

# philippine studies

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

---

## **The Archeological Record of Chinese Influences in the Philippines**

Robert Fox

*Philippine Studies* vol. 15, no. 1 (1967): 41–62

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](mailto:philstudies@admu.edu.ph).

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

# The Archeological Record of Chinese Influences in the Philippines

---

ROBERT B. FOX

**I**NFLUENCES from China loom large in the culture history of the Philippines. During the Neolithic period people from south China and Indo-China sailed either directly into the Philippines (Beyer 1948b) or around the southern margins of the China Sea basin bringing new stone-tool traditions and agricultural practices. Striking similarities may also be seen between the earlier flake-tool assemblages now being recovered in Tabon Cave, Palawan (Fox 1963), and China (Chang 1958), and the writer believes that future research in paleolithic sites in these two areas will disclose common tool traditions which date back to Pleistocene times. Early cultural developments in China, as Chang has pointed out (1962), have had a great impact either directly or indirectly upon the peoples of Southeast Asia. This view is strongly supported by current archeological research in the Philippines.

Contacts between China and the Philippines were greatly intensified during the proto-historic period, beginning probably in the 10th century A.D. During this period tens of thousands of pieces of trade pottery as well as other products made in China reached the Archipelago. It was primarily during the proto-historic period and in the subsequent Spanish period that the Chinese influences occurred which have become a

widely recognized feature of the contemporary social and economic life of the Filipino people.

This paper will attempt to assess briefly the evidences of Chinese contact and influences which occurred during the proto-historic period and which are revealed by the archeological record. As pottery formed probably the major item of trade brought by the Chinese into the Islands—pottery which has survived in the graves and habitation sites of the early Filipinos—primary emphasis will be given to the discussion of Chinese-Philippine relationships which the story of the trade potteries provides.

Only brief mention will be made of Chinese sources, with which the writer has only secondary and casual familiarity. Moreover, for the writer at least, available Chinese references to the Philippines prior to Spanish contact are both brief and allusive, presenting relatively little ethnographic data of value to the culture historian. The study of ancient Chinese-Philippine relationships may still be described as exploratory, both from the standpoint of systematic archeology and from that of the search for references to the Philippines in Chinese written sources. In the past only a few scholars competent in Chinese history have had an equal competence and interest in Philippine and Chinese ethnology and archeology (Wu Ching-hong 1959:158).

Although the archeological record is highly incomplete because of the perishable quality of most materials, it is still not unlikely that current and future excavations in the Islands will provide the major source of information about Chinese influences in the Philippines, even during the period covered by Chinese written sources. The first possible reference to the Philippines in Chinese sources is 982 A.D., and the first "detailed" account which may be treated with confidence is that of Chau-Ju-Kua, 1225 A.D., who lived in Chinkiang, Fukien Province, during the Southern Sung Dynasty (Wu Ching-hong 1959:75-111). Scholars agree that there are no reliable references to the Philippines in the Chinese sources which date prior to the Sung Dynasty.

The archeological record provides a far more detailed relation despite the very limited number of systematic excavations of proto-historic sites that have been made in the Islands. Jars from China in the collection of Dr. Arturo de Santos are possibly pre-T'ang, 6th century or earlier. According to Beyer (1947), moreover, late T'ang pottery had been recovered in Philippine sites, pointing to the beginning of trade between the Islands and south China at that time, although there is little evidence of extensive trade between China and the Philippines until late Sung times. A Northern Sung coin was excavated in a Filipino grave at Calatagan, Batangas, by the National Museum which has been dated by Dr. Max Loehr of Harvard University as "Hsüan-ho" (1119-1125 A.D.). Mr. Legaspi of the National Museum has recently recovered numerous Sung coins from Bolinao, Pangasinan, dating from the 10th to the 12th century, the earliest being 906 A.D.. Similar coins of Sung date are found in the de Santos and Locsin collections.

The term Chinese as employed herein will refer to the people and influences from *south* China, for it is from this area—south of the Huang-ho or Yellow River—that tools and ideas spread into the Philippines.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the trade between China and the Philippines during most of the proto-historic period originated probably entirely with ports in south China. The historical affinities between south China, the Philippines, and the area usually referred to as Southeast Asia are so close, Chang (1962:1) believes. that:

In culture history, South China was definitely a part of Southeast Asia throughout the various prehistoric and historic periods until after the Han Dynasty, when the islands and the peninsula, except off its northern fringes, first came under Indian and then under European influences.

Thus, the history of Philippine and Chinese relations provides a challenging and fruitful field for many generations of

---

<sup>1</sup> This does not ignore the fact that the origins of the civilizations in south China lay in north China, pointing out only that influences were mediated through south China, which had closer racial, cultural, and geographical ties with the Philippines and Southeast Asia generally than north China.

future scholars. And systematic archeology will unquestionably play the major role in further studies of Chinese-Philippines relations.

#### PROTO-HISTORIC SITES AND COLLECTIONS

##### *Research prior to 1945*

Archeological research in the Philippines prior to World War II which is pertinent to the study of Chinese influences in the Islands was accomplished largely by one man—the late Professor H. Otley Beyer. His detailed data on this subject, however, remain in manuscript form: *The Philippines before Magellan* (1921) and *Chinese, Siamese, and other Oriental ceramic wares in the Philippine Islands* (1930).<sup>2</sup> A brief outline of his views on the early patterns of Chinese trade is presented in his *Early history of Philippine relations with foreign countries, especially China* (1948a).

Professor Beyer's familiarity with the types of Chinese and other Asian potteries which reached the Philippines and Southeast Asia during the proto-historic period was probably unrivaled, and in his *Outline review of Philippine archaeology by islands and provinces* (1947), he has briefly dated and discussed all archeological sites in the Islands, including those which contain Chinese trade wares and other artifacts which were known to him at the time of the publication of his study. An analysis of the distribution and age of sites in the Islands which contain Chinese materials as set forth in Beyer's study and including more recent surveys made by the staff of the National Museum provides considerable data as to (a) the period when Chinese contacts first occurred; (b) the relative intensity of the trade from T'ang to early Ming times; and (c) the focal points of contact and influences as based upon the number of sites in a specific area. Beyer also lists a few non-ceramic artifacts of Chinese origin, such as coins and bronze objects, but these were either not common or missed, in contrast to the sizable number of metal objects being recovered

<sup>2</sup> Portions of Beyer's *The Philippines before Magellan* were published in *Asia Magazine*, October and November, 1921.

in post-war sites.<sup>3</sup> This paper draws heavily upon Beyer's few published materials and upon many conversations with him.

Professor Beyer also gathered and purchased a large collection of whole pieces of Chinese pottery, approximately 3,000 in all, including many superb and rare pieces: large Lungch'uan celadon plates, Temoko bowls, spotted *tobi seiji* wares of the Sung period, very early blue-and-white pieces now known to be of Sung date, and others (Robb 1930). His sherd collection of Chinese pottery numbers in the hundreds of thousands, and whether whole or fragmentary each vessel provides some data on Chinese-Philippine contacts.

The second largest pre-war collection was made by E. D. Hester with the cooperation of Professor Beyer and including Siamese and Annamese wares though largely Chinese, numbered 855 pieces in all. This collection is now found in the Chicago Field Museum and at the University of Michigan, fortunately escaping the destruction of World War II. Professor Kamer Aga-Oglu of the University of Michigan has worked extensively with the Hester collection, as well as the earlier collection of Dr. Carl Guthe who surveyed and excavated many cave sites throughout the Philippines from 1922 to 1925.<sup>4</sup> Professor Aga-Oglu's studies of the Chinese potteries reaching the Archipelago have greatly extended our knowledge of their age and provenance (Aga-Oglu 1946, 1948, 1950, 1951, 1955, and 1961). Beyer (1947) notes many other porcelain collections in the Philippines prior to World War II, including those of Babcock, Cadwallader, Day, Spencer, Pardo de Tavera, and others. Most of these collections were destroyed or scattered during World War II, as was the collection of the National Museum; but in all the pre-war collections from China must have numbered several thousands of pieces.

<sup>3</sup> A major portion of Beyer's collection of Chinese pottery was made by local collectors and friends, not from systematic excavations by him (Beyer 1947:281-91). It is the writer's experience that when porcelains are sought and purchased, other artifacts in the grave will be either ignored or handled carelessly and lost.

<sup>4</sup> The records of the Guthe Expedition have not been published, though Beyer has briefly discussed some of the sites (Beyer 1947).

*Excavations by the National Museum: 1958 to present*

In the past nine years, four extensive excavations have been carried out by the National Museum under the writer's direction which are pertinent to the study of Chinese contacts with the Philippines, and many new sites with trade wares have been recorded and surveyed including some preliminary excavations in selected sites. These excavations represent the first intensive and systematic work by trained archeologists in Philippine sites containing trade pottery and provide many new data as well as the means for evaluating previous researches.

The most extensive of these excavations were those undertaken at Calatagan, Batangas (Fox 1959), where from May 1958 through June 1961, more than 1,300 Tagalog graves—all pre-Spanish and late 14th to the early 16th century in date—were excavated in eleven different burial sites. As the writer has noted elsewhere (Fox 1962): "Rarely in the history of Asian archeology has such a series of closely related burial sites produced the quantity of cultural materials as Calatagan, in particular the great number of trade potteries and porcelain from South China, Siam, and Annam."

In the 1,300 graves excavated by the Museum, some 1,135 pieces of trade pottery were recovered of which approximately 80 per cent are Chinese. During 1960-61, at least 20 other burial sites on the Calatagan Peninsula were looted by local laborers and the porcelains sold to private collectors in Manila. A very cautious estimate would be that at least 3,000 additional pieces of trade pottery, also largely Chinese, were obtained by the looters. Thus, including pieces excavated by the Museum, more than 4,000 Chinese, Siamese, and Annamese vessels were obtained from Calatagan Peninsula alone, evidence of a major trade during early Ming times. The Museum collection is of particular importance, for each individual grave was carefully excavated, drawn, photographed, mapped, and each artifact in a grave labeled. Thus the association of all trade pottery and other grave artifacts is known, providing quantitative data on their relative ages.

A second extensive excavation was made during 1959 at Butong, San Luis, Batangas, supported by the Manila Times Publishing Corporation. Some 70 graves there, also 14th to the early 16th century, yielded 89 pieces of Chinese, Siamese, and Annamese pottery. The excavations in Butong, particularly in giving data control over a larger area, re-affirmed generally the findings at Calatagan.

In 1960-61 during a six-months period supported by Don Andres Soriano, two sites were excavated on Hacienda Ramon, Porac, Pampanga; one, Gubat, dating from late T'ang through the Yüan Dynasty, and the other, Balukbuk, from late Sung through early Ming times (Evangalista 1960). Although very few whole pieces of trade pottery were recovered (the grave areas of both sites were systematically looted before the war, despite Beyer's [1947:226-27] statements, by means of probing the soft earth with metal rods), a considerable quantity of non-ceramic materials associated with thousands of datable sherds of Chinese pottery were recovered, including a stratified midden ranging in date from late Sung to early Ming times, that add to our knowledge of an earlier phase of Chinese contact. A blue-and-white sherd of Sung date was found in the Porac site.

Systematic excavations during 1961 were also carried out by Evangalista (1961) in Pilapil Cave, Marinduque Island, providing an extensive association of Sung and Yüan sherds with local artifacts. During 1960 brief excavations were also made by Evangalista in caves elsewhere in Marinduque Island and Banton Island which yielded 14th and 15th century pottery from China and Siam.

The staff of the Division of Anthropology, National Museum, which consisted of only two persons in 1947, now numbers six trained archeologists and anthropologists in addition to laboratory assistants. Extensive excavations are now being carried out on Palawan Island (Fox 1962, 1963), and some early sites with trade pottery—all pre-Ming—have been located on the west coast of the island. Mr. Avelino Legaspi has been excavating a site in Bolinao, Pangasinan, which dates from the 13th and 14th centuries A.D. Extensive excavations,



supported by the First Lady, Mrs. Imelda R. Marcos, are now being carried out by the National Museum in the Church yard and along Old Lamayan Road, Santa Ana, Manila. The sites contain large quantities of late Sung pottery. The near future should see the recovery of much new data on Chinese influences in the Philippines, specifically from sites associated with Sung or still earlier trade potteries. An international symposium on Asian trade potteries is planned to be held in Manila during 1968.

*Private collections: 1958 to present*

During the past few years, private collectors in the Philippines have assembled collections of potteries from China, Siam, and Annam which both in quality and quantity eclipse all pre-war efforts. One such collection, that of Dr. Arturo de Santos, is perhaps the finest in the world of the types of pottery which reached the Philippines and Southeast Asia generally during the proto-historic period. Another equally superb collection is that of Mr. and Mrs. Leandro Locsin. These are only two of many new collections which date from 1958—that year marking the beginning of the Calatagan excavations, which stimulated great local interest in the trade potteries from Asia. As these new collections are unknown abroad even among specialists and add new data about the ceramic art of Asia and about early Chinese-Philippine relations, it is appropriate to discuss them briefly.<sup>5</sup> A thorough study of these new collections will require years of research by ceramics scholars, and no attempt will be made to describe these collections in this paper.

*The Arturo de Santos Collections.* This collection, which now numbers more than 7,000 (!) perfect or restored pieces from China, Siam, Cambodia, and Annam, was begun only five years ago. It is beautifully displayed in Dr. de Santos' Ma-

<sup>5</sup> The recency of the collections being discussed may be pointed out by noting that Kamer Aga-Oglu on the occasion of the Symposium on Trade Porcelain and Stoneware in Southeast Asia at the Tenth Pacific Science Congress in 1961 made no mention of any of the new collections noted herein. Numerous remarks in her contribution (Aga-Oglu 1962) to this Symposium must be revised in view of the vast quantity of new materials.

nila home and is readily accessible to scholars and students of Asian pottery. Dr. de Santos is donating the collection to the new cultural center being built in Manila.

The Ming materials are largely from Calatagan, Batangas; Verde Island, Batangas;<sup>6</sup> and Minolo Bay, Puerto Galera, Mindoro.<sup>7</sup> From these areas too came many Annamese and Siamese pieces. Dr. de Santos' collection of Siamese pottery may well be the finest in the world. The tremendous quantity of Sung and some probable T'ang pieces, including jars which are possibly Six Dynasties, 6th century A.D., came largely from two other sites on the east coast of Mindoro Island, Naujan and Victoria. Some fine earlier pieces also came from Puerto Galera, Mindoro, and the Taal-Lemery area of Batangas. It is impossible at this time to describe this collection even briefly, for there are hundreds of pieces which appear to be unique; at least they have not appeared heretofore in Philippine collections of trade potteries from China and are unknown to ceramics experts from abroad who have seen Dr. de Santos' collection.

Included in the De Santos collection are also many metal objects of Chinese origin: coins, mirrors, dagger handles, scales, locks, pins, projectile points, hinges, chains, hooks, bowls, cover bowls, and studs. His collection of gold ornaments, the finest in the Philippines, may also include Chinese items. However, the gold ornaments are presently thought to be largely either of local manufacture or traded in from Indonesia, for Indian design elements are readily apparent in most items. His large bead collection includes many types which are undoubtedly of Chinese origin, or if not Chinese, introduced through the Chinese trade.

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Avelino Legaspi, archeologist of the National Museum, made a brief excavation during 1963 in Verde Island in order to check grave associations and the relationships with the Calatagan findings. The data recovered indicate that the Verde Island, Calatagan, and Taal sites are very closely related (Legaspi 1966).

<sup>7</sup> This site was visited twice by the writer in 1959 but despite its tremendous potentialities, the writer was unable to obtain financial support for a systematic excavation. The site contained hundreds of graves dating from late T'ang through early Ming times and possibly after Spanish contact. According to the looters, over 4,000 (!) whole potteries have been recovered.

The writer hopes to work intensively with the De Santos collection upon the termination of his present field obligations on Palawan Island.

*The Locsin Collection.* This collection numbers approximately 3,500 pieces and is equal to that of Dr. de Santos in quality and uniqueness of items. Many of the monochromes and celadons of Sung date are probably the finest to be found in Philippine collections. Their finest piece is probably a rare blue-and white bottle of the early 14th century of incomparable quality. A sizable part of this collection was excavated at Santa Ana, Manila, the work being carefully supervised by Mr. and Mrs. Locsin. A manuscript, *Oriental Ceramics discovered in the Philippines*, has been prepared and will be published early this year. It includes discussions of the associations of the 1,516 pieces of pottery recovered in 202 graves at Santa Ana, mostly Sung in date. The value of their collection to the historian is considerably enhanced as a result of their systematic work. The Locsin's excavation clearly shows the appearance of painting in cobalt under the glaze, the so-called blue-and-white porcelain, during late Sung times. The present excavations by the National Museum at Santa Ana have reaffirmed the Locsin's earlier work. The collection is beautifully displayed in the basement of their home. A number of non-ceramic items of Chinese origin are found in the Locsin collection, including a rare gray-green soapstone figurine and many fine gold items.

*Other Philippine collections.* A number of private collections in Manila were built by the sponsors of the Calatagan excavations, specifically those of the Zobel family, Don Eugenio Lopez and the Lopez Memorial Museum, and Don Luis Araneta.<sup>3</sup> Each of these collections contains exceptional pieces,

---

<sup>3</sup> The costs of labor, the maintenance of field personnel, and travel expenses during the Calatagan excavations were borne wholly by private or institutional sponsors. The National Museum had no funds for field work in archeology, providing only the salaries of the field staff. In return, one half of the trade potteries were shared with the sponsors, the other half and non-ceramic artifacts going to the National Museum.

and as they were excavated by the National Museum, complete archeological data are associated with each piece.

Among other new collectors with sizable collections, each of which contains some unusual pieces, are Don Alfonso Zobel, Don Fernando Zobel, Mrs. Consuelo Abaya, Dr. Enrique Carlos, the late Mr. Leo Coronel, Mr. Hans Kasten, Dr. Gregorio Lim, Mr. Arturo Luz, and Mr. S. Zuellig, all residents of greater Manila.

A valuable collection of possibly late T'ang and Sung pieces from the Sampaloc Lake area of San Pablo City, Laguna Province, is found in the small museum of Mr. Arsenio Escudero at Tiaong, Quezon Province.

The sheer quantity of Chinese pottery found in the recently acquired private collections, as well as in the new and large collection of the National Museum, testifies dramatically to the flourishing trade between China and the Philippines during the proto-historic period.

#### ARCHEOLOGY AND HISTORY

##### *Contacts during the T'ang Dynasty (618-906 A.D.)*

The archeological data and pottery collections indicate with certainty, according to Beyer (1947), that contact and trade between China and the Philippines began during the late T'ang Dynasty, at least by the late 10th century A.D. and possibly earlier. Trade with China continued to expand until Spanish contact—a period from the 10th to the 16th century A.D. which Beyer (1947:208) describes as the Porcelain Age in Philippine prehistory.<sup>9</sup> There is likelihood too of still earlier

---

<sup>9</sup> The use of the term "Porcelain Age" to designate a period of historical development in the Philippines is, the writer believes, highly inappropriate. It reflects the type of archeology which is based upon collecting, not upon systematic excavations, as well as the ability of the vitrified and relatively indestructible trade pottery to survive when other artifacts and evidences have disappeared. Porcelains do not create "ages"; rather the period was one of increasing contacts and formal trade with the Great Traditions of Asia—Chinese, Indian, Arabian, Indonesian, and others—during which many ideological and technological influences, not simply porcelains, reached the Archipelago.

Chinese contacts, for possibly pre-T'ang pottery, as noted above, is beginning to appear in Philippine collections.

Surprisingly, as Wu Ching-hong notes (1959:74), "...We still do not find any authentic data in Chinese sources before 982 to fit the archeological finds of the T'ang in the Philippines." The explanation may lie in part in the notion, as pointed out by Beyer (1948a), that it was Arab traders rather than Chinese who carried the T'ang pottery into the Philippines. Chinese records (Wu Ching-hong 1959:67-68) do testify to the prosperous foreign trade in south China, especially by Arabians and Persians, during T'ang times, and the writer believes that future archeology in the Philippines will establish a significant participation by the Arabs in the foreign trade of this period.

Whether in Chinese or Arab ships, some late T'ang potteries did reach the Philippines, according to Beyer (1947). The distribution of sites containing T'ang pieces as presently known (Beyer 1947) would appear to mirror an actual trade pattern largely with coastal communities but including riverine movements into near-coastal settlements. Sites yielding T'ang potteries are found in the Babuyan Islands to the north of Luzon; along the Ilocos and Pangasinan coasts; in Manila and the surrounding area; on the island of Mindoro; on the islands of Bohol and Cebu in the central Philippines; and on Jolo and Cagayan de Sulu in the extreme south—forming, thus, a relatively protected sea route through the Archipelago from north to south and vice versa. The writer has stated elsewhere (Fox 1962) that the appearance of T'ang potteries in the Philippines may not have been due to deliberate trading but rather to casual bartering for food and ship's supplies by the early voyagers.<sup>10</sup>

The outstanding archeological work now being carried on by Tom and Barbara Harrison in nearby Sarawak, Borneo, has revealed an enormous amount of T'ang materials, including coins with dates as early as 723-768 A.D. (Harrison 1962:22), providing evidences in Borneo of extensive Chinese contacts

<sup>10</sup> The writer and others at this time are not as certain as Beyer that pottery he has identified as late T'ang *is* T'ang. Rather, these may be T'ang types which persisted into the early Sung Dynasty.

during the T'ang Dynasty. These data are highly pertinent to Philippine history. Some trade items were found in Borneo which were not encountered in the Philippines and which were in great demand in China, such as hornbill ivory and rhinoceros horn. The northwest coast of Borneo, moreover, was relatively near an early trade route described in the Chinese sources which ran along the coast of Indochina and Malaya into India, Arabia, and the Near East. The position of the Philippines was marginal, both geographically and culturally. Thus, it is probable that early Chinese contacts with Borneo as well as with other areas of Southeast Asia were more extensive than with the Philippines.

The writer believes, nevertheless, that future archeological research in the Philippines will reveal as in Borneo a far more extensive Chinese-Philippine contact during T'ang times. No systematic and extensive excavation has been made to date in a Philippine site with T'ang associations. The T'ang element in the Hacienda Ramon excavations in Pampanga was far too limited to provide definitive data. Nor has any study been made of the non-ceramic items of T'ang (or Sung) attribution which are in the recently acquired private collections, and Beyer has provided no detailed inventory of his non-ceramic materials associated with trade potteries. The available archeological record provides few details on Chinese-Philippine relations during the T'ang Dynasty, although Chinese artifacts recovered in the Philippines clearly define contacts during T'ang times which are not recorded in available Chinese sources.

*Chinese-Philippine relations during the Sung Dynasty  
(960-1279 A.D.)*

Although it is usual to discuss Chinese history and pottery of the Sung Dynasty in terms of the Northern Sung Period (960-1127 A.D.) and the Southern Sung Period (1127-1179 A.D.)—the Imperial Court fled before the invading Tartars in 1127 A.D. from Kaifeng to Hangchou—this distinction is *not* significant in the study of early Chinese-Philippine relations. Trade contact throughout the Sung Period, as shown by the

archeological record and Chinese sources, was wholly between south China and the Philippines. The writer is using the terms "early" Sung and "late" Sung to describe the dates of Sung pottery from south China.

Thus, there is no chronological break in the Philippine archeological record between sites which might contain northern Sung potteries and southern Sung wares. On the contrary, very few (if any) celadons and other Chinese pottery have been excavated in the Islands which can be attributed with safety to northern Sung kilns, but thousands of early and late Sung potteries associated with datable coins have been excavated in the Philippines. Many early Sung kiln sites have been discovered since World War II (Koyama 1962:8-16), mostly in Fukien Province, and it was from these southern kilns that the early Sung pottery and late T'ang pottery reached the Philippines.

A number of explanations may be offered to support the view that there was relatively little contact between the Philippines and north China during Sung times. First, Arab trade from the latter part of the 10th century to the end of the 12th century (Beyer 1948a), was largely with ports in south China, particularly Canton and Ch'üan-chou, and the Chinese themselves did not become active in the trade until the end of the 12th century. Hobson, as Gompertz notes (1958:39), suggests that northern Sung celadons did not figure prominently in the export trade as the kiln sites were located in the interior at considerable distances from the seaports.

The relatively great quantity of Chinese pottery and other trade objects found in Philippine sites of late Sung date (1127-1279 A.D.) clearly establishes that formal trade between the Philippines and China had begun to flourish by this time, a trade which was by now dominated by Chinese merchants. Ch'üan-chou during the second quarter of the 14th century was one of the great ports in the world, and it was probably from this port near Amoy that much of the earlier goods and influences from China reached the Islands (Wu Ching-hong 1962). At least 80 per cent of the Chinese that came to the Philippines during the Spanish period were from Fukien Province.

Two types of late Sung wares that are commonly encountered in 12th and 13th century sites in the Philippines were undoubtedly traded through Ch'üan-chou. One is a moulded ware in "Ying-Ch'ing" style with an ivory colored glaze and raised line decorations which is now known to have been made at T'e-hua and nearby kiln sites. The kilns at Tung-an yao and others in Fukien Province apparently provided the celadons which have double fish motifs in the interior and others with "combed" designs. Probably the most important kiln in terms of productivity was at Lung-ch'uan at the southern extreme of Chekiang Province near the Fukien border. The distinctive celadons from Lung-ch'uan are extensively represented in Philippine collections.

Pottery undoubtedly reached the Islands from the Canton area, Canton being one of the three largest ports in China during early Sung times. A kiln recently discovered (Koyama 1962) at Hsits'un near Canton produced a great variety of Sung potteries, types which are familiar to the Philippines. As Koyama notes (1962:15-16):

Every kind of utensil is represented including basins, bowls, dishes, cups, bottles, jars, small pots and covered boxes, as well as pottery toys. The glazes comprise celadons, "Ying-Ching", white, black, brown and yellow, and a low fired coloured glaze of which the varieties are very common. The shapes and designs are also richly varied and include types similar to Hsing-chou yao, Ju yao (Northern celadon) "Ying-Ching" and Tz'u-chou yao. It is thought that the origins of this kiln go back to late T'ang or the Five Dynasties. However most of the sherds belong to the Northern Sung period and it seems to have been a very flourishing kiln at that time.

A study of the archeological record reveals three features of the trade at this time. First, there were no major entrepôts in the Philippines of Chinese products excepting perhaps Manila; rather, the junks traded directly with coastal communities throughout the Islands. Justification for this statement will be set forth below. Second, the earlier trade included many non-ceramic items unlike the late pre-Spanish trade. Thus, many non-ceramic objects will be found in association with Filipino graves which date from the Sung period—mirrors, scales, projectile points, coins, and so forth. Such associations are very rare in graves of Ming date. One would sense an effort on the part of the earlier Chinese merchants to find



a market for a variety of products whereas the late trade was predominately porcelain and probably iron and cloth. Third, the pottery traded into the Philippines during the Sung period was of finer quality (often superb) and showed greater variety in form than wares reaching the Islands during Ming times.

During later Sung times large jars began to appear in the Philippines in significant quantities, becoming linked with the production of rice wine for rituals and for infant- and secondary-burial. The pottery stove, apparently of Chinese origin, also appeared in the Islands during the Sung period of trade. Stoves are not encountered in pre-porcelain sites.

The porcelain trade from China, later from Annam and Siam, eclipsed the ceramic art of the Philippines. During the late Neolithic and Metal Age, locally made pottery was highly sophisticated, presenting a rich variety of forms and designs as shown in the widely distributed Kalanay wares (Solheim 1959). The early Philippine earthenwares were closely integrated with the ritual life of the people, the most remarkable pieces being placed with the dead in caves and graves. Porcelains from China, later from Annam and Siam, quickly replaced the ritual function of the local earthenwares. The production of earthenwares became confined almost wholly to household use—the simple cooking bowls. Though merely household and utilitarian vessels in China, the trade potteries were unquestionably the most prized possessions of the early Filipinos. Among contemporary mountain peoples, stoneware jars and porcelain bowls and plates are still among the most highly valued heirlooms. The ready use and the widespread ritual functions which the trade potteries found in the Archipelago explain, in part, the dominant role of pottery in the trade between China and the Philippines.

The on-going excavations at Santa Ana, Manila, provide strong evidence that the China trade led to the development during Sung times of new Filipino communities near bays and major rivers so that the people could more effectively participate in the trade. Santa Ana, a major pre-Spanish Manila settlement, was not founded until after trade with China began during the Sung Dynasty.

*Developments during the period of the Yuan (1260-1368 A.D.) and early Ming (late 14th through early 16th centuries) Dynasties*

During the 86 years of the Yüan Dynasty under the Mongols, Chinese trade with Southeast Asia and elsewhere greatly expanded, a result of the breakdown of political barriers and the rapid development of ship building, as well as industrial growth in China which provided numerous trade products. When the Ming Emperors returned to power in 1368 A.D., attempts were made to regulate all external trade and to create a government monopoly. Only the ships of the countries paying tribute to the Chinese Empire were allowed to enter Chinese ports (Ts'ao Yung-ho 1962). Although this prohibitive trade policy was in effect from the fourth year of Hong-wu, 1371 A.D., to the first year of Lung-ch'ing, 1567 A.D., it is clear that the policy did not affect the external trade with the Philippines. Ts'ao Yung-ho notes (1962:430) that contraband trade was rampant, and the tremendous quantities of early Ming pottery recovered in Philippine archeological sites vividly illustrate a steady growth in intercourse between China and the Philippines during this so-called monopolistic period. By Spanish contact the "private" trade between China and the Philippines was reaching a climax. The main trading port was still Ch'üan-chou and the trade generally was from ports in Fukien Province.

Chinese sources too indicate a strengthening of relationships between China and the Philippines during the early Ming Dynasty. Wu Ching-hong writes (1962:477-78):

According to the *Ming Shih*, several tribute embassies from the Philippines arrived in China, the first in 1372 and the last in 1421. In the year 1372 Emperor Hung-wu welcomed the Filipino tribute embassy at his court and presented it, upon its departure, with valuable gifts, including some precious porcelain vases and "a silk gauze woven of gold and colored threads."

Again during the reign of Emperor Ch'eng-tsu in 1406, another Filipino king from Pangasinan paid his visit to the Imperial Court of Ming at Nanking with horses, silver, and other native products as his friendly tribute. ...The Pangasinan king repeated his trips, followed by hundreds of officials, in 1408 and 1410. Emperor Ch'eng-tsu enriched them all with gold coins, silver, horse-shoes, silk, porcelain wares, lacquer wares, and others.

By the 15th century Chinese merchants had visited and traded with most of the coastal areas of the Philippines, as shown by the distribution of archeological sites containing trade potteries. By this time, too, focal points of trade were developing—Manila, Cebu, Jolo, and possibly other coastal communities. There is evidence that Manila had become an actual entrepôt of trade in late pre-Spanish times, associated with the appearance of some resident Chinese. In 1750, Martin de Goiti found 40 Chinese living in Manila. It is precisely within the Manila area and similar focal areas of trade that the greatest Chinese influence may be seen in contemporary Filipino society.

Jolo and Sulu too became an early center of the China trade—pearls, pearl shells, and other sea products drawing merchants to this area. It would appear that the Badjaw or “Sea Gypsies” have been symbiotically associated as fishermen with Chinese middle-men for centuries, shark fishing being in the past a primary activity of the Badjaw. Beyer (1947: 332) writes that a local iron coinage developed in Sulu after the Sulu rulers visited the Imperial Ming Court in 1417 (Wu Ching-hong says 1416). Chinese trade in the Sulu area was partially interrupted after the introduction of Islam in the mid-15th century, and again during the Moro Wars during the 17th and 18th centuries.

Manila and Jolo were probably representative of emerging trading centers in the late pre-Spanish period where goods were reshipped to other areas. Generally, however, the lack of local political stability as well as the paucity of local trade goods hindered the development of a truly major trade and the appearance of large enclaves of resident Chinese merchants. The earlier pattern of trade, discussed above, continued up to Spanish contact; the Chinese merchants traded by and large directly with coastal communities throughout the Islands. This was demonstrated by the excavation at Calatagan of late 14th and 15th century Tagalog burial sites.

In the numerous cemeteries at Calatagan a similar range of Chinese pottery was recovered, but specific types of pottery, such as blue-and-white plate with a kylin design, were statis-

tically far more numerous in one burial site than in another. At Puerto Galera, one looter found over sixty identical late Sung monochrome saucers in one grave. By Ming times it is known that the Chinese junks carried into the Islands large numbers of particular types of pottery from specific kilns, mostly highly inferior ware which could not find a local market. Thus the junks would flood one area with one or a few types of porcelain, another area with other types of porcelain.

From the late 14th century until Spanish contact, the types of trade materials appearing in the archeological record are highly restricted, in fact, predominantly trade pottery. Only a mere handful of non-ceramic items were found in the more than 1,300 Calatagan graves; four early Ming coins, one tray, two locks, a few bells, and projectile points. It is apparent that the Filipinos were demanding specific types of trade items including perishable materials such as cloth, as well as pottery and iron.

The selective nature of the trade is suggested by the study of the trade pottery. Types of porcelain are recovered in the Philippines which are not found in collections from the mainland of China and are unknown in the Near Eastern sites and collections. One type described as "hole-bottom" ware by Professor Beyer—the plates and saucers of this type of Yüan and Ming ware have no foot-rim—are commonly found in the Philippines but only in limited quantities in the Celebes, North Borneo, Taiwan, and Okinawa. Only a single sherd of this ware has been found in Malaya, according to conversations I have had with Michael Sullivan, and they are apparently rare in Indonesia.

The hole-bottom ware may thus be described as a true export ware in contrast to the great majority of the pottery reaching the Philippines, which was simply the ordinary "people's ware" used in China and culled for trade overseas. Many unique types of Chinese pottery are beginning to appear in the Philippines in considerable numbers—types not recognized by visiting experts such as John Alexander Pope and Soames Jennings—further testifying to the distinctive trade. It would appear that although the pottery of south China shared the large tradition of ceramic development in China, a sub-tradi-

tion emerged in the south of China. It was pottery types of this sub-tradition which reached the Philippines in great quantities. One need only examine Pope's study (1956) of the great collection in the Ardebil Shrine, Turkey, to see the striking differences in the types and quality of pottery which reached the Middle East and the island world of Southeast Asia.

Aga-Oglu's statement (1962:250) that the pottery which reached the Philippines "is mainly of the same general type that is found in other parts of Southeast Asia, in Korea, Japan, Iran, Turkey, and Egypt" is not, the writer believes, true. In fact, the statement disguises basic differences in the Chinese pottery trade when one area is compared with another. Nor is it true that only heavily potted pieces (to avoid breakage) were traded overseas by the Chinese, for hundreds of fragile and finely potted wares of the Sung Dynasty, such as the Ying-Ch'ing, are appearing in Philippine sites. On the contrary, heavily potted pieces did reach the Philippines in greater quantities, notably during later periods of the pottery trade, because sturdy plates, bowls, and jars were in great demand for ritual purposes in which they received very rough usage. This may still be seen in the manner in which mountain peoples use Chinese trade pottery during ceremonies. And whether the trade pottery is fragile or heavy is clearly related to the time-period of the trade. Thus, the earlier Sung wares include probably a majority of delicate pieces whereas by Ming times the pieces are heavy and coarse.

This paper, unfortunately, dwells heavily on the pottery trade, but it is to be hoped that further systematic archeological research in the Philippines will reveal other items and characteristics of the trade between China and the Philippines. Thus, for example, the Museum archeological teams have recovered cloth impressions in the rust cake of iron implements found in Filipino graves with Chinese trade pottery, and future comparative studies will probably show that these cloths were from China. It will only be through a systematic and adequately supported archeological program in the Philippines, as the writer has noted, that the details of contacts and relationships between China and the Philippines during the proto-historic period will be revealed.

## REFERENCES CITED

## AGA-OGU, KAMER

- 1946 Ying-Ch'ing porcelain found in the Philippines. *Art Quarterly* 9:315-26. 11 figures.
- 1948 Ming export blue and white jars in the University of Michigan collection. *Art Quarterly* 11:201-17. 12 figures.
- 1949 The relationship between the Ying-Ch'ing, Shu-Fu and early blue and white. *Far Eastern Ceramic Bulletin* No. 8:27-33. 3 plates.
- 1950 Early blue and white pot excavated in the Philippines. *Far Eastern Ceramic Bulletin* No. 10:64-71. 1 plate.
- 1951 Blue and white porcelain plates made for Moslem patrons. *Far Eastern Ceramic Bulletin* 3, No. 3 (Serial No. 15): 12-16. 2 plates.
- 1955 The so-called "Swatow" wares: types and problems of provenance. *Far Eastern Ceramic Bulletin* 7, No. 2 (Serial No. 30):1-34. 24 plates.
- 1961 Ming porcelain from sites in the Philippines. *Asian Perspectives* 5:243-52. 5 plates.
- 1962 Ming porcelain in the Philippines. *Proceedings of the Tenth Pacific Science Congress, Honolulu, 1961.*

## BEYER, H. OTLEY

- 1921 The Philippines before Magellan. *Asia Magazine* 21, No. 10:861-892.
- 1930 Chinese, Siamese, and other Oriental ceramic wares in the Philippine Islands. Ms.
- 1947 Outline review of Philippine archaeology by islands and provinces. *The Philippine Journal of Science* 77:205-374.
- 1948a Early history of Philippine relations with foreign countries, especially China. Manila, H. Otley Beyer (National Printing Company).
- 1948b Philippine and East Asian archaeology, and its relation to the origin of the Pacific Islands population. *National Research Council of the Philippines, Bulletin* No. 29.

## CHANG, KWANG-CHIH

- 1958 New light on early man in China. *Asian Perspectives* 2, No. 2:41-61.
- 1962 Major problems in the culture history of Southeast Asia. *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology Academia Sinica* 13 (Spring):1-23.

## CHING-HONG, WU

- 1959 A study of references to the Philippines in Chinese sources from earliest times to the Ming Dynasty. *Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review* 24:1-181.
- 1962 The rise and decline of Ch'uan-chou's international trade and its relation to the Philippine Islands. Taipei, Second Biennial Conference Proceedings of the International Association of Historians of Asia, 469-83.

## EVANGELISTA, ALFREDO E.

- 1960 Philippines. *Asian Perspectives* 4:85-8.
- 1961 Philippines. *Asian Perspectives* 5:67-70.

## FOX, ROBERT B.

- 1959 The Calatagan excavations: two 15th century burial sites in Batangas, Philippines. *Philippine Studies* 7:325-90. 167 plates.
- 1962 Chinese pottery in the Philippines. *The Fookien Times Yearbook*.
- 1963 Ancient man in Palawan: a progress report of current excavations. Manila, National Museum (mimeographed).

## GOMPERTZ, G. ST. G. M.

- 1958 Chinese celadon wares. London, Faber and Faber.

## HARRISON, TOM

- 1962 Borneo death. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde*, Deel 118. 's-Gravenhage, Martinus Nijhoff.

## KOYAMA, FUJIO

- 1962 Post war discoveries of T'ang and Sung kiln sites. Translated by John Figiss. Privately printed.

## LEGASPI, AVELINO

- 1966 A brief report on Verde Island, Batangas, Philippines. The Research Foundation in Philippine Anthropology and Archaeology, Inc. (mimeographed).

## POPE, JOHN

- 1956 Chinese porcelains from the Ardebil Shrine. Washington, Freer Gallery of Art.

## ROBB, WALTER

- 1930 New data on Chinese and Siamese ceramic wares of the 14th and 15th centuries. *Philippine Magazine* 27, Nos. 3-4:9-10.

## SOLHEIM, WILHELM G. II

- 1959 Further notes on the Kalanay pottery complex in the Philippines. *Asian Perspectives* 3:157-65.

## YUNG-HO, T'SAO

- 1962 Chinese overseas trade in the late Ming period. Taipei, Second Biennial Conference Proceedings of the International Association of Historians of Asia, 429-58.