



# **THALAMASIN, ARI KASIKIS AND URDUJA: US COLONIAL DISCOURSE IN THE MAKING OF A CONTRIVED OR FAKE HISTORY AND LESSONS IN HISTORICAL METHODOLOGY**



**Erwin Soriano Fernandez**



**ABUNG NA PANAGBASAY PANGASINAN  
WORKING PAPER SERIES NO. 2-2023  
(June 2023)**

## **THALAMASIN, ARI KASIKIS AND URDUJA: US COLONIAL DISCOURSE IN THE MAKING OF A CONTRIVED OR FAKE HISTORY AND LESSONS IN HISTORICAL METHODOLOGY**

**Erwin Soriano Fernandez**

Erwin Soriano Fernandez is a doctoral student at the University of Salamanca. He graduated with master's in political analysis at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. He earned his bachelor's (cum laude) and master's degrees in history from the University of the Philippines in Diliman, Quezon City. This article has been submitted to a number of "refereed" journals in the Philippines and abroad and so it has benefited from the reviews (some, however, are a little helpful) but the undue and needless delay as well as effort to block certain passages as a condition for its publication in order not to put in bad light an author or even a particular university in one of these journals prompted the author to publish it as soon as possible. He is the author of *The Diplomat-Scholar: A biography of Leon Ma. Guerrero* published by ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute in Singapore and which won the 2019 National Book Awards Finalist for Creative Nonfiction (English) and the 2020 Gintong Aklat Award Finalist for the same category. Email: [win1tree@yahoo.com](mailto:win1tree@yahoo.com).

The **APP Working Paper Series** is published electronically by the **Abung na Panagbasay Pangasinan (House of Pangasinan Studies/Casa de los Estudios Pangasinanos)**.

© Copyright is held by the author.

**APP Working Papers** cannot be republished, reprinted or reproduced in any form without the permission of the author. It is established to facilitate the publication of a research and stimulate discussion. Cover image is Philippine National Artist for Painting Fernando Amorsolo's *Princess Urduja* (Yuchengco Museum).

To cite this, use the following:

Fernandez, Erwin S. 2023. Thalamasin, Ari Kasikis and Urduja: US colonial discourse in the making of a contrived or fake history and lessons in historical methodology. Abung na Panagbasay Pangasinan (APP) Working Paper Series No. 1-2023 (June 2023).

### **Abung na Panagbasay Pangasinan**

4 Mitura St. San Vicente West  
Urdaneta City, Pangasinan  
Mobile: +639166608628  
Email: [win1tree@yahoo.com](mailto:win1tree@yahoo.com)

**Thalamin, Ari Kasikis and Urduja:  
US colonial discourse in the making of a contrived or fake history and lessons in historical  
methodology**

Erwin S. Fernandez

Abstract

In April 1990, a conference was held in Lingayen in the Philippines to finally determine the historicity of Urduja, the fabled princess of Tawalisi, as told by Ibn Battuta in his Southeast Asian travels. The image long ingrained in the minds of Pangasinans was of an Amazon woman-warrior brandishing a sword and leading an army of women. Several scholars have pointed out that Urduja, whose name was given as name of the official residence of the Pangasinan provincial governor in 1953, was not a Pangasinan historical figure and that the kingdom of Tawalisi was not located in Pangasinan but in Indochina (now Vietnam). But more than 25 years after the conference, the governor's house is still named after the princess. Why is there a persistence of Urduja despite evidences are presented against her? Another product of a fertile but faulty historical imagination was Thalamin. Was Thalamin Pangasinan? Were there indeed an Ari Kasilag of Pangasinan and an Ari Kasikis of Caboloan? In this article, I tackle whether Thalamin in Friar Odoric's account refers to Pangasinan or not, question the existence of these two kings, trace the genealogy of Urduja in Philippine historiography beginning with Jose Rizal's discursive yet flawed scholarly contribution, discuss how historical claims are deployed to invent the Pangasinan kingdom and its subtle connection with US colonial discourse and argue for the correction of lies in Pangasinan and Philippine history.

Keywords: Thalamin, Ari Kasikis, Urduja, US colonial discourse, Jose Rizal, Austin Craig, Antonio del Castillo, Yamamoto Tatsuro.

### **Introduction**

There is much to be said about the early history of Pangasinan that has not been told because of the huge challenge that it would entail. What have been popularized are unverified stories from other lands long considered to be outside the ambit of authentic Pangasinan history. Was the first Philippine mass celebrated in Pangasinan in 1324 by Friar Odoric? Were there really Ari Kasilag of the coastal kingdom of Pangasinan and Ari Kasikis of the kingdom of Caboloan before Spanish colonialism? Was the kingdom of Tawalisi where Urduja was a princess located in Pangasinan?

Pangasinan is a premier province in Northwest Luzon in the Philippines of more than three million people yet without an international airport and an international seaport. One of the earliest and biggest provinces organized by the Spaniards, it is the homeland of Pangasinans before other provinces were carved from it – Zambales, La Union, and Tarlac while other Pangasinans lived in or migrated to Nueva Ecija when that province was established (Cortes 1990; Fernandez 2015a). The language has close affinities with Ibaloi, Kalanguya (Ikalahan), Karao and Ilongot, speakers of these live in Pangasinan, La Union, Benguet, Nueva Vizcaya, Nueva Ecija, Quirino and Isabela (Himes 1998, Fernandez 2008). Prior to its foundation as a colonial province, Pangasinans were dealing with the Chinese as early as 1406 while years prior to the onset of Spanish conquest, the Japanese traded with them in Agoon called by the Spaniards, "Puerto del Japon" or Japanese port

(Scott 1989; Loarca 1582/2000; Fernandez 2015b). They were also trading with the Bonis or people from Borneo that must have included the Bruneians. Pangasinan refers to the people, language and the province. Caboloan is the other term for Pangasinan language, the people and the province when the place was full of this type of bamboo, bolo. The Spaniards would adopt the name Pangasinan and to refer to them in plural, they were called Pangasinanes. They were also called later Pangasinenses although I assume that it was only in the early decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century that it was coined by Filipinos themselves, not necessarily Pangasinans, for most literatures written by the Spanish Dominican friars who had mastery over the language, the language and the people were called Pangasinan, never Pangasinense (López 1690; 2014; Pellicer 1862).<sup>1</sup> It is wrong to say Pangasinense to call the language as most texts would refer to it; rather the language is Pangasinan, the speakers Pangasinenses.

Who was Friar Odoric? Friar Odoric was the Italian author of a dictated manuscript mostly in Latin about his travels to the east as a Franciscan missionary from 1318 to 1330 who purportedly celebrated the first mass in Pangasinan (Yule 1866, I: 1-11).<sup>2</sup> In the case of Ari Kasilag and Ari Kasikis, these were the names of kings believed to be the pre-Hispanic rulers who ruled Pangasinan before the Spaniards came or at the point of Spanish contact. “Ari” in Pangasinan language means “king”. In every account, historical or otherwise, of the province, with the exception of one or two, these kings were mentioned as real historical figures. But did they exist? What was the truth of their historicity? Lastly, Urduja was the name of a princess who allegedly ruled Pangasinan before the advent of colonialism. How true was this? Her story came from the account of Ibn Battuta, an Arab Muslim traveler and geographer.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A cursory look at the texts written or translated by the Spanish Dominican priests, including a Pangasinan grammar book and a dictionary, published in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the term used was Pangasinan, not Pangasinense, to denote the language and the people as well as the province. I could not mention them all here.

<sup>2</sup> Native of Pordenone in Friuli, Odoric was known for his piety, asceticism and miraculous acts before his journey. From Padua, he arrived at Constantinople by way of Venice and passed over the Black Sea to Trebizond. From there, he moved to Erzurum in Armenia, Tabriz under the Kingdom of Georgia and Soltania. He continued to Kashan, Yazd, Persepolis and Shiraz before moving to Baghdad and stopping on Hormuz on his voyage to India. Disembarked at Thana, he visited many parts of the subcontinent and perhaps even went to Ceylon (now Sri Lanka). Sailing in a junk, he went to Sumatra, Java and Borneo before making it to south China where he toured around the country even staying in Beijing for three years. He embarked to go back home by passing at Lhasa (Tibet) and Persia. After arriving at Padua, he narrated his story in May 1330, which was recorded in Latin by William of Solagna, a Franciscan brother. On his way to Avignon in France to report on his activities, he suffered a serious illness so that he returned to Udine where he died on 14 January 1331. A public funeral was held after in which rumors of miracles swept the town. A shrine was erected fit for a saint but it was only in 1755 when he was beatified.

Yule (1866, I) has noted four types of Odoric’s narrative. The first were manuscripts that were closest to the original dictation. The second were those Latin and Italian manuscripts that bore the declaration of William of Solagna as the amanuensis. The third type were the manuscripts at the British Museum that became one of the bases by the Hakluyt Society for publication. The fourth type were the manuscripts edited by Ramusio, long and short versions in Italian, which Yule quoted from. He would notice peculiarities in the versions, which I will discuss later in connection with Thalamasin.

<sup>3</sup> Born in Tangiers in Morocco in 1304, Battuta travelled to many places, which can be divided into three phases. The first phase started in 1325 when he decided to do a pilgrimage in Mecca by passing through the North African coast and arriving at Alexandria before moving to Cairo to which he returned to take a trip to Damascus, Hebron, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Medina and finally Mecca in November 1326. Instead of heading home he continued his voyage to Ilkhanate crossing the Arabian Peninsula to Baghdad and other surrounding areas before he again went for Mecca for his second hajj in 1330. He went to Jeddah and from its port made his way to Yemen and disembarked at Aden on his way to the coast of Somalia and Swahili before sailing back to Arabia, passing first at Oman, the Strait of Hormuz and then Mecca for his third hajj in 1332.

In the process of discussing these three problematic claims, I will demonstrate how isolated datum can be mobilized and constructed to create a manufactured history. When unproven information is connected to one or two or more verifiable datum in order to create a historical claim, it is what I call a contrived history. It becomes history when these so-called historical claims remain unchallenged, or if they are challenged, they are still taught in schools as history, propagated in media and sustained by the government. Beneath it is the attempt to rewrite early Philippine past to denigrate Spanish contribution. These seemingly disparate issues were in one way connected to another as they attempt to present an American construction of early Philippine history based on foreign and indigenous accounts whose facts, as I will show, were either found later to be unrelated to the Philippines or obviously pure invention.

Contrived history or more popularly called “fake history” serves its slick and guileful purpose – that of propagating lies and falsehoods for the vested interests of the faker, the propagator and the charlatan. At first, it ostensibly unites the people who believe in it. Then, it becomes larger than life – a symbol, an emblem, a rallying cry – as it will form part of their consciousness. A lie that is repeated a thousand times becomes the truth, says the Nazi propagandist, Joseph Goebbels. Thus, it becomes the truth; others become politicians, even gods. Genuine history, however, is buried, silenced, marginalized and sidelined. Contrived history is easy to concoct and spread while the opposite requires skills, painstaking research, backbreaking effort and most often is ignored. Lying is not condoned in Pangasinan society as in any human grouping. The Pangasinan proverb “Say matila kapinsay matakew” (A liar is cousin to a thief) means that among Pangasinan people lying or being a liar is akin to stealing or being a thief, maybe

---

The second phase, 1332-1347, began when he decided to go to Anatolia (present-day Turkey) by crossing the Red Sea to reach Cairo. From Egypt he passed through the Sinai Peninsula to Palestine. On a ship from Latakia in Syria, he landed at Alanya and moved to the port of Antalya where he crossed to the Crimean Peninsula via the Black Sea, Northern Caucasus, Saray, capital of the Golden Horde, Oz Beg and Constantinople. Coming to Saray, he proceeded to Khwarezm and Bokhara, Khorasan and Kabul, before arriving at the fringes of India. In India, he was received with honors and later appointed as grand qadi of Delhi by Muhammad ibn Tughluq. He was dispatched as an envoy to China in 1342 but he was delayed due to Hindu insurgency and local wars in Malabar that made him decide to go to Maldives where he stayed for two years. After marrying into a ruling family in the islands, he went to Sri Lanka and was shipwrecked in Coromandel Coast, returned to Maldives, moved to Bengal and Assam. From the last, he sailed to Sumatra, Malacca and Tawalisi before he went to China. It was in his stopover at Tawalisi that he encountered Urduja at the city of Kailukari. Urduja, daughter of Tawalisi, also the name of the country, ruled the city with her women-warriors. It was alleged that Tawalisi was Pangasinan and Urduja ruled Pangasinan.

From China, he went back to Malabar and Arabian coast and wandered through Hormuz and Baghdad, then to Damascus, Hamath and Aleppo and back to Damascus, Jerusalem, Egypt and Mecca where he did his last pilgrimage. He continued to Tunis and Tenes before arriving finally to Fez, capital of his country, in November 1349 after twenty-four years of absence.

After going back to Tangiers, he started the third phase, 1349-1354, of his travels by going to Andalucia in Spain in an effort to defend the territory from Catholic invasion. He returned to Morocco stopping for a while at Marrakech and back to Tangier. Then in 1351, he set out for Saharan region at Sijilmasa; then moved in early 1352 in a caravan to Taghaza, Mali, capital of Sudan, Timbuktu; sailed in Niger River to Gao and Takedda. Upon receiving an order from his king to return, he embarked for Sijilmasa in September 1353 and arrived in Morocco early 1354. Not long after, his travels were put into writing, not through his hands, but through the sultan’s secretary.

When the whole work was known in Europe and was made available, the Asiatic Society of Paris commissioned C. Defrèremery and B.F. Sanguinetti’s to edit the Arabic texts as well as render the French translation in four volumes from which Yule (1913-1916, 4: 43) based his translations into English. Yule whose full name was Sir Henry Yule was a Scottish military colonel who served in India and Burma. Upon his retirement he devoted his time to medieval history and geography by editing and translating manuscripts and became president of Hakluyt Society, a London society that published scholarly editions of primary source materials on voyages, travels and geography.

because if you lie you somewhat steal a reason, a justification, the lie masquerading as truth, in order to appear as proper and correct even though you are not. In this case, you steal a princess from other lands (Urduja), or you make up kings instead of real flesh and blood indigenous rulers (Ari Kasikis) or you see a fancy place in order to be blinded on what is yours (Thalamin). In this age of post-truth, the proliferation of fake news and contrived or fake history is expected in the Philippines (Couttie 2020) and around the world (Donald 2021; English 2022; Teeuwisse 2023) but fighting for the truth remains. Yet, in the early decades of American rule in the Philippines, contriving history was connected to American imperial praxis of knowledge production. How?

Subsequent to American occupation of the Philippines was the subtle attempt by the Americans to shape how Filipinos should view its past, its history. In the early decades of American rule, a national university in 1908, a general hospital in 1907, a library and a museum in 1916 were established apart from the creation of mass education in English with the creation of Department of Public Instruction in 1901. The atmosphere at that time must have been agog about anything on Philippine history, particularly about its prehispanic past. Encouraged by the Americans, the Filipinos responded with eagerness as well who were yearning for an illustrious prehispanic past. One of those who responded was Jose E. Marco, ex-teacher, postmaster, a librarian, and a philatelist, if we believe him, from Negros Occidental who in 1912 donated three bark manuscripts to the Philippine Library and Museum (Scott 1984; Morrow 2006). The latter in 1914 acquired from the same person five manuscripts, one of which was about the Code of Kalantiao, supposedly a Philippine criminal code before the Spaniards arrived. In 1917, the director of the library and museum, James A. Robertson, published in a book the said “prehispanic criminal code” of the Philippines. In due time, a national shrine was built in honor of Datu Kalantiao in Panay Island in 1957 and Pangasinan provincial government named him in one of its buildings in Lingayen in 1958. A decade later, William Henry Scott, an American missionary turned historian, examined sources on early Philippine history in a doctoral dissertation and concluded that the Code of Kalantiao was a complete hoax, a forgery done by Marco (1984). One cannot entirely blame Marco on the greatest fabrication in Philippine history he created as Salman (2009) has pointed out since a hoax cannot persist without the complicity of American intellectuals like Robertson among others, educational institutions, and the public. Devoting only two pages on Urduja and pointing out other places that vied as location of her kingdom aside from Pangasinan, Scott (Ibid., 83) dismissed her as “a fairytale princess”. By not studying Urduja thoroughly, Scott missed the opportunity to connect her with the larger discourse of imperialist propaganda in the scholarly activities of Austin Craig.<sup>4</sup>

### **US colonial discourse and the rewriting of early Philippine history: The case of Austin Craig**

When the United States conquered the Philippines, the imperialist power had to produce and promote a new discourse designed to further its interests in the country (Cano 2008b, 4). First, it has to disseminate among the conquered that it has come to liberate them from Spanish yoke. Second, in order to propagate this narrative, it has to deploy a propaganda among the native populace by employing an effective machinery involving career officials, publishing houses, journalists and universities. Third, the propaganda would come in the form of textbooks that contain arguments for the retention and maintenance of the country as a colony as well as new and

---

<sup>4</sup> Recently, Glenn A. May, in a similar fashion, critiqued sources used on the life story of Andres Bonifacio, the founder of the Katipunan, in his *Inventing a hero: The post-humous Recreation of Andres Bonifacio* (1996).

revisionist perspectives in history that glorify the imperial regime while putting in bad light the Spanish period as a “dark age”. Fourth, universities had a big role in the propagation of this imperialist and colonial discourse.

One of these universities was the University of the Philippines (UP). Established in 1908 by an act of Philippine legislature, UP was patterned after American universities with an American, Rev. Murray Simpson Bartlett heading it first (Estella 1922). Although Bartlett envisioned the university to be the “University for the Filipino”, vestiges and traces of American colonial narrative in its institutions endured as a number of American professors were found in its roster. One of them was Austin Craig. Born in New York in 1872, and educated at Cornell University for his Bachelor of Laws (1894) and Rochester University for his Master of Arts (1911), Craig became a supervising teacher, division superintendent of schools and principal, instructor in history from 1904-1912 in various schools after arriving in 1904 in Manila and later professor at the UP Department of History, Economics and Sociology, (later these disciplines would have their own separate departments), from 1912 to 1922 whose prominent works were about Rizal (Nellist 1931, I: 71; Craig 1915; Ordoñez 2008; Pastores 1977, 247, 249-250). He has written on the early history of the Philippines before the coming of the Spaniards (Craig 1914; 1916a). He became chair of the department in 1914 and was responsible for teaching four courses on the history of the Philippines: History 7 History of the Philippines under Spanish flag, History 7a History of the Philippines Before the Arrival of the Spaniards, History 7b. History of the Philippines Start of Nationalist Consciousness 1896-1903 and History 14 Seminar in Philippine History; research on indigenous history (Camagay 1977, 244). Due to his actions said to be prejudicial to the university, he was dismissed from the service in 1922 (Ordoñez 2008).

It was curious that one of his former colleagues at the department was James Alexander Robertson who was among the pioneers in the department (Camagay 1977, 243). As said previously, Robertson, now the director of the Philippine Library and Museum, would write an introduction to Craig’s *Lineage Life and Labors of Jose Rizal Philippine Patriot* in 1913. Earlier, Robertson was the editor and translator of the monumental *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898* from 1903 to 1909 along with Emma Helen Blair under the direction of James A. LeRoy with a motive of discrediting Spanish colonial rule (Cano 2008a; 2008b). Craig belonged, no doubt, to this set of American colonial officials and academics represented by LeRoy who believed in the backwardness of Spain and Spanish rule in the Philippines (Cano 2013). LeRoy in his publications, primarily *Americans in the Philippines*, fostered a negative view of Spanish conquest and administration in the Philippines, arguing for example that the Spanish friars had “little tolerance...for the customs of the natives” (1914, I: 8), a perspective that became influential in the country as we shall later see in Craig. In 1916, Craig edited a compilation of travelogues by foreigners on their visit to the Philippines and, in his preface, he argued that “the conditions in the successive periods of Spanish influence were recognized to be indication of little progress, if not actually retrogressive” (n.p.). That LeRoy bore an imprint in Craig was evidenced by the fact that in this book by Craig he cited LeRoy’s monumental work by quoting LeRoy’s favorable comment about a particular travelogue.

Now let me discuss each one of the claims and how Craig was instrumental in their development as historical fact.

### **1. Is Thalamasin Pangasinan?**

The account of Friar Odoric of Pordenone on a certain island of Thalamasin is embellished as having celebrated the first mass in the Philippines in what was identified as Santiago Island in Bolinao in Pangasinan. Predating by two centuries the supposed first mass in 1521, the story as told by an Italian priest who donated a marker was that Friar Odoric was stranded in Thalamasin, or Pangasinan, in the island on his way to China in 1324 baptising the king, Dalisay, including the daughter, Urduja (Malamocco 2006; Sotelo-Fuertes 2007). The source of this contrived history was Del Castillo (1986/1988) who manipulated unrelated and problematic facts including Odoric's tale with archaeological data to produce a Pangasinan portrait of Urduja. How different is this from the Code of Kalantiao, the former name of a building in the Pangasinan Capitol Complex, and the forgeries of Jose Marco?

Let us examine this particular account by Friar Odoric as translated by Yule (1913-1916, 2:155-163):

Of the land called Thalamasin and of the trees that give flour and other marvels.

Near to this country is another which is called PANTEN, but others call it THALAMASYN, the king whereof hath many islands under him. Here be found trees that produce flour, and some that produce honey, others that produce wine, and others a poison the most deadly that existeth in the world. For there is no antidote to it known except one; and that is that if any one hath imbibed that poison he shall take of *stercus humanum* and dilute it with water, and of this potion shall he drink, and so shall he be absolutely quit of the poison. [And the men of this country being nearly all rovers, when they go to battle they carry every man a cane in the hand about a fathom in length, and put into one end of it an iron bodkin poisoned with this poison, and when they blow into the cane, the bodkin flieth and striketh whom they list, and those who are thus stricken incontinently die.]

But, as for the trees that produce flour, 'tis after this fashion. These are thick, but not of any great height; they are cut into with an axe round about the foot of the stem, so that a certain liquor flows from them resembling size. Now this is put into bags made of leaves, and put for fifteen days in the sun; and after that space of time a flour is found to have formed from the liquor. This they steep for two days in seawater, and then wash it with fresh water. And the result is the best paste in the world, from which they make whatever they choose, cates of sorts and excellent bread, of which I friar Odoric have eaten: for all these things have I seen with mine own eyes. And this kind of bread is white outside, but inside it is somewhat blackish.

By the coast of this country towards the south is the sea called the Dead Sea, the water whereof runneth ever towards the south, and if any one falleth into that water he is never found more. [And if the shipmen go but a little way from the shore they are carried rapidly downwards and never return again. And no one knoweth whither they are carried, and many have thus passed away, and it hath never been known what became of them.]

In this country also there be canes or reeds like great trees, and full sixty paces in length. There be also canes of another kind which are called *Cassan*, and these



always grow along the ground like what we call dog's grass, and at each of their knots they send out roots, and in such wise extend themselves for a good mile in lengths. And in these canes are found certain stones which be such that if any man wear one of them upon his person he can never be hurt or wounded by iron in any shape, and so for the most part the men of that country do wear such stones upon them. And when their boys are still young they take them and make a little cut in the arm and insert one of these stones, to be a safeguard against any wound by steel. And the little wound thus made in the boy's arm is speedily healed by applying to it the powder of a certain fish.

And thus through the great virtue of those stones the men who wear them become potent in battle and great corsairs at sea. But those who from being shipmen on that sea have suffered at their hands, have found out a remedy for the mischief. For they carry as weapons of offence sharp stakes of very hard wood, and arrows likewise that have no iron on the points; and as those corsairs are but poorly harnessed the shipmen are able to wound and pierce them through with these wooden weapons, and by this device they succeed in defending themselves most manfully.

Of these canes called Cassan they make sails for their ships, dishes, houses, and a vast number of other things of the greatest utility to them. And many other matters there be in that country which it would cause great astonishment to read or hear tell of; wherefore I am not careful to write them at present.

What is the truth about Friar Odoric's account? Nowhere did he say that when he was in Thalamasin, not Tawalisi, he baptized a king and a princess (Yule 1866, 1: 90-95; 1913-1916, 2: 155-163). Neither did he mention Dalisay nor Urduja. What he said was that near Java was an island of that name, also called Panten, where a king ruled over many islands. In this place, he noticed trees that produced flour, honey, and wine while others made of poison of which only one antidote could neutralize by mixing it with water for the poisoned to drink. The people of this land were mostly archers; they used a cane in which they put a poisoned instrument that they blew – a blowpipe – whenever they wished to kill anybody. He described the tree that bears flour – no doubt the sago palm – and how bread was manufactured from it. South of the island was a sea called “Dead Sea”; it was because anyone who passed and drowned in it would never come back and be lost forever. He described trees like canes or reeds, which are positively bamboos but also mentioned a kind of grass called *cassan* – rattan to Yule – that grew a mile or so bearing certain stones that the people gather to wear them so that they will not get hurt by iron. On the arms of their boys, they would make an incision to put in one of these and apply a powder from a certain kind of fish to heal the wound. With these on their bodies as amulets, they became invincible at sea as corsairs but their weakness was revealed to their enemies who have wooden weapons without iron able to pierce their skins. This *cassan* was used to make sails for their vessels, houses and other things useful to them. After this account, he told about the king of Zampa or Champa.

But where is Panten or Thalamasin on the map? In a long annotation, Yule (1866, 1: 90) said that there were many candidates for Panten such as Bantam, Bintang, Bandan, Patani and many others but no one had a good claim to it. Citing Crawfurd, Panten had many identical forms in Malay, Pantai or Pante, which meant shore or beach, Pantan or Pantian, a place on the beach; in Javanese, Panti, a house. Thalamasin, again from Crawfurd, could stand for Talaga Masin or the

Salt Lake, a place he had not encountered in any country. Yule suggested Tana Masin or Salt Land. The description by Friar Odoric led him to conclude that it nearly applied to the whole Indo-Malaysian archipelago but specifically cited Borneo, Celebes and the Moluccas. He favored Banjarmasin from banjar, order, and masin, salt or Salt Garden in Kalimantan in the island of Borneo noting that in the 11<sup>th</sup> century it has grown into flourishing state and later became tributary to Majapahit. But he offered other possibilities: on the coast of Biru in Eastern Borneo, a river-delta was called Panteh on Steiler's atlas while on the dictionary by Crawfurd, on almost the same spot was the place called Talysian. He also mentioned that in another reference there was a place south of Cambodia, ten days of travel, called Tanmaling. No place could, therefore, lay claim solidly on Panten and Thalamasin. Cordier would put forward a different but more plausible candidate citing Gerini who mentioned a village called Bentam "on the mainland side of Singapore Strait, right opposite the mouth of the Sungei Selitar, on the northern shore of Singapore Island, it is not likely that both travellers [Polo and Odoric] mistook the coast of the Malay Peninsula for an island. The island of Pentam, Paten, or Pantem must therefore be the Be-Tumah (Island) of the Arab Navigators, the Tamasak Island of the Malays; and, in short, the Singapore Island of our day" (Yule 1913, 2: 156). Gerini demolished theories that Pentam could be Batang or Bintang for reasons of geography. In his note to Thalamasin, Cordier wrote seven versions of the name: Thalamasym, Thalamasim, Talamasim, Thamalsi, Talamosa, Malamasin, and Malamasmi. The fourth, Thamalsi, is closer to Tamasak or Tumasik, the old name of Singapore.

So where is Panten or Thalamasin? Definitely, it is not in Pangasinan although it is tempting to associate Thalamasin with the province particularly because Yule suggested Tana Masin or Land of Salt from Malay tana meaning land. Pangasinan is known as the place where salt is made. But salt, of course, is not only found in Pangasinan. Bamboos and rattans abound in both of these places as well as sago but the Pangasinans when the Spaniards arrive were rice producers unlike in the Visayas and Mindanao where they were accustomed to eat sago or *lumbia* in their language. Blowpipe is also a weapon to Pangasinans known as *sumpit*. The custom of carrying amulets is common among Pangasinans but the practice of inserting one through a wound on the arm is not found in their tradition. Yule, in fact, raised some doubts on the account of Friar Odoric for the Minor Ramusian told about Nicoverra and Dondin between the accounts of India and China. But in the longer versions, he gave accounts of Sumatra, Java, Thalamasin and Champa, then Nicoverra, Ceylon and Dondin, which Yule found anomalous because Champa should have been followed by the account of China. He justified the inconsistent sequence as being due to the work of later amanuensis who took over the writing of the longer version from the incomplete narrative of the Minor Ramusian.

How did Pangasinan come into the picture? Following the logic of Jose Rizal on Tawalisi as I shall discuss later about Urduja after taking note of Yule's and Crawfurd's comments, the American historian, Austin Craig (1916a, 17), professor at the University of the Philippines, believed that Thalamasin could not be Sulu but somewhere in Luzon. "Salt regions", he wrote, were "common" in the country and he specifically mentioned Pangasinan as "a salt kingdom once powerful enough to be recognized by China, south [sic] to Sulu." From mere mention of Pangasinan as possible site for Thalamasin, it became the place where the first mass was held, which is a claim that is absolutely unfounded.

## **2. The kings who never reigned**

The case of Ari Kasikis of Caboloan and Ari Kasilag of Pangasinan, the former foisted by the *Census of the Philippine Islands Taken Under the Direction of Philippine Legislature in the year 1918*, were cited as historical personages by a long list of scholars, journalists and researchers beginning with Pulido (1936) followed by Velasquez (1957), Muñoz (1990), Basa (1997) and Flores (2001b; 2007; 2010). But did they really exist?

Let us go back to the contact period accounts. When Juan de Salcedo and his men explored the northern Philippines, they arrived in Pangasinan on 23 or 24 May 1572, spending five or six days in Bolinao, before embarking towards Lingayen Gulf (San Agustin 1698, 1698/1998, 614-619). They went inland to the town of Malimpit where they were fought by the inhabitants. Due to this resistance, they went from coast to coast until they reached Nacarlan River, which must be the Angalacan River in Mangaldan and San Fabian (Keesing 1962, 52-53). Having stayed for a night, the next morning they entered the river and arrived at a village where they were challenged once more. They took a different course into the sea until they arrived at a port, Agoo, where they saw three Japanese ships. They clashed with the Japanese leaving the place. Out again to the sea in which the following night they encountered an elevated village called Atuley. Ordering his men to scale the rock, they reached the top forcing the local inhabitants to leave the place. Salcedo was said to have seen the most beautiful place he had ever seen and learned afterwards that the place was the capital of the province. Peace was made with the natives when some returned but on the following day no one came back forcing Salcedo to continue their journey up north. Relying on Fr. Gaspar de San Agustin's account, Salcedo did not meet any king nor did he mention any King Kasilag.

Let us then take a look at another more detailed account (Salazar 1572), which provides the names of the chiefs and the settlements when Maestre de Campo Martin de Goiti went to Pangasinan on 9 December 1572. The expeditionary force arrived first at "province" of Burinao Guyurin town in Comendadores Island. The chief, Siac, gave tribute. On 13 December, Goiti arrived in the Pagasinan "province" in Pagasinan town along the river of Pagasinan ("rio de Pagasinan") or the Agno River. The leader, Cabiabbab, gave tribute. The following day, 14 December, Sibinaga of Yngayen did the same. From 16-30 December, thirty villages or towns under their respective chieftains gave tributes.

Name of village or town	Name of the chieftain
1. Guyurin in the province of Burinao	Siac
2. Pagasinan	Cabiabbab
3. Yngayen	Sibinaga
4. Sagud	Amavitac
5. Agoo	Mansamun
6. Silac	Balinguinguin
7. Sagut	Suimanguimo
8. Calabaco	Calic
9. Banagua	Simacasic
10. Madadan	Macabcab
11. Agoo	Salabac
12. Maluguin	Palinlingan
13. Sumian	Lamboy

14. Baruan	Marinclin
15. Lida	Tomapol
16. Pangayori	Mablango
17. Antin	Simarayaque and Piquie
18. Panpan	Dumacad
19. Vacayo	Manaca
20. Pao	Simli
21. Pangalayan	Calin
22. Pantol	Mabuley
23. Lungai in the “province” of Agoo	Gayos
24. Maedaddan	Catreney
25. Turey in the “province” of Turey	Galan
26. Ayafuen	Guayaguac
27. Calubugao	Magaguin
28. Guaguiguaguan	Calic
29. Salisay	Bunaga
30. Gabo	Atiba

**Table 1.** List of towns or villages in Pangasinan, Agoo and Turey with the names of their respective chiefs (Salazar 1572).

One of the towns can easily be identified. Yngayen is Lingayen (Santos 2004, 3). Sagud (or sagur in the local language means west) is a town or a village west of Lingayen. There are two towns named Agoo but another signified a province. Another province is named Turey. Both were listed under Pangasinan. Turey could be the Atuley in San Agustin’s account, said to be the capital of a province he did not mention. But in this later account, Turey is a town under a province of the same name. Atuley most probably came from the Pangasinan word, *uley* or *oley*, meaning “authority or rule” (Cosgaya 1865a, 235). *Atuley* would most likely mean “a town, which rules other towns” or the capital. On the other hand, Turey is close to, *turay*, an Iloco word, which means “rule” (Carro 1849, 299). Salisay might be Salasa, now Bugallon. Gabo could be the Gabon of succeeding years and later changed its name to Calasiao. Madadan might be Mangaldan and the river is no other than Angalacan River.

With the evidence thus presented, these villages do not represent a single constituted territory under a sovereign king but settlements ruled by various chieftains having more or lesser authority than the other. The case of Atuley or Turey, which is said to be the capital, might suggest otherwise but the lack of a centralized bureaucracy ruled by a paramount chief/king belies this. Where were Ari Kasikis and Ari Kasilag who were said to have reigned at the point of Spanish contact? Kasilag was alleged to have ruled the coastal kingdom of Pangasinan while Kasikis governed the interior kingdom of Caboloan. However, as I have examined it here Salcedo and de Goiti did not meet either Kasilag or Kasikis but they had to deal with 30 chieftains.

The source on one of these kings is the *Census of the Philippine Islands Taken Under the Direction of Philippine Legislature in the year 1918*. It mentioned Kasikis as being the king of

what is called the “Layug [sic] na Caboloan” (234-235). This second-hand account tells of Kasikis as having ruled Caboloan from his capital at Sapan Palapar somewhere in the vicinity of Binalatongan, now San Carlos City. Caboloan, a place where bolo are abundant, also means the language (Cosgaya 1865a, 94). King Kasikis was said to have been angered by missionary activities that he ordered the killing of the friars when King Lacandola of Tondo intervened and counselled Kasikis to treat them well. Note, however, that Caboloan as a toponym cannot be found in San Carlos but as barangays in Urdaneta City, Sta. Maria and San Nicolas in eastern Pangasinan and in Victoria in Tarlac province. In addition, Kasikis gives out its origins as it came from Spanish word “cacique” that was adapted from Caribbean Taino term for local ruler (Real Academia Española 2001). The change in orthography from c and q to k led to cacique becoming kasiki. Thus, Kasikis is only the plural form of caciques. From a term that means chief, it became the name of a king. While the census takers may have only recorded popular Pangasinan folklore at that time, they could have written it in a way that says so, not as real, flesh and blood character who existed before the Spaniards arrived.

But why cacique? The Spaniards never used it widely to refer to the indigenous rulers of the Philippines who were called *regulos*, *reyezuelo* or *principales*. But in the early years of American occupation of the Philippines, cacique was a term that was invested with much American scholarship to re-signify the Filipino leadership class who would take the blame along with the Spanish past for the failure of Americans to implant their brand of democracy (Cano 2006, 12 passim). Through the works of the American historian James A. LeRoy (1875-1909) in 1905 and 1914, it is possible that the king of Caboloan, Kasikis, was taken from the caciques much hated and blamed upon by American policymakers like William Howard Taft, head of the Philippine Commission, as oppressors who engaged in ladronism and religious fanaticism. LeRoy was instrumental in the recasting of the Spanish past in Philippine history as “backward”, and “medieval” in order to portray the coming of the Americans as purveyors of modernity. What about Urduja?

### **3. Urduja: The invention of a Pangasinan princess**

Urduja is still the name of the Pangasinan governor’s house in Lingayen since it was named as such in 1953. Who really is Urduja? It is necessary to discuss her in light of the refusal of some persons to yield to historical evidence and who continue to propagate and cling to her as Pangasinan’s indispensable symbol. The resilience of Urduja in the popular mind can be attributed to a number of factors: the teaching of her invented story in the school curriculum and her dissemination in popular culture. Those who insist in flaunting her as Pangasinan’s ultimate icon and mascot for women’s liberation movement should know that history is never static. It is dynamic for the people create their own history. And when a heroine like Urduja has been found to be mere fabrication, history is there to be known by going deep into it and that means looking for other historical figures and ideas which could serve as a model and as a symbol rooted in the Pangasinan people’s *actual* historical experience and struggles.

In 2006. I wrote a Pangasinan poem, which won a minor prize, extolling Urduja without knowing that she is not Pangasinan at all. In the last verse I wrote: Balet bangon ka, Urduja! Bangon ka! / Bangon kad lobók na linawa / Say polim panpurakdad sika asinggerla / Ta say inarom ya salita pateyto nabuasla! with my translation: But arise, Urduja! Arise! / Arise from the grave of consciousness / The extermination of you by your people is nearing / Because your beloved language its death is tomorrow! The contradiction in the poem is glaring because how can Urduja

speaking Pangasinan language when she was not a Pangasinan but most probably a Cham. How on earth did Urduja arrive in Pangasinan shores so to speak when she was from Tawalisi in Southeast Asian mainland?



**Figure 1.** The alleged portrait of Pangasinan Princess Urduja in the reissue of Galang's *Encyclopedia of the Philippines* in the 1950s.

Let me quote in full the account by Ibn Batuta using the translation made by Yule (1913-1916, 4:103-108):

After leaving Kakula they sailed for thirty-four days, and then arrived at the Calm or Pacific Sea (ul Bahr-ul Káhil), which is of a reddish tint, and in spite of its great extent is disturbed by neither winds nor waves. The boats were brought into play to tow the ship, and the great sweeps of the junk were pulled likewise. They were thirty-seven days in passing this sea, and it was thought an excellent passage, for the time occupied was usually forty or fifty days at least. They now arrived at the country of Tawalisi, a name derived, according to Ibn Batuta, from that of its king.

It is very extensive, and the sovereign is the equal of the King of China. He possesses numerous junks with which he makes war upon the Chinese until they sue for peace, and consent to grant him certain concessions. The people are idolaters; their countenances are good, and they bear a strong resemblance to the Turks. They are usually of a copper complexion, and are very valiant and warlike. The women ride, shoot, and throw the javelin well, and fight in fact just like the

men. We cast anchor in one of their ports which is called Kailukari. It is also one of their greatest and finest cities, and the king's son used to reside there. When we had entered the harbour soldiers came down to the beach, and the skipper landed to speak with them. He took a present with him for the king's son; but he was told that the king had assigned him the government of another province, and had set over this city his daughter, called Urduja.

The second day after our arrival in the port of Kailukari, this princess invited the *Nákhodah* or skipper, the *Karáni* or purser, the merchants and persons of note, the *Tindail* or chief of the sailors, the *Sipahsalár* or chief of the archers, to partake of a banquet which Urduja had provided for them according to her hospitable custom. The skipper asked me to accompany them, but I declined, for these people are infidels and it is unlawful to partake of their food. So when the guests arrived at the Princess's she said to them: "Is there anyone of your party missing?" The captain replied: "There is but one man absent, the *Bakshi* (or Divine), who does not eat of your dishes." Urduja rejoined: "Let him be sent for." So a party of her guards came for me, and with them some of the captain's people, who said to me: "Do as the Princess desires."

So I went, and found her seated on her great chair or throne, whilst some of her women were in front of her with papers which they were laying before her. Round about were elderly ladies, or *duennas*, who acted as her counsellors, seated below the throne on chairs of sandalwood. The men also were in front of the Princess. The throne was covered with silk, and canopied with silk curtains, being itself made of sandalwood and plated with gold. In the audience hall there were buffets of carved wood, on which were set forth many vessels of gold of all sizes, vases, pitchers, and flagons. The skipper told me that these vessels were filled with a drink compounded with sugar and spice, which these people use after dinner; he said it had an aromatic odour and delicious flavour; that it produced hilarity, sweetened the breath, promoted digestion, etc., etc.

As soon as I had saluted the princess she said to me in the Turkish tongue *Husn misen yakhshi misen* (*Khúsh mísan? Yakhshi mísan?*) which is as much as to say. Are you well? How do you do? and made me sit down beside her. This princess could write the Arabic character well. She said to one of her servants *Dawát wa batak katur*, that is to say, "Bring inkstand and paper." He brought these, and then the princess wrote *Bismillah Arrahmán Arrahím* (In the name of God the merciful and compassionate!) saying to me "What's this?" I replied "*Tanzari nám*" (Tangri nam), which is as much as to say "the name of God" ; whereupon she rejoined "Khushn," or "It is well." She then asked from what country I had come, and I told her that I came from India. The princess asked again, "From the Pepper country?" I said "Yes." She proceeded to put many questions to me about India and its vicissitudes, and these I answered. She then went on, "I must positively go to war with that country and get possession of it, for its great wealth and great forces attract me." Quoth I, "You had better do so." Then the princess made me a present consisting of dresses, two elephant-loads of rice, two she buffaloes, ten sheep, four

roths of cordial syrup, and four *Martabans*, or stout jars, filled with ginger, pepper, citron and mango, all prepared with salt as for a sea voyage.

The skipper told me that Urduja had in her army free women, slave girls, and female captives, who fought just like men; that she was in the habit of making incursions into the territories of her enemies, taking part in battle, and engaging in combat with warriors of repute. He also told me that on one occasion an obstinate battle took place between this princess and one of her enemies a great number of her soldiers had been slain, and her whole force was on the point of running away, when Urduja rushed to the front, and forcing her way through the ranks of the combatants till she got at the king himself with whom she was at war, she dealt him a mortal wound, so that he died, and his troops fled. The princess returned with his head carried on a spear, and the king's family paid a vast sum to redeem it. And when the princess rejoined her father he gave her this city of Kailukari, which her brother had previously governed. I heard likewise from the same skipper that various sons of kings had sought Urduja's hand, but she always answered, "I will marry no one but him who shall fight and conquer me!" so they all avoided the trial, for fear of the shame of being beaten by her.

We quitted the country of Tawalisi, and after a voyage of seventeen days, during which the wind was always favourable, we arrived in China.

The personality of Pangasinan's Urduja is apparently taken from the Arabic account of Ibn Battuta and Pangasinan folklore. Battuta, a Moroccan Berber travelling between 1324 and 1354 in the Orient, went to Sumutrah or Sumatra and Mul Jawah or the Malay Peninsula and from there along with fellow passengers they sailed to Tawalisi, also the name of its king, and arrived at its main port, Kaylukari (Yule 1866, 2: 473-477; Yule 1913-1916, 4: 103-108; see also Mackintosh-Smith 2002, 258-259). As can be read from above, the king was said to possess many junks he commanded to levy war against China until they came to an agreement. They were "infidels", worshipped idols, had reddish skin and looked like Turks; their women were horseback riders and good archers. Kaylukari, their most impressive city, was governed by the king's son but when they anchored at that port, they learned that he was appointed to rule another place while the king's daughter, Urduja, was put in his stead. A day after their arrival, Urduja summoned them including the captain for a banquet but Battuta refused because being a Muslim *qadi* he was not allowed to eat their unlawful food. When the princess learned this, she sent her guards to fetch him. He went finding Urduja on her throne surrounded by elderly women on their chairs. In front of the majestic seat with silk canopy were the men in a hall decked with carved wood, vessels of gold and jars of special wine. After showing his obeisance, Battuta was asked by Urduja in Turkish on his health, told him to sit beside her and told one of her servants in her language "Dawat wa batak katur", which means to bring inkstand and paper. With them at hand, she wrote in Arabic the name of God asking him about it, which he answered. Then, she asked him where he came from and he said India asking him many questions and told him she wanted to go to war and possess that country. Battuta encouraged her to do so. Later Urduja gifted him with clothing, two elephant loads of rice, two buffaloes, ten sheep, four pounds of syrup, four Martabans or large jars with ginger, pepper, lemons and mangoes, all salted for the next journey. Battuta was told by the captain that Urduja had her own army of women, either free, slaves or captives, she had led in forays in enemy



territories, engaged in combat with leading enemy warriors and once led her troops against the enemy; she was nearly routed but she got her way to kill the enemy king. The king's head on a spear she carried back, which the king's family paid huge money to ransom. Her father, the king, pleased, awarded her the city of Kailukari. Battuta was told also by the captain that the princess was likely to have spurned many suitors since she declared that she would marry one if he could fight and defeat her.

That, in sum, is the story of Urduja. Like Thalamasin, where is Tawalisi and Kailukari? This question also baffled scholars since the travel account's transcription from Arabic and translation into French by Defrémery and Sanguinetti in the 1850s. These translators put Thauâlisy either in the island of Celebes or Tonkin; they were, however, silent on Orduodjâ's Cailoûcary (1853-1859/1873-1879, 4: 248-249). Though he said that their position cannot be established with precision, Dulaurier (1847, 81-82) identified it as Cambodia, Conchin-China or Tonkin. On the skin color, he said that this indicated that the people of Thawalisy were on the vicinity of China and could have lived in Tonkin. On the latter, he was supported by Lassen (1847-1862, 890 as cited in Yule 1913-1916, 4: 68) who cited the frequent wars between Tonkin and China. Walckenaer (1842 as cited in Yule 1913-1916, 4: 68-69) placed it in Tawal, an island composing the Bacan archipelago in Moluccas. Yule (1913-1916, 4: 157-160) disputed Walckenaer because the latter's argument was based on the name and its proximity to Java, which cannot be since Mul Jawah was the Malay Peninsula. He did not agree with Cambodia, Conchin-China and Tonkin for two reasons: the length of travel of 71 days and those 37 days was spent on the Bahr-al-Kâhil he refused to believe as the China Sea. Doubts lingered in him as to the veracity of the story because Killa-karai was a port in south India. Urduja, which was also the consort's name of a sultan mentioned in another part of Battuta's travelogue and Urduja's ability to speak Turkish and Persian led him to conclude that Tawalisi can only be found in Captain Gulliver's atlas. Leaving aside these misgivings, he proposed Sulu islands and the calm sea was the body of water stretching from Java to Celebes. As to the presence of elephants, he cited Dalrymple, objected to the hesitation of Crawford and argued that they were domesticated in Brunei. He still raised doubt, however, on Tawalisi's rivalry with China, a characteristic that did suit Sulu. He made it a point to mention Talysian on East Borneo, and Tawi-Tawi, one of the principal islands of Sulu archipelago as sounding like Tawalisi while for Kailukari, he gave Curi-curi on the west side of Celebes as indicated in Mercator's and Hondius' atlas, the present Kaili on the same spot, and Kalakah, a place northeast of Borneo. There is therefore uncertainty as scholars were not so sure where they would place on the map Tawalisi and Kailukari. On a note by Cordier, he cited G. J. Dozy (as quoted in Van der Lith and Devic 1883-1886, 245n) who wrote that Ibn Battuta could have passed through the Java Sea either through the Makassar Straits or Moluccas because contrary winds in some of the year made crossing the strait of Melaka difficult and suggested that Tawalisi could be found in the Philippine Islands.

### **Rizal and his flawed historical method**

In the two hundred and fifty years of Spanish rule, Urduja was not known. Then, came the second half of the nineteenth century, the foremost Filipino propagandist and nationalist, Jose Rizal, tackled Urduja in one of his letters. The idea that Rizal was the first to identify Tawalisi with the Philippines is false. In any case, how did Rizal come to engage in speculating where in the Philippines could Tawalisi be? In London, he was busy annotating Morga when Dr. Adolf B. Meyer, the director of the Anthropological and Ethnographic Museum in Dresden, wrote him on 12 December 1888 asking his opinion on whether Tawalisi could be the Philippines or a part of it.

Rizal replied on 7 January 1889 (1962), which I will quote extensively using my own translation of the Spanish texts because besides being a lesson in historical method, it will show either the validity or inconsistencies and outright ridiculousness of his arguments for or against his position.

Dividing his answer into four sections, he first gave reasons why he preferred more the translation of Sanguinetti than the ones by Lee and Yule. Lee (1829) was the first English translator of a condensed version of the Arabic manuscripts by Battuta. Yule (1866) based his English translation on Defrèremery and Sanguinetti's French translation of the complete Arabic text (1853-1859). Rizal was referring to these works although he kept on citing Sanguinetti and failed to mention Defrèremery perhaps for shorthand purposes. Meyer recommended Lee's but Rizal said that it was good for those who knew Arabic "because what is lacking in the text is excused in the abundance of notes, which enriches it, but unfortunately my knowledge of Arabic is very limited." Lee's "seems an extract and contains to my view some contradictions and inaccuracies that become obvious when compared with the texts of Yule and Sanguinetti." He gave as examples the name of the king, Tawalisi, of which in Lee's it was written as Wahi Arduja while this was reserved for the king's daughter in Yule and Sanguinetti; the name of the region after getting it correct as Tawalisi was made later Tiālīsī and the number of days from this area to Canton was seven days as opposed to Yule's and Sanguinetti's seventeen days. Weighing his sources, he deliberated:

Yule's translation, although it is now more extensive and more detailed than Lee's, is however less than that of Sanguinetti, and in some parts it seems a translation of the latter. For this and not having anything different from that of Sanguinetti, we prefer the latter because it is more extensive and more detailed, although it is not annotated as Yule's.

He would cite and underscore the pertinent texts in French. He could not accept Yule's disbelief that Battuta's account on Tawalisi came out of Gulliver's geography. There were omissions in some of the information by Battutah but he believed that on the voyage to Tawalisi "there are details that only the reality of events could have supplied, details that could not have been invented like the change of Kailucary's government, ruled before by the king's son etc." He asked, "What interest Ibn Battuta may have on lying?" He "had visited so many beautiful countries, much more interesting than Tawalisi and would not discredit himself to tell about an insignificant tale." But "that he wanted to embellish his trip with certain exaggerated or fictitious details is possible; the imagination, the love of the marvelous, or some confusion in the ideas produced by the multitude of things seen, may well have been the cause."

To a certain extent, Rizal found Battuta credible. Battuta voyaged from Kakula in Mul Jawah to Tawalisi in 71 days of which 34 were by sail and 37 by rowing and 15 days from Tawalisi to Canton by favorable wind. Using the distance by days of travel, which he said that it did not vary with time unlike names and customs, and deducing that the average speed of the vessel on which Battuta was riding was eight to ten geographic miles (fifteen to a degree) from the length of travel from Maldives to Bengal, 43 days and from Bengal to Babahnagar, which he placed at either Cap Negrais or Pegu, 15 days, Rizal drew two arcs:

one from Canton with a radius of 180 geographic miles or leagues, assuming that with a favourable wind they were running at 12 leagues daily; and another from Kakula (between Java and Sumatra) of a 430 radius, calculating that by rowing

only they were obtaining an average speed, we will get that the intersection of both arches falls precisely in the region north of the Philippines.

He rejected the idea that Tawalisi could be found in Celebes (Sanguinetti's) and in Jolo (Yule) because one cannot go to Canton from these two places in fifteen days. Neither can Tawalisi be found in Tonkin (Sanguinetti) nor in Formosa because a problem arose on where to locate the calm sea or the Bahr-al-Káhil, which was not the China Sea, a description that fit the Celebes Sea of Yule while the red tinge on the waters of the sea he hesitatingly suggested Borneo. Regarding the ethnographic details that Battuta had described Tawalisi like its being equal to China, Rizal said that this did not apply to Jolo but to "Luzon and its king whose son in the 16<sup>th</sup> century was the commander of the armed forces of the King of Borneo and that he had, moreover, before the arrival of the Spaniards (1570) an arms factory so big 'as that of Malaga' (Gaspar de S. Agustin)"; that it possessed numerous junks, it meant "the extensive trade by the inhabitants of Luzon by land and by sea to Cebu, Mindanao and Jolo"; on the war that it carried out against the Chinese, "the inhabitants of Mindoro captured a Chinese junk upon the arrival of Legaspi to the island, whom they freed"; on the fact that the people worshipped idols, "Islam was introduced in Luzon only through the elite perhaps only in the 15<sup>th</sup> century or towards the end"; on women riding horses, "here the only detail that there is against our conjecture is the widespread belief that the introduction of the horse is later in the Philippines after the arrival of the Spaniards although none speak of the precise time of their introduction"; "Did the horse exist or were they imported in the 14<sup>th</sup> century and later they became extinct like what happened to the elephant?"; on the four martabans given as gifts containing ginger, syrup, citrus and mango, "this exactly agrees with what Pigafetta says about the gift from a Samar kinglet. We call martabana the ones ruddy vases of proper cream color for storing water, oil and salted fruits like preserved mango"; and on ladies fighting like men,

In Philippine theater, there is always the princess with the character of a warrior, especially if she is a Moor. In real life we knew women truly amazons, like the famous smuggler Dagul of Pangasinan. We do not know if the bellicose character of our princesses in the theater comes from historical memories or from chivalric books that were introduced by the Spaniards.

Regarding Orduodja's returning with her enemy's head on a spear, Rizal wrote that "although this custom of beheading the enemy is found not only among the Hebrews but also among Scots (Macbeth), Spaniards and American Indians, here one can see the tribal custom of Philippine headhunters"; on the ransoming of the king's head by his family with rich treasures, "Dato in keeping with family affections that exist in the Philippines"; on the return of the princess she was awarded the city of Cailoucary by the king, "Perhaps the Philippines is the only country in the Far East where the woman was always considered equal to the man. The daughter inherits and succeeds in power the father if there was no male, and even now during the life of her parents, the young woman negotiates and manages funds and ensures the tilling of the fields"; and on Orduodja's claim that she would not marry except the one who could fight and vanquish her, "Although we do not know any Tagalog word equivalent to the contest (tournament) nevertheless the idea of tournaments is in most of the Tagalog poems, and certainly in some the woman fights."

Finally, on the name Tawalisi, he proposed that it came from *Taga Luzon* from Tagalog, which meant from Luzon or resident or inhabitant of Luzon although he said Arabists could clarify

more on this. The Spaniards did not name the island for it was already known as such by the Chinese and Japanese whom he consulted and also Pigafetta's calling it Loson or Luzon. He said that "there are Philippine towns called Talisay, one in Batangas at the bank of Bombon Lake where Salcedo arrived at when he came for the first time." He rejected Yule's suggestion that Tawalisi was near Bachian or today's Bacan as well as the idea of placing it east of Formosa in the village called Ta-wa-li for they could not meet the fifteen-day sail with favorable wind declaring that "the country north of the group that forms the Philippines is the only one that has more bases." He wrote further that:

Against the only contrary data of women who could mount on horseback, all circumstances concur to sustain this opinion on all the important information on the days of travel. There is, besides, a favourable wind to navigate from the Philippines to China, and a current that goes northward.

Based on the preceding arguments, did Rizal give convincing evidence to support his position? He was stretching evidence to locate Tawalisi in Luzon to the point of absurdity. He used contemporary events or facts to validate his claim. On Tawalisi in Luzon as being equal to China, he cited the instance when a Chinese junk was captured by the inhabitants in Mindoro in 1571. On the thousand junks the king of Tawalisi was able to send and engage them in war against China, he twisted it as to mean the extensive trade Luzon people had going as far as Jolo. On women riding horses in Tawalisi, although he accepted that the horse brought serious questions to his claim, he nonetheless said that "the women of Batangas, Laguna and Tayabas are at present excellent horseback riders." While his method of arriving at Luzon with two arcs intersecting at it is acknowledged as "ingenious", Cortes (1995, 65) said that it is open to criticism because using the same method would point to the coast of Indochina. It is clear he was not saying that Tawalisi was located in Pangasinan because what he meant by northern part of the Philippines was Luzon. The only reference to Pangasinan was the notorious female smuggler known as Dagul. He could not pinpoint the location of Kailukari, the city which Urduja was appointed the governor; he seemed to locate the capital of Tawalisi in Manila referring to the reigning sovereigns at the time of Legazpi's arrival in 1571. He vacillated on Luzon for while he said that Tawalisi came from *Taga Luzon* he also mentioned Talisay, an obscure town in Batangas, as source for that name. With due respect to him, when he accused the Ilocano historian Isabelo de los Reyes of excessive Ilocanism barely a month after writing Meyer (1889/1931, 116), did Rizal not suffer here a severe form of Luzonism or Tagalism? What could have been the reaction of Meyer to this strange mix of scattered facts collected to give credence to the idea that Tawalisi could be found in the Philippines? We do not have Meyer's reply in the list of Rizal's correspondence.

De Veyra (1951) pointed out the inconsistencies in the narratives about Urduja and the lack of correspondence between the conditions found in her kingdom and the Philippines prior to or at the time of Spanish contact and questioned the historicity of Urduja calling her in his words "ser mitológico" (legendary or mythological being) although he would posit his own hypothesis that Kailukari was Ka-ilukuan (12). Zafra (1952, 62-67; 1977, 160-163) followed this up in an article approaching it in a historical-geographical perspective disproving Rizal's hypothesis by arguing that the intersection of arcs could also point to Indochina, if indeed Battuta used the route determined by Rizal Battuta could not have missed the many islands in the Philippines along the way, which he never mentioned in his account and that *Bahr-al-kahil* or the calm sea was located in the Mekong River. One drawback was he interpreted Rizal's northern part of the Philippines as

“Northwestern Philippines” (62). His student, Cortes, professor at the University of the Philippines and author of three-volume history of Pangasinan, (1995, 65, 69), presented the same exact view, even the words and phrases of her mentor – a plagiarism<sup>5</sup> – without adding a new argument that Tawalisi could not be Luzon but Indochina. However, as early as 1936, Yamamoto provided the basis that the city of Kaylukari could be Po Klong Garai in Panduranga in the Cham kingdom in present-day Vietnam.

How did Pangasinan come into the picture when Rizal did not specifically say that Pangasinan was Tawalisi? In fact, he was saying that Tawalisi was the island of Luzon or other adjacent islands. The reason is some scholars began to elaborate on Rizal’s hypothesis. Craig (1916a, 17), the same American professor of history at the University of the Philippines who believed Thalamasin was Pangasinan, was one and the first among them who came up with Pangasinan as the possible location of that ancient kingdom ruled by so-called Amazons when he agreed with Rizal on the possible location of Tawalisi in the northern part of the Philippines. It would not take long for others to get the cue from Craig and write about Urduja as one Pangasinan princess who ruled in the 14<sup>th</sup> century.

The Benitez brothers (1923, 13-14) published a collection of biographies of famous Filipinos; Urduja was included as someone from Pangasinan. An encyclopedia about the Philippines wrote about Urduja as the woman ruler of the kingdom of Pangasinan (Galang 1935, 2: 23). Pedrito Reyes and Jose D. Karasig (1940) included her in their brief biographies of famous Filipinas but placed her kingdom in Aparri, Cagayan. Another historian after the American Craig, this time a Filipino, claimed Urduja as the Amazonic warrior-ruler of ancient Pangasinan (Zaide 1949, 65). With scholars giving legitimacy to the claim by Rizal that Tawalisi was in Luzon and the assertion by Craig that it was in Pangasinan, its expression in popular culture from the pages of school textbooks appeared in the form of paintings dated 1935, 1954 and 1959, movies in 1974 and 1975 whose impact must have been tremendous during the censorship years of Martial Law, apart from names of building, hotel, bank, pharmacy outlet, sari-sari store, feminist organizations and actual persons (Flores 2010a, 29).

### **Del Castillo and his absurd historical approach**

The Pangasinan obsession to Urduja reached a point when Del Castillo (1986/1988), a professor at a local university in Pangasinan, manipulated evidence that Urduja reigned in Pangasinan in the orbit of the Sri Vijaya and Majapahit empires. How? Artifacts found in Bolinao graves like Sung and Tang coins and ceramics were presented as buttressing the claim. Del Castillo absurdly asserted that Bolinao was Mai and that its proximity to China made it the true candidate for his Amazon kingdom. Since Urduja spoke Turkish, Arabic and knew the Koran, Del Castillo gave account on the Islamization of the Philippines further asserting that “Thalawasin” – not Thalamasin – or Bolinao was islamized after 1324, after the celebration of the first mass by Friar Odoric. He furthermore claimed that Princess Urduja was a Muslim and that her people became Muslims from 1344 up to 1574. Then, he related the story of Princess Tere-es, leader of the Amazons of Lingayen, descendants of Princess Urduja, who refused Spanish sovereignty and resisted conversion and the payment of tribute as told to him by Doña Glicería del Castillo, as told to her by her father.

---

<sup>5</sup> Although Cortes cited Zafra, she did not put in quotation marks the words she lifted from Zafra’s work. This still constitutes plagiarism. The issue of Cortes’ plagiarism was brought to my attention by Dr. Jaime B. Veneracion, retired UP professor of history, when I was still teaching at the UP Department of History.

To explain the wind pattern in Battutah's account, he mentioned Pangasinan terms for types of winds. To bolster his claim to Bolinao, he cited the transcription of the account of Friar Odoric by Luther Parker, an American superintendent of education as having mentioned the Isla de Tempestades as nothing but Bolinao where Fr. Odoric celebrated the first mass and baptized Urduja. In a footnote, he stated that Thalamasin in Pangasinan means soaked ("talem") in salt ("asin") while Tawalisi means to barter ("tawal") salt ("asin"). Since Battuta told of Tawalisi as idolaters and looked Turkish, he argued that the people of Bolinao were so. That they were horseback riders and warlike, he said that tradition spoke of "kinalakian" or masculinized women who could lift heavy loads or even knew martial arts of arnis called dose teros. He even claimed that the name of Princess Urduja meant "princessa ed porowa (princess on the astern)" (56) and provided the Pangasinan transliteration of "dawat wa batak katur." Again, the alleged female skeletal remains at Balingasay graves in Bolinao confirmed his claim that indeed the remains were Urduja and her kingdom. He suggested through a mish-mash of facts, sometimes unrelated and at times ridiculous, that Princess Urduja and her women warriors were descendants of the exiles of the Sri Vijayan empire and that due to the loss of manpower women began to train as warriors and that they resisted the troops of Majapahit empire, their defeat led to their graves in Bolinao.

He put forward the idea that the Calatagan burial sites were the graves of the Sailendra dynasty without providing incontrovertible evidence and concluded that Urduja and her women were Sumatrans. He gave an account of the tributary relations between Ming China and Pangasinan, the Lingayen mestizo sangleys and their customs and what he called "petty kingdoms" in Pangasinan as continuation of Princess Urduja's rule they being the heirs of the princess. He identified three kings at the time of Spanish contact, Ari Alaos of Lingayen, father of Princess Terees, Ari Kasikis, again this Ari Kasikis mentioned before, of Binalatongan and Ari Potohan of Bolinao. When the Spanish conquistadores came to demand tribute, he wrote that Princess Terees resisted; those who did not want to be subdued went to the mountains. The remnants of this kingdom, Del Castillo claimed, were the tribes in Benguet, Kiangnan Ifugao and Apayao. The existence of toponyms Angarian in Lingayen, Bugallon and Aguilar was given as proof of Urduja's kingdom because the word meant "the place where the king was crowned." The capital of Urduja's kingdom, Kailukari, is said to be Pangasinan, Ka-ili-u-ari or Ka-ili-i-ari, which means "king's guest" or "king's reception place" (159). Again to prove his point, he cited archaeological record that flora and fauna such as elephants and products found in her kingdom described by Battuta can be found in Pangasinan.

Overall, the texts suffered from bad grammar and painful construction of English sentences; it did not cite its sources properly. But the most important issue is the atrocious lack of application of historical method by the author. What he did was to gather unrelated data to support his preposterous claims. He built his main argument by choosing information from various sources to the point where he was able to create a fantastic tale of outlandish proportions. The use of Pangasinan folklore was employed to support his view of an authentic Pangasinan princess not knowing that folklore were products of the milieu where they came from, most probably the result of reading accounts of Urduja in textbooks and embellished through the word of mouth by elders who grew up before World War II and a decade after. The Pangasinan language was manipulated to suit the wild conjectures of the author. In the appendix, Del Castillo unwittingly gave the source where the name Dalisay, alleged to be the father of Urduja, the king, appeared. It was an imaginative speech by Urduja, probably written by the author of the textbook *Gems of Philippine Oratory* (1924), the same Austin Craig! Can a credible historian accept and use as a source a supposed speech of Urduja, which is certainly a product of a good speechwriter?

From an unconfirmed anecdote by a Moroccan traveler, Urduja became larger than life itself that not only Pangasinan having stake on it but almost everyone including the feminists and fanatics who would insist that Urduja represented, regardless of her nationality or historicity, someone dear to the heart of every Pangasinan and Filipino. She could have articulated the power of women and for that she symbolized the yearning for equality, if not superiority, in a patriarchal society but to suggest that she embodied a matriarchal past is way off and completely made up (Flores 2001a, 11; 2010, 31). She was not deployed as “defensive response...to the onslaught of Hispanization” as Flores (2010a, 31) claimed but rather simply an obvious invention of a splendid pre-Hispanic past owing to sloppy scholarship perhaps in reaction to Eurocentricism. Del Castillo and those who followed his footsteps had a model in Rizal and later Craig by connecting unrelated facts to create a seemingly credible story of Princess Urduja of Pangasinan. More than the reality of gender inequality and colonial experience that she supposedly highlights is the unrecognized fact that she is a representation of the colonized’s penchant for the foreign, the exotic, which is equivalent to the humiliation of his own indigenous culture, history and heroes.

If Princess Urduja is a historical figure not of Pangasinan history but of another nation’s history, how do we write, then, the early history of Pangasinan? Cortes (1974), knowing the difficulty that lay in the reconstruction of the pre-colonial history of Pangasinan, began her narrative in 1572 upon the arrival of De Goiti and his forces on the shore of Pangasinan although she wrote an introduction to Pangasinan pre-Hispanic indigenous culture. She did not tackle Urduja informed well of the dangers of having to deal with a problematic character. Local historians like Del Castillo (1986/1988) in awe of what is written by outsiders began to accept hook, line and sinker the story of Urduja because it satisfied their longing for a rich and magnificent past. Others are credulous to folklore that they believed it to be history when in reality it could be one of the sources of history liable to fabrication and distortion.

### **Yamamoto or how to be a critical historian**

As an afterthought, if Zaide, De Veyra, Zafra, Del Castillo and the rest of the scholars who presented at the 1990 National Conference on Urduja knew of Yamamoto’s work (1936) that Kailukari was no other than Po Klong Garai in Panduranga in the Cham kingdom, could they have asserted what they have asserted, that Urduja’s kingdom is in Pangasinan? Let us examine how Yamamoto arrived at his argument that Kailukari was Po Klong Garai. But first, who was Yamamoto?

Yamamoto Tatsuro was a first-rate Japanese historian of Southeast Asia with main specialization in Annamese history. Born in 1910, he studied literature at the University of Tokyo where he graduated in 1933 (Serizawa 2013, 148). When he published his work in 1936 on Tawalisi, he travelled to colonial Southeast Asia and moved to Paris to study at l’École française d’Extrême-Orient under George Coedes, the eminent French scholar on Indianized Southeast Asia. His dissertation in 1950 about Annamese history was published in the same year and garnered him in May 1952 the Japan Academy Prize, which is only given to persons with notable research or outstanding book (See <http://www.japan-acad.go.jp/en/activities/jyusho/041to050.html#anker010>). Yamamoto was therefore the complete opposite of both Rizal, Craig and Castillo. Rigorous in his approach to scholarship, he understood and knew the application of historical method.

At the outset, Yamamoto was forthright that the account of Tawalisi by Battuta was “most questionable” to commentators (1936, 94). He cited authors, Defrémery and Sanguinetti, Lassen, Dulaurier and Boulting, who believed that Tawalisi was Tonking, which Yule opposed and

proposed Sulu instead. Yamamoto, however, did not support Yule for two reasons: first, either Tonking or Sulu did not favor the length of time, which took the voyage of 71 days citing Chinese maritime travel accounts that from Qui-nhon to Malacca, it would take only 10 days while from Qui-nhon to Surabaya, Cheng-Ho reached it in 25 days and second, the route from Sulu would be “circuitous” (101). Ferrand took the extreme view that Ibn Battuta’s account was not authentic with so many passages untrustworthy. While Yamamoto believed in some of Ferrand’s assumptions, he did not agree with the summary dismissal of the travelogue pointing that the account of China had details that only Ibn Battutah could have observed first-hand.

Instead of Sulu and Tonking, Yamamoto offered Champa as the most likely location of Tawalisi arguing that it “was once an important country in Indo-China and flourished in maritime commerce and navigation” (104). Being an Annamese scholar had helped him identify Tawalisi as Champa since identification of sites in early Southeast Asia and other regions is full of pitfalls and poses a lot of difficulties to historians. It was an important port of call between China and India via Strait of Malacca. How did he account for Tawalisi? For him, it was not the name of a place but as Ibn Battuta said, it was the name of the king. In Champa, there was a title, Taval, placed before the name of a Champa king or nobleman. Thus in the inscriptions, Jaya Sinhavarman IV, king of Champa from 1307-1312, was also called Taval Çura Adhikavarman while names of noblemen had also this before their names. Yamamoto believed that this Taval has relation to Tawalisi. To buttress his claim, he cited Annamese accounts of Champa kingdom in 1342 AD – the year Ibn Battuta went to China – when Ché A nan died, his son-in-law Trà hoà Bó đê took the throne usurping the king’s son Ché Mỗ who was appointed by the late king Bó điên or Great King while reserving to Trà hoà Bó đê the position of Bó đê or premier. Based on his inference, Trà hoà Bó đê was not the whole name of the king. The first two Trà hoà was the “phonetical transcription” of Taval (109).

Was Champa equal to the King of China, possessing a lot of junks to carry out war until the Chinese sue for peace according to the account of Ibn Battuta? While this statement seemed to be an exaggeration, Yamamoto reasonably related a factual account, which somewhat supported the claim. In 1282 AD Kublai Khan wanted to conquer Champa, sending Yuan troops by sea but the attempt was unsuccessful. He followed it up by land but again it did not succeed. Were they idolaters? Indeed, they were as Champa people were practicing Hinduism, particularly Shivaism coupled with the worship of the linga, and Buddhism. As to their warlike attitude, he cited several Chinese sources to prove that they were. The reference to the people of Tawalisi as having resemblance to the Turks can be taken in general, broader sense. The story of the king’s son being assigned to another province brought to mind the real account of Prince Ché Mỗ who, after the death of his father, the king, took refuge in Annam after he was driven out by Trà hoà Bó đê.

As regards the products of Tawalisi such as gold, elephant, buffalo, sheep, sugar, rice, ginger, citron or much better as lemon, mango, pepper, sandalwood and silk, all these can be found in Champa. The syrup, to Yamamoto, should be better transliterated as “rose-water”, which was listed as one of Champa’s tribute, being known as Ch’iang-wei-shui. As to the terms Ibn Battuta used such as *nākhōdza* or skipper, *karāni* or purser, *tāndīl* or chief of the sailors, *sipāh sālār* or chief of the archers and *bakšī*, supposedly meaning Divine, he did not agree with scholars claiming the latter as having derived from Turkish, Mongolian and Persian words but rather he believed it to be derivative of the Sanskrit word *bhikshu* or monk for the Champa people used Sanskrit as their official language.

Regarding Kaylukari, the port in which Ibn Battuta has visited, Yamamoto posited that it was Phanrang (Panduranga). In the town of Phanrang, a historical site is called Po Klong Garai,



which was a king's name. The "Po" in Po Klong Garai is an honorific term while "Klong" – Kung, Ko-lun or Ku-lun – signified the title of a king or a high official in Chinese history. On the other hand, "Garai" is said to be a "corrupt form" of the Sanskrit word "nagaraja" (116). He, then, compared the Arabic form of Kaylukari, KiLuKRi, to Klong Garai without the Po with "Kaylu" being the Arabic transcription of "Klong" and "kari" of "Garai" and concluded that Kaylukari must be the "Arabic transcription" of Klong Garai. How did Ibn Battuta come to know Po Klong Garai? Po Klong Garai was the most famous Cham king who ruled from 1151-1205 AD. Thus by the time Ibn Battuta arrived in Champa, Po Klong Garai must have been held high in Cham people's memory and that Ibn Battuta must have heard the name of the king and have it rendered as Kaylukari.

Yamamoto found the claim by Ibn Battuta that the king's son used to reside in Kaylukari as further supporting his interpretation that Kaylukari must be Panduranga. Panduranga was an important port in South Champa such that an *adhipati* or viceroy, who later held the title of a *senapati* or general, governed the district. Later the crown prince would hold the post. An epitaph of a monument to honor the memory of a victory by yuvaraja (young king) was found on top of a hill in Po Klong Garai. Panduranga can be regarded as the territory of the crown prince before his accession to kingship. Archaeologically, Panduranga is represented by two historical sites: Po Nagar in Nha-trang and Po Klong Garai. Built in the eighth century, Po Nagar was eventually eclipsed by Po Klong Garai, built towards the end of the thirteenth century by Jaya Shinhavarman III (1297-1306). By the time Ibn Battuta arrived in the scene, Po Klong Garai had become the most important religious centre.

How did Yamamoto account for the long time of travel that Ibn Battutah took from one place to another? As a scholar knowledgeable of Chinese navigation sources, he compared Ibn Battuta's to Cheng Ho's maritime travels in Chinese source, finding the former's travel reckoning too long. For example, the trip of 71 days from Kakula to Tawalisi was too long when a Chinese source estimated that it would take 25 days between Champa and Java. Yamamoto would explain the exaggeration of the number of days of places west of India as resulting from the lack of accurate knowledge by Arabs while trips east of India would indicate the mastery that Arabs had on these places. Yamamoto believed that Ibn Battuta had intentionally embellished his account of his Eastern travels "to give an impression of a very remote journey" (123).

What about the story of Urduja? Yamamoto had doubts on the story and related that Arabian tales written by Arab writers contained stories about women and their supremacy, about an island in China Sea where they rule. Even Marco Polo told a story of Aijaruc that resembled the story of Urduja. Yamamoto believed that Ibn Battuta must have heard the stories from his travels and woven a story about Urduja. He presumed that the Muslim traveller wanted to receive credit for having visited the country of women. But why Tawalisi or Champa? According to Yamamoto, Ibn Battuta must have wanted to place this country of women in a mysterious place as Champa. By not mentioning any Muslim believer in Champa, he would like to portray Champa as mysterious as he could.

The apparent long voyage can be explained as Ibn Battuta's way of mystifying Champa and the "calm sea" "of reddish tint" was nothing but fabrication. Thus, instead of using the popular name of Champa, which among Arabs were known as Sanf since the Tang period, Ibn Battuta adopted Tawalisi. The famous product of Champa, aloes-wood, called "canfi" by the Arabs, was expressly left out by Ibn Battutah as one of the products of the country. Phanrang was also called Chia-nan-mao or Chia-nan-mo, names which were derived from calambac or aloes-wood. Ibn Battuta avoided the use of Champa and reference to aloes-wood and invented Kaylukari to suit his

purpose of creating a mysterious country of women. This fanciful account of women was further accentuated by the story of a strange bird Ibn Battuta and his men have allegedly encountered in the vicinity of Tawalisi. The name of Urduja o Urdudja has induced Yamamoto that it must have come not only from the name of the queens of Kipchak Khan, which Ibn Battuta mentioned in the same travelogue, but also from Uroja, mythical founder and first king of the Champa kingdom. With deficient knowledge of Turkish, he attributed to Urduja that she could speak Turkish and that her people looked Turkish, which to Yamamoto was again a fabrication. On the princess' knowledge of Allah, being a Muslim Ibn Battuta entertained the thought that in Tawalisi, in the farthest corner of the earth, the name of Allah was known.

## Conclusion

History is an unfinished business. It is always tentative and subject to revision as new authenticated primary sources would appear. It is never a value-free discipline since it involves the participation of historians who are filled with passions as the next human being. But then, how do historical claims evolve?

In the case of Thalamasin, the American historian, Craig (1916a) put forward the idea that Pangasinan could be Thalamasin without providing any indisputable proof. Eight years later, Craig (1924) even wrote a supposed speech of Urduja based on the account of Ibn Battuta citing Rizal who allegedly identified Tawalisi as Northern Luzon providing the exact year of 1344 as the traveller's arrival as well as the account of Friar Odoric. In the same speech, Urduja mentioned a priest obviously Friar Odoric who visited the same place, according to Craig, twenty years before Ibn Battuta or 1324 and in the imaginative words of Craig through the mouth of Urduja "Our sago-trees, that produce flour, interested him, he admired the sugar-giving buri palms, and liked our coconut wines" and met Dalisay, Urduja's father, which is a deliberate invention by Craig (11). Based on the foregoing, it was Craig who connected Thalamasin and Tawalisi as one and the same place. Without even referring to Pangasinan in this publication but as "Northern Luzon", Craig (1916), however, in an earlier publication identified Thalamasin as Pangasinan. Why was Craig bent on placing Tawalisi and Thalamasin in the Philippines?

The reason has got to do with imperial hubris and propaganda. The United States took over Spain after the payment of a handsome sum of twenty million dollars with the signing of the treaty of Paris while the Philippines under Aguinaldo was still fighting the war against the Americans. Fresh as imperial power, the US sent men and women to understand its newly acquired colony. In 1908 the University of the Philippines was established with the Department of History as the earliest to be organized. It accepted Americans as part of the faculty. But these personnel like Craig were not immune to biases and prejudices, especially one that vilified Spain in the broad category of the so-called "leyenda negra" or black legend (Cano 2008a). The subtitle of the book revealed Craig's motive: "selections representing fourteen centuries of Philippine thought, carefully compiled from credible sources *in substitution for the pre-Spanish writings destroyed by missionary zeal, to supplement the later literature stunted by intolerant religious and political censorship*, and as specimens of the untrammelled present-day utterances [my emphasis]."

It is clear that Craig was animated by his desire to balance the paucity of prehispanic documents by providing uncorroborated accounts from Friar Odoric and Ibn Battuta due to what he perceived as Spanish missionary efforts to destroy them as well as religious bigotry and suppression, a perspective that LeRoy also believed in (Cano 2006, 152). A look at the rest of the contents of Craig's book included references to Rajah Bendahara Kalantiaw and Rajah Mamagtal

whose sources were the Pavon manuscripts, which were translated later by Robertson, co-editor of the monumental collection of sources of Philippine history and discredited later as the work of Jose Marco (Scott 1968/1984). In a larger context, Craig was part of a US discourse that sought to present pre-Spanish past as “great” and Spanish past as “evil” (Cano 2006). On the other hand, Rizal was more interested in the construction of a national history than in historical accuracy. He was trying to construct a pre-Spanish conception of Philippine past as “glorious” before the advent of Spain. All three issues – Thalamasin, Ari Kasikis and Urduja – have common denominator in that they came out in 1916, 1918 and 1924, all during the American regime with the intention of conjuring up a great pre-Spanish past.

What were the main faults of Craig and Rizal as historians? They did not corroborate the details in Ibn Battuta’s account of Tawalisi and Friar Odoric’s Thalamasin with other primary sources. Internal criticism has demonstrated that both Ibn Battuta and Friar Odoric were somewhat telling the truth. Craig and Rizal have accepted this. But data from other primary sources could establish facts about certain claims by Ibn Battuta and Friar Odoric. Corroboration with other sources requires specialized skills like knowledge about Cham history, epigraphy and linguistics. Unlike Yamamoto, Rizal and Craig lacked the necessary skills to understand and decode fully the meaning and substance of Ibn Battuta’s account. This lack of skills led to gross misrepresentation of Philippine past.

What are the essential lessons in historical methodology that we can learn from all these? A historical claim is always tentative because it must be subjected to verification and authentication. In order to ascertain a claim, it is necessary to go back to the original source, understand their meaning and check their consistencies and inconsistencies with other sources. But the most important is the requisite skill and specialization. If the claims cannot be supported by evidences as in the case of Thalamasin, Ari Kasikis, Ari Kasilag and Urduja, they have to be declared false and spurious and the lies and misconceptions must be corrected at once. Otherwise, a historical consciousness that is born of fallacies will engender a generation of people believing in the errors of their elders and growing complacent as to become slothful in the pursuit of scholarship. Such is the case of Urduja. Instead of studying Pangasinan history and other histories as it should be, like going to and examining the primary sources and undertaking archeological and linguistic studies, scholars and the public are content in parroting and repeating the lies that they read and heard and so their imagination is distorted and their appreciation of their culture is shallow. Like recently, Urduja is named after a film festival in Pangasinan in 2014 when there are Pangasinan people who are really good in filmmaking and acting like Fernando Poe Sr. who was from San Carlos City, and Fernando Poe Jr., son of Fernando Sr., the so-called “King of Philippine Movies”. Or if they are looking for a female Pangasinan actress who deserves recognition, it would be Lolita Rodriguez from Urdaneta who was a stellar multi-awarded actress. If they want a female historical figure at the time of Spanish conquest, there was Lalo, wife of anacbanua Casipit of Mangaldan, who was said to be instrumental in the gradual acceptance of Catholicism in Pangasinan when Pangasinans were vigorously resisting the Spanish friars (Aduarte 1693). It would mean that Lalo – being a woman – displayed her influence in Pangasinan society and that it can be said that elite women were equal to elite men in terms of influence and power. Even her name means something – to be greater or more than, a term used for comparative and superlative degree in Pangasinan language.

Debunking the bogus and the absurd in Philippine history, the work of William Henry Scott (1968/1984) constantly brings to mind the critical tasks of a historian. What are these critical tasks? First is the gathering of data from all relevant sources: primary or secondary. Second is testing the

data/source as to their authenticity and reliability. Third is creating appropriate framework or method for writing the narrative.

Again, there is a claim that Pangasinan came from Panag-asinan (Flores 2010b). Is this true? In the same document from the Archivo General de Indias that recorded the names of the Pangasinan chieftains I mentioned here, Pangasinan was rendered Pagasinan, which must be a clerical error. In the Pangasinan dictionary, “Pangaasinan” is the place for salt-pans or saltbeds (Cosgaya 1865b, 101). Thus, through the process of elision, Pangaasinan became Pangasinan, not Panag-asinan.

Lastly, how should we account for the claim that Urduja was Deboxah (or Debuca) among the Ibalois to whom they traced their ancestry (Gutierrez 1999) when Urduja was really a legendary Cham princess, the claim from Tublay informants that Deboxah, Princess Urduja, was the granddaughter of Udayan, a Darew warrior (Bagamaspad and Pawid 1985) and the claim that a princess named Kabontatala gave birth to a son of Limahong, her name deserving to replace Urduja as the name of the governor’s residence (Anon. 2006)? The latter I categorically say rubbish and gladly put before you the challenge to discover why but I agree that Urduja’s name be replaced and should be expunged from Philippine and Pangasinan history and memory.

After the 1990 conference, there were efforts to relegate Urduja to its proper place such as textbooks were corrected but her name remains in Lingayen. In 2008, an animated film adapted Urduja’s story but with a bizarre, ahistorical twist in that she was in love with the Chinese pirate Limahong, a real historical character who escaped to Pangasinan in 1574 after his failed attempt to conquer Spanish Manila. Only when her name is erased in that building and the Pangasinan people have realized their folly and stupidity that Urduja was part of a tendentious US colonial discourse will Urduja return where she properly belongs – to the dustbin.

---

I acknowledge the help of the following: Dr. Geoff Wade, Yamamura Yoshiteru of Toyo Bunko, and Dr. Motoe Terami-Wada as well as UP Kamalayan, a student organization in University of the Philippines Baguio, where I first presented a preliminary version of this article as invited speaker in 2017.

## References

- Aduarte, Diego de. 1693. *Historia de la provincia del Santo Rosario de Filipinas, Iapon y China de la Sagrada Orden de Predicadores*. Zaragoza: por Domingo Gascon.
- Anon. 2006. Local historian wants Urduja House renamed Prinsesa Kabontatala. <http://gopangasinan.blogspot.com/2006/12/princess-urduja-vs-princesa-kabontatala.html> <accessed 15 March 2017>.
- Bagamaspad, Anavic and Zenaida H. Pawid. 1985. *A peoples’ history of Benguet province*. Baguio City: Provincial Government of Benguet.
- Basa, Restituto. 1997. *The story of Dagupan*. Dagupan City: Manaois Press.

- Benitez, Francisco F. and Conrado F. Benitez. 1923. *Stories of great Filipinos*. Manila: National Book Co.
- Blair, Emma H. and James Alexander Robertson, ed. 1903-1907/2000. *The Philippine Islands 1493-1898*. 55 Vol. (CD-ROM edition).
- Camagay, Ma. Luisa T. 1977. Maikling kasaysayan ng Departamento ng Kasaysayan. *Kasaysayan* 11 (1): 243-246.
- Cano, Gloria. 2006. The “Spanish colonial past” in the construction of modern Philippine history: A critical inquiry into the (mis)use of Spanish sources. PhD dissertation, National University of Singapore.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008a. Evidence for the deliberate distortion of the Spanish Philippine colonial historical record in *The Philippine Islands 1493–1898*. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 39 (1): 1-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008b. Blair and Robertson’s *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898*: Scholarship or imperialist propaganda. *Philippine Studies* 56 (1): 3-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013. LeRoy’s *The Americans in the Philippines* and the History of Spanish Rule in the Philippines. *Philippine Studies* 61 (1): 3-44.
- Carro, Andres. 1849. *Vocabulario de la lengua Ilocana*. Manila: Establicimiento Tipográfico del Colegio de Santo Tomás.
- Census office of the Philippine Islands. 1920. *Census of the Philippine Islands taken under the direction of Philippine Legislature in the year 1918: Geography, history and climatology*, Vol. 1. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Cortes, Rosario M. 1995. Princess Urduja as a historical problem. *Kahirup* (March): 34, 63-65, 69, 75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974. *Pangasinan 1572-1800*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- Cosgaya, Lorenzo F. 1865a. *Diccionario Pangasinan-Español*. Manila: Estab. Tip. del Colegio de Santo Tomas.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1865b. *Vocabulario Hispano-Pangasinan*. Manila: Estab. Tip. del Colegio de Santo Tomas.
- Couttie, Bob. 2020. *Fool’s Gold: Fraud, fallacy and fable in Philippine history*. Vol. 1. Manila: Central Book Supply.
- Craig, Austin. 1913. *Lineage Life and Labors of Jose Rizal Philippine Patriot: A study of the growth of free ideas in the transpacific American territory*. Manila: Philippine Education Co.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1914. *A thousand years of Philippine history before the coming of the Spaniards*. Manila.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1915. Report of Associate Professor Austin Craig. Manila.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1916a. *The particulars of the Philippines' pre-Spanish past*. Manila: E. C. McCullough & Co.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1916b. *The former Philippines thru foreign eyes*. Manila: Philippine Education Co.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1924. *Gems of Philippine Oratory*. Fajardo Press.
- Defrémery, C. and B.R. Sanguinetti. 1853-1859/1873-1879. *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah, texte arabe, accompagné d'une traduction*, Tome 1-4. Paris: Impr. Nationale pour Société Asiatique.
- Del Castillo, Antonio T. 1986/1988. *Princess Urduja, Queen of the Orient Seas before and after her time in the political orbit of the Shri-vi-ja-ya and Madjapahit maritime empire: A pre-Hispanic history of the Philippines*. Lingayen: A. del Castillo.
- De Veyra, Jaime. 1951. *Quien fue Urduja: Un ser mitológico; Estudio histórico*. Manila: Nueva Era Press.
- Donald, Graeme. 2021. *Fake history*. Michael O'Mara Books.
- Dulaudier, Edoard. 1847. *Description de l'Archipel d'Asie par Ibn-Bathouta*. Paris: Imprimerie Royale. First published in *Journal Asiatique*, Février, 93-134; Mars, 218-59.
- English, Otto. 2022. *Fake history: Ten great lies and how they shape the world*. Welbeck Publishing Group.
- Estella, Felipe. *A brief history of the University of the Philippines*. Manila: University of the Philippines, 1922.
- Fernandez, Erwin S. 2009. Exploring the Pangasinan-Cordillera connection: The Pangasinenses and the Ibalois. *The Cordillera Review* 1 (2): 87-99.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Towards an early history of Pangasinan: Preliminary notes and observations. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 38 (2): 147-171.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015a. Geologic origins, past and present geographies, 3-83. *Pangasinan, Pinablin Dalin: History, Culture and Development*. Pangasinan Historical and Cultural Commission.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015b. Early Pangasinan: From ethnogenesis to the rise of Feng-chia-hsi-lan in multinational Asian trade, 85-159. *Pangasinan, Pinablin Dalin: History, Culture and Development*. Pangasinan Historical and Cultural Commission.
- Flores, Ma. Crisanta N. 2001a. Princess Urduja: A symbolic subversion. *Balon Silew* 1 (2)

- [January-March]: 7-11, 13, 29. First published in *Review of Women's Studies* 9 (1-2) (1999).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001b. Taga-baibay – taga-alog dichotomy: Confluence and divergence of Pangasinan coastal communities and Caboloan inland plains. *Balon Silew* 2 (1) [October-December]: 9, 11, 13, 26-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *The cattle caravans of ancient Caboloan: Connecting history, culture and commerce by cartwheel*. Manila: National Historical Institute.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010a. Pangasinan: Salt of the earth. *Balibbayan: The Asian Journal Magazine* 2 (1) [April-May]: 26-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010b. Pangasinan: Kung paano naimapa ang lalawigan mula sa matandang dikotomiya ng Baybay-Alog (Panag-‘Asinan’ - Caboloan). *Philippine Social Sciences Review* 62 (1): 73-101.
- Galang, Zoilo M. 1935-37. *Encyclopedia of the Philippines*. Manila: P. Vera.
- Gutierrez, Chit B. 1999. In search of a princess. *Filipinas* (June): 73, 84.
- Himes, Ronald S. 1998. The Southern Cordilleran group of Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 37 (1): 120-177.
- Keesing, Felix M. 1962. *The ethnohistory of Northern Luzon*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lassen, Christian. 1847-1862. *Indische Alterthumskunde: Geschichte des Handels und des griechisch-römischen Wissens von Indien und Geschichte des Nördlichen Indiens von 319 nach Christi Geburt bis auf die Muhammedaner*. Leipzig: L.A. Kittler.
- Lee, Samuel. 1829. *The travels of Ibn Batuta*. London: Oriental Translation Committee.
- LeRoy, James A. 1914. *The Americans in the Philippines: A history of the conquest and first years of occupation with an introductory account of the Spanish rule*. Vol. I and II. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Loarca, Miguel de. 1582/2000. Relacion de las Yslas Filipinas / Relation of the Filipinas Islands. In Blair and Robertson, Vol. 5: 34-187.
- López, Andrés. 1690. *Arte de la lengua de Pangasinan*. Manila: en el Colegio y Universidad de Santo Thomas de Aquino por Gaspar de los Reyes.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014. *Arte de la lengua de Pangasinan*. Joaquín Sueiro Justel y Ma. Dolores Riveiro Lema (eds.). Madrid y Frankfurt: Iberoamericana y Vervuert.
- Mackintosh-Smith, Tim, ed. 2002. *The travels of Ibn Battutah*. London: Picador.

- Malamocco, P. Luigi. 2006. Dal friule alle Filippine. *Dal mondo stigmatino*.  
<http://www.stigmatini.it/missioni/ilmissio/06/10/storia2.htm> <accessed 2 June 2012>.
- May, Glenn A. 1996. *Inventing a Hero: The Posthumous Re-creation of Andres Bonifacio*.  
 Madison: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, University of Wisconsin.
- Morrow, Paul. 2006. Jose E. Marco: Con artist of the century. *Pilipino Express* 2 (15) August 1.  
 See also <https://www.pilipino-express.com/history-a-culture/in-other-words/395-jose-marco.html>
- Muñoz, Jose Ag. 1990. *The Binalatongan (San Carlos) story: Then and now, September 1587-1990*. San Carlos City: Sanchez Press.
- Nellist, George F. 1931. *Men of the Philippines: A biographical record of men of substantial achievement in the Philippine islands*. Vol. 1. Manila: The Sugar News Company.
- Ordoñez, Elmer A. 2008. A UP tale: The case of Austin Craig. *Manila Times*, February 2.
- Pastores, Elizabeth A. 1977. Bahaging talaan ng mga pananaliksik at lathala ng mga naging kasapi sa Departamento ng Kasaysayan mula 1911 hanggang 1958. *Kasaysayan I* 1 (1): 247-259.
- Pellicer, Mariano. 1862. *Arte de la lengua pangasinana o caboloan*. Manila: Imprenta del Colegio de Santo Tomás a cargo de D. Juan Cortada.
- Real Academia Española. 2001. *Diccionario de la Lengua Española*. 22<sup>a</sup> ed.  
[http://buscon.rae.es/draeI/SrvltConsulta?TIPO\\_BUS=3&LEMA=cacique](http://buscon.rae.es/draeI/SrvltConsulta?TIPO_BUS=3&LEMA=cacique) <16 October 2011>.
- Reyes, Pedrito and Jose D. Karasig. 1940. *Maikling Biyograpiyang 300 Dakila at Ulirang Pilipina*. Manila.
- Rizal, José. 1889/1962. Carta al Dr. Adolf B. Meyer; acerca del Tawalisi de Ibn Batuta, 7 Enero. *Facsimiles de los escritos de Jose Rizal*, 438-444. Tomo IX de Escritos de Jose Rizal. Manila: Comision Nacional del Centenario de Jose Rizal.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1889/1931. De Laong Laan a Del Pilar, 4 Febrero. *Epistolario Rizalino*, 116-118. Tomo Segundo 1887-1890. Teodoro M. Kalaw, ed. Manila: Biblioteca Nacional de Filipinas.
- Salazar, Francisco de. 1572. Relación de los pueblos que tributan en Luzón. *Archivo General de Indias*, Patronato, 24, R. 21.
- Salazar, Francisco de. 1572/1990-96. Authorized copy of the account of the tributes collected by Martin de Goiti, Maestre de Campo of the Islas Filipinas, in the province of Bolinao, Pangasinan and other places, which he colonized and pacified. In *The Philippines under*



- Spain: A compilation and translation of original documents, Book III (1572-1583)*, 17-24. Virginia Benitez Licuanan and Jose Llavador Mira, ed. Manila: National Trust for Historic and Cultural Preservation of the Philippines.
- Salman, Michael. 2009. Confabulating American Colonial Knowledge of the Philippines - What the Social Life of Jose E. Marco's Forgeries and Ahmed Chalabi Can Tell Us about the Epistemology of Empire. In *Colonial Crucible, Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*. Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano, eds. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- San Agustin, Gaspar de. 1698. *Conquistas de las Islas Philipinas*, 3 tomos. Madrid: Imprenta de Manuel Ruiz de Murga.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1698/1998. *Conquistas de las Islas Filipinas / Conquest of the Philippine Islands 1565-1615*. Luis Antonio Mañeru, trans. Manila: San Agustin Museum.
- Santos, Edilberto V. 2004. *Western Pangasinan: Earliest beginnings, 1582-1898 as told by primary sources*, Vol. 1. Alaminos: Diocese of Alaminos.
- Scott, William H. 1968/1984. *Prehispanic source materials for the study of Philippine history*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. *Filipinos in China before 1500*. Manila: Chinese Studies Program, De la Salle University.
- Serizawa, Takamichi. 2013. A Genealogy of Japanese Solidarity Discourse on Philippine History: War with America and Area Studies in the Cold War. PhD dissertation, National University of Singapore.
- Sotelo-Fuertes, Yolanda. 2007. Bolinao stakes claim to mass held in 1324. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, November 17. In [http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/inquirerheadlines/regions/view/20071117-101541/Bolinao\\_stakes\\_claim\\_to\\_Mass\\_held\\_in\\_1324](http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/inquirerheadlines/regions/view/20071117-101541/Bolinao_stakes_claim_to_Mass_held_in_1324), <accessed 2 June 2012>.
- Teeuwisse, Jo. 2023. *Fake history: 101 things that never happened*. WH Allen.
- Van der Lith, P. and Marcel Devic. 1883-1886. *Livre des merveilles de l'Inde, par le capitaine Bozorg fils de Chakriyār de Ramhormoz, texte arabe publié*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Velasquez, Santiago S. 1957. *Sipi awaray baley na Lingayen*. Manuscript at the Pangasinan Provincial Library.
- Walckenaer, Baron. 1842. Mèmoire sur la chronologie de l'histoire des Javanais. *Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* 15.
- Yamamoto Tatsuro. 1936. On Tawalisi described by Ibn Battuta. *Memoirs of the Research*

*Department of the Toyo Bunko* 8: 93-133.

Yule, Henry, ed., trans. 1866. *Cathay and the way thither*, Vol. 1 and 2. London: The Hakluyt Society.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1913-1916. *Cathay and the way thither*, Vol. 1-4. Henri Cordier, ed. London: The Hakluyt Society.

Zafra, Nicolas. 1952. Was the kingdom of Princess Urduja in the Philippines? *Journal of Philippines Historical Society* 2 (1) [January]: 55-67.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1977. Rizal on the location of the kingdom of Princess Urduja, 152-163. In *Jose Rizal: Historical studies*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Zaide, Gregorio F. 1949. *The Philippines since pre-Spanish times*. Manila: R. P. Garcia Pub.