

A Rhetorical Analysis of Isabelo F. de los Reyes's *El Tinguian*

Iö M. Jularbal

University of the Philippines Baguio

ABSTRACT

El Tinguian published in 1888 was considered as the most complete study of the Tinguian at that time; it would mirror travel writings that were produced by Europeans about the region. With its accentuated notions on differentiation and otherings, de los Reyes's "gaze" at the Tinguian served as his representation of the ethnolinguistic group to the world. *El Tinguian* presents itself as indeed a counter-discourse, an attempt to both refute and dispute several notions and nuances that tend to misrepresent the Tinguian. De los Reyes is in a position that shares colonial scientific knowledge with local experience and nativistic thinking which would make one assume that the legitimacy of the text should not even be questioned by anyone in the literary and ethnographic community. But what about the Tinguian? This paper theorizes that the gaze is often utilized on a race that is surmised incapable of speaking for itself. From a postcolonial stance, though himself a Filipino, de los Reyes utilizes a dominating colonial discourse and gazes on an abject other. De los Reyes defines and transforms the indigenous "other" into a set of categories to be utilized by the non-Tinguian as a basis for comparison and differentiation.

This paper tackles Isabelo de los Reyes's views and representations of the indigenous "other" in his study titled *El Tinguian*. In writing about the Tinguian, de los Reyes attempts to produce a more localized and nativistic view of the Tinguian which tends to differentiate itself from European writings about the people. But with his use of rhetorical devices in order to give meaning and understanding of the "other", his study still delivers itself as an outsider's view of the Tinguian.

Keywords: Postcolonial, rhetorical analysis, travel writing, cultural criticism, Tinguian, Cordilleran history

INTRODUCTION

The rise of the Filipino educated class during the latter part of the 19th century has paved the way for native intellectuals to create the foundations for Philippine studies. Eurocentered studies on the Philippines took a back seat as more and more Filipinos started to take the reins of learning about their people and having such published for its own purpose. Among this new breed of Filipino intellectuals was Isabelo F. de los Reyes. Aside from publishing several works on Iloko, de los Reyes would also dabble on the history of his region, learning about its literary past, and cultivating an initial ethnographical background as well. Learning about his peoples past would eventually lead to his study of the neighboring tribes who resided in close proximity to his own home town, the Tinguian.

The Tinguian are an ethno-linguistic group who are considered to be the indigenous occupants of Abra and the mountain ranges that traverse the Ilocos region. Being situated in the Gran Cordillera Region, they are also considered Igorot (Laory 3). In terms of Amianan and Cordillera studies, the Tinguian provide a cultural bridge for both the Ilocos and the Cordillera highlands. Though there are a number of literatures pertaining to studies on the Tinguian at present, there are not many concerning critiques and analyses on initial colonial texts.

"El Tinguian" published in 1888 was part of his works entitled, *Filipinas, Articulos Varios ... Sobre etnographia, historia y costumbres del pais*. This was an early attempt at a locally based ethnographic study on a Philippine Indigenous group. Considered to be the most complete study of the Tinguian at that time, "El Tinguian" would mirror travel writings that were produced by Europeans about the region. With its accentuated notions on differentiation and otherings, de los Reyes's "gaze" at the Tinguian served as his representation of the ethnolinguistic group to the world. The English version used in this study was translated by Dr. Ma. Elinore Imson of the University of the Philippines Baguio and was published under the Cordillera Studies Center in 2007.

Born in Vigan, Ilocos Sur, and academically trained in Manila, de los Reyes is a product of a colonial Philippines coming into terms with the establishment of its own identity. Providing the foreword for the English translation, Dr. Raymundo D. Rovillos refers to de los Reyes as locating himself in three situations: "as an outsider, insider, and as both outsider-insider to Tinguian culture" (Imson 10). De los Reyes's apprehensions of the Tinguian primarily belong in a European designed ethnological inquiry. This puts de los Reyes in the position of a scientific observer imparting his gaze on a subject completely separated and removed. But on the other hand, de los Reyes is also compelled to represent his countrymen by producing a view which

owes itself to the locality. He believes that much objectivity is required as far as his observations are concerned and that previous European observations remain biased and culturally subjective. According to Resil Mojares, de los Reyes produced a “counter-representation” as *El Tinguian* was written with “objectivity and truthfulness” (105) in mind. It also has to be taken in consideration, however, that the format and designs of his ethnography on the Tinguian ironically utilizes prevailing Western methodologies, designs, and discourse.

“*El Tinguian*” presents itself as indeed a counter-discourse, an attempt to refute and dispute several notions and nuances that tend to misrepresent the Tinguian. De los Reyes is in a position that shares colonial scientific knowledge with local experience and nativistic thinking which would make one assume that the legitimacy of the text should not even be questioned by anyone in the literary/ethnographic community.

But what about the Tinguian? A gaze is still imparted on a race that is surmised incapable of speaking for itself. From a postcolonial stance, though de los Reyes is Filipino, he still utilizes dominant colonial discourse and gaze on an abject other. His assumptions and selectivities become what molds the “other” as nothing more than a set of categories to be compared, differentiated, and analyzed for an outside consumer other than the Tinguian. Homi K. Bhaba writes:

The objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction. (101)

Though there is no physical conquest of the Tinguian, de los Reyes is conducting an academic takeover on them, spatializing them and reconfiguring them as either abjectionable, vilifying, exoticized, or however he sees fit.

THE TRAVELER, THE TEXT, AND THE TRIBE

Though a Filipino, Isabelo de los Reyes’s observations still exhibits a form of discourse similar to colonial travel writings at that time. His gaze still pertains to an outsider’s view which provides representations and imageries of the Tinguian and their culture. These representations require scrutiny as such views still pertain to characterize and essentialize the Indigenous other which still receive currency even at present.

This study finds it important to analyze and question Isabelo de los Reyes's "El Tinguian" as possibly constituting a form of colonial discourse and in answering this problem, this paper will also delve into the following issues; how does "El Tinguian" produce a representation of the Indigenous other? What rhetorical devices were used in the production of such a representation? What relevant issues arise from such a representational practice?

The critique and analysis of colonial texts on the Indigenous peoples of the Philippines have not garnered much attention in local scholarship, there is much to discover about it. Matters concerning the power produced by such texts through their engagement in the articulation of not only Tinguian but Cordilleran identity as well would be at question here. This study is significant based on what it can contribute to both Cordillera and Amianan studies.

This study is not primarily interested in treating "El Tinguian" as a historical document (i.e., as source of data for historical writing). Nevertheless, it may also find it necessary to look into its connection to historical writing. Questions with regard to its reliability and transparency as historical document may arise. What devices were used by the writer to produce the discourse that it represents? What did it include and exclude and why? If properly addressed, these are questions that could give this study greater significance. In answering these questions concerning travel writing, this study could contribute to the understanding of how Amianan history and identity have been molded through forms of ideological constructions.

WRITING ABOUT THE OTHER

In *Beginning Postcolonialism*, John Macleod writes that "language does not passively reflect reality" (19), it also goes a long way toward creating a person's understanding of their world, and it houses values by which we live our lives. He states that under colonialism, a colonized people are made subservient to ways of regarding the world which reflect and support colonialist values. "The cultural values of the colonized peoples" he writes, "are deemed as lacking in value, or being as uncivilized, from which they must be rescued." The colonizer is civilized, rational, intelligent; the colonized, on the other hand, is the opposite of all these qualities. From this binary opposition, the colonizing peoples derive their sense of superiority and normality.

Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin's *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* illustrates how postcolonial discourse is used by authors of

former colonial countries to produce their own image of their identity and culture. Literature has always been a deeply political phenomenon and the authors of the book try to show this by looking at postcolonial literatures. Concerning travel writings, Ashcroft et al. refer to texts written by the colonial traveler as texts that “could never form the basis for an indigenous culture nor can they be integrated in a way with the culture which already exists in the country invaded” (16). Though such travel writings present a detailed reportage on custom, language, landscape etc., these travel writings are geared toward emphasizing “home” over the “native,” “metropolitan” over “provincial.” The claim to objectivity that travel writings tend to produce is used to hide the colonial discourse through which they are created.

In determining the strategies of appropriation in postcolonial writing, Ashcroft et al. write that postcolonial texts may signify difference in their representations in place, in nomenclature, and through the deployment of themes. But it is in language that cultural “revelation” and cultural “silence” are evident. All postcolonial societies share the same strategies where difference is constructed and English is appropriated. The critical models of postcolonial literatures were produced as writers and critics became aware of the “special character” that such texts produced. This, in turn, created the need to develop an adequate model to account for postcolonial texts. The authors suggest four models: first, what the authors refer to as “national” or regional models, which “emphasize the distinctive features of the particular national or regional culture”; second, “race-based” models which identify certain shared characteristics across varied national literatures; third, the “comparative models of varying complexity” which seek to account for particular linguistic, historical, and cultural features across two or more postcolonial literatures; and fourth, “comprehensive comparative models” which argue for features such as hybridity and syncreticity as constitutive elements of all postcolonial literatures. The authors suggest that these models often operate as “assumptions within critical practice rather than specific and discrete schools of thought; in any discussion of postcolonial writing a number of them maybe operating at the same time.”

David Spurr, in his book *The Rhetoric of the Empire*, writes that the formal end of the period of European colonialism during the latter half of the twentieth century has brought about a new approach towards reexamining the history, politics, psychology, and language of colonization. Regarding travel writings, Spurr states that the traditional Western ideals stated within such texts are ideals that “have served in the historical process of colonization” (1).

Spurr analyzes colonial discourse by using colonial travel writings and journalism. He begins by identifying rhetorical features present in the text and analyzes how

such rhetorical features work in producing coherent representations of the colonized. Spurr writes that the “antithesis of civilized value” is the colonizer’s traditional insistence on difference that the colonized is the savage and therefore the savage is the other. Colonial discourse bears an uncertainty which leads to an inherent confusion of identity and difference. This uncertainty begins as modern, civilized human beings assert authority over the savage, but such an assertion acknowledges its own incompleteness as an authority. There is a simultaneous disavowal and avowal in colonial discourse, as Spurr writes, and “this fundamental instability makes for a rich profusion of rhetorical forms which often clash with one another” (7).

Travel writings during the colonial period are colonial discourses which are adapted to a specific historical situation. Spurr writes, the Western writer “constructs a coherent representation of the strange and often incomprehensible realities confronted in the non- Western world” (3). But, Spurr asks: how are such constructs produced and under what basis? Spurr sees the study of discourse in relation to text as questioning how writing works in whatever form to produce knowledge about other cultures and not how one literary form differs from another. The text speaks ambiguously and the study of discourse recognizes this. As Spurr writes, “is it the voice of an individual writer, the voice of institutional authority, of cultural ideology? It is all of these things at the same time” (11). Colonial discourse, Spurr writes, “does not simply reproduce an ideology or a set of ideas that must constantly be repeated,” it is a way of producing and responding to “a reality that is infinitely adaptable in its function of preserving the basic structures of power” (11).

Bentley in *Travel Narratives* writes that “travel accounts representing the observations and experiences of individuals who visited foreign lands constitute a special category of primary source for historians” (1). But although they may be treated as historical texts, travel accounts are not wholly reliable and transparent sources of history. Bentley claims that travel accounts are problematic sources which require careful and critical analysis. Their problematic nature stems from the idea that “Sometimes authors of travel accounts did not notice, or were not able to notice, or perhaps were not even permitted to notice certain aspects of the societies they visited.” Bentley adds that travel accounts are not extensively analyzed even as a historical source.

The native is “othered”(139) and homogenized into what Mary Louise Pratt calls a “collective they.”(139) In her essay *Scratches on the Face of the Country; or What Mr. Barrow Saw in the Land of the Bushmen,*” she gives her analysis of John Barrow’s travel accounts into the interior of South Africa in the years 1797 and 1798. Pratt writes the abstracted “they” occurs as a verb in a timeless present tense, which

characterizes the native not only within a specific historical event but as an instance of a “pregiven custom or trait.”(139) The other in this discourse could be textualized or processed as nothing more than an enumeration of traits. Such an enumeration, as Pratt writes, is a “normalizing”(139) discourse that tends to codify the native’s difference. The subject “other” as represented in travel writings stays within a fixed and unchangeable position. Pratt continues by saying that the literature of the imperial frontier has always flourished as a “normalizing force” (140) which retains an authority of credibility.

Bill Aschroft in *The Response to Foreign Topography* writes that the writer assumes a position of power when writing about space. The colonial space is converted into an “aesthetically seamless landscape often disassociated from its human inhabitants” (141-42). The elevated position of the writer invests him with the power to create order from his own set of values, since the colonial writer is in a position to diminish and marginalize the colonial subject. There is chaos and confusion attached to the savage other that has to be tamed and given order to by the colonizer.

Ethnic identity as produced in travel writings draws from various forms of representation. The image of the native is formed based on the classification of the travel writing. It may draw from using issues concerning the purpose of the travel, the social status and religion of the writer and even gender of the writer and the subject.

Aguilar-Cariño in her article “The Igorot as Other: Four Discourses from the Colonial Period” writes that many descriptions of the Igorot accrued through historical time and space and that these descriptions until today still remain distorted and inaccurate. The proliferation of texts concerning the Cordilleras during the Philippine colonial period has “mythologized” the Cordilleran image at a time when a book-learning culture flourished. Early Cordillerans did not have a system of writing nor access to such texts.

Different kinds of information on early Cordilleran tribal life and customs are widely distributed and circulated through foreign chronicles which perpetuate and help reproduce stereotyped notions of Cordilleran life, culture, and imageries. Cariño says that the authors of such colonial texts could not escape the condition of their own subjectivity and cultural difference. Even the non-Cordilleran Filipino response toward the image produced by foreign colonial authors about the Cordilleras, tends to gravitate toward the image of the Igorot as subjugated. The “civilized versus uncivilized” framework produced that have spawned realities whose fictiveness has been forgotten.

William Henry Scott writes that the colonial process has steadily divided the Filipino people into two categories; the “submissive and the unsubmissive,” the “faithful and the faithless,” the “good and the bad.” “Indigenosity” and the pride attached to it draws from the fact that the Igorot has remained closer to the original lifeways than other Filipinos. “Indigenosity” implies non-submissiveness to colonizing powers.

ON MATTERS CONCERNING COLONIAL AND ANTICOLONIAL RHETORICS

The rhetorics of the colonial Orientalist is always assumed to be one that is always pitted against a negative account on the oriental other. European travel writings on the Cordilleras which started with the Spanish colonial expanse in the territory would always begin with genocidal accounts of extreme barbarism, bestiality, and violence. Frey Francisco Vicente, in 1619 along with other Jesuit friars, would write letters to the Spanish colonial government concerning their notices on the Igorots. These letters were later collected and translated by William Henry Scott and published in the *University of Baguio Journal* in 1971. In one of their earlier accounts of the Cordilleras and the Igorots, Vicente would include in his travel writings descriptions of the Igorot as “eating human flesh,” drinking out of severed skulls, and being the cause of preventing other natives from “becoming Christian” (171-72). These notices were written as a justification of the pacification of the natives and their mines by the Spanish colonial government. This view of the Igorot would continue as more and more Spanish travel writers would penetrate the northern “terra incognita.” Of course it has to be made clear that their objectives at that time were based on colonial motives, of which its rhetoric requires a differentiating and degrading stance. Later on, such views on the “savage other” would become standard notions imparted even by the lowland natives toward the Igorot.

The beginning of the 1800s would now see a new class of European travel writers that entered the county. The emerging German academic class and their need to expand their research horizons would now find themselves also entering the Cordilleras. But as compared to the Spanish colonial rhetoric, German notions would have a more scientific and methodical approach combining systematic measurements and logical apprehensions. Hans Meyer, a German botanist would write extensively about the Igorot, measuring and describing physical traits. He would then generalize the Igorot as “sturdy, muscular figures” who were far more superior as compared to their “lazy” lowland counterparts (89). Though this can be seen rhetorically as a classifying view, it also produces a notion of an anti-colonial view regardless of the rhetoric, treating the other as a specimen scrutinized and studied. Other German

travelers cum researchers such as Richard Von Drasche (1876) and Carl Semper (1862) would write of a Cordillera looking like to the forests of Germany with its women carrying vegetable baskets similar to how Alpine women carried their produce. The Igorot and his territory all of a sudden for the Germans revealed itself as a more primordial image of itself but at the same time having the same notions of cultural and societal superiority compared to other Filipinos.

Isabelo de los Reyes is caught in the middle of two dominating views. As far as his views of the Tinguian are concerned he had to work around two apprehensions which were concretized during that time. One was extensive Spanish travel writings on the Tinguian and Abra and the other, ethnological studies conducted later by the Germans. Though it was mentioned earlier that de los Reyes's work on the Tinguian is indeed unique because it is the first ethnological study conducted by a native, his work still had to follow travel writing conventions and dominating views on the "savage other" at that time. "El Tinguian" now becomes Orientalizing as his views on the other are seen as being part of a Spanish colonizing rhetoric of dominance. Imparting a gaze on the other is already a colonizing act. As an *illustrado*, de los Reyes's Hispanically reared sensibilities dictate his apprehensions of the Tinguian as savage mountain people, whereas his more modernistic industrialized views see them as specimens for preservation and study as in the case of the German travel writers. But the native in him would suggest that the Tinguian are his fellowmen and should be treated humanely. Paradoxically, de los Reyes notions tend to degrade the Tinguian for their ways but at the same time laud them for their purity and indigeneity. Kenneth Gergen in his essay entitled, *The Self: Colonization in Psychology and Society*, would state that "we tend to presume that our discourse for the self is ontologically secure" (1). De los Reyes identifies himself as a native and as one, he assumes credibility and authority on writing and passing judgment on the Tinguian.

THE TINGUIAN AS SELF-ORIENTALIZING

Alexander Kiossev in his essay entitled *Notes of Self-colonizing Cultures* would state that "the self-colonising cultures import alien values and civilisational models by themselves and that they lovingly colonise their own authenticity through these foreign models" (http://www.academia.edu/3477652/The_Self-Colonization_Cultures). The Tinguian and all their years of being subject to scrutiny and judgment has indeed utilized what Kiossev refers to as "a great replacement" where they utilize colonial models in order to become part of a recognized system of legitimization and propaganda. The Tinguian are therefore seen by de los Reyes as self-orientalizing and self-colonizing, maintaining and preserving orientalist

notions towards themselves because such views have been understood as being exclusively theirs and therefore become their identity. As Kiossev continues “by adopting these alien universal models, the self-colonising cultures traumatise themselves—for they also adopt their own inferiority, their own painful lack of essential Substance and Universality.” (http://www.academia.edu/3477652/The_Self-Colonization_Cultures).

Bogdan Stefanescu in his essay, “Filling in the Historical Blanks: A Tropology of the Void in Postcommunist and Postcolonial Reconstructions of Identity,” would write that East European cultures would “construct their identity in a recognizable colonial fashion” (108). Stefanescu suggests that the need for marginal cultures to utilize colonial models of identity is based on the “lack that comes from the absence of its own, home-brewed civilizational model” (108). It now becomes normative because they admit that their culture in essence becomes only existent because of outside views.

ON ANALYZING THE TEXT

For this study, the analysis “El Tinguian” would involve an identification of rhetorical features present in the text and how such features produce coherent colonial representations. To arrive at an identification of rhetorical features, several factors have to be taken into consideration. This study will apply a rhetorical analysis of colonial discourse found in colonial travel writings as demonstrated by David Spurr.

This method would begin by first identifying rhetorical features present in the text and analyzing how such features work in producing representations of the colonized. This could be achieved by primarily identifying how the colonizer (travel writer) looks at the other (subject). This is what Spurr refers to as *surveillance*. The reporter’s function as a witness would often begin with visual observation, since reporting always would begin with looking.

An analysis of the selective surveillance of the travel writer would then be studied by looking into how the writer produces differences with observations and how such differences are reconciled. This is what David Spurr refers to as *appropriation*. The territory observed by the colonizer becomes his own and such observations would then lead to the colonizer to imply an aesthetic or an appropriation of chaos and disorder in the territory that requires to be reformed and civilized by the colonizer.

Then, this study will apply what Spurr refers to as *aestheticization* where an analysis and identification is given on how various methods and devices are used by the writer in grabbing the attention of the intended audience of the text. The audience requires a detachment from the real conditions that constitute the object of representation, producing its own complex dimension of human interest. The acceptability of travel writing and its exotic pull was not only based on the strangeness of its subject but was also dependent on the writer itself. Next, a *classification* will be applied with regards to how the writer sorts and arranges the subjects based on their civility as compared to the writer's own civilizing standards. Then there is what Spurr (1999) terms as *debasement* and *negation*. The given classifications of the native are taken into account with the objective of exposing the negative end of a system of value, an active production of images based on fear and loathing concentrating on a notion of abjection, that is debasement. Negation, on the other hand, implies an analysis of rhetorical strategies that Western writers use in conceiving the other as under a consciousness of absence with structures of imagination and desire. Negation serves to imply a "clearing" of the colonized space for the inclusion and expansion of the colonial imagination and for the pursuit of desire, fundamentals in establishing and maintaining colonial rule.

In contrast to negation, the next method suggested by Spurr in the rhetorical analysis of travel writings is termed as *affirmation*. This is a rhetorical method which implies self-idealization as a means to establish a political and ethical order to the native. The primary affirmation of a colonial discourse is "one which justifies the authority of those in control of the discourse through demonstration of moral superiority."

Idealization is the analysis and examination of rhetorical situations in which the writer takes an ethical position with regards to his own culture. The native is seen not as historical truth but instead is given hypothetical and conditional reasonings produced by the colonizer to create a much more understandable and better fitted explanation of the nature of the native. Bhabha analyzes how colonizing power uses language to impose power and authority. Bhabha states that the objective of colonial discourse is to "construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction." Bhabha also says that "Colonial power produces the colonized as a fixed reality, which is at once an 'other' and yet entirely knowable and visible" (198).

Insubstantialization is a method in rhetorical analysis used by this study to draw out the idea that as a rhetorical gesture it is used by the dominant culture to

convert the experience as an “inner journey” where the observer defines or orients himself.

The last concepts of rhetorical analysis that Spurr suggests are *naturalization*, *eroticization*, and *resistance*. The first takes the native as primitive peoples living in a state of nature and therefore subject to the laws of nature. Domination is naturalized by colonial discourse, whereas it finds a natural justification for colonial domination of nature and people or what Spurr calls “children of nature.”

Eroticization, on the other hand involves the rhetorical technique in which the subject people are allegorized as a female body having the same qualities and attributes of that of a female. Eroticization of the colonized uses rhetorical instances such as metaphors, seductive fantasies, expressions of sexual anxiety where phallogocentric discourses of the colonialist coincide. Such representations are based on the fulfillment of sexual desires.

Spurr writes “discourse can be not only an instrument or an effect of power, but also a point of resistance” (184). The last methodology for rhetorical analysis of colonial travel writings is “resistance,” and this entails that if discourse can produce, transmit and reinforce power it can also be used to expose, undermine and go against it. Colonial discourse is based on the creation of patterns and structuring but such structures and patterns tend to limit views of the world. This is an act of ambivalence produced as a product of the dominant discourse.

“EL TINGUIAN”

De los Reyes’s ethnographic report on the Tinguian was part of a collection of various articles on Philippine history, ethnography and customs. Aptly entitled *Articulosvarios ... Sobre Etnografica, Historia y Costumbres del Pais*, the collection was released in 1887 in Manila, consisting of seven chapters namely:

1. The Filiation of the Tinguians
2. Ethnography
3. Theogony, Priests, Temples, Rites, and Superstitions
4. Government and Laws
5. Customs and Occupations
6. Philology, Music, and Dance
7. History

The text also includes a preface written by Cesareo Blanco Y Sierra and a Dedication Professor Ferdinand Blumentritt.

I. The Filiation of the Tinguians

The first chapter of the report deals with the Filiation of the Tinguians. At this part, de los Reyes conducts a recollection of previous existing studies on the origins of the Tinguian specifically on issues concerning their Chinese descent. As he would comment:

We are not at all uncomfortable with this idea of the Tinguian having *some* Chinese blood; but, we do find it a mistake to attribute the origin of the Tinguians to the Chinese when they appear more like the Filipino natives than any other race. (29)

Previous notions produced by the Spaniards concerning the Tinguian and their supposed Chinese ancestry and origin seem too far-fetched and unbelievable for de los Reyes. Rhetorical insubstantialization is evident in this stance as the Tinguian and their origins become a matter of determining who is in the better position of appropriating them. De los Reyes' discourse leads to a more nationalistic / geographic inclination towards academic ownership of the Tinguian, as if trying to answer, who better to study them than those who live in close cultural and geographic proximity to them. He continues to write:

My objective in writing this chapter is mainly to refute the dominant opinion that the Tinguians are of the Mongolian family. They, like other indigenous Filipinos, are of Malay filiation as can be seen in their languages, traditions, ethnography and other evidence that I will have to deal with in another book. (30)

According to David Spurr, as a rhetorical gesture, Insubstantialization converts the observed other into an "inner journey" and in so doing "renders that world insubstantial, as the backdrop of baseless fabric against which is played the drama of the writers self" (Spurr 142). De los Reyes' appropriative stance on the Tinguian exist insubstantially as a coming-to-terms with his own self, a gesture of needing to belong and to represent. This view is based on a realization that identities have changed because of the colonial process. De los Reyes sees himself as having the need to re-identify himself with his native roots because it is his true identity.

II. ETHNOGRAPHY

"Reporting begins with looking. Visual observation is the essence of the reporter's [in this case traveller's] function as a witness," writes Spurr (13). In discussing the second chapter of his text (Ethnography), de los Reyes begins with an assessment of Tinguian settlements, taking note that all of these are "divided into barrios, most of which are near a river or a stream perhaps for the Tinguian daily bath" (31). The creation of a spatial arrangement with regard to the location of the villages tends to produce a notion of familiarity with, and control over, the area. The Tinguian landscape is given a much more understandable geographical standpoint which enters into what Pratt refers to as a "discursive configuration," one that "centers the landscape, separates people from place to place, and effaces the speaking self" (143). Following Spurr's idea of naturalization, the mere mentioning of the village situated near a body of water implies the formations of a fledgling civilization as all primordial communities do find their origins near a body of water. Water means life and everything else that gravitates towards that discourse. By simply mentioning "perhaps for the Tinguian daily bath", de los Reyes's rhetoric delves towards an aestheticizing view of the native as also having an inclination towards sanitation and cleanliness.

De los Reyes continues:

They live in huts made of wood, bamboo or cogon grass (*Saccharum Koenigii*) each according to his means. Take note that nipa (*Nipafrutilans*) is not used since this palm tree does not, strangely enough, grow in forests of Abra. These huts are generally grouped together on hilltops to avoid any surprise attack from the aborigines of Guinaang; they have the same shape and structure as those of the natives. (31)

In this set of images, de los Reyes continues his classification by now assessing the Tinguian abode and subjecting it to a visual dissection where materials of construction are named and given scientific names. Rhetorically, this mode of classification functions not only in providing details on what is being described but also serves as an academic display of the writer's scientific acumen and expertise in the subject.

In continuing with his discourse, de los Reyes now mentions names of objects found around and inside the hut, as he writes:

The furniture and utensils consists of benches, earthen jars which are called by many names according to their kinds, trunks, bolos (iron knives),

shields iron bamboo spears with heavy wooden handles called *sulbong* (they do not use bows and arrows like the Aetas), big and small dippers (bowls made out of coconut shells) which they use as glasses and plates, and trays of different sizes. It is indispensable to have a neat pile of pillows in a cabinet in the living-room: they usually serve as decor and are used only for very important guests. From the doors and the stairs hang horse, carabao (*bubulusbuffulus*) and deer skulls that serve as amulets called *rorog*. In addition to the items already mentioned, the rich usually have tables, armchairs, beds and 50 decorative pillows. (31-32)

The most intimate views of the subject other occur when the gaze imparted by the traveller penetrates the confines of the savage abode. De los Reyes's observations on the objects found inside and out the Tinguian hut seem to provide a discourse which describes the civilized status of the natives. Objects like plates, bowls, dippers, and even pillows produce a naturalizing stance that implies that the Tinguian are like normal folk who have and use the same implements and comforts as everybody else. But another part of discourse leads to a more genocidal rhetoric as images of decorative pillows find themselves beside bolos, spears, and decorative animal parts. In this naturalizing stance, the Tinguian is put in a position where daily life is still bombarded by images of savagery and warfare amidst an effort to collectively civilize themselves. The native is ridiculed and considered different based on its non-civilized way of living. The colonizer "may treat subjects of local interest in a manner calculated to damage or even to jeopardize Imperial interests" (Said 44). The appropriation of the native calls for the improvement of its life and living conditions through colonial civilized influences. The irony is, once the native acknowledges and absorbs civilized life, the native is still ridiculed for imitating the colonizer.

De los Reyes continues by now imparting his gaze on the Tinguian body. Spurr writes that "in classic colonial discourse, the body of the primitive becomes as much the object of examination, commentary, and valorization as the landscape of the primitive" (22). Just like his assessment of the village, the Tinguian body is also given a systematic view, in this case from head-to-toe. As he observes:

An average height of 6 feet for men and 5 feet for women, cranium flat at the back, oval face crowned with stiff, straight, long black hair. The men sport Chinese-like pigtails; but they do not shave like those in the celestial realms; big black eyes, snub rather than pointed nose, thick at

the base with nostrils flaring; wheat-colored or brown skin; somewhat thick lips; sparse beard; regular mouth and extremities; and muscular, well-proportioned legs. (32)

If the surveillance of the landscape implies an authoritative stance and visual possession of the terrain, surveillance of the primitive body also entails its ownership and control. De los Reyes's method of observing Tinguian bodies share a similarity with how he examines landscapes. He implores a systematic analysis which follows a spatial arrangement. Western notions of physical standards are used by de los Reyes in assessing the natives. Tinguian physical characteristics that are deemed more comparable to that of Westerner's become quantifying and spatializing in such a way that such isolated characteristics become aesthetic means of judging on specific degrees of civilization compared to other natives.

The more the native conforms to Western standards of physical appearance, the more the native is seen to be more superior to others. De los Reyes' detailed inspection transforms Tinguian bodies into having scientific and touristic qualities, providing imageries that serve in providing scientifically relevant data while at the same time presenting scenes that tend to exoticize and aestheticize the native as items of Western interest and curiosity. With this in mind each and every detail of the Tinguian has to be noted including whatever is attached to the native's body. De los Reyes continues by observing tattoos:

The entire body is covered up to the knees with many drawings and they must certainly suffer a great deal with the tattooing for they are made to stay in bed for a few days looking like lepers. Normally the whole body is done over several days rather than a single day. The tattooed skin remains smooth unlike among the Mariveles Aetas upon whose bodies, according to the German Doctor Semper, "the drawing comes out in relief like so many swollen scars." It seems like only the women only paint their arms. (33)

According to Spurr (22), "Under western eyes, the body is that which is most proper to the primitive, the sign by which the primitive is represented." The value of the primitive under western eyes lies in various ways the primitive is appropriated. It can be based on seeing them as either as workers, as a sources of aesthetic value, an ethical, scientific, and moral measure, and as a source of erotic desire. De los Reyes treats the body of the primitive as if he were describing landscape. Describing the body of the primitive systematically, using spatial organization delivers the idea that their bodies are for viewing and inspection. De los Reyes puts emphasis on

describing specific details such as hair style, skin color, tattoos, and tooth dyeing, because he feels that describing such would elucidate feelings of wonder and amusement to his intended audience. Tattoos provide a highly exoticizing view of the Tinguian as aesthetics and culture of beautification go hand in hand with a culture of pain and suffering.

In rhetorically naturalizing the Tinguian, de los Reyes also produces their debasement. Their exoticized appearance as a result of painful body modifications would lead to assumptions of the lack of civility and morals. But in a sudden turn of his discourse, de los Reyes is ready to defend the abilities of his observed tribe as he writes:

Nature has endowed the Tinguian with discernment and cunning. However, although he may be superior to all other mountain tribes, and he definitely does not deserve to be called a savage for he observes certain social principles and is not a cannibal, he still has a long way to go to reach the level of morality and civilization of the natives who live in towns. (34)

De los Reyes is compelled to defend the Tinguian even referring to them as “superior to all other mountain tribes” this stems forth from his personal identification with them as a people. His insubstantial rhetoric again surfaces in this instance as the Tinguians all of a sudden find themselves in de los Reyes’s appropriation as people to be described and defended. But be that as it may, de los Reyes’s appropriations of the Tinguian whether it be positive or debasing still functions in totally imparting an authoritative stance, one which the Tinguian have no control over.

De los Reyes continues to debase his “superior mountain tribe” by again providing specific details concerning their lack of civility. He would mention notions concerning their indolence, laziness, and general naked disposition. But amidst this debasement, he again takes an insubstantial stance. He writes:

In the barrios, the women do not wear shirts; but if they enter the natives’ towns, they put on shirts similar to those of the native women; the only difference is that the sleeves are wide and very short so that the countless beads that had been coiled around their arms at an early age could be seen. (36)

In this set of images, de los Reyes portrays a picture of the savage who is well aware of its own condition. The act of putting on shirts “similar to those of the

native woman” if they enter civilized villages creates this notion that the Tinguian know how to adjust, to fit in, so to speak. But under a naturalizing stance, for the Tinguian, civilization (as portrayed symbolically with the wearing of the shirt) is a mere option—and not a requirement. The discourse developed here implies that if given a choice, these people would rather stick to their primitive conditions because that is what they really are.

III. Theogony, Priests, Temples, Rites, and Superstitions

In this chapter, de los Reyes takes the liberty of ascertaining Tinguian religion as part of their culture. The argumentative stance for this chapter simply implies that the development of a civilization goes hand-in-hand with the development of a belief system.

The relationship between religion and civilization for the Spanish colonizer implies an immediate assumption that the tribal populations of the country were incapable of developing a belief system because of their “savage” nature. De los Reyes argues that this is not so. Though admitting that some tribal groups in the country do not have a belief system, he would defend the Tinguian civilization as having such. He writes:

Yes. The Tinguians like other rational animals, may not know the true God, but they know and recognize that this Supreme being must exist in reality. (37)

Historically, the Dominicans believed that the Tinguian do not worship a divinity nor do they have temples for such. Trivializing the subject race’s religion may be considered an issue in terms of negating them. Denying the Tinguian a complex and sophisticated religious belief system displaces them to a historical and cultural zero. As Spurr argues, “To speak of a zero degree in this way implies a single direction for historical development” (101).

De los Reyes in his account would explain why the Dominicans were not able to observe a Tinguian belief system, as he writes:

In truth, the Tinguian is not keen on revealing his beliefs to a stranger; that is why he tries to hide them; but if one should go into his settlement, one cannot help but exclaim in unison with a contemporary writer: “since there is no people without a language, neither can there be one without a religion.” (38)

The Western enchantment for things non-Western relies on imagery which remains different and diverse, an exoticized ideal devoid of the familiar and monotonous ways civilized life offered in the West. The Tinguians *do* have a belief system, but it is one that is supposedly kept in secrecy away from the outsider's prying eyes. The mere mention of a secret religion evokes images of an exoticizing rhetoric, which in turn presents itself as both a source of interest and taboo for the outsider.

De los Reyes would also mention classified and arranged descriptions of Tinguian belief from: the worship of stone idols to the presence of a priest in every settlement. But what is noticeable is de los Reyes's debasing treatment of the belief systems, his presentations and assumptions of Tinguian religion are limited to social instinct alone. Tinguians do not have an idea of self-regarding virtues because their religion caters to the well-being of everyone in the tribe. The absence of self-regarding virtues tend to debase the Tinguian by denying them qualities such as physical decency, chastity, self control among others. The absence of these therefore affects the tribe as a whole. The natives becomes "othered" in such a way that they "are homogenized into a collective 'they'" (Pratt 139) which becomes distilled into an iconic state. To add to this, de los Reyes would portray a religion based on libations and blood offerings as he writes:

When some grave illness befalls the Tinguian, he consults the Baglan who usually advises the family to beg for Anito's protection by consecrating an idol to him. If the family of the sick person follows the advice of Anito's respected minister, they prepare provisions, get drunk and head straight out of the settlement where they gather the stones for the idol, shouting and brandishing their spears as they make their way. (41)

Images of idol worshipping, spear brandishing, and shouting drunks actually function under a debasing stance. De los Reyes's observations ironically tends to trivialize the Tinguian rather than produce a civilized view of them. De los Reyes's notice does not really fit into the Tinguian image he is trying to forge for his readers. Trivializing the subject race's religion may be considered an issue in terms of negating them.

Primitive reliance on omens, premonitions, and prophecies supports the general civilized idea that the savage's reliance on superstition makes up for the lack of intelligence and reason. This debasing gesture also dictates the assumed racial character of the Tinguian as being essentially savage. Though de los Reyes's descriptions present a fascinating and technical view toward primitive conventions

on superstitions, the portrayal exposes the problem of the Tinguian condition. The Tinguian belief system is a hindrance to their evolution and becomes a cause for their ignorance and non-development.

IV. Government and Laws

The level of advancement a society has is also measured by the existence of a complex form of governance. The existence of laws and a body politic dictates a society's morals and development. The essentialized Tinguian's legal relations and government are presented by de los Reyes in the previous chapter as being attached to more superstitious conventions just like their religious beliefs. Though it is observed that "the gobernadorcillos issues preventive and interim police decisions" (45). For the Tinguian, "The more important decisions" as de los Reyes writes: "such as for example, court sentences and rulings, are handed down by the elders assembled as a council in the tribunal" (48). In a naturalizing rhetoric, the Tinguian are put in a position of having government and laws established and dependent on the Spanish government, but it is their primitiveness that implies that more traditional conventions rise above that which is more developed.

De los Reyes continues:

Civil cases are decided on the basis of their customs, even before they are brought to the courts of first instance. Criminal cases must be, as mandated, judged according to legislation enacted for every Filipino. They, however, hide their crimes and the elders settle their disputes, a practice consistent with their inexplicable abhorrence of presenting themselves before our courts. It sometimes happens that when the government and the court of first instance of Abra calls them, they run to the houses of the officials of said institutions to avoid the presentation before the pertinent authorities even when they're not guilty of anything. (48)

In his account of the Tinguian system of governance, de los Reyes creates a picture of an archaic form of government. Though processes of laws for criminal offence, rules on divorce, and division of properties were mentioned, it is still noted that Tinguian law is still completely reliant on decisions made by town elders, a characteristic of prehistoric human groups. This is what Spurr refers to as negation: the Tinguian are denied their history because they do not have one in the first place. The inviolability of their laws as decided upon by the elders regardless of

the presence of Spanish laws produces the notion that their primitive minds remain recalcitrant to development and change, that their means of governance should not be subject to change and should remain as is.

V. Customs and Occupations

Savage reality is best exhibited with a presentation of their customs and culture. It is through the display of such that they are seen for what they truly are. But the gaze imparted on the subject other's culture can also be modified and utilized to present the observers own notions, exhibiting his pre-assigned ideals and even prejudices.

According to Pratt:

manners-and-custom description is always in play with other sorts of representation that also bespeak difference and position subjects in their own ways. Sometimes these other positioning complement the ideological project of normalizing description, and sometimes they do not. (140)

The enchantment directed toward the primitive other relies on imageries which remain different and diverse, an exoticized ideal devoid of the familiar and monotonous ways that civilized life has to offer. Producing an account of customs and occupations for any travel text actually provides adequate material for human interest. As Pratt writes:

Indigenous peoples are relocated in separate manners-and-customs chapters as if in textual homelands or reservations, where they are pulled out of time to be preserved, contained studied, admired, detested, pitied, mourned. (146)

De los Reyes in this chapter discusses several cultural traits and occupations that the Tinguian have (i.e., birth and wedding rituals). But most notable in his discourse is the presentation of cultural traits which represent them as uniquely Tinguian. As de los Reyes writes concerning love and courtship under the Tinguian context:

At first, the ladylove usually refuses to accept the offering, giving excuses in another song full of mellifluous phrases. Given such a refusal, the rejected suitor answers with another song, complaining of the lady

love's cruelty, thereupon a musical love argument begins, until finally the desperate suitor swears that he will kill himself rather than be scorned. If the woman takes the bait, taking pity on the enthusiastic lover, goodbye Tinguian lady! She drains the proffered glass, and another, and still others because the despicable suitor, hoping to achieve his cherished ends through illicit means, does not cease to offer glasses left and right to those present and the companions of the lady until everyone feels the narcotic effects of the *basi*. Once the Tinguian lady and her companion fall asleep, the suitor tries to steal the *cuba* or loincloth of the adored which symbolizes her "yes" and serves, among the Tinguians, as a perfect proof of their mutual love. (54)

In this set of images, de los Reyes rhetorically aestheticizes the subject other by portraying Tinguian love and courtship as overtly romanticized yet at the same time trivialized as childish and nonsensical. Savage love is delivered as devoid of choice and is merely reliant on libations and stealing of loincloths, but the discourse also offers a more entertaining look at Tinguian love. Whether the presentation of the Tinguian is made in positive or negative contexts, aesthetic value is still attached. De los Reyes's act of attaching aesthetic value to folkways performs as a function in colonizing and dominating in itself as it relegates the Tinguian into the status of an object to be defined under beauty, pathos, and passion.

Concerning Tinguian occupations de los Reyes writes:

Beyond the shadow of the doubt, every man would like nothing better than to get tired, sleep well and to pass the time relaxing and having fun. This natural inclination for frivolity, apathy, lack of ambition and absence of need is all the more evident in the Tinguian. (55)

Several rhetorical devices can be applied in interpreting the statement above. First, de los Reyes discourse rhetorically aestheticizes the Tinguian as living under conditions which remain perfect and desirable for any man. Primitive life is converted into a pleasurable experience devoid of the drudgeries of civilized living and responsibility. But such traits are also seen by de los Reyes as rhetorically debased, as the Tinguian are portrayed to be nothing more than lazy, unmotivated, and easily content people, attributes of which perfectly complement the underbelly of underdeveloped primitive life. Under an Idealizing and naturalizing stance, Tinguian indolence is innate due to the conditions presented by their general way of living, a trait which can only be improved with the intrusion of civilization.

De los Reyes continues:

Generally, the Tinguian is content with a little toasted rice or corn, which is the base of his diet, with a plate of spicy salted water as his only dish. He needs not biscuits, cakes nor sweets, but *basi* or any other drink, for his fondness for such beverages extends to others that he does not even know how to make. (55)

Under rhetorical resistance, the voice of the colonizer presents both difference and ambivalence, an observation still dependent on the observer's authority. In this context, both colonizer and colonized are presented as not being equally burdened but sharing the same effects of a structure of power. In de los Reyes's case, everyone must eat, but the debauchery toward food and the wastage of such is mostly found in more civilized communities. Primitive life remains in this instance as commendable as it survives on the most barest of essentials. Imagery of consuming only "salted water" and "toasted rice" is something the civilized population cannot be content with. But still the debasing rhetoric would dominate as de los Reyes would continue his observations by taking note of more examples of Tinguian indolence, such as asking for food from wealthier neighbors to their inability to engage in business. As de los Reyes's would end the chapter:

Because of his indolence, the Tinguian can only become rich not by strength of his arms but through inheritance. He who acquires a good inheritance is a rich man and he does not lose it by taking risks because, as I have repeated time and again, he has very few needs: he does not gamble except on some very rare occasions, and he knows no other way to spend money than to buy wine. (57)

Under the rhetorical act of surveillance, the gaze becomes an authority which denies the surveyed the right to gaze back and if spoken to, they are denied the power to speak. To immediately assume that the Tinguian are lazy and unmotivated is a one-sided view that is based on modern conventions of civilization. The Tinguian in this case becomes the model for man in his most primordial state. Having less needs and the slightest concept on what money is can be commendable based on an aestheticizing stance but may also function as debasing since the Tinguian is transformed into a being recalcitrant to development and change.

VI. Philology, Music, and Dance

The sophistication of a culture may be gauged on the complexity of their language. In this chapter, de los Reyes cites *Vocabular des Guinaan u Tinguiano* written by a German anthropologist, Hans Meyer. Meyer's list becomes a contention for correction as far as de los Reyes is concerned as he takes note of several mistakes made with Iloko word spellings. De los Reyes writes:

I doubt that Dr. Meyer's list of vocabulary words were faithfully gathered; but I cannot claim them to be incorrect with complete certainty since I am not familiar with all the Tinguian dialects. (61)

The rhetoric of resistance in this instance questions the ability of the civilized mind to comprehend ironically what defines the echelon of a society. Taking note of Hans Meyer's mistakes in his Tinguian vocabulary list raises issues against the validity, quality, and accuracy of study made by outsiders in foreign lands. Rhetorical resistance becomes a concept which both native and colonizer share. But such a similarity could be reappropriated by the colonizer and used against the primitive institutions from which they originate, since the primitive is still placed in a corner of silence regardless of the studies made of them are accurate or not. Said writes, "Orientalism was ultimately a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the difference between the familiar and the strange" (43). For Meyer, the Tinguian are strange and, therefore, require a more orientalizing structure for defining them. But for de los Reyes, the Tinguian are a familiar subject. De los Reyes's discourse in this instance also produces an aestheticizing rhetoric because it puts the Tinguian into a position of nationalistic and cultural representation. The Tinguian and how they are studied are best handled by the interests of people who are geographically and culturally familiar with.

In line with the analysis of Tinguian language and dialects, de los Reyes again includes in his analysis a comparison of the Tinguian to other cultures, a seemingly familiar pattern in his discourse. As part of a topic of human interest and resistance, de los Reyes's point is to humanize the Tinguian rather than to put them in a position of savagery and barbarism. To exhibit how similar the Tinguian are to so many more developed cultures actually breaks the common notions of othering as rendered by his colonial-Western counterparts.

In further continuing his notices on language, de los Reyes also takes the liberty of including music and dance in the chapter. In reference to Tinguian music, he would comment:

The Tinguians have their own music that sounds soothing in some compositions and noisy in others, always discordant and monotonous at the same time; it is not pleasant to listen to and sounds like Chinese music. (63)

Just like language, the degree of development that a civilization has can also be gauged by looking at other culturally expressive traits. Music and dance in this instance becomes another rhetorically classifying device to which de los Reyes can impart a gaze on the subject other. Describing Tinguian music as always being “discordant and monotonous” creates a debasing stance which sees their music as underdeveloped and still in its primordial state. Music which is “not pleasant to listen to” clearly utilizes a naturalizing rhetoric since the savage is not at all expected to mimic the musical tenacity of a Mozart or Bach, but rather the musical stylings of another then subjugated race, the Chinese.

As for the dance, the same rhetorical devices are utilized. De los Reyes limits Tinguian dance to no more than two types, “the *tadec* and another whose name I do not know, similar to the Igorot *dongngiasan*” (64). Dances which again move monotonously repeating the same formations “as many times as they wish” implies a culture so limited in its artistic and expressive capabilities that the repetition of dance and music are inevitable.

VII. History and Its Lesson: De los Reyes's Conclusion

In the rhetoric of negation, the non-West or in this case the subject-other, becomes open to the various interpretations of the observer since it is considered to be a negative space—negative in the sense that it is empty and non-existing, where history is absent and society and the progress of life is put at a zero degree of development. Negative space implies an empty space, space which becomes the roaming ground of civilized ideals and interpretations. The transformation of the other into emptiness is a colonizing gesture because the act denies them their own interpretation and understanding and makes itself free and subject to civilized authority of judgment.

For de los Reyes, the purpose of the last chapter is to quell the negation of the Tinguian, by simply implying that they too, have a history. But this discourse still remains rhetorically negating because as far as Tinguian history for de los Reyes is concerned, it begins with the penetration of the Spanish. As he writes:

In 1572 (not 1574 as almost all the modern writers claim) when the brave captain Juan de Salcedo arrived in Vigan, he found the Tinguians living at the site now occupied by the civilized peoples of Abra up to the western slopes of the mountains of Ilocos. (65)

Just like the origins of so many ancient civilizations, the need for great men to discover new lands is indeed necessary in formulating a rich and formidable history. "The brave" Juan de Salcedo in de los Reyes's words becomes the great founder of the Tinguian, among other names which would be mentioned in the chapter as benefactors and "indulgent fathers."

It is also in this chapter that the author would again produce comparisons but this time it would be the Ilocanos who would be at the upper ranks of the comparative scale. As de los Reyes continues:

The Ilocanos, hardworking and naturally excellent subjects, entered Abra under the protection of the Spaniards. The Tinguans readily became their friends.

Perhaps because they realized, through the Ilocano example, the advantages of the civilization that conquerors were trying to impart to them. (65)

In this set of images, the Ilocano takes the role of ambassadors of civilization for the Tinguian. Their role as "excellent subjects" supports an affirming rhetorical stance since it simply implies the civilizing effects of Spanish colonization as being beneficial to them.

In finishing his notices, de los Reyes would conclude by writing:

Let a competent authority force the Tinguian to work, through indirect means, for example against vagrancy; and may eager missionaries show him the advantage of civilization and ill effects of his apathy, teaching this unhappy soul every that he does not know.

Let the Tinguian be assimilated as much as possible into the community of civilized Filipinos since many confessed to me that they received no grace from being baptized or civilized (in the Philippines these two words are almost synonymous) since natives were given greater responsibilities in their communities. (71)

De los Reyes is well aware of the positive effects of colonization in the Philippines and especially to the country's less developed population. By producing a work which tends to describe who the Tinguian are, a rhetorical affirmation is actually achieved, one which implies that the text's intent is to provide the authorities a more conventional plea in helping them. According to Edward Said, "Orientalism was ultimately a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the difference between the familiar and the strange" (43). De los Reyes's methods are indeed in substantializing as the subject race are taken as beings to be displayed based on their exoticized worth and ability to produce apathy at the same time.

CONCLUSION

The Tinguian for de los Reyes served as a mirror to the past, but not only of the country's but of himself as well. Being detached from family and home at an early age might be one of de los Reyes's reasons for looking for a solid background on who he is. His observations of the Tinguian portray an insubstantial rendering as they served their purpose as an inner journey both forging his identity not only as a Filipino but as an Ilokano as well.

In terms of discourse, modern conventions on orientalizing views and methods occur in de los Reyes's text. Said would write, "in each of these cases the Oriental is contained and represented by dominating frameworks" (40). De los Reyes's Tinguian became classified, surveyed, appropriated, and even debased, a method similar to how Europeans wrote of them in previous and present studies. Rovillos's assertion that de los Reyes is locating himself as "an outsider, insider, and as both" (Imson 10) is evident in the author's discourse as it remains divided with conflicting views. As an insider, de los Reyes would write about how great the Tinguian are and would rhetorically resort to comparing them with other "greater" civilizations. As an outsider, he would try to debase them by exposing their general backwardness, filth, and indolence. But there is also a part where the Tinguian are presented to be part of a human condition which has to be helped and appropriated for values of their contributions to the country when they will be educated.

De los Reyes's observations exhibit how the Indigenous Other were seen by those who were deemed their countrymen. His proximity to the Tinguian showed early on the possibility of the native learning about the other without Western intervention, truly a work ahead of its time. But de los Reyes's gaze through rhetorical analysis could also work in throwing back the gaze at the author. His methods, goals, and visions among others were indeed exposed. *El Tinguian* did not only paint a picture of the Tinguian but it also produced an idea on who Isabelo de los Reyes is.

But in further expanding the discourse on representations and the native as well as an avenue for future studies, matters concerning the structures and formation of self-colonization could be another topic which would come out from such a rhetorical analysis. Silent as they may have been, the Tinguian in the text could also be theorized as the ones who are in total control of how they have been represented. It has to be made evident that Tinguian culture and collective identity would not have come into fruition if not for it being represented by the outside gaze. The self-colonizing of the Tinguian starts with recognizing what sets them apart from the other, because it is in difference where they see their uniqueness and their identity.

At present, the discourse on the indigenous other in the Philippines still has a long way to go in terms of political correctness and accuracy. Though there are now a number of texts which tend to correct issues on indigenous identity and culture, former colonial tropes still tend to find its way into modern Philippine discourse. The Tinguian experience is an example of the conditions that Indigenous peoples in our country go through; they are denied the right to speak for themselves and it is only now that they are starting to learn to do so. But this process takes time and should start with addressing how such tropes and stereotypes were formed. The indigenous other did not write their history. But this doesn't mean that they should detest what was written about them. Colonial texts provide an avenue for expanding horizons and learning more about culture and identities. De los Reyes's *El Tinguian* exhibit aspects of culture, literature, and examinations (among others) that could be very helpful for the Tinguian to further address how they are to present themselves at present and into the future.

WORKS CITED

- Aschroft, Bill. *Postcolonial Transformation*. London: Routledge, 2001. Print.
- Ashcroft, Bill et al. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Bentley, Jerry. *Travel Narratives*. <http://chnm.gmu.edu/worldhistorysources/unpacking/travelguide.pdf>. Web. 22 October 2010.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge. 2005. Print.
- . "The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism. In *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures*, ed. Russel Ferguson. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1990. 77-85. Print.
- Cariño, Ma. Luisa Aguilar. "The Igorot as Other: Four Discourses from the Colonial Period." *Philippine Studies* 42 (Second Quarter 1994): 194-209. Print.
- De los Reyes, Isabelo. *The Tinguian*. Trans. Ma. Elinora Imson. Baguio, Philippines: Cordillera Studies Center, 2007. Print.
- Gergen, Kenneth. *The Self: Colonization in Psychology and Society*. [http://www.swarthmore.edu/Documents/faculty/gergen The_Self_Colonization_in_Psychology_and_Society.pdf](http://www.swarthmore.edu/Documents/faculty/gergen/The_Self_Colonization_in_Psychology_and_Society.pdf). Web. 7 November 2015.
- Kiossev, Alexander. *Notes of Self-colonizing Cultures*. http://www.academia.edu/3477652/The_Self-Colonization_Cultures. Web. 7 November 2015.
- Laory, M. B. *Tinguian ethnohistory: 1930-2005*. Laoag City, Philippines: Crown Printers, 2006. Print.
- Macleod, John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2000. Print.
- Mojares, Resil. "Isabelos Archive: The Formation of Philippine Studies". In *The Cordillera Review* 1.1 (March 2009): 105-120. Print.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge. 1992. Print.
- . "Scratches on the Face of the Country; or What Mr. Barrow Saw in the Land of the Bushmen." In *"Race", Writing and Difference*, ed. Henry Louis Gates Jr. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1985. 117-137. Print.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin Books, 1991. Print.
- Scott, William Henry, ed. *German Travelers on the Cordillera (1860-1890)*. Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1975. Print.

Spurr, David. *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1999. Print.

Stefanescu, Bogdan. *Filling in the Historical Blanks: A Tropology of the Void in Postcommunist and Postcolonial Reconstructions of Identity*. Ed. Dobrota Pucherová, Róbert Gáfrik, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava, and Trnava University, Slovakia, 2015. Print

Trincada, Evaristo De Liebana. "A Few Facts about the Igorots." In *Notes on the History of the Mountain Province*, ed. William Henry Scott. *University of Baguio Research Journal* IX.1 (July-December 1974): 1-13. Print.

Iö M. Jularbal <io.mones.jularbal@gmail.com> is Assistant Professor at the Department of Language and Literature, College of Arts and Communication, University of the Philippines Baguio. He is Chair of UP Baguio Center for Culture and the Arts and Head of UP Baguio Cordillera Studies Center Program for Language and Literature. He obtained his Master of Arts in Language and Literature from the University of the Philippines Baguio. A Bontoc Igorot, he was born in Baguio City on 10 September 1980.