S. Schwartz

Spaniards, 'pardos', and the missing mestizos: identities and racial categories in the early Hispanic Caribbean

Traces the history of the mestizos, the descendants of Spanish-Indian contacts during the early stages of Caribbean settlement. Author asks whether they constituted a separate ethnicity. He also looks at the question why the position of the mestizos in the Spanish Caribbean seems different from that in other areas in Spanish America.

In: *New West Indian Guide/ Nieuwe West-Indische Gids* 71 (1997), no: 1/2, Leiden, 5-19

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

STUART B. SCHWARTZ

SPANIARDS, *PARDOS*, AND THE MISSING MESTIZOS:
IDENTITIES AND RACIAL CATEGORIES IN
THE EARLY HISPANIC CARIBBEAN¹

On arrival in Puerto Rico today, one can not but help noticing the way in which the term *criollo* has become a descriptive adjective denoting things local or indigenous to the island: café criollo, comida criolla, música criolla, pan criollo, etc. The word *criollo* has become a way of claiming authenticity and a distinctive island identity. In the Americas, the term “criollo” had a complex history, many uses, and considerable regional variation. Used in Brazil (*crioulo*) and in early Spanish America as a designation for American-born black slaves, the term was often employed generically for anything locally-born. Hence usages such as *ganado criollo* (native cattle) or even, as in the case of Guatemala, of references to *mestizos criollos* (Megged 1992:422-24; García Arévalo 1992a). The traditional usage of the term in colonial mainland Spanish America – as a designation a white person of European heritage born in the colony – had begun to take hold in the 1560s (Lavallé 1986, 1993; Lockhart 1994) but it had never fully taken hold in the islands.² Father Agustín Iñigo Abbad y Lasierra (1771: 181-84) reported in the 1780s: “They give the name *criollo* without distinction to all those born on the island regardless of the caste or mixture from which they derive.” Clearly a fusion of categories of social and racial differences was summarized in this term. In it, an identity and a history are claimed (Sider 1994).

In the Hispanic Caribbean with its peculiar early demographic history of elimination of the indigenous population, low levels of European immigration, and the large-scale importation of Africans, the process of classification had a distinctive character and form in which whites, blacks, Indians, and people of mixed origins were grouped and categorized in different ways at different times. This study seeks to explore a small part of

this process by examining the mestizos, the descendants of Spanish-Indian contacts during the early stages of Caribbean settlement. Mestizos, there from the outset, seem to fade from sight. What happened to them? Did they constitute a separate ethnicity, and why does their position in the Hispanic Caribbean seem different from that in other areas of Spanish America?

In the search for the origins of identities in the colonial world, it has become increasingly clear that identity and ethnicity are not the same thing. In colonial Latin America (and I suspect elsewhere), the ethnic and color categories applied to people by others and those used for self-identification often resulted from a variety of practical considerations: responsibility for taxes, tribute, or military service, access to resources, escape from labor requirements, desire for social mobility and other such goals. They did not necessarily reflect identities – ways in which people defined themselves and perceived collective interests – in any meaningful way. There has been a tendency in Latin American and Caribbean historiography to assume that the commonly employed ethnic markers – Spaniards, Indians, mestizos, Africans, slaves – constituted groupings that expressed identities. That is an assumption that needs to be reconsidered. These designations and labels were temporally and regionally determined, historically specific, and subject to creation and alteration. They did not necessarily indicate much about identity or even ethnicity. In fact, I would argue that much colonial social legislation specifically sought to force the congruence of legally defined ethnic and racial categories with social realities – often unsuccessfully.

The conquest and early settlement of the Americas set in motion a complex series of processes of creation and redefinition of human categories and purported affiliations of which miscegenation was only one. Peoples were defined by their hostility or acquiescence into “tribes” or kingdoms, new groupings of historically disparate peoples developed in response to European pressures; processes of fission, migration, fusion, and recombination, all of which had taken place before the European arrival, probably intensified thereafter. One need only mention the “invention” of the Caribs to recognize some of these processes at work (Sued Badillo 1978; Hulme 1986; Whitehead 1990). At the same time, the conquest resulted in the production of new groupings and definitions – *caciques*, *naborias* (dependents who were virtually but not legally slaves), and *allegados* (Indians no longer living in their original villages) – and ultimately of whole new colonial categories like “Indian,” “creole” or “mestizo.”³ Even a term like “Spaniard” while lexically unchanged acquired a different semantic meaning in the spaces of contact where it came

to mean anyone accepted as a member of the conquering caste and sharing certain cultural attributes rather than a person born in Spain.

Noticeable from the outset after 1492 is the relative lack of reference to people of mixed origin or, perhaps more exactly, to people called “*mestizos*.” This is surely not because they did not exist. There was no lack of sexual contact. Almost all the early chroniclers, Benzoni, Oviedo, Las Casas, and others make this abundantly clear (Pérez de Barradas 1948). Beginning with the presumed abuses of Indian women by the contingent of mariners left by Columbus at La Navidad in 1492, and continuing in places like the Villa de Vera Paz where Las Casas reported “seventy Spaniards, most of them *hidalgos*, married to women of this land,” the rapes, concubinage, and formalized unions surely produced a generation of children of mixed origin. Subsequent references to them in the Caribbean, however, are remarkably few. Surely this is a matter of definition, not reproduction.

To understand miscegenation and Spanish ambivalence toward this process, it is useful to review early policy and practice about contact with Indian women. While there are examples from early Española that relations between Spanish men and Indian women were ideologically deplored, such unions were also at times suggested to prevent moral lapses or to obtain economic or social advantages.⁴ Spanish-Indian marriages were projected in the Laws of Burgos (1512) and were expressly permitted by royal order in 1514. Cardinal Cisneros’s instructions (1516) to the Jeronymite missionaries to promote marriages between Spaniards and the daughters of caciques so that in a generation all the caciques would be Spaniards underlined not only the utilitarian ends of such policy, but also the assumption that the mestizo offspring would be defined as Spaniards (Konetzke 1947).

As settlement and occupation rather than conquest per se increasingly preoccupied Spanish concerns, a policy which emphasized stability emerged. There was growing criticism of unrestrained sexual exploitation and of concubinage. Just as the Portuguese were to do in their Indian Ocean colonies, by the 1510s, the Spaniards preferred and encouraged the settlement of *casados* or married men in the Spanish Caribbean, even if those marriages were with Indian women (Uchmany 1987; Subrahmanyam 1993:219-22). Governor Ovando under urging from the Franciscans brought considerable pressure on Spaniards resident on Española to marry their mistresses who were among the “principal and most beautiful [Taino] women on the island.” Many did so in order not to lose “the service and the lordship that they held over these women” (Herrera y Tordesillas

1601-15, I:vi, xviii). The policy, however, was not welcomed by everyone, including the king.

In the 1514 distribution of Indian laborers on Española known as the "Repartimento de Albuquerque," men known to have their wives in Spain were, in a number of cases, required to bring them to the island or else lose their access to Indian workers. At that time, of the 551 encomenderos listed on the island, over 35 percent (195) were married men and about one-third of them married to Indians, referred to a women "of the island" (Moya Pons 1982).⁵ There was a similar recognition of the importance of marital status in the "Información de Francisco Manuel de Lando," a census taken in Puerto Rico between November 1530 and February 1531.⁶

Table 1. Marital Status in San Juan 1531

		Percent of all listed	Percent of those married
solteros (single)	60	43.5	
married to Spaniards	68	48.5	87.2
mujer de Castilla	12		
mujer de España	37		
mujer en España	* 19		
married to non-Spaniards	10	6.0	12.9
mujer india	2	1.0	2.6
mujer de esta tierra	* 6	4.0	7.7
mujer negra	2	1.0	2.6

* includes one case of a man engaged (*desposado*)

Source: Damiani Cósimi 1994.

Of the 138 propertied men in the district of San Juan for whom marital status can be determined in the Lando census, over half were married and of those, 87 percent (68) were married to Spanish women, the majority of whom resided on the island. Why the census made a distinction between women from Castile (*mujer de Castilla*) and women from Spain (*mujer de España*) is unclear since Castile and Spain were often used interchangeably as descriptive markers of location, and I doubt any regional or provincial distinction was made.

Marriages to Indian women were almost non-existent, but there were a number of men married to women "of this land" (*de esta tierra*).⁷ In the earlier censuses in Santo Domingo, this designation had been a euphemism for Indian, but may in the Lando census denote "mestizo," and thereby be the beginning of recognition of a separate status for women of mixed origin. If that is the case, then Spanish men were marrying them in pre-

ference to Indians, and one man is even listed as being formally engaged (*desposado*) to a “woman of the land.” What is important to note here is that statistically marriage to mestizo or Indian women did not affect access to laborers and did not disadvantage those who married them. Finally, we must assume that many of the unmarried Spaniards were living in irregular unions with local women. The administration severely criticized an early administrator of the city of San Juan for not punishing these public sins “of which there were plenty” and later ecclesiastical authorities continually complained of the immorality of the situation (Murga Sanz 1957-64, II:49).⁸

These early censuses suggest the emergence of a population of mixed origin but they do not resolve the problem of its place within the social structure nor the existence of any kind of distinct identity. In the Caribbean as elsewhere, the problems of examining the role and status of persons of mixed origin is their liminal position. The first generation of mestizos were not so much a new category of people as a “new kind of people,” not contained within the usual social definitions and subject to new ones (Schwartz & Salomon forthcoming). Throughout Spanish America, the process of their definition would take place historically in relation not only to the dominant Hispanic colonial regime, but also in relation to local indigenous society. The relationship of mestizos to their mothers’ family and kinship units, their mothers’ social standing or rank, and the access of these mestizos to the patronage and resources of their fathers all served to determine their position. So long as there was an indigenous society as referent – Inca, Nahuatl, Chibcha, Tupinambá, etc. – mestizos had some choice about their interests and attachments and identities. They might be accepted into Hispanic society, especially if they were legitimate and even more so if they were women, they might serve in key roles as intermediaries between Spanish and indigenous societies, or in some cases use their understanding of European ways to assume leadership roles in movements of indigenous resistance, but such roles depended on the existence of, and acceptance by indigenous societies.

The Caribbean, especially the islands of the Greater Antilles, presented a considerable variation in this process. Here, the rapid and precipitous drop in Indian population essentially left the mestizos within a generation or two without a role as cultural go-betweens, and an existence only in relation to Hispanic society or later to the growing number of Africans brought in to fill the demand for labor. Thus options of designation and identification became limited. People of mixed origin could become “Spaniards,” or they could become a neoteric indigenous population, but they could not – for long – become Indians.⁹

The word “mestizo” itself appeared in the Caribbean as early as the 1520s but it was rarely used, a fact surprisingly paralleled in early Peru and Paraguay where less pejorative terms like *genízaro* or *montanés* were preferred at first. In a place like Puerto Rico, for example, it is difficult to find any references to mestizos despite the fact that many already existed by the 1530s. The Lando census of 1530 enumerated Spaniards, Indians, and blacks but made no mention of persons of mixed origin. Over a century later, in the 1645 synod of San Juan there was no reference to mestizos, and the presiding Bishop, Damián López de Haro, in describing the island’s population made no mention of them.¹⁰ Still, modern historian Francisco Scarano (1993:199) has argued that by the seventeenth century mestizos “were probably more numerous than the Spaniards themselves.” What may be at stake here is not the definition of “mestizo,” but rather the definition of “Spaniard.” Mestizos, especially those born legitimately and who lived according to accepted colonial norms were being accepted as “Spaniards,” a term that now no longer indicated place of origin alone, but was being expanded to indicate status and a level of acceptance based on cultural attributes and probably to some extent on appearance (Schwartz 1995).

Some clues to the process of miscegenation and definition are suggested by a statement in the Repartimiento of Albuquerque of 1514 which documents the assignment of the Indians of Española to Spaniards. Apparently, some Spaniards had previously appropriated the children of mixed unions as laborers. The representative of the crown specifically prohibited such actions. The precise language of the prohibition is important to note here:

It is said that if some sons and daughters of Christians are registered in the said repartimiento, it being said that they are the children of women natives of the said island, and that [in] the said repartimiento they have been assigned to one or another of the said persons, that the said assignments [*encomienda*] be void, and that the children of Christians be free from all subjugation and servitude, and that their parents or relatives do with them freely whatever they wish.¹¹

Noticeable here is the recognition of the existence of Indian-white offspring and their definition not as “mestizos,” but rather as “children of Christians.”

This terminology and perhaps the perception of it began to change slowly. A proposal to promote the populating of Española spoke of a plan to bring together colonists from Spain and “negros y mestizos.”¹² The term “mestizo” was employed as early as 1533 with pejorative connotations. Francisco de Barrionuevo wrote to Charles I from Santo Domingo:

Here there are many mestizos, children of Spaniards and Indians, who are generally born on the ranches [*estancias*] and in the countryside [*despoblados*] and one can say that outside the city everything is unpopulated. They are naturally bellicose, mendacious, and friends of every evil. It would be convenient to take them to Spain when very young and not let them return unless they turn out well; otherwise one can fear that they will cause a rising of the blacks and natives.¹³

Barrionuevo said this because at that moment mestizos were reported to be among the group of Enriquillo¹⁴ and others resisting Spanish rule. Such fears were easily transformed into prejudices. When Father Riberos, son of a conquistador and an Indian woman, received a position with a royal pension there were those who opposed him and pointed to the stain (*mancha*) of his birth. The Archbishop of Santo Domingo had to come to his defense, noting that he was the best singer in the choir and when he was absent the service greatly suffered (Utrera 1978, I:67).

Given the many references to the Spanish appropriation of Indian women, often by force, sometimes as a strategy to acquire rights of succession, and sometimes for personal or amorous considerations, it is clear that a large and growing population of mixed origin existed. In the Repartimiento of Albuquerque, of the 182 Spaniards listed as married, fifty-seven (31 percent) were married to Indian women (Moya Pons 1982). Where are their offspring? Their absence in existing documentation suggests that they were being defined not as a separate category, but as Spaniards (López Cantos 1985).

We know the names and histories of some. Miguel Díaz de Aux in Santo Domingo had two children with a high-status Indian woman. A son, Miguelico, was recognized in his father's will of 1504 and later participated in his father's military activities (García Arévalo 1992b:249). Of the Cuban "mestizos," there were those like Gómez Suárez de Figueroa who went with his father along with Hernando de Soto to Florida and became a powerful patriarch in Puerto Príncipe; Cortés's own daughter with a Cuban Indian woman who later married Juan de Salcedo, a conquistador of Mexico; Father Miguel Velázquez, who taught Latin in Santiago de Cuba in the 1540s and later served on its town council (Pérez de Barradas 1948:96-97).

These examples serve to underline the permeability of the category Spaniard, the fact that it was accessible to people of mixed origin, and the ambivalence of colonial definitions of these people. A military census of Havana in 1582 did not include slaves but it divided the population into *vecinos* or permanent residents, their children and dependents, and single men; *vecinos* who lived by their own labor (artisans), and their children;

those passing through (*estantes*), free blacks, and Indians. These were categories of legal status associated with occupation. There was no separate mestizo category. But the term mestizo like that of mulatto and of the non-Spanish and thus separately registered Portuguese was used as a personal descriptor, a means of identification. Twenty-two mestizos were listed, mostly as permanent residents who lived by a trade.

Table 2. Military Effectives in Havana (1582)

	Portuguese	Mestizos	Mulattos	total
vecinos	4	0	0	47
vecino sons and dependents	0	0	0	14
vecinos that labor	15	7	1	60
sons of laboring vecinos	0	14	0	29
non-established residents	3	2	2	48 (198)
freed blacks	1	25		
Indians				39 (64)
				262

Source: Marrero 1974-92, II:332-34.¹⁵

Here we see that categories like mestizo and mulatto were descriptors of origin but not separate categories of status. Mestizos were accepted as vecinos, but were concentrated among the laboring and artisan occupations where, in fact, they made up about a quarter of that group. No mestizos could be found among the ranks of the senior civil and military officials, members of the *cabildo*, or wealthiest citizens. The "stain" of their birth disqualified them for such honors and distinctions, but such disabilities were also suffered by them and by whites because of artisan or mechanic origins. By the end of the sixteenth century, mestizos had been absorbed into the "Spanish" population, sometimes as members of honorable families, and sometimes as a subordinate category. The effect of this process was to expand the islands' definition of Spaniard but not always with the approval of those coming from Spain itself. Bishop Sebastian Lorenzo Pizzaro could write from San Juan in 1738: "there are very few white families without mixture of all the bad races" (Sued Badillo & López Cantos 1986:256-73).

The first stage of miscegenation and incorporation thus accompanied the rapid demise of the Indian population and the subsequent depopulation of the islands in the wake of the further conquests of the American

mainlands. In 1520, in an investigation of the depopulation of Española, many witnesses testified to the shrinking of population both of "people and Indians (*gente e indios*), or as Hernando Gorjón put it, of "Castilian people, workers, men of means, farmers and merchants and of Indians, natives of this island."¹⁶

As these demographic changes took place, the position and condition of the people of mixed origin changed. The disappearance of the Indian population meant subsequent generations of mestizos could not spring primarily from European-Indian contacts, but rather from unions between Europeans and people of mixed origins or from unions among the mestizos themselves. Furthermore, unlike the later situation in Mexico and Peru, there was virtually no creation of cultural mestizos, that is, Indians who by dress, language, and action were changing their status and thereby swelling the mestizo ranks. Under these conditions, the people of mixed origin could not have easily become a new subordinate group, a kind of ersatz Indians replacing the former indigenous population. Moreover, their early acceptance as Spaniards and continued unions with Europeans complicated that process.

If Spaniards and Indians had been the only actors in this story, then the mestizos might simply have been absorbed into the Spanish population, although recognized as lacking the honor and distinction that was associated with high status, but the arrival of significant numbers of Africans essentially prevented that from happening. Whereas there had been considerable ambivalence about the status of children produced by contact with Indians, and despite some pejorative and negative definitions, a tendency for them to be absorbed into the category of "Spaniard," there was no such uncertainty over the status of Africans. Traditional associations with slavery and with the lack of *civilitas* placed Africans in a mostly unambiguous subordinate category.¹⁷ As the importation of Africans increased and a population of mixed Afro-European origins resulted, all mixtures came to be associated with it and with its lack of honor and distinction. Mestizos who at first had been absorbed into the status of Spaniards, became increasingly defined as part of a general *pardo* or mulatto population, more closely associated with Africans, and thus of lower status.

A comment on both official attitude and island practice can be seen in a letter from Bishop Francisco Escañuelas in 1674 who complained that the governor of Puerto Rico was removing soldiers from their positions if they married on the island. As the Bishop said, "some governor will say it is so that no Spaniard will marry with a *mulata* so that he will not have children with the stain [*hijos manchados*]." Bishop Escañuelas pointed out with

irony that many soldiers had lived for twenty years on the island in illicit unions with black and mulatto women creating “damnable children” (*hijos de maldición*) and suffering no loss of status for their sins, but if they followed the precepts of the Church and the bishop’s urgings and married these women, then the governor claimed their honor was lost. His complaint was not in defense of such unions or of mulattos, for he seemed to share the governor’s negative opinions. He was simply defending the sacrament of marriage (López Cantos 1974:37, n.56).

In fact, Bishop Escañuelas was joining a debate that had taken place on the island for some time. In 1660, Governor Pedro Alvarez de Toledo had written to the king arguing against any attempt to limit local marriages by the soldiers coming from Spain. He claimed,

this is a land so small that there is no one to marry the women if some soldier or stranger does not arrive, for everyone is related to everyone else and if the soldiers’ positions are taken away (if they marry with some creole woman as has been proposed), they will go to the hills to seek their sustenance (López Cantos 1974:36).

Thus by the mid-seventeenth century, the term *criolla* already had acquired the multiple meanings of local and racially mixed, and there was a perception of a potential loss in honor and status for those who entered into unions with such people.

While official attitudes toward miscegenation in the Hispanic Caribbean were never fully codified nor expressed with the clarity and vigor of Edward Long who in his *History of Jamaica* (1774, II:332) called such unions, “the staining of a moral creature by an immoral one ... the conjunctions of white and black ... two tinctures which nature has disassociated like oil and vinegar.” Nevertheless, the elites widely shared negative and pejorative perceptions of such contact and its results, although little could be done to stop the process.

The term “mestizo” itself came to mean any person of mixed origin, no matter what groups were involved. Bishop Pérez Lozano had complained in 1738 that there had been so much marriage with pardos that it was impossible to find candidates qualified for civil office or religious vocations (Sued Badillo & López Cantos 1986:21). This process was long but by the eighteenth century it had transformed the perception of the island populations. Father Abbad y Lasierra in his travels in Puerto Rico in the late eighteenth century noted, for example, that in the town of Añasco the population had been almost entirely Indian (mestizo) but that:

one sees none of this caste for they have mixed with others from which has resulted a community of zambos and mulattos and one can not find a fully white man, and this has happened throughout the island for although in the general accounting many whites are listed and they are held as such, one sees in the parish registers in all the towns that they are the mixture of whites and Indians and these with zambos, mulattos, and blacks (Abbad y Lasierra 1977).

This homogenization of categories based on color or origins into a generalized category of *pardos* or what García Arévalo has called in Hispanola "mulatinization," appears to have been a common phenomenon in the Hispanic Caribbean. The term "mestizo" came to mean any person of mixed origin. In none of the islands did "mestizo" become an identity in any meaningful way, it was simply becoming a term of self-reference, a way of not being a mulatto. Such racially-defined labels were always volatile and relational and as the demographic and social contexts of the islands changed, so too did the nature of the definitions and the relations.¹⁸ What did happen over time, however, was the increasing identification of mixed background as a general characteristic of the free population as a whole.¹⁹ In the Hispanic Caribbean, "Spaniards" were not Spaniards, whites were not quite white, mestizos became pardos, Indians "disappeared," and as Abbad y Lasierra recognized, everyone became a *criollo*.

NOTES

1. The author wishes to thank Genaro Rodríguez Morel, Francisco Scarano, David Ryden, and Franklin Knight for their help and suggestions. The author also benefited from the discussion of an earlier version of this study that was presented to the Association of Caribbean Historians (Barbados 1996).

2. The etymology of the term *criollo* is complex and controversial. It has been suggested that it came into Spanish from the Portuguese term *crioulo* used for slaves born in America and may have been introduced by the Africans themselves who learned the term from the Portuguese who controlled the early slave trade to Spanish America. Garcilaso de la Vega said that it was a term used by blacks too to refer to the offspring of Spanish men and women. By the end of the sixteenth century it had acquired this meaning in Mexico and Peru although there were regional variations (see Alvar 1987).

3. An interesting discussion of how pre-contact categories could be transformed and given new meaning is provided by the term *naboria*. See the discussion in Zavala 1948:152-54.

4. Governor Ovando exiled from Española a Spaniard who had served as a go-between in a marriage between an Indian and a Spaniard. On this and on the differing Spanish policies toward miscegenation, see Richard Konezke 1947:38-48. On the Spanish attempts to acquire chieftainships through marriage see Wilson 1985.

5. There were apparently 738 encomenderos but information on marital status seems to exist only on 551. See Moya Pons 1982:42, Table iv.
6. Marital status was a central feature in the recording of labor-holding settlers in the area of San Juan but was not recorded for the district of San Germán. Thus it is impossible to compare this feature across the island.
7. There were two cases of men married to black women but both were themselves black like, "Diego Hernández, de color negro casado con muger de su color." See Damiani Cosimi 1994:96.
8. *Residencia of Licenciado Velázquez in Murga Sanz 1957-64*, II:49. Spanish ambivalence on the issue of marriage to Indian women and the need to create a stable, married population led to contradictory legislation and debates between civil and ecclesiastical officials. See Konetzke 1947:218-19.
9. On Cuba, at least, Indians were still a presence until the late sixteenth century, but it is difficult to determine if they were indigenous to the island. The Spanish Caribbean practice of bringing indigenous peoples from other islands and the mainlands (including Brazil) truly began to create a population for which the term "Indian" was not a misnomer, but rather a new colonial category. For recognition of the Indian presence in Cuba, see Knight 1988. On "neoteric" societies which are often hybrid populations with rather shallow traditions, see the classic article by Nancie L. Gonzalez (1970) and her case study of the Black Caribs (1983). Also relevant are Helms 1969; Bateman 1990; and Chappel 1993.
10. Archivo General de Indias (AGI), Seville, Sección Santo Domingo (SD), 172 cited in *Sínodo de San Juan de Puerto Rico de 1645*:xxv.
11. Pacheco, Cárdenas & Torres de Mendoza 1864-84, I:225, "Repartimiento de la Isla española."
12. "Proyecto sobre la población de la Española, que proponen a su Magestad algunos vecinos principales della," *Santo Domingo en los manuscritos de Juan Bautista Muñoz* (Santo Domingo, 1981), pp. 292-93.
13. AGI, SD 77, Ramo 111, doc. 69, Francisco de Barrionuevo (August 26, 1533). It also appears in a somewhat modified version in Marte (1981:36). See also Konetzke 1947:17.
14. Enriquillo was the cacique of Xaragua who had risen in 1519 and who led a stiff resistance of Indians and escaped black slaves until the Spanish finally concluded a peace with him in 1533.
15. The original appears in AGI, SD 99. See also, Governor Pedro de Valdés to the king (January 3, 1604) in which he mentions the "gente de la tierra," (Indians, blacks, and mulattos) and notes their lack of civility and their susceptibility to heresy (Pichardo 1977, I:123-40).
16. AGI, Patronato real, 2, caja 1, leg. 18, printed in Pacheco, Cárdenas & Torres de Mendoza I:386-414.
17. On European perceptions of differences in the status of civility and savagery as justifications for conquest and empire see Pagden 1995:31-62.

18. See the debate and discussion on "identities," in Joyce 1995.
19. We must also not overlook the contemporary European perception of the supposed effects of the New World on the Spaniards themselves who under influence of Indian ways and customs and the climate, had, like the plants and animals of the Old World, been altered in their character. Tomás de Córdova (1968, I:177) wrote in the early nineteenth century: "Los primeros españoles que se establecieron en esta Isla, corrigieron en parte el character de los Indios, tomando de estos al mismo tiempo el modo de vivir, alimentarse, y alojarse; dexaron mucha parte de las costumbres de su educación con su trato y mudanza de clima; la misma variación se observa en los animales, plantas, y semillas que se transportan de España à América."

REFERENCES

- ABBAD Y LASIERRA, AGUSTÍN IÑIGO, 1971. *Historia geográfica civil y natural de la isla de San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico*. Edited by Isabel Gutierrez del Arroyo. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.
- , 1977. Viaje al America. *Boletín de la Academia Puertorriqueña de la Historia* 5:18.
- ALVAR, MANUEL, 1987. *Lexico del mestizaje en Hispanoamerica*. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispanica.
- BATEMAN, REBECCA B., 1990. Africans and Indians: A Comparative Study of the Black Carib and Black Seminole. *Ethnohistory* 37(1):4-24.
- CHAPPEL, DAVID A., 1993. Ethnogenesis and Frontiers. *Journal of World History* 4(2):268-324.
- CÓRDOVA, PEDRO TOMÁS DE, 1968. *Memorias geográficas, históricas, económicas y estadísticas de la isla de Puerto Rico*. 6 vols. San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña. [Orig. 1831-33.]
- DAMIANI CÓSIMI, JULIO, 1994. *Estratificación social, esclavos y naborías en el Puerto Rico minero del siglo XVI*. Río Piedras: Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- GARCÍA ARÉVALO, MANUEL A., 1992a. El criollo: origen y evolución conceptual. *Santo Domingo en ocasión del Quinto Centenario*. Santo Domingo: Colección Quinto Centenario, pp. 259-64.
- , 1992b. Orígenes del mestizaje y la mulatización en Santo Domingo. *Santo Domingo en ocasión del Quinto Centenario*. Santo Domingo: Colección Quinto Centenario, pp. 245-58.
- GONZALEZ, NANCIE L., 1970. The Neoteric Society. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 12(1):1-13.
- , 1983. New Evidence on the Origin of the Black Carib. *New West Indian Guide* 57:143-72.

- HELMS, MARY W., 1969. The Cultural Ecology of a Colonial Tribe. *Ethnology* 8(1):76-83.
- HERRERA Y TORDESILLAS, ANTONIO DE, 1601-15. *Historia general de los hechos de los Castellanos en las islas i Tierra Firme del Mar Oceano*. 4 vols. Madrid: en la Empleutarea.
- HULME, PETER, 1986. *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492-1797*. London: Routledge.
- JOYCE, PATRICK, 1995. The End of Social History. *Social History* 20(1):73-91.
- KNIGHT, FRANKLIN, 1988. *Slavery and the Transformation of Society in Cuba, 1511-1760*. Mona, Jamaica: Department of History, University of the West Indies.
- KONETZKE, RICHARD, 1947. *El mestizaje y su importancia en el desarrollo de la población hispanoamericana durante la epoca colonial*. Madrid: Anuario de Estudios Americanos.
- KUZNESOF, ELIZABETH ANNE, 1995. Ethnic and Gender Influences on "Spanish" Creole Society in Colonial Spanish America. *Colonial Latin American Review* 4(1):153-76.
- LAVALLÉ, BERNARD, 1986. La aparición de la palabra criollo y su contexto en el Perú del siglo XVI. *Kuntur* 1:20-24.
- , 1993. *Las promesas ambiguas: Ensayos sobre el criollismo colonial en los Andes*. Lima: Pontifica Universidad Católica del Perú, Instituto Riva-Agüero.
- LOCKHART, JAMES, 1994. *Spanish Peru: A Social History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. [Orig. 1968.]
- LONG, EDWARD, 1774. *The History of Jamaica*. 2 vols. London: T. Lowndes.
- LÓPEZ CANTOS, ANGEL, 1975. *Historia de Puerto Rico (1650-1700)*. Seville: Escuela de Estudios Hispanoamericanos.
- , 1985. La sociedad de Puerto Rico en el siglo XVIII. *Anales* (San German) new series, 1(2):7-29.
- MARRERO, LEVI, 1974-92. *Cuba: Economía y sociedad*. 15 vols. Madrid: Playor.
- MARTE, ROBERTO, 1981. *Santo Domingo en los manuscritos de Juan Bautista Muñoz*. Santo Domingo: Ediciones Fundación García Arévalo.
- MEGGED, AMOS, 1992. The Rise of Creole Identity in Early Colonial Guatemala: Differential Patterns in Town and Countryside. *Social History* 17:421-40.
- MOYA PONS, FRANK, 1982. Los trabajadores indígenas y la estructura social de la española, 1514. *Casas Reales* 13:27-43.
- MURGA SANZ, VINCENTE, 1957-64. *Historia documental de Puerto Rico*. 3 vols. Santander: Artes Gráficas Aldus.
- PACHECO, JOAQUIN F., FRANCISCO CÁRDENAS & LUIS TORRES DE MENDOZA (eds.), 1864-84. *Collección de documentos ineditos relativos al descubrimiento conquista y colonización de las posesiones españolas en America y Oceanía, sacados, en su*

- major parte, del Real Archivo de Indias*. 42 vols. Madrid: Imprenta Española.
- PAGDEN, ANTHONY, 1995. *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c. 1500-c. 1800*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- PÉREZ DE BARRADAS, JOSÉ, 1948. *Los mestizos de América*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- PICHARDO, HORTENSIA, 1976-80. *Documentos para la historia de Cuba*. 2 vols. Havana: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales. [Orig. 1968.]
- SCARANO, FRANCISCO, 1993. *Puerto Rico: Cinco siglos de historia*. San Juan: McGraw Hill.
- SCHWARTZ, STUART B., 1995. Colonial Identities and the Sociedad de Castas. *Colonial Latin American Review* 4(1):185-202.
- SCHWARTZ, STUART B. & FRANK SALOMON, forthcoming. New Peoples and New Kinds of People: Adaptation, Readjustment, and Ethnogenesis in South American Indigenous Societies. In Frank Salomon & Stuart B. Schwartz (eds.), *Cambridge History of Native American Peoples*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SIDER, GERALD, 1994. Identity and History: Ethnohistory, Ethnogenesis, and Ethnocide in the Southeastern United States. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 1(1):109-22.
- SUBRAHMANYAM, SANJAY, 1993. *The Portuguese Empire in Asia, 1500-1700: A Political and Economic History*. London: Longman.
- SUED BADILLO, JALIL, 1978. *Los Caribes: Realidad o fabula*. Río Piedras: Editorial Antillana.
- SUED BADILLO, JALIL & LÓPEZ CANTOS, ANGEL, 1986. *Puerto Rico negro*. Río Piedras: Editorial Cultural.
- UCHMANY, EVA, 1987. El mestizaje en el siglo XVI novohispano. *Historia Mexicana* 37(1):29-47.
- UTRERA, FRAY CIPRIANO DE, 1978. *Noticias historicas de Santo Domingo*. Edited by Emilio Rodríguez Demorizi. 11 vols. Santo Domingo: Ed. Taller.
- WHITEHEAD, NEIL, 1990. Carib Ethnic Soldiering in Venezuela, the Guianas, and the Antilles. *Ethnohistory* 37:357-85.
- WILSON, SAMUEL M., 1985. The Spanish Caciques: Renegades in the Chiefdoms of the Caribbean. Unpublished paper, American Society for Ethnohistory, Chicago, IL.
- ZAVALA, SILVIO, 1948. *Estudios indianos*. Mexico City: Colegio Nacional.

STUART B. SCHWARTZ
 Department of History
 Yale University
 New Haven CT 06520, U.S.A.