

philippine studies

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

Problems in Partido: 1741-1810

Norman G. Owen

Philippine Studies vol. 38, no. 4 (1990) 421–452

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

Problems in Partido: 1741-1810

NORMAN G. OWEN

Surrounded by forested hills that for centuries were inhabited only by swidden (*kaingin*) cultivators and hunter-gatherers is a small coastal plain watered by the Lagonoy river and other streams that flow from the great dormant volcano, Mt. Isarog, into a nearby gulf. This district (*partido*) of Lagonoy in Camarines Sur—nowadays known simply as “Partido”—is surely one of the most neglected corners in Philippine history. Even in studies of Kabikolan almost nothing is said about it prior to its emergence as an abaca-producing center in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The Spanish always found it an awkward district to administer; it was never populous enough to constitute a province of its own, yet it was difficult to reach from the Bikol provincial capitals. Partido was accessible from Nueva Caceres (Naga), capital of Camarines, only by a journey of more than twelve hours over the treacherous paths that skirted Isarog, whose crannied slopes were a perpetual refuge for bandits and fugitives. It could best be reached from Albay town (now Legazpi) by sea, where both storms and Moro pirates awaited the unwary voyager, even when there was no prevailing east wind to pen small ships in the harbors or blow them back onto the rocky coast.¹

Given the fragmentary and biased nature of the available sources, our understanding of the history of this remote corner of the Philip-

I am grateful to the archivists of the Archivo Franciscano Ibero-Oriental, Madrid, and the Directors of the National Archives, Manila, for access to their respective collections, including the provisions of photocopies, and to Bruce Cruikshank for biographical information on Franciscan missionaries in the Philippines.

1. The southwest *vendabal* of the summer months was the “Moro wind” in eighteenth century Kabikolan. By the time the Moros departed (in September or October), it was typhoon season, and the monsoon was starting to blow in from the northeast. Although it was possible to clamber along coastal paths from Partido to Tiwi, shipments of cattle or freight that had to go to Albay by land were actually routed through Rinconada.

piners will always be extremely imperfect, especially for the period before the abaca boom. Even when the records are extensive, they are rarely complete. In many cases, we have to depend almost entirely on documents deriving from just one party to a dispute. Antifriar views, for example, often come to us refracted through Franciscan eyes, hardly a good basis for an objective evaluation of the evidence. We may never be able to discover "what really happened," much less write a definitive history of Partido.

What we can do, however, is to study the concerns of the ruling classes—Filipino and Spanish, ecclesiastical and civil—as reflected in these sources. What did they agree upon, and what did they fight about? What, in particular, were the underlying causes of the lengthy feud between Lagonoy parish and the Franciscan missions of Goa and Tigaon that dominates the historical records for the latter half of the eighteenth century?

FOUNDINGS AND REFOUNDINGS

The early history of the parishes and missions of Partido is extremely confused, but we can attempt a rough reconstruction of the principal events. According to Fr. Felix de Huerta, the town of Lagonoy was founded and converted around 1580 by Franciscan missionaries, who continued to administer it until 1636, when it passed from the Franciscan Province of Saint Gregory the Great to the "mitre" of the bishop of (Nueva) Caceres.² In 1591, however, the district and all its *encomiendas* (amounting to about 1500 *tributos*, or some 6000 souls) were said to be totally without Christian instruction, and no surviving "chapter table" (*tabula capituli*) indicates that perhaps no Franciscan was ever assigned to Lagonoy as missionary or curate.³ Somehow the

2. Huerta, *Estado geográfico, topográfico, estadístico, histórico-religioso, de la Santa y Apostólica Provincia de S. Gregorio Magno, de Religioso Menores Descalzos de la Regular y Mas Estrecha Obsevoancia de N.S.P.S. Francisco, en las Islas Filipinas: desde su fundación en año de 1577 hasta el de 1865*, 2d ed. (Binondo: M. Sanchez C.a, 1865), 586–87. Huerta also refers to a Franciscan mission called Colaocolauan, founded in 1639, that was supposedly merged with Lagonoy in 1655. Elsewhere Huerta asserts that Siminandig (another name for Lagonoy) was "reduced" in 1680; see below. On the diocese of (Nueva) Caceres, see Domingo Abella, *Bikol Annals*, vol.1, *The See of Nueva Caceres* (Manila: no pub., 1954). In this article Spanish proper names are given without accent, since these are generally omitted in the historical documents from which they were taken.

3. "Relacion de las encomiendas existentes en Filipinas el día 31 de mayo de 1591 anos," in W.E. Retana, *Archivo del Bibliófilo Filipino*, 5 vols. (Madrid: Viuda de M. Minuesa de los Rios, 1895–1905), 4:39–73; personal communication, Bruce Cruikshank, 6 June

people were converted, however, and by the latter half of the seventeenth century the parish of Lagonoy was the responsibility of the bishop, who administered it through secular priests.

In 1682 Bishop Andres Gonzalez, O.P., made a visit to Lagonoy (also known as Agonoy, or Siminandig) and was appalled by what he discovered, particularly the fact that hundreds of parishioners were dying without the sacraments. The failure was bad enough in Lagonoy itself, but was even more acute in other towns, such as Caramoan and Sagnay, that also fell within the jurisdiction of the parish priest, Diego Sanz Bautista. With royal permission (obtained in 1685), Gonzalez therefore entreated the Franciscans in 1687 to take over the ecclesiastical administration of the partido of Lagonoy, which they accepted.⁴

Subsequent Franciscan chroniclers are quite inaccurate and inconsistent in describing the events of these years. Huerta variously asserts that Fr. Francisco de la Cruz y Oropesa began in 1680 the "reduction" of Siminandig, which was made a *pueblo* under Franciscan control in 1687, that in 1684 the Franciscans began the reduction of Sagnay with the construction of a little church and house for the priest, and that it too came under their formal control after 1690, and that Oropesa (by then sixty years old) founded Caramoan in 1687 and eventually died there, being buried in the church.⁵ Fr. Eusebio Gomez Platero, on the other hand, indicates that Oropesa, after founding the *pueblo* of Caramoan and the mission of Siminandig, administered some lowland Bikol parishes. In 1700 he returned to Mt. Isarog, where from his base in Himoragat—later part of Manguirin mission—he reconnoitered "the missions of Colasi and Salog" before returning to die in

1990. The earliest surviving chapter table is from 1599, so it remains possible that Franciscans were assigned to administer Lagonoy sometime between 1591 and 1598.

4. "*Obispado de Cam.s. Año de 1687. Tantto de la Causa Sumaria Sobre el encarga y entrega del beneficio y Partido del Agonoi a los Religiosos descalco de la regular obserbancia del S.or San Francisco*," Archivo Franciscano Ibero-Oriental [AFIO] (Madrid), 93/6; cf. Abella, 76–82, 109. For the generally disparaging views of Gonzales toward the secular clergy—whom he also accused of leaving their parishes, failing to say Mass, gambling, and chewing *buyo*—see his letter to the King, 16 May 1683, in the Archivo General de Indias [AGI] (Seville), Filipinas, 76; copy in Domingo Abella papers [1973].

5. Huerta, *Estado*, 200–201, 587; [Huerta to OFM provincial, 1859?], AFIO 93/27; Huerta to Governor General Lemery, 29 September 1861, AFIO 93/28–1. The second of these sources can be attributed to Huerta, and approximately dated, by a response to it from Bishop Manuel Grijalvo, O.S.A., 26 October 1859, in the same file. On "reduction"—forcing Filipinos to concentrate their homes in villages and towns, rather than live scattered in fields and forests—see John Leedy Phelan, *The Hispanization of the Philippines: Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses, 1570–1700* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1959), 44–49.

Siminandig in 1708.⁶ Although these men were sometimes rather partisan scholars, it is very unlikely that they falsified the record deliberately. Their erroneous claim that the Franciscans founded the Lagonoy missions in the 1680s might stem, at least in part, from the sudden appearance of these ministries in the chapter tables: Caramoan and "Siminandig de Lagonoy" in 1687, Sagnay in 1690.⁷

Fr. Lorenzo Perez, unlike the other two chroniclers, acknowledges the offer from Bishop Gonzalez but mistakenly claims that the Franciscans, "believing it to be contrary to their mission," refused the Lagonoy cession.⁸ His error may well reflect the subsequent reasoning of the Province, a recognition that their limited resources would be more profitably utilized in new missionary activity than in the administration of existing Christian settlements. In fact "protracted canonico-civil litigation" followed the original cession, which was apparently reversed by Manila before long. Huerta indicates that the Franciscans withdrew from the administration of Siminandig sometime after 1687, that Caramoan was ceded to the mitre in 1696, and that the inhabitants of Sagnay were "dispersed" by 1697.⁹ What this suggests is a decade of indecision and frustration, at the end of which Partido was again, as it had been for many years before, in the hands of the bishop and the secular clergy.

At the turn of the century, Bishop Gonzalez, the Franciscans, and the government all agreed that it was time to do something about the long-standing problem of the non-Christians living on the slopes of Mt. Isarog. Some of these mountaineers (*monteses*) were negritos (*agtas* or *aetas*) and other Filipinos who had never been "reduced" or converted. Mixed in with them were fugitives from the lowlands (*ci-marrones* or *remontados*) who sometime over the previous century had decided that it was better to live free in the hills than under Spanish Christian authority in the towns. To the Spaniards they all represented a spiritual scandal and a political and economic threat. Throughout

6. *Catálogo biográfico de los Religiosos Franciscanos de la Provincia de San Gregorio Magno de Filipinas desde 1577 en que llegaron los primeros a Manila hasta los de nuestros días* (Manila: Real Colegio de Santo Tomas, 1880), 318. Chapter table list Oropesa in Caramoan between 1688 and 1693 in Siminandig in 1694 in Hibon and Hibmanan in 1697 and 1699, and in Himoragat in 1700; Cruikshank, 6 June 1990.

7. Cruikshank, 6 June 1990. Undoubtedly Oropesa and the other late seventeenth century missionaries engaged in some evangelical activity in these sites, even if they did not formally "found" the missions, as was claimed.

8. *Labor patriótica de los Franciscanos en el Extremo Oriente*, (Madrid: Hijos de Tomas Minuesa de los Rios, 1929), pp. 20-29.

9. Abella, 76-82; Huerta to Lemery, AFIO 93/28-1; Huerta, *Estado*, 587. Siminandig and Caramoan last appear in the Franciscan chapter tables in 1694 and Sagnay disappears between 1693 and 1852; Cruikshank, 6 June 1990.

the entire period of Spanish rule there were sporadic efforts to reduce, Christianize, and civilize these "infidels."¹⁰

In January 1701 the relevant authorities agreed that two missionaries should be sent to Mt. Isarog (and another to the hills of Ragay), and in May of the same year Frs. Oropesa and Matias de Valdesoto began their evangelical work there. Valdesoto made his headquarters in Manguirin and extended his activities around the southern slopes of the mountain. Early in 1702 he reached Gayang, where a lay brother named Bernabe de Jesus already had gathered some 216 persons, mostly negritos, in a new settlement called Santa Clara del Monte.¹¹ This was eventually to become Tigaon. Oropesa labored on the northern slopes, founding Himoragat and a number of other settlements within his first year. By 1707, it was said, he had established the mission of San Francisco de Salog in the foothills beyond Lagonoy, not far from a site called Goa, to which it later moved.¹²

During the next forty years these pioneer missions apparently faltered, although the details are by no means clear. According to some sources, by 1739 Manguirin (under Fr. Pascual Catala) was the only active mission on Mt. Isarog, the rest having been "lost."¹³ Other sources, however, suggest that in 1729 or 1731 there had been a renewal

10. On the *monteses*, see Norman G. Owen, *Prosperity without Progress: Manila Hemp and Material Life in the Colonial Philippines* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1984), pp. 20–23, Francisco V. Mallari, S.J., "The Remontados of Isarog," *Kinaadman* 5 (1983): 103–117 for parallel Spanish policies toward other upland minorities, see William Henry Scott, *The Discovery of the Igorots: Spanish Contacts with the Pagans of Northern Luzon* (Quezon City: New Day, 1974).

11. Gayang is possibly Mayangayanga, about five miles west-south-west of Tigaon today.

12. Fr. Matias de Valdesoto, report of 4 April 1702, AFIO 93/8; Fr. Joseph Casañes, OFM, reports of 24 and 28 January 1775, in AFIO 92/31; Fr. Gines Antonio Fernandez (missionary of Salog), report of 14 May 1776, AFIO 93/21; Fr. Juan de la Concepcion Manrique (missionary of Sta. Clara), report of 15 May 1776, AFIO 93/22; Perez, 22–23. Perez, citing Oropesa's reports of 1702, does not refer to either Salog or Goa; Casañes (28 January 1775), indicates that Salog was founded in *sitio* Colasasi in 1707, but that Goa was not reduced until 1751; Fernandez, probably less reliable, claims that Salog was founded in 1701 and visita Goa ("a little below where it now is") in 1707. Huerta, *Estado*, 204–6, contains a number of statements that contradict other accounts of the founding of these missions, including the assertions that Valdesoto founded Goa as well as Tigaon and that Tigaon was a visita of Sagnay and Goa a visita of Manguirin until 1729.

13. Juan Francisco de Antonio, OFM, *Chronicas de la Apostolica Provincia de S. Gregorio de Religiosos Descalzos de N.S.P.S. Francisco en las Islas Philipinas, China, Japon, & c.* (Sampaloc: Imprenta del uso de la propia Provincia . . . por Fr. Juan del Sotillo, 1738), 219–20, lists Manguirin as the only mission on Mt. Isarog; cf. Casañes, report of 28 January 1775, AFIO 92/31; Fernandez, AFIO 92/31; Perez, pp. 23–24. According to Fernandez the original settlement of Salog collapsed on the death of Oropesa [1708], after which "no priest set foot there" for many years.

of activity in the missions of Salog and Tigaon.¹⁴ In any event the Franciscan Provincial, Sebastian de Totanes, pleaded with the government in Manila in 1738 to authorize an armed expedition (*entrada*) up the mountain to bring it under cross and crown again. This expedition was launched by the governor (*alcalde mayor*) of Camarines the following year, and though it was only half completed, it helped to "reduce" several hundred cimarrones to missions and pueblos. In its aftermath the Franciscans set out to reclaim the mountain people spiritually, persuading Governor General Gaspar de la Torre that the government should pay the stipends of three missionaries, who would establish three missions—Manguirin, Salog and Santa Clara—at roughly equal intervals around its circumference. The friars entrusted with this task were Frs. Catala, Pedro de la Madre de Dios (Salmeroncillo), and Antonio Tadeo Morales, who "refounded" the missions in 1741.¹⁵ As ecclesiastical and political entities Salog/Goa and Santa Clara/Tigaon can be said to have existed continuously since at least that year, despite later changes of location and jurisdiction, *de facto* mergers, and unsuccessful schemes to subordinate one or both of them to some larger unit.¹⁶

"MORTAL ADVERSARIES": LAGONoy VS. THE MISSIONS

Over the next seventy years (1741–1810) tension between the pueblo and parish of Lagonoy and the missions of Mt. Isarog was a recurrent theme in the history of Partido. In the absence of a coherent history

14. Fr. Juan [Silva] de la Concepcion y Xerez (missionary of Salog), 17 October 1753, AFIO 93/16; Huerta, *Estado*, 204–6. Silva also indicated that Salog had existed in the period 1726–35 and reported that by 1753 some of its settlers had been living there for thirty years or more. Huerta claimed that Goa and Tigaon were promoted from visitas to full missions, under Frs Catala and Antonio Tadeo Morales, respectively, in 1729; but Morales did not arrive in the Philippines until 1732, and did not obtain his first parish (Bula) until 1739; Gomez Platero, p. 441. Another source indicates that Morales was still in Bula in 1740 and only became the missionary of Santa Clara (Tigaon) in 1741; Casañes, report of 24 January 1775, AFIO 92/31.

15. Casañes, reports of 24 and 28 January 1775, AFIO 92/31; Fernandez, AFIO 93/21; Manrique, AFIO 93/2; Perez, pp. 23–27. The phrase "refounded" is specifically applied to Salog by both Casañes and Fernandez.

16. Both missions first appear in the Franciscan chapter tables in 1741, though they then disappear in 1742, with Salog reappearing in 1744 and Sta. Clara in 1745; Cruikshank, 6 June 1990. It is not clear exactly where Santa Clara was located at that time: Casañes, 24 January 1775, AFIO 92/31, refers to the founding in 1749 of a "reduction" in *sitio* "Tiganon," which was the "present head [*cabecera*] of the Mission." In 1753 the governor of Camarines addressed a letter to the (two) missionaries of the missions of "Salog, Tigaon, and Santa Clara de Gayang"; AFIO 93/16. On Salog, see below.

of Partido, or even a complete set of records from which such a history might be drawn, we can only compile a summary chronicle of incidents involving these settlements as they appear in the available sources.

The feud may have begun even before 1741, if we are to judge by a 1753 comment that the complaint (apparently instigated by Lagonoy) that Salog was an "asylum and shelter of fugitives" was "as ancient as it is unfounded."¹⁷ In 1751, Jose Gomez de Cervantes, governor of Camarines, was shocked to discover on visiting Salog that majority of its inhabitants did not live in the "town" (pueblo) itself, but in or near their fields, in order, as he saw it, "to be without correction at their ease," from which came "wounds, violent deaths, [and] . . . offenses to God." He ordered that within three months there should be no structures in these fields except simple sheds without walls (*cobocobo*). He also seems to have ordered that those living in the mission but not officially enrolled there should return to their native towns.¹⁸ Presumably in response to this, the missionary of Salog "delivered" to the interim parish priest (Joseph de Paglinauan) and *capitán* (Juan Angelo) of Lagonoy those natives of that town who had settled in the mission, some "forty families with children, women, and servants, besides bachelors and spinsters," while Tigaon apparently delivered another thirty tributos.¹⁹

It was in 1753, however, that underlying tensions broke out into bitter remonstrances. Manila, presumably at the instigation of Lagonoy, ordered that under no circumstances were "fugitives" from the towns to be permitted to live in the missions, as this caused grave fiscal

It would be virtually impossible to establish the exact boundaries of either mission prior to the late nineteenth century; even when the historical descriptions are relatively precise, they refer to sitios that no longer exist and cannot be placed on the map with any assurance today. At its greatest extent Tigaon apparently included visitas as far west as Pili and as far east as Sagnay, while Goa stretched from Tinambac to the Gulf of Lagonoy.

17. Silva to Santiago de Vargas Machuca, governor of Camarines, 17 October 1753, AFIO 93/14. See also the 1776 reference of Manrique, AFIO 93/22, to Lagonoy's "ancient but entangled claim" to be the capital of Partido and of its citizens to be the "Lords" of Mt. Isarog.

18. Cervantes to the *teniente* of Salog, 30 April 1751, AFIO 93/12. The order is actually rather obscure on the latter point, but the covering note (by Silva) refers to it as "compelling" those listed "to return to their pueblos."

19. Silva, 17 October 1753, AFIO 93/16; Silva, 17 October 1753, AFIO 93/14. (Both of these letters were written to Vargas Machuca, the latter apparently as an amplification of the former, which was a direct response to a governmental inquiry.) Around 1775 Goa delivered another thirty-four "houses or couples" and eight unmarried adults, plus women and children, to Lagonoy; Casañes, 28 January 1775, AFIO 92/31.

problems. Lagonoy had fallen far short on its tribute payments and was blaming this on its loss of parishioners to Salog and Tigaon, claiming that the migrants, under the pretext of being new converts, obtained exemption from tribute and compulsory labor services there.²⁰

The friars indignantly denied these "sinister reports" and insisted that Salog and Tigaon had very few settlers from Lagonoy (or Sagnay), and that these few had come legally and paid regular tribute. If Lagonoy was in arrears, they said, the authorities should look elsewhere; "the shortfall of that town is not from this Mission." Indeed, the natives of Lagonoy had fled to Caramoan, to Catanduanes, to other towns in both Albay and Camarines, and to the forests (*kadlangan*) that covered the surrounding hills, according to lists supplied by Fr. Juan [Silva] de la Concepcion y Xerez.²¹ Even some of those delivered from Salog to Lagonoy in 1751 had left again within two years, to the great sorrow of the missionaries, he said. Silva had no hesitation in suggesting that the civic and church authorities of Lagonoy had driven away their citizen-parishioners by their own greed, brutality, and incompetence. It was not the fault of the missions, he claimed, that Lagonoy had no school, no community chest, no *tribunal* (town hall), not even a house for the parish priest. It was not the missionaries who governed Lagonoy so badly that fewer than half of its inhabitants actually had houses in the pueblo itself, the rest living in "huts and hiding places" scattered around its six leagues of "coconuts, cogonales [*gongon*] and *kadlangan*."²²

We are in no position, nearly two and a half centuries after the fact, to weigh these charges and countercharges, including the further accusation that the parish priest of Lagonoy refused to give his parishioners the certificates they needed in order to marry inhabitants of the missions. The Franciscan case sounds stronger than that of Lagonoy, but that may be just because it has been better documented. We cannot render a verdict in their favor without hearing the other side; all we can do is note the apparent depth of feeling in both camps.

20. The decree of Gov. Gen. Obando, 11 August 1753, is cited by Vargas Machuca, circular of 5 October 1753, AFIO 93/16; its background must be declared from Franciscan responses to it in AFIO 93/12, 93/13, 93/14, 93/15, and 93/16.

21. These lists appear in AFIO 93/12, one naming the people delivered from Salog to Lagonoy in 1751, three more naming Lagonoy natives no longer living in that town, with an indication of where they were actually located (the point being that they were *not* in the missions). Manrique, AFIO 93/22, and Fernandez, AFIO 93/21, refer to another list, compiled by Fr. Madre de Dios in 1749, of people from Lagonoy said to be living in Santa Clara but in fact ascertained to be hiding in the mountains or enrolled in other Bicol towns.

22. AFIO 93/12 to 93/16, particularly Silva's two letters of 17 October 1753 in AFIO 93/14 and 93/16.

It was probably in, or shortly after, 1755, that the next crisis occurred. In that year a chapel (*ermita*) was first established in Goa, and soon afterwards, apparently, that site became the headquarters (*cabe-cera*) of San Francisco de Salog, although the old name of the mission was to persist for another half-century.²³ Sometime within the next few years Bishop Manuel de la Concepcion y Matos, OFM, another notorious critic of the secular clergy, had the Pampangan priest of Lagonoy, Joseph Roberto (or Norberto) Manicdao, transferred to Virac, Catanduanes. The friars attributed this decision to the "excess of punishments," including "hundreds of lashes" (*azotes*), with which Father Manicdao had chastised the people of Lagonoy, as well as to the fact that the Franciscans had loaned the diocese a priest (Fr. Geronimo Domingo) who could serve in Lagonoy but not in Catanduanes, so that it made sense to move Manicdao there. The leaders of Lagonoy, however, saw another motive entirely: Father Manicdao had been transferred for objecting to the "dismemberment" of Lagonoy by the creation of Goa, which, they said, had been a barrio of their town.²⁴

At some point within the next twenty years the town of Lagonoy was transferred juridically from Camarines to Albay in order to expedite the shipping of tribute goods to the provincial capital. Apparently two years' worth of abaca destined for the royal cordage-works had been spoiled before it could be carried over the rocky paths to Nueva Caceres, and the authorities thought that the sea route to Albay would be a safer and more efficient way of ensuring that the crown got its revenues.²⁵ There is no reason to assume that this change of jurisdictions was inspired by Lagonoy's conflict with the missions, but it

23. Fernandez, AFIO 93/21. Fernandez also indicates that Ysidro de la Santissima Trinidad, as Franciscan Provincial, gave permission for a church to be built in Goa. Casañes, 28 January 1775, AFIO 92/31, corroborates the admission of Fernandez that Salog in 1741 was not where Goa was in 1775-76, and notes that sitio Goa was only "founded or reduced" in 1751, though Fernandez suggests that it dated back to 1707.

24. Casañes to Manrique, 23 April 1776, AFIO 93/22; Fernandez, AFIO 93/21; Manrique, AFIO 93/22. None of these sources dates the incident except by indicating that Matos, who served as bishop from 1754 to 1765, was responsible for the transfer. The Franciscan chapter tables make no reference to this event, but indicate that Domingo served in Libon 1756 to 1759 and in Bato after 1762; thus he might have been loaned to the diocese in 1754-55 or 1760-61. The identification of Manicdao as a Pampangan, his continuing reputation as a trouble-maker, and news of his death at over sixty years of age late in 1776 are found in a report by an unnamed Franciscan (presumably Casañes; cf. Abella, pp. 133-34) to Bishop-elect Antonio Maceira, 26 October 1776, AFIO 92/32.

25. Philippine National Archives [PNA], Ereccion de Pueblos, Camarines Sur [EPCS], 1791-1891, "Camarines. Ano de 1806 a 7. Expediente creado á presentacion del Provincial de S.n Fran.co, para que se erija en pueblo la Mision de Goa, situado en el Monte de Ysarog," report of Valentino de los Reyes (gobernadorcillo) and principales of Lagonoy, 11 January 1805; PNA, Ereccion de Pueblos, Albay [EPA], 1799-1864?, "Albay . . . 1807.

complicated later dealings with the missions which remained in Camarines, although Goa was only an hour's walk away from Lagonoy. Bishop Antonio de Luna, O.F.M., maintained in 1772 that Lagonoy would have twice the population it had if it were not for the "tyranny" with which it was treated by the governor of Albay and his representatives. He particularly blamed the commissioners for the collection of taxes, who by their "rapacity and vexations" had caused many, even *principales* to abandon the town and flee to the hills, where they lived like infidels.²⁶

Luna died in 1773 and over the next few years diocesan authority fell, in the absence of a new bishop, to Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Santa Justa y Rufina of Manila, famous for his attempts to enforce visitation on the friars and to secularize Philippine parishes. The day-to-day running of the diocese he left in the hands of its provisor and vicar-general, Cristobal Leandro Quiñones, who as parish priest of Sorsogon had objected vigorously to the attempts of Bishop Matos to turn the parishes of Sorsogon over to the Recollect friars in 1761, an objection he pursued all the way to the courts of Manila.²⁷ In the province of Albay the vicar forane was none other than Father Manicdao. It is little wonder that the friars felt beleaguered during the mid-1770s.²⁸

The first recorded challenge to the Franciscans in this period, however, came neither from the secular clergy nor from Lagonoy, but from their own parishioners and the governor of Camarines, Fermin de Zaldibar. He reported in 1773 that the self-proclaimed capitán of Tigaon, Francisco Balangit, had asked that towns be formed in the

Diligencias practicadas por el Alc.e mor contra D. Antonio Laurenisano . . .," report of Laurenciano (gobernadorcillo) and principales, undated [ca. 10 September 1806]; cf. PNA, EPA, 1799-1864?, "Albay, 1806. Presentacion de los principales de la Visita de Borabod . . . 4.a Pza.," Domingo Navea (governor of Albay) to Governor General Aguilar, 14 August 1806. (Aguilar had in fact died on 8 August 1806, but the news had evidently not reached Albay by the date of this letter.) All of these documents refer to the separation and give the ostensible reasons for it, but do not mention the year. At this stage I am only able to date it roughly by bracketing references to Lagonoy in Camarines (up to 1753) with those to it in Albay (from 1772 onward); with more research it should be possible to be more precise.

26. Luna to Governor General Anda y Salazar, 6 May 1772, AFIO 92/28. On principales, see Norman G. Owen, "The Principalia in Philippine History: Kabikolan, 1790-1898," *Philippine Studies* 22 (1974): 297-324.

27. Abella, pp. 107-8, 118, 132.

28. See in particular Fernandez to Sancho, 13 December 1775, AFIO 93/18, blaming Quiñones and Manicdao for instigating the troubles he was having in Lagonoy (see below); and Casañes to Maceira, 26 October 1776, AFIO 92/32, referring disparagingly to Quiñones's age, infirmity, and antifriar diatribes.

missions, apparently on the grounds that this would create "due vassalage" to the crown and therefore entitle them to greater protection from the "extortions" of the infidels of Mt. Isarog. The Franciscans grumbled that Balangit, with his "spirit of bad inclination" to authority and ambition for the staff (*vara*) of official captaincy, was just the kind of native that Zaldibar liked, "Because he is against the friars." Whatever his motives, Zaldibar granted this request and proceeded to conduct formal elections for town officials in both Tigaon and Goa.²⁹

Simultaneously, many complaints against the missionaries, particularly Fr. Gines Antonio Fernandez of Goa, were lodged with both ecclesiastical and civil authorities. Zaldibar, according to the Franciscans, welcomed and even exaggerated these complaints, which alleged that Fernandez "held the natives of that Mission, without exception of sex, in perpetual and continuous service." Those who resisted, it was said, had their arms seized ("and the women their looms") while the missionary ordered that their crops be pulled up, "lash[ed] them with inhumanity," and did not allow them time to procure food for themselves and their families. An investigation by Fr. Morales, the Franciscan Visitant Commissioner (*comisario visitador*), cleared Fernandez of these charges.³⁰

Although Lagonoy was not immediately involved in these 1773 incidents, it emerged again as a center of controversy in 1775-76. Its parish priest was a Spanish (European-born) secular, Joseph Diaz Bandera, whom the Franciscan Provincial Commissioner (*comisario provincial*), Fr. Joseph Casañes, praised for his "singular zeal, spirit, and fervor," particularly in the founding of a little church in the *visita* of Danglog. Bandera reportedly felt "persecuted" by his Lagonoy parishioners, however, and wound up returning to Manila for "consolation."³¹ His interim replacement was Nicolas Suarez, whose priestly performance was so inadequate that in June 1775 the Archbishop found it necessary to swallow his prejudices against the friars and request Fernandez to assume the jurisdiction of Lagonoy, along with his regular

29. Zaldibar, order of 23 August 1773, and undated commentary by unnamed Franciscan (presumably Casañes late January 1775?), AFIO 92/31. Friar antipathy to Zaldibar was increased when he withheld the government stipends payable to the missionaries of Mt. Isarog for 1774 and 1775; Casañes, AFIO 92/32.

30. Casañes commentary, AFIO 92/31. No further information on this case is available, but it should be noted that less than two years after this incident Archbishop Sancho asked Fernandez to step in and administer Lagonoy (see below), which suggests an official exoneration.

31. Casañes, AFIO 92/32. It should be noted that all characterization of the attitudes of Diaz Bandera come from Casañes rather than from Diaz Bandera himself.

responsibilities as missionary of Goa. Suarez was to be sent promptly back to his own town.³²

Fr. Fernandez agreed to this assignment, but by December of the same year he was begging the Archbishop for relief. Besides the physical strain of making the rounds of Salog, Lagonoy, and Danglog every Sunday, as well as ministering to various *rancherías* (outlying settlements), he was worn down by the recalcitrance of the Lagonoy elite. The capitán and other local officials refused to pay the "festivities fee" according to the ecclesiastical tariff;³³ they failed to attend Mass, suggesting that saying the rosary was just as good as attending Mass on prescribed days; they did not notify him of deaths in outlying *visitas*, but insisted that the deceased had properly confessed anyway; they did not send their children to school (Lagonoy, with 300 tributos, had only 20 schoolchildren, while Danglog, with just 100 tributos, had 100) and thus thwarted the teaching of Spanish; they mocked efforts to bring people from the hills into the town and missions, but went on collecting tribute from them, etc. Fernandez primarily blamed the capitán Pedro de los Reyes, for these actions, but also claimed that Reyes had been incited and supported by Father Quiñones, Manicdao, and Suarez.³⁴

By October of the following year, Father Diaz Bandera had returned to his parish, but "with great mournfulness," for in his absence the church and convent he had built in Danglog had been demolished, apparently on the orders of Quiñones, who claimed that their construction had never been properly authorized. Diaz Bandera had clearly preferred Danglog and its people to those of Lagonoy, who did not "respect, assist, or care for their priest"; the demolition of its church

32. Sancho to Fernandez, 17 June 1775, AFIO 93/18. The failures of Suarez are not specified, but are implied by the Archbishop's references to the parishioners being "without adequate spiritual food," and the majority of them as not having "fulfilled their obligations to the Church."

33. This "contribution" of three *reales* per tribute, for the feasts of Corpus Christi, the patron saint, and the monument, had been originally imposed in 1704, but Bishop Felipe de Molina (1724-38) had reduced it to one-half *real*, a practice confirmed by his successor, Bishop Ysidoro de Arevalo (1740-51), but reversed by Bishop Matos (1754-65), who apparently reinstated the full fee; Abella, p. 283; Francisco Leandra de Viana, "Financial Affairs of the Islands, 1766," in Emma H. Blair and Jams A. Robertson, eds., *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898*, 55 vols. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co., 1903-9), 50:95-96. In Lagonoy the claim that local officials (including *cabezas de barangay*) were exempt from payment of this fee was based on the decision of an unspecified past governor and the advice of Father Quiñones.

34. Fernandez to Sancho, 13 December 1775, AFIO 93/18. Casañes, AFIO 92/32, refers to "disaffected influences . . . in other curacies" who "were governing, disposing, and ordering" the people of Lagonoy.

(where, rather than in Lagonoy, Diaz Bandera had chosen to store the "divine deposit") and the dispersal of its settlers may therefore be seen as a kind of triumph for Lagonoy.³⁵

Father Quiñones, meanwhile, had launched a new attack on the missions, reporting to the governor general charges that obviously originated from Lagonoy. First he reasserted Lagonoy's old claim that Goa had been one of its barrios, "dismembered" from it by force over the protest of Father Manicdao. A new charge was that all three missions on Mt. Isarog had, without proper license, constructed capacious stone churches and convents that could be used as forts in an uprising by "Negros and Cimarrones" and thus might serve to damage or destroy Lagonoy and other lowland towns.³⁶

With regard to Goa, the Franciscans dwelt at length on the founding of Salog and the actions of Governor General Torre in 1741, which they interpreted as "entrusting" Mt. Isarog to them. Moreover, they said, Goa had never been a barrio of Lagonoy; the place was nothing but a "table of idolatry" before the mission was founded. They passed very lightly over the change of site from Salog to Goa—a mere administrative relocation within an existing and entirely legitimate mission—and the transfer of Manicdao which was clearly within the bishop's authority, and had nothing to do with that priest's opposition to Goa.³⁷

The friars disposed of the second charge by pointing out that the stone churches in Goa and Tigaon were very small and that only Goa had a stone convent, also very small; all were totally unsuitable for military use.³⁸ They went on to claim that it was laughable to suggest that the denizens of Mt. Isarog would ever launch an attack on the lowland towns, much less use forts for this purpose. Cimarrones might burn buildings, steal cattle, or even engage in kidnapping, but it would be "fantastic or malicious" to fear them using the churches as forts, as "they always flee from the Church." At the same time, however—and in apparent contradiction to their earlier argument—they also claimed that the missions served as a "wall" or "redoubt" (*cota*) against

35. Casañes, AFIO 92/32. Fernandez to Sancho, 13 December 1775, AFIO 93/18, also expressed a clear preference for Danglog, mentioning his desire at times "to abandon Lagonoy and take care only of the *visita* of Danglog."

36. Casañes to Manrique, 23 April 1776, AFIO 93/22. Identical letters were sent to Fr. Manuel de los Dolores, missionary of Manguirin (AFIO 93/20) and to Fernandez.

37. This paragraph and the next three are based on Fernandez, AFIO 93/21, and Manrique, AFIO 93/22.

38. The documents provide the actual dimensions of these structures. The friars also made much of the fact that in Manguirin neither the church nor the convent was made of stone.

dangers lurking in the forests. Before the missions were founded, Fernandez alleged, the people of Lagonoy could not even draw water from the river without danger of being shot by the arrows of cimarrones. All of this, except for cattlerustling, had ceased with the founding of Goa. Moreover, he claimed, by building roads the missionaries had facilitated peaceful trade. The cimarrones reluctant to enter Lagonoy, now brought abaca to Goa to exchange for trinkets (*frioleras*).

From defense the friars moved to counterattack. The charges, asserted Fr. Juan de la Concepcion Manrique of Tigaon, were all "calumnies," "lies," "incitations and false testimonies," born of "emulation" and attempts by those of Lagonoy "to conceal their natural propensity to attribute their own perturbations, which are many, to the missions" and to be the "Lords" (*Señores*) of Mt. Isarog again. Fernandez went even further, claiming that opposition to the missions came from the Old Serpent (*el Antiquo Culebron*) himself. "The Demon wants no Friar near, because they, as old Christians, could not easily agree to the disreputable practices of Lagonoy, which, he implied, the secular clergy condoned.

Fr. Fernandez then alluded to a remarkable number of obscure but clearly discreditable incidents involving Lagonoy and the secular clergy: Father Mercado, a former parish priest, having his officials beat (*apaleaban*) people in the church (which left them no recourse but to flee)³⁹ and gathering signatures of school children on writings "against Mission and Missionary"; Father Manicdao lashing his parishioners and trying to force all the women and children, under pain of excommunication, to shelter in the church during a Moro attack, rather than flee to the hills; Father Quiñones making an official visit to Lagonoy carrying blunderbusses (*trabucos*) in his sedan chair (*talabón*) and saying that they were his Saviors (*Santos Cristos*), which so frightened the people of ranchería Basod that the recently refounded settlement was "lost"; Quiñones attending public cockfights, although he knew that at least 100 cows a year were lost at gambling; open card-playing during Lent; the diocesan *fiscal* wandering from street to street in search of cockfights and inviting all and sundry to oppose the priest (Diaz Bandera); Quiñones sending twenty-five soldiers with rifles, bayonets, and shackles after Father Diaz—what an example for new converts! These allusions and allegations clearly suggest once again the enmity that pervaded disputes in Partido.

We have very little information on the next thirty years of Partido history. Bishops Juan Antonio de Orbigo, O.F.M., and Domingo

39. Fernandez relates this to the provision of a list of names by Fr. Madre de Dios, which Manrique in turn dates to 1749.

Collantes, O.P., passed through it on their diocesan visits. The latter, at least, said nothing about local conflicts except to note that many more cimarrones might be baptized if they did not have to deal with catechism and reduction.⁴⁰ In July 1791 the governor of Camarines appointed a commissioner to try to sort out the borders of Goa, Tigaon, and Sagnay, the last of which was emerging again as a political and ecclesiastical entity in its own right.⁴¹ Between October 1797 and June 1798 Fr. Jose Perciva, missionary of Tigaon, in an amazing burst of evangelical energy that took him from Pili to Sagnay, baptized over two hundred new converts and married more than forty couples, then died "from the labors undertaken in the mission of Libod." His average of twenty-five baptisms a month was more than ten times that of his immediate predecessors and successors in Tigaon.⁴² As we shall see, the feud between Lagonoy and the missions did not disappear during these years, but it does not show up in the documentary record, at least not in the documents that have been investigated so far.⁴³

40. Abella, p. 137, cites Orbigo as "the first bishop of this see to make a visitation of his whole jurisdiction," but does not refer to the records of that visit. The records of Collantes' visitation tour are found in AGI, Filipinas, 1033, "Testimonio de la Visita Diocesana de Nueva Caceres. Ano de 1791" and "Testimonio de la Prosecucion de la 2.a Parte de la Visita Diocesana de Nueva Caceres. Años de 1791,y1792," the latter containing his account of Partido, through which passed in August 1792.

41. PNA, EPCS, 1817-98, "Camarines Sur. Año 1862. Gubernativo. El Gobernadorcillo de Sangay pide . . . Comisionado . . ." Despite the claims of Huerta, based almost entirely on the death of Fr. Silva in 1770 while travelling from Tigaon to Sagnay to say Mass, most of the documentary evidence suggests that throughout the eighteenth century Sagnay was not generally under the Franciscans, but was regarded as a visita of Lagonoy. In 1753 its capitan apparently joined with that of Lagonoy in harnessing the missions; in 1792 Collantes referred to it as Lagonoy's "annex town" (*pueblo anexo*); in 1806 it had its own capitan and priest (*teniente cura absoluto*) and fell, like Lagonoy, under the jurisdiction of Albay. Only in 1818 was Sagnay transferred to Tigaon, and only in the latter half of the nineteenth century did the Franciscans—thanks to Huerta's arguments!—administer it again as an independent mission. Besides the *expediente* cited, see Silva, AFIO 93/14; AGI, Filipinas, 1033, "Testimonio de la Prosecucion . . ."; and PNA, EPCS, 1817-1898, "Acta de deslinde de los pueblos de Tigaon y Sagnay de la province de Camarines Sur."

42. Tigaon parish records; Norman G. Owen, "Requiem for a heroic priest," in *Festschrift in Honor of Dr. Marcelino Foronda, Jr.*, ed. Emerita S. Quito (Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1987), 243-45. I am grateful to Archbishop Teopisto Alberto of Nuevo Caceres and Father Jose Rey of Tigaon for offering access to the Tigaon records. To be fair, most of Perciva's predecessors and successors in Tigaon were overextended, for they served as missionaries in Goa as well. Franciscan chapter tables indicate a single missionary administering both Goa and Tigaon in all but one year between 1795 and 1810; Cruikshank, 6 June 1990.

43. There are no manuscripts in AFIO or in PNA, Ereccion de Pueblos, that by their titles pertain to Partido disputes in this period, but anyone who has worked in either

In 1803 the Franciscans asked that Goa be formally made into a town (*pueblo*) and in the course of presenting their case, offered new glimpses of its relations with Lagonoy. The *gobernadorcillo* of Goa, Domingo de la Concepcion, testified in July 1804 that the people of the mission had no other rice fields than those that the natives of Lagonoy let them work. The Lagonoyans, he said, claiming that "Goa has no more land than its house plots," annually allocated land to the mission—in some years more than sufficient for its consumption, in other years less. Lagonoy had a surplus of land, and many of its fields had not been cultivated for four or five years, but if the people of Goa tried to farm them without permission, the capitán of Lagonoy sent 300 men to uproot the crop, destroy the houses, and ruin the poor of the mission! Lagonoy, Concepcion continued, ignored complaints from the missionary of Goa, and even from the governor of Camarines (on instructions from the governor of Albay). But if Goa, combined with Tigaon—both at that time under Fr. Antonio Chica—became a town in its own right, Concepcion said, it could stand up to Lagonoy.

Two former missionaries of Goa and Tigaon, Frs. Mariano Guarch and Jose de Fuensalida, endorsed these remarks and suggested that to help resolve the interminable problems in the district, Lagonoy (which could never be governed by Albay) should be re-annexed by Camarines, with Albay to receive Cagsaua (Daraga) and Budiao (destroyed in the 1814 eruption of Mt. Mayon) in exchange. Bishop Collantes explained that Lagonoy had helped in the building of Goa's church, convent, and town, and some of Goa's lands were those which settlers from Lagonoy had purchased though others were independently opened. The same was true of Tigaon. But as Goa grew, Lagonoy had become jealous, and, being the more powerful settlement, "Permitted or prohibited" whatever it saw fit. Although a cross—the usual marker—had been established at the river Colasi (Pilasi creek), Lagonoy never acknowledged it as the municipal boundary.⁴⁴ The erection of Goa into a *pueblo* and the exchange of Lagonoy and Caramoan for Cagsaua and Budiao might help end these disputes.

The Lagonoy *principalía*, under *gobernadorcillo* Valentino de los Reyes, responded in January 1805 by "respectfully" opposing the Goa

archive knows that one can never rely on such titles, since the Spanish system of record keeping, classification, and cross-referencing was not designed for the convenience of twentieth century researchers. It is more than likely that documentation relevant to this topic does indeed exist, but that it is filed under another heading or another period entirely.

44. In 1775 Fernandez implied that Gov. Gen. Torre had divided the missions from Lagonoy at the Colasi in 1741; AFIO 93/21. It is possible that the cross referred to had been set up by the 1791 boundary commission.

proposal, "as we always have." Water rights, they claimed, were at the heart of the problem. The Lagonoy river (presumably including the Colasi, one of its tributaries) was insufficient for all of Lagonoy's fields, which explained why they were rotated, with some serving as pasture in fallow years. There was certainly no surplus. The people of Goa were "intruders" who did not have their own lands or water and so tried to seize Lagonoy's idle fields and divert its water. This led to interminable disputes, mostly instigated by the missionaries themselves. Boundary commissions had failed because they had not acknowledged Lagonoy's peaceful possession of its own jurisdiction, which could only be guaranteed, said the principales, either by Goa and Tigaon moving somewhere else where they no longer threatened Lagonoy's livelihood, or by their agreeing to "aggregate" with Lagonoy. They did not care which province the town was in, but acknowledged that it was marginally easier to transport tribute goods to Albay.⁴⁵

Less than two years later it was a different story, with Lagonoy begging to be returned to Camarines. This was one outcome of an extraordinary complex and vituperative series of encounters between the principalía of Lagonoy, under Gobernadorcillo Antonio Martin Laurenciano, and the governor of Albay (Domingo de Navea) and his various "commissioners" in Partido, particularly Theodoro de Navas.⁴⁶ Although we cannot disentangle the entire 1806 controversy here, we can at least say that at heart it was an economic struggle. Navea and Navas were trying to collect more rice, abaca, cattle, and sulphur from Lagonoy—ostensibly for tribute and to supply the galleon *Magallanes*—than Laurenciano was able or willing to provide. They claimed that he was procrastinating and holding out on them. He countered with the accusation that they were cheating Lagonoy and trying to exploit their official positions in trading on their own account. Eventually, and undoubtedly to the surprise of the two Spanish officials, the Filipino beat them at their own game. He enlisted the support of other influential Spaniards (particularly Bishop Collantes) and ultimately produced for Manila better documentation in support of his case than Navea and Navas did. Several hundred pages of evidence were compiled, providing many incidental insights into the roots of conflict in Partido.⁴⁷

45. PNA, EPCS, 1791-1891, "Camarines. Año de 1806 a 7. Expediente creado á presentacion del Provincial . . ."

46. Navas was also a Spaniard (or perhaps a Spanish mestizo), said to be the son of a former governor of Albay.

47. The principal sources for the "Lagonoy incident" of 1806 are five expedientes in the Philippine National Archives, Ereccion de pueblos, Albay [EPA], 1799-1864?, which for the purposes of this paper are designated as follows: (A) = "Albay . . . 1807. Diligencias

Although they could, and at times did, mobilize a small military force (twenty-five to fifty soldiers) to enforce their orders, the strongest weapon that Navea and Navas employed in the effort to impose their will on Lagonoy seems to have been the threat of separating visitas Borabod and Salogon as independent towns.⁴⁸ This was generally justified by reference to the putative benefits it would bring both to the government, through the more efficient collection of tributes, and to these visitas, by freeing them from "the tyrannic despotism of the *cacique* who directs and dominates Lagonoy." In one note, however, Navas let slip a slightly different purpose for this separation: "to weaken the forces of" Lagonoy, whose *gobernadorcillo*, alone in the entire province, had managed to render Manila's orders "illusory."⁴⁹

In attempting this division Navea and Navas were able to exploit some genuine local grievances. The *principales* of Borabod spoke not only of losing a school they had in the days when Father Diaz Bandera was priest, but of the "shame" (*vergüenza*) they felt that they were dependent on Lagonoy and did not elect their officials.⁵⁰ The Lagonoy *principalía* claimed, however, that these were mere *visitillas*, without resources or proper standing. The inhabitants of Salogon (and of Joyonjoyon, which was later attached to it) were described as "newcomers who do not have land of their own" other than fields owned by the people of Lagonoy, whose forefathers had let them be cultivated only in usufruct, not in ownership; most of the lands around

practicadas por el Alc.e mor contra D. Antonio Laurenisano [sic] *gobernadorcillo* del pueblo de Lagonoy, acusandole alboratador y tumultuario del pueblo"; (B) = "Testim.o de las Diligencias practicadas relativas a la presentacion del Comisionado Navas, contra el *Governadillo* de Lagonoy"; (C) = "Const.ta del Alc.e m.or de Albay de 9 de Feb.o de [1]807 p.a.q. al Gov.ilo del Pue.o de Lagonoy D. Ant.o Laurenc.no se le permita bolver a su Pue.o de don.e se profugo. . . 3.a Pza"; (D) = "*Albay*, 1806. Presentacion de los *principales* de la Visita de Borabod jurisdiccion del pueblo de Lagonoy provincia de Albay solicitando se les de *Gobernadorcillo*. 4.a Pza"; (E) = "*Albay*, 1806 á 1809. Diligencias practicadas contra el *Gobernadorcillo* del pueblo de Lagonoy D.n Antonio Laurenciano, á pedimento del Comisionado D. Teodoro Navas, acusandole de varios eccessos."

48. These would have been "absolute lieutenantships" (*tenencias absolutas*), rather than the full "captaincy" of a *pueblo*. Borabod was to include Sabang, San Sebastian, Maagnas, and Quinalanson; Salogon was to include San Miguel and Joyonjoyon; Danlog, Pilintubig, and San Roque were to remain with Lagonoy; (A), Navea to Pheipe de la Cruz (captain of provincial militias, commissioned to implement the separation), 4 September 1806

49. (B), Navea to Aguilar, 14 August 1806; (B) Navas to Navea, 3 September 1806; cf. (E) Navas to Navea, 4 September 1806; (A) Navea to Cruz, 4 September 1806; (E), Navea to Governor General Folgueras, 22 September 1806.

50. (B), *Principales* and other natives of Borabod to Navas, 11 July 1806; (E), *Cobradores* and *principales* of Borabod to Navas, 2 August 1806.

Borabod were also owned by residents of Lagonoy. Separation, said the principales, would serve no useful purpose and would be the destruction of Lagonoy.⁵¹

The secular parish priests of Lagonoy (Salvador Mendoza and his coadjutor, Jorge de Vergara) were wholeheartedly (perhaps excessively) on the side of its principalía in this dispute. At a minimum they helped call town meetings and framed letters that kept Bishop Collantes informed,⁵² but they may have gone much further. Two Borabod principales claimed that Father Mendoza had called them in after Mass one Sunday and made them confess (on the cross) that they had signed a petition asking for Borabod's separation. Then he and Vergara bullied them into signing a blank piece of paper, presumably so that they could be made to renounce or refute whatever they had earlier written. Later, when Mendoza discovered that Domingo Lozada, one of those involved, had informed Navas of this incident, he summoned him after Mass again, this time alone, abused him and gave him "so many and such strong blows that his whole face was swollen, and he remained . . . deaf for eight days."⁵³

While Borabod complained of Lagonoy's secular priests, Lagonoy complained of Fr. Chica. By the end of September 1806 the Borabod and Salogon petitioners for separation avoided the Lagonoy church and went to hear Mass in Goa, in the company of Navas and other provincial commissioners. Laurenciano insisted that Chica was very close to both Navea and Navas, exchanging gifts with the former and visiting the latter "by day and night," communicating through secret talks and secret letters, and "sustaining [him] with chocolate and a thousand things." "The missions of Goa and Tigaon," he declared, "are mortal adversaries of Lagonoy."⁵⁴ Bishop Collantes may not have

51. (A), Undated *informe* in letter of Jorge de Vergara (coadjutor of Lagonoy) to Collantes, 24 September 1806; cf. (D), Ysidro de los Reyes and principales of Lagonoy to the Fiscal of the Royal Hacienda, Manila, in his capacity as "Protector of Indios," 9 November 1806. Reyes was interim gobernadorcillo while Laurenciano was detained by Navea in Albay.

52. (A), *expediente* of Lagonoy principales, 29 August 1806; (A), Vergara to Collantes, 23 September 1806 and 24 September 1806; (A), Laurenciano to Collantes, 29 September 1806;

53. (E), Hermenegildo del Rosario and Domingo Lozada to Navas, 31 July 1806; (E), testimony of Lozada (before Navea), 4 September 1806. Other witnesses testified to having heard of Lozada's buffeting or having seen his swollen face.

54. (A), Laurenciano to Collantes, 29 September 1806; cf. (A), Laurenciano, statement of 2 October 1806, enclosed in letter to Collantes, 3 October 1806. Earlier Laurenciano had alleged that when Navas was getting ready to bring him to Albay to face charges, Chica went at night to Sagnay with more than fifty men, presumably to help Navas seize him; (A), Laurenciano to Collantes, 12 September 1806.

accepted this characterization in full, but he seems to have been persuaded by Laurenciano's general interpretation of the conflict, as he not only protested vigorously against the effort to separate the visitas, but blamed all the troubles on "ill-informed Navea, captious Navas, and turbulent [*revoltoso*] Father Chica."⁵⁵ Manila accepted the judgment of Collantes and on 4 February 1807 Governor General Mariano Fernandez de Folgueras ordered Navea to release Laurenciano and restore the visitas to Lagonoy.⁵⁶

Meanwhile the questions of municipal and provincial boundaries and of Goa's quest for pueblo status were still under consideration. In May 1806 Jose de Eguia, governor of Camarines, had asked Navea to look into the matter, and he in turn had commissioned Navas to investigate. Over the next three months Navas collected precedents and testimony from both settlements, including Goa's petition to be made a pueblo and forty pages of local judicial proceedings involving "various individuals from Goa apprehended in Lagonoy, and insults."⁵⁷

By August the two governors were ready to present their views. Eguia suggested that Goa be made a visita of Lagonoy, while Tigaon, together with Sagnay and Lagonoy's existing southern visitas (Joyonjoyon, San Miguel, and Salogon), be "erected" into an independent pueblo. This would have the effect of dividing Partido into northern and southern halves, rather than the east-west split implied by making Goa-Tigaon a pueblo. In any event, he concluded, all Partido should be under a single province, and for ease of communications that province should be Albay.⁵⁸

Navea claimed that the people of Lagonoy realized that any attempt "to aggregate them newly to Camarines would be to bury them again in the same ruins and disgraces from which they were liberated" by the original transfer to Albay. Convinced that Goa was Lagonoy's territory, inhabited by its resentful "fugitives," they believed (he said) that the mission should be annexed to Lagonoy, which would end conflict over "the just distribution of the waters, source of

55. (A), Collantes to Fiscal (as Protector of Indios), 13 October 1806.

56. (A), endorsement of Fiscal Pineros, 14 November 1806; (A), endorsement of Assessor Suarez, 29 January 1807; (A), decision of Folgueras, 4 February 1807; (C), Folgueras to Navea, 4 February 1807.

57. (D), Navea to Aguilar, 14 August 1806.

58. PNA, EPCS, 1791-1891, "Camarines. Ano de 1806 a 7. Expediente creado a presentacion del Provincial . . .," Eguia to Aguilar, 9 August 1806. An accompanying map shows the proposed boundary between the two towns to be the Rangas river, flowing into what is today Punis creek. Eguia referred to Sagnay as a visita of Lagonoy too, but this was apparently an error, as at the time it had a capitán and priest of its own; it was probably still a *pueblo anexo*.

the disturbances." Navea himself advocated keeping Goa and Lagonoy separate, but attempting to clarify their boundaries and water rights and, as we have seen, splitting Lagonoy into three. He was strongly opposed to the suggestion of exchanging Lagonoy for Cagsaua and Budiao.⁵⁹

In September Laurenciano and the other principales of Lagonoy, by then deep in conflict with Navea and Navas, appealed to Bishop Collantes for their return to their "ancient Matrix," Camarines. They admitted that in 1805 they had been indifferent, but since then Navas had been fomenting trouble by trying to split off their *visitillas* and had "manufactured" statements from the town purporting to show that it was firmly against leaving Albay. They therefore "renounce[d] the agreement" not to separate from Albay and asked to be restored to Camarines "to reap the benefit of quietude that the towns of that province enjoy."⁶⁰ In November they reiterated their desire to be free of the oppressions of Albay and claimed again that Navea had misinterpreted their desires by "induc[ing]" the people of Lagonoy to sign the documents Navas had "manufactured." What they asked for was in effect a modification of Eguia's plan, with Partido divided into just two pueblos—Lagonoy (with Goa) and Tigaon (with Sagnay and Lagonoy's southern *visitas*)—but Lagonoy, at least, belonging to Camarines rather than Albay. What is interesting here is their willingness to abandon Joyonjoyon, San Miguel, and Salogon if that meant obtaining control over Goa and thus ending "contentious disputes over cattle and irrigation works [*presas de agua*]."⁶¹

Manila deferred making a decision on this, and in fact did nothing for several years. In 1818, as part of a larger project to establish new missions on Mt. Isarog at Pili and Mabatobato, Governor General Folgueras, on the advice of Bishop Bernardo de la Concepcion, OFM, transferred the *visitas* of Sagnay, Joyonjoyon, and San Miguel from Lagonoy and the new town of San Jose (which had inherited rights in them from Lagonoy upon its founding in 1814) to the jurisdiction of Tigaon.⁶² But Goa was never annexed by Lagonoy or transferred

59. Ibid.

60. (A), Laurenciano, et al. to Collantes, undated [ca. 10 September 1806]; cf. (A), *informe* in letter from Vergara to Collantes, 24 September 1806, asking the Bishop to "ratify" this decision. Although "matrix" was the conventional term for the settlement from which a smaller settlement had sprung, the term *matriz* may also be translated as "womb," which would carry more emotional weight.

61. (D), Reyes et al. to Fiscal, 9 November 1806. They too proposed the Rangas river as the intermunicipal boundary.

62. PNA, EPCS, 1817-98, "Camarines Sur. Año 1862. Gubernativo El Gobernadorcillo de Sangay pide . . . Comisionado . . .," copy of letter from Folgueras to Concepcion, 16

to Albay, and Lagonoy remained in the province of Albay until 1846, when the government returned all of Partido, including Caramoan, San Jose, and Sagnay (!), to Camarines in exchange for the towns of Iraya district.⁶³

How then did Lagonoy and the missions resolve their disputes? Or did they? In 1809 there was a minor altercation between Goa and Lagonoy involving the right of Filipinos to change their residence. Goa, citing orders from Francisco Xavier Velasco, governor of Camarines, argued that no one should be permitted to move from one town to another. Lagonoy, on orders from Navea, claimed that this violated Manila's ordinances and "the general liberty of the natives for which the open *padrón* has been established." Besides, they said, Lagonoy was not bound by the decisions of the governor of Camarines. In the few documents we have, however, gobernadorcillos Juan Antonio de Brosas of Goa and Mariano Mercado of Lagonoy wrote to each other with civility. There is little of the rancor that was typical of earlier confrontations.⁶⁴

After 1810, in any event, the old feud between Lagonoy and the missions seems to have faded away. The neighboring settlements may have continued to engage in the kind of local squabbles that frequently characterized intermunicipal relations in the Philippines, but if they did, these did not escalate as they had before. Goa and Tigaon were apparently no longer "mortal adversaries" of Lagonoy.

"INDOMITABLE AND INSUBORDINATE": THE ROOTS OF CONFLICT?

It is clear that a number of different issues were involved in the nearly seven decades of struggle between Lagonoy and the missions; it is less clear whether or how they were linked. Some of the disputes

April 1818; cf. Folgueras to Juan Antonio de Lillo [Franciscan Provincial; later Bishop of Caceres], 16 April 1818, AFIO 93/26. Apparently a single priest was administering both Lagonoy and San Jose, and Folgueras seems to have regarded both towns as possessing rights in the *visitas* transferred to Tigaon. Later disputes over Sagnay refer to it as belonging either to Lagonoy or to San Jose prior to this 1818 decision; cf. other documents in *ibid.*; PNA, EPCS, 1817-98, "Acta de deslinde..."; AFIO 93/27 and 93/28.

63. I have been unable to ascertain when, if ever, Goa and Tigaon officially became *pueblos*, but they were still referred to as "missions" during the last half of the nineteenth century. On the 1846 redrawing of provincial boundaries, see Archiva Histórico Nacional (Madrid), Ultramar, Legajo 5150, Año 1847, Expediente 39.

64. PNA, EPA, 1773?-1836?, "Albay. Año de 1810. Expediente promovido por D. n Domingo Navea Alc.e M.or de Albay contra el Comisionado de su residencia D. n Franz.co Velasco." A *padron* was a list of inhabitants of a town or parish; I have been unable to determine exactly what was meant by an "open *padron* policy.

seem to have arisen from an unfortunate clash of personalities. Each side had prickly individuals who could create a crisis out of almost nothing. But in view of the persistence of this rivalry, it may be worth our while to see if we can discern underlying patterns in it.

For a start, the rivalry does not seem to have been about profound philosophical principles. All of the parties involved were Christian. Lagonoy displayed none of the animist inclinations that frequently characterized resistance movements in the Visayas.⁶⁵ If these had been present, we can be sure the friars would have mentioned them. Nor is there any hint of anti-Spanish sentiment, save in the passing comment by Fr. Casañes that Father Diaz Bandera might be encountering troubles in Lagonoy because of "opposition to his Blood."⁶⁶ Certainly no one from Lagonoy challenged Spanish authority, however, and again we can reasonably assume that any actual evidence of proto-nationalist sentiments would have been cited by the friars in their diatribes. Both sides also agreed that there were inherent and intimate connections among Christianity, loyalty to Spain, and "civilization," which necessarily included urbanism. Good Christians live in towns, paid tribute as a sign of their vassalage to the king, and resisted the incursions of infidel outsiders, such as Moros and cimarrones. Lagonoy and the Franciscans were equally vehement in bewailing the loss to "both Majesties" (God and King) created by the existence of non-Christians living at large in the hills, and both urged armed entradas to reduce them and attract them to the church.⁶⁷

Principles were sometimes invoked in these controversies, but as agreed-upon standards against which practice should be measured rather than as points in dispute. The charge was not that the other side denied these principles, but that they failed to live up to them. The friars alleged that Lagonoy and its secular priests were not good

65. Alfred W. McCoy, "Baylan: Animist Religion and Philippine Peasant Ideology," in *Moral Order and the Question of Change: Essays on Southwest Asian Thought*, ed. David K. Wyatt and Alexander Woodside (New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, 1982), pp. 389-95.

66. Casañes, AFIO 92/32.

67. Cf. Phelan, 44-57; Robert R. Reed, "Hispanic Urbanism in the Philippines: A Study of the Impact on Church and State," *University of Manila Journal of East Asiatic Studies* 11(March 1967): 1-222. According to official policy, "infidels" could not be forcibly converted to Christianity, but it was entirely legitimate to compel them by force of arms to live in a settlement where they could be required to hear the gospel. Tribute liability was not supposed to begin until those newly settled had fully accepted vassalage, but this precept was often honored in the breach; cf. Fernandez to Sancho, AFIO 93/18, on Lagonoy *principales* collecting tribute from the unconfessed.

Christians, but never that they were not Christians at all.⁶⁸ Their opponents, in turn, accused the Franciscans of un-Christian behavior (holding the inhabitants of the missions in servitude) and of lax security and the lack of zeal in their reduction of cimarrones, but never of repudiating the faith or suggesting that it was in fact acceptable for people to live as they chose in the hills.⁶⁹ The commitment to the triumvirate of Christianity, Spanish rule, and "civilized" urbanism, however sincerely held by some individuals, was not the root cause of the feud between Lagonoy and the missions.

There is more evidence to suggest that some of these disputes were, at least in part, local manifestations of power struggles among various elements of the Spanish colonial hierarchy. There are occasional suggestions of tensions between church and state, particularly in the allegation that Governor Zaldibar was "against the friars."⁷⁰ In other instances, we may suspect that rival representatives of the civil government were making Partido a battlefield in their own private war. At the time of the 1809 confrontation between Goa and Lagonoy, for example, Velasco and Navea were in bitter opposition on a number of issues. Not only were they governors of neighboring provinces, but Velasco was in charge of Navea's *residencia*, the investigation at the end of his term of office that would decide how much he had stolen and thus how much he had to repay. It is likely, therefore, that they made more of this dispute than the towns themselves would have if left to their own devices.⁷¹

The major inter-Spanish power struggle affecting Partido in this period, however, was not church against state, or state against state, but church against church. The efforts of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to limit friar power (through enforced episcopal visitation and the secularization of parishes) and the fervent resistance of the regular

68. The closest they came was in the reference of Fr. Fernandez, AFIO 93/21, to the friars as "old Christians," with its implications that their opponents were "new Christians." This term was used for recently converted Filipinos but might also have been read as a derogatory historical allusion, since in the days of the Inquisition it was applied to those former Jews or Muslims whose conversion to Christianity was suspected of being fraudulent.

69. Casañes commentary, AFIO 92/31; Cervantes, AFIO 93/12; PNA, EPCS, 1791-1891, "Camarines. Año de 1806 a 7. Expediente creado á presentacion del Provincial . . .," Valentino de los Reyes et al., 11 January 1805. The last of these includes the allegation that the missionaries did not conquer infidels at all.

70. Casañes commentary, AFIO 92/31.

71. PNA, EPA, 1773?-1836?, "Albay. Año de 1810. Expediente promovido por D.n Domingo Navea . . ."

orders to such measures are recurrent themes in Philippine history.⁷² In Partido these conflicts appear as early as the 1680s and 1690s and return again with great force in the 1770s. There is little direct evidence of such tension in the 1750s or 1800s, however, and even at the worst of times it would hardly have accounted for all local disputes. It was Archbishop Sancho, after all, who in 1775 replaced a secular priest in Lagonoy with a Franciscan. This hardly suggests that he was creating the crisis there by his antifriar activities.

None of the principal Spanish authorities, moreover, lived in Partido, and very few of them even visited it, so far as I can tell. No archbishop or governor general ever set foot in Kabikolan during his term of office (unless perhaps the galleon bringing him stopped off in Sorso-gon). Even the Bicol authorities were remote. Other than Cervantes, no provincial governor seems to have bothered to travel to Partido or the eastern slopes of Mt. Isarog in this period. The bishops were somewhat more active, but would hardly have visited the district more than once every fifteen years or so.⁷³ The missions and towns of Partido were an abstraction to the Spanish authorities, and though they may have used them from time to time to make points in their own political battles, they were just as likely to have been used themselves, by priests and principales engaged in their own local struggles.

If we look at the problems in Partido as primarily local, rather than national, we see that they tend to revolve around questions of autonomy and authority. Because of its remoteness, Lagonoy had enjoyed much more freedom than most Philippine towns to interpret the requirements of church and state as its *principalía* saw fit, and had used this freedom to earn a reputation for being self-willed. Fr. Fernandez meant no compliment when he described Lagonoy as "indomitable" and "full of opinion."⁷⁴ Neither did Bishop Collantes when he said that the town was "very bellicose, and subject only to the Principales who rule it, [who] will not obey the governor except when it profits them," even though he later wound up supporting

72. John N. Schumacher, SJ, *Readings in Philippine Church History* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University, Loyola School of Theology, 1979), pp. 123-40, 202-210; cf. Phelan, pp. 32-35.

73. Besides the visits of Orbigo and Collantes, mentioned above, one source claims that Bishop Matos "travelled part of this Mountain [Isarog] on foot," through Gayang and the haunts of infidels, "sowing peace on the mountain and away from it"; Fernandez, 93/21. It is entirely possible that further research will turn up gubernatorial or episcopal visits that I have missed, but we can be reasonably certain that these were not regular occurrences in the eighteenth century.

74. Fernandez to Sancho, AFIO 93/18.

them against Navea.⁷⁵ Governor General Folgueras, in his 1818 decree, enjoined the governors of Albay and Camarines not to listen to "the resistance which those of Lagonoy usually make."⁷⁶ Even the *principales* themselves admitted in 1805 that the charge that Lagonoy was "indomitable and insubordinate" had been circulating for years, though they insisted that it had never actually been substantiated.⁷⁷

Pedro de los Reyes and Antonio Laurenciano were singled out by the Spanish as trouble-makers, but the authorities also had trouble when these two *gobernadorcillos* were not around, as other officials ably filled in for them. Most of the parish priests also seem to have supported the *principalía* in asserting Lagonoy's rights. Fathers Mercado and Paglinauan apparently pursued the claim that there were fugitive Lagonoyans in the missions, Father Manicdao protested the foundation of Goa as detrimental to Lagonoy's interests, and Fathers Mendoza and Vergara fought against the separation of Borabod and Salogon. Mendoza is even reported to have said "that the Alcalde [Navea] had his Government only for three years, but he, he is the curate of Lagonoy, and cannot be removed while he has life." Only a few priests, such as Diaz Bandera and Fernandez, did not go along with the Lagonoy leadership, and they became frustrated and bitter before their short terms in the parish were over.⁷⁸

The missions represented a dual challenge to this autonomy of *principales* and priests. First, the Franciscans were frequent critics of Lagonoy and its priests, exposing them to a scrutiny they might otherwise, in the absence of other Spaniards in Partido, have avoided. Second, by their very existence the missions represented an alternative authority in the district, a source of refuge or an avenue of appeal for those who dissented from the leaders of Lagonoy.

75. (C), Collantes to Aguilar, 22 Feb. 1806. This is actually a copy made by Navea, 10 April 1807, and it is possible that he, rather than Collantes, is responsible for underlining this passage.

76. PNA, EPCS, 1817-98, "Camarines Sur. Año 1862. Gubernativo. El Gobernadorcillo de Sangay pide . . . Comisionado . . .," Folgueras to Concepcion, 16 April 1818.

77. PNA, EPCS, 1791-1821, "Camarines. Año de 1806 a 7. Espediente creado á presentacion del Provincial . . .," Valentino de los Reyes et al., 11 January 1805. The charge of insubordination is said to have originated "in the time of Don Alexo"; I have been unable to establish exactly when Alexo Rodriguez was governor of Albay, but it appears to have been in the 1790s. The *principales* claimed that Lagonoy in fact conformed with Manila's orders as well as, or better than, other towns in the province.

78. (E), Rosario and Lozada to Navas, 31 July 1806. Unfortunately we are unable to tell the nationality of many of the parish priests of Lagonoy. Diaz Bandera and the Franciscans (including those who served in "Siminandig" between 1687 and 1694) were Spaniards; Manicdao is known to have been a Pampangan and Vergara an *indio* (Filipino); we may assume from his name that Paglinauan was also a Filipino; but for the rest we are at present in the dark.

Within this framework, different specific issues surfaced from time to time. In the early days, the chief concern of Lagonoy seems to have been the control of people. The missions were seen as a place to which "fugitives" might flee, avoiding the payment of tribute. We may reasonably infer that some of these fugitives were seeking protection from the principales and priests of Lagonoy as well. The disclaimers of the Franciscans are rather disingenuous. After asserting that the missions did "not claim, nor seek" fugitives and vagabonds, they acknowledged that some Lagonoyans, having already fled to the hills "where they were living like apostates," eventually wound up in Goa and Tigaon, where they were welcomed "in order that their souls should not perish."⁷⁹ The hills themselves, of course, had always offered a refuge from the excesses of the towns, but those who fled to the missions would not have to forsake the practice of Christianity and the protection of the crown, as true remontados did.

Ethnicity, curiously enough, does not seem to have been a particular cause of friction between Lagonoy and the missions. The terminology of the time reflects a number of overlapping racial, civil and religious categories, including *agtas* (nominally *negritos*),⁸⁰ *cimarrones* (presumably lowland fugitives, but often lumped with *agtas* in a single category), "neophytes," "catechumens," or "new Christians" (recently reduced *agtas* or *cimarrones*, not yet paying tribute), and *poblanos* (villagers). It is difficult to determine just how these categories were defined in practice or how people moved from one to another. Obviously many of the *poblanos* had started out as *agtas* or *cimarrones*, but it is not clear when or how they changed from "neophytes" to ordinary villagers, either by official definition or in popular regard.⁸¹

79. Silva, 17 October 1753, AFIO 93/14 and 93/16; Joseph de Hervas (missionary of Santa Clara), 18 October 1753, AFIO 93/15.

80. Although "*agta*" is normally glossed as "*negrito*," one knowledgeable Bicolano informant (Dr. Wilfredo Arce, personal communication, 28 October 1983) observed that when he was growing up a distinction was made between the two terms, with "*agta*" implying a person of mixed race, resembling lowland Filipinos in size and color, but having curly hair. The eighteenth- and nineteenth-century sources frequently refer to unions between the *agtas* and fugitive Filipinos from the lowlands, suggesting a long process of homogenization, and by the twentieth century there were in fact very few *negritos* on Mt. Isarog. Tigaon and many other Bicol towns include settlements that were "*rancherías* of baptized *agtas*" in the nineteenth century, but now are virtually indistinguishable from the rest of the population.

81. Ethnicity can be correlated with residence and ecological adaptation, but not very precisely; both ends of the spectrum are clearer than the middle. Those who lived in the poblacion (town or mission center) and practised wet-rice agriculture were clearly *poblanos*; hunters and gatherers who lived in isolated huts were clearly *monteses*. Much

Very little of this seems to have entered into the Lagonoy-mission disputes, however. At no time is it stated or even implied that this was an ethnic struggle between the poblanos of Lagonoy and the mountaineers of the missions. Although Lagonoy was essentially a lowland town, it too had its rancherías of recent converts, while the missions, though they had been created to convert agtas and cimarrones, always had a core of poblanos as well.⁸² To the extent that control of people mattered, the poblanos, who paid tribute and were liable for labor services, were targeted by both parties. Lagonoy wanted to keep its poblanos from disappearing to the missions, while the friars fought to retain those they had. Concern over the whereabouts of "neophytes" seems to have been more detached. One party would blame the other for having driven away recent converts by repression or neglect, but it was never suggested that they had been "usurped" by the opposition. It appears that while poblanos were a recognized asset, "neophytes" may have been regarded simply as an extra responsibility, if not a liability.

Only in the early nineteenth century did control over land and water emerge as a major theme in the disputes between Lagonoy and the missions, though this may simply reflect the uneven nature of the sources available to us.⁸³ It is possible that Lagonoy's earlier objection to the movement of Salog to Goa also stemmed from such concerns, as well as from its historical claims to the latter site. Salog was situated in an enclave that would have supported little wet-rice cultivation, whereas Goa (actually slightly farther from Lagonoy) was on the fringe of a plain that opened to the sea. Thus Goa, unlike Salog, might have threatened to develop into a substantial farming settlement within

of the district, however, was inhabited by people who lived in small settlements (rancherías) and practised some version of shifting cultivation (*kaingin*) or dry-cropping; this was true both of the missions and of many mountaineer settlements, known to be regular producers of both abaca and tobacco. "Reduction" would have been a step on the road from nomadic foraging to sedentary agriculture, but we cannot tell how large a step it was in practice.

82. The mission poblanos included lowlanders who were assigned to serve as the "escort" of the missionaries in the founding years, and their descendants, as well as later settlers.

83. Prior to 1800, we depend heavily on Franciscan accounts, whereas after that date most of our information comes from governmental archives. It is possible, therefore, that there were earlier complaints about land and water rights that the Franciscans did not bother to record, though if these had been serious we might have expected the Franciscans to respond, if only to refute them.

what Lagonoy considered its own domain, a magnet for poblanos, not just a home for converted mountaineers.⁸⁴

In any event, the major concern of the Lagonoy principales in 1805–06 was no longer that they were losing people, but that “intruders” were encroaching on the land and water that they needed for growing rice. To solve the problems, they suggested either that Goa should be annexed to Lagonoy or that the missions of Goa and Tigaon should move elsewhere, the latter option implying that the lands had become more important than the people that occupied them. This shift of emphasis appears to reflect a process that was occurring throughout nineteenth-century Southeast Asia: a rise in the value of property relative to that of people. Traditionally, political and economic power in the region stemmed from direct control of people, usually through slavery or other forms of bondage (including debt-service). Land without people was regarded as almost worthless. With the modern rise in population, however, land became a scarcer, and therefore more valuable, factor in agricultural production.⁸⁵ Although we lack reliable demographic data, it is clear that the supply of labor in Partido was increasing during the late eighteenth century. In addition to whatever natural surplus of births over deaths there may have been, the ongoing process of reduction and Christianization was turning mountaineers into poblanos.⁸⁶ There is also some evidence of immigration from the Tabaco district of Albay.⁸⁷

The other arena in which the missions represented a threat to Lagonoy's autonomy was behavior. Over the years Lagonoy had

84. See in particular the map enclosed in PNA, EPCS, 1791–1891, “Camarines. Ano de 1806 a 7. Espediente creado a presentacion del Provincial . . .,” Eguia to Aguilar, 9 August 1806, which shows irrigation works on the Colasi river near Goa. Salog was about three miles from Lagonoy, Goa nearly four.

85. Norman G. Owen, “Population and Society in Southeast Asia before 1900,” forthcoming in volume on Southeast Asian historical demography, edited by Peter S. Xenos.

86. Fernandez, AFIO 93/21, refers to the poblanos of Goa as “the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of infidels.”

87. Tigaon parish records; Norman G. Owen, “Life, Death, and the Sacraments in a Nineteenth-Century Philippine Parish,” forthcoming in a volume on Philippine historical demography, edited by Michael Cullinane. Several sources provide numbers of *tributos* (tribute-paying adult couples) in Lagonoy or the missions; unfortunately, these do not constitute a reliable series of population data for this period. In broad terms, however, we find Lagonoy growing from around 400–500 *tributos* in the 1750s–1770s to 1100 by the first decade of the nineteenth century, while Goa and Tigaon increased from fewer than 100 *tributos* (as late as 1762) to over 300.

developed its own customs in many areas, customs which were often at variance with official government or church policy. Their officials did not pay the "festivities fee" required by the church and disputed some of the demands of the governor for forced delivery of goods. To judge by the complaints of Franciscans, the priests and the principales of Lagonoy also did not enforce with proper rigor regulations regarding church compliance, schooling, settlement patterns, or gambling. Although the friars rarely had even the nominal authority to compel the Lagonoyans to change their ways, they had the irritating habit of drawing these deviations from the rules to the attention of others—bishops and governors—who did have such authority.

From a twentieth-century perspective, we can perhaps see Lagonoy as representing a more relaxed, flexible, "Filipino" approach to regulations than the Iberian strictness which the friars preached. But we should not push this too far. For one thing Lagonoy was usually able to find Spanish allies, including bishops and governors, occasionally even friars.⁸⁸ More significantly, many Filipinos clearly preferred living in the missions, under direct Spanish authority, to living under the priests and principales of Lagonoy. To the very end of Spanish rule, of course, others rejected all civic authority and attempted the hard life of the hills, where they were officially regarded as outlaws whether they lived as peaceful farmers or as cattle rustlers and armed bandits.

Whatever the principalía of Lagonoy stood for, it was not an effort to govern on behalf of the common Filipino. Like many later political movements in the Philippines, they represented a local elite engaging outsiders in a contest for power, including power over the masses. The principales, like the friars, thought that ordinary Filipinos ought to be taxed and made to perform labor services, while they themselves should be exempt. Both decried liberty and mobility, insisted that civilization implied subordination, and maintained "constables of vagabonds" (*alguaciles de vagamundos*) to prevent commoners from evading their authority. Neither had qualms about compelling mountaineers to settle under their supervision by force of arms or "delivering" ordinary poblanos from one jurisdiction to another without consulting them. Both generally sought to aggrandize the resources—human and physical—under their control. And, if we may judge by

88. An unnamed informant reported to Navea in 1806 that Laurenciano's escape from Lagonoy ahead of the efforts of Navas to arrest him was not unprecedented, since years before, when Governor Alexo Rodriguez of Albay had tried to seize him, "he took refuge in the convent of Goa, where the then Missionary hid him"; (B), report of 15 September 1806.

their mutual accusations, both were willing to resort to violence, even to the lash, to maintain their authority against challenges from below.

The decline of hostilities after 1810 probably had much to do with the fact that a growing Franciscan personnel crisis compelled the friars to vacate the missions at that time. A severe shortage of new missionaries, which lasted until after 1850, forced the Province of Saint Gregory the Great to leave many of its parishes and missions vacant or to turn them over "temporarily" to the secular clergy to administer. By 1811 there was no friar assigned to either Goa or Tigaon. Over the next thirty years, though they remained "missions" in name, they were in practice minor provincial towns under secular priests like their neighbors. Father Vergara himself was the parish priest of Tigaon from 1819 until his death in 1833.⁸⁹

Although Lagonoy won its skirmish with Navea and might be said to have won (by default) its battle with the missions, it did not win its long term war for autonomy. The founding of San Jose (also known as Patrocinio) in 1814 dismembered the town far more effectively than the establishment of Goa had done. It resembled the separation of Borabod and Salogon that Navea had advocated.⁹⁰ In 1818, moreover, Folgueras decided that some of the "surplus" lands of Lagonoy should be allocated to Goa.⁹¹ Over the long run Lagonoy would also have been affected by the enormous expansion of the colonial superstructure, which made it far more difficult for any corner of the Philippines to go unsupervised by Manila.⁹² Partido lost much of its isolation, and in the latter half of the nineteenth century Lagonoy became an ordi-

89. Cruikshank, 6 June 1990; Tigaon parish records. AFIO 93/25 records the formal "delivery" of Goa to an interim secular priest in March 1812, but the 1811 chapter table already lists the mission as vacant. On the Franciscan personnel crisis see Owen, *Prosperity*, p. 194; we will know much more about it when Bruce Cruikshank finishes what promises to be the definitive study of Franciscan missionaries and their assignments in the Philippines.

90. Unfortunately, I have so far been able to locate any contemporary documentation on this event in the PNA, the AFIO, the AGI (Seville), or the Archivo Histórico Nacional (Madrid), though one or more of these rich repositories may still conceal relevant documents. Borabod, ironically, was still petitioning—unsuccessfully—for independence from Lagonoy in 1833; see *informe* of Governor General Pascual Enrile, 11 July 1834, Museo Naval (Madrid), MS 1671, D11.

91. PNA, EPCS, 1817-98, "*Camarines Sur. Año 1862. Gubernativo. El Gobernadorcillo de Sangay pide . . . Comisionado . . .*," "Folgueras to Concepcion, 16 April 1818.

92. Owen, *Prosperity Without Progress*, pp. 193-99.

nary Philippine town, rising and falling on the tides of international commodity markets.⁹³

On 9 November 1902, however, the municipal council of Lagonoy, along with Father Vicente Ramirez, the parish priest, voted unanimously that the parish should leave the Roman Catholic Church and affiliate with the new Iglesia Filipina Independiente.⁹⁴ There are many possible explanations, sociological and theological, for this switch to Aglipayanism, which was unique in Kabikolan. But in historical perspective, we may also choose to see in it a final flash of the town's traditional resistance to authority, a reaffirmation (perhaps unconscious) that it still was "indomitable."

93. Around midcentury the towns of Partido were still "the most miserable in Albay"; PNA, EPCS, 1809?-1887?, untitled *expediente*, Calisto Rodriguez (Public Scribe of Camarines) to Governor General Claveria, no date [January 1848?]. Soon thereafter the abaca boom reached the district and the economy picked up, though Lagonoy, despite its traditional role as district leader and its port, does not seem to have prospered appreciably more than abaca-growing towns like Goa and Tigaon.

94. Pedro Achutegui, SJ, and Miguel A. Bernad, SJ, *Religious Revolution in the Philippines: Life and Church of Gregorio Aglipay, 1860-1940*, 2d ed. revised, 4 vols. (Manila: Ateneo de Manila, 1961-72), 1: 341-45; John N. Schumacher, SJ, *Revolutionary Clergy: The Filipino Clergy and the Nationalist Movement, 1850-1903* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1981), 235-36. Lagonoy's attempt to transfer the church property to IFI control was challenged by Bishop Jorge Barlin in one of the most historic decisions of the Philippine Supreme Court (*Barlin v. Ramirez*); the court ruled in favor of the Catholics, so the Aglipayans of Lagonoy, and elsewhere in the Philippines, had to build their own churches.