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Abstract

A study of Benavides’s *Memoriales* in Spanish is made difficult because only the 1630 Memorial has a Spanish edition accompanying it. The 1634 Memorial has been published only as a translation into English. Despite this insufficiency, comparing the two translations suffices to demonstrate that the term "revision," if it means "correcting" or "improving," does not aptly describe the textual relationship between the two. Furthermore, the remaining physical evidence of the 1634 Memorial makes it seems unlikely that it was ever published or, more importantly, that it ever reached Pope Urban VIII to whom it was directed.

---

I wish herewith to express my deepest gratitude to the two readers of the UNM Latin American and Iberian Institute's Research Paper Series whose penetrating insights and useful suggestions have improved this study immensely. Remaining infelicities are the author’s alone.
Fray Alonso de Benavides's *Memoriales* of 1630 and 1634: Preliminary Observations

Alonso de Benavides was born around 1578 and, by one account, apparently perished at sea en route to a new assignment as the auxiliary bishop of Goa, India. Hodge, Hammond, and Rey state in the introduction to their 1945 English translation with the title *Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial of 1634*: “It is now quite evident that Benavides spent the period between the spring of 1634 and February of 1636 in Spain and Italy, . . .” (15) adding that “There seems to be no record of Benavides after his appointment as auxiliary bishop of Goa, in Portuguese India, of which there now appears to be no doubt” (16). He came to the New World for the first time, however, in 1598, the same year that Oñate crossed into New Mexico. Benavides was admitted into the Franciscan Order in 1601, and professed “in the convento (apparently the Convento de Nuestro Padre San Francisco) of the City of Mexico, August 12, 1603, later becoming master of novices in the monastery of Puebla.”

Although appointed to the position *custos* in New Mexico in 1623, he did not actually occupy the position until his arrival in 1626, indubitably a temporal indication of the difficulties encountered when anyone decided to travel from Mexico to New Mexico in the seventeenth century. From 1626 to 1629 he served as *custos* in New Mexico and it on this experience in New Mexico that both *Memoriales* are based.

---

2Memorial 1630, Frederick Webb Hodge, 188n2.

3“The word [custos] has various acceptations in ancient as well as in modern Franciscan legislation. Nor do the three great existing branches of the order — the Friars Minor, Conventuals, and Capuchins — attach the same meaning to the term at the present day. Saint Francis sometimes applies the word to any superior in the order — guardians, provincials, and even to the general (see Rule, IV and VIII, and Testament). Sometimes he restricts it to officials presiding over a certain number of convents in the larger provinces of the order with restricted powers and subject to their respective provincials.” (“Custos.”)

4For the historical information presented above, less the information identified via footnote or parenthetically, I largely paraphrase the text of “Benavides, Alonso de” in *The Handbook of Texas Online."

5See Chapter 6 “A Forgotten Province” (122-35 and notes 213-17) of Andrew L. Knaut’s *The Pueblo Revolt of 1680* to begin to conceptualize the difficulties and impediments with which the 750 miles between Mexico at its northernmost frontier in Santa Bárbara and “New Mexico’s remote provincial capital” (123) was fraught.
The central term in the title by which both of Benavides’s works are known, namely “memorial,” is defined both by the current *Diccionario de la lengua española* and the eighteenth-century *Diccionario de autoridades* as: “1. m. Libro o cuaderno en que se apunta o anota algo para un fin. 2. m. Papel o escrito en que se pide una merced o gracia, alegando los méritos o motivos en que se funda la solicitud” (*Diccionario de la lengua española* 1006 and *Autoridades* 538). The *Memorial* of 1630, published in Madrid, still exists and can be found published in photographic copy, that is, as a facsimile edition, which accompanies the English translation by Mrs. Edward E. Ayer, née Emma Burbank (see Burbank). This one was dedicated to King Philip IV of Spain. The second *Memorial*, to my knowledge has only been published in aforementioned 1945, English translation by Frederick Webb Hodge, George P. Hammond, and Agapito Rey while the original text exists in manuscript form, in Benavides’s own hand, housed in the Vatican archives (Guisinde 190 Hodge, Hammond, and Rey 30-31). This text was dedicated to Pope Urban VIII.

What the following study proposes to achieve, using the two Benavides *Memoriales* in English translation, is a general textual comparison to determine more specifically what the relationship between the two texts, appearing four years apart from each other, both constituting a *Memorial*, and both written by the same author – one dedicated to Philip IV, King of Spain and the other to Pope Urban VIII – might be. The specific translations used are the Ayer translation for the 1630 version and the Hodge, Hammond, and Rey translation of the 1634 *Memorial*. The study is descriptive because it relies on English translations of Fray Alonso de Benavides’s works and can only reliably compare these as regards content. Stylistic similarities and differences must await Spanish editions of both texts. The first version appeared in 1630 in Madrid upon Benavides’s return to Spain from New Mexico through Mexico, and the second, ostensibly was
not published but was written in 1634. Despite the handicap of having to compare both texts in translation, sufficient textual evidence will suggest that the term “revision,” if it means, “to alter something already written or printed, in order to make corrections, improve, or update” (Dictionary.com Unabridged) really does not apply to the 1634 version. Of three synonyms provided by the same source – “change; emend, correct” – only the most generic term – “change” – applies. For what we have, as will be seen in the comparison, is not a correction, nor an emendation, but a changing, an alteration, a switch, an adjustment for a different end. This perspective on the relationship takes issue with what the distinguished historian Marc Simmons seems to imply in 2004 regarding the relationship holding between these two texts. He writes:

Once in Madrid, Benavides wrote up his account of New Mexican affairs and saw it printed, allowing him to make a formal presentation to the king.

This document is known to scholars as the Benavides Memorial of 1630. It contains much useful history, population figures for individual pueblo villages and some unique glimpses of life along the upper Rio Grande.

In a letter from Madrid to his fellow missionaries back in New Mexico, Benavides declared that his printed report, given to His Majesty and advisers, had been so well received that he was revising and expanding it to bring out a new edition.

Benavides spent several years getting the job done. On Feb. 12, 1634, he was in Rome, where he presented Pope Urban VIII with a just-released copy of his Revised Memorial of 1634. (Simmons; emphasis added)

The implication, or what is at least inferable from this quote, is that, somehow or another, the 1634 Memorial verges on being a revised, expanded, and new edition of the 1630 Memorial much like the yearly updates that we see in beginning Spanish text books, a ploy to make Spanish textbook publishers the lucrative businesses that they are. It implies an amelioration of some sort, an expansion that incorporates material missing in the earlier text, a more complete version, as it were. This is not totally off base as the 1634 version does include information not found in that
of 1630 and omits some actually presented by it. But again, the differences are not aimed at improving the 1630 version but at coming up with another Memorial with a slightly different goal in mind as we shall see. Another notion that needs to be examined in the same quote is that on 12 February 1634 Benavides presented Urban VIII “with a just-released copy of his Revised Memorial of 1634” (Simmons; emphasis added). This repeats what Hodge, Hammond, and Rey assert in 1945 – “Benavides presented his revised Memorial to Pope Urban the VIII on February 12, 1634” (11). With Simmons’s inclusion of the term “Revised” in majuscules, it appears to be a part of the title. Then he adds the notion that the “Revised Memorial” was “a just released copy,” tantamount to saying it was “hot off the press.” Granted the date can be read at the beginning of the 1634 text. Nevertheless, searches for a printed form of the 1634 Memorial have proved futile. Furthermore, Hodge, Hammond, and Rey indicate in their introduction that at the publication of Carl Russell Fish’s Guide in 1911 “Peter Guilday, of the Catholic University of America, obtained from the Propaganda Archives in Rome a photographic reproduction of the revised Memorial, dated February 12, 1634, comprising fifty-eight pages in the handwriting of Benavides and signed by him, …” (30-31). This is the same information provided by Martin Guisinde in 1930 (190). A not outlandish conclusion, then, might be that, because the 1634 Memorial exists in manuscript form and that a printed copy of it cannot be found, it was never published as was the version of 1630 and, thus, to describe its completion as “a just-released copy of his Revised Memorial of 1634” would be doubly misleading as regards its publication and its characterization as an expansion with the implication that it was and improvement over the 1630 Memorial. Furthermore, the rough and draft-like nature of the manuscript in question forces challenging the assertion that it was presented to the Pope, unless one is willing to believe or has evidence to prove that hand-written drafts with cross-outs and other sundry corrections throughout were a
sufficiently dignified format for presenting one’s case to His Holiness even if Urban VIII were known to possess a penchant for promoting missionary activities (“Urban VIII” and “The Galileo Project”) although a new emphasis on the missionary activity especially as regards martyrdom is one of the main new emphases of the 1634 version. If Urban VIII did receive the 1634 Memorial, I hold that it must have been in a more polished, finished form than that manifested by the first page of the manuscript. For, one must ask, how appropriate would it be to present a manuscript draft in Spanish to a Roman Catholic Pope despite Spanish coetaneous inroads into Naples and Sicily, just south of the Papal State (“The Galileo Project”)? When we learn that on 11 April 1634 Benavides summarized in faulty Italian the 1634 Memorial (Hodge, Hammond, Rey 32 and Appendix XIV, 159-166), one has to ask why? This is totally superfluous if the Pope had only two months earlier received a copy of the 12 February 1634 Memorial but, on the other hand, it would have been useful if he had not yet received a copy of this version for whatever reason. A summary might be issued then as a stopgap measure and as a courtesy until an actually published version could be presented to the Pope.

The titles of both works follow and from them one already can notice some significant differences:

**Title for the 1630 Memorial:**

*Memorial qve Fray Ivan de Santander de la orden de San Francisco, Comissario General de Indias, presenta a la Magestad Catolica del rey don Felipe qvarto nuestro señor, hecho por el padre fray Alonso de Benauides comissario del santo oficio, y custodio que ha sido de las prouincias, y conuersiones del Nueuo Mexico.* (Ayer 79)

---

6See the reproductions of a portion of the initial page of the 1634 manuscript in Appendix B.II.
Title for the 1634 Memorial:
Memorial a la Sanctidad de Urbano 8 nuestro señor acerca de las conuerçiones del Nueuo Mexico hechas en el felicissimo tiempo del gobierno de su pontificiado y presentado a su sanctidad por el Padre Fray Alonso de Benauides de la orden de nuestro Padre San Francisco, custodio de las dichas conuerçiones, en 12 de febrero del año 1634.7

Perhaps the most noteworthy difference in the two titles is that in the 1630 Memorial it is Fray Juan de Santander who officially presents the text by Alonso de Benavides to the King whereas in the 1634 title it is Benavides himself who presents not only the text – “presentado a su sanctidad,” but also is directly responsible for “las conuerçiones del Nueuo Mexico hechas.” Again, the 1634 title not only states “conuerçiones . . . hechas . . . por el Padre Fray Alonso de Benauides” but concludes with the statement that he was the “custodio de las dichas conuerçiones.” The only agent of both the presentation and the conversions introduced by the preposition “por” is Alonso de Benavides himself. This centers Benavides more than does the 1630 title in which it is Juan de Santander who presents the work done by Benavides to the King, and almost as an afterthought, Benavides is mentioned as “custodio . . . de las prouincias, y coñuersiones del Nueuo Mexico” without stating that he himself is responsible for the conversions.

As regards the 1630 Memorial, despite having been “received with high favor, not only in Spain but throughout the civilized world . . . indicated by the fact that within four years it appeared in four other languages”– Dutch, Latin, German and French – (Ayer 191), and despite being hailed by recent critics as “the scarcest of all Americana,” “an historical source of the first order” (O’Hara 76) and “One of the most important documents on New Mexico and the el Paso area in the first half of the seventeenth century” (Timmons 38),8 the 1630 version has been

7The title is obtained from a microfilm copy of the Ayer MS 1044 of the Newberry Library in Chicago to whom I am grateful for providing me copy of their text. Transcription is mine and has been somewhat normalized. Both titles can be viewed in facsimile from in Appendix B.
8The only exception I have found to this favorable assessment is by María Herrera-Sobek who qualifies the 1630 text as “eurocentric and imperialistic” (34), perhaps an accurate albeit bootless appraisal.
relatively ignored in recent times although less so than has the 1634 version if my search for bibliography pertinent to Benavides’s writings is any indication. I have found at least three translations of the 1630 Memorial: by Ayer, Forrestal, and Morrow. There are also two editions of it in Spanish: in 1900 published by the Museo Nacional of Mexico, although I have not seen this text first-hand and am judging it is a Spanish edition based on its title, place of publication, and publisher: “Memorial que fr. Juan de Santander de la Orden de San Francisco, comisario general de Indias, presenta a la majestad católica del rey don Felipe Cuarto, nuestro señor.” The only other edition is the facsimile edition, which accompanies the Ayer translation of 1630 Spanish Memorial. As concerns the 1634 version, I have already stated that the Hammond, Hodge, Rey translation is the only published version I have found.

What does become patent in the few studies pertaining to Benavides’s works is that most scholars refer to the translations into English as “editions” rather than as “translations.” W. H. Timmons, for example, claims that “[w]hat is usually regarded as the definitive edition of the Memorial of 1630 was privately printed in Chicago in 1916 from a translation into English by Mrs. Edward E Ayer” (38; emphasis added) even though the Ayer translation is accompanied by an excellent, photographic copy, i.e., a facsimile edition of the Spanish 1630 text. Examination of the term “edition” in Webster’s Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary provides the meaning “the form which a text (as a printed book) is published” (263) which allows for such usage. Anyone who has worked with texts in the original language and in translation, however, will testify to the appropriateness of the following dictum as regards the fidelity of translation taken from Miguel de Cervantes’s Don Quijote:

Pero, con todo esto, me parece que el traducir de una lengua en otra, como no sea de las reinas de las lenguas, griega y latina, es como quien mira los tapices
flamencos por el revés, que, aunque se ven las figuras, son llenas de hilos que las escurecen, y no se ven con la lisura y tez de la haz; . . . (Cervantes 811)

Furthermore, in a somewhat stricter sense, perhaps in a more philological sense, in other words, not a translation, whereas we have a facsimile edition of the Spanish 1630 version published with Ayer’s translation, I have found no published edition of the Spanish 1634 version. If this is the case, it is a serious issue for Benavides studies, since reliable editions of the Spanish are a sine qua non, a gap which I hope to remedy and have started to do so already. Nevertheless, given this state of affairs as regards the Benavides Memoriales, it will be impossible, other than tentatively because we are basing it on the English translations rather than the Spanish originals, or editions of them, to make a close textual analysis to see what exactly of the 1630 Memorial was incorporated into the 1634 one. Among the various studies dedicated to the Benavides writings, Carroll L. Riley’s is one which has made excellent use of the 1630 facsimile edition to establish a relationship between “Las Casas and the Benavides Memorial of 1630,” the title of a 1973 study.

Despite the dearth of Spanish editions of these works, we know that the first Memorial was deigned for the eyes of King Philip IV, whereas the second was proposed to be viewed by Pope Urban VIII. The papal version was seemingly written after Benavides’s return to Europe and probably while he was in Rome and is generally considered a revision and expansion of the earlier version, although as stated previously, it may be appropriate to take issue with this perspective. Within self-imposed parameters, I propose to examine in general terms the nature of this revision and expansion to show how some of the motives for the changes can be deduced by their nature and, thereby, contravene John F. O’Hara’s assessment that “The relationship between the two Memorials is not exactly definable” (76) or perhaps, more importantly the summation by
Simmons that “Benavides spent several years getting the job done. On Feb. 12, 1634, he was in Rome, where he presented Pope Urban VIII with a just-released copy of his Revised Memorial of 1634.” My sources for the greater portions of the text examined, alas, are the English translations by Ayer and Hodge, Hammond, and Rey.

The central term in the title by which both of Benavides’s works are known, namely “memorial,” is defined both by the current Diccionario de la lengua española and the eighteenth-century Diccionario de autoridades as: “1. m. Libro o cuaderno en que se apunta o anota algo para un fin. 2. m. Papel o escrito en que se pide una merced o gracia, alegando los méritos o motivos en que se funda la solicitud” (Diccionario de la lengua española 1006 and Autoridades 538). The very title of each version suggests fairly clearly what the “merced” or “boon” sought might have been. The full Spanish title for the 1630 version adds after the main title as listed above: “Tratase en el de los tesoros espirituales, y temporales, que la Diuina Magestad ha manifestado en aquellas conuersiones, y nueuos descubrimientos, por medio de los padres desta serafica religion” (Ayer 79). The treasures discovered are first spiritual per force and then temporal; they are manifested by the Divine Majesty, and above all by the fathers of this seraphic order, the Franciscans. The propaganda on behalf of the Franciscans is paramount and not unwarranted given, if we can trust what Daniel Reff states regarding Benavides: “the friar was a member of a religious order that saw itself as competing not only with Satan, but also with other religious orders, particularly the Jesuits” (53) as well as with the Dominicans (Reff 59, 61). In fine, what is being requested is regal support for the Franciscan undertaking. Similarly, the title of the 1634 Memorial stresses the matter of conversions made during the most blessed duration of the pontificate of Urban VIII, again conversions accomplished by the order of St. Francis, and
perhaps more importantly, as seen in the title, conversions for which Alonso de Benavides himself was directly responsible.

Reff points out the decidedly concerted effort to employ “images and rhetoric that resonated with a religious audience” (61) and “his efforts to promote not only the Franciscan enterprise in New Mexico but his own career within the church” (61), since, as the 1634 title states, he was “custodio de las dichas converçiones.” This is, as seen, much more prominent and direct than the phraseology of the 1630 Memorial which reads: “custodio que ha sido de la prouincias, y conuersiones del Nuevo Mexico.” Or stated more specifically, Benavides was interested in being appointed bishop to New Mexico. Hodge, Hammond, and Rey write:

It is now quite evident that Benavides spent the period between the spring of 1630 and February of 1636 in Spain and Italy, engaged in an effort to stimulate further interest in the missions of New Mexico, in preparing the revision of his Memorial, and, perhaps not the least of his endeavors, in aiming to arouse a sentiment favorable to the establishment of a bishopric in New Mexico – in which his interests were not entirely impersonal – an effort brought forward on a number of occasions for years afterward. (16-17)

That the beginning of this later text lacks the intervention of Fray Juan de Santander or any other sacerdotal dignitary by itself inclines one toward the perception of a more personal endeavor, namely one without mediation of any sort.

Another matter that seems worth reconsidering is the notion of “revision.” There is no doubt, as we shall soon see, that much of the material from the 1630 work is included in the 1634 version. But revision implies as Webster’s Seventh corroborates as we have seen before, “to look over again in order to correct or improve” (736), and this is not the case for the 1634 Memorial.

Benavides does not seem to be “revising” in its strict sense, i.e., he isn’t “correcting” or “improving.” Even O’Hara who, as seen, has claimed a “not exactly definable” relationship between the two Memoriales, accurately states that the 1634 version does not supersede the 1630
version, instead he states that “it supplements in a certain measure the printed book by the addition of some valuable biographical and ethnological data” (O’Hara 76). In fact, what Benavides seems to be doing is modifying a former text, i.e., reshaping it for a different purpose. The texts are still intimately related and there is no doubt that the latter repeats much of the former, as a summary examination of their content will reveal. Strictly speaking the first text of 1630 should be called *Memorial . . . a la Magestad Catolica del rey don Felipe quarto nuestro señor* and the later one offers *Memorial a la Sanctidad de Urbano 8 nuestro señor*. How are they alike? Both are *memoriales*, both overlap considerably as regards content, and both are written by Alonso de Benavides. How are they different? One is directed to his Majesty Philip IV and the other to His Holiness Urban VIII and, thus, they offer different emphases.

If one discounts the initial material of both works – in the 1630 text, the letter of Fray Juan de Santander to the King followed by Benavides’s letter to the same and in the 1634 text Benavides’s presentation to Urban VIII – the 1630 *Memorial* comprises forty-five chapters while the 1634 one presents fifty-six.\(^9\) Thirty-four of these forty-five offer the same titles as chapters in the later text although the order varies between the two.

Next, if we look at the content of the various chapters of both works, we can at least initially divide the correspondences into five kinds: 1. Practically verbatim correspondence; 2) Same content with variations; 3) Little to no correspondence between chapters; 4) Material in the 1630 version omitted in 1634; and 5) Material lacking in the 1630 version added in 1634 in the 1634 version. It should be noted here that the chapters in the 1630 *Memorial* are not numbered such that the chapter numbers provided in brackets in the examples below are mine:

\(^9\)Hodge, Hammond, and Rey do not count the preliminary text to Urban VIII, and have a chapter II and IIA which offset their count of chapters from mine by two. See Appendix A for chapter listings as contained in the English translations of both works.
1. Practically verbatim correspondence.

Tuzayan: Text of the 1630 *Memorial*:

[43] Tuzayan
Following this same direction to the west, toward the coast of the Sea of the South, eighty leagues from Tihues, is the Province of Tuzayan, which has as many as [hasta] thirty pueblos of good houses, though not as [good as] the aforesaid. (Ayer 72)

Tuzayan: Text of the 1634 *Memorial*:

XI
Tuzayan
On the same road toward the west, on the coast of the South sea, eighty leagues from Tihues, there is a province which is called Tuzayán which has up to thirty pueblos with good houses, although not as fine as the ones mentioned above. (Hodge, Hammond, Rey 48)

An example of the first degree of high correspondence might be the chapter on Tuzayán, today a small village of 562 (2000 census) just south of the south rim of the Grand Canyon (see “Tusayan”). “The community name derives from [the] Navajo term for ‘country of isolated buttes’” (“Tusayan Community Profile”). Baker H. Morrow states “Tuzayán is now thought to be Hopi, or Moqui, discussed earlier in the *Memorial*” (100n1) but does not provide the source for this observation. Editorial note 44 by Hodge, Hammond, and Rey offers the following: “The province of Tusayán, or ‘Tuzayán,’ was the Hopi villages of the present northeastern Arizona. There is no reason to suppose that the number of towns in Benavides’ time was any greater than when the province was visited by Tovar in 1540, when they numbered seven; indeed, it is now evident that one of the Hopi villages, identified with Kawaika, or Kawaiokúh, was destroyed by Coronado’s men under Tovar and Padilla in 1540 as mentioned by Luxán of the Espejo expedition in 1583” (241). Henry F. Dobyns, however, in his study, citing Bartolomé de las Casas corroborates thirty as the number for the villages which could have been considered Tusayan. Finally, it is interesting to note that the 80 leagues distance Tusayan is from Tiguex,
today some place close to Bernalillo, NM, places the small village of Tusayan on the south side of
the Grand Canyon some 417 miles distance from Bernalillo (“Yahoo Driving Directions”).

2) Same content with variations:

The Mansa Nation: Text of the 1630 Memorial:

Having traversed these one hundred leagues, we reach the famous
Rio del Norte, which has this title because it brings its current from
that direction many leagues. A hundred leagues before reaching
New Mexico, this river is inhabited by a nation which we
commonly call Mansos or Gorretas, [the later] because they cut the

hair in such fashion that it looks [as if] they wore a small cap set
upon the head. . . . (Ayer 13)

The Mansa Nation: Text of the 1634 Memorial:

XVII
Mansa Nation of the Rio del Norte
Having traversed these one hundred leagues, the Spaniards arrived
at the river, which we call del Norte, because its course flows from
thence. It is inhabited by a nation we call Mansos. They, too, are
savage Indians like the preceding ones, and also naked, except for
the women, who wear two deerskins, one in the front and one
behind. They are a voracious people and great eaters. . . . (Hodge,
Hammond, Rey 52)

This may be an example of what Martin Gusinde means regarding the 1634
version: “Der Stil und die Abfassung dieses ist unverkennbar viel lebhafter und
interessanter als der des ersten Memorial; . . .” (189).

3) Little to no correspondence between chapters:

Saintly Offices: Text of the 1630 Memorial:

[35] Saintly Offices in which the religious busy themselves.
Well it may be inferred, fr
without contradiction, but that, all idolatry and adorations of the Demon being taken away, only the Lord and Creator of all things is adored. (Ayer 66)

Pious tasks: Text of the 1634 Memorial:

LIII
Pious tasks of the friars of these conversions.
Since the land is very remote and isolated and the difficulties of the long journeys require more than a year of travel, the friars, although there are many who wish to dedicate themselves to those conversions, find themselves unable to do so because of their poverty. Hence only those go there who are sent by the Catholic king at his own expense, for the cost is so excessive that only his royal zeal can afford it. (Hodge, Hammond, and Rey 100)

4) Material in the 1630 version omitted in 1634:

[23] What that kingdom owes unto your Majesty.

5) Material lacking in the 1630 version added in 1634:

Seven chapters on the martyrdom of the following Franciscans named in the various chapters as follows are found only in the 1634 Memorial:

14. Fray Marcos de Niza; 15. Fray Juan de Padilla and Fray Juan de la Cruz; 18. Fray Juan de Santa María; 19. Fray Francisco López; 20. Fray Agustín Ruiz; 40. Fray Francisco de Porras; 41. Fray Francisco Letrado; 42. Fray Martín de Arvide.

Another chapter, number 16 treats the entry of Fray Francisco López, Fray Juan de Santa María, Fray Agustín into New Mexico, and of course these were martyred in chapters 19, 18, and 20 respectively.

¹⁰Reff surmises that “this chapter did not appear in Benavides’s Revised Memorial, which was addressed to the pope, who would have benefited [sic] only indirectly, if at all, from the discovery of gold or silver in New Mexico” (60).
Regarding these martyrs, what is curious is that Benavides includes Fray Marcos de Niza who died in Mexico in 1558 but not as a martyr (Hodge, Hammond, Rey (242n47). The next two martyrs, Fray Juan de Padilla and Fray Juan de la Cruz; were part of the Coronado 1540-1542 expedition (Hodge, Hammond, Rey 242n48). Fray Juan de Santa María, Fray Francisco López, and Fray Agustín Ruiz came up with the Rodríguez-Chamusco expedition, 1581-1582 (Hodge, Hammond, Rey 242n49). It is not until chapter 40 with the martyrdom of Fray Francisco de Porrás at Moqui, Fray Francisco Letrado and Fray Martín de Arvide at Zuñi with the respective dates of martyrdom as 28 June 1633, 22 February 1632, and 27 February 1632 (Hodge, Hammond, Rey, 300n106, 300n107, 78 respectively) that we come to martyrdoms contemporaneous with Benavides’s position as custos of New Mexico.

Conclusions

A brief summary of the findings is in order. There appears to be no Spanish editions of the 1634 Memorial and there is one and possibly two of the 1630 Memorial: the potential one published in 1899 [1900] in Mexico City and the facsimile edition which accompanies the Ayer translation, published in 1916 and reprinted in 1965. This may be the biggest hindrance to Benavides studies. We cannot apply the term “revision” to the 1634 Memorial if it means “correcting” or “improving,” for what seems to be happening is a reshaping for a different purpose, such most significantly made patent by the omission in 1634 of certain chapters designated for Felipe IV, namely Chapter [7], “Mines of Socorro” and Chapter [23], “What that kingdom owes unto your Majesty.” On the other hand, the 1634 version adds eight chapters pertaining to the martyrdom of twelve Franciscan missionaries which would not necessarily have been uninteresting to Philip IV but which would certainly have had special significance for a Pope with a missionary proclivity such as Urban VIII is reported to have had. Related to this as well,
judging from the titles of both works, the 1634 version places Alonso de Benavides in a more central position than that of the 1630 *Memorial*, a placing not necessarily uncalculated keeping in mind Benavides’s arguments to the Pope in this later version for creating a bishopric in New Mexico (Hodge, Hammond, Rey 15-16). The last point worthy of emphasis is that the 1634 *Memorial* seems not to have been printed ever, and the draft form in which it survives makes it dubious that it was ever formally presented to the Pope.
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manifestado
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medio de los Padres desta serafica Religion.
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