

ABANDONADOS AND AFORTUNADOS: THE PROSECUTION OF CORSARIOS BY THE MEXICAN INQUISITION

ROBERT BROMBER
University of California

Following the battle of San Juan de Ulúa in 1568, a large group of Englishmen were stranded in New Spain. Because a number of ships were sunk, Sir John Hawkins, the ranking officer, found himself with inadequate space –and provisions– to see all of his men safely home. The story of the *abandonados* represents the quintaessential early modern saga of Atlantic world confrontation. After the *abandonados* fled the battle scene and put ashore, they were set upon by Indians. Some of their party were killed. The survivors were captured by the Spanish. Martín Enríquez de Almansa, the new viceroy of Mexico, was presented with a dilemma: what to do with a large number of heretical foreigners. Incarceration was not an alternative. Mexico lacked both facilities and money to deal with a conundrum of such magnitude. Enríquez distributed them among Mexico's leading families. This quasi-servitude benefited both the viceroy and their custodians. Enríquez cemented his power base while the elite of New Spain enjoyed the labors of the *abandonados*. The arrangement was spoiled in 1571 by the arrival of Pedro Moya de Contreras, Phillip II's newly appointed archbishop of Mexico. Contreras held strong views about the respective roles of church and state. The *abandonados* presented Contreras with an opportunity to diminish the viceroy's power, gain favor in Madrid, and, purportedly stamp out heresy in New Spain. The conflict between the viceroy and the archbishop permits many avenues for investigation. Their quest for power substantiates, at its outset, that the Mexican Inquisition was –like its predecessor, the Spanish Inquisition– a pragmatic and political tool. The exploitation of the *abandonados* sheds a new perspective on the unfolding drama between Elizabeth I and Phillip II and the complexity of the expanding early modern Atlantic world.

I

Too often, individuals become merely flotsam in the wake of history. Persons considered of little significance escape notice in the turbulence following moments of great change. But their frequent exclusion should not automatically suggest a conscious effort to elevate others. Often the absence of information on those who physically supply the muscle that drive events is partly due to a paucity of records. The confrontation between the Englishman, John Hawkins, and Martín Enríquez de Almansa, the viceroy of Mexico, at San Juan de Ulúa on

16 September 1568, fits into this category –or so it might seem. What happened to the participants after the Battle of San Juan de Ulúa is accorded little importance. In this article, by contrast, the fate of the ordinary English seamen is crucial. With their stories, I intend to revisit the institution of the early Mexican Inquisition, correcting a few historical inaccuracies, and describe –in some small measure– how the Inquisition interacted with colonial government.

Following their capture, the Englishmen sank into historical oblivion. Some traces of them exist, but the records are scattered over several continents. A consolidation of primary sources is woefully lacking and reliable secondary sources are virtually nonexistent. Even primary sources such as trial records, correspondence, and chronicles written by two *abandonados* are fraught with inaccuracies and often present an incomplete picture.¹

My study was undertaken as a small step toward finally establishing an accurate record. Obviously, identifying the English participants by name was the logical place to start. As losers in the confrontation they were subjected to the Spanish legal process. Not all records of trial, interviews under torture, or judicial hearings survive, but the names of most of the Englishmen surface in other contemporary manuscripts. From these records and the few peripheral studies referencing them, I was able to reconstruct a roster of the *abandonados*. This census became the foundation of this study.

As the list of individuals and details of their lives took on an ordered form, it became apparent that most historians who touched the subject were either misled by some of the primary documentation or accepted another historian's account as reliable. This resulted in the mutation of certain "truths" which inured to the battle (and its aftermath) and were then told and retold. Perhaps the grossest misconception is that the *afortunados* were treated with leniency because of their youth.² Because of the disparity of treatment the Englishmen received, the idea of a monolithic and dogmatic Mexican Inquisition is brought into question (Kamen 1999; Homza 2000).³

There is no disagreement that some *abandonados* received lesser punishments than their contemporaries. Most accounts identify only six such men.⁴ My census proves that this presumption is flawed. It clearly shows that more than six men received leniency. The use of youth (*niños* –a term used by court) as a mitigating factor is misleading and possibly fallacious since there were so many other men of identical age. The Spanish judges used this, in my opinion, as an excuse to

1. *Abandonados* is a term coined by Conway (1920). I use his term throughout this essay to identify the English as a group. I am indebted to the Cambridge University Library for maintaining, and making available, the Conway Collection. The collection contains photocopies of *procesos* found in The Mexican National Archives as well as Simancas and Seville.

2. The term *afortunados* is my designation of a subgroup of Englishmen who escaped the punishment visited on the majority of their shipmates.

3. Both Professors Kamen and Homza revise some of the long-held tenets of the Inquisition finding them long on legend (Black) and short on proof.

4. Williamson (1949) extrapolates and stresses the testimony that leniency should be (and was) granted to *niños*. Evidence of the age issue, although somewhat contradictory, can be found in the full text trial transcripts found in Jiménez Rueda (1945b).

mask a pragmatic handling of those Englishmen who developed influential social or political ties in Mexico during the three years between their seizure and their trials.

To challenge an Inquisitor's motivation from a position four centuries removed may seem presumptions, but the evidence supports this conclusion. The records show that those treated leniently were subjected to trials more secular in character than the standard ecclesiastical treatment received by the others. In addition, both the database, and the extant narratives imply that personal relationships created a powerful protective shield for the *afortunados*. This leniency can be interpreted on several levels. However, it is my intent to demonstrate that the Holy Office, upon establishment in Mexico, quickly adopted political and social aspects to fit the needs of the community.

II

In 1568 Spain and England were still on reasonably amicable terms. The English could trade in the New Spain but only under strict conditions (Andrews 1978). All trade was routed through Seville. The English occasionally took the liberty of violating their licenses by stopping off to trade in unauthorized ports. Despite the lack of permission, the need for slaves which the English used as currency presented an irresistible commodity to the labor-starved communities.

John Hawkins' third voyage to the Indies began with reasonable success. However, time and season began to work against him. After being at sea for over a year, his small fleet was low on provisions and in dire need of repairs. Struggling against unfavorable winds, Hawkins decided to put into the small harbor at San Juan de Ulúa. The undermanned garrison, thinking the approaching sails were the anticipated *flota* making its scheduled stop before returning to Spain, offered no resistance –initially. Shortly thereafter the treasure fleet arrived and a fight ensued.

The English lost so many ships in the fight that there was neither room on board the three surviving vessels for the crews nor adequate provisions to see them home. As it was, one of the fleeing ships, the *Minion*, put ashore several times attempting to secure water and food. There was precious little available. One hapless sailor commented that:

Hunger constrained us to eat hides, cats and dogs, mice, rats, parrats and munkies, our hunger was so great that wee thought it savourie and sweete whatsoever wee could get to eat. (Hakluyt 1968: 320-23)

The terrible condition of the ships coupled with the lack of stores forced Hawkins to make a dreadful request of the seamen. He solicited volunteers to remain in Mexico with the promise that he would return the following year to retrieve them.

III

The two contemporary English resources by Miles Philips and Job Hortop, initiated a pattern of misinformation that dogged this investigation (Hakluyt

1968:320-23). With their assistance alone, a reconstruction of events, and in particular the fate of the crew, was impossible. Ultimately, the Spanish archives held the key, mainly in the form of the trial records of the *abandonados*. Some English witnesses testified against their fellow countrymen and, in so doing, a manifest of sorts became part of the record.

The trial transcripts began three years after the battle, not because of a slow Spanish legal system, but for political reasons discussed below. There is some question as to the accuracy of the transcripts, but that too must wait. The point, however, is that the Spanish neglected to make a roster of the *abandonados* when they were taken into custody. Or perhaps, given the Spanish bureaucracy's penchant for making lists, it may be reasonable to assume that no list survived.

Viceroy Enríquez disposed of most of the *abandonados* by assigning them to Spaniards as quasi-slaves after receiving a promise that their new masters give them up for trial on demand. They would not be returned for trial until three years later. During that time, many of the *abandonados* assimilated into the community. As the database shows, many ended up in the mines of Zacatecas. Their Spanish overseers, for the most part, used them to supervise work gangs. These jobs allowed many to accumulate considerable fortunes which were later confiscated by the *Santo Oficio*. The database also exhibits a diversity of professions among the Englishmen, some of whom were prized for their skills. The group included tailors, locksmiths, butchers, barbers, a firework maker, and even a musician.

Paul Horseywell, whose name appeared infrequently in the record, became a servant to Pedro de los Ríos. He was the secretary of the court that was charged with prosecuting the *abandonados*. The fact that Ríos was the official keeper of the record might explain the absence of Horseywell in the transcripts. There seemed to be a conscious effort to keep Horseywell out of the spotlight. This unusual and singular treatment of Horseywell prompted my search for *afortunados*. It seemed odd that such deferential handling was extended to some and not to others. It became apparent that there were motives other than those stated by the judges in their *niño* pronouncements (Jiménez Rueda 1945).

The reason the *abandonados* were entrusted to civilians, although technically still in custody, represents the nature of justice in Mexico. Disposition of the intruders was a controversial issue even before they entered the legal system. Francisco de Luján—the top military officer in Mexico—grumbled to Philip II in a letter dated October 20, 1568:

Y según lo ha comunicado conmigo el virrey quiere que todos [Englishmen] que vayan en la flota: yo le he dicho mi parecer e lo que hiciera según vuestra majestad me lo manda por su instrucción si él no me hubiera ido a la mano, porque entiendo que demas de ser herejes, tuvieron gran atrevimiento en deservicio de vuestra majestad por todas las partes destas Indias... (Paso y Troncoso 1939-42)

Despite Luján's suggestion, Enríquez chose to retain the *abandonados*, a strategy uncontested by Madrid. Political expediency inspired the Viceroy to release the Englishmen to the custody of his friends. This was a most unusual action given some important facts: the English had invaded sovereign territory, they committed crimes against property, traded illegally, killed Philip's subjects, and,

worse yet, they were heretics.

When Archbishop don Pedro Moya de Contreras arrived, he came with the spirit of the Council of Trent and was armed with the king's mandate (Poole 1987).⁵ The *cédula*, dated 16 August 1570, established a permanent tribunal under the authority of the Holy Office. Contreras oversaw the new power structure. He considered heresy a real and present danger. The Viceroy did not welcome Contreras. Their struggle for power triggered an intense feud (Larrey 1965). The acrimony between Enríquez and Contreras was not contained within the borders of the New World; both invoked their hierarchical positions and sent sharply worded complaints to Philip hoping to dislodge the other from royal favor. The *abandonados* became pawns in this struggle.

The Englishmen were the first individuals to be tried by the permanent Holy Office in Mexico. They were the centerpiece of the first *auto de fe* administered by Contreras. The majority of the English were tried as heretics. However, as previously suggested, the degrees of punishment meted out for similar accusations were strangely divergent—especially for the *afortunados*.

The matter of punishment inevitably surfaces in discussions centered on the Inquisition, as does process and reform. Epitomizing the genre—and specific to the period under investigation—is a book by Antonio F. García-Abasolo (1983). His work was essential in this study because it detailed the reforms which I believe were triggered by the English presence. However, Abasolo, too, fell heir to misstatement because an accurate history was not readily available. His words validate my argument:

Por herejía manifiesta—luteranismo y judaísmo—, o proposiciones heréticas más o menos graves, se cuentan sobre 45 procesados, de los cuales 34 eran extranjeros—veinticuatro ingleses, siete franceses, un portugués, un flamenco y un irlandés—. De éstos, seis fueron entregados al brazo seglar para ser relajados; el resto fue reconciliado y sentenciado a penas varias, consistentes preferentemente en servicios en galeras, azotes dados públicamente por las calles de México, o servir a personas escogidas por el tribunal durante un número determinado de años, en los cuales habían de vestir el sambenito. Entre los relajados, Jorge Rively, Pedro Monfrie, y el irlandés Guillermo Cornells pertenecían a la armada de Hawkins; Marin Cornu y Guillermo Corcel eran franceses, pertenecientes a una flota corsaria que había actuado en Nombre de Dios y Yucatán a principios de 1571. (García-Abasolo 1983: 319)

The number of trials is incorrect. The head count of nationalities is incorrect. The identities of the individuals executed are also incorrect. The tendency to dismiss this type of reporting as trivial is tempting. However, that would be a mistake.

The errors are easy to come by. In fact, many of the latter are attributable not only to secondary works but, in many instances, to primary sources. Job Hortop, an *abandonado*, reached out across the centuries and told Abasolo about Pedro

5. Poole provides a marvelous insight into the depths of his subjects religious fervor. He devotes little time to the *abandonados* but clearly sees them as a major point of conflict between Contreras and the Viceroy.

Monfrie's death, but there is no record, nor fragment, to support the information. Monfrie's demise, repeated over time, became legitimized. The numbers cited by Abasolo most likely came from José Toribio Medina, or J. A. Williamson, who may have misunderstood one of Conway's works (Williamson 1949; Toribio Medina 1952). Conway mentions thirty Englishmen and provides citation from their respective trial transcripts. Nowhere does he suggest that other trials did not exist. In fact, *Libro primero de votos de la Inquisición de Mexico 1573-1600*, lists more than thirty trials (1949). Although Conway rescued, compiled, and researched the documents pertaining to the *abandonados*, his only work that presents just a fraction of the documentation he possessed is *An Englishman and the Mexican Inquisition*. Oddly enough, it was not about an *abandonado* but about one of three Englishmen who were put on trial in Mexico prior to 1571.

Spanish primary resources far exceed those in English archives regarding the *abandonados*. Not just in trial records but in correspondence between Mexico and Madrid.⁶ The wrangling over jurisdiction, reporting the disposition of trials, orders from the Holy Office to familiars, rumor, gossip, and a wealth of other minutiae appear in the most unexpected places. An area unresearched, but one that would certainly pique the interest of social historians, is that of the *abandonados* assimilation. Apparently, the subject teased a few scholars who mentioned the English integration in passing. But, more frequently than not, more disinformation resulted. As a result, credible scholars, such as Abasolo, working from flawed data, reach conclusions such as: "De otro lado, una vez cumplidas sus sentencias, la mayoría permaneció en Nueva España y algunos contrajeron matrimonio con españolas o mestizas más o menos ricas" (García-Abasolo 1983: 319). The following chapter upsets this notion as well as others previously mentioned.

IV

The facts show that the majority of the *abandonados* were not married, nor did they remain in Mexico. Ten Englishmen left with the *flota* within days of the battle. Ten died from wounds inflicted by Indians (Martínez del Río 1943: 241-94). Three avoided capture altogether (Unwin 1960). Thirty-five of them were sent to Spain to serve in the galleys as a result of judicial proceedings. And three were executed. That accounts for sixty-one individuals, the majority, that left Mexico—dead or alive. Out of the *known* population of eighty-seven, only seven were married—less than ten percent.

Philips is probably to blame for the mischaracterization of marital status of

6. The following volumes contain either direct or peripheral information involving the battle, trials, procedural matters, protocol, expenses, general intelligence about the Englishmen. Some trials involving Spaniards who crossed the paths of the English are found in several of the sources, two will be discussed below. *Cartas de Indias* (1877); *Cinco cartas de Illmo. y Excmo. Señor D. Pedro Moya de Contrera* (1962); García Icazbalçeta (1886-1892) and (1941); Cuevas (1914); *Colección de documentos inéditos* (1842-1845); *Documentos inéditos o muy raros* (1905-1911); Paso y Troncoso (1905-1906).

the Englishmen. He claimed that his compatriots were pressured to marry. He theorized that the Spanish thought a spouse provided a set of eyes for the Holy Office, encouraged sentence compliance, and insured against a relapse. Philips, however, was not speaking of the entire group of *abandonados* but only of the *afortunados*. Of the seven recorded marriages, six were those of the fortunate ones; those who received leniency at trial. The seventh, John Martin, burned for his confessional differences.

Philips avoided matrimony with the express purpose of escape. His sentence, three years labor in a Jesuit mission, allowed relative freedom. He was in a position to stay in touch with his fellow *afortunados* thereby passing along extremely accurate information, but only about them. The seven *afortunados* identified by Philips are: David Alexander, Robert Cooke, Thomas Ebren, Paul Hawkins, John Story, Richard Williams and himself. This is no record of an Ebren marriage, however, the other five were wed: two of the *abandonados* were married.

Abasolo's contention that "algunos contrajeron matrimonio con españolas o mestizas más o menos ricas," can also be challenged (García-Abasolo 1983: 319). Of the *afortunados*, two (Alexander and Storey) married "negro" women (Hakluyt 1968: 431). One was married to a *mestiza*. And a doubly lucky *afortunado*, Richard Williams, not only received minimal punishment but wed a rich widow from Vizcaya. Williams's union is the only one where wealth, marriage, and a Spanish born bride are mentioned in any record. There may have been another. Philips confirmed that William Lowe "is now married" but failed to provide details.

Two *abandonados* married: John Moon and John Martin. Marriage did not save Martin from the stake, nor did it keep Moon from a penalty of 200 *azotes* and 6-8 years in the galleys. Neither of them married *peninsulares* but Martin exemplifies the mythic *abandonado*. After splitting away from his fellow shipmates at Tampico, he found his way to the town of Trinidad, Guatemala. Martin worked as a barber and a surgeon. He fathered one child. After his execution nothing more was heard of Martin's widow, his child, or any grandchildren. However, contrast the total disappearance of Martin from the record with just one of the *afortunados* who left a distinct trail: Paul Hawkins.

Paul Hawkins, (Horsewell) apart from his marital state, was the quintessential *niño*: one of those who was purportedly granted leniency by the court because of youth. Williamson's reading of the transcripts found several instances (as have others) of the court's determination that "those who had been small children when Elizabeth came to the throne, and had therefore never had any Catholic instruction, were for the most part sentenced to a period of menial service in a monastery, where they could be taught their new faith. However, many of the same age were not treated in a similar manner making it inappropriate for Williamson to make such a leap. The following data destroys even the judges' attempt at rationalization, or better said, their own self interests. The political and social reality of the punishments meted out to the Philip's *afortunados* render the *niño* argument indefensible.

The *afortunados*, Alexander, Cooke, Hawkins, Lowe, Philips, Storey, and Williams are generally acknowledged as the group that received leniency predicated on

their youth. Whether name similarities or outright misidentification created the problem, or whether there was too much reliance placed on Philips' chronicle, one thing is certain: there were more *afortunados* than contemporary or later reports allowed. John Evans at 21 years of age received a three year sentence in a monastery. Thomas Ebrén was 18 when sentenced to serve the church. John Perrin, age 19, was born in Flanders but raised in England. He was originally sentenced to monastic service but behaved in a manner that later condemned him to the galleys. These three, added to the number originally discussed, refute Toribio's claim of seven individuals receiving special handling.

The misidentification of the *afortunados*, or for that matter the number of them, is understandable. However, more significant are the ages of twenty five other *abandonados* which clearly suggest that they were also *niños* if one uses the court's criteria. Notwithstanding their tender years, most suffered the *auto de fe*, "y que se le den doscientos azotes por las calles públicas de esta ciudad, en forma de justicia, y sea desterrado a las galeras de S. M., donde sirva al remo por galeote sin sueldo alguno ocho años, y el hábito se le quite a la lengua del agua" (*Libro primero* 1949: 39; penalty summary of John Lee in 1573).

Besides my ten *afortunados*, two others fared well: Roldán Escalart and Andrés Martín (Archivo General Nacional 55.4). Even though neither was English, both are included in the database because the Spanish considered them part of the Hawkins group. They were French. Both men professed the true faith and were not found wanting by the Inquisitors –they were acquitted.

If the two acquitted and the ten treated leniently (a twofold increase in the historic group of *afortunados*) are compared with thirteen others of the exact same age group the disparate treatment is stark. The thirteen received –at minimum– 200 lashes and time in the galleys, which undermines any idea of a consistent sentence. In fact, it destroys the accepted historical argument of an elite group treated with deference solely because of their age. The few that avoided the seemingly inescapable sentences imposed by the Holy Office were not just lucky. They owed their *afortunado* status to either political connections, kinship, societal value, or sometimes a combination of each.

Hawkins' status as a page was not missed by the court. Most pages were not drawn from the ranks of commoners and usually had notable connections. Hawkins was the nephew of John Hawkins, Captain-General of the Fleet of England, and master of the *Jesus of Labeck*, a vessel owned by Elizabeth I. Paul's father was Robert, paymaster of the Elizabeth's navy. His uncle, William, was the mayor of Plymouth, a safe haven for Spanish ships seeking refuge from the Sea Beggars. The second time Hawkins was taken into custody (first by the Viceroy, second by the Inquisition), he became the servant of Ríos, secretary to the tribunal. His case evidently caused great consternation amongst the judges, who, after sentencing the *afortunado* to only one year of monastic seclusion, referred the case to the Supreme Council in Spain. Hawkins was released into the custody of Juan de Marquina of Mexico in 1577 for instruction in the Catholic faith. He remained in Mexico.

David Alexander, John Perrin and Miles Philips were also pages to fleet

captains. They received sentences varying from three to five years in monasteries. Perrin, whose father was a cook for Philip II and Mary Tudor, violated the terms of his sentence and was sent off to the galleys despite his father's culinary connection. Philips escaped Mexico via Spain and wrote his famous chronicle. Alexander served Spain in the Philippines.

Richard Williams was a servant (page?) to Robert Barrett, the first mate of the *Jesus of Lübeck*. Williams, who was slightly older than the other *afortunados*, married a rich Vizcayan widow. Despite depositions extracted from William Callens and Morgan Tillert accusing Williams of zealous Lutheranism, his acquired wealth and family connection served him well: his sentence was five years service in the monastery of San Francisco. Williams was "released as a good Christian on 10th [sic] March 1578" (Conway 1920: 160).

Another who served an English ship's master, John Evans, also begs the question of *niño* status. He was 21 at the time of his trial, yet he definitely falls into the *afortunado* group because of his light sentence. His penalty of three years of monastery service was completed in 1577. No *abandonado* who served as a page, cabin boy, or personal servant to John Hawkins' officers fell under the lash nor went to the galleys.

V

Clear evidence of the regionality and the flexibility of both Spanish governance and the Inquisition abound in the story of the *abandonados*. Between 1568 and 1574, a new governor, while trying to establish authority, suffered a foreign invasion of sorts. The Englishmen captured after the battle of San Juan de Ulúa presented both an opportunity and a problem. The English were heretics by confession and criminals by their acts against Spain. However, used advantageously, they enhanced the Viceroy's standing within the *peninsulare* community in New Spain. The Viceroy released the English into the custody of individuals whose pledge to return them for trial carried some weight. In other words, persons of honor and status. This somewhat unusual disposition of prisoners can only be seen as a politically utilitarian act.

The Viceroy's dispensation may have gone unchallenged had it not been for archbishop Contreras's intervention. He clearly intended to wrest away the Viceroy's jurisdictional domain. The *abandonados* were unwitting participants of the political and ecclesiastical battle. Contreras caught Enríquez in an awkward position. Three years earlier, Enríquez established the criminality and heresy of the English in a legal forum.⁷ He could hardly object to the charges Contreras lodged against them since the accusations were almost identical. As acrimonious as their relationship appeared to be, there was apparently either a tacit understanding,

7. Robert Barrett and William Orlando were tried before 1571 prior to the arrival of the regular Inquisition. Their trials differ in length and were more secular nature than those that followed.

or some type of accommodation made, to avoid vigorously prosecuting all of the *abandonados*.

Both men were pragmatists: they knew a cohesive and strong community relied upon mutual cooperation between governing entities and leading families. As much as Contreras may have wanted Enríquez's power diminished, Enríquez was still the Viceroy, and, as such, could not be undermined completely. It was political suicide to try to eliminate the king's chosen representative. At the same time, the societal damage of a wholesale prosecution, conviction, and removal of community assets (the *afortunados*) was counterproductive. The Inquisitor needed the elite as much as the Viceroy.

Spain still needed England –or, at least a neutral England. The surest way to antagonize an early modern monarch, or a powerful family, was to attack their property or detain (or kill) their relations. The treatment of the *afortunados*, Paul Hawkins especially, reflects the concern for international stability. Severe punishment of an individual who possessed direct family or personal relationships with important personages –in England, Spain, or Mexico– might have precipitated diplomatic difficulties.

It is difficult not to take an original document at face value despite the warnings of historians who went before. The inherent danger of ignoring that advice is evident in the primary and secondary resources that tell the story of the *abandonados*. The historical record, once sorted and organized, pokes holes in the fabric of a four-hundred and thirty year old tale. Toribio's *Historia*, Greenleaf's *Mexican Inquisition*, or other tales of the Mexican Inquisition that portray a blind monolith applying the Spanish rule of law, need tempering (Greenleaf 1969). Even at inception in 1571, despite a feud at the highest levels, pragmatic solutions were found which benefited the immediate community, the perception of justice prevailed, God's work was done, neither the Church nor the State lost status, and an attempt was made to minimize the international repercussions. The judges, who I claimed earlier were disingenuous in their characterization of some of the *abandonados* as *niños*, were not prevaricating to subvert the record. Instead, their justification was the welfare of the community. All parties were winners, except the *abandonados*.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, K. R. 1978: *The Spanish Caribbean: Trade and Plunder 1530-1630*. New Haven, Yale UP.
- Cartas de Indias* 1877. Ministerio de fomento, Spain. 2 vols. Madrid, Manuel G. Hernandez.
- Cinco cartas de Illmo. y Excmo. Señor D. Pedro Moya de Contreras, arzobispo- virrey y primer inquisidor de la Nueva España*. 1962. Biblioteca Tenanitla, Libros españoles e hispano-americanos, no. 3. Madrid, Ediciones José Porrúa Turanzas.
- Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España*. 1842-1845: 112 vols. Madrid.
- Conway, G. R. G. 1920: *An Englishman in Mexico: AD 1625*. Mexico City, Private Printing.

- Cuevas, M. S. J., ed. 1914: *Documentos inéditos del siglo XVI para la historia de Mexico*. Mexico. *Documentos inéditos o muy raros para la historia de Mexico*. 1905-1911: 36 vols. Mexico, Genaro García y Carlos Pereyra.
- García-Abasolo, A. F. 1983: *Martín Enríquez y la reforma de 1568 en Nueva España*. Seville, Excma. Diputación Provincial de Sevilla.
- García Icazbalçeta, J. ed. 1886-1892: *Nueva colección de documentos para la historia de Mexico*. 5 vols. Mexico.
- 1941: *Códice Franciscano. Nueva colección de documentos para la historia de Mexico*. 2nd ed. Mexico, Editorial Salvador Chávez Hayhoe.
- Greenleaf, R. E. 1969: *The Mexican Inquisition of the Sixteenth Century*. Albuquerque, U of New Mexico P.
- Hakluyt, R. 1903: *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation Made by Sea and Farthest Distant Quarters of the Earth at any time within the compasse of these 1600 Yeeres*. Glasgow, James MacLehose and Sons.
- 1968: The Voyage of Mike Philips. >*Voyages* 6. New York, Dutton. 320-23.
- Homza, L. A. 2000: *Religious Authority in the Spanish Renaissance*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins.
- Jiménez Rueda, J. ed. 1945: *Documentos relativos a los Corsarios en la costa del oeste de México, 1587*. Mexico City, UNAM.
- 1945b: *Corsarios Franceses e Ingleses en la Inquisición de la Nueva España*. Mexico City, UNAM.
- Kamen, H. 1999: *The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision*. New Haven, Yale UP.
- Larrey, M. F. 1965: *A Viceroy and His Challengers: Supremacy Struggles During the Viceroyalty of Martín Enríquez, 1568-1580*. Ph.D. diss. Santa Barbara, U of California.
- Libro primero de votos de la Inquisición de México 1573-1600*. 1949: México: Imprenta Universitaria.
- Martínez del Río, P. D. 1943: La aventura mexicana de Sir John Hawkins. >Memorias de la Academia Mexicana de la historia correspondiente de la real de Madrid 2.3. 241-94.
- Paso y Troncoso, F. del, ed. 1939-42: *Epistolario de Nueva España, 1505-1818*. 16 vols. Mexico, Antigua Librería Robredo de J. Porrúa e hijos.
- 1905-1906: *Papeles de Nueva España*. 6 vols. Madrid.
- Poole, Stafford 1987: *Pedro Moya de Contreras: Catholic Reform and Royal Power in New Spain*. Berkeley, U of California P.
- Toribio Medina, J. 1952: *Historia del tribunal del santo oficio de la inquisición en México*. México City, Ediciones Fuente Cultural.
- Unwin, R. 1960: *The Defeat of John Hawkins*. New York, Macmillan.
- Williamson, J. A. 1949: *Hawkins of Plymouth: A New History of Sir John Hawkins and of Other Members of His Family Prominent in Tudor England*. London, Adam and Charles Black.