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PREFACE

It is important that the reader have a clear idea what is not included in this work. There are no "detailed ethnohistoric" of the Indians of early, colonial Nicaragua so there is no discussion of the social structure, belief systems, religions, kinship systems, legal structures, or special descriptions of the land tenure and land ownership systems of the Nahuas, Chortí, Las Marías, and Chondales Indians. For the Nahuas the reader is referred to Fowler (1989), which is the finest source of ethnohistoric information about the Nahuas at the time of the conquest. For the other major ethnic groups present in western Nicaragua, the Chortí, Las Marías, and Chondales, there unfortunately does not appear to be any Spanish priest or lawyer who recorded detailed ethnohistoric information during those first years of the Spanish colony in western Nicaragua or at any later time when native people still remembered the details about each of their respective cultures. This type of data does not appear to exist.

Thanks to the genius of Dr. Andrés Vega Bolaños the collection of early colonial documents known as the Colección Somotá exists, which contains a surprisingly large amount of ethnohistoric data regarding the Indians that lived in western Nicaragua at the onset of the conquest. That information is not organized in any form but is disorganized among the more than 10,000 pages of the Colección. In the numerous lawsuits there is much information about the Indians, including the names of over 160 Indian caciques and "principales", or representatives of the major ethnic groups of Indians, and the names of about 150 of the villages that were found by the Spaniards, the great majority of which are now extinct and have been located and identified as to their ethnicity. In the tasaciones of 1548 and 1581 there is much information regarding the size and population and locations of the major ethnic groups, their economic production and their differing skills in the artisanal manufacture of many different objects of use to the Spaniards. With other existing data, including that of Oviedo, Cereceda, Bobadilla and Codrillo, one can reconstruct the great majority of the Indian villages, including their specific sizes and ethnic identity, that existed in 1548 and also in 1581.

The data presented in this work is presented in three periods: from the initial conquest in 1522 up to 1548; the tasación of 1548; and the census and tasación of 1581. During the first 60 years of Spanish control of Nicaragua there was a strong impact on the native populations; this work contains all of the sources known to the author regarding the groups of Indians that lived in western Nicaragua beginning on January 1, 1522, and how they survived, or became extinct, as a result of the coming of the Spaniards to 1581.

The maps that accompany the text are an approximation of the locations of about 160 of the 198 encomiendas found in the census and tasación of 1548 and the great majority of the villages that survived up to 1581. My intent is that those maps will be used by other investigators, historians, and archaeologists to further knowledge about the different groups of Indians that lived in western Nicaragua during the first 60 years of the colony.

It is also my hope that the data found herein will serve to rectify some of the traditional ideas generally held about the prehistory and history of colonial Nicaragua that are really more belief systems than true representations of how things were at the beginning of the colony. The practice of assuming that a place name in the Nahua language means, with no other proof, that that village was a Nahua village in the 16th century, is a belief that must be strongly questioned in the absence of any other contemporary, corroborating information. For example, the language of the well known Quegiete is obviously a pigeon Spanish and Nahua; the area where it originated, Diriamba-Masaya, was undoubtedly Oto-Mangue speaking at the time of the
conquest. Aside from its theatrical qualities, about all the Queuegience means is that some Nahua speakers who didn’t like their patrones moved to Diriamba after the conquest. Another area of confusion is found in present day Nicaraguan place names. Almost none of the extinct villages are known by their 16th century names but by Nahua names, probably assigned by later inhabitants. The long lists of place names compiled by Ince and Mántica, while useful, are quite misleading when one tries to recreate 16th century Nicaragua with them. One searches in vain on modern maps for the great majority of encomiendas listed in the 16th century.

Another aspect of the problem is that the great majority of village names that existed at the onset of the conquest were extinct by the beginning of the 18th century and almost all of the names of these extinct villages had been lost from the collective recollection of Nicaraguan society when its history first started to be written, beginning about 1870. The names of those many villages have been recovered from 16th century documents and the two 16th century censuses to assist in the reconstruction of 16th century Nicaragua that is found in this work.

No attempt has been made to write a chronology or narrative regarding what occurred to the Indians during and after the conquest. There is not sufficient data to do that. Rather, this work follows the example set by Jaime Incer Barquero (1985 and 1990), Frederick Lange (1992) and Antonio Esquive (1993 and 1995) by identifying each bit of information, classifying it in an easy-to-understand system and relating each bit of information to other relevant information.

This work also follows paths of investigation that were first utilized by Walter Lehmann in his magnum opus, Zentralamerika (1920). A cursory review of this work demonstrates that it is quite similar to Robert Dressler’s Phylogeny And Classification Of The Orchid Family ( Dioscorides Press, Portland, Oregon, 1993) and his equally fine Field Guide To The Orchids Of Costa Rica And Panama (Constock Publishing Associates, Ithaca and London, 1993). These two works took a disorganized body of information regarding the taxonomy of the orchids and organized them, in clear prose, so that any attempt at systematics or genetic experimentation does not become clouded in scientific mumbo jumbo. I hope that the organization of ethnic data found herein will serve to similarly clarify what is known about early Nicaragua.

This monograph grew out of a much larger work regarding early colonial Nicaragua. After reviewing several early descriptions of Indian groups in Nicaragua in the contact period it appeared that there was a large body of information available that had been little used because of the lack of a classification system regarding concrete citations of Indian or Indian-Spaniard information. Most ethnohistorians have tended to rely on the work of Gonzalo Fernandez de Oviedo as objectively and conclusively true in his discussions of Nicaragua and as the main source of ethnographic information for western Nicaragua. Nothing could be further from the case.

I also attempted to state in a clear fashion the Spanish legal institution of encomienda that guided and defined much of the early settlers’ actions with the Indians, something that has not often been included in ethnohistorical accounts of this time period. It becomes obvious, for example, that the New Laws of 1542 were of rather underestimated importance in understanding the Spanish settlements in Nicaragua and the Spanish government’s reaction to the large number of Spanish colonizers who arrived in this period. The New Laws of 1542, the Probate Code of 1553, and the various Royal edicts regarding inheritance, the instructions with regard to the definition of Royal offices such as governor, accountant, treasurer, overseer, and inspector, were of great importance in understanding how the government, society, economy, and encomiendas of the 16th century functioned.
THE COLONY OF NICARAGUA IN 1548 AS DEFINED BY ENCOMIENDAS.

THE COLONY OF NICARAGUA IN 1581 AS DEFINED BY ENCOMIENDAS.

AUTHOR PATRICK S. WERNER
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The early history of the colony of Nicaragua was a violent and destructive interaction between Hispanic and indigenous cultures and institutions. The recreation of that interaction has been ignored in most accounts of early Nicaragua: historians tend to give short shrift to archaeological data or repeat the mistakes of earlier writers; archaeologists tend to treat data of contact period developments as occurring in a vacuum and little or no effort is placed on identifying with specificity the Hispanic institutions that so changed those Indian institutions. An exception is Newson (1987), who integrated a huge amount of data to explain the disastrous population trends in Nicaragua to 1580.

Other efforts to create a usable data base of contact period Nicaragua have reviewed the largest body of ethnographic data in the Colección Somosa, the tasação of 1548 (14 CS 357, November and December 1548). Radell (1969), Newson (1987), and Stanislawski (1983) all tried to use the tasação of 1548 to locate the villages mentioned by their ethnographic composition, but were largely unsuccessful (Fowler, 1989:27).

Part of the problem in recreating Indian populations of early Nicaragua may lie in depending on some of the early transcriptions of conversations with early Indian leaders at the onset of the conquest as being objectively true in all respects. A second difficulty is not being familiar enough with Nicaraguan geography so that the many strong hints and downright decisive identifying data can be understood. The first entrada of Spaniards into Nicaragua occurred in the spring of 1522, and was led by Gil Gonzalez Davila. That entrada generated three documents that have influenced historians and archaeologists ever since. Andres de Cereceda, the treasurer of the expedition, conducted long interviews with the chief of the largest village, the cacique Nicaragua. Cereceda, who was a very meticulous and accurate observer, transcribed that interview, which was later used extensively by Peter Martyr, Lopez de Gomara, Herrera y Tordesillas, and much later Fowler (1989) to reconstruct the ethnographical characteristics of the Nicaraos, the apparent ethnic name of the Indians who lived under the tutelage of the cacique Nicaragua, and who lived by the side of Lake Nicaragua close by the present town of San Jorge. Though that report has apparently been lost, it was quoted by later writers and became the basis for ethnographic knowledge of the "Nicaraos", called in this work "Nahuas". The second document was the itinerary of that first entrada. Cereceda recorded 37 visits to Indian villages during the entrada from western Panama to the Ochomogo river north of Rivas, Nicaragua. He recorded distances traveled, the names of the villages, caciques, and numbers of persons baptized and gold taken from the Indians. That has proved valuable in locating some of the encomiendas listed in the tasação of 1548 and in giving some idea of the size and location of Indian populations at the onset of the conquest. Lastly, Gil Gonzalez himself wrote a report, or relación, to the Crown. That document, found at 1 CS 89, (March 6, 1524) is of more limited use in reconstructing the Indian populations of early Nicaragua.

A second major source of ethnographic data (and subsequent confusion) that has been repeatedly used is the interviews conducted by priest Francisco de Bobadilla in 1528. Pedrarias Davila felt that Gil Gonzalez's, Hernandez' and Lopez de Salcedo's figures on baptisms were inflated, so he sent the priest (and probable relative of his wife, Isabel de Bobadilla) to
"rebpapte" Indians (Cronistas 3:310 et seq). Bobadilla left Leon in September of 1528 and set out to repapate and interview Indians already baptized by Gil González.

Confusion as to the meaning of the data recorded by Bobadilla began in 1920 when Lehmann identified the town (or more probably galpon) where Bobadilla conducted his interviews, Teoca, as really Tecatega. Tecatega, as noted below, is probably the present day El Viejo, which was a very populous town in Oviedo's day and probably was populated by Nahua Indians. In fact, the "Teoca" of Bobadilla almost certainly was a galpon or adjacent plaza of the pueblo of the cacique Nicaraguá, precisely where Cereceda had conducted interviews regarding ethnographic data six years before. The itinerary of Bobadilla makes it clear that Bobadilla baptized 29,063 persons in the province of Nicaragua (which in this sense means the area under the political control of the cacique Nicaraguá, not the colonial province of Nicaragua) which "lies in the jurisdiction of Granada", not Leon, where Tecatega was located. From Teoca, Bobadilla traveled to the village of the cacique Ochomogo, then to the location of Díaz, then to Bombacho (Mombacho), and later to Masaya, etc. Clearly Bobadilla was traveling from southern Nicaragua northwest toward Leon, and ended up in March of 1529 baptizing 2,169 persons at the town of "Tecatega" which is a variant of Tecategá, the pueblo and later town El Viejo. The ethnographic data of Cereceda and Bobadilla were, in all probability, recorded in the same "Nicara" town of the cacique of Nicaragua. And, as Fowler correctly points out (1989:21), that has been the best source of 16th century American ethnography. Not surprisingly, it corresponds somewhat to the data of Martí, Gomara, and Herrera.

Far ranging speculation about the origin of the "Nicara" was introduced into historiography and ethnography of western Nicaragua by Fray Juan de Torquemada's Monarquía Indiana (1615, 1699). There, probably from some lost work of Motolinía, Torquemada stated that Nicaragua was settled by emigrants from Mexico. Bobadilla identified the Mexican towns of Ticomega and Maguataha as the places where the Nicara were from (Fowler 1989:32-33). Torquemada described the history of the migration (Fowler 34-35).

Every writer and historian from Torquemada through Lothrop in the 20th century has mixed and matched in various permutations the accounts of Oviedo, Bobadilla, Cereceda, and Torquemada, with very little detailed consideration as to the geographical locations mentioned, or the obvious implications of their conclusions. The result has been incredible confusion. The functional uselessness of this trend in Nicaraguan ethnohistory and colonial history became more apparent when the precolombian ceramic sequence of central and southern Nicaragua began to be formulated by empirical methods, rather than relying on very questionable historical chronicles. Clearly the ceramic sequence is at odds with the historical chronicles.

Rather than assume the conclusion about the existence of any identifiable ethnic group, the approach used in this chapter is to utilize many different sources to try to factually reconstruct Indian populations as they existed from 1522 to 1581, where they were located, what crops they produced, and how they interacted with the Spaniards.

Compared with ethnohistory, very little consideration has been given to Hispanic institutions that were introduced to Nicaragua during the contact period. The standard sources of Nicaraguan colonial history are Ayón (1993), Gamez (1993), Salavattra (1939), and Incér (1990). Of the 19th century historians, both Ayón and Gamez are restatements and recombinations of Herrera, Oviedo, Martí, and others. Ayón was a conservative and Gamez was a liberal, and the politics of 19th century Nicaragua are easily perceived in their works. Gamez is quite critical of Ayón regarding his careless use of facts. Gamez is much more
poor understanding of what happened. The focus on both Hispanic and indigenous institutions will be the approach utilized in this work.

By concentrating on the specific information that was collected contemporaneously during the first 60 years of the colony of Nicaragua a closer approximation of the Indian populations then existent in western Nicaragua can be reconstructed than has been possible in the past by relying on a few cronistas with mostly anecdotal information. Rather than retell the same old tales about the "Nicarao and Chorotegas" the focus of this work will be to isolate each individual fact that was collected or observed during the first 60 years of the colony of Nicaragua, reorganize those facts in a coherent fashion, and only then, draw conclusions about the Indian groups that were present, their population size, economic production, pueblos, and how those same Indians and their institutions were changed by the coming of the Spaniards. Hopefully, then, the conclusions will follow the proofs, and not the other way around.

---

1 On the location of the village (or villages, or galpones) of Atolgalpa, the probable name of the pueblo of cacique Nicaragua, see 1 CS 100; the location of the village of the cacique Nicaragua is three leagues inland from the Mar del Sur (Pacific Ocean) and next to the houses on the other side is the Mar Duco, or Lake Nicaragua. On Atolgalpa as the name of the pueblo of the cacique Nicaragua, or one situated next to his plaza, see 2 CS at 110. Note. 2 CS 110 means the document found in volume two at page 110.

8 The transcription of those interviews and the towns visited are not found in the Coleccion Somonza but were reproduced by Oviedo and published in the 1970's in Nicaragua by the Bank of America cultural series (Cronistas 3: 310 et seq). Oviedo, sitting as castellano in Santo Domingo in the 1540's misstated the date of those interviews at 1538, during the regime of Pedrarias Davila, which was obviously wrong, since Pedrarias died in 1531. All subsequent writers have taken that date as 1528, probably correctly.

6 Which has several variants in spelling throughout the Coleccion Somonza, but undoubtedly refers to the large village where the cacique was called Agatete in Oviedo's time and is now El Viejo. El Viejo is located about 230 km by modern roads from Rivas and San Jorge. The modern highways pass through almost all of the locations mentioned by Bobadilla. Either Lehmenn ignored Nicaraguan geography or Bobadilla had some very fast horses.

7 His work merits a new edition. The quality of history written from original sources rather than from earlier summaries of earlier works is obvious.
Chapter 2
INDIAN AND HISPANIC INSTITUTIONS

INDIGENOUS INSTITUTIONS

At the beginning of the contact period, i.e. 1522, western Nicaragua was densely populated with Indians. Population figures run from between 600,000 to one million inhabitants (Las Casas 1992, Herrera, 12 CS 453, Oviedo, 1976, Newsom, 1987, McCleod, 1973, Stanisłowsky, 1968). Major population centers were the complex of villages (i.e. Otagalpa, Xoxoya, Teoca, Coatega) located by present day San Jorge, the complex of villages (i.e. Managua, Mazagalpa, and Itiptapa) stretched along the southern shores of Lake Managua, a group of villages, or galpones located southwest of present day Chinandega named Mistega, and the group of villages around the major pueblo of Tezutaga, present day El Viejo. Another major population center was in the Nicoya peninsula where the village of the cacique Nicoya was located. This was, in turn, close by the island of Chira, which also had dense populations of Indians.

The organization of several of these pueblos was centered around the "galpon", a term in the Nicaraugua language that Oviedo identified as meaning either, "portal cubierto" (Cronistas 3: 479) or vassals of the king (Cronistas 3: 306-307). Oviedo noted that the caciques of Teocateca (Tezutaga), Mistega, Nicaraugua, and Nicoya (undoubtedly a Chorotegan speaking pueblo) all had "galpones". Bobadilla was probably closer to the mark when he recorded in his interview with Indians in 1528 that the galpon was,

The casa de cabildo (or town or barrio meeting hall) is called the galpon, but according to what I have seen there are many doorways (portales) in the plazas of that land, and those although they may be together, and to maintain divisions and each one is divided so that it is a separate unit. In each of them there is a head man (principal) with a certain number of people that always are there to guard the main chief, and each portal is called a galpon (Cronistas 3:343).

A review of some of the early deeds of encomienda found in the Coleccion Somosa clarify Oviedo's contradictory passages. For example, Pedrarias Davila awarded an encomienda to his alcalde mayor, Francisco de Castañeda (presumably while they were still speaking to each other); that encomienda was later confirmed by Queen mother Juana, 3 CS 21, March 11, 1531. On August 26, 1529 the deed was executed granting Castañeda in encomienda the "plaza principal" of the large pueblo of Mistega, located three leagues east of Realejo (2 CS 91). The deed stated that Castañeda got the "nine galpones of the plaza as follows:"

1. the galpon of Astaconis; principal (headman or ward leader) named Teyoa;
2. the galpon of Chamologanga and the principal named Huesey;
3. the galpon of Eszianiagoa and the principal named Olin;
4. the galpon of Coacazteca and the principal named Mata;
5. the galpon of Escologalpon and the principal named Escolon;
6. the galpon of Tepeyga and the principal named Alzaguancone;
7. the galpon of Coalcone and the principal named Agat;
8. the galpon of Otalgalpanega and the principal named Tezatotot.

(Total of Indians who owed tribute 600; 2,460 inhabitants)

Pedrarias also gave encomiendas to an associate of his that included the plaza and galpons of the cacique of Nicaragua (2 CS 102 et seq). A third mention of galpones is found in the deed of encomienda that Francisco de Castañeda gave to Pedro de los Rios soon after Rios' arrival in Nicaragua to take up duties as Crown treasurer. That deed, executed on December 25, 1533 (5 CS 373-374), provided that Rios was granted the following encomienda:

1. the plaza of Ayatega and its galpones;
2. the plaza and galpones of Solosusyata;
3. the galpones that were previously owned by Gonzalo de los Rios on the island of Petronila.

Several other references found in deeds of encomienda or summaries of deeds of encomienda, while not mentioning galpones per se, clearly describe the organization of Indian pueblos around regional headmen or barrio leaders. See, for example:

a. the deed of encomienda at 14 CS 168 (July 2, 1537) Grantor: Rodrigo de Contreras; Grantee Diego de Contreras (his son); the Indians and plazas of (1) Abangasa; (2) Ysotaca; (3) Yguala; (4) Mazacol. Major caciques: Francisco, Miguist, Maca, and Acosca;

b. the deed of encomienda at 14 CS 170, (December 17, 1540) Grantor: Rodrigo de Contreras; Grantee: Marfa de Feñalosa (his wife): The Indians and plazas of (1) Tezutaga; (2) Nicoya; (3) Chira. Major caciques of Nicoya: Nipopoyamoto; Moto; an Indian woman named Nyesica in Christian and Namayo in Indian. Major caciques of Chira: Catalina in Christian; a male Indian named Noqui. Major caciques of Tezutaga: An Indio named Cazumate; an Indian woman named Violante in Christian; and an Indio named Quiat.

Another characteristic of some of the Indian villages is that they were multi-ethnic.

Bishop and Protector Alvarez Ocio first visited the pueblo of Mistega in 1529. He noted that there was a galpon in the plaza of Mistega of the Guazama language, which was a different language than that of the plaza of Mistega (2 CS 92, August 26, 1529). Chondal Indians were also noted in a deed of encomienda issued by Rodrigo de Contreras to his son Vasco de Contreras on April 15, 1542 (14 CS 174). That deed included the plazas of Monimbo, Zaguapa, Chinagual, and Motolynes Chondales, and identified the caciques of Zaguapa, one Socher and Chicaqezan, as Chondales, along with the pueblo of Motolynes Chondales. Those pueblos were located in the jurisdiction of Granada, in southern, Pacific Nicaragua. A third example of the multietnicity of Indian pueblos is found in a deed of encomienda dated December 16, 1542. Governor Rodrigo de Contreras as grantor executed a deed of encomienda to his son Pedro de Contreras. The deed recited that it granted an encomienda of the following plazas: (a) Gazaluaque; (b) the two Uegas; and (c) The Chondal that are included in the aforesaid plaza of Gazaluaque, all in the jurisdiction of Leon in the province of the Maribios. This encomienda was vacated by the death of the Bishop of Nicaragua, Francisco de Mendavia (14 CS 173).
EVIDENCE OF INDIAN LANGUAGES AND ETHNIC GROUPS

Based in part upon the early chronicles of Nicaragua, many writers have speculated about the ethnic groups in Nicaragua at the time of the conquest. Bobadilla, Oviedo, and Torquemada made the work pretty easy since, particularly with Torquemada, it was obvious that the ethnic groups in western Nicaragua, the only region that the Spaniards controlled through 1550, were predominantly Mexican. Almost every writer since Torquemada, i.e., Squier, Ayón, Gamez, and Jorge Eduardo Arellano, have all taken Torquemada's account more or less at face value. Oviedo stated that there were a variety of languages spoken in Tierra Firme, and he included seven languages that arguably were spoken in early Nicaragua: Chondal, Nicaragua or Nahua, Chortega or Oto-Mangue, Cueva, Guazama, Guatares, and Mariobis (Cronistas 3: 35-36). Oviedo further identified the largest Indian populations as being those of the pueblos (and probably surrounding villages) of Tezuatega, Mista, Nicaragua, and Nicoya (Cronistas 3: 306).

CUEVA. It is apparent from both the first entrada of Gil Gonzalez and the tasacion of 1548 that several villages in the Peninsula of Nicoya were incorporated into early Nicaragua. Specifically, the well-known villages of Nicoya and Chira were visited by Gil Gonzalez in 1522 and were subject to encomiendas in 1548. Two less well-known villages that were visited by Gil Gonzalez and later are found in the tasacion of 1548 were Cangen and Sabandi. Oviedo noted that while Indians of Nicoya and Orosi spoke Chortega (Cronistas 3: 186) he also noted that other Indians east of the village of the cacique of Nicaragua spoke possibly Cueva and could not understand Chortega (Cronistas 3: 177). The evidence is flimsy but Cangen and Sabandi may not be Chortega but some other language and ethnic group, possibly Cueva. Oviedo noted that the Indians spoke "Cueva" past the point where they spoke Chortega.

CHOROTEJGA-OTO-MANGUE. Oviedo was notably vague in discussing this linguistic group. He usually mentioned the Chortegas in comparison with the Nicaraguans and noted that there were more Chortegas than Nicaraguans and that the Nicaraguan language was Mexican. He also noted that both were cannibals. (Cronistas 3: 294). The only place name that used the word "Chortega" was Chortega Malalaca. Oviedo identified that area as around and north of the Gulf of Fonseca (Cronistas 3: 294). This is consistent with at least a dozen references in the Coleccion Somoza, several regarding the ill-fated expedition of Martin de Estete, a conquistador who could not shoot straight, to "Chortega Malalaca", also known as Nequitio, in the fall of 1529. No reference known to the author explicitly states that this is a reference to the ethnic groups that inhabited the area. The Honduran town of Choluteca, a variant of Chortega, is found in the region, on the banks of the Choluteca River. What is lacking in all discussions of the Chortega is any kind of exacting description of ethnographic data of the Chortega. No one seems to have taken any such information down. The totality of the information about the Chortegas found in Oviedo will not fill five pages of text. Squier further confused the matter by inventing the name "Dirianes" to represent the Chortega (Squier 1990:8). He reportedly visited the village of Dirih, located on the Moseta de los Pueblos, and renamed the linguistic group based on where he knew Chortega speakers lived. That renaming has served to confuse writers ever since.

Unquestionably the best source of information regarding the Chortegas is Lehmann (1920: 794-900). Lehmann combined a complete list of existing ethnographic and historic sources with the most extensive lists of vocabularies that has been compiled to the present day. The evidence is clear that the Chortegas were closely related to a family of languages originating in Oaxaca, Guerrero, and Chiapas, of southern Mexico. Lehmann grouped Chortega-Mangue (the population tended to call themselves "Chortegas" and the language they spoke "Mangue") and the related languages of southern Mexico, as follows:

I. Chortega-Mangue
II. Chiapaneken
III. Mazateken
IV. Related to the linguistic group of the Choco-Popoluca (Olmeken), Otomis, Trique, and Isicacteco.

The first mention of the Chortegans is found in the relation that Gil Gonzalez wrote regarding their first entrada into Nicaragua from Panama. From this and other sources Lehmann compiled extensive lists of place names in the Chortega-Mangue language. Other, later sources, such as Velasco (1571), and Herrera were also summarized. Lehmann went on to list similar place names of El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. The reproduction of the language itself was made by Squier (1852), with 80 words; de la Rocha (1842) 59 words and phrases; a longer list of words from Diria (Squier) 1852, with 357 words and phrases. Later work undertaken at the turn of the century in Masaya and Monimbó produced 128 more words and phrases. Unfortunately no one ever apparently tried to produce a grammar of Chortega or Oto-Mangue.

Lehmann, however, made extensive comparisons between word lists of Chortega-Oto-Mangue and Chiapaneken (Lehmann 1920: 846-858) and the very close relation between the two languages becomes obvious. Existing grammars of Chiapaneken were also reproduced (Lehmann 1920:869-876), and it is possible that those grammars can give some idea of how the Chortega-Oto-Mangue language worked.

Regarding their origin there is only a mention or two. Remesal, a 17th century cronista, mentioned that the Chiapanecas came to Chiapas from Nicaragua (Lothrop 1979:27). More probably, however, is a report by García, another colonial cronista, that the Chortega of Soconusco (El Salvador) and Nicaragua came from southern Mexico, and that part of them returned there (Lothrop 1979:27).

Almost nothing is known about their social structure, beliefs, political organization, culture and society. Vovkhani only mentioned that, "... their languages, manners, customs, and ceremonies were so different... as to be utterly incomprehensible to the other. He nevertheless adds that their religion was the same (as that of the Nahua),..." (Squier 1990:7 quoting Oviedo). Oviedo only made one mention of observing a human sacrifice and then the cannibalized feast that followed the sacrifice (Lothrop 1979: 79-80) and also mentioned the name of some of the deities of the pueblo of Mateare (still located today about 25 km west of Managua) which was clearly identified as a Chortega pueblo (Cronistas 3:446; Lehmann 1920:864). No other directly observed ethnographic information exists about the Chortegas.

One other source of information regarding the Oto-Mangue language is Campbell (1988). A more up to date analysis of Oto-Mangue and its relation to other languages is found there (Campbell 1988: 2-4) and it is noted that the Oto-Mangue languages are apparently unrelated to all of the other mesoamerican languages and has an unknown origin. Only two documents written in Chiapanec, a closely related language to Oto-Mangue are mentioned; one,
a rendition of the Lord’s prayer reproduced also in Chol and Zoque. It was found in the diocesan archives of San Cristobal de las Casas, Mexico. The other document is an alabado printed in modern times in Suchiapa. No contemporary documents written or mentioned in Nicaragua written in Oto-Mangue have come to light.

NAHUA. Regarding the Nicaraos, or the people who spoke the language of the cacique Nicaragua that was called Nahua, the only group of villages identifiable by specific reference is Atolgalpa and surrounding villages, located by present day San Jorge. There is no question that the village of the cacique Nicaragua was located by the shores of Lake Nicaragua and that there were several different villages, or galpones, located in the immediate area (1 CS 94, 100). Lehmann’s erroneous equating of Teoca with Tezateoga had the effect of multiplying the number of pueblos and people who were Nahua, making them apparently more important than they actually may have been, and confusing later scholars. Tezateoga, also called by Oviedo El Viejo (Cronistas 3: 428), its present day name, was predominantly Nahua. In the only passage where Oviedo gave ethnographic information that he himself collected, he described a pueblo of 20,000 persons and cultural artifacts such as the volador dancers that are undoubtedly mesoamerican in origin. This was confirmed by Cibdad Real, who in 1586 recorded that the town of El Viejo spoke corrupt Mexican, as did its sister town of Chinanega, located five kilometers away (Cronistas 1: 147-148). As soon as Cibdad Real reached Mazatega, 10 km east of Chinanega, he ran out of the area where Nahua was spoken and entered a rather large area where Mariobios was spoken (Cronistas 1: 148-150). Whether or not the ethnographic data collected by Oviedo himself in 1528 proves that the language and culture of Tezateoga (See Cronistas 3:428-435) was that of pure Nahua, or a unique "Nicaraguan" mix of cultural artifacts of differing cultural traditions are all equally possible and impossible.

Squier confused matters by inventing a new name for the Nicaraos, the Niqurimonos (Squier 1990: 8). The word originated with him and has been cited by various writers, usually without any kind of precision or concise meaning. Fowler (1989) has done the most exacting research in reconstructing the culture and ethnohistory of the Nicaraos. Fowler identified another village, Olomega (encomienda # 79 with 20 tributary Indians, 14 CS at 406) as being Nahua speakers because Ciudad Real noted that the site was vacant and that the villagers of Olomega had relocated to El Viejo. His unstated assumption was that the pueblos of Nicaragua were ethnically "pure", something that a review of several encomiendas has shown to be a false assumption as ethnic plurality, as least between the Chondales and other groups occurred in several of those encomiendas, mentioned above. From the Tasciación of 1581 it is clear that Olomega was a Chondales village.

Another location mentioned by Fowler was Leon Viejo, based upon Haberland seeing some Managua polychrome pottery by Leon and inferring there may have been a large Nicarao population in the area, linking Managua polychromes with Nicarao populations. If there were any Nahua speakers in the Leon area it was a pretty well kept secret. Oviedo, who identified with specificity every pueblo that spoke Nicaragua, omitted any mention of Nagrado, the name of the Indian village where Leon was founded (Cronistas 3: 53,89, 100,303,304; 3 CS 182) as being a Nahua speaking village, at least in 1528. Several other villages were located around Leon Viejo, which were named with regularity by every chronicler that wrote about Nicaragua. Several other encomiendas are found in the tasciación of 1548 that were obviously fishing villages in the area surrounding Leon Viejo. There is simply no mention of any Nahua speakers residing close to Leon Viejo. The prevailing evidence is that many or all of the villages around Leon Viejo were Chorotegan. One village close by, for example, Matiai, clearly had a pantheon of gods quite different than those described by the Cacique Nicaragua to Cereceda and later descriptions to Bobadilla (Cronistas 3: 446), perhaps giving solid proof of ethnic identity different from that of the Nicaraguas. It also was identified as being a Chorotegan village. The probative value of Managua polychromes as an indicator of the presence of the Nicaraos is an untested hypothesis. Until there is more extensive controlled excavations at both El Viejo and the San Jorge area it is very premature to equate the presence of Managua polychromes with the presence of Nahuaus.

Lastly, Fowler mentioned the existence of the city of Quauhcapolca as the city of the cacique Nicaragua, based upon Torquemada, who probably based his work on a now lost report of Motolinia (Fowler 1981: 635-636; Fowler 1989: 23). This may be as much a wish as a request to Tezateoga and Ticomeca. Every chronicler who wrote about early Nicaragua passed through the San Jorge area; many of the early reports of the three first volumes of the Coleccion Somotzo mention about a dozen pueblos or galpones that were found by the pueblo of the cacique of Nicaragua. Quauhcapolca is not mentioned anywhere. At least seven encomiendas of villages either called Nicaragua or located next to Nicaragua are listed in the tasciación of 1548 (i.e. # 99, Tolgala; # 108, Xooxota; # 149, Nicaragua y Guatgalpa; # 153, #159, # 172, Nicaragua; # 168, Nicaragua Anata). Quauhcapolca simply does not appear anywhere until Torquemada reported it as being the city of the cacique Nicaragua.

One other Nahua speaking village was mentioned by Oviedo. The pueblo of Ayatega is mentioned repeatedly throughout the Coleccion Somotzo. Oviedo stated that the pueblos of Ayatega was populated by Nahua speakers (Cronistas 3: 58). Later Crown treasurer Pedro de los Rios received Ayatega in encomienda and traveled and visited there quite often. On the jurats of several of his documents the scribe mentioned that the documents were executed in the pueblo of Ayatega. Further, Pedro de los Rios executed his will there in 1540. Three encomiendas of the tasciación of 1548 were listed as located in the pueblo of Ayatega, # 62 (30 tributary Indians), # 76 (16 tributary Indians), and # 189, (30 tributary Indians), representing in 1548 a total population of about 350 Indians. No location of Ayatega is given; it was described as being 14 leagues from Leon Viejo, about the same distance as Tezateoga and Chinanega. Its location has been placed tentatively close by the pueblos of Chinanega and Tezateoga, in the absence any other information.

CHONDAL. If there is vagueness and uncertainty with the treatment of the Chorotegos and Nicaraguas there is complete confusion and obsfuscation regarding the Chondales. Oviedo had little to say about the Chondales. The only ethnographic data that Oviedo collected about the Chondales recounted how they used soot from certain plants to make a dye that was used for scarifying and tattooing (Cronistas 3: 33-34). Oviedo also mentioned that the Chondales were cannibals, a fact confirmed by Benito Hurtado on January 21, 1527, when he and other Spaniards were attacked at the mining town of Caceres de la Frontera, later called Villahermosa, located somewhere in the Olancho valley of Honduras, and eaten, along with their horses (Cronistas 3:113, 454-455).

The language of the Chondales Oviedo described as being unintelligible to the Chorotegos and Nahuaos (they were unintelligible to each other) (Cronistas 3: 306). He described them as being nasty people ("avilanada") from the mountains (Cronistas 3: 302).

The only "industry" other than slavery in early Nicaragua was mining. From 1527 to 1534 the Spaniards established six mining towns and the Indians of present day Nueva Segovia
burned all of them down and killed and ate all of the Spaniards that they could find. Those Indians were uniformly called “Chondales” in many reports and requests for money to support a garrison to fight the Chondales. Little ethnographic data about the Chondales is found in the Coleccion Soma, probably because few Spaniards ever got very close to the Chondales in northern Nicaragua and survived. The letters and reports of acting governor Francisco de Castañeda, who fought a war with the Chondales and lost, spoke of military formations equal in size to those sent by the colonists of Leon and Granada (40 Spaniards and several hundred Indians), and the military success of the Chondales, who boasted to the expeditionary garrison that they liked to see the Spaniards come to the north country because then they (the Chondales) did not have to worry about food.

Part of the problem with the Chondales may be that their name, “Chondal” or “Chontal”, may have two meanings, one, the standard Nahua word for brute or uncivilized person, and the other the name of a particular ethnic group. One school of thought has associated the Chondales with the Matagalpas and placed them in the macro-Chibchoid tradition. Lehmann (1920; Incer, 1985; Constenta Umana, 1994; Fonseca Zamoara, 1994; and Ibarra, 1994, among others.) Constenta Umana (1994) and Ibarras (1994) have both argued that the major Indian presence east of western Nicaragua was Matagalpa. Incer (1985) advocated a similar position and created a lengthy list of place names that he felt were given by Indians who were of Misumalpan or Chibchan affiliations. Other linguistic information that has focused on specific languages in Mesoamerica has identified the Chondales not as members of an unknown language but of a dialect of Mayan languages (Schele 1982, 8-9; Campbell 1988-9). Two suggestions are in this work regarding the possible identity of the Nicaraguan Chondales of the 16th century: first, that they may have some Mayoid affiliation; and secondly, that they may have had Lenca affiliation or a combination of the two.

MAYOID A document from the tasacion of 1581, taken pursuant to the order of governor and Capitan General of Nicaragua, don Diego de Artieda Cherino, may shed light on the possible identity of this group of Indians. And other historical and archival evidence exists that may permit the possibility of support for a “Maya” theory about the cultural identity of the Chondales. Oviedo, in discussing the tragedy of the massacre of the Spaniards at the early mining town of Caceres de la Fronda, described the route from Leon Viejo to the site of the villa:

From Leon (Viejo) travel six leagues to Olocoton; then travel three leagues to the first Quaxencios; then travel six leagues to the other Quaxenicos; then travel six leagues to Anaguasa; then travel six leagues to Chalan; then travel six leagues to Guayape; then travel four leagues to Telpaneca, where the Indians killed Alonso Solis; then travel four leagues toward Leon in the province of Telpaneca, where they killed the said Hurtado and the other Spaniards at the aforesaid Villahermosa (Cronistas 3: 454-455).

This account is of interest for two reasons: first, it gives some specific idea of the route taken from Leon to Caceres de la Fronda, later called Villahermosa; and secondly, it includes the approximate location of two villages, Olocoton and Guaxencos, later identified in the Tasacion of 1581 as Chontales villages.

No mention was made by Oviedo of Putun Mayas in his extensive work; neither was any mention made in the Coleccion Soma regarding the Putun Maya. Evidence does exist, however, that there may have been Putun Mayas in Nicaragua at the time of the conquest. Garcia Palacio noted in 1576 that at least six languages were spoken in Nicaragua, one being “Potom” or “Ponc” (Lehmann 1920: 911). And almost alone, Lehmann mentioned the curious fact that Cortes in 1524 on his trip to Honduras obtained a map drawn on cotton cloth in Tabasco from possibly Mayan Indians. That map showed the route from Xicalanco, through Naco and Nito and included the Pacific Coast of Nicaragua (Lehmann 1920: 913). Obviously Nicaragua was a well known place at the onset of the conquest to the Indians of Tabasco.

Lehmann identified the Maya word “guaxencos” with “deformed forehead”, the custom of the Mayas of deforming the heads of infants by tying strips of wood on the head to make the head grow with an artificially slanted forehead (Lehmann 1920: 911) 111. More importantly, he identified the “guaxencos” as ethnic Putun Mayas. It follows from passages cited above that Lehmann may have suspected that the Chontales of contact period Nicaragua were Putun Maya; he lacked any sort of documentary proof linking the Guaxencos and the Chontales and therefore identified the Chontales with possible affiliations with Chibchoid speaking Indians. The importance of the Tasacion of 1581 is that it specifically identifies the Guaxencos as being included within the ethnic group of the “Chontales” and thus clarifies the existence of the Guaxencos and Chontales as being the same ethnic group. Hence, the tentative suggestion that the Chontales of northwestern Nicaragua were ethnic Putun Mayas not speaking a Chibchoid language is justified by available linguistic and archival evidence.

Six Chontales villages are mentioned in the tasacion of 1581: (1) Olocoton; (2) Guaxinjia; (3) Olomega; (4) otro Olocoton; (5) Condega; and (6) Somoto. The location and history of these villages have somewhat confused modern day historians as two modern day Nicaraguan towns, Condega and Somoto, have the same names as two of the Chontales villages. Thus, various historians, including Arrellano (1990) and Romero (1995), have equated at least one or the other of these villages in their modern day locations, with their mention by Cibdad Real in 1586, placing the Chontales of the 16th century in Estell and Madriz provinces. Luckily, there exist four sources that serve to locate these villages in northwest Chinandega province. The first source is that previously mentioned by Oviedo describing the trajectory of the route from Leon Viejo to Caceres de la Fronda. Secondly, Cibdad Real’s 1586 account of his travel by foot from Honduras down the camino real to Leon Viejo and Granada leaves no mystery as to the location of at least Condega, Somoto, and Olocoton. Cibdad Real kept track of the dates, distances traveled, and time it took to travel throughout northern and central Nicaragua. He defined distances in terms of leagues, and was most exact in his measurements, leading one to speculate that he counted his paces to define a league.

The third source in identifying the location of Olocoton and Olomega is Sonnenstern’s map of Nicaragua produced in 1863 (Orient Jarez: 1995). That map locates comarcas known as Olocoton and Olomega north of Telica and stretching toward modern day Guasicua, with precisely the same distances as noted by both Oviedo and Cibdad Real. The fourth source is the
tacación of 1581, which locates the villages nine leagues, or 38 km northwest of Leon Viejo very close to the Rio Negro and Sierras de la Botija.

Of the villages mentioned, at least one, Olocoton, provoked the wrath of Pedrarías. The Crown treasurer of governor Lopez de Salcedo, one Alonso de Peralta, another Spaniard named Zuniaga, two servants, a brother named Baezas, six or seven in total, were killed and eaten, including their horses in the area of Olocoton (Cronistas 3: 442). Pedrarías responded to that banquet by capturing 14 supposed caciques of Olocoton and having them ripped apart by killer dogs in the town square of Leon viejo. Oviedo witnessed the event and noted that Pedrarías was so angry about the murder of the Spaniards by the slaughtered Indians that he prohibited the body parts of the dead Indians to be removed from the town square for four days, until the stench became overpowering. Still, Oviedo observed, some of the Indians, while cleaning up the rotting pieces of bodies, sliced off some choice cuts that they took home to eat.

The only mention of any other of the villages is found in Cibdad Real’s journal, where on Tuesday, May 20, 1586, he described finding the village of Olomega, somewhat more than three leagues from Somoto, abandoned and next to a staging area for the production, storage, and shipping of pine pitch and tar from the mountains of the Sierra de la Botija (Cronistas 1: 144-145).

One other linguistic remnant of the Mayas bears mention. Oviedo reported that the Indians of the cacique of Nicaragua called their caciques “tyete” or “calachuix”xlviii. “Tyete” has been identified as a Nahua word meaning cacique or chief (Fowler 1989: 193-194). “Calachuix” was analysed by Lehmans in the following manner:

“Damit erklärst sich dann auch in befriedigender Weise das Vorkomen des Maya-Wortes calachuix cacique” (= Maya halauch-unic) in Nicaragua die Oviedo (z. B. l.b. 8 cap. 30 vol. I p. 316 (.), 319 (r.).) The appearance of the Mayan word “Calachuix cacique” is thus explained in a satisfactory manner in Oviedo. Tr. Author (Lehmann 1920: 913xlix)

Lastly, Fowler, almost alone among ethno historians, has posited that the Chontales of the 16th century central America may not have been culturally or linguistically of the Chibcheo tradition, but Mayas:

Although both Cortés (1963: 291-292) and Bernal Díaz (1968: 2: ch. 181, p. 224) gave indications of Naco’s former prosperity and power, neither commented on the language spoken by its inhabitants. Cortés (1963: 291) reported that several of his Aztec allies spoke to a group of former residents of Naco, apparently without the aid of an interpreter. Later, Cortés himself spoke to the same individuals through his interpreter, Doña Marina, who was fluent in Nahua and Chontal. This information indicates that the people of Naco spoke a dialect of Nahua or Chontal Maya or both. The Chontal (or Putun) Maya were an expansive group; many, especially merchants, were bilingual in Chontal and Nahua (Thompson 1970: 4-5, 43-78. (Fowler 1989: 57).

Of some interest is the origin of the reference of the Indians east of Lake Nicaragua, possibly Chibcheo speakers, as “Chontales”. With little question the use of the word “Chontal” to describe the Indians east of Lake Nicaragua in 19th century Nicaragua was invented by Ephraim Squier. He noted:

The region of Chontales was visited by my friend, Mr. Julius Froebel in the summer of this year (1851). He penetrated to the headwaters of the Rio Mico, Escondido, or Bluefields, where he found the Indians to be agriculturists, partially civilized, and generally speaking the Spanish language. They are called Caribs by their Spanish neighbors, but have themselves a vague tradition that they came originally from the shores of Lake Managua. Mr. Froebel procured a brief vocabulary of their original language which, however, seems to have little affinity to any of the languages spoken in other parts of the country, on the coast, or in the interior. I have elsewhere given it the name of Chondal from the fact that it exists in the district of Chontales, and to distinguish it from the others. But I have since ascertained that it is the true language of a tribe called the Woolwas, lying immediately between the remnants of semi-civilized stocks and the savage Moscon or Waikas on the coast. (Squier 1996: 9)

Further evidence of the 19th century origin of calling the Indians east of Lake Nicaragua Chontales is found in the major source commonly cited as proof of the existence of the “Chontales”. The main source is Lehmann 1920: 599-604. He listed Noguerus (1855), Valle (1909), place names of Jinotega (1763), Habel (for Danil, Honduras) (1878), Gaddea (Jinotega) (1909), and the Statistical Bulletin of Nicaragua (1907) as his data base for the language he called Matagalpa (accord, Constena Umana 1994: 194-195) and was referred to in the text as Popoluca. This is the language presently called both Matagalpa and “Chontales” (Constena Umana 1994; Ibarra 1994).

One of the major problems with identifying the Chontales of the 16th century with the obvious locations of the of the Chontales of the 19th century identified by Froebel and Lehmann is that the contemporary 16th century accounts of the colony of Nicaragua did not mention the existence of “Chontales” in the present province of Chontales but in western and northwestern Nicaraguaxlix. At least two encomiendas of the tacsion of 1548 are identifiable in the province, one in central or eastern Nicaragua, where the Chontales should have been.lix Encomienda 156, owned by Benito Díaz, included the villages of Cagualpa, Tuestepe, Alaginan, Xulte, Xoapa, Gologalpa, and Xaltaba. It had 300 tributary Indians, approximately 1230 inhabitants, and assessed tribute very much consistent with that assessed against the major populations of Indians at Managua, Subtiaba, Cindega, and the village of Nicaragua.xlx Of the villages mentioned at least one, Tuestepe, an old spelling of Tuestepe, is still located about 15 miles west of the present day town of Boaco in the Malacatoya river drainage, clearly within the territorial boundaries defined as “Chontal”. One other encomienda, # 177, Chujigalpa- Tcastolgalpa, is even more closely tied to the “Chontales” country of the 19th century. Chujigalpa is probably an old form of the word Juigalpa, the present department capital of the Nicaraguan province of Chontales. The encomienda was owned by one Juan Arias, had 71 tributary Indians and a total population of approximately 287 Indians. The tribute assessed was extremely light, 10 arrobas of chenep, 6 cantares of honey, and 2 arrobas of wax, much lighter than any village in western Nicaragua. But nowhere are the Indians of either of these two encomiendas referred to as “Chontales” Indians or villages.

There are, however, several references to Chontal Indian populations in western Nicaragua pre-1548. A deed of encomienda dated December 16, 1541, but almost certainly a back dated forgery, was issued by Governor Rodrigo de Conterras to Pedro de Conterras, his son (14 CS 173xlix). That deed granted Pedro de Conterras the plaza of Cazalauque (probably modern day Quetzalque), along with the Chontal Indians included in the pueblo of Cazalauque. A second group of Chontales, specifically referred to as the Motolynes Chontales, was included in the issuance of another, probably fraudulent, back dated deed issued by Rodrigo de Conterras to his son Vasco, dated April 15, 1542 (14 CS 174). That deed granted Vasco de
The tasación of 1581 mentions the main villages of the Chontales on the northern plains of Chinandega province in northwest Nicaragua at the edge of the Sierra de la Bota, almost on top of where the modern, Panamanian highway leads from Leon to the Honduran border at Guasaule (ancient Condega). Almost completely absent is any mention of any Chontal Indians in Cerroco, Matagalpa, Jinotega, Boaco, and a couple of towns that have since disappeared, such as Pinaguina and Linaguina. All of these towns were not listed in the tasación of 1548 and were listed in the tasación of 1581, probably because the frontier of Spanish control had moved considerably between 1548 and 1581 eastward of the plains of Leon. The exception is encomienda # 91 (tasación 1581: 184) which was only named "Los Chontales", was listed in the summaries of the encomiendas next to Boaco (E # 91, Tasación 1581: 184), and contained two tributary Indians and a total population of inhabitants of 34 persons.

More importantly, the cedula issued by Governor Diego de Arredia Cherino authorizing the tasación specifically instructed the census takers to enquire about the ethnicity and languages of the Indians of Nicaragua. What is recorded in the Tasación of 1581 is the result of that cedula; that work does disclose some surprises, such as at least one village or both of the twin villages of Linaguina and Pinaguina of the Sebaco region spoke "naguat". The census takers who interviewed the caciques and most of the people of the pueblos of the mountainous center of Nicaragua reported using translators to speak to the Indians but none of them were identified as speaking "Chontal".

The only other mention of possible Chontal Indians was in the encomienda of Yacaycoyagua located close by Subtiaba. That encomienda was described including Indians who spoke a barbaric language, "that is to say" Chontal, even though not many Indians in that encomienda spoke that language. Although the copy of the tasación is difficult to read, it appears to be saying that the village also contained speakers of "mexicano", probably Nahua, and that the speakers of the other, barbaric language, were few in number. What that means is not easy to perceive.

Cibdad Real walked through this same country five years later and noted that on the outskirts of Subtiaba he passed through a village named Yacaycoyagua, that spoke an unknown language named Tacacho. Whoever these people were, they were not particularly numerous, as the village contained only 210 persons of all sexes and ages (Encomienda # 100, Tasación 1581: 186). No one has ever been able to identify what language "Tacacho" was.

Another problem with equating the Chontales with Chibche groups comes from archaeology itself. A very definite ceramic sequence for Chontales province was established by Gorin (1990), based upon excavations at multiple sites. That sequence is completely different from the known ceramic sequence that has been established in the northern provinces of Estelí and Madriz. From existing archaeological data the obvious inference is that the groups that produced the ceramic sequence in Chontales province were different culturally from the groups that produced the ceramic sequence in northern, Pacific Nicaragua. There were probably Chibche speakers in either Chontales province or in the north country but probably not both places.

In conclusion, the tasación of 1581 sheds light on the identity of the Chontales of northwest Nicaragua in the 16th century. Other compiled archival data and the relations of the first chroniclers of early colonial Nicaragua tend to support the proposition that the Chontales were not Chikcheo speakers, but a distant group of the Putum Maya. The accuracy of the descriptions of early travelers, such as Cibdad Real and Oviedo, and at least one 19th century map, make the location of the sites of one or more of these pueblos quite an easy task. Archaeological studies of northwest Nicaragua may well clarify who these people were.

LENCA. Another possibility is that the Chontales may have been Lenca. Fowler (1989: 26) has suggested that, at least in El Salvador, the word "Chontal" may have referred to both, "Chorti and Lenca outlanders". Further, a review of the sources for late 16th century Central America, Cibdad Real and García de Palacio, reveals that Chontal speakers were common around the Choluteca area and on islands in the golf of Fonseca (Fowler 1989: 60-61).

When the early colonial ethnohistory of El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua are compared it becomes clear that the "Chontales (or Chontal)"", as they were repeatedly referred to by all major cronistas of the period, were not a group of Indians located on the east side of Lake Nicaragua but were a group that were found over large expanses of the territories of colonial Honduras, San Salvador, and Nicaragua. Both Fowler (1989) and Newson (1992) found extensive villages of Chontales Indians in their respective analysis of 16th century ethnographic data regarding El Salvador and Honduras. This fact has not been addressed before, perhaps because the historiography of each Central American country tends to be confined to the geographical boundaries of the countries where the historian resides. By rejecting a "nationalist" approach to early Central American ethnohistory and adopting a regional approach, it may be possible to gain a better understanding of the geographical extent of the Chontales, be they Lenca, Putum Maya, or a mix thereof. Finally, Lehmann (1920 668: 722) compiled an extensive list of Lenca vocabulary, grammar, and place names in both Hondurans and El Salvador, including Comixagua (Lehmann 1920 720), the island located in the golf of Fonseca called Comazac, mentioned below, as well as the island of Matoguera or Manguera, also located in the golf of Fonseca and mentioned in an early Nicaraguan encomienda below (Lehmann 1920: 720).

For example, one of the most obvious bell weathers of the archaeology of western Nicaragua is that white slipped (Papagallo) or light tan slipped (Vallejo) vessels predominate in the areas that were described as being Choroteca at the time of the conquest and has later been called Gran Nicoya; in some areas that are identified as Chontales area by this work surface ceramic remains are almost uniformly orange slipped. The area where the author has observed sites with abundant orange slipped potsherds include the area of the province of Nueva Segovia up to the town of Wiwilí on the shores of the Coco River. Though there have been few controlled excavations in northern Nicaragua, there has been some work completed. The results of those preliminary works (Fletcher, Salgado and Espinoza, 1994; Espinoza, Fletcher, and Salgado 1996) make it clear that what is called Segovia anarandajo in Nicaragua is very close to or the same as the Sulaco anarandajo of Honduras (Hirth, 1989). It is also perhaps the most abundant type of bi-chrome and poly-chrome pottery found in areas north of the limits of Chorotenian occupation as defined by this work. To the present time, the marked difference between the ceramic sequence of Gran Nicoya (Vincolao 13, nos. 1-2, 1987) and the orange slipped ceramics identified as Segovia anarandajo, correspond quite closely to the geographical border between the Chorotes, Maríbirs, and Chontales, particularly in the area between Telica, identified as a Maríbirs village, and Olocoton and Olomega, located about 15 miles north and identified by every source as Chontales villages. Other areas where the Lenca, or Parakas, were identified in the middle 17th century include the Pantasma river valley, located east of the
valley where the original Nueva Segovia was built in 1543 (Incer 1980: 251). That area, as well as the entire province of Jinotega, remains terra incognita, archaeologically.

In conclusion, there exists the possibility that the Chondales of 16th-century Nicaragua may have been Lenca speakers or groups affiliated culturally with Lenca speakers. The archival record as it presently exists gives enough tantalizing hints to suggest the presence of Lenca speakers in early, colonial Nicaragua as an alternative explanation as to the identity of the Chondales. And, as with the suggestion of the possibility of the presence of the Putun-Mayá in Nicaragua, the true identity of the Chondales will be established only by archaeology, absent the location of other, presently unknown, colonial documents.

MARIBIOS. This was undoubtedly a large ethnic group. Populations of "Maribios" extended from Abangasca, located 5 km west of present day Leon to at least Chichigalpa, and including the encomienda of Telica (# 62, 100 tribal Indians, owned by the children of Luis de Guevara). The report of Fray Bobadilla, who traveled through the country of the Maribios and Tezucatae in late 1528 and early 1529 may give some indications of the relative sizes of population between the Maribios Indians and the Nahua. Among the Maribios Bobadilla reported that he baptized 6,346 souls; in the province of Tezucatae, where Oviedo wrote that the plaza alone of Tezucatae contained 20,000 souls, Bobadilla baptized 2,169 Indians. While admittedly the baptizing of souls may not reach the level of completeness as a census, and some villages may not have been counted, Bobadilla was clearly ordered by Pedrarias to get his "soul" count as high as possible to buttress Pedrarias' arguments about the fineness of earlier reports and the effectiveness of his administration in converting Indians to Catholicism. The gross figures, while being underinclusive, may give some idea, in gross numbers of the relative size of populations in the provinces of the Maribios and the Maribios. Two other later bits of information seem to support the hypothesis of a sizeable groups of Maribios in relation to Nahua speakers. First, in the Tasación of 1548, the villages of identified Maribios speakers include Mazatega (# 47, 44 tribal Indians owned by Pedro Orejon (30 population); Chichigalpa (# 48, 80 tribal Indians, owned by Ana Ximenez (an unverified, 330 population); Pozolotea, (# 23, 70 tribal Indians, owned by the children of Martin Miembro (290 population); # 64, (18 tribal Indians, owned by the children of Luis de Guevara, 75 population); # 190, (60 tribal Indians, owned by the Crown, 260 population); total population of Indians of Pozolotea: 935; Mauagualpa (not listed in the tasacion of 1548, but called by Cidbado Real Pozoludgetza; it may be listed in one of the encomiendas of Pozolotea); Cindegas # 9, (20 tribal Indians, owned by Ysabael Velas, 82 population); # 12, (100 Indians, owned by Ysco de Santiago, 410 population); # 22, (64 tribal Indians, owned by Diego de Caceres, population of 250 Indians); # 56, (45 tribal Indians, owned by Diego Sanchez, 190 population); # 73, (80 tribal Indians, owned by Francisco Nunez, population of 330 Indians); # 84, (80 tribal Indians, owned by Alonso de Torrejon, population of 330 Indians); total Indian population of 1,592; Telica, # 63, 100 tribal Indians owned by the children of Luis de Guevara, 410 Indian population; Abangasca, # 193, 40 Indians, owned by the Crown, 165 Indian population; Pangua, # 53, 30 tribal Indians, owned by Diego Sanchez, 125 Indian population; Utega, # 12, 25 tribal Indians, owned by Felipe Mercado, 103 Indian population; # 33, 22 tribal Indians, owned by Alvaro de Zamora, 90 Indian population; Ygualtetega, # 16, 22 tribal Indians, owned by Alonso Mendes, 90 Indian population; Astatage, # 54, 60 tribal Indians, owned by Diego Sanchez, 250 Indian population. The total population of Maribios speaking villages in 1548 was 4530 Indians. The total population of Indians identified with Tezucatae are found in only two encomiendas, # 49 (identified as Tezotaca), 10 tribal Indians, owned by Ana Ximenez, 41 Indian population; and # 191 (identified as Tezatega), 70 tribal Indians, owned by the Crown, 290 Indian population. That totaled an Indian population, identified as Tezucatae, of about 350 Indians. The inhabitants of the other, identified Nahua speaking villages of northern Nicaragua, Ayatega # 62, 30 tribal Indians owned by Peralveraz of Oviedo, 125 Indian population; # 76, 16 tribal Indians, owned by Joan de Salamanca, 66 Indian population; and # 189, 30 tribal Indians, owned by the Crown, 125 Indian population; totaling 316 total population of Ayatega; and Chinandega, # 43, 160 tribal Indians, owned by the children of Martin Miembro, 660 Indian population; total Nahua speaking population of 1,326 Indians. Based on these figures the Maribios speakers outnumbered the Nahua speakers from Tezucatae by about four times, 4350 Indians versus 1326 Indians. If one assumes that disease and the gentle ministrations of the Spaniards were equally hard on the Maribios speaking and Nahua speaking Indians, a completely different picture emerges regarding the ethnic makeup of northwest Nicaragua at the time of the conquest, one dominated by Maribios Indians, not Nahua speakers.

The other fact suggested by these figures and the data of Cidbado Real is that the Maribios by 1586 had maintained a degree of geographical coherency quite in line with the identifiable data on the formation and the expansion of the colony of Nicaragua and extending to the residents of 1548. By 1548 the Nahua speakers were on a severe demographic decline. By 1586 one of their main villages, Ayatega, had dwindled severely, and Tezucatae was a mere ghost of what it was in Oviedo's time. Finally, by 1586 the inhabitants of El Viejo-Tezucatae, could not quite remember why El Viejo was called El Viejo. They gave Cidbado Real two different theories, one of which was pure make believe, and the other mirrored the information given by Oviedo, i.e. that El Viejo was named after the cacique in control of Tezucatae in 1528, Agatelye, who was very old. The fact that the townspeople were not sure in 1586 may indicate that the people living there in 1586 were not the descendants of people who had been living in Tezucatae in 1528, but new groups, possibly emigrants from farther north.

Ethnographic information about the Maribios is almost non-existent. Incer (1985:13) equates the Maribios with the Sutiabas and notes that they are linguistically related to Hokano, which was a language that originated in the United States. This is at odds with Cidbado Real who noted that the Indians of Sutiaba spoke Mangue, or Chortega (Cronistas 3: 151-152). Squier ignored all mention of the Maribios in his explanation of Nicaraguan languages (Squier 1989: 453-472) even while he was completing a detailed vocabulary list and grammar of Maribio, which he called, Nagrando. And there has been less speculation about the Maribios than other languages spoken in western Nicaragua at the time of the conquest. Incer (1985) did not mention any place names identified with the Maribios language. Bishop and Protector Alvarez Osorio also failed to identify Maribios as a distinct linguistic stock of western Nicaragua (3 CS 106-107) and identified Chondal, Chortega, and Nahua as the three dominant languages of western Nicaragua. Oviedo mentioned the Maribios Indians six times, all very fragmentary notations. Oviedo noted that the Maribios were located by where three volcanoes were smoking (acord Cidbado Real), possibly the volcanoes of San Christobal, Telica, and El Hoyo, all three of which smoked today. The most famous mention of the Maribios is Oviedo's report of how they were killed and ate their elderly citizens, skinned them, and then wore the skins inside out to scare the Spaniards. He located the site of the clash between the Maribios Indians and the Spaniards as five leagues from Leon Viejo, probably at Abangasca, located just west of present day Leon. This agrees with all other evidence of the easternmost extension of the Maribios. The other mention of the Maribios is found in Oviedo's description of the Indians of Maribichica, a gold
mining town that he located 30 leguas (probably north) of Leon Viejo. He noted that the people of Maribichicoa had migrated to the new location to find more food and that they still had relatives in the Maribios territory and old people still had recollection of the migration (Cronistas 3: 456). No other data is known to the author regarding the ethnohistorical characteristics of the Maribios Indians. The Coleccion Somocoa contains no specific data, but mentions the Maribios as both an area inhabited by the Maribios Indians, and uses the term "Dessollados" interchangeably with Maribios (accord Oviedo). From some of the deeds of encomienda Maribio was clearly a separate language or dialect. A review of the names of Maribios principales that were present at the granting of encomiendas discloses that most of the names are taken from the calendrical names of the Nahua 20 day calendar, perhaps suggesting mesoamerican ties.

Lehmann compiled probably the most comprehensive linguistic information regarding the Maribios. Squier unwittingly collected much of that information (Lehmann 1920: 924-928) when he collected data from the inhabitants of Subtiaba. Later, Brinton (Lehmann 1920: 931) and Lehmann himself (Lehmann 1920:932-969) recreated the language and its grammar. Lastly, Lehmann established the linguistic relation of Maribio to the north American Indian languages of Tlapazca-Yopi (Lehmann 1920: 969-978).

GUAZAMA. This was a distinct ethnic and linguistic group. There are several references to the "Guazamas" or place of the Guazama in the Coleccion Somocoa. Oviedo made four references to the Guazamas. He noted that he was in the plaza of the Guazamas on February 9, 1529, when he heard a tale of witchcraft and cannibalism (Cronistas 3: 39, 457. The second reference is obviously a restatement of the first reference, with a bit more gossip thrown in.).184 Oviedo noted that the Indians of Tezuateca and Guazama planted the Tembleque tree for shade by their houses.

Bishop Osorio wrote to the Crown in 1529 that Guazama was spoken in one of the galpones of Mistega and that it was a different language than that spoke in Mistega (2 CS 93, letter of August 26, 1529). That galpon was Otalgalapanega, with the principal named Tezototol (2 CS 91, August 26, 1529). Later notes establish that the plaza of Guazama, mentioned repeatedly in the Coleccion Somocoa was also called Cotagalapanega of the plaza of Mistega (9 CS at 413). Mistega was one of the largest sites of Indian population noted by Oviedo in 1529 and it was located three leagues (15 km), more or less, from Realejo (2 CS at 262). Nothing is known of the ethnicity of the Guazamas.

TACACHO. A village of Tacacho speakers, Yacocoyagus, was encountered by Fray Ponce on May 27, 1586. That village was located one-half league west of Sutiaba (Cibdad Real, Cronistas 1: 151). That location is very close to or coincident with the village of Abangasca, mentioned repeatedly throughout the Coleccion Somocoa as a Maribios village and the site of many happenings, including the nearly fatal attack on sheriff Luis de Guevara in 1535 or 1536 and the probable site of the largest hostile engagement between the Spaniards of Francisco Hernandez and the Maribios in 1524. By 1548 it only had 40 tributary Indians and perhaps 170 inhabitants, clearly in demographic decline. The possibility exists, then, that Tacacho was the language of another group of Indians that emigrated to the area at some unknown time (The village named by Cibdad Real may be found in the Coleccion Somocoa.185 Under a phonetically similar spelling, see the discussion of each encomienda noted below.).

Another source of the names of early languages is found in a letter that Protector Alvarez Osorio wrote to the Crown in 1531. On November 9, 1531, Osorio wrote to the Crown asking for reimbursement for expenses. One of the items he included was reimbursement for the cost of buying slave boys to act as interpreters of the languages that were spoken in Nicaragua (or at least the places that Osorio, not the most aggressive of all Protectors, ventured to go). He paid 80 pesos for Gorgico who spoke Chorotega, 40 pesos for Diaguito who spoke Sendal (in all probability Chondal), and 20 pesos for Perico, who spoke the language of Nicaraguans. (letter, 3 CS 106-107).

HISPANIC INSTITUTIONS: THE ENCOMIENDA IN NICARAGUA

Most works that discuss encomienda do so in the general sense, and not in the specific sense. To understand how encomienda worked in Nicaragua to 1550, the documents of encomienda must be examined, as well as how they were utilized by the Spaniards. The vision of encomienda under Hispanic law was that it was not a property right per se, but was a set of duties and privileges that the encomendero and the Indian, established by commonly held legal principles. The encomienda was awarded as a means to compensate soldiers and knights who were expected to conquer new lands for the Crown with as little financial burden on the Crown as possible. The Knight received income for a temporary period of time and the Indians received Christian training, thus guaranteeing the entry of their souls to heaven.

The practice in Nicaragua, however, documented the development of something very much akin to a property right in the work and personal property of others, similar to a profla a prendre, defined by geographic location, and granted and transferred by documents that very much resembled deeds of real property. Further, the ceremony for granting possessions of the encomienda almost exactly duplicated the English tradition of the livery of seisin. Deeds of encomienda granted both the right to receive tribute in the form of goods as well as the right to exact labor from Indians of the encomienda.186 The issuance of deeds of encomienda was envisioned by the Crown as a temporary means to encourage others to do the conquering of lands for the Crown at no Crown expense; just as surely the encomienda was envisioned by the encomenderos as a chaste property right that could be passed on by conveyance and inheritance. The institution grew by itself without any firm guidelines as to who was eligible for encomiendas, how they were to be involuntarily transferred from one encomendero to another, and exactly what were the rules of inheritance regarding the encomiendas. Failure by the Crown to timely set up a legal procedure to resolve these issues helped to create legal chaos and untold lawsuits throughout the empire. The presumption that existed but did not show up in either lawsuits or royal edicts until 1540 was that encomiendas should be only given to those knights who had spent a lot of money on the conquest and put both their life and property on the line for the Crown. That appears to be exactly how encomiendas were administered at the beginning of the Spanish presence in Nicaragua. The scanty evidence that exists shows that Francisco Hernandez issued several encomiendas during his time as conqueror of Nicaragua. When Pedarias came to Nicaragua in 1526 he removed at least some of those encomiendas and gave them to persons who supported him. When Lopez de Salcedo came to Nicaragua in 1527 he took back some of the encomiendas of Pedрасria and issued new deeds of encomienda. Upon Pedrias' return to Nicaragua in 1528 he took back the deeds of encomienda that had been issued by Lopez de Salcedo and reissued them to his supporters (See
for example, the diligencias of Francisco de Castañeda regarding his encomienda at Mistaega and a history of its title, 2 CS 102, September 6, 1529; deeds of encomienda issued by Pedrarías mentioned at 5 CS 367 et seq, February 5, 1536; mention of the deeds of encomienda of Pedrarías, 3 CS 134, January 31, 1532, mentioned in their entirety in the encomienda transferring title from Isabel de Bobadilla (decedent), widow of Pedrarías to her daughter María de Pefalosa, wife of Governor Rodrigo de Conteras, 14 CS 170, December 17, 1540.

Encomiendas were the most tangible measure of wealth in early Nicaragua since mining was not very profitable, and slaving obviously produced diminishing returns; thus control of the encomiendas is as good a measure as any for determining the economic and political elites in Nicaragua. From the fragmentary information noted above, it is clear that Pedrarías had four villages in encomienda and that they were probably the largest villages, and richest encomiendas in Nicaragua. Those villages were Tezuneteg, Nicyoa, Chira, and possibly Chinandega at an unnamed location at the mines in Nueva Segovia. Lopez de Salcedo took at least the village of Nicyoa for himself, and was described as having 4,000 tributary Indians (though whether this is just Nicyoa or includes other villages cannot be ascertained). Pedrarías returned, stole back his encomiendas, and died. His successor, Francisco de Castañeda owned the encomienda of Mistaega; what other encomiendas he owned is not known. The pattern of the early governors was to own the richest encomiendas, but not to try to own great numbers of encomiendas.

The administration of Rodrigo de Conteras substantially changed how encomiendas were assigned: he simply dreamed up a legal pretext and took what encomienda he wanted. This of course created animosity among the dispossessed encomenderos, a group that became sizeable, extremely vocal, and litigious. The administration of Pedrarías did not produce a single complaint about his administration of the assignment of encomiendas. The administration of Castañeda, while it produced complaints, did not produce one complaint about the assigning or removing of encomiendas. The administration of Conteras produced a series of letters complaining of the abuses of Conteras regarding encomiendas, 8th and major lawsuits for the restitution of encomienda: BARTOLOME TELLO v. RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS, 8 CS 382 (FEBRUARY 11, 1544); RODRIGO ALONSO, GUARDIAN OF MINOR JUAN VEGA v. JUAN DE ROYOS, 11 CS 77, (JUNE 21, 1544); JUAN GALLEGOS, GUARDIAN OF THE WIDOW AND CHILDREN OF JUAN SANCHEZ v. JUAN CARBALLO, 13 CS 304 (OCTOBER 27, 1543).

The thread running through these cases is that Conteras had removed the encomiendas from their rightful owners without a hearing or any due process. In each one of these cases Conteras or his grantees lost on appeal. In the efforts of Conteras’ wife to regain the Conteras family encomiendas, MARIA DE PEÑALOSA ET AL v. THE CROWN, 14 CS 124, (AUGUST 22, 1548) and its companion case, RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS v. THE CROWN, 15 CS 96 (SEPTEMBER 20, 1549) the legal basis for denying the request of Pefalosa was that Rodrigo de Conteras had committed fraud in backdating deeds of encomienda to avoid the New Laws and had stolen encomiendas from other encomenderos.

Between 1514 and 1550 the Crown issued several royal edicts to establish a regular procedure for administering encomiendas that: (a) established the legal basis for granting encomienda; (b) prohibited the taking of encomienda without a hearing; (c) limited the eligibility for receiving encomienda to those who had helped in the conquest, needed the support, and had their Spanish wife living with them in the colonies; (d) limited the length of time that an encomienda could be owned; and (e) defined inheritance rights of encomiendas.

After Alonso de Cerrato was appointed President of the Audiencia de los Confines, he did undertake to make the law more uniform and to cover specific situations that were not covered by the general nature of the Royal edicts. The issue of who could inherit encomiendas after the death of the encomendero became a knotty problem, especially if the various possibilities of the form of the family of the decedent were considered. To settle some of these matters Cerrato wrote to the Crown on May 21, 1549 (15 CS 63); the Crown’s reply is found at 17 CS 227 (October 2, 1550). That letter and response are noted below in Appendix Four, below, as one document, as they pretty much resolve any question about the issue of inheritance of encomienda.

The Crown had stated the laws regarding both testate and intestate succession in its Royal edict of May 26, 1536, found at 6 CS 64. The repeated violations of this law by governors, particularly Rodrigo de Conteras, caused much discussion within the Consejo de las Indias about the advisability of continuing the testate and intestate succession of encomiendas in light of the vicious, illegal, and irresponsible activities of much of the administrative bureaucracy in the New World. The New Laws of 1542, 7 CS 333, and particularly section 26, sought to resolve the problems of faulty administration, the dangerous creation of a self-sufficient, ambitious, and sometimes unreasonable control of the Crown, and the puny remuneration (in comparison with the arisocrats in the New World) that the Crown received from the conquest and the obtaining of a huge new empire. In one stroke the Crown hoped to take the encomiendas from the ruling colonial elites, deprive them of an independent economic base, and place the lucrative encomiendas directly under the Crown so the Crown directly would receive the Indian tribute.

The reaction of the colonial ruling elites was rapid, vicious, and effective: widespread forgeries, blatantly fraudulent conveyances, continued large scale embezzlement of Crown funds, civil war in Peru and smoldering problems in Nicaragua that eventually led to the Conteras rebellion in 1550. The Crown retreated from its position, as it had when it initially prohibited slavery of Indians, revoked section 26 of the New Laws, and gave the right to determine succession and the granting of encomiendas back to the audiencias.

This administrative flip-flopping caused administrative chaos among the Audiencias since it was not clear who owned what and the Crown did not immediately give any guidelines to replace either the earlier edicts of 1536 or the revoked section 26 of the New Laws of 1542. In order to remedy this problem President Cerrato wrote the Crown, posed the most likely possibilities of succession to the Crown, and asked for the Crown to decree some laws to tell the Audiencias how to handle the succession of encomiendas. The Crown response finally resolved most questions regarding inheritance rights of encomenderos’ children, including female children that had come of age. 8

Regarding the treatment of Indians, little is found in the Coleccion Sonoma that realistically portrayed how the Crown officials protected the Indian villages against cruel or greedy encomenderos. The most glaring case is that of THE CROWN v. MATEO LEZCANO, 9 CS 481 (1540), where Conteras convicted one of his friends of cruelty to the Indians of Cindega and sent him to prison. Lezcano died in jail and Conteras took his encomienda for himself. Several cases were referred as proof of Conteras’ fidelity to the laws of encomienda during his residency, IN RE RESIDENCIA OF CONTRERAS, 9 CS 1, (JUNE 24, 1544). Judge Herrera was not impressed and largely ignored those cases in the sentence he issued against Herrera on July 18, 1544, 9 CS 548. Treatment of the Indians under encomienda was not a subject that got much airing by any Spaniard in early Nicaragua.
A review of the available, contemporary data reveals that the various Indian groups of western Nicaragua from time to time formed multi-ethnic pueblos. Furthermore, all sources indicate that the main ethnic groups included the Chorotegas, Nahua, Maribios, and Chontal Indians. Of these four main groups information is simply incomplete to be able to define with certainty which language the Chontal Indians spoke. Two suggestions are made that they spoke either a dialect of Putum Maya or Lenca. Hispanic institutions defined the relationship between the Indian groups and Spaniards. Moreover, a developing and complex Hispanic legal system defined the property rights of who should be awarded encomiendas, how they should be inherited, and under what circumstances they should be removed from their owner.

1 In this work the following system of citation for codes and lawsuits in the Colección Somosa is used: 12 CS 453 means the document cited is found in volume 12 of the Colección Somosa at page 453.

2 The sources used to locate these and other villages found in the Colección Somosa and related documents are found below.

24 A natural reaction is to compare the galpon with the Aztec institution of calpulli. What is known about the calpulli was recorded by Alonso de Zóritza in his The Brief And Summery Relation Of The Lords Of New Spain, first written on or before 1570, and reprinted various times, including 1994 (University of Oklahoma Press). Clearly Zóritza described a clan, a unit of commoners to pay taxes, a unit for the organization of land use, and a barrio in common parlance. The word calpulli is not found in the Coleccion Somosa, nor is it found in any document contemporary with the contact period known to the author. The galpon, at least as it is used in the deeds of encomienda in the Coleccion Somosa, is analogous to a unit for pueblo organization, probably land use outside of the pueblos, and for tribute collection. The word "calpulli" does exist at about two dozen locations (and probably more not known to the author) throughout Nicaragua. The term means precolombian stone mound, and without fail, if one travels to a place called "el calpulli" a stone mound or mounds will be found. How this came about the author will leave for others to speculate about.

24 At the onset a clarification of the spelling used in place names and Indian names should be noted. All the contemporary documents of the 16th century are written in a Spanish that was emerging from its mother language, Romance. Commonly used in spelling by Oviedo (who in relation with his contemporaries was not the most literate of Spaniards in Spanish) is a dozen of other documents is the cedilla. "c". Sometimes the cedilla is "modernized" to a straight "x", sometimes to an "i", which is closest to its phonetic sound, and the "a", which confuses things even further. The confusion over Tezutaga (the form used in this chapter), which has over a dozen different spellings, and the town of Zoatega, where Gil Gonzalez was attacked heading south and Francisco Hernandez divided up the booty in May of 1524, which also has several spellings was caused largely by this problem. Vega Bolatlos recognized the problem with the cedilla and consistently listed place names in his index with both the cedilla and a.

24 For the purposes of this chapter the conversion factor of 4.1 inhabitants for every Indian who owed tribute has been used to arrive at population figures for Indian pueblos. See Newson 1987: 90-110.

24 The island of Petrosilla was the largest island in the Gulf of Fonseca and was named by Gil Gonzalez (Cronistas 3:188). Several of the islands in the Gulf of Fonseca had enough Indian populations for Spaniards to be granted encomiendas. Those encomiendas are discussed below.

24 This is undoubtedly one of the encomiendas that Contreras backdated when he found out about the New Laws but before there were publically enacted in Leon in September, 1543 by pregonero. The encomiendas had been used by Mendavia's brother Pedro de Mendavia for 16 months after Bishop Mendavia died in October of 1540. When Contreras and Pedro de Mendavia began fighting in December 1541 one of the first acts was to strip from Mendavia the income of these encomiendas. These same villages are named in the supposed forged judgment and cedula that Mendavia brought back from Panama in November of 1542. See generally Werner: 1996b on the church-state conflict in early Nicaragua where these matters are discussed in detail.
Which caused one archaeologist to comment once that if this were so, archaeology was a waste of time.

Of all the modern Nicaraguan writers, only Incer (1985) has recognized that Torquemada should not be taken at face value. He is also the only writer that appears to have done an exhaustive study of linguistic sources, both inside and out side of Nicaragua before he began writing. His work to identify place names with actual places in Nicaragua is the first modern attempt to empirically reconstruct Indian names and languages of early Nicaragua and has proved quite useful in locating some of the locations mentioned in the Coleccion Somosa.

Oviedo lists other languages such as Burica, the language of París, the language of Veragua, Oro, and Costa, and others he does not name because he said they were found later on in his works. Whether or not these were the names of caciques or separate language will probably never be known as Oviedo and other of his contemporaries used language names, place names, and cacique names almost interchangeably. Unless other documents can be found to shed some light on these other languages one guess as about as good as another.

The possibility exists that the term Chorotega Matalaca did in some way describe an ethnic group in the area. Interestingly, the term "Pipil" is not found in the Coleccion Somosa. It is found in one instance in the Tassadics of 1581 in a reference to a village named Cindega-Pipil, possibly a remnant of the large Maribios village of Cindega. It contained 11 Indians in total.

This appears to be the case to the present day. It is reported that while there has been recent research in the Chibcha languages of Costa Rica and Panama, there has been little or no recent research in the Chorotegan languages of Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Honduras (personal communication, Terry Kaufman, March, 1996). Lehmann's Zentralamerikas (1920) is still the best source of current information regarding the Chorotegas-Oto-Mangue languages.

See references and map below.

These villages are named with specificity in the description of individual villages found below.

Any such hypothesis equating Managua Polychromes with the Nahua would of necessity exclude Managua polychromes from Chorotega speaking area and only predict its existence in those areas of known Nahua settlements, i.e. Tezautega, Chinandega, and Atolgalpa. To the author's knowledge Managua Polychromes have been found in Managua, which Oviedo identified as a Chorotega speaking population in 1528 and Leon-Viejo-Nagarando, which had no specific reference to its ethnicity. A separate suggestion about the cultural origin of Managua polychrome pottery may entail its development as a post-conquest type of pottery, rather than being diagnostic of any particular precolombian ethnic group.

There is one encomienda, #109 Zapulco, that is phonetically similar to Torquemada's village. In 1548 it had 26 tributory Indians, which would put its population in 1548 at about 105 persons. It had to produce, along with the customary goods and services, salt and cacao, in limited quantities. There are no other references to Zapulco and the author has no idea where this small village was located except that it was probably in the jurisdiction of Granada, i.e. southern Nicaragua.

This account, in turn, is corroborated by several references in the Coleccion Somosa by both Francisco de Castañeda and Andres de Cereceda. See Werner (1966) where those references are noted in detail.

Thus, a reference to the "Chontales" in the first half of the 17th century may have referred to a specific language and ethnic group. A reference to "Chontales or Chontales" in the 17th century may refer to a group that could not speak corrupt Mexican but may have been a completely different ethnic group than the Chontales of the Nueva Segovia, and more southern regions of Nicaragua of the first half of the 17th century.

He lists 489 place names as being "Matagalpa," Incer 1985: 276-348).

Lehmann also noted that some old ruins, named Opico, located on the Isla de Zanate in the gulf of Fonseca, may be Putumayan ruins (Lehmann 1920: 913)

Solte Guanexicos gleich mexik. qua-xini-co sein? Das könnte dann eine Schät-(Stämm)-abspaltung andeutet (mex. qua 'Stäm' xini 'deshacer'), was eine besondere Sitte war, welche die Maya vor den Mexikanern auszeichnete...Die Nicarao hätten dann Grusoe gehabt, die entwurden Maya (Poten) nach dieser auffälligen Sitte zu bitten.

See, for example, the table in Lehmann 1920: 913 where he identified the Chondal with the Sumo-Miskito and Guastuso-Rama and the Guanexicos with the Putumayan.

The information found in the taxacion regarding the Chontales is found in two places; the first being pp 172-174, that contains mention of each village, the geography, flora fauna, and location of the Chontales villages; the second source includes a summary of the census information of each encomienda and village, p. 180. The pagination of the unpublished census is added by the author to ease referencing of materials. An "E" number for each of the 118 encomiendas found in the census also was added to ease referencing of each encomienda. That disclosed that most of the encomiendas found in the census are listed in both the general summary section, pp. 174-186, and in the more detailed counting of every individual in each separate encomienda. A few encomiendas are only found in the summary section, while others are only found in the detailed counting of each encomienda. It is highly probable that the Taxacion of 1581 is not a complete document, as many sizeable encomiendas are missing. It is also obvious that it was a rather slipshod affair, with seven different "teams" of census takers generating seven different types of information. The contrast with the uniformly well administered Tasacion of 1548, administered by Alonso de Cerrato, is obvious.
The account of Cibdéd Real's journey used for this paper is found at Cronista 1: 143-169. From Cibdéd Real's description it is obvious that Condéga was located close to or at the present site of Guasauí; Somoto was located exactly one league, or 4.5 km away. That is precisely the location of today's Somoto. Since it is obvious that Cibdéd Real was on foot his highly unlikely that he could have walked in one day from a river by present day Somoto to Condéga, and arrived at the end of that day at a place not far from present day El Viejo, a distance in excess of 150 km. Cibdéd Real's descriptions of large rivers and swamps is also at odds with the geography around Somoto, which is mountainous and desert-like. In the Somoto area the Río Coco, the longest and largest river in Central America can be jumped across by a reasonably athletic midget. Regarding the matter of the distance found in a league in 1586, it is obvious that Cibdéd Real defined a league as 5000 varas or paces, equalling 4179.5 meters (Barnes, Naylor, and Polier: 70).

"y los caçiques y señores que alcanzan estos árboles (cacao) en sus heredamientos, tienendos por muy rico calachumi o principios, porque al principal señor llaman calachumi en lengu de Nicaragué, que es tanto como deste rey, y también se llamas reyje, que es lo mismo que calachumi o rey." (Cronista 3: 66)


There is one very small exception found in the tasacion of 1581, Eq. 90, p. 181, discussed below.

The tasacion of 1548, sometimes called the Cerrato tasacion (Fowler 1989), is found in its entirety at 14 CS 357. The tasacion lists 198 encomiendas, which are consecutively numbered, along with the owner of the encomienda, the number of tributary Indians, and tribute assessed. Those encomiendas "identification numbers" are reproduced in the text above.

Two different patterns of tribute assessment are found in the tasacion of 1548: one that was applied quite similarly to the Maribios, Chorotegas, Chontales, and Nahua and defined tribute payment with corn, beans, cotton, the production of cotton fabric, salt, honey, and way, all based upon a set formula per tributary Indian. The other was applied to Indian villages that were possibly of a different ethnic identity since the pattern of tribute assessed was completely different in both products assessed and the amounts assessed per tributary Indian. Generally the products did not include the same pattern of food stuffs and cotton cloth, and the tribute assessed was much less per tributary Indian. The author points out the total number of inhabitants based upon the number of tributary Indians was calculated by multiplying the number of tributary Indians by 300 (Newson 1987: 235-240). Later investigations of the tasacion of 1581 confirm this factor as a realistic number.

For a detailed discussion of Conterras' mishandling of early Nicaragua, see Werner: 1996b.

Obviously the names Pinaguina and Linaguina would lead one, absent other information, to identify those villages as being Matagalpa or "Chontal". Such a conclusion just as obviously would be incorrect since the census takers identified at least one, or both of the villages as speaking "naguins", or Nahua. This points out that it is of uncertain utility to identify a village or area as being inhabited by a certain ethnic group based solely upon an etymological identification of the place name absent other corroborating information.

That encomienda, numbered 100, is found at page 65 of the microfilmed manuscript of the tasacion of 1581, mentioned above.

For an explanation of the work in Chontales, see Espinoza Perez and Rigat (1994); for an explanation of the work in the north country, see Espinoza Perez, Gonzáles Rivas and Rigat (1994); and Fletcher, Salgado Galán, and Espinoza Perez (1994). See also Werner (1996: 86-88), and Espinoza Perez, Fletcher, and Salgado Galeano (1996). Edgar Espinoza Perez, as a member of the Nicaraguan Department of Archaeology, had the opportunity to take part in the extensive field work that was carried out in both Chontales province and the northern provinces of Estelí and Madriz in the late 1980's and early 1990's. His judgement is that the ceramic sequences of Chontales and the north country are mutually exclusive (personal communication, May, 1995). He noted: "Es interesante mencionar que los reconocimientos arqueológicos efectuados en Estelí y Madriz, norte de Nicaragua, una zona supuestamente también matagulana (Fletcher y Salgado, 1991), el material cerámico es completamente diferente a al encontrado en Chontales, lo cual indica que se debe buscar otra explicación a estos cambios." Espinoza Perez and Rigat (1994:150).

See, for example, PE 1.5 below in Chapter Three, a series of early encomiendas, dated 1526 to 1532, granted on various of the islands found in the golf of Fonseca.

The census and narrative information about the Chondal Indians found in the Tasacion of 1581 is found in Appendix One, below.

In several instances women are mentioned as owning encomiendas in their own name, even while they were probably married, which was not a typical arrangement for holding interests in real property in Spain. Ana Ximénez had been in Leon from at least 1529. She was mentioned as a possible romantic interest of the Crown treasurer of Nicaragua, Diego de la Tobilla, who also liked young Indian girls and died in 1530. See, for example, 2 CS 245.

The listing of encomiendas owned by the children of Martín Mimbreno, who was the scribe of Rodrigo de Conterras and probably created several arful forgeries, as well as the children of Luis de Quevara, who was Conterras chief sheriff and bully boy, were almost certainly the back dated, forged creations of Mimbreno to get around the strict provisions of the New Laws of 1542 which forbade any Crown official from owning encomiendas. See for example the letter, (and probably brief on appeal) of Judge Diego de Herrera, 11 CS 285 et seq.

The work of the Audience de los Confines, under the new control of Alonso de Cerrato, clearly was less than rigorous in placing fraudulently conveyed encomiendas into the name of the Crown. The fraudulently conveyed encomiendas, such as those to the children of Luis de Quevara and Martín Mimbreno, who were bastard mestizo children of an age ready for kindergarten, were undoubtedly known by everyone. Cerrato's reification of these obvious frauds may have been what caused Bishop Valdivieso to write an acerbic letter to Cerrato, calling into question his morals and legal abilities. Unfortunately that letter has not been found; Cerrato's equally acerbic and sarcastic letter is found at 15 CS 489, January 22, 1550.

1 The location and population of Cindega is an educated guess. Perez-Valle located Cindega as another name for Chinandega, which is clearly in error. Cibdéd Real noted four different villages, all named Chinadea, when walking towards Sutiapa from Pococelga and Pococelguila on May 27, 1586, one league from Pococelga (Cronista 3: 150-151). He identified these villages as speaking Maripio. As will be seen below, one of the largest villages, as measured by size and number of encomiendas was Cindega. The assumption of the author is that either the village was extinguished by Spanish slave trade between 1548 and 1586, or the Cindega of 1548 was the four Chinadeas of Cibdéd Real in 1586.
Vasco de Santiago was the widow of Mateo de Lezcano. She had come to Nicaragua as a servant for María de Peláez, wife of Governor Rodrigo de Contreras. She met her husband, Mateo de Lezcano, in the household of Contreras, who employed Lezcano, and married him. Later Lezcano was convicted of cruelty to the Indians (THE CROWN v. MATEO LEZCANO, 9 CS 481, 1540). Contreras took away the encomiendas of Lezcano. Vasco may have gotten some of the encomiendas back during the trials of Judge Pineda between August 1543 and February of 1544.

Diego Sanchez was a scribe during the administration of acting Governor Francisco de Castañeda. He fought with Castañeda, and later fought with Contreras, who stripped him of his encomiendas and appointment of Crown scribe. Sanchez went through lengthy legal battles and got his Crown appointment as Scribe back, as well as at least some of his encomiendas.

As is figure is probably incomplete, since other villages, such as Potega and Nolcaque are frequently mentioned in deeds of encomiendas along with Maribios speaking villages.

This number may be underinclusive also. The deeds of encomiendas for Tez Irépe do not appear to list as many ancillary villages as do the deeds of encomiendas for Maribio speaking villages.

As with his other invention of names of linguistic groups in Nicaragua, Squier’s characterization of the Indian language of Subtiaba as “Nagranda” is unfortunate. Nagrado was the original name of either the province or cluster of villages where Leon Viejo was founded in 1524. The predominant Indian language at Nagrado was probably Chorote-Chic-Mangue. How that name jumped 30 km to Subtiaba is unexplained. Perhaps the original place name of Nagrado was carried from its original location by Lake Managua to the present site of Leon when the town was moved in 1610. In any event, calling the Maribio language Nagranas, as Squier does (Squier 1990: 83), served no purpose except to further confuse the understanding of Indian languages of western Nicaragua.

Perez-Valle, the editor of volume three of the Bank of America cultural series, where Oviedo’s data regarding Nicaragua is found, located the plaza of the Guazama as being in or near the plaza of Tez Irépe. (Ovendias 3: 83). He bases this conclusion on Oviedo’s description of Guazama being 1/2 league from the cacique of Pecocoate, which Perez-Valle assumed was Tez Irépe. The encomiendas of Pedrarías to Castañeda, quoted above, suggests that Pecocoate was perhaps Coxcate, galpon (4) of Mistega, which is in accord with virtually all other information regarding the location of the Guazamas, quoted below.

The assumption is that if the “Tacachos” were there some one would have written about them, since Abangac is one of the most mentioned villages and places in the Coleccion Sanchez. One other possibility is that Cibdad Real got his information wrong, was being given false information by Indians with a sense of humor, or there was a transcription error subsequent to Cibdad Real writing his relacion.

An example of the content and working of a deed of encomienda is found in Appendix Two, below.

See, for example the list of villages owned or controlled by Contreras, 11 CS at 152, contained in a letter dated June 24, 1544, 11 CS 146.
Chapter 3
ETHNOHISTORIC INFORMATION ON EARLY, COLONIAL NICARAGUAN INDIAN COMMUNITIES

A considerable body of information exists regarding many Indian villages that pre-date the first comprehensive census of Indians in Pacific Nicaragua in 1548. The importance of this information is that it represents almost the sum total of what is known of Nicaraguan Indians while their populations were still largely intact. In order to organize that ethnographic material found in the Coleccion Somosa, Oviedo, Cibdad Real, and others, and to have any success in locating the many villages mentioned, it is necessary to enter into the arcane world of 16th century units of land measurement. The basic unit of land measurement used by the Spaniards to measure distance, and mentioned by most cronistas and in many lawsuits and related documents, was the league. All of the original Cronistas through Cibdad Real gave distances between Nicaraguan villages and landmarks in leagues. Just how long was a league is therefore germane to locating places mentioned in the documentation with some degree of specificity.

The first mention of leagues is found in the journals of Christopher Columbus. Morrison (1970: 190-191) pointed out that Columbus based his distance in leagues with one league being defined as four Roman miles, or 3.18 nautical miles. Morrison, after analyzing Columbus’ journals also came to the conclusion that Columbus purposefully “judged” his figures of leagues to keep his crew happy. A substantial amount of error was introduced into Columbus’ idea of the circumference of the Earth by his underestimating the number of nautical miles (and leagues) in one degree of longitude by 25% (45 nautical miles to an actual 60 nautical miles).4

Barnes, Naylor, and Polzer (1981) made a much more thorough study of colonial linear measurements (1981: 69-70). They concluded that the league was based upon the vara of Burgos, which varied considerably but was equal to 5000 varas of Burgos, which were 32.909 inches or 0.836 and 0.838 meters in length. The league was then defined as 4,179.5 meters, 4.17 kilometers, or 2.59 miles.

In analyzing the linear distances between villages and places in the Coleccion Somosa, and especially Oviedo, things are not so cut and dried. One great bit of assistance is that many of the villages named are places such as Matiarri, Managua, Nindiri, and Masaya, which are located more or less on their original sites. By comparing the travels of Bobadilla, Cereceda, Oviedo, and Cibdad Real to a modern map of Nicaragua, it is obvious that many of the present roads in Nicaragua follow the same trails described by the early Cronistas. By following Cibdad Real, for instance, it becomes quite obvious where the original Camino Real was located.

Oviedo was not very precise in describing distances and his leagues are as stretchy as a rubber band. Where they can be defined with precision they are between five and six kilometers in length. Most of the references in the Coleccion Somosa are also not very exact, and may be from four to seven kilometers in length. The great clarifier of distances in colonial Nicaragua was Cibdad Real, who must have counted paces to arrive at the precise measurements of distances that are found in his relation. With little ambiguity his league, or “legua”, was about 4.5 kilometers long. That is the unit of length that is utilized in this chapter, as it is undoubtedly the best numerical average of the various leagues found in the early documents.

Lastly, it should be noted that all the villages mentioned in this chapter have been given an index number preceded by “P”, which represents a mention of a village that predates the first comprehensive census of 1548, discussed in detail in the following chapter. Each of the major sources is given a primary number, i.e. P1.0 represents the mention of all the villages noted in Gil Gonzalez’ first entrada into Nicaragua in 1522. P2.0 represents a summary of Oviedo’s work. P3.0 represents the sources found in Bobadilla or villages thought to lie within the districts visited by Bobadilla, and P4.0 represents the mention of additional villages from diverse sources.

SOURCES OF ETHNOGRAPHIC DATA OF EARLY COLONIAL NICARAGUA.

P1.0 GIL GONZALEZ DAVILA, 1522, 1 CS 84, et seq, (1522).

The first entrada into Nicaragua by Spaniards was the entry of Gil Gonzalez in 1522. Gil Gonzalez was accompanied by Andres de Cereceda, unquestionably the most able accountant and accurate record keeper in early Nicaragua. The letter that Gil Gonzalez wrote the Crown telling of his exploits is almost incomprehensible since Gil Gonzalez was at best semi-literate (1 CS 89; March 6, 1524). Cereceda, who was quite literate, made a day by day inventory of the distance traveled in leagues, the number of Indians baptized, the name of Indian villages encountered, and the amount of gold stolen from the Indians. He also apparently also wrote a longer, now lost relation about what he found that was the basis of much of the ethnographic data on the Nicaraguans that was reproduced in Martyr and Herrera and then in every subsequent ethnographic account of the Nicaraguans (Fowler 1989:18; Squier 1989:453).

The account of Cereceda mentioned 37 different locations and noted that the expedition traveled 224 leagues, “converted” 32, 264 Indians, stole 112,525 pesos de buen oro (probably counting 450 maravedis to the peso; the alloy reportedly did not measure up and was less than 18 carats, which was the early standard of purity), and 145 pesos of pearls. Germane to a discussion of Nicaragua is entry 26, Cangen, as it is the first identifiable village of the Nicoya that is found to have survived to 1548 and be subject to an encomienda. It was, in some sense, the southernmost limit of the gobernación of Nicaragua in 1548.

P 1.1 NAME OF VILLAGE: Cangen
LOCATION: Three leagues past the village of the cacique Paro, presumably traveling northwest, around the north shore of the gulf of Nicoya.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: 1,118 Indians baptized and 3,257 pesos of gold taken from the Indians.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Oviedo mentioned the village by the name of Cange (Cronistas 3: 181) and placed the village exactly where Cereceda placed Cangen. Oviedo visited the site in either 1528 or 1529. Francisco de Castañeda, in the first letter to the Crown that he wrote from Nicaragua, 1 CS 478, March 31, 1529, noted that Cangen was a village that was close to Nicoya with about 200 Indians (whether he was referring to the size of the village or the potential number of tributary Indians, a more likely proposition, cannot be ascertained) (1 CS at 494; see also Melendez 1993:99).
STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Canagen survived and was subject to encomienda # 165, owned by Francisco Gutierrez. It contained 75 tributary Indians and an Indian population of about 310 people.

ETHNIC STATUS: No definite information, possibly Chorotega, since Oviedo stated that the Indians of the peninsula of Nicoya spoke Chorotega up to the village of Nicoya.

P1.2 NAME OF VILLAGE: Nicoya
Location: Five leagues inland past Canagen.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: 6,063 Indians baptized and 13,442 pesos taken. A little more gold was taken from a cacique named Mateo.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Oviedo mentioned Nicoya in many passages (Cronistas 3: 10, 11, 71, 73, 74, 86, 90, 126, 144, 149, 151, 167, 181, 182, 183, 186, 306, 434, 438, 440, 452). Most of the ethnographic data is found at page 440, where Oviedo described their manner of tattooing and dress and noted that the villagers spoke Chorotega. He also noted that the women of Nicoya were the prettiest of Nicaragua.

Nicoya was the largest village encountered by Gil Gonzalez south of the village of the cacique Nicaragua. Pedrarias took the village as one of four villages for his private encomienda. Later, Lopez de Salcedo in 1527 also took Nicoya as his private encomienda. He reportedly had 4-5,000 tributary Indians, but it is unclear if that was only Nicoya, or included other, unknown villages. When Pedrarias returned to Nicaragua in April of 1528 he took back the village of Nicoya again as his private encomienda. Francisco de Castañeda noted when he passed by Nicoya that it was the largest pueblo in the region and that it had 2,000 Indians (As in the references to nearby villages it is not clear if he meant tributary Indians or total population. It can be argued that since the Spaniards were interested in tribute a count of possible tributary Indians was of more interest to them than the total number of Indians in the pueblo.).

After Pedrarias died a royal edict issued by Queen Mother Juana La Loca granted his widow, Isabel de Bobadilla, possessory rights in Pedrarias' encomiendas of the cacique of Chira, the cacique of Tezutatega, the cacique of Nicoya, and the cacique of Chinandega 3 CS 134 (January 31, 1532).

Upon the death of Isabel de Bobadilla, her son-in-law, governor of Nicaragua Rodrigo de Contreras, issued a deed of encomienda vesting the villages of Tezutatega, Nicoya and Chira in his wife, Maria de Petalosa, daughter of the decedent Isabel de Bobadilla. In the act of possession, which took place at Leon on April 8, 1541, the following caciques of Nicoya were present: (1) Hipppoyamot; (2) Moto; (3) a female cacique named Nyesica in Christian; and (4) Namayo. 14 CS 170 (December 17, 1540).

STATUS OF VILLAGE IN 1548: The village of Nicoya survived as encomienda # 68 with 400 tributary Indians, and # 69 with 200 tributary Indians owned by the Crown. It was the single largest village in Nicaragua, totaling 600 tributary Indians and with a village population of 2640 Indians. Perhaps the cacique of Nicoya wisely tried to make friends with the Spaniards, as by 1548 there still remained about one third of the tributary Indians that had been in the pueblo of Nicoya in early 1529, probably the highest percentage rate of survival of any village in Nicaragua.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotega, directly identified by Oviedo.

P1.3 NAME OF VILLAGE: Sabandi.
LOCATION: Five leagues further past Nicoya. Oviedo also mentioned Sabandi as lying three leagues (15 kilometers) where the tide flows form the gulf of Nicoya up a river that flows from the end of the gulf (Tempisque River?) (Cronistas 3: 181).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No mention is made of the number of Indians baptized or gold taken.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Sabandi survived encomienda # 179, with 80 tributary Indians, owned by Miguel de la Costa, with a total Indian population of 340 Indians.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotega, based upon Oviedo.

P1.4 NAME OF VILLAGE: Corevisi
LOCATION: Four leagues past Sabandi, presumably northwest.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: Baptized 210 Indians, including the leaders of Sabandi, Maragua and the caciques of Chira; 840 pesos, 3 tomases of gold collected.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Oviedo noted the existence of Corevisi (3 Cronistas: 181) and located the pueblo next to or northeast of Sabandi; "... y a par del (Sabandi) al noroeste, esta otro cacique que se llama Corobici..." Francisco de Castañeda also noted the existence of Corobicci, saying, "...otro cacique que se dize Cagen que temn hasta 200 Indios ay a la vande de Corobicci..." (1 CS 479, 494, March 30, 1528). Castañeda located Corobicci as lying on the mainland directly in front of the island of Chira.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Extinct

ETHNIC STATUS: No direct references, probably Chorotega since Oviedo stated that all the pueblos to Nicoya were Chorotega.

P1.5 NAME OF VILLAGE: the mines of Chira.
LOCATION: Seven leagues past Corobisi, presumably northwest.
INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: A band of Spaniards traveled three hours inland and panned 10 pesos and 4 tostones (tomines?) of gold. Note that no direct contact was recorded by Cereceda of the pueblo of Chira.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Oviedo mentioned the island of Chira at length, (Cronistas 3: 181-182), and noted that the Indians there manufactured very fine blackware pottery, possibly Murillo polychrome. Oviedo also mentioned the island of Chara, which the Spaniards called San Lucar, and noted that they spoke a different language than that of Chira, which presumably was Chorotega. He added that on Chira they understood some Cueva and that their cacique was named Nari. Francisco de Castañeda (1 CS 479, 493-494, March 30, 1529) also mentioned Chira and noted that the cacique of Nicoya always got along well with the Spaniards and provided canoes and cargo carriers for the ships that unloaded much of their cargo on the island of Chira and then was transferred to the mainland by canoes. Livestock were taken off the ships at a place close by the village of Nicoya since the winds north to Realejo were quite dangerous (here he probably mentioned the Papagayo winds that blast through northern Costa Rica and southern Nicaragua from January to May every year.). Castañeda also mentioned that the inhabitants of Chira produced very fine ceramic blackware and cotton cloth. There is no mention, however, of the mines of Chira, which, from the description, were inland and located between Corovisi and the Sapoa river, perhaps in the vicinity of present day La Cruz. Thus, when Oviedo and others mentioned Chira it is not always clear if they meant the island or the mines.

Chira was mentioned as one of the four pueblos owned in encomienda by Pedrarias, which was granted to his widow, Isabel de Bobadilla by Queen Mother Juana La Loca 3 CS 134, January 31, 1532. When Isabel de Bobadilla died Governor Rodrigo deContreras awarded the encomienda of Pedrarias and Isabel de Bobadilla to her daughter and his wife, Maria de Peñalosa (minus the pueblo of Chirandega), 14 CS 170 (December 17, 1540). At the act of possession on April 8, 1541, Maria de Peñalosa took possession of the pueblo of Chira with the assistance of a principal named Catalina in Christian and a male Indian named Noqui.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Chira survived as encomienda # 70 owned by the Crown, with 60 tributary Indians and a total population of about 246 Indians.

ETHNIC STATUS: Probably Chorotega, since Oviedo mentioned a difference in language between the island of Chira and Chara and noted that Chara spoke a “different language”, possibly related to Cueva.

PI.6
NAME OF VILLAGE: Not given. There was apparently a meeting of Gil Gonzalez and the cacique of Corobici somewhere in the countryside.

LOCATION: Eight leagues, probably northwest, past the foray to the mines of Chira.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: 150 Indians were baptized and 133 pesos and 6 tostones were collected from the Indians.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None. Oviedo mentioned the gulf of Papagayo twice, (Cronistas 3: 187, 289). Lothrop and later Fowler (1989: 226) identified Papagayo as a

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: None.

ETHNIC STATUS: Not known.

PI.7
NAME OF VILLAGE: Namiapi

LOCATION: Five leagues further on by the coast.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: Six Indians baptized and 172 pesos of gold collected and 22 pesos of pearls.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Extinct.

ETHNIC STATUS: Possibly Chorotega. It is possible that this village is found in the tacao of 1548 as the encomienda of Tenami, # 170.

PI.8
NAME OF VILLAGE: Orosi.

LOCATION: Five leagues inland.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: 134 Indians baptized and collected 198 pesos, 4 tostones of gold.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Extinct.

ETHNIC STATUS: Probably Chorotega.

PI.9
NAME OF VILLAGE: Papagayo.

LOCATION: 10 leagues farther on.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: baptized 137 Indians and collected 259 pesos of low grade gold.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None. Oviedo mentioned the gulf of Papagayo twice, (Cronistas 3: 187, 289). Lothrop and later Fowler (1989: 226) identified Papagayo as a
"Nicarao polity". This conflicts with Oviedo who stated clearly that the Indians were Chorotega between Nicoya and the village of the cacique Nicaragua, where Papagayo was located.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Extinct.

ETHNIC STATUS: Probably Chorotega.

P1.10
NAME OF VILLAGE: Nicaragua, or the village of the cacique Nicaragua

LOCATION: six leagues further on, three leagues inland, next to the great lake.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: baptized 9,018 Indians and collected 18,506 pesos, mostly low grade.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Cereceda spent several days interviewing the cacique Nicaragua. That interview has been lost, but Peter Martir apparently quoted from it at length. That interview, along with the interviews conducted at the same location by Fray Bobadilla in 1528 mentioned below, and data collected by Motolinia is the bulk of what is known about the Nicaragua Indians. Later, Fowler (1899) very skilfully wove those sources into an ethnography of the Nicaragua Indians. Gil Gonzalez' letter to the Crown (1 CS 89, March 6, 1524) is another ethnographic source, albeit a bit hard to understand because of Gil Gonzalez' best semi-literate prose.

References to the cacique Nicaragua in Gil Gonzalez' letter to the Crown:
1 CS at 94: Gil Gonzalez, upon leaving his port of San Vicente heard of the great cacique Nicaragua and he was advised not to go there.

1 CS at 95: About one league from Nicaragua's village Gil Gonzalez got a message that the cacique was waiting for him. He went to the village where he was kindly received and given shelter and was given 15,000 gold pesos.

1 CS at 96: Gil Gonzalez told Diriangen and his Indians everything that he had told Nicaragua about who they were and what they were doing there.

1 CS at 98: When Nicaragua found out that Gil Gonzalez had a lot of gold he attacked him when he passed back through his village.

1 CS at 99: Nicaragua tried to apologize to Gil Gonzalez telling him that it wasn't his men who had attacked him but Gonzalez did not believe him.

1 CS at 100: The village of Nicaragua is three leagues inland from the coast of the Mar del Sur and next to the houses on the other side is the Mar Dulce.

Castañeda, in his letter to the Crown of March 30, 1529 (1 CS 479), makes no reference to the village of the cacique of Nicaragua.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: The village of the cacique of Nicaragua barely survived in 1548. The encomienda of Nicaragua and Guatapalga, # 149 had 119 tributary Indians and was owned by Francisco Gutierrez; encomienda # 153 of Nicaragua had 100 tributary Indians and was owned by Joao Carvallo; encomienda # 159 had 60 tributary Indians and was owned by Luis de la Rocha; encomienda # 172 of Nicaragua had 10 tributary Indians and was owned by Andres de Sevilla; encomienda # 168 of Nicaragua Anata (Here the assumption is that this was also a village very close to, or a galpon of, the pueblo of the cacique Nicaragua. No direct reference has been found linking Nicaragua Anata with the village of Nicaragua) had 30 tributary Indians and was owned by Geronimo Anpies. This totals 319 tributary Indians and a total population of 1308 Indians.

Three other villages, or galpones should probably be added to this count. The cacique or principal of the village, or galpon, of Xoxoyta was identified by Bobadilla as lying within the village of Nicaragua or very close to it (This village is more completely discussed below). It survived to 1548 as encomienda # 108, with 60 tributary Indians and was owned by Joao Malvavi. The village or galpon of Atolgalpa or Tolgalpa was identified by Castañeda in a sort of primitive title search in 1529 as lying next to or included in the plaza of Nicaragua (2 CS 102, 110, September 6, 1529) Tolgalpa survived to 1548 as encomienda # 99 with 30 tributary Indians and was owned by the Crown. The village of Totoaca was mentioned by Bobadilla as being within the pueblo of Nicaragua (Cronistas 3: 353). Totoaca probably survived in 1548 as the village of Totoaca, encomienda # 192. It was owned by the Crown and had 23 tributary Indians and a total population of about 70 Indians. The inclusion of Xoxoyta, Totoaca, and Tolgalpa increases the size of the "greater" pueblo of the cacique Nicaragua to 432 tributary Indians and a total population of about 1,800 Indians.

The earliest figures of the population of the village of Nicaragua are the number of Indians baptized by Father Agueri who accompanied Gil Gonzalez, 9,018 Indians, which date from the Spring of 1522. Fray Bobadilla in late September and early October of 1528 baptized 29,063 Indians during nine days of baptizing. It is assumed that the villages that produced those 29,063 Indians are the villages and galpones named above and that those baptized Indians included women and children (Cronistas 3:355). That would indicate an Indian survival rate in 1548 of six percent.

ETHNIC STATUS: Nahua.

P1.11
NAME OF VILLAGE: Tolgalpa (Atolgalpa)

LOCATION: Next to or in the plaza of the cacique of Nicaragua.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Juan de Quinones, in a sworn statement on September 6, 1529, noted that Licenciado Diego de Molina had an encomienda of Atolgalpa next to or included within the plaza of Nicaragua.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Tolgalpa survived as encomienda # 99 with 30 tributary Indians and was owned by the Crown. It had a total population of about 124 Indians.
ETHNIC STATUS: Probably Nahua.

**P1.12**
**NAME OF VILLAGE:** Totoaca

LOCATION: Described by Oviedo as lying in the plaza of the village of Nicaragua (Cronistas: 3: 353).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Subject to the caveat noted above, the village survived as Totoaque, encomienda # 192, with 23 tributary Indians and owned by the Crown. It had a total population of about 90 Indians.

ETHNIC STATUS: Nahua

At this point Cereceda changed the format of his reporting of villages and grouped them together. He noted that six leagues further onward, probably meaning northwest, was located the province of Nochari. That would place Nochari very close to the Ochomogo river, as Rivas is located at Km 103 on the south (Panamerican) highway and the bridge over the Ochomogo river is at km 81 on the south highway. He mentioned six caciques of villages, noted below. Cereceda also noted that the caciques of Dirianjen traveled to the province of Nochari to meet with Gil Gonzalez: "...a esta provincia de nochari vinieron los caciques de Dirianjen..." (1 CS 84,88 ). Similarly the totals for gold collected and Indians baptized are grouped together.

FROM THECACIQUES OF NOCHARI: 12,608 Indians baptized and 33,434 pesos of gold collected.

FROM THECACIQUES OF DIRIANJEN: No mention of Indians baptized and 18,818 pesos of gold collected.

VILLAGES OF THE PROVINCE OF NOCHARI

**P1.13**
**NAME OF VILLAGE** (and/or cacique): Ochomogo

LOCATION: Approximately six leagues north of the village of Nicaragua.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: See above.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Oviedo may have mentioned the village of the cacique Ochomogo when he noted that Bobadilla baptized 85 persons from the village of the cacique Oxomario (Cronistas: 3: 355). Ochomogo is also mentioned as one of the gods in the religion of the Nahusas (Cronistas: 3: 312). Lothrop and later Fowler identified Ochomogo and Oxomario, probably a variant of the same village name, as "Nicarao polities" (Fowler 1989:226).

**STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548:** Extinct.

ETHNIC STATUS: Not clear, but possibly Chorotega as all Cronistas mention only Chorotega as the language spoken between Managua and the pueblo of Nicaragua.

**P1.14**
**NAME OF VILLAGE:** Nandapia

LOCATION: There is conflicting evidence: the reference of Cereceda only mentions a location of six leagues northwest of the village of Nicaragua. The later encomienda Manbach-Mandapio would indicate a location closer to the volcano Mombacho.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: See above.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Nandapia probably survived in 1548 as the encomienda # 145, Mandapio Manbach, owned by Bartolome Tello, with 90 tributary Indians and a total population of 370 Indians.

ETHNIC STATUS: Probably Chorotega as all Cronistas mention only Chorotega as the major language spoken between Managua and the pueblo of Nicaragua.

**P1.15**
**NAME OF VILLAGE:** Monbacho

LOCATION: Note conflicts above. In the tasacion of 1548 there are at least two different encomiendas mentioned named Manbach, # 145, mentioned above, and # 120, Nambach and Susujeto, probably meaning different locations around the volcano Mombacho.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: See BARTOLOME TELLO v. RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS, 8 CS 382, (February 11, 1544). This was a suit brought by Tello for the recovery of the encomienda of the village of Mombacho.

**STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548:** It is unclear whether there was one or two villages called Monbacho or Manbach. Encomienda #120, Manbacho and Susujeto, was owned by Francisco Ruiz, had 80 tributary Indians, and about 330 Indians; encomienda # 145, Mandapio Manbach, was owned by Bartolome Tello (he won the lawsuit), had 90 tributary Indians, and about 370 Indians. Whether there were two different villages or one with two different barrios is unknown.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotega.
NAME OF VILLAGE: Nandaime

LOCATION: See above.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information. See above.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Nandaime was a sizeable village. It was first made subject to encomienda between 1524 and 1526 when Francisco Hernandez granted the pueblo of Nandaime to Juan Xuaez (who does not appear as one of the original conquistadores who entered Nicaragua with Francisco Hernandez in 1524 (Melendez 1993: 141-151). That encomienda was reified by Pedrarias. Later the encomienda came into the possession of Juan Sanchez (Xuaez may be a transcription error). Sanchez died leaving minor children and his widow married one Juan Gallegos; acting governor Pedro de los Rios stole part of the encomienda and assigned two-thirds of it to Juan Carvallo, one of his and Contreras’ allies. The estate of Juan Sanchez retained only 60 Indians. A deed of encomienda was issued by Rios in 1543 granting Juan Carvallo 90 Indians of the plaza of Nandaime; one cacique was called in Christian Pedro (he was a mestizo) and in the Indian language Yonboyme.

Rios mentioned Nandaime as lying in the quarter towards La Cavana and towards Nandapio, a pueblo close to Mombacho; it only had 80 tributary Indians and so Rios awarded another 12 tributary Indians from the plaza of the cacique Juan, probably of Nandapio, or one of the other related villages. Possession of the plaza took place on September 5, 1543, with the following Indians present: (1) Anonboyme or Ynanboyme, main cacique; (2) Diomynody; (3) Zindino; (4) Naytonbue; (5) Arotary; (6) Nacatime; (7) Potronario; (8) Zetos; (9) Piron; (10) Urzarayarn.

The case of JUAN GALLEGOS, ex rel v. RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS AND PEDRO DE LOS RIOS, 11 CS 302. (September 25, 1544) gives a complete history of the encomienda of Nandaime. It was also the most litigated case regarding encomienda in the COLECCION SOMOZA. Judge Pineda set aside Rios’ theft and gave the encomienda back to Gallegos and Luisa Sanchez; on his return to Nicaragua Rodrigo de Contreras reversed Pineda and gave it back to Carvallo. During the residency of Contreras Herrera, in an ancillary action, reversed Contreras and returned the encomienda to Gallegos and Sanchez. On appeal to the Audiencia de los Confines, all allies of Contreras, Herrera was reversed and the encomienda was given back to Carvallo. On appeal to the Consejo de las Indias the encomienda was finally returned to Gallegos and Sanchez.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Three and possibly four encomiendas are mentioned as located in Nandaime. Encomienda # 135 contained 100 tributary Indians and was owned by Bernaldino de Miranda. It had a total population of about 410 Indians. Encomienda # 148 was owned by the children of Suarez and contained 51 tributary Indians and a total population of about 200 Indians. Encomienda # 154 was owned by Juan Carvallo (the ownership of Nandaime was still on appeal in 1548) with 80 tributary Indians and a total population of about 320 Indians. That makes a total population of Nandaime in 1548 of 930 Indians and agrees completely with data found in the lawsuit mentioned above. Another encomienda, # 167, Nandyayotra, owned by Geromino Ampies with 27 tributary Indians and a total population of 110 Indians may also pertain to Nandaime and may have been entered as “another Nandaime- NandyayOTRA. That word is not found anywhere else in the COLECCION SOMOZA and is typical of the clerical errors found in the tasacion of 1548.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotega.

NAME OF VILLAGE: Morati

LOCATION: See above.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: See above.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Extinct.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotegan.

NAME OF VILLAGE: Zotega (Zotega, Coatega, Hacotega).

LOCATION: See above.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: See above.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE. The approximate location of Zotega has been the subject of the wildest speculation. Melendez located it either at the Laguna de Apyo or more probably Tezutega (Melendez 1993:55). Arrellano (1990: 78) also placed Zoatega at Tezutega (El Viejo). Cereceda’s account makes it clear that Zotega or Zoatega was located in the vicinity of six leagues north of the village of Nicaragua, which would put it in the vicinity of the Ochomogo river and Nandaime. Gil Gonzalez described Zoatega as the place where he was attacked by warriors of “Dirianjen”. When Francisco Hernandez had completed his first entrada into Nicaragua and stopped to divide up the booty, he did so at Hacotega (probably Zoatega) in May 1, 1524 (Melendez 1993:136), perhaps as an act to establish Spanish control over the place where Gil Gonzalez was lucky to escape with his life. Oviedo mentioned the village when he described the attack of the Indians of Zoatega on Gil Gonzalez. He noted that the Indians shouted, “ teba, teba, teba, xuya”. “Teba” meant good (bueno); and “xuya” meant “go away” (vete). The Indians were also saying " toya, toya", which meant “get walking” (Cronistas 3: 177).

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Extinct.

ETHNIC STATUS: Unclear whether Zoatega was allied with the cacique of Nicaragua and was therefore perhaps Nicaraguan or was Chorotegan. When Gil Gonzalez passed through the village of Nicaragua the cacique Nicaragua assured Gil Gonzalez that it was not his men that had
attacked Gil Gonzalez but those of Zoatega. Gil Gonzalez did not believe him. Lehmann (1920: 1014) identified the language of Zoatega as Nahua.

### P1.19 NAME OF VILLAGE: of (?) DIRIANJEN

It is not certain if Dirianjen was a cacique or village name, though the accounts of Cereceda tend towards Dirianjen being a person. There is no information where Dirianjen came from. Cereceda clearly stated that the cacique (or cacique of) Dirianjen came to the province of Nochari and gave Gil Gonzalez 18, 918 pesos of low grade gold. All other well embellished accounts of "Dirianjen", such as that of Gomara (Melendez 1993:43), are a hopelessly random mix of fact and nonsense. Another possibility is that the village of Dirianjen was Xalteba. Cereceda filed a series of documents to assist in the audit that Pedrarias' men conducted in 1529. In those documents was an affidavit that described Gil Gonzalez' and Cereceda's early movements in the first entrada into Nicaragua. There Cereceda flatly stated that Gil Gonzalez' forces reached the place where Granada was later founded (IN RE CERECEDA, 17 CS 302, 428, October 27, 1550)

### P2.0 OVIEDO.

Gonzalo Fernandez de Oviedo is undoubtedly the best known cronista of early Nicaragua and his Historia General Y Natural De Las Islas Y Tierras Del Mar Oceano (1855) is usually cited as the source of the bulk of information about Nicaragua in the contact period, 1522-1550. Some writers, such as Abel-Vidor have characterized Oviedo's work as quite valuable since,

The HISTORIA provides a rich fund of ethnographic information which no other colonial has matched for that region, particularly in Nicaragua, where Oviedo's two-year experience found him intensely involved in recording the destruction of indigenous cultures and societies by unscrupulous conquistadores. Moreover, it was recorded only six to seven years after the first entrada into Nicaragua, before the full impact of Indian depopulation was felt in that colony, and therefore is of unique importance to the archaeology and ethnohistory of western Nicaragua and northwestern Costa Rica. (Abel-Vidor 1988: 264).

Fowler (1989) has also lauded Oviedo's abilities as, "...an excellent historian, quite a good naturalist, and a decent ethnologist" (Fowler 1989:20). The view of the value of Oviedo's works presented in this work is quite different: as a historian of events involving Spaniards in early Nicaragua he is completely and intentionally misleading and unreliable; as an ethnographer his information is quite fragmentary and repetitive; as a naturalist his work is quite good, probably the finest work produced until the scientific work of the Bourbon period under Charles III (Arceiegas 1973: 264).

The value of Oviedo is that he copied, probably verbatim, the report submitted by Fray Bobadilla and that he visited a few locations and wrote eyewitness reports about what he saw. His presence in the Coleccion Somoza is a much deflated presence of a minor hanger-on of Lopez Salcedo who worked hard at keeping his activities in Nicaragua unknown to everyone, wrote one letter to the Crown about the Masaya volcano, is mentioned in correspondence by Prince Phillip as being probably involved with the embezzlement of the estate of the executed Nuñez de Balboa, and acting as a supplementary accountant in the kangaroo court proceedings that terminated in the ejection of Lopez Salcedo and his Crown officials from Nicaragua, stripped of their financial resources (and in Cereceda's case stripped of most of his clothes as well since he left Nicaragua in only his underwear.). The other value of Oviedo is to add corroborating information about references in the Coleccion Somoza and Cibdad Real.

### P3.0 FRAY DE BOBADILLA.

The single greatest source of ethnographic data in Oviedo was not written by him but was copied from the report of Bobadilla (Cronistas 3: 310-360). Fray Bobadilla, possibly a relative of Pedrias' wife, Isabel de Bobadilla, was asked by Pedrarias to baptize (or rebaptize) Nicaraguan Indians. Obviously Pedrarias was seeking legitimacy by creating statistics about how efficient his Christianization of the Indians was progressing, and also to show that the previous reports and "body counts" of baptisms of his enemies Cereceda and Francisco Hernandez (which have never been found) were suspect. Oviedo noted that Bobadilla left Leon and traveled to the "province of Nicaragua", taking the scribe Bartolome Perez to tabulate the numbers desired by Pedrarias (Cronistas 3: 311).

### P3.1 NAME OF VILLAGE: Teoca

LOCATION: In the pueblo of, or a galpon of, the village of Nicaragua. #P1.10 above (Cronistas 3: 311).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute collected. Baptized 29,063 Indians in nine days. Interviewed the following Indians and recorded ethnographic data: (1) Chicoatonal, cacique; (2) Zipat, an elder; (3) Miseboy, another cacique; (4) Tzotyeya, a defrocked Indian priest; (5) Coyevet, an elder of about 80 years of age.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Extinct, though Teoca may be nothing more than a galpon of the village of Nicaragua.

ETHNIC STATUS: Nahua

### P3.2 NAME OF VILLAGE: Nicaragua (See discussion of pueblo above, P 1.10)

### P3.3 NAME OF VILLAGE: Xoxoyta

LOCATION: In the pueblo of Nicaragua (Cronistas 3: 324)

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute collected. Bobadilla interviewed: (1) a cacique named Quivaiv; (2) Astochimal, a man 30 years old (Cronistas 3: 325), and gathered more ethnographic data. Apparently at the same interviewing process that took three days, Bobadilla and his interpreters gathered together 13 more unnamed caciques and elders and asked more questions (Cronistas 3: 327).
LOCATION OF VILLAGE: Not given. Almost certainly close to or on the site of the modern village of Diria, close to the Laguna de Apoyo. Cibdad Real (1586) described perfectly the present road that climbs up the Meseta de los Pueblos behind Masaya and passes by Dirioyomo and Diria (Cronistas: 1:157).

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: The villages of Diria and Guatetep, encomienda #196 mentioned below, were granted in a deed of encomienda (with other villages) by Pedro de los Rios to his wife, Maria de Peñalosa, on October 21, 1542. The Act of Possession took place the next day, on October 22, 1542, with the caciques of Diria named as Francisquilla, possibly a woman, and Gonzalo (11 CS 302). This was one of the fraudulent conveyances and forgeries that were produced by Pedro de los Rios to get around the confiscatory provisions of the New Laws of 1542.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Diria survived in 1548 as a sizeable village subject to several encomiendas: #127, with 75 tributary Indians, owned by Francisco Romero, with a total Indian population of 310 Indians; #180 (delderia), with 80 tributary Indians, owned by Miguel de la Costa, and with a total population of 330 Indians; #196 (delderia and guatetep), with 115 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with a total Indian population of 480 Indians. The village had a total population of 1346 Indians. Encomienda #166 (Xalteva) also mentioned that the Indians of Xalteva had to help the Indians of "del deria" to clear rocks from the fields. Present day Jalateva and Diria are about 15 km apart.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotega. All Cronistas were uniform that the Indians between Managua and the village of Nicaragua spoke Chorotega. See, for example Cibdad Real (Cronistas: 1:143 et seq) and Oviedo (Cronistas: 3:373, 375).

P3.7
NAME OF VILLAGE: Bombacho (or the cacique of Bombacho).

LOCATION: See discussion in P1.16, above.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute collected. Baptized 3,241 Indians. That figure is about four and one-half times as large as the combined populations of encomiendas #120 and 145 which totaled 700 Indians. Since Bobadilla took his time it is the assumption that he could have visited both plazas or had the cacique call together all of his subjects for baptism.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: See discussion in P1.15, above.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: See discussion in P1.15, above.

ETHNIC STATUS: See discussion in P1.15, above.

P3.8
NAME OF VILLAGE: Masaya

LOCATION OF VILLAGE: Not given. Almost certainly close to or on the site of the modern village of Diria, close to the Laguna de Apoyo. Cibdad Real (1586) described perfectly the present road that climbs up the Meseta de los Pueblos behind Masaya and passes by Dirioyomo and Diria (Cronistas: 1:157).

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: The villages of Diria and Guatetep, encomienda #196 mentioned below, were granted in a deed of encomienda (with other villages) by Pedro de los Rios to his wife, Maria de Peñalosa, on October 21, 1542. The Act of Possession took place the next day, on October 22, 1542, with the caciques of Diria named as Francisquilla, possibly a woman, and Gonzalo (11 CS 302). This was one of the fraudulent conveyances and forgeries that were produced by Pedro de los Rios to get around the confiscatory provisions of the New Laws of 1542.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Diria survived in 1548 as a sizeable village subject to several encomiendas: #127, with 75 tributary Indians, owned by Francisco Romero, with a total Indian population of 310 Indians; #180 (delderia), with 80 tributary Indians, owned by Miguel de la Costa, and with a total population of 330 Indians; #196 (delderia and guatetep), with 115 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with a total Indian population of 480 Indians. The village had a total population of 1346 Indians. Encomienda #166 (Xalteva) also mentioned that the Indians of Xalteva had to help the Indians of "del deria" to clear rocks from the fields. Present day Jalateva and Diria are about 15 km apart.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotega. All Cronistas were uniform that the Indians between Managua and the village of Nicaragua spoke Chorotega. See, for example Cibdad Real (Cronistas: 1:143 et seq) and Oviedo (Cronistas: 3:373, 375).

P3.7
NAME OF VILLAGE: Bombacho (or the cacique of Bombacho).

LOCATION: See discussion in P1.16, above.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute collected. Baptized 3,241 Indians. That figure is about four and one-half times as large as the combined populations of encomiendas #120 and 145 which totaled 700 Indians. Since Bobadilla took his time it is the assumption that he could have visited both plazas or had the cacique call together all of his subjects for baptism.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: See discussion in P1.15, above.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: See discussion in P1.15, above.

ETHNIC STATUS: See discussion in P1.15, above.

P3.8
NAME OF VILLAGE: Masaya

LOCATION OF VILLAGE: Not given. Almost certainly close to or on the site of the modern village of Diria, close to the Laguna de Apoyo. Cibdad Real (1586) described perfectly the present road that climbs up the Meseta de los Pueblos behind Masaya and passes by Dirioyomo and Diria (Cronistas: 1:157).

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: The villages of Diria and Guatetep, encomienda #196 mentioned below, were granted in a deed of encomienda (with other villages) by Pedro de los Rios to his wife, Maria de Peñalosa, on October 21, 1542. The Act of Possession took place the next day, on October 22, 1542, with the caciques of Diria named as Francisquilla, possibly a woman, and Gonzalo (11 CS 302). This was one of the fraudulent conveyances and forgeries that were produced by Pedro de los Rios to get around the confiscatory provisions of the New Laws of 1542.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Diria survived in 1548 as a sizeable village subject to several encomiendas: #127, with 75 tributary Indians, owned by Francisco Romero, with a total Indian population of 310 Indians; #180 (delderia), with 80 tributary Indians, owned by Miguel de la Costa, and with a total population of 330 Indians; #196 (delderia and guatetep), with 115 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with a total Indian population of 480 Indians. The village had a total population of 1346 Indians. Encomienda #166 (Xalteva) also mentioned that the Indians of Xalteva had to help the Indians of "del deria" to clear rocks from the fields. Present day Jalateva and Diria are about 15 km apart.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotega. All Cronistas were uniform that the Indians between Managua and the village of Nicaragua spoke Chorotega. See, for example Cibdad Real (Cronistas: 1:143 et seq) and Oviedo (Cronistas: 3:373, 375).

P3.7
NAME OF VILLAGE: Bombacho (or the cacique of Bombacho).

LOCATION: See discussion in P1.16, above.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute collected. Baptized 3,241 Indians. That figure is about four and one-half times as large as the combined populations of encomiendas #120 and 145 which totaled 700 Indians. Since Bobadilla took his time it is the assumption that he could have visited both plazas or had the cacique call together all of his subjects for baptism.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: See discussion in P1.15, above.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: See discussion in P1.15, above.

ETHNIC STATUS: See discussion in P1.15, above.

P3.8
NAME OF VILLAGE: Masaya
LOCATION: Close to or at the present day city of Masaya.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute collected. Bobadilla reported baptizing 937 Indians.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: The small number of Indians baptized is a mystery. Bobadilla was charged by Pedrarias to bring in a good head count of baptisms. At almost the same time as Bobadilla’s baptizing journey was taking place (1528), Oviedo reported Masaya as a town or regional center that had in excess of 100,000 inhabitants (Cronistas 3: 373). He never said where he came up with this figure, perhaps gotten from Diego de Machuca in conversation. Oviedo mentioned Masaya repeatedly. He noted that the nancite tree grew around the Masaya volcano. As with all others Spaniards he was fascinated with the Masaya volcano, and climbed it in July, 1528, using Diego de Machuca's estancia in Lenderi (today's Nindiri) as a base of operations. He went to considerable lengths to explain Fray Blas Castillo's excursion into the mouth of the volcano. His only letter to the Crown, reproduced in the Coleccion Somozoa, is found at 6 CS 19 (July 17, 1539). It described the Masaya volcano. Lastly, Oviedo described some of the folklore of the aged goddess that lived in the mouth of the Masaya volcano. See (Cronistas 3: 11, 26, 86, 182, 355, 364, 372, 373, 375, 378, 380, 382, 383, 384, 390, 391, 393, 394, 397, 399, 401, 402, 408, 411, 413, 415, 417, 421).

The encomienda found at 14 CS 174 that was granted by Rodrigo de Contreras to his young son Vasco de Contreras on April 15, 1542 included the plazas of: (1) Monimbo, a barrio of modern day Masaya, with the caciques Botoy, Nacay, and Mandita; (2) Zagalupa, with the caciques named Socher and Chicaquez; (3) Chinagalpa; (4) Motolynes Chondales of the city of Granada. The Act of Possession took place at the Puerto de la Possession (El Realejo) on July 6, 1542. Monimbo, Zagalupa, and Chinagalpa all probably lay within today's "greater Masaya". Those three plazas are usually mentioned together throughout the Coleccion Somozoa, though there is no reference known to the author that specifically states that Zagalupa and Chinagalpa were plazas close to Masaya. Mulagalpa (encomienda # 102), and listed next to Direga, # 101 and another barrio of Masaya, (Incer 1985: 417) was also always mentioned in discussion of encomiendas close to or at Masaya. The Tasacon of 1581, summarized below, makes it clear that Mulagalpa was an encomienda in Lenderi. The presence of Chondal Indians is clearly mentioned in this encomienda. Both Motolynes and Zagalupa were referred to as "Chondales", 14 CS at 176.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Masaya survived as a large village in the tasacion of 1548. Encomienda # 117 contained 150 tributary Indians, was owned by Joan Davila, and had 675 inhabitants; encomienda # 151 had 110 tributary Indians, was owned by Francisco Sanchez, and 450 inhabitants. Interestingly, even at that early date their handiwork was recognized for its quality and they had to deliver finely made hamacas as part of their tribute.

Another pueblo or galpon, named Direga, has been identified by various writers such as Incer (1985: 417) as an old barrio of Masaya. Direga is listed as encomienda # 101, with 240 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 980 inhabitants. Monimbo survived as encomienda # 198, with 140 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and 650 inhabitants. Zagalupa survived as encomienda # 156 (Zagalupa and other pueblos), with 300 tributary Indians, owned by Benito Diaz, and 1230 inhabitants; encomienda # 197, with 20 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, with 82 inhabitants; total population was 2,292 inhabitants. The encomiendas of Motolynes and Chinagalpa have become extinct, or more likely, this encomienda survived relatively intact and they are included in the "other pueblos" of encomienda # 156. "Greater Masaya" may be said to have had in 1548 960 tributary Indians and 3,936 inhabitants. The difference with populations observed by Oviedo in 1528 is obvious, a decrease in population of 95%. Bobadilla's small number of baptized Indians is unexplained.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotega, with a small population of Chondales. Cibdul Real reported in 1586 that Chorotega (Oto-Mangue) was the language of the inhabitants of Masaya (Cronistas 1: 154).

P3.9
NAME OF VILLAGE: Matapalete ("...in the province of Masaya...")

LOCATION: No specific reference. From context it would have been located between Masaya and the present village of Nindiri, about 8 km away. It may have been located around the small mountains called today Coyotepe and La Barranca, next to the Laguna de Masaya.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute collected. 154 persons were baptized.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Extinct.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotega.

P3.10
NAME OF VILLAGE: Marinalte

LOCATION: No specific reference. From context it may have been located close to Lenderi and Matapalete.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute collected. 409 persons were baptized.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Marinalte survived in 1548 as three encomiendas: # 126, with five tributary Indians, owned by Luis de Guevara (or his ghost); # 130 with 10 tributary Indians, owned by Roman de Cardenas, with 41 inhabitants; and # 144, with 40 Indians, owned by Bartolome Tello, and 164 inhabitants. Total population of the village in 1548 was 211 inhabitants, a decrease in population of about 40%.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotega.
P3.11
NAME OF VILLAGE: Lenderi

LOCATION: Close to or on the actual site of the village of Nindiri, which is also known as Lenderi and also as Tenderi.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute collected. 2,917 persons baptized.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Oviedo mentioned Lenderi as being held in encomienda by Diego de Machuca de Zuazo, a first cousin of Rodrigo de Contreras (Cronistas 3: 364). Oviedo also stayed in Lenderi the night of July 25, 1529 in order to climb the Masaya volcano (Cronistas 3: 383-384), and while there mentioned the cacique of Lenderi, named Francisco in Spanish and Nacatime in Chorotega (Cronistas 3: 385) See also (Cronistas 3: 10, 11, 356, 364, 371, 373, 374, 383, 391).

Before Diego de Machuca died he and Rodrigo de Contreras became bitter enemies over who should receive a reward from the Crown for the discovery of the mouth of the Rio San Juan (See CONTRERAS v. THE CROWN; ALONSO CALERO AND DIEGO DE MACHUCA v. CONTRERAS AND THE CROWN, 13 CS 1, July 8, 1544). Contreras took out his vengeance by taking Machuca's encomiendas away from Machuca's widow, Catalina de Gutierrez. Gutierrez brought a lawsuit for the restitution of the encomiendas that had previously been owned by Machuca, CATALINA GUTIERREZ, VIUDA DE DIEGO DE MACHUCA v. THE CROWN, 14 CS 74 (1547). Included in those encomiendas was the encomienda of Nindiri.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Lenderi survived as Nindiri, encomienda # 178, with 300 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 1240 inhabitants, a decrease in population of about 65%.

ETHNIC STATUS: Specifically referred to as Chorotegan. Cibdad Real reported in 1586 that the inhabitants of Nindiri spoke Chorotega (Oto-Mangue) (Cronistas 1: 154).

P3.12
NAME OF VILLAGE: Managua

LOCATION: The present location of Managua

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute collected. Bobadilla baptized 1,116 persons.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Oviedo mentioned Managua on several occasions (Cronistas 3: 10, 376, 377, 378, 383). He noted that in 1525 Managua was the most populous Indian pueblo in the colony of Nicaragua, that it stretched for three leagues along the southern shore of Lake Managua, and that it had 10,000 warriors and 40,000 inhabitants. By 1528 or 1529 Oviedo reported that it was the most depopulated and desolate place in the colony of Nicaragua, with less than 1,000 inhabitants (Cronistas 3: 377).

Managua was also one of the encomiendas that had been previously owned by Diego Machuca and that his widow, Catalina Gutierrez, tried to recover from the Crown, CATALINA GUTIERREZ, VIUDA DE DIEGO DE MACHUCA v. THE CROWN 14 CS 74 (1547).

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Managua survived in 1548 as one of the larger villages in western Nicaragua and subject to five encomiendas: (1) # 71, with 100 tributary Indians, owned by Francisco Tellez, and with 410 inhabitants; (2) # 123, with 100 tributary Indians, owned by Christobal de Sant Martin, and with 410 inhabitants; (3) # 138, with 10 tributary Indians, owned by Diego de Pstrana, and with 41 inhabitants; (4) # 157, with 25 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 103 inhabitants; (5) # 160, with 30 tributary Indians, owned by Luis de la Rocha, and with 123 inhabitants. Mazagalpa has also been identified by Incer as one of the barrios or galpones of early Managua (Incer 1985: 432). Mazagalpa survived in 1548 with three encomiendas: (1) # 34, with 70 tributary Indians, owned by Alvaro Zamora, and with 290 inhabitants; (2) # 161, with 55 tributary Indians, owned by Pedro de la Palma, and with 225 inhabitants; and (3) # 195, with 60 tributary Indians, owned by Tienle Fuentes, and with 246 inhabitants.

The Tasación of 1581 makes it clear that Managua also contained the following encomiendas, heretofore not located: GVIN 1, Yatan, with 18 tributary Indians, property of Pedro Menor and with 74 inhabitants; GVIN Mulagalpa, with 35 tributary Indians, property of Alonso de Horozco, and with 144 inhabitants; GVIN 6, Acompa, with 10 tributary Indians, property of Joan Lemin, and with 41 inhabitants; GVIN 15, Guatpe and Tonala, with 75 tributary Indians, property of Gomez Palomingo, and with 308 inhabitants; GVIN 50, Xicagalpa, with 45 tributary Indians, property of Diego Bermudez, and with 185 inhabitants. Also, the tasación of 1581 also includes at least two encomiendas, Telpanega and Xulist, that are not found in any earlier documents. The total number of inhabitants of "Greater Managua" was 2,556 Indians. This population exceeds the 1,116 Indians baptized by Bobadilla in 1528. The decline in population is 94% from the estimated population of Managua in 1525 of 40,000 persons.

ETHNIC STATUS: Oviedo specifically referred to the inhabitants of Managua as speaking Chorotega (Cronistas 3: 376). In 1586 Cibdad Real noted that at Managua the Indians spoke corrupt Mexican (Nahua) (Cronistas 1: 154). This led Fowler to suggest that by the 1580's the Indians of western Nicaragua were developing a Nahua "patois" (Fowler 1989: 67). It may also suggest that there were new Indian groups, as well as linguistic patterns, that entered Nicaragua after 1522.

P3.13
NAME OF VILLAGE: Mattrari

LOCATION: Near or at the present town of Mattrari, located west of Managua on the New Leon Highway. Virtually every traveler who has visited Nicaragua since Oviedo has located Mattrari at the same location.
INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute was collected. Bobadilla reported baptizing 421 persons.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Oviedo wrote a rather puzzling report of Matiari. He noted that Matiari had 4,000 inhabitants, including 600 warriors. He also noted that in Matiari there were 1,000 warriors and 12,000 inhabitants (Cronistas: 3: 377). Whether this was one village with two galpones, or two different villages is unclear. "Matiari" does not appear in the Coleccion Somozas. For the purposes of this work both population figures will be placed together, to create a "greater" Matiari of 16,000 inhabitants. Oviedo also noted this was the population figure not as he eyewitnessed it, but as it was described to him by persons who had witnessed these population figures in the time of Gil Gonzalez and Francisco Hernandez, i.e. 1524. He added that the countryside "boiled" with people. Thus there is no clear report of the size of Matiari in 1528 from Oviedo.

Oviedo also noted another interesting characteristic of Matiari, its pantheon of gods. All other reports of Nicaraguan gods are based upon the two interviews of Cereceda in 1522 and Bobadilla in 1528 at the village of the cacique Nicaraguas, and undoubtedly gods of the Nahua. Regarding Matiari, Oviedo noted,

En Matiari llaman a Dios Ttipitani, e dicen que ovo un hombre e una muger, del qual todos los mortales oviiron principio, que al hombre llaman Nenibitia e a la muger Nenguimalia: a Dios llaman los de Nicaragua (and here it is not clear if he means the Nicaragua-Nahuas, or the Indians of the gobernacion of the colony of Nicaragua) Thomasocho, que quiere decir grand Dios, e dicen que aquel tuvo un hijo que estuvo acia abaxo, e le llaman Theobilicho: a los angeles pequenos de acia abaxo, quieren decir que se llaman Tamachas; e Tazaacatia e Tamastravol son los principales angeles del cielo. Asi lo dijen estos indios, e dijen quel angel es criatura del cielo, e que vuelan e tienen alas: e otras muchas vanidades dicen, que nunca se acabaran de escribir, si el todo se dijese lo quellos patician; e y en lo menos son conformes. (Cronistas: 3: 446; see also Lehmann 1920: 864).

Cibdad Real mentioned Fray Ponce passing through Matiari on May 29, 1586 in the same location where the town of Matiari is located today. He also mentioned that the Indians gave him tasty mojarra (Chichosoma sp) to eat, a fish still eaten in Matiari since it is located on the southwestern shore of Lake Managua. (Cronistas: 1: 152-153).

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Matiari survived in 1548 as the village of Matrare, encomienda # 82, with 100 tributary Indians, owned by Francisco de Robles, and with 410 inhabitants. Included in the tribute due was fish and the services of two fishermen every day. The population of Matiari in 1528 as reported by Bobadilla's baptisms and the tasacion of 1548 are almost identical in size. Oviedo's population figures either show a plague, a lot of slaving, or an active imagination. No conclusion can be reached.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotegan. Consistent with Oviedo's and every other cronista's habit, the absence of a designated linguistic group means Chorotegan. The pantheon of gods is obviously different from those described in the village of Nicaragua, and may give some clue as to who the Chorotega really were. Cibdad Real, in 1586, noted by reference to previously mentioned villages that the Indians of Matiari were the same Indians as those of Mabiti and Nagarote, which he identified as Mangue (Chorotega) (Cronistas: 1: 152-153).

P.3.14
NAME OF VILLAGE: Mavitiapomo

LOCATION: Unclear. Obviously Bobadilla was traveling on a trajectory north or northwest from Matiari. Cibdad Real in 1586 noted that he came upon a village named Mabiti on May 28, 1586 1/2 league northwest from the village of Nagarote (which still exists and lies about 15 km, or three leagues, northwest of the town of Matiare). He identified that village as speaking Mangue (Chorotega) (Cronistas: 1: 152). From there things get more confused. The suffix "pomo" is used as a prefix in the encomienda of Pomonagaranagro, # 98; Mabitianagaranago is the name of encomienda # 95; and Mabita is the name of encomienda # 96. "Yopomo" means "the plaza of" in Chipaneco, a closely related language of Oto-Mangue (Lehmann 1920: 794-901). Perhaps indicating that the encomiendas in this region were recorded in some kind of numerical order, Nagarote is listed as encomienda # 97. Without any further information Mavitiapomo is placed where Cibdad Real placed it 1/2 league northwest of Nagarote; if that was not its exact location it was located close by. To confuse matters more, Squier put on his 1860 map of Nicaragua a "Punta Imabite" located about 10 miles south of Leon Viejo on Lake Managua, nowhere near the location mentioned by Cibdad Real.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No tribute collected. Bobadilla reported baptizing 75 Indians.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Francisco de Casañeda reported breaking up 200 Indian idols in Imabite in the region of Leon Viejo in 1531 (3 CS 75). Oviedo's only mention of Mabita is in his relation of the trip of Fray Bobadilla; he made no other reference to any of the name variants. Mabita was mentioned as a village that was used to support with its tribute the convent of La Merced in Leon Viejo (6 CS 61, October 18, 1539).

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: The encomiendas that contained the name "Mabita" included: (1) Mabitianagaranago, # 95, with 20 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 82 inhabitants; (2) encomienda # 96, Mabita, with 22 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, with 90 inhabitants; (3) encomienda # 58, Nabit, with 11 tributary Indians, owned by Joan de la Calle, and with 45 inhabitants; (4) encomienda # 5, Nabitia, with six tributary Indians, owned by Rodrigo de Contreras Biedma, and with 25 inhabitants; (5) Nabitio Yopomo (possibly the exact site visited by Bobadilla), encomienda # 89, with 60 tributary Indians, owned by Geronimo de Toledo, and with 250 inhabitants; (6) encomienda # 8, Mabiti, with four tributary Indians, owned by Pedro Garcia, and with 16 inhabitants. "Greater" Mabita had 508 inhabitants in 1548.

ETHNIC STATUS: Chorotegan

From this point onward, Bobadilla stopped keeping count in every village he encountered and began grouping villages together. The next entry mentioned baptizing 585 persons of the cacique of Nagrado, Aariat, Mabitra and Mahometombo.
P3.15
NAME OF VILLAGE: Nagranro or the cacique of Nagranro.

LOCATION OF VILLAGE: At the site of Leon Viejo. Benito Davila clearly and plainly stated that Leon was founded at the village of Nagranro (3 CS 180, 182, January 15, 1533). From the diligencias filed by Davila it is clear that he arrived in Nicaragua in 1524 or 1525 to help out Francisco Hernandez, who was under siege around Leon; Davila was either an eyewitness to the founding of Leon or arrived just after it was founded. Oviedo also stated that Leon was founded on the village of Nagranro (or Nagranro) (Crónicas 3: 198).

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Pedrarias in 1525 stated that the population of Indians, "naturales", around Leon was about 15,000 (1 CS 128). Whether this was tributary Indians or was a rough estimate of the total population of the Indians around the site of Leon Viejo is unclear. A population of 15,000 inhabitants would provide about 3,500 tributary Indians; a population of 15,000 vecinos, or heads of households, the unit on which tribute was based, would indicate a total population of 61,500 Indians.

Oviedo's references to Nagranro were numerous: 49, 53, 78, 89, 90, 95, 99, 100, 109, 192, 248, 290, 301, 303, 304, 357, 363, 367, 440. The only ethnographic information listed is at 440 where Oviedo noted that the dress of the women of Nagranro was similar to that of the women of Nycoya and Mexico.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: The encomiendas of Nagranro are # 95, Mabitanagaranro, with 20 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 82 inhabitants; and encomienda # 98, Pomonagaranro, with 12 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 50 inhabitants. That totals 132 Indian inhabitants of Nagranro-Len Viejo in 1548. There may have been some small villages surrounding the Nagranro mentioned by Pedrarias in 1525. Matemombo, mentioned below, was about 1/4 league from Leon Viejo and was subject to two encomiendas, # 4, with 35 tributary Indians and 140 inhabitants; and encomienda # 184 with 20 tributary Indians and 82 inhabitants. Total population of Mabitanagaranro: 222 Indians; greater Nagranro had no more than 500 inhabitants.

An analysis of tribute provides a clue about the existence of other possible fishing villages around both Leon Viejo and Granada. The presence or absence of salt and fish and/or fishermen is assumed to mean the following:

a. If salt but no fish-fishermen are mentioned as tributary items it means that the village is close enough to either produce salt or trade for salt, but not close enough to the Pacific Ocean to be able to provide fresh fish to Spanish colonists. Based upon the experience of the author both as a sport fisherman and commercial fish producer on the Miskito coast, fresh caught fish don't last more than two hours in the tropical heat and sunlight of Nicaragua before it starts to rot. In rough terms that means that a dugout canoe can only be paddled about 5 km before the fish spoils; it is also probably the limit that fish can be brought overland on foot in the heat of Pacific Nicaragua (both Leon Viejo and Granada have substantially the same climate) before the fish starts to rot.

b. If Fish-fishermen, but no salt is mentioned it means that the village is too far from the sea coast to produce salt or trade for salt but is within one league, five km, of Leon Viejo (or Granada) to be able to produce fresh fish in Leon Viejo (or Granada).

c. If fish-fishermen and salt are both mentioned as tributary items it means that the village is close enough to both Leon Viejo and the ocean to produce both items.

d. If neither fish-fishermen nor salt is produced it means that the village is so far inland that it can neither produce or trade for salt nor produce fish or fishermen for Leon Viejo (or Granada).

Based upon these assumptions three more villages may be added to the "greater" Nagranro area. Encomienda # 66, Nolacoque, with 13 tributary Indians, was owned by the children of Luis de Guevara, and with 50 inhabitants (this encomienda is mentioned as located by Nagranro, 1 CS at 477); encomienda # 80, Matarenco, with 26 tributary Indians, owned by Francisco de Robles, and with 105 inhabitants; and encomienda # 94, Tonalgea, with 40 tributary Indians, owned by Catalina de Molina, and with 166 inhabitants. These three villages had to provide fish or fishermen but no salt to Leon Viejo.

Even with these three more villages, the total number of tributary Indians close to Leon was 166 Indians, and with 543 Indian inhabitants. That represents a decrease in population of 96%, based upon Pedrarias' figure of 15,000 naturales around Leon Viejo in 1525.

ETHNIC STATUS: No direct references. Consistent with Oviedo's and all other contemporary writers, the absence of identification of the Indians of Nagranro as speaking Nahua means that the Indians spoke Oto-Mangue, in the absence of any other conflicting information.

P3.16
NAME OF VILLAGE: Ariat

LOCATION: Unknown.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF VILLAGE IN 1548: Extinct

ETHNIC STATUS OF VILLAGE: Probably Chorotegan. From the word usage of Oviedo it is possible that Ariat was the name of a cacique, not the name of a village. Nothing else is known about "Ariat".

P3.17
NAME OF VILLAGE: Mabita. This is the only place that "Mabita" appears in any documents. The assumption is that this is the same location as "Mabita" and its variants mentioned in P 3.14, above.
P3.18
NAME OF VILLAGE: Mahometombo

LOCATION: Either 1/2 or 1/4 league from Leon Viejo. The location of the plaza of Mahometombo is mentioned as being 1/2 league from Leon in an encomienda that Pedrarías granted to Francisco de Castañeda on August 26, 1529 (2 CS 91). Oviedo mentioned that he went to the plaza of Mahometombo and destroyed the temples of Indian religions. He located Mahometombo as lying 1/4 league from Leon (Cronistas 3: 69).

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Mahometombo survived as a village in 1548 subject to two encomiendas: (1) encomienda # 4, with 35 tributary Indians, owned by Rodrigo de Contreras Biedma, and with 140 inhabitants; (2) encomienda # 184, with 20 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 82 inhabitants. Total number of tributary Indians was 55, and with a total village population of 222 Indians.

ETHNIC STATUS: Clearly Chorotegan. Oviedo stated that the Indians of the plaza of Mahometombo spoke Chorotegan (Cronistas 3: 69).

PROVINCE OF THE MARIBIOS

For the province of Maribios Bobadilla made no separate breakdown of Indians baptized in each village. As noted above, aside from the cannibalistic tendencies of the Maribios Indians little is known about their culture and language. Protector and Bishop Osorio did not mention the Maribios language when he reported to the Crown in 1529 that he had to purchase Indians boys as interpreters; either he had other interpreters or the Maribios Indians may have spoken a dialect of Oto-Mangue, Nahua, or Chondal that could be understood by his interpreters. The ethnic makeup of the Maribios Indians remains a mystery, with little guidance found in any source known to the author. Oviedo located the province of the Maribios as five leagues from Leon Viejo (Cronistas 3: 444), which is consistent with the geographical distribution of the Maribios Indians mentioned by every other source. Other mention of the Maribios by Oviedo are found at: Cronistas 3: 26, 36, 78, 301, 357, 444, 456.

Location of the province of Maribios and the towns and populations in the province of Maribios was much more successful than for the Chortegas and Nahua for two separate reasons. First, the Spaniards of Leon tended to fight with each other, steal each other's encomienda, and mistreat, torture, and murder Indians with greater frequency than those Spaniards who lived in Granada. The ensuing criminal cases, complaints to the Crown, and complaints found in the residencias of Pedro de los Ríos, (10 CS 1, 1544), Rodrigo de Contreras (9 CS 1 (1544), and Luis de Guevara, (10 CS 168 (1544)) provided a multitude of references to the villages of the Maribios Indians. And secondly, the key to locating and identifying the ethnicity of many of those villages was the report of Cibdad Real (Cronistas 1: 141 et seq ), who noted with astounding accuracy the location of Maribios villages in 1586, all of which were easily located in pre-1548 documents as well as the tasación of 1548. Putting together the documentation of the Coleccion Somoza with Cibdad Real's account gives a more exacting picture of Maribios villages than exists with either the Chortegas or Nahua.

In late 1528 or early 1529 Fray Bobadilla baptized 6,346 persons in the province of the Maribios. The villages identified as Maribios and either found in the tasación of 1548 or not mentioned are listed below.

P3.19
NAME OF VILLAGE: Mazatega

LOCATION: Two leagues (10 km) southeast of Chinandega, Cibdad Real (Cronistas 1: 149).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Taugema was the cacique of the pueblos of Mazatega and Tecoloteqga (5 CS 134).

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Mazatega survived in 1548 as encomienda # 47, with 44 tributary Indians owned by Pedro Orejon, and with 230 inhabitants.

ETHNIC STATUS: Maribio.

P3.20
NAME OF VILLAGE: Chichigalpa

LOCATION: One-half league (2 1/2 km) southeast of Mazatega Cibdad Real (Cronistas 1: 149).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Various references.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Chichigalpa survived in 1548 as encomienda # 48, with 80 tributary Indians, owned by Ana Ximenex, and with 340 inhabitants.

ETHNIC STATUS: Maribio.

P3.21
NAME OF VILLAGE: Pozoltega.

LOCATION: One league (5 km) southeast of Chichigalpa. Cibdad Real (Cronistas 1: 150).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Acting governor Pedro de los Ríos granted his wife, María de Peñalosa, an encomienda that included the pueblo of Pozoltega (11 CS 302, October 21, 1542). The Act of Possession took place on October 22, 1542, and the caciques of Pozoltega named Don Alonso and Don Francisco Lopez were present.
STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Pozoltega survived in 1548 as three encomiendas: (1) #23, with 70 tributary Indians, owned by the children of Martin Membreno, and with 290 inhabitants; (2) # 64, 18 tributary Indians, owned by the children of Luis de Guevara, and with 75 inhabitants; (3) # 190 60 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 260 inhabitants; total population of Pozoltega, 657 Indians.

ETHNIC STATUS: No direct reference, probably Maribios. Cibdad Real noted that the women dressed like Mexicans: "Las Indias de aquel pueblo usan guapiles como las mexicanas, y ellos y ellas andan bien vestidas..." (Cronistas 1: 150).

P3.22
NAME OF VILLAGE: Cazalauque (Cazalaoque, Quezalguegue)

LOCATION: On or near the present day town of Quezalguegue.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Cazalauque was set aside for the support of the Bishop of Nicaragua at least since the times of Bishop Alvarez Osorio. Acting bishop and Deán Mendavia recited that fact in the Royal edict found at 12 CS 8,10, (November, 1542). Deán Mendavia used the village of Cazalauque, as well as the fishing village (probably near Leon Viejo) of Alauque for over a year until he got in a power struggle with Rodrigo de Contreras, who removed the village from the jurisdiction of the Bishopric and gave it to his son, Pedro de Contreras. That deed of encomienda is found at 14 CS 173, dated December 16, 1541, and noted that a group of Chontal Indians were also included within the village of Cazalauque. There was also an earlier deed of encomienda, found at 14 CS 168, dated July 11, 1539, that purported to grant "Quizalauque" to Pedro de Contreras. This may have been a second backdated and forged instrument to insure that the encomienda would not be forfeited to the Crown because of the New Laws.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Cazalauque survived in 1548 subject to encomienda # 187, "Cazalaoque", with 154 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 625 inhabitants.

ETHNIC STATUS: Maribios. The deed of encomienda found at 14 CS 173 clearly stated that Cazalauque was located in the province of the Maribios.

P3.23
NAME OF VILLAGE: Miaugalpa

LOCATION: One-quarter league southeast of Pozoltega. Cibdad Real (Cronistas 1: 150).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: None.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Extinct or possibly included in one of the encomiendas of Pozoltega. Another possibility is that it is encomienda # 26, Ayagalpa and Miagalpa.

ETHNIC STATUS: No direct reference; probably Maribios.

P3.24
NAME OF VILLAGE: Cindega

LOCATION: Not clear, probably 3/4 of a league from the site of Miaugalpa, or one league southeast of Pozoltega. At that site Cibdad Real found four villages about 1/2 league apart all called Chinandega and all speaking the Maribios language. (Cronistas 1: 150-151). Perez-Valle equated Cindega with Chinanadega, which is obviously wrong since there are numerous references in all sources to Chinanadega and also to Cindega, an obviously different location in all contemporary documents. (Ibarra 1994: 230) placed Cindega in its correct location. Cindega was one of the largest Maribios towns and the scene of a substantial amount of conflict and litigation. The location of Chinanadega as the Cindega so often referred to in the Coleccion Somaya is supported by the many references to Cindega's proximity to the villages of Utega, Ybaltega, and Iguala (2 CS at 121) which were identified as being Maribios villages (9 CS 422). Cindega was also mentioned as being close to Abangasca, another Maribios village which was located 5 km west of present day Leon (9 CS 488); Cindega is also mentioned as lying close to Abangasca and 12 leagues from Mainey, which was a small encomienda one league from Leon Viejo (See 9 CS 514-515). The sum and substance of these descriptions is that Cindega was either next to the pueblo of Abangasca or was a bit farther northwest, closer to Pozoltega. These two possible locations are about 20 km apart.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Cindega was owned in encomienda by Mateo Leczano, erstwhile ally of Rodrigo de Contreras. Contreras later prosecuted him for cruelty to Indians in the case of THE CROWN v. MATEO LECZANO, 9 CS 481 (July 3,1540). Leczano mistreated Indian women by forcing them to travel to another town he had in encomienda, Guateteo, seven leagues from Cindega, to spin thread and weave cloth. He also deposed the cacique of Cindega, one don Diego and made him act as a cowboy at Leczano's pastures at the encomienda of Mainey. Contreras produced several Indian witnesses against Leczano, including (1) an Indian principal named Nyongua; (2) an Indian principal named Ozilo (The galpon of Olaquina is also mentioned as incorporated within the pueblo of Cindega) (9 CS at 510); (3) the caciques Migiriisti and de Anbaco are mentioned as caciques of Cindega (4) Quespal is also mentioned as a principal of Cindega; (5) Myguyest and Anbabaniga were also Indian witnesses against Leczano.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Cindega survived as a very large Indian pueblo subject to the following encomiendas: (1) # 9, 20 tributary Indians, owned by Ysabel Velez, with 82 inhabitants; (2) # 12, 100 tributary Indians, owned by Yseo de Santiago (widow of Mateo Leczano), and with 410 inhabitants; (3) # 22, 64 tributary Indians, owned by Diego de Caceres, and with 250 inhabitants; (4) # 56, with 45 tributary Indians, owned by Diego Sanchez, and with 190 inhabitants; (5) # 73, with 80 tributary Indians, owned by Francisco Nunez, and with 330
inhabitants; (6) # 84, with 80 tributary Indians, owned by Alonso de Torrejon and with 330 inhabitants. Total population of Cindega: 1,592 Indians.

ETHNIC STATUS: Maribio.

P3.25
NAME OF VILLAGE: Telica (Telia)

LOCATION: Close to or on the present day location of the village of Telica.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Telica is mentioned as being in the province of the Maribios (9 CS 442) and as being owned by Francisco Tellez (9 CS 85). Several Indians of Telica were asked questions in a legal proceeding. An interpreter, named Miguel Martin, was used and the Indians of Abangasca, another Maribios pueblo, and Telica answered the questions together (9 CS 477), thus indicating that they may have been speaking a common language. Francisco de Castañeda took Indians with him to Peru when he left Nicaragua in May of 1535. Those Indians, all from Telica, were named: Aguatonate, Teguano, and Tegurisique (9 CS 414). Other Indians from Telica mentioned were Xaquantona and Teguano (9 CS 442).

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Telica survived in 1548 as encomienda # 63, with 100 tributary Indians, owned by the children of Luis de Guevara, and with 410 inhabitants.

ETHNIC STATUS: Maribio.

P3.26
NAME OF VILLAGE: Abangasca.

LOCATION: About five km west of Sutiaba. There are two comarcas presently listed on the topographical map of Leon designated Abangasca norte and Abangasca sur at that location. Abangasca was the location noted by Oviedo (Cronistas 3: 444) as the place where the largest confrontation took place between the army of Francisco Hernandez and the Maribios Indians. It is also the place where assassins hired by Pedro de los Rios hacked away part of Sheriff Luis de Guevar's face (5 CS 358). It apparently was the main thoroughfare to the port of El Realejo.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Abangasca was identified as a Maribios village and located next to, (or part of) the Maribios village of Ybaltega (9 CS at 442). In the original encomienda that Pedrarias granted to Francisco de Castañeda on August 26, 1529, mentioned was the grant of one-half of the Indians of the plaza of Abangasca (CS 91). Indians of the plaza of Abangasca-Ybaltega that were taken by Francisco de Castañeda to Peru included Topagua, Soche, and Diego. Sworn testimony was taken regarding the removal of those Indians of the caciques and principales of the plaza of Abangasca, named Juan and Mateo, using Miguel Martin as interpreter (CS 476-477). Other Indians taken by Castañeda to Peru from Abangasca include: Tereza, Juana, Quisno, Abaspapa, Meza, Domingo, Tamagaz Jandi, Indiqui, Anbatoto, and Netey (9 CS 413-414).

Abangasca and Cindega were placed close together in the interrogatorios found at (9 CS 490); Ozilo was mentioned as a principal of Cindega and also of Abangasca. Ozilo was also mentioned as a principal of Cindega at (9 CS 512). Herman Nieto's encomienda, mentioned at 9 CS 155, also included the plaza of "Ocuna" Cindega in his encomienda. Rodrigo de Contreras granted the encomienda of Abangasca to his son, Diego de Contreras, on August 2, 1537 (14 CS 169).

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Abangasca survived in 1548 as encomienda # 193, with 40 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 165 inhabitants. In 1529 the plaza of Abangasca contained 200 tributary Indians, and after that the village had been decimated by either disease or starvation (2 CS 101 et seq). Abangasca had suffered an 80 % decrease in population of tributary Indians and most probably general population as well between 1529 and 1548.

ETHNIC STATUS: Maribio.

P3.27
NAME OF VILLAGE: Pangua.


INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Pangua was mentioned in a deed of encomienda issued by Rodrigo de Contreras to Juan Durreta on June 30, 1538, after having taken the encomienda away from his enemy Diego Sanchez (9 CS 114-115). In the Act of Possession the return of service mentioned the caciques of Pangua as Uzelo and Malina. In litigation to get back his encomiendas, Diego Sanchez mentioned Pangua and Astatega together as plazas in his encomienda (9 CS at 140).

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Pangua survived as encomienda # 55, with 30 tributary Indians, owned by Diego Sanchez (He got the encomienda back either through the actions of Judge Pineda or Oydar Herrera), and with 125 inhabitants.

ETHNIC STATUS: Probably Maribio.

P3.28
NAME OF VILLAGE: Utega.

LOCATION: Unclear, probably near Quezalguague (9 CS 4).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No information.
OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Utega, or the two Utegas, were granted to Bishop Alvarez Osorio to assist in his support, along with the plaza of Cacalauque (assumed to be the present day Quezalquague). Francisco de Castañeda briefly mentioned the village Dutega (assumed to be De Utega) (2 CS 121). Bishop Francisco de Mendavia also was granted those villages to assist in his support. When he died, his brother, acting Bishop and Dean Pedro de Mendavia used those villages for support for 17 months until he got in a struggle with Rodrigo de Contreras over the control of the church and civil government in Nicaragua. Contreras took those villages away from Mendavia and gave them to his son Pedro de Contreras on December 16, 1541 (14 CS at 173). The deed of encomienda recited that included in the encomienda were the "two Utegas" (one may also have been called Utegazumba, 14 CS at 168), all in the jurisdiction of Leon in the province of the Maribios.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Utega survived in 1548 as a village subject to two encomiendas: (1) # 21, with 25 tributary Indians, owned by Felipe Mercado, and with 104 inhabitants; (2) # 35, with 22 tributary Indians, owned by Alvaro de Zamora, and with 90 inhabitants. Total number of inhabitants of Utega was about 200 Indians.

ETHNIC STATUS: Maribio.

P.329
NAME OF VILLAGE: Yglaltega Ybaltega, Ybatega

LOCATION: In the province of the Maribios (9 CS 423); probably alongside the village of Abangasca.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: The plaza of Ybatega is mentioned as in the province of the Maribios, and one of the Indians was named Papa. Soche was mentioned as a principal of the plaza of Abangasca-Yvaltega (9 CS 442). For mention of Indians taken to Peru by Castañeda, see P.3.25, above.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Ygualtega survived in 1548 as encomienda # 16, with 22 tributary Indians, owned by Alonso Mendes, and with 90 inhabitants.

ETHNIC STATUS: Maribio.

P.3.30
NAME OF VILLAGE: Iguala

LOCATION: No direct reference. It was mentioned together with Ybaltega (Ygualtega) and as possibly twin villages, or galpones and as lying in the province of the Maribios (9 CS 422).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: The reference at 9 CS 422 has to do with an Indian named Juana Yazenso, who died apparently in Peru. She had been taken from Ybatelga-Iguala to Peru by Francisco de Castañeda as a servant. The context of the legal proceeding was a suit to forfeit the bond that had been posted by Luis de Guevara, a friend of Castañeda's, to guarantee the return of the Indians taken out of Nicaragua. Iguala was later named as part of the encomienda that Rodrigo de Contreras awarded to his son Diego de Contreras, 14 CS 169 (August 2, 1537). The language in the deed of encomienda mentions the major caciques as Francisco, Miquisti, Maca, and Acoasca, with Maca, third in the list of caciques pertaining to Iguala, which also was third in the list of plazas.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Either extinct, or considered part of the encomienda # 16, which pertained to Yglaltega, P.3.29, above.

ETHNIC STATUS: Maribio.

P.3.31
NAME OF VILLAGE: Mistega

LOCATION: Three leagues (15 km) from El Realejo, probably east or south east (near a water source) (2 CS at 262).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Mistega is one of the villages mentioned as a large village and has the most complete history of its encomienda of any village during the contact period. Oviedo mentioned Mistega in the context of naming some of the largest villages and politically powerful caciques in Nicaragua. The others he listed were Tezuateg, Nicaragua, and Nicoya (Cronistas 3:306-307). Pedrarias granted, on August 26, 1529, Francisco de Castañeda a large encomienda (2 CS 91). Mistega was described as being comprised of the galpones of: (1) Astaconzi, and the principal named Teyos; (2) Chamolongoa and the principal named Hueyac; (3) Estanzingo, and the principal named Olin; (4) Cozatega, and the principal named Matac; (5) Escolaglpon, and the principal named Escolon; (6) Tepaya and the principal named Alzaguaconce; (7) Coalcone and the principal named Agat; (8) Otgalpanega, and the principal named Tezatot. These galpones totaled 600 tributary Indians, or 2,460 inhabitants. Castañeda later made Mistega his headquarters; it was the scene of a confrontation between Castañeda and Crown treasurer Diego de la Bobilla that almost ended in a fight to the death between the men. That dispute was preserved in IN RE DISPUTE BETWEEN FRANCISCO DE CASTANEDA AND PEDRARIAS DAVILA, BISHOP ORONZO, AND DIEGO DE LA TOBILLA, 2 CS 219, (November 16, 1529).

Bishop Alvarez Osorio visited Mistega and noted in August of 1529 that one of the galpones of Mistega was of the Guazama language (2 CS 95). That galpon is identified elsewhere as Otgalpanega or Otgalpanega (9 CS 442) or Cotopulpanega "of the plaza of Guazama" (9 CS 413), verified at 9 CS 413. He also noted that there were only 321 tributary Indians, not 600 as mentioned in the deed of encomienda. Castañeda was probably in agreement with Alvarez Osorio and caused to be filed a title search and history of the encomienda he was granted by Pedrarias, including the pueblo of
Mistega. That diligence, 2 CS 102, (September 6, 1529) documented the perceived stinginess of Pedrarias in granting Castañeda the encomiendas listed.

Just a year and a half earlier Mistega had a larger population. Lopez de Salcedo was said to have had 4,000 or 5,000 tributary Indians in 1527. That included 2,000 tributary Indians of Nicoya as well as the encomienda of Mistega. That would have meant that Mistega also had about 2,000 tributary Indians, or about 8,200 inhabitants. But by September 1529 it probably had only 1500 inhabitants (2 CS at 104). Consistent with other reports there was either a famine or an epidemic, or both, that killed a lot of Indians in 1528-1529. Castañeda noted that the Indians of Mahometombo, another of his encomiendas, had less than 500 tributary Indians; Abangasca, another of his encomiendas, above, did not have 40 tributary Indians. The fact of the death of many Indians in 1528-1529 was also recited in a few of the encomiendas of the islands in the gulf of Fonseca, noted below, and by Pedrarias in 1528.

Mistega was also mentioned by Oviedo as having a "sacred swing" in its plaza (Cronistas 3: 468). In that passage Oviedo noted that the swing was used by both Chorotegas and Nahuaus, who called the swing "comelagatoazte". He apparently did not know the Chorotega name for the swing.

After Castañeda left Nicaragua in May of 1535 the encomienda of Mistega was granted by Rodrigo de Contreras to Pedro Gonzales Calvillo. When Calvillo died the encomienda of Mistega was granted by Rodrigo de Contreras to his wife, Maria de Peñaflosa (14 CS 166, May 6, 1539). At the Act of Possession the caciques of Mistega present were Ziesogat and Maquil. Other caciques of Mistega were named as Tequexit and Yaquín (9 CS 476-477).

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Mistega is not found in the tascación of 1548, with the exception of "Guazama" (encomienda # 20, with 40 tributary Indians, owned by Hernando de Haro, with 170 inhabitants, mentioned below), which in all probability was the galpon of Otgalpanega, since it is the only location that is identified throughout the Coleccion Somosa as the place of "Guazama" speakers. It was either extinct, or is listed as Mistega, encomienda # 186, with 130 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 440 inhabitants. If Guazama is added back into "Mistega", the total population in 1548 was about 610 Indians, a decrease in population of 92% from the earliest population figures from 1527-1528.

ETHNIC STATUS: UNCLEAR. Fowler identified Mistega as being Nicaragua or Nahua (Fowler 1989:226), citing Lothrop. There is no clear cut statement, with the exception of Alvarez Osorio's statement about the presence of Guazamas, that identifies Mistega with any ethnic group. Two bits of evidence, however, tend to support the identification of Mistega with the Maribios. First, its location would place it very close to Pozoltega and Chichigalpa, both Maribios settlements. Second, in the sworn testimony taken of two chiefs of Mistega, Tequexit and Yyzquin (9 CS 476-477) they used the same interpreter, Miguel Martin, who had been employed elsewhere as a translator of Maribios, and only Maribios, and not either Chorotega or Nicaragua. There is no other information known to the author regarding the ethnic status of Mistega. While not overpowering, Mistega should probably be placed among the Maribios until other, conflicting information is found.

P3.32
NAME OF VILLAGE: Gualteveo

LOCATION: Unclear. Gualteveo was described as being seven leagues (35 km) from Cindega (9 CS 513). No other information is known as to its location. The encomiendas of Gualteveo, # 13 and 31 include tribute of salt and fish, indicating a location somewhere between the Pacific Ocean and Lake Managua, close enough to get fresh fish to Leon.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: The village was mentioned repeatedly in the lawsuit of THE CROWN v. MATEO LEZCANO, 9 CS 481). Lezcano had at least three encomiendas, Cindega, Gualteveo, and Mamey. Lezcano was accused of mistreating the Indians by removing the cacique of Cindega, Don Diego from power, and making him herd cattle at Mamey, located one league from Leon Viejo. Lezcano was also accused of forcing Indian women to travel from their village of Cindega seven leagues to Gualteveo to spin cotton into thread.

An interesting document is found at 10 CS 64, where Yseo de Santiago, unrelenting enemy of Pedro de los Rios and Rodrigo de Contreras, supposedly waived all title, right, and interest to the encomienda of Gualteveo. This was most probably a complete forgery cooked up by Pedro de los Rios and scribe Martin Mimbreno, his favorite forger.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Gualteveo survived in 1548 as two encomiendas: (1) # 13, 100 tributary Indians, owned by Yseo de Santiago, widow of Mateo Lezcano, and with 410 inhabitants; (2) # 31, 37 tributary Indians, owned by Cervigon, and with 145 inhabitants. Total population of the village was 550 inhabitants.

ETHNIC STATUS OF THE VILLAGE: Unclear. There is no specific reference identifying Gualteveo with any specific ethnic group. The evidence is slight that Gualteveo was Maribios, but it was placed among the Maribios villages because of its identification with Lezcano and Cindega. Though not absolute, there appeared to be a tendency to grant encomenderos villages with like ethnic groups. Cindega, noted above, was clearly a Maribios village. Secondly, it probably would have made more sense for Lezcano to send the Indian women of Cindega to the probable Chorotega village of Maney to spin thread if he wanted to send them to a Chorotega village which he owned, and which was closer to Leon than Gualteveo. He probably sent the Indian women to Gualteveo because they grew cotton and also spoke a common language, Maribio.

P3.33
NAME OF VILLAGE: Astatega.

LOCATION: Astatega was identified as being in the province of the Maribios, along with Pangua, noted above, (9 CS 108, 111).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: The village of Astatega was subject to at least two different encomiendas. Before Rodrigo de Contreras came to Nicaragua Luis de Guevara was granted the village of Astatega, along with seven other villages, in encomienda (9 CS 150).
Francisco de Castañeda granted Diego Sanchez two pueblos in encomienda, Pangua and Astatega (9 CS 140-141). Later Diego Sanchez tried to get Contreras removed as governor of Nicaragua. Contreras removed the encomiendas from Sanchez and gave them, including the encomienda of Astatega, ", that is in the province of the Maribios" to one Pedro de la Palma (9 CS 110-111).

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Astatega survived in 1548 as encomienda # 54, with 60 tributary Indians, owned by Diego Sanchez. He had appealed his case to Mexico and came back with a Royal edict ordering Contreras to give him back his encomienda, which Contreras refused to honor. Either Odyor Herrera or President Cerrato returned the encomienda to Sanchez. The village had 250 inhabitants.

In 1548 the Maribios villages totaled about 5,700 inhabitants, compared to Bobadilla's baptizing 6,023 Indians in early 1529. Either the Spaniards were especially easy on the Maribios Indians, or Bobadilla did a rather incomplete job of baptizing in 1529. Perhaps the Maribios Indians were not so pliable as the Chorotegas in consenting to be counted and baptized.

PROVINCE OF THE NORTHERN NAHUAS

At the province of Tecatega Bobadilla baptized 2,169 Indians, which was a far different figure from Oviedo's 20,000 inhabitants. The difference is unexplained. There were three identifiable Nicaragua speaking villages in northwest Nicaragua, Tezuatega, Chinandega, and Ayatega.

P3.34
NAME OF VILLAGE: Tezuatega

LOCATION: Near or on the present day site of El Viejo (Cronistas 3: 428).

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: Bobadilla reported baptizing 2,169 Indians in the province of Tezuatega (Cronistas 3: 358).

OTHER REFERENCES TO TEZUATEGA: The only "ethnography" written by Oviedo that he ever personally witnessed described the village of Tezuatega, presided over by the cacique Agatyey (Cronistas 3: 428-434; 461-468). The Coleccion Somoza had few references to Tezuatega or to Agatyey. Cibdad Real briefly mentioned the village of El Viejo as speaking corrupt Mexican or Nahuas (Cronistas 1: 147). Oviedo stated that the Indians of Tezuatega spoke Nahuas.

Pedrarias took the plaza of Tezuatega for his own encomienda. When he died his widow, Isabel de Bobadilla, was granted his encomienda by Juana La Loca (3 CS 134, January 31, 1532). When Isabel de Bobadilla died in October, 1539, her son-in-law, Governor Rodrigo de Contreras, granted that encomienda to his wife and Isabel de Bobadilla's daughter, Maria de Peñalosa (14 CS 170, December 17, 1540). At the Act of Possession three caciques of Tezuatega were present: (1) the Indio Casumate; (2) the India called Violante in Christian; and (3) an Indio named Quiat.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Tezuatega survived in 1548 as the village of Tezotaca, encomienda # 49 with 10 tributary Indians, owned by Ana Ximenez, and with 41 inhabitants.

Encomienda # 191, identified as the village of Tezuatega, had 70 tributary Indians, was owned by the Crown, and had 290 inhabitants. The total population of Tezuatega, almost certainly Nahuas speakers, was about 350 Indians.

ETHNIC STATUS: Nahua.

P3.35
NAME OF VILLAGE: Ayatega

LOCATION: Ayatega was located 14 leagues from Leon viejo. That would place Ayatega a bit farther from Leon than either Tezuatega or Chinandega. In the absence of any other information Ayatega is placed in the vicinity of Tezuatega and Chinandega, the only two identified Nahuas speaking villages in northwest Nicaragua.

INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Oviedo identified Ayatega as Nahua speaking (Cronistas 3: 57-58). The first encomendero of Ayatega was Gonzalo de los Rios. He left Nicaragua and Francisco de Castañeda awarded the village of Ayatega, along with the villages of Solosunyta and the island of Petronila to Crown Treasurer Pedro de los Rios in encomienda on December 25, 1533 (5 CS 373-374).

Rios later made Ayatega his headquarters and executed many legal documents and jurats there, including his will (16 CS 42, November 23, 1541).

Because of the New Laws, (7 CS 333, November 19, 1542) Pedro de los Rios backdated a deed of encomienda to his wife Isabel de Bobadilla, and granted her the encomienda of the villages of Pozoltega, Potega, Ayateca, and Mahometombo, in the jurisdiction of Leon (October 21, 1542, 11 CS 302). At the Act of Possession, "dated" October 22, 1542, the cacique of Ayatega, Pedro was present, as was his principal called Qualcoa.

Cibdad Real did not mention Ayatega in his 1586 report, suggesting that it was not located on the camino real from Honduras to Nicaragua. Ayatega does still appear as an encomienda of Subtiava in the Tascion of 1581.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Ayatega survived in 1548 as a village subject to three encomiendas (1): # 63, with 30 tributary Indians, owned by Peralvarez de Oviedo, and with 125 inhabitants; (2) # 76, with 16 tributary Indians, owned by Joan de Salamanca, and with 66 inhabitants; (3) #189 (probably Rios' old encomienda), with 30 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 125 inhabitants. Total population of the village of Ayatega was about 315 inhabitants.

ETHNIC STATUS: Nahua.

P3.36
NAME OF VILLAGE: Chinandega.

LOCATION: Near by or at its present location, one league (five km) from El Viejo.
INDIAN CONTACT AND TRIBUTE COLLECTED: No separate information.

OTHER REFERENCES TO THE VILLAGE: Cibad Real identified Chinandega as a Nahua speaking village (Cronistas 1: 147-148). Oviedo made no mention of Chinandega. Chinandega was not subject to any controversies so little mention is found of Chinandega in the Coleccion Somosa.

STATUS OF THE VILLAGE IN 1548: Chinandega survived as encomienda # 43, with 160 Indians, owned by the children of Martin Mimbreno, and with 660 inhabitants.

ETHNIC STATUS: Nahua.

If Oviedo’s figure of 20,000 Indians in the province of Tezontepe in February of 1529 can be relied on, the presence of only 1325 Indians, the combined populations of Tezontepe, Ayatepe, and Chinandega in 1548, would indicate a decrease in population of about 82% of the Nahua Indians in northwestern Nicaragua. It is unclear what Bobadilla’s reported baptizing of 2,169 persons in the province of Tezontepe means when at almost the same time, early 1529, Oviedo claimed that there were 20,000 Indians present. Though the evidence is slim, it appears to have been very bad luck to be an Indian in an encomienda owned by Pedro de los Rios close by an ocean port (El Realejo).

ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF PRE-1548 ETHNOGRAPHIC DATA OF EARLY NICARAGUA.

Between the first entradas into Nicaragua noted above and the tasacion of 1548 there is a random scattering of ethnographic data, which was not organized in any pattern, but was found mostly in the reports to the Crown and the many lawsuits and residencias of the Coleccion Somosa. There is almost no description of folkways, agricultural techniques, or other cultural artifacts. The commonest place where information is found is in the interrogatorios having to do with lawsuits regarding encomienda, complaints to the Crown for the theft of encomiendas, and tax records of slaving.

Because of the nature of the information presented, the information is of necessity of fragmentary composition. When compared with the tasacion of 1548, and other contemporary sources, that fragmentary information discloses useful data about Indian populations and their location, absent any of the misleading conclusory statements of later sources. While the data is presented in a roughly chronological basis, more importance was placed organizing a body of data, rather than strictly adhering to a chronological presentation.

ADDITIONAL ETHNIC DATA

P4.1 NAME OF VILLAGE OR LOCATION: Isla de Tagajologalpa.

LOCATION: An island in Lake Nicaragua located next to, or near, Granada (1 CS 374, 411, July 13, 1528).

COMMENT: This was either one of the isletas close to modern day Granada, or it was the original name of the island of Zapatera. The passage is an answer to an interrogatorio and described the responsibility for the fort at Granada: "... y se sabe que para la fortaleza de granada deco una isla que se llama tagajologalpa que esta junto con la ciudad y por alcaldes de las dichas fortalezas, a los dichos Martin Estete e Diego Texerena." The location of the island has a few obvious possibilities. The northernmost isleta, San Pablo, was made into a small fortress in the 1770’s by the Spanish colonial administration. It is so small, however, that it could not harbor a permanent population of more than one family of fishermen. Squier found a large statue close by Granada on the island he called "Pensacola" that is today called "Marcola." That site has never been systematically excavated. No vestigial remains of any fortresses are visible on the surface of the isleta. The third possibility is the island of Zapatera, located 10 miles south of Granada. There are the remains of two very large ceremonial sites, and several other smaller sites. Both Punta de las Figuras, on the northwest corner of the island, and Punta de Sonaspote on the northeastern corner of the island are the most likely candidates to be the fortresses briefly described in the passage.

THE ENCOMIENDAS IN THE GULF OF FONSECA.

The first attempt to remove Rodrigo de Contreras from office occurred in late 1537 or early 1538, when some of the citizens of Nicaragua, including Diego Sanchez, petitioned the Audiencia of Santo Domingo, which had appellate jurisdiction over Nicaragua, to send a judge of residencia to end Contreras’ rule. This attempt was unsuccessful and later both Judge Herrera and Factor Martin Desguibel thought that Contreras had bribed either the judge sent, Dr. Blazquez, or his scribe, or both.

Part of the documents filed by Contreras in his defense were the diligencias found at 5 CS 348 (January 20, 1538). Included in those documents are six encomiendas that were located on the islands in the Gulf of Fonseca, first called the islands of Petronila by Gil Gonzalez (Cronistas 3: 294). Several encomenderos complained that slaving expeditions from San Miguel (located in modern day El Salvador) were decimating the Indians. To document their claims several deeds of encomiendas were included in the diligencias. In the preliminary discussion it was apparent that most of the slaving expeditions came from San Miguel and that Indians were taken mainly from the islands of Petronila and Mixoa (also written as Comixoa) (5 CS 360-361). It should also be noted that all encomiendas identified before the Tasacion of 1548 have been given an index number beginning with "PE", that represents a recognized encomienda that predates 1548.

Comixoa and Petronila were described as being located together in the gulf of Fonseca (5 CS 363). The galpones listed in #PE1, listed below, may be the galpones of Comixoa. From the descriptions the island of Petronila is probably known today as Isla Zacate Grande, Comixoa is probably known as isla el Tigre, the isla de Chimagun #PE2, below) is probably known today as isla Manguera. Abstracts of the deeds of encomienda are reproduced below. Lehmam (1920: 668, 718) identified both Manguera and Comixoa as Lenca place names.

#PE1. DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (5 CS 367).

Grantor: Pedrarias Davila.
Grantee: Juan de Morales

Plazas of:
P4.21: Omaguiamota; cacique named Guamul;
P4.22: Yomangauna; cacique named Macuna;
P4.23: Guzgalpanega; cacique named Amama;
P4.24: Nohuli; cacique named Capena;
P4.25: Zuanagastona; cacique named Macoci;
P4.26: Mazoco; cacique named Aguyu.

Additional information: Ten more Indians were included together with the rest to total 200 tributary Indians, or 820 inhabitants.

Date: August 9, 1526.

STATUS OF THE PLAZAS IN 1548: Except for the possible encomiendas listed below, all of these villages were extinct by 1548.

Comment: Guzgalpanega, # P4.23, is phonetically similar to the name of the Guazama galpon at Mistega, Otolgalpanega. Zuanagastona, # P4.25, is phonetically similar to the encomiendas Joanaegasta, # 45, with 128 tributary Indians, owned by Blasco Porras de Leon, and with about 520 inhabitants; Juanaegastilla, # 46, with 24 tributary Indians, owned by Pedro Orejon, and with 100 inhabitants; and Juanaegastega, # 41 ( included also Condega), with 105 tributary Indians, owned by Joan Gallego, and with 425 inhabitants. The locations of both Joanaegasta and Juanaegastilla are not certain. There is indirect evidence, though, that at least Joanaegasta was a name of a Chondal village located one legua from Condega. See for example, the discussion of Condega and Juangasta in the tasacion of 1548, LVIN 31, below, and its description and identification as a Chondal village, called Guaxinaja, E# 57, in the tasacion of 1581. Another possibility is that these were names of small villages around the edge of the Gulf of Fonsecas, possibly by the mouth of the Rio Negro or Rio Choluteca. That area includes the area covered by the Chondal territory identified in 1581.

#PE2. DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (5 CS 368).
Grantor: Pedrarias Davila
Grantee: Cristobal Burgos and Alonso de Segovia.

Plazas of:
P4.27: Island of Chinagan
Additional Information: Chinagan was described as being, "...even with Caziguina...". Pedrarias granted 200 tributary Indians to each encomendero, 400 Indians in total, with 1620 inhabitants.

Date: November 24, 1530.

Status of the Plaza in 1548: Extinct.

#PE3. DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (5 CS 369).
Grantor: Francisco de Castañeda.
Grantee: Alcalde Hernando de Alcantara Botello.

Plazas of:
P4.28: "The island of Conzaguna, with a Christian name of San Martin, that is in the island of Cuziguina."

Date: July 5, 1532.

Additional Information: Castañeda granted this encomienda because of the great mortality of Indians.

Status of the plaza in 1548: Extinct.

#PE4. DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (5 CS 370).
Grantor: Francisco de Castañeda.
Grantee: Gonzalo de los Ríos

Plazas of:
P4.29: "...the island of Colapatepet, in another name Caza, and in Christian, La Petronila, a plaza of Indians called Miangues."

Date: August 17, 1532.

Additional Information: Castañeda granted this encomienda to Ríos because of the amount that he had spent on the conquest and many of his Indians had died that he had in other encomiendas. This encomienda was granted to supplement his income. The ethnic identity of the village was probably Chorotega, as noted from the linguistic information. Cibdad Real may have mentioned this island by calling it Cisaltepeel and identifying it at least partly as Nahua; the Nahua speakers had previously abandoned it and moved to El Viejo before he passed by in 1586 (Fowler 1989: 60).

Status of the plaza in 1548: Extinct.

#PE5. DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (5 CS 372)
Grantor: Francisco de Castañeda.
Grantee: Pedro Gonzales Calvillo

Plazas of:
P4.29: the island of Colapatepet, also called Caza, and in Christian La Petronila, a plaza of Indians of that island called Mozozo.

Date: August 16, 1532.
Additional information: Castañeda awarded this encomienda to Gonzales because of the many Indians deaths that had apparently diminished his other encomiendas. This encomienda and the previous one, # P4.29 were obviously both on the island of Petronila. See comment above.

Status of the plaza in 1548: Extinct.

#PE6. DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (5 CS 373).
Grantor: Francisco de Castañeda.
Grantee: Pedro de los Ríos.

Plazas of:
P3.35 the plaza of Ayatega and its galpones (probably referring to Ayatega, noted above);
P4.31: the plaza and galpones of Petronila.
The galpones of the island of Petronila that were owned by Gonzalo de los Ríos, P3.29 above.

Date: December 25, 1533.

Additional Information: Castañeda gave this encomienda to Ríos because of his status as Crown treasurer.

Status of the Plazas in 1548: Ayatega survived as encomienda # 62, with 30 tributary Indians, owned by Peralvarez de Oviedo, and with 125 inhabitants; encomienda # 76, with 16 tributary Indians, owned by Joan de Salmanca, and with 66 inhabitants; and encomienda # 189, with 30 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 125 inhabitants. Total population of Ayatega was 316 inhabitants. Both Petrosunyta and Petronila were extinct by 1548.

ENCOMIENDAS OF FRANCISCO DE CASTAÑEDA: MISTEGA, ABANGASCA, MAHOMETONBO.

When Francisco de Castañeda arrived in Nicaragua in early 1529 he was granted an encomienda by Governor Pedrarias Davila. Castañeda was upset because he felt the encomienda was too small, and so he took testimony about the history of the encomienda of Mistega (2 CS 102, September 6, 1529). Francisco Hernandez granted Mistega to alcalde ordinario Juan Talavera. Lopez de Salcedo removed Talavera and took Mistega for his own encomienda. Combined with other encomiendas, including Nicoya, Lopez de Salcedo had 45,000 tributary Indians in encomienda (2 CS 104). Since Nicoya had a reported 2,000 tributary Indians (See P1.2), the population of Mistega in 1527 would have been (assuming Lopez did not have any other sizable encomiendas) about 4,000 tributary Indians and about 8,200 inhabitants.

#PE7. DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (2 CS 91, August 26, 1529).
Grantor: Pedrarias Davila.
Grantee: Francisco de Castañeda.

Plazas of:
P3.31 Mistega, including the galpones:
P4.32(a) Astaconzi; principal Teyoa;
P4.32(b) Chamologanga; principal Huyec;
P4.32(c) Estanzingo; principal Olin;
P4.32(d) Cozcastega; principal Mata;
P4.32(e) Escalogapol; principal Escoaloan;
P4.32(f) Tepegya; principal Alzагuанcone;
P4.32(g) Coalccone; principal Agat;
P4.32(h) Otalgalpanega; principal Tezatotot.
This plaza totalled 600 tributary Indians.
P3.26 Abangasca. Castañeda was also awarded one-half of the plaza totalling 100 tributary Indians.
P3.18 Mahometonbo. Castañeda was also awarded this plaza.

Date: August 26, 1529.

Additional Information: Bishop Alvarez Osorio claimed that in 1529 there were only 321 tributary Indians in Mistega. He also noted that one of the galpones of Mistega spoke the Guazama language. Castañeda complained that there were not 50 tributary Indians in Mahometonbo nor 40 tributary Indians in Abangasca by September, 1529. This was universally attributed to disease and/or famine. See generally the comments at P3.26.

Status of the Plazas in 1548:
P3.31 Mistega: Either extinct or listed as Mastega, encomienda # 186, with 440 inhabitants. Otalgalpanega survived as Gauham, encomienda # 20, with 170 inhabitants. Total population of Mistega was about 610 inhabitants.
P3.18 Mahometonbo was subject to two encomiendas, # 4 and 184, with 55 tributary Indians and 222 inhabitants.
P3.26 Abangasca was subject to encomienda # 193 with 40 tributary Indians and 165 inhabitants.

Comment: Mistega had plummeted from about 8,200 inhabitants in 1527 to 610 Indians, a decrease of about 92%. Both Abangasca and Mahometonbo had maintained their populations very close to the 1529 levels reported by Castañeda.

PE#8 Encomienda of Bartolome Tello. (9 CS 144).
Grantor: Francisco de Castañeda
Grantee: Bartolome Tello.
Plazas of:

P1.15 Monbacho. (Mentioned 9 CS 144).

Additional Information: None.

Date: Unknown, pre May, 1535.

Status of the Plaza in 1548: See discussion in P1.15, above.

Comment: It is unclear which of two different plazas named Monbacho in the tasación of 1548 are referred to in this encomienda. Tello brought a lawsuit against Conterras for the return of his encomienda, BARTOLOME TELLO v. RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS, 8 CS 382, (February 11, 1544). He won the lawsuit and was listed in 1548 as the encomendero of encomienda # 145, Manbach Mandapio.

ENCOMIENDAS OF PEDRARIAS DAVILA.

There is no direct reference to the encomiendas of Pedrarias. After his death Queen Mother Juana La Loca awarded his widow, Isabel de Bobadilla, his encomiendas for the remainder of her life (3 CS 134, January 31, 1532). The villages named in that Royal edict are as follows:

#PE9 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (3 CS 134, January 31, 1532).

Grantor: Pedrarias Davila

Grantee: Pedrarias Davila

Plazas of:

P1.2 Nicoya;
P1.5 Chira (Note the earlier reference, P1.5 is to the mines, not the plaza, of Chira.)
P3.34 Tezutega
P3.36 Chinandega.

Additional Information: After Isabel de Bobadilla's death, Governor Rodrigo de Conterras granted that encomienda, minus the plaza of Chinandega, to his wife (and Isabel de Bobadilla's daughter) Maria de Peñalosa, 14 CS 170, # PE25, noted below.

Date: Either 1526 or 1528.

Status of the Plaza in 1548:

P1.2 Nicoya: Survived, see discussion in P1.2, above.
P1.5 Chira: Survived, see discussion in P1.5, above.

PE10 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (9 CS 156).

Grantor(s): Pedrarias Davila and Francisco de Castañeda.

Grantee: Hernan Nieto.

Plazas of:

P4.33: Apustega, Tepustega (They are equivalent names 9 CS 156) (E# 36).
P4.34: Lazate and its galpones (Lazato= Zoquipa?)
P4.35: Ocuma Cindegas, probably Cindegas P 3.24.
P4.36: The islas, probably the islas of Petronila, #PE 1-6, above.

Additional Information: This encomienda is mentioned in the residencia of Rodrigo de Conterras (9 CS 1, 1544) as being stolen by Conterras and granted to one Miguel Diaz (9 CS at 155) Later Hernan Nieto was listed as one of the encomenderos of Tepustega, encomienda # 36, with 100 tributary Indians, and 410- inhabitants. Tepustega has not been located, but it paid tribute of both salt and fish, so it must have not been far from Leon Viejo, possibly between Leon Viejo and the Pacific Ocean.

Date: Both awards of encomiendas to Nieto were made before June of 1535.

Status of the plaza(s) in 1548:

P4.33 Apustega. Survived as Tepustega, encomienda # 36.
P4.34 Extinct.
P4.35 Ocuma Cindegas. Survived as Cindegas, noted in P3.23, above.
P4.36: The islas of Petronila, extinct.

PE11 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (9 CS 144)

Grantor: Francisco de Castañeda (?)

Grantee: Luis de Guevara
Plazas of:
P4.37: Asolotega, probably Azolotega, encomienda # 65.
P4.39: Ysotague, possibly Ysaltega P3.29.
P3.33: Astatega, P3.33
P4.40: Noloaque, encomienda # 66.
P3.30: Iguala, P3.30
P3.28: Yntega, or possibly Utega, P3.28. (9 CS 144)

Additional Information: This encomienda is mentioned in the residencia of Rodrigo de Contreras. Guevara was a crony of Castañeda and acted as Castañeda's attorney at Castañeda's residencia, IN RE RESIDENCIA OF FRANCISCO DE CASTAÑEDA, 4 CS 1 (1536). This encomienda was granted to Guevara probably by Castañeda.

Date: Before June, 1535.

Status of the plaza(s) in 1548: All of these pueblos were listed in the tasacion of 1548, albeit as mostly very small encomiendas. Asolotega, # 65, had 70 tributary Indians, was owned by the children of Luis de Guevara, and had 290 inhabitants; Noloaque, encomienda # 66, had 13 tributary Indians, was owned by the children of Luis de Guevara, and had about 55 inhabitants. Asolotega has not been located. Noloaque is mentioned as lying in the province of Nagrando, and was probably not far away from Leon Viejo (1 CS 477). No information is known about the ethnic identity of either of these two pueblos. Most of the other pueblos mentioned in this encomienda were Maribios. More information is found in their respective, numbered paragraphs.

PE#12 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (9 CS 140).
Grantor: Francisco de Castañeda.
Grantee: Diego Sanchez

Plazas of:
P3.33: Astatega
P3.26: Pangua, (Mentioned 9 CS 140-141).

Additional Information: Diego Sanchez quarreled with both Castañeda and Contreras. After he left Nicaragua to appeal some of the judgements of Contreras, Rodrigo de Contreras gave his encomiendas to Juan Durreta and Pedro de la Palma.

Date: Before June, 1535.

Status of the plaza(s) in 1548: Both Astatega, P3.33 and Pangua, P3.27, survived, as noted in their respective paragraphs. Both were clearly Maribios villages. Diego Sanchez owned both encomiendas.

PE#13 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (9 CS 110).
Plazas of:

**P4.41:** Potega, encomienda # 188; principales (1) Pedro; (2) Quiaguito; (3) Cozomal

**P4.42:** Guazama, encomienda # 20, part of Mistega, P3.31; principales (1) Papalo; (2) Sochet Guegue (10 CS 67).

Additional Information: Mbrenro was one of Contreras favorite forgers and was rewarded for his work. He killed at least one priest in the Easter Uprising of 1543 to defend Pedro de los Rios and died in 1545 in Leon Viejo. His estate disappeared after his death. Potega has not been located, except that it was 13-15 leagues from Leon Viejo (5 CS at 107), perhaps located near Ayatega, which was 14 leagues from Leon viejo. It had 70 tributary Indians, was owned by the Crown, and had about 290 inhabitants. No information is known about its ethnic status. Information about Guazama is noted in paragraph P3.31 (Mistega). It had 166 inhabitants who spoke Guazama, an unknown language. The former grantee of the encomienda was Miguel Lucas, decedent.

Date: August 30, 1541.

State of the plazas in 1548: Potega survived, as noted above, as did Guazama, as noted in P3.31.

**PE#17 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (14 CS 74).**

Grantor: Pedrarias Davila or Lopez de Salcedo

Grantee: Diego Machuca de Zuazo

Plazas of:

**P3.11:** Nindiri.

**P3.12:** Managua.

**P4.43:** Guazamalga on the island of Omotepe, also called Isla Grande, and also called Minguire Elayela (14 CS 74), possibly encomienda # 158, Isla de Nicaragua.

Additional Information: Diego Machuca de Zuazo was the first cousin of Rodrigo de Contreras and was in Nicaragua by at least 1528 or 1529, when Oviedo used Machuca's encomienda of Nindiri as a base of operations to climb up the Masaya volcano. Machuca and Alonso Calero were appointed by Rodrigo de Contreras to find the mouth of the San Juan River in 1540. After that disastrous undertaking Machuca, Calero, and Contreras became mortal enemies. Contreras accused Calero of treason, a capital crime, in documents sent to Prince Phillip. Contreras removed the encomiendas of Machuca without a hearing.

Machuca's widow, Catalina Gutierrez brought a lawsuit for the restitution of Machuca's encomienda, CATALINA GUTIERREZ, VIUDA DE DIEGO MACHUCA DE ZUAZO v. RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS, 14 CS 74 (February 26, 1547). It is not known whether she was successful in the lawsuit and was awarded again Nindiri and the plaza of Guazamalga on the Isla de Nicaragua.

Date: Probably 1528, or before the administrations of Castañeda and Contreras.

Status of the plaza(s) in 1548:

**P3.11:** Nindiri was a Crown encomienda, # 178, with 300 tributary Indians and 1240 inhabitants.

**P3.12:** Managua, survived as noted in P3.12.

**P4.43:** Isla de Nicaragua survived with at least two encomiendas, # 158, with 114 tributary Indians, owned by Luis de la Rocha, and 470 inhabitants; and # 111, Moyogalpa, with 60 tributary Indians, owned by Juan Yequerado, and with 250 inhabitants.

**PE#18 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (11 CS 325).**

Grantor: Pedrarias Davila, Lopez de Salcedo, Pedrarias Davila, and Francisco de Castañeda.

Grantee: Juan Suarez.

Plaza of:

**P1.16:** Nandaima; principales Candamari and Mendone, (13 CS 339, 1528); in 1543 the principales were Pedro in Christian (he was a mistizo) and Yanbombe (other variations Anobonyme or Ysanbomye) the main cacique; other Indians present were Diomynoy, Zindiondo, Nayyonbue, Arottery, Nacatime (possibly the cacique of Nindiri or another cacique with the same name) Potrinario, Zetesos Piron, and Utzarayre (11 CS 325).

Additional Information: Sanchez received four different encomiendas for the pueblo of Nandaima: (1) granted by Pedrarias on December 4, 1526, two-thirds of the tributary Indians of Nandaima which totaled 500 tributary Indians (13 CS 340-341); (2) granted by Lopez de Salcedo on January 10, 1527 (13 CS 341-342); (3) granted by Pedrarias on October 20, 1528 (13 CS 337-338) two thirds of the plaza of Nandaima, which totaled 500 tributary Indians; (4) granted by Francisco de Castañeda, December 2, 1533 the last third of the tributary Indians of Nandaima (13 CS 339-340). Encomiendas one, two, and three are the restatement of the same encomienda. Encomienda four, granted by Castañeda, was a new grant of the last third of the Indians of Nandaima since the former encomendero of that last third, Alonso de Heredia, had left Nicaragua. The population of tributary Indians of Nandaima in 1527 was 750 Indians, with about 3100 inhabitants.

Contreras took away the encomienda of Suarez and gave it to Juan Carballo. The second husband of Suarez' widow, Juan Gallegos, brought suit for the restitution of the encomienda, JUAN GALLEGOS, GUARDIAN OF THE WIDOW AND CHILDREN OF JUAN SANCHEZ v. JUAN CARBALLO, 13 CS 304 (October 27, 1543). After several years of litigation Gallegos won the case.

Date: (1) December 4, 1526; (2) January 10, 1527; (3) October 20, 1528; and (4) December 2, 1533.
Status of the plaza in 1548: Nandaime survived in 1548 as a village subject to three encomiendas: (1) # 135, with 100 tributary Indians, owned by Bernaldino de Miranda, and with 410 inhabitants; (2) # 148, with 51 tributary Indians, owned by the children of Xuarez, and with 206 inhabitants; and (3) # 154, with 80 tributary Indians, owned by Juan Carballo, with 330 inhabitants. The total inhabitants of Nandaime in 1548 was 946 persons, a decrease of the 1527 population of about 70 percent.

PE#19 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (11 CS 91).
Grantor: Pedrarias Davila.
Grantee: Hernando Vega.
Plaza of: P4.44 Jalteva (100 tributary Indians) 11 CS 91.

Additional Information: Hernando Vega was granted an encomienda in the pueblo of Jalteva. He died and Contreras later took away the encomienda; acting governor Pedro de los Ríos then granted the encomienda to a third party, Juan de Hoyos (Royal edict of Pedro de los Ríos, dated January 23, 1543, 11 CS 103-105). Suit was brought by the guardian of the minor child of decedent, Juan Vega, RODRIGO ALONSO, GUARDIAN OF THE MINOR JUAN VEGA v. JUAN DE HOYOS 11 CS 77 (June 21, 1544). Alonso won the lawsuit.

Date: August 13, 1526.

Status of the plaza in 1548: Jalteva was subject to several encomiendas: (1) # 106, 10 tributary Indians, owned by Joan Lozano, and with 41 inhabitants; (2) # 118, 30 tributary Indians, owned by Juan Davila, and with 124 inhabitants; (3) #122, 15 tributary Indians, owned by Gonzalo Melgarejo, and with 62 inhabitants; (4) # 124, 10 tributary Indians, owned by Christobal Sant Martin, and with 41 inhabitants; (5) # 132, with 10 tributary Indians, owned by Alonso Ruiz, and with 41 inhabitants; (6) # 143, 15 tributary Indians, owned by Texerina, and with 62 inhabitants; (7) # 150, 14 tributary Indians, owned by Francisco Gutierrez, and with 58 inhabitants; (8) # 152, 5 tributary Indians, owned by Francisco Sanchez, and with 21 inhabitants; (9) # 156, an unknown number of Indians of several villages, and owned by Benito Diaz; (10) # 163, 40 tributary Indians, owned by Juan de Hoyos (the subject of the above mentioned lawsuit), and with 164 inhabitants; (11) # 166, 35 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 140 inhabitants; (12) # 169, 8 tributary Indians, owned by Marcos Aleman, and with 34 inhabitants.

Pedrarias wrote the Crown in 1525 that Jalteva, where Granada was founded, had about 8,000 "naturales" or inhabitants (1 CS 128). In 1548 Jalteva had about 800 inhabitants, a decrease in population of about 90%. Other information about the specific encomienda of Hernando Vega shows that his encomienda of 100 tributary Indians in 1526 was 40 tributary Indians in 1548, a decrease of only 60%. There appears to be a tendency among the encomiendas of Granada to suffer slightly less decrease in population than the pueblos around Leon and that are closer to the port of El Realejo. Jalteva also has the most "mini" encomiendas, perhaps evidencing that those encomiendas were at one time much larger.

PE#20 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (12 CS 10).
Grantor: Unknown, either Pedrarias or Francisco de Castilloa.
Grantee: The sitting Bishop, Osoorio, Francisco de Mendavia, and acting Bishop and Dean of Nicaragua Pedro de Mendavia from October 7, 1540 to December 16, 1541.
Plazas of:
P4.45a: Cazahuaque.
P4.45b: Ahuaque, a village of fishermen; no previous, or later reference (12 CS 8,10, November 1542) (Nolocoa 7).
Additional Information: Mendavia recited the fact of these two villages as being assigned to the sitting Bishop for his support in the Royal edict at 12 CS 8,10, which may or may not have been forged. In the deed of encomienda that granted the encomienda to his son, Rodrigo de Contreras, did not mention Ahuaque.

Date: From approximately 1531 to December 16, 1541.

Status of the Plaza(s) in 1548:
P4.45a survived as noted.
P4.45b was extinct.

Several encomiendas were owned by Rodrigo de Contreras and Pedro de los Rios. The encomiendas of Contreras were listed in the case of MARIA DE PEÑALOSA v. THE CROWN, 14 CS 124 (August 22, 1548). The Audiencia de los Confines, through the efforts of both Odyor Diego de Herrera and Presidente Alonso de Cerrato, had removed the encomiendas that had been owned by Contreras, based upon the strong proofs that Contreras had obtained most of those encomiendas by theft and that they were put in the names of Contreras' family members by backdating the dates of the deeds of encomienda to avoid the confiscatory effect of the New laws (7 CS 333, November 19, 1542), and by forgery (11 CS 285, August 16, 1544). The Consejo de Las Indias did not return the encomiendas to the Contreras family. The only deed of encomienda of Pedro de los Rios is found as part of the proofs of the fraudulent conveyances noted by Herrera (11 CS 285, 302-303, August 16, 1544). The encomiendas of the Contreras family and of Pedro de los Rios are listed below.

PE#21 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (14 CS 168).
Grantor: Rodrigo de Contreras
Grantee: Pedro de Contreras, his son.
Plazas of:
P3.28: Utega.

P4.46: Utegaizimba, possibly part of Utega, since Utega had two encomiendas.

P4.45a: Quizalauque, probably Cazaloaque, encomienda # 187 (14 CS 168).

P4.47: Chilitega, not mentioned before or afterward.

P4.48: Opotega, not mentioned before or afterward (Potega ?).

Additional Information: This deed purported to transfer the encomiendas of the towns mentioned because of vacancies caused by the death of Bishop Alvarez Osorio and one Alonso de Segovia.

Date: July 11, 1539.

Status of the Plaza(s) in 1548:

P3.28 probably survived as two encomiendas as noted in P3.27.

P4.45a survived as encomienda Quizalauque, E# 187.

P4.47 and 4.48 became extinct or were merged into other encomiendas.

PE#22 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (14 CS 173).

Grantor: Rodrigo de Contreras

Grantee: Pedro de Contreras, his son.

Plazas of:

P4.45a Cazaloaque (probably modern day Quezalgueque), Encomienda # 187 (Cazaloaque), with 153 tributary Indians, owned by the Crown, and with 615 inhabitants. Cazaloaque was identified as a Maribios village, (14 CS 173).

P3.28: the two Utega. Only one "Utega" is mentioned earlier and the other Utega may have been "Utegaizimba", (14 CS 168).

P4.49: The Chondal Indians that were included in the village of Cazaloaque. (14 CS 173).

Date: December 16, 1541.

Additional Information: This deed of encomienda recited that it became vacant when the Bishop of Nicaragua, Francisco de Mendavia died, as it had been used since the days of Bishop Alvarez Osorio to support the Bishop of Nicaragua. Contreras allowed Deán Pedro de Mendavia use the encomienda until he got into a dispute with Mendavia in December 1541. He obviously removed the encomienda out of spite and gave it to his son. This dispute is discussed in detail elsewhere by the author.

Survival of the plaza(s) in 1548:

P4.45a: Cazaloaque survived as noted above.

P3.28: The two Utega survived as noted above.

P4.49: Nothing is known of the Chondal Indians mentioned in the encomienda.

PE#23 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (14 CS 166)

Grantor: Rodrigo de Contreras.

Grantee: María de Peñalosa, his wife.

Plazas of:

P3.31: Mistega; principales (1) Ziesgat and (2) Maquil (14 CS 166)

Additional Information: The encomienda of Mistega was vacated when its previous owner, Pedro Gonzales Calvillo, died.

Date: May 6, 1539.

Status of the Plaza(s) in 1548: Mistega survived as Mastega and Guazama as noted in P3.31.

PE#24 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (14 CS 169).

Grantor: Rodrigo de Contreras

Grantee: Diego de Contreras, his son.

Plazas of:

P3.26: Avangaaca.

P4.50: Ysotaca, not mentioned before or afterward.

P3.29: Yguala.

P4.51: Mazacon, not mentioned before or afterward (14 CS 169)

Additional Information: The major caciques present at the Act of Possession were listed as Francisco, Migisti, and Maca a cosa. None of the caciques were listed as coming from any specific pueblo.

Date: August 2, 1537.

Status of the Plazas in 1548:
P3.26: Abangasca survived as noted above.
P4.50: Ysotaca was extinct.
P3.29: Yguala was extinct.
P4.51: Mazacon was extinct.

PE#25 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (14 CS 170).
Grantor: Rodrigo de Contreras.
Grantee: María de Peñalosa, his wife.

Plazas of:
P1.2: Nacoya: caciques (1) Nipopoyamot; (2) Moto; (3) una India Ynesica; (4) an Indio, Namayo.
P1.5: Chira: caciques (1) Catalina in Christian; (2) an Indio named Nogui.
P3.34: Tezuatega: caciques: (1) Casamates; (2) an Indian named Violante in Christian; (3) an Indio named Quiat.

Additional Information: María de Peñalosa’s mother, Isabel de Bobadilla, had died six months previous to the issuance of the deed of encomienda, on or about September 10, 1539. This deed of encomienda, minus the village of Chinandega, was issued to keep the encomienda in the family. See PE#38, above.

Date: December 17, 1540.

Status of the Plazas in 1548:
P1.2: Nacoya survived.
P1.5: Chira survived.
P3.34: Tezuatega survived as noted.

PE#26 DEED OF ENCOMIENDA (14 CS 174).
Grantor: Rodrigo de Contreras.
Grantee: Vasco de Contreras.

Plazas of:
P4.52: Monimbo: Principales (1) Botoy; (2) Nacay; (3) Mandati.
P4.53: Zagualpa: Principales (1) Socher; (2) Chicaezgue.
P4.54: Motolyenes Choncales of the city of Granada.

Additional Information: Both the caciques of Zagualpa and Motolyenes Choncales were referred to as Choncales (14 CS at 176).

Date: April 15, 1542.

Status of the Plazas in 1548:
P4.52: Monimbo survived as part of greater Masaya.
P4.53: Zagualpa survived as part of greater Masaya.
P4.54: Motolyenes Choncales was extinct or absorbed into the greater population of Granada.

REFERENCES TO INDIGENOUS POPULATIONS IN NORTHERN NICARAGUA

While there are many references to the mines and the seven mining towns established by the Spaniards, there are almost no concrete references to villages or Indians other than calling them Choncales. The only exception was one of the very early mining towns that was founded in either southern Honduras or northern Nicaragua, Caceras de la Frontera, also called Villahermosa by Benito Hurtado, sent by Pedrarias to hijack Caceres de la Frontera. Information about the location of that villa comes from the founding documents of the town, interrogatorios taken regarding its destruction, and Oviedo’s mention of the route taken to arrive at the location of Caceras de la Frontera. Some of the unpaid royal fifth of taxes due for the branding of slaves are found in IN RE ACCOUNTING OF THE ESTATE OF PEDRO DE LOS RÍOS, 16 CS 7, 374 (September 17, 1550). More extensive listings are found in IN RE ACCOUNTING OF THE ESTATE OF CERECEDA, 17 CS 302 (1550), but the accounting of Indian brandings in IN RE RÍOS are unique because they also include where the Indians were from that were being sold as slaves. Those accounts were for 10U’s, not for amounts paid, and included 11 entries of Indians from the mines or garnacion. No towns are listed, as they are for other regions in western Nicaragua.

A review of a map of western Nicaragua invites speculation about the path traveled to the mines. A natural corridor to the north central part of Nicaragua is the drainage of the Rio Viejo, which drains into Lake Managua about 30 km east of Leon viejo. Recent archaeological exploration has shown the river to be an almost continuous band of archaeological sites as one progresses upstream from the area around Sebaco (Espinosa, Gonzalez, and Rigat, 1994: 157, 162). Little evidence is found, in the tasación of 1548, however, that Spaniards traveled very far east of Leon Viejo; only one encomienda, Mescales, # 28, with 14 tributary Indians, owned by Alonso Mendez, and with 55 inhabitants, located in the drainage of the Mescales river, has been located far to the east.

Oviedo gave enough details to have some idea of the route taken to the mines at Caceras de la Frontera. An abstract of his description to Caceras de la Frontera is as follows:

a. 5.1 From Leon Viejo travel six leagues to Olocoton; then
b. 5.2 travel six leagues to the first Quaxenicos (probably an unidentified ethnic group, possibly Putun Maya); then
c. 5.3 travel six leagues to other Quaxenicos; then
d. 5.4 travel three leagues to Palangalpa; then
e. 5.5 travel six leagues to Anagua; then
f. 5.6 travel six leagues to Chalan; then
g. 5.7 travel six leagues to Guayape; then
h. 5.8 travel four leagues to Telpanega, "where the Indians killed Alonso Solis"; then
i. 5.9 travel four leagues, "... mas hacia la parte de Leon en la provincia de Tepaneca, es donde mataron al dicho Hurtado y los otros espanoles en la dicha Villahermosa". *(Cronistas 3:454-455)*.

While some of the Indian villages have disappeared, some of the names mentioned by Oviedo can be located. Olocoton, encomienda # 2, with 24 tributary Indians, owned by Francisco de Medina, and with 100 inhabitants, is a location northwest of Leon Viejo in the direction of Somotillo. That would indicate a trajectory not east toward the Río Viejo, but northwest to Somotillo and then perhaps north and then east.

A clue may be found in the Sonnenstern map of 1863. It clearly shows a main route to northern Nicaragua that climbs the Sierra de la Botija north of Somotillo, follows the rim of that sierra, and then turns east in the area of Macquelizo and Santa Maria. One other clue may be that one of the only two encomiendas identified in northern Nicaragua, Limay, (modern day San Juan de Limay), (encomienda # 75, with 44 Indians, owned by Diego de Molina Polanco, and with 180 inhabitants) is located in a natural depression just east a few kilometers from the rim of the sierra and would be plainly visible by a horseman riding the rim of the Sierra de la Botija.

Most of the other references in Oviedo's directions to Caceres de la Frontera have been lost in time. Anaguaca is mentioned once, at 1 CS 475, in a list of slaves taken by one of Lopez de Salcedo's men on the way from Trujillo, Honduras, to Leon Viejo. Guayape is also mentioned, as this was an early location of placer gold mining in the Olancho district of Honduras located far to the east and north of the Jalapa valley, and may not agree at all with the distances mentioned by Oviedo.

Cereceda placed Villahermosa fifty leagues from Leon Viejo and two leagues away from the site of Caceres de la Frontera (17 CS 430-431). He also placed Caceres de la Frontera almost exactly between Trujillo and Leon Viejo in the valley of Olancho in modern day Honduras. Of the two, Cereceda was a much more exact observer than Oviedo and his account was written in 1529 in Nicaragua, while Oviedo's was written close to twenty years later in Santo Domingo. The exact location of Caceres de la Frontera will probably be established by archaeological means if it still exists in a recognizable condition.

Of further interest in the founding of Caceres de la Frontera are the names of some of the villages mentioned in the Act of Possession (1 CS 133, May 12, 1526).

**NAME OF VILLAGE: Agalca.**
LOCATION: Valley of Olancho (?).

**DATE:** May 20, 1526.

**NAME OF VILLAGE:** Telicachequiza

LOCATION: Close to the village of Canjapachequiza, which was "up valley", probably meaning west, a little more than one league from Escalina la Grande.

**NAME OF VILLAGE:** Canjapachequiza

LOCATION: See P 6.2, above.

**DATE:** May 20, 1526.

**NAME OF VILLAGE:** Cacaquiza

LOCATION: Jurisdiction of Nueva Segovia, otherwise unknown.

**DATE:** May 20, 1526.

**NAME OF VILLAGE:** Toquea

LOCATION: Jurisdiction of Nueva Segovia, otherwise unknown.

**DATE:** May 20, 1526.

**NAME OF VILLAGE:** Condeguila

LOCATION: Jurisdiction of Nueva Segovia, otherwise unknown.

**DATE:** May 20, 1526.

**NAME OF VILLAGE:** Comayna

LOCATION: Jurisdiction of Nueva Segovia, otherwise unknown.
### TABLE 4.11 ENCOMENDEROS OF THE CONTRERAS-RIOS ALLIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encomendero</th>
<th># of tributary Indians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EL 4 R. de Contreras B.</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EL 5 A. Botre</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EL 17 Children of Mimbreno</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EL 19 Maldonado</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EL 22 P. Palma</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EL 28 P. Orejon</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EL 30 D. Contreras</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. EL 36 Children of Guevara</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. EL 37 A. Rodriguez</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. EL 38 F. Nunez</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. EL D. Molina</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. EL 41 F. Robles</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. EL 43 A. Torrejon</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. EL 44 A. de Guevara</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. EL 47 G. de Toledo</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. EG 14 F. Ruiz</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. EG 17 L. de Guevara</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. EG 30 F. Gutierrez</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. EG 31 J. Carballo</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. EG 34 P. Palma</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. EG 35 J. Hoyos</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. EG 40 D. Bermudez</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of encomenderos: 22  
Number of Indians per encomendero: 119

### TABLE 4.12: ENCOMENDEROS IN THE ANTI-CONTRERAS GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encomendero</th>
<th># of Tributary Indians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EL 6 Pero Garcia</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EL 8 Yeño de Santiago</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EL 9 Joan Gallego</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EL 14 Hernando de Haro</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EL 21 Zervigon</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EL 23 A. Zamora</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EL 24 H. Nieto</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. EL 31 D. Sanchez</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. EL 34 J. de Salamanca</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. EL 42 S. Picado</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. EL 46 G. Cano</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. EL 48 J. Alonso</td>
<td>(7) (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. EL 50 Guebondo</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. EG 5 P. Garcia          60  
15. EG 8 J. Izquierdo       70  
16. EG 15 G. de Malagurko   75  
17. EG 18 P. Romero         75  
18. EG 23 B. de Miranda     100  
19. EG 24 P. Sanchez        150  
20. EG 25 D. de Pachrana    30  
21. EG 26 Texerina          135  
22. EG 27 B. Tello          130  
23. EG 28 M. Aleman         105  
24. EG 29 Children of Suarez  51  
25. EG 32 B. Díaz           300  
26. EG 36 G. Anipes         92  
27. EG 37 A. de Sevilla     42  
28. EG 38 P. Fernández      50

Total encomenderos: 28  
Total 2699 Tributary Indians

Number of Indians per encomendero 96.

Number of Tributary Indians in Nicaragua: 10, 683

Number of encomenderos (not counting the Crown encomenderos): 89
Average number of Indians held by private encomenderos: 97
Average number of Indians per encomienda: 54

It is clear that Cerrato and the Audiencia made an attempt to correct past abuses of the Contreras regime. It is also clear that Cerrato made his decisions with little or no regard to the wrongdoing or complicity of the allies of Contreras family. Obviously, since the Contreras family lost their appeals in the Consejo de las Indias for the return of their encomiendas they did not get back their encomiendas. Several enemies of Contreras did regain their encomiendas, though partially through the decisions of oydores Pineda and Herrera which were uniformly upheld on appeal.

One of the indirect results of Contreras' machinations to recall Herrera back to Gracias a Dios before he could finish with his works is that many of the cronies of Contreras and Ríos apparently retained their encomiendas, regardless of how much skulduggery they did to obtain them. The only exceptions are a handful of cases where the wronged former owners of encomienda prosecuted their own lawsuits. In terms of size, the encomiendas of the Contreras-Ríos alliance were larger, 119 tributary Indians versus 97 for the anti group. It made good business sense to be a member of the Contreras-Ríos alliance.

Whether the size of the Nicaraguan encomiendas were sufficient to maintain an encomendero in comfortable circumstances is doubtful. Newson reported that the minimum number of tributary Indians needed to maintain a Spaniard with a reasonable standard of living was 500 pesos; to be considered rich an encomendero needed 1,000 pesos. None of the encomenderos in Nicaragua had encomienda rights for numbers of tributary Indians necessary to produce that wealth; at most the tribute exacted from the Indians allowed a very basic existence. The only means to gain wealth in early Nicaragua was from gold mining, or from slaving.
documented journey through Nicaragua by Fray Cibdad Real in 1586 served to clear up many questions regarding the location and ethnicity of still more villages. By assigning village identification numbers to all citations and standardizing the information regarding each village it became possible for the first time to quantitatively study many Nicaraguan Indian villages through time, from the conquest in the 1520's through the censuses of 1548 and 1581.

1 As a measure of the cultural remnants of early Nicaragua that still exist in Nueva Segovia, the most common unit of measurement east of Ocotal is still the legua, which measures about 4 kilometers. Gold miners in that area still talk about their yields in gold panning in terms of tomines, with 1 1/2 tomines equaling one gram. This very closely describes the value of a tomine of 18 carat gold as noted in a related work on early gold mining in Nicaragua, Werner 1996.

2 For the curious, the closest estimate of the circumference of the Earth done by the ancients was the first recorded estimate of Eratosthenes, made about 200 B.C., which was off only about 500 miles. From this the idea of a degree of latitude at the equator of about 70 nautical miles was developed. Later estimates introduced error; Columbus' estimate of the number of Roman miles in a degree of latitude, 56 2/3, was the most erroneous of all and about 25% less that exists in reality (Morrison 1970: 539). His success in finding the American continents, which caused the social interaction which is the subject of this work, was done by blind luck, not by any ideas of navigation or geography that had any relation to reality. Columbus is the classic example of a glaz eyed fanatic (or nut) who got lucky. Or he had talked to someone who had already sailed to the Americas and had returned, a possibility discounted by Morrison, as much on faith as by any tangible rationality.

3 The vara is still the dominant unit of measure of length for the purchase of cloth in Managua. It is defined as 33 inches in length. The vara is also the basic unit for the definition of land measurements in Nicaragua, with one manaza, or 1.71 acres, being made up of 10,000 square varas.

4 The location of the Camino Real of 1586 is noted in the discussion of Cibdad Real, below, as well as noted on the map accompanying the discussion.

5 The geographical distribution of the major Indian groups at the onset of the conquest is found in Figure 3.

6 It is impossible to tell if the village was named Cangon or it was the village of the cacique named Cangon as both terms are used in such a confused manner that it is impossible to tell which version is correct, and with many names listed in the early chronicles and the Coleccion Somozas. At any rate the name Cangon stuck to the village, as will be seen below.

7 The possibility exists that the Totoaque of 1548 was actually located by Leon Viejo, not San Jorge. The encomienda identified as Totoaque was located within the jurisdiction of Leon, not Granada, where it obviously was located. In several other instances villages are located within jurisdictions where they did not belong, such as Mayales, also described as within the jurisdiction of Leon, and Managua, which was located within both the jurisdiction of Leon and Granada. Sloppy record keeping by the Audiencia de los Confines or transcription errors of clerks may have contributed to these obvious errors. In the absence of any concrete, conflicting evidence Totoaque will be placed within the village of Nicaragua.

It should be noted that Bernal Diaz del Castillo, the tough, factual, and best chronista of the conquest of Mexico, wrote his True History out of disgust for the garbage and self-serving non-history that Gomara had written about the conquest of Mexico and Cortes.

8 The manner in which all early Spaniards used the word "Nicaragua" has served to confuse many later historians and writers. Very early, at least by 1526 "Nicaragua" was used to designate the colony founded by Gil Gonzalez, Francisco Hernandez and Pedarias. Lopez de Salcedo tried briefly to call the colony the "Nuevo Reino de Leon" (1 CS 284, 1527). When discussing the region of early Nicaragua that was at that time governed by the cacique Nicaragua, Oviedo and others called the region the province of Nicaragua, thus introducing ambiguity. Lehmann jumped to the conclusion that Teoca was Tezutaca and later writers have followed in this error (Fowler 1989:21). To further clarify the matter, Oviedo identified Teoca as lying within the jurisdiction of Granada, which was consistent with the later usage in the tasacion of 1548, that divided up all encomiendas between those in the jurisdiction of Leon, northern and western Nicaragua, and those in the jurisdiction of Granada, those from Managua south to the Nicoya peninsula. Lastly, the towns mentioned by Bobadilla as he traveled back to Leon obviously described a route that went northwest from the region of present day San Jorge to El Viejo (Tezutaca) in northwest Nicaragua.

The designation "PE" means a title of encomienda, or fragment thereof, that predates the tasacion of 1548. The reproduced documents themselves include much helpful information.

The history of Caceres de la Frontera and Villahermosa is discussed in detail in Werner (1996).
Chapter 4
THE TASACIÓN OF 1548

Without question, the most important document regarding ethnographic data of early Nicaragua is the tasación of 1548 (14 CS 357, November, 1548). It represents the first systematic compilation of information regarding the Indians of western Nicaragua that survived until 1548, and when utilized with other contemporary information, it allows the Indian villages to be recreated with surprising detail. In the past historians and archaeologists have had some difficulty in using the detail in the tasación of 1548 for two reasons. First, the inability to link each encomienda with a location and/or an ethnic identity rendered the tasación useless in terms of reconstructing the Indian populations and ethnic groups of early Nicaragua. And secondly, the arcane indexing system and misspelling made the reconstruction of Indian population centers difficult to locate and identify.

Perhaps the best manner to understand the difficulty experienced in utilizing the data found in the tasación of 1548 is by examining an example of the tasacion, encomienda number one, the encomienda of Cuçivina (14 CS 357):

Number 1: )
Cuçivina )
Martin Zanbrano XL (40) Indians )
Leon de Nicaragua )

"In the city of San Salvador of the province of Guatemala on the 24th day of November, 1548, by the senior president and oidores of the Royal Audiencia and Chancillerie of His Majesty, that in the said city was taken the census and tax assessment of the pueblo of Cuçivina which is found in the jurisdiction of the city of Leon (Viejo) of the province of Nicaragua and that is granted in encomienda to Martin Zanbrano, resident of the said city; the Indians (of Cuçivina) are ordered that every year they are to plant four fanegas of corn seed in two fields, two fanegas of seeds in each field; and in the aforesaid two fields they are also to plant one fanega of beans; and they are to guard and care for the crop; and they are to plant one and a half fanegas of cotton seed, and they are to care for said seed, and are to give their encomendero 50 white cotton blankets of the usual size; and they are to give each year 50 carguillas of salt of the size that 10 carguillas make up one carga; and they are to give each year one dozen Castillian chickens; and each year 10 cántaros and 10 woven mats; and they are to give each year six cántaros of honey and one arroba of wax; and for four months, that is December, January, February, and March they are to give two Indians for service; and the encomendero is obliged during this time to give them food during this time of service and to teach them the Christian doctrine; and the Indians are to give no other thing and the encomendero is not to take the Indians anywhere, nor ask for any other tribute, under penalty of the laws and ordinances of His Majesty passed for the good governance of the Indians. El Licenciado Çerrato. El Licenciado Pedro Ramírez. El Licenciado Rogel."

Regarding the first problem, a suggested reconstruction of over 160 of the 198 encomiendas, including location and ethnic group, serves to give a realistic representation for the first time of early, historic Nicaraguan populations. Since the tasación itself is silent as to the location of each encomienda information from other sources was invaluable in determining the location and ethnicity of the great majority of Indian villages, most of which are now extinct. A similar problem stems from the fact that the number of Indians listed in each encomienda are tributary Indians, or heads of households. The total population of Indians of each village, then is a multiple of the number of tributary Indians. For the purposes of this work a multiplier factor of 4.1 was applied to the tributary Indians in order to derive the total population of Indians. And secondly, by grouping together encomiendas according to geographical location, much of the mystery of the tasación is explained.

The tasación was ordered taken by the Crown in 1547 (14 CS 295, November 23, 1547) and was undertaken with surprising speed. It was ordered taken because there had never been a systematic census of the Indians of Nicaraguan taken previously and because the state of incomienda in Nicaragua, and the rest of the empire, was chaotic. The Crown issued its famous New Laws of 1542, (5 CS 333, November 20, 1542) including its ban on government officials from owning encomiendas and the general restrictions on granting new encomiendas (New Laws, sections 26-30). The fierce lobbying of the encomenderos quickly changed the royal mind, and in 1545 Charles V, or at least Prince Philip, performed a royal flip-flop and cancelled those sameenson in provisions of the New Laws. The Crown promulgated two other royal edicts, 14 CS 330 (August 18, 1548) and 14 CS 340 (August 18, 1548), which reinstated the powers of the royal audiencias to grant new encomiendas.

No report exists regarding the actual process used to collect the information for the tasación. Lozoya (1920:105) hints that the Audiencia de los Conflines sent three hacks to Nicaragua in 1547 remove the encomiendas from the Conterras family. Lozoya also notes that the Conterras familyparty believed that Bishop Valdivieso sent some letters to the Crown that fatally damaged the Conterras family's chances to regain their encomiendas after Judge Herrera removed them during the residence of Rodrigo de Conterras. There is no specific proof of this; the letters of Valdivieso that have survived end in 1547 and do not specifically document his allegations as to why the Conterras family should not retain their encomiendas.

At the time that the census was taken the newly appointed president of the Audiencia de los Conflines was Lic. Alonso de Cerrato, Bartolome de las Casas' personal choice for the position, and was supposed to be a reform minded bureaucrat appointed to clean up the gigantic mess created by the first President of the Audiencia, Lic. Alonso Maldonado, who was a close friend of Conterras and related by marriage to Pedro de los Ríos, son-in-law of Rodrigo de Conterras.

The tasación was issued from San Salvador during the months of November and December, 1548 (14 CS 357). In all, 198 numbered encomiendas were listed. The listings were organized as encomiendas within the jurisdiction of the cities of Leon and Granada. Also are listed the owner of the encomienda, the specific type of tribute to be given over to the encomendero, and a prohibition against exacting more tribute than that specified in the encomienda. The tribute consisted of both goods and services. The listed encomiendas define to a large degree the geographical extent of Spanish domination in western Nicaragua.

The specific types of goods and crops included within the encomiendas are summarized in Appendix Five, below, and give an accurate picture of the farming and handicraft activities of the Indian populations. They also indicate that certain goods tended to be produced by certain ethnic groups and certain crops, such as cacao, were also only produced by certain groups of Indians and were not universally grown.
The major variables in the tasación are the villages and encomenderos; the tasación has been reorganized in two master lists according to these variables. Regular operating procedure was that in the larger villages the Indians were divided into two or more encomiendas and assigned to different encomenderos. In order to reconstruct the population of the entire village the various encomiendas of that village were placed together. The reconstructed villages give a clear idea as to the size of the villages in 1548 and a means to extrapolate backwards in time to recreate the populations of western Nicaragua in 1522. The reorganization of the encomiendas according to the encomendero allows the economic and political elite and early political coalitions of eastern Nicaragua to be identified, since in 1548 the only measure of wealth and power was ownership of encomienda. It also gives some clues as to the location of encomiendas since there was a tendency, not always followed, to give encomenderos villages or galpones clustered together or along a main road.

The tasación itself shows some evidence of clerical errors and sloppy accounting and at least two persons' work. It is obvious that the tribute amounts charged to each encomienda were calculated according to a fixed formula according to each product and the available population of the village. Within the jurisdiction of Leon that formula was applied uniformly; each village was taxed in equal proportion. In Granada, on the other hand, some villages were taxed very heavily in proportion to their population; either the tribute assessor was careless in his work or the tribute was based on larger population figures that existed earlier. There are also a few encomiendas that exacted very light tribute in comparison with their available populations. Those encomiendas were located on the east side of Lake Nicaragua and possibly represent population centers that were not very strongly under Spanish domination in 1548.91

The location and ethnic identity of the Indian pueblos has proved to be a much more uncertain task, with information scattered in various sources. The most important sources for locating villages and identifying ethnic groups are: (a) Cereceda’s first entrada into Nicaragua; (b) Bobadilla’s baptizing expedition in 1528; (c) Oviedo; (d) the ethnographic references in the Coleccion Somozas; (e) Cibdad Real; (f) Velasco; (g) Morel de Santa Cruz; (h) Lehmann; and (i) the Tasación of 1581.

Other sources bear mention. The favorite of many historians and linguists, Torquemada, proved to be of little use except to indicate that the Indians around San Jorge spoke Nahuatl and told some priest that they came from the north. Of much greater help was a large relief map and many topographical maps of Nicaragua. If one is to speak of geographic location a thorough knowledge of Nicaraguan geography is a necessity, as is the necessity of visiting as many sites as possible to gain an understanding of the relationship between sites and land forms. For example, it is obvious that while the encomiendas have been assigned a number from 1 to 198 they were listed in groups of either pueblos and encomiendas lying in close proximity or along a main road (the major Mariobis pueblos were listed in this fashion), or according to the encomendero (such as Pedro de la Palma’s two encomiendas, # 74 Yoaltezende and # 75 Limay) or a combination of the two methods.

(a). Cereceda’s first entrada into Nicaragua from the south was valuable since he recorded the distances between villages and the number of people baptized in each village. He was a very exact accountant and his figures must be considered accurate.

(b). Bobadilla’s baptizing expedition, undertaken in 1528 at the request of Pedrarias, is also quite valuable since he identified the number of persons baptized, gave some idea of the distances traveled and the names of villages, and the ethnic groups he encountered. Bobadilla’s account partially overlaps the ground covered by Cereceda and serves to corroborate Cereceda and other major cronistas.

(c). Oviedo. Oviedo is the most quoted cronista and without a doubt not the most reliable. He listed the population of several population centers and always did so in round numbers, the only cronista to do so; all the rest used exact numbers. And except for the population figure of Tezuatega (20,000) and Masaya (100,000) he admitted that the population figures of Managua (40,000) and Mateare (12,000) he got second hand. He placed the population of Managua in 1528 at 1,100 inhabitants, less than what it was in 1548. Because some of the other matters he reported in his Historia Natural were either outright lies or intentional omissions obviously intended to mislead the reader, his population figures should be taken with caution.

(d). The references to the Coleccion Somozas proved invaluable in identifying population sizes and ethnic identities of Indians. The several hundred references found in the Coleccion are found in the relaciones and many lawsuits, both residencias and between Spanish vientos, and are almost always given in reference to something else and are not given because someone has a vested interest in the truthfulness of the assertion of the fact of the location or ethnic identity of a particular pueblo.

(e). Cibdad Real. Though he traveled through Nicaragua in 1586, Cibdad Real’s account is exacting and corroborates other, earlier information. He kept the most detailed information about the distances between villages and their ethnic identity and served to locate many Mariobis villages that had been identified as Mariobis in the Coleccion Somozas but were lacking in any information about their location. The account of the trip to Granada also served to corroborate the ethnic quality and location of many of the villages that still are found between Masaya and Granada; i.e. Catarrina, San Juan de Oriente, Diririo and Diriria.

(f). Velasco. Written at the end of the 16th century, Velasco’s geography of the Spanish empire gave some idea of Spanish populations of the in the four Spanish cities, Leon, Granada, Realdejo, and Nueva Segovia. It also listed the encomiendas of Leon and Granada. That listing appears to be a poorly transcribed copy of the tasación of 1548, as it contains much of the same information with a few changes.

(g). Morel de Santa Cruz. Newly appointed Bishop Morel took it upon himself to visit each parish in Nicaragua in 1751. He reported on his trip and gave many details, including the number of houses in each pueblo and their means of roof construction, paja or teja, to determine if they were Spanish or Indian populations. He also listed the names of some of the barrios of the larger cities, which allowed for a few of the encomiendas of 1548 (such as Mazagalpa, encomiendas # 34, 161, and # 155; and Dirirga, encomienda # 101) to be finally located.

(h). Lehmann. Though written in 1920, Lehmann’s magnum opus is still the most exhaustively researched reconstruction of the ancient languages of western Nicaragua. Unfortunately Lehmann did not have the Coleccion Somozas and so had to rely on much later sources, mostly in the 19th century, and Velasco’s botched copy of the tasación of 1548, as a data base. His encyclopedic documentation did allow at least one encomienda, Nicopasaya, encomienda # 174,
Total Population: 2598

Ethnic Identity: Chorotegan
Estimated population in 1522: 51,960 (2598/0.05)

Oviedo estimated, on what he had been told, that Managua at the onset of the conquest in 1524 had a population of 40,000.

d. Masaya
TABLE 4.4: THE VILLAGES OF MASAYA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GVIN 2 Diriega</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GVIN 18 Masaya</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GVIN 54 Monimbo</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total population: 2173
Ethnic Identity: Chorotegan
Estimated population in 1522: 43,460 (2173/0.05)

In 1528 Oviedo estimated the population of the Masaya area as 100,000. The figure of 43,460 does not include many of the villages that surrounded the laguna de Masaya, but only those within the general area of the present day town of Masaya. If those other villages are entered into the calculations the population of the greater Masaya area slightly exceeds 100,000.

e. San Jorge
TABLE 4.5: THE VILLAGES OF SAN JORGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GVIN 9 Xoxoya</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GVIN 37 Nicaragua</td>
<td>1368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GVIN 53 Tolgalpa</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GVIN 55 Totoaque</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total population: 1835
Ethnic Identity: Nicarao
Estimated population in 1522: 36,700 (1835/0.05)

The Indians of San Jorge were counted twice, once by Cereceda and the second time by Bobadilla, who baptized 29,063 persons at San Jorge in the fall of 1528.

f. Tezuatega-Chinandega-Ayatega
TABLE 4.6: THE VILLAGES OF TEZUATEGA-ChINANDEGA-AYATEG A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LVIN 87 Tezuatega</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LVIN 33 Chinandega</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. LVIN 49 Ayatega</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LVIN 79 Potega</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Population: 1542
Ethnic Identity: Nahua
Estimated Population in 1522: 30,840 (1542/0.05)

When Oviedo visited the village of Tezuatega in 1528 he estimated the population of Tezuatega to be 20,000. The figure of 30,340 represents Tezuatega, and in addition the two Nahua villages of Ayatega and Potega, which may not have lain close enough to Tezuatega to be considered part of greater Tezuatega.

g. Granada-Jalteva
TABLE 4.7: THE VILLAGES OF JALTEVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GVIN 7 Xalteba</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnic Identity: Chorotegan
Estimated Population in 1522: 5880 (882/0.15)

Pedrarias Davila wrote to the Crown in 1525 and estimated the population of the Indians of Granada to be about 8,000 "naturales". The discrepancy may lie in the fact that there were obviously fishing villages along the shore of Lake Nicaragua that may have pertained to any of about six encomiendas that had to furnish fishermen to the encomenderos of Granada. For reasons stated above those encomiendas were not included in the count for Jalteva.

The villages assessed fishermen and fish for Granada totaled 14 and were clustered from Masaya south. One encomienda, of the isla de Nicaragua, GVIN 39 was assessed two arrobas of fish every cuaresma. The fishing villages of Granada were:

1. GVIN 7 Xalteba
2. GVIN 13 Guatepeque
3. GVIN 14 Niratia
4. GVIN 18 Masaya
5. GVIN 20 Manbacho and Susujeto
6. GVIN 22 Nontiba
7. GVIN 23 Marinalte
to be approximately located, and corroborated many more. His reconstruction of the Chorotegan language and its close relationship with the Chipianecan language assisted in clarifying the name of at least three encomiendas: # 89 Nabitio Yopomo, Pomonagarando # 98, and Mohomo # 110. The word “nuponmo” in Chispanecan means “the plaza of” (Lehmann 1920: 884).

(i) The Tasación of 1581. This unpublished document was very useful in reconstructing the villages of Managua, in finally identifying the Chontales villages, and in a scattering of other data, such as the villages around Sebaco. It also contains exact information about the size of each village, right down to each man, woman, and child, including in some instances their names. It is incomplete and lacks many village references, such as those of Masaya, Nueva Segovia, and Nicoya, that obviously were in existence in 1581.

A RECONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN POPULATION CENTERS.

The restatement of the tasación of 1548 allows some of the larger villages and/or clusters of barrios, or galpones, to be reconstructed for that year. Oviedo commented that he noted several large cacicazgos: El Viejo, Mistega, Nicoya, and the village of the cacique Nicaragua. From the Coleccion Somota and related cronistas cited above, the following approximation can be made of the main Indian population centers in 1548:

a. Leon Viejo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LVIN 12 Mamey</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LVIN 4 Momotombo</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. LVIN 5 Nabitia</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LVIN 75 Pomonagarando</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Indian population

Ethnic identity: Chorotegan

Estimated 1522 population: 20,000 (999 conversion factor of 0.05). Pedrarias Davila mentioned the population of Nagarando in 1525 at 15,000 "naturales".

In addition, 18 villages furnished fishermen or fish to Leon Viejo. Some of them, at least, may have been clustered around the shoreline north and south of Leon Viejo. Others, such as Pozoltega and Utega were Maribios villages which were several leagues from Leon. The farthest identified village from Leon Viejo was Totogalpa, which was located probably near or at the present day site of Totogalpa, Nueva Segovia. The villages are:

1. LVIN 5 Nabití
2. LVIN 7 Huegalpa
3. LVIN 12 Mamey

b. Mistega

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LVIN 10 Capotea</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LVIN 7 Guazama</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. LVIN 77 Mastega</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LVIN 42 Tatamustega</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LVIN 67 Estanguiz</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Population: 1003

Ethnic identity: Maribios (except Guazama)

Estimated 1522 population: 20,000 (1003/0.05)

No specific estimate has been found of the population of Mistega at the onset of the conquest.

c. Managua

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LVIN 28 Mazagalpa</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LVIN 56 Managua</td>
<td>1087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GVIN 1 Yatan</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GVIN 3 Mulagalpa</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GVIN 6 Aconpa</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GVIN 15 Guatape and Tonala</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. GVIN 50 Gicogalpa</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. GV1N 25 Loma
9. GV1N 28 Nandaime
10. GV1N 36 Nicaragua
11. GV1N 38 Cagualpa et al
12. GV1N 39 Isla de Nicaragua
13. GV1N 40 Atotone
14. GV1N 44 Tenami

\[ \text{h. Cindega}
\]

**TABLE 4.8: THE VILLAGE OF CINDEGA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GV1N 8 Cindega</td>
<td>1747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ethnic Identity: Maribios
| Estimated Population in 1522: 34,940 (1747/0.05). |

Cindega was mentioned many times by every eyewitness that passed by the road that ran west of Subtiava towards El Realejo and Honduras. In 1586 Cibdad Real mentioned four small pueblos, all named Cinandega lying where previous eye witnesses had located Cindega. It was one of a cluster of Maribios villages that ran from the western edge of Subtiava at least to Mistega, and perhaps onward to the Pacific coast. There was no specific earlier estimate of Cindega’s population.

\[ \text{i. Nicoya-Chira}
\]

**TABLE 4.9: THE VILLAGE OF NICOYA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GV1N 54 Nicoya</td>
<td>2460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Population: 2460 |
| Ethnic Identity: Chorotegan |

| Estimated population in 1522: 6,000 reported, so the depopulation was about 57 percent, the lowest depopulation figure of any village in Nicaragua. |

\[ \text{j. Mayales-Chuigalpa-Tacoxolgalpa}
\]

**TABLE 4.10: THE VILLAGES OF MAYALES, CHUIGALPA, AND TACOXOLGALPA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GV1N 33 Mayales</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Chuigalpa-Tacoxolgalpa

| Total Population: 287 |
| Ethnic Identity: Unknown |
| Estimated Population in 1522: Unknown |

The tribute assessments for these two villages were completely different than for villages in western Nicaragua. The assessments were very light when compared on a per capita basis with the rest of the assessments and indicate a possibly different ethnic group or at least groups not yet willing to pay high rates of tribute.

**THE ENCOMENDEROS**

The economic elite of early, colonial Nicaragua were the encomenderos. Since the colony had no more than 400-500 Spaniards, including men, women, and Spanish children, in residence up to 1550, their means of support was largely defined by the encomienda. Up to the end of the Contreras regime in 1544, when the encomiendas were concentrated in the hands of Contreras and his allies, and through the first tribute census and systematic recognition of the Nicaraguan encomiendas in 1548, President Cerrato of the Audiencia de los Confines, charged with making the census and tribute assessments, apparently tried to recognize existing ownership whenever possible and make redistribution in an even handed manner. By identifying the two or three political groups and seeing how they were rewarded with the awarding of encomiendas, some specific idea of how Cerrato worked can be realized.

Among the colonists, two opposing groups were obvious: the Contreras-Ríos alliance, and the reformers and enemies of the Contreras-Ríos alliance. Arguably a third group existed, those who tried not to anger each of the other two groups. The identification of each of these three groups is fairly easily accomplished: members of the Contreras-Ríos alliance included the immediate members of both families and their close relatives, their identified agents, or criados, and encomenderos who rendered favorable testimony in the many lawsuits that were generated by the Contreras-Ríos administration. Members of the reformers and enemies of the Contreras alliance are equally easily identified: those that had their encomiendas taken away by Contreras or Ríos, those that repeatedly tried to have Contreras removed by residencia, and those that rendered hostile information and interrogatories in the many lawsuits of the Contreras era. How these two groups fared in the Cerrato tasación of 1548 should give a clear idea of who was in control of Nicaragua’s economy in late 1548, four years after Contreras had been removed from power. Lastly, a comparison between the original invading army of Hernandez de Cordoba and the recognized encomenderos of 1548 should give an equally clear idea of just how realistic was the promise of quick riches for those that risked life and property to conquer the new territory of Nicaragua.

**ANALYSIS OF ENCOMENDEROS**

The work of President Cerrato and the Audiencia de los Confines can be better understood when the two active political groups are compared.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.11: Encomenderos of the Contreras-Ríos Alliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encomendero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. EL 4 R. de Contreras B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EL 5 A. Botre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EL 17 Children of Mimbreno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EL 19 Maldonado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EL 22 P. Palma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EL 28 P. Orejon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EL 30 D. Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. EL 36 Children of Guevara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. EL 37 A. Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. EL 38 F. Nunez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. EL D. Molina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. EL 41 F. Robles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. EL 43 A. Torrejon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. EL 44 A. de Guevara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. EL 47 G. de Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. EG 14 F. Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. EG 17 L. de Guevara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. EG 30 F. Gutierrez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. EG 31 J. Carballo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. EG 34 P. Palma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. EG 35 J. Hoyos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. EG 40 D. Bermudez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of encomenderos: 22
Number of Indians per encomendero: 119
Number of Tributary Indians: 2616

Table 4.12: Encomenderos in the Anti-Contreras Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encomendero</th>
<th># of Tributary Indians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EL 6 Pero Garcia</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EL 8 Yseo de Santiago</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EL 9 Joan Gallego</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EL 14 Hernando de Haro</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EL 21 Zervigon</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EL 23 A. Zamora</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EL 24 H. Nieto</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. EL 31 D. Sanchez</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. EL 34 J. de Salamanca</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. EL 42 S. Picado</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. EL 46 G. Cano</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. EL 48 J. Alonso</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. EL 50 Orohondo</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Tributary Indians: 2699

14. EG 5 P. Garcia | 60 |
15. EG 8 J. Iziquierdo | 70 |
16. EG 15 G. de Malgarejo | 75 |
17. EG 18 P. Romero | 75 |
18. EG 23 B. de Miranda | 100 |
19. EG 24 F. Sanchez | 150 |
20. EG 25 D. de Pastrana | 30 |
21. EG 26 Texerina | 135 |
22. EG 27 B. Tello | 130 |
23. EG 28 M. Aleman | 105 |
24. EG 29 Children of Suarez | 51 |
25. EG 32 B. Diaz | 300 |
26. EG 36 G. Angies | 92 |
27. EG 37 A. de Sevilla | 42 |
28. EG 38 P. Fernandez | 50 |

Total encomenderos: 28
Total number of Indians per encomendero: 96
Number of Tributary Indians: 10,683
Number of encomenderos: 89
Average number of Indians per encomendero: 97
Average number of Indians: 54

It is clear that Cerrato and the Audiencia made an attempt to correct past abuses of the Contreras regime. It is also clear that Cerrato made his decisions with little or no regard to the wrongdoing or complicity of the allies of Contreras family. Obviously, once the Contreras family lost their appeals in the Consejo de las Indias for the return of their encomiendas they did not get back their encomiendas. Several enemies of Contreras did regain their encomiendas, though partially through the decisions of oydores Pineda and Herrera which were uniformly upheld on appeal.

One of the indirect results of Contreras’ machinations to recall Herrera back to Gracias a Dios before he could finish with his works is that many of the cronies of Contreras and Ríos apparently retained their encomiendas, regardless of how much skullduggery they did to obtain them. The only exceptions are a handful of cases where the wronged former owners of encomienda prosecuted their own lawsuits.

In terms of size, the encomiendas of the Contreras-Ríos alliance were larger, 119 tributary Indians versus 97 for the anti-group. It made good business sense to be a member of the Contreras-Ríos alliance.

Whether the size of the Nicaraguan encomiendas were sufficient to maintain an encomendero in comfortable circumstances is doubtful. Newson reported that the minimum number of tributary Indians needed to maintain a Spaniard with a reasonable standard of living was 500 pesos; to be considered rich an encomendero needed 1,000 pesos. None of the encomenderos in Nicaragua had encomienda rights for numbers of tributary Indians necessary to produce that wealth; at most the tribute exacted from the Indians allowed a very basic existence. The only means to gain wealth in early Nicaragua was from gold mining, or from slaving.
Lastly the utility of conquering Nicaragua as a means of gaining wealth should be considered. Uniformly, the instructions for awarding encomiendas emphasized that they should go first to those who helped in the conquest, and then to those vellinos who were quality people and who were married to Spanish women and who had their wives with them. The reality was that very few of the original members of Hernandez invading army in 1524 were awarded encomiendas.  


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENCOMENDERO</th>
<th># OF TRIBUTARY INDIANS</th>
<th>POLITICAL AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EL 10 Alonso Mendez</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EL 12 Joan Gallegos</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EL 26 Pedro Sanchez</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EL 32 Joan de la Calle</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EL 43 Alonso Torrejon</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EG 4 Joan Lozano</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EG 15 Gonzalo Melgarejo</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. EG 19 Alonso Ruiz</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. EG 25 Diego de Pastrana</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. EG 26 Tercerina</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. EG 33 Luis de la Rocha</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of that group, only one encomendero, Alonso Torrejon, was a member of the Contreras-Rios alliance, four were members of the anti group, and six were members of the neutral or unknown group. Of the 229 men who were members of Hernandez invading army in 1524, only 11, or five percent, were encomenderos 24 years later. The great majority of the encomenderos were members of the second wave of Spaniards that came after the countryside was secure, or were the employees and cronies of Contreras and Rios. Conquering Nicaragua as a means to gain wealth was a fleeting dream.

In conclusion, by utilizing the large amount of specific information existent about Nicaragua’s Indian villages it is possible to reconstruct the villages found in the tasacion of 1548 to a great degree, as to location, ethnicity, population size, and economic production. Various clusters of villages appear based upon this reconstruction, most of whom are now extinct, but some of which, such as the villages between Leon and Chinandega, and those found on the Meseta de los Pueblos, represent remnants of pre-columbian villages that have survived to the present day. The reconstruction of the Indian villages also allows the determination of the economic elite among the Spaniards, those who received grants of encomiendas. By comparing the list of encomenderos with the known allies and enemies of the Contreras-Rios Alliance it is easy to perceive that President Cerrato did an even handed job of assigning encomiendas in 1548. And by comparing the list of encomenderos with the list of Spaniards who entered Nicaragua with the conquering army of Francisco Hernandez de Cordoba it is clear that the dream of riches and encomiendas for the conquerors of Nicaragua was not very realistic - most of the encomenderos were men who came to Nicaragua in the second or third wave of colonists, and not the first wave of soldiers and adventurers who came largely from Panama.

1 The colony of Nicaragua in 1548, as defined by its 198 encomiendas, is found in Figure 1; the distribution of encomiendas from 1522 to 1548 is found in Figure 4. 
2 For an explanation of this conversion factor, see Appendix Five, below. 
3 See, for example, MARIA DE PEÑALOSA, ET AL v. THE CROWN, 14 CS 124 (August 24, 1548).
4 The correspondence of Herrera, on the other hand, gives sufficient and detailed information why he removed the encomiendas from the Contreras family. See, for example, 11 CS 285, (1544).
5 An annotated abstract of the Tasacion of 1548 is found in its entirety in Appendix Five, below.
6 The ethnic identity of the pueblos on the east side of Lake Nicaragua is not mentioned anywhere. But the great disparity between the amount of tribute levied on Indian villages in western Nicaragua and that levied on the eastern villages make it clear that different rules for the determination of tribute were in force. Below, the Indians of those encomiendas and villages are referred to as periphery populations.
7 Regarding fishing villages, the tasacion lists many villages that had to supply fishermen at Leon viejo. Some of those villages were obviously close to the Spanish settlement. Some of the known villages that had to supply fishermen were some distance away from Leon Viejo, and for that reason have not been placed within the “Greater Leon Viejo” area.
8 Spacially, the villages listed are considered to be no more than one league, or 4.5 km, from the population center. The exception is Nabiita, which appears to have been an arc of settlements south of Leon Viejo that was about two leagues, at its southeastern point, from Leon Viejo. From the tribute lists and other citations it is obvious that Nabiita, or Imbiste, was economically associated with Nagrado-Leon Viejo, and is properly placed within the “Greater Leon Viejo” area.
9 For an explanation of the conversion factors used in calculating the 1522 populations, see the next subsection below.
10 Obviously San Jorge was not the Indian name of the cluster of Nahua villages at the present day site of San Jorge. The problem is that contemporary observers never gave a name for the congregation of villages. Cerceda, for example, only referred to the place of the village of the cacique Nicaragua. Benito Davila estimated that the name might be Tolgalpa, the name of one of the galpones. Only a century later did Torquemada come up with the name of Quascapolca (Fowler 1989: 68) which may or may not have been a later embellishment. In any event there was no contemporary agreement on the correct name of the village of the cacique Nicaragua and so its later Spanish name is used.
11 Since both Pero Garcia and Pedro de la Palma had encomiendas in both Leon and Granada, 2 was taken away from the total number of private encomenderos (91) to arrive at the number of 89 private encomenderos.
The Crowns was not counted since it held 28 encomiendas with 2058 tribute Indians, which would skewed the numbers artificially toward the number of Indians per encomendero.

\[ \text{This number was calculated by dividing the number of Tribute Indians held by private encomenderos (10,683-2058=8625) by the number of private encomenderos (89).} \]

\[ \text{This number was calculated by dividing the total tributary Indians (10,683) by the total number of encomiendas (198).} \]

\[ \text{See, for example, SANCHEZ v. CONTRERAS, 9 CS 372, (1539); BARTOLOME TELLO v. RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS, 8 CS 382, (February 11, 1544); RODRIGO ALONSO, GUARDIAN OF THE MINOR JUAN VEGA v. JUAN DE HOYOS, 11 CS 77, (June 21, 1544); JUAN GALLEGOS, GUARDIAN OF THE WIDOW AND CHILDREN OF JUAN SANCHEZ v. JUAN CARBALLO, 13 CS 393 (October 27, 1545); CATALINA GUTIERREZ, VIUDA DE DIEGO DE MACHUCA DE ZUAZO v. RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS, 14 CS 74 (1547); YSEDO DE SANTIAGO v. RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS (fragment, only referred to).} \]

\[ \text{A complete annotated list and abstract of the encomenderos of the Tasación of 1548 is found in Appendix Six, below.} \]

\[ \text{For the list of members of Hernandez army, see Melendez 1993: 133-143.} \]

Chapter 5

COLONIAL TRIBUTES

The tribute assessment by the Audiencia de los Confines followed certain patterns that can be readily perceived when the assessments are summarized and analyzed. The assessors followed a uniform system of assessment based upon the family unit of the Indian villages. That systematic assessment discloses that the four main ethnic groups, Maribios, Chorotegas, Nahua, and Chondal were all assessed tribute according to a common set of criteria. Another, different, system of tribute assessment was applied to several other Indian villages that from their identified location indicates that they may have been either of different ethnic identities and did not produce the "standard" Nicaraguan crops and products, or they were not under sufficient Spanish domination for the colonial authorities to be able to assess them the standard tribute products and amounts, or both. They are called periphery peoples since they were always found on the geographical peripheries of Spanish domination.

Though the Spanish assessors used the same system of assessments in Leon and Granada, the specific assessments disclose a quite uniform setting of tribute in the villages of Leon and a more arbitrary (in relation to the recorded number of tributary Indians) pattern of assessment in the villages of Granada. Since the variation in ratios of tribute varied both upwards and downwards, making the tribute heavier or lighter in relation to other like sized villages, the variation is due probably to carelessness of assessment rather than any intent to oppress the Indians in one village more than the Indians in other villages.

The customary tribute assessed against the main ethnic groups were annual amounts of corn, beans, cotton and its woven products, and salt. One encomienda #69 Chira, LVIN 58, was the only assessment for only one product, pottery. Three of those four products, corn, beans, and cotton, are all produced in the environments of western Nicaragua, i.e. dry deciduous forest or tropical savannah. None of the food crops of more humid areas to the east, such as yuca or pejibay, appear in the tribute lists. Cotton, particularly, is only grown in hot, dry plains with a part of the year in desert like conditions. That is the environment where the great majority of Nicaraguan Indians under Spanish domination lived in 1548. In cases where the four main tributary products were not assessed the village populations were comprised of less than 10 tributary families.

CORN PRODUCTION

Regarding corn, Zea mays (L) the colonial assessors used the fanega as the uniform measure, set the tribute at the ratio of eight tributary Indians, or families, for every fanega of corn to be planted, tended, and harvested. The size of the field was never recorded in the assessments, but mention was always made of the number of fields to be planted, varying between one and two. No set pattern of the number of fields appears, except that when the tributary Indians totaled more than 15 or so they were instructed to plant two fields of corn. In some encomiendas the Indians were instructed to plant beans in the same field as the corn while in others they were instructed to plant a separate field for beans, without relation to either size of corn or bean assessment or number of tributary Indians.
BEAN PRODUCTION

Regarding beans, Phaseolus vulgaris (L.), the assessor used the fanega as the unit of measure in the great majority of cases, while occasionally using the celemín or almud in cases of small encomiendas where the assessed beans to be planted was a fraction of a fanega. Beans were instructed to be planted in the same field as the corn or a different field and the assessments were quite variable, much more so than the corn assessments. Assessments ran from a low of 100 tributary Indians for one fanega of beans Comayna and Niaglapa, # 21 LVIN 20 to a high assessment of five tributary Indians for one fanega of beans to be planted, Diriomón, # 119, GVIN 19.2 The average was 40 tributary Indians for every fanega of beans to be planted.

COTTON PRODUCTION

Regarding cotton, Gossypium sp., as with beans, there was much variability in the assessments. The average was about 40 tributary Indians for every fanega of cotton seed to be planted and harvested. The highest assessment in the north was Utega, # 21, LVIN 18 Utega, with 12 tributary Indians for a fanega of cotton and in the south Diriomón, GVIN 19 with five tributary Indians for a fanega of cotton. Most of the cotton assessments also included the instruction that the Indians were to harvest the cotton and then weave it into various types of items, such as white sheets (mantas blancas), cotton blankets (lonas), painted sheets (mantas pintadas) smaller cloths (telilas), spools of thread (ovillos), cloth boots (alpartagas), and in a few instances hammocks (hamacas). Though the figures varied widely, production of 25 white sheets used 0.5 to one fanega of cotton seed.

The ratio of tributary Indians to each white sheet produced was approximately 1:1, with some small variation. All four major ethnic groups were equally assessed white cotton sheet production without any perceptible pattern favoring one group over another. Small cloths, or telilas, tended to be assessed against Chorotegan villages of Granada, but rather sporadically.

Indians were also instructed to produce painted sheets. The encomiendas that were assessed those sheets are as follows:

**TABLE 5.1: PAINTED SHEETS PRODUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encomienda</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mazagalpa #161</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>60 painted sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curupalu #195</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>60 painted sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Zumbuzugua #50</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>6 painted sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Managua #123</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>100 painted sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Xalteba #166</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>30 painted sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Guatepe &amp; Tonala #114</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>60 painted sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Xicogalpa #181</td>
<td>(Ch and N)</td>
<td>40 painted sheets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the identifiable encomiendas that produced painted sheets were Chorotegan. Zumbuzugua may have been Chorotegan also, but there is no independent way to establish this. Painted sheets were produced at the approximate ratio of one painted sheet per tributary Indian, the same ratio as between tributary Indians and white sheet production.

Salt production centered around the carguilla, or five pounds of salt. Even where the Indian village was some distance from the Pacific Ocean, such as Moyogalpa, located on the island of Ometepe, the tributary Indians were expected to produce, or at least obtain, salt for payment of tribute.8 The usual assessment was five pounds of salt per 1.2 tributary Indians, with Amatega (#30 LVIN 25) with a typical assessment of 10 carguillas of salt for 10 tributary Indians and Utega (#21 LVIN 18) with an assessed salt tribute of 6 carguillas per tributary Indian. In several assessments the salt tribute was defined in multiples of cargas, which was probably a mistake of transcription.

CAACO PRODUCTION (Cacca theobroma):

Of the food grain products of the tasación of 1548 cacao was a minor tributary item in comparison with the other food grains. Fowler noted that the most used unit of measure of cacao production in Guatemala and Salvador was the xiquipil, a unit of 6,000 cacao beans that weighed about 8.7 (Fowler 1989: 162-163).9 Alone among the central American nations the tasación of 1548 defined assessments in Nicaragua in terms of fanegas, almundes (1/2 fanega) and calemines (1/12 fanega) (Fowler 1989: 170).

Confusion exists regarding the Cronistas' reports about which ethnic groups cultivated cacao. Oviedo reported that only the Nicarao cultivated cacao (Fowler 1989: 169). Gonara (1946: 283) reported that the Chorotega produced cacao. Fowler seems to favor Oviedo's position in that only the Nicarao produced cacao but notes that Bergman (1969:95) noted, "...the Cerrato tasacions indicate minor cacao cultivation in the Leon and Granada regions", (Fowler 1989: 170).

The tasación of 1548 clearly discloses that both Chorotega and Nicarao produced cacao and that the Marinios probably did not cultivate cacao, since none of the known Marinio villages were assessed any cacao tribute.

**TABLE 5.2: NICARAGUAN VILLAGES PRODUCING CACAO IN 1548**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Ethnic identity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ayatega #190</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>1 fanega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ayatega #76</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>0.5 fanega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Zapulco #109</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>2 almundes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nicaragua &amp; Guatigalpa #149</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>1 fanega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nicaragua #153</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>1 fanega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Diriomón #119</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>2 calemines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monbacho &amp; Susutego #120</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>1 fanega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Loma #129</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>4 almundes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Diriana #133</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>1 fanega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Masitande #136</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>2 almundes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mandapio Manbach #145</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>1 fanega</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Ethnic identity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Nandyme #154</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>1 fanega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Coyotega #</td>
<td>15 (U)</td>
<td>1 fanega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Potega #188</td>
<td>(U)/(N7)</td>
<td>1 fanega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Manati #90</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>0.5 fanega</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Production:** 15 fanegas, 2 calemines
In native units this would be roughly equivalent to 76 zontles or xiquipiles. Salvadoran assessments in the Tasacón of 1548 totaled 5269 xiquipiles of cacao. Nicaraguan cacao production was about 1.5 percent of cacao production in the province of San Salvador in 1548. As Fowler concluded, a comparison of Nicaraguan cacao production with that of El Salvador and Guatemala makes it clear that cacao was a much less important crop in Nicaragua that in those more northern portions of central America. Of the 15 identified encomiendas that were assessed cacao production five of the encomiendas were Nahua, seven were Chorotega, and three have not been identified regarding their ethnic identity.

The locations of cacao production can be identified in three clusters and one single encomienda. Potega and Ayateca were within a league or two of each other, were located possibly north of Chinandega a league or two, and they constituted the only three Nahua cacao producing encomiendas in the Chinandega-El Viejo Nahua settlement. Maniati was located by itself at or near the present site of Puerto Sandino and its ethnic identity is unknown. Capulco was possibly located between Masaya and San Jorge, was possibly Nahua, and, along with Nicaragua and Guatigalpa #149 and Nicaragua #153 were the southern Nicaraguan cluster of encomiendas around San Jorge.

The Chorotegan villages of Dirioimo, Mombacho and Susojeto, Loma, Mandapio Manbach, Nandayme, Diranba, and Masitande were clustered on the meseta de los pueblos and on the south side of Mombacho adjacent to the meseta all within about 25 km of each other.

CHILI PRODUCTION

Chili Production (Capsicum sp). Only one encomienda, # 158, the isla de Nicaragua, GVIN 39, also known as Ometepe, was assessed tribute consisting of the crop resulting from the planting of one almu, or 1/2 fanega, of chili seeds.

POTTERY PRODUCTION

An analysis of assessed pottery tribute raises as many questions as it answers. One of the lingering issues of the archaeology of Gran Nicoya is whether any linkage can be established between specific ethnic groups and the known ceramic sequence. There can be no question that the extent of the known Chorotegan villages describe approximately the archaeological region known as Gran Nicoya. Since the precolombian ceramic sequence is quite well known some attempt has been made to link ceramic types and varieties to specific ethnic groups. This speculation has generally taken the form of trying to find some identifiable Nahua types and varieties, based upon erroneous ideas of the extent of settlement and influence of the Nicara at the time of the conquest. Haberland identified Managua polychromes with the Nicara and suggested the presence of a Nicara settlement to Leon Viejo, based upon specimens of Managua polychromes from a site near Leon Viejo.

Managua polychromes are a ceramic type about which almost nothing was been written. Lothrop (1979: 209-212) first described Managua polichrome and noted its obvious similarity to Aztec tripod bowls from the valley of Mexico. Little is known about Managua polychrome except that it has been found at Managua and Leon Viejo. The problem with linking Managua polichromes to a Nahua settlement is that all documentary evidence is in agreement that Managua and Leon were both exclusively Chorotegan settlements at the time of the conquest.

The same problem exists with Vallejo polychromes, which appeared from about 1350 A.D. until the coming of the Spaniards. Healy (1980: 140-152), Day and Abel-Vidor (1980), and Sweeney (1976: 39), among others have attempted to link in some fashion Vallejo polychromes with Nahua settlements. Healy, in examining potsherds from the San Jorge region, was clearly examining archaeological evidence from one of the two large Nahua settlements in Nicaragua at the time of the conquest. The other large, identified Nahua settlement, El Viejo-Chinandega-Ayateca, has not been systematically studied archaeologically, so it may be quite early to generalize about the identification of Vallejo polychromes with Nahua settlements.

Another problem with Vallejo polychromes is their widespread distribution throughout western Nicaragua, including areas clearly identified as Chorotegan. In areas on the outskirts of Masaya Vallejo polychrome, Papagalpol polychrome, and Sacasa striated potsherds predominate. And in all of the collections viewed by the author the predominant ceramic types are Papagalpol and Vallejo polychromes. Obviously the Vallejo polychromes were used by Chorotegan populations as well as Nahua speaking villages.

Lastly, the centers of pottery production found in the tasación establish that at least in 1548 the Nahua were not involved in pottery production and that the Chorotegans and Maribios were clearly producing most or all of the pottery that was assessed as tribute.

### TABLE 5.3: POTTERY PRODUCTION IN 1548

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Ethnic identity</th>
<th>Tribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Subtiava #19</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>12 comales, 12 cantaros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mazagalpa #34</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>6 comales, 6 ollas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chira #70</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>1050°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Matamor #82</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>12 comales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Chorotegan production:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1098 pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cindeg #12</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>12 cantaros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#56</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>6 comales, 6 ollas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gualteve #13</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>12 comales, 12 cantaros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>6 comales, 6 cantaros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Utega #21</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>12 cantaros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pozolte #33</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>6 cantaros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mazate #47</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>6 cantaros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Maribios production:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>84 pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cucuina #1</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>10 cantaros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#92</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>12 cantaros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ceramic production was most common among the Chorotegas, with the largest center of production being the island of Chira with 1,000 small pieces and 50 large water jars, or tinajas. The other known Chorotegan population centers such as Managua (Masagalpa), Subtiava, and Matiare are also represented. Unexpectedly, the Maribios villages also produced substantial ceramics. The villages of Cindega, Gualteveo, Utela, Pozoltega, and Mazatega were all clustered between Subtiava and Chinanega, a distance of about 25 km and all were assessed ceramic objects for tribute.

Surprisingly, neither of the two Nahua population centers, the village of Nicaragua and surrounding gaipones and villages and Tezuatega-Chinanega-Ayatega, were assessed any pottery production. An active imagination can supply any number of possible explanations for this absence. But the plain fact is that the Spaniards did not believe that the Nahua produced any ceramics of value to warrant their being included in tribute assessments. This, of course, flies in the face of conventional thought regarding the impact of the Nahua on western Nicaraguan Indian populations and who was producing pottery in 1548 and who was not.

**PRODUCTION OF OTHER WOVEN AND PROCESSED FIBER ITEMS**

The tasación also assessed tribute in the form of various woven and processed plant fiber products. Alpargatas, or cloth boots, were frequently named as tribute. They were made with soles of cabuya, or maguey, fibers, and were mentioned in Rodrigo de Contreras' ill-fated expedition to find the riches of the Desaguadero. The production of cloth boots probably represented a high degree of artisanship and skill in weaving, sewing and fitting the parts of the boots together.

**TABLE 5.4: ALPARGATA PRODUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Number of pairs per annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nicoya #68</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#69</td>
<td>(CH)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manbacho &amp; Susujeto #120</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nomativa #134</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Niquenohomo #142</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mandapio Manbach #145</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nenderi #178</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>720^viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Diriega #101</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Masaya #117</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Monimbo #198</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Chorotegan alpargata production: 2,340 pr per annum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Number of pairs per annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Mastega #186</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cazaloaque #187</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Maribios alpargata production: 360 pr per annum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Number of pairs per annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Coyatega #15</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teoatega #37</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teoatega #39</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Tosta #38</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Utega #21 (M) 20
Total Mariobios production: 32 sets
9. Nicaragua & Guatgalpa #159 (N) 12
Total Nahua production: 12 sets
10. Comayna & Niagalpa #24 (U) 20
Total production by Unidentified Ethnic groups: 20 sets.

OTHER FIBER RAW MATERIALS AND PRODUCTS.
A few other products and raw material production bear mention. The ubiquitous hammock, or hamaca, was assessed as tribute from a few villages.

TABLE 5.6: HAMMOCK PRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Annual production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nicoya #68 #69</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Isla de Nicaragua #158</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nicopasaya #174</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Masaya #117</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Chorotegan production: 19 hamacas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total production by unidentified ethnic groups: 2 hamacas

Lastly, the plaza of Nabitio Yopomo # 89 had to produce 12 sogas or ropes and Niquenohomo #142 had to produce four ropes for water wells.

RAW MATERIAL
Several villages were assessed amounts of raw henequen as part of their tribute.
TABLE 5.7: HENEQUEN PRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Quantity (arobas=a or quintales=q)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coagalpa #139</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>10 q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Niquenohomo #142</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td>10 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mayales #141</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>20 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Isla de Nicaragua #158</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>60 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nicaragua Anata #168</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>2 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chuigalpa &amp; Tacaxolgalpa #177</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>10 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Zagualpa et al #156</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>60 a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Henequen production: 10 quintals, 162 arobas.

Of the villages assessed henequen as part of their tribute only two, Niquenohomo and Coagalpa, were Chorotegan, one, Nicaragua Anata was Nahua, and the rest were all of uncertain ethnic identity. Mayales and Chuigalpa were located in Chontales province and possibly were populated by Indians who were Chontales-Matagalpa in language and/or culture. Zagualpa is really a conglomeration of small encomiendas that include sites close by Masaya, Xalteba, and the Malacatoya river drainage in the present day province of Boaco, which may have been peopled by ethnic groups that were not one of the four main ethnic groups in western Nicaragua. That is also suggested by the great disparity between the tribute assessments in western Nicaragua and in some of the areas on the periphery of Spanish control: those encomiendas, such as Chuigalpa, Mayales, Zagualpa, and Limay in the north, were assessed a much smaller amount of tribute per capita than were any of the other encomiendas in the entire tasación.

PETATE PRODUCTION.

An unusual pattern of tribute assessment is found in the petate tribute. With the villages in the municipalidad of Leon almost every village has a petate assessment. Small villages had an assessment of six petates and larger villages and an assessment of 12 petates. There were only a few exceptions, such as Ayagalpa and Miagalpa, #26 who had an assessment of 50 petates of various sizes, and Coyatega, #15, that had 10 petates assessed. In the villages of the municipalidad of Granada, however, only three villages out of 55, Diriamba, #133 (24 petates), Tipilita, #137 (4 petates), and the isla of Nicaragua #158 (6 petates) had petates to make for tribute. Either the Indians in southern Nicaragua did not know how to make good petates, or the tax assessor for the municipalidad of Granada did his work slightly different than his counterpart in northwestern Nicaragua. Total petate production for Nicaragua was 492 pieces; 458 were produced in the north and 34, or seven percent, were produced in the south. This anomaly remains unexplained.

The reconstructed tribute assessments for the villages of early, colonial Nicaragua disclose that the Chorotegas were the masters in artisanal production of vegetable fibers and pottery. That is the main distinguishing characteristic among the four main ethnic groups of eastern Nicaragua. For the production of foodstuffs there is a great deal of unanimity in the assessments of western and northern Nicaragua; when one ventures to the East Side of Lake Nicaragua a completely different pattern of foodstuff production emerges. Finally, long standing speculation about who really produced cacao is put to rest when it becomes clear that both the Chorotegans and Nahua produced small amounts of cacao. Clearly the production of cacao was of small import in Nicaragua, in contrast with the province of El Salvador, that produced almost 100 times as much cacao as Nicaragua in 1548.
Chapter 6

PREHISPANIC AND EARLY COLONIAL INDIAN POPULATIONS

In order to determine in some sense the population of western Nicaragua in 1522, three sets of information are necessary: the geographical extent of Spanish domination as determined by the tasación of 1548; the ratio of tributary males to the total population in the tasación of 1548; and the percentage of depopulation of Indian populations in the Spanish dominated areas from 1522 to 1548.

A. Geographical Extent of Spanish Domination in 1548. Though the Spaniards had traveled widely in the colonial of Nicaragua, their domination of Indian populations covered much less ground. The 198 encomiendas define an area that began in the northwest in the drainage of the Choluteca river and extended southwest to the golf of Nicoya south to the encomienda of Cangén, located 15 km northwest of the village of the cacique Paro and about 24 km southwest of the large village of the cacique of Nicoya. Spanish domination extended northward on the west side of Lake Nicaragua, around Lake Managua and north to the base of the cordillera central in Estelí, defined by the village of Mescales, in the east. The valley of Sebaco was not mentioned in the tasación, and probably was not under Spanish control, as it was in the tasación of 1581. Spanish domination did extend eastward around Lake Managua towards Boaco and included at least one village in the Malacatoya drainage, Tuestepet, or modern day Tuestepet. That domination continued around Lake Nicaragua to the east to include the encomiendas of Chinigalpa and Mayales. North of Leon Viejo Spanish control included the valley of Limay and extended in an arc north and eastward to include the village of Togotalpa in the drainage of the Coco River. No encomienda has been identified in the area of Nueva Segovia, which was a functioning town in 1548, having been founded in 1543. The local Indians, who had a good record of defeating the Spaniards, may have been keeping the vecinos of Nueva Segovia too busy with surviving to have brought any Indians under domination. Spanish domination of early, colonial Nicaragua, then, covered a long strip of land in the modern day states of Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, and perhaps El Salvador as well. Eastward expansion was only in its incipient stages in Chontales and Nueva Segovia and the great majority of Indians were clustered in the plains of Leon and around the shores of Lakes Nicaragua and Managua. That is the land area described by the Indian population groups during the period of 1522-1548, discussed herein.

B. The Ratio of Indian Populations To Tributary Males In the Tasación of 1548. The Colección Somosa and all other chronicles are devoid of any specific information about the relationship between tribe populations and total Indian populations. Newsom (1987, 235-240) has given this subject the most exhaustive analysis of any historian and derived the ratio of 4.1 inhabitants for every tributary male counted in the tasación of 1581. Absent other information, the assumption of this work is that the population ratio of 4.1 inhabitants to tributary Indians was substantially the same in 1548 as in 1581; therefore this ratio was been used to reconstruct the size of encomiendas, and Indian villages, represented in the tasación of 1548.
C. The Percentage Of Indian Depopulation In Spanish Dominated Areas Between 1522 and 1548. The issue of Indian depopulation in Nicaragua up to 1550 has been the subject of much speculation. Newsom, among others, estimated the depopulation at 92.4% (Newsom 1987: 118). Others, some Nicaraguan historians, have estimated the depopulation to be of much less proportions, mainly because they did not believe that the ground had the carrying capacity for upwards of 600,000 Indians in the Spanish dominated portions of Nicaragua (Lorenzo Cardenal, personal communication, July, 1994). Enough sketchy information exists from the first decade of Spanish activity in Nicaragua to define some of the relationships and ratios between populations in the 1520's and in 1548, which are much more exact. Table 6.1 represents a summary of the quantitative reports of Spaniards through 1528. The population figures for 1548 are based upon the reconstruction of Indian villages and the use of Newsom's multiplier to derive an estimate of total inhabitants of the villages in 1548.

TABLE 6.1: COMPARISON BETWEEN EARLIER POPULATION REPORTS AND THE TASACIÓN OF 1548

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pueblo Depopulation</th>
<th>Population in 1522</th>
<th>Population in 1548</th>
<th>Percentage of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cangen</td>
<td>1118(c)</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nicoya</td>
<td>2917(b)</td>
<td>2640</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Masaya</td>
<td>100,000(o)</td>
<td>2768</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Marinalte</td>
<td>409(b)</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lenderi</td>
<td>2917(b)</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Manbacho</td>
<td>3241(b)</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Managua</td>
<td>1116(b)</td>
<td>2598</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Matirari</td>
<td>12,000(o)</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Nabiti</td>
<td>15,000(p)</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Xalteva</td>
<td>8,000(p)</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIBIOS</td>
<td>6345(b)</td>
<td>Results not clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mazatega</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Chichigalpa</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nicarao

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pueblo Depopulation</th>
<th>Population in 1548</th>
<th>Percentage of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tezuatega</td>
<td>(c)20,000 2,168(b)</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ayatega</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chinandega</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nicaragua</td>
<td>9018(c) 29063(b)</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the data is scanty it is obvious from such diverse sources as Cereceda, Bobadilla, and Oviedo, that there was a substantial population decrease between 1522 and 1548. Regarding the Chorotegas villages the depopulation amounted to 95% in most instances. In three villages, Marinalte, Nicoya and Cangem, the depopulation was the least, with Xalteva, at 88%, less than in Chorotegan villages farther north. With the Nahuas, the only existing figures are for the villages of the cacique named Nicaragua, with 96% depopulation, and Tezuatega, with 93% depopulation. There is little information regarding the Maribios. Bobadilla reported that he baptized 6,346 Indians of the province of the Maribios, without naming any particular villages. How extensively he searched for Indians is not known, and this group is the only group that appears to be seriously under represented in Bobadilla's baptisms. For that reason his count of baptisms will not be used to derive Maribios Indian populations in 1522. Rather, the assumption is that Maribios Indian populations, since they were situated along side Chorotegan and Nicarao population centers from Subtiava to Tezuatega, and possibly to the Pacific coast, were vulnerable
to the same causes of depopulation as were the Chorotegas and Nicaraque and therefore suffered similar decreases in population between 1522 and 1548. Among Indian populations a slight difference in pattern appears between the villages of Leon, down to and including Masaya, and the villages farther south, to Cangre. Those villages in the north tended to have a depopulation decrease of about 95% while the southern villages suffered a slightly less depopulation decrease, of about 85%.

In order to estimate the populations of preconquest Indian villages, then, two different numbers, or coefﬁcients, of population reconstruction can be used according to the following formula:

\[ \text{I}(1522) = \frac{\text{I}(1548)}{\text{CR}} \]

where,

\[ \text{I}(1548) = \text{total inhabitants living in the village in 1548} \]

\[ \text{I}(1522) = \text{total inhabitants living in the village in 1522} \]

\[ \text{CR} = \text{coefﬁcient of reconstruction of Indian populations in 1522.} \]

The coefﬁcient for the villages of Leon, and including Masaya, is 0.05, since those villages experienced on the average 95% depopulation. The coefﬁcient for the villages of Granada, is 0.15, since those villages experienced a bit less depopulation, or about 85%.

### TABLE 6.2: CHOROTEGAN VILLAGES AND ENCOMIENDAS IN NORTHERN NICARAGUA

(Note: The coefﬁcient of I(1548)/0.05 applies to these villages.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LVIN 3 Subtiava</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LVIN 4 Momotombo</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. LVIN 5 Nahihi</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LVIN 12 Mamay</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LVIN 24 Malalaca</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LVIN 28 Mazagalpa</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. LVIN 54 Nicoya</td>
<td>2460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. LVIN 55 Chira</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. LVIN 56 Managua</td>
<td>2597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. LVIN 65 Matarene</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. LVIN 74 Nagarote</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. GVIN 18 Masaya</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. GVIN 2 Diriega</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. GVIN 54 Monimbo</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>11,462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Population in 1522: (11,462/0.05)= 229,240

### TABLE 6.3: CHOROTEGAN VILLAGES IN SOUTHERN NICARAGUA

(Note: the coefﬁcient of I(1548)/0.15 applies to these villages and encomiendas.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GVIN 4 Mazatepeque</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. GVIN 5 Xinetepueque 492
3. GVIN 7 Xalteva 882
4. GVIN 8 Apasolota 246
5. GVIN 10 Zapulco 107
6. GVIN 11 Mohomó 164
7. GVIN 13 Guatepeque 251
8. GVIN 14 Niatia 41
9. GVIN 16 Minarte 164
10. GVIN 17 Xionbo 87
11. GVIN 19 Dirico 353
12. GVIN 20 Monbaco & Susujeo 328
13. GVIN 21 Nanorima 90
14. GVIN 22 Nontiba 451
15. GVIN 23 Marinalte 349
16. GVIN 24 Dería 1346
17. GVIN 25 Loma 164
18. GVIN 26 Dirianba 410
19. GVIN 27 Nomativa 410
20. GVIN 28 Nandame 930
21. GVIN 29 Masitande 144
22. GVIN 34 Niuppenohono 492
23. GVIN 35 Nandagio Manbach 369
24. GVIN 37 Martinezo 123
25. GVIN 40 Atotone 111
26. GVIN 41 Chicopalpa 144
27. GVIN 42 Cengen 308
28. GVIN 43 Nandlayon 111
29. GVIN 44 Tenami 119
30. GVIN 45 Nandamalata 205
31. GVIN 46 Nicopasaya 410
32. GVIN 48 Nenderi 1230
33. GVIN 49 Capandi 328
34. GVIN 51 Monagalpa 66
35. GVIN 53 Soliata 17

Subtotal: 11,647

Estimated Population in 1522: (11,647/0.15)= 77,647

Total Estimated Population of Identified Chorotegan Villages In 1522: 306,887

### TABLE 6.4: MARBIBIS VILLAGES AND ENCOMIENDAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

122

123
1. LVIN 8 Cindega 1747
2. LVIN 11 Guatuleve 562
3. LVIN 14 Ygualtega 91
4. LVIN 18 Utega 194
5. LVIN 19 Pozoltega 607
6. LVIN 37 Mazatega 181
7. LVIN 38 Chichigalpa 328
8. LVIN 44 Astatega 410
9. LVIN 45 Pangua 125
10. LVIN 50 Telica 410
11. LVIN 10 Zapotega 160
12. LVIN 51 Azolotega 287
13. LVIN 67 Estanguix 135
14. LVIN 77 Mastega 533
15. LVIN 78 Cazaloque 668
16. LVIN 81 Abaragaca 164
Subtotal of Inhabitants: 7,475

Estimated Population in 1522: (7475/0.05) = 149,500

TABLE 6:5 NAHUA VILLAGES AND ENCOMIENDAS IN NORTHERN NICARAGUA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 33 Chinandega</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 49 Ayatega</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 79 Potega(?)</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 80 Tezatega</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subtotal of Inhabitants: 1542

Estimated Nahua inhabitants in northern Nicaragua in 1522: (1542/0.05) = 30,840.

TABLE 6:6 NAHUA VILLAGES AND ENCOMIENDAS IN SOUTHERN NICARAGUA

(Note: for the Nahua villages in southern Nicaragua the coefficient of I(1548)/0.15 is used, for the reasons stated above.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 9 Xoxoyta</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 37 Nicaragua</td>
<td>1368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 53 Toligalpa</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 55 Totosaque</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Population: 1835

Estimated Population in 1522: (1835/0.15) = 36,180


Table 6:7 CHONDALES VILLAGES IN NORTHERN NICARAGUA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pueblo</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 2 Olocooten</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 31 Condega and Joangasta</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 34 Joangasta</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 30 Joangastilla</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 61 Olomela</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of Chondal Indians: 665

Estimated Population in 1522: 13,300 (665/0.05)

OTHER POPULATIONS.
Evidence exists that there were at least two or three other pockets of different ethnic populations on the periphery of Spanish dominated Nicaragua in 1548. Those groups may be identified as the Uluaas and the periphery peoples. Because of the sketchy information that exists regarding these groups no attempt has been made to estimate their 1522 populations.

a. ULUAS. No specific mention of the Uluaas is found in the Coleccion Somotl. Ciblad Real, however, noted that when he passed into Nicaragua from Honduras, he passed by two villages, Zomoto and Condega, that were "Uluaa." From the geographical information he included in his report it is clear that his Condega was close to or located at the modern day border town of Guasacule, and that Zomoto was modern day Somotillo. Those two towns were probably mentioned in the tasacion of 1548 as Condega and Joangasta, LVIN 32 (I=431). That encomienda included the traditional tribute that was assessed against the three main ethnic groups and included corn, beans, and cotton. It is the only place in the Coleccion Somotl where the word "milpa" is used to describe a field of cotton.

b. PERIPHERY PEOPLES. The villages of Mayales GVIN 33 (I=1240), Chigalpa & Tacaxogalpa GVIN 47 (I=287) were located on the eastern side of Lake Nicaragua and had tribute assessments completely different than those in the rest of Spanish dominated Nicaragua in 1548. The per capita assessments were the lowest of any of the 196 encomiendas in the tasacion,
produced no corn, beans, or cotton, and only produced henequen, some wax, and a few chickens. These periphery peoples, then, on the basis of their geographical distribution and tribute assessment, were probably not members of the four main ethnic groups of western Nicaragua, and may have been members of the macro-Chibcheoid peoples later called "Chontales".

VILLAGES OF UNIDENTIFIED ETHNICITY

Unfortunately, the total body of documents consulted for this work did not result in the identification of the ethnicity of all of the encomiendas found in the taçaón of 1548. In order to finally calculate the total population of Indians in Nicaragua in 1522, these encomiendas and pueblos are treated in a similar fashion as those identified villages of Leon and Granada: a reconstruction coefficient of 0.05 has been utilized for the Leon encomiendas, and 0.15 has been used for the encomiendas of Granada. Lastly, as has been obvious throughout the analysis of the taçaón of 1548, the attribution of ethnic identity solely on the basis of a suffix or prefix appearing to be Nahuatl or Chorotegan is usually misleading and mostly wrong. Many of the Maribios and Chorotegan villages, for example, had either Nahuatl or Matagalpa word endings, which probably led investigators in the past to erroneously conclude those villages were Nahuatl or Matagalpa, when they were indisputably Chorotegan or Maribios. The method used in this work was to find some other corroborating fact before a village was identified with a suspected, particular ethnic group.

TABLE 6.8: UNIDENTIFIED VILLAGES OF LEON VIEJO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population in 1548</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LVIN 1 Cucivina</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LVIN 6 Molaceoyale</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. LVIN 7 Huegagalpa</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LVIN 9 Xcocoteca</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LVIN 15 Deacorazo</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LVIN 20 Comayna &amp; Niagalpa</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. LVIN 21 Ayagalpa &amp; Miagalpa</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. LVIN 22 Ccoayanga &amp; Acoayagua</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. LVIN 23 Mescabes</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. LVIN 25 Amatega</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. LVIN 26 Tepanzinga</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. LVIN 27 Colima</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. LVIN 29 Tepustega</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. LVIN 30 Teoteca</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. LVIN 31 Tista</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. LVIN 34 Totogalpa</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. LVIN 40 Zumbazuga</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. LVIN 41 Chamalpan</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. LVIN 43 Agagalpa</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. LVIN 46 Nepeuno</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. LVIN 47 Tencogalpa</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. LVIN 48 Nandayayo  115
23. LVIN 52 Noloque   53
24. LVIN 53 Ccoaguaco  7
25. LVIN 57 Tsteaga   49
26. LVIN 58 Yoalcazeuend 206
27. LVIN 60 Hugalpa   90
28. LVIN 61 Xcocogalpa 33
29. LVIN 63 Matarrego 107
30. LVIN 64 Diorindo  98
31. LVIN 66 Anaelca   74
32. LVIN 69 Demutinio 267
33. LVIN 70 Mamiati   82
34. LVIN 71 Paynateca  7
35. LVIN 72 Toscoaga  49
36. LVIN 73 Tonateca  164
37. LVIN 76 Caguarto  25
38. LVIN 82 Cooayaco  472

Subtotal: 7,387

Estimated Population in 1522 (7387/0.05) = 147,740

TABLE 6.9: UNIDENTIFIED VILLAGES OF GRANADA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GVIN 12 Moyoyalpa</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GVIN 30 Tiptipa</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GVIN 39 Isla de Nicaragua</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: 755

Estimated Population in 1522 (755/0.15) = 5033

A final estimate can now be made regard the total Indian population in western Nicaragua at the onset of the conquest.

TABLE 6.10: THE POPULATION OF WESTERN NICARAGUA IN 1522

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chorotega(northern)</td>
<td>229,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chorotega(southern)</td>
<td>77,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Chorotegas 306,887
3 Maribios: 149,500
4 Nahua (northern): 30,640
5 Nahua (southern): 36,180
Total Nahuas: 67,020

Total of Chontales: 13,300
6 Periphery Peoples: 10,180 (Limay, Chiugalpa, Mayales)
7. Unidentified villages and encomiendas: 152,773

Total Population in 1522 of Indians
In What Later Became The Colony Of Nicaragua: 699,660

It should be emphasized that the figure of 699,660 Indians is at most an approximate figure, regardless of its apparent exactitude. In order to check the approximate accuracy of this figure a comparison can be made with data that exists from contemporary observers and from modern interpretations of that data. There are three contemporary estimates of the population of at the onset of the conquest. Las Casas estimated that over a million Indians were living in the area that became colonized as Nicaragua. He noted that over 500,000 Indians had been exported as slaves, 500,000 had been killed in battles, 20,000-30,000 had died of famine, and that only 5,000 remained alive (Las Casas, 1992: 53-57). This is double the population estimated by Motolinia (Motolinia: 197). Diego de Herrera, the reformist judge who aided Contreras’ political career, estimated that the pre-conquest population of Nicaragua was 600,000 and that in 1544 only 30,000 Indians remained (11 CS 364, December 24, 1544). This figure derives a figure closest to the analysis of this work. Herrera was an experienced judge and examiner of facts, as his letters amply attest, and his figures are probably the most accurate contemporary estimates of pre-conquest Indian populations that exist.

Among modern historians, Radell (1976), Sherman (1979), and McLeod (1973) have all concentrated on the early slave trade and have not dwelled on Indian populations. By implication Radell put the population of Nicaragua at over a million Indians, as did McLeod (Newson 1987:85). By looking at the ability of the land to support populations, Newson arrived at a reasonable estimate of Indian populations in western Nicaragua and Nicoya, based upon available agricultural technology, at 609,262 Indians, substantially the same figure as determined by this work and as estimated by Judge Herrera (Newson 1987:88).

DEPOPULATION
Just what were the causes of Nicaragua’s disastrous depopulation between 1522 and 1548 is a subject that has provoked much discussion. In the most general sense it is inescapable that the implantation of Hispanic institutions in Nicaragua was the major cause of the destruction of almost all of the native populations in western Nicaragua. In later centuries such dramatic depopulation would be greeted with choice epithets, not the least of which would be “genocide”. The usual justifications, the bringing of European culture and civilization to “uncivilized” hea-

then, the introduction of Christianity to idolatrous cannibals, have shown to have been flimsy excuses indeed. The major enemy of the Catholic church and all of the most humane qualities of Hispanic society was the first colonial Spanish administrations, who succeeded in destroying everything they touched: Catholic church, Indian populations, other Spaniards who opposed their rapacious and conscienceless activities, and the Crown’s own laws.

In a more specific sense, the causes of Indian depopulation can be identified as: (a) warfare; (b) disease; (c) enslavement and the exportation of slaves to Panama and Peru; and (d) destruction of Indian societal welfare mechanisms.

(a) WARFARE. Padre Las Casas was the main proponent of warfare as one of the major causes of the depopulation of Nicaragua. He stated, “In the internal wars waged by the Spaniards another five or six hundred thousand souls perished up to the present time (Las Casas, 1994:56-57). The major document, that in all probability was written by a scribe under the command of Francisco Hernandez de Cordoba, that discussed the conquest of Nicaragua in 1524, has never been found. Pedrazas probably referred to it when he notified the Crown of the conquest of Nicaragua and establishment of the Spanish cities of Leon and Granada sometime in early 1523 (1 CS 128).

An insight into the fighting between the Spaniards and Indians, or rather the lack of it, can be found in the reportamiento of booby recorded by Hernandez in May of 1524. His men had obtained from the Indians the sum of 135,724 pesos de buen oro (a weight measure that indicated gold of aproximately 18 carats in purity) in the conquest and pacification of Nicaragua (Melendez 1993: 133-152). For that first successful entrada Hernandez’ army totaled 229 men. Of those 229 men, two were listed as deceased (causes unknown): Sebastian Perez and Anton Mayor. It is doubtful, then that there was much fighting at the onset of the conquest from the casualties listed in May of 1524.

The record of later fighting is sketchy, but it appears that the Indians rose up and tried to defeat the Spaniards by means of guerrilla warfare. Three sources bear mention. First, the testimonio produced by Benito Davila regarding his service to the Crown (3 CS 180, January 15, 1533). Davila, who was a participant in the later pacification of western Nicaragua, stated that he came as a rescue mission for Hernandez as the Indians were in rebellion and the Spaniards were in danger of being wiped out (3 CS 182-183). Lopez de Salcedo’s interrogatories regarding the destruction of Cadeces de la Frontera by Pedrazas’ underling Benito Hurtado (1 CS 318, May 6, 1528) described a Leon on the point of destruction by the Indians when help arrived from Lopez de Salcedo’s men. After Pedrazas had imprisoned Lopez de Salcedo in 1528 he caused to be recorded another set of interrogatories (1 CS 374, July 15, 1528) that described the Leon under the administration of Lopez de Salcedo to be equally at risk from an Indian attack. The vellinas slept with their horses saddled so that they could escape quickly, according the preserved testimony.

Apart from these references, the remaining body of references to Indian wars describe the Indian wars in the mining towns of northern Nicaragua, where the Indians do not appear to have been conquered by the Spaniards or suffered many casualties until at least 1543; even then the major casualties appear to be Indians imported from the Leon and Granada areas who died, not the local Indians of the mining region.

In sum, there simply is no evidence of the massive slaughter of Indians complained of by Las Casas. Neither do the casualties recorded by the Spaniards give any evidence of 500,000 Indians killed in battle. By 1524 two Spaniards had died, from causes unknown. There were
estimated that 400,000 had died as a result of the slave trade (Newson 1987:105). Sherman disagreed and estimated the total slave trade out of Central America from 1524 to 1549 to have been 50,000 (Sherman 74-82). MacLeod noted that 200,000 Indians during the slave trade from Nicaragua was too conservative an estimate (MacLeod: 52) Newson settled on the figure of 200,000-500,000 as a reasonable figure of the slaves exported from Nicaragua up to 1542.

A major problem with treating the slave trade in generalities is that only fragmentary information exists about the Nicaraguan slave trade, all of it from the late 1520's and all of it very specific; none of this information appears to have been consulted by anyone in deriving general estimates of slave exports.

Slavery during the 1520's was a completely legal enterprise under Spanish law that was regularly taxed at 20% of the sale price of the slave. In 1531 the Crown banned Indian slavery (3 CS1, January 25, 1531), but vacillated several times before slavery was finally banned in the New Laws of 1542 (7 CS 333, November 19, 1542).

The only complete statement of Indian slavery in early Nicaragua is found in the audit of the accounting books and estate of Andres de Cereceda (IN RE CERECEDA, 17 CS 302 (1550). Cereceda recorded the tax receipts that resulted from the sale and branding of Indian slaves. Spanish law dictated that the fator and contador, or their representatives, be present when the Indian was turned into a slave, usually by branding the face with a "G" or an "R", noting the slave was a slave "de guerra" or "de rescate"; women were described as being branded on the thigh. The event of the branding was a taxable event, the tax was established at 20% of the value of the slave. The process was very similar to the smelting of gold ore into gold bullion which also was a taxable event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.11: SUMMARY OF TAXES ASSESSED AND INDIANS ENSLAVED FROM JULY, 1527 TO DECEMBER, 1528</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Indian slaves taxed and paid:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,368p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Indian slaves taxed and unpaid:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount of Indian slaves taxed, paid and unpaid:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,654p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average cost of assessment per Indian:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~1p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimate of Indians enslaved from July, 1527 to December, 1528:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,645 Indians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the early days of the colony Andres de Cereceda, as Crown accountant, kept accurate track of all moneys owing to the Crown. In his subsequent residence undertaken by his successor and mortal enemy, Diego de la Tobilia, there was not found one grano of gold missing, which testifies to the accuracy and reliability of his books. Had there been any evidence of slave smuggling or embezzlement from the Crown coffers undoubtedly Cereceda would have been severely punished by the people who examined his books. The information on tax assessments and estimates of the number of Indians enslaved from July, 1527 to December, 1528, are as accurate as any source in existence. Since slavery was completely legal at that time
and Indians were quite numerous, it is probable that the figure of 7600 Indians represents an accurate number of the quantity of Indians that could be enslaved, processed, and exported by 150-200 Spanishi on a yearly basis. It is probable that 7,600 or so Indians were exported from Nicaragua until the epidemics mentioned above decimated available indigenous populations.

During the 1530's the evidence of slaving expeditions is only found in Las Casas' reports since no evidence of slavery is mentioned later on in the Coleccion Somaza. Las Casas reported that during the 1530's at least 37,000 Indians had been exported from Nicaragua (Newson, 1987: 105). Francisco Sanchez also charged governor Rodrigo de Contreras with allowing 2,000 slaves to be exported from Nicaragua in his unsuccessful attempt to end Contreras' regime with a residencia. 56

The only contemporary prosecution for illegally exporting slaves is found in the case of THE CROWN v. BARTOLOME RUIZ Y OTROS, 2 CS 28 (July 3, 1529), where Ruiz, a ship captain and agent of the Pizarros and Almagros, shipped out 89 Indians and an unspecified number of Spaniards without going through the legal procedure to get a license to leave the port of El Realejo. By itself this doesn't prove much, and there are no other proofs of this sort in existence.

A more fertile bed of accusations should appear in the residencias of Rodrigo de Contreras, (9 CS 1, 1544) and Pedro de los Rios (10 CS 1, 1544). Both residencias were tried in Leon Viejo during June-August of 1544 by Judge and Oyador Diego de Herrera. Though Herrera probably started out neutral towards the Contreras administration, Contreras' unsuccessful and crude attempts to bribe Herrera set him very much against Contreras and his allies. When Herrera found out the extent, complexity, and longevity of the corrupt and destructive regime of Contreras, he became Contreras' most bitter enemy. 56b Herrera also obviously loathed Rios, but he was a completely professional attorney and judge and was quite fair to both Contreras and Rios in his fact finding and rendering of verdicts. For example, Rios was charged by Herrera with permitting Diego de Castañeda to enslave an unlimited number of Indians in his attempt to re-establish a mining town in Nueva Segovia. Herrera found him guilty of that charge and of two other charges of permitting slaving operations. 56b Contreras was charged with four counts (out of a 42 count criminal indictment) of permitting Indians to leave Nicaragua without proper permission and none had returned to Nicaragua. Herrera simply remitted this matter to the Consejo de las Indias and made no factual determination.

What is lacking in the voluminous file collected by Herrera is any sort of proof of large scale slaving taking place after 1535. Herrera tried very hard to find proofs, and had 43 ship's manifests introduced into evidence, in the residencias of Contreras and Rios. 56b A review of those ship's manifests discloses that Contreras was guilty of letting vecinos leave Nicaragua and never collecting on the bonds they had to post to guarantee the return of Indians leaving Nicaragua. No large scale slave shipping exists in any of the manifests. The total number of Indians represented in those 44 ship's manifests that left Nicaragua from May 27, 1539 to August 3, 1543, and never returned, did not exceed 200. The issue of the logistical problem in undertaking slavery in Nicaragua seems never to have been considered. For example, such matters as the few numbers of Spaniards in early Nicaragua, the Papagallos winds, and relatively few sailing ships and their small size all militate against the large scale slaving that various authors propose.

This does not agree at all with the prevailing view of 200,000 to 500,000 Indians exported from Nicaragua up to 1544 (Newson 1987: 105). 'Two explanations are possible: either the shipping took place completely without any documentation and even Rios' and Contreras'
As noted in the discussion of the encomiendas, the possibility exists that Amyma may have been an encomienda in the vicinity of Nueva Segovia. There just is not enough information to come to a conclusion about this encomienda.

The four most obvious causes of depopulation, warfare, disease, slavery, and societal disintegration and collapse, will be considered below.

Sources as noted as follows: (p)=Pedrajas Davila (1525); (o)=Oviedo (1528); (b)=Bobadilla (1528); (c)=Cereceda (1522).

The source of this information is the reconstruction of encomiendas and village populations based upon the ratio of 1 tributary Indian for 4.1 total inhabitants.

This figure may have been inflated by Oviedo. In all of the population figures he noted he only spoke of round numbers and not exact numbers, as did the rest of the Spaniards. Oviedo had axes to grind and by inflating the numbers of Indians he saw by Masaya he was indirectly attacking his old adversary Pedrajas. He has the highest population figures of anyone and his numbers are most suspect. A more probable figure for Masaya is 55,360, based upon conversion factors noted below. The figure of 100,000 probably describes the population of the area surrounding Masaya for 15 km in each direction. See the accompanying map.

Note Bambacho, 79%; Landeri, 65%; Laiteva, 88%; but note Nicarague, with 96%.

For the rationale for the identification of villages and encomiendas see the preceding discussion of the taxation of 1548, and accompanying map.

Sherman has suggested that Herrera may have pumped up his figures to damage Contreras' reputation (Sherman: 78). While it is undisputed that Herrera hated Contreras, it does not follow that Herrera would have compromised his reputation and deliberately exaggerated Indian population figures. His treatment of the charges against Contreras for trafficking in Indians in his residence of Contreras (IN RE RESIDENCIA OF CONTRERAS, 9 CS 1, 1544) was quite flemish, and the proofs were only introduced regarding single Indians, usually named, or small groups, and not the wholesale enslavement of Indians population that was mentioned by Las Casas. Sherman's allegations against Herrera's figures are quite unfounded.

The massacre of the governor of the original Costa Rica, Diego Gutierrez, was killed with about 18 men somewhere on the Atlantic coast, probably in present day Costa Rica. Those casualties had nothing to do with the conquest of western Nicaragua. See the discussion of the discovery of the mouth of the Rio San Juan elsewhere by the author.

See, for example, the report of Protector Alvarez Osorio to the village of Mistega on August 26, 1529, when he could only find 321 tributary Indians (2 CS 93).

While it is recognized that Spanish law recognized two types of slaves, esclavos de rescate, those who were found to be slaves when their masters were brought under Spanish control, and esclavos de guerra, those Indians enslaved because they had fought against Spanish authority, the taxing process and exploitation of slaves were applied equally to both categories of slaves and no such difference is noted in the accounting noted below.

See also Newton 1987: 102-103).

Scattered throughout the Coleccion Somarza are mention of unbranded slaves, indicating that either some of the Spaniards were kinder than others or that taxes were not collected on all slaves.

The actual tally sheets, translated into English, of the taxing process involved with the branding of new, Indian slaves during the period that Andres de Cereceda was Crown Accountant of Nicaragua are found in their entirety in Appendix Seven, below.

For an exhaustive analysis of his books, see IN RE ANDRES DE CERECEDA, 17 CS 302, (1550).

See. FRANCISCO SANCHEZ versus RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS, 6 CS 103, (July 1, 1540). It should be noted that Francisco Sanchez was a bitter enemy of Rodrigo de Contreras, as was Bartolome de Las Casas. Both were in Nicaragua during the years of 1535-1536 and both would have been privy to the same information and gossip. In all of the other documents written by or about Sanchez, he appeared to be factual and exact in his representations. It therefore is possible that the 37,000 Indians of Las Casas were in actuality the 2,000 Indians of Francisco Sanchez.

Contreras complained, in the grudge lawsuit that he later filed against Herrera, RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS versus DIEGO DE HERRERA, 15 CS 232 (June, 1548), that Herrera could be heard bawling and screaming at witnesses who were giving perjured testimony to help Contreras at the prosaico secretas, or preliminary examination of the evidence.

The complaints against Rios was relatively short, made up of seven counts. Herrera found Rios guilty of three of the counts, some of which were quite serious. Obviously, Herrera was trying to be fair.

Herrera also introduced into evidence the ship's manifest of 28 other ships in the companion residence of Luis de Guevara, chief enforcer, bully-boy and aguacil of the Contreras group, 10 CS 472-519.
Chapter 7
THE TASACIÓN OF 1581: AN ABSTRACT AND SUMMARY

Little has been previously written specifically about the population dynamics of Nicaragua following the conquest, particularly after 1550. Only Newsom (1987) has utilized the Tasación of 1581; unfortunately her very valuable work only summarizes data without the complete data base of the census being reproduced. The purpose of this chapter is to make readily available the data of the census without having to suffer through reading the original documents.

Census data makes for boring reading; nonetheless any historical or ethnographical work that attempts to explain and describe what happened in Nicaragua in the second half of the 16th century works in the dark without considering the population dynamics evidenced by the censuses of 1548 and 1581. Much history has been written in this manner and cannot of necessity accurately describe what happened in early, colonial Nicaragua. Anecdotal and allegorical references to a few memorable occurrences are no substitute for hard, demographic data. Any good history must contain both elements, events that define a time period and the quantitative information about the people living in those times. The second half of the 16th century merits closer study and hopefully this chapter will contribute to that end.

The documents comprising the Tasación of 1581 were printed from a microfilm made of the original documents in the Archives of the Indies in Seville, Spain. That microfilm was made at the request of Professor Eugenio Ibarra of the Universidad de Costa Rica by Sra. Ionina de Vecchio Ugalde, Costa Rican ambassador to Spain in 1989. A copy of that microfilm was graciously furnished by Professor Ibarra. The contents of this microfilm were printed at the request of Dr. Fred Lange of the University of Colorado.

The reason for taking the census was to obtain a clear idea of tax assessments of the Indians in the colony of Nicaragua. The last reliable census had been made in 1548 by Presidente de la Audiencia Alonso de Cerredo. The data from that census is found in its entirety at 14 CS 357 and has been analyzed previously in this work. That census demonstrates that Cerredo administered the census in a rational manner that the tribute assessments were based on ratios of Indians to products assessed in a generally uniform manner. The information about each of the 198 encomiendas is stated in a clear fashion; tribute assessments are stated using the same format throughout the census.

The contrast with the Tasación of 1581 is obvious. Governor Diego de Arrieta Cherino issued seven different cédulas to seven different teams of census takers. Each team, made up of the Crown official designated in the cédula and the chief church officer in the district to be tallied, generated seven different types of census information, depending on how closely they followed the directives of the governor. Those cédulas are as follows:

1. page 50, authorizing Fernando Otul, vecino of Leon, to take the census of Pozoltega and Chichigalpa;
2. page 56, authorizing Don Francisco de Cecepedes, vecino of El Realejo, to take the census of El Realejo;
3. page 61, authorizing el Bachiller Duarte de Salgado, vecino of Leon, to take the census of the province of Sutíaba;
4. page 71, cédula is illegible, possibly of the Diríá area;
5. page 132, authorizing Francisco de la Cereales Diez, vecino of Leon, to take the census of Chirandega;

(6) page 188, authorizing Gomez Palomino, vecino of Granada, to take the census of Managua;
(7) page 264, authorizing Francisco de Aguiar, de la province of Cebaco, to take the census of the province of Cebaco.

The most legible cédula, that authorized the census of the province of Cebaco, provided as follows:

Diego de Arrieta Cherino, governador y capitán general por su Magestad de la provincia de Nicaragua, Nicoya, y Costa Rica; y por la presente cometo y mando a VOS, Francisco de Aguiar de la mision por mi nombrada de la provincia de Cebaco; que VOS y el muy Reverendo padre y vicario de la provincia os juntas y ambos conteye y haganos contar todo de los indios y yndios que en el pueblo por si y quien lo posee y los tributarios de cada pueblo y de las viudas cada uno y los viejos y niños por la de tal manera que de una manera por contas y que en ellos no ay fraude ni engaño alguno por cuanto por una su real cédula que originalmente queda en mi poder lo mande y ensi mismo y os informen se si solteros pagan tributo y los tributarios que tributo pagan y en lo que estan tasacées y el juez que los tasa y hechos con todo brevedad y con cuidado y vigencia a me los envíeys buen recuerdo; Para que los informe la en la de nuestra Señor y Rey Natural. Hecho en la ciudad de Leon en el diezieses de mes de diciembre de Mil quinientos ochenta.

Firma

Diego de Arrieta Cherino

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.1: THE TASACIÓN OF 1581</th>
<th>ENCOMIENDAS OF THE DIRÍÁ REGION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encomienda</td>
<td>Tributary Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Diríá</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Diríánojutato</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Diríá</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 7.2: THE ENCOMIENDAS OF THE PROVINCE OF NANDAYME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encomienda</th>
<th>E11 No name, the assumption is that it is Nandayme (p. 4-6)</th>
<th>E12 otro Nandayme (p. 27)</th>
<th>E13 otro Nandayme (p. 29)</th>
<th>E14 Minaorte (p. 7)</th>
<th>E15 Noma (p. 21)</th>
<th>E16 Diriambore (p. 19?)</th>
<th>E17 otro Minaorte (p. 23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E18 Mastandé (p. 18)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19 Xinoetepe (p. 9)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20 otro Xinoetepe (p. 11)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21 Pozoltega (p. 52)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22 Alangasca (p. 52)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23 Pozolteguilla (p. 52)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24 Mialalpa (p. 52)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 7.3: THE ENCOMIENDAS OF THE PROVINCE OF SUTIABA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encomienda</th>
<th>E21 Pozoltega (p. 52)</th>
<th>E22 Alangasca (p. 52)</th>
<th>E23 Pozolteguilla (p. 52)</th>
<th>E24 Mialalpa (p. 52)</th>
<th>E25 Tustega (p. 52)</th>
<th>E26 Guazana (p. 53)</th>
<th>E27 Chichigalpa (p. 54)</th>
<th>E28 Mazatega (p. 54)</th>
<th>E29 Ysoloteo or Gultege (p. 54)</th>
<th>E30 Tostecacinte (p. 54)</th>
<th>E31 Tosta (p. 55)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E18 Mastandé (p. 18)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19 Xinoetepe (p. 9)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20 otro Xinoetepe (p. 11)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21 Pozoltega (p. 52)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Maribios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22 Alangasca (p. 52)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Maribios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23 Pozolteguilla (p. 52)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Maribios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24 Mialalpa (p. 52)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25 Tustega (p. 52)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E26 Guazana (p. 53)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Guazana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E27 Chichigalpa (p. 54)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>Maribios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E28 Mazatega (p. 54)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Maribios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E29 Ysoloteo or Gultege (p. 54)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Maribios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E30 Tostecacinte (p. 54)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E31 Tosta (p. 55)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tribute Assessments of these villages: "Estos dan de tributo una manta que vale veinte reales, una gallina vale dos reales, y una cuartillo de miel que vale un real, un almud de sal... y sembran un almud de maiz y frijol."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E32 Gualteveo (p. 134)</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>257</th>
<th>Maribios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E33 Chamalpan (p. 136)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E34 Agagalpa (p. 137)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E35 Guanejaste (p. 138)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Chondal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Located close by el Realjo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E36 Potega (p 139)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Maribios ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nahua ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E37 Mistega (p. 140)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Maribios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E38 Ayatega (p. 141)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Nahua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E39 Cozibina (p. 141)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E40 Tepostega (p. 142)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E41 Teotega (p. 142)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E42 otro Teotega (p. 143)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E43 Totoagala (p. 144)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E44 Colama (p. 144)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E45 Omaguia (p. 145)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This village possibly was included in the same encomienda as Condega in the Tausicion of 1548. Since Condega is identified as a Chontal village Guanejaste is also identified as Chontal, absent other evidence.

| E46 Ocozma (p. 145) | 11 | 31 | Maribios ? |
| E47 Pangua (p. 145)  | 7  | 25 | Maribios |
| E48 Gualteveo (p. 145) | 34 | 152 | Maribios |
| E49 Chinandega (p. 146) | 70 | 275 | Nahua |
| E50 Tezuatega (p. 148) | 48 | 190 | Nahua |
| E51 Tezuateguilla (p. 149) | 6  | 23 | Nahua |
| E52 Mazagalpa (p. 149) | 34 | 131 | Unknown |

This encomienda may be the remnant of the encomienda Condega Ocozma mentioned in the Cerrato Tausicion. Since Condega was a Maribios village this encomienda is tentatively identified as a Maribios village.

This encomienda did not appear in the Cerrato Tausicion and was probably included as part of the pueblito of Tezuatega in the earlier census.

This encomienda is a mystery. Mazagalpa was one of the major encomiendas of greater Matang and is mentioned there below. Whether this was a bookkeeping error or a separate village in the Suitaba area is unknown.
### TABLE 7.4: VILLAGES OF DIFFERING GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS.

The village listed in this section are from the Sebaco region north of Managua, the northwestern part of Nicaragua between present day Telica and Guasacate, the peninsula of Cojiguiña, and the mountainous northern region of Matagalpa and Jinotega. This appears to be a book keeping creation with no other commonality identifiable between the different villages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E53 Cebaco (p. 268)</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>210</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>This encomienda was mentioned as owned by Rodrigo de Contreras in 1543 but was not mentioned by name in the Cerrato Tassación.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E54 Migagalpa (p. 270)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>This possibly may be another encomienda of Migagalpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E55 Ysagalpa (p. 271)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>This encomienda was not mentioned in the Cerrato Tassación.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E56 Olocoton (p. 172)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Chontal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E57 Guaxinicós (p. J72)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Chontal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E58 Olonag (p. 172)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Chontal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E59 otro Olocoton (p. 172)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Chontal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E60 Corregia (p. 172)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Chontal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E61 Çomoto (p. 172)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Chontal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E62 Guazama</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Guazama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E63 Cusivina</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E64 otro Cusivina</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>* que es junto con el otro.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tribute assessed up to Encomienda 61, Çomoto, noted, "Estos Indios dan de tributo una manta listada que vale veinte reales; una gallina de castilla dos reales; media almud de sal un real; media almud de frijoles un real; siembran un almud de maíz de lo cojido."

### TABLE 7.5: ENCOMIENDAS OWNED BY VECINOS FROM GRANADA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E65 Xinotega (p. 277)</th>
<th>91?</th>
<th>290</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Not listed in the Cerrato Tassación.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E66 Matagalpa (p. 280)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Not listed in the Cerrato Tassación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E67 Solingalpa (p. 282)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Not listed in the Cerrato Tassación.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E68 Conolaguina or Molaguina (p. 283)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Not listed in the Cerrato Tassación.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E69 Diriana (p. 16)</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>155</th>
<th>Mangue</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E70 Nandayatza (p. 48)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E71 Papalota (p. 71)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E72 Niquinobono (p. 32)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E73 Masatepe (p. 37)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E74 otro Masatepe (p. 39)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E75 Nanbonima (p. 42)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Mangue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E76 Xalista (p. 44)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Unknown, possibly Mangue.</td>
<td>This encomienda was probably located between Masatepe and the Masaya Laguna so there is still a place on that road called Xalita.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7.6: ENCOMIENDAS OF THE PROVINCE OF MANAGUA

The following encomiendas are included within the area of "greater" Managua. At the beginning of the tally sheets the encomiendas are specifically identified as lying within the province of Managua. Later they are not so identified. That were all recorded by one person is obvious from the handwriting. Some of the encomiendas, such as Yatan, are located by Managua for the first time. The languages spoken in these villages present a problem. All cronistas who visited the Managua area identified the predominant language as Mangue. In 1586 Fray Cibdad Real identified the predominant language in Managua as Nahua. Both languages are noted for the area. Along with Subtiaba and Jinotepe it appears that greater Managua grew in size from the time of the Cerroco Tasación in 1548 while the Indian population generally was one half of what it was in 1548. Along with the apparent disappearance of many smaller villages, Managua, along with Subtiaba and Jinotepe, may have attracted Indians of various languages and thus lost some of their original ethnic character by 1586.

| E77 | Mazagalpa (p. 190) | 77 | 348 | Mangue and Nahua | There is a mention in that census that would have placed Guatepe between Diría and Xalteva. Whether there were two different encomiendas with this name is unknown. |
| E79 | Yatan (p. 200) | 23 | 69 | Nahua | |
| E80 | Coacazanti (p. 204) | 88 | 436 | Mangue and Nahua | This encomienda did not appear in the Cerroco Tasación. |
| E81 | Guatepe (p. 214) | 107 | 482 | Mangue and Nahua | It is unclear whether this encomienda was included in the Cerroco Tasación. |
| E82 | Çicogalpa (p. 224) | 54 | 238 | Mangue and Nahua |
| E83 | otro Çicogalpa (p. 230) | 15 | 77 | Mangue and Nahua |
| E84 | Telpanca (p. 234) | 133 | 670 | Mangue and Nahua | This name has confused historians for years since all identification of this encomienda has been where the present day town of Telpanca is found in Madrid province. This encomienda is not found in the Cerroco Tasación. |
| E85 | Xuist (p. 248) | 16 | 70 | Mangue and Nahua | This encomienda does not appear in the Cerroco Tasación. |
| E86 | Emilgalpa or Mualgalpa (p. 252) | 22 | 103 | Mangue and Nahua |
| E87 | Mualgalpa (p. 256) | 12 | 58 | Mangue and Nahua |
| E88 | Paynalan (p. 260) | 7 | 41 | Mangue and Nahua | This encomienda does not appear in the Cerroco Tasación. |
| E89 | Atonpa (p. 262) | 9 | 27 | Mangue and Nahua | This is probably a later spelling of the encomienda OVEN 6: Achonpa. |
TABLE 7.7: THE ENCOMIENDAS OF BOACO AND CENTRAL NICARAGUA

The next eight encomiendas were found in central Nicaragua. The location of the original Boaco, the location of the encomienda listed below, was about 50 km east of the present day city of Boaco. The town was moved in the 18th century due to pirate attacks. Mayale refers to both a major river in Chontales province that runs through the capital town of Juigalpa and a point of land nearby in Lake Nicaragua. Coyagalpa and Coagalpa were twin encomiendas mentioned in the Cerrato Tasacón and possibly located in the Malacatoya drainage in the area of Tuestepe. A single encomienda called "los Chontales" is listed consecutively and for that reason is placed in this group. The single listing of this encomienda is found only in the summary section and not in the tally sheets and so its actual location is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E90</th>
<th>Los Chontales</th>
<th>E91</th>
<th>Boaco (p 158)</th>
<th>E92</th>
<th>Coyagalpa (p 160)</th>
<th>E93</th>
<th>Coagalpa (p 162)</th>
<th>E94</th>
<th>Zuhngalpa (p 164)</th>
<th>E95</th>
<th>Quiboga (p 168)</th>
<th>E96</th>
<th>otro Quiboga (169)</th>
<th>E97</th>
<th>Mayale (p 170)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This encomienda is not mentioned in the Cerrato Tasacón. There is a single mention of Boaco at the onset of the conquest and then nothing more until this encomienda is listed. It may be located at a site still known as Boaco viejo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E98</th>
<th>No name, it is assumed that it is Subtiava proper (p 63)</th>
<th>189</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E99</td>
<td>San Pedro (p 65)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E100</td>
<td>Yacocoyagua (p 65)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E101</td>
<td>Coyatega or Soyatega (p 66)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E102</td>
<td>Pozolteguilla (p 66)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

very large encomienda, with 500 tributary Indians and about 1230 inhabitants. The tribute pattern was much different that of western Nicaragua and was much lighter per capita.

Tribute Assessment for this group of encomiendas: "Estos Indios pagan de tributo una moneda vale veinte reales; una gallina un real; un quinto de miel, un real; ... y un quinto de frutillas medio real y entre todos seis petatesque vale cada petate ocho reales mas siembran un almidon de maiz.

TABLE 7.8: MORE ENCOMIENDAS OF THE PROVINCE OF SUTILAVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E98</th>
<th>No name, it is assumed that it is Subtiava proper (p 63)</th>
<th>189</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E99</td>
<td>San Pedro (p 65)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E100</td>
<td>Yacocoyagua (p 65)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E101</td>
<td>Coyatega or Soyatega (p 66)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E102</td>
<td>Pozolteguilla (p 66)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E103 Xiquilapa (p. 66)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E104 Ayatega (p. 67)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E105 Ayatega (p. 67)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E106 Cindeguspipl (p. 68)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E107 Paynaltega (p. 68)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E108 Acocaco (p. 68)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E109 Distanguis (p. 68)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E111 La Villa de Realejo (p. 56)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E112 Guazcesayna (p. 272)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E113 Linaguina (p. 275)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E114 Pinaguina (p. 276)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E115 Noma (p. 24)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 7.9: ADDITIONAL ENCOMIENDAS FOUND IN THE TASCABIN OF 1581.**

Found in the tally sheets of the census are several villages that do not appear in the summary section. They are reproduced in the following table.
The population dynamics of 16th century Nicaragua are clearly seen when the census of 1548 is compared with that of 1581. Since many of the villages in the two censuses are easily identified as to both name and place, direct comparisons can be made. The population figures show a uniformly declining population, with a few centers growing in population.

**TABLE 7.10: COMPARISON BETWEEN THE TASACIÓNES OF 1548 AND 1581**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Identification Number</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Total Indians</th>
<th>Total Inhabitants</th>
<th>Encomienda Indians</th>
<th>Encomienda Inhabitants</th>
<th>Tributary Indians</th>
<th>Tributary Inhabitants</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1548</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1581</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 1 Cucivina</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 2 Olocoton</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chontal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 3 Sutiava</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>902</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>702</td>
<td></td>
<td>They spoke Maribios in much of the province of Sutiava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 4 Mormotombo (2E)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct or not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 5 Nabita (6E)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 6 Malacecoyite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 7 Huesagapata</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 8 Cindega (7E)</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Identification Number</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Total Indians</th>
<th>Total Inhabitants</th>
<th>Encomienda Indians</th>
<th>Encomienda Inhabitants</th>
<th>Tributary Indians</th>
<th>Tributary Inhabitants</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1548</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1581</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 10 Zapoteca (2E)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 11 Gualeveo (2E)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>562</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 12 Maneey</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td>Probably Chocotega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 13 Coyatega (2E)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>738</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maribios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 14 Ygualtega</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 15 Deacozaco (2E)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spoke &quot;mexico&quot; in 1581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 16 Guazama</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 17 Utega (2E)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 18 Pozoltega (3E)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>607</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 19 Comayna and Niagapla</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 20 Ayagalpa and Miagapla</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 21 Cohoyagui</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td>This pueblo spoke both Tacach, an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td>unknown language or Chontales, and Mexican, or Nahua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 22 Mescas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 23 Malalaca</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td>By 1581 this pueblo was probably incorporated into the colony of El Salvador or had died out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 24 Amateca</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 25 Tepunt?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 26 Colima</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Colama #44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 27 Mazagalpa (3E)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>Mazagalpa #52, 78</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 28 Tepustega (3E)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Tepustega</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 29 Toatega</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Toatega #41, 42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 30 Tosta</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Tosta #31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 31 Condega and Juangasta</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>Condega, #60, and Guamujaste #35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 32 Chinandeg</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>Chinandeg</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 33 Totogalpa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Totogalpa, #43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 34 Juangasta</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>See LVIN 31, above. Probably spoke Chontales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 35 Juangastilla</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>See LVIN 31, above. Probably spoke Chontales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 36 Mazateca</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Mazateca #28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 37 Chichigalpa</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Chichigalpa, #27</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 38 Tocotaca</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 39 Zumbunagua</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 40 Chamalpan</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Chamalpan, #33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 41 Tatanustega</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Extinct?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 42 Agagalpa</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Agagalpa #34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was probably located close by El Real de Alvarado, signed an agreement here with Francisco de Castafeda in 1533 regarding shipping out Indian slaves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LVIN</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 43</td>
<td>Astatega</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 44</td>
<td>Pangua</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 45</td>
<td>Nepeumo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 46</td>
<td>Tencogalpa</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 47</td>
<td>Nandamayo</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 48</td>
<td>Ayatega (3E)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 49</td>
<td>Telica</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 50</td>
<td>Asoletega</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 51</td>
<td>Noloque</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIN 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LVIN 53 | Nicoya | 600 | 2460 | Not Reported |
| LVIN 54 | Chira | 60 | 246 | Not Reported |
| LVIN 55 | Managua | 306 | 1254 | Not reported as Managua |
| LVIN 56 | Tustega | 12 | 49 | Tustega #25 | 15 | 51 |
| LVIN 57 | Limay | 44 | 197 | Extinct or not Reported under this name. |
| LVIN 58 | Yealtezaende | 60 | 246 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 59 | Husgalpa | 22 | 90 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 60 | Xocogalpa | 8 | 33 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |

*PV: encomienda in 1548 probably had less than 10 families, based upon tribute assessment.*
| LVIN 61 | Olomega | 20 | 82 | Olomega | 12 | 33 | Chontales |
| LVIN 62 | Matucayo | 26 | 107 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 63 | Diriendo | 24 | 98 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 64 | Matare | 100 | 410 | Probably not extinct but not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 65 | 'Alateca | 18 | 74 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 66 | Estanguiz | 33 | 135 | Distanguis #109 | 13 | 67 | Matilloes |
| LVIN 67 | Nuecenem | 40 | 165 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 68 | Dematnio | 65 | 267 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 69 | Maniati | 20 | 82 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 70 | Paynaltega | ? | ? | Paynaltega #107 | 2 | 5 | This village was either Chorotega or Nahua |
| LVIN 71 | Toscondo | 12 | 49 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 72 | Tunaltega | 40 | 64 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 73 | Naguaro | 30 | 123 | Not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 74 | Pomononagrand | 12 | 49 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| LVIN 75 | | 6 | 25 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |

This village was either located by Leon or Nueva Segovia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>158</th>
<th>159</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caguatoto</strong></td>
<td><strong>not reported under this name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LVIN 76 Mastega</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mistega # 37</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This may have included also Tatanustega. This was one of the four largest cacicarugas identified by Oviedo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LVIN 77 Cazaloaque</strong></td>
<td><strong>Probably not extinct but not reported under this name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This Marbíos village was reported by Cidradas Real in 1586 precisely at its present location and so was probably not an extinct village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LVIN 78 Potega</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potega # 36</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity unclear, though it was usually mentioned in conjunction with the Nahuay village of Yeatega, and so possibly may have been Nahuay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LVIN 79 Tezuatega</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tezuatega # 50, 51</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This Nahuay village was identified by Oviedo as perhaps the largest of the four major cacicarugas in existence in Nicaragua at the onset of the conquest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LVIN 80 Abangasca | 40 | 164 | Abangasca # 22 | 28 | 89 | Marbíos village |
| LVIN 81 Cosayco | 115 | 472 |Extinct or not reported under this name |   |   | Possibly another encomienda of the village called Cocoyayco or Acocoyayco |

**TABLE 7.11: THE ENCOMIENDAS OF GRANADA IN 1548 AND NEW ENCOMIENDAS OF 1581**

<p>| GVIN 1 Yatan | 18 | 74 | Yatan # 79 | 23 | 69 | This encomienda was located in the Managua area in 1581 and probably was there at the time of the conquest. |
| GVIN 2 Dríega | 240 | 984 | Not reported under this name. |   |   | This encomienda was reported during much of the colonial period as a barrio of Manaya A street by that name is located close by the main plaza. |
| GVIN 3 Mulagalpa | 35 | 144 | Mulagalpa # 86 &amp; 87 | 12 | 58 | This encomienda was located in the Managua area in 1581 and probably was |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVIN</th>
<th>Numeral</th>
<th>Mazatepe</th>
<th>Mazatepe  #</th>
<th>Chorotega village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># 75, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>Chorotega village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Chorotega village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>Probably originally a Chorotega village but by 1581 Cibdab Real reported use of Nahua in Granada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>Extinct or unreported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Extinct or unreported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Extinct or unreported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Not reported in 1581.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moyogalpa was and is located on the island of Oronote and is its main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>port. The Tausición of 1581 specifically mentioned that the encomiendas of the island in Lake Nicaragua were not included (Tausición 1581: 266).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported in 1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported in 1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Guatepe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Minarote # 14 and 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>Not extinct but not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massaya</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>GVIN 19 Diriomo</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 20 Susuquito and Manbacho</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Probably extinct due to a mudslide in 1571.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 21 Namborim</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Namborim E# 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 22 Nontiba</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 23 Marinalle</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 24 Daria</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>Diriá E# 1,2,3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 25 Loma Noma</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Noma E# 15, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 26 Diramba</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Diriamborui E# 16, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 27 Nomativa</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Nomativa E# 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 28 Nandaime</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Nandaime E# 11,12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 29 Masutaude</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Masutaude E# 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 30 Tiptapa</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Extinct or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| GVIN 31 Coagalpa | Reported under this name. | 70  | 287 | Coagalpa E# 93 | 25  | 93 |
| GVIN 32 Coyagalpa | Reported under this name. | 30  | 123 | Coyagalpa E# 92 | 31  | 66 |
| GVIN 33 Mayales | Reported under this name. | 300 | 1230 | Mayale E# 97 | 21  | 85 |
| GVIN 34 Niquinohomo | Reported under this name. | 120 | 492 | Niquinohomo E# 72 | 171 | 740 |
| GVIN 35 Manbacho and Mandapio | Reported under this name. | 90  | 369 | Extinct probably due to a mudslide in 1571. |
| GVIN 36 Nicaragua and Guatagalpa | Reported under this name. | 319 | 1368 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| GVIN 37 Martinator | Reported under this name. | 30  | 123 | Martinator E# 111 | 8  | 36 |
| GVIN 38 Caguisalpa et al | Reported under this name. | 300 | 1230 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |
| GVIN 39 Isla de Nicaragua | Reported under this name. | 109 | 447 | Not reported in the Tasación. |
| GVIN 40 Axotone | Reported under this name. | 35  | 144 | Extinct or not reported under this name. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVIN 41 Chicogalpa</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>144</th>
<th>Extinct or not reported under this name.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 42 Cangenal</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Nicoya not reported in the Tasación.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 43 Nandayotra</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Nandayotra E# 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 44 Tenami</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 45 Nandamalata</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 46 Nicopassaya</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Nicoya not reported in the Tasación.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 47 Chuiagalpa</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 48 Nenderi</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>Obviously not extinct but not reported in the Tasación.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 49 Capandi</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Nicoya not reported under the Tasación.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVIN 50 Xicogalpa</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>185</th>
<th>Cicogalpa E# 82 and 83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 51 Monagalpa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 52 Solista</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 53 Tolgalpa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 54 Momotnbo</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVIN 55 Totoaque</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Extinct or not reported under this name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matagalpa E# 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martinarote E# 111, p 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Villa de El Realejo E# 12, p. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guayacan, E# 113,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Página</td>
<td>Nombre</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Linaquima E# 114, p. 275</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Pinaguina E# 115, p. 276</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Cebaco E# 53, p. 268</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Miguagalpa E# 54, p. 270</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Ystagalpa E# 55, p. 271</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Colingalpa E# 67, p. 282</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Jinotega E# 65, p. 277</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Molaguina E# 68, p. 283</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Los Chontales E# 90, p. 184</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Pozolteguil la, E# 23 p 52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Miagalpa E# 24, p. 52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gulutega E# 54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Página</th>
<th>Nombre</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tostecacint e E# 30, p. 54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Omaguia E# 45, p. 145</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Ocorza E# 46, p. 145</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Tezustegu lla E# 51, p. 149</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Quaxinicos E# 57, p. 172</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Nanda-mo E# 77, p. 46</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Cocazarrati E# 80, p. 204</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Telpaneca (possibly Tecpaneca) E# 84, p. 234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Payalan E# 88, p. 250</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Xuit E# 85, p. 248</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Zulnigalpa E# 94, p. 164</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quiboga E# 95, p</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Name</td>
<td>Village in 1548</td>
<td>Village in 1581</td>
<td>Percentage of Change (+ -)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Cucívina</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>-51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Olocotón</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>+16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 Sutiava</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8 Cindegá (pipil)</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11 Gualtevéo</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12 Sojatega</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>-76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L15 Deacozaco</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L16 Guazama</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>+214%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L18 Pozoltega</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L20 Agagalpa and Aliagalpa</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>+18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L21 Cocoyagua</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L27 Mazagalpa</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L28 Tepustega</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L29 Teotega</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L30 Tosta</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L31 Cindegá and Juanaguastl</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L32 Chinandega</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>-58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L33 Totogalpa</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L36 Mazatega</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L37 Chichigalpa</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L40 Chamalpan</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L42 Agagalpa</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L44 Pungua</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L48 Ayatega</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L50 Azolotega</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L56 Tostega</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L61 Olomega</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L66 Estanguiz</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L70 Paynaltega</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L76 Mistega</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>-71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L78 Potega</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L79 Tezuatega</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since it is obvious that the Tasajón of 1581 is an incomplete document, any comparisons between the Tasajones of 1548 and 1581 must be limited to comparisons of the same villages in order to accurately calculate demographic changes. Newson (1987), for example, seems to have compared these two censuses without taking into consideration the incompleteness of the 1581 census in relation to that of 1548. The above table is a comparison of only identifiable villages in both censuses, excluding from comparison many villages of the 1548 census that had obviously disappeared, and also the villages of central and northern Nicaragua that are not found in the 1548 census.

Of the 67 villages compared, 44 showed a population decrease while only 13 showed an increase in population. Those population changes, however, seem to indicate a regrouping of Indian populations in the six decades following the conquest. Many of the smaller encomiendas of the 1548 census had disappeared by 1581. Possibly remnants of these disappeared villages went to larger villages. There is some evidence, for example, of the Spanish authorities at the end of the 16th century and beginnings of the 17th century, regrouping Indians in the form of reducciones or forming new villages completely. For example, in 1652 the remnants of the Indian villages in the Leon viejo area were sent to found a pueblo in an uninhabited part of the camino real between Nagarote and Leon. That community of Indians was called San Nicolas del Valle de Solis, today’s La Paz Centro (Molina 1973: 40-42). In 1626 Indians from the Muy Muy area were resettled in the Metapa area by Franciscan priests. Later, in 1696, Friar Diego Alarcón removed converted Indians from Muy Muy to the Posoltega area (Newson 1987: 168). Whether other regroupings were ordered by the Crown is unknown, but clearly the conquest and then colonial experience served to mix up ethnic groups in the Indian villages that survived, and grew at the end of the 16th century.

### Table 7.13: Encomiendas and Population Centers That Had Increased Their Populations in 1581 in Relation to That of 1548

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Population Center</th>
<th>1548 Population</th>
<th>1581 Population</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greater Managua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including the following encomiendas: E78 Mazagalpa</td>
<td>2598</td>
<td>2619</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E79 Yatan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E80 Cacazmati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E81 Guatepe (and Tonala)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E82 Cicosgalpa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E83 oro Cicosgalpa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E84 Telpaneca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E85 Xuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E86 Mulagalpa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E87 otro Mulagalpa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 23,257 12,480 -46%
Encomienda | Tributary Indians | Total Inhabitants
--- | --- | ---
E78 Mazagalpa | 77 | 348
E79 Yatan | 23 | 69
E80 Cacaznati | 88 | 436
E81 Guatape | 107 | 482
E82 Ciyegalpa | 54 | 238
E83 otro Ciyegalpa | 15 | 77
E84 Telpaneca (or Tepaneca) | 133 | 670
E85 Xust | 16 | 70
E86 Mulagalpa | 22 | 103
E87 otro Mulagalpa | 12 | 58
E88 Paynalan | 7 | 41
E89 Atonpa | 9 | 27
Totals: | 563 | 2619

OTHER POPULATION CENTERS IN 1581
The other major population center was greater Subtiava. Subtiava itself had dropped in population from 902 inhabitants in 1548 to 702 in 1581. Still, it was one of the largest population centers in Nicaragua in 1581. Greater Subtiava included many of the villages within about a 25 km radius of Subtiava and included many of the Maribios villages listed in the Tasación of 1548. The major Maribios population center of Chinagual had almost completely disappeared (E106 Chinagual, with 11 inhabitants), and Mestega, one of the four largest cacicazgos listed by Oviedo in 1528, had almost also totally disappeared, with only E26&62 Guazama, with 352 inhabitants and E37 Mestega, with 155 inhabitants. Greater Subtiava, as described by the Tasación of 1581, totalled 1486 tributary Indians and 5675 total inhabitants. Ethnically, greater Subtiava was a mix of three or four different groups. Cibdad Real reported in 1586 that Subtiava itself was made of MANGUE speakers. The majority of encomiendas of greater Subtiava were Maribios villages. One village, Xacoyagua, had a few speakers who spoke Tacono, an unknown language, and may or may not have spoken Chontales, as the reference is quite ambiguous. At least one village, Acorazo, spoke Nahua.

TABLE 7.14: THE ENCOMIENDAS OF MANAGUA

TABLE 7.15: THE ENCOMIENDAS AND VILLAGES OF GREATER SUBTIAVA

Village or Encomienda | Tributary Indians | Total Inhabitants
--- | --- | ---
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173
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E21 Pozoltega</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>151</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E22 Abangasea</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E23 Pozoteguilla</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E24 Miagalpa</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E25 Tustega</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E26 Guazama</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E27 Chichigalpa</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E28 Mazatega</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E29 Ysolotega</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E30 Tostecacinte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E31 Tosta</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E32 Gualteveo</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E33 Chamalpan</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E34 Agagalpa</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E35 Guanjaste</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E36 Potega</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E37 Mistega</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E38 Ayatega</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E39 Cozibina</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E40 Tepostega</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E41 Teotega</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E42 otro Teotega</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E43 Totogalpa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E44 Colama</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E45 Ormagnia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E46 Ocoznia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E47 Pangua</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E48 Gualteveo</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>152</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E49 Chinandega</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E50 Tezatega</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E51 Tezateguilla</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E52 Mazagalpa</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E98 Sutiava</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E99 San Pedro</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E100Yacocoyagua</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E101 Coyatega</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E102 Pozolteguilla</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E103 Xiquilapa</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E104 Ayatega</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E105 Ayatega</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E106 Cindegapipl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E107 Paynaltega</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E108 Acozaco</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E109 Distanguis</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: **1486**  
**5675**

The Indian populations of Nagarote, Matiare, Jalteva, Masaya, Monimbo, Nindiri, Leon Viejo, Nicoya, Nueva Segovia, the islands of Lake Nicaragua, and Atogalpa, the village of Nicaragua (present day San Jorge) are not reported in the Tascación of 1581, for unknown reasons. The Tascación itself mentions that the encomiendas of Nueva Segovia, Nicoya, and Sololantania are not included in the census. Unexplained is the absence of the encomiendas of Leon Viejo and Jalteva. Perhaps the Indian populations by Leon and Granada had disappeared by 1581. Obviously, the Indian populations of Masaya, Nindiri, Nagarote, and Matiare had not disappeared; either the census documents were not preserved or the census was not completed. The absence of these villages in the Tascación of 1581 is unexplained and little can be inferred from this absence, lacking other information.
TABLE 7.16: THE CHONTAL VILLAGES

Listed separately are the Chontales villages, with the exception of a very small encomienda, simply called "Los Chontales" (E 90) with 34 inhabitants and located somewhere within the ancient province of Boaco. The six Chontales encomiendas were located in a cluster in Chinandega province, from present day Guasauque (called then Condega), Somotillo (called then Somoto) Olocotan and Olomega, located about 10 miles north of present day Telica. They apparently were able to maintain their ethnic identity up to 1581, and possibly were remnants of an earlier putum Maya population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Tributary Indians</th>
<th>Total Inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. E56 Olocotan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. E57 Guaxinicos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. E58 Olomega</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. E59 otro Olocotan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. E60 Condega</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. E61 Somoto</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7.17: THE ENCOMIENDAS AND VILLAGES OF DIRIA

In both the Tasaciones of 1548 and 1581 the cluster of villages around Diria represented a sizeable Indian population. While Diria proper had lost population between 1548 and 1581 (1346 versus 951 inhabitants) "greater" Diria it still contained 20 encomiendas with 885 tributary Indians and 3256 total inhabitants. It was probably still predominantly Chorotega in ethnic identity as no known reference exists identifying this group of villages with any other Indian group until Britton identified the folk play El Goee- ence, which originated in Ditamba or Masaya possibly in the 18th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encomienda</th>
<th>Tributary Indians</th>
<th>Total Inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1 Diria</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Dirianojutato</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Diria</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the Tasación of 1548, the census of 1581 clearly shows the extent of Spanish control extending into the mountainous regions of central and northern Nicaragua. If it can be assumed that no village under Spanish control was allowed to go free and not pay any tribute, then one can conclude that the region from modern day Sebaco to finotepe was only placed under Spanish dominion between 1548 and 1581. The area was very sparsely populated and all encomiendas were small. The majority of the encomenderos of these villages were listed as residents of Nueva Segovia, just south of modern day Quilalí. The ethnic identities of the villages of Cebaco are mostly unknown since there are few contemporary references that identify ethnic groups and little archaeological work has been done to date in the Sebaco area.

One reference in the Tasación of 1581 identifies the villages of Linaguina and Pinaguina as being Nahua speakers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Tributary Indians</th>
<th>Total Inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E53 Cebaco</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E65 Xinotega</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E66 Matagalpa</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E67 Salingalpa</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E68 Molaguina</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E112 Guazcauyna</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E113 Linaguina</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E114 Pinaguina</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7.19: THE VILLAGES AND ENCOMIENDAS OF BOACO AND THE PRESENT DAY PROVINCE CALLED CHONTALES

As with the encomiendas of Sebaco, the extent of Spanish domination east of Lake Nicaragua is noted in the villages of Boaco. Though little information is available, the area may have experienced severe depopulation along with western Nicaragua. The encomienda of Mayales, for example, in 1548 had 1230 total inhabitants; in 1581 it had at most 85 inhabitants. The ethnic identity of the villages of Boaco and Chontales is unknown. No reference exists in the census specifically identifying a particular language in any of the villages. One mini-encomienda, E90, is called simply “Los Chontales” with no other information listed. Since the tribute assessments include woven goods in slightly different forms than the rest of the tribute assessments and tobacco is listed as a tributary item, the ethnic identity, and language, of the inhabitants of Boaco and Chontales may have been different than those of western Nicaragua. But not enough information exists to hazard a guess about who those Indians were in 1581.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Tributary Indians</th>
<th>Total Inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E96 oto Quiboga</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E97 Mayale</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tasación of 1581 depicts a much different Nicaragua than that of 1548. The population had plummeted by perhaps one third, many new pueblos are found for the first time, and a few, new barrios appeared in greater Managua. A few villages, mostly in the Meseta de los Pueblos, actually grew in population in relation to that of 1548, and Subtiaba remained another large, regional population center, even though it was smaller than it was in 1548. Spanish domination had finally reached Sebaco, Matagalpa and Xinotega, though all of those villages were tiny and of no economic consequence. Tribute patterns had changed completely, with the amount and type of tribute assessed in smaller amounts and less diverse forms. The ability to detect any ethnic differences in the tribute assessment was lost by the imposition of a few standard items, such as blue and white striped cloths about 15 feet long and four feet wide. The remaining Chontal villages were finally identified as to their ethnicity and some details about their subsistence economy were noted in a report about the Chontales; no other Indian group had such a report. The colony of Nicaragua by 1581 was a mere shadow of what it had been with the coming of the Spaniards in 1522, and it probably reached its nadir in population and productivity about the time that tasación was taken. Finally, many of the villages of western and northern Nicaragua, such as those around Nueva Segovia, Masaya, Nandayme, Leon proper, and San Jorge, are not found in the tasación, for some unknown reason. A complete picture of Nicaragua in 1581 still eludes description.

1 The colony of Nicaragua in 1581 as defined by its 115 encomiendas is found in Figure 2.
11 An annotated abstract of the 115 encomiendas of the entire Tasación of 1581 is found in Appendix Eight, below.
13 This number is the estimated population of total inhabitants of the village in 1548.
14 This is the actual number of inhabitants according to the Tasación of 1581.
Chapter 8

PROPER NAMES OF CACIQUES, PRINCIPALES, AND OTHER INDIANS

An interesting cultural remnant of the various indigenous cultures in Nicaragua during the Contact Period, before 1548, are the actual, or proper names of various of the caciques, principales, and other Indians that are found in many contemporary documents. For various legal reasons it was necessary to include the names of specific Indians in various legal documents, principally encomienda titles and their accompanying acts of possession, Indian witnesses, or victims in criminal cases, and Indians that appear in the ship manifests of various vessels that shipped out of El Realejo. Finally, some Indians names appear in the surety bonds that were filed by the Spaniards in order to obtain permission to export Indians from Nicaragua. To assist the reader in understanding the names the Nahua calendar is reproduced, along with equivalent words in both Spanish and Oté-Mangue. The names of Indians, given in Spanish, are, for the most part, not included in this list, for obvious reasons. Similarly, some of the names of noted caciques mentioned in the San Juan River district and the Saueré district of Costa Rica are omitted from this work. They will be included in a separate work regarding the history of the conquest and defeat of the Spaniards on the north coast of Costa Rica and the subsequent killing and roasting of the doomed governor of Costa Rica, Diego Gutierrez, in 1545. The reference numbers of the pueblos are the same ones used in Chapter Three of this work.

TABLE 8.1: THE NAMES OF THE DAYS IN THE MEXICAN CALENDAR IN NAHUA WITH ITS EQUIVALENTS IN OTÉ-MANGUE AND SPANISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name in Nahua</th>
<th>Name in Oté-Mangue</th>
<th>Name in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cipat</td>
<td>Nyuju (pescado)</td>
<td>animal del mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hecat</td>
<td>Neshu</td>
<td>aire o viento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cali</td>
<td>Nangu</td>
<td>casa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quexpal</td>
<td>Nyukid</td>
<td>lagarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coat</td>
<td>Nule</td>
<td>serpiente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Migiste</td>
<td>Gagame</td>
<td>muerte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mazat</td>
<td>Numbongame</td>
<td>venado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Toste</td>
<td>Nyuku</td>
<td>conejo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. At</td>
<td>Nimbu</td>
<td>agua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Esquindi</td>
<td>Nambi</td>
<td>perro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ocante</td>
<td>Nambi (mono)</td>
<td>gorila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Malinal</td>
<td>Nata-tigama (Chiapaneca)</td>
<td>zacate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Acato</td>
<td>Nirimbome</td>
<td>caña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ocelot</td>
<td>Nambuco o Nambú</td>
<td>tigre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following are the names of specific Indians, with other identifying information.

THE NAHUAS

1. Location: El pueblo de Tooca, en la provincia del cacique llamado Nicaragua
   Date: October, 1528, Interviewed by Fray Bobadilla
   Type of Document: Interview
   Source: Cronistas 3: 310-31, seq
   Ethnicity: Nahua
   Names: (1) Chicoayotonal, cacique; (2) Cipat, un viejo (gaugue); (3) Miscaybo, cacique; (4) Tazoteyda, viejo sacerdote excomulgado; (5) Coyevet, un indio gaugue de 80 años.
   Reference: P 3.5

2. Location: Xoxoyta, a pueblo o galapon of the pueblo of the cacique named Nicaragua
   Date: September, 1528
   Type of Document: Entrevista by Fray Bobadilla
   Source: Cronistas 3: 324, et seq.
   Ethnicity: Nahua
   Names: (1) a cacique named Quiavit, señor de la plaza of Xoxoyta; (2) Astochinal, a man of 30 años.
   Reference: P 3.3

3. Location: Tezuzzlega
   Date: 1528 and 1540
   Type of Document: 1528: Interview by Oviedo; 1540: an encomienda title and act of possession
   Source: 1528: Cronistas 3: 461; 1540: 14 CS 170, 172
   Ethnicity: Nahua
   Names: 1528: Agatete; 1540: (1) an Indian named Caçumate; (2) a female Indian named Violarte in Christian; (3) an Indian named Qariat.
   Reference: P 3.34
   Comment: Indians named Ysero y Perico were taken from Tezuzzlega and sent to Panama, 10 CS 67.

4. Location: Ayatega
   Date: October 22, 1542
THE CHOROTEGAS

7. Location: Nicoya
Date: December 17, 1540
Type of Document: Encomienda Title
Source: 14 CS 170, 172
Ethnicity: Chorotega
Names: Principales: (1) Nipopoyamat; (2) Mato; (3) a female named Ynesica en Christian; (4) Namay; Oviedo remembered that in 1528 el cacique de Nicoya was called "Namir" o Nambir", dog in Oto-Mangue.
Reference: P 1.2

8. Location: Nandayme
Date: September 5, 1543
Type of Document: Encomienda Title
Source: 13 CS 326 et seq
Ethnicity: Chorotega
Names: caciques: (1) Anonboymes y Ynanboym, cacique mayor; (2) Dionynboy; (3) Zindinodo; (4) Nayyonbue; (5) Aroity; (6) Nacatime; (7) Potrinatio; (8) Zezes; (4) Piron; (10) Uraxayre
After the first act of possession there was another. 13 CS 338, on the 3rd day of March, 1529
Named were the caciques of Nandayme called Canamari and Mendome. There was a third acta de possession, noted at 13 CS 467, on the 23rd of September, 1544
Present were the following caciques: (1) Namhueme; (2) Nomboy; (3) Tipueta mochacho; (4) Mondoy yndio. Another act of possession at 13 CS 454 mentioned the caciques: (1) Pedro Namhueme; (2) Sirayo.
Reference: P 1.16

9. Location: Diriá
Date: October 22, 1542
Type of Document: Encomienda Title
Source: 11 CS 302
Ethnicity: Chorotega
Names: (1) Franquisquilla (possibly a woman); (2) Gonzalo
Reference: P3.6

10. Location: Monimbó
Date: April 15, 1542
Type of Document: Encomienda Title
Source: 14 CS 174
Ethnicity: Chorotega
Names: (1) Botoy; (2) Nacy; (3) Mandati
11 Location: Lenderi
Date: 1529
Type of Document: Oviedo’s work
Source: Cronistas 3: 385
Ethnicity: Chorote
Names: The cacique of Lenderi was called Francisco in Spanish and Nacatime in Chorote.
Reference: P3.11
Comment: the encomienda in the tasacion of 1548, 14 CS 473, is the only encomienda that notes the proper names of the three caciques, Pedro, Juan, and Diego, that had responsibility for tribute production at Lenderi. It would appear that artisanal production was better organized at Lenderi than in all the other encomiendas.

12 Location: Chira
Date: April 8, 1541
Type of Document: Encomienda Title
Source: 14 CS 170, 172
Ethnicity: Chorote
Names: (1) a female, called Catalina in Christian; (2) an Indian named Nogui
Reference: PE 25

13 Location: Xalteba
Date: August 20, 1541
Type of Document: Criminal proceeding against Alonso Calero
Source: 9 CS 161
Ethnicity: Probably Chorote
Names: Tacol, cacique de Xalteba
Another mention of Indians from Xalteva is found at the act of possession of an encomienda on October 22, 1542, 11 CS 303; the Indians were named: (1) Coco; (2) Tochil.
Reference: P4.44

14 Location: Nandapio (Nandapio Mombach)
Date: 8 de abril, 1529
Type of Document: Legal proceeding against Miguel Juan de Rivas, et al
Source: 2 CS 16, 21
Ethnicity: Probably Chorote
Names: (1) a woman named Eçelo.
Reference: GVIN 35

THE MARIBIOS

15 Location: Maçatega

16 Location: Pocotecha
Date: October 22, 1542
Type of Document: Encomienda Title
Source: 11 CS 302, 304
Ethnicity: Maribios
Names: (1) Don Alonso, cacique; (2) Don Francisco Lopez, principal
Reference: P 3.21

17 Location: Cindega
Date: July 3, 1540
Type of Document: criminal proceeding, LA CORONA v. MATEO LEZCANO
Source: 9 CS 481
Ethnicity: Maribios
Names: (1) cacique Don Diego; witnesses against Lezcano: (2) un principal, Nyongua; (3) un principal, Ozilo; (4) un cacique, Migiriisti; (5) un cacique, de Anbaco; (6) un principal, Quespal; (7) Mgyusi; (8) Anbabanga (these last names could be repetitions of the preceding names: (9) Ousua; (10) Ayaca; (11) Samon; (12) Yulsaco; (13) Ysquan; (14) Sando; (15) Pican; (16) Yquon; (17) Yeile, principal; (18) Teguisaya, principal; (19) Mycana, principal; (20) Baco, principal Bascupa; (22) Ambicapo; (23) Cuxua; (24) Aquonu; (25) Equey (26) Eqibóqilo “and in Maribio Nyongua”; (27) Talalegualc, cacique
Reference: P 3.24

18 Location: Telica
Date: 1535 (the Indians taken by Francisco de Castañeda);
Type of Document: lawsuit, RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS v. LUIS DE GUEVARA
Source: 9 CS 411, 9 CS 414; 9 CS 442; mentioned at 9 CS 477
Ethnicity: Maribios
Names: (1) Aguatonate; (2) Teguano; (3) Teguisque; (4) Xaguantona; (5) Teguane. Another mention of Indian taken from Telica to Panama, 10 CS 479, (1) Ybigalma; (2) Quisqui
Reference: P3.25
Comment: It is possible that the names in four and five are repeated

19 Location: Abangasca
Date: 1535
Type of Document: Bond forfeiture against the bond filed by Francisco de Castañeda and guaranteed by Luis de Guevara, RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS vs. LUIs DE GUEVARA.
Source: 9 CS 412 et seq., 442 et seq., 476 et seq., 9 CS 512, relative to Cindega.
Ethnicity: Mariébos
Names: (1) una india, Teyoa y en christian Juaana La Zegela; (2) una yndia Tereza; (3) una yndia Juana; (4) un yndio, Quisno; (5) un yndio, Abaspapa; (4) un yndio, Meca; (7) un yndio, Domingo; (8) un yndio Tamagaz Jandy; (5) un yndio Gasparillo; (10) un yndio Yndiliqu; (11) un yndio Añbato; (12) un yndio Netey; (13) Ozilo, principal de Abangasca y Cindega
Reference: P.3.26

20. Location: Pangua
Date: June 30, 1538
Type of Document: Encomienda Title and possession.
Source: 9 CS 114-115
Ethnicity: Mariébos
Names: (1) Uzelo, cacique; (2) Malina, cacique
Reference: P.3.27

21. Location: Ygualtega
Date: April 3, 1536
Type of Document: Bond forfeiture lawsuit, see the above entry.
Source: 9 CS 442-443
Ethnicity: Mariébos
Names: (1) Soche, principal de Abangasca-Ygualtega; (2) principal, Topagua; (3) principal, Diego; (4) Papa, natural; (5) Juana Cuerno, deceased (9 CS 422)
Reference: P.3.29
Comment: It appears that Abangasca and Ygualtega were located close together

22. Location: Iguala, (Yguala)
Date: August 2, 1537
Type of Document: Encomienda Deed and Possession
Source: 14 CS 169
Ethnicity: Mariébos
Names: (1) Juana Yazesno, difunta probably the same person mentioned above; (2) cacique Francisco; (3) Migisti, cacique; (4) Maça, cacique; (5) Cosca, cacique
Reference: P.3.30
Comment: It seems that Iguala was located next to Ygualtega-Abangasca or was possibly another form of Ygualtega

23. Location: Mistega
Date: 1529
Type of Document: Title history of the encomienda of Mistega

Source: 2 CS 101
Ethnicity: Mariébos, with the exception of Ootgalpanega, that was Guazama, an unknown language.
Names: (1) Astaconzi with the principal named Teyoa; (2) Chamologonga and with the principal named Hueysc; (3) Estanzingoa and with the principal named Ohin; (4) Cozcatega with the principal named Matac; (5) Escologalpon with the principal named Escolon; (6) Topajax with the principal named Alzaguancone; (7) Cojacone with the principal named Agat; (8) Ootgalpanega with the principal named Tetzatotot.

Other mentions of Mistega: 9 CS 412-413: (1) Tesolo and in Christian Juanylo; 9 CS 476-477: (1) Tequet; (2) Yequin; (3) Tesolo

Another mention of Mistega: encomienda deed and possession, 14 CS 166, (May 6, 1539).
Names: (1) cacique, Don Francisco; (2) Çiesogat, principal; (3) Maquil, principal
Reference: P.3.31

24. Location: Guazama
Date: September 15, 1541
Type of Document: Encomienda deed and possession
Source: 10 CS 69
Ethnicity: Guazama, an unknown language
Names: (1) Papalo, cacique; (2) Sochet, goque
Reference: LVIN 16
Comment: Guazama was the language of a galpon of Mistega called Ootgalpanega. It was identified by protector Alvarez Osorio as a language different from the one in general use in Mistega.

25. Location: Astatega
Date: December 29, 1541
Type of Document: lawsuit, LA CORONA v. DIEGO ARIAS
Source: 10 CS 521
Ethnicity: Mariébos
Names: (1) Oçiilo, murdered; (2) Çepal, witness; (3) Çindio Chontal, witness; (4) Tastucate, witness; (5) Tapaleque (Tapaleque), witness; (6) Çindio Coaguate, witness; (7) Maganui, witness; (8) Sendione, witness; (9) Tastucate, witness; (10) Çindio Cahuyte, witness; (11) Çipael; (12) Trascuate
Reference: LVIN 43

THE CHONDALES

26. Location: Çagalupa
Date: July 6, 1542
Type of Document: Encomienda Title and Possession
Source: 14 CS 174
Ethnicity: Chondal
Names: (1) Socher, principal; (2) Chiçigue
Reference: P. 453
Comment: The encomienda title identifies the village of Cagualpa as a Chondales Indian village, similar to the "motolynes chondales". The two villages were included in the municipalidad of Granada.

UNKNOWN GROUPS

27 Location: The islands in the golf of Fonseca
Date: August 9, 1526
Type of Document: Encomienda Title
Source: 5 CS 368
Ethnicity: Unknown
Names: The Plazas of:
Omguianota; cacique llamado Guamul;
Yomunguisa; cacique llamado Macuna;
Guagalpanega; cacique llamado Amama;
Nohuali; cacique llamado Capena;
Zuanagastona; cacique llamado Macoci;
Mazoco; cacique llamado Aguy.
Reference: PE 1

28 Location: Cosigüina
Date: February 28, 1541
Type of Document: lawsuit, LA CORONA v. ANDRES MEDRANO.
Source: 10 CS 427
Ethnicity: Unknown
Names: (1) a woman, Soche, deceased; (2) Guayanolo, witness; (3) Limaz; (4) Nebelron; (5) Soche, witness; (6) Cinonate, cacique principal; (7) Cita, witness; (8) Nino Tela, witness; (9) Ybigama.
Reference: LVIN 1

29 Location: Close to the mouth of the río San Juan
Date: September 3, 1541
Type of Document: Criminal case against Alonso de Horozco and Antonio de Nurueña
Source: 10 CS 252
Ethnicity: Unknown
Names: (1) Chontalejo
Reference: None

30 Location: El pueblo de Agataça, (location unknown)
Date: July 11, 1544
Type of Document: Fragment of lawsuit against Bartolome Gonçales

Source: 9 CS 400
Ethnicity: Unknown
Names: Coçote
Reference: None

31 Location: Tonaltega (location unknown)
Date: March 8, 1535
Type of Document: Diligencias
Source: 4 CS 453 et seq.
Ethnicity: Unknown
Names: (1) a woman named Guical
Reference: LVIN 72

32 Location: Coloma (possibly Colima, encomienda # 33, 14 CS 379)
Date: March 8, 1535
Type of Document: Diligencias
Source: 4 CS 453, 456
Ethnicity: Unknown
Names: (1) Juana Ochalchel; (2) Sochel; (3) Iuanica; (4) Beatrizica
Reference: LVIN 26

33 Location: Island of Mancarran in Lake Nicaragua
Date: Shortly before June 1, 1544 (exact date not clear)
Type of Document: Residencia of Rodrigo de Conterras
Source: 9 CS 1, 9 CS 245
Ethnicity: Unclear
Names: the cacique of Mancarran, named Montipe, with a chief named Anbatonto
Reference: P. 72

The inspection of many documents of the 16th century has disclosed the names of many Indian caciques and principales that lived and ruled in Nicaragua before 1548. A review of those names makes it obvious that two distinct phonetic patterns are found in those names. First, the proper names of Chortega caciques and principales have little or no relation to names related to the Nahua, not Nahautl, calendar; proper names of caciques and principales of the Nahua, Macibios, and Chontales are taken in large part from the names of days of the Nahua calendar. The names "Flower" (Soche), "Death" (Migiste), "Deer" (Mazat), "Dog" (Izquindi), "Sun Movement" (Olin), and "Rain" (Quiauvit) were the most commonly cited proper names, with "Flower" in its many forms, i.e. Soche, Sochit, Socher, being the most common. At no place were Nahautl names found. What this interesting pattern discloses will most likely become known as more contemporary, colonial documents are discovered and examined.

The name list of the calendrical days of the Nahua comes from Squiers 1990. There is another version in Lotrope 1979: 71-72 that is different in some of its aspects from that of Squier. What is most important is that the proper names of the days are identical. The day names in Oto-Mangue were made by the author using the
Appendix 1

Information On The Chondales Indians Found In The Tasación of 1581,
page 181

E# 56 Olocoton, de Doña Isabel Cerrato

caciques = 2
12 casados x 2 = 24
viudos = 3
muchachos = 18

total: 47, reported 40

E# 57 Guaxinjua, de Felipe Baltozano

caciques = 2

casados 10 x 2 = 20
solteros = 2
viudos = 2
muchachos = 14

total: 40, reported 38

E# 58 Olomega, de Doña Isabel de Cazada

cacique = 2

casados 12 x 2 = 24
muchachos = 7

total: 33, reported 31

E# 59 otro Olocoton junto con Olomega, de Antonio de Tapia

caciques = 2

casados 18 x 2 = 36
muchachos = 30

total: 68, reported 66

E# 60 Condega, de Gomez Cezon de Meza
Los Chontales

Los pueblos de los Chontales de la ciudad de Leon están distantes del casado 9 leguas. Es tierra llana y senagosa y de muchos Ríos y buenas aguas y son los siguientes:

Olocotón. Esta encomendada de doña Isabel Cerrato; tiene doce indios casados. Tres viudos. Diez y ocho muchachos. Por todos son quarenta personas de todas edades.

Guaxinjía. Que esta junto al pueblo de Olocotón. Esta encomendada de Felipe Baltadano. Tiene diez indios casados. Dos solteros y dos viudos y catorce muchachas. Que por todos son treinta y ocho personas de todas edades.

Olomea. Que esta encomendado de Isabel de Cazada. Tiene doce indios casados. Siete muchachos. Son de todos treinta y un personas de todas edades.


Condega esta encomendados de Gomez Cezen de Mesa. Tiene veinte y un indios casados. Cinco yndias viudas. Treinta y seis muchachas. Que son todos ochenta y tres personas de todas edades.

Yomoto esta encomendado de Julio Gaytan. Tiene cincuenta y dos indios casados. Y una yndia viuda y sesenta y dos muchachos. Que son todos ciento y sesenta y siete personas de todas edades.
This refers to the encomienda, or "E" number given the encomienda as a means to ease discussion and referencing. Unlike the tasación of 1548, the tasación of 1581 did not number each encomienda, either when the actual census was taken, or when it was restated in the summary section of the tasación, pp 176-186. The person listed is the encomendero who owned the encomienda.

What is apparent throughout the Tasación of 1581, is that each village had a cacique or two who were exempt from paying tribute and who probably directed the collection of tribute.

The tasación is uniform in that the basic taxing unit was the married couple or "indio tributario". In order to establish the actual number of Indians in each village each married couple was multiplied by the number two to reconstruct married persons instead of married couples, something not always obvious in the tasación.

As in many other parts of the tasación the numbers reported did not always agree with the numbers found in summaries. In contrast with the well administered census of 1548, directed by Oviedo and President Alonso de Cerredo, the tasación of 1581 was a slipshod work, with each of the seven identifiable teams sent out to conduct the census compiling data in different ways.


Appendix 2

A Deed of Encomienda dated April 15, 1542

DEED OF ENCOMIENDA
(14 CS 174)

Rodrigo de Contreras, governor and captain general by your Majesties in these provinces of Nicaragua, acting in the name of His Majesty and by virtue of the Royal powers contained therein that I have, I grant to you, Vasco de Contreras, the encomienda of the Indian caciques and principales that now are, or will be from now on of the plazas of Monimbo and Chagualpa (also listed as Zagalapa) and Chinagalpa and Motolynes Chontales that are found in the jurisdiction of Granada, that were vacated and removed from the encomendero Francisco de la Pena by reason of his absence from Nicaragua, who was formerly a citizen of Granada,

Those villages I grant you in encomienda so that they may serve you and you may enjoy the fruits of their labors and that they may assist you in your estates, projects and farming and granaries and in mining for gold in the mines;

You are also obligated to do personally, or by means of a person appointed by you, to take charge of the Indians and set them at work and teach them things about our holy faith, and you are also to give them good treatment and to safeguard and comply with all orders and laws of the Crown regarding Indians and encomienda;

And if these things are not done it will be charged against the conscience of the person responsible for the Indians and will not be charged against the Crown nor against me in my official capacity as representative of the Crown in these matters and which I have granted you, Vasco de Contreras in encomienda of the aforesaid villages that were owned and possessed before by Francisco de la Pena;

And I order that the justices and inspectors of these parts compel you and your legal representatives to comply with all legal obligations of encomienda, and to punish you and begin legal proceedings against you and/or your legal representatives and that you be deprived of the possession of these villages in encomienda and in each one of them. Executed at Los Xagayues and the Puerto de la Posesion (El Realejo) in the jurisdiction of Leon of this province of Nicaragua on April 15, 1542.

(signed) Rodrigo de Contreras, By power of Your Highness
(signed) Martin Minhsreno, Scribe
ACT OF POSSESSION

In the city of Leon of this province of Nicaragua on the 6th day of July, of the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, 1542, before the very noble Captain Luis de Guevara, Lieutenant of the Governor and alcalde mayor in this province, and in my presence, Martin Mimbreno, Crown Scribe, and Public Scribe, of the number of this city, witnessed:

Before me appeared Senora Doña María de Peñalosa as mother and guardian and legitimate administrator of the estate and person of Vasco de Contreras, her minor son, who was also present, and they presented to me a deed of encomienda of the governor of this province, and then requested the assistance of the Lieutenant governor, Luis de Guevara, in taking possession of the villages named in the encomienda, and they also asked that Antonio Rodriguez, Juan Sanchez and Pedro de Aguilar, all present and citizens of this city of Leon, should act as witnesses;

Then, the aforesaid Lieutenant Governor, Luis de Guevara, having seen and read the aforesaid deed of encomienda, took by the hand an Indian named Mado Botoy, and another Indian named Nacay, and another named Mandotti, caciques and principales of the pueblo of Monimbo; and two other Indians and principales, one named Sochex and the other Chiceague of the pueblo of Zagalpa, named in the aforesaid deed of encomienda,

And then he gave their hands to the Senora Dona Maria de Peñalosa and the said Vasco de Contreras her son, who were present; and Guevara then said that he gave and delivered by his authority and in the name of other Indians of the said villages of Monimbo and Zagalpa Chondales and Motolines, contained in the deed of encomienda;

And he further said that Señora Maria de Peñalosa was truly in rightful legal possession of the encomienda and that Maria de Peñalosa and Vasco de Contreras were in peaceful and quiet possession of the aforesaid Indians, superior to the claims of any third party who may appear;

And the aforesaid Maria de Peñalosa and Vasco de Contreras requested that Lt. Governor Guevara act as witness to the taking of possession of the encomienda and execute all necessary documents to that end, and all the named witnesses who witnessed this act of possession signed as witnesses.

And I, Martin Mimbreno, Crown scribe and public scribe of the number of this city of Leon, was present with the aforesaid witnesses and with the aforesaid Lt. Governor that here signed his name, and the foregoing I have executed with my seal. A true copy.

signed,

Martin Mimbreno, public scribe.
Appendix 3
Statutory Provisions That Controlled The Granting and Administering of Encomiendas

A. LEGAL BASIS FOR GRANTING ENCOMIENDA

The original organic law for the colonization of Nicaragua was the Royal edict issued by King Ferdinand to Pedrarias for the conquest of Tierra Firme (1 CS 43, 1513). This edict was made applicable to Nicaragua by another Royal edict, (1 CS 256, June 19, 1527). The legal basis for encomienda was discussed in sections 9-12 of that edict:

Section 9

a. "And in the event that the Indians do want to come under our control and give us obedience, and they make war, you have to see that by no matter should you make war, when the Indians are not the aggressors, nor having harmed or threatened to harm our men, and although they may have committed (such acts) before breaking away you have to do your duty and do what is necessary so that they may come under our control; one or two or three or more times, as many times as you deem necessary, in conformity with how you have been instructed;

b. And you will take with you some Christians that know the native language, and by and through them you shall place the Indians under our control and authority, and the evil and deaths of men that come about as a result of war, and especially those Indians who are thus enslaved, and of this everyone should take notice, and cannot pretend to be ignorant, and so Christians can have a clear conscience, based upon what has been said before;

c. You are further ordered to discuss these matters with all of your men, because the Indians don't want to be put in encomiendas and this causes war and therefore you must discuss these matters for the good that it will bring, and in these matters it seems a better idea that for this the r.p. juan de quevedo. bishop of darien and his priests be utilized, since the priests can handle these matters with less passion since they have no possible personal or financial interests in these matters;

Section 10

In the event that the Indians are given to encomiendas in the form of naborias, you have to make sure the ordenanzas, a copy of which you carry, are followed, because there has been much information about this, and that in such manner they should be better conserved and treated and better taught our Catholic faith, and for this reason you should not take any situation as trifling, and you are to see that things are done for the benefit of the indians, and their health and conversion to the catholic faith, and it will be good for the indians to be better treated and live contented with the Christians; the resolution of this is in this provision and in the preceding provisions and clearly states that the indians are to be treated with love and intentional acts, and friendship, so that they will be attracted to our holy Catholic faith, and all forced acts and mistreatments are to be avoided whenever possible, because by this means our god is served and i want you to so serve me.

Section 11.

a. It is absolutely necessary that in Panama you act differently than Spaniards acted on Hispaniola, because there the Indians are poorly applied to work and they have always become accustomed to acting so, and we have seen on Hispaniola that the Indians flee to the mountains so that they don't have to work and they think they are better off there, and in Panama they can go inland, something they cannot do on Hispaniola, and they just have to leave their houses (to disappear); for this reason it seems very doubtful and difficult that you can place the Indians in encomiendas in the same manner as on Hispaniola, and in this project it seems to be a better idea to do so by means of peace and agreement, making the work easiest for all in this manner, that those that want to leave in peace and in concert with the christians, and with obedience and as vassals;

b. This you should do, and they should serve us and furnish a certain number of workers and not force all of the group to work, only a fraction of the men in the village, such as a third or fourth or fifth, or workers under the control of the cacique, as these things are done on Hispaniola, and that these men work a month or two and then they may be allowed to return home and another group take their place, because in this manner they will work harder and suffer fewer deaths and hardships;

c. And if they have a lot of gold to mine in Panama, as they say, they should look for gold in the rivers and not make them dig in mines, because it will be easier for them to get accustomed to mining in the rivers first according to the manner described above, and afterwards, in the second wave of workers (vuelta), they can be made to work in underground mines with less difficulty, because they will then be accustomed to mining, although underground mining is more work.

Section 13.

You are to use the means stated above to place the indians in encomiendas, by one means or another, and thirdly, you are to require from each pueblo or each cacique a certain amount of gold each month or lunar month, as they indicate; and doing so you are to insure that they do not get into mischief and you are to have signals or signs in each village showing they are under control of the Crown, and also that they should carry on their persons identification to show that they are friendly and not hostile and are our vassals, and so they do not do harm to our people when paying tribute; and in this matter you are to judge how much gold is sufficient, since we are too far away here in Spain to judge a sufficient amount of gold; you are to do so in the most advantageous manner you can."

While acting as governor of Nicaragua in 1527 Lopez de Saucedo planned to send Captain Gabriel de Rojas to find the mouth of the San Juan River. Lopez de Saucedo drafted a set of instrucciones (1 CS 284, 1527) for Rojas to guide him in the conquest of the San Juan River. Pedrarias returned to Nicaragua in early 1528 and the expedition never took place. Section 22 of those instrucciones provided as follows:

Section 22.

"And you are also to inform me of the caciques and indians that you place in encomiendas so that i might know of this and confirm with the crown these encomiendas."
The abuses of the colonial governments and encomenderos toward the Indians caused the Crown to issue its famous New Laws of 1542, 7 CS 333 (November 29, 1542). Germany to the discussion of encomienda are several provisions. Section 26 removed all encomiendas from the colonial and Crown officials and placed them under the control of the Crown: section 27 provided that all Indians held illegally were to be placed under the control of the Crown; section 30 prohibited governors from granting any more encomiendas. Those provisions are noted below.

(7 CS 333): Section 26.

"Because the viceroys, governors, and their assistants, and crown officials and prelates, monasteries, hospitales, and houses of religions, as well as secular houses and the treasury of them and the offices of the Crown administration (real hacienda) and other persons favored by reason of their office, have continued to pay Indians in encomiendas in a disorganized fashion, it is our will and it is hereby ordered that all of the enumerated encomiendas above be placed under the control of the Crown with all of the Indians that they possess, by whatever title held and for whatever reason held by viceroys, governors, or assistants, or any crown official of justice or of crown administration, houses of prelates and religion or of crown administration of hospitales, cofradías, or other similar entities, regardless of whether the Indians are being held in encomiendas by reason of said offices and although those above enumerated officials say they wish to resign their offices or government positions and remain with possessing the Indians; it won't matter because they must not fail to comply with this order.

Section 27.

It is hereby ordered that all persons who control Indians without any title, and only by their authority, have their Indians removed, and the Indians are to be placed under the control of the Crown.

Section 30.

a. It is hereby ordered that from this day forward, no viceroys, governors, audiencias, discoverers, nor any other person, can grant or make encomiendas of Indians for any new provision, nor for renunciation, nor for donation, nor in any form whatsoever, nor means, nor for vacating, nor for inheritance; but when the person dies who owns the encomienda those Indians are to be placed under the control of the Crown; and the audiencias are empowered to investigate the particular facts about when such a person dies and true quality of that person, and his merits, and service, and how he treated the Indians that he possessed, and whether or not he left a widow and children or other heirs."

Because of the uproar and threats of rebellion that occurred as a result of the implementation of the New Laws of 1542, the Crown quickly backedpedaled and nullified the confiscatory provisions that had removed encomiendas from Crown officials and prohibited them from granting any more encomiendas. On August 18, 1548, Prince Philip issued two almost identical Royal edicts (14 CS 330 and 14 CS 340) that set forth the new rules for the Audiencia de los Conquistas on how to award vacated encomiendas. The edict 14 CS 330 is noted below.

The Prince

"To the president and oidores of the royal Audiencia of the Conquistas, be it known that I issue a royal edict as follows: you should know by now that the king, Charles V, by means of a letter and royal provisions revoked the law that ordered that the encomiendas that were vacated because of the death of the original encomendero were to be placed under the control of the crown. I order that all of that is now changed and that the audiencia can award encomiendas that become vacated in the manner that the governors awarded encomiendas in the past, and it is approved that you do so and the governors did and now do and you are to award the encomiendas to those that assisted in the conquest and those that are married and whose wives live with them and who need the encomiendas for financial support; and for this I give you permission and license to from now on to grant encomiendas that become vacant in the provinces subject to your jurisdiction that can be granted as a result of the revocation of the former law that forbid this matter of granting encomiendas, according to the manner in which the governors used to grant encomiendas before the aforesaid law was enacted; and I also give you all ancillary powers to carry out this royal edict, keeping in mind that you are to prefer in your grants the conquistadores and married men who have served and have their wives with them.

Executed at Zaragoza on June 30, 1547, by I, the Prince, by order of the King, by Samano.

I have been informed that by means of this royal edict herein incorporated you are given the power and license to grant encomiendas of Indians that have become vacant in the Audiencia of los Conquistas from the above date forward; and encomiendas do not have to be placed under the control of the Crown when they become vacant, and you can grant encomiendas from the date of the revocation of the previous law, which date is October 20, 1545, according to the manner that the governors granted encomiendas, always keeping in mind that you are to favor original conquistadores and married men who have their wives with them who have given service to the crown.

Executed in Valladolid on the 16th of August, 1548, I, the Prince, by Samano."

B. EDICTS PROHIBITING THE TAKING OF ENCOMIENDAS WITHOUT A HEARING

By 1533 the problem of governors acting arbitrarily by removing encomiendas from vecinos was recognized and the Crown addressed the problem in a Royal edict, dated October 25, 1533, (3 CS 304).

Don Carlos, etc, to you, our governors of the provinces of the Cape of Honduras and Las Higueras and Cozumel and Galizia of New Spain, and Nicaragua and each one of them, to you, whomever this edict is shown to and served upon, good health and grace be to you; be it known that we are informed that you have removed and taken away and are now taking away from vecinos and conquistadores of those aforesaid provinces the Indians that they have in encomiendas and you put them at your control, and those aforesaid vecinos and conquistadores are harmed thereby;
and this matter having come on for discussion and review in the Consejo de las Indias, and it was agreed upon that we ought to issue this royal edict, so that you may well understand things perfectly.

It is therefore commanded and decreed that everyone and each one of you in your respective provinces and jurisdictions that you are put on notice of this royal edict and you are not to take or remove from the vecinos and conquistadores of your respective jurisdictions the pueblos of Indians that they now possess in encomienda without being heard by a judge and judge according to special enactments (fueros) and laws (derecho) regarding these matters;

And in the event that the sentence is appealed, the law of appeals governs those matters and you are to grant the claim of appeal so that the appeal may be pursued in the proper forum; and in the event that you do not comply with this edict we will command the president of our audiencia in New Spain to make this royal edict in full force and effect; and if this royal edict is not complied with by anyone there will be a fine of 10,000 maravedis imposed.

Executed in Monzon on October 25, 1533,
I, the King.
Countersigned by the Count of Beltran and Mercado.

C  INHERITANCE RIGHTS OF THE ENCOMENDEROS TO 1550.

As in any established society, the question of who can receive the property of deceased parents, siblings, and blood relatives, and how the title of that property is legally removed from the name of the deceased person and granted to the living heir, received detailed treatment in the Coleccion Somozas as vecinos and conquistadores began to die of old age. That treatment was consistent with the earlier law of inheritance that had first been promulgated in Book VI of Las Siete Partidas (1265) and the Leyes De Toro (1505). The first major Royal edict that set forth inheritance rights of the families of encomenderos, issued on October 18, 1539 (6 CS 64), stated as follows:

"te: diego martin de lepe
the agreed upon law regarding the succession of the Indians (encomiendas).

Don Carlos, etc., to you that are or may be our governor of the province of Nicaragua, good health and grace; be it known that we command and give our letter and royal law signed by the empress and our queen, the beloved daughter and woman, may she rest in glory, said law sealed with our seal and issued by our Consejo de la Indias, as follows:

(Below follows the law regarding the tasacion of the Indians and the laws regarding inheritance rights of the wives and children of the conquistadores; and because the actual document addressed to Nicaragua was not found, the following document, thought to be similar, sent to New Spain, was inserted by editor Andés Vega Bolado's Author's Note).

Don Carlos, etc., to you, Antonio de Mendoza, our governor of New Spain; and to the president of our royal Audiencia that resides in New Spain, and to you padre luis de Zumarraga, Bishop of Mexico of our Consejo:

We are informed that because all of the Indians of that land are given in encomienda to diverse persons, and the tributes of those Indians have not been counted, nor a census taken regarding the amounts that the Indians of each pueblo have to pay the Spaniards that own their pertaining encomiendas, and that they have delivered and continue to deliver many things in greater quantity than they owe and can actually pay, and that there have occurred and continue many difficult circumstances of great harm and damage to the Indians; all of these circumstances would cease if there were a royally ordered census of tribute, and if it were known how much should be paid in tribute, in that amount and no more, in our royal estates as in the estates of private Spaniards that own encomiendas, or in any other manner;

and, because by experience it has appeared that after the oyer and final of our Audiencia had a clear idea of the amounts of tribute due and payable because of a census the worst abuses have diminished; and, because from now on these abuses should cease, and discussing this matter in our royal consejo, it was agreed that we should order and command be means of this letter and law, for you, for the aforesaid reasons according to our royal will:

Section 1 We therefore order and command that if you see that there has not been a census of tribute (tasación) and the Indians that are to pay said tribute, you are to get together in the city of Mexico and so all together you are to have a mass of the Holy Spirit in order to assist you in your understanding, and you are to give thanks and so that you act in a just and correct manner regarding that which you are by this letter charged to perform; and the aforesaid mass having been heard and celebrated, you are to promise and to solemnly swear before the priest that performed the mass, that you will perform the said tasks, without hate nor by means of influence you will see that the things will be performed that are contained therein, and having made this oath, you and the persons appointed by you in which you have confidence, and fear of God, are to personally see all of the pueblos that are in peace in that land, and encomiendas that are there, including royal encomiendas as well as encomiendas held by private persons, and you are to count the number of inhabitants and Indians of each pueblo, and the quality of land of those areas; you are to inform yourself of the amounts of tribute paid to caciques before the conquest, and how much they now pay to the Crown and to encomenderos, and the amounts that the Indians can realistically pay from now on to the Crown and encomenderos by our royal grace, and those that hold encomiendas by any other means, and after you are well informed of these matters, you and your group are to determine how much the Indians can realistically pay without causing them hardship, and this you are to do according to your conscience and God, having respect for the tributes that had to be paid, be they of the things that the Indians have or grow or raise on their lands, keeping in mind that these tributes shall not destroy the Indians;

Section 2 And so declared, you are to make an inventory of the aforesaid pueblos and inhabitants and of the tributes that you are to determine for the Indians so that they may know exactly what they must pay to the crown and to the encomenderos, and for the people now and in the future that may own encomiendas, preserving the crown's rightful share;

Section 3 And we further order and decree that from now on no Crown official or private party publicly or privately, directly or indirectly, or through a third party, may take nor take from the Indians, any other thing, save those amounts and things in your royal tasacion, under penalty that for the first offense if any excess amounts are taken the penalty shall be four times the amount
taken, as if they had stolen from the royal treasury, and for the second time the loss of the encomienda and any other property right that that person may have to tribute, and he shall lose also one half of his estate for the royal treasury;

Section 4. We also order and decree that you are to leave a copy of the census in each pueblo that pertains to that pueblo, signed with your names, in the control of the local cacique or principal of that pueblo, and further you are to advise the cacique by means of an interpreter if necessary of the content of the census, and you are to furnish a copy of the census to the person in charge of collecting the tribute so that that person cannot claim ignorance of the census, and you our judges from now are charged with carefully overseeing the execution of the contents of this letter and law, and you are also to send to Spain by the first ship that sails a copy of the census along with a report of your activities that you have undertaken.

Section 5. And because it is our royal will that the persons who enjoy the fruits of the tribute of the Indians may wish to stay in those lands, it appears that they will be more willing to stay if they know that after they die that the widows and children of those persons will enjoy the benefits and fruits of the tributes that they had during their lives, we declare and order and command that having completed and put into effect the tribute census in conformity with this letter and law in the Indian pueblos the following is hereby decreed:

A. That when a Spanish colonist dies having possessed an encomienda and having in that land a legitimate son and born to a legitimate marriage, you are to grant that son those Indians that his father had in encomienda, so that he may possess them and give them work and teach them about our Holy Catholic faith, always safeguarding and following our laws and ordenanzas as we order them to be followed, especially regarding the protection of the Indians, which is why they were enacted, and with the obligation that until he be of legal age to bear arms for the Crown that he provide a substitute soldier (escudero) that will serve us in war, with the cost that was obligatory that his father pay;

B. And in the event that the married man died without leaving issue born of that legitimate marriage, you will assign that encomienda to the man's widow; and if she remarries and her second husband has other Indians you are to give him one of the aforesaid repartimientos that he wants, and he can only possess the Indians that the widow may have;

C. The aforesaid encomienda of the Indians we order that it may be possessed for such time as our royal grace and will permits, according to how they are now held, and until we order something else for the good of the land and the preservation of the Indians of the land and the sustenance of the Spaniards of that land;

D. And you are to serve by town crier (pregonero) these laws in the plazas and markets and other usual places in the Audiencia of Mexico and all other cities, villas, and places of that province, by pregonero, before a public scribe, so that no one can pretend ignorance.

Enacted in the Villa of Madrid on May 26, 1536. I, the Queen.

And now Sebastian Rodriguez in the name of Diego Martin de Lepe, Spanish colonist of the city of Leon that is in the province of Nicaragua, has related that he is one of the first conquistadores and inhabitants of Nicaragua, and that in remuneration for his services he was granted encomiendas of certain Indian villages, which he now possesses and he asks that we (the Crown) order in conformity with the above law herein incorporated that after his death his widow and children be awarded the encomienda according to the above law; it be and hereby is ordered and commanded that this law be followed and complied with in all of its provisions.

Given in the Villa of Madrid on October 18, 1539, I, the King, by Simancas.

Identical provisions for the following list of vecinos of Nicaragua:

Pero Gonzalez Calvillo, Alonso Perez Giron, Gonzalo Cano, Luis de Quevara, Mateo de L eccentrico, Herman Nieto, Joan Carvallo, Joan de Quinones, Joan Gonzalez Gallego, and Joan Vasquez de Abila.

Comment: This provision sets forth the legal rights of inheritance of encomiendas, the most important source of wealth of early Nicaragua. The requests for the preservation of the encomiendas were probably sent to Spain because by 1539 Rodrigo de Contreras was actively engaged in stealing encomiendas, both from vecinos as well as dispossessing widows and orphans. The major source of wrongdoing found by Judge Diego de Herrera in Contreras' residencia, 9 CS 1 (1544), was the systematic violation of this provision.
Appendix 4

Correspondence Between President of the Audiencia de los Confines Alonso López de Cerrato and Charles V Regarding Inheritance Rights of Heirs of Encomenderos, Including Female Children Of Age.

Letter that the president and oidores of the Royal Audiencia de los Confines wrote to the Crown requesting direction in the compliance of several royal edicts, including the reassigning and testate and intestate succession of encomiendas, 1535 CS 63 (May 21, 1549).

"Because it seemed to us that having the capital of the Audiencia located in Gracias a Dios (Honduras) was completely ineffectual and because we could not comply with Crown orders located there we decided to move the Audiencia to Guatemala City because it is the centralized and principal city of the province, since it has more Spaniards and Indians than anywhere else and more of everything else....

Regarding the succession of the Indians when an encomendero dies, something that happens every day, there are many differences of opinion and doubts about how to handle this situation and so it behooves your Highness to declare some laws and guidelines to your royal servants, and so for the good of everything and the population, here are some hypothetical situations that need to be clarified:

A. There is a royal provision that states that if an encomendero dies and he leaves a son in these Indies that he shall be granted the encomienda of his father and if the encomendero only leaves a son you grant the encomienda to his widow (here possibly meaning minor son; otherwise this passage does not make sense); and if an encomendero dies and leaves surviving him many sons it is not clear if we should grant the encomiendas to all the sons or to the eldest son, and if the mother does not remarry whether we should grant her some of the benefits ("frutos", probably meaning usufruct) of the encomienda.

B. Also, if an encomendero dies and leaves a son and daughters it is also unclear whether we should grant the encomienda to only the son or to the son and daughters.

C. Also, it is unclear if an encomendero dies leaving only daughters whether we should grant the encomienda to only the eldest daughter or to all of the daughters.

D. Also, it is unclear if when an encomendero dies leaving sons and the encomienda is given to one of the sons and that son dies, whether the encomienda should be granted to the other sons or should be declared vacant.

E. Another unclear matter has to do with the New Laws, one provision of which orders that all of the encomiendas of Indians held by justice officials and of the royal hacienda be placed under the control of the Crown. In this province this provision was not enforced until a short time ago, and all pertaining encomiendas were placed under the control of the Crown. Later there came an other Royal Edict that orders that we are to make new grants of encomiendas of the encomiendas removed from Crown officials because of the revoked provisions of the New Laws.
We are unclear whether we are to maintain the encomiendas removed because of the revoked New Law in the Crown control or if we are to make new grants of these encomiendas because the law that was the basis of their removal from crown officials was revoked.

Signed, el licenciado Cerrato  El licenciado Pedro Ramirez 

Royal Edict issued July 7, 1550, directed to the President and oidores of the Royal Audiencia de los Confines, answering their letter of enquiry of May 21, 1549.

"The King.

President and oidores of our Royal Audiencia de los Confines, I read your letter of May 21 last year of 1549 in which you report the relocating of the capital to Guatemala City from Gracias a Dios, and this is fine with me because of what you say about the condition of the roads; and regarding the tasación of the Indians of San Salvador; and also that you found many Indians being held as slaves, and in conformity with the law you released all of them and heard cases, as you did when you returned to Santiago de Guatemala.

iii. We saw your notes that you made regarding the doubts and unclear matters that you say you encounter every day in the Audiencia regarding the succession of the Indians (encomienda) when some encomendero dies and I hope to send satisfactory answers to those questions and doubts.

V. In as much as you say that there is a Royal provision that states that if some encomendero dies and leaves a son surviving him in the Indies that son should be granted the encomienda of his father, and if he does not leave a surviving son his widow should be granted the encomienda, and if an encomendero dies leaving surviving him many sons and you are unclear whether you should grant the encomienda to only the eldest son or to all of the sons, and if the widow does not remarry whether she should be granted some of the fruits (usufruct) of the encomienda, we declare as follows: that when it occurs that such a person dies that you are to grant the Indians (encomienda) that person leaves to his primogenito (eldest) son, who will then be obligated to support his siblings while they are unable to support themselves, and he is to support his mother also as long as she does not remarry, and this law you will enforce and safeguard in the provinces subject to the Audiencia, keeping in mind that the support shall be according to the quality of the persons involved and the quantity of the encomiendas and the need of the persons that have to be supported.

vi. Another matter to be clarified has to do with the situation where an encomendero dies leaving a son and daughters surviving him, and you ask the Crown to clarify if the Indians are to be granted only to the son or to the son and daughters, we order and declare that in such a situation you are only to grant the encomienda to the son and he is to be in charge of the support of his sisters, even though he may be younger than his sisters in the aforesaid case.

vii. Another matter to be clarified has to do with the situation where an encomendero dies leaving only daughters surviving him, and you ask the Crown to clarify how the encomienda is to be distributed, we declare that in the absence of a son that you grant the encomienda to the eldest daughter with the same duties to support her siblings, including if she marries, being of age within one year of the grant, as if she is not of age when this should occur (?) she is to be granted the Indians with the same responsibilities that her father had.

viii. Another matter to be clarified has to do with the situation where an encomendero dies leaving surviving sons and one of the sons is granted the encomienda and he subsequently dies, whether the remaining sons should be granted the encomienda or it should be declared vacant, we order and declare as follows: in that situation you are not to grant the encomienda to any of the other brothers, and it is left up to your discretion to grant the encomienda to another brother of the deceased brother if you wish, or to another person that appears to be justly entitled to an encomienda, but you are not to give the encomienda to any of your underlings (criados) or creditors under any circumstances or by any means.

ix. Another matter to be clarified has to do with the situation where the New Laws ordered that all encomiendas of royal officials be removed and placed under the control of the Crown, and this provision was not executed in the province of Guatemala until just recently, and then another Edict was issued that ordered the Audiencia to grant those encomiendas after the revocation of the New Law, and we had ordered that you were to have placed all of the vacant Indians under the control of the Crown, and you now are unclear if those Indians of the Crown officials that after the revocation were taken from those Crown officials, but before the news of the revocation of the New Law was known, should remain under the Crown or be given in encomiendas, we order and declare that all those Indians that were taken from the governors and Crown officials of the provinces of that Audiencia shall stay and remain under the control of the Crown and they are not to be granted to any person.

Comment: This royal edict clarified all of the questions raised by President Cerrato in his earlier letter cited above. The Crown recognized the right of primogeniture and the Anglo-American doctrine of necessities in matters of family support. The legal and bureaucratic nightmare created by the issuance and then revocation of section 26 of the New Laws of 1542 was clarified by the Crown deciding that those Indians that had been placed under the control of the Crown, even those that had been removed after the prior law had been revoked but before that fact was known in the Audiencia, should remain under the control of the Crown.
Appendix 5

The Tasación of 1548

Reference Keys of the Tasación of

In order to compress information about the tasación of 1548 these symbols are presented. Regarding the ethnicity of the village the following code is used: U means unknown ethnicity; G means Guaumaz; Ch means Chorotegea; N means Nahua; M means Mariobis; Ul means Ulma; Chl means Chondal. Regarding the location of the village, L means the village has been located; NL means the village has not been located. The title holder of record of the encomienda is also listed.

The Indian villages of the tasación of 1548 are listed as being included within either the municipalidad of Leon or Granada; in a few instances it is very possible that the Audiencia de los Confines mixed up some villages and included villages from the municipalidad of Granada with those of Leon, and vice versa. Those instances are noted in the discussion of each village. Each village has been given a village identification number (VIN) that is preceded with an "L" meaning it is listed from within the municipalidad of Leon or a "G" meaning it is listed from within the municipalidad of Granada. The symbol "#" refers to the registration number given the encomienda in the tasación; "TP" refers to the number of tributary Indians listed in the encomienda; and "I" refers to the total number of Indian inhabitants in the encomienda or the village. The villages that are located may be found on the accompanying map.

Lastly, it should be noted that this reconstruction of the tasación of 1548 is most inexact and undoubtedly contains errors. It does represent a statement based on all available information of one version of a reconstruction of early Nicaraguan Indian populations. Where assumptions have been made an effort has been made to state those assumptions so that the reader may judge for himself or herself the correctness of those assumptions.

Information Regarding Measurement Units in the Tasación

In order to understand the units and measuring systems found in the Tasación a few introductory remarks should be made regarding 16th century units of measure, and how information is generally found in the tasación. The three main seed crops mentioned are corn, beans, and cotton. A fourth crop, cacao was also mentioned, but much less frequently, and so it must be considered to have been a minor crop. A fifth seed crop, aji, or chili pepper, is mentioned once. When seed crops are listed, as in five fanegas of corn, the clear intent was that the Indians of that encomienda were to plant, care for, and harvest those 5 fanegas of seeds and give that harvest over to the encomendero. Two other fibrous crops are also mentioned, cubuya, a Mariobis word for maguay (Lehmann 1920: 973), and henequen. It cannot be determined if those crops were harvested wild or from cultivated plants.

The dry units of measure for the four seed crops mentioned are:

a. Funega- this unit for measuring corn was equal to about 1.5 bushels and weighed about 100 pounds (Barnes, et al 1981: 69, 73).
b. Almud- this unit was said to equal to 1/12 fanega, or about 4.2 quarts (Barnes et al 1981: 69). This use of this unit of measurement in context with celenines does not make sense in the

Collection Fowler has suggested that the almud was 1/2 of fanega (Fowler 1989: 170). It is clear that in the tasación of 1581 the almud was 1/12 of a fanega.
c. Celenine- this unit was also used and was defined as 1/12 of a fanega, but in terms of land area; its precise volumetric definition is unclear (Barnes et al 1981: 72).

Measurements for honey was in arrobas, or about 25 pounds (Barnes et al 1981: 73). Measurement for wax, almost certainly beeswax, was by the quintal, or 100 pounds (Barnes et al 1981: 73).

Measurements for salt production were not so clear. The unit of most assessments of salt production was the carquilla, defined as 10 carquillas to the carga. In a few encomiendas, however, the carquillas was defined as four carquillas to the carga. In still other encomiendas the tribute was defined in terms of cargas, not carquillas (which was probably a clerical error). The size of the carga is not stated. The assumption in this work is that the carga was equal to 50 pounds (Barnes et al 1981: 73). That would make a carquilla weigh about five pounds.

The Villages on the Municipalidad of Leon

1. LVIN 1 Cucivina (U)(L approximately))

# 1 Martin Zambrana:  
I= 164

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn  
(2) 1 fanega of beans  
(3) 1 1/2 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 50 carquillas of salt  
(5) 1 dozen chickens  
(6) 10 cantaros  
(7) 10 petates  
(8) 6 cantaros of honey  
(9) 1 arroba of wax  
(10) 2 Indians for services

# 92 Juan Derves:  
I= 246

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn  
(2) 1 fanega of beans  
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 70 white sheets  
(5) 80 carquillas of salt  
(6) 1 dozen petates  
(7) 1 dozen cantaros  
(8) 10 cantaros of honey  
(9) 2 arbojas wax  
(10) 3 Indians for services
# 40 (Zuavina) The Crown, formerly
Cristobal Garcia  TI= 20
I= 82
Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 cedemines of cotton
(4) 20 white sheets
(5) 20 caraguillas of salt

TI total = 120
I total = 492

Comment: The encomiendas of Cucuquina probably refer to populations on the peninsula of Cosiguina. The only pre-1548 mention of Cosiguina is a lawsuit of THE CROWN v. ANDRES MEDRANO (10 CS 427, February 25, 1541), where a Spaniard burned to death an Indian woman for not working hard enough. Lehmann gives some indication that Cucuquina may have been populated by Maribios Indians since the Maribios word for Cosiguina is Gisihuina (Lehmann 1902:963), phonetically very close to the name listed in encomiendas #1, #40, and #92, rather than the Chontal "Cosiguina" (Ince 1985:293). Encomienda #40, Zuavina, is included because of its phonetic similarity to the other two encomiendas. "Zuavina" is not found in any other source known to the author. The tribute exacted makes it clear that the encomiendas were located in dry, deciduous forest and savannahs, exactly the habitat of the peninsula of Cosiguina.

Cross references: None.

2 LVIN 2 Olocoton (Chl) (L)
#2 Francisco de Medina  TI= 24
I= 99
Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 1 Indian for service
(4) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(5) 25 white sheets
(6) 20 caraguillas of salt
(7) 6 chickens

Comment: Olocoton was the site of an early massacre of Spaniards. Oviedo reported that, "... the Crown treasures of Lopez de Salcedo, Alonso de Peralta, another Spaniard named Zuniga, two servants, a brother named Baezas, six or seven in total, were killed and eaten, including their horses." (Cronistas 3:442). Olocoton is listed on the Sonnenstein map of 1863 as lying a bit south and east of Somotillo on the main road, which is probably where the village of Olocoton was located. Olocoton is also mentioned by Oviedo as lying on the route from Leon Viejo to the

site of the massacred villa of Caceres de la Frontera (Cronistas 3:454-455). The ethnic identity of Olocoton was established by the Tasacion of 1581 as being Chondal (Tasacion 1581: 172-174). The site lies on the northern fringe area of the Maribios. The volcano close by the hot springs of San Isidro is also called Olocoton (Ince 1985: 445). The only other reported instance of Indians eating Spaniards and horses is the massacre of Benito Hurtaedo and his band of men at Villa Hermosa in 1527. Those Indians were identified as Chondales.

Cross References: P 5.1.

3. LVIN 3 Subtiava (Ch) (L)
#3 Francisco de Castrillo  TI= 60
I= 246
Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 70 white sheets
(5) 1 dozen chickens
(6) 1 dozen petates
(7) 80 caraguillas of salt
(8) 3 Indians for service

#19 Francisco Tellez  TI= 160
I= 656
Tribute: (1) 16 fanegas of corn
(2) 5 fanegas of beans
(3) 5 fanegas of cotton
(4) 200 white sheets
(5) 300 caraguillas of salt
(6) 2 Indians for fishing
(7) 18 petates
(8) 1 dozen cantaros
(9) 1 dozen comales

TI total = 220
I total = 902

Comment: Subtiava was identified as a Chorotegan speaking population by Cibdad Real (Cronistas 1:151). Squier's extensive linguistic study of Maribios, which he undertook while he
stayed in Leon in 1850 negotiating a canal treaty with the Nicaraguan government and called "Subtiava", is undoubtedly the result of Maribios populations moving into Subtiava after 1586, the date of Cibdad Real's visit. It should also be mentioned that two Maribios settlements, Ygualtega and Abangasca, were located just a few km west of Subtiava, so the presence of Maribios speakers in Subtiava in 1850 is completely understandable.

Cross reference: Abangasca LVIN 80 and Ygualtega LVIN 14

4. LVIN 4 Mahometombo (Momotombo) (Ch) (L)
   #4 Rodrigo de Contreras
   Biedma                      TL= 35
   I= 144

   Tribute: (1) 2 Indian fishers
            (2) 2 Indians for services
            (3) 60 white sheets
            (4) 1 dozen petates
            (5) 1 dozen cantaros

   # 184 The Crown             TL= 20
   I= 82

   Tribute: (1) 12 pairs of alpargatas

   TL total= 55
   I total= 226

Comment: and Cross reference: see discussion in P 3.18 above. Morel de Santa Cruz reported that the town of Pueblo Nuevo (it was renamed La Paz Centro in the 1860's) had an original Indian name of Momotombo (Morel de Santa Cruz: 12). Molina Arguello (1973) reported that Momotombo was founded in the 17th century out of the remnants of Indians still residing in the Leon viejo area. La Paz Centro is located about 30 km or about 6 leagues southwest of Leon Viejo, a bit farther than the Mahometombo reported by both Castañeda and Oviedo. The tribute charged against Momotombo seems to indicate a close proximity to Lake Managua.

5. LVIN 5 Nabitia (Ch) (L)
   #5 Rodrigo de Contreras
   Biedma                      TL= 6
   I= 25

   Tribute: (1) 1 Indian for service during summer.
            (2) 1 Indian fisher during Cuaresma

   #8 (Mabitit) (Ch) (L)
   Pedro Garcia                TL= 4
   I= 17

   Tribute: (1) 1 Indian for service during summer.

   #57 (Mabitio) (Ch)(L)
   Joan de la Calle            TL= 18
   I= 74

   Tribute: (1) 5 fanegas of corn
            (2) 0.5 fanega of cotton
            (3) 18 white sheets
            (4) 10 cargillas of salt
            (5) 6 petates
            (6) 5 cantarillos of honey
            (7) 2 Indians for service

   #58 (Nabitio) (Ch) (L)
   Joan de la Calle            TL= 11
   I= 46

   Tribute: (1) 3 celemimes of cotton
            (2) 11 white sheets yearly
            (3) 3 celemimes of beans
            (4) 6 chickens

   #89 (Nabitio Yopomo) (Ch) (L)
   Gerónimo de Toledo          TL= 60
   I= 246

   Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
            (2) 2 fanegas of cotton
            (3) 70 white sheets
            (4) 10 cargillas of salt
            (5) 12 petates
            (6) 6 chickens
            (7) 12 sogas
            (8) 3 Indians for 4 months service.

   #95 (Mabitianagrando) (Ch) (L)
   The Crown                   TL= 20
   I= 82

   Tribute: (1) 2 sementeras of corn (7)
            (2) 0.5 fanegas of beans
            (3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
            (4) 20 white sheets
            (5) 12 chickens
#95 (Mabitia) (Ch) (L)
The Crown

Tribute: (1) 2 sementeras of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 4 calefanes of cotton
(4) 20 white sheets

TI total= 141
I total= 580

Comment and Cross reference: See P. 3.14 and 3.17, above. The tribute and name Mabitiangarando suggest a string of villages close by the shore of Lake Managua extending towards the site of Leon Vieje. A site of extensive potsherd, identified as "Mabitie", was recently located 2 km north of Naganore, about 2 1/2 km from the shore of Lake Managua, close to a place locally called Punta Moalba. Cibdad Real reported that the village of Mabitie was located one half league, probably north, from Naganore. That is precisely the spot that is now identified as "Mabitie".

6 LVIN 6 Molacecoyale (U) (NL)
#6 Rodrigo de Rocos

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas to be planted in 2 sementeras, probably of corn.

Cross reference and Comment: Nothing else is known about this encomienda.

7 LVIN 7 Huegagalpa (U) (NL)
#7 Antonio Botre

Tribute: (1) 2 Indians for service during the summer.
(2) 1 Indian fisher during Cuaresma
(3) 40 white sheets

Cross reference and Comment: Nothing else is known about this encomienda.

8 LVIN 8 Cindega (M) (L)

#9 Ysabel Velez

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 20 white sheets
(4) 20 calefanes of salt
(5) 2 Indians to serve food.

#12 Ysco de Santiago

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 4 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 20 white sheets
(5) 12 petates
(6) 12 cantaros
(7) 2 fishers during Cuaresma
(8) 200 calefanes of salt
(9) 5 Indians to serve food.

#22 Diego de Caceres

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 80 white sheets
(5) 100 calefanes of salt
(6) 2 Indians during summer
(7) 2 fishers during Cuaresma
(8) cabuya (msguey) to make 80 pairs of alpargatas
(9) 12 chickens

#56 Diego Sanchez

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 1 fanega of cotton
(4) 30 white sheets monthly
(5) 40 calefanes of salt
(6) 6 cantaros
(7) 6 comales
(8) 6 petates
(9) 2 Indians for service
Comment and Cross Reference: The encomienda of Cindegazmiba has been added to the other encomiendas of Cindega based upon the similarity of the name. Ibarra (1994: 240) suggests that this may be a Pipil "galpon" of Cindega. See P 3.23; for a reference to "Ozuma Cindega" possibly a variant of Cindegazmiba, see P 4.34. When Clidad Real traveled through this part of Nicaragua in 1586 he noted the presence of three villages, all Maribios, named "Cinadega", located in the same place that "Cindegua" had been earlier described. Those villages were located about one league apart. This suggests that the Maribios villages, at least, were quite strung out, similar to the string of plazas of Managua that Oviedo described that extended along the coast of Lake Managua for several km. Cindega was located close by Abangasca since Indians could easily walk to Cindegua from Abangasca (9 CS 490)

Cross Reference: P 3.24

9. LVIN 9 Xocotega (U) (NL)
   #10 Ysabel Velez     Tl= 21
   I= 87

   Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
            (2) 0.5 fanega of cotton
            (3) 20 white sheets
            (4) 20 carguillas of salt
            (5) 12 chickens
            (6) 2 Indians to serve food

   Comment and Cross reference: Nothing else is known about this encomienda.

10. LVIN 10 Capotea (U) (NL)
    #11 Ysabel Velez     Tl= 19
    I= 78

    Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
             (2) 0.5 fanega of cotton
             (3) 20 white sheets
             (4) 20 carguillas of salt
             (5) 12 chickens
             (6) 2 Indians to serve food

    #88 Gonzalo Cano     Tl= 20
    I= 82

    Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
             (2) 1 fanega of beans
             (3) 1 fanega of cotton
             (4) 20 white sheets
             (5) 20 carguilla of salt
             (6) 1 dozen chickens
12. **LVIN 12 Maney (Ch) (L)**

#14 Yece de Santiago  
**TI= 35**  
**I= 144**

**Tribute:**
- (1) 4 fanegas of corn
- (2) 40 white sheets
- (3) 2 fishers during Cuaresma

Comment: Maney was a village where Mateo de Lezcano had a cattle farm. It was located one league, or about 4.5 km from Leon Viejo (9 CS 514-515) (direction unknown). It was also located 12 leagues from Cindega/ Abangasca (9 CS 513). It was mentioned in a lawsuit, THE CROWN v. MATHEO LEZCANO, 9 CS 481. Lezcano was accused of removing the casique of Cindega, don Diego, from power, and making him herd cattle on Lezcano’s cattle farm at Maney. Maney was definitely located one league, or 4.5 km from Leon Viejo. It is identified as a Chorotega village on the assumption that since Nagrando, Momotombo, and the Inahite cluster of villages were definitely identified as Chorotega villages, Maney was probably Chorotega also. The other possibility is that Maney was Mauibios, since don Diego obviously spoke Mauibios and may have been placed at Maney because he could speak the “local language.” More recent scholarship by Dr. Carlos Molina may have clarified the location of Maney. In the November 11, 1995 issue of “Nuevo Amanecer Cultural” (issue number 792) the weekly supplement of El Nuevo Diario, Molina published a rare map of Leon Viejo drawn by Oviedo. When the Spanish Royal Academy published the famous 1855 version of Oviedo’s magnus opus, they did some editing and left out some text and drawings. From the drawing reproduced in El Nuevo Amanecer Cultural it is obvious that the name of the volcano located next to Leon Viejo was not Momotombo, but Maney, or, in Oviedo’s words, “El Inferno de Mamea” Lake Managua is also called “Laguna Ayagualo.” The obvious inference is that Maney, or Mamea, was located very close to the volcano now named Momotombo, about 5 km from the ruins of Leon Viejo. Further prospecting may locate the village of Maney either by the shore of Lake Managua, or perhaps by a series of lakes called Las Playitas.


13. **LVIN 13 Coystega (Soyastea) (M) (NL)**

#15 Lope Zuazo  
**TI= 80**  
**I= 328**

**Tribute:**
- (1) 8 fanegas of corn
- (2) 1 fanega of beans
- (3) 1 fanega of cotton
- (4) 100 white sheets
- (5) 50 carguillas of salt
- (6) 2 fishers during fishing season
- (7) 10 petates
- (8) 10 ollas (pans)

Comment and Cross reference: See P 3.32
(9) 10 comales
(10) 1 fanega of cacao
(11) 36 chickens
(12) 10 pairs of alpargatas monthly (120 pt yearly)

#25 (Coyatega) Rodrigo de Contreras Beldma
TI= 100
I= 410

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 4 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 50 white sheets every 4 months (150 sheets yr)
(5) 200 carguilas of salt
(6) 2 fishers during Cuaresma
(7) 6 chickens for Christmas
(8) 6 Indians to serve during summer.

TI total= 180
I total= 738

Comment: Nothing is known about the encomienda or village of Coyatega. It is possible that it may be a misspelling of Zapotega, LVIN 12, above. Since the village of Soyatega was identified as a Maribios village in the Tasación of 1581, it has been identified as a Maribios village.

14 LVIN 14 Ygualtega (M) (L) TI= 22
#16 Alonso Mendez
I= 91

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 25 white sheets
(5) 2 Indians during summer to serve food

Comment: Ygualteca and Iguala were both spoken of as lying within the province of the Maribios (9 CS 422). Ygualteca was spoken of as lying close to or next to the village of Abangasca.


15 LVIN 15 Deacozaco (Acozaco)(N?) (L)
#18 Joan Gallego
TI= 40
I= 164

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 50 white sheets
(5) 50 carguilas of salt
(6) 2 Indians to fish and serve.

#176 Juan de Hoyos (N) (L)
TI= 36
I= 148

Tribute: (1) 1 fanega of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 30 teillas
(5) 3 cantaros of honey
(6) 15 carguilas of salt

TI total= 76
I total= 312

Comment and Cross reference: These two encomiendas were placed together because of the similarity of their phonetic sound. One #18 is listed within the municipio of Leon and the other (#176) is found in the municipio of Granada, which may be a clerical error. A possible location for Deacozaco is a prominent small mountain located 2 km outside of Subtiaba, named now Acosasco. In the late 19th century a fortress was built there that overlooked the entire plains where Leon is located. Squier (1973: 304-306) mentioned the remains of a large platform, possibly a temple, on a mountain overlooking Leon about 3 leagues away from Leon, which may be a reference to Acosasco. The Tasación of 1581 noted that Acosaco, encomienda #108, was located in the provincia of Sutiaba and spoke "mexicano" or Nahua.

16 LVIN 16 Guazama (G) (L)
#20 Hernando de Haro
TI= 40
I= 164

Tribute: (1) 2 sementeras of corn (?)
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 50 white sheets
(6) 6 petates
(7) 3 Indians to serve during summer
(8) 12 chickens
(9) 12 headstalls (cabestros)

Comment: Guazama was either the name of the language or the name of the plaza of the locale included in this encomienda. The plaza of Guazama was originally called the galpon of Otalganpanega of the pueblo of Mistega (See P 3.30, above; see also 9 CS 413, 442 for the positive identification of Guazama). Bishop Osorio noted that the Indians of Guazama spoke a different language than Chorotega, Nahua, or Chondal, for which he had interpreters. One may ask if Guazama is another variant of Guazecitos, inhabitants of two villages in northern Nicaragua identified by Oviedo and thought by Lehmann to be Putun Maya. Mistega was located three leguas, or about 15 km from Realejo, probably on the old road that ran between Leon Viejo and Realejo. Francisco de Castañeda made Mistega his base of operations and there were occasional premones of ships' departures read at Mistega.

Cross references: P 3.31, PE # 16

17. LVIN 17 Utega (M) (L)
#21 Felipe Mercado

Tl= 25
I= 103

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 3 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 150 white sheets
(5) 6 Indians to serve
(6) 12 chickens at Christmas
(7) 12 petates
(8) 12 cantaros
(9) 150 carguillas of salt
(10) 2 fishes for Cuaresma
(11) 20 jaquimas and headstalls

#35 Alvaro de Camara

Tl= 22
I= 91

Tribute: (1) 23 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 5 fanegas of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 25 white sheets
(5) 20 carguillas of salt

(6) 2 Indians to serve during summer

TI total = 47
I total = 194

Comment and Cross reference: Utega was described as being close to the village of Quezaltasque in the province of the Maribios (9 CS 4). Encomienda # 21 is one of the most onerous tributes to be paid by any village in early Nicaragua. There was either a clerical error, a massive die out of Indians, or some other cause to make the tribute at least six times the tribute ordered paid by other encomiendas of like size. There is one reference to an earlier encomienda that included the village of Utegazumba, possibly the same village.

Cross reference: See P 3.28; for Utegazumba see P 4.46

18. LVIN 18 Pozoltega (M) (L)
#23 Children of M. Mimbreno

Tl= 70
I= 290

Tribute: (1) 8 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 80 white sheets
(5) 100 carguillas of salt
(6) 6 chickens for Christmas
(7) 6 petates
(8) 6 cantaros
(9) 2 fishes during Cuaresma and summer
(10) 4 Indians to serve

#64 Children of L. Guevara

Tl= 18
I= 75

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 6 celemínes of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 18 celemínes each year (7) (possible clerical error)
(5) 2 Indians for service

#190 The Crown

Tl= 60
I= 246

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 30 white sheets every 4 months (90 per year)
(5) 24 chickens

TI total= 148
I total= 607


19. LVIN 19 Comayna and Niagalpa
(U or Chontal) (NL)

#24 Antonio Botre Tl= 200
I= 829

Tribute: (1) 16 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 sementeras of beans (?)
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 200 white sheets
(5) 200 caraguillas of salt
(6) 2 fishers during Cuaresma
(7) 12 ceramic jars (ollas)
(8) 12 petates
(9) 12 comales
(10) 6 Indians to serve during summer
(11) 12 chickens
(12) 20 jaquimas and headstalls (cabestros)
(13) 2 Indians to herd cattle, if the encomendero had any cattle

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda. There is one reference to the encomiendas of the Contreras family in Nueva Segovia. The village of "Comoyna" was included as one of their villages. A problem with this inference is that the tribute mentioned in # 24 included salt and fish, tributary items not likely to come from Nueva Segovia, where there were no salt deposits. Obviously there were fish to be had in the Rio Coco, which flows close by the site of Nueva Segovia, but it seems highly impractical to pay tribute from 250 km in the mountains when the ocean was only 39 km from Leon Viejo. This anomaly is unexplained.

Cross references: P 6.7 and 6.8; 11 CS 146, 152-153, (June 24, 1544).

#26 Gonzalo Hernandez Tl= 60
I= 246

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 70 white sheets
(5) 50 petates of varas
(6) 1 fisher for Cuaresma
(7) 4 Indians to serve during the summer

Comment and Cross reference: Nothing is known about this encomienda. It may be the Mianagalpa (Cronistas 1: 150) described by Cibdad Real. If so, it was most probably Maribios, as it lay in the middle of the Maribios territory. For that reason it is listed as a Maribios village.

Cross reference: P 3.23

21. LVIN 21 Co coayagua and Agoayagua (N and CHL?) (L)

#27 Gonzalo Hernandez Tl= 70
I= 287

Tribute: (1) 8 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 1 sementera of cotton (?)
(4) 80 white sheets
(5) 6 chickens during Christmas
(6) 100 caraguillas of salt
(7) 12 petates
(8) 12 cantaros
(9) 1 fisher during Cuaresma
(10) 4 Indians to serve during summer

Comment and Cross Reference: Nothing is known about this encomienda. It may be an early reference to the village of Acocoyagua, listed in both the Tasaion of 1581 and mentions by Cibdad Real in 1586. It was located very close to Sutiaba and spoke either "chontal" or Nahua or both according to the Tasaion of 1581. Cibdad Real mentioned that its inhabitants spoke "tacacho", an unknown language. Quite a bit of ink has been expended in the 20th century speculating about "tacacho". Maybe he was misinformed. It has been tentatively identified as being about 1/2 league, or 2 km, from Sutiaba.

22. LVIN 22 Mescalez (U) (L)

#28 Alonso Mendez Tl= 14
I= 58

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanegas of cotton
(15 white sheets

Comment and Cross reference: No specific site has been located for this encomienda. From the tribute it is obvious that it was located in dry, deciduous tropical forest and/or tropical savannah. It has been tentatively located by the Mescal river, which is located at the southern end of the Cordillera central north and a little west of the Sebacon valley. It represents the farthest eastern Spanish penetration north of Lake Nicaragua up to 1548, that has been located. No encomienda has been located and identified in the Sebacon valley, even though there is one reference (11 CS 152-153) to the Contercas having an encomienda there in the early 1540's.

23. LVIN 23 Malalaca (Ch) (NL)
#29 Don Cristobal Maldonado
Tl= 55
Ie= 226

Tribute: (1) 5 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 sementeras of beans
(3) 1 fanega of cotton
(4) 70 white sheets
(5) 70 cagulleras of salt
(6) 12 chickens at Christmas
(7) 12 petates
(8) 2 cantaros
(9) 2 Indians for service during summer

Comment and Cross reference: This encomienda was probably located outside of present day Nicaragua. The "provincia" de Chorotega Malalaca was located around the golf of Fonseca and was the scene of Martin de Estete's unsuccessful slaving expedition in 1529. A possible location for the encomienda could be in the Choluteca river drainage. For references to Chorotega Malalaca, see, for example, 1 CS 456, 463, 469 482, 506, 507.

Don Cristobal Maldonado was a member of the Maldonado family, a very powerful family in Central America at the onset of the colonization process. The first president of the Audiencia de los Confines appointed by the Crown was Alonso de Maldonado, who was married to a daughter of Francisco de Montejo, the first conquistador and governor of Yucatan (15 CS 83). They were possibly related at least by marriage to the Cueva family, a member of which was the wife of Pedro de Alvarado. The Cueva family was related by marriage to Pedro de los Rios. The administrative actions of the Montejos, Maldonados, and Pedro de los Rios proved similar since they stole as much as they could and destroyed everything that they touched, including Spaniards who did not bow to them and the indigenous cultures under their control. See, for example, president Cerrato's devastating evaluation of the corruption and thievery of the Maldonado administration of the Audiencia de los Confines at 14 CS 344, September 28, 1548. Cristobal Maldonado obviously had nothing to do with Nicaragua and this encomienda may be one of those that set Bishop Valdivieso so implacably against the supposed reform president of the Audiencia de los Confines, Alonso de Cerrato

24. LVIN 24 Amateca (U) (NL)
#30 Marif Gutierrez
Tl= 10
Ie= 41

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 3 celemines of beans
(3) 3 celemines of cotton
(4) 12 white sheets
(5) 10 cantaros

Comment and Cross reference: Nothing is known about this encomienda.

25. LVIN 25 Tepanzinga (U) (NL)
#32 Pedro de la Palma
Tl= 12
Ie= 50

Tribute: (1) 3 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 30 white sheets
(5) 50 cagulleras of salt
(6) 12 petates
(7) 2 Indians to serve during the summer

Comment: Tepanzinga was one of the original mining districts in the 1520's and was owned at one time by Pedro de Garavito, son of Capitan Andres Garavito. It was also mentioned in the criminal case of ISIDRO DE ROBLES v. ALONSO PEREZ DE VALER, 2 CS 178, 179, 80, 182, (September 21, 1529) when Perez de Valer broke into the house of Robles to steal an Indian girl from Tepanzinga. Castañeda also mentioned that the gold mines at Tepanzinga were abandoned in 1553 since they were a long way from Leon Viejo, difficult to supply, and all of the miners had left for Peru (city council minutes of Leon Viejo, June 16, 1553, 4 CS 701-704).

From the tribute it is obvious that Tepanzinga was located in country where cotton would grow, i.e. dry, tropical savannah and forest. There are old placer and lode mining remains in upper Chinandega province near the town of Villanueva, which was the site of small placer operations in the 18th century and it is possible that Tepanzinga was located somewhere in that area.
26. LVIN 26 Colima (U) (NL)
   #33 Pedro de la Palma   T= 80
   I= 328

   Tribute: (1) 8 fanegas of corn
   (2) 1 sementera of beans(?)
   (3) 1.5 fanegas of cotton
   (4) 100 white sheets
   (5) 50 carguillas of salt
   (6) 12 chickens for Christmas
   (7) 12 petates
   (8) 12 cantaros
   (9) 3 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Nothing is known about Colima except that it was owned by Pedro de la Palma, who was a close ally of Rodrigo de Contreras. It was close to Tepanzinga, or at any rate no more than one league from Tepanzinga, since the Indians of Colima were instructed to help with the fields of Tepanzinga: "mandose a los naturales del dicho pueblo que en cada año vengan al pueblo de Tepanzinga y en él se hagan dos sementeras cada uno..." (14 CS 379).

27. LVIN 27 Mazagalpa (Ch) (L)
   #34 Alvaro de Zamora   T= 70
   I= 287

   Tribute: (1) 8 fanegas of corn
   (2) 4 fanegas of beans
   (3) 2 fanegas of cotton
   (4) 80 white sheets
   (5) 24 chickens
   (6) 6 petates
   (7) 6 comales
   (8) 6 ollas
   (9) 3 Indians for service during summer

#161 Pedro de la Palma   T= 55
I= 226

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
   (2) 1 fanega of beans
   (3) 1 fanega of cotton
   (4) 60 painted sheets
   (5) 24 chickens

#195 Tienle Fuentes   T= 60
I= 246

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
   (2) 1 fanega of beans
   (3) 1 fanega of cotton
   (4) 60 painted sheets
   (5) All the Indians that worked in said sementeras were given food. The officials of his Majesty had to buy and give the said Indians huchas and acuelas to make canoes.

   TT total= 185
   I total= 759

Comment: Mazagalpa was listed by Bishop Morel de Santa Cruz as an old barrio of Managua (Morel de Santa Cruz 1967:11). It was a large village or galpon of Managua and most likely was populated by Chorotegos. It was one of the few villages that produced painted sheets and the only place listed in the Coleccion Somoza that produced dug out canoes. It is also mentioned in the Tasacion of 1581 as being one of the barrios of Managua.

28. LVIN 28 Tepustega (U) (NL)
   #36 Hernan Nieto   T= 100
   I= 410

   Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
   (2) 3 fanegas of beans
   (3) 150 white sheets
   (4) 6 petates
   (5) 6 cantaros and ollas
   (6) 100 carguillas of salt
   (7) 2 fishers for Cuaresma
   (8) 5 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda.

Cross reference: P 4.33
29. **LVIN 29** Taotega (Teotega) (U) (L)
   
   #37 Hernan Nieto
   
   **Tl= 100**
   
   **I= 410**
   
   Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
   (2) 3 fanegas of beans
   (3) 3 fanegas of cotton
   (4) 150 white sheets
   (5) 100 caraguillas of salt
   (6) 12 small petetes
   (7) 50 pairs of alpargatas
   (8) 5 Indians for service during summer
   
   #39 Francisco Tellez
   
   **Tl= 45**
   
   **I= 185**
   
   Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
   (2) 1 fanega of beans
   (3) 1 fanega of cotton
   (4) 75 white sheets
   (5) 50 caraguillas of salt
   (6) 3 Indians for service during summer
   (7) 40 pairs of alpargatas
   (8) 12 petetes
   
   #42 Joan Gallego
   
   **Tl= 50**
   
   **I= 205**
   
   Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
   (2) 0.5 fanegas of beans
   (3) 1 fanega of cotton
   (4) 75 white sheets
   (5) 1 fisher during Cuaresma
   (6) 3 Indians to serve during summer
   (7) 80 caraguillas of salt
   
   **TI total= 195**
   
   **I total= 800**
   
Comment: Teotega was located one league, or about 4.5 km, from Realejo, (2 CS 34). It is also
where Isabel de Bobadilla, the widow of Pedrarias ran a cathouse using Indian girls to service the
sailors visiting Realejo (6 CS 108). The main objection of the other colonists is that she
maintained a monopoly on the trade and wouldn’t let them open other cathouses. Crown treasur-
er Juan Tellez Nunez had most of his assets at Teotega at the time of his death and probate of his
estate. See, In Re Tellez, 6 CS 118, (May 3, 1533). It may be located just upstream from El
Realejo. One early map shows an Indian village, only called “pueblo viejo”, located in that
place.

30. **LVIN 30** Tosta (U) (NL)
   
   #38 Hernan Nieto
   
   **Tl= 90**
   
   **I= 369**
   
   Tribute: (1) 10 fanegas of corn
   (2) 2.5 fanegas of beans
   (3) 2.5 fanegas of cotton
   (4) 540 white sheets
   (5) 80 caraguillas of salt
   (6) 40 pairs of alpargatas
   (7) 1 fisher for Cuaresma
   (8) 4 Indians for service during summer
   
Comment: Little is known about this encomienda. The name means rabbit in Nahuat and is
one of the days found in the Nahuat calendar (See Chapter Ten). Consistent with other usages that
may indicate that Tosta was either Nahuat or Mariblos. Hernando de Soto had a small house, or
hut in this pueblo. There was a fight between Spaniards as a result of a card game. One knifed
the other, who died. See, THE CROWN (CASTANEDA) v PEDRO DE TORRES, 4 CS 531,
(February 26, 1530). See also Duncan 1996: 97-108.

31. **LVIN 31** Condega and Ioaanagastega
   (Ulúa and/or Chontal) (L)
   
   #41 Joan Gallego
   
   **Tl= 105**
   
   **I= 431**
   
   Tribute: (1) 14 fanegas of corn
   (2) 2 fanegas of beans
   (3) 3 fanegas of cotton in a milpa
   (4) 60 cotton sheets
   (5) for four months, December, January, February,
   and March, 8 Indians for service
   (6) 100 caraguillas of salt
   (7) each Pascua 12 chickens
(8) On Fridays and Cuaraesma 2 Indian fishers

Comment: Condega was almost certainly not the Condega located in the mountains of Estelí province, but located close to or at the present day town of Guasacate. Cibdad Real noted that the northernmost village in the gubernación of Nicaragua traveling from Honduras along the golf of Fonseca was named Condega. It should also be mentioned that Cibdad Real was able to travel, by foot, in one day from Condega to the town of El Viejo. In order for him to have walked on one day from Condega, Estelí province, to El Viejo would mean a jaunt of over 150 km, making Cibdad Real a man of iron legs. In the rivers near Condega he noticed jumping or flying fish, probably the Anaboles dori, or "four eyed fish." (Villa 1962: 145) He identified the Indians of Condega as Ulías, and noted that Zomoto, another Indian village, was located one league away. From the geographical description Zomoto was almost certainly modern-day Sorotillo. Joanagastilla may be another variation of Juananostega, mountains mentioned at the onset of the conquest as the site of at least one battle with the Indians. The mountains of Juananostega may be the Sierres de las Botijas that begin to rise directly to the north of Sorotillo and where are found several old mining towns such as San Francisco, San Pedro, and Cinco Pinos. In any event the language of the encomienda makes it clear that the Indians of Condega had to help the Indians of Zomoto clear their fields for planting as well as do their own planting. This would indicate a distance between the two villages of probably not more than 10 km, similar to the distance between the encomiendas of Guatepe and Jaltéva, noted below in the encomiendas of the municipalidad of Granada. The Tasación of 1581 further clarified the matter and identifies Condega as a Chontales village. It should also be mentioned that the word milpa is only used once in the Colección Somocas when referring to this encomienda.

Cross reference: LVIN 60 Olomega.

32 LVIN 32 Chinandega (N) (L)

#43 Children of M. Mimbreno
T=160
I=656

Tribute: (1) 14 fanegas of corn
(2) 3 fanegas of beans
(3) 3 fanegas of cotton
(4) 180 white sheets
(5) 100 carguillas of salt
(6) 12 chickens for Christmas
(7) 2 fishers for Cuaraesma
(8) 6 Indians for service in summer
(9) 12 petates

Comment: Chinandega was undoubtedly a Nahua speaking village and was so identified by Cibdad Real in 1586. It is located exactly 1 league from El Viejo (Tezuatega).

Cross reference: P 3.36

33 LVIN 33 Totogalpa (U) (L)

#44 Pedro Sanchez
T=24
I=99

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 25 white sheets
(5) 6 petates
(6) 40 carguillas of salt
(7) 1 fisher for Cuaraesma

Comment: Totogalpa was probably located where the present day town of Totogalpa is located in Madriz province. The presence of salt as tribute and the providing of 1 fisher does put this proposed location of Totogalpa in question as it is a long way from the ocean and from Leon Viejo. This anomaly is unexplained.

34 LVIN 34 Joanagastilla (Chl) (L)

#45 Blasco Porras de Leon
T=78
I=320

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 60 white sheets
(4) 50 carguillas of salt
(5) 3 Indians for service in summer

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda. It was probably located close by the following encomienda, Joanagastilla. Based upon Condega being identified as a Chontales village in 1581 and Condega and Joanagastilla being included in the same encomienda, this village is identified as being a Chontales village. It may be one of the villages identified by Oviedo in 1528, in describing the route to Villahermosa, called Guaxinaja, and also called that in the Tasación of 1581. From the tribute it is clear that the subsistence economy, and agricultural and estesal production, of the Chontales was similar to that of the Chorotegas, Nahua, and Matibes Indians.

35 LVIN 35 Joanagastilla (Chl) (L)

#46 Pedro Orefon
T=24
I=99

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanegas of cotton
(4) 25 white sheets
(5) 25 carguillas of salt

234
(6) 2 Indians for service in summer

Comment: Nothing specifically is known of this encomienda. Since it is mentioned above as being included in the encomienda of Condega, it is tentatively identified as being Chontales also and located in the vicinity of Condega, or today's Guasaule. See also comments above in LVIN 34, Joanagasta.

36. LVIN 36 Mazatega (M) (L)
   #47 Pedro Orejon  Tl= 44  I= 181
   Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
           (2) 1 fanega of beans
           (3) 1 fanega of cotton
           (4) 40 carguillas of salt
           (5) 6 potates
           (6) 6 camaruras
           (7) 3 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Mazatega was identified by Cibdad Real as a Maribios village and located two leagues from Chinanegra. Lehmann identified the word Mazatega as the name of a language related to Oto-Mangue (Lehmann 1920: 901-910).

Cross reference: P 3.19

37. LVIN 37 Chichicalpa (M) (L)
   #48 Ana Ximenes  Tl= 80  I= 328
   Tribute: (1) 8 fanegas of corn
           (2) 3 fanegas of beans
           (3) 2 fanegas of cotton
           (4) 100 white sheets
           (5) 12 potates
           (6) 12 chickens during Christmas
           (7) 20 capriotes
           (8) 40 carguillas of salt
           (9) 4 Indians to serve during summer

Comment: Chichicalpa was identified by Cibdad Real as a Maribios village and located on its present day location.

Cross reference: P 3.20

38. LVIN 38 Tecotaca (N7) (L7)
   #49 Ana Ximenez

39. LVIN 39 Zumbaruaga (U) (NL)
   #50 Diego de Contreras  Tl= 16  I= 66
   Tribute: (1) 1.5 fanegas of corn
           (2) 0.5 fanegas of beans
           (3) 0.5 fanegas of cotton
           (4) 10 capriotes
           (5) 6 painted sheets

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda.

40. LVIN 40 Chimalapa (U) (L)
   #51 Diego de Contreras  Tl= 90  I= 369
   Tribute: (1) 10 fanegas of corn
           (2) 2 fanegas of beans
           (3) 2 fanegas of cotton
           (4) 100 white sheets
           (5) 100 carguillas of salt
           (6) 12 potates
           (7) 10 pairs of alpagatas
           (8) 2 fishers during Cuatesma
           (9) 12 chickens for Christmas
           (10) 5 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Little is known of this encomienda. There is a site located just north of Realejo on the Pacific coast that is still called Chimalapa. The location is consistent with the tribute charged against the village of Chimalapa and is tentatively located there. The other alternative is a location north of the Rio Negro, by the Honduran border (Incer 1985: 412).

41. LVIN 41 Tatamustega (U) (L)  Tl= 22
#52 The Crown

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(3) 20 white sheets
(4) 30 carguillas of salt

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda. It may have been located at or close to Mistega. It may be an encomienda of another variant of Mistega (2 CS 34).

42 LVIN 42 Agagalpa (U) (L)

43 LVIN 43 Astatega (M) (L7)

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 4 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 150 white sheets
(5) 100 carguillas of salt
(6) 2 fishers for Cuaresma
(7) 12 cantaros
(8) 12 conales
(9) 36 chickens
(10) 12 petates for barboca (7)
(11) 5 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda. In 1533 Alvarado and Francisco de Castañeda signed their peace agreement here so it was probably located close by El Realejo.

45 LVIN 45 Nepuemo (U) (NL)

Tribute: (1) 3 celemines of cotton
(2) 10 white sheets
(3) 6 chickens

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda.

47 LVIN 47 Nandamayo (U) (NL)

Tribute: (1) 2 sermenteras of corn and the cotton that the encomendero got from the harvest
(2) 30 white sheets
(3) 20 carguillas of salt
(4) 2 Indians for service
(5) 24 chickens

Comment: Diego Sanchez mentioned Astatega and Pangua as plazas almost being situated together (9 CS 140). When Rodrigo de Contreras fought with Diego Sanchez he removed Sanchez' encomiendas, including Pangua. A new deed of encomienda was issued to Juan Durreta. At the livery of seizin (or its Hispanic equivalent) the caciques Uzelo and Malina were present (9 CS 414). It was clearly identified as a Maribios village. Cibdad Real did not mention the village in 1586, but it was listed as an encomienda in the Tasacion of 1581.

Cross reference: P 3.27, PE 12.
Tribute: (1) 3 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 30 white sheets
(5) 2 Indians for service 4 months a year

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda.

Cross reference: P 3.34

49. LVIN 49 Telia (Telica) (M) (L)
#63 Children of M. Mimbreno  TI= 100
I= 410

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of cotton
(3) 150 sheets
(4) 100 carguillas of salt
(5) 2 fanegas of beans
(6) 5 Indians for service
(7) 12 petates
(8) 36 chickens

Comment: This village was located at or near the location of the village of the same name. There were reported one or two Indians murdered there by a Portuguese worker in the employ of Pedro de los Ríos (9 CS 674).

Cross reference: P 3.25
Comment: Azolotega may be a variant of Ozolotega, the name of one of the villages that was owned by Luis de Guevara during the administration of Pedrarias (9 CS 144). It was always listed next to the village of Astatega, indicating that it may have been located close to Astatega and Pangua. An Indian leader, named Ozelo, called a principal, was listed as a representative of the village of Ozolotega, along with the cacique of Cindega, don Diego (9 CS 510). For these reasons Azolotega may be another variant of Ozolotega. The cacique Tongema was the cacique of Mazatega and Tezolotega in 1537 (5 CS 134, February 3, 1537).

51 LVIN 51 Noloaque (Ch?) (L2)
#66 Children of L. Guevara
TI= 13
I= 53

Tribute: (1) 1 fisher during Cuaresma
(2) 2 Indians for service

Comment: This village was originally part of the encomienda of Luis de Guevara, granted by Francisco de Castañeda before 1555. From the tribute charged against the village it may have been located close to Leon viejo along the shores of Lake Managua. It may also be a variant of the village of Aluque, which was one of the villages assigned to the office of the Bishop of Nicaragua for the support of the church. Molina Arguello listed it as a fishing village close to Leon Viejo (Molina Arguello: 1995)

Cross reference: P 4.40; for Aluque PE 20, P 4.45b.

52 LVIN 52 Cocoagua (U) (NL)
#67 Children of L. Guevara
TI= ?
I= ?

Tribute: (1) 1 dozen chickens

(Based on tribute, the size of the village was about 10 families.)

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda. It may be another spelling variant of the encomienda Cocoagua, listed above.

53 LVIN 53 Nicoya (Ch) (L)
#68 The Crown
TI= 400

I= 1640

Tribute: (1) 30 fanegas of corn
(2) 10 fanegas of beans
(3) 200 cantaros of beans
(4) 6 quintales of wax
(5) 400 white sheets
(6) 10 hamacas
(7) 100 ovillos of cotton string
(8) 200 chickens
(9) 500 pairs of alpargatas
(10) 20 cargas of salt

#69 The Crown
TI= 200
I= 820

Tribute: (1) 15 fanegas of corn
(2) 5 fanegas of beans
(3) 100 cantaros of honey
(4) 3 quintales of wax
(5) 200 white sheets
(6) 5 hamacas
(7) 50 ovillos
(8) 100 chickens
(9) 250 pairs of alpargatas
(10) 10 cargas of salt

TI total= 600
1 total= 2460

Comment: These two encomiendas were the richest encomiendas in Nicaragua and show that president Cerrato was trying to follow, in some measure, the instrucciones he was given in the assignment of encomiendas (see 14 CS 330 and 340). They are included in the municipio of Leon, probably by clerical mistake, as they obviously describe the cacique and village of Nicoya, located in Guanacaste, and described by every cronista who passed by there.

Cross reference: P 1.2

54 LVIN 54 Chira (Ch) (L7)
Tribute: (1) 50 tinajas (large earthen jars)
(2) 1,000 little pieces of jarros, cantaros, etc.

Comment: One of the mysteries is what kind of ceramics were produced at Chiria. Lange reports (personal communication, June, 1995) that the most obvious choices for late polychrome blackware pottery, the kind described by both Francisco de Castraleda and Oviedo, are Munillo applique and Castillo engraved (see generally Vincucoles 13 no 1-2). Neutron activation has disclosed that both types of pottery were not produced from the soils of the island of Chiria, located in the gulf of Nicoya, but from a location closer to La Cruz, close by the Nicaraguan border. Cereceda, in his original entrada in 1522 did not visit the island of Chiria, but the mines of Chiria, which may be the site where both types of blackware were produced. This is the only encomienda in Nicaragua that only produced one product, in this instance, pottery. Another possibility is that it may be a reference not to the island of Chiria, but to the mines of Chiria.

Cross reference: P 1.5

55. LVIN 55 Managua (Ch) (L)
#71 Francisco Tellez

TI= 100
I= 41

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 4 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 150 white sheets
(5) 100 carguillas of salt
(6) 2 Indians for fishing
(7) 5 Indians during summer
(8) 36 chickens

#123 Cristobal de San Martin

TI= 100
I= 410

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 4 fanegas of beans
(3) 3 fanegas of cotton
(4) 100 painted sheets
(5) 2 quintales of wax
(6) 16 cantaros of honey
(7) 100 carguillas of salt
(8) 100 chickens

#138 Diego de Pastrana

TI= 10
I= 41

Tribute: (1) 1 fanega of corn
(2) 1 colemin of cotton to produce 6 white sheets
(3) 2 colemines of beans
(4) 6 chickens
(5) 1 cantaro of honey
(6) 4 carguillas of salt

#157 The Crown

TI= 25
I= 103

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton to produce 25 white sheets
(4) 20 chickens

#160 Luis de la Rocha

TI= 30
I= 123

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 1 fanega of cotton to produce 20 white sheets
(4) 10 cargas of salt
(5) 4 cantaros of honey
(6) 1 arroba of wax
(7) 12 chickens

TI total= 306
I total= 1254

Comment: Including Mazagalpa, Managua was one of the largest Chorotegan population centers in Nicaragua. In 1581 the whole area was known as the provincia of Managua and Managua per
se was not listed as the name of an encomienda. Also included within greater Managua in the Tasaón of 1581 were Guatepe and Tonala, Yatan, both Xicogalpa, Achonpa, Mulugalpa, Xuits, and Telpanea (or Tepcanea).

Cross reference: P 3.12; Mazagalpa LVIN 27, Yatan, GVIN 1, Achonpa, GVIN 6, Mulugalpa, GVIN 3, Guatepe and Tonala, GVIN 15.

56. LVIN 56 Tustega (U) (NL)
   #72 Antonio Rodriguez
   T= 12
   I= 49

Tribute: (1) 1.5 fanegas of corn
(2) 3 cecelines of cotton to produce 12 white sheets
(3) 6 chickens
(4) 1 Indian for the four summer months
(5) 0.5 fanega of cacao

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda.

Cross reference: P 6.4

57. LVIN 57 Yoaltezende (U) (NL)
   #74 Diego de Molina Polanco
   T= 60
   I= 246

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 1.5 fanegas for 80 white sheets
(4) 80 carguiillas of salt
(5) 3 Indians for service during 4 summer months
(6) 6 petates

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda. It was possibly located close by Limay, the next encomienda, known today as San Juan de Limay, and located in a deep valley in Estel province. It was owned by the same encomendero, an ally of Rodrigo de Contreras, as owned Limay.

58. LVIN 58 Limay (U) (L)
   #75 Diego de Molina Polanco
   T= 48
   I= 197

Tribute: (1) 2 Indians for service
(2) 6 petates
(3) 6 cantaros of honey
(4) 1 arroba of wax

Comment: This encomienda was probably located at or near the present day location of San Juan de Limay. It is accessible from the plains of Leon through a cut in the mountains that leads to the present day town of Acharupa and then to Limay. This route paralleled the Sierras de las Botijas and may give a clue as to the route taken by the Spaniards to Nueva Segovia, located just south of Quilali. The fairest identified encomiendas to the north are Limay and Totogalpa, LVIN 35, above, which describe an immanently practical route to Nueva Segovia. Both Yoaltezende and Limay were owned by Diego de Molina Polanco, an employee and ally of the Contreras-Rios political party, and their clustering in the tasaon may mean that they were located close together or at least on the same route. The nature of the tribute charged against the village suggests that Limay was not any of the three major ethnic groups and may not have been very much under Spanish domination. The contrast in tribute between Yoaltezende and Limay, both roughly the same size, is obvious. The complete absence of cotton production when the fields around Limay are prime cotton country, suggests that the Indians around Limay did not customarily grow cotton. It may have been on the frontiers of "Chondal" country.

59. LVIN 59 Huxgalpa (U) (NL)
   #77 Rafael de la Plaza
   T= 22
   I= 90

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 20 white sheets
(5) 20 carguiillas of salt
(6) 1 Indian for service during the summer

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda.

60. LVIN 60 Xocogalpa (U) (NL)
   #78 Rafael de la Plaza
   T= 8
   I= 33

Tribute: (1) 1 Indian for services

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda.

61. LVIN 61 Olomega (Chl) (L)
   #79 Rafael de la Plaza
   T= 20
   I= 82

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanegas of beans

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda.
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 20 white sheets
(5) 20 carguillas of salt
(6) 12 chickens
(7) 1 Indians for service during the summer months

Comment: Fowler (1989: 67) identified Olomea as a Nahua village based upon Cibdad Real's report (Cronistas 1: 145) that its inhabitants had abandoned the site and moved to El Viejo, a known Nahua village. This assumes that Nicaraguan villages were monoethnic, which of course was not the case. Lehmann raised the question of whether the place named was a reference to an old Olmec site (Lehmann 1920: 1003). The place name of Olomea survived to be placed on Sonnenstein's 1863 map of Nicaragua. Olomea was located about 10 miles north of Telica, west a few miles from Olocoton. It was identified as a Chontales village in the Tasación of 1581.

62. **LVIN 62 Matrarejo (U) (NL)**
   #80 Francisca de Robles
   Tl=26
   I=107

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of beans
(2) 30 white sheets
(3) 1 fisher during Lent
(4) 2 Indians for services

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda.

63. **LVIN 63 Diriondo (U) (NL)**
   #81 Francisca de Robles
   Tl=24
   I=98

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 25 white sheets
(5) 20 carguillas of salt
(6) 6 petates
(7) 6 cantaros of honey
(8) 1 arroba of wax
(9) 12 chickens
(10) 2 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda. It is possible that it is a clerical error and pertains to the village of Diriondo, which was located in the municipio of Granada and is situated alongside Diria on the Meseta de los Pueblos.

64. **LVIN 64 Matrare (Ch) (L)**
   #82 Francisca de Robles
   Tl=100
   I=410

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 4 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton to produce 150 white sheets
(4) 2 Indian fishers on fish days (probably Fridays and Lent).
(5) 5 Indians for service during summer
(6) 12 chickens
(7) 20 cantaros of honey
(8) 2 arrobals of wax
(9) 12 petates
(10) 12 comales

Comment: Matare was located where the modern day town of Matiare is located about 20 km west of Managua along the shores of Lake Managua.

Cross reference: P 3.13

65. **LVIN 65 Alatoca (U) (NL)**
   #83 Sebastian Picado
   Tl=18
   I=74

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 3 celeminas of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 18 white sheets
(5) 2 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda.

66. **LVIN 66 Estanguiz (M) (NL)**
   #85 Alonso de Torrejon
   Tl=33
   I=135

Tribute: (1) 2 fanega of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 1 fanega of cotton
(4) 36 white sheets
(5) 12 cantaros
(6) 6 petates
(7) 50 carguillas of salt
(8) 12 chickens
(9) 2 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda. It is possible that it is one of the galpones of Mistega, originally called Estanzingoa. It was identified in the Tasación of 1581 as being a Matiles village.

Cross reference: Mistega, PE 7, Estanzingoa P 3.31c.

67 LVIN 67 Necueneme (Ch) (L)
#86 Ana de Guevara
Tl= 40
L= 165

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 1 fanega of cotton
(4) 40 white sheets
(5) 12 petates
(6) 12 cantaros
(7) 6 chickens
(8) 6 cantaros of honey
(9) 1 arroba of wax
(10) 2 Indians for service

Comment: This encomienda was probably located on the north side of the volcano Momotombo near or at the site of present day Tecuahame, 15 kms north of Leon Viejo. See, for example, Cronistas 3:375

68 LVIN 68 Dematínio (U) (NL)
#87 Francisco Peres de Leon
Tl= 65
L= 267

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 1 fanega of cotton
(4) 70 white sheets
(5) 80 carguillas of salt
(6) 3 Indians for service during summer
(7) 12 petates
(8) 12 cantaros
(9) 12 cantaros of honey
(10) 2 arrobas of wax

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda.

69 LVIN 69 Maniati (Maniati) (U) (L)
#90 Francisco Peres de Leon
Tl= 20
L= 82

Tribute: (1) 23 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 Indians for service during summer
(3) 6 petates
(4) 12 chickens
(5) 0.5 fanega of cacao
(6) 12 ovillos of cotton thread, each one weighing
0.5 pound

Comment: Maniati or Maniati was the name for the seaport where Puerto Sandino is located today. Hernando de Soto was given a reward of 200 pesos de buen oro for finding that port. Benito Davila, in a report to the Crown about his merits and service in the conquest of Nicaragua (3 CS 180, January 15, 1533) described the fierce warfare that sometimes occurred and his losing a horse during an Indian attack in the province he called Maniati, perhaps a variation of Maniati (3 CS 192). There is no other reference to a place name in the Coleccion Somanzi that is in any way similar to Maniati, Maniati, Maniati.

70 LVIN 70 Paymaltega (U) (L)
#91 Joan Alonso
Tl= ?
L= ?

(Based on tribute, the village was small, about 15 families.)

Tribute: (1) 1 fanega of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 15 white sheets
(4) 15 carguillas of salt
(5) 6 chickens
(6) 1 Indian for service during the summer
Comment: Nothing further is mentioned of this encomienda in the Coleccion Somotza. Sonnenstern have have located the site of Paynaltega in the last century. His map of Nicaragua (1863) clearly identified the ruins of Paynaltega as lying just north of Quilali. He also noted, "En el departamento de Nueva Segovia se encuentran algunos lugares de poblaciones antiguas, en ruinas, como por ejemplo, la Ciudad Vieja de Segovia en el llano Coco, con los lugares de los antiguos pueblos Gualingi i Painaldega." (Bolivar Juarez 1995: 110). This site was visited by the author in March of 1996. There is a corn field with many river rocks that could have been monticulos at one time. The site has been regularly cultivated for some time.

71. LVIN 71 Toscosa (U) (NL)  
#93 Ochoa de Otihondo  
Tf= 12  
I= 49

Tribute: (1) 1 fanega of corn  
(2) 6 petates  
(3) 6 ollas  
(4) 6 comales

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda

72. LVIN 72 Tonaltega (U) (NL)  
#94 Catalina de Molina  
Tf= 40  
I= 164

Tribute: (1) 5 fanegas of corn  
(2) 2 fanegas of beans  
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton  
(4) 50 white sheets  
(5) 12 petates  
(6) 5 chickens  
(7) 1 Indian fish during fishing days, probably meaning every Friday and during Lent

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda. Because of the service of a fisherman it is probable that Tonaltega was located within one league of Leon Viejo.

73. LVIN 73 Nagarote (Ch) (L)  
#97 The Crown  
Tf= 30  
I= 123

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn  
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans  
(3) 25 white sheets

(4) 10 cargas of salt

Comment: Nagarote was visited by Cibdad Real on May 28, 1586 (1 Cronistas: 152). He did not specifically identify Nagarote as Mangue speaking, though he did so identify Nabitii, one half league, about 2.5 km as Mangue speaking. On the basis of proximity Nagarote is identified as being a Chorotega village. All cronistas were consistent in assuming all villages in western Nicaragua were Oto-Mangue speaking unless they specifically noted a different language.

74. LVIN 74 Pomonagarando (Ch) (L)  
#98 The Crown  
Tf= 12  
I= 49

Tribute: (1) 0.5 fanega of corn  
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans  
(3) 12 white sheets

Comment: This mini-encomienda of 12 families is all that was left alive of the village and caciquargo of Nagonando. As noted above, the prefix "pomo" is probably a variant of Napomo or Yopomo, which was Chilapanca for "the plaza of". The only other encomienda to mention Nagando is #95 Mabbitanagarando, incorporated into the discussion of Inabite, above.

Pedresolas Davila estimated the population of Nagando at 15,000 "vecinos naturales" in 1524.

Cross reference: P 3.15.

75. LVIN 75 Caguatoto (U) (NL)  
#185 The Crown  
Tf= 6  
I= 25

Tribute: (1) 3 celemines of corn  
(2) 6 white sheets

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda

76. LVIN 76 Mastega (Mistega?) (M)(L)  
#186 The Crown  
Tf= 130  
I= 433

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn  
(2) 4 fanegas of beans  
(3) 150 white sheets  
(4) 150 carguillas of salt
(5) 120 pairs of alpargatas
Comment: The assumption is that Mastega is the remnant of Mistega, one of the four largest Indian populations in western Nicaragua at the onset of the conquest. The word “Mastega” is not found elsewhere in the Colección Someza. Of the eight galpones listed in the deed of encomienda of 1529, at least three galpones can be found in the tasación: Guazama, Cozcatega, and Estanguiz.

Cross reference: P 3.30

77. LVIN 77 Cazaloaque (M) (L)
#187 The Crown
Tl= 163
I= 668
Tribute: (1) 8 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of cotton
(3) 200 white sheets
(4) 36 chickens
(5) 200 carguillas of salt
(6) 240 pairs of alpargatas

Comment: Cazaloaque was probably located at or near the present site of Quezaltenango and was part of the encomiendas dedicated to support the Bishopric of Nicaragua. It was located in the middle of Maribios country, one league south of Telica and east of Pozoleta. For that reason it is identified as Maribios. The easternmost Maribios village, Abangaseca is located several km east of Quezaltenango. The identified Maribios village of Utega was located near Cazaloaque (9 CS 4).


78. LVIN 78 Potega (N7) (L)
#188 The Crown
Tl= 70
I= 287

Tribute: (1) 8 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 100 white sheets
(5) 150 carguillas of salt
(6) 1 fanega of cacao

Comment: One is tempted to call Potega a Nahuahua village since it is most often named in conjunction with Ayatega, a known Nahua village. Potega was located 13 or 14 leagues from Leon Viejo, probably in the direction of El Viejo and Ayatega (5 CS 107).

(5) 10 cantaros of honey
(6) 1 quintal of wax
(7) 48 chickens
(8) 12 petates

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda.

Total Tributary Indians = 5,714
Total Indian Inhabitants = 22,913
The Villages of the Municipalidad of Granada

Explanatory Note: There is less specific information about the villages in the municipalidad of Granada than exists about the villages of Leon. All cronistas are uniform in that from Managua to present day San Jorge the Indian populations were Chorotegas. The only exceptions are found in a few, early encomiendas, noted above, that included Chontales Indians, and the large Nahua settlement at San Jorge. That was the logic used in the identification of the Indian villages of Granada. The other reason why there is less information about the encomiendas of Granada is that there were fewer lawsuits between Spaniards about those encomiendas and so less information was recorded about them.

1 GVIN 1 Yatan (Ch?) (L)
#100 Pedro Menor
Tl= 18
I= 74
Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton

Comment: There are no references to this encomienda in the Coleccion Somoc,A Lehmann suggested that the word "Yatan" was Nahua for, "the place of the tobacco" (Lehmann 1920: 1008). Yaat was a substance that the cacique Nicaragua described to Gil Gonzalez that most probably was coca leaves (Fowler 1989: 108; Newson 1987: 52-53). Hence "Yatan" may have been the source where the warriors of Nicaragua grew coca bushes. The Tasaicion of 1581 lists Yatan within the provincia of Managua and for that reason it is tentatively listed as a Chorotegan village.

2 GVIN 2 Diriega (Ch)(L)
#101 The Crown
Tl= 240
I= 984
Tribute: (1) 10 fanegas of corn
(2) 4 fanegas of beans
(3) 5 fanegas of cotton
(4) 300 teilllas
(5) 50 cantutos of honey
(6) 8 arrobas of wax
(7) 80 carguillas of salt
(8) 250 pairs of alpargatas
(9) 120 chickens

Comment: Diriega was identified by Morel de Santa Cruz as an old barrio of Masaya (Morel de Santa Cruz 1967: 10). All that exists today of Diriega is a street name one block south of the main plaza of Masaya.

3 GVIN 3 Mulagalpa (Ch and N) (L)
   #102 Alonso de Horozco  TI= 35
   I= 144

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanegas of beans
(3) 0.5 fanegas of cotton
(4) 30 white sheets
(5) 6 cantaros of honey
(6) 10 carguillas of salt
(7) 1 Indian fisher for fishing days and Lent

Comment: Nothing specific is known of this encomienda. In the Tasación of 1581 it is listed as one of the encomiendas of greater Managua.

4 GVIN 4 Mazatepeque (Ch) (L)
   #103 Miguel Lopez et al  TI= 50
   I= 205

Tribute: (1) 5 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 1 fanega of cotton
(4) 40 telillas
(5) 40 cargas of salt (?)
(6) 10 cantaros of honey
(7) 0.5 quintal of wax
(8) 40 chickens
(9) 2 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Mazatepeque was located on or near the present site of Masatepe

5 GVIN 5 Xintotepeque (Xintotepe)(Ch) (L)
   #104 Miguel Lopez et al  TI= 60
   I= 246

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of corn

6 GVIN 6 Achenba (Ch and N) (L)
   #105 Joan Lozano  TI= 10
   I= 41

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 10 sheets
(4) 6 carguillas of salt

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda. The Tasación of 1581 listed it as lying within greater Managua.

7 GVIN 7 Xalteva (Ch) (L)
   (1)#106 Joan Lozano  TI= 10
   I= 41

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 20 telillas
(5) 50 cantaros of honey
(6) 5 arrobas of wax
(7) 80 carguillas of salt
(8) 48 chickens
(9) 4 Indians for service during summer

#128 Alonso Ruiz  TI= 60
   I= 246

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 70 telillas
(5) 10 cantaros of honey
(6) 1 quintal of wax
(7) 50 carguillas of salt
(8) 60 chickens
(9) 3 Indians for service during summer

TI total= 120
I total= 492

Comment: Xintotepe was located close to or at the present location of Xintotepe. Its square is laid out most similar to those of Nueva Segovia and Villa Nueva.

258
Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 10 white sheets
(4) 0.5 fanega of cotton

(2)#118 Juan Davila
TI= 30
I= 123

Tribute: (1) 2 Indian fishers during fish days and Lent
(2) 2 Indians for service
(3) 1 dozen esteras (?)

(3)#122 Gonzalo Melgarejo
TI= 15
I= 62

Tribute: (1) 2 Indians for service during summer
(2) 8 capirotas

(4)#124 C de San Martin
TI= 10
I= 41

Tribute: (1) 2 Indians for service during summer

(5)#132 Alonso Ruiz
TI= 10
I= 41

Tribute: (1) 0.5 fanega of corn

(6)#143 Teterina
TI= 15
I= 62

Tribute: (1) for 4 summer months 2 Indians to make roof tiles (tejas)

(7)#150 Francisco Gutierrez
TI= 14
I= 57

Tribute: (1) 1 Indian for service every day
(2) 2 Indian fishers for Fridays and Lent

(8)#152 Francisco Sanches
TI= 5
I= 21

Tribute: (1) 1 Indian for service during summer

(9)#163 Juan de Hoyos
TI= 40
I= 164

Tribute: (1) 3 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(3) 30 white sheets
(4) 1 Indian fisher for Fridays and Lent
(5) 12 chickens
(6) 10 cantaros of honey
(7) 2 arrobas of wax
(8) 2 Indians for service during summer

(10)#166 The Crown
TI= 35
I= 144

Tribute: (1) 30 painted sheets
(2) 6 chickens

(11)#169 Marcos Aleman
TI= 8
I= 33

Tribute: (1) 1 Indian fisher for Fridays and Lent

(12)#171 Andres de Sevilla
TI= 3
I= 12

Tribute: (1) every Sunday one carga of fruits

(13)#175 Luis de la Rrocha
TI= 20
I= 82

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 Indians for service during summer

TI total = 215
Comment: Jalteva represents the greatest concentration of mini-encomiendas of any Indian village in Nicaragua. It probably represents the remnants of earlier, larger encomiendas that were decimated by disease, disastrous expeditions to the Desaguadero, and to a much lesser extent, the enslavement of Indians.

Cross reference: P 4.41

8. **GVIN 8 Apapalota (Ch) (NL)**
   - #107 Pedro García
   - Tl= 60
   - I= 246

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 1.5 fanegas of beans
(3) 1.5 fanegas of cotton
(4) 20 white sheets
(5) 36 chickens
(6) 50 carguilas of salt

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda.

9. **GVIN 9 Xoxoyta (N) (L)**
   - #108 Joan Malvasi
   - Tl= 60
   - I= 246

Tribute: (1) 1 fanega of corn
(2) 6 cargas of salt (probably meaning carguilas)
(3) 4 estanzenas
(4) 4 capirotas

Comment: Xoxoyta was identified as one of the plazas, or galpones, of Nahua Indians at the village of the cacique Nicaragua. An informant recently named one of the barrios of San Jorge as “Xoxoyca” (personal communication, May, 1995). Considering the size of the village the tribute of corn is quite small.

Cross reference: P 3.3

10. **GVIN 10 Zapulco (Ch) (L7)**
    - #109 Maluena
    - Tl= 26
    - I= 107

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of cotton
(3) 2 almades of cacao
(4) 20 capirotas
(5) 15 carguilas of salt

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda.

11. **GVIN 11 Mohorno (Ch) (NL)**
    - #110 Joan de Malvasi
    - Tl= 40
    - I= 164

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 1 fanega of cotton
(4) 40 telillas
(5) 12 cantaros of honey
(6) 1 quintal of wax
(7) 24 chickens
(8) 20 carguilas of salt

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda. The name is possibly a variation of the Ch'ixtlayanek word “mahomó”, which means “the plaza of.” Thus this encomienda possibly means “the plaza.”

12. **GVIN 12 Moyogalpa (U) (L)**
    - #111 Joan Ysquierdo
    - Tl= 55
    - I= 226

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 50 painted sheets
(5) 8 chickens
(6) 20 cargas (probably carguilas) of salt

Comment: Moyogalpa was probably located on or near the present town of Moyogalpa, located on the island of Ometepe, known generally in the 16th century as the “isla de Nicaragua.” The
ethnic identity of Moyogalpa is unknown, and has been subject to some speculation. The general consensus of Nicaraguan historians is that it was Nahua speaking. Haberland emphatically stated that he was sure that Ometepe was not Nahua speaking at the time of the conquest (Lange 1992: 115-116). He also noted Ciudad Real’s observation that in 1586 the inhabitants of Ometepe spoke a language not Nahua, Chorotega, nor Matilteco (Cronistas 1: 162). Brandsford (1881) found the very distinctive Luna polychromes on a finca of a señor Luna about one mile east of Moyogalpa and archaeologists have been wondering ever since where they came from. There seems to be little resemblance or relationship between Luna polychrome and any other ceramic style of Gran Nicoya. Magnus (1974) could not find any relationship between the ceramic sequences he found around Pearl Lagoon and Bluefields, nor could he ascribe any relationship between Luna polychrome and more southern ceramic developments. Where Luna polychrome came from still remains a mystery. Maybe the potters found good weed to smoke, got inspired, and produced Luna as a result. The tribute charged against Moyogalpa is completely consistent with other tribute assessments in Gran Nicoya, and different from tribute assessments against villages on the eastern side of Lake Nicaragua, such as Chuiagalpa and Mayali, noted below. This mystery is unexplained.

13. **GVIN 13 Guatepeque (Ch) (L)**
   #112 Joan de Segovia  
   TL= 61  
   I= 251

   **Tribute:**  
   (1) 6 fanegas of corn  
   (2) 1 fanega of cotton  
   (3) 50 telillas  
   (4) 10 carguillas of salt  
   (5) 2 Indians for fishers  
   (6) 2 Indians for service

   **Comment:** This encomienda was probably located between the village of Diriia and Jalteva; see discussion below.

14. **GVIN 14 Niratia (Ch) (NL)**
   #113 Joan Ysquierdo  
   TL= 14  
   I= 41

   **Tribute:**  
   (1) 1 Indian fisher

   **Comment:** From the tribute charged it is quite possible that Niratia was located within a league or two of Granada, if not adjacent to Granada itself.

15. **GVIN 15 Guatepe and Tonala (Ch and N) (L)**
   #114 Gomez Palomino  
   TL= 75  
   I= 308

   **Tribute:**  
   (1) 7 fanegas of corn  
   (2) 1 fanega of beans  
   (3) 2 fanegas of cotton  
   (4) 60 painted sheets  
   (5) 1 quintal of wax  
   (6) 12 cantaros of honey  
   (7) 25 carguillas of salt  
   (8) 60 chickens  
   (9) 4 Indians for service during summer  
   (10) 1 fisher for Fridays and Lent

   **Comment:** This encomienda is listed as lying within greater Managua in the Tasación of 1581. Incer notes a location named “Tonalá” north of El Viejo in northwestern Nicaragua (Incer 1985: 474)

16. **GVIN 16 Minahote (Ch) (NL)**
   #115 Joan de Segovia  
   TL= 40  
   I= 164

   **Tribute:**  
   (1) 4 fanegas of corn  
   (2) 2 fanegas of beans  
   (3) 1 fanega of cotton  
   (4) 3 arrobas of wax  
   (5) 6 cantaros of honey  
   (6) 2 Indians for service

   **Comment:** Nothing is known about this encomienda.

17. **GVIN 17 Xionbo (Ch) (NL)**
   #116 Joan de Moger  
   TL= 21  
   I= 87

   **Tribute:**  
   (1) 2 fanegas of corn  
   (2) 2 cantaros of honey

   **Comment:** Nothing is known about this encomienda.

18. **GVIN 18 Masaya (Ch) (L)**
   #117 Joan Davila  
   TL= 150  
   I= 615
Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn  
(2) 4 fanegas of beans  
(3) 3 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 100 telillas  
(5) 10 pairs of alpargatas  
(6) 60 chickens  
(7) 2 hamacas  
(8) 2 quintales of wax  
(9) 20 cantaros of honey  
(10) 100 carguillas of salt  
(11) 4 Indians for service

#151 Francisco Sanchez  
TL= 110  
I= 451

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn  
(2) 3 fanegas of beans  
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 100 white sheets  
(5) 209 cantaros of honey  
(6) 2 arrobas of wax  
(7) 100 carguillas of salt  
(8) 48 chickens  
(9) 1 Indian fisher  
(10) 4 Indians for service

TL= 260  
I= 1125

Comment: Masaya and neighboring villages such as Diriega, Monimbo, and Zagualpa made up one of the largest population centers in early Nicaragua. Even in 1548 it was producing good hamacas.

Cross reference: P 3.8

19 GVIN 19 Diriono (Deriondo)(Ch) (L)  
#119 Pedro Ximenez  
TL= 10  
I= 41

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn  
(2) 2 fanegas of beans  
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 60 thick sheets  
(5) 40 carguillas of salt  
(6) 2 celenimes of cacao  
(7) 1 quintal of wax  
(8) 8 cantaros of honey  
(9) 2 Indians for service

#131 Roman de Cardenas  
TL= 40  
I= 164

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn  
(2) 2 fanegas of beans  
(3) 24 chickens  
(4) 40 telillas  
(5) 20 carguillas of salt  
(6) 3 arrobas of wax  
(7) 8 cantaros of honey  
(8) 2 Indians for service

#147 (Deriondo)  
Marcos Aleman  
TL= 37  
I= 148

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn  
(2) 1 fanega of beans  
(3) 1 fanega of cotton  
(4) 40 telillas  
(5) 2 arrobas of wax  
(6) 6 cantaros of honey  
(7) 10 carguillas of salt  
(8) 24 chickens  
(9) 2 Indians for service

TL total: 87  
I total: 353

Comment: Diriono was located at or near the present site of Diriono on the meseta de los pueblos.

20 GVIN 20 Manbacho and Susiuteo (Ch) (L7)
Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 3 fanegas of beans
(3) 12 chickens
(4) 12 jaquimas and headstalls
(5) 16 cantaros of wax
(6) 80 carguilas of salt
(7) 1.5 quintales of wax
(8) 100 thin sheets
(9) 2 Indian fishers
(10) 5 Indians for service

Comment: When this assignment of the encomienda was made in November of 1548 Luis de Guevara had been dead for three years. He gained quite a reputation for being a bully and enforcer of the Contreras-Rios faction as he was aguacel mayor of Nicaragua. When Guevara died in 1545 exacting vengeance against all those who had testified against Contreras in his residencia in 1544, Bishop Valdivieso wrote that God had killed Guevara. When president Cerrato assigned this encomienda to the dead enemy of Valdivieso it must have provoked the anger and heated correspondence that characterized the last exchange of letters between Cerrato and Valdivieso before Valdivieso was murdered by Rodrigo de Contreras' sons Hermann and Pedro.

23. GVIN 23 Marinat (Ch) (L7)
#126 Luis de Guevara
Tf= 5
I= 21

Tribute: (1) 1 Indian for service

24. GVIN 24 Marinat (Ch) (L7)
#130 Roman de Cardenas
Tf= 40
I= 164

Tribute: (1) 12 chickens
(2) 6 telillas
(3) 4 cantaros of honey
(4) 1 Indian fisher

#144 Bartolome Tello
Tf= 40
I= 164

Tribute: (1) 5 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of cotton
(3) 40 white sheets

Comment: This village was located between the village of Masatepe and the Masaya volcano. The original road between those two locations was called Nanborime (Inces 1985: 440). That is the basis for the proposed location of this encomienda.
(4) 2 Indian fishers
(5) 12 jaquimas and headstalls
(6) 6 chickens

TI total= 85
I total= 349

Cross reference: P 3.10

24. GVIN 24 Daria (Delderia)(Ch) (L)
#127 Francisco Romero  
TI= 75
I= 308

Tribute: (1) 8 fanegas of corn
(2) 3 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 80 white sheets
(5) 12 cantaros of honey
(6) 1 quintal of wax
(7) 2 Indian fishers
(8) 50 carguillas of salt
(9) 3 Indians for service

#146 Marcos Aleman  
TI= 60
I= 246

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 3 fanegas of beans
(3) 1 fanega of cotton
(4) 60 telillas
(5) 10 cantaros of honey
(6) 1 quintal of wax
(7) 50 carguillas of salt
(8) 12 chickens
(9) 2 Indians for service

#180 Miguel de la Costa  
TI= 80
I= 328

Tribute: (1) 10 fanegas of corn
(2) 4 fanegas of beans

#196 Delderia and Guatepet  
TI= 115
(I= 472

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 6 fanegas of beans planted by the Indians of Jalteva
(3) 3 fanegas of cotton
(4) 120 white sheets
(5) 10 cantaros of honey
(6) 6 arrobas of wax
(7) 48 chickens
(8) 36 bateas
(9) 100 carguillas of salt

TI total= 330
I total= 1346

Comment: the information in #196 clearly established the location of the encomiendas of Diriá
and Guatepet. The tribute is a little unusual since it included bateas, or liquid beaters, the only
such tributary item found in the Coleccion Somoza.

Cross reference: P 3.6

25. GVIN 25 Loma (Ch) (L)
#129 Juan de Jaen  
TI= 40
I= 164

Tribute: (1) 5 fanegas of corn
(2) 8 cantaros of honey
(3) 2 arrobas of wax
(4) 30 chickens
(5) 1 Indian fisher
(6) 430 carguillas of salt
(7) 40 almudes of cacao
(8) 40 telillas
Comment: This encomienda was located on the road that passes from Masaya to Granada by way of Catarina. La Loma probably refers to one of the hills along that road. Ciudad Real described that road and a place called "La Loma" in 1586 (Cronistas 1: 157), possibly referring to the Cerro de las Ardiellas.

26. GVIN 26 Dirianba (Ch) (L)
   #133 Joan Arias  Tl= 100
   T= 410
   Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
   (2) 4 fanegas of beans
   (3) 100 carguillas of salt
   (4) 50 lonas
   (5) 24 petates
   (6) 2 quintales of wax
   (7) 16 cantaros of honey
   (8) 1 fanega of cacao
   (9) 3 Indians for service

Comment: Dirianba was close to or at the present location of the town of Dirianba.

27. GVIN 27 Nomativa (Ch) (L)
   #134 Alonso de Orozco  Tl= 100
   T= 410
   Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
   (2) 4 fanegas of beans
   (3) 3 fanegas of cotton
   (4) 100 white sheets
   (5) 2 quintales of wax
   (6) 2 Indian fishers
   (7) 5 Indians for service
   (8) 100 pairs of alpargatas
   (9) 100 carguillas of salt
   (10) 12 chickens

Comment: this encomienda was located at or near the present day town of Catarina. Its original name was Santa Catarina de Nomativa. Morel de Santa Cruz noted in 1751 that there were two Nomativas, Santa Catarina de Nomativa and the other with a patron saint of San Juan, probably today's San Juan de Oriente (Morel de Santa Cruz 1967: 9-10).

28. GVIN 28 Nandaim (Ch) (L)
   #155 Bernardino de Miranda  Tl= 100
   T= 410
   Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
   (2) 4 fanegas of beans
   (3) 100 white sheets
   (4) 16 cantaros of honey
   (5) 2 quintales of wax
   (6) 100 carguillas of salt
   (7) 12 chickens
   (8) 5 Indians for service

   #148 Children of Suarez  Tl= 51
   T= 209
   Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
   (2) 2 fanegas of beans
   (3) 1 fanega of cotton
   (4) 50 lonas
   (5) 10 cantaros of honey
   (6) 1 quintal of wax
   (7) 30 carguillas of salt
   (8) 3 Indians for service

   #154 Juan Carvallo  Tl= 80
   T= 328
   Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
   (2) 2 fanegas
   (3) 2 fanegas of cotton
   (4) 100 white sheets
   (5) 80 cargas (probably carguillas) of salt
   (6) 5 Indians for service
   (7) 1 fanega of cacao
   (8) 1 Indian fisher

   T= 231
   T= 930
Comment: The village of Nandoime was one of the few villages that was subject to litigation in the municipio of Granada. It apparently was subject to Spanish domination from the 1520's onward and so more is known of the village and encomiendas of Nandoime than other villages in the area.

Cross reference: P 1.16

31 GVIN 31 Coagalpa (U) (NL)
#139 Joan de Jaen
TI= 70
Is 287

Tribute: (1) 10 quintales de nequen (probably henequen).

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda. From the tribute it is likely that it was on the periphery of Spanish domination and of a different ethnic group than the four main groups usually encountered in the tasación. It was probably located close to the next encomienda #160, Coagalpa.

32 GVIN 32 Coyagalpa (U) (NL)
#140 Joan de Jaen
TI= 30
Is 123

Tribute: (1) 20 esteras (?)

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda. It was possibly located close to the present town of the same name in Boaco province, in the Malacatoya drainage. It has a common ownership with the preceding encomienda and also shows a much different pattern of tribute than found in the majority of the encomiendas. This suggests that it was not completely controlled by the Spaniards or that this village produced different products than the four major ethnic groups of western Nicaragua. It was probably located close to the preceding encomienda, #139, Coagalpa.

33 GVIN 33 Mayaules (U) (L)
#141 Joan de Segovia
TI= 300
Is 1230

Tribute: (1) 20 arrobas of henequen (henequen)
(2) 12 chickens

Comment: This encomienda was included in the encomiendas of Leon probably by mistake. The large size of the village and the minuscule amount and type of tribute charged against the village indicates this village was not exploited as harshly as villages on the western side of Lake Nicaragua where the three main ethnic groups predominated. It also suggests that the Indians of Mayaules did not produce the same type of items as the Indians on the west side of Lake Nicaragua. Mayaules was almost certainly located somewhere by the mouth of the Mayaules river in Chontales province. Alonso Calero mentioned the site in his letter reporting the discovery of the mouth of the Rio San Juan (6 CS 75,77, 1539 or 1540). He called a group of islands the
Mayali islands, possibly the islands of Nancital, located south of the mouth of the Mayaless River. Gorin (1990) searched the area around the mouth of the Mayaless river and found no archaeological sites. Reports from rice farmers in the area suggest that there are large sites around the mouth of the Mayaless River.

34 GVIN 34 Niqueenohomo (Ch) (L)  
#142 Tekerina  
Tl= 120  
I= 492

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn  
(2) 5 fanegas of beans  
(3) 3 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 100 pairs of alpargatas  
(5) 12 xaquimas with headstalls  
(6) 4 sogas for water wells (pozos)  
(7) 20 cantaros of honey  
(8) 2 quintales of wax  
(9) 100 caurillas of salt  
(10) 10 arbojas of niacin (henequen)  
(11) 12 chickens

Comment: For the size of the village the tribute was pretty heavy. The villagers were some of the best workers in plant fibers since they produced all major types of fiber products: alpargatas, xaquimas (backamoires) and ropes. The village was located at or near the present site of Niqueenohomo. The name possibly meant the plaza of henequen in Chorotega or Chiapanekan: Niacin + nahomo (the plaza of). For another interpretation, see Incer 1985: 443.

Cross reference: P 1.14 and 1.15; GVIN 20 Mambah and Susujeto.

35 GVIN 35 Mandapio Mambah (Ch) (L,T,7)  
#145 Bartolome Tello  
Tl= 90  
I= 369

Tribute: (1) 10 fanegas of corn  
(2) 12 cantaros of honey  
(3) 1 5 quintals of wax  
(4) 90 white sheets  
(5) 1 fanega of cacao  
(6) 60 chickens  
(7) 12 xaquimas with headstall  
(8) 50 caurillas of salt  
(9) 100 pairs of alpargatas

Comment: This is the second encomienda using the name Mambah, in all probability a reference to the volcano Mambaho, as its title, the other being GVIN 20, Mambah and Susujeto. The tribute charged against the town is quite heavy and similar to the tribute charged against Niqueenohomo, suggesting that the two villages may not have been far apart. It was probably located on the slopes of Mambaho. Salgado (personal communication, 1993) reported finding archaeological remains up to 1,000 m in altitude on Mambaho.

Cross reference: P 1.14 and 1.15; GVIN 20 Mambah and Susujeto.

36 GVIN 36 Nicaragua and Guatigalpa  
(Nicaragua) (N) (L)  
#149 Francisco Gutierrez  
Tl= 119  
I= 488

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn  
(2) 3 fanegas of beans  
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 100 white sheets  
(5) 1 fanega of cacao  
(6) 100 caurillas of salt  
(7) 12 chickens  
(8) 2 quintales of wax  
(9) 20 cantaros of honey  
(10) 50 pairs of alpargatas  
(11) 2 fishers for Fridays and Lent  
(12) 4 Indians for service during summer

#153 Joan Carvallo  
Tl= 100  
I= 410

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn  
(2) 2 fanegas of beans  
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 100 white sheets  
(5) 80 caurillas of salt  
(6) 1 fanega of cacao  
(7) 5 Indians for service during summer  
(8) 1 Indian fisher

#159 Luis de la Rocha  
Tl= 60  
I= 246
Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 4 estencenas
(4) 30 capirotes
(5) 12 xaqueñas with headstalls
(6) 40 pairs of alpargatas
(7) 10 carguilas of salt
(8) 2 Indians for service

#172 Andres de Sevilla
Tl= 10
I= 41

Tribute: (1) 50 cargas of salt (probably meaning carguilas)

#168 (Nicaragua Anata)
Geronimo de Anpies
Tl= 30
I= 123

Tribute: (1) 3 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 2 Indians for service during summer
(4) 2 Indians to "deservar un roزال" (?)
(5) 2 arrobas of niacin (henequen)
(6) 0.5 aroba of wax
(7) 30 white sheets

Tl total= 319
I total= 1368

Comment: These encomiendas are the remnant of the village of the cacique named Nicaragua, first reported by Cereceda and Gil Gonzalez in 1522 and Bobadilla in 1528.

Cross reference: P 1.10, P 1.11, P 3.3

37 GVIN 37 Martinarote (Ch) (NL?)
#155 Joan Carvallo
Tl= 30
I= 123

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 20 carguilas of salt
(5) 5 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Possibly located by the encomienda Manbach Nandapio, GVIN 20. Nothing else is known of this encomienda.

38 GVIN 38 Cagualpa and other villages
Tuestepe, Alaginan, Xuitava, Xopospa, Gologalpa and Xalteba (Ch) (L, some)

#156 Benito Diaz
Tl= 300
I= 1230

Tribute: (1) 12 fanegas of corn
(2) 4 fanegas of beans
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton
(4) 1 dozen white sheets
(5) 2 arrobas of wax
(6) 20 cargas of salt (probably carguilas)
(7) 2 Indian fishers
(8) 12 chickens
(9) 2 Indians for service during summer

Comment: This encomienda appears to be a bookkeeper's solution to several dispersed encomiendas. Tuestepe is possibly a variant of Tuestepe, a town located in the Malacatoya drainage and on the road from Managua to Bouco and Huigalpa. The tribute is consistent with the tribute assessed against villages in western Nicaragua and the assumption is that these villages, or at least Sutiava and Xalteba, were Chorotegan and and Cagualpa was a Chondal pueblo.

39 GVIN 39 Isla de Nicaragua (U) (L)
#158 Luis de la Rocha
Tl= 109
I= 447

Tribute: (1) 10 fanegas of corn, 5 fanegas to be planted in Nicaragua, possibly meaning the mainland by San Jorge:
(2) 2 fanegas of cotton
(3) 100 naguas
(4) 50 arrobas of niacin
(5) 1 almud "de tierra de aji", probably chiliis
(6) 2 arrobas of fish
(7) 6 petates
(8) 2 hamacas
(9) 2 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Consistent with usage throughout the Coleccion Sonora the isla de Nicaragua means Ometepe, which was a term only used by Oviedo at the time of the conquest. The assessed tribute is consistent with tribute west of Lake Nicaragua, with the exception of the nagus (7) and almadu of tierra de aji or chili peppers. No judgement is made as this time regarding the ethnic group or groups that inhabited Ometepe at during the contact period. The artesanal production as well as the production of aji suggests mesoamerican connections.

Cross reference: GVIN12 Moyogalpa

40 GVIN 40 Atotone (Ch) (L)
#162 Juan de Hoyos        TI= 27
I= 111

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 6 5 fanegas of cotton
(4) 6 cantaros of honey
(5) 1 arroba of wax
(6) 10 cargas of salt (probably carguillas)
(7) 6 chickens every Christmas
(8) 1 fisher for Fridays and Lent
(9) 1 Indian for service during summer

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda. From the tribute it is probable that Atotone was close to Granada, probably within one or two leagues of Granada.

41 GVIN 41 Chicogalpa (Ch) (NL)
#164 Geronimo Anpies        TI= 35
I= 144

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 30 white sheets
(5) 6 cantaros of honey
(6) 1 arroba of wax
(7) 40 pairs of alpagaras
(8) 20 carguillas of salt
(9) 6 chickens

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda.

42 GVIN 42 Cangen (Ch) (L)
#165 Francisco Gutierrez    TI= 75
I= 308

Tribute: (1) 6 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 80 white sheets
(4) 3 arrobas of wax
(5) 10 cantaros of honey

Comment: This is the encomienda farthest southeast in Costa Rica to be considered part of the gobernacion of Nicaragua in 1548. Cereceda first reported its existence in 1522.

Cross reference: P 1.1

43 GVIN 43 Nandayotra (Ch) (NL)
#167 Geronimo de Anpies    TI= 27
I= 111

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(3) 20 carguillas of salt
(4) 4 cantaros of honey
(5) 1 arroba of wax
(6) 2 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda. Because of its name it could be a contraction of Chorotea and Spanish, as in "another Nandaime"

44 GVIN 44 Tenami (Ch) (NL)
#170 Andres de Sevilla      TI= 29
I= 119

Tribute: (1) 3 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 0.5 fanega of cotton
(4) 12 white sheets
(5) 1 Indian fisher for Fridays and Lent
(6) 1 Indian for service during summer

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda. From the tribute it is probable that Tenamí was located within one or two leagues of Granada because of the fisher being part of the tribute.

45. GVIN 45 Nandumaxalata (NL)(U)  
#173 Francisco Fernandez  
Tt= 50  
I= 205

Tribute:  
(1) 5 fanegas of corn  
(2) 1 fanega of beans  
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 30 lotas or sheets  
(5) 6 cantaros of honey  
(6) 3 arrobas of wax  
(7) 30 carguillas of salt  
(8) 2 Indians for service during summer

Comment: Nothing is known about this encomienda.

46. GVIN 46 Nicopasaya (Ch) (L)  
#174 Luis de la Rocha  
Tt= 100  
I= 410

Tribute:  
(1) 10 fanegas of corn  
(2) 2 fanegas of beans  
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 100 white sheets  
(5) 2 hamacas  
(6) 20 cantaros of honey  
(7) 1 quintal of wax

Comment: Lehmann located Nicopasaya in Guanacaste province of Costa Rica. The name may be another Spanish-Chorotegan contraction. Nico is the Chorotegan word for alligator or caiman (Lehmann 1920: 883). Nicopasaya may mean the place of the caiman or where the caiman passes. Nothing else is known about this encomienda.

47. GVIN 47 Chuigalpa Tacazolgalpa (U) (L)

#177 Juan Arias  
Tt= 70  
I= 287

Tribute:  
(1) 10 arrobas of nicas (henequen)  
(2) 5 cantaros of honey  
(3) 2 arrobas of wax

Comment: This encomienda was located at or near the present town of Juigalpa, Chontales province. This encomienda may be related to the site "Aguja Buena", located 4 km outside of Juigalpa, and consisting of over 200 stone mounds (Lange 1992: 49-50). The tribute is consistent with tribute of peoples probably not members of the four main ethnic groups of western Nicaragua and peoples who either had not mastered weaving or the Spaniards had not sufficiently placed them under the Spanish yolk for them to be forced to pay with woven goods. The absence of both corn and bean tribute suggests either a different economic base or a different attitude towards this encomienda on the part of the Spaniards.

48. GVIN 48 Nenderi (Ch) (L)  
#178 The Crown  
Tt= 300  
I=1230

Tribute:  
(1) 24 fanegas of corn  
(2) 8 fanegas of beans  
(3) 6 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 280 telillas  
(5) 65 cantaros of honey  
(6) 100 carguillas of salt  
(7) 720 pairs of alparagas  
(8) 108 chickens

Comment: This encomienda was located on or near the present day town of Nindiri. The tribute was very high, even considering the large population.

Cross reference: P 3.11

49. GVIN 49 Capandi (Ch) (L)  
#179 Miguel de la Costa  
Tt= 80  
I= 328

Tribute:  
(1) 5 fanegas of corn  
(2) 2 fanegas of beans  
(3) 2 fanegas of cotton  
(4) 24 telillas  
(5) 20 cantaros of miel

Comment: Capandi was probably located on the banks of the Tempisque river in Guanacaste province, Costa Rica and was one of the first Chorotega settlements that Cereceda encountered in his entrada into Nicaragua.
50. GVIN 50 Xicogalpa (Ch and N) (L)
   #181 Diego Bermudez
   T= 45
   I= 185

Tribute: (1) 4 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 1 fanega of cotton
(4) 40 painted sheets
(5) 18 chickens
(6) 6 cantaros of honey
(7) 2 arrobas of cera
(8) 20 carguillas of salt

Comment: This encomienda is listed as lying within greater Managua in the Tasacion of 1581.

51. GVIN 51 Monagalpa (Ch) (NL)
   #182 Alonso de Horozco
   T= 16
   I= 66

Tribute: (1) 1 fanega of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans
(3) 4 almudes of cotton
(4) 20 white sheets
(5) 3 cantaros of honey
(6) 12 chickens

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda.

52. GVIN 52 Soliata (Ch) (NL)
   #183 The Crown
   T= 4
   I= 17

Tribute: (1) 12 pairs of alpargatas

Comment: Nothing is known of this encomienda.

53. GVIN 53 Togalpa (N) (L)
   #99 Pedro Menor
   T= 30
   I= 123

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 1 fanega of beans
(3) 20 carguillas of salt

Comment: Togalpa, or Atogalpa, was identified as one of the galpones, or plazas of the village of the cacique Nicaragu.

Cross reference: P 1.11

54. GVIN 54 Monimbo (Ch) (L)
   #198 The Crown
   T= 140
   I= 574

Tribute: (1) 20 fanegas of corn
(2) 2 fanegas of beans
(3) 4 fanegas of cotton
(4) 200 telillas
(5) 20 cantaros of honey
(6) 8 arrobas of wax
(7) 100 carguillas of salt
(8) 200 pairs of alpargatas
(9) 100 chickens

Comment: The tribute assessed against this village was very high, even considering its population. It was located on or near the present barrio of Monimbo in Masaya.

Cross reference: P 4.49

55. GVIN 55 Totoaque (N) (L)
   #192 The Crown
   T= 24
   I= 98

Tribute: (1) 2 fanegas of corn
(2) 0.5 fanega of beans

Comment: This encomienda probably belongs in the encomiendas of Granada, since it was located adjacent to the plaza of Nicaragua, at the present day San Jorge. It was listed in the Tasacion as belonging to Leon.

Cross reference: P 1.12
Appendix 6

The Encomenderos Of The Tasación Of 1548

The following key system has been utilized to identify the various affiliations of the encomenderos of early Nicaragua:

(C) means inclusion in the Conteras-Ríos alliance;

(A) means inclusion in the reformist-anti-Conteras alliance;

(N) means neutral or unknown political affiliation;

(H) means the encomendero was a member of the first army of Francisco Hernandez in 1524 to successfully enter and conquer part of Nicaragua.

THE ENCOMENDEROS OF LEON

1. El 1 Martín Zambrano ¹ (N) #1 Cucivina

   Ti= 40
   I= 164

   Cross reference: LVIN 1 Cucivina.

2. El 2 Francisco de Medina (N) #2 Olocoton

   Ti= 24
   I= 99

   Cross reference: LVIN 2 Olocoton.

3. El 3 Francisco de Castrillo (N) #3 Subtiava

   Ti= 60
   I= 246

   Cross reference: LVIN 3 Subtiava.

4. El 4 Rodrigo de Conteras Biedma (C) #4 Momotombo

   Ti= 35
   I= 144

   #5 Nabitia
   Ti= 6
   I= 25

   #25 Coyatega
   Ti= 100
   I= 410

   Ti total: 141
   I total: 579

   Comment: Rodrigo de Conteras Biedma was identified as a cousin of Rodrigo de Conteras and is identified as an ally of Conteras.

   Cross reference: LVIN 4 Momotombo; LVIN 5 Nabitia; LVIN 13 Coyatega.

5. El 5 Antonio Boze (C) #7 Huegagalpa

   Ti= 30
   I= 123

   #24 Comayna & Niagalpa
   Ti= 200
   I= 820

   Ti total: 230
   I total: 943
Comment: Antonio Bote was identified as a close ally of Rodrigo de Contreras by Diego de Herrera in the case of RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS v. DIEGO DE HERRERA, 15 CS 232, 484 (June 1548).
Cross reference: LVIN 7 Huagagapalpa; LVIN 19 Comayna & Niagalpa.

6. El 6 Pedro García (A)  
#8 Mabití  
TΙ = 4  
I = 16

Comment: For his political affiliation, see letter, 11 CS 418 (February 10, 1545).
Cross reference: LVIN 5 Nabitía.

7. El 7 Ysabel Veizal (N)  
#9 Cindega  
#10 Xocotea  
#11 Capotea  
TΙ = 20  
I = 82

TI total:  
60  
I total:  
246

Comment: Cindega. LVIN 8, and possibly Capotea, LVIN 10, were Maribios villages. This clustering raises the possibility that Xocotea LVIN 9 was also a Maribios village clustered around or between the villages of Cindega and Capotea.
Cross reference: LVIN 8 Cindega; LVIN 9 Xocotea; LVIN 10 Capotea.

8. El 8 Yseoa de Santiago (A)  
#12 Cindega  
#13 Gualteveo  
#14 Maney  
TΙ = 100  
I = 410

TI total:  
235  
I total:  
964

Comment: Yseoa de Santiago was one of the Contreras-Ríos alliance’s bitterest enemies. Her recovery of her dead (possibly murdered- Mateo Lezcano) husband’s encomiendas is some indication that Cerrato tried to be even handed with all persons. See, RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS v. MATEO LEZCANO, 9 CS 481 (June 3, 1540).
Cross reference: LVIN 8 Cindega; LVIN 11 Gualteveo; and LVIN 12 Maney.

9. El 9 Lope Guanco (N)  
#15 Coyatea  
TΙ = 80  
I = 246


10. El 10 Alonso Mendez (H) (N)  
#16 Ygualtega  
#28 Mesceg  
TΙ = 22  
I = 91

TI total:  
36

I total:  
166

Cross reference: LVIN 14 Ygualtega; LVIN 22 Mesceg.

11. El 11 Diego de Ayala (N)  
#17 Cindegaamiba  
TI = 40  
I = 164

Cross reference: LVIN 8 Cindega.

12. El 12 Joan Gallego (H) (A)  
#18 Deacozaco  
#41 Condega & Joangastea  
#42 Teotega  
TI = 105  
I = 431

TI total:  
185  
I total:  
800

Comment: For his political affiliation, see JUAN GALLEGOS ET AL v. JUAN CARBALLO, 13 CS 305 (October 27, 1543).
Cross reference: LVIN 15 Deacozaco, LVIN 31 Condega and Joangastea, LVIN 29 Teotega.

13. El 13 Francisco Telloz (N)  
#19 Subtiava  
#39 Teotea  
#71 Managua  
TI = 160  
I = 656

TI total:  
305  
I total:  
1251

Cross reference: LVIN 3 Subtiava, LVIN 29 Teotega, LVIN 55, Managua.

14. El Hernando de Haro (A)  
#20 Guazama  
TI = 40  
I = 164

Cross reference: For his political affiliation, see 10 CS 35.

15. El 15 Felipe Mercado (N)  
#21 Utega  
TI = 25  
I = 104

Cross reference: LVIN 17 Utega.

16. El 16 Diego de Caceres (N)  
#22 Cindega  
TI = 64  
I = 263

Cross reference: LVIN 8 Cindega.

17. El 17 Children of Martin Mimbrono (C)  
#23 Pozoletga  
TI = 70  
I = 290
Comment: For his political affiliation, see 15 CS 232, 484
Cross reference: LVIN 25 Tepanzinga; LVIN 26 Colima

23. El 23 Alvaro de Zamora (A)

#34 Mazagalpa

TI = 70
I = 287

#35 Utega

TI = 22
I = 91

TI total: 92
I total: 287

Comment: These two encomiendas are good example why the consecutive numbering of encomiendas does not necessarily mean a clustering geographically. Mazagalpa was a barrio in Managua and Utega was located just west of Subtiava by Abangacca-Chindega, about 90 km to the northwest. For his political affiliations, see letter 5, 11 CS 140 (June 24, 1544).
Cross reference: LVIN 17 Utega, LVIN 27 Mazagalpa.

24. El 24 Hernan Nieto (A)

#36 Tepuntega

TI = 100
I = 410

#37 Tatoega

TI = 100
I = 410

#38 Tosta

TI = 90
I = 369

TI total: 290
I total: 1189

Comment: Hernan Nieto was an early settler in Leon Viejo. He became an enemy of Rodrigo de Contreras. Later both he and his son participated in the assassination of Bishop Valdivieso. His son was killed and he was executed in Panama city for taking part in the Contreras rebellion. His house was located close by, and possibly next to, the Las Mercedes church. Of the three encomiendas Teotega was located one league from the Puerto de La Posesion; the other two encomiendas have not been located.

For his political affiliation, see 10 CS 584.


#40 Cucivina

TI = 20
I = 82

#52 Totamustega

TI = 22
I = 89

#68 Nicoya

TI = 400
I = 2460

#69 Nicoya

TI = 200
I = 1230

#70 Chita

TI = 60
I = 246

#95 Mabita-Nagarano

TI = 20
I = 82

#96 Mabitia

TI = 22
I = 89

#97 Nagarote

TI = 30
I = 125
| #98 Pomonagarando | Ti=12 | I=50 |
| #99 Tolgalpa     | Ti=30 | I=125 |
| #157 Managua     | Ti=25 | I=104 |
| #166 Jalteva     | Ti=35 | I=144 |
| #178 Nenderi     | Ti=300 | I=1240 |
| #183 Solita      | Ti=4 | I=16 |
| #184 Mahometombo | Ti=2 | I=82 |
| #185 Caguato     | Ti=6 | I=25 |
| #186 Masategga   | Ti=130 | I=25 |
| #187 Cazaloaque  | Ti=153 | I=627 |
| #188 Potega      | Ti=70 | I=288 |
| #189 Ayatega     | Ti=30 | I=125 |
| #190 Pozoltega   | Ti=60 | I=246 |
| #191 Tezategga   | Ti=70 | I=288 |
| #192 Totoaque    | Ti=23 | I=99 |
| #193 Abangasca   | Ti=40 | I=164 |
| #194 Zoayaco     | Ti=115 | I=472 |
| #196 Deldaria & Guatepet | Ti=115 | I=472 |
| #197 Zaguapa     | Ti=20 | I=82 |
| #198 Monimbo     | Ti=140 | I=574 |

Comment: The encomiendas assigned to the Crown are a heterogeneous group of small and large encomiendas in both the jurisdictions of Leon and Granada. Some of the encomiendas are obviously clustered and some are not. President Cerrato at least paid lip service to his instrucciones and assigned about one-fifth of the encomiendas to the Crown. Some of the richest encomiendas, such as those in the area of Leon Viejo, Managua, Masaya, Granada, Tezategga, and at least three Maribios towns, Pozoltega, Abangasca, and Cazaloaque. Some of the encomiendas were formerly held by the Conteras family, with others it is impossible to establish a chain of title.

Cross reference: LVIN 1 Cucivina; LVIN 76 Mastega (Mistega); LVIN 53 Nicoya; LVIN 54 Chira; LVIN 5 Mabiti; LVIN 73 Nagaroite; GVIN 53 Togalpa; GVIN 7 Xiteva; GVIN 48 Nenderi; GVIN 52 Solita; LVIN 4 Monmotombo; LVIN 75 Caguato; LVIN 77 Cazaloque; LVIN 78 Potega; LVIN 48 Ayatega; LVIN 18 Pozoltega; LVIN 99 Tezategga (Tezategga); GVIN 55 Totoaque; LVIN 80 Abangasca; LVIN 81 Guayaco; GVIN 24 Dira; GVIN 38 Cagualpa et al.; GVIN 54 Monimbo.

26. El 26 Pedro Sanchez (H) #44 Togalpa | Ti=24 | I=99
Cross reference: LVIN 33 Togalpa

27. El 27 Blasco Porras de Leon (N) #45 Joanagasta | Ti=78 | I=320
Cross reference: LVIN 34 Joanagasta

28. El 28 Pedro Orejon (C) #46 Joanagastilla | Ti=24 | I=99
#47 Mazatega | Ti=44 | I=164
TI total: 68
I total: 263
Comment: For Orejon's political affiliation, see 9 CS 2
Cross reference: LVIN 55 Joanagastilla; LVIN 56 Mazatega.

29. El 29 Ana Ximenez (N) #48 Chichagalpa | Ti=80 | I=328
#49 Tezotaca | Ti=10 | I=41
TI total: 90
I total: 369
Cross reference: LVIN 37 Chichagalpa; LVIN 38 Tezotaca.

30. El 30 Diego de Conteras (C) #50 Zumbazugra | Ti=16 | I=66
#51 Chamalpan | Ti=90 | I=369
TI total: 106
I total: 435
Cross reference: LVIN 39 Zumbazugra; LVIN 40 Chamalpan.

31. El 31 Diego Sanchez (A) #53 Agagalpa | Ti=100
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Astatega</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Pangoa</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Cinodega</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TI total:</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Diego Sanchez was an enemy of both Francisco de Castella and Rodrigo de Contreras, who stripped him of all his encomiendas and office as a Crown scribe. Sanchez escaped from Nicaragua and received a cédula from the Audiencia of Mexico reinstating all of his encomiendas and office of town scribe. Sanchez survived all of his battles with Contreras and in 1548 had one of the larger encomiendas in Nicaragua. See, RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS v. DIEGO SANCHEZ 9 CS 87 (August 29, 1539). Cross reference: LVIN 42 Agagalpa; LVIN 43 Astatega; LVIN 44 Pangua; LVIN 8 Cinodega.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>El 32 Joan de la Calle (H) (N)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mabito</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naborit</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nepuemto</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TI total:</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross reference: LVIN 5 Mabito; LVIN 45 Nepuemto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>El 33 Garcia de Rocs (N)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tencopalpa</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross reference: LVIN 46 Tencopalpa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>El 34 Joan de Salamanca (A)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nandayamo</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ayteaga</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TI total:</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: For his political affiliation, see 11 CS 146 (June 24, 1544). Cross reference: LVIN 47 Nandayamo; LVIN 48 Ayteaga.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>El 35 Peralvarez de Oviedo (N)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ayteaga</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross reference: LVIN 48 Ayteaga.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>El 36 Children of Luis de Guevara (C)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teli(c)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Of these three villages Olomega has been located north of Telica. The other villages have not been located. From their clustering it is possible that they were located close together or at least along a common road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross reference: LVIN 57 Yoaltezande; LVIN 58 Limay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment: Of these three villages Matare is positively located at its present site, Diriondo is perhaps located by Leon Viejo, and Matarejo is not located. They may have been located close together or along a common road. For his political affiliation, see 9 CS 454.

Cross reference: LVIN 62 Matarejo; LVIN 63 Diriondo; LVIN 64 Matare.

Comment: For his political affiliation, see 10 CS 35.

Cross reference: LVIN 10 Capotega.

Comment: For his political affiliation, see 10 CS 584.

Cross reference: LVIN 70 Paynaltega.

Comment: For his political affiliation, see 10 CS 35.

Cross reference: LVIN 71 Toscoaga.

Comment: She was possibly married to Diego de Molina Polanco, which would place her in the Contreras-Rios alliance; there is not enough information presently known to include her in that group; For that reason she is placed in the neutral or unknown group.

Cross reference: LVIN 72 Tonaltega.

THE ENCOMENDEROS OF GRANADA

1. EG 1 Pedro Menor (N) #100 Yatan

Comment: For his political affiliation, see 10 CS 35.

Cross reference: LVIN 1 Yatan.

2. EG 2 Alonso de Orozco (N?) #102 Mulagalpa

Comment: For his political affiliation, see 10 CS 584.

Cross reference: LVIN 3 Mulagalpa; GVIN 27 Nonativa; GVIN 51 Monagalpa.

Comment: For his political affiliation, see 10 CS 35.

Cross reference: GVIN 3 Mulagalpa; GVIN 27 Nonativa; GVIN 51 Monagalpa.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#104 Xintepaque</th>
<th>TI=60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I total:</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross reference: GVIN 4 Mazatepeque; GVIN 5 Xintepaque.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. El 4 Joan Lozano (H) (N)</th>
<th>#105 Achonba</th>
<th>TI=10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#106 Xalteba</td>
<td>I=41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross reference: GVIN 6 Achonba; GVIN 7 Xalteba.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>EG 5 Pedro García (A)</th>
<th>#107 Apapalota</th>
<th>TI=60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I=246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: Pedro García is probably the same Pedro García, EL 6 that owned a small encomienda in the district of Leon. For his political affiliation, see 11 CS 418 (February 10, 1545).

Cross reference: GVIN 8 Apapalota.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>EG 6 Juan Malvasi (N)</th>
<th># 109 Xoxoyta</th>
<th>TI=60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I=246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross reference: GVIN 9 Xoxoyta; GVIN 11 Mohomo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>EG 7 Malcho Malvenas (N)</th>
<th># 109 Zapulco</th>
<th>TI=26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I=107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross reference: GVIN 10 Zapulco.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>EG 8 Juan Izquierdo (A)</th>
<th># 111 Moyogalpa</th>
<th>TI=60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I=246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: For his political affiliation, see 11 CS 405 (January 10, 1545).

Cross reference: GVIN 12 Moyogalpa; GVIN 14 Niatia.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>EG 10 Joan de Segovia (N)</th>
<th># 112 Guatepeque</th>
<th>TI=56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># 115 Minarote</td>
<td>TI=40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># 141 Mayaques</td>
<td>TI=300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross reference: GVIN 16 Minarote; GVIN 33 Mayaques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>EG 11 Juan de Moger (N)</th>
<th># 116 Xionbo</th>
<th>TI=21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I=86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: There is a mention of Moger at 9 CS 723 which may indicate an affiliation, but the proofs are too flimsy.

Cross reference: GVIN 17 Xionbo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>EG 12 Juan Davila (N)</th>
<th># 117 Masaya</th>
<th>TI=110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># 118 Xalteba</td>
<td>TI=30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I=125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross reference: GVIN 18 Masaya; GVIN 7 Xalteba.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>EG 13 Pero Ximenez (N)</th>
<th># 119 Diriomo</th>
<th>TI=10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I=41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross reference: GVIN 19 Diriomo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>EG 14 Francisco Ruiz (C)</th>
<th># 120 Manbaco &amp;</th>
<th>TI=80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susujeto</td>
<td>I=328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comment: For his political affiliation, see 15 CS 232, 484.

Cross reference: GVIN 20 Mombacho & Susjeto

15. EG 15 Gonzalo de Malgarcejo (H)(A) # 121 Nanborima

# 122 Xalteba
TI=15
I=62
TI total: 75
I total: 308

132 Xalteba
TI=10
I=41
TI total: 70
I total: 287

Cross reference: GVIN 5 Xinoitepe; GVIN 7 Xalteba.

20. EG 20 Juan de Jaen (N)

# 129 Loma
TI=40
I=164

# 139 Zoogalpa
TI=70
I=287

# 140 Zoyagalpa
TI=30
I=125

TI total: 140
I total: 574


16. EG 16 Cristobal de Sant Martin (N)

# 123 Managua
TI=100
I=410

# 124 Xalteba
TI=10
I=41

TI total: 100
I total: 451

Cross reference: LVIN 55 Managua; GVIN 7 Xalteba.

17. EG 17 Luis de Guevara (C)

# 125 Nontiba
TI=110
I=451

# 126 Marinalte
TI=5
I=21

TI total: 115
I total: 472

Comment: It is unclear who this person was. Luis de Guevara was the chief encomendero of the Contreras-Rios alliance. He died in 1545. This may be a clerical error or perhaps a son of Luis de Guevara not included in the hijos de Luis Guevara category. It must have been Bishop Valdivieso living to see this encomienda, since he had fought with the Contreras-Rios group for years. He reported that God killed Luis de Guevara. Soon afterward, Contreras’ sons killed Valdivieso.

Cross reference: GVIN 22 Nontiba; GVIN 23 Marinalte.

18. EG 18 Francisco Romero (A)

# 127 Deria
TI=75
I=308


19. EG 19 Alonso Ruiz (H)(N)

# 128 Xinoitepe
TI=60
I=246

# 136 Masitande
TI=35
I=144

# 151 Masaya
TI=110
I=451

# 152 Xalteba
TI=5
I=21

TI total: 150
I total: 615


23. EG 23 Bernardino de Miranda (A)

# 135 Nandayme
TI=100
I=410

Cross reference: GVIN 26 Diriamba; GVIN 47 Chiugalpa.

24. EG 24 Francisco Sanchez (A)

# 136 Masitande
TI=35
I=144

# 151 Masaya
TI=110
I=451

# 152 Xalteba
TI=5
I=21

TI total: 150
I total: 615

Comment: Francisco Sanchez was one of Contreras' oldest enemies in Nicaragua, along with Diego Sanchez. The awarding of encomiendas with 150 Indians surely indicates that Cerrato was trying to be even handed in his restructuring of the encomiendas of Nicaragua.
Cross reference: GVIN 29 Masitrande; GVIN 18 Masaya; GVIN 7 Xalteba.

25. EG 25 Diego de Pastrana (H) (A) # 137 Tipitupa
   TI=20
   I=82
   # 138 Managua
   TI=10
   I=41
   TI total: 30
   I total: 145
Comment: For his political affiliation, see 11 CS 405 (January 10, 1545).
Cross reference: GVIN 30 Tipitupa; LVIN 55 Managua.

26. EG 26 Texerina (H) (A) # 142 Niquenohomo
   TI=120
   I=492
   # 143 Xalteba
   TI=15
   I=62
   TI total: 135
   I total: 554
Comment: For his political affiliation, see 11 CS 362. (November 28, 1544).
Cross reference: GVIN 34 Niquenohomo; GVIN 7 Xalteba.

27. EG 27 Bartolome Tello (A) # 144 Marinalte
   TI=40
   I=164
   # 145 Mandapio & Manbach
   TI=90
   I=369
   TI total: 130
   I total: 533
Comment: Bartolome Tello was another bitter enemy of the Contreras-Rios alliance. He tried unsuccessfully to have the Audiencia of Panama and Contreras' and Rios' rule. See, for example, ALONSO CALERO AND BARTOLOME TELLO v. PEDRO DE LOS RIOS AND MARIA DE PEÑALOSA, 8 CS 1 (June 23, 1543); BARTOLOME TELLO v. RODRIGO DE CONTRERAS, 8 CS 382 (February 11, 1544).
Cross reference: GVIN 23 Marinalte; GVIN 35 Mandapio Manbach.

28. EG 28 Marcos Alaman (A) # 146 Delederia
   TI=50
   I=246
   # 147 Dericondo
   TI=37
   I=152
   # 169 Xalteba
   TI=8
   I=33
   TI total: 105
   I total: 431
Comment: For his political affiliation, see 9 CS 140, 147, 317
Cross reference: GVIN 24 Diriia; GVIN 19 Diriioso; GVIN 7 Xalteba.

29. EG 29 Children of Suarez (A) # 148 Nandayme
   TI=51
   I=209
Comment: These children received this encomienda because they won the lawsuit of JUAN GALLEGOS, GUARDIAN OF THE CHILDREN OF JUAN SANCHEZ v. JUAN CARBALLO, 13 CS 305. (October 27, 1543). Contreras stole this encomienda and awarded it to Caballo, a crony of his.

30. EG 30 Francisco Gutierrez (C) # 149 Nicaragua & Guatgalpa
   TI=19
   I=488
   # 150 Xalteba
   TI=13
   I=53
   # 165 Canegn
   TI=75
   I=308
   TI total: 207
   I total: 849
Comment: These encomiendas were quite spread out, from Xalteba to the far reaches of Spanish control in the Nicoya region. For his political affiliation, see 15 CS 232, 484.
Cross reference: GVIN 36 Nicaragua; GVIN 7 Xalteba; GVIN 42 Canegn.

31. EG 31 Joan Carvallo (C) # 153 Nicaragua
   TI=100
   I=410
   # 154 Nandayme
   TI=80
   I=328
   # 155 Martinorote
   TI=50
   I=125
   TI total: 210
   I total: 861
Comment: Carvallo, or Caballo, was the defendant in the case of JUAN GALLEGOS, GUARDIAN OF THE WIDOW AND CHILDREN OF JUAN SANCHEZ v. JUAN CARBALLO, 13 CS 305. (October 27, 1543). The case was still on appeal when the tasacion of 1548 was completed and Carballo lost his encomienda of Nandayme in the Consejo de las Indias.
Cross reference: GVIN 36 Nicaragua; GVIN 28 Nandayme; GVIN 37 Martinorote.

32. EG 32 Benito Diaz (C) # 156 Cugalpa et all
   TI=300
   I=1230
Comment: For his political affiliation, see 9 CS 372
Cross reference: GVIN 38 Cugalpa et all.

33. EG 33 Luis de la Rocha (H) (N) # 158 Isla de Nicaragua
   TI=113
37. EG 37 Andrés de Sevilla (A) #170 Tenami TL=29 I=119
#171 Xalteba TL=3 I=12
#172 Nicaragua TL=10 I=41
TI total: 42 I total: 172
Comment: For his political affiliation, see 10 CS 35; 10 CS 584.
Cross reference: GVIN 44 Tenami; GVIN 7 Xalteba; GVIN 36 Nicaragua.

38. EG 38 Francisco Fernandez (A) #173 Nandamacalata TL=50 I=204
Comment: For his political affiliation, see 11 CS 418.
Cross reference: GVIN 45 Nandamacalata.

39. EG 39 Miguel de la Costa (N) #179 Capandi TL=80 I=328
#180 Delheria TL=60 I=328
#181 Xicogalpa TL=160 I=656
TI total: 160 I total: 1656
Cross reference: GVIN 49 Capandi; GVIN 24 Deria.

40. EG 40 Diego Bermudez (C) #181 Xicogalpa TL=45 I=185
Comment: For his political affiliation, see 15 CS 232, 484.
Cross reference: GVIN 50

41. EG 41 Tiente Fuentes (N) #195 Mazagalpa TL=60 I=246
Cross reference: GVIN 27 Mazagalpa.

---

1 Each encomendero has been assigned an encomendero number, El refers to an encomendero from Leon; EG refers to an encomendero from Granada.
Appendix 7

Tax Receipts From The Slave Trade, 1527-1528

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROWN RECEIPTS FROM THE ENSLAVEMENT OF INDIANS</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 17 CS at 346</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>July 24, 1528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 17 CS at 346</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>May 11, 1527 to July 10, 1528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 17 CS at 347</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>August 1, 1527 to December 31, 1527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 17 CS at 347</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>February 4, 1528 to July 9, 1528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 17 CS at 348</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>July 29, 1527 to October 3, 1528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 17 CS at 348</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>July 29, 1528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 17 CS at 348</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>July 30, 1528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 17 CS at 407</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>January 20, 1528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 17 CS at 407</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>January 20, 1528&lt;sup&gt;iii&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 17 CS at 408</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>January 20, 1529&lt;sup&gt;iv&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 17 CS at 414</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>January 20, 1529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 17 CS at 415</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>January, 1529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>7,368 p, 6 t, 5 gr&lt;sup&gt;v&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact left out of these ledger entries is how many Indians the taxes represent. It is clear they represent 20% of the value, or sale price, of Indian slaves. Cereceda did not quite follow his instrucciones since they specified that the amount of Indians branded, or gold smelted, must also be stated, to cut down on the possibility of fraud. Pedro de los Ríos recognized this problem and refused to take charge of the Crown books in 1532 until there had been an audit of Cereceda's books as well as those of his successor, Juan Tellez Nuñez. That audit appears as part of the audit found in IN RE PEDRO DE LOS RÍOS, 16 CS 7, (September 17, 1550) and is dated February 22, 1553.

A large amount of due, but unpaid receipts were discovered in the books of Cereceda (Crown treasurer from July 1527 to 1528), and Ríos insisted that he not be responsible for recovering those debts owed to the Crown since many of the people owing those tax assessments were either dead, gone from Nicaragua, or uncollectible— they were all "bad debts" in the colony of Nicaragua.<sup>vi</sup>

DEBTS OWING AND UNPAID FROM THE TAXING OF INDIAN SLAVES

FIFTH COPY<sup>iii</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner and number of Indians</th>
<th>From Where</th>
<th>Amount Owed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Hernan Gonzalez, by Diego Ayala, 3 Indians</td>
<td>The mines</td>
<td>3p, 4t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Anton Negro of Granada, 2 Indians</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1p, 1t, 7gr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ysabel Flores, wife of Juan Martin, 2 Indians</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Christoval Folego, 2 Indians</td>
<td>mines (guarnicion)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Antonio de Cabrera, 3 Indians</td>
<td>Gualtepeo</td>
<td>2p, 4t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Hernan Valiente, 6 Indians</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>6p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Joan Zabano of Leon, 1 Indian</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>1p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Andreas Morales, 7 Indians</td>
<td>mines (guarnicion)</td>
<td>4p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Antonio Nogro, 15 Indians</td>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>11p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Christoval de Segovia, son of Alonso de Segovia, 3 Indians</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Alonso Roman, 2 Indians</td>
<td>Maribios</td>
<td>3p, 4t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 Alonso Roman, from the cattle herds of the Desollados,  
4 Indians  
Maribios  
3p, 4t

13 Hernan Valiente,  
1 Indian  
Leon  
4t

14 Gonzalo Cano  
? In the estancia of Martin Esterie  
2p

15 Anton Nogro,  
2 Indians  
Granada  
1p, 1t, 7gr

16 Andres de Morales,  
or Mateo Sanchez,  
3 Indians  
In the guarnicion, he returned from Chuloteca(Chortega)  
1p, 2t

17 Bernaldino de Miranda,  
1 Indian  
Granada  
6t

18 Dona Maria de Narvaez,  
or Alonso Tellez her husband, 1 Indian  
Unknown  
1p, 1t, 7gr

19 Christoval Moreno,  
3 Indians  
In the mines, for the estate of Andres Munoz and Moreno  
3p

Subtotals: 19 transactions; 5 from the mines, 4 from Leon, 3 from Granada; 61 Indians; Taxes assessed: 52p, 9 gr, or 0 85p per Indian

SIXTH COPY:

1 Baltasar de Herrera,  
1 Indian  
The mines  
1p, 1t, 7gr

2 Anton Ramos,  
1 Indian  
Unknown  
1p

3 Hernan Valiente,  

8 Indians  
Leon  
7p

4 Luis Daca,  
2 Indians  
Unknown  
1p, 4t

5 Joan de San Martin,  
1 Indian  
Unknown  
1p, 4t

Subtotals: 5 transactions; 1 from the mines, 1 from Leon; 13 Indians; taxes assessed: 12p 2t, 7gr; assessment of 0 85p per Indian

SEVENTH COPY:

1 Alonso de Villabueno,  
7 Indians  
In the golf(?)  
4t

2 Pero Martin,  
1 Indian  
In the golf  
1p

3 Anton Nogro,  
4 Indians  
from Granada  
3p, 4t

4 Joan Ochoa de Bilbao  
from Leon  
3p

Subtotals: 4 transactions, 2 from the golf (San Lucar possibly), 1 from Granada, 1 from Leon; 10 Indians; taxes assessed: 11p, 4t.

EIGHTH COPY:

1 Joan Lopez de Toledo  
1 Indian  
from the mines  
1p

2 Joan de Leyba  
4 Indians  
Unknown  
3p

Totals: 30 transactions, 89 Indians, 79p, 7t, 4gr; taxes assessed per Indian: 0 896 pesos per Indian

A second accounting was reported that covered the unpaid assessment of taxes on slaving from August to December 31, 1527, during the time of Cereceda's tenure as Crown accountant.

SECOND GROUP OF UNPAID TAX ASSESSMENTS RELATING TO SLAVES
Owner and Number of Indians From Where Amount Owed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Francisco Martín de Lorca</td>
<td>1p, 4t</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>from the mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hernando de Cartaya,</td>
<td>6p, 2t</td>
<td>from Leon</td>
<td>from Leon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Luis de Jaen</td>
<td>7p</td>
<td>from Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alonso de Carmona,</td>
<td>6t, 5gr</td>
<td>from Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Luis de Jaen</td>
<td>2p, 3t, 5gr</td>
<td>from Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Joan Zarbano</td>
<td>1p, 1t, 5gr</td>
<td>from Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Joan de Balmaesteda</td>
<td>14p</td>
<td>from Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Anton de Bargas</td>
<td>2p, 6t, 5gr</td>
<td>from Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Joan de Evas</td>
<td>4p, 4t</td>
<td>from Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Antonio de Lugones</td>
<td>1p, 1t</td>
<td>from the mines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Doña María, wife of Juan Carilio</td>
<td>19p, 5t, 7gr</td>
<td>from Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bernaldino de Miranda</td>
<td>1p, 6t, 5gr</td>
<td>from Granada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Antonio de Lugones</td>
<td>3p</td>
<td>from the mines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nicolas Nunez</td>
<td>22p</td>
<td>from Granada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Francisco Guerrero</td>
<td>6p</td>
<td>from the mines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Christoval Folego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hernando de Vega</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trompeta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Benito Díaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Alonso Maltes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Alonso Bivas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Diego Machuca de Zaaco &amp; Joan de Barrientos</td>
<td>13 p still owing</td>
<td>from Granada</td>
<td>13 p still owing from 26 originally owing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jeyme Forniel (deceased)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Joan Gomez de Jaen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Francisco de Milan el Viejo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Christoval Fulego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Joan de Moger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pedro de Robles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Alonso Bivas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Melchior Martines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. Joan Palma (deceased),
11 Indians

31. Luis Manuel,
1 Indian

Unknown
from Chinandega

12p
6t

Totals: 31 transactions, 9 from Leon, 4 from the mines, 12 from Granada, 1 from Chinandega; 142 Indians; taxes assessed and unpaid: 197p, 10gr; average tax assessed per Indian: 1.38 pesos

---

1 See, IN RE ACCOUNTING OF CERECEDA, (17 CS 302, 1550).

2 La pesa de buen oro, 450 maravedis to the peso, eight tomines to the peso and 12 gramos to the tomin. At a gold price of 310d per troy ounce, the peso was worth about $25.

3 This entry appears to have been an IOU since it was not paid.

4 This entry also appears to not have been paid.

5 For clarity, the tomines and gramos have been left out of the columns but were calculated from the ledger entries. The total includes the tomines and gramos.

6 These ledger entries are found at 16 CS 374 et seq. and include the administration of Cerceda as Crown accountant, July 1527 to July, 1528. The tax assessments were made by Diego Saavedra at Brunelas and Francisco Rodriguez at Villa Hermosa (probably representing transactions that occurred before January 21, 1527 when Villa Hermosa was destroyed in an Indian attack). No ledger entries are found naming El Rodalje, or Puerto de la Pasion as the place of tax assessment.

7 What "fifth copy" means is unclear. It may refer to the fact that tax ledgers were made in multiple copies, or that "copy" in this context means separate ledger entry for a series of related transactions.

8 This data is found at 16 CS 446.

9 This debt was to have been paid by his administrator, 16 CS at 395.

10 These slaves came from the household of Luis de Guevara in Granada.
Appendix 8

The Tasación of 1581

THE ENCOMIENDAS OF 1581

Though partly illegible, the encomiendas of the census of 1581 comprise the best source of ethnographic and geographical information that exists about the Indian populations of the later part of the sixteenth century. Each encomienda has been abstracted and summarized below in the order in which they appear in the microfilm. As with the tasación of 1548 each encomienda was given a reference number: E1 means the first encomienda found in the census, E2 the second, and so on. The same symbols for ethnic group of Indians and whether they have been located as used in Chapter Four are used in this work. Lastly, it should be noted that the information in the tasación is found in two different sorts of documents. The vast majority of pages comprise the actual tally sheets where the name of each person counted is noted, and an "x" placed by their name. The summaries of the tally sheets, probably prepared after the head counting was complete comprise the other sort of document found in the tasación.

THE ENCOMIENDAS OF DIRIA

1. El Diríananguex (Ch) (L)
Encomendero: None listed
Tribute: None listed
Tl= 39
I= 134
Cross Reference: GVIN 24
Comment: Encomiendas #1-10 are found only in the summary section of the census. It is possible that the tally sheets are found among the illegible sheets.

2. E2 Diriangojutato (Ch) (L)
Encomendero: None listed
Tribute: None listed
Tl= 55
I= 138
Cross Reference: GVIN 24
Comment: See comment for E1.

3. E3 Diría (Ch) (L)
Encomendero: None Listed
Tribute: None listed
Tl= 56?
I= 240
Cross Reference: GVIN 24
Comment: See comment for E1.

4. E4 Diría (Ch) (L)
Encomendero: None listed

5. E5 otro Diria (Ch) (L)
Encomendero: None listed
Tribute: None listed
Tl= 59
I= 223
Cross Reference: GVIN 24
Comment: See comment for E1.

6. E6 Diriromo (Ch) (L)
Encomendero: None Listed
Tribute: None listed
Tl= 54
I= 224
Cross Reference: GVIN 19
Comment: See comment E1.

7. E7 otro Diriromo (Ch)(L)
Encomendero: None listed
Tribute: None listed
Tl= 43
I= 166
Cross Reference: GVIN 19
Comment: See comment E1.

8. E8 otro Diriromo (Ch) (L)
Encomendero: None listed
Tribute: None listed
Tl= 74
I= 279
Cross Reference: GVIN 19
Comment: See comment E1.

9. E9 Nomativa (Ch) (L)
Encomendero: None listed
Tribute: None listed
Tl= 74
I= 240
Cross Reference: GVIN 27
Comment: See comment E1.
10. El10 Oto Nomativa (Ch) (L)
Encomendero: None listed
Tribute: None listed
T= 62
I= 240
Cross Reference: GVIN 17
Comment: Tribute Assessment listed in the summaries: "Estos dan de tributo una manta que vale veinte reales, una gallina vale dos reales, y un cuartillo de mel que vale un real, un almud de sal... y sembran un almud de maíz y frijol." (Tasación 1581: 176-177)

THE PROVINCIA OF NANDAYME (Information recorded by Sebastian de Morales)

11. E11 (No name I assume it's Nandayme) (Tasación 1581: 6)
Encomendero: Not listed (A page may be missing)
Tribute: (1) Dos telas de seis brazos de largos, tres quartos de ancho
T= 66
I= 265
Cross Reference: GVIN 28
Comment:

12. E12 Oto Nandayme (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 27)
Encomendero: Alonso Xúarez
Tribute: (1) 27 Telas de algodon de seis brazos de largo y 3/4 de ancho
(2) 27 gallinas de Castilla
(3) 10 almudes de frijoles
(4) Una fanega y media de almud de sal
(5) Siembran dos fanegas y un almud de maíz en dos semeneras
T= 23
I= 81
Cross Reference: GVIN 28
Comment:

13. E13 Oto Nandayme (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 29)
Encomendero: Baltazar Carballo
Tribute: 
(1) 17 telas de seis brazos de largo y 3/4 de ancho
(2) 17 gallinas de Castilla
(3) 7 almudes de frijoles
(4) 9 almudes de sal
(5) 18 almudes de maíz sembran en dos semeneras.
T= 17
I= 62
Cross Reference: GVIN 28
Comment:

14. E14 Minarote (Ch) (L)
Encomendero: Unclear
Tribute: Unclear
T= 14
I= 57
Cross Reference: GVIN 16
Comment: The references in the Tasación to this village and encomienda are ambiguous and it is unclear where this is the encomienda listed on page 23 or not

15. E15 Noma (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 21)
Encomendero: Pablo del Rey (?), vecino de Granada
Tribute: 
(1) 17 telas de 6 brazas de largo y 3/4 de ancho
(2) 17 gallinas de Castilla
(3) media fanega de frijoles
(4) almud y media de sal
(5) 16 almudes de maíz sembran en dos semeneras
T= 16
I= 66
Cross Reference: GVIN 25
Comment: 

16. E16 Diriambari (probably Diriaamba) (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 19)
Encomendero: Ana Gutierrez, viuda vecino de Granada
Tribute: 
(1) Ocho telas de seis brazos de largo y 3/4 de ancho
(2) Tres almudes de frijoles
(3) Cuatro almudes de sal
(4) Ocho almudes en semeneras de maíz
(5) En cada año se tienen que sembrar cuatro almud en cada sementera, invierno y verano
T= 11
I= 28
Cross Reference: GVIN 26
Comment:

17. E17 otro Minarote (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 23)
Encomendero: Baltazar Carballo
Tribute: 
(1) 13 telas de algodon seis brazos de largo y 3/4 de ancho
(2) 13 gallinas de Castilla
(3) Media fanega de
(4) Un almud de sal en cada año
(5) 14 almudes de maíz sembran en dos semeneras, una en invierno, otra verano
T= 8
I= 35
18. E18 Masianta (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 18)
Encomendado: Zamaco Rodriguez (?)
Tribute:
(1) Not listed.
TI= 2
I= 13
Cross Reference: GVIN 29

19. E19 Xinotepe (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 9)
Encomendado: Andrea de Cerceda, vecino de Granada
Tribute:
(1) 87 mantas de dos brazos, tres quartos de ancho;
(2) ______ quartillos de miel
(3) ______ almudes y media de ________
(4) Siembran cada año ______ almudes de maiza, En cada de dos sementeras...
TI= 84
I= 258
Cross reference: GVIN 5

20. E20 otro Xinotepe (Ch)(L) (Tasación 1581: 11)
Encomendado: Antonio de Opinega (?) vecino de Granada.
Tribute:
(1) 92 mantas de tres piernas_______tiene cada pieza dos brazos y media de largo y 3/4 de ancho.
(2) 92 gallinas de Castilla
(3) ______ quartillos de miel
(4) Tres fanegas y almidad de sal
(5) Tres fanegas y 10 almudes de maiza sembran en dos sementeras
TI= 89
I= 269
Cross Reference: GVIN 5

21. E21 Pozoltega (M) (L) (Tasación 1581: 52)
Encomendado: The Crown
Tribute: Mantas listadas de azul y blanco, gallinas de castilla y sal y maiz.
TI= 40
I= 151
Cross Reference: LVIN 18

22. E22 Abangasca (M) (L) (Tasación 1581: 52)
Encomendado: The Crown
Tribute: Mantas listadas y gallinas de castilla miel sal y maiz
TI= 28
I= 89
Cross Reference: LVIN 80

23. E23 Pozolteguilla (M) (L) (Tasación 1581: 52)
Encomendado: The Crown
Tribute: mantas listadas de azul y blanco y gallinas de castilla y miel y sal y maiz.
TI= 56
I= 221
Cross Reference: LVIN 18

24. E24 Mingalpa(U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 52)
Encomendado: Leon de Aguilar
Tribute: Mantas listadas de azul y blanco y gallinas de Castilla, myel, sal y maiz.
TI= 36
I= 141
Cross Reference: LVIN 20

25. E25 Tastega (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 52)
Encomendado: Diego de Trejo (?)
Tribute: mantas listadas y gallinas de Castilla, myel y sal y maiz.
TI= 13
I= 51
Cross Reference: LVIN 56

26. E26 Guazama (G) (L) (Tasación 1581: 53)
Encomendado: Jesus Bercer
Tribute: mantas listadas de azul y blanco y gallinas de Castilla y sal y myel y maiz.
TI= 27
I= 52
Cross Reference: LVIN 16

27. E27 Chichigalpa (M) (L) (Tasación 1581: 54)
Encomendado: De Su Magestad
Tribute: gallinas de Castilla, mantas listadas de azul y blanco y alpargatas y sal y maiz.
TI= 72
28. E28 Mazateca (M) (Tasación 1581: 54)
  Encomendero: Juan Gaytan
  Tributo: Mantas listadas de azul y blanco y sal y alpargatas y maíz.
  Tl= 40
  I= 155
  Cross Reference: LVIN 36
  Comment:

29. E29 Ysalotega (U) (Tasación 1581: 54)
  Encomendero: Miguel de Guaza
  Tributo: Mantas listadas de blanco y azul y alpargatas y sal y maíz
  Tl= 36
  I= 144
  Cross Reference: LVIN 50? Azolotega?
  Comment:

30. E30 Tosotecinte (U) (?)(Tasación 1581: 54)
  Encomendero: Noel Espino
  Tributo: Mantas listadas de azul y blanco y sal y alpargatas y maíz.
  Tl= 6
  I= 35
  Cross Reference:
  Comment: This pueblo has been tentatively located at its present location in Nueva Segovia.
  The fact that is listed with obviously Maribios villages located between Sutiaba and Chinandega
  with an identical tribute pattern may indicate that this pueblo was actually located in the
  vicinity of the main Maribios settlements in northwestern Nicaragua.

31. E31 Tosta (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 55)
  Encomendero: Gaspar de Brieno
  Tributo: Gallinas de Castilla, Mantas listadas de azul y blancos y alpargatas y sal y maíz.
  Tl= 45
  I= 130
  Cross Reference: LVIN 30
  Comment:

32. E32 Guateco (M) (Tasación 1581: 134)
  Encomendero: Francisco de los Dios
  Tributo: Not specifically listed; it may be listed in the summary sheets. It does mention vides,
  dan media manta y una gallina de Castilla.
  Tl= 57
  I= 257
  Cross Reference: LVIN 11
  Comment:

33. E33 Chamalpan (U) (Tasación 1581: 136)
  Encomendero: Bbia (or Bia) de Castanza
  Tributo: None listed
  Tl= 64
  I= 158
  Cross Reference: LVIN 40
  Comment:

34. E34 Agagalpa (U) (L) (Tasación 1581: 137)
  Encomendero: Melchor
  Tributo: None listed
  Tl= 32
  I= 158
  Cross Reference: LVIN 42
  Comment:

35. E35 Guanajaste (Chl) (L) (Tasación 1581: 138)
  Encomendero: Juan de____
  Tributo: Not Listed
  Tl= 26
  I= 83
  Cross Reference: LVIN 34
  Comment:

36. E36 Potega (U) (L) (Tasación 1581: 139)
  Encomendero: Juan____
  Tributo: Not Listed
  Tl= 35
  I= 133
  Cross Reference: LVIN 78
  Comment:

37. E37 Mistega (M) (L) (Tasación 1581: 140)
  Encomendero: El Rey
  Tributo: Not Listed except the, “Vuidas pagan media manta y una gallina no otra cosa.”
  Tl= 39
  I= 155
  Cross Reference: LVIN 76
  Comment:

38. E38 Aytega (N) (U) (Tasación 1581:141)
  Encomendero: del Rey
  Tributo: Not Listed
39. E39 Cozibina (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 141)
Encomendero: Antonio del Tapia
Tf= 36
I= 134
Cross Reference: LVIN 1
Comment:

40. E40 Tepostega (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 142)
Encomendero: Juan de Gallegos
Tf= 21
I= 92
Cross Reference: LVIN 28
Comment:

41. E41 Teotega (U) (L) (Tasación 1581: 142)
Encomendero: De _______
Tf= 24
I= 115
Cross Reference: LVIN 29
Comment:

42. E42 otro Teotega (U) (L) (Tasación 1581: 143)
Encomendero: Doña Petromila ?
Tf= 36
I= 123
Cross Reference: LVIN 29
Comment:

43. E43 Totogalpa (U) (L?) (Tasación 1481: 144)
Encomendero: Doña Ana Xiron o su hijo
Tf= 5
I= 23
Cross Reference: LVIN 33

Comment:

44. E44 Colama (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 144)
Encomendero: Felix de Gaitada
Tf= 7
I= 29
Cross Reference: 26
Comment:

45. E45 Omagua (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 145)
Encomendero: Juan Arias Riquel
Tf= 7
I= 33
Cross Reference:?
Comment:

46. E46 Ocozma (M?) (L?) (Tasación 1581: 145)
Encomendero: Galgiller Salazar
Tf= 11
I= 31
Cross Reference:?
Comment:

47. E47 Pangua (M) (L) (Tasación 1581: 145)
Encomendero: Juan Arias de Melchior
Tf= 7
I= 25
Cross Reference: LVIN 44
Comment:

48. E48 Gualteveo (M) (L) (Tasación 1581: 145)
Encomendero: Joan de Hinojosa
Tf= 34
I= 152
Cross Reference: LVIN 11
Comment:

49. E49 Chinandega (N) (L) (Tasación 1581: 146)
Encomendero: Illegible
Tf= Not Listed
Tf= 70
Comment: "Los reservados no pagan tributo."
Cross Reference: LVIN 32

Comment:

50. E50 Tezuatega (N) (L) (Tasación 1581: 148)
Encomendero: _____ de Miranda
Tribute: Not Listed generally  "... que pagan una manta y una gallina y no otra cosa"
T= 50
I= 190
Cross Reference: LVIN 79
Comment:

51. E51 Tezateguilla (N) (L) (Tasación 1581: 149)
Encomendero: De Su Magestad
Tribute: Not Listed
T= 6
I= 23
Cross Reference: LVIN 79
Comment:

52. E52 Mazagalpa (?) (?) (Tasación 1581: 149)
Encomendero: _____ de Diego
Tribute: Not Listed.
T= 34
I= 131
Cross Reference: LVIN 27
Comment: This encomienda is a mystery. Mazagalpa was listed as one of the major encomiendas of Managua. The listing of this encomienda along with several villages of Matibios Indian villages in the Chinandega area is unexplained.

53. E53 Cebaco (?) (L) (Tasación 1581: 268)
Encomendero: La Corona
Tribute: Not Listed
T= 37
I= 210
Cross Reference: None
Comment:

54. E54 Migagalpa (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 270)
Encomendero: Not Listed (maybe it is included in the possessions of the Crown).
Tribute: Not Listed
T= 31
I= 150
Cross Reference: ?

Comment: It may have been located next to Cebaco since the notation for this encomienda is found right after that of Cebaco and it begins, "Estando tambien juntos el pueblo de Migagalpa..."

55. E55 Ystagalpa (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 271)
Encomendero: Not Listed. The cacique is listed as Don Antonio de Contreras.
Tribute:
(1) 22 viudas pay tribute
(2) Tribute for everyone: Una manta
(3) Casados:
   (1) Una manta listada
   (2) Ciento y dos gallinas
   (3) 80 quartillas de miel
   (4) 20 petates
   (5) sembran en dos sembreras en cada año...
   (6) 6 or 8 almudes de maíz
   (7) pagan esto los Indios y las viudas. Los viejos no pagan nada.

Cross Reference: ?
Comment:

56. E56 Olocoton (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 172)
Encomendero: Doña Isabel Cerrato
Tribute: Not Listed separately
T= 12
I= 47 (reported 40)
Cross Reference: LVIN 2
Comment:

57. E57 Guaxinja (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 172)
Encomendero: Felipe Baltodano
Tribute: Not Listed separately
T= 10
I= 40 (reported 38)
Cross Reference: ? One of the Guanecastes?
Comment:

58. E58 Olomega (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 172)
Encomendero: Doña Isabel de Cazada
Tribute: Not Listed separately
T= 12
I= 33 (reported 31)
Cross Reference: LVIN 61
Comment:

59. E59 otro Olocoton (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 172)
Encomendero: Antonio de Tapia
Tribute: Not Listed separately
TI= 18
I= 68 (reported 66)
Cross Reference: LVIN 2
Comment:

60. E60 Condega (Chl) (L) (Tasación 1581: 172)
Encomendero: Gomez Cezon de Meza
Tribute: Not Listed Separately
TI= 21
I= 85
Cross Reference: LVIN 31
Comment:

61. E61 Cnotto (Chl) (L) (Tasación 1581: 172)
Encomendero: ___ Gaitan
Tribute: Not Listed separately.
TI= 52
I= 169 (reported 167)
Cross Reference: LVIN 31?
Comment:

62. E62 Gauzana (G) (L) (Tasación 1581:7)
Encomendero:
Tribute:
TI= 22
I= 81
Cross Reference:
Comment: LVIN 16

63. E63 Cusivina (U) (L) (Tasación 1581:7)
Encomendero:
Tribute:
TI= 12
I= 47
Cross Reference: LVIN 1
Comment:

64. E64 otro Cusivina (U) (L) (Tasación 1581:7)
Encomendero:
Tribute:
TI= 12
I= 61
Cross Reference: LVIN 1

Comment: “... que es junto con el otro”

65. E65 Ximotega (U) (L) (Tasación 1581: 277)
Encomendero: ___ Muñoz, vecino de la ciudad de La Nueva Segovia.
Tribute:
1) 62 telas y media
2) 30 petates
3) 77 gallinas
4) 4 quartillos de maiz (?)
TI= 91
I= 290
Cross Reference: None
Comment: “dos leguas y media que de Cebaco, cabeza del partido” This may be tortured syntax and may refer instead to the twin villages of Linaguina and Pinaguina, which may have been located that distance from Cebaco on the old road to Matagalpa and Jinotega.

66. E66 Matagalpa (U) (L) (Tasación 1581: 280)
Encomendero: Baltasar de Vino, vecino de la ciudad de la Nueva Segovia
Tribute:
1) 56 telas y media
2) 77 gallinas
3) 46 Quartillos de miel
4) Fanega y media de frijoles; and/ or 1 almud de maiz to be planted in two sementeras
TI= 32
I= 155
Cross Reference: None
Comment: It was located five leguas from Jinotega

67. E67 Solingalpa(U) (L) (Tasación 1581: 281-282)
Encomendero: Doña Beatriz, viuda de Aguilar, vecino de la ciudad de la Nueva Segovia
Tribute:
1) 29 telas
2) 38 gallinas
3) Una fanega de frijoles
4) 20 quartillos de miel
5) Senbran 20 almudes de maiz en dos sementeras...
TI= 18
I= 92
Cross Reference: None
Comment: It was located 1/4 or 1/2 legua west of Matagalpa

68. E68 Conolague or Molague (U) (L) (Tasación 1581: 283)
Encomendero: Doña Beatriz viuda y Ana Cavalllos.
Tribute:
1) 23 mantas azul listedas
2) 29 gallinas
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(3) 17 quartillos de miel
(4) 7 almudes de frijoles
(5) 16 almudes (maiz?) en dos sementeras
(6) Pagan tributo 20 Indios casados y dos viudas; los solteros no pagan tributo

Tl= 20
I= 98
Cross Reference: None
Comment: Ese pueblo queda de este pueblo de Solingalpa al de Molaguina media legua

69 E69 Diúinba (CH) (L) (Tasación 1581: 16)
Encomendero: Gerardo que Reza de Granada
Tribute:
(1) 41 telas de siete brazos de largo y tres quartos de ancho
(2) 41 quartillos de miel
(3) una fanega y dos almudes y media de sal
(4) dos fanegas y 14 almudes de maiz; senbran 1/2 almad en cada una sementera verano y invierno.

Tl= 42
I= 155
Cross Reference: GVIN 26
Comment:

70 E70 Nandayota (U) (Ch) (Tasación 1581: 48)
Encomendero: Miguel Rromero, vecino de la ciudad de Granada
Tribute:
(1) Diez telas de 6 brazos de largo y 3/4 de ancho
(2) 9 quartillos de miel
(3) 4 almudes de sal
(4) 4 almudes de sal
(5) dos sementeras de maiz y en cada una dellas senbran 4 almudes de maiz.

Tl= 9
I= 40
Cross Reference: GVIN 43
Comment:

71 E71 Papatota (Ch) (U) (Tasación 1581: 7)
Encomendero:
Tribute:
Tl= 18
I= 61
Cross Reference: GVIN 8
Comment:

72 E72 Niquinohomo (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 32)
Encomendero: Luis de Pineda de al ciudad de Granada
Tribute:

(1) 181 telas, la mitad en manta de 3 piernas de largo y la mitad de 6 piernas de largo
(2) 197 gallinas de Castilla
(3) 166 quartillos de miel
(4) 7 fanegas y 3 almudes de sal
(5) senbran 2 sementeras de maiz, 7 fanegas y 4 almudes y media de maiz.

Tl= 171
I= 740
Cross Reference: GVIN 34
Comment:

73 E73 Masatepe (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 37)
Encomendero: Andres de Lazcada, vecino de la ciudad de Granada
Tribute:
(1) 42 telas de seis brazos de largo y 3/4 de ancho
(2) 43 gallinas de Castilla
(3) 41 quartillos de miel
(4) una fanega y ___ almad de sal
(5) senbran una fanega y 9 almudes de maiz en dos sementeras verano y inverno.

Tl= 34
I= 125
Cross Reference: GVIN 4
Comment:

74 E74 otro Masatepe (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 39)
Encomendero: ___ Alema, vecino de Granada
Tribute:
(1) 527 telas de seis brazos de largo y 3/4 de ancho
(2) 52 gallinas de Castilla
(3) 50 quartillos de miel
(4) 2 fanegas y un almad de sal
(5) senbran dos fanegas y dos almudes de maiz en dos sementeras.

Tl= 48
I= 174
Cross Reference: GVIN 4
Comment:

75 E75 Nanborima (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 42)
Encomendero: De La Corona
Tribute:
(1) 45 telas de seis brazos de largo y 3/4 de ancho
(2) 45 gallinas de Castilla
(3) Senbran three fanegas y 20 almades (maiz?) en dos sementeras
(4) 2 Fanegas de sal
(5) 45 quartillos de miel

Tl= 48
I= 174
Cross Reference: GVIN 21
Comment:

76. E76 Xalata (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 44)
Encomendero: Melchior Fernandez de Granada
Tributo:
1. 22 mantas de tres piernas de cada año dos brazos y media de largo y tres quarto de ancho
2. 22 gallinas de Castilla
3. 22 quartillos de miel
4. 1 fanega de sal y 3 almudes de ______
5. sienbran ____ almudes de maiz en dos sementeras

Ti= 26
I= 88
Cross Reference: None
Comment:

77. E77 Nandamo (Nandusmo?) (Ch) (U) (Tasación 1581: 46)
Encomendero: Melchior Fernandez, vezino de Granada
Tributo:
1. 17 telas de 6 brazos de largo y 3/4 de ancho
2. 17 gallinas de Castilla
3. 19 quartillos de miel
4. 9 almudes de sal
5. sienbran 10 almudes de maiz en dos sementeras, invierno y verano.

Ti=16
I= 67
Cross Reference: None
Comment:

78. Mazagalpa (Ch and N) (L) (Tasación 1581: 190)
Encomendero: Illegible
Tributo: Cada indio cada año:
1. una manta de tres piernas y media
2. una gallina
3. un quartillo de miel
4. un almude de maiz
5. sienbran en dos sementeras.
6. un almude de sal
7. Pagan los viudos una manta de tres piernas y una gallina y cada quartillo de miel

Ti= 77
I= 348
Cross Reference: LVIN 27
Comment: This was one of the encomiendas of Managua

79. E79 Yatan (Ch and N) (L) (Tasación 1581: 200)
Encomendero: Alvaro Maltes
Tributo:
1. Cada indio cada año una manta de tres piernas
2. una gallina
3. un quartillo de miel
4. sienbran veinte y dos almudes de maiz en dos sementeras
5. quinze almudes de sal

Ti= 23
I= 69
Cross Reference: GVIN 1
Comment: This was one of the encomiendas of Managua.

80. E80 Cocazarmte (Ch and N) (L) (Tasación: 204)
Encomendero: Illegible
Tributo: Pagan de cada indio cada año:
1. una manta de tres piernas
2. una gallina
3. un quartillo de miel
4. sienbran siete fanegas y diez almudes de maiz la mitad...
5. pagan los viudos y viudas un amanta y una gallina cada año.

Ti= 88
I= 436
Cross Reference: None
Comment: This was one of the encomiendas of Managua. It does not appear in the Tasacion of 1548.

81. E81 Guatepe (N and Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 214)
Encomendero: Gomez Palomino
Tributo: Dan de tributo cada un indio casado:
1. una manta de tres piernas;
2. Una gallina
3. un quartillo de miel
4. las viudas y viudos dan de tributo una manta y una gallina.
5. sienbran en dos sementeras quatro fanegas y quatro almudes y no maiz
6. Y dan quatro fanegas y quatro almudes de sal

(7) -- Illegible

Ti= 107
I= 482
Cross Reference: GVIN 15 Guatepe and Tonala?
Comment: This was listed as one of the major encomiendas of Managua.

82. E82 Cicogalpa (Gavagalpa) (N and Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 224)
Encomendero: Gomez Palomino
Tributo: Cada Yndio casado:
1. una manta de tres piernas
(2) un quartoillo de miel
(3) Sienbran en dos sementeras quatro fanegas de maíz
(4) quatro almudes de sal
(5) sienbran el algodon que declare mantas.

TI= 54
I= 238
Cross Reference: LVIN 60 or GVIN 50
Comment: This was one of the encomiendas of Managua.

83 E83 otro Ciegualpa (N and Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 230)
Encomendero: De La Corona
Tribute: Pagan de tributo de tributo cada Yndio casado:
(1) una manta de tres piernas
(2) una gallina
(3) un quartoillo de miel
(4) sienbran en dos sementeras diez y siete almudes de maíz y mas dan ___ de maíz
(5) Y una de sal
(6) sienbran algodon necesario ___ tributo

TI= 54
I= 70
Cross Reference: LVIN 60 or GVIN 50
Comment: This was one of the encomiendas of Managua. It does not appear in the Tasacion of 1548.

86 E86 Eaugralpa or Mulagulpa (N and Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 252)
Encomendero: Illegible
Tribute: Dan de tributo cada yndio casado:
(1) una manta de tres piernas
(2) una gallina
(3) un quartoillo de miel
(4) Hacen dos sementeras de maíz una de yunvierno y otra de berano en cada una de cual sienbran 10 almudes y media de mismo maíz.
(5) y sienbran algodon ___ tributo

Cross Reference: GVIN 3

87 E87 Mulagulpa (N and Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 256)
Encomendero: Diego de Medina
Tribute: (1) Una manta de tres piernas
(2) una gallina
(3) un quartoillo de miel
(4) hacen en dos sementeras de maíz y un den verano y una de invierno y en cada sementeras sienbran almude y media de maíz
(5) seys almudes de sal
(6) sienbran algodon que mantas.

TI= 133
I= 670
Cross Reference: None
Comment: This was one of the encomiendas of Managua. It does not appear in the Tasacion of 1548.

88 E88 Paynalana (N and Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581: 262)
Encomendero: Illegible
Tribute: (1) Un quartoillo de miel
(2) sienbran en dos sementeras de maíz, veano y inndio almud y medida cada sementera
(3) almud y media de sal
(4) sienbran algodon ___ mantas

TI= 7
I= 41
Cross reference: None
Comment: This was one of the encomiendas of Managua. This does not appear in the Tasación of 1548.

89. E89 Atonapa (N and Ch)(L) (Tasación 1581: 262)
Encomendero: Julio de Britzuela(?)
Tribute:
(1) una manta de tres piernas
(2) una gallina
(3) un quartillo de miel
(4) hacen dn dos semeneras de maiz, ybienio y verano, almud y media de maiz cada una
(5) almud y media de sal
(6) y senbran algodon mantas
Cross Reference: GVIN 6
Comment: This was one of the encomiendas of Managua.

The Encomiendas of Boaco and Central Nicaragua

90. E90 Los Chontales (Chl) (U) (Tasación 1581: 184)
Encomendero: Not listed
Tribute: Not listed
Tl= 3
I= 34
Cross Reference: None
Comment: This reference to the Chontales is found only in the summary section of the tasación and not in the tally sheets. The location is unknown.

91. E91 Boaco (U) (L) (Tasación 1581: 158)
Encomendero: Not listed
Tribute: Cada Indio casado:
(1) una quinta arroba de henequen
(2) mas la senbran cuatro fanegas en semeneras
(3) mas ocho mantas de tres piernas y dos de dos braza y media de largo y 3/4 de ancho
(4) mas dan 50 gallinas de castilla
(5) mas dan arroba de miel
(6) y ___mausos de tabaco
(7) los cinco viudos pagan ___ arrobas de henequen y gallinas y ayudan...
Tl= 50
I= 188
Cross Reference: None
Comment: Note the difference in pattern of tribute payment and the inclusion of henequen and tobacco as items of tribute assessment. It is assumed that this pueblo was located at the site known as Boaco viejo, located approximately 50 km east of present day Boaco, which was relocated in the 18th century after pirate and Indian attacks.

92. E92 Coyagalpa (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 160)
Encomendero: Not listed
Tribute:
(1) ___ Henequen
(2) 16 gallinas de Castilla
(3) Siembran 8 almudes de maiz en cada semenera en cada año.
Tl= 31
I= 66
Cross Reference: GVIN 32; or GVIN 38
Comment:

93. E93 Coagalpa (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 162)
Encomendero: Alonso de ___ de Iaen
Tribute:
(1) Cada año un arroba de henequen
(2) 20 gallinas de Castilla
(3) Dan seis mantas
(4) y senbran dos fanegas de maiz en cada año en dos semeneras...
Tl= 25
I= 93
Cross Reference: GVIN 31; or GVIN 38
Comment:

94. E94 Zuligalpa (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 164)
Encomendero: de Melchior ___
Tribute:
(1) 40 arrobas de henequen
(2) 40 gallinas de castilla
(3) 8 petates de tres brazos de largo y dos de abando pintadas
(4) mas senbran dos fanegas de semeneras, la mitad de invierno y la otra de verano
Tl= 42
I= 141
Cross Reference: None
Comment:

95. E95 Quiboga (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 168)
Encomendero: Juan de los ___
Tribute: Not Listed
Tl= 11
I= 24
Cross Reference: None
Comment: Many of the Indian names of the inhabitants are illegible, especially at 168

96. E96 otro Quiboga (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 168)
Encomendero: Illegible
106. Cindegapipil (N) (Tasación 1581: 68)
Encomendero: Gaspar de Salinas
Tribute: Not listed separately
TL= 3
I= 11
Cross Reference: LVIN 8
Comment: This is the only reference to the Pipiles in any document known to the author through the 16th century.

107. E107 Paynaltega(U) (NL?) (Tasación 1581: 68)
Encomendero: Not listed
Tribute: Not listed separately.
TL= 5
I= 5
Cross Reference: LVIN 70
Comment: According to the sequence of the encomiendas this encomienda was located somewhere in the area of Subtiava

108. E108 Acocaco (N) (L) (Tasación 1581: 68)
Encomendero: que posee en nombre de su mujer Sicilia de __
Tribute: Not listed separately
TL= 7
I= 48
Cross Reference: LVIN 15
Comment: This name is almost identical to the present site of Acosasco, located on a hill top three kilometers from the plaza of Subtiava.

109. E109 Distangui (M) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 68)
Encomendero: Illegible
Tribute: Not listed separately
TL= 13
I= 67
Cross Reference: LVIN 66
Comment:

110. E110 otro Martinarote (Ch) (L7) (Tasación 1581: 17)
Encomendero: Francisco de Castillo
Tribute: (1) 9 telas y media de 6 brazos de largo y 3/4 de ancho
(2) __ almudes de frijoles

(3) cinco almudes y media de sal
(4) Sembran media almud de maíz en dos semeteras, uno en yunbierno y otra el verano

TL= 8
I= 36
Cross Reference: GVIN 37
Comment:

111. E111 La Villa de Realejo (U) (L) (Tasación 1581: 56)
Encomendero: Not listed
Tribute: Not listed separately
TL= 20
I= 88
Cross Reference: None
Comment:

112. E112 Guarcacayo (U) (NL) (Tasación 1581: 272)
Encomendero: Diego de Targo de la ciudad de la Nueva Segovia
Tribute: (1) 31 mantas listadas cana año
(2) los veinte y dos tributarios y doce viudas mas pagan 37 gallinas
(3) 25 quartillos de miel
(4) Ocho peates de tres brazos de largo
(5) Sembran mas dos fanegas y un almud de maíz en dos semeteras

TL= 22
I= 153
Cross Reference: None
Comment: This pueblo was located somewhere between present day Sebaco and Jinotega. From the language used it was either close to Sebaco or by Jinotega.

113. E113 Linaguina (N) (L) (Tasación 1581: 275)
Encomendero: Not listed
Tribute: (1) 19 mantas coloradas de dos piernas y media
(2) 24 gallinas
(3) 11 quartillos de miel
(4) 6 petates
(5) Sembran semeteras 7 1/2 almudes de maíz
(6) los dezo Indios y cinco viudos pagan esto

TL=12
I= 67
Cross Reference: None
Comment:

114. E114 Pinaguina (N) (L) (Tasación 1581: 276)
Encomendero: Juan Fernandez
Tribute:
(1) 10 mantas coloradoas de dos piernas listadas
(2) media arroba de miel
(3) 3 libras de cera
(4) sembran una fanega, media inverno, media verano.

TI= 12
Je 59

Cross Reference: None

Comment: Linaquina and Pinaguina were described as being close together, "juntos" and 2 1/2 leagues from Cebaco. Since the census takers were traveling towards Matagalpa it is possible that the present site of Chaguatillo is close to the site of these two villages

115 El 115 Noma (Ch) (L) (Tasación 1581): 24
Encomendero: Alonso de Iaen que esta de esta provincia (Granada).

Tribute:
(1) cinco fanegas y cuatro almudes de maiz en dos sermenteras ...
(2) 74 telas de seis brazos de largo de algodon y 3/4 de ancho
(3) 74 gallinas de Castilla
(4) ___ fanegas ___ almund de frijoles
(5) Dos fanegas de ocho almudes de sal y algodon que sembran.

TI= 54
Je 224

Cross Reference: ?

Comment: This encomienda is not found in the summary section. It possibly is the pueblo found by Cibdad Real in 1586 that he called Loma. It was located close to or at the present day location of Catarina.

---
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