

Chapter 5

San Joseph de Oruña (1592–1802)

Predated by the two short-lived settlement attempts of Antonio Sedeño (1530–1534) and Juan Troche Ponce de León (1569–1579), the first permanent Spanish settlement was established in Trinidad in May 1592. Based on the conclusion of the previous chapter that the Spaniards until then had not lawfully acquired Trinidad and the Orinoco area, this chapter examines the Spanish practices of occupation, treaty making (unlawful in the Vitorian sense in times of war), and conquest (in the sense of its legal replacement by “pacification”) in Trinidad since the establishment of San Joseph (1592), including its numerous attacks by the Nepoio, English, Dutch, French, Caribs, and Tivitives until the end of the seventeenth century, before investigating the spatial extensions of Capuchin missions from 1687 until the “conquest” of the Spaniards by the English in 1797, resulting in the (unlawful) Spanish cession of *whole* Trinidad to the English in the Treaty of Amiens in 1802.

Lines in the Soil (1592–1637)

The first Spanish settlement on the island of Trinidad (Cairi)¹ was San Joseph de Oruña, which was symbolically established during a founding ceremony in May 1592 with the erection of “a forty feet high wooden cross” and some lines drawn in the soil, the demarcation of proposed sites of the governor’s house, church, *cabildo*, and prison and the proclamation of Domingo de Vera that “he had [formally] taken possession of this Island in the name of the [Spanish] [k]ing”.² The proclamation was repeated by the Spaniard

1 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 7. Cairi (Caeril) represents the indigenous people’s name of the island, while Columbus had reportedly named the island Trinidad, after he saw “the summit of three mountains rising above the horizon” on 31 July 1498 (ibid.).

2 NATT, Domingo de Vera, “Account on the Foundation of San Joseph”, 15 May 1592, publication No. 15.

before the two Caciques Maycay and Paraco³ at the “port of Cumucurape”,⁴ where Domingo de Vera had likewise formally announced “to settle in [Trinidad] one or two or more towns of Spaniards” and promised Spanish protection “against the Caribs”⁵ in return for their obedience to the King of Spain and “the Holy Faith”. The two Caciques had assertively agreed and indicated their intention “to live in peace”, after they were “decorated with a military sash”, which the Spaniard interpreted as “the formal acknowledgement of possession”.⁶

However, the establishment of the first Spanish settlement San Joseph on a site, situated “close to the River Caroni”⁷ and located “three leagues inland from the port they call Port-of-Spain [. . .] where an Indian Cacique Guanaguanare had his settlement”,⁸ was based on an agreement with the Carinepagoto Cacique Guanaguanare of the “higher land”, who “granted [Domingo de Vera] an area on the highlands where the Spaniards could settle”,⁹ whereupon the Cacique withdrew “to another part of the Island”.¹⁰ While Arie Boomert assumes that Guanaguanare may have been “appeased with Spanish gifts”,¹¹ the conclusion of treaties and agreements was not a legal means of Spanish colonial appropriation in the Americas and rendered as “unjust” by Francisco Vitoria, as was

3 It is unknown, if those two Caciques were from Trinidad or just visiting the port from elsewhere. At the same time, other Caciques of the island, such as Carroari, Taroopanama, Maquarima, and Aterima, were not mentioned in de Vera’s account. Those Caciques, in particular, emerge in the context of the Walter Raleigh attack of 1595 (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 100).

4 Afterwards, this place was named Mucurapo (D. W. Thompson, “Pre-British Place-names in Trinidad”, *De West-Indische Gids* 39 [December 1959] 2/4, pp. 137–165, at 149–150) and is part of contemporary Port of Spain.

5 This suggests that these Caciques were “non-Carib”. However, it remains unclear in this context, if “Carib” refers to a Carib-speaking group or are indicated the opponents of the Spaniards (*caribas*).

6 NATT, De Vera, “Account on the Foundation of San Joseph”, May 1592.

7 This river means “water” and carries the same name, as the Caroni River in mainland Guayana.

8 NATT, Licenciado Pedro de Liano, “Letter to King of Spain”, 15 March 1596, publication No. 23. The name of the cacique displays some similarities with the Arawak Guacanaagari of Hispaniola, who had allied with Columbus in March 1495 (chapter 3).

9 NATT, De Vera, “Account on the Foundation of San Joseph”, May 1592.

10 NATT, De Liano, “Letter to King of Spain”, 15 March 1596. Furthermore, the Licenciado declared that the settlement would have to be situated at “the best [site] in the Island because pirogues can sail up the river as far as half league distant from the town” (*ibid.*). In contrast, Francisco Morales Padrón claims that “Vera took possession of the island of Trinidad, the land, and indigenous peoples” (Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, p. 50).

11 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 99.

the application of force during the short intermezzo of Antonio de Berrio as acting governor in Trinidad, whose settlement was in January 1593 still without royal recognition,¹² although the request “to occupy the Island” was pursued since October 1591.¹³ Hence, Antonio de Berrio, in November 1593, had sent another request to the Spanish king, this time for “a hundred” men for “patrol[ing] the coast and protect this Island and go to conquer and settle that [mainland]”,¹⁴ although “conquest” was royally prohibited since 1530. Despite, de Berrio insisted that the “70 men” of San Joseph¹⁵ would have had faced “more than 6,000 war Indians”,¹⁶ ordered Domingo de Vera to “combat the *caribes*”,¹⁷ and emphasized the strategic importance of Trinidad to expel the English, French, and Caribs and prevent attacks by the Caribs of Granada, Dominica, and Matalino.

Eventually, Antonio de Berrio, in breach with the Spanish colonial law, proceeded against the Indigenous Peoples of the western part of the island during the period 1593–1595, most likely the Yaio (Jaio), Salvaio (Salvajos),¹⁸ and Arawak,¹⁹

12 As resulting from a letter of Antonio de Berrio to the Spanish king, where the former stated: “I desire that the fact of its settlement may be proclaimed” (Antonio de Berrio, “Letter to King of Spain”, Margarita, 1 January 1593, in: BRC, serial No. 1, pp. 1–7, at 7).

13 NATT, Antonio de Berrio, “Letter to King of Spain”, Margarita, 26 October 1591, publication No. 265.

14 NATT, Antonio de Berrio, “Letter to King of Spain”, San Josephe de Oruna, 24 November 1593, publication No. 18.

15 The small Spanish settlement had comprised “houses, a large Church and a Franciscan Convent” (ibid.).

16 NATT, De Berrio, “Letter to King of Spain”, San Josephe de Oruna, 24 November 1593. Instead, de Berrio estimated the number as “7,000”, with “so many Indians married that they would exceed 35,000 souls” in October 1591 (NATT, De Berrio, “Letter to King of Spain”, Margarita, 26 October 1591). However, those number most likely represent estimations and no precise calculations and are not including those areas, not yet visited.

17 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*. p. 100. Furthermore, Arie Boomert narrates that Antonio de Berrio requested “many Nepoio, followers of Carapana, [to] come over from the mainland” in support for the Nepoio already living on the island (ibid.).

18 W. Raleigh, “The Discovery of the Large, Rich, And Beautiful Empire of Guiana (1595)”, in: N. Whitehead (ed.), *The Discovery of the Large, Rich, And Beautiful Empire of Guiana*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997, pp. 22, 19–20; Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, p. 7. The Yaio settlement at Parico is confirmed by the Griego brothers, in 1582, in the context of their voyage to the Orinoco (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 95).

19 Raleigh, “Discovery”, pp. 22; 19–20; Thompson, “Pre-British Place-names in Trinidad”, p. 147. In addition, the Nepojo area was reported to be situated “to the north of the Arawaks and all along the eastern coast” (Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, p. 7), while the Carinepagotos were located in the area of San Joseph in the northwestern part of the island (Raleigh, “Discovery”, p. 22). In this context, Walter Raleigh indicates that this overview is not exhausted, since “[o]f the rest of the

who vividly traded with the French and English at Paracoa,²⁰ before killing those, who were trading with the English Jacob Whidden²¹ and bartering with Sir Robert Dudley in January 1595 at Curiapan to be “punished” after Dudleys’ departure in March 1595 “by the soldiers of Antonio de Berrio”,²² although the legal requirements for an “offense” were not fulfilled. Furthermore, the Spanish explorer also ordered that “[t]wo of [the Caciques] were hanged and quartered” and “headmen from all over the island were taken prisoner, including Carroari, Maquarima, Taroopanama, Aterima, and Goanagoanare, the Carinepagoto chief of northwest Trinidad”, which was violating the Spanish colonial law of Vitoria in terms of self-defense and a defensive war. Nevertheless, the five Caciques were soon afterwards released by Walter Raleigh, before, in April 1595, the Englishman allied with the Yaio of Cariapan, Arawak of Cumucurapo,²³ and Carinapagoto of liberated Cacique Guanaguanare²⁴ and attacked San Joseph, where they killed 22 Spanish soldiers, burnt the sole Spanish settlement and captured Antonio de Berrio along with Captain Alvaro Jorge.²⁵ As a consequence, the Carinepagoto resettled San Joseph and Raleigh established an English fort at Curiapan,²⁶ where he had convened “a great conference” to announce “the end of the Spanish empire” and allegedly placed “Trinidad under the English [q]ueen” (see Figure 3)²⁷ before departing with five boats and his captives Antonio de Berrio and Alvaro Jorge for the Orinoco²⁸ to guide him to the Cacique Moriquite and his secret holdings of gold.

naciones, and of the other ports and rivers, I leave to speake [sic!] [. . .] here, being impertinent to my purpose [. . .]” (ibid.), while Neil Whitehead assumes that the Carinepagotos are a “Carib-group” (Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 15).

20 According to the Dudley report, this was situated north of a place called “Point la Brea”, which he assumes to be situated “probably at or near San Fernando” (Thompson, “Pre-British Place-names in Trinidad”, p. 150).

21 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*. p. 100.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid., pp. 100; 102.

24 NATT, De Liano, “Letter to King of Spain”, 15 March 1596.

25 NATT, Pedro de Salazar, “Letter to King of Spain”, 10 July 1595, publication No. 20. Previously, Raleigh had killed 14 Spaniards when he arrived on the shore on 4 April 1595. Among them was de Berrio’s nephew Rodrigo de la Hoz (NATT, De Liano, “Letter to King of Spain”, 15 March 1596).

26 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 102.

27 Ibid. The Spaniards recognized this event as defeat, since “the General Guaterral [Raleigh] [. . .] took possession of the Island of Trinidad” (NATT, De Liano, “Letter to King of Spain”, 15 March 1596).

28 Ibid.



Figure 3: Map of the Island of Trinidad and Paria by Walter Raleigh (c. 1595).

Hence, Antonio de Berrio's governorship in Trinidad came to an abrupt end due to the forceful intervention of Walter Raleigh in union with the Yaio, Arawak and Carinepagoto, since the Spaniard found Trinidad "in an unprotected state" after his release from English captivity on the shores of Cumaná in July 1595²⁹ and crossed over to the Orinoco "with ten men" to settle "in the town of the Cacique Moriquito", situated "a distance of 80 leagues from the mouth of the River".³⁰ The governorship position of Antonio de Berrio in Trinidad was then also legally revoked in January 1596, after his competitor, governor Francisco de Vides of Cumaná, had successfully challenged the foundational legality of the grant, since Antonio de Berrio had claimed the governorship for Trinidad on the basis of a royal letter patent of 1582, which was de facto issued for the mainland area between the Pauto and Papamene. As a result, in January 1596, the treasurer of Cumaná, Roque de Montes, presented the compromise that Antonio de Berrio would "proceed and explore and conquer [sic!] Guayana", while Francisco de Vides was "restricted to the conquest [sic!] and settlement of Trinidad".³¹ Francisco de Vides

²⁹ NATT, De Salazar, "Letter to King of Spain", 10 July 1595.

³⁰ NATT, De Liano, "Letter to King of Spain", 15 March 1596.

³¹ NATT, Treasurer of Cumaná Roque de Montes, "Account on the Dispute between de Vides and de Berrio", January 1596, publication No. 95.

then built San Phelipe de Montes, which was fortified in March 1596 for “a good resistance against the enemies who may attack that coast”.³²

Nevertheless, after the death of his father Antonio in 1597, Fernando de Berrio had regained the governorship of both San Joseph and Santo Tome in May 1598 and re-founded San Joseph in 1606 with 470 African slaves, who were illegally purchased from the Dutch.³³ Furthermore, Don Fernando vividly traded with the English and French, who were sometimes present at the Spanish port with “up to 18 vessels” at a time,³⁴ which in February 1610 had prompted “royal warrants” against him.³⁵ Simultaneously, Governor Fernando de Berrio had gained a position in the enslavement of Indigenous Peoples, which he had forcefully carried off between 1602 and 1623 as far as Tobago³⁶ and sold in Margarita, such as in 1605, when “ten to twelve canoe loads” of slaves from the *encomiendas* in Trinidad were sold on the neighbouring island of Margarita. Thereupon, in the years 1609 and 1610 Indigenous Peoples were also sold “for thirty ducats each”,³⁷ although his father’s second-in-command Domingo de Vera had in 1592 expressively “warned those present that no one was to make a slave of the Indians of Trinidad nor to give them arms for which they would be liable to the penalty of death”.³⁸ In consequence, the Audiencia of Santa Fé had initiated official investigations against the governor in November 1611,³⁹ whereupon Fernando de Berrio had to face “thirty-

32 NATT, De Liano, “Letter to King of Spain”, 15 March 1596. The precise location is further indicated as being situated “on the south bank, three leagues distant from the sea and from the port called ‘De España’ [Port-of-Spain], on a river they call Caroni [in Trinidad]” (Treasurer of Cumaná Roque de Montes, “Letter to the King of Spain”, 18 April 1596, in: BRC, serial No. 5, pp. 11–14).

33 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 106.

34 Sancho de Alquica, “Letter to King of Spain”, 14 June 1612, in: BRC, serial No. 12, pp. 29–31, at 29.

35 NATT, Licenciado Pedro de Betranilla, “Letter to King of Spain”, 30 November 1609, publication No. 81.

36 In contrast, Domingo de Vera in 1592 had, based on unknown grounds, declared the area within a radius of 50 leagues around Trinidad as “repartimiento”, including “the Islands of Granada, Dominica, Matalino, Tavaco and all others that may be within the said fifty leagues which are similarly taken into possession in the name of the King” (ibid.). However, the only de facto settlement attempt of the Spaniards in those islands was the one by Juan Rodriguez in Toabgo in 1614, which failed four months later (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 116).

37 Ibid., p. 106. In comparison, Domingo de Vera had transported 470 Spaniards in “44 large pirogues” in April 1596 (NATT, Domingo de Vera, “Letter to King of Spain”, April 1596, publication No. 131).

38 NATT, De Vera, “Account on the Foundation of San Joseph”, May 1592.

39 De Alquica, “Letter to King of Spain”, 14 June 1612, p. 29.

eight charges”, among them “the seizure and sale of Indian natives of that province [which was] unjustly [sic!],”⁴⁰ and was sentenced by the Council of the Indies on 24 November 1614 with the “perpetual deprivation of his Government”,⁴¹ since the governor was identified as “the fountain head” of illicit trade,⁴² a “seminary of rascals” and “chosen resort of secular criminals, irregular priests and apostate friars” and determined as inappropriately behaving “as an absolute king and Lord of that country”.⁴³ Subsequently, the charge was toned down “by license from Your Majesty”⁴⁴ into “the exclusion from his provinces” on 29 July 1615.⁴⁵ Hence, Fernando de Berrio retreated to his “estates” about 70 leagues outside of Bogotá, where he remained until unexpected events caused him to return to the Orinoco in 1618.

Prior, the *caribas* had continued to resist to their enslavement by “constant attacks” against the Spaniards between 1606 and 1613,⁴⁶ such as in 1606, when “up to fifty pirogues” went “as far away as Hispaniola”,⁴⁷ and in 1608, when “the *caribes* (Kalinago) of Dominica, Martinique, Guadeloupe, St. Vincent, Grenada, and St. Lucia” attacked the Spaniards in Trinidad, who afterwards “plainly confessed” that they “knew not how to suppress them”.⁴⁸ Moreover, an additional attack was undertaken by “a party of Island Caribs from Grenada, Martinique and Dominica” in 1613,⁴⁹ after the “pearl fishery of Margarita” was raided in 1610 and the African slaves from there taken “to the neighbouring islands, particularly St. Vincent”.⁵⁰ In response, the Spanish monarch had reaffirmed the previous royal orders of 1503 and 1511 by granting “licenses to make war” against them, whereupon “many Carib prisoners [. . .] were sold off at public auction”. According to Arie Boomert, this had caused “more than 10,000” Indigenous Peoples to leave

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 31.

⁴¹ NATT, Council of the Indies, “Sentence to Fernando de Berrio”, 24 November 1614, publication No. 170. This decision was based on the recommendation of the investigator de Alquica (De Alquica, “Letter to King of Spain”, 14 June 1612, p. 31).

⁴² NATT, De Betranilla, “Letter to King of Spain”, 30 November 1609.

⁴³ Council of the Indies, “Report to King of Spain”, 29 July 1615, p. 43; NATT, Council of the Indies, “Account to King of Spain”, 15 March 1611, publication No. 99; De Alquica, “Letter to King of Spain”, 14 June 1612, serial No. 12, p. 31.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 29.

⁴⁵ NATT, Council of the Indies, “Sentence to Fernando de Berrio”, 24 November 1614.

⁴⁶ Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 12.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 85.

⁴⁸ NATT, English explorer Robert Harcourt, “Account”, 1608, publication No. 672.

⁴⁹ Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 108. Arie Boomert also indicates that the Yaio were mentioned in connection with Trinidad in the Dutch Cabeliau report of 1599 (ibid., p. 106).

⁵⁰ Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 85.

“Trinidad for the mainland”, in particular the “Yaio, Shebaio and numerous Arawaks”, while the Carinepagotos “took refuge in Tobago”.⁵¹

Abolished by the “New Laws of the Indies”, the Spaniards in Trinidad had until 1612 also established four *encomiendas* in the vicinity of San Joseph,⁵² although Antonio de Berrio had in 1593 announced to have “given out seventy *encomiendas* to his soldiers as a reward for their services”.⁵³ At that time (1612), the number of Indigenous Peoples in the *encomiendas* of San Juan, Tacarigua, Arouca, and Caura was estimated as 300 Nepoio or Arouca,⁵⁴ which remained unchanged until 1626, when Englishman Thomas Warner had emphasized that “most of the some 300 Amerindians in the *encomiendas* remained unconverted as there was no priest available to take care of them”,⁵⁵ since “the Bishop of Puerto Rico [. . .] was not supplying clergymen and had only visited the island twice”,⁵⁶ although Trinidad since 1588 formally belonged to the diocese of Puerto Rico.⁵⁷ The number of *encomiendas* then increased to seven by 1637.⁵⁸

51 Whitehead, “Carib Cannibalism”, p. 73.

52 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 104.

53 NATT, De Berrio, “Letter to King of Spain”, San Joseph de Oruna, 24 November 1593.

54 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 104. The total number of Indigenous Peoples on the island was estimated as “4000” for the year 1612 (*ibid.*).

55 *Ibid.*, pp. 108–109.

56 Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, p. 129.

57 The diocese of Puerto Rico was formally established by the papal bull *Pontifex Romanus* of 8 August 1511 of Julius II (M. Ott, “Pope Julius II”, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 8, New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08562a.htm> (accessed 20 September 2018), after the first Spanish settlement in Puerto Rico was established in 1509, the first church built in 1511 at Caparra, and Father Alonso Manso assertively became the first bishop in “the New World”, who arrived in Puerto Rico in 1513 and became “the first Inquisitor General of the Indies” in 1519, who “assigned a number of Indians in the *repartimiento* made by the Crown”, while “successive bishops had retained a number of natives as *Encomiendas* to care for the cathedral”, when his jurisdiction became – again without the Spanish having de facto and de jure obtained title to possession-extended by the inclusion of “all the Windward Islands of the Lesser Antilles from Santa Cruz to Dominica, thus rendering the jurisdiction of the bishop coextensive with the civil and military sway of the first governor and colonizer [of Puerto Rico], Juan Ponce de Leon”. The jurisdiction of the diocese was again formally extended to the islands “Margarita and Cubagua [. . .] during the episcopate of Rodrigo de Bastidas”, who succeeded Manso on 6 July 1541, before Trinidad and parts of the mainland followed in February 1588 (W. Jones, “Porto Rico”, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 12, New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1911, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12291b.htm> (accessed 30 September 2018)).

58 Ousiel, “Account of the Spanish coasts to the West India Company”, 1637, in: BC, No. 25, pp. 83–96, at 87.

In contrast, the Indigenous Peoples outside of the *encomiendas*, such as the Carinepagoto on the northern coast and the “Arawaks and Nepoio”, would have only rarely keep up “a friendly relationship with [. . .] S[an] Joseph”,⁵⁹ have avoided visiting the sole Spanish settlement in Trinidad “unless they are fetched” and had “hidden themselves and moved well inland”. However, a Spanish witness had also reported in 1624 that the Arawak were since about ten years “revolting [and] trading ‘freely and openly’ with the English and Dutch”.⁶⁰ At that time, the Nepoio Cacique Hierreima liberated himself from Spanish enslavement and “more than once joined in expeditions against them [the Spaniards]” and had “killed two Spaniards in some encounters”, before Chief Hierreima, who was considered as “the most famous and powerful among those people”, had in February 1636 offered the Dutch in Tobago his cooperation “for driving the Spaniards out of the aforesaid island [of Trinidad] with 100 or 80 white musketeers and 400 Indians”.⁶¹ The agreement was based on the hostage practice “as an assurance of his good intentions and purposes”⁶² and materialized in a joint attack by the Nepojo and Dutch on San Joseph and Santo Tomé in 1637 in response to the Spanish attacks in Tobago and Trinidad in the previous year 1636.

Battered San Joseph (1636–1699)

Joined by two Dutch settlements among the Nepojo and Arawak⁶³ of northeastern Trinidad⁶⁴ and some Dutch settlers in seven Nepojo settlements until 1636,⁶⁵ the Spanish governor of San Joseph, Diego Escobar, attacked the Dutch

⁵⁹ Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 109, based on an account of the first Governor of St. Kitts, Thomas Warner (*ibid.*).

⁶⁰ Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, pp. 106–107.

⁶¹ Ousiel, “Account of the Spanish coasts to the West India Company”, 1637, p. 87. This source also stated that Hierreima, once “a slave or *encomendado* among the Spaniards”, had managed to flee from enslavement about eleven years ago (*ibid.*).

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 88. Thus, the indigenous Chief offered “all their women and children and old men” as hostages until the attack was carried out (*ibid.*).

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 87–88.

⁶⁴ NATT, Escobar, “Account”, San Joseph, November 1636. Arie Boomert assumes that this was in the area of Moruga on the southern coast (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 111). However, this could not be verified by the examined historical records. Furthermore, the Dutch settlements were described as being fortified by a “large fort with two redoubts” (NATT, Escobar, “Account”, San Joseph, November 1636).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* Jacques Ousiel also indicated that those Nepojo and Arawak were “especiallly” friendly to the Dutch and “deadly enemies of the Spaniards” (Ousiel, “Account of the Spanish coasts to the West India Company”, 1637, pp. 87–88).

in September 1636 to eject them “from their present position”.⁶⁶ In result, the Dutch surrendered and were all taken as “enemy prisoners”, whereas the Nepojo escaped and Governor Escobar, therefore, ordered his Captain to “punishing all the [“rebel”] Indians he came across” and destroying all of “their food supplies,” before he headed to Tobago to attack the Dutch settlement of Jan de Moor on 1 December 1636.⁶⁷

The Dutch responded promptly and attacked Santo Tome on the mainland in July 1637. In union with the Nepojo Cacique Hierreyrna,⁶⁸ Aruacas, Caribs, and Tibetibes [Tivitives],⁶⁹ the Dutch in October 1637 also sacked the “principal settlement of the Spaniards” in Trinidad, burnt San Joseph,⁷⁰ and made the 30 Spaniards flee into the forest.⁷¹ The involvement of Caribs, Aruacs, and Tivitives is

66 NATT, Governor Diego Escobar, “Report to Audiencia”, St. Thome, 11 April 1637, publication No. 100.

67 NATT, Escobar, “Account”, San Joseph, November 1636.

68 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, pp. 100; 117. The settlement of the Nepojo Cacique is indicated as being situated “3,5 leagues” eastwards of San Joseph. Arie Boomert in this context also notes that the name of the Cacique “is remarkably similar to that of the later mission village of Arima, first mentioned in the documentary sources in 1699” (*ibid.*, p. 100).

69 Cabildo of Trinidad, “Report concerning the State of the Town of Santo Thomé of Guiana and San Joseph of Trinidad”, San Joseph, 27 December 1637, in: BRC, serial No. 41, Annex, p. 88). Instead, other accounts only refer to the “Caribs, Aruacas and Nepuyos” (Councillor of Trinidad Jacinto de Mendoca, “Declaration”, prior 12 December 1637, in: BRC, serial No. 42, Annex 2, pp. 92–93; Trinidad inhabitant Lorenzo Manuel, “Declaration”, prior 12 December 1637, in: *ibid.*, Annex 3, pp. 93–94; Don Juan de Eulate, “Agreement”, Town of the Assumption in the island of Margarita, 12 December 1637, in: *ibid.*, Annex 5, pp. 96–97) or just indicate an alliance “with corsairs of the Carib and other tribes” (Cabildo of Trinidad, “Letter to Margarita Governor Don Juan de Eulate”, San Joseph, 17 November 1637, in: *ibid.*, Annex 4, pp. 94–95, at 94). Furthermore, Arie Boomert also claims an involvement of the Waraos (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 112).

70 Cabildo of Trinidad, “Letter to Margarita Governor Don Juan de Eulate”, San Joseph, 17 November 1637, pp. 94–95.

71 These numbers are based on the accounts of a Spanish eyewitnesses of the attack (De Mendoca, “Declaration”, prior 12 December 1637, pp. 92–93; Manuel, “Declaration”, prior 12 December 1637, pp. 93–94). At that time (1637), the Dutch Jacques Ousiel has described the “town” San Joseph as “open, consisting of 30 houses and 40 to 50 men, sometimes more and sometimes less, inasmuch as some who come there, either sent there by the Dutch or

confirmed by the Cabilbo of Trinidad, who likewise assumed that “the Dutch and Indian Caribs from the River Bervis” had participated in the San Joseph attack.⁷² In contrast, Cornelis Goslinga more plausibly suggests that the Dutch forces were led by private Zeeland trader Aert Groenewegen (“Captain Llanes”⁷³) from Essequibo,⁷⁴ who – according to the Cooperation of Santo Thomé de Guayana – would have had attacked Santo Tome and with “the same fleet of pirogues” taken “supplies of food at Amacuro [. . .] and from there passed to Trinidad, where the same thing happened an hour before daybreak”.⁷⁵ With certainty, the Hierreima-Dutch attackers had gained significant support from Indigenous Peoples of the neighbouring Orinoco mouth, where the Dutch had increasingly settled since 1636⁷⁶ among the Caribs and Aruacas.⁷⁷ Furthermore, the Dutch had in April 1637

otherwise, are against their will held there by the Governors, and get away again in canoes when they can, as happened as many as three different times within the 6 months that the writer lay there”, while also indicating seven Spanish plantations situated “[a]bout one mile east and one mile west of the aforesaid town [San Joseph] [. . .] [t]he name of the eastern place is Tacaribe, and for the western Aracao” (Ousiel, “Account of the Spanish coasts to the West India Company”, 1637, p. 86).

⁷² Cabildo of Trinidad, “Report concerning the State of the Town of Santo Thomé of Guiana and San Joseph of Trinidad”, San Joseph, 27 December 1637, p. 88.

⁷³ C. Goslinga, *The Dutch in the Caribbean and the Wild Coast, 1580–1680*, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1971, pp. 414–415. This assumption is based on the story about the stolen tabernacle during the Santo Tome attack, which, according to “a prisoner whom we made [. . .] on another occasion”, would be “kept by the Dutch in a house on a river, which is in this coast, which they call Esquebo”, which is [. . .] further protected by 10,000 to 11,000 Caribs”, near whom they reside and who are their allies” (ibid.).

⁷⁴ Goslinga, *The Dutch in the Caribbean and the Wild Coast*, p. 414.

⁷⁵ Cooperation of Santo Thomé de Guayana, “Letter to Governor of Carácas Don Rui Fernandez Fuenmayor”, Santo Thomé de Guayana, February 1638, in: BRC, serial No. 43, Annex 2, pp. 102–105, at 103–104.

⁷⁶ Don Juan Desolguren, “Memorandum”, 19 November 1637, in: BRC, serial No. 39, pp. 77–82, at 78. More precisely, it was reported that he had established a settlement in the river Orinoco, where since the previous year of 1636 “ten Dutch [were] waiting for reinforcements to fortify themselves” (ibid.).

⁷⁷ Cooperation of Santo Thomé de Guayana, “Letter to the Royal Audiencia of the New kingdom of Grenada”, Santo Thomé, 11 April 1637, in: BRC, serial No. 44, Annex 2, pp. 109–110, at 109.

established a settlement at the mouths of the Aniavero⁷⁸ and a fort⁷⁹ at the Amacuro,⁸⁰ situated in the area of the Tivitives and Chaguanas.⁸¹

In response, the Spanish king ordered the governor Diego Escobar to conduct a “relief expedition” against the Dutch in Essequibo, but had to charge Escobar in January 1640 for his failure to carry out the order,⁸² as Escobar had remained in mainland Cabruta until 1638⁸³ to carry out enslavement expeditions, which were justified by the “infinity of Indians”, who would have been “all [. . .] given as slaves”,⁸⁴ which clearly violated the legal provisions of Francisco de Vitoria. Assertively, Escobar in August 1639 also entered into “negotiations with the Caribs of the Caura” and proposed a “jointly raid [. . .] for slaves” in the River Pao⁸⁵ and instructed Major Diego Ruiz Maldonado to deliver “thirty

78 Ibid. This settlement still existed in 1638 (Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 89).

79 Major Diego Ruiz Maldonado, “Accounts of the Great River Orinoco, Meta, and Casanare”, 1638–1639, in: BRC, serial No. 46, pp. 117–129, at 124. This fort was reported to be situated in the mouth of the river, 20 [Spanish] leagues “windward of the Orinoco” (ibid.).

80 Cooperation and Governor of Santo Thomé, “Letter to the Royal Audiencia”, 1638, pp. 115–116. This source confirms “sixteen Dutchman” who are at this river (Amacuro “at the east entrance of the Orinoco”) and settled among “a great population of Carib Indians” (ibid.). In 1638, those Dutch settlements were contemplated by a settlement in “the mouth of the Guayapiche”, where they have made themselves masters of a salt pit which lies between the said river and the creek of Curiaco, and of more than “20.000 head of cattle which they feed in a place they call Oquetay”. Furthermore, the governor claims that “[a]ll these villages are subject to, and under the protection of Essequibo, where the fortress is” (Cooperation and Governor of Santo Thomé, “Letter to Royal Audiencia”, 1638, p. 116).

81 Maldonado, “Account of the Great Rivers Orinoco, Meta and Casanare”, 1638–1639, p. 121. Maldonado also confirms that the Tivitives and Chaguanas are occupying the Orinoco mouth, whereas the Chaguanas were “dwell[ing] about these territories” situated “on the banks large forests”, including “a village of about 1,000 able-bodied men” (ibid., pp. 120–121). This is supporting the indications of the earlier report of Captain Santiago of November 1595, who had stated that “on the banks of all these [Orinoco] mouths mentioned many natives of two tribes, known as the Chaguanes and Tivitives, dwell, both of them living in swamps” (Captain Philip de Santiago, “Report on the Navigation of the River Orinoco to Cumaná Treasurer Roque de Monte for His Majesty”, 1595, in: BRC, serial No. 4, pp. 9–11, at 9). Likewise, the Raleigh map of 1596 had determined Tivitives settlements in the islands of the whole Orinoco mouth (W. Raleigh, “Chart of Guayana”, c. 1595, BC, No. 21, p. 55). According to Neil Whitehead, those Tivitives are further distinguished into “the one called Crawani, and the other Waraweete” (Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 16).

82 NATT, King Philip IV, “Royal Cedula”, 31 July 1640, publication No. 103.

83 Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 89. Prior, Diego Escobar had also shortly taken “refuge in the Sierra Imataca” (ibid.).

84 Governor Diego Escobar, “Letter to King of Spain”, Guayana, 20 February 1638, in: BRC, serial No. 43, Annex 1, pp. 101–102, at 101.

85 Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 90.

Indians, male and female” to Captain Alonso de Aguilar to transport these slaves to Trinidad.⁸⁶ As a result, Diego Escobar would have had “amused himself” with a party of Lutherans and a Portuguese, instead of returning to Guayana and carrying out the royal order with regard to the “dislodging of the enemy from these places and forts, which is the object for which the help was sent, and to secure that province”.⁸⁷ In consequence, the Spanish king on 31 July 1640 commanded Escobar “to leave his government physically at the arrival of his successor”.⁸⁸

One week later, San Joseph faced yet another attack, this time by the English, who had landed on Trinidad with 250 Englishmen on 7 August 1640,⁸⁹ when at the same time Robert Masham had formed a small settlement in Toco of north-eastern Trinidad,⁹⁰ where the Henry Colt colony had attempted the same already at the end of 1632 before they were destroyed by “fifty Guaiqueri archers”⁹¹ in union with the forces of the Spanish governor of Margarita, who captured Henry Colt and put him “to death on Margarita.”⁹² Similar, the Masham colony of 1640 was chased away “by Island Caribs of St. Vincent and their governor Robert Masham killed”.⁹³ This Carib attack of 1640 was initiated by Cacique Baron of Dominica, who after “extensive preparations” had commenced the “war against the Aruacs who lived in the Island of Trinidad”, which was supported by “a large army of Savages from all the Islands of the Antilles”. In result, Cacique Baron would have had “killed and wounded many Aruacs and as they were unaccustomed to facing firearms, they turned to fly and hide themselves in the mountains leaving the field of battle to the victorious Caribs”. The firearms were provided by the French of Guadeloupe, who had supplied Baron “with good arms and all the ammunition”, after the Carib and the French governor Jean Aubert of Guadeloupe had concluded an agreement of “alliance” in 1640, which was based on “the

86 Maldonado, “Account of the Great Rivers Orinoco, Meta and Casanare”, 1638–1639, p. 119. By contrast, Arie Boomert assumes that those 30 Indigenous Peoples were “Nepoio and their allies”, who were sent “to Margarita and Cumaná for sale as slaves” (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 112).

87 Maldonado, “Account of the Great Rivers Orinoco, Meta and Casanare”, 1638–1639, p. 121.

88 NATT, King Philip IV, “Royal Cedula”, 31 July 1640.

89 NATT, N. N., “Governors of Guayana Escobar and Hoz Berrio y Quesada, including Ciacomare Indigenous Peoples”, 1652, publication No. 121.

90 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 112.

91 Alternative spellings are Waikerí or Guayquerí.

92 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 109.

93 *Ibid.*, p. 112. In the meantime, the surviving English colonists had joined forces with “experienced planters from Barbados and St. Kitts” to establish a “new colony”, which lived in friendship with Nepoio and Arawak and so “flourished for five years” (*ibid.*) until they were “dislodged” by the Spaniard Juan Pacheco (NATT, N. N., “Governors of Guayana”, 1652).

guarantee of hostages". Rooted in a confidential and "special" friendship between Baron and first Guadeloupe governor Jean du Plessis, which was "cemented by exchanging their names with each other", this friendship was, however, damaged by French successor Charles D'Olive, who "had very imprudently made war against the Savages", in which the Caciques of Dominica took several French "prisoner of war", who were restored by an agreement with governor Jean Aubert in 1640.⁹⁴ Nevertheless, in the early 1650s a "virtual war broke out" between the "Caribs" of St. Vincent, Grenada and Martinique and the French, when "raiding parties of up to 300 travelled all over these islands taking French settlements unaware",⁹⁵ which resulted in a treaty between the "Caribs" of Saint Vincent and Dominica and the French on 31 March 1660.⁹⁶

At the same time, the 30 to 40 Spaniards⁹⁷ and three priests of San Joseph in Trinidad had,⁹⁸ in response to the Carib and English attacks, "desire[d] to abandon it", since the shores of the island would be "infested with enemies [so that] no one from these kingdoms dares to trade with these ports as there is so great risk and so little profit".⁹⁹ These conditions remained when the Treaty of Münster was concluded (1648) and the new governor Martin de Mendoza y Berrio was able to fulfil the royal order in 1652 to rebuild and fortify the two towns of San Josef in Trinidad and San Thome in Guayana¹⁰⁰ to "drive out the enemy".¹⁰¹ However, the Spanish colonists were "suffering great want" and "their crops are worthless as they have no market for them", since no "authorized ship went to these parts" during the last "20 years".¹⁰²

Before Governor Mendoza y Berrio died in 1657,¹⁰³ the Spanish king had also reaffirmed the previous royal orders in 1652 to cease "armed conquest" in favour

94 NATT, N. N., "Account on Carib Cacique Baron of Dominica", 1640, publication No. 563.

95 Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 97.

96 NATT, King of France, "Instructions to Governor of Martinique", 21 October 1749, publication No. 320.

97 NATT, N. N., "Governors of Guayana", 1652.

98 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 113. Boomert indicates the number of Spanish settlers as "not more than 30" (*ibid.*).

99 NATT, Council of the Indies, "Report to King of Spain", 30 April 1640, publication No. 268.

100 NATT, N. N., "Governors of Guayana", 1652.

101 NATT, King Philip IV, "Royal Cedula", 31 July 1640.

102 NATT, Commission, "Letter to Governor of Barbados relating plantations in Tobago", publication No. 44.

103 NATT, N. N., "Account on Governors of Guayana Pedro de Viedma and Martin Mendoza de Berrio", publication No. 270. A detachment of "80 soldiers" sent from the Audiencia of Santa Fe "for defence" had arrived too late (NATT, Council of War, "Report to Spanish king", Madrid, 10 May 1662, publication No. 803).

of “missionary pacification”,¹⁰⁴ while in 1654 the Spaniard Sebastian de Roteta considered it “advisable in the interest of Your Majesty and the benefit of the Indians, to redeem them from slavery and to save their souls”, and with 300 liberated Indigenous Peoples¹⁰⁵ from the three remaining *encomiendas* of Gerónima de Urreiatu (101 slaves), Maria de Mier (60), and Captain Fabian de Mier (120),¹⁰⁶ “founded the Pueblo called Buenavista near to the town of St. Joseph de Oruna”, whose “spiritual needs were attended to by the Parish Cura of the said town”.¹⁰⁷ In 1662, 80–90 of them had remained in San Joseph, since “the others had withdrawn to their native freedom”.¹⁰⁸ Reportedly, those Indigenous Peoples were initially captured in the Casanare, based on the justification “that they had been first taken by Caribs”,¹⁰⁹ or “ransomed” from “unfaithful Amerindians” in Guiana and Suriname.¹¹⁰

Meanwhile, in May 1662, San Joseph was formally transferred from the Audiencia of San Domingo to the new Kingdom of Granada “on account of the facility with which it could be helped from there and also owing to its being at a distance of 300 leagues from San Domingo by sea”. The number of Spanish colonists then increased from “not more than 40 including Spaniards and Mulattos” in 1659 to “about 80–100 Spaniards” in 1666,¹¹¹ when Indigenous Peoples were “brought from Brazil” to be placed in “Trinidad, Margarita and Cumaná” for making them

104 Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 174.

105 NATT, Council of the Indies, “Report to King of Spain”, 28 January 1737, publication No. 594. Furthermore, Francisco Morales Padrón notes that the Franciscans had “requested to go to the island” in 1569, whereupon “a few clerics [. . .] were stationed in St Joseph” (Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, p. 120),

106 Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, pp. 130–131.

107 NATT, Council of the Indies, “Report to King of Spain”, 28 January 1737. Another village was planned in contemporary Port of Spain “with twenty Amerindians” to “assist a lieutenant with his ship inspections”, but never came into being due to “a lack of resources”, which is why the former slaves were brought to the parish of San Joseph (Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, p. 164).

108 NATT, Council of War, “Report to Spanish king”, Madrid, 10 May 1662.

109 Ibid, p. 132. In this context, the Council of the Indies in 1737 claimed that “from time immemorial the Caribs have captured Indians to sell them and that they have now become more active in this slavery as they can sell them to the English and Dutch who occupy the Colonies of Essequibo and Suriname, in whose power they lose all liberty either of soul or body” (Council of the Indies, “Report to King of Spain”, 28 January 1737).

110 Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, p. 164. In contrast, Whitehead indicates the number of slaves as “2,000 Caribs, mainly from the Caura and Cucivero Rivers”. Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 30.

111 NATT, Council of War, “Report to Spanish king”, Madrid, 10 May 1662; NATT, N. N., “Description of Careeby (Caribee) Islands”, 1666, publication No 357.

“peaceful”,¹¹² resulting in “an outbreak of war” in December 1666,¹¹³ when the first mission of Trinidad “San Francisco de los Arenales” was attacked and “the governor and three Capuchin missionaries were killed”.¹¹⁴ Thereupon, “most residents” had left San Joseph by 1670 “for Cumaná and Caracas”,¹¹⁵ wherefore the settlement became “virtually deserted”.¹¹⁶ As a solution, the Spanish governor Tiburcio de Aspe y Zuñiga in 1678 convened “some 500 chiefs” for “encouraging them to settle in the coastal zone of the island so as to be able to better defend the colony” and “to be controlled with less effort”.¹¹⁷ Nevertheless, the governor was soon afterwards (July 1684) captured by the French and taken by the Caribs to their village in the Aguire,¹¹⁸ after the French had taken “possession of Trinidad and Orinoco” in July 1682¹¹⁹ and “made themselves masters of the fort in Oronoque” in May 1684, where they remained until May 1685.¹²⁰ They turned then their attention to Cumaná, which was threatened by 200 Caribs in four pirogues in 1688,¹²¹ before the French and 300 Caribs destroyed the Dutch post in Pomeroun on 30 April 1689¹²² and had built “a strong-house” in Barima in October 1689.¹²³ They also “fortified a position on the Guanipa” in 1695, “maintained their presence on the Guarapiche” in July 1696 and made occasional attacks on the missions in Trinidad until 1699.¹²⁴

112 Don Tiburcio de Axpe y Zuniga, “Report to Secretary of the Council of the Indies Don Antonio Ortiz Otalora”, Madrid, 26 April 1686, in: BRC, serial No. 107, Annex 1, pp. 194–196.

113 NATT, N. N., “Account on Killed Franciscans in Trinidad in December 1699”, publication No. 310.

114 NATT, King Philip V, “Royal Cedula to Governor of Trinidad and Audiencia of Santa Fe”, 1716, publication No. 784.

115 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 113.

116 Ibid. Afterwards, the Spaniards resettled San Joseph only in the 1680s (ibid.).

117 Ibid. See Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, pp. 30; 174.

118 NATT, Alcaldes of Trinidad, “Report to Governor of Margarita”, San Joseph, 15 July 1684, publication No. 565.

119 Commander Essequibo Abraham Beekman, “Letter to the West India Company (WIC)”, 18 July 1682, in: BC, No. 55, pp. 154–155, at 155; commander Essequibo, “Letter to the West India Company”, Essequibo, 18 August 1684, in: BRC, serial No. 100, p. 187.

120 Commander Essequibo, “Letter to West India Company”, Essequibo, 1 May 1685, in: BRC, serial No. 102, p. 188. For a slightly different translation, see commander Essequibo Abraham Beekman, “Report to WIC”, 1 May 1685, in: BC, No. 64, pp. 173–4, at 173.

121 Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 102.

122 Commander Pomeroun Jacob de Jonge, “Letter to WIC”, 6 July 1689, in: BB3, serial No. 22 (Dutch sources), p. 66. See also Council of the Indies, “Report”, Madrid, 1776, in: ibid. (Spanish sources), serial No. 30, Annex 5, pp. 299–305, at 300.

123 Beekman, “Letter to WIC”, 12 October 1689, p. 190. The Dutch original reads “sterck huys” (ibid.).

124 Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 102.

The Spatial Extent of Capuchin Missions in Trinidad (1686–1783)

The Spanish governor captured by the French and Caribs and the Jesuits having renounced their service, the Spanish king in 1686/87 appointed the Catalan Capuchins to conduct missionary work in Trinidad by royal orders of 7 February 1686 and 29 April 1687,¹²⁵ after having reaffirmed in 1652 that conquest is to be replaced by pacification or “*conquista de almas* (conquest of the souls)”,¹²⁶ which was officially practised in northeastern South America since 1552 and became the general Spanish colonial practice in 1573. Moreover, in March 1687 the Spanish monarch exempted converted Indigenous Peoples from “pay[ing] tribute of any kind for twenty years” and prohibited their distribution or order “to labour on estates if they do not wish to do so”,¹²⁷ after “every sort of bondage-contract of Indians” was abolished in “the Province of Trinidad and Guayana” by the Royal Cedula of 29 May 1682, which was ordered to be executed by the Council of the Indies in April 1686.¹²⁸

Thereupon, twelve Capuchin missionaries arrived in Trinidad in August 1687 to establish the four Naparima missions Guayria, Savana Grande, Sabaneta, and Montserrat,¹²⁹ as well as other short-lived missions, such as Careiro (1688–1691) and San Francisco de los Arenales (1688).¹³⁰ Carrying the same name as Trinidad’s first mission (which was destroyed in 1666), San Francisco again served as the stage for “a major uprising” in 1699, this time undertaken by the Nepoio after they received the news that the Spanish governor had hanged their shamans in the Naparima missions as punishment. They killed the priest and a carpenter, ambushed the governor and fled to the forests, where the Spaniards killed 61 of them, while the women and children were enslaved.¹³¹ In addition, the Capuchins had to face occasional raids from the mainland “Caribs” until 1699, the “demoralized” Catalan missionaries in 1703 “deserted Trinidad completely on a

¹²⁵ Governor of Cumaná José Diguja, “Report to King of Spain”, 18 December 1761, in: VEN, No. 392, pp. 341–347, at 344. See Governor of Cumaná Don Diguja, “Report”, Cumaná, 15 December 1763, in: BRC, serial No. 391, pp. 1–102, at 96.

¹²⁶ Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 113.

¹²⁷ NATT, King Philip V, “Royal Cedula”, 1716.

¹²⁸ Council of the Indies, “Council Minutes about the Royal Cedula of 1682 to Don Francisco de Amolar”, Madrid, 26 April 1686, in: BRC, serial No. 107, p. 193.

¹²⁹ Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 132; Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, pp. 162–165.

¹³⁰ Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, pp. 132–133.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 135–136.

French vessel” to return in 1718 for “another six years”.¹³² Instead, Arie Boomert claims that the Capuchins only left Trinidad in 1714 on the Spaniards’ “recommendation” to “withdraw the missionaries” for economic reasons, following a royal order of 1713,¹³³ which contradicts the complaint of the Spanish king in 1716 about the lack of Christianization of the Indigenous Peoples in the *encomiendas*, as “the Indians remain in a state more pagan than ever before” and “without a visit from a Priest to administer them”. At the same time, the Royal Cedula indicated that “the Indians of the *encomiendas*, by reason of their freedom, were [. . .] alluring away those already converted and settled in the Missions, as recently occurred with forty families”. In 1716, there were “over 800” Indigenous Peoples in *encomiendas* in Trinidad,¹³⁴ including 650 in Naparima.¹³⁵

In consequence, the Spanish Crown ordered the governor of Trinidad, Cristobal Felix de Guzman, “that all the *encomiendas* of that Island should be taken over by the Royal Estate (as was done in Cumaná), since the *encomenderos* hold no valid title for their enjoyment”, but instead “promote their own interests and neglect those of My Royal Estate”,¹³⁶ resulting in the transformation of missions (*pueblos de doctrina*).¹³⁷ Hence, three of the initial four *encomiendas* of 1612 were transformed into royal estates, while the fourth *encomienda* (San Juan) vanished. Thereupon, the new missions of San Augustin de Arauca (Aruaca), San Pedro de Pacarigua (Tacarigua), and Partido de Quara (Cuara) emerged in 1716 and were still in place in 1734, when the Capuchins requested an exemption “from the tribute for this year” for the 48 Nepoio, who had “voluntarily” participated in the “expedition” against the “Caribs of the Orinoco”, led by Barima Chief Taricura in the early 1730s.¹³⁸

By 1760, seven missions had survived, which were all situated either in the vicinity of San Joseph or on the southwestern coast, namely the four Naparima missions and three former *encomiendas* (Cuara was annexed to Tacarigua),¹³⁹ whereas the established missions of the royally mandated Aragonese Capuchins of 1744 were all short-lived, such as Mucurapo (Arawak, abandoned 1751), Santa Rosa de Arima (Nepoio, abandoned 1754) and five other attempts of establishing missions between 1758 and 1759, namely Asución (Chaima, Caribs), Arrecifes

¹³² Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirits*, p. 109.

¹³³ Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 137.

¹³⁴ NATT, King Philip V, “Royal Cedula”, 1716.

¹³⁵ Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 138.

¹³⁶ NATT, King Philip V, “Royal Cedula”, 1716, emphasis added.

¹³⁷ Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 138.

¹³⁸ NATT, N. N., “Account”, 20 July 1734, publication No. 378.

¹³⁹ Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, p. 162.

(Caribs, Chaima, Pariagoto), Divina Pastora (Warao, Arawak), Cumana (Caribs), and an unnamed mission in the vicinity of the Matura village (Chaima), which continued as “unfaithful” settlements,¹⁴⁰ since “the Capuchins left the island again after a few years since the local government was unwilling to support them financially”.¹⁴¹ Six of the “unfaithful” villages still existed in 1773, namely Cumaná Point, Aricuagua, Matura, Naparimas, Siparia, and Toco, whereas Toco had in 1740 served as a “refuge area”¹⁴² and Aricuagua, Cumaná Point, and Matura were all settled by Chiama,¹⁴³ after 150 of them were brought to Naparima in 1739 and 1765.¹⁴⁴ For the first time, the Chiama were recorded for the Guarapiche (1684) and re-appeared in the Moruca between 1745 and 1769, when they were concerned by the violent removal of the Catalanian Capuchins of the Lower Orinoco.

In 1773, the Spanish governor then assertively “placed a captain” in Toco, Naparimas, and Siparia (Arawak, “five leagues” distant from the Naparimas coast) “to instruct the Amerindians in religious matters, as well as to teach them fidelity to the Spanish [k]ing”. By including the six “unfaithful” settlements, the number of Indigenous Peoples in missions (along with the Naparima and former *encomienda* missions) increased volatile from 1.241 (1773) to 1.824 (1777) in the years 1773–1777, but decreased again to 1.490 (1783) and 1.124 (1784),¹⁴⁵ after the most significant decrease had taken place between 1760 (2.500, 1.700 thereof converted)¹⁴⁶ and 1765 (1.277),¹⁴⁷ which might have been caused by a smallpox epidemic in 1764.¹⁴⁸ Thereupon, the number of forceful removed Indigenous Peoples in those missions remained relatively stable until 1773 (1.241),¹⁴⁹ whereas the number of colonists in San Joseph increased from “80” in 1705¹⁵⁰ to 234 in 1777, after “72 families” had arrived from Grenada (1774),¹⁵¹ and to 1,093 in 1783,¹⁵² after a royal order of the same year (1783) had presented the

140 Ibid.

141 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, pp. 139–140.

142 Ibid., p. 140.

143 Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, p. 162.

144 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 139–140.

145 Ibid., p. 167.

146 Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, pp. 162–167.

147 J. Harricharan, *Church and Society in Trinidad*, Bloomington: AuthorHouse, 2005, p. 35.

148 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 141. Other smallpox outbreaks took place in 1739, 1741, and 1770/71 (ibid., p. 139–140).

149 Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, p. 165.

150 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 135.

151 Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, pp. 162–163.

152 Ibid., p. 166–167.

prospect of “generous grants of land” for Catholic settlers.¹⁵³ However, the number of colonists already decreased again to 719 in the following year (1784)¹⁵⁴ and rapidly to “24” until 1808,¹⁵⁵ after the Spaniards had (unlawfully) ceded the *whole* island of Trinidad in “full property and sovereignty” to the English by the Treaty of Amiens of 25 March 1802, which was to be effected “within three months”.¹⁵⁶

Notably, the cession of Trinidad in property and sovereignty was undertaken in violation of the European colonial law of the time of acquisition, since the Spaniards had only occupied just the limited area in the vicinity of San Joseph in northwestern Trinidad, along with the missions on the southwestern coast. Furthermore, the Spaniards had lawfully just acquired land in property by occupation (and not sovereignty or jurisdiction), since both the concluded agreement of Domingo de Vera with the Carinepagoto Cacique Guanaguanare of 1592 and the “punishment” expeditions of Antonio de Berrio between 1593 and 1595 were unlawful. Instead, the Spaniards acquired the area of San Joseph (established in 1592; interrupted in 1595, 1637, 1640–1652, and 1682–1684) and four *encomiendas* in its vicinity (transformed into missions in 1716) as property by occupation, which was followed by four Naparima missions (1687–1760) and six “unfaithful” villages (about 1773), whereas the Englishmen Alexander Campbell had still in 1788 indicated that the “Caribs” of Trinidad are of “great [in] number” and occupy “different parts of the Island” and had remained “in the same savage state as they were at the first settlement of the Island”.¹⁵⁷ Thus, the Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad remained lawfully in possession of the jurisdiction and sovereignty for the area settled by the Spaniards, while they hold land as property, jurisdiction and sovereignty for all other areas, which was clearly violated by the cession of whole Trinidad to the English in property and sovereignty by the Treaty of Amiens of 1802. Hence, the next chapter analogously examines the Spanish colonial appropriation practices on the coastal mainland, which had commenced with the establishment of Santo Tome in 1595.

¹⁵³ Harricharan, *Church and Society in Trinidad*, p. 36.

¹⁵⁴ Morales Padrón, *Spanish Trinidad*, p. 166–167.

¹⁵⁵ NATT, N. N., “Slave Trade in Trinidad and Guayana, 1674–1712”, publication No. 767.

¹⁵⁶ Napoleon Series, “Treaty of Amiens”, March 1802, Article 3, www.napoleon-series.org/research/government/diplomatic/c_amiens.html (accessed 5 October 2018). In this context, Trinidad was not considered as “restored” and presented an “exception” (*ibid.*, Article 2).

¹⁵⁷ NATT, Alexander Campbell, “Account”, 1788, publication No. 628. In addition, the governor of Trinidad, on 23 November 1812, also reported about the movement of Caribs from St. Vincent to Trinidad due to an earthquake on the former island (NATT, Governor of Trinidad, “Account on the Movement of Caribs from St. Vincent to Trinidad due to an Earthquake”, 23 November 1812, publication No. 309).