filipino elite were particularly good at exploiting the potential countervailing powers created by such situations; cf. Owen, “The Power of the Principalia: Local Politics in Early 19th Century Kabikolan” (paper for Fourth International Philippine Studies Conference, Canberra, 1992).

¹⁸Luis Camara Dery, “Prostitution in Colonial Manila,” *Philippine Studies* 39 (1991): 475-89; Greg Bankoff, *Crime, Society, and the State in the Nineteenth-Century Philippines* (Q.C.: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1996), 26-27, 41-44; Ken De Bevoise, *Agents of Apocalypse: Epidemic Disease in the Colonial Philippines* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), Chapter 3 (“Venereal Disease: Evolution of a Social Problem”), 69-93.

¹⁹See Camagay, Chapter 5 (“Las Maestras”) on female schoolteachers and Chapter 6 (“Matronas titulares”) on registered midwives. The professionalization of medicine also began the marginalization of many traditional healers and herbalists of both sexes.

Men would also have benefited, presumably (as suggested by Ester Boserup, *Woman’s Role in Economic Development* [London: Allen & Unwin, 1970]) from state-sponsored improvements in agriculture or other industries, since the Spanish, like most colonialists, tended to assume that men were the managers of production and the effective agents of change. Despite numerous measures devoted to “development,” however, I have seen no evidence that any such officially-sponsored government initiative, other than the exploitative tobacco monopoly, actually worked in the Spanish period. (The American record is slightly better.)

²⁰Leon Ma. Guerrero, *The First Filipino: A Biography of Jose Rizal* (Manila: National Historical Commission, 1971), 223-24. On Rizal's "Letter to the Young Women of Malolos," see below.

²¹Carolyn Israel Sobritchea, "American Colonial Education and Its Impact on the Status of Filipino Women," in *Women's Role in Philippine History*, 79-108.

²²According to the U.S., Bureau of the Census, *Census of the Philippine Islands: Taken Under the Direction of the Philippine Commission in the Year 1903*, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1905), vol. 2, there were over one million Filipinas who were literate, 42% of the women over 10 (as against 47% for the men), though only a quarter of that number (11%) could both read and write. Although some of this may be attributed to the Americans (who opened schools almost as soon as a given district was "pacified"), most of this female literacy has to be credited to Spanish schools.

²³Cf. Camagay, Chapter 5.

²⁴If we regard the Roman Catholic church as an "official" institution in the Spanish Philippines, the discrepancy becomes even greater. Although there were some opportunities for women as nuns (as well as positions in lay organizations), these could not compare with the openings available to Filipino men as secular priests, with the possibility of moving up even higher in terms of diocesan rank (though not all the way to bishop, until 1906).

²⁵Marshall S. McLennan, *The Central Luzon Plain: Land and Society on the Inland Frontier* (Quezon City: Alemar's-Phoenix Publishing House, 1980); Larkin "Philippine History Reconsidered: A Socioeconomic Perspective," *American Historical Review* 87 (June 1982): 595-628; Alfred W. McCoy, "A Queen Dies Slowly: The Rise and Decline of Iloilo City," in McCoy and de Jesus, 314-26; Owen, *Prosperity*, 115-20, 134-36; Bruce Cruikshank, *Samar: 1768-1898* (Manila: Historical Conservation Society, 1985), 139, 284-88; Paul A. Rodell, "Calculating Rural Migration Patterns for the Nineteenth Century Philippines," in *Patterns of Migration in Southeast Asia*, ed. Robert R. Reed (Berkeley: University of California, 1990), 60-77.

²⁶Peter C. Smith, "The Turn-of-the-Century Birth Rate," in Wilhelm Flieger and Smith, eds., *A Demographic Path to Modernity: Patterns of Early-Transition in the Philippines* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, for the Population Institute, 1975), 82-90; Smith and Ng Shui-meng, "The Components

of Population Growth in Nineteenth Century Southeast Asia: Village Data from the Philippines,” *Population Studies* 36 (1982): 237-55; Owen, “The Paradox of Population Growth in Nineteenth-Century Southeast Asia: Evidence from Java and the Philippines,” *JSEAS* 18 (1987): 45-57; Doeppers and Xenos, “A Demographic Frame for Philippine History,” in Doeppers and Xenos, *Population and History*, 3-36; Owen, “Philippine Historical Demography: Sources and Prospects,” in *Southeast Asia’s Demographic History: A Survey of Themes and Materials*, ed. Peter S. Xenos, forthcoming.

Whether the demand for labor actually stimulated population growth (as suggested by Eviota, 59, after Tilly and Scott), or whether demography was essentially an independent variable, is a question we do not, at present, have the evidence to answer. Similar questions—also unanswered—rise in conjunction with Javanese population growth under the Cultivation System; see Benjamin White, “Demand for Labor and Population Growth in Colonial Java,” *Human Ecology* 1 (March 1973): 217-36; Owen, “Paradox,” 54-55.

²⁷Owen, “Capitalism and Welfare in the 19th-Century Philippines,” paper presented at International Conference on the Centennial of the 1896 Philippine Revolution, Manila, August 1996.

²⁸This class, composed of landlords and merchants, has been variously labelled the *ilustrados* (literally, “enlightened ones”), the middle class or bourgeoisie (Fil.: *burgis*), the “super-principales,” and the elite, among other terms. It is often asserted that the core of this class was ethnically Chinese mestizo, though we lack the evidence to substantiate this in any quantitative sense. The relationship between wealth, power and status remains, as always, a matter for controversy. For overviews of the scholarly literature as it pertains to the Philippines, see Owen, “The Principalia in Philippine History: Kabikolan, 1790-1898,” *Philippine Studies* 22 (3rd and 4th quarters, 1974): 297-324; Mark Macdonald Turner, “Interpretations of Class and Status in the Philippines: A Critical Evaluation,” *Cultures et Développement* 10 (1978): 265-96. Such distinctions and disputes need not detain us here, so long as we recognize that there were Filipinos, who, in economic resources and lifestyle, had more in common with their Spanish masters than with the peasant majority.

²⁹Robert R. Reed, *Colonial Manila: The Context of Hispanic Urbanism and the Process of Morphogenesis* (Berkeley: University of California, Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, 1978); Wilfredo V. Villacorta, Isagani R.

Cruz, and Ma. Lourdes Brillantes, *Manila: History, People and Culture: The Proceedings of the Manila Studies Conference* (Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1989); McCoy, "Queen Dies"; Michael Cullinane, "The Changing Nature of the Cebu Urban Elite in the 19th Century," in McCoy and De Jesus, 251-96.

³⁰This is by no means solely the fault of women's history. Making due allowances for the shortcomings of indexes, it still is remarkable that the index to McCoy and De Jesus, *Philippine Social History*, lists citations to "women" in only three of the fifteen papers, while there is just one index citation each in Corpuz, *Roots and Economic History* (see also comments on De Jesus, *The Tobacco Monopoly*, and Larkin, *Sugar*, below).

³¹A more nuanced analysis might distinguish the provincial and municipal elites as "in-between" classes, in touch with Hispanized society through trips to, or relatives in, Manila (note that *Urbana at Feliza* [below] takes the form of letters between an urbanized woman and her country cousin), yet still involved, to a greater or lesser extent, with the more traditional values and structures of the countryside—or, especially in the case of the sugar plantations, with the growing new opportunities there; cf. Larkin, *Pampangans*, 84-99; Larkin, *Sugar and the Origins of Modern Philippine Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 101-124.

³²On Rizal, see below. For a sampling of other sources, see Jagor, Felix Roxas, *The World of Felix Roxas* (Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1970); Joaquin, *Culture and History* (Mandaluyong: Solar Publishing Corporation, 1988); Gilda Cordero-Fernando, *Turn of the Century*, and (in cartoon style), Mariel N. Francisco and Fe Maria C. Arriola, *The History of the Burgis* (Q.C.: GCF Books, 1987).

³³It is likely that this class also produced a high proportion of the female religious (*beatas* and nuns), whose convents were heavily concentrated in or near Manila.

³⁴"Migration to Manila: Changing Gender Representation, Migration Field, and Urban Structure," in Doeppers and Xenos, *Population and History*, 139-79.

³⁵Camagay, 1 and *passim*. On the *cigarreras* (female cigar-makers), see also Edilberto de Jesus, "Manila's First Factories," *Philippine Historical Review* 1 (1971): 97-109.

³⁶There was, however, some "regulation" of prostitution in Manila—giving it a quasi-official sanction—late in the century; De Bevoise, 79-84.

³⁷Owen, "Textile Displacement"; Owen, "Life, Death, and the Sacraments," 237; both using evidence from 19th century Kabikolan. In any given year, the tendency was for all brides to be listed with the same occupation (*oficio*), suggesting that "farmer" and "weaver" were not distinct occupations but overlapping, even synonymous, terms for women's customary employment.

The absence of domestic servants from the marriage registers is not, of course, proof that they did not exist. In the rural Philippines, such servants might also have been called upon to weave or work the fields, or maids may have been effectively precluded from marriage by their status (and poverty). A significant minority of women (5-10% in Nagcarlan, Laguna; 15-25% in Tigaon, Camarines Sur) apparently never married at all.

³⁸Eviota, 47-48 (citing the *Census of 1903*). In Edilberto C. de Jesus' otherwise excellent study, *The Tobacco Monopoly in the Philippines: Bureaucratic Enterprise and Social Change, 1766-1880* (Q.C.: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1980), there is almost no description of the actual cultivation or preparation of tobacco, much less an analysis of gendered labor in the industry (outside the factories).

³⁹At least there have been some scholarly studies of these industries, esp. Owen, *Prosperity*, for abaca, and Larkin, *Sugar*. There are, to the best of my knowledge, no studies at all of the 19th century production of such cash crops as coffee (which flourished in Batangas) and coconuts/copra (which would emerge as one of the major 20th century exports). On gendered labor in sugar, Larkin, 7, has only this to say:

I do not mean to imply that sugar was exclusively a male preserve, for it was decidedly not so. Women, young and old, labored in the fields, especially during planting and weeding season, and they participated in family decision making on economic matters. Some women owned sugar lands in their own right, supervised work on their holdings, and made all kinds of investments from sugar profits. The sources, however, proved somewhat stingy in yielding specific information on the activities of women and children, for in the Philippines the tendency is for men to receive much of the public attention in all economic and political endeavours, even when others deserve a goodly share of the credit. So, while I have not been able to describe the particular impact women may have had upon the industry, let it be recognized that they played a substantial role.

⁴⁰So was *corveé* labor, which was significantly reduced during the 19th century in favor of higher cash obligations to the government.

⁴¹Owen, "Textile Displacement," 1981 ed., 2-7; McCoy, "A Queen Dies." The introduction of milled rice—whether imported or milled locally—also took a traditional task, that of pounding rice at home, away from many women. It seems likely that they were glad to be free of this particular labor (as those who were not could continue to buy *palay* in the husk), but the implications of what they did with the time thus "released," or how they paid the premium for milled rice, have not been explored.

⁴²Edgar Wickberg, *The Chinese in Philippine Life, 1850-1898* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965). Over 99% of the Chinese in the Philippines at that time were male.

One critical factor in shaping the gendered world of commerce may have been the amount of travelling it entailed. By and large, women seem to have restricted themselves to the kind of trade that they could conduct within a day's trip of their home; most commerce over long distances thus fell by default to men, whether Chinese or Filipino. By the end of the century, however, Chinese shopkeepers were challenging Filipinas on their home turf, the municipal market.

⁴³In "Textile Displacement," 1981 ed., 13-19, I also speculate on the symbolic loss resulting from women's abandonment of weaving, a traditional feminine-defining activity.

⁴⁴Criminal records (as analyzed by Bankoff, among others) and parish records (see Owen, "Life, Death, and the Sacraments," 243-44) provide quantitative documentation for these commonplace observances. It should be noted, however, that although women were about twice as likely as men to take communion, still 30% or so of them did not do so. Taken collectively, Filipinas were "pious" only in contrast with male Filipinos.

⁴⁵Syed Hussein Alatas, *The Myth of the Lazy Native* (London: Cass, 1977); Owen, *Prosperity*, 222-25.

⁴⁶Among the elite, of course, there were possibilities for leisure on both sides, but the greater opportunities men had for salaried employment, whether with the government, with business firms or in the professions, are likely to have stimulated the same sense of male entitlement.

⁴⁷Owen, "Life, Death, and the Sacraments," 228. I suspect that these data reflect common-law marriages, rather than promiscuity, so that in most cases, the father was indeed "known," just not officially acknowledged in a church wedding (Cf. Blanc-Szanton, 368-70, on common-law marriages). The average illegitimacy rate in the Bikol parishes I have sampled was around 15%; it seems to have been lower in the Tagalog parishes closer to Manila. As late as 1918, 10% of all married Bikolanos were married "consensually" rather than legally; Philippine Islands, Census Office, *Census of the Philippine Islands... 1918* (Manila: GPO, 1920-21), 2:736-37.

⁴⁸Owen, "Life, Death, and the Sacraments," 240-42.

⁴⁹Owen, *Prosperity*, 109.

⁵⁰Owen, "Life, Death, and the Sacraments," 239. Between 1868 and 1900, the recorded age at first marriage of women whose father was listed as "Don" was 20.4 years, as against 21.4 years for all other first marriages. This also conforms to an Asia-wide pattern of elite women marrying younger than the average, perhaps because it was more important that their wealth and social position be suitably deployed and secured for family benefit.

⁵¹*Ibid*; Smith and Ng, 248-50; Ng Shui Meng, "Demographic Change, Marriage and Family Formation: The Case of Nineteenth Century Nagcarlan, The Philippines." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii, 1979, 119. Whereas, in Nagcarlan there is just a single movement downward, in Tigaon (which I studied), the drop in the 1860s follows an apparent **upward** movement, of roughly the same magnitude, in the 1840s. These trends appear to hold for both the *principalia* and the rest.

This decline in marriage age (if confirmed) apparently implies general rising prosperity in the latter part of the century, at least in cash terms, a conclusion contradicted by some other evidence (see Owen, "Capitalism"). A partial explanation for this paradox may lie in the devaluation of the peso and consequent price inflation in the last few decades of the century. Even though they were not worth as much, pesos were easier to come by than ever before, which may have helped courting couples cross the threshold into marriage.

⁵²Owen, "Life, Death, and the Sacraments," 232-33. Recorded maternal mortality rates, undoubtedly understated, are on the order of 1% (100 deaths per 10,000 conceptions), a substantial risk in a society where large families prevailed.

⁵³Cf. Cruikshank, 284-88, on Calbayog, Samar, which had a sex ratio of 143.5 in 1896.

⁵⁴The records surviving in the Philippine National Archives show that a majority of Manila women accused of prostitution originally came from the provinces, especially nearby in Luzon; see Camagay, 108; De Bevoise, 75; and Bankoff, 41, for slightly different figures reflecting this.

⁵⁵Scattered evidence on the social structure of newer settlements (*e.g.* from the "Historical Data Papers" in the Philippine National Library) suggests that traditional hierarchies were more likely to be replicated than to be replaced by more democratic or egalitarian institutions. Often a new *visita* would, in fact, be "sponsored" by a member of the traditional elite, who would then (it seems) automatically become its "captain." We may surmise from this that Filipino migrants might have tried to maintain traditional gender roles as well—but with what success?

⁵⁶From a handbook for the instruction of parish priests, as quoted in Boxer, 97.

⁵⁷Rene B. Javellana, S.J., ed. and trans., *Casaysayan nang Pasiong Mahal ni Jesuscristong Panginoon natin na Sucat Ipag-alab nang Puso nang Sinomang Babasa* (Q.C.: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1988), 162-63 (stanzas 157-63). See also Reynaldo Clemeña Ilete, *Pasyon and Revolution* (Q.C.: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979), 15-28 and *passim*, on the significance of this *pasyon* in Tagalog life.

⁵⁸"The Pasyon Pilapil: An-'other' Reading," in Kintanar, 71-89. The "Pasyon Pilapil" is the same text as the "Casaysayan nang Pasiong Mahal..." though Patajo-Legasto is using a different edition from that edited and translated by Javellana.

⁵⁹It is actually anonymous, but it is based on an earlier *pasyon* by Gaspar Aquino de Belen; all the other *pasyon* texts of which the authorship is known are also attributed to men.

⁶⁰Pineda-Ofreneo, 35, refers to Leona Florentino, an Ilocana, as a prolific 19th century poet, some of whose occasional verses were saved from oblivion when her famous son, Isabelo de los Reyes, sent them to Europe for publication. Unfortunately, Pineda-Ofreneo does not cite the poems themselves; her only source appears to be a 1984 article in *Celebrity* by Dolores S. Feria.

During the Philippine-American War, a couple of women were contributors to revolutionary newspapers; Paz Policarpio, "The Filipino Women During the Revolution," in *Review of Women's Studies* 5/2-6/1 (1996): 28-29.

⁶¹One notable exception consists of Jose Rizal's correspondence with his sisters, which have been published (*Letters Between Rizal and Family Members* [Manila: National Centennial Commission, 1964]); see Patricia B. Arinto, "Reading Correspondences: A Critical Analysis of the Letters Between Rizal and His Sisters," *Review of Women's Studies* 5/2-6/1 (1996): 181-90.

⁶²The title begins, in some versions, *Pagsusulat na ng Dalawang Binibini na si Urbana at (ni) Feliza* ("Letters of two young women named Urbana and Feliza"). It may be significant that the names given the young women imply a distinction (contrast?) between "urban" and "happy."

I have not been able to confirm the original publication date, but the earliest edition held by a Philippine library is said to be 1864; by 1866 it had been translated into Ilocano.

⁶³Originally published in Spanish in 1887 and 1891. "Noli me Tangere" literally means "Touch me not" and refers to the words of Jesus to his female followers after the resurrection; English translations of the book have tended to opt for alternative titles such as *The Social Cancer* or *The Lost Eden*. "Filibusterismo" may be translated as "subversion," the action of a "filibustero" (freebooter, partisan).

⁶⁴Rizal, like other liberal intellectuals, expressed considerable sympathy for the exploited and illiterate masses, who deserved, he suggested, better leadership than they were getting from the elite. It was those who had opportunities and failed to use them, or who thought that they were better than they were, who were the main targets of his wit or wrath. Having said that, it must be acknowledged that the art of Rizal, like that of other great writers, is so rich that it renders any capsule summary unjust.

⁶⁵Eviota, 60-61; cf. Lopez-Gonzaga, 171.

⁶⁶Roces, "Reflections." I am not, as yet, convinced that the distinction Roces makes between women as "bearers of culture" and as "agents of change" is a very significant one. In either case, women can be seen as the instruments of men; Spanish friars employ them to maintain the conservative/colonial status quo, while Filipinos who want change, whether moderate (De Castro), reformist (Rizal), or radical (Bonifacio), also use them for their own ends. In all likelihood, women modified to some extent the messages they were intended (by men) to convey, but that needs to be separately asserted and documented; it is not inherent in their roles as either "cultural transmitters" or "agents of change."

⁶⁷*Woman Enough and Other Essays* (Q.C.: Vibal, 1963), 29-34, as cited in Lilia Quindoza Santiago, "The Filipina as Metaphor for Crisis," in Kintanar, 119-20.

⁶⁸Santiago, 120-122, referring also to the work of Pura Santillan Castrence.

⁶⁹Lopez Gonzaga, 144. Eviota (182 n55) seemingly concurs: Rizal "did not think the woman Maria Clara was an ideal role model for women."

⁷⁰"Nationalism, Imagery and the Filipino Intelligentsia in the 19th Century," in *Discrepant Histories: Translocal Essays on Filipino Cultures*, ed. Rafael (Manila: Anvil, 1995), 136-46. See also Iletto, 121-31, 192-94, and *passim*, on the imagery of "Mother Country" (*Inang Bayan*) in the writings of the Katipunan.

⁷¹Santiago, 119-20, pointing to "Doña Consolacion" in *Noli* as "the epitome of the devil woman."

⁷²Perhaps the most generally accessible version of this document is in Jose Rizal, *Political and Historical Writings*, Centennial edition (Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1964), 7:56-66. I am grateful to Dr. Ruby Paredes for having provided me with a copy.

⁷³*Ibid.*, 58-59.

⁷⁴*Ibid.*, 60-61.

⁷⁵*Ibid.*, 61.

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, 63-64.

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, 65.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*, 63.

⁷⁹Ambeth Ocampo, *Rizal Without the Overcoat*, rev. ed. (Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, 1995), provides a light-hearted tour through these affairs, already well-documented in biographies by Leon Ma. Guerrero and Austin Coates, among others.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 61-62.

⁸¹Rafael, 146-47; cf. Ocampo, *Rizal*; Ocampo, *Luna's Moustache* (Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, 1997). Rafael describes the Indios Bravos as “a masculine alternative to what they conceived to be the menacingly androgynous and corrupt regime of the Spanish friars.” Although I recognize the roots of the image, I am not entirely convinced by the menace of friar “androgyny.” Similar “masculinist” imagery has arisen among rebels elsewhere whose colonial oppressors did not wear long robes.

⁸²Owen, “Masculinity and National Identity in the 19th Century Philippines,” *Illes I Imperis* (Barcelona) 2 (1999): 23-47. A generation later, the patriotic Filipino playwrights of the early 20th century also encoded the nation and freedom as female, fought over by patriots on one side, colonialists and collaborators on the other. “It is as if these dramas triangulate social desire, casting nationhood in terms of the masculine struggle over a feminized object... Women personify the beloved nation waiting to be rescued.” Rafael, “White Love: Surveillance and Nationalist Resistance in the U.S. Colonization of the Philippines,” in *Cultures of U.S. Imperialism*, ed. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 212-13. Rafael goes on to add, however, that “these gender stereotypes appear provisional and shifting... (Women) are objects of masculine contention, but they are also active interlocutors in the debate over the future disposition of their body politic.”

⁸³Minhalini Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity: The ‘Manly Englishman’ and the ‘Effeminate Bengali’ in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995); Warwick Anderson, “The Trespass Speaks: White

Masculinity and Colonial Breakdown,” *American Historical Review* 102 (Dec. 1997): 1343-70, esp. 1346-47 and sources cited therein. See also Ronald Hyam, *Empire and Sexuality: The British Experience* (Manchester University Press, 1990), 72-73, 202-3; and, on colonial “hypermasculinity,” Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983).

⁸⁴Here, as in so many other situations, Mahatma Gandhi is the conspicuous exception to the rule, generally refusing to try to out-macho the Raj.

⁸⁵Some of the internal tension that so bedeviled the Philippine Revolution, including that between Aguinaldo and Bonifacio and between Aguinaldo and Antonio Luna (Juan’s brother) may be ascribed to the friction of strong male egos rubbing against each other.

⁸⁶E.g. Camagay, “Women in the Text and in Reality,” in *Review of Women’s Studies* 5/2-6/1 (1996): 11-18, endorsing Lilia Quindoza-Santiago’s “refusal to accept Rizal as a feminist because of Rizal’s use of ‘helpmate’ (*katulong*) instead of ‘partner’ in referring to women” (11-12).

⁸⁷Cf. Arinto (185): “Although Rizal cannot be considered a feminist—indeed, his view of women remained quite conventional and traditional—he was also not a male chauvinist pig.” Cf. Kumari Jayawardena, *The White Woman’s Other Burden: Western Women and South Asia During British Colonial Rule* (N.Y.: Routledge, 1995), 6-8; Jayawardena and Malathi de Alwis, eds., *Embodied Violence: Communalising Women’s Sexuality in South Asia* (New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1996), ix-xix and *passim*; for a more forthright appraisal of some of the tensions between nationalism and feminism in South Asia.

⁸⁸Roces; Camagay, “Women in the Text.”

⁸⁹Cf. Teodoro Agoncillo, *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan* (Q.C.: University of the Philippines, 1956); Glenn Anthony May, *A Past Recovered* (Q.C.: New Day, 1987); May, *Inventing a Hero: The Posthumous Re-Creation of Andres Bonifacio* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, 1997).

It may even be significant that Jacinto, who, like Rizal, refers to women as “helpers” (*katulong*), was the most *ilustrado*-like of Katipunan leaders. In terms of education, Mabini was among the most “enlightened” of *ilustrados*, but

in wealth, background and status, he was closer to the municipal elites, if not the peasant “masses.”

⁹⁰This was Agueda Kahabagan of Batangas, commissioned by General Miguel Malvar. The fact that other “Heneralas” were not officially recognized is not necessarily a sign of sex discrimination; in the chaos of guerilla war, many leaders of both sexes simply awarded themselves ranks and hoped that in due course, their reputation would warrant its ratification by some higher revolutionary authority. On “General” Simeon Ola, see Owen, “Winding Down the War in Albay, 1900-1903,” *Pacific Historical Review* 48 (Nov): 557-89.

⁹¹Policarpio, 23-25.

⁹²The president of the Women’s Katipunan was Josefa Rizal (Jose’s sister), the fiscal was Angelica Rizal Lopez (her cousin) and the vice-president was Gregoria de Jesus (Bonifacio’s wife). On the involvement of notable *ilustrado* women—including Aguinaldo’s wife, sister and mother—in the revolutionary Red Cross see also Policarpio, 30-34.

⁹³Roces, drawing on concepts from her *Women Power and Kinship Politics in Post-war Philippines* (Westport: Praeger, 1998).

⁹⁴Roces mentions Lilia Quindoza Santiago as drawing attention to women’s ongoing use of “male yardsticks” and wondering what an alternative vision of women’s history might be.

⁹⁵Judith E. Walsh, “What Women Learned When Men Gave Them Advice: Rewriting Patriarchy in Late Nineteenth Century Bengal,” *JAS* 56 (August 1997): 641-77, based on comparing advice manuals written by men with those written by a woman. Unfortunately, we know of no female counterpart to Modesto de Castro.

⁹⁶Blanc-Szanton, quote from 360. As she also observes, the higher up the Filipino social ladder, the more Hispanized the values, implying that in certain ways, women of the *ilustrado* class were actually less liberated than their poorer sisters.

⁹⁷Mary Grace Ampil Tirona, “*Pañuelo* Activism,” in *Women’s Role in Philippine History*, 108-130. (The *pañuelo* is the stiff handkerchief worn over

the shoulders in formal Filipina dress; the title refers to the early suffragists.) Blanc-Szanton, 368-71, makes effective use of two early 20th century sources, by American schoolteacher Mary H. Fee (1912) and Mendoza-Guanzon (1928).

⁹⁸Cf. Blanc-Szanton, 380: “And yet she (the Filipina) remained industrious, resourceful and strong, and used daily images of femaleness that did not quite match the Spanish versions.”