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Abstract: With the discovery of the foundations of the 17th-century Spanish church of Todos los Santos in Heping Island (Keelung, Taiwan) during the excavations from 2011 to 2019, the interest in this church has been ignited. It is not only viewed as a topic for academic discussion but also as a significant cultural heritage site for the city of Keelung. The study of this church, established by Spanish Dominicans coming from the Philippines between 1626 and 1642, has been approached from two angles: one based on historical documents and the other on archaeological data, effectively complementing each other. This paper primarily relies on Spanish and Dutch documentary sources to provide a better understanding of the archaeological findings. Moreover, it offers new perspectives on the archaeological conclusions by highlighting the distinction between two crucial elements: the convent and the church. The paper proposes the possibility that the final church, constructed with stone, may have remained unfinished, which complicates the interpretation of the discovered cemetery in the same site.
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The Catholic mission in the Spanish colonial settlement of San Salvador (1626-1642), situated on Heping Island in Keelung City (northern Taiwan), was an extension of the Dominican missions in the Philippines. This mission was under the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Nueva Segovia, located in the Cagayan Valley of northern Luzon. The diocese was founded in 1595 and entrusted to the Province of the Holy Rosary of the Dominican order. Very soon, the Dominicans erected churches near the coast of Northern Luzon, like the cathedral of Nueva Segovia in Lallo, or those of Buguey, Malaueg and others (see Figure 1). Northern Luzon held strategic importance for the Dominicans because it might serve as a launching point for their missionary endeavors in Japan and the hopeful establishment of missions in China.¹

Todos los Santos as a missionary extension of the Cagayan Valley’ missions

The Dominicans had reached Japan from the Philippines by 1602, led by Father Francisco Morales, who in 1609 started the convent and church of Santo Domingo in Nagasaki, being one of the largest church compounds of the Dominicans in Japan. But after the Japanese Edict of Persecution against Christianity of 1614, the missions were not able to spread freely, and the big compound of the Dominican house with its church was confiscated. It was later acquired by a local merchant and magistrate named Heizo Suetsugu and subsequently passed into the ownership of the Takagi family in the 18th century. Over the centuries, each owner made significant renovations and modifications to the property. The area where the old church was located was excavated twenty years ago, but the modifications made to the original compound over the centuries posed challenges in interpreting the findings, as it can be seen in the floor maps of the excavation in the original Dominican religious compound, published in 2004.²

In 1614 the Christians in Japan went underground as the political pressure increased, but the Dominicans in the Philippines (like other orders involved in Japan) tried to continue giving support to the Christians in Japan, and they put this task on the shoulders of their missions in Nueva Segovia (Cagayan Valley). This situation led to the creation of missions at the edge of Northern Luzon, and beyond like in Fuga Island (1619) (in the archipelago of Babuyanes), and in Northern Taiwan (1626). To achieve this latter goal, the Dominicans were very active in pushing the Philippines Governor Fernando da Silva to the conquest of one location in this island, already

known since the end of the 16th century. After the military expedition of the Spanish army in 1626, they built in Kelang (Northern Taiwan) the church of Todos los Santos. For these reasons the comparison of Dominican church buildings in places like the one mentioned of Nagasaki, or those of Lallo, Buguey, Fuga, etc., can help us to better understand the history and architectonic structure of the recently excavated church of Todos los Santos.

Figure 1: Map of Luzon, part of the coast of China and Isla Hermosa” (1597), by De los Ríos Coronel. AGI, MP Filipinas 6

On top of this map the Dominican missions mentioned in this article and other villages have been added. First, along the Cagayan Valley, six missions appear, later the mission of Fuga was established in Babuyanes Islands. Lastly, in the northern region of Taiwan, specifically in the area known as Kelang (present-day Heping Island, at the entrance of the harbor of Keelung) the embryonic city of San Salvador was located, which housed the convent and church of Todos los Santos. Another mission existed in Nagasaki until 1614. The mission of Todos los Santos was contemporary to those depicted on the Luzon map. Missionaries were shifting between Cagayan Valley and Fuga Island or Todos los Santos. The aboriginal Basay villages of Quimaquirri and Taparri were situated near San Salvador. Additionally, Tayouan (nowadays Tainan) referred to a general area where the Dutch fort Zeelandia was located.

3 By Kelang we refer to the small island at the entrance of Keelung harbor, now called Heping Island. Also, we can refer Taiwan as Formosa or, according to the Spanish historical sources, Isla Hermosa.
The beginning of the Dominican mission in Kelang

The beginning of the missionary activities in Isla Hermosa started under the direction of the Provincial Bartolomé Martínez with four Dominicans more who arrived in the first expedition of 1626, led by the sergeant major Carreño de Valdés (SIT, 76). Afterwards, Martínez made the trip back to Manila, and Jerónimo Morer became the head of the Dominican community. Regarding the pastoral work, the Dominicans must have categorized the people in Kelang in two groups. First, the Christians (basically military personnel, comprising Spaniards, Mexicans, natives of the Philippines—mainly Pampangos—and others like the black people of the galleys, probably Christianized slaves, etc.); and second, the pagans (basically, the Basayan natives of the nearby villages of Quimaurri and Taparri, and a few Chinese merchants). Each of these two groups will be accommodated in separated quarters, and the missionaries will try to provide each group a small church. However, it was challenging due to the limited number of missionaries residing in a temporary convent, to which they attached a wooden church under the advocacion of Todos los Santos, serving as a temporary preaching place for the Spaniards and Filipino soldiers forming the whole Spanish army, and to start the conversion of the Basayan natives of Kelang.

To erect this mission lawfully the ecclesiastical, civil and religious authorities in the Philippines must grant their respective permissions. This explains that the first reference that we have about the mission was on 18 July 1627, when the Archbishop of Manila, Miguel García Serrano, granted to the Dominicans of Isla Hermosa the faculty of administering sacraments to the natives. To obtain this ecclesiastical permission it was assumed that at least a minimal construction for a parish had been erected in Kelang. When the said archbishop granted the permission, he reminded the Dominicans that, according to the procedures of the governing royal patronage, this endorsement should be confirmed by the civil authority, who was represented now by the newly arrived Governor General of the Philippines, Don Juan Niño de Tavora (SIT, 95-96).

Surprisingly, in the light of what we have just said, the chronicle of Dominican historian Aduarte mentions that the first baptisms were performed prior to these permissions, just after the Spanish arrival in Kelang, because they baptized “two girls, the daughters of a Japanese Christian, who had settled there and married a native woman, a pagan” (SIT, 86). Besides, to give more solemnity to this baptism, and to

---

4 By the acronym SIT we refer to our book Spaniards in Taiwn, a collection of historical sources in Spanish, Dutch, Portuguese, etc., translated into English, published in two volumes, and covering the years 1582-1682.

5 The permission was issued by the Archbishop of Manila because at that time the chair of the dioceses of Nueva Segovia (in northern Luzon) was vacant.
set an example for the natives, the governor of San Salvador, Carreño de Valdés, acted as the godfather, and some artillery shots were fired. Probably, the reason why they administered that baptism prior to the arrival of the above-mentioned permission, was because the girls were daughters of a Christian.

As for the organization of the religious group of missionaries, they needed a formal erection within the Order, particularly within the Province of the Holy Rosary, which was established in the Philippines in 1588 and extended to Japan, and envisioned to extend to China. As Aduarte stated, in this year of 1627 the “intermediate chapter” of the Dominicans in the Philippines “recognized and incorporated into de [Dominican] Province of the Holy Rosary] the house [i.e., convent] of Isla Hermosa, and it was erected as vicariate.” (Acta, 1627: 143). Father Francisco de Mola was appointed as vicar,6 and sent to Kelang, to govern the vicariate based on the Ordinations issued by the Provincial Father, as stated by missionary Esquivel in 1632 (SIT, 189). Consequently, the veteran Morer was not needed anymore, and after one year he went back to Fuga Island.7

In order to better understand the excavations of the Church of Todos los Santos in Heping Island, the previous explanation shows us the pattern of two logistic institutions, which crystalized in two different but connected buildings, the convent8 and the church. This happened not only in all the missions in Cagayan Valley, or in Fuga Island, but even in Nagasaki. If we apply this scheme to the city of San Salvador, on one side we can consider the convent of Santo Domingo, recognized by the Dominican’s chapter of 1627; and, on the other side, the church of Todos los Santos, approved by the bishop, but run by the Dominicans. Even the Spanish official sources make a clear difference between the convent (“convento”) and church (“iglesia”); for example, in the interrogation to the soldier Cristóbal Sánchez, during the trial of Governor General Sebastián Hurtado de Corcuera for the loss of Isla Hermosa, Sanchez declared that 1641 “the Dutch enemy... burned the village of our native friends and the convent and the church of the Fathers of St. Dominic” (SIT, 545).

Also, the posterior Dutch sources use two words to refer these two religious buildings, one is “klooster/clooster,” meaning the convent, and the other is “kerk/

6 In the 17th century context, the “vicar” is the formal head of a church (nowadays we can say parish priest), while the “provincial vicar” is the head of a Dominican community of several priests and brothers, who might be scattered in different churches, as it happened in Taiwan. In the annex, the name of the provincial vicars appears highlighted.
7 It is interesting to mention that in the biography of Morer in the book of Ocio-Neira (2000), based on Dominican official documents, the short stay of Morer in Isla Hermosa does not appear, implying that his presence in Taiwan was not intended to be definitive, but a kind of service commission.
8 For a better understanding of the convents in the Philippines see Jose, Simbahan (1991: 102-110).
kerck,” referring to the church, as it is the case in one instruction issued on 11 September 1643 by Dutch governor in Taiwan, Maximiliaen Le Maire (SIT, 463). In this sense, we will talk separately of these two buildings, the convent and the church. This is important because, even if the discovered remains of the church show an impressive structure, the real organizational work of the missionary activity was done in the convent. Let us start by presenting the convent, as headquarter of the whole missional compound.

The wooden convent of Santo Domingo (1626-1635)

First of all, we assigned this name of Santo Domingo, not only to differentiate from the church of Todos los Santos, but because this name was sometimes used in this way to refer most of the convents of the Dominican missions. The convent obviously existed, although the excavations of 2011-2019 did not find clear traces of it. The convent, like the church or any other building, has its own construction history, and in this case the convent made of stone existed as an institution before the final stone church. By 1632 (six years after the arrival of the Dominicans) it was still a simple lodging, described by Fr. Esquivel in a non-definitive state when he was proposing a plan for dividing up the different ministries of the mission:

The third [ministry to take care] shall be our present house that will have to be rebuilt into a convent school where Chinese and Japanese children may be taught Latin and a little of moral theology in order to ordain the ones who are more capable, or at least to educate doxicos, or catechists. (SIT, 185)

And the same Esquivel, in a moment of disappointment, also in 1632, described the life of the convent in this way:

We have neither a master for novices nor a house where to form them in the religious life and the observance of the Rule. We only have a house where laymen constantly come and go, uncloistered and unsealed in any way because only one father takes care of it and he has many other things to do. (SIT, 189)

9 For this paper, we have translated the Dutch word “klooster” in the original Dutch documents as a convent. It refers also to the Spanish word “claustro,” which is the closed porticoed garden around which the life of a convent or monastery evolves. For example, two cloisters were portrayed in both sides of the town of Taparri in the map of Keerdekoe (1654), but we think—as we will explain later—that they were done out of imagination, just aiming to testify the existence of the missions of the Franciscans and the Dominicans in that place, which, we presume, never went beyond hut lodgings.

10 It can be mentioned that after some years of the Dutch presence the difference between these two units were blurred, to the point that they use the term “clooster” to refer the whole compound of the church and the convent, as it happens in the map of Isaac de Graaff (the one containing side notes) of 1667 (fig. 18), where a square area is labeled as demolished convent (“gedemolished klooster”), depicting probably the fenced area portrayed earlier in the map of Keerdekoe (1654) (fig. 14).
But Aduarte, the bishop of Nueva Segovia, who made a visit to the Dominican mission in San Salvador, also in 1632, was more positive when talking, for example, about the “other things to do” mentioned by Esquivel:

Many children have been baptized. Their parents have [wanted this] without our forcing them. There have been few adult baptisms, most of which have been done at a person’s deathbed. The reason is that for such persons, bad habits— inherited from their ancestors— must first be uprooted before the goods of Christianity are introduced… The worst of these customs is that of cutting off each other’s heads and those of shipwrecked foreigners who are washed onto their shores. (SIT, 191)

New baptisms came thanks to the involvement of governor Alonso García Romero (1634-1635) which favored the missionary actions in Cavalan province, a big plain at the southeast of Kelang. Even if baptisms imply the existence of a church, after more than one decade, we have no particular mention of a representative building of a church made of stone, nor of any material or economic aid from the governor to build anything.

The stone convent of Santo Domingo (1636-1642)

Surprisingly, the years when the stone convent started to be built coincided with an apparent crisis in the mission. Fr. Quirós (1632-1642), the last provincial vicar of San Salvador, arrived in the mission in the previous favorable years. He saw the positive changes of the times of governor García Romero, but very soon he—as the vicar of the church of Todos los Santos—experienced some difficulties, probably since the time of next governor Francisco Hernández (1636-1637). Looking retrospectively at these years he said in 1643: “everything that was spent by the friars in their ministry came from the Order, without the servants of our Lord the King giving a single real. They even were hesitant to assign four laborers to build a shed in which to teach and say Mass to the natives” (SIT, 458). In 1636 the mission experienced several hardships. Brothers Antonio Domínguez and Juan Sánchez died natural deaths, Fathers Lorenzo Arnedo, Miguel Corena and the Japanese Felipe del Espíritu Santo went back to Manila, and the worst one was that Fr. Luis Muro, one of the recent arrivals, was assassinated by the natives of Tamsui, accelerating the crisis of the general Spanish presence in the island, because the army abandoned the fort of Santo Domingo in Tamsui, and, in fact, not much later the new Governor General Corcuera was no longer interested in keeping the Spanish positions in Isla Hermosa.

Even worse was the division of the Dominican Province, motivated by the impatience of the Dominican missionary in Japan, Diego Collado. This determined missionary was able to create the Congregation of Saint Paul, for a direct and
autonomous missionary work in China and Japan, when the doors of this kingdom were just closed.11 The convent of Santo Domingo and the church of Todos los Santos, naturally fell into this new congregation together with the couple of missionaries already in China. Only one priest, Fr. Juan de los Ángeles, was assigned there from Manila. Fortunately, the congregation only lasted a couple of years and the Province was reunified again, but in fact no more missionaries were sent to Taiwan. It is impressive how Quirós and De los Ángeles developed the mission with little manpower in comparison with the previous years. For example, in those last six years they were engaged in building the stone convent of Santo Domingo as well as the foundations of the stone church of Todos los Santos; the only new manpower came from two soldiers who had just become Dominican brothers, Basilio Cervantes y Amador Acuña.

The first news of the construction of a stone building was for the convent, during the time of governor Pedro Palomino (1637-1639). We suppose that was a timely moment to do it because the main fortress of San Salvador was practically finished, and the Sangley masons could now dedicate themselves to this new project.12 Since the convent was going to be made of stone, its definitive shape was seen as strategically dangerous by the same governor Palomino in case of a future attack by the Dutch, for this reason he told the Dominicans to stop the construction, but they were reluctant. In a letter of 8 October 1638 Palomino reported to the Governor General Corcuera in Manila:

In the town of Quimaurri, a musket shot from this fort, on the other side of mainland, the Dominican fathers tried to build a house of stone.13 As they began the construction, I ordered them to stop and not to proceed with it because I did not want to have a structure higher than ours, for the enemy could easily take advantage of it. Despite this, they carried on and they are finishing it. I have suffered much reproof from those priests over this matter. They tell me that I am preventing the spread of the Holy Gospel and that this was how the Lutheran sect began, and that they would all go to the other side, and many more threats. May God, out of His infinite goodness, be served in all this and grant me peace. (SIT, 291)

The previous document tells us that by the end of 1638 the stone building of the convent, at least the main part, was almost finished by the vicar of San Salvador,

11 For details see vol. 1 of Spaniards in Taiwan (SIT, 237-238).
12 Regarding the finishing of the main fortress during the times of Palomino, one eyewitness of the loss of San Salvador to the Dutch mentioned in an interrogation: “To the fifth question, he said, that he heard that Sergeant Major Pedro Palomino was succeeded in the said post by Sergeant Major Cristóbal Márquez Valenzuela. And during his entire period of governance this witness did not seem him do anything considerable except for half of the parapets of the main fortress, for he had nothing else to do and because everything had been finished and fortified.” (SIT, 530).
13 We understand that this house has nothing to do with the church, but with the convent.
Teodoro Quirós. In the process he expended a large amount of money, to the point that the Provincial of the Dominicans in Manila was unhappy with this expenditure. Quirós justified his actions in a letter to his superior in Manila, on 4 October 1639, saying that his motives were three, to be ready for the expected battle with the Dutch, the new belligerent attitude of some the natives of Taparri, and the facilities provided for covering the whole cost:

Last year [1638], Your Reverence wrote me saying that I have been spending too much money. I say that I have spent very little. If you were here, you will see how appalling the conditions are. My accounts are open for inspection so that people may see the little that I have spent.

The King had sent me much quicklime to build good walls (15 pesos for each fathom of wall, very wide and well done) and make this house more comfortable and readier to stand a fight. I would carry (sacred) images on my back and bring them to an islet. I did this because the ministry is still unstable and there are no natives. Still I was in good spirits because I knew that I should not make the Province spend for anything. But times have changed and so I ended up paying for the work done there. The people from that place owe me 50 pesos, the amount sent to me by Captain Licona, who died here. This is what I had spent for this undertaking. Please inform our Provincial that, God willing, this shall continue. Our Order has so much to gain from it.

The first floor of the house now serves as a church, because the natives burned the one of the Taparri and four others which were built by the river. If this house were not of stone, then they would have burned the church, too, with me inside. But the Rosary of the Mother of God has protected us, as we pray it in chorus with the natives every day. (SIT, 304).

This text is very relevant not only because it says that Quirós was incurring heavy expenses when building the final convent in Quimaurri, but also because it justifies these expenses for security reasons. Furthermore, the text states that the convent was eventually completed and consisted of two floors, and that the first floor was used provisionally as a church. In other words, the well-defined new stone building of the church of Todos los Santos (the one excavated from 2012 to 2019) was not yet constructed, and most probably the construction commenced after the completion of the convent.

---

14 By this comment we understand that Quirós got the most valuable things from the small church of Taparri and transferred them to the new house in the island of Kelang. One of the reasons was security because, as Palomino explained to the Governor General, the Franciscan residing in the other church of Taparri, sometimes was going to China or residing in Kelang Island, and when in Taparri he was always discussing with the natives, so they burned his church (SIT, 291).

15 This is consistent with the comment of Santa Cruz, another Dominican who continued the History of the Dominican Order in the Philippines, Japan and China of Aduarte, who—talking about the year 1636—mentioned that “the Convent of Todos los Santos was the church of the city” (SIT, 237).
Exploring the design of the convent

It makes sense to differentiate two stages of construction in the building of a convent, or a church. The first one is at the beginning of a mission, where the construction was of wood and straw, and the second when it was built definitively in stone. Regarding the construction of convents, “one ordinance given in 1621 by the Provincial of the Dominicans Miguel Ruiz said that from that moment on new convents will have only four rooms ("celdas") for the priests, except those of Abulug and Nassiping which will have six” (Malumbres, 1918: 400).

We presume that the latest convent of Santo Domingo in Kelang might also have come under this exception, given the fact that many missionaries passed by there (see the annex). Besides, it had to be designed with additional rooms for teaching catechism or liturgy to the young natives, and even with a place to store their books. Yes, we know the existence of a well provided library, because the Dutch, just after occupying the area, made an inventory of everything, including the catalog of 118 books kept in the convent (SIT, 400-403). The Dutch classified the books by their size: in folio (38 books), in quarto (36 books), in octavo (37 books), in decimo sexto (7 books). These books dealt mainly on religious themes, for helping the Dominican fathers to preach. For this reason, catechisms from the Council of Trent, collection of homilies, and books from Dominican authors like Saint Thomas, or Fr. Luis of Granada, can be found. Also, in this library there were a few secular books, like two dictionaries one of Spanish-French, and the other of Spanish-Latin, a history of Castile (probably the Libro de los claros varones de Castilla, of Hernando del Pulgar, published in 1486), and the Eglogas and Georgicas of the Roman poet Virgil.

Inside the convent was also installed the so-called Misericordia (SIT, 209), a kind of financial and charitable lay institution which gathered funds to care—among other things—for the needs of Spanish residents in San Salvador (Borao, 2005). It was well provided, because the lieutenant Pérez de Rueda, the secretary of the institution Misericordia, declared—on the occasion of the trial of Governor General Corcuera in 1644, for the loss of the Spanish forces in Isla Hermosa—the following:

the Dutch enemy seized 8,000 pesos in reals, 10 plates of ordinary silver, two large plates and merchandise worth 1,000 pesos which belonged to the Santa Misericordia of that island. At that time, this witness was its scribe, which is why he knows about this, and because he was the person who kept the key where the said properties were stored. (SIT, 518)

16 In relation to this, we can mention the case of Aparri, which, according to Malumbres, “in 1604 a license was granted to make public buildings” (Malumbres, 1918: 369). We can speculate that these public buildings must be stronger, probably with at least a stone foundation. It is not clear if religious ones were also included; in any case we did not find such a permission in Cagayan for churches, neither for the convent of Santo Domingo of Kelang. It is a pity because it might had help to better know the material history of the building and the surrounding structures.
Since the excavations in the parking area of Heping Island have not revealed any structure related to the convent, we only can imagine the distribution of the convent and church by comparison to contemporary Dominican compounds (convent and church) in Cagayan, particularly to those already mentioned of Malaueg (church of Saint Raymundo of Peñafort) and Fuga Island (church of Saint Ursula and the Eleven Thousand Virgins):

Comparing the two floor-maps of these Dominican compounds with modern photos (Figures 2 & 3), we can see, first, that the entrance of the church and of the convent are aligned, and facing the same area, normally a plaza (not visible in these floor maps); second, that the convent is situated in the left side of the church, creating a kind of pattern that we can call “Dominican convent’s left-side location;” third, that the bell tower is also aligned with the church and the convent, but at the right side of the church; fourth, that this disposition creates a kind of cloister between the church and the convent, as long the convent is expanding in parallel to the nave of the church, something recognizable in the case of Malaueg; and finally that in both cases the convent have two floors, as it was mentioned before for the case of Santo Domingo of San Salvador by Fr. Quirós in his above-mentioned letter of 4 October 1639. These two cases can be a good reference to guess the location of the convent.
of Santo Domingo in San Salvador, in relation to the church of Todos los Santos, as we will do later.

**The wooden church of Todos los Santos**

One of the first references to the Church of Todos los Santos comes from the Dominican chronicler Aduarte, who comments that at the beginning the missionaries were very busy attending the soldiers, and, as soon as they could, they made a small and humble church. They did it in 1635, after which they could devote more time to the natives:

They [the Dominicans] later tried to put up a church and, under the title of All Saints, there rose a small and humble one ... and [there they] heard the Spaniards’ confessions, preached to them, instructed them and acted as their parish priests until around 1635. [Just after arrival] there was enough work for them to do, but their hearts could not rest seeing those islanders fleeing from the faith and separated from the Church despite the fact that they were at her gates and already had [a church] of St. Dominic in their land. (SIT, 85)

![Figure 4. Spanish encampment and bastion San Antonio el Grande of the fort San Salvador in the early moment of construction (1629).](image)

This first image of a building is San Salvador was the one drawn by Gerbrantsz Black, who draw a dwelling from the Domburg, the ship that came from Tayouan (the Dutch base in the South, present Tainan) to spy the Spanish settlements in 1629. The map had strategic and military purposes. That is why the main bastion of the
fortress (possibly the only one finished at that moment), as well as the galleys are quite well defined, nevertheless the area of the island is quite inaccurate. Near this bastion can be seen many tents for the soldiers and, separated by a channel of water, a building that probably refers to a military lodging or to the church. In the map, the structure of that building is very simple, but clear: two pairs of windows, and another one on top of the entrance. We do not know the real meaning of this building, but it is easy to imagine that after three years of their stay in Taiwan the governor might have built a dwelling, or the Dominicans a reasonable wooden church.17

If it were the church, who should be the designer? It is difficult to know with certainty, but one candidate could be the above-mentioned leader of the first missionary group, the veteran Fr. Jerónimo Morer, because before going to Taiwan he was stationed first, in Fuga Island (Babuyanes) from 1619 to 1623, laying the foundations of the convent and church there; and later, from 1623 to 1625, in Gattaran (in the Cagayan Valley) where he used his previous experience to contribute in the renovation of the church after the earthquake of 1619 (Jose, 2020c: 505). Finally, he then went to Taiwan (1626-1627), and after this assignment in this island of establishing the mission, he returned to Fuga, where “he finalized the church” (Jose, 2018a: 110). Even if he were a gifted missionary for architectural design it is difficult to evaluate his involvement in their construction of the final church of Todos los Santos, because in the beginning the definitive church of stone could not have been a priority for the mission, the most than Morer might have done for the definitive church and convent of stone is to identify the location and to draw the outline of the foundations.

Certainly, in 1632, when the bishop of Nueva Segovia, the Dominican Aduarte, visited San Salvador, he mentioned in his History just two very simple houses with churches like “shepherd’s huts,” to serve the natives, the church of Saint Joseph in Quimaurri and the one of Our Lady of the Rosary in Tamsui.18 We still have to wait several years until the stone church of Todos los Santos started the process of construction and—as we have said above — we might assume that the definitive moment to do this job continuously was when the masons who had worked for the fortress and later for the convent, were able to switch to working on the church.

17 The detailed Dutch description of Kelang, written in the diary of the Domburg (SIT, 141) does not mention this building.

18 Aduarte also added: “We now have among them [the natives] two small houses with churches much alike a shepherd’s hut in structure and in the materials used. Both are near the two Spanish fortresses, and the distance between them are as what has been mentioned. One is beside the fort of San Salvador in a village of natives called Camaurri, and it is under the patronage of the glorious St. Joseph. The other, in Tanchuy, [is] devoted to the Virgin of the Rosary” (SIT, 220), ... “and made by Captain Luis de Guzman with his camp laborers; who, in few days built a house and a church of wood and straw common to that land.” (SIT, 225)
The stone building of the church of Todos los Santos (1639-1642)

Governor Palomino (1637-1639) had said that the fortress was completed or almost finished during his times; but the new governor Cristóbal Márquez (1639-1640) was not of the same opinion. He said that he still needed masons to finalize some defensive works. In his first letter to the Governor General in the Philippines, written on 6 October 1639, just upon his arrival, Márquez explained the situation of the defenses (fortress and auxiliary forts) in case of an eventual Dutch attack, but he did not mention the trouble that the high stone convent of the Dominicans might cause. He just referred that, even if the former governor Palomino had worked a lot in the fortress, some parts were still unfinished and others needed repair.19 Nevertheless, in the same letter he just added one laconic concern about the religious orders who were unhappy about the Spanish troops’ withdrawal from Tamsui (SIT, 307), but he did not refer to any new church, which makes us think that the Todos los Santos church was still in its early stage of construction and was not a determining structure in a possible impending battle.

We suppose that around 1640 the church started to be built, maybe after the transition of the governorship from Márquez to the new and last governor, Gonzalo de Portillo (1640-1642). Portillo was diametrically opposed to the construction of this building, because it was a “padrastro” (a higher dominating structure), and very dangerous for the defense of the fortress. In fact, he was right, because one year later, at the end of the summer of 1641, the Dutch made their first attack to San Salvador, and they used the church as strategic offensive structure in their movements. This reveals that the church was by then taking shape. This attack was a rehearsal of the real one which took place one year later. Portillo after this first attack reported on the 9th September 1641 to the Governor General Corcuera in the following terms:

The enemy made a safe landing... They arrived in a town called Quimaurri and lodged there for the night. In the morning, [the enemy] with their banners and drums climbed a hill that commands a view of the said village and of the entire force because it is a high point... They also went to the Cubo [one auxiliary fort] and saw what they wanted. From the Retirada [the third and last auxiliary fort], they sent me a letter demanding the surrender of the fortress, but I replied with another... When the enemy received my letter, they retreated and, along the way, burned down the town and the church of Quimaurri, and boarded their launches in the spot where they had disembarked. (SIT, 328)

19 “Sergeant Major Pedro Palomino has labored and worked much in this fort and I wish to inform Your Lordship that there remains much to do. And so that Your Lordship may be informed, I say that a curtain wall without a parapet [has to be built]. It also urgently needs a buttress since it has been pitifully worn down by the sea winds that at times beat against it. Likewise, there is a second curtain wall with four stones less than what it needs. The cordon and parapet of the third curtain wall need to be reinforced 12 fathoms more; and of these 12 fathoms, three stones, a cordon and a parapet are lacking. The San Antonio caballero lacks two stones, a cordon and a parapet [and] much of the embankment.” (SIT, 306)
We think that this church of Quimaurri is the wooden one, devoted to Saint Joseph. This is clearer in a new letter, written by Portillo two days later (11 September 1641) to the Governor General, repeating some ideas, but in a more detailed way, where it seems he differentiated both churches. He said that the Dutch went around the incipient church of stone, and, after hesitating whether to attack the main fort or not, they decided to go back. Then, when leaving the town of Quimaurri, burned both places: the town and the [old wooden] church:

This town faces the gates of the fort and has no other crossing but the port. At nine in the morning, a great troop of Dutchmen and natives climbed to the top of a hill [La Mira], where they flaunted their strength to us. Two war drums boomed away, while flags fluttered atop the hill and through the corridors of the village’s stone church. From there, I summoned some of our native friends, and called a truce. I gave them a letter written to me by the corporal of the enemy fort in Tayouan, which is also on this island. I have enclosed a copy of this letter, along with the reply...

However, on that same day, the enemy retreated into their vessels that were always within canon range. As they did this, they set the town and the [wooden] church on fire, razing everything to ground. They did not take any prisoner, except for the natives who took from me the aide-de-camp Carvajal, two men from Cagayan, and four natives of this land. (SIT, 332-333)

This new letter confirms that the church made by stone existed to some extent and even had some “corridors,” so this can only refer to Todos los Santos church, the one discovered in the recent excavations. These comments lead us to understand that in the first year of Portillo, from the summer of 1640 to the summer of 1641, the construction of the church could have experienced some progress, but it was not yet finalized. In any case some developments were experienced, because the final battle (summer of 1642) played an important strategic role. Most probably the construction had continued in between these two battles, since the vicar, the Dominican Teodoro Quirós, was so determined to continue in the mission, whatever the result of the fight with the Dutch.

Before seeing the last moment of the church, her role in the war, and her posterior destruction, let us try to understand first the architectural nature of this stone building.

**Architecture of the church of Todos los Santos**

1. *The foundations.* As we had explained, by the end of the Márquez governorship the Chinese masons were not much required in the fortress as before,
for this reason the Dominicans might have hired them as workers for the church. This assumption not only makes sense, but also it could be somehow supported by the fact that the foundations of the two buildings looked quite similar (Figures 5 & 6): ashlars along the edges of the curtains of the fortress, and the same in the walls of the church, filled up in both cases with stone masonry in between, and similar width of the foundation of the curtains of the fortress and of the church.20

2. As for the plan of the church of Todos los Santos, the results of the archaeological work of 2019, as any visitor can see, present a clear shape composed of a single nave ending in the north with a proportionally big square apse. The main problem is to guess the length of the nave, because a significant part of the area was destroyed at the beginning of the 20th century, due to the urban planning of the Japanese, which created new streets. We think there are three options for envisaging the length of the nave of the church (Figure 7). First, a short plan with only four buttresses in the nave (3-6, 10-13); this makes sense because the church was located in a gentle hill going down towards the area of the entrance, meaning that the longer the church was, the more difficult to adapt to the descending level,

20 The person in Figure 5 is Prof. Nakamura, whom the author of this article met at a conference at National Taiwan University in 1992. The author of this paper estimates Prof. Nakamura’s height to be around 1.65 meters. Therefore, the foundation of the curtain could be 2 meters or even more. Regarding the church, according to Ellen Hsieh, the width of the buttress in front of Figure 6 is 2.30 meters, while of the apse behind is 1.94 meters (謝艾倫, 2023).
requiring stairs on an artificial platform. Second, a middle-sized plan, assuming that the church would have a total of five buttresses on each side (2-6, 10-14). The third option is of a longer building. This possibility is based not on the nature of the terrain, but on the similarity with much longer Dominican churches in Cagayan (Galván, 2004: floor-maps). In that case we can assign 15 buttresses (1-6, 10-15).21

If we continue analyzing the floor map, we can observe a slight discontinuity in the wall on the nave when it reaches buttress 5 and possibly 11, creating a slightly wider space. This discontinuity should not be regarded as a mistake on the part of the designer or builder, as similar features can be found in contemporary churches in Cagayan, particularly in Malaeug and to some extent in Buguey and Lallo. Even the famous church of San Paul in Macao exhibits this characteristic (Pereira, 1994: 84). We can interpret this discontinuity as a small transept-like space, defined here by buttresses 5, 6, 10, 11. This space could contribute to defining a model of these Dominican churches,22 as depicted in Figure 8:

---

21 Regarding the length of the church Ellen Hsieh states, “Part of the existing remains encloses the rectangular nave space where the altar is located, as well as part of the nave. The interior width of the nave is 12.3 meters. According to general proportions, the whole church must be at least 40 to 50 meters long. If the width of the side room is added, it may be 20 meters wide. Therefore, the size of this church is almost equal to the oldest existing church of St. Augustine in Intramuros, Manila.” (Hsieh, 2021: 81). We believe that Hsieh’s estimations of the length of the church are correct, as the 40-meter estimate falls in the second category and the 50-meter estimation aligns with the third category.

22 This proportion is similar to other churches constructed in Spain at the same time, which are labeled as “Herrerian style.” One example, although not brilliant, is very clear for our purpose because its plan can be seen in its present state (absence of roof) on Google maps. It is the church of Saint Peter in Ariza (Zaragoza, Spain), which was built in 1620, a few years before the Spaniards arrived in Taiwan. However, in this case the church does not have a long nave.
3. As for the ceiling, there were two ways of covering the church building, by a vault or by a wooden deck. The walls and the buttresses are very wide, which makes us to suspect that the Dominican architect might have planned to cover the building with a vault, if not in a first stage, at least in the second one. Nevertheless, this idea can be challenged by several reasons:

1. It seems that no Cagayan churches of the 17th century have vaults in the nave, even though they have huge buttresses.23

2. The wooden deck seems more stable and safer for a place with many earthquakes.

3. The external buttress in the wall of the apse (10) doesn’t have counterpart (6). If this solution was final, the buttresses work more to fix the walls than to oppose the force of a vault, something especially clear in the buttress number 8.

4. It seems there are two transverse arch footings, which corresponds to buttresses 6 and 10, which might lead to an arch or to a vault just only in the apse, 24 but the lack of buttress 6 might negate this idea, or better suggest that the church was still under construction in the early 1640s.

23 The works of Regalado Trota Jose on the Cagayan churches (see bibliography) present an extensive visual documentation of these churches were no vaults can be recognized presently in the naves.

24 According to the small size of the apse of Todos los Santos church it is credible the purpose of putting a vault in the apse, as it happened in some churches of Cagayan, where the altar chapel in the apse is covered by a vault. If this was the case in Todos los Santos, the reason for the missing buttress (number 6) might be that the church was not yet finished. Certainly, and complementing what had been said in the previous note, Trota Jose presents two rare examples of Dominican churches of the 17th century where the apse is covered by vaults. The first one is in Fottol, in Cagayan Valley, which still conserves the original vault in the apse (José, 2018b: 346-348) and the second one, San Pablo, in Isabela, where a vault can be recognized in a narrow passage and in a renovated apse (José, 2018c: 572, 575).
In any case, whether the church building was completed or unfinished in 1642, when the Dutch took over Kelang, the church of Todos los Santos—as an entity—had served for more than 15 years. That is why it was well equipped with “items for church worship, including chalices and others in wrought silver worth about 800 pesos” (SIT, 492).

The possible location of the convent of Santo Domingo in Kelang

To guess the possible location of the convent, first we can try to see if there was a pattern relating convent and churches in contemporary Dominican churches. If we examine again the mission compounds in Fuga and Malaueg, and we compare side by side the façade of the church and the convent with the floor map (Figures 2 & 3), we see that in both cases the convent is located at the left side of the church (looking at the church from the main entrance). This also happens in the first Dominican church and convent in Binondo (Manila), as we can see in one of its earliest representations (Figure 9):

These two images belong to a map included in the document: “Pleitos sobre propiedad de tierras entre varios vecinos de Tondo,” made in 1639, and kept in Valladolid, in the Archivo de la Provincia Agustiniana de Filipinas [APAF, 331/1-d]. I thank the former archivist of UST Library (Manila), Mr. Regalado Trota Jose, for sharing with me this material, which he discovered and photographed in 2019.
On the contrary the church of Tondo (Figure 10), which appears in the same map, shows a two-story convent located on the right side of the church, but this does not necessarily invalidate the “left-side location pattern” of Dominican convents, since this church was built by the Augustinians, and something similar applies to the famous Augustinian church of San Agustin in Intramuros.

Assuming that this “left-side location pattern” was a common pattern in early 17th century in the Dominican mission compounds, we apply it to the church of Todos los Santos, projecting conceptually (no with the same measures) the floor maps of Malaueg and Fuga on the plan of Todos los Santos, as it is done in Figures 11 and 12:
This comparison, based on proportions (not in real dimensions), shows us the possible location of the convent, provided that the length of the church of Todos los Santos follows the above-mentioned option 3, of 15 buttresses. We choose this option because if there were 13 buttresses the convent of Santo Domingo would be on top of excavated areas, which they did not reveal any building structure. If these ideal projections on 15 buttresses are right, it might be possible to discover some foundations of the convent in the unexcavated area surrounding the big tree in the corner of the parking lot, and additionally they might provide the length of the nave of the church. It is obvious that the second projection (the one of Fuga) offers more feasible archaeological expectations than the first one (Malauieg), whose layout is unique even among many churches in Cagayan Valley.

The role of the convent (and the church) during the battles of 1641 and 1642

The prediction of governor Palomino about the potentially dangerous role of the convent in a Dutch attack was right, because the convent played a significant role in favor of the Dutch during their two attacks of 1641 and 1642, and even in the aftermath as a temporary residence for the defeated Spaniards. The Dutch attack in 1641 was aimed to test the defenses of San Salvador and, if the attack proved unsuccessful, it would provide valuable information for the Dutch in planning a decisive battle the following year. Finally, they limited their advance until the area of the convent and the church, and they did not engage in a final attack to the main fortress. Their retreat was clearly in order to prepare a more suitable armada to the final assault in 1642. Portillo anticipated that, and he prepared his defenses for the second attack, repairing the old auxiliary forts, and deciding on his own to tear down the convent, against the will of the Dominicans. He knew that there was no time for consultation with Governor General Corcuera in Manila for this action, neither time to ask permission from the Provincial of the Dominicans in Manila, so he acted by himself on his own responsibility, expecting further understanding and approval of this fait accompli. Once he tore down the convent he wrote to Governor General Corcuera, on 2 March 1642, justifying his actions:

With this I send your Lordship [the document] from another council ordering the demolition of the convent-house of Santo Domingo in Quimaurri—which last time was occupied by the enemy—much against the will of the friars. Having learned that the enemy wanted to return to the same spot, I feared the harm they can do, as they can turn its walls into a provisional fortress. [However,] contrary to our previous agreement, [the fathers refused to have the convent destroyed], for which I made notes and messages to their Order to justify the demolition. But when I brought these for them to sign, they refused, saying that they were going to hold this
action against me, both in civil and in Church [law]... From the very start of its construction in the time of Sergeant Major Pedro Palomino, [the said officer] was already arguing with the priests about continuing the project. I ask Your Lordship to speak with the Dominican Provincial in Manila so that he may consider the matter well and not file a suit against me for such a just cause. The convent is useless, as seen in the declarations of the master builder and the Sangley masons. (SIT, 372)

As we have seen, to justify his actions, Portillo recalled the former opinion of Palomino of three and a half years earlier, and the opinion of master builder and the Sangley masons that the convent was useless.

It is difficult to state the extent to which the convent was fully destroyed, or rendered unusable. During the siege the only active church was probably the chapel of the fortress (St. Peter church), from where “Fr. Quirós took the Blessed Sacrament from the monstrance and brought it to a safer place from the enemy bullets” (SIT, 460). But, in any case, something in the stone church and the convent was standing, because, after the Spanish defeat and surrender, the religious compound was used for a provisional lodging for the Spanish troops, while waiting for deportation to Tayouan and later to Batavia. The first article of the surrender agreement with the Dutch commander, made on the 26 August 1642, said the following:

Articles concluded and agreed upon by the valiant captain Commander Hendrick Harouse and his council, on behalf of the honorary gentlemen of the States General and His Excellency Prince Fredrick Hendrick and the honorable gentlemen directors of the United Dutch East Indies Company, on the one hand, and Gonzalo Portillo, governor of the fortresses on the island of Kelang, on behalf of His Majesty the King of Spain, on the other, concerning the withdrawal and transfer of the Spaniards, on 26 August 1642: First, that the governor and all his soldiers will pull out of the fortress in full arms and go to the convent [of Santo Domingo] but not further, where they will lay down their weapons. (SIT, 383)

Here, the translation for “clooster” (as it appears in Dutch sources) as a convent, that we are using, is used again by Captain Harousse in a subsequent letter of 28 August 1642, when he reported about the successful conquest, saying that he was using “clooster St. Domingo” (i.e., the convent of Santo Domingo, as different from to the church of Todos los Santos) as a provisional shelter for the defeated:

At noon on the 26th, four companies of soldiers entered the fortress, each one occupying one point (and each very impressive). At present, none of the Spanish soldiers are in the fortress. In accordance with the agreement, they all laid down their muskets and entered the convent Santo Domingo. (SIT, 381)
The Dominican Juan de los Ángeles, also present in the defeat of San Salvador, stated the same in a memoir written in the exile of Macassar six months later (March 1643), informing that the convent of the Franciscans was also used for this purpose:

Having deported from the fort under these terms, they placed us all in the convents of Santo Domingo and San Francisco, with guards, while they went about their affairs, and prepared to send us to Tayguan [Tainan, now Tainan] ... [Later] from the convents they had kept us, they embarked us in four ships bound for the fortress of Tayguan. (SIT, 415)

All this leads us to conclude that the recently excavated church of San Salvador was not finished, and its walls maybe were not so high, although everything had cost many resources to the main promoter of this construction, Fr. Quirós. No wonder, he was even tempted to remain hidden in Taiwan after the conquest of the Dutch, to continue his missionary endeavor (SIT, 457).

**The stone church during the first Dutch stay in Kelang (1642-1662)**

Since the succeeding Dutch maps of 1654 and 1666 had placed an important role in reconstructing the ideal image of the excavated church of Todos los Santos, let us analyze them in a historical context. After the conquest of Kelang, the ongoing building of the church was not used by the Dutch for worship, not only because it was not finished, or because it was badly damaged during the transition of power, but also because no Protestant ministers were available to take it over. Only pastor Marcus Masius came to minister northern Taiwan, Kelang and Tamsui, during the years 1655 to 1661. When in Kelang, he was offered a place to stay, but it seems it was a hut or wooden house, not a stone residence, implying that the old convent was also out of use. In May 1661 he went to Japan and in December of the same year back to Batavia.25 Instead, after the conquest, the stones of the convent were taken out and reused to repair other military constructions, for example in a report sent to Fort Zeelandia, on 7 May 1643, it is said that some stones were taken from the convent to repair the auxiliary fort Victoria:

Since the bastion [fort Victoria] collapsed, we have employed all possible means to rebuild it with a load of lime found and taken from the convent walls on January 23. As a mason, we have used a certain Chinese whom we found when conquering this place. He understands the work so well that

---

25 He was disappointed because the VOC controlled the church very much, manipulating the mission and education, unlike in the previous times (1624-1642). Besides the schoolmasters committed the same crimes as those of the Tayouan times in the South, such as adultery or drunkenness. See Lin Changhua (2003). VOC refers to the documents in the Archive of the Dutch East India Company (Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie), located in the National Archives of The Netherlands.
he is better than all of the masons coming from your end. (VOC 1146, f. 486)26

Besides, on 11 September 1643, Castle Zeelandia of Tayouan decided to eliminate all the stone constructions of Kelang, and President Maximiliaen Le Maire sent instructions ordering the destruction of the Spanish fortresses, church, convent, and other stone houses. Here there is one extract of the order:

Having arrived thither... you will confer with the honorable Harouse and spare no effort to tear down everything. You must be attentive and see to it that the work proceeds well. To this end, Your Honor has been given a load of crowbars and other tools. One shall start tearing down the castle La Santísima, then the small fortress and then the church, convent [kerck t’clooster], and the stone houses. If it takes too much effort to demolish the walls with tools, Your Honor shall resort to gunpowder to blow up the more solid parts. If there is no other way of getting the job done, Your Honor can spend 20 to 25 barrels of gunpowder, but no more. We trust this will suffice to accomplish the most important part of the works and recommend that Your Honor take these matters to heart. (SIT, 463)

But, as early as 25 September 1643 there was a deliberation on how to follow the order of tearing down the fortress, as well as the church, in order to additionally send some of the stones to Tamsui, but it is not clear if in the case of the church this was finally done, even partially, because, according to the instructions, it will be the last one to be demolished, and given that there is still enough gunpowder to do it:

We began, in accordance with your mandate, to knock down the main church [“groote kerck”]. As the above-mentioned instruction ordered to first commence the demolition of castle San Salvador, we immediately began to do so on the 23th. As this work is quite large and heavy, we commanded the lieutenant in Tamsui that same day to dispatch all immediately and on short notice available Sulphur junks to come here as quickly as possible. They are needed to recuperate and transport all reusable stone, which can be obtained in abundance and in greater quantity then we deem necessary for the intended construction of the redoubt in Tamsui. (VOC 1146, f. 484)

Eleven years after this order, we have a second and clear image of the church of Todos los Santos in the map of Simon Keerdekoe of 1654, but we think that this

---

26 This letter was acknowledged later by Fort Zeelandia on the 19 May 1643: “From your writing we were pleased to learn that the construction of the round tower, recently collapsed after hard rains, from the stone taken from the broken-down convent, as well as the lime left there to the enemy, has already begun and stands to be perfected in near future; we truly hope that its secure work will lend itself to a noticeable strengthening of the Company’s new conquest there.” (VOC 1146, f. 477).

27 Initially the island of Kelang was called by the Spaniards Santísima Trinidad, and this name was known by the Dutch, who consequently applied to the fortress. So, along these years, the Dutch continued calling the San Salvador Fortress, Santísima Trinidad Fortress.
is misleading, because, according to the documents we have commented, no intact church was standing there, only some ruins of the beginning of a construction. On the contrary the church portrayed in 1654 is depicted in a similar way to the one made in 1629 by Gerbrantsz Black (see Figures 13 & 14). The only differences are the three crosses, which are on top of the churches of Keerdekoe map. In these ones, the cross in the middle looks like to be on top of a needle-shaped dome, an architectonically irrational structure for such a small building. Other possibility is that this cross is at the top of a bell-tower behind the church. Probably this was the way the Spanish archaeologists understood it, when they published an ideal reconstruction of the floor-map of the church (Cruz, 2018: fig. 10).

Also, there is a Dutch document written in Batavia on 3 January 1655 (few months after the map of Keerdekoe) which, presumably, was intended to accompany this map as an explanation. It clearly states: “A great but unknown amount of stones from the destroyed fortifications, church and convent lay scattered on Kelang Island. These may be useful for something” (SIT, 576). In other words, the drawing of the church in the map was more of a conventional representation rather than an accurate depiction of an existing building.28

28 Our understanding clearly contradicts the one of the Spanish archaeology team, who says: “The map of Simon Keerdekoe (1654) ... clearly shows the standing church, and possibly the cemetery, although it is positioned relatively far from the church.” (Cruz et al., 2020: 243) Our disagreement goes not only to the existence of the church (as we have said, it is just an icon for reference, not a reality), but to the cemetery, because it seems the archaeologists identified the cemetery with two squared areas in front of the entrance. As we will explain later, these structures were not the cemetery, but, in the Keerdekoe understanding, “two wells, where the priest purified themselves” (SIT, 576).
churches located in the two extremes of the village are represented (Figure 15). They have glamorous yards surrounded by a cloister, which make a deep impression to the viewers of the map, as if there was going on a great missionary activity. But we know that, even if the Franciscans and the Dominicans had a mission station there (and the two churches may represent them), they were not made of stone, not so glamorous and, different from Todos los Santos, the presence of a priest was not very regular. No wonder, in this same Dutch document commenting the map it is said: “There had been a convent on both sides of the village where the priests trained the youth, but baptisms and marriages were performed in the Kelang church.” (SIT, 577)

This comparison and observation of images lead us to think that the three churches of the map of Keerdekoe were made symbolically, as an ideal repetitive icon, not portraying any actual building. Summarizing, the reasons are:

1. The design of the two churches of Tapurri (Figure 15) follows the same pattern (a cloister with the church in a corner), matching the style we have defined earlier as “Dominican convent’s left-side location.”

2. The three Keerdekoe churches, two in Tapurri (Figure 15) and one in Quimaurri (Figure 14), show a needle-shaped dome, a very strange structure for such small churches, with three crosses on top of the roof.

3. It is strange that the less important missionary place (Tapurri) should have two glamorous compounds, much more than the more important ones in Quimaurri; and they not only have a church, but a big convent, with an attached cloister.

4. The church of Todos los Santos in Kelang (Figure 14) is very similar in design and disposition to the one on the map made by Black aboard the ship Domburg, in 1629 (Figure 13). This make us to think on the possibility of using the shape of the 1629’s design map in the one of 1654. This is not impossible for two
considerations: first, the final drawing of the big map of Keerdekoe of northern Taiwan (in which the church represents a very minimal part of it) was made in Batavia by assembling different sketches drawn probably by four different teams of cartographers.29 For this, we can imagine that the cartographer of the area of Kelang used the map of 1629, or a copy of it, following the same perspective, to represent a church in the place of the ruins. The second consideration for not discarding this previous idea is that we know that the Dutch kept previous maps in Batavia or Fort Zeelandia for this purpose of military intelligence (see VOC 1098, f. 40).

We think that is safe to conclude that the churches in the map of Keerdekoe do not represent actual churches, but conventional icons of ruined Spanish religious settlements. The Keerdekoe’s map just wants to show that in those places the Dominicans and Franciscans have had religious buildings or missional lodgings; consequently, we cannot treat these images as detailed descriptions of something real.30

Let us finish this part saying that the map of Keerdekoe is the only extant one of northern Taiwan, and the Dutch still stayed in Kelang until 1661, on the eve of the Zheng Chenggong (Koxinga) attack on Fort Zeelandia. After losing Tayouan the Dutch never returned to their former base, but they did it to Kelang.

The church and convent in the second Dutch period in Kelang (1664-1668)

Reinstalling in Kelang. The governance of the Dutch in Kelang during the first period (1642-1661) depended on the main headquarters of Tamsui; as a result, the fortress and the church in Kelang lost importance and ended up ruined. In the second stay in Kelang and Tamsui (1664-1668), these Dutch spots were the only ones in Taiwan, so all the colonial interest was concentrated in the north. Soon after this second arrival, they were expecting an imminent attack from the Zheng forces (the successors of Koxinga) governing now most of the island, then they prepared supplies for a siege of three months, and repaired the main fort and repaired the basic structures to prepare for a long defense.31 On the other hand, Vogels, a scholar who


30 It is important to clarify that when we state that Quimaurri was situated in Kelang Island and Taparri in front (in the mainland), we are referring to the Spanish era. However, during the early Dutch period there was a domino effect: Quimaurrians relocated to Taparri, and the Taparrians moved to Tamsui (Borao, 2009: 110). Therefore, the map depicted in Figure 15, which was created during the Dutch era, actually represents the location of the former Taparri, but now occupy manly by Quimaurrians.

31 "Of utmost importance was the bastion Oosterpunt, also called the Half Moon Bastion, which was the eastern bastion. The northern bastion, called Zeeburg, protected the fortress from sea attack."
made a doctoral dissertation on the Dutch second stay in Keelung, said, “[The Dutch] considered that the height of some still existing walls of the ruined convent could be of great disadvantage but they did not have time to change that” (Vogels, 1988: 44). In other words, Vogels shows that the convent building was still recognizable, and some walls were still good enough to be used by the Chinese in an attack.

The question now is what the map of Cornelis Vischbee (1667) represents with a fenced area with two inner perpendicular paths with a small house at the crossing point of the paths (Figures 16 & 17). Is the church with a cemetery or is another structure? The Spanish archaeologists thought that this was the church, clearly standing, and surrounded by a cemetery, but we consider that this is a misinterpretation of the map.\(^{32}\) If we compare the map of Vischbee (Figure 16) with the map of De Graaff (Figure 18), the side notes of this one tells us clearly that the fenced area is totally different from the church. Also, it is said that this fenced area corresponds to the orchards that the VOC was cultivating for the sustenance of their own people, an activity very much documented in the Dutch sources. Besides, this other map clearly indicates, at the right side of the orchards, a different area described as the “demolished convent” (maybe here the word “convent” refers to the whole compound, convent and church). In other words, the church seems not to be standing, only some ruined walls of the convent are traced, probably because it would still be useful for the Dutch to face the Zheng army, in the expected attack.

\textit{Attack of the Zheng.} On 11 May 1666, the Zheng army landed in Kelang and started to take positions. The ruins of the convent played again a strategic role in the attack, as recorded in two different diaries. The diary of Constantin Nobel said:

On Wednesday morning, with gates up, the outside guards explore the field. A troop of another forty men is positioned outside to lay down behind the height of the convent. Their objective is to observe if the enemy

\(^{32}\) “The map of Vischbee (1667) shows a fenced area annexed to the church that seems to be the cemetery. In both cases, leaving aside the doubts about the cemetery (and accuracy of the maps, always an issue with cartography of the age), the church is clearly standing and visible. It is therefore appropriate to infer the continuity of the building and all its functions into the Dutch period, although perhaps with some renovation and reconstruction. Indeed, the Dutch respected the sacred ground” (Cruz et alt., 2020: 243). Probably, the Spanish archaeologists were led to this mistake because the author of this paper also wrongly identified the fenced area with the church in the first edition of his book \textit{The Spanish Experience in Taiwan} (HK University Press, 2009). In the second edition of the book (SMC Publishing, Taipei, 2020) the error is corrected.
would come out from behind the mountain. To ensure proper vigilance, a reliable sentry has been assigned. (VOC 1258, f. 1551)

Also, since the Chinese were around the convent, this area became a battlefield, in which the victory was for the Dutch. The merchant and head of Kelang, Joan de Meijer, described in his diary, also on the 11 May 1666, the defeat of the Chinese:

The enemy became emboldened and chased us in great numbers. However, each time they were stopped by about 10 to 12 of our men that fought back. It was believed they reached the was spruijtie (?) and the company’s tuijt (?). They chased our fleeing people and thought running immediately through the gates when the cannon on the parapets fired upon them. At this moment our strepen (?), lying behind the elevation of the former convent, jumped out to support us causing the enemy to flee. (VOC 1258, f. 1547)

_The aftermath and new maps._ Even if the Zheng forces had failed in their attack, the Dutch anticipated that there will be a second one, therefore the Dutch made new preparations to be ready for that moment. Since the ruins of the former Dominican mission compound was located close to the expected disembarkation area, in 1666 the Dutch decided to clear the gentle hill where those ruins were located, to avoid being used as a parapet and battery by the Zheng forces against the main fort. The remaining stones of the church and convent were used for other buildings. To carry out that work four barrows should be made (Vogels, 1988:45), specifically to repair the foundation of the half-moon Bultemburg bastion, which was very weak; this started on the 13th of December 1666 and finished on the 15 of January 1667 (Vogels, 1988:45). How the religious compounds were standing after the attack and the repairs? In 1667, the Dutch made three maps of Kelang, and in one of them, as we had said, the convent appears (see the circle of Figure 18), but no relevant information is added.
Figure 17: Detail of the map of Cornelis Vichbee (1667). Algemeen Rijksarchief, VEL 307

Figure 18: Map of Isaac de Graaff (1667) Algemeen Rijksarchief, VEL 305

Figure 19: Stylized map (1667) Algemeen Rijksarchief
If we compare the maps of Figures 16 and 18, the orchards appeared in both cases, designed in the same way: a big square field divided in four parts. The fact that the missionary compound (probably including the convent and the church) only appears in the map of Figure 18 reveals that this is just a vague reference for locating the ruined missionary area. We must add that the fourth one, the “Stylized map” (Figure 19) portrays a silhouette very similar to the map of Vichbee (Figure 16), but with no reference to the convent, the church and to the orchards, just only to the fortress. In other words, it insists in the idea that the church building had been torn down, almost nonexistent, unable or insignificant to be portrayed. In July 1688 the decision in Batavia to evacuate Kelang was taken, with the idea that “as little as possible had to be left for the Chinese: the point [the main bastion] and buildings had to be blown up, the rest had to be destroyed and burned” (Vogels, 1988: 93). Finally, the Dutch left the place in December 1668.

References to the church in the 19th and 20th centuries

What happened later, were the ruins of the religious compound still visible in the 19th century? The Dominicans came back to Taiwan in 1859, but they established first in the south and in the second half of the century in the central area of the island. In these years Fr. Herce, was commissioned to go to Keelung (modern Kelang) to see if there were any remains of the evangelization of 200 years before, and to see if it was possible to start a mission there. Consequently, a very minimal mission was alive there, during years 1867-1869. We did not find any document of Herce reporting on his trip to the north, or whether he explored the ruins of the 17th century mission or not; but, 20 years after the trip of Herce, Fr. Arranz, the Dominican who founded the mission in Taipei in 1887, after his first visit of Keelung commented:

The first day, which was 9 October [November 1887], I arrived to Keelung, a city of many memories for a Dominican. In front of the harbor is the island Sia-Liau, or Palm Island [Heping Island], where twenty years ago Fr. Herce found the foundations of the church, and a big part of the vault and remains of the Spanish fort. (Correo Sino-Annamita 22, 1888: 62)

The words of Arranz are very clear, besides the Spanish fort, he talks about the “foundations of a church” and a “great part of a vault,” which is not clear if it belongs to the fortress (the bastions had vault), or to the church. The words of Arranz should be taken with some caution, because they refer to something observed by Herce twenty years earlier, that he had heard from him, and who might have been exaggerating or overestimating what he had seen. Even if he refers to the vault as something related
the foundations of the church, maybe the vault of to the convent, not to the church. We justify our doubts by the fact that in 1871, a few years after the visit of Herce to Palm Island (Kelang Island, modern Heping Island), the Protestant pastor Leslie Mackay arrived in Taiwan and he established himself in Tamsui. Oftentimes he went to Keelung. His first trip to Keelung was registered in his diary in the entry of 27 of September 1872 (only three years after the stay of Herce), and he went to explore the possibility of establishing a mission in Palm Island. In this day he also made a detailed visit to the ruins of the fortress, which he described very well:

> On one end of the Island I examined the ‘Dutch Fort’ which must have been built more than two hundred years ago. It is square including an area of several acres, built mainly of sand stone and mortar with a Mote at one time fully ten feet in depth all around. On this were mounted their guns. Although is telling on the whole, there is no difficulty in getting good idea of the whole arrangement. (Mackay’s Diaries, 1871-1901: 43-44)

We presume that, as a Protestant missionary, he would have mentioned the existence of a church, even Catholic one, if still was visible, but he did not mention at all,33 neither in the entry of that particular day or in the entries of the other times that he went to Keelung (Kelang), roughly twice a year, in which sometimes he stayed several days. He made more visits to Palm Island, particularly since the summer of 1886 when a Protestant chapel was built there. Besides, Mackay had strong cultural interests to the extent that he made a museum with all the artifacts he was collecting in Tamsui, therefore if the church ruins still were visible he might have elaborated on them.

Finally, the church was indirectly mentioned in a report on the fortress of Keelung, made by Osaki Hidezane and Ike Kaoru, presented to the Japanese colonial authorities in 1931, in order to study the convenience of the preservation of the ruins of the fortress. They visited She Liao Tao to describe the situation of these ruins, and, after doing that, they added in their report the following comments: “We think that these remains [of the fort] are worth preserving as historical relics, and can be added to the list of historical sites. We also can presume the approximate location of the abandoned monastery and its orchard and gardens cultivated by the religious.” (SIT, 674) From this comment we can see that some dispersed, almost unrecognizable, ruins of the convent, the church and the orchards of the Dutch were still visible around, but the report mixed Spanish and Dutch works, attributing all of them to the missionaries.

---

33 Of course, always there is the coincidental possibility that the foundations mention by Fr. Herce totally disappeared in one moment between 1867 and 1872.
Additionally, we know that in 1936 the bastion of San Sebastian was excavated by a team from Taihoku University who made a good collection of photographs.34 But later, the whole area of the fortress, and adjacent ones, were leveled, in order to create a dry dock on top of the area of the fortress, with the consequent total removal of the fortress. As a result a shipyard was created on top of this historical relic. The new construction expanded later with a second dry dock, both still existing in the present times, making the old historical area of the fortress totally unrecognizable.

Half kilometer away the shipyard company owned a rectangular lot of land which was very well defined after the Japanese urban planning. Some Japanese houses were built there, and after several decades they were torn down, the place was leveled, and converted temporarily in a public parking lot. In this place the excavations looking for the church of Todos los Santos started in 2011, and luckily in 2012 one buttress of the church appeared.35 The excavation continued and in 2019 the general plan of the church was clear, although unfortunately an important part of the nave had disappeared during the construction of the adjacent lanes created by the Japanese urban planning. Now, the future of this parking lot is in the hands of the Keelung Government and the modern shipyard (who is the successor to the Japanese one), who are discussing how to organize there a cultural facility, or museum, for the city.

Other structures of the missionary compound of Todos los Santos

The cemetery. This is a very important area because the Spanish written sources did not mention such a place, but the excavations have provided clear evidences. We only found a reference to a graveyard in the Dutch sources when reporting a big typhoon on 8 July 1648. “All the Company’s houses have been destroyed, like the ‘landdag house’ [the one for the assemblies with the natives], the houses for the slaves, the hospital and the graveyard” (VOC 1170, f. 498v). In the context, it seems that the Dutch graveyard was close to the bastion North Holland, or near the seashore, adding more data for the speculation on graveyards in Kelang, and the ones in the church. Even if we were not part of the archaeological team of the fourth archaeological season onwards, we want to present some opinions on four archaeological discoveries made in the succeeding excavations.

34 Most of the pictures and the Japanese diary of the excavation can be seen in 宮本延人・岩生成一・中村孝志等，〈社寮島城址發掘、社寮島史蹟發掘日誌、社寮島發掘〉In: 鮑曉鴻，洪曉純 (主編), 《尋找消逝的基隆》 (Recovering the Past of Jilong: New archaeological findings from Heping Island of Northern Taiwan), 南天, 台北, 2015, pp. 3-37.

35 It is a pity that the Japanese archaeological team of 1936 didn’t take pictures of the church ruins, if any. In the first three years (2011-2013) the author of this paper was part of the Taiwanese archaeological team who looked for the cooperation of the Spanish archaeological team.
(1) **The burials.** The excavations carried out from 2014 to 2019 discovered burials inside and outside the church foundations, leading the archaeologists to think on the existence of two cemeteries, internal and external. The archaeologists were discussing this evidence trying to see, for example, if the different orientation can be associated to the different religion of the colonizers, Catholic for the Spaniards and Calvinist for the Dutch, but for the moment they haven’t manifested definitive conclusions.36 The archaeologists also mentioned that the burials follow a Christian tradition: “All the burials indeed seem to have followed a Christian rite, with a coffin attested in at least one of them through wooden remains and nails, and no accompanying objects preserved” (Cruz et alt., 2018). We just want to add that this is consistent with the indications given by the Dominican Province of the Holy Rosary (Philippines, Japan and China), which in the General Chapter of 1635, when taking about the destination of alms by the sick people, they mentioned that the alms cannot be destined to the coffin, which—they added—is made of wood.37

Regarding the existence of two cemeteries, we believe, as external observers, that still it is too early to definitively classify them as separated entities, one internal and one external. As discussed in this paper, the construction of the church began towards the end of the Spanish presence, and it remains uncertain whether it was entirely finished when the Spaniards departed from Taiwan. Consequently, various possibilities emerge when interpreting the relationship between the church and the burials. Just to mention one, maybe the cemeteries did not originate based on the location of the church, but, on the contrary, the church could have been built on top of a pre-existing cemetery, resulting in some burials being inside the church while others remained outside.38 On the other hand, the sepulchral area within the church does not seem densely populated with tombs, suggesting the need for an external area. If the church of the convent was made after the burials, a wooden and straw

---

36 This idea is expressed by the archaeologists: “The orientations might offer some information about the colonial phase to which belong the burials, although this still is under study” (Cruz & Serrano, 2019).

37 “Although the sick should be encouraged to leave the alms of the mass for the benefit of their souls in a will or testament, no one, however, should be compelled to do this, nor be induced to give any other alms, and much less for the silver cross, or to be buried in the greater chapel, or for the wooden box, or Ataud” (Acta, 1635: 173).

38 This could be possible because the first nine discovered European burials can be divided into two groups without significant distinctive differences: the group inside the church premises has four burials (three of them oriented N-S, and one E-W) while the area outside the church has five burials (four of them oriented E-W, and one N-S) (Cruz & Serrano, 2019). We contacted Prof. Yves Krumenacker on 2nd November 2020, who stated, “It’s a difficult problem. I don’t know any rule about the orientation. But in the protestant cemeteries that have been excavated, the corpses are very often East-West (head to the West and feet to the East). It is the case in Paris and Lyon.”
structure might have served as the original and provisional church, located nearby but not necessarily in the exact same place as the stone-built church.

(2) *The indigenous burial.* The archaeologists are also trying to see if there is any connection between these burials with the one of an infant buried according to the native rite, which was discovered by the Taiwanese team during the first excavation, in December 2011. The Spanish archaeologists considered that there was a connection, and this might manifest the tolerance of the colonizers to accept indigenous rites in a Catholic cemetery. They say:

A burial of a four-year old child... was also unearthed in the same stratigraphic context and therefore belonging to the cemetery... it followed the native ritual as the child had been placed in a jar (with no detectable orientation) and interred with some offerings maybe worn in life... The ritual however is substantially modified in that it should normally have been performed under the family house; moreover, it was accompanied by Chinese objects. Thus, the finding shows an interesting mix of elements (aboriginal Taiwanese, Chinese) for a probable native convert (or rather, let baptized by the parents) in which the apparent respect of the Catholic authorities for the native uses is remarkable. (Cruz, et alt. 2018)39

In a posterior article, the archaeologists reaffirm the idea that this burial was of the same time of the cemetery (Cruz et alt., 2020: 274). We coincide with the idea that this burial followed a native ritual, since “Taiwanese aborigines often used Chinese stoneware as burial jars for infants, and the discovered jar with the body inside contained a glass earring as a mortuary object” (Borao & Hung 2015: 270-271).40 But we think there is not enough basis to say that “it is in the same stratigraphic context,” and, consequently, the burial should be associated to of a Christian native infant, or, at the very least, with a Catholic cemetery. On the contrary, our direct observations of the excavation in 2011 make us consider that the layer of this burial was in a slightly higher location than the European burials, leading us to think that the connection is not so obvious. In fact, considering the post-holes of the area of the burial, and the custom of burying people under their houses, mentioned among many others by Esquivel (*SIT*, 180), led us to think that this burial could be done after the

39 In a posterior article, the archaeologists suggest again the idea that this burial was at the same time of the cemetery: Our re-excavation in 2014 of the location of the jar burial to reconstruct the original excavation process and stratigraphic relations showed the imprint of the jar in the soil and its stratigraphic position was highly suggestive that it belonged to the cemetery (Cruz, et alt. 2020: 257).

40 This was a common practice in Southeast Asia, which can be also recognized in the excavations in Lal-lo (coincidentally, the center of the Dominican missions in Cagayan): “The primary burials with the trade ceramics also existed in the San Lorenzo site [near Iguig], in the same funeral area. These trade ceramics are celadons, blue and white porcelains and brown glazed jars, and date from 14th to 18th Century” (Ogawa, 1998).
European presence, under the new wooden houses stablished there. In this way we follow the same view of the Taiwanese team that excavated that test pit in 2011, who said: “It is speculated that [this infant burial] should belong to the aboriginal people who contacted the Han people in the Ming or Qing dynasties” (基隆和平島古隊, 2015: 112). 41

(3) The empty tomb. The archaeologists also revealed that there was an empty tomb, and we think that the written sources can help us find an explanation. If there was an empty tomb it must be for one of the two following reasons; first, because it was prepared for someone, but the imminence of the war with the Dutch prevented them to place the corpse; or, second, because someone was buried there and his body was later removed by the Dominicans when they were forced to accompany the captured Spanish soldiers to their destination firstly to Tayouan, later to Batavia and finally to Manila or Spain. And the written sources suggest that this might be the case. Certainly, there are two references in this sense that might help us know who was the possible person buried in this empty tomb. The first document comes from one account written seven years after the departure of Kelang, in 5 September 1649, by the Prior of Santo Domingo (Manila), Fr. Juan de los Angeles, who stayed several

41 In the mentioned research paper of 2020 the archaeologists insisted that the infant burial should be related to the cemetery of the Spanish period, and to justify the divergence of indigenous practice in a Catholic venue, they speculated on three possibilities (Cruz, 2020: 273-275): (1) the priests might have exerted some pressure for burial in a Catholic graveyard, particularly the corpses of children, because this procedure will be fundamental for the conversion process; (2) the missionaries have adopted infants, after saving them from the practice of infanticide, and they were raised as Christians; (3) the beliefs or desire of the parents of native children to fall under the influence of a foreign church. Even if we have expressed our opinion that most probably this burial was done after the European colonial period, additionally, these three reasons sound quite unlikely to us. First, to force this burial against the desires of the parents might be more detrimental than favorable to the conversion process. Second, certainly bishop Aduarte who visited the missions in 1632 mentioned in a book written in 1640 the possibility of adopting children, and the fact of this possibility was publicly announced, but from that we cannot infer that this really happened (SIT, 192). In fact, such action was never recorded. He merely expresses his desire, and points out that only few children have been baptized. Besides, considering all the problems that the missionaries have to face, we hardly can imagine that they even adopted children after saving them from infanticide, because of the additional problems of finding wet-nurses, etc. [Note: this work of raising children in an orphanage is very complicated; the Dominicans only did it in the 19th century with a lot of external help. See J. E. Borao, “Catholic Orphanages in Fujian in the 19th and 20th Centuries,” 《漢學研究》 (Chinese Studies), Sept. 2021, Vol. 39 Issue 3, pp. 187-228. In any case, we cannot ignore one comment in a report made by a Jesuit in the Philippines, on 30 July 1628, who mentioned that some natives in some part of the northern coast of Taiwan send some children as hostages to the fortress, to avoid punishment, and “they are been reared in our fort” (SIT, 133)]. And, as for the “beliefs of the parents or their desire to fall under the influence of the foreign church,” this is more likely; but it is still difficult to believe that the Dominicans might have accepted non-baptized people in a Catholic cemetery.
years in Isla Hermosa, including the final ones. In a report requested to him by the Governor General, Diego Fajardo, De los Angeles said:

The number of priests of our Order assigned to that Island was more than 20 at certain periods of time during the 16 years that the Spaniards kept a garrison there. Two of them were killed by arrows shot by the natives… and afterwards they were beheaded for having preached the Gospel. They are Fr. Francisco [Váez] de Santo Domingo, a Portuguese… and Fr. Luis Muro… Fr. Bartolomé Martínez, the Provincial, Fr. Mateo de Cobisa, and other very great men were also buried in the Island, although the bones of the two holy martyrs (the ones of Fr. Luis Muro were reduced to ashes) were taken to Manila when the Spaniards left the Island. (SIT, 573)

According to this text, since Francisco Váez and Luis Muro were considered martyrs (they were killed in Tamsui), this was probably the reason why their remains were intended to be brought to Manila,\(^{42}\) maybe for the purpose of having their relics in a future case of possible canonization. However, while the remains of Fr. Luis Muro were cremated,\(^{43}\) only the bones of Fr. Francisco Váez were preserved. It is uncertain whether Fr. Muro’s remains were incinerated first or if the cremation of Fr. Váez was not possible due to time constraints or other reasons. Nevertheless, based on the literal interpretation of the text, both of them were brought to Manila: Muro’s remains in the form of ashes and Váez’s remains in the form of bones. If the empty tomb is associated with one of these two missionaries, it remains difficult to determine which one was buried there.

\(^{42}\) This is not an unusual practice, because this occurred with the head of Fr. Capillas. He had lived in Cagayan for a long term, later in Fuga (1636-1641), and from there travelled to Isla Hermosa, where he stayed for two years, before going on to China, just before the Dutch conquest of San Salvador. We know that Fr. Juan Polanco brought the head of the Venerable Fr. Capillas to Valladolid, to keep it as relic in the Convent of San Pablo. This was done after two juridical protocols, first in China (under the judgement of Fr. Juan Bautista Morales, on September 13, 1650) and the second in Nueva Segovia (in two sessions of January 1652) (Polvorosa, 1989: 646).

\(^{43}\) In any case, this procedure sounds very strange because of the long tradition in the Catholic Church to bury the corpses without cremation. In fact, because the introduction or revival of some pagan customs, “Boniface VIII, on 21 February, 1300, … promulgated a law which was in substance as follows: ‘They were ipso facto excommunicated who disemboweled bodies of the dead or inhumanly boiled them to separate the flesh from the bones, with a view to transportation for burial in their native land.” (New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia).
the Governor sent troops to the island, and took possession of it, more than 40 or 60 leagues from the Dutch fort. Only the Dominican went on this occasion. Then it befell that many of the troops died, for the island is very cold” (SIT, 115). Along the years we have also the scattered deaths, some documented like the Dominicans: Bartolomé Martínez (1629), Mateo Cobissa (1630), Luis Muro (1633)\(^{44}\), and three more in 1636: Francisco Vaéz, Antonio Domínguez, Juan Sánchez. We have also the comment of Fr. Quirós which retrospectively gave this general figure: “the natives killed more than one hundred of Spaniards” (SIT, 456). We have also the few Spaniards (and Dutch) who died in the battle of San Salvador (August 1642), when the Dutch took over Kelang.

Later we have those who died during the Dutch first period of occupation of Kelang, and not to mention those who died in “Tamsui, a place considered less healthy than Kelang” by the Dutch, as stated in a letter of 18 July 1646 (VOC 1160, ff. 231v). There much news about sicknesses spreading among the natives, that also affected the soldiers; many weak people in the hospitals, some of whom recovered, some not.\(^{45}\) We cannot make reliable statistics of dead people during the first Dutch period, but during the second period of Dutch occupation of Kelang we have a non-exhaustive list totaling almost 100 persons in the short period of three years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Dutch dead (1664-1667)</th>
<th>deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 September 1664 - 25 February 1665</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 February – 30 October 1665</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 November 1665 – February 1666</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March – 31 August 1666</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 September 1666 -3 February 1667</td>
<td>ca 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Vogels, 1988: 50

\(^{44}\) Due to a certain degree of ambiguity in the sources, we had considered in our previous articles that Fr. Francisco Váez died in 1633, however we are inclined now to consider his death in 1633, after accepting the information provided by contemporary Dominican historian Aduarte at face value (SIT, 239).

\(^{45}\) Just to cite some examples: on 19 October 1642 “one soldier died because of diarrhea” (VOC 1140, f. 320), on 18 April 1648 “two persons have died in the last six months, one person died in Noordt Hollandt and one in Tamsuij, which is certainly not much” (VOC 1170, f. 503), on 1651 “Vorgert Loubrecq corporal died (in Kelang), some soldiers in Tamsuy got serious plague, so we are considering to move troops to Kelang” (VOC 1183, f. 817), etc.
Finally, we even can mention those Dutch and Chinese who died during the failed Zheng attempt of conquering Kelang in 1666, whose dead bodies have fallen, scattered around the old convent and church buildings because that area was the main battlefield of this fight. In short, all this indicates the existence of different cemeteries (and this without counting the native burials). This explains the present difficulty for the archaeologists on reaching conclusions about the burials they have found.

The two artificial ponds. One structure mentioned in the Dutch document “Description of the situation on Kelang and Tamsui,” made on the 3 January 1655 (SIT, 575), which possibly was made as an explanation to the drawing of the map of Keerdekoe, is the existence of two ponds in front of the church (Figure 14): “Outside, near the church are two curious ponds paved with stone, which has odd-looking stairs that start from the bottom. In these ponds the clergy purified their bodies.” (SIT, 575) Literally, the text means that this was a kind of bath place. Other possibilities might be that it was a place to keep fresh water, or a place for baptism by immersion, although in the 17th century this kind of baptism was not as popular in Catholicism as it had been before. But the importance of the existence of these two ponds is that they can challenge the theory we had said before: that the church was not standing anymore during the times of Keerdekoe (1654). Yes, the vivid and detailed description of the ponds (with “odd-looking stairs that start from the bottom”) made their existence very credible, as if they were drawn by an eyewitness. In other words, if the text and the drawing match when referring to these two ponds, it will be the evidence of the existence of the ponds, and consequently the drawing of the church near the ponds might also be real. Yes, but this contradicts the fact, that the same document says a few lines later: “A great, but unknown amount of stones from the destroyed fortifications, church and convent, lay scattered on Kelang island. These may be useful for something” (SIT, 576); in other words, the church was totally ruined, and the cartographer used a pre-established standard icon to portray it. As for the ponds we just said that the detailed description makes its existence plausible, because the author of this text was very interested on these curious structures. The

46 “Instead of a basin below the floor level, walls of masonry were built up to a height of three or four feet, to facilitate the ministers holding a child over its opening; or a font hewn from solid stone rested on the chapel floor. Immersion of children had come to be the rule, and as the practice was adopted too in the case of adults, the fonts were sometimes large enough to admit of their being immersed. With the thirteenth century, however, simple infusion came by degrees to be adopted, and with its general use, the font became smaller and shallower, and was raised from the floor on piers or columns.” New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, word: baptismal font (archaeology), https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02274a.htm.
best way to reconcile the existence of the two ponds in 1654 is that they still were providing fresh water a decade later the church was abandoned.

Is it strange that there existed artificial “ponds” (as the Dutch sources defined them)? Actually not. It will be easier to understand if we considered them as real wells, because of the artificial stairs going inside. In fact, today there are many wells of different dimensions scattered around the small island of Heping. Besides, archivist Jose informed us that this structure is no alien to some convents in northern Luzon; particularly two Augustinian convents which still keep the wells with inner staircases in the convents of Bacarra and of Piddig, located in Ilocos Norte, a neighboring province of Cagayan. He mentioned to us that these wells look from the 19th century, but they might have had an early origin. Another example is the church of Iguig in Cagayan Valley which had a well that served as source of water for the community.

**Religious life in the church and convent of Todos los Santos**

The activity in the convent was proper of any other of the Catholic church at that time: celebrating masses, administering baptisms, and teaching Catholic doctrine mainly to the native children, because they have more time, they were more receptive and quicker to understand not only the doctrine, but even the Spanish language. They learned Spanish from the priest very soon, even from the soldiers, and they helped in the services of the church. One of these native youngsters was Teodoro, who was “responsible for the receipts and expenditures of the candles [in the church]” ([SIT](#), 477), and years later—during the Dutch times—became the chieftain of the village of Quimaurri. Other activity was the processions, where even Latin songs were sung.

The Dutch sources several times show a kind of disappointment for not being able to offer the same religious services that in the Spanish times. For example, in a letter from Kelang to Zeelandia on 10 November 1657, the Dutch say:

> It seems that before, the Basay, were better Christians than they are now… The Spaniards managed to instill so much civilization in the minds of the Basay that they turned their back on their shameful way of life. Besides, the Basay have adopted the Spanish temperament and many other evils. In many other habits, like trimming money and so on, they equal than the Jew. That they inclined towards Christianity as more as than two or three years ago is because they have been taught recently as much by the Spaniards… If today one asks a Basayer if he is Christian, he will reply ‘Yes Sir, I am a
good Christian of the Castilian,’ and they are just as fluent in reciting the Pater Noster as a magpie is in chatting. (VOC 1228, f. 591)

Other ceremonies, as the archaeology reveals, must be the funerals for the people dying there, mainly the Spanish soldiers and probably even some natives, although there are no written references for that.

Regarding the friars we know that a total of 48 clergy passed through the city of San Salvador (see Annex): 37 Dominicans and 9 Franciscans. But some of them stayed for a very short time. Usually they were around 6-7 years at any given time, and 9-10 in special periods. Among those who stayed just a couple of years we can mention Esquivel, who wrote several descriptions of the native Basay people, particularly those of Tamsui. Also, the convent of Todos los Santos was a stop-over in the journey of these missionaries to China or Japan, countries where their job was done in clandestine conditions. As we have mentioned earlier, a Franciscan convent was also established in 1633, which lasted until 1642, but we do not have much details on that.47 Also, the embryonic city of San Salvador was the place where the discussion of the Chinese Rites started because of the easy communication between Franciscans and Dominicans, and their collaboration on going to China, where the Jesuits had entered some decades before. This jumping board to China, and especially to Japan, was very dangerous for missionaries. Some of them died on their way to their destination, like the same Esquivel, who was killed by the Japanese sailors on his way to Japan, just after leaving Kelang. Other Dominicans who were Japanese managed easily to return to their country but after few years they were discovered and also martyred.

Conclusion

The construction of the church of Todos los Santos in San Salvador followed a process similar to the buildings of the missions of Cagayan (northern Philippines). First (1626-1629), there was the creation of a convent house for the residence of the Dominicans, made of wood and straw. Almost at the same time, they proceeded to construct a provisional church using the same kind of materials. Initially these first buildings were designated for the service of the Christians in San Salvador, the soldiers, and other colony personnel; therefore, we presume the church was located near the

47 Here we present one of the few references, from the Franciscan Huerta: “Convent of Formosa. In year 1636 R.P. Fr. Gaspar Alenda (who had arrived to the Philippines in 1611) founded a convent of ours, devoting it to our Seraphic P. Saint Francis, and the same year the mentioned Fr. Alenda was appointed as guardian of the convent. This convent pertained to this Apostolic Province of Saint Gregory, until 25 August 1642, in which the Dutch defeated the Spaniards, and took the island” (Huerta, 1865: 604).
fortress. Meanwhile, the missionaries tried to learn the language of the natives, and after a few years, they began to have close dealings with them.

The next step (1629-1635) was to create small straw churches in the villages of Quimaurri and Taparri while continuing to learn the language and to bring the mission to a state of maturity. Probably with the visit of Fr. Provincial Domingo González (1634), new guidelines were given to improve the mission. Among them was the expansion to include the village of Santiago (present Fu-long) and the Cavalan province (present Yilan). It also made sense, within this zeal for expansion, to establish a permanent convent made of stone in San Salvador as soon as possible, following the pattern of those in the Cagayan province.

The moment to start the definitive convent of stone arrived during the times of governor Palomino (1637-1639). Probably because this governor considered that the fortress was sufficiently built and ready for a Dutch attack, the Chinese masons working for the fortress were not needed as much as before, and could be transferred to other construction projects. The stone convent must have been making rapid progress, because governor Palomino suddenly realized that, in fact, it was detrimental for the defense of the fortress, as it could be used by the enemy as a parapet during an attack. However, he did nothing about it.

When the next governor, Cristóbal Márquez (1639-1640), arrived in San Salvador we must assume that the convent was already finished, as Fr. Quirós mentioned on 4 October 1639 that he was living very safely in the second floor, while the first floor served as a church. In other words, the stone church may not have existed yet, or was not finalized at that time. However, Márquez, unlike Palomino, believed that some defensive work might still be required in the fortress, and he possibly reclaimed the Chinese masons who were working in the church. Consequently, the most that Fr. Quirós could do without them was to create plans for the definitive church, outlining or even continuing its foundations. Since this work was carried out underneath, it did not affect the defense of the main fortress, at least for the meantime. That could explain why Márquez did not complain about the church, not

---

48 This chapel of the garrison, or a new one, continued there to the end of the Spanish presence. The location of this church, devoted to Saint Peter (as it was called, at least in 1641), was so close to the Corps du Gard at the entrance of the fortress that governor Gonzalo Portillo was unhappy, because the soldiers easily can do a “recourse to the sacred.” Portillo said in a letter to Corcuera on the 2nd of March 1642: “A soldier hid inside the Royal Chapel because he had wounded another with a bottle during a skirmish. The Lord was not in the chapel then. I have been gravely afflicted as to whether he respected the church or not. May Your Lordship advise me on this and send a declaration from there because the men in the fort can dare try some other act of insolence. The corps of guards is located close to the church and they can seize it at any hour of the night” (SIT, 334).
about the convent, probably because it was already finished, and he may have wanted to avoid any confrontation with the Dominicans.

On the other hand, the new and last governor, Gonzalo Portillo (1640-1642) was very belligerent towards the convent building. After the Dutch attack of 1641, he felt vindicated in his concern because, although the Dutch did not materialize their assault to the main fortress and ultimately retreated, they had used the convent (not the church building) as a parapet. In February 1642, while preparing for the next seasonal attack expected in the summer, Portillo informed Manila that he had taken the initiative to destroy the convent, citing the lack of time to seek and await orders. However, we believe the destruction was only partial, as after the Spanish defeat in August 1642, the Santo Domingo convent, along with the San Francisco convent, were temporarily used to house Spanish soldiers before their exile.

Once again, there is no specific mention of the church, although some structures must have been there, leading us to consider the possibility that the church building was never actually finished. In this context, the division of the cemetery in two parts, internal and external, remains open to discussion, as the graveyard could have been established earlier than the construction of the church. Therefore, we believe the idea presented by the Spanish team of archaeologists, suggesting that “The Spanish cemetery would have been opened as the church of Todos los Santos began its life, probably by locating the burials in the immediacy of the church. Dutch continuity in the use of the burial ground, however, cannot be excluded” (Cruz et al., 2020: 243), and should be revisited.

An isolated reference to the stone church building only appears in September 1643 in the Dutch documents. This was when Governor Le Maire sent instructions to Kelang ordering the destruction of all the Spanish buildings, including the forts, the convent, and the church. However, this instruction seems strange because, as we have mentioned before, no actual building was standing, neither in 1643, nor in 1654 when Keerdekoe portrayed a church on his map. From that time until the early 20th century only minimal ruins of the church, if any, can be identified (despite the strange comment attributed to the second-generation Dominican, Fr. Herce, who claimed to have seen a vault of the church in 1872). It was not until the year 2012 that we started seeing a part of the church again: the foundation of a buttress.
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### Annex: Missionaries who came to Taiwan or passed by on their way to Japan or China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Missionary Name</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bartolomé Martínez, O.P.</td>
<td>Losillo (Logroño)</td>
<td>1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Domingo de la Borda, O.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Francisco Vázquez de Santo Domingo, O.P.</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>ca. 1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Jerónimo Morer, O.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Francisco Mola, O.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Juan de Elgueta, O.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Tomás Hioji Rokuzyemon Nishi de San Jacinto, O.P.</td>
<td>Hirado, Kyushu</td>
<td>1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Jacobo Kiusei Gorobiyoie Tomonaga, O.P.</td>
<td>Kyushu</td>
<td>1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Brother Francisco de Acevedo, O.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Angelo Cocchi de San Antonio, O.P.</td>
<td>Florence (Italy)</td>
<td>1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Lucas de Atienza, O.S.A. (Only for a few days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Domingo Fernández, O.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Brother Antonio Dominguez de Santo Domingo, O.P.</td>
<td>Viana (Portugal)</td>
<td>1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Brother Andrés Jiménez del Rosario, O.P.</td>
<td>Toledo (Spain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Jacinto Esquivel del Rosario, O.P.</td>
<td>Vitoria (Spain)</td>
<td>1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Francisco Bravo, O.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Tomás Serra de la Magdalena, O.P.</td>
<td>Sardinia Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Domingo Aduarte, O.P.</td>
<td>Zaragoza (Spain)</td>
<td>1569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Teodoro Quirós de la Madre de Dios, O.P.</td>
<td>Vivero (Lugo)</td>
<td>1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Miguel Corena, O.P.</td>
<td>Zaragoza (Spain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Lucas García, O.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Brother Antonio Estrada del Rosario, O.P.</td>
<td>Tenerife (Spain)</td>
<td>ca.1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Juan Bautista Morales, O.P.</td>
<td>Ecija (Spain)</td>
<td>1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Pedro Chaves, O.P.</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Gaspar de Alenda, O.F.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Onofre Pelleja de Jesús, O.F.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Antonio de Ciudad Rodrigo, O.F.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Brother Juan de San Marcos, O.F.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Antonio María Caballero de Santa María, O.F.M.</td>
<td>Baltanás (Palencia)</td>
<td>1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Francisco Bermúdez de la Madre de Dios, de Alameda, O.F.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Francisco de Escalona de Jesús, O.F.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Domingo Urquicio de Jesús, o Vizcaino, O.F.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Diego de Jesús, O.F.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Years in Taiwan (unless otherwise indicated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1626</th>
<th>1627</th>
<th>1628</th>
<th>1629</th>
<th>1630</th>
<th>1631</th>
<th>1632</th>
<th>1633</th>
<th>1634</th>
<th>1635</th>
<th>1636</th>
<th>1637</th>
<th>1638</th>
<th>1639</th>
<th>1640</th>
<th>1641</th>
<th>1642</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>29†</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>26</td>
<td>Cg†</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ml†</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Jp†</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>Cg</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ch†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>28</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>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30†</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>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Ml†</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>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33†</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>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ml†</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>31</td>
<td>Ch†</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</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>Ml</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Cg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ml†</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>33</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Mc</td>
<td>Mc</td>
<td>Rm</td>
<td>Rm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ty</td>
<td>Ty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</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>38</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>39</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>33</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Mc</td>
<td>Mc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</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>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Missionaries</td>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td>Birth</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Domingo González, O.P.</td>
<td>Valladolid (Spain)</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>36</td>
<td>Francisco Díaz, O.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1606</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>37</td>
<td>Juan García, O.P.</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Brother Juan Sánchez de los Santos, O.P.</td>
<td>Pedrera (Spain)</td>
<td>ca.1600</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>39</td>
<td>Luis Muro de San Miguel, O.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ca.1606</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>40</td>
<td>Lorenzo Arnedo, O.P.</td>
<td>(Albay) Philippines</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>41</td>
<td>Felipe del Espíritu Santo, O.P.</td>
<td>Japan</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>42</td>
<td>Juan de los Ángeles, O.P.</td>
<td>Zafra (Spain)</td>
<td>1609</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>43</td>
<td>Juan de (B)alcázar (diocesan priest)</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Antonio de la Torre, O.P.</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Juan de Arjona, O.P.</td>
<td>Córdoba (Spain)</td>
<td>1582</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>46</td>
<td>Brother Pedro Ruiz, O.P.</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Brother Basilio Cervantes del Rosario, O.P.</td>
<td>Alcázar de Consuegra</td>
<td>ca.1612</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>48</td>
<td>Brother Amador Acuña (postulante), O.P.</td>
<td>Macao</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>49</td>
<td>Francisco Fernández de Capillas, O.P.</td>
<td>Barquerín (Spain)</td>
<td>1607</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>

The years in shaded boxes: provincial vicar (the leader of the mission, different from the vicar of a specific house)

Names in bold highlight the most prominent missionaries.

The names taken by the missionaries when they entered their religious order are in italics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1626</th>
<th>1627</th>
<th>1628</th>
<th>1629</th>
<th>1630</th>
<th>1631</th>
<th>1632</th>
<th>1633</th>
<th>1634</th>
<th>1635</th>
<th>1636</th>
<th>1637</th>
<th>1638</th>
<th>1639</th>
<th>1640</th>
<th>1641</th>
<th>1642</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36†</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>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ml</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>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ml</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</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>Sold.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years underlined mean that the missionary died that year.

Ch: China; Mc: Macao; Ml: Manila; Rm: Rome; Ty: Tàyouan; Cg: Cagayan; Sold.; soldier (before becoming a Dominican)

The numbers inside the shaded boxes correspond to the years that the missionary was the vicar of the Dominicans.
La salve Regina quan
Ell veu teus reynay uma
de demisericordia, vida
dulcera y esperança mia. Dios
tesalve at allamamos los selec
tados hijos de Cua. Atisupri
camos gumiendo yllorando en
aqueste valle de lagrimas. En
pues abogada nuestra, huelue
anoteros estos tus misericor
diosos ojos, y después de a

[Translation note: The text in the image appears to be in Latin or another ancient language. The content is not legible due to the quality of the image.]