

7-1-1936

Church and State in New Mexico, 1610–1650

France V. Scholes

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr>

Recommended Citation

Scholes, France V.. "Church and State in New Mexico, 1610–1650." *New Mexico Historical Review* 11, 3 (1936). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol11/iss3/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in New Mexico Historical Review by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact amywinter@unm.edu, lsloane@salud.unm.edu, sarahrk@unm.edu.

CHURCH AND STATE IN NEW MEXICO
1610-1650

By FRANCE V. SCHOLES

(Continued)

CHAPTER IV

KEEPING THE ISSUES ALIVE
1626-1637

I

FOR SEVERAL years following the departure of Juan de Eulate from New Mexico in 1626 the relations of Church and State were fairly peaceful. The prelates—Friar Alonso de Benavides (1625-1629), Friar Estéban de Perea (1629-1630), Friar Juan de Salas (1630-1632), and Friar Juan de Góngora (1632-1635)—were very much preoccupied with the expanding mission program and the indoctrination of the newly converted pueblos. The immediate successors of Governor Eulate were not always wholly sympathetic toward the Church and the missions, but their actions did not cause any major disputes. Prior to 1635 the investigations of the commissaries of the Holy Office (Benavides, 1626-1629, and Perea, 1630-c. 1639) were confined mostly to cases of bigamy, superstition, witchcraft, and demonology involving the ignorant and lowly members of society rather than the civil officers of the province.¹ But the old wounds, which had been created by the Peralta, Ceballos, and Eulate episodes, never entirely healed. Occasional irritations and differences occurred which kept the old issues alive.

Felipe de Sotelo Osorio, who succeeded Eulate as governor in 1625, appears to have maintained fairly friendly relations with Father Benavides, although his attitude on certain questions was regarded with some suspicion. In 1626 and at intervals during 1627 and 1628 Benavides received testimony which indicated a lack of orthodoxy and a certain hos-

tility to the Church on the part of the governor. It was said that Sotelo scorned ecclesiastical censures, that he expressed views contrary to the rights and immunities of the Church, and that he was guilty of heresy, blasphemy, and immorality.² But Benavides appears to have made little effort to investigate these charges. The accusations were made by soldier-encomenderos of Santa Fé, leaders in the local community. In their testimony one feels a definite personal hostility that was probably inspired either by rash statements and boasts on the part of Sotelo, or by resentment against certain of his governmental policies. More than fifty years later Governor Antonio de Otermín referred to the Sotelo situation in a letter addressed to the viceroy on April 5, 1682. Otermín stated, that because Sotelo had imposed severe punishment in certain cases of theft and public immorality he had aroused such bitterness and resentment that he was ruined financially, and was even reduced to the extremity of watering his own horse! Otermín cited this case, together with several others, to prove that the soldier-citizens had always been unfriendly, even hostile, to governors who opposed their wishes.³

There is no reason, however, to assume that Sotelo was entirely sympathetic toward the Church, or that the charges against him were entirely baseless. But it does seem clear that they were inspired, in part, by malice. The citizens tried then, as later, to embarrass the governor by making charges that were ecclesiastical in character, or by denouncing him to the representative of the Inquisition. In due course of time Benavides transmitted the sworn testimony to the Holy Office in Mexico City, but it appears that no action was taken against Sotelo by that tribunal.

Sotelo's successor, Francisco Manuel de Silva Nieto, who governed the province from 1629 to 1632, was apparently *persona grata* to the Church because of his co-operation in the founding of new missions. But the next governor, Francisco de la Mora Ceballos, who held office from 1632 to 1635, soon earned the ill will of many persons, both clerical

and lay, by his eager desire to use his official position as a means of personal profit. Although no open crisis occurred during Mora's administration, some of his actions were so unsatisfactory that Friar Estéban de Perea, acting in his capacity as commissary of the Inquisition and as senior friar in the province, deemed it necessary to denounce them to the proper authorities.

In October, 1632, Perea informed the Holy Office that Mora was a bit lukewarm toward the affairs of the Inquisition,⁴ but this mild criticism was as nothing compared with the outburst contained in a letter which he wrote a year later. In the second dispatch Perea accused the governor of insatiable greed and of acts of injustice against all classes. "The whole land protests." Mora had turned the convents into trading posts and had made the friars his hucksters. Quantities of knives had been left at the mission pueblos, and the clergy were expected to trade them for hides. From the Indians he had seized their meager possessions. More, he had adopted Eulate's practice of giving *vales*, or permits,—"two fingers' width of paper"—authorizing the seizure of Indian boys and girls, "as if they were calves and colts," to be used as servants and laborers. These actions, Perea said, had inspired in the Indians a hatred for the Christian faith, "regarding our Holy Law as a law of slavery, [it] being [in reality] the law of most perfect liberty." Moreover, Mora had seized the possessions of many of the soldiers, and, "in order to shut their mouths and keep them from crying out to heaven," he had given them permission to establish estancias for stock raising, "not only on the *milpas* of the natives but even in the patios of the convents." There was no recourse, and Perea appealed to "the fountain of all justice and piety" for protection of the Church "and of these miserable souls."

Partial confirmation of Perea's denunciation is contained in a viceregal decree, dated February 18, 1634. The decree stated that reports had been received that Mora had "destroyed" the province by sending to Santa Bárbara eight hundred cows, four hundred mares, and a quantity of

“ganado menor,” to be sold in that market, and that as a result the citizens of New Mexico had nothing with which to sustain themselves. It was also stated that four persons, whose property had been seized, had fled “from the tyranny of said governor.” The decree ordered an investigation of the charges.⁶ It is interesting to compare the contents of this decree with a statement in Otermín’s letter of April 5, 1632, to the effect that Mora was so persecuted that he had to hide in the convent of Galisteo.⁷

There is probably no doubt that Mora tried to squeeze a large profit out of his term of office. But apparently he was able to present an adequate justification of his record to the authorities in Mexico City, for he was later appointed commander of the garrison and *alcalde mayor* of Acapulco.^{7a}

II

In November, 1634, Mora turned over the government of the province to his successor, Francisco Martínez de Baeza, who remained in office until April 18, 1637.^{7b} Baeza’s chief interest was to make the most of his opportunity as governor. It was the same old story—exploitation of the Indians and of the struggling Hispanic community. The sources of profit were few, but all of the governors exploited them, the only difference being in the zeal with which they pressed their advantage. The complaints of the clergy were ever the same, and they were made so often that they became a sort of litany. Neglect of the missions, denial of ecclesiastical authority, exploitation of Indian labor—over and over again the familiar refrain was repeated in letters addressed to the superior prelates of the Franciscan Order and to the viceroy, or in testimony transmitted to the Holy Office.

According to the clergy, Baeza lost no time in organizing trading ventures and exploiting Indian labor, to the utter neglect of his official obligations and duties. “. . . from the moment that he assumed control he has attended only to his own gain, and this with great excess and harm to all these provinces . . .” He imposed a heavy burden of labor on the

Indians, for which they received only a fraction of the wage due. Some were forced to gather piñon, which they carried in on their own backs to Baeza's warehouse; others were sent out to trade for hides; in all of the pueblos the Indians were forced to weave and paint great quantities of *mantas*, bunting, and hangings, and some of the pueblos that did not raise enough cotton "to cover their own nakedness" were obliged to barter with other villages for the cotton needed. The prices paid for the finished goods represented only one-sixth or one-eighth of the current local values. By the end of 1636 Baeza had accumulated such large quantities of piñon, hides, and locally manufactured goods that nine wagon loads were made ready for transportation to New Spain.⁸

In pursuing his own gain, the governor utterly neglected the missions. He abandoned the example set by his predecessors in promoting and assisting the conversions and in enforcing mission discipline.⁹ No new pueblos were baptized. And it was stated that the Indians, realizing that Baeza was not interested in supporting the labors of the Church, were becoming insubordinate and restless.¹⁰ Baeza, like Eulate, showing little enthusiasm or respect for the ceremonial of the Church, forced his servants to risk excommunication by requiring them to labor on feast days, scorned ecclesiastical censures and ridiculed persons who submitted to such censures, and indicated a certain lack of respect for the jurisdictional authority of the custodian. And according to the clergy there was no lack of persons who followed Baeza's example.¹¹

Thus by word and deed Baeza was said to have embarrassed the missionary labors of the friars. The most serious controversy between Baeza and the clergy was caused by the old problem of military escort for missionaries assigned to frontier pueblos. The Zuñi pueblos, where missionaries with resident friars had been established in 1629, grew restless under the restraining hand of their spiritual advisers. On February 22, 1632, the Zuñis killed Friar Francisco de

Letrado, who was in charge of the mission at Hawikuh, and five days later Friar Martín de Arvide, who was on his way to convert the Zípias who lived in northern Sonora, was killed by his Zuñi servants. A punitive expedition was sent out to the Zuñi country, but the Indians do not appear to have been thoroughly pacified. They fled to a refuge on Corn Mountain where they seem to have remained until 1635, when they began to reoccupy their villages.¹³ At the meeting of the custodial chapter that year, friars were chosen to resume the work of the Church among the Zuñis, but failure of the governor to provide military escort for them delayed their departure.¹³

Finally, on September 24, 1636, Friar Cristóbal de Quiros, the custodian, addressed the governor in a formal *auto* in which he reviewed the situation at Zuñi, stated his desire to re-establish the missions there, and called upon Baeza to furnish sufficient military escort for the friars that were to be sent. His request was stated in the following language: "therefore I beg and beseech, and, if necessary require it, in behalf of His Majesty, that you appoint and send . . . military escort."¹⁴ Baeza resented the manner in which the request was made, and in his reply he declared that the custodian should present his petition in the manner in which "an ecclesiastical judge ordinary should address a governor and captain general, and not by *auto*."¹⁵ Baeza's reply could have had but one effect. Quiros responded by another formal petition in which he reviewed the obligations of the governors to provide escort for friars, and then added: "I demand of Your Lordship, on behalf of His Majesty and as prelate of these provinces by whom His Majesty discharges his royal conscience, that you grant and appoint the escort necessary for the province of Zuñi." Quiros also insisted that although it was the expressed opinion of certain persons that the friars should pay for the sustenance and wages of such escort, actually the friars were under no such obligation. On the contrary, it was the duty of the governor to provide the same, for to this purpose the king granted to the

Spaniards encomiendas and tributes of the natives. In conclusion, Quiros stated that should the escort be refused, "then all the spiritual and temporal damage that may result therefrom must be laid up to the account of Your Lordship."¹⁶

Quiros was clearly right in his request for an escort, as the viceregal instructions addressed to Governor Eulate on February 5, 1621, had provided for such escort by the encomenderos. But in a blazing decree Baeza demanded that Quiros present documents to prove that the king had ordered such escorts and that these should be at the cost of the encomenderos. The encomiendas had been granted, he said, in order that the encomenderos might reside in the Villa de Santa Fé in the capacity of citizens of the same, "and for no other purpose except as the governor may order." In fact, had it not been decreed that the conversions should be made in apostolic fashion, and had not the friars themselves presented reports stating that there was no need of soldiers in these provinces? Let Quiros present his proof! More, let him also make his requests without exceeding the jurisdiction actually his, unless by inclination he cannot refrain from pleas and "disgustos," such as he has had with all the governors from Peralta to the present.¹⁷

The outcome of this controversy is not known with certainty, but it is improbable that friars were sent to the Zuñi area at this time.¹⁸ Whatever the result may have been, the immediate concern of both parties was apparently the preparation of justificatory reports to be sent to Mexico City. Baeza's letters have not been found, but it is probable that his major complaint had to do with the alleged arrogance of the clergy, their habit of stirring up strife and contention, and the unjust manner in which they were said to impose ecclesiastical censures.¹⁹

The reports of the clergy took the form of a series of letters addressed to the viceroy in November and December, 1636.²⁰ These letters, which have been summarized in part in the foregoing discussion, contained scathing denunciations of Baeza and all his works. The whole land had felt

the weight of his tyranny—Indians, clergy, and Spaniards alike. He had violated royal and viceregal decrees, and had put his own advantage above that of the Crown. By manipulating elections he had made the cabildo of Santa Fé his servant. False reports had been sent to the viceroy. "Most Excellent Sir," wrote Friar Zambrano, "I swear that Governor Francisco Martínez is unworthy of receiving a single *real* from the royal treasury, because he does not deserve it," etc.²¹ The clergy stated that although they had sought a remedy for such conditions on other occasions, the instructions and orders that had been issued as a result of their petitions had always been violated. "They are dead and buried . . . Wherefore, we supplicate Your Excellency with the greatest humility and submission possible that you may look with pity on this new Church and its poor ministers."²²

The letters of Father Quiros and his associates were sent to New Spain by special messenger during the winter of 1636-1637. Near Parral the messenger met the mission supply caravan, which was proceeding northward on its regular triennial journey, and Friar Tomás Manso, administrator of the caravan, added a letter of his own to be sent with those of his New Mexico colleagues. He stated that reports indicated that conditions in New Mexico were very serious and that the Church and clergy were being subjected to open insult. He also stated that the reports which Governor Baeza was sending concerning the conduct of the friars were based on falsified testimony, and that the two men who were bearing the dispatches were so untrustworthy that the viceroy should not give credence to anything they said. But Manso saw a ray of hope. A new governor, Luís de Rosas, was accompanying the caravan and would soon take over the administration of the province. "And may God be praised . . . for his actions promise us great pleasure and peace and the increase of that Church which at present is so despised." Manso begged the viceroy to suspend judgment until Rosas had taken Baeza's residencia and had filed a report concerning the same.²³

(To be continued)

NOTES

1. See F. V. Scholes, "The First Decade of the Inquisition in New Mexico," *New Mex. Hist. Rev.* (1935), 195-241.

2. The original testimony is in A. G. P. M., *Inquisición*, Tomos 356 and 363. For a more detailed statement of the charges, see Scholes, "First Decade of the Inquisition in New Mexico," 201-206.

3. Otermín to the viceroy, April 5, 1632. A. G. I., Mexico 53. (In my article cited in notes 1 and 2, I incorrectly gave this letter as in A. G. I., Guadalajara 138.)

4. ". . . el governador don Francisco de la Mora se muestra un poco tibio o sin oficio a lo que toca al santo Tribunal (lo que no hacia don Francisco de Silva) . . ." Perea to the Holy Office, October 2, 1632. A. G. P. M., *Inquisición* 304, f. 180.

5. Perea's letter is in A. G. P. M., *Inquisición* 380, ff. 231, 232.

6. A. G. P. M., *Provincias Internas*, Tomo 35, Exp. 5.

7. Otermín to the viceroy, April 5, 1632. A. G. I., Mexico 53.

7a. Letters of Viceroy Cadereita, Mexico, February 28, 1639, in A. G. I., Mexico 469; libranza of March 11, 1639, in A. G. I., *Contaduría* 738.

7b. Baeza left Mexico City on July 4, 1634, arrived in New Mexico toward the end of November, 1634, and served as governor until April 18, 1637. Libranza of December 7, 1638, in A. G. I., *Contaduría* 734; declaration of Fray Jerónimo de la Llana, at Cuarcac, January 1, 1636, in A. G. P. M., *Inquisición* 369, exp. 14.

8. *Cartas que se escriuieron a su Ex^a del nueuo Mexico Por los Religiosos della Por fin del año de 636 quezandose del Gouierno de francisco Martinez de Baeza*. A. G. P. M., *Provincias Internas*, Tomo 35, Exp. 3.

9. ". . . Y los Gouern^o que a hauido en estas prouincias sus antecessores an ayudado Siempre a la Conuers^on de alguna prouincia y vissitado los pueblos por sus personas animando a Los infieles a que se bapticen Y Reduzgan a la Yglesia; Y a los fieles dandoles a entender Acudan a la Obligacion q tienen a la doctrina y obediencia a los Ministros: dandoles p^a esto muy grandes exemplos para mouerlos a ello, y castigando a los malhechores y turbadores." Letter of the custodian and definitors to the viceroy, November 28, 1638, *Ibid.* This praise of former governors does not square with Perea's bitter denunciation of Governor Mora Ceballos.

10. ". . . y en cosas del seru^o de Dios y de Su Mag^d no a acudido y sino fuera la mucha Vigilancia de los rreligiosos Entiendo estubiera la tierra alçalda porque los propios naturales no hazen caso de sus mandatos ni bales que a los pueblos inbia ni quieren acudir a la doctrina ni missa como tienen obligacion y todo esto procede Ex^{mo} S. por el poco castigo que a hecho y gran rremision del gouer^o y auizandole algunos rreligiosos q lo rremedia les ha rrespondido que quien le mete a el," etc. Friar Pedro de Zambrano to the viceroy, November 6, 1636. *Ibid.*

11. (a) ". . . cap^on albaro garcia olgado . . . dixo . . . que abra dos años poco mas o menos questandole este declarante diziendole pintar vn^as mantas Y trabajando Los dias de fiesta saluo los domingos y fiestas prinzipales y que en las otras fiestas que no obligauan a los yndios y obligauan a los españoles, Le hazia el dho gouer^o a este declarante oue traaujando los yndios El trabajase Tambien con ellos lo qual sauido por el prelado Puso vna descomunion fijada en la puerta de la yglesia en que daba por descomulgados a los que trabajasen en los dhos dias de fiesta y sobre otras cosas semejantes a esta Y que este declarante Tubo noti^a esta descomunion Y Se uio a absolver della Y luego fue a proseguir en la pintura de las dhas mantas a casa del dho Fr. Martinez de Baeza Y allandole a la puerta Por uer si le dejaua yr a su casa le dixo como Venia de absolverse de la descomunion en q avia incurrido Por auerle obedezido en trabajar en dias de fiesta a lo qual el dho Fran^{co} martinez de baeza muy enojado y con Vos alta: dixo a Vorrachos buzarrones rreptiendolo dos veses con aquel enojo Y visolo tal este declarante baxo los ombos Y Vbo de obedezelerle Y trabajar todos los demas dias de fiesta de alli adelante asta que se acauo tiempo de quatro meses yncurriendo siempre en la descomunion . . . Y que oyo dezir en otra ocasion a personas de Credito q estandole haziendo vn^as Carretas al dho Fran^{co} martinez de baeza El Capitan alonso martin Barba

Y porque debio de sauer que no trabajaban los dias de fiesta les embio a dezir que no measen tanto agua Vendita q Trabajasen aunque fuesen los dias de fiesta y que saue este declarante q en estas cosas es defectuoso." Declaration of Alvaro García Holgado, July 13, 1637. A. G. P. M., Inquisición 369, Exp. 14.

(b) "... fr. fran^{co} de San Buena Ventura . . . denuncia y declara que abra Vn año Poco mas o m^{os} que estando en el pueblo de Jacona de la nazon teguas en ocasion q estaua alli tambien el g^{or} fr^{co} martinez de baeza: Y el Capitan P^o Lucero de godoy y el cap^{an} fran^{co} de Madrid. Tratando de algunos pleitos que abia sobre descomuniones entre el dho gouernador y el prelado destas prouy^{as} Le dijo este declarante: q el prelado en las censuras q Ponia Le parecia q Tenia R^{on} y Justi^a y que las dhas censuras eran las armas de la yglesia a lo qual rrespondio dho gouernador afeando a los soldados el ser temerosos de Dios y a las censuras de la yglesia que eran Vnos diçones Pues no hera p^a sufrir vna descomunion Y Dice mas este declarante que vn mes antes desto estando el dho gouer^{or} fran^{co} martinez de baeza en este dho conv^{to} con la mayor parte del Cauildo, Yendo hacia la porteria oyo al dho gouer^{or} que les Yba diziendo: a todos los suso dhos que heran buzarrones Por auerse dejado descomulgar por Los prelados pasados," etc. Declaration of Friar Francisco de San Buenaventura, July 11, 1637. *Ibid.*

(c) "... el Capitan fran^{co} de madrid . . . dixo que lo que saue es que abiendo el prelado Y Jues ordinario destas prouy^{as} descomulgado el Cap.^{an} Manuel correa Y pedidole el auxilio al gouer^{or} fran^{co} martinez de Baeza p^a Prenderle y proceder contra el y abiendo el dho fran^{co} Martinez de baeza Mandado al ayudante di.^o martin barba q le prendiese Y tubiese preso en su propia Casa Pero que añidio Luego El dho gouer.^{or} fran^{co} Martinez de baeza mandando al dho ayundante que aunque el prelado Y juez ord.^o le pidiese no se le entregase Porque tenia tambien q. proceder contra El y que aunque Vajase Jesuxpto no se le entregase quanto mas que no bajaria Jesuchristo a eso." Declaration of Capt. Francisco de Madrid, July 14, 1637. *Ibid.*

(d) "... Doña maria de romero . . . dice y denuncia q. el año pass^{do} Vispera de la Assess^{on} estando rrepicando a Visperas Y estando actualm^{te} en su casa el gouer^{or} fran^{co} Martinez de baeza: Le dijo esta declarante por certesia con liz^a de VS^a me boy a visperas a lo qual le dijo el dho Fran^{co} Martinez de baeza con enojo: Voto a christo q si mi mug^r fuera que la matara a palos Porque no fuera A misa ni a visperas ni a Completar." Declaration of Maria de Romero, July 14. 1637. *Ibid.*

(e) "... Y siempre a proseguido con sus malas palabras en abatir y afrentar a los Religiosos en todas sus conuersaciones y platicas alla entre sus Soldados, con palabras tan feas y sucias q. son indignas de oir y menos de escriuirse; Y es claro q. a tales palabras de vn Gouern^{or} y cabeza no an de faltar (antes sobrar) Soldados q le imiten, atreuiendosse a muy grandes descomposturas de manos y de palabras, como consta por la aberiguacion q se a hecho dello, hasta hauer Soldado q a dho al Religioso, calla Papista que te dare de palos; Lenguaje de inglaterra y de los paisses Rebelados. Y como se allega a esto el decir el Gourn^{or} qu no ay Aqui Jurisdiccion Eclessiastica ordinaria, que conosca O pueda conocer de caussa alguna de Soldado, sino solo el Gouern^{or} Y ser la gente desta tierra de tan pobres y miserables Subjetos y que entre ellos emos tambien conosido, vnos griegos, bassallos del turco, ingleses, franceses flamencos munchos, Y alemanes, italianos y lebantiscos y que les emos de creer q son del pueblo O ciudad de que ellos quieren decir y de la fee q ellos quieren professan-Los hijos de aquestos criados sin Doctrina de sus padres q tales pueden ser? por lo qual se padescen muy grandes traujos. Y la caussa de Dios muy gran Ruina." Letter of the custodian and definitors to the viceroy, November 28, 1636. *Cartas que se escriuieron*. A. G. P. M., Provincias Internas 35, Exp. 3.

12. The punitive expedition was sent in March, 1632. Hodge (Benavides, *Memorial*, 293) reproduces the following modernized version of the inscription left by one Luján, a member of the expedition, on El Morro, or Inscription Rock: "Se pasaron á 23 de Marzo de 1632 Años a la Benganza de Muerte del Padre Letrado." It is impossible to state with certainty whether this expedition was sent out by Governor Silva or by Governor Mora, although it has been customary to state that the latter sent it. Coan, *History of New Mexico*, 190. According to the records in the Sección de Contaduría,

A. G. I., it appears that Mora succeeded Silva in March, 1632, but it is impossible to state the exact date in March. It is entirely possible, therefore, that the expedition was sent by Mora, and this may be the basis of the assertion of Friar Quiros that Mora left them at peace. Cf. note 14. Cf. also A. F. Bandelier, "An Outline of the Documentary History of the Zuñi Tribe," *Journal of American Ethnology and Archaeology*, III (1892), 96-102.

13. Cf. note 14.

14. "Fray christoual de quiros custodio destas prouy^{as} del nueuo Mex^{co} y Jues ordinario della por autoridad apostolica ett^a—digo q por quanto los yndios del peñol de caquima de la prouy^a de Çuñi q se abian alsado en tiempo del gou^{or} don fran^{co} de silua los quales yndios, don Fran^{co} de la mora q susedio en el gouierno los dejo de paz la qual siempre an conseruado desde q embio el dho don Fran^{co} de la mora al Mro. de campo Thomas de albisu y subieron los rrelijiosos q yuan con el dho Mro de campo al peñol con algunos Soldados los quales yndios tengo noticia q se ban poblando en sus pueblos de un año a esta parte poco despues q yo bine de aquella dha prouy^a y por ser ya esta dha gente Xtiana y tener yo el dho custodio de mi parte obligacion y la Mag^d del Rey nro S.^r de la suya de conservar los dhos yndios en dotrina y por el peligro q corren las almas de tantos Xptianos de morirse sin los santos sacramentos y asi mismo los niños q uan nasciendo y se mueren sin el agua del S.^{to} baptismo por auer ya seis años poco mas o menos q carecen de ministro—por tanto a VS.^a pido y suplico y si nesecario es se lo rrequiero de parte de su Mag.^d q señale y embie a la dha prouy^a de çuñi Soldados de escolta sufisiente para conseruacion de aquella prouy^a lo vno para q acauen de congregar los dhos Yndios y lo otro para seguridad de los ministros q quiero ynbiar y tengo señalados vn año a en el capitulo de S^a Fran.^{co} de sandia por q de no dar la dha escolta no suseda lo q susedio en tiempo del dho don fran^{co} de silua q se alsaron los yndios y mataron a su ministro con lo qual pusieron en rriesgo a los yndios de la prouy^a de moqui a alsarse y matar a su ministro y perder su Mag.^d lo q tanto le a costado el poner estas prouy^{as} en el estado q estan y mando a nro secretario el P^e fray domingo o del S^{to} Predicador y guar^{an} de la uilla de S^a fee notifique este auto a la pers^a del S^r Fran^{co} martinez de baeça gouernador destas dhas prouy^{as}—fr. Xptoual de quiros custodio." A. G. P. M., Provincias Internas 34, Exp. 1.

15. Auto, September 24, 1636. *Ibid.*

16. Quiros to Baeza, September 27, 1636. *Ibid.*

17. Auto, September 27, 1636. *Ibid.* For the obligations of encomenderos to serve as escort for friars, see *Instructions to Eulate*, February 5, 1621 (New Mex. Hist. Rev., III (1928), 377-378). Baeza's statement that it had been decreed that conversions should be made in apostolic manner was probably based on the stereotyped instructions issued to each governor when he took office. These followed the form of Peralta's instructions in 1609, in which we find the following statement: "Y en caso que despues se ayen de hacer algunas entradas contra los Yndios que no estubieren de paz permitira que solo las hagan Religiosos que quisieren salir en la forma apostolica a fundar y plantar nra santa fe y esto de manera que quede dotrina basante para los que al presente estubieren de paz." New Mex. Hist. Rev., IV (1929), 186.

18. Father Quiros reported as follows: ". . . desde el dia q Vino por Govern^{or} francisco martinez de baeça, q es el que de presente la gouierna La Conuers^{on} destes naturales a cesado de todo punto sin querer dar fauor a los M^{ros} como se lo pedi para Los indios dela prouy^a de Çuñi q se hauian alçado los años passados, Y son Xptianos, los quales, D. francisco de la mora Gouernando estas Prouy^{as} (como es la verdad) los dexo de paz. Y por hauer muerto Los indios al Religioso q los administraua se hauian alçado, Y hauiendose dado de paz temiendo yo q el Religioso q se les podria dar no tendria Seguridad de la vida pedi escolta Y fauor al dho fran.^{co} martinez de baeça, por q^{to} aquella Prouy^a a seis años, q la gente della es Xtiana, y es lastima, q se condemnen tantas almas por carecer de M^{ro} Y de los S^{tos} Sacramentos lo q^l no fue posible querer dar ayuda Y fauor, como Constara a V. Ex.^a por la dilig^a que por Escripto hize la qual imbio a Vex^a por mano de mis Prelados." Quiros to the viceroy, December 1, 1636. *Cartas que se escriuieron*, A. G. P. M., Provincias Internas 35, Exp. 3. But we

should take into account the implications of the following inscription on El Morro: "Pasamos por aqui el Sargento Mayor y Capitan Jua de Archuleta y el Aiudante Diego Martin . . . 1636." R. E. Twitchell, *Leading Facts of New Mexican History*, I (Cedar Rapids, Ia., 1911), 340. Whether these soldiers visited the western part of the province before or after September, it is impossible to state. Likewise, we are left in the dark concerning their mission. It is worth noting, however, that in December of 1636 Diego Martin Barba held the office of "Secretary of War and Government." Declaration of Mateo de Mançanares, December 7, 1636. A. G. P. M., Provincias Internas 34, Exp. 1. Cf also the following comment or superscription on the original manuscript of the *autos*, etc., which passed between Baeza and Quiros in 1636: "Y para que si Embiaren ymform.^{on} o Ynforme de q. los dhos Çuñis Estauan de paz y Reduzidos. En tiempo de mi antecesor aviendo pasado tantos años por que no les avian puesto ministro Y escolta q.^{do} se reduxeron, Como an querido dar a entender.—Conque se conoze por estos autos del Cust.^o averlos yo Reduzido y abaxado De paz Y no otro ningun gouer.^{or} demas de Constar desta Verdad por la ymform.^{on} que Remito." *Ibid.* However we may interpret the meaning of these bits of evidence, it is fairly certain that no permanent missions were re-established in 1636.

19. In the autumn and early winter of 1636, Baeza compiled evidence concerning the practice of Father Quiros and his associates of excommunicating persons for failure to attend mass on feast days, and the alleged inconvenience that was involved in seeking out the prelate in order to obtain absolution. A. G. P. M., Provincias Internas 34, Exp. 1.

20. These are the letters cited as *Cartas que se escriuieron*. A. G. P. M., Provincias Internas 35, Exp. 3.

21. Zambrano to the viceroy, November 6, 1636. *Ibid.*

22. Letter to the custodian and defintors, November 2, 1636. *Ibid.*

23. Manso to the viceroy, February 11, 1637. *Ibid.*