

philippine studies

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

Diego Silang's Revolt: A New Approach

Fernando Palanco

Translated by Jose S. Arcillia, S.J.

Philippine Studies vol. 50, no. 4 (2002): 512–537

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>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

Diego Silang's Revolt: A New Approach

Fernando Palanco

Translated by Jose S. Arcilla, S.J.

Diego Silang's revolt is one of the more well-known uprisings against the Spanish colonial government in the Philippines, but I believe that not everything has been said about it. A detailed reading of the sources of information on the uprising will reveal new details, some obscure points, and various doubts regarding the topic. I aim to show these in the following pages, without insisting too much on already known details. I will begin by explaining some ideas about the sources and certain aspects of the historical context. This essay does not share the nationalistic premises on which discussions of Philippine uprisings are usually presented. I admit that certain movements, such as the one Diego Silang led, could have certain proto-nationalistic ingredients; but to take these proto-nationalistic elements, as a center for the analysis of the events seems to me to ignore their complexity.

Sources

Pedro del Vivar's Report¹

Fray Pedro del Vivar was an Augustinian friar occupied with his church ministry in Batac when the uprising occurred. He wrote a Report immediately after the incidents, and, as he indicates in that report, it was to respond to his superior's request.² Doubtless, the latter placed at his disposition all the documents the Augustinian Order had, which added therefore to his personal experience, and to the information directly received from his brothers in the habit. Written meticulously and in a clear expository style, the Report consists of almost 200 printed pages, with an introduction, two parts and some final statements. Together they number 321 numbered paragraphs in 45 chapters. It is a primary source of inestimable value, but we must not forget that it pre-

sents the version of the Augustinians in charge of the parishes of the province of Ilocos (except the provincial capital).

In general, all the chronicles of the friars in the Philippines tend to praise their efforts and their suffering for the spread of the gospel and for peace. Rivalry with the *alcaldes mayores* and the lack of respect for the secular clergy are frequent characteristics. We find all of these in the Report. We must also keep in mind that Pedro del Vivar wrote his report while there was an uprising in Pangasinan, and serious accusations against the Dominicans of having provoked it had reached Simón de Anda y Salazar.³ We can then guess that the Augustinians hoped to forestall generalizations that could include their Order. Hence, there may be details or nuances regarding the friars' situation, which del Vivar conceals, exaggerates or minimizes.

The Report appeared in print only in 1893, but manuscript copies had gone around, like the one in the Augustinian Archives in Valladolid.⁴ This, or others like it, must have been the copy Joaquín Martínez de Zúñiga⁵ and José Montero y Vidal,⁶ used for their own summaries in their histories. In sum, all the works based on either of these two authors also follow Pedro del Vivar. In his *Historia de Ilocos*, Isabelo de los Reyes, Sr., added some conjectures, but no new information.⁷

Testimonio de Autos⁸

A *Testimonio de Autos* is a collection of documents related to a legal trial held by the Audiencia according to Spanish law. Since the Governor General was the supreme juridical authority in the Philippines, he headed every court action, at the end of which he sent to Madrid one or several copies of the cases tried by the Manila Audiencia.

Two copies of the *Testimonio*, with the title *Testimony on the Conspiracy and Uprising of Some Towns in the Province of Ilocos led by Diego Silang* are in the Archivo General de Indias (AGI) in Seville. Simón de Anda y Salazar ordered the opening of the proceedings they contain. The objective in this instance was not the legal prosecution of someone accused, but the justification of the extraordinary measures the civil and religious authorities had to adopt in the face of these incidents.

The *Testimonio de Autos* on the Ilocos revolt contains several letters exchanged between the deposed *alcalde mayor* of the province, the Governor General, the Augustinian friars, Bishop Bernardo Ustáriz, the secular clergy of Vigan, some *principales* in the towns, officers of the Spanish army, British authorities in Manila, and Diego Silang himself. It also includes decrees, information from the fiscal of the Audiencia, and

records of an interesting trial held at the local tribunal in Laoag against two suspected followers of Silang. Numerous letters are either addressed or sent to an Augustinian friar, but they add nothing to Pedro del Vivar's narrative. It is good to keep in mind that at that time, all the correspondence of the friars with others not of the same Order had to pass through the hands of their Provincial Vicar. This meant a certain degree of censorship, and that particular statements against the Order's interests would have been excluded.

David Routledge, as far as we know, was the first researcher who worked on the *Testimonio de Autos*. In referring to it, however, he qualifies it as a "report" of the Governor General of the Philippines to the Council of the Indies. His work has undoubtedly contributed to our knowledge of the topic,⁹ but he did not exhaust the potential of this documentary source.

Other Documentary Sources

All the *Testimonios de Autos*, with a letter summarizing their contents, were sent to the king. The letter of Gov. Simón de Anda y Salazar accompanying the Testimony on the Silang revolt, signed 27 June 1764, is now to be found with it in the AGI. The work of Emma H. Blair and James A. Robertson refers to a copy of this letter preserved in another Spanish archive,¹⁰ but being a résumé, it adds nothing to the contents of the Testimony.

British documentation on the topic and on the occupation of Manila is abundant. Judging from research done on the topic, however, we can learn nothing more than what we know of Diego Silang's precarious links with the British through two main sources.¹¹

Sources of incalculable worth, which have not yet been sufficiently used, are the parish books of Vigan, preserved in the Archbishop's Palace in that city.¹² Fr. Frederick Schapf's work, based on the *Libros de Entierros*, confirms the exactness of Pedro del Vivar's information concerning the number and the personality of those who died in various skirmishes in Vigan.¹³ But beyond what strictly concerns the protagonists of the revolt, a study of the demographic panorama based on these books could support my thesis that demographic growth before 1762 could have fuelled the rebel explosion.

Other documentary sources mentioned in this study do not refer directly to the Silang revolt, but to issues related to a trial of 1755 against the alcalde mayor of Ilocos, and another opened against Santiago Orendain for collaborating with the British.¹⁴

Some Important Aspects from a Historical Context

A detailed review of the historical context surrounding the revolt of Diego Silang would go beyond the limits of this essay. I shall therefore emphasize only three aspects that I believe are important: the demographic growth and the land problem, the inter-province trade, and the situation created by the British occupation of Manila.

Demographic Growth and the Land Problem

Despite the lack of precise data, it seems clear that the first half of the 18th century was a period of demographic growth. Although moderate in the archipelago as a whole, this increase must have been important in the traditionally more populated zones, such as the area around Manila, Pangasinan, the lower Cagayan Valley, and the Ilocos coast. The first was the scene of serious uprisings in 1745, the others in 1762 and 1763.

Jack A. Goldstone offers an initial analysis of the link between demographic increase and an uprising, with which I agree: a conjuncture of demographic expansion is manifested in a high percentage of youth, which is more non-conformist than the adult.¹⁵

A second, perhaps more evident, connection is the scarcity of cultivable land. The Spanish authorities, civil as well as religious, looked unfavorably on the dispersal of the people and tried everything possible to stop it. While, therefore, extensive zones in the archipelago remained unpopulated and unexploited, the lack of cultivable terrain in the more populated zones began to be a serious problem in the 18th century. Of the uprisings in the mid-18th century, that of the Tagalogs is the most closely linked to the lack of land, although in the other cases, there is also evidence that points to the same problem.

Pedro del Vivar regrets the dispersal in Vigan. New towns and villages were set up and these became the centers of conflict during the uprising.¹⁶ That dispersal, which he blames on the "neglect of the *alcaldes mayores*," was doubtless occasioned by population growth. The friar also refers to the presence of "Pangasinenses," whom he accuses of being a bad influence on the Ilocanos, and names them as the most important protagonists in the uprising.¹⁷ The name "Pangasinenses" is perhaps not exact, since some could have been Zambals and others from the present La Union province. Anyway, their presence in Vigan reflects the migratory tide that added to the demographic increase.

Another point of Pedro del Vivar regarding the preceding trend does not belong to this section, but it is worth summing up to show a contrast: in the villages the Augustinian friars ministered to, "their resettled residents dwelt in community within hearing of the bell," while the new villages were dispersed under the care of the secular parish priests.¹⁸ Pedro del Vivar misses no opportunity to blame the secular clergy openly, but perhaps he is right in the sense that the latter's control of the people was not as tight as that of the friars.

Commerce

The 18th century saw the slow growth of internal commerce in the Philippines, from which the *alcaldes mayores* found a new lode to increase their income. To the traditional list, then, of abuses and outrageous acts that the friars and the people accused them of doing were added those connected with commerce: *bandalas*, for their personal benefit, monopoly, extortion, etc. The Laws of the Indies banned all of these; but, once again, implementation of Spanish policy was quite distinct from what was legally ordained.

The *alcalde* of Ilocos, Francisco Cedrón y Rivadeneira, was not the only one tried for engaging in commerce, and, being perhaps the most intelligent of other *alcaldes*, he represents a unique case. The *Testimonio de Autos* of his trial in 1755 clearly shows that, instead of acting alone, he organized a wide commercial web, which many joined. The volume of confiscated merchandise was enormous and included all kinds of goods: cotton cloth, woolen textiles, iron, paper, porcelain, wax, rice, sugar, wine, and others. His business linked Vigan with China, Manila, and the entire Ilocos province. He had connections with the Chinese Sangleys, the *mestizos* of Vigan, the *principales* of various towns, and even several priests. Some of these individuals helped him by hiding the goods when there was notice of the arrival of a judge the Manila Audiencia had commissioned to investigate him. The search for goods, carried out from warehouse to warehouse, was beset by difficulties and, doubtless, incomplete. The work of evaluation and confiscation were more deficient because of the huge number of creditors and the indebted who appeared.¹⁹ All of these show that Ilocos, Vigan especially, was by that time enjoying a notable commercial exchange involving a powerful sector of the *principalia*.

A review of the names appearing in the list contained in the proceedings against Francisco Cedrón is also very interesting. Some of them reappear years later in connection with the uprising. The name

that calls the greatest attention is that of the judge sent from Manila, Santiago Orendain, confidant of Gov. Pedro Manuel de Arandía (1754–59).²⁰ Three persons from the locality who stood as witnesses to the accusations would later form part of Diego Silang's government: Julián Miranda, Martín Crispín, and Juan Salazar. If we believe del Vivar's Report, a fourth who acted as Orendain's agent was Diego Silang himself.²¹

Francisco Cedrón's case is perhaps the last one held against an *alcalde* for commercial reasons. A few years later, unable to eradicate the *alcaldes'* practice, the colonial government decided to legalize and profit from it by imposing a tax called "*alcabala*." Unlike the original meaning of the Castilian *alcabala*, the Philippine counterpart meant an indulgence to allow what was banned.²² As we shall see, this measure was not alien to the origins of Diego Silang's uprising.

On the other hand, the existence of a small community of Sangleyes living in the *pariancillo* of Vigan, as well as a wealthy community of mestizos with their own officials, shows its commercial dynamism. The mestizos in the Philippines had to pay twice the tribute paid by the indigenous inhabitants, since the former were considered a more productive and powerful group.

The Occupation of Manila and the Pangasinan Rebellion

The uprising in Ilocos, as well as those in Pangasinan and Cagayan, occurred at a period of special danger to Spain's government. On 22 September 1762, a British squadron that the British East India Company had sent from Madras besieged Manila. On 5 October, Archbishop Manuel Rojo, acting governor general, surrendered the city. Only the resolute action of the *Oidor* Simón de Anda y Salazar, who installed himself as governor, preserved Spanish sovereignty over most of the provinces.

Dissatisfaction over Spanish rule among the indigenous population was one of the supposed motives William Draper had foreseen.²³ At an early date, therefore, he signed a proclamation addressed "to all the *indios* and mestizos dwelling in the Islands," promising protection, the end of the tribute, free trade, and guarantees to continue their practice of the Catholic religion.²⁴ Sangley support, which is not mentioned here, had been assured beforehand.

We know that in the name of the British, Santiago Orendain incited the natives to rise. In his trial, which Simón de Anda initiated, it was proven that there had been meetings in his house with the emissaries from the provinces of Pampanga and Pangasinan.²⁵

The British message did not affect the attitude of the Filipinos. The petty mercantilist dream could only seduce the groups involved in the medium- and major-scale commerce, that is, the Sangleys, the mestizos, and a rather limited *principalía*. To blunt its force, Simón de Anda decreed the expulsion of the Chinese and the freedom of commerce in the provinces that the British did not occupy. But the occupation of Manila could not but affect the feelings of the natives. With the fall of the head of the Spanish government, many underestimated the capacity of the rest of the body to react.

On the Spanish side, the surrender of Manila provoked a profound uncertainty. Anda's action permitted the sovereign power to continue to exist, but it did not normalize the situation. When recounting the numerous uprisings during the Spanish domination, the friar chroniclers usually resorted to the simile of a flame, which, if not extinguished at the first moments, spreads and goes out of control. Inspired by this idea, every time there were mutinies or local uprisings, the friars called for and applauded quick and harsh measures. If the Spaniards had been in a position to punish the leaders of the uprisings of Binalatongan (today, San Carlos City) and Vigan, they would have done so and history's course would have been different. Certainly, the people of Pangasinan and Ilocos were aware of Spanish weakness when they decided to express their complaints energetically.

On 2 December in Pangasinan, the Dominican Vicar, Fray Andrés Meléndez, agreed to the Binalatongan mutineers' demands to suppress the tribute and expel the *alcalde*, among others. On 14 December, the demand voiced in Vigan was practically the same, and it was sanctioned by Bishop Bernardo Ustáriz. Surrender in both incidents seemed clear, and, based on del Vivar's interpretation, it is an admitted fact that Diego Silang himself served as the liaison.²⁶

Diego Silang's Background

Everything we know of Diego Silang's background comes from Pedro del Vivar.²⁷ Many guesses have been made on the basis of a few ideas contained in two paragraphs, although most of them are hard to verify. The Augustinian friar, who did not know Silang personally, writes what his companions told him. Considering his unconcealed prejudice against the leader, we must weigh all his assertions objectively.

Del Vivar fixed Silang's genealogy and his birthday (16 December 1730) quite precisely, leading us to think that his information came from the entry in the parish baptismal registers of Vigan. I have not found

this entry, but I found that of the burial (8 November 1750) of his mother, Doña Nicolasa de los Santos. In it she is listed as the wife of Don Miguel Silang, native of Lingayen.²⁸ Let us keep in mind that the titles "Don" and "Doña" were reserved for the principales.

Silang's Pangasinan antecedents are not at all unusual, since there was a sizeable community of this origin in Vigan. His relationship with many individuals of this and other origins need not be understood strictly, but in a more extended sense, although it implied ties of unity and alliance. Precisely, one of the characteristics common to all the Filipino leaders who fought against, or in alliance with the Spaniards in those centuries was to have an extensive chain of relatives.

It may be true that, as a young man, Diego Silang entered the service of the parish priest of Vigan. It was a usual practice among the priests, both religious and secular, to take in the sons of the more prominent principales, a privilege which provided better education for their sons. According to del Vivar, Silang's relations with the secular clergy of Vigan since his childhood endured till the days of the uprising.²⁹ The emphasis on that connection minimizes the relations he also had with the Augustinians, to which he refers only indirectly, when further on he observes that the "Prior of Paoay, Fray Manuel Moreno, went to Vigan to warn Silang, since this priest was known to him, and at another time he had done him favors."³⁰

The incidents of Silang's shipwreck off the Bolinao coast and his stay as a slave of the Negritos have turned out to be fiction. Del Vivar attributes to that circumstance his familiarity with the pagan rites and "his aversion to the sacrament of confession."³¹ The first needs no explanation, since, as we shall see, pagan rites appear wherever there is an uprising, and Silang did not have to be their principal promoter. The second statement, meanwhile, contradicts Silang's piety, which del Vivar himself acknowledges in successive paragraphs.³² On the other hand, with a Recollect friar involved in Silang's supposed liberation, it is strange that no chronicle of this Order alludes to the event.

In his desire to belittle Silang, del Vivar pictures him as an illiterate who "learned how to read but only a little." Yet, further on, he makes us understand that he was the one who had personally written several letters and orders before 22 March 1763, when he appointed a scribe.³³

That Silang depended on the charity of the secular clergy of Vigan in order to live also contradicts his position as "courier of letters and messages to all kinds of people," including an annual trip to Manila when the galleon arrived.

Diego Silang's marriage with Gabriela de Estrada is verified in the Vigan parish records. It is certainly incorrect to say "Gabriela Silang," since in Spain the wife always keeps her maiden name, and that rule was followed in the Philippines during the entire colonial period. Until now, I have not found their marriage registration either, but I found that of her burial on 17 November 1763: *Doña Gabriela de Estrada, viuda de Diego Silang, natural de esta ciudad, del barangay de Endaya.*³⁴

Since Don Tomás de Endaya was Silang's baptismal godfather, we can guess that both spouses were residents of the same *barangay*. That the secular priests of Vigan arranged the marriage seems to be an added remark from del Vivar that is not too sympathetic. Likewise Gabriela's supposed widowhood can be such. Contemporary Spanish attitudes attributed only selfish material interests to a young man marrying a widow.

All in all, unfortunately, there are very few trustworthy details about Diego Silang's life before 14 December 1762.

The Uprising

The Origins

The friars did not like the alcalde, Antonio Zabala. Pedro del Vivar refers to him disparagingly on various occasions.³⁵ Of a long list of abuses blamed on him, the following is noteworthy: "He wanted to monopolize the provincial trade."³⁶ This could possibly be true. Actually, his appointment as alcalde of Ilocos coincided with the imposition of the alcabala, referred to above. If he paid it in order to be able to engage in commerce, he certainly must have wanted to benefit from his rights. Let us recall that seven years previously, Francisco Cedrón, then alcalde, engaged in trade in connivance with a good number of the principales, Sangleys, and mestizos of Vigan. These people could not logically look with indifferent eyes on the monopolistic pretensions of the new alcalde.

To top it all, one of Simón de Anda y Salazar's first measures on assuming charge as governor, was to ban trade with Manila and among the different provinces. That concerning the provincial commerce would quickly be revoked, but, from the start, the man charged with promulgating and implementing this order in Ilocos was its alcalde, occasioning the ire of the affected group.

The usual friar's hostility and the hostility of the traders were perhaps not sufficient reason for an uprising; but they added to the unease

provoked by the news arriving from outside. On 5 December 1762, Antonio Zabala wrote to Simón de Anda:

After the British entered Manila, there have been here disturbances among the indios, whether or not they ought to pay the tribute, or whether or not the British should govern them, or the Spaniards should continue. All of these is due to the news they send from there, including men who ought to refrain by reason of their state [in reference to the priests], and of some refugees who have arrived here, spreading word that Bulacan and Pampanga were up in arms and were not paying the tribute. And now, those rumors from Pangasinan, too.³⁷

Various Versions on the Events of 14 December 1762

The Spanish governor, Simón de Anda y Salazar, received four district reports of the incident in Vigan on 14 December 1762: (1) from the Augustinian Provincial Vicar, Fray Juan Olalla; (2) from the diocesan Bishop, Bernardo Ustáriz; (3) from the Provisor of Vigan, Father Tomás Millán; and (4) from the *alcalde* Zabala, already mentioned. All agreed more or less on the events: about 2,000 armed indios headed by Diego Silang appeared at dawn before the *Casa Real*, or the *alcalde*'s residence; the Provisor went out to calm them down, and accompanied them to negotiate with Bishop Ustáriz, who was in the neighboring town of Bantay. But each of the reports had its own version of the demands and what were granted.

The first to report to Anda was the Augustinian Provincial, Fray Juan Olalla, transmitting that same day, the 14th, the information he had received from the Prior of Bantay. The latter reported that the noisy mob had consisted of the residents of Vigan and the neighboring towns. Olalla emphasizes the point parenthetically: "And I suppose it will be for having banned trade between the two provinces." Then he continues that they wanted to kill the *alcalde*, and that the priest [Tomás Millán] with other secular priests promised them, in order to calm them down, that the *alcalde* would leave the capital on this date. "And since they demanded as *alcalde* the pastor of Vigan, His Excellency, Bishop Ustáriz, tells me that he was ready to listen to them in everything." And he indicates immediately an informant's opinion, that he says he agrees with: "He was just saying that the indios are right in their demands, but the manner of asking is very bad."³⁸

From the start, Fray Bernardo Ustáriz, bishop-elect of the diocese of Nueva Segovia, played a leading role in the events. He informed Anda in those days that the whole problem was rooted in the *alcalde* mayor:

"because of his bad ways, the extortions, abuses which they have suffered from him and from his countrymen and familiars." He agreed to the departure of the *alcalde*, but without making any reference to his being substituted by the Provisor of Vigan.³⁹

A third informant is the Provisor himself, Bachiller Tomás Millán, who mentions "the uprising of the *timawa* indios of this province of Ilocos against the *alcalde mayor*, Don Antonio Zabala." To him, the primary aim of the insurgents was none other than the previous ones that had not been cited: "That they be freed of the tribute and personal services."⁴⁰

Finally, the harassed *alcalde* says that the mutineers intended to take hold of the artillery in the Casa Real, that in the morning he had approved holding back the tribute until the British foes left. Since he failed with that to quiet the turmoil, he agreed in the afternoon to leave without resorting to force: "For the Provisor and all the clergy assured me all the people of the province were there (which was not true, for they were only from the capital and its vicinity)."⁴¹

From this tangle we can draw some conclusions: first, the support of the priests—secular, friars, and the bishop himself—for the *alcalde's* expulsion; second, their lack of clarity at the time to explain what they actually discussed and offered to the mutineers; third, the convergence of different claims: the *alcalde's* expulsion, the exemption from the tribute, and the freedom of commerce.

The existence of divergent claims only reflects the participation in the movement of various social groups. The *alcalde's* expulsion united everyone, but the *principalía* had no reason for acceding to the matter of a tribute, which they were not paying. Most of the people, meanwhile, could hardly complain about a commerce in which they did not invest.

The Clash for Power Between Bishop Bernardo Ustáriz and Diego Silang

After the incidents of 14 December and the *alcalde's* departure, Bishop Bernardo Ustáriz and Diego Silang became rivals for the control of the province.

The bishop was suspicious of Silang, explaining it thus to Anda on 18 December: "The principal moving force seems to be that he seeks many things, pretending they are against neither his Catholic Majesty nor the Christian religion, but for everyone's good, as he says. But since these brothers are so changeable, tomorrow they may seek another thing which is not convenient for us." To stop Diego Silang, the bishop was

asking for a quick appointment of a new *alcalde mayor*, and suggested the name of Esteban de los Reyes, "a Spaniard who is a very good Christian, humble, and who will do everything I tell him."⁴² A few days later, the bishop addressed the people in the province in these terms: "I order and command you to recognize me as your head . . . I order and command you to prepare arms against the rebel Diego Silang." In the same letter, he announced the cancellation of a year's tribute.⁴³

During these same dates, Diego Silang and his emissaries went around the towns recruiting the support of the *timawas*. Pedro del Vivar mentioned that Silang was looking for an "authentic document canceling the tribute."⁴⁴ This act shows that Silang did not trust the bishop's words, but that he was also a skillful man, aware of the legal and bureaucratic formalities of the Spanish government. But his leadership was not based only on that skill. Pedro del Vivar also mentions the enthusiasm his person stirred in the masses: "The concept which the common people formed of Silang was that of one sent by God to liberate them from oppression."⁴⁵ The group of *principales* and *mestizos* in Vigan, which had supported him, apparently quickly abandoned him. In his letter cited above, Ustáriz says: "all of the *principales* are on our side."⁴⁶ Nonetheless, one cannot deny that some could also have been drawn by Silang's charisma and by pressure from his followers.

The increasing number of Diego Silang's followers must have seriously preoccupied the bishop and the Augustinians. Together they favored the organization of an army in the towns of Amianan, Ilocos Norte, to fall on the nucleus of the rebellion, located in Vigan and in the nearby towns. On Christmas Day, that army tried to enter the capital, but it was repulsed and forced to flee in disorder. The next day the insurgents ransacked the parish residence, where the arms and possessions left by the *alcalde* had been deposited; they killed six custodians. Del Vivar speaks of treachery, cowardice, of a lack of organization and of the acquiescence of the secular priests.⁴⁷ The Provisor Tomás Millán agrees on the first points, but concludes parenthetically: "It would have been better had they not come to stir up the anthill."⁴⁸ Right away there was a second attempt to contain the rebels. Del Vivar narrates that on 5 January, the loyal troops met them near Cabugao, and that the latter attracted some with friendly words to attack them later. The rest then fled in fright: "But the relations some towns had with the rebels had a great influence in this."⁴⁹

Meanwhile, Governor Anda had installed himself in Pampanga, trying to organize resistance against the British. Appointing all the mili-

tary forces at his disposal to this mission, he had no other recourse than to leave to the friars' hands the pacification of the rebel provinces. Nonetheless, in the case of Ilocos, the attributes Ustáriz assigned to himself must have displeased him: his call to the people to be recognized as the "head" had no legal basis, much less his announcement of canceling the tribute, a favor which only the king himself could grant. And so Anda did not yield to the pronouncement of Ustáriz, and on 26 December he appointed Domingo de Sanz y Arana as *alcalde mayor*. The decree of nomination and the instructions given to the new *alcalde* are included in the *Testimonio de Autos*.⁵⁰ And yet, nowhere is found the act of possession, nor is there any reference at all to his arrival in the province, something which is explained by the difficult situation the Spanish government was going through.

Diego Silang's Government

After the two frustrated military counterattacks from the north, Diego Silang was master of the situation in Vigan and the nearby towns by the second week of 1763. His populist and egalitarian messages are well known. From them many statements about the goodness of his government have been drawn. But within such a short span of time, one can hardly perceive results. No matter how sincere his intentions, that type of convulsive circumstances is always prone to chaos. Such is the panorama Bishop Ustáriz describes on 25 March: "Closed roads, commerce paralyzed, no one can earn a living nor attend to his duties, for everyone goes about confused."⁵¹ Pedro del Vivar narrates how Silang took measures to prevent the excesses of his men, whom he too found beyond his control: "He was saying that he regretted the killings and the damage his men were causing, but that he could not stop them."⁵²

As for concrete measures of government, most were directed to maintaining his power, of whose precariousness Silang must have been aware: controlling the movements of the friars and the *principales*, control of roads and coasts, construction of defenses, and the dispatch of expeditions to obtain the submission of the entire province. The latter were more successful in the south than in the north, where the operations were more to sack places.⁵³

The government depended on a network of local heads, who took the place of the *gobernadorcillos* the Spaniards had appointed. But, as in the previous system, orders were transmitted in writing through commands that passed like a chain from one town to the next, or were given

verbally by summoning the heads to Vigan when the serious nature of the case demanded it.

The influence of the Spanish system is also reflected in other administrative formalities: the diffusion of orders through public criers, meetings in the local government halls, issuance of titles of appointment to the delegated authorities and safe-conducts for travelers, collection of dues for these titles, and others. After almost two centuries of Spanish presence in Ilocos, we would not expect anything else.

It seems clear that Diego Silang counted on the *timawas'* support, even if for the friars he was always an impostor: "By force he has caused all these towns to rise up . . . assuring them that they would not pay the tribute nor perform personal services and other similar things, by which he attracts the mob."⁵⁴ According to Pedro del Vivar, the fervor with which the masses were following him was based not only on his promises, but on his pious language and ways of acting.⁵⁵

Silang's language is best expressed in three letters written between January and March 1763, one addressed to the Augustinians,⁵⁶ a second to the province,⁵⁷ and the third to the Provincial Vicar, Fray Juan Olalla.⁵⁸ The three are loaded with pious circumlocutions, which made them long and confusing. They have, besides, numerous expressions which describe him as a victim of the attacks and misunderstandings provoked by the devil. In the Testimony, but especially in del Vivar's Report, are collected many missives and orders sent to the heads, as well as other correspondence during the first months of 1763. In these, the writing is more direct and follows the Spanish bureaucratic style, although with one or other religious allusions betraying his personal inspiration.⁵⁹

Silang must have been aware that his most powerful enemies were Bishop Ustáriz and the Augustinian friars. It is clear that he took measures to control them, but when addressing himself to them, he adopted a submissive and servile tone. A letter Pedro Leonardo sent to the heads, dated 11 January, is included in the Testimony, in which in Silang's name he ordered that the friars be brought to Narvacan. Four days later, Silang himself answered the latter's indignant answers: "My reverend fathers, being just a worm dragging itself on the road or on the ground which it occupies, what power could I have to order or command the arrest and embarkation of one with full power, since he is the representative or the image of God on earth?"⁶⁰

Alliance with the British

Until March 1763, Diego Silang's messages proclaimed his loyalty to the Spanish king, repeatedly calling the British the enemies. On 31 March, however, he sent them an extensive letter reporting what had been happening in the province since December, the *alcalde's* evil ways in failing to implement the royal *cedulas* regarding proper treatment of the natives, Simón de Anda's denunciatory edicts and Bishop Ustáriz's threats. He added that he was placing himself under the service and protection of George III, while requesting arms and forces to defend the province, and sending a list of gifts he was sending and the commodities which the province offered for trade.⁶¹

The suddenness of this change in Silang's policy is hard to explain. Routledge attributes it to the need for help after the failure to maintain an understanding with the friars, and later considers it as the best choice for the interests of the Ilocanos.⁶² I understand it differently, considering it risky to try to evaluate what was good or bad for the Ilocanos.

It was clear that Bishop Ustáriz and the Augustinians were continually exerting greater pressure on Silang, and the bishop's letter of 25 March threatening the rebel heads with denial of the sacraments must have infuriated him.⁶³ In my opinion, however, the total change, which Silang's letter (31 March) to the British implies, was due not just to anger at the bishop's letter. Before he received it, there had been a transcendental change in his government, namely, the appointment of a personal council, which del Vivar dates on 22 March. Its seven members bear the title "Don," a sign that they were *principales*. This means a total defection by one who had titled himself "chief head elected by all the native *timawas*."

We find as members of this council the names of Don Martín Crispín, Don Juan Salazar, Don Julián Miranda, the counselor. As indicated above, the relations of these three with Orendain dated years back. Now that the latter had become the principal collaborator of the British in Manila, everything points to him as the key character of a plot which sought to place the province of Ilocos at the feet of the British. Furthermore, in the trial Anda initiated, it was proven that Orendain composed in his own handwriting the drafts of the letters the British sent to Diego Silang.⁶⁴ The reason for his waiting till now to move in Ilocos may have some relation with the dynamism itself of the events in the province, as well as with the different viewpoints and even rivalries going on in the

British camp. It certainly was not by accident that this maneuver coincided with the departure of Gen. William Draper and Vice-Admiral Samuel Cornish, leaving alone as governor, Dawsonne Drake, who was the one who kept very close ties with Orendain.⁶⁵

In answer to Silang's letter of 31 March, the British dispatched the boat *Seaford*. Pedro del Vivar speaks of a "splendid banquet Silang served them, during which the British were fully suspicious about him and he about them." There was an exchange of gifts, letters, titles, but they parted immediately with promises of trade and military aid, which never materialized.⁶⁶ Tracy also refers to the controversy, which broke out on the British side, regarding the dispatch of that expedition when Anda's pressure discouraged the separation of forces.⁶⁷

The letters brought by *Seaford* were dated, 5, 6, 8, and 9 May and, as has been said, their drafts had come from Orendain's office. In them are indicated the titles of "Field Marshal" and "Deputy Chief Justice" granted to Silang, besides other blank titles for the local constables. In that of the 6th, they requested that Silang convince the people of Pangasinan and Cagayan to place themselves under British protection. That of the 8th indicated that all the Augustinian friars should be sent to Manila, with the guarantee of substituting them with secular priests. All letters praised free trade and urged Silang to promote it. Various reasons were given for declining the dispatch of military forces.⁶⁸

In the documents attributed to Silang until 31 March, there are discrepancies between the individual ones and the official ones, but there is a certain correlation. The letters and dispatches in April and May follow exactly the Spanish bureaucratic style, are written in a more refined language, and omit all religious allusions. The matter of trade, which was present in the complaints of 14 December, does not appear in the next three months, but takes first place in the correspondence with the British. Pedro del Vivar points to another very significant difference when referring to the letter of 31 March: "It was Diego Silang's first letter in Spanish, the preceding ones were all in Ilocano."⁶⁹ Routledge attributes this double message to intelligent political opportunism.⁷⁰ I suspect that the council appointed on 22 March was using Silang's name rather than following his directives.

But there is a surprising turn in these developments. In obedience to the British demand to remove the Augustinian friars, Silang sent a letter on 14 May to the Provincial, Fray Juan Olalla, ordering that six friars be sent to Vigan. The superior's angry protest led to a new order arranging for their immediate release. For this reason, Silang sent a letter to

the imprisoned friars, in which we find again a trace of the piety of the early Silang. The difference in style and message between this and the previous letter, or all the others sent to the British, is once again absolute, but the most surprising thing is that he keeps referring to the British as "the enemies of our holy faith."⁷¹

The chapter in which Pedro del Vivar recounts the appointments of 22 March is entitled "Silang Appoints a Scribe, an Adviser, and Interpreters, and the Natives Begin to See their Error in Following Them."⁷² It is not surprising that both events are related. The Silang who was signing the proclamations toward the end of March was not the same Silang who had inflamed the multitudes.

Christian Piety and Pagan Ritualism in the Uprising

Silang's religiosity and his language are displayed in his manner of acting, which del Vivar illustrates with several examples: "At home he kept several images, with many candles continually lit. Before them, he used to recite the rosary frequently and ordered it recited by all his commissioners in the towns through which they were going to pass." He named an image of Jesus of Nazareth a "general." He banned card games and playing dice; and issued instructions to avoid drunkenness and concubinage, among others. Later del Vivar describes Silang as "timid and compassionate," and ends up admitting that "at his direct orders no one was killed."⁷³ This religiosity extended to Silang's followers, who demanded the sacraments and wanted to assist at the Holy Eucharist, even when they went to attack the parish house of Vigan on 26 December.

Together with this Catholic piety there was pagan ritualism. Pedro del Vivar refers to Benito Estrada, Silang's brother-in-law, as its outstanding practitioner, who ate the heart of one of the Spaniards killed that same 26 December. In another incident, Estrada celebrated their triumph by drinking wine in the place where they had thrown the heads of their enemies.⁷⁴

We cannot say whether those who had assisted at the Holy Eucharist in the morning were the same as those who in the afternoon ate a human heart with Estrada. Without going to such extremes, the practice of *anito* worship formed part of the insurgents' celebrations, as well as those of the faithful who had answered the friars' summons against the uprising: "On entering the towns, they were received with *anito* sacrifices, which they used to hold on such occasions when they were pagans." Del Vivar, who preserves this notice, adds: "This saddened some

of the priests, but keep in mind that today the indios have the same, except if not more anitos than in their pagan days."⁷⁵

I am not joining the debate on whether it was a question of religious syncretism or superposition of pagan and Christian elements. Clearly, this phenomenon is so frequent in certain sectors of Philippine Catholicism, at times even today; in moments of popular exaltation, like those characterized by the rebellion, it may take an intense form.

Before leaving this point, we must take note of the trial held by the local authorities of Laoag against Antonio de la Cruz, known as Butarga, and his son, Miguel de la Cruz, both natives of Paoay. Both were accused of being Silang's letter carriers. The records of the trial, which took place between 30 December 1762 and 3 January 1763, show us the interesting symbolic elements that the insurgents used.

On his detention, Miguel de la Cruz had "a belt with three knots... untying them, they found inside some hairs and three roots." They also found in him "a fruit they call 'cat's eye,' a piece of ginger, some wax stuck to a piece of paper, some leaves, and a dry areca leaf." All of these were considered as "quite against our holy Catholic faith." On his father's lapel was a white cross, considered the distinctive mark of Silang's followers.

Even without any Spanish official intervening, Antonio and Miguel de la Cruz were pronounced guilty, executed and quartered. The documents on this incident occupy 22 sheets in the *Testimonio de Autos*.⁷⁶

Silang's Assassination

If not everything in Silang's relations with the British is known, his death is also much more obscure than what the known popular version tells us.

Again, the original source of that version is Pedro del Vivar, who describes Silang's assassination as the idea of Don Miguel Vicos, former collaborator in the revolt, and of Pedro Becbec. Both acted in agreement with Bishop Ustáriz, who blessed them in the morning of 28 May, before they carried out the plan. On returning, they thanked God with a *Te Deum*. Still, some later details, less well-known, uncover participation not limited to the two protagonists. "With Silang dead, all the Ilocanos soon showed their satisfaction over it, especially those who had gone with Vicos and Becbec."⁷⁷

In the first letter to Simón de Anda after the events, the bishop justifies his involvement in Silang's death because of the existence of a supposed plot to murder all the friars. He speaks of Becbec's aptness, "for

the big following he had in the province," and reported that he had distributed Silang's arms "among the towns who joined the deed, which are Santa Catalina, Vigan, Bantay, and San Vicente."⁷⁸ Surprisingly, these were the towns that massed in Silang's favor in the first days of the uprising.

For the moment, Ustáriz appointed Tomás Millán as alcalde, Don Pedro Becbec as the chief magistrate, and announced a general pardon and cancellation of the tribute "until the restoration of Manila, or until your lordship [Anda] orders something else." He distributed the arms, as mentioned, and left the province, considering it had already been pacified.⁷⁹ On 12 June, Anda observed he had been contaminated with the bishop's optimism and approved everything the latter did. That same day he dispatched a letter of gratitude to Becbec and the towns listed as participants in Silang's death.⁸⁰

Why did the same towns that had supported Silang cooperate in his assassination? Later, this matter will be a bit more complicated, but now it is good to indicate that, with this death, some were clearly prejudiced: Orendain's men who had formed Silang's council in March. Of these, we have information only about the scribe, Cristobal de Sales, who was imprisoned.⁸¹ In the uprising that followed, none of them appears and the ties with the British are not mentioned again.

Second Uprising and Its Suppression by the Northern Towns

With the disappearance from the stage of the party we could call pro-British, or "Orendainist," the uprising took on again the characteristics of that of the first months. Pedro del Vivar points to Nicolás Cariño as the principal leader, and Gabriela as the principal instigator of the new uprising. He does not describe Gabriela on horseback and with the ferocity of the Makati statue—I do not know what could have been the source of that iconography—but as a woman going from house to house secretly organizing nightly vigils, during which alcoholic drinks were imbibed, something which brings her close to traditional pagan ritualism.⁸² Del Vivar describes Nicolás Cariño with respect: "an old man, representing with dignity his profession." Like Silang, Cariño sprinkled his letters with religious allusions, proclaimed his loyalty to *Both Majesties*, and strove to be in control of the situation.⁸³ He was less successful in this last point than Silang.

On 23 June, now from Pangasinan, Bishop Ustáriz reported having received disquieting news from new meetings.⁸⁴ On the feast of St. John, a mob entered the town of Santa Catalina in search of Pedro Becbec.

They razed everything they found on their way, including the church. The friars' correspondence emphasizes that "the outrages and suffering in those days could not compare with those of the first uprising."⁸⁵

It is surprising that the four towns that had cooperated in killing Silang were the ones involved in the new uprising: Vigan, Bantay, Santa Catalina, and San Vicente. Thanks to this participation, as mentioned, Bishop Ustáriz had given them the arms obtained from the dead leader. Later, they would also be the most penalized.

The action that ended the Ilocano uprising occurred in July, and was again carried out by forces coming from the town of Amianan. Around the 12th, an armed skirmish occurred between the towns of Sinait and Cabugao, which scattered the rebels. Immediately after, an army of between eight and nine thousand men the Augustinians had recruited fell on Vigan. Actually, after the military debacle of January, the friars entrusted the organization and direction of that new expedition to the principales, but there are a multitude of details that tell of the friars' direct hand. In the letter, for example, which the captains sent from Vigan to Anda one reads: "We burnt all the *visitas* of the capital that they might resettle within hearing of the bells, although as we see and because of the little esteem they have for the secular priests, it will not take place. Above all, sir, we again beg Your Lordship to send a head to govern us, for his flock pay no attention to the Lord Provisor."⁸⁶

Nevertheless, some friars, among them Pedro del Vivar, criticized what they described as tepidity in its suppression. "Since the city of Vigan is a rotten apple, which no diligence will succeed in curing, except to destroy it by taking out the seeds to plant them anew, the people of Amianan were wrong in not carrying out what they planned: to finish off in blood and fire this whole mob. However the Fathers were at fault in this, since to them the least justice seemed cruelty."⁸⁷

For their part, one of those Fathers there accused of sentimentality, wrote to Anda describing this frightful picture of what had happened:

As soon as they arrived at the town of Bantay, these commanders and their troops intimated to the Provisor that he tell the inhabitants of the barrios to take refuge in the sanctuary of the parish church of this city without arms, if they wanted to save their lives; for they resolved to put the barrios to blood and fire . . . And while in those parish churches, these troops went through those barrios burning houses, sheds, and taking out animals or furniture and other substantial things. As many men as they found, they left without life, since these were unarmed. More to be regretted is that the refugees, both those contaminated with this rebellion as well as the innocent, took out of the church,

notwithstanding the pleas of my Provisor here and of the other priests, and killed them outside the church patio . . . In the end, sir, all who voluntarily redeemed themselves by wanting to put themselves under the protection of the royal banner of our Catholic Majesty, regretting their error, they put to death, so that they executed them as if they were killing fierce animals.⁸⁸

Many fled the reprisals by seeking refuge in the mountains, in the island of Pingit near Vigan, or in Abra. Among them was Gabriela Estrada, Silang's widow.

Thinking they could take charge of the situation with the forces of Amianan, and judging that the arrival of troops from outside would only worsen even more the scarcity of food in the province, the friars had advised Anda not to send them. Nonetheless, on 23 August, they went through difficult moments when a party tried to penetrate Abra, in pursuit of the rebels hiding there. The battle that followed in sitio Banaoang counted 35 dead among the loyal troops.⁸⁹

Finally, on 20 September, Captain Manuel de Arza arrived in Vigan by sea. With men from Cagayan, he proceeded to apprehend the escapees. Pedro del Vivar sums it up by saying that he set up gallows and executed Gabriela Estrada with more than 90 accused.⁹⁰

Some Conclusions

If anything remains clear, it is that the Ilocos uprising was extremely complicated and cannot be reduced to a simple confrontation between two sides, Spanish and Filipino, as some nationalist interpretations claim. That type of confrontation took place in the first moments of the conquest, but not after almost two centuries of Spanish rule and Christianization, as was the case with Ilocos in 1762. At that time, Ilocano society was a complex world impregnated with Western and Christian elements, in which different interests existed side by side, more or less molded into the Spanish order. The least Hispanized and the poorest residents of new towns and villages around Vigan constituted the central nucleus of the rebel group. Other *timawas* of the province gathered together around them, but these distanced themselves once they saw that the movement was going against their more immediate interests. On the other hand, with the *alcalde mayor* and his little coterie of Spaniards of the province gone, the insurgents' ire centered much more on the *principales* than on the friars, who in the end represented much more the established power.

For the Spanish regime, the Ilocos uprising was briefer and less dangerous than the contemporary one in Pangasinan. Still, Diego Silang's leadership is more interesting than that of the leaders of that other province. In reality, Silang is neither unique nor novel, but more than anyone else, he embodies the prototype of the Filipino leader in those centuries: a middle-aged man who counts on an extensive following or relatives; educated under the friars, he is imbued with their pious tendencies and at the same time backed by a cohort of old men and women connected to atavistic ancestral cults. That symbiosis of Christianity and paganism around his person can be one reason why the people identified themselves with him. It does not suffice to explain, however, the tremendous magnetism he exercised over the multitudes. Like other leaders before and after him, Diego Silang personified something of magic, which gave him a messianic character.

That Diego Silang was a leader is evident. His status as a hero, however, can be more open to discussion. The first is a title conferred by the acclamation of the masses at a given moment, while the character of a hero is usually conferred by historians and politicians afterwards, who often attribute qualities more in keeping with their own desires than with reality. If we agree to grant the title of hero upon the demand of the masses and the populist language, we would have to give it also to some more recent figures in Philippine history that clearly do not deserve it.

I have tried to show, in these pages, that new things can still be said about Diego Silang's revolt. I intended to reopen an issue, not to say the last word. The sources contain many details and the possibility of new hypotheses and interpretations.

Notes

1. Pedro del Vivar, O. S. A., "Relación de los alzamientos de la ciudad de Vigan, cabecera de la provincia de Ilocos, en los años 1762 y 1763," (1764). In Juan de Medina, *Historia de los Sucesos de la Orden de San Agustín* (Manila, 1893), Annex.

2. Pedro del Vivar, § 320. (Numbers refer to the author's paragraphs.)

3. These accusations, found in Archivo General de Indias (abbreviated as AGI), *Filipinas*, leg. 609: "Testimonio del Expediente sobre la alteración del común del pueblo de Binalatongan," are repeated in the trial about the Pangasinan uprising. This is not the place to detail this other uprising, but in my opinion such accusations did not have a sufficient basis in fact.

4. Archivo de la Provincia Agustiniana de Filipinas, leg. 188.

5. Joaquin Martínez de Zúñiga, O. S. A., *Historia de las Islas Filipinas* (Sampaloc, 1803), 653-62.

6. José Montero y Vidal, *Historia General de Filipinas* (Madrid, 1887–94), II, 83–111.
7. Isabelo de los Reyes, *Historia de Ilocos* (Manila, 1890), II, 173–83.
8. *Testimonio sobre la conspiración y alzamiento de algunos pueblos de la provincia de Ilocos inducidas por Diego Silang*: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605. Another copy is in leg. 481.
9. David Routledge, *Diego Silang and the Origins of Philippine Nationalism* (Quezon City: Philippine Center for Advanced Studies, University of the Philippines System, 1979).
10. Emma H. Blair and James A. Robertson, *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898* (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark, 1903–09), vol. 49.
11. See Blair and Robertson, *op. cit.*; Serafin Quiason, “The British Manila Council and Don Diego Silang,” *The Ilocos Review* 1 (1969), 95–105; Nicholas Tracy, *Manila Ransomed: The British Assault on Manila in the Seven Years War* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1995).
12. Through the kindness of Dámaso Q. King, local historian of Vigan, I have copies of some inscriptions, among which are those cited in the notes below.
13. Frederick Scharpf, “Memorable Days for Vigan,” *The Ilocos Review* 17 (1995), 92–108.
14. AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 160: *Testimonio de las diligencias de descubrimiento de bienes de don Francisco Cedrón. Año 1757*, ff. 220; leg. 606: *Testimonio del crimen de infidencia perpetrado por el doctor don Santiago Orendain. Año 1764*, ff. 121.
15. Jack A. Goldstone, *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).
16. Pedro del Vivar, § 3.
17. Pedro del Vivar, § 4, 202, 213.
18. Pedro del Vivar, § 3.
19. See note 14 above.
20. On Santiago Orendain, see Fernando Palanco, “Santiago Orendain: Semblanza de un criollo Filipino.” In Ma. Dolores Elizalde, Josep M. Fradera, and Luis Alonso Alvarez (eds.), *Imperios y naciones en el Pacífico. Vol. I La formación de una colonia: Filipinas* (Madrid: CSIC-AEEP, 2001) 367–79.
21. Pedro del Vivar, § 29.
22. On this matter, see José Cosano Moyano, *Filipinas y su Real Hacienda* (Córdoba: Publicaciones del Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Córdoba, 1986), 198–99.
23. See Nicholas Tracy, *Manila Ransomed*, 15.
24. “Bando británico dado al borde del Norfolk a 24 de Septiembre de 1762”: AGI *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 70–71.
25. AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 606, ff. 19v–27r.
26. Pedro del Vivar, § 29, 30.
27. Pedro del Vivar, § 28, 29.
28. Archives of the Archdiocese of Vigan, *Libros de Entierros*, see note 12.
29. Pedro del Vivar, § 28, 29, 31, 32, 56, 111.
30. Pedro del Vivar, § 70.
31. Pedro del Vivar, § 28.
32. Pedro del Vivar, § 33, 94, 95, 96.
33. Pedro del Vivar, § 38, 70, 84, 95, 118, 119.
34. “Doña Gabriela de Estrada, widow of Diego Silang, native of this city of the

- barangay of Endaya": Archdiocesan Archives of Vigan, *Libro de Entierros* (see note 12). Frederick Scharpf also cites this inscription in "Memorable Days for Vigan," 105.
35. Pedro del Vivar, § 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 31.
36. Pedro del Vivar, § 16.
37. Antonio Zabala letter to Simón de Anda, Santa Cruz, 5 December 1762: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 215-16.
38. Fray Juan Olalla's letter to Simón de Anda, Magsingal, 14 December 1762: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 4-5.
39. Bishop Ustáriz letter to Anda y Salazar, Bantay, 15 December 1762: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 3.
40. Tomás Millán report, 16 January 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 16v-20.
41. Antonio Zabala's letter to Simón de Anda y Salazar, Santa María, 20 December 1762: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 202-205.
42. Bishop Ustáriz's letter to Simón de Anda, Bantay, 18 December 1762: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 3v-4.
43. *Mandamiento del Obispo Ustáriz a los pueblos de Amianan*. Paoay, 27 December 1762: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 104v-150v. This command is included also in Pedro del Vivar's Report, § 38.
44. Pedro del Vivar, § 38.
45. Pedro del Vivar, § 72.
46. Bishop Ustáriz's letter to Anda, Bantay, 18 December 1762: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 3v-4.
47. Pedro del Vivar, § 45-54.
48. Tomás Millán's report, 16 January 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 16v-20.
49. Pedro del Vivar, § 58-64.
50. "Instrucciones dadas por Simón de Anda para el nuevo alcalde de Ilocos, Domingo de Sanz y Arana," followed by the decree of nomination, dated at Mexico, Pampanga, 15 December 1762: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 205v-210.
51. Bishop Ustáriz's letter to Diego Silang, Santa Catalina, 25 March 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 150v-153.
52. Pedro del Vivar, § 72-77, 96.
53. Pedro del Vivar, § 65-70, 78-83.
54. Fray Francisco A. Maldonado's letter to Simón de Anda, Candón, 5 January 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 14v-16.
55. Pedro del Vivar, § 97.
56. Diego Silang's letter to Fray Matías Echevarría, Fray Nicolás Tardés, Fray Francisco Maldonado, and Fray Andrés Carro, Vigan, 15 January 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 22-24.
57. Diego Silang's letter to the province, Vigan, 14 February 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 58v-61.
58. Pedro del Vivar, § 118. This letter carries no date, but it corresponds to March 1763.
59. Pedro del Vivar, § 38, 88, 95, 103, 105, 106, 107, 116, 119, 121, 124, 127, 130.
60. See note 56 above.
61. Diego Silang's letter to the British, Vigan, 31 March 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 289v-294.

PHILIPPINE STUDIES

62. Routledge, *Diego Silang and the Origins of the Philippine Revolution*, 29, 81.
63. Bishop Ustáriz's letter to Diego Silang, Santa Catalina, 25 March 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 150v-153.
64. See note 25 above.
65. Tracy, *Manila Ransomed*, 97-98.
66. Pedro del Vivar, § 14-148.
67. Tracy, *Manila Ransomed*, 87-88.
68. Letters from the British to Diego Silang, Manila, 5, 6, 8, May 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 53v-57v; 68-70; 72-74.
69. Pedro del Vivar, § 142-43.
70. Routledge, *Diego Silang*, 83.
71. Pedro del Vivar, § 161.
72. Pedro del Vivar, § 142-48.
73. Pedro del Vivar, § 94-96.
74. Pedro del Vivar, § 54, 74.
75. Pedro del Vivar, § 300.
76. Charges against Antonio and Miguel de la Cruz, Laoag, 30 December 1762 to 3 January 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 101v-123.
77. Pedro del Vivar, § 185-94.
78. Bishop Ustáriz's letter to Anda, Bacnotan, June 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 74v-76v.
79. *Ibid.*
80. Congratulatory letters Anda dispatched to the towns of Vigan, Bantay, Santa Catalina, and San Vicente, Bacolor, 12 June 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 77v-82.
81. Pedro del Vivar, § 197.
82. Pedro del Vivar, § 212, 227.
83. Pedro del Vivar, § 212, 213, 223., 225, 227.
84. Bishop Ustáriz's letter to Anda, San Fabián, 23 June 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 134v-136.
85. Fray Manuel Muñoz's letter to Anda, Magsingal, 18 July 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 169v-174. This includes letters from the priests in Narvacan and Namacpacan.
86. The captains' letter to Anda, Bantay, 16 July 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 230-34.
87. Pedro del Vivar, § 271.
88. Bachiller Agustín de la Encarnación's letter to Anda, Vigan, 1 August 1763: AGI, *Filipinas*, leg. 605, ff. 268v-270.
89. All of these are listed in the *Libro de Entierros* of Vigan. See Frederick Scharpf, *Memorable Days for Vigan*, 101-103.
90. Pedro del Vivar, § 299. See also *Libro de Entierros*, cited in Scharpf, *Memorable Days*, 103-106.

References

- Blair, Emma H. and James A. Robertson. 1903-1909. *The Philippine islands, 1493-1898*. Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark. Volume 49.
- Cosano Moyano, Jose. 1986. *Filipinas y su real hacienda*. Córdoba: Publicaciones del Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Córdoba.

- De los Reyes, Isabelo. 1890. *Historia de Ilocos*. Manila.
- Del Vivar, Pedro, O.S.A. 1893. Relación de los alzamientos de la ciudad de Vigan, cabecera de la provincia de Ilocos, en los años 1762 y 1763. In *Historia de los sucesos de la orden de San Agustín*, by Juan de Medina. Manila. Annex.
- Goldstone, Jack A. 1991. *Revolution and rebellion in the early modern world*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Martinez de Zuñiga, Joaquin, O.S.A. 1803. *Historia de las Islas Filipinas*. Sampaloc.
- Montero y Vidal, Jose. 1887-94. *Historia general de Filipinas*. Madrid.
- Palanco, Fernando. 2001. Santiago Orendain: Semblanza de un criollo filipino. In *Imperios y naciones en el Pacífico*. Vol. I: *La formación de una colonia: Filipinas*. Edited by Ma. Dolores Elizalde, Josep M. Fradera, and Luis Alonso Alvarez. Madrid: CSIC-AEEP.
- Quiason, Serafin. 1969. The British Manila Council and Don Diego Silang. *The Ilocos Review*, 1:95-105.
- Routledge, David. 1979. *Diego Silang and the origins of Philippine nationalism*. Quezon City: Philippine Center for Advanced Studies, University of the Philippines System.
- Scharpf, Frederick. 1995. Memorable days for Vigan. *The Ilocos Review* 17:92-108.
- Tracy, Nicholas. 1995. *Manila ransomed: The British assault on Manila in the seven years war*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.