

*'William Fowler', Sir William Garrard, Sir John Hawkins and the Sixteenth-Century Atlantic Slave Trade**

In late January 1569, the remnants of an English slaving fleet limped into Mount's Bay, Cornwall.¹ Its commander, Sir John Hawkins, is often described as England's first slave trader, pioneering for the English what would later become known as the Atlantic 'triangular trade', a system established by Portuguese and Spanish merchants in the early decades of the sixteenth century.² Goods were shipped from Europe to West Africa to be exchanged for enslaved Africans, the human cargo was then taken across the Atlantic and sold in the Americas, and the ships then returned to Europe with monetary profits, luxury goods and staple commodities for European markets. Hawkins had led two earlier slaving voyages following this route, in 1562–3 and 1564–5, and this third expedition, which had departed Plymouth on 2 October 1567, was therefore not his first attempt to enter the Atlantic slave trade.³ It certainly proved to be the most infamous of the three expeditions. Only three ships from Hawkins's fleet, and a handful of the 408 men with whom he had set out from Plymouth, returned to England after being defeated by a Spanish flotilla at the Battle of San Juan de Ulúa, off present-day Veracruz in Mexico.⁴

* The research underpinning this article is funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, for which we are grateful (AH/L004062/1 and AH/W004011/1 projects at the University of Southampton, led by Professor Craig Lambert). We would also like to thank Dr Nicholas Karn, Dr Francois Soyer and Dr Guilhem Pépin for their advice on certain aspects of this article. Finally, we would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful and constructive comments.

1. In this period, the New Year started on Lady Day (25 March), and thus the fleet's return, which was in the modern calendar year of 1569, was at the time considered as still being in 1568. In this article, we have applied the modern calendar year of 1 January to 31 December to all dates and years.

2. The phrase 'triangular trade' is colloquially used as helpful shorthand to describe the basic flow of the trade routes between Europe, West Africa and the Americas. In reality, the commercial and social networks that spanned the Atlantic world were far more complex. For an overview of the system's origin and development, see K. Morgan, *Slavery and the British Empire: From Africa to America* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 54–83.

3. Hawkins was an active participant in these three voyages. He also provided ships for another expedition in 1566 led by Captain John Lovell. Lovell's voyage is sometimes referred to as Hawkins's third expedition, and the 1567–9 venture the fourth and last of the Hawkins series: see K.R. Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480–1630* (Cambridge, 1984), p. 125. Hawkins's first two voyages were particularly fruitful, with an estimated £3,000 profit made on the first voyage alone, doubtlessly encouraging the subsequent ventures: K.R. Andrews, *The Spanish Caribbean: Trade and Plunder, 1530–1630* (New Haven, CT, 1978), p. 127.

4. For discussion of Hawkins's expedition and its aftermath, see H. Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins: Queen Elizabeth's Slave Trader* (New Haven, CT, 2003), pp. 70–115. On the size of Hawkins's

On his return to England, Hawkins immediately contacted Queen Elizabeth's ministers, his first report being a lengthy account of the voyage sent to William Cecil, Lord Burghley, the Secretary of State and Elizabeth's chief minister and advisor.⁵ Hawkins's first task seems to have been to salvage his reputation, having lost a large amount of capital and men on the voyage.⁶ To this end, he was in London by February, where he published a short pamphlet detailing the events of the voyage and alleging Spanish treachery, in particular the actions of the new Spanish viceroy in Mexico, Don Martín Enríquez de Almanza, as the reason for its failure.⁷ Shortly thereafter, with Sir William Garrard—one of the expedition's principal financial backers—Hawkins began formal proceedings against the Spanish Crown to claim compensation for the losses the expedition had suffered, resulting in a series of depositions before the High Court of the Admiralty in March and April 1569.⁸

crew, see B. Morgan, 'Hawkins, Sir John (1532–95)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [hereafter *ODNB*], available online at <https://www.oxforddnb.com/> (all references are to this online edition). Hawkins set out with six ships: the *Jesus of Lübeck*, the *Minion*, the *William and John*, the *Swallow*, the *Judith* and the *Angel*. He acquired further vessels during the voyage: a caravel at Cabo Blanco, two French ships taken near Cape Verde and a Portuguese caravel taken at Río Santo Domingo (renamed the *Grace of God*). The *William and John* lost contact with the fleet in the Florida Channel and returned to England with heavy losses. Not all of the remaining ships took part in the battle, but only the *Judith*, commanded by Hawkins's cousin Francis Drake, and the *Minion* under Hawkins, made it back to England. It is difficult to know precisely how many of those men that set out from Plymouth in October 1567 came back. There were certainly no more than fifteen mariners aboard the *Minion* upon its return, along with the crews of the *Judith* and *William and John*. Only four of the ninety-six men put ashore by Hawkins after the battle and captured by the Spanish are known to have returned to England. In all, Hawkins probably lost around 300 men on the voyage; see Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement*, pp. 126–7.

5. Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 99.

6. There is some debate as to whether or not the expedition made a profit or loss overall. The expedition apparently returned with gold (which the Spanish ambassador later valued at 28,000 pesos) and a chest of pearls. On the issues of profit and loss, see H. Kelsey, 'Drake, Sir Francis (1540–1596)', *ODNB*; H. Kelsey, *Sir Francis Drake: The Queen's Pirate* (New Haven, CT, 1998), pp. 41–2. Andrews, *Spanish Caribbean*, p. 130, argues that the voyage probably broke even.

7. [John Hawkins], *A True Declaration of the Troublesome Voyage of M. John Hawkins to the Parties of Guynea and the West Indies, in the Yeares of our Lord 1567 and 1568* (London, 1569). Richard Hakluyt republished Hawkins's pamphlet in the first edition of his *Principal Navigations* in 1589, along with two other narratives related to the expedition by Miles Philips and David Ingram: R. Hakluyt, *The Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation, made by Sea or Over Land, to the Most Remote and Farthest Distant Quarters of the Earth at any time within the Compose of these 1500 Yeeres* (London, 1589) [hereafter PN1], pp. 553–7 (Hawkins), 557–62 (Ingram) and 562–80 (Philips). The Hawkins pamphlet and Philips's account were again published by Hakluyt in the second, expanded edition: R. Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voiages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation* (3 vols in 2 parts, London, 1598–1600) [hereafter PN2], iii, pt ii, pp. 469–87 (Philips), and 521–5 (Hawkins). Hakluyt also included the account of Job Hortop in PN2 (another participant in the 1567–9 voyage), which was first published elsewhere in 1591: PN2, iii, pt ii, pp. 487–95. David Ingram's account from PN1 was not reproduced in PN2, perhaps because Hakluyt did not believe some of the more fanciful descriptions of the Americas provided by Ingram; see P.C. Mancall, *Hakluyt's Promise: An Elizabethan's Obsession for an English America* (New Haven, CT, 2007), pp. 232–4.

8. From 1540 the court's sessions were held at the Church of St Margaret in Southwark; see G. Durston, *The Admiralty Sessions, 1536–1834: Maritime Crime and the Silver Oar* (Cambridge, 2017), p. 104.

The Hawkins voyage of 1567–9 has rightly attracted a good deal of scholarly attention, ranging from how Hawkins and his English contemporaries engaged with the early, Iberian-controlled, transatlantic slave trade to who invested in his voyage, and its diplomatic and political repercussions.⁹ Yet, invaluable as this research has been, relatively little attention has been paid to some of the key witnesses called to give evidence in support of the claims for compensation from Hawkins, Garrard and the other financiers of the expedition. One witness in particular, the merchant William Fowler, is especially intriguing because, of all the witnesses called before the High Court of the Admiralty, he appears to be the only individual not to have taken part in the voyage. Instead, Fowler's role was that of the expert witness, brought before the court to offer in-depth knowledge of the mechanics of commerce within the Atlantic sphere of the Global Hispanic Monarchy; a trading system, given the content of his testimony, with which he was intimately familiar.

Fowler's testimony has not gone entirely unnoticed by scholars. In 1903, Raymond Beazley edited and published a series of accounts and commentaries of English voyages and travels in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with an abridged version of Fowler's testimony among them.¹⁰ Beazley's edition is valuable for bringing this source to light, but he does not examine Fowler's testimony in any depth, merely highlighting the fact that his evidence was there to provide estimates and credibility as to the losses suffered and compensation claimed by Hawkins and his backers. Twenty-seven years later, Elizabeth Donnan published the part of Fowler's testimony in which he discusses the slave trade, and other scholars have also reproduced small sections of Fowler's testimony in print.¹¹ Fowler's deposition, however, also provides evidence of the other commodities that sixteenth-century Englishmen were eager to sell in the Americas, thus highlighting the range of commercial opportunities that English traders pursued in transatlantic commerce. When compared with the schedule of losses (outlined below), it also sheds light on Garrard's and Hawkins's claims for compensation. Moreover, no scholar to date has investigated Fowler's background, the social and geographical networks that brought him

9. Much of the relevant scholarship is referenced throughout this article.

10. Beazley's edition has documentation from all Hawkins's slaving voyages: *An English Garner: Voyages and Travels Mainly During the 16th and 17th Centuries*, ed. C.R. Beazley (2 vols, Westminster, 1903), i, pp. 29–30 (1562–3, first voyage); pp. 31–80 (1564–5, second voyage); pp. 81–126, 161–242 (1567–9, third voyage). Fowler's testimony is at pp. 106–8. For the 1567–9 accounts, Beazley drew upon the testimonies in the State Papers, although his edition does not provide full coverage of the witnesses called to give evidence.

11. *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America, I: 1440–1700*, ed. E. Donnan (Washington, DC, 1930), p. 72. D. Wheat, *Atlantic Africa and the Spanish Caribbean, 1570–1640* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2016), p. 218, for example, reproduces the section of Fowler's testimony that discusses the various prices slaves fetched depending on their age and knowledge of Iberian culture and languages.

to the court to support Hawkins and Garrard, or offered, beyond the discussion of the slave trade, any comment on his testimony's value as a source. This is a significant historical omission, not only because it was Fowler's knowledge of the logistics and value of commodities traded within Spanish America which formed the basis of Garrard and Hawkins's estimation of the expedition's losses, but also because his testimony makes plain that Fowler operated officially (or had operated in the past) within the Atlantic arm of the Global Hispanic Monarchy, and not as an 'external interloper', as Hawkins was. Because of its historical importance, a full transcription of Fowler's deposition from the Admiralty Court book is provided at the end of this account: the first, unabridged version of this document.

This article examines afresh the Admiralty Court hearings of early 1569, and in so doing uncovers more about the origins and identity of William Fowler, why he was involved in the hearings, the value and importance of his testimony to Garrard, Hawkins and the expedition's other financial backers, and how his testimony fits against the background of the Atlantic slave trade of the day. At the same time, some of the socio-economic and personal links between Fowler, the expedition's financiers and Hawkins are highlighted to illustrate the close interconnections between the sixteenth-century London mercantile class. Furthermore, while previous scholars have argued that Garrard and Hawkins exaggerated their claims for compensation for goods lost, this article, by linking the evidence in Fowler's testimony with the judicial records, demonstrates that, with the exception of a few commodities, the claims for compensation were conservative rather than unrealistic or inflated.¹²

As well as highlighting the financial credibility of Hawkins's and Garrard's claims for compensation, this re-examination of the Admiralty Court hearing of 1569, its aftermath, and William Fowler's contribution to it, is important for two principal reasons. First, Hawkins's 1567–9 voyage was the largest (in terms of ships and manpower) and most heavily funded English transatlantic slaving venture of the sixteenth century, its financial backers including some of the most influential and powerful merchants, noblemen and courtiers in the kingdom, as well as Queen Elizabeth herself. Its near-complete failure caused a fundamental shift in English policy towards Spain and Spanish territories in the Americas. The debacle at San Juan de Ulúa marked the end of large-scale English slaving voyages for the foreseeable future, indeed until the seventeenth century, although they undoubtedly continued illicitly at a lower level.¹³

12. See, for example, Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 101, who argues that the compensation claim was exaggerated—but Kelsey had mistakenly transcribed some of the records linked with the claim (see Table 1 below). Andrews, *Spanish Caribbean*, p. 129, argues that the claims should be seen as the upper limit of the value of the goods lost.

13. After Hawkins's last voyage, the numbers of slaves transported across the Atlantic in English ships fell dramatically. It is estimated that 1,700 enslaved people were transported in English ships

It led to a far more aggressive stance towards Spanish America, with men such as Francis Drake abandoning the passive circumspect methods of Hawkins in favour of outright piracy, conducting raids on Iberian settlements and shipping with the tacit backing of the Crown. Secondly, the investigation of the role William Fowler played in the Admiralty proceedings, and an examination of his origins, reveals just how interconnected the Atlantic World was, showing how both English and Spanish merchants operated within the framework of the Global Hispanic Monarchy.

I

On his arrival in England in January 1569, Hawkins returned to a tumultuous geopolitical situation, his expedition only the latest in a series of events which had heightened Anglo-Spanish tensions. In late 1568, the Spanish governor of the Netherlands, the Duke of Alba, had begun military campaigning against Protestants in the Low Countries rebelling against Spanish Catholic rule, a situation which alarmed England's Protestant authorities. Tensions continued to heighten with Elizabeth's seizure soon afterwards of a consignment of Genoese money, intended to be loaned to Philip II.¹⁴ In response, in January and February 1569, Philip ordered the arrest of English merchants and their goods within his realm. Elizabeth retaliated by ordering the arrest of any ship which belonged to a port within Philip's dominions that sailed into an English harbour.¹⁵ Anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish feeling in England was further exacerbated by the arrival of the Catholic Mary, Queen of Scots in England in May 1568, a woman whom many English Catholics believed to be rightful queen of England. Her presence created the spectre in the minds of the English Protestant authorities of a Catholic insurrection backed by Spanish intervention. It was against this febrile political backdrop that Elizabeth's ministers began organising a formal procedure of complaint against Spain, which included the request by Garrard, Hawkins and the other financial backers for compensation for the goods they had lost at San Juan de Ulúa.¹⁶ The rationale for including Garrard's and Hawkins's protestations against the Spanish

in 1551–75, and 200 in 1576–1600. In 1626–50, however, this rose to 34,000 enslaved, and the numbers continued to increase thereafter; see D. Eltis and D. Richardson, with a foreword by D.B. Davis and an afterword by D.W. Blight, *Atlas of the Transatlantic Slave Trade* (New Haven, CT, 2010), p. 23.

14. The Genoese ships had taken refuge from French pirates in Plymouth and Southampton, but William Hawkins (brother to John) had received news of the events at San Juan de Ulúa and encouraged Cecil to use this money to reimburse Hawkins's losses. Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 100.

15. Kew, The National Archives [hereafter TNA], SP 12/53, fos 58r–66v.

16. The Spanish authorities also provided their own counterclaims against Hawkins. See, for example, the account of Guerau de Espés (Philip's ambassador to England) of events at San Juan de Ulúa delivered to the Privy Council, in Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, pp. 106–7.

within the wider English complaint, and how Garrard, Hawkins and the other financiers justified their own actions, was that, while they did not have official sanction to trade within the Atlantic sphere of the Global Hispanic Monarchy, Hawkins had received permits from officials in Spanish America allowing him to do so, permits the English government told Philip's ambassador they could provide. The government also informed the Spanish king that it did not recognise the pope's division of the globe into Spanish and Portuguese areas of influence and reminded him that Spanish subjects could trade in English ports.¹⁷

In March 1569, therefore, Hawkins, Fowler and five other deponents appeared before the High Court of the Admiralty in London over a period of several days, outlining the events of the expedition to seek legal redress and compensation from Philip's government. Thomas Hampton was the 44-year-old captain of the *Minion*. William Clarke, 28, was one of the four merchants on the voyage who had sailed home in the *William and John*. John Tornes/Tomes was 27 and Hawkins's personal servant. Humphrey Fones, 25, was steward of the *Angel*, and John Turren, 30, was trumpeter on the *Jesus of Lübeck*.¹⁸ The Admiralty sessions were led by two men, the Lord Admiral (Edward Fiennes, Lord Clinton) and David Lewes, a judge of the Admiralty Court, and ran until July. Hawkins and his backers began the process by setting out claims for reimbursement.¹⁹

These 'Hawkins depositions' survive in two copies, both now in the UK National Archives. One set is contained within the State Papers, and the other is recorded over two prize books of the High Court of the Admiralty, with both sets having been compiled by Roger Parker, a clerk of the Admiralty.²⁰ The content of the testimonies of those who

17. *Spanish Documents Concerning English Voyages to the Caribbean, 1527–1568: Selected from the Archives of the Indies at Seville*, ed. I.A. Wright (London, 1929), p. 10.

18. Unfortunately, Hawkins did not provide his own age. Francis Drake's omission from the list of deponents is puzzling given his participation on the voyage and familial link with Hawkins. Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 104, states that 'Gossips in Spain said he [Drake] was in prison because he refused to give an accounting of the goods and treasure brought home in the *Judith*, but no English source confirms this', or that Drake was already back in the Indies undertaking reprisals against the Spanish. Alternatively, there could well have been animosity between Hawkins and Drake. Drake, in the *Judith* the night after the battle, left Hawkins in the *Minion*, though whether by accident or design is unknown. Hawkins, while not naming Drake in the pamphlet published in early 1569, stated that 'so with the *Minion* onelye and the *Judith* (a small barke of 50. tonne) we escaped which barke the same nighte forsoke us in oure greate miserie'; see [Hawkins], *True Declaration*, fos 12v–13r.

19. On the backers of the voyage, see R. Pollitt, 'John Hawkins's Troublesome Voyages: Merchants, Bureaucrats, and the Origin of the Slave Trade', *Journal of British Studies*, xii (1973), pp. 26–40.

20. State Papers copy: TNA, SP 12/53; John Turren (fos 8r–14r); William Clarke (fos 14r–22r); Thomas Hampton (fos 22r–33v); John Hawkins (fos 33v–42v); John Tornes/Tomes (fos 42v–48r); Humphrey Fones (fos 48r–54v); William Fowler (fos 54v–57r). The State Papers version of Hawkins's voyage confusingly places the events out of chronological order: the testimonies of Hawkins's voyage (taken in Mar./Apr. 1569) appear first followed by the queen's letter of reprisal (6 Jan. 1569), and then accounts of three witnesses not connected to the Hawkins depositions (William Harris, John Caige and William Harebrowne) who gave evidence on the arrest of English merchants and goods in Philip's dominions: TNA, SP 12/53, fos 58r–65v. High

participated in the voyage are identical in both versions. The State Papers account, however, differs in layout. In it, a list of twelve articles precedes the individual testimonies which outline the basis for the complaint. Following this is a schedule of losses in the form of twenty-seven items listing the goods for which Garrard, Hawkins and the other backers were claiming compensation, and which only appear in this form in the State Papers version. In both versions, each deponent commented on the twelve articles which provided the background to, and narrative of, the voyage, including the claim by the English that the Spanish broke the agreement not to fight while both fleets were at San Juan de Ulúa.²¹ Each deponent also gave their opinion as to the value of the losses as laid out in the twenty-seven items (see [Table 1](#) for a breakdown of the lost items and the valuations for compensation).²²

Why two copies of the testimonies were made, and which set was compiled first, is not clear. A likely explanation is that Hawkins's voyage was deemed politically sensitive enough that the copy made before the Admiralty (as the testimonies were verbally delivered by the deponents) was reproduced for the Secretary of State, William Cecil, so that he had a copy among his personal papers for easy reference. This would mean that the 'Admiralty prize book' version was compiled first, an argument strengthened by the fact that, while both sets of testimonies are near identical in content, the 'Admiralty' version has been signed by each deponent, and contains some additional marginalia not found in the State Papers account. If we are right in the assumption that the deponents only delivered their testimonies once, this would explain why only the prize books version is signed; this was the version compiled when the deponents were present, with the copy in the State Papers made at a later date. Moreover, the more methodical structure of the State Papers version suggests that this was compiled afterwards to form the basis of the claim that would be sent to Philip's representatives in England.

Whatever the explanation for the duplication of the testimonies, they clearly demonstrate that it was Sir William Garrard who was the prime mover, along with Hawkins, in initiating the proceedings for securing

Court of the Admiralty (prize books) copy: the testimonies cover two prize books in chronological order: TNA, HCA 13/16: John Turren (fos 421v–425v); William Clarke (fos 438v–444v); Thomas Hampton (fos 445v–454r); John Hawkins (fos 456v–465v); John Tornes (Tomes) (fos 464r–468r); Humphrey Fones (fos 468v–473r), and HCA 13/17, fos 2r–4r, for William Fowler. All the depositions are dated in March and April 1569. John Turren's account was missed by Kenneth Andrews (*Andrews, Spanish Caribbean*, p. 110, no. 4), who states that all testimonies were given in April (Turren's occurred on 26 March). Parker's name is mentioned in the State Paper testimonies, which strengthens the argument that he compiled the accounts in the prize books.

21. See, for example, Thomas Hampton's testimony, in which he states that 'the whole companie then of Englishemen were genen to quetres and remande in quett manner till suche tyme as they were provoked by the on sett of the Spaniards who beganne the fight contrare to ther promise': TNA, HCA 13/16, fo. 447v. The Spanish, by contrast, claimed Hawkins had fortified his positions which was contrary to the agreement.

22. TNA, SP 12/53: 12 articles (fos 3v–6r); the schedule of losses (fos 6v–7v).

Table 1: List of Goods and Equipment for which William Garrard and John Hawkins Claimed Compensation^a

Item	Lost Goods	Value
1	The <i>Jesus of Lübeck</i> and its equipment	£5,000
2	Guns/cannons aboard the <i>Jesus of Lübeck</i>	£2,000
3	Gunpowder, guns and ammunition [*]	£1,000
4	Anchors, lines and cables from the <i>Minion</i>	£200
5	The <i>Swallow</i> and its victuals and equipment	£850
6	The <i>Angel</i> and its equipment and victuals	£180
7	The <i>Grace of God</i> with equipment and victuals	£400
8	In the <i>Jesus</i> and three other ships, 57 Ethiopians 'of the best kind of stature' worth 400 gold <i>pesos</i> each [†]	£9,120
9	In the <i>Jesus</i> and three other ships, 30 bales of linen cloth, each worth 3,000 <i>reales</i>	£2,250
10	In the said four ships, 1,000 pieces of dyed cloth (<i>pintados</i>), each worth 15s each	£750
11	In the said four ships 400 lbs of merchandise called ' <i>margaritas</i> '	£100
12	In the said four ships 300 lbs of pewter, each pound worth 2s	£30
13	A bale of broad called taffetas, [‡] containing 40 varas	£40
14	4 bales of woollen cloth called Hampshires and Northern, each worth £8	£340
15	6 bales of cottons	£90
16	A chest containing 30 decorated swords	£120
17	12 quintals of wax	£120
18	7 tuns of <i>manillios</i> , commonly 7 tons of arm and wrist bands, each worth £50	£350
19	In the <i>Jesus</i> a sack of gold and silver containing 6,000 <i>pesos</i> of gold and silver [§]	£2,400
20	In the <i>Jesus</i> a chest containing pieces of silver plate	£200
21	In the <i>Jesus</i> silver currency	£500
22	In the said four ships 20 barrels of Cretan and Spanish wine (commonly 20 butts of sack and malmsey)	£300
23	In the said four ships, 36 barrels of meal (flour), each worth £4	£144
24	In the four ships other victuals	£150
25	In the <i>Jesus</i> clothes belonging to John Hawkins	£300
26	In the <i>Jesus</i> chests containing seamen's belongings	£900
27	In the <i>Jesus</i> a bale of 20 mantels, commonly called cloaks each worth £4	£80
Total		£27,914

^{*} Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 101, records the value at £2,000, but it is clearly £1,000.

[†] According to Fowler's testimony, the estimation of 400 gold *pesos* undervalued Hawkins's slaves.

[‡] A fine, crisp and usually lustrous fabric of plain weave in which the weft threads are thicker than those of the warp, originally of silk and later also of a silk mix, or other fibres.

Table 1. Continued

§ Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 103, and *An English Garner*, ed. Beazley, i, p. 123, say 600 *pesos*, but it is clearly 6,000. According to Fowler's testimony (in which he clearly refers to gold *pesos*) each *peso de oro* was worth approximately 7*s*, which means that if this sack contained gold *pesos* its value would be £2,100. However, in this case Hawkins clearly values each *peso* at 8*s*, hence the £2,400 claim.

a Taken from TNA, SP 12/53, fos 6*v*–7*v*. Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, pp. 101–4, and *An English Garner*, ed. Beazley, i, pp. 115–26, provide a fuller description, although there are errors in both Kelsey's and Beazley's transcriptions.

redress. Garrard, a London merchant and former mayor and MP of the city, had made his fortune exporting cloth to Antwerp, and had later expanded his horizons and moved to financing more risky overseas ventures which offered the potential of larger profits. He had financed a voyage to the Barbary Coast in 1552 and several voyages to Guinea in the 1550s and 1560s, as well as the Hawkins slaving voyages and Richard Chancellor's expedition to Russia in 1553.²³ Several of the deponents mention Garrard's prominent role in financing Hawkins's expedition. Humphrey Fones, for example, stated that the fleet departed out of England

very well furnished having in them divers sortes of wares and marchandizes which were provided at the chardge of the articutlate Sir William Garrard, Rowland Heyward and others ... The cheffe chardge and government of which voyadge was committed by the saide Sir William Garrard.²⁴

Indeed, the marginalia next to Fowler's testimony in the prize books states that what follows is a 'Complaint by Lord William Garrard and others for English ships that were sunk in parts of the Indies'.²⁵ This makes it clear that Fowler was brought to the court to provide independent expert advice to substantiate the financial claims made by Garrard and Hawkins. They were certainly not alone in wishing to seek financial redress. The backers of Hawkins's voyages have been examined in detail by several scholars, and alongside Garrard there were a number of other high-status and high-profile financiers who invested in the 1567–9 venture, including Sir Rowland Heyward, Sir Lionel Duckett, Sir William Winter, the earls of Leicester and Pembroke, Lord Clinton, Sir William Chester, Benjamin Gonson, Edward Castelin, Anthony Hickman, Benedict Spinola, William Cecil and, most prominently of all, the queen. Like Garrard, many of these backers had long histories of funding trading ventures centred on the Canaries, the Mediterranean and further afield, such as Lionel Duckett, who had financed voyages

23. H. Miller, 'Garrard, Sir William (1510–1571)', *ODNB*.

24. TNA, HCA 13/16, fo. 468*v*.

25. Translated from the Latin marginalia of the account: '*Querela Domini Willelmi Garrard et aliorum pro submercione navium Anglicarum in partibus Indie facta*': TNA, HCA 13/17, fo. 2*r*. The same wording appears next to the testimony of John Turren (HCA 13/16, fo. 421*v*) and William Clark (HCA 13/16, fo. 438*v*).

to Guinea in the 1550s, and William Winter, who in 1553 participated in Thomas Wyndham's voyage to Guinea.²⁶ Many were also linked through the various London livery companies and guilds, especially the Company of Merchant Adventurers, and were also engaged in the cloth trade, England's most important export commodity.

With such an array of prominent backers, it is hardly surprising that Garrard's and Hawkins's claims were given such prominence. Indeed, an examination of the men involved in the 'Hawkins depositions'—the deponents, their backers and even those conducting the proceedings—reveals that several had connections to one another. In his will of December 1577, Roger Parker, the clerk who compiled both copies of the depositions, for example, bequeathed £5 to David Lewes, the Admiralty judge who presided over the proceedings, so that he could buy a death ring to remember him.²⁷ Similarly, in his will of 1584, Lewes recalled that he had a 'greate ringe with deaths head which I had at the death of Sir William Garrard knight'.²⁸ As we have noted, Edward Fiennes, Lord Clinton, was also an investor in the 1567–9 voyage, and as Lord Admiral of England he was sure to guarantee that the judicial proceedings were sympathetic towards Garrard and Hawkins, not least because he probably hoped to recoup some of his investment through their claim.²⁹

II

These personal connections almost certainly explain why William Fowler was called to provide testimony in support of Garrard and Hawkins. Evidence from Fowler's testimony in the prize books shows that in 1569 he was residing in Ratcliff in the hundred of Ossulstone, Middlesex.³⁰ This is the same hundred where the naval administrator, Benjamin Gonson

26. For discussion of these individuals and their mercantile interests, see Pollitt, 'John Hawkins's Troublesome Voyages'; J.A. Williamson, *Sir John Hawkins* (Oxford, 1927), p. 129; J. McDermott, 'Castelin, Edward (1554–1578)', *ODNB*; P. Hunnyball, 'Hickman, Walter (1552–1617)', in A. Thrush and J.P. Ferris, eds, *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1604–1629* (Cambridge, 2010), available online at <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/hickman-walter-1552-1617> (accessed 8 Dec. 2023). L. Blum, 'Empire Later: England and West Africa, 1553–1631, and the Foundations of English Dominance in the Region in the Late Seventeenth Century' (Univ. of Southampton Ph.D. thesis, 2019), pp. 41–9, provides detailed analysis of the mercantile careers of Duckett, Hickman, Castelin, Chester, Garrard, Gonson senior and Winter.

27. TNA, PROB 11/61, fos 129r–129v. Born in Chichester, he eventually settled in London (Middlesex), where much of his property/land was located. He left money to the poor of St Faith's parish, which was adjacent to St Pauls, and therefore close to the hundred of Ossulstone where Fowler resided, along with more than £300 in land and cash for relatives and friends (including Dr Lewes).

28. TNA, PROB 11/67, fos 75r–76r. He had also dealt with Hawkins before; see Kelsey, *John Hawkins*, pp. 38–9.

29. A. Duffin, 'Clinton, Edward Fiennes de, first earl of Lincoln (1512–1585)', *ODNB*. He was also involved in the Guinea trade in the 1550s and invested in the previous slaving voyages undertaken by Hawkins; see Pollitt, 'John Hawkins's Troublesome Voyages'.

30. TNA, HCA 13/17, fo. 2r. Ratcliff was formerly a hamlet on the north bank of the River Thames and is now part of the Greater London districts of Limehouse, Stepney and Shadwell.

senior (d. 1577) lived, and where, in 1576, John Hawkins would marry Gonson's daughter, Katherine.³¹ Gonson senior resided in Tower Street in the parish of St Dunstan-in-the-East, a stone's throw from Ratcliff on the north bank of the Thames, and in the tax assessments of 1589 his son Benjamin Gonson junior (b. 1551) was listed among the Ratcliff residents.³² Gonson senior had also backed Hawkins's earlier slaving voyages, and like Hawkins, the Gonson family must have been aware of Fowler and his career trading in Spanish America.³³ William Garrard also had connections to this area: he was governor of the hospitals of Bridewell (1558–9) and St Bartholomew's (1559–71), both of which are close to Ratcliff.³⁴ Lionel Duckett lived in Cripplegate, and both he and William Chester had links with Bassishaw. William Winter resided in East Smithfield.³⁵ In short, several of the merchant backers of Hawkins's third slaving voyage lived within a few kilometres of each other, in and around London, and perhaps knew Fowler through business or even personally.

It is also clear that some, probably all, of the other witnesses who appeared before the Admiralty Court were carefully chosen by Garrard and Hawkins because they had connections to them prior to the voyage. In his testimony, John Turren, trumpeter aboard the *Jesus*, made it clear that while the voyage was being planned, he along with others had met with Garrard to drink wine.³⁶ Thomas Hampton, shipmaster of the *Minion*, also socialised with Garrard prior to the voyage, and had long-standing connections to Hawkins. Thomas and his brother James had frequently used Hawkins's ships to trade, and on a few occasions took command of vessels owned by Hawkins. On the 1562–3 slaving voyage, Thomas commanded the *Jonas*. In 1566, both Thomas and his brother participated in John Lovell's slaving voyage, on which Hawkins had originally intended to sail. Their careers also intersected with that of Francis Drake, as James often took command of Drake's ships the *Pasco* and *Judith*, the latter captained by Drake during the 1567–9 voyage.³⁷ The connections between the Hamptons, Hawkins and Garrard meant that Thomas was a man who could be relied upon to act as one the key witnesses in 1569.³⁸

31. J. Bennell, 'William Gonson (d. 1540) and Benjamin Gonson (d. 1577)', *ODNB*. They resided in the parish of St Dunstan, which was part of the hundred of Ossulstone, which also included Ratcliff.

32. TNA, E 179/142/239, rot. 5d. Benjamin Gonson junior was later clerk of the ships in 1588–1600; see also Bennell, 'William Gonson', *ODNB*.

33. On Gonson's involvement, see Pollitt, 'John Hawkins's Troublesome Voyages'.

34. Miller, 'Garrard, Sir William', *ODNB*.

35. *Two Tudor Subsidy Rolls for the City of London*, ed. R.G. Lang (London, 1993), pp. 206–19; J.C. Appleby, 'Duckett, Sir Lionel (d. 1587)', J.D. Alsop, 'Chester, Sir William (c.1509–1595?)', and D. Loades, 'Winter, Sir William (c.1525–1589)', *ODNB*.

36. TNA, HCA 13/16, fo. 421v.

37. Drake and his brother John owned the *Pasco* that was used in Lovell's voyage in 1566; see Kelsey, *Queen's Pirate*, p. 50.

38. For details of the Hampton family and their links with Hawkins, see C. Lambert, 'Tudor Shipmasters and Maritime Communities', in C. Jowitt, C. Lambert and S. Mentz, eds, *The Routledge Companion to Marine and Maritime Worlds, 1400–1800* (London, 2020), pp. 323–48, at 333.

But who was William Fowler? We know from his deposition that he lived close to Hawkins and the other backers, that he was 28 years old in 1569, meaning that he was born *circa* 1541, and that he had intimate knowledge of trade in the Spanish New World.³⁹ His deposition states that:

this deponent seythe that he hathe traded from Civille to the saide porte of la Vera Crux, Mexico, and other places in the West Indias, and there hathe ben six severall tymes and hathe carried wares to and from the same places.⁴⁰

Given the fact that he was called before the inquiry as an expert witness on the price of commodities in pan-Atlantic trading, one would assume that he was a man of some mercantile standing in England, like many of the expedition's prominent backers. This does not appear to have been the case. Indeed, records of Fowler's activities prior to 1569, and even his identity, are difficult to ascertain. There is no mention of him in the livery company records of London, and he seems never to have sat as an MP or held any significant offices at local or national level. A William Fowler does appear in the London customs accounts shipping wool in 1556, but if this was the same man he would have been in his mid-teens at the time and most likely too young to be trading in this way.⁴¹ Another 'William Fowler', more contemporaneous to the testimony given to the Admiralty in 1569, appears as a shipmaster on several occasions in the English national customs accounts in 1567–74. This, however, is highly unlikely to be the same William Fowler as the man who gave testimony in favour of Hawkins in 1569. When this William Fowler initially appears in the port books in 1567 he is described as an 'indigenous'—that is to say 'English'—shipmaster from Great Yarmouth, which, as will be discussed below, does not chime easily with other evidence for the origins of the deponent of 1569. Moreover, and most tellingly, the links between Hawkins, Fowler and Garrard related above do not extend to the Yarmouth shipmaster, and even though the port books are far from complete there is nothing in the recorded career of William Fowler, Yarmouth shipmaster, which suggests any connection to the pan-Atlantic trade with the Americas.⁴²

Another 'identification' of William Fowler has been made by scholars. Antonio Rumeu de Armas, for example, identified Fowler as one of the ten hostages exchanged at San Juan de Ulúa.⁴³ These hostages were

39. Beazley mistakenly gives his age as 38; see *An English Garner*, ed. Beazley, i, p. 106.

40. TNA, HCA 13/17, fo. 2v.

41. TNA, E 122/46/8, m. 4d.

42. TNA, E 190/4/1, fo. 24v; E 190/305/11, fo. 2v; E 190/472/4, fos 5r, 7v, 9r; E 190/473/7, fo. 20v. He was also active as late as 1579–80; see E 190/6/8, fos 9r, 20v, 47v; E 190/4/1, fo. 24v. Another William Fowler (d. 1572), a prominent Edinburgh merchant, magistrate and treasurer of the French revenues of Mary, Queen of Scots was also in England in 1568, but the deponent William Fowler's connections to Ratcliff firmly rule out the Scot; see M.H.B. Sanderson, 'Fokart, Janet (d. 1596)', *ODNB*.

43. A. Rumeu de Armas, *Los Viajes de John Hawkins a América, 1562–1595* (Seville, 1947), p. 289. David Wheat also suggests that the Fowler who gave evidence in 1569 was present on

handed over upon the arrival at San Juan de Ulúa of a Spanish fleet under the command of Francisco de Luxan and Admiral Juan de Ubillo, which carried the new Viceroy, Don Martín Enríquez. The fleet's arrival no doubt surprised the English, who were at anchor in the small harbour making repairs, as much as it did the Spanish; the English, after all, were not supposed to be there without licence. The exchange of hostages was intended to ensure cordial relations between the English and Spanish. If this identification of Fowler as one of the hostages is correct then Fowler did participate in the Hawkins slaving voyage of 1567–9. The evidence for Rumeu de Armas's claim comes from a letter composed by three Englishmen—George Fitzwilliam, John Varney and someone who simply signed his name as 'Fowler'—writing on behalf of themselves and several other prisoners incarcerated in Seville. With the help of the duquesa de Feria, the letter, dated 25 February 1570, was sent to Cecil in the hope that he would arrange for their release.⁴⁴

This identification of William Fowler with 'Fowler' the prisoner can be dismissed on three grounds. First, and most obvious, is the fact that William Fowler gave his testimony before the Admiralty Court in London on 30 April 1569, shortly after Hawkins's arrival back in England. William Fowler, therefore, cannot have been one of the hostages exchanged at San Juan de Ulúa in September 1568, as all these hostages were still in Spanish custody at the time Fowler gave his testimony to the Admiralty. Moreover, at no point in his testimony before the Admiralty does Fowler say he was with Hawkins, something he would surely have stated to the court. He is also not listed as one of the many prisoners taken and tried by the Spanish in Mexico after Hawkins's fleet had left.⁴⁵ While it is possible that Fowler, after giving his testimony in April 1569, travelled to Spain and was incarcerated along with the Hawkins prisoners in Seville (for some unknown reason), and was thus involved in the prisoners' letter to Cecil ten months later,

the voyage; see Wheat, *Atlantic Africa*, p. 218. The incarcerated Fowler was also noted by J.A. Williamson, *Hawkins of Plymouth: A New History of Sir John Hawkins and other Members of his Family Prominent in Tudor England* (London, 1949), pp. 105–6, although he does not suggest that the prisoner Fowler is the same man as the one giving testimony before the Admiralty in 1569. Beazley (*An English Garner*, ed. Beazley, i, p. 104), which pre-dates Rumeu de Armas, says Fowler was not on the expedition, but he seems unaware of the letter in the State Papers. The suggestion by Rumeu de Armas that Fowler participated in the voyage probably influenced later historians. For the number of hostages exchanged, see *Spanish Documents, 1527–1568*, ed. Wright, p. 28. For information on Luxan's fleet, see P.R. Chaunu and H. Chaunu, *Seville et l'Atlantique, 1504–1650*, III: *Le Trafic de 1561 a 1595* (Paris, 1955).

44. TNA, SP 70/110, fo. 87r. The latter has been dated by its compilers in the calendar year 1570; legally in England it was still 1569 until 25 March.

45. In addition to the ten hostages exchanged at San Juan de Ulúa, Hawkins had been forced to put ninety-six men ashore, many of whom were captured by the Spanish. The prisoners in the letter were a combination of the ten hostages and an unspecified number of those Hawkins had put ashore; see *An Englishman and the Mexican Inquisition, 1556–1560: Being an Account of the Voyage of Robert Tomson to New Spain, his Trial for Heresy in the City of Mexico and other Contemporary Historical Documents*, ed. G.R.G. Conway (Mexico, 1927), appendix III, which provides a list of the prisoners including notes on their trials and punishments.

this seems highly unlikely. Indeed, a more probable scenario is that the William Fowler giving evidence in England in 1569 was a relative—a father, uncle or sibling—of the Fowler in the Seville jail. This would certainly have provided William Fowler with an additional motivation to appear before the Admiralty Court in 1569, but, unless further evidence comes to light, the idea of a familial link between the prisoner and the testimony-giver must remain conjecture. Even if a familial link could be established, the essential point that William Fowler was used as an expert witness by Garrard and Hawkins remains valid.

The second reason why William Fowler and Fowler the prisoner cannot be the same person is the content of the prisoners' letter, which states that they were captured in the Indies, which, as we have seen, rules William Fowler out from being one of them.⁴⁶ The third reason arises from a comparison of the Fowler signatures; that of 'Fowler' on the prison letter and 'William Fowler' on the 'Admiralty' copy of the deposition of 1569. The letter forms and handwriting of the two signatures are very different and were clearly not written by the same person. It is true that the prisoners were in very poor condition, and this may have affected their writing, but there are too many differences to accept such a conclusion. Moreover, we do not know the forename of 'Fowler' who signed the letter in 1570, so we cannot even be certain he was called William.

In fact, it is the signature of 'William Fowler' on the Admiralty copy of his deposition, linked to evidence from the English national customs accounts, which provides a major clue to his identity. He signed his testimony 'Gillernio Foulas'—a Spanish spelling of 'William Fowler'.⁴⁷ All the other deponents who signed their testimonies before the Admiralty Court in March/April 1569 did so in English. This strongly suggests that 'William Fowler' was of Spanish descent, and it is possible to add further credence to this by again turning to the English national customs accounts. In April, and again in August 1580, the port books record a merchant named William Fowler shipping iron from Rochester into London on the 30-ton *Swallow* of Mill-Hall, Kent.⁴⁸ The customs clerks for both ports record this William Fowler as holding the dual status of both an indigenous and alien (foreign) merchant, an uncommon

46. We know for certain that Fitzwilliam was a hostage, and that by the summer of 1570 he was back in England; see Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 115. Varney could have been either a hostage or one of those Hawkins put ashore. He is probably the man of the same name who commanded the *Elizabeth Drake* in 1585/6, so must also have been released; see Kelsey, *Sir Francis Drake*, p. 243.

47. If 'Fowler' was writing his Christian name in a Latin form, this would be either 'Wilhelmus' or 'Willelmus': see *The Record Interpreter: A Collection of Abbreviations, Latin Words and Names used in English Historical Manuscripts and Records*, ed. Charles Trice Martin (London, 1892), p. 339.

48. TNA, E 190/6/8, fo. 68v (Apr.); E 190/641/12 (Aug.). There are no folio numbers in the latter book, but the date the ship exited can be used as the reference point. The vessel was commanded by Robert Harrison. The following port books were searched for references to William Fowler. London books: E 190/1/1; E 190/1/2; E 190/1/3; E 190/1/4; E 190/2/1; E 190/2/3; E 190/4/3; E 190/4/4; E 190/5/1; E 190/5/3; E 190/5/5; E 190/5/6; E 190/6/1; E 190/6/3; E 190/6/4; E 190/6/5; E 190/6/6; E 190/6/7; E 190/6/8; E 190/6/9; E 190/7/1; E 190/7/2; E 190/7/4; E 190/7/5; E 190/8/4.

identification.⁴⁹ It is therefore possible to argue that, after his 1569 testimony, 'Fowler' continued to operate in England as a merchant but, based on the entry in the port books, the customs officials were unsure of how to designate him. Frustratingly, there are no wills for William Fowler in the London Metropolitan Archives, nor any in the Canterbury probate records, that are a suitable match for the man who gave evidence in 1569.⁵⁰ Additionally, he cannot be located in the tax records linked with Ratcliff.⁵¹ Of course, our only geographical fix for Fowler occurs in 1569 when he declares himself to be a resident of Ratcliff, and while he may still have been trading in 1580, he could have moved elsewhere in England or gone overseas after that date.⁵²

Plymouth books: E 190/1011/23; E 190/1011/12; E 190/1015/23. Sandwich books: E 190/639/1; E 190/639/2; E 190/639/3; E 190/640/11; E 190/642/1; E 190/642/12; E 190/644/1; E 190/645/1. The Plymouth and Sandwich port books (including ports under Sandwich's jurisdiction) were searched based on Fowler's use of a Kent-based ship, or any possible connections that were formed with the Hawkins family after 1569. 'Fowler' also appears in the 1587 coastal account for Rochester shipping iron into London aboard the *Marie Thomas* (commanded by John Dionesse) of Mill-Hall, but on this occasion, he is only given indigenous status: E 190/643/3, entry dated to 25 Sept. 1587. Incidentally, Cantabrian iron, because of its quality, was traded between England and Spain at this time, and even after the outbreak of war in 1585 merchants found ways of circumventing embargoes; see P. Croft, 'Trading with The Enemy, 1585–1604', *Historical Journal*, xxxii (1989), pp. 281–302. In trading iron, it is possible that Fowler was drawing on existing Anglo-Spanish commercial networks, but freighting the commodity via coastal trade after a third party had brought it in from abroad. Alternatively, the Weald provided an English source of iron, much of which was shipped from Sussex ports into London before being shipped coastwise from the capital.

49. English customs officials recorded the nationality of shipmasters and merchants in their accounts because custom duties differed between natives and aliens; see N.S.B. Gras, *The Early English Customs System: A Documentary Study of the Institutional and Economic History of the Customs from the Thirteenth to the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1918), p. 110.

50. When searching the London Metropolitan Archives [hereafter LMA], all variants of his surname were considered. Based on his possible links with Kent, the Kent Archives Office in Maidstone was also searched, but nothing could be found. There is no evidence of a 'William Fowler' in the Canterbury Probate Records (1396–1858) Database (Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, 2023–) available at <https://wills.canterbury-cathedral.org/> (accessed 8 Dec 2023), and no matches could be found linked with Rochester wills. There are several 'William Fowlers' recorded in death records in London, but these sources usually only list a name and date of death, making it impossible to know if they are our 'William Fowler'; see, for example, LMA, P69/GEO/A/001/MS04791, which records a burial of a William Fowler on 11 September 1609 at St George, Botolph Lane (this would make our William approximately 68 years old); or LMA, CLC/199/TC/002/MS09659/00, which records the burial of a William Fowler at the Collegiate Church of St Katherine by the Tower, City of London, on 23 August 1593 (making him approximately 52 years old).

51. The closest surviving tax record for Ratcliff to the HCA proceedings in 1569 dates to 1563; TNA, E 179/142/193, rot. 2d, and 9. The record on rot. 2d, dated 18 May, is a communal assessment and does not name the residents. That on rot. 9 of 14 May does provide names, but 'Fowler/Foulas' is not among either the English or alien residents of the settlement. The next surviving nominal tax assessment was made in 1591 (TNA, E 179/142/221; Ratcliff on m. 1) for a tax granted to the queen in March 1589, but of the nineteen people named on the document 'Fowler' is not among them. Another assessment survives for 1598 (TNA, E 179/142/239; Ratcliff on rot. 5r–d) but while ninety-five residents of Ratcliff are listed, Fowler is again not among them. By this date he would have been in his late fifties.

52. Based on his link with Rochester, the 1594 tax assessment for that city was also searched (TNA, E 179/127/509): among 119 people Fowler is not listed. The other nominal tax records for Rochester are probably too early for Fowler to have lived there: TNA, E 179/234/10 (1550); E 179/125/327 (1560); E 179/126/392 (1563).

If 'Foulas' the testimony provider and 'Fowler' the merchant were the same man, there are several possible explanations for his dual status. One is that Fowler, or rather Foulas, was not an Englishman but a Spaniard who moved to England with his parents, possibly when Mary I's marriage to Philip II encouraged many Spaniards to move to England for the purposes of trade. Once Mary died and the Protestant Elizabeth I came to the throne his parents might have relocated to Spain, after which Foulas started to trade in the Spanish New World, only to travel back to England before 1569.⁵³ This would help explain why he signed his name as he did; he was, and considered himself, a Spaniard. If he was born in England and christened 'William', he would surely have signed his name as such, not 'Gillernio'. Moreover, that he was Spanish might have added credibility to his witness statement and his knowledge of commodity prices in the New World. Yet, if 'William Fowler' did not participate in the 1567–9 voyage, and was not one of the financiers, his independence would surely not have been questioned in any case. What Garrard and Hawkins required was someone not connected with the expedition, but who could provide first-hand experience of trading in the Spanish New World, including the prices of various commodities. If they found such a person, especially if that person were a Spaniard, then the testimony would add credibility to the claims for compensation.

Another possible explanation is that Fowler/Foulas was one of those Englishmen sent to Seville to learn the art of trade, and who over many years assimilated into Seville's mercantile community. It was relatively common at this time for the sons of merchants to travel abroad and live within English communes among foreign trading partners. This helped not only to ingratiate them with those with whom they and their families were doing business, but also provided them with knowledge of the language and customs of their partners, and an insight into sometimes nuanced practices and trading activities of which those outside the system were ignorant. The English merchant Robert Tomson, for example, noted that by 1553 John Fields, another English merchant, had resided in Seville for twenty years, and Tomson lodged with him for one year to 'learne the Castillian tongue, and to see the orders of the country, and the customs of the people'.⁵⁴ In 1555, Fields, with his wife, children and Tomson, purchased a licence to travel to New Spain and crossed the Atlantic. Indeed, a series of studies point out that movement between Spanish and English mercantile communities was common, and it is possible that Foulas was part of this community and happened to be in England at the time of Hawkins's return

53. L.H. Yungblut, *Strangers Settled Here Amongst Us: Policies, Perceptions and the Presence of Aliens in Elizabethan England* (London, 1996), p. 102, points out that over the 1560s and 1570s large numbers of immigrants settled in England.

54. *An Englishman and the Mexican Inquisition*, ed. Conway, p. 2.

from the Americas.⁵⁵ From the late Middle Ages, Seville had attracted merchants from all over Europe and, by the early sixteenth century, 'social, cultural, and racial divisions were often blurred' in the port.⁵⁶ That 'Fowler' chose to sign his High Court of the Admiralty testimony in the prize books as Gillernio Foulas, an Hispanicised version of his name, might be indicative of the level to which he had adopted a Spanish identity.⁵⁷ If we accept the latter explanation, then Fowler's assimilation must have been deep. Roger Barlow, an English merchant resident in Seville a few decades prior to Fowler's testimony, did not use a Hispanicised form of his name, although rather than being sent there as a child Barlow was at least 25 when he was in Seville.⁵⁸ Barlow's career does, however, demonstrate that if English merchants formed alliances with Spanish traders they could engage in trade with Spain's Atlantic colonies, which might explain how Fowler/Foulas was able to trade within Spain's Atlantic system.⁵⁹

These two explanations, however, do not quite chime with Fowler's dual status designations in the customs accounts. It is therefore possible to offer another, even more plausible explanation for his origins: that he was born in England but to Spanish parents; that he was born in Spain to two English parents; or in either country to mixed Anglo-Spanish parents. That he would be born in Spain to English parents but given a Spanish name seems doubtful. It is likely, therefore, that Gillernio Foulas was *never* called William Fowler, the latter name being an Anglicised form used by Roger Parker and the English customs officials. This would explain why 'William Fowler' signed his testimony using his given name of Gillernio Foulas, and why there is no William Fowler recorded as residing among the English merchants in Spain.⁶⁰ Children of foreigners born in England were subjects of the English Crown, but London guilds and other city officials classified them as 'denizens who are reputed strangers', which conveyed a kind of second-class citizenship upon them. Such 'English-born strangers'

55. G. Connell-Smith, 'English Merchants Trading to the New World in the Early Sixteenth Century', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, xxiii (1950), pp. 53–66; H. Dalton, 'Negotiating Fortune: English Merchants in Early Sixteenth-Century Seville', in C. Williams, ed., *Bridging of the Early Modern Atlantic World: People, Products, and Practices on the Move* (Farnham, 2009), pp. 57–74.

56. H. Dalton, *Merchants and Explorers: Roger Barlow, Sebastian Cabot, and Networks of Atlantic Exchange* (Oxford, 2016), p. 44.

57. M. Sheaves, 'The Anglo-Iberian Atlantic as a Hemispheric System?', in J. Cañizares-Esguerra, ed., *Entangled Empires: The Anglo-Iberian Atlantic, 1500–1830* (Philadelphia, PA, 2018), pp. 19–41, discusses in detail how national identities could be fluid in this period.

58. Dalton, *Merchants and Explorers*, p. 10. In Seville, Barlow wrote a will before he left for a sea voyage in 1526 with Sebastian Cabot and signed it 'Roger Barlo'.

59. *Ibid.*, pp. 40–41. Documents show that Barlow was able to trade from Seville to places such as San Domingo.

60. For example, 'William Fowler' does not appear in the comprehensive lists of foreign merchants living in several Spanish towns and ports; see E.L. Sanz, *Comercio de España Con America en la Epoca de Felipe II* (2 vols, Valladolid, 1979–80). Given that 'William Fowler' signed his name as 'Gillernio Foulas', from this point he will be referred to as Foulas.

were excluded by the City of London from a host of civic offices, apprenticeships and guilds, which would explain why Foulas does not appear in any of London's mercantile company records, and why he did not engage in overseas trade out of London, commercial activity that was regulated to a greater degree by merchant companies.⁶¹ Children born to aliens were also liable to pay higher rates of tax, including those assigned to customs charged on maritime commerce. This would explain why Foulas can be seen working in the coasting trade, a more open section of the maritime economy which was recorded but not taxed, and why the customs collectors accorded him the dual status of being denizen and alien.⁶² Unfortunately, Foulas's father cannot be located in the surviving records, although it is worth noting that the key source for aliens in the 1540s is tax records, which do not always list names, and which do not run in an unbroken sequence.⁶³ As noted above, in 1587 Foulas the testimony-giver was designated as indigenous by the customs collector at Rochester, which suggests that after *circa* 1580 he might have applied for denizen status.⁶⁴ The key point,

61. An act issued in 1574 stated that it was paternal descent that mattered (i.e. the child was born in England but descended from a foreign father or grandfather). This topic is discussed in detail by Yungblut, *Strangers Settled*, ch. 4, and J. Selwood, "English-Born Reputed Strangers": Birth and Descent in Seventeenth-Century London', *Journal of British Studies*, xlv (2005), pp. 728–53. On regulation, monopolies and closed access to merchant companies, see R. Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550–1653* (London, 2003), ch. 2. Overseas merchants who were part of associations such as the Hanseatic League had an advantage because they controlled trade networks across Europe and could bargain with the Crown. Lone operators such as Foulas, who probably lacked connections and influence, would have found it more difficult to engage in activities that competed with London merchants.

62. While coastal trade was not taxed it was still subjected to scrutiny by customs officials. This was to ensure that merchants and shipmasters did not use coastal certificates for merchandise brought in directly from abroad, thus avoiding paying overseas customs duties. In coastal trade merchants were expected to get coastal certificates (which recorded their cargo) from the port they departed, and they were expected to show these certificates to the officials in the port they arrived at; thus the customs officials could check that the vessel had not illicitly deposited cargo overseas and avoided paying tax. As noted above, although the trade was not taxed customs officials would usually record the status of the merchants as indigenous or alien. For evidence of other coastal traders designated as indigenous and alien, see TNA, E 190/309/9 (William Richardson and George Bowles, trading haberdashery and grocery wares from Hull to London, 1593); E 190/750/4, fo. 2r (Thomas Torrell, trading lead, grocery wares and vinegar between Chichester and London, 1597); E 190/644/6, fo. 2r (Ralph Hyd, moving grocery wares between London and Sandwich, 1592).

63. The search for Fowler's father was centred on Ratcliff and the London area. Fowler does not appear in a list of over 7,000 'strangers that are presentlie abiding within the cytie of London and the liberties and suburbs of the same' which was prepared for the privy council in 1571: SP 12/18, fos 2r–111r (the strangers of Ratcliff are recorded at fo. 100r). The database *England's Immigrants, 1350–1550* (University of York et al., 2012–) at <https://www.englishimmigrants.com/> (accessed 11 Dec. 2023) was searched, but for the period after 1525 the project relied on letters of denization and if Fowler/Foulas applied for one it does not survive; see *Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalisation for Aliens in England, 1509–1603*, ed. William Page (Lymington, 1893). For names of aliens residing in London taken from taxation records (including Middlesex), see *Returns of Aliens Dwelling in the City and Suburbs of London from the Reign of Henry VIII to that of James I, I: 1525–1571*, ed. R.E.G. Kirk (Aberdeen, 1900).

64. See above, at n. 48. It is possible that after 1587 Foulas ceased his maritime trading activities, because over the sixteenth century most alien merchants in England gradually became artisans; see Yungblut, *Strangers Settled*, p. 102.

however, is that prior to 1587 there is no evidence to suggest he applied for such status, meaning that when he gave evidence to the Admiralty in 1569 he did so as an alien, or, perhaps, as an 'English-born stranger'.

The key ingredients of living successfully in another polity were to adopt the accepted religious practices and cultural traditions of that place, and finding Foulas living in Ratcliff and engaging in maritime commerce is not surprising.⁶⁵ Indeed, clusters of English merchants would reside in Spanish ports, and, conversely, Spanish merchants would reside, sometimes permanently, in England. The 1560s were also a period of importance in this cultural transition. As relations between England and Spain soured, in part because of the actions of Hawkins, many English merchants opted for denizen status in Spain, and many Spaniards settled in England, sometimes forced to do so by the Inquisition.⁶⁶

The cases of John Frampton and Henry Hawks, two English merchants, are illustrative of the dangers of living and working between two polities. In 1561, Frampton made a voyage to Spain and was soon being hunted by the Inquisition for having an English Cato (a late antique Latin collection of moral proverbs). Once tracked down by the authorities he was imprisoned at the Castle of Triana (San Jorge), tried by the Bishop of Tarragona at Seville, sent to prison and ordered to remain in Spain under pain of death. By 1572, he had escaped back to England, because that year he appeared before the Admiralty Court to make a claim against the Spanish for compensation.⁶⁷ The story of Frampton's friend, Henry Hawks, also highlights the degree to which merchants could assimilate within different polities, but also shows us that such individuals, if the need arose, had to be fleet of foot. Hawks was also known as Pedro Sánchez, a Bristolian by birth, but someone who married a *Malagueña* (a woman from Malaga), and who in the late 1560s travelled to Mexico to trade. Indeed, Hawks's story is relevant to the Hawkins voyage. In 1567, Hawks was in Mexico and was arrested by the Inquisition after the debacle at San Juan de Ulúa, even though he was not involved with Hawkins. He managed to escape from Mexico back to Spain before resettling in England in 1571.⁶⁸ His account of the Spanish trade networks later appeared in Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*.⁶⁹ In

65. Sheaves, 'Anglo-Iberian Atlantic', provides details of all relevant scholarship on this topic.

66. See the Introduction of P. Croft, *The Spanish Company* (London, 1973), which discusses the worsening relations between England, Spain, and Portugal in the late sixteenth century, especially in the 1560s, much of which was linked to English clandestine activities in the Caribbean and West Africa.

67. TNA, HCA 13/19, fos 309r–323v. He was given a public trial where he was forced to stand on a scaffold wearing a coat with a St Andrew's cross emblazoned upon it. Frampton went on to produce a series of important translations of Spanish navigational and geographical texts; see D. Beecher, 'John Frampton of Bristol, Trader and Translator', in C.G. Di Biase, ed., *Travel and Translation in the Early Modern Period* (Amsterdam, 2006), pp. 103–21.

68. *Ibid.*, p. 111.

69. D.B. Quinn, ed., *The Hakluyt Handbook* (2 vols, London, 1974), i, pp. 224, 236, and ii, p. 446; Sheaves, 'Anglo-Iberian Atlantic'.

the late 1560s, therefore, it is probable that Foulas, and many individuals in his position in both England and Spain—even those such as Henry Hawks who seemingly embraced his Spanish identity—had to decide whether to live in one or the other's jurisdiction, each choice having certain advantages and disadvantages dependent on the circumstances of the individual. By 1569, Foulas had clearly decided to live in London's environs, a wise choice after giving evidence in support of Garrard and Hawkins.⁷⁰ The price of staying in London, however, was that he would never be fully admitted into the city's mercantile community.

III

To comprehend the importance of Foulas's deposition before the Admiralty Court in 1569 it is first necessary to understand the context of the Atlantic World and slavery at the time. The sixteenth-century transatlantic slave trade owed much to the activities of the Portuguese and Spanish.⁷¹ It is difficult to know the precise scale of the Iberian slave trade in its early decades, but research suggests that the period from 1526 to 1580 saw around 89,000 Africans transported on more than 299 voyages to the Americas.⁷² The Spanish demand for enslaved peoples in the Americas was a result of the catastrophic decline in indigenous populations across the Caribbean, Mexico and Peru. One of the chief causes of this decline was that Indigenous American peoples succumbed quickly to 'Old World' diseases such as smallpox and measles, against which they had little natural immunity.⁷³ This was exacerbated further

70. *Letters of Denization*, ed. Page, contains many Spanish merchants granted denizen status.

71. H.S. Klein, *The Atlantic Slave Trade* (Cambridge, 2012), chs 4 and 5.

72. A. Borucki, D. Eltis and D. Wheat, 'The Size and Direction of the Slave Trade to the Spanish Americas', in A. Borucki, D. Eltis and D. Wheat, eds, *From Galleons to the Highlands: Slave Trade Routes in the Spanish Americas* (Albuquerque, NM, 2020), pp. 15–46, esp. 20–22. Some slave voyages did go the other way, such as when Columbus shipped to Spain a group of indigenous Taíno people in 1493/94, although once the populations of indigenous societies had been reduced the traffic was predominantly from the east to the west. On Columbus and slavery, see C. Dodds Pennock, 'Aztecs Abroad? Uncovering the Early Indigenous Atlantic', *American Historical Review*, cxxv (2020), pp. 787–814, at 798; T. Green, *The Rise of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade in Western Africa, 1300–1589* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 182–3; F. Fernández-Armesto, *Columbus* (Oxford, 1991); K. Sale, *Christopher Columbus and the Columbian Legacy: The Conquest of Paradise* (London, 1992).

73. It should be noted that 'Old World' diseases being the prime cause of the decimation of Indigenous American populations has been challenged in recent years. For example, it has been argued that the idea of 'immunological determinism' in the decline of native populations 'lets European colonialism off the moral hook'. See, for example, the collection of essays in C.M. Cameron, P. Kelton and A.C. Swedlund, eds, *Beyond Germs: Native Depopulation in North America* (Tucson, AZ, 2015); quotations from p. ix. The population demographic density of indigenous societies, and thus the impact of disease, is still debated; see, for example, J.D. Daniels, 'The Indian Population of North America in 1492', *William and Mary Quarterly*, xlix (1992), pp. 298–320; L.A. Newson, 'The Demographic Collapse of Native Peoples of the Americas, 1492–1650', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, lxxxi (1993), pp. 247–88; M. Livi-Bacci, 'The Depopulation of Hispanic America after the Conquest', *Population and Development Review*, xxxii (2006), pp. 199–232.

by the implementation of the *encomienda/repartiniento* systems on the indigenous populations in Spanish territories in the Americas. This was in many respects akin to slavery, forcing the indigenous peoples to work on the land, in towns and in mining. As a consequence of these impositions, over-work, slave raids, brutal colonisation tactics and land clearances, in conjunction with epidemic diseases, the native populations declined dramatically. In the early 1500s, the Spanish began to transport enslaved persons from West Africa to the Spanish Caribbean to fill these labour shortages, especially in the towns and agricultural sectors, such as milling, farming and sugar growing.⁷⁴ From the 1540s, demand for enslaved Africans increased due to the Spanish–French War, the discovery of the Potosi silver mines (1545) and the measures introduced by the Spanish Crown to reduce the use of Indigenous Americans as labourers.⁷⁵

The Spanish slave trade was regulated and under the overall control of *la Casa de la Contratación de las Indias* (House of Trade of the Indies) in Seville, established in 1503. The Spanish colonies, especially in their early days, needed European manufactured goods and foodstuffs in order to survive. European merchants were forced to take their goods to Seville where they could sell them for transport on Spanish ships to the colonies, and ships had to gain cargo registries from Seville, Cadiz or the Canaries.⁷⁶ Yet the House was not omnipotent and many merchants subverted the official registration system to avoid customs charges, enabling them to sell goods, including the enslaved, at reduced prices.⁷⁷ Portuguese slavers, for example, would often make *arribadas* (unscheduled landings) across the Caribbean as a way of circumventing the registration and licensing systems.⁷⁸ Spanish

74. M. Eagle, 'The Early Slave Trade to Spanish America: Caribbean Pathways, 1530–1580', in I. Altman and D. Wheat, eds, *The Spanish Caribbean and the Atlantic World in the Long Sixteenth Century* (Lincoln, NE, 2019), pp. 139–62; A.R. Disney, *A History of Portugal and the Portuguese Empire* (2 vols, Cambridge, 2009), ii, p. 63; J.A. Rawley, *The Transatlantic Slave Trade* (New York, 1981), pp. 10, 26; Green, *Rise of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade*, pp. 187–8; R. Ferreira and P.M.S. Silva, 'Portugal, Spain, and the Transatlantic Slave Trade', in F. Bouza, P. Cardim and A. Feros, eds, *The Iberian World, 1450–1820* (Abingdon, 2020), pp. 375–92, at 379. Many enslaved people never crossed the Atlantic and instead were shipped to Spain and Portugal; see A.J.M. Barros, 'Slave Trade and Northern Portuguese Seaport Operations in the Sixteenth Century', in A.M.R. Medina, ed., *Ports in the Medieval European Atlantic: Shipping, Transport and Labour* (Woodbridge, 2021), pp. 77–98.

75. J.H. Parry, *The Spanish Seaborne Empire* (London, 1966), pp. 90–91 (note: labour was also required for the mercury mine at Huanacavélica); Eagle, 'Early Slave Trade', pp. 145–6; D. Eltis, *The Rise of African Slavery in the Americas* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 60. The key measures introduced by the Crown to reduce the exploitation of Amerindians were the Laws of Burgos (1512) and the New Laws of 1542. However, the Spanish Crown (or local governors) could still force indigenous peoples to labour, if the work was deemed necessary for the 'public good', with the importance of the silver mines to the Spanish economy meaning that they were classified as one of these 'public goods'; see L.B. Simpson, *The Encomienda in New Spain: The Beginning of Spanish Mexico* (Berkeley, CA, 1966), pp. 10, 29–38, 123–43.

76. Parry, *Spanish Seaborne Empire*, pp. 102–22; Eagle, 'Early Slave Trade', p. 140.

77. *Spanish Documents, 1527–68*, ed. Wright, p. 6.

78. Eagle, 'Early Slave Trade', pp. 140, 147

officials would also support clandestine shipments of enslaved people and other commodities into Spain's New World territories.⁷⁹

In the sixteenth century, the Spanish Crown used two systems to regulate the slave trade. A licensing system was used in which each licence represented permission for a trader to ship one enslaved person. Licences could be, and were, issued to one individual who might sell these grants on (and many of these individual licences were indeed resold). The second method was to grant an *asiento*, a form of monopoly contract which was usually a multi-year arrangement allowing the holder of the *asiento* to ship thousands of enslaved Africans.⁸⁰ In 1518, for example, Charles V granted a *cédula* (an import licence) to his senior steward which permitted the shipment of 4,000 enslaved people from Africa to Hispaniola, and in 1528 an *asiento* was issued to agents of the Welsers, a powerful German banking and merchant family.⁸¹ Of the two systems, the Spanish Crown favoured licences, and after the Welser *asiento* expired it tended to only grant individual licences. The key problem was that the tax charged for these licences made them unprofitable, and as a result many went unused, meaning they failed to meet demand for enslaved labour.⁸² Moreover, as holders of *asientos* had a monopoly over slave provision to the Americas, accusations were made that such practices restricted the shipment of enslaved peoples, while the holders of monopoly rights claimed that merchants trading within illicit networks were breaking the terms of their grants.

While the sixteenth-century Atlantic slave trade was mainly in the hands of the Portuguese and Spanish, other Europeans also engaged in it. French ships, for example, sailed to Sierra Leone, as did Dutch pirates, but their lack of a permanent presence within Africa meant that they could only purchase (or take by force) limited numbers of enslaved peoples compared with the Iberian powers.⁸³ However, like Hawkins, they did manage to sell slaves. In 1577, for example, Jerónimo de Torres, clerk of La Yaguana, noted that the Portuguese and French brought enslaved people and cloth from Europe and Africa, selling a slave for fifty to sixty hides.⁸⁴

79. M. Eagle and D. Wheat, 'The Early Iberian Slave Trade to the Spanish Caribbean, 1550–1580', in Borucki, Eltis and Wheat, eds, *From Galleons to the Highlands*, pp. 47–72, at 63. Such practices continued into the seventeenth century; see C. Schmitt, 'Centering Spanish Jamaica: Regional Competition, Informal Trade, and the English Invasion, 1620–62', *William and Mary Quarterly*, lxxvi (2019), pp. 697–726.

80. Licences and monopoly grants are discussed in Eagle and Wheat, 'Early Iberian Slave Trade', pp. 53–7.

81. Dalton, *Merchants and Explores*, p. 47; Eagle, 'Early Slave Trade', pp. 140–41; Mendes, 'Foundations', p. 73.

82. *Spanish Documents, 1527–1568*, ed. Wright, p. 6.

83. P.E.H. Hair, 'A Note on French and Spanish Voyages to Sierra Leone, 1550–1585', *History in Africa*, xviii (1993), pp. 61–9; J. Postma, *The Dutch in the Atlantic Slave Trade, 1600–1815* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 10.

84. Andrews, *Spanish Caribbean*, p. 77.

At the same time, English traders were intruding on Portuguese interests in West Africa, though the volume of these early English voyages to the region is difficult to quantify. In the 1530s and 1540s, Devonshire shippers are known to have sailed to West Africa, principally to Guinea for brazilwood, gold and ivory.⁸⁵ In the 1550s and 1560s, a group of wealthy London merchants (many of whom, as we have seen, backed Hawkins's slaving voyages) led by the aforementioned Sir William Garrard, Anthony Hickman, Sir William Chester, Sir Lionel Duckett, Sir William Winter and Edward Castelin, along with Sir George Barne, Sir John York, Thomas Lodge, William Towerson and Elizabeth I, started to invest in West African voyages.⁸⁶ The focus of these voyages was the Gold Coast, but they were dogged by clashes with the Portuguese. We know that on some voyages to Guinea in the 1550s Africans were taken back to Europe; some travelled willingly, others did not.⁸⁷ It is certain that some of the English voyages to West Africa in the early to mid-sixteenth century had a slaving element. For instance, in 1555 John Lok returned from Guinea with a cargo of enslaved people, and in 1566 George Fenner set course for Guinea, probably hoping to collect slaves.⁸⁸ All told, it is estimated that in the second half of the sixteenth century there were approximately fifty voyages made by English ships to West Africa.⁸⁹

85. Information garnered from Richard Hakluyt shows that in the 1530s William Hawkins had sailed to Guinea and Brazil; see *The Hawkins' Voyages During the Reigns of Henry VIII, Queen Elizabeth, and James I*, ed. C.R. Markham (Cambridge, 2010). In the 1530 voyage, Hawkins commanded the *Paul*, and this vessel seems to have been used to sail to West Africa in the 1540s: TNA, E 122/116/13, fos 1v, 26v, which record two voyages made by the *Paul* of Plymouth carrying brazilwood and ivory, dated 1541.

86. See TNA, SP 12/26, fos 87–95, 97–98. These voyages and their financiers are covered in Blum, 'Empire Later', esp. ch. 1. See also J.D. Alsop, 'The Career of William Towerson', *International Journal of Maritime History*, iv, no. 2 (1992), pp. 45–82; P.E.H. Hair, 'The Experience of the Sixteenth-Century English Voyages to Guinea', *Mariner's Mirror*, lxxxiii (1997), pp. 3–13; P.E. Hair and J.D. Alsop, *English Seamen and Traders in Guinea, 1553–65: The New Evidence of the Wills* (New York, 1992); J.W. Blake, *West Africa: The Quest for God and Gold, 1454–1578* (London, 1977); Pollit, 'John Hawkins's Troublesome Voyages'; *Documents*, ed. Donnan, i, p. 43.

87. The *Slave Voyages* database contains seventeen entries for English slave ships sailing before 1570. However, all of these are linked to the three Hawkins voyages in the 1560s, and some of the information is incorrect. For example, the *William and John* was owned by William and John Hawkins, not William Garrard, William Winter, Rowland Heyward or Anthony Goddard, and the *Jesus of Lübeck* was owned by the queen. Garrard, Winter and Heyward had of course invested in the voyages: *Slave Voyages* (Slave Voyages Consortium, 2008–), available at <https://www.slavevoyages.org/voyage/database>. Goddard (a prominent Plymouth merchant) had participated in Hawkins's earlier slaving voyages, was a participant in the 1567–9 expedition, and was one of those put ashore and captured by the Spanish. Goddard's will is printed in W.U. Reynell-Upam, 'Anthony Goddard and the Defences of Plymouth', *Devon and Cornwall Notes and Queries*, ix (1916), pp. 52–3. On his involvement in the 1567–9 expedition, see Kelsey, *John Hawkins*, pp. 53, 111–12.

88. PN2 (1598–1600), ii, pt 2, pp. 14–23 (John Lok); pp. 57–64 (Fenner). The narrator of Fenner's voyage mentions that slaves could be acquired. See also B. Klein, 'The *Minion* and its Travels: Sailing to Guinea in the Sixteenth Century', in R.J. Blakemore and J. Davey, eds, *The Maritime World of Early Modern Britain* (Amsterdam, 2020), pp. 35–74, at 57–61; M. Guasco, 'Agents of Empire: Africans and the Origins of English Colonialism in the Americas', in Cañizares-Esguerra, ed., *Entangled Empires*, pp. 42–62.

89. Guasco, 'Agents of Empire', p. 45.

The most famous English slaving voyages of the 1560s, however, were those commanded by John Hawkins, who learnt of the potential profitability of the slave trade in the Canaries.⁹⁰ English involvement in the slave trade up to this point had been sporadic, generally involving relatively small fleets, but fleets that were also often heavily manned and armed flotillas backed by the Crown, nobility and wealthy merchants. If we exclude the voyages made by English traders that focused on the gold and ivory trade, the English had developed a way of engaging in the Atlantic slave trade. The *modus operandi* of men like Hawkins was to sail to Guinea, acquire a cargo of enslaved people, by force and/or barter, and ship them to the Spanish Caribbean and Mexico.⁹¹ Here, Hawkins would claim inclement weather had forced him to the area (a tactic used by many illicit traders), offer platitudes to local officials and sometimes promise to help clear out foreign pirates from the area.⁹² In return, he asked the Spanish to purchase his enslaved people. If that failed, he became aggressive, after which the local elites, often undermanned and in relatively lightly defended settlements, would agree to purchase his human cargo. This show of force was perhaps part of a rehearsed charade that allowed the Spanish to claim they had no choice but to deal with Hawkins, even though they knew Hawkins had no official licence to be there; either way, it was a system which suited both Hawkins and his 'coerced' trading partners.⁹³ Like many other slave traders, therefore, Hawkins was attempting to circumnavigate the rules introduced by the Spanish Crown which it hoped would protect trade within the Global Spanish Monarchy.

IV

As can be seen from the preceding discussion, those, like Hawkins and his backers, who wished to participate in the mid-sixteenth-century transatlantic slave trade outside the rules that governed commerce within the Global Spanish Monarchy had to be inventive. This was why Foulas's testimony before the High Court of the Admiralty in 1569 was so important, for it had a dual purpose. It has already been stated that Foulas acted as an expert witness for Garrard and Hawkins, and could provide them with precise information on the economics of Spanish New World commerce, and values of commodities, because at some point in his career prior

90. Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, pp. 12–13.

91. *Documents*, ed. Donnan, i, pp. 57–8, produces a letter from Guzman de Silva to Philip II which suggests that in 1565 Hawkins might have purchased some of his enslaved people from the Portuguese.

92. Williams, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 77; Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 26. Eagle, 'Early Slave Trade', pp. 140, 147.

93. Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 26. *Spanish Documents, 1527–1568*, ed. Wright, pp. 8–13, discusses in detail how Hawkins was trading without official licence, and how Spanish officials in the Caribbean applied loopholes which allowed them to trade with him.

to 1569, whatever the truth of his background, he had clearly operated within the prescribed rules that underpinned trade in Spanish America. The accuracy of this knowledge clearly helped legitimise any claims for compensation. At the same time, Foulas's testimony demonstrated detailed knowledge of the mechanics that underpinned Spanish Atlantic trade, and how this might be subverted. As Kenneth Andrews noted, even after the debacle of 1568 there were still opportunities for slaving voyages to New Spain.⁹⁴ What this document represents, therefore, is not only a witness statement that could be used to bolster claims for compensation, but also one that doubled as a fact-finding exercise, providing information on the intricacies of Spanish–New Spain commerce. While it is the slave trading aspect of Foulas's testimony that has received the most attention from scholars, equally important for Garrard and Hawkins was what Foulas had to say about other commodities that English merchants were keen to trade in the Spanish New World. Foulas had no stake in the Hawkins's slaving enterprise, and thus his valuations were independent from those provided by Hawkins's men. This meant that Foulas's valuations, the English doubtlessly hoped, would carry more weight in the eyes of the Spanish.

Foulas's testimony provides detailed contemporary knowledge of the costs of the goods that were lost on the expedition. Not surprisingly these goods, such as wine, wax and cloth, were important commodities in the Spanish–New World trades.⁹⁵ Foulas links some of the valuations directly to the schedule of twenty-seven losses summarised in the depositions now in the State Papers, although he does not value items such as ships' equipment, tackle and weapons, presumably because Hawkins knew the prices of such things.⁹⁶ The first information Foulas relates is the cost of freightage from Seville to Veracruz. He says merchants commonly paid 30 *ducats* per ton of freight with each *ducat* worth 11 *reales*. Later in his testimony Foulas informs us that a *ducat* could be worth 7s. This meant traders moving cargo from Seville to New Spain paid approximately £8–10 per ton of freight. The return rates were much higher, at 60 *ducats* per ton of freight. As a comparison, in 1540 the freight rates for carrying wine from Southern Iberia to Bristol could be 25s per tun of wine. However, by the late 1560s prices

94. Andrews, *Spanish Caribbean*, pp. 126–7. Andrews argues that the Spanish fleet that challenged Hawkins was not sent to intercept him, nor was it part of a wider Spanish strategy of ridding the area of raiders and pirates. Indeed, Andrews suggests that it was the size of the third voyage that was its ultimate downfall as the outlay costs of the voyage were so high that profits would be difficult to make.

95. Parry, *Spanish Seaborne Empire*, pp. 102–3; Andrews, *Spanish Caribbean*, p. 77.

96. Evidence suggests that Hawkins usually sourced his weapons for these slaving voyages from London. For example, in July 1561 Thomas Hampton sailed into Plymouth from London in command of the *Peter* carrying a cargo for John Hawkins that, among other supplies, contained 2 chests of arrows, 1 last of powder, 2 chests of arquebuses, 150 pikes, four dozen black bills, 1 bale of mather and 5,000 weight of tarred ropes, all most probably to be used for the slaving voyage in 1562–3: see TNA, E 122/118/3, fo. 10r.

in England had risen by some 70 per cent, meaning that by the time Foulas gave his testimony the costs of shipping wine from Southern Iberia to Bristol could have been as high as £4 7s per tun of wine.⁹⁷ Outward fleets from Seville to New Spain would be packed full of the commodities that were in high demand in the Americas, such as wine, oil and manufactured goods.⁹⁸ Likewise, the returning fleets from New Spain to Seville carried silver and other high-value goods. The competition for hull space on both the outward and the returning convoys increased freight rates. Moreover, the danger posed by predatory ships from other nations meant Spanish merchants had to pay the *averia*, a charge levied on the goods to cover the costs of escort ships.⁹⁹ Foulas's information on freight rates was important as the high costs were surely passed over to the consumer. Until the 1560s, English voyages to New Spain took the form of illicit trading, but if the English could undercut the Spanish rates this would give their traders an advantage.

One of the most important pieces of Foulas's testimony, of course, relates to the Atlantic slave trade, especially in highlighting the trade's intricacies, such as how the age, language skills, and place of sale affected a slave's value. He reveals that in Mexico and the West Indies young and strong enslaved people sold for 400–600 *pesos*, although if they were a 'Bossale', and thus unable to speak Spanish or Portuguese, they would only fetch 400–450 *pesos*.¹⁰⁰ A Portuguese or Spanish speaker, a 'Ladino',

97. E.T. Jones, 'The Bristol Shipping Industry in the Sixteenth Century' (Univ. of Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 1998), pp. 14–16. The figure of £4 7s can only be a broad estimation because multiple factors influenced the costs of shipping goods. It has been argued that between 1500 and 1600 the price of key foodstuffs increased sixfold: see R.B. Outhwaite, *Inflation in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1969). It is difficult to be precise about what Foulas meant by the phrase 'per ton of freight'. For example, at this point in his testimony, it is not clear whether he was referring to English or Spanish weights and measures. A wine tun in England held approximately 252 old gallons. For a discussion of weights and measures and the problems of comparisons, see M.C. Stampa, 'The Evolution of Weights and Measures in New Spain', *Hispanic American Historical Review*, xxix (1949), pp. 2–24, and F.C. Lane, 'Tonnages, Medieval and Modern', *Economic History Review*, xvii (1964), pp. 213–33.

98. Similar issues also had an impact on Anglo-Spanish trade. Demand for English commodities in Spain was limited, and thus ships leaving England for Spain would often carry only, or mainly, ballast. Consequently, freight rates from England to Spain were low because of a lack of demand for cargo space. For the return voyage from Spain to England, however, the opposite was true; high-value and sought-after commodities in England—such as wine and olive oil—meant increased competition for hull space, which pushed up freight charges. See E.T. Jones, 'The Shipping Industry of the Severn Sea', in E.T. Jones and R. Stone, eds, *The World of the Newport Medieval Ship: Trade, Politics and Shipping in the Mid-Fifteenth Century* (Cardiff, 2018), pp. 135–60.

99. Parry, *Spanish Seaborne Empire*, pp. 102–22, discusses the Spanish Atlantic convoy system and the issues which increased freight rates. For a general discussion of the various taxes that merchants trading to and from America were expected to pay, see E. Gil-Blanco, 'The Financing of Spanish Colonial Commerce in America: The *Almojarifazgo* and the port of Veracruz', in R.M. Yonk and V. Bobek, eds, *Perspectives on Economic Development: Public Policy, Culture, and Economic Development* (London, 2020), pp. 145–60.

100. *Bozale* was used to describe an un-Hispanised enslaved person not familiar with Iberian culture and language; see Wheat, *Atlantic Africa*, p. 216. This term was also used to describe indigenous peoples of Brazil (*indios bozales*) who were captured and enslaved. It meant the enslaved person was deemed 'savage' and 'untrained'; see D. Abulafia, *The Discovery of Mankind: Atlantic*

Foulas recounts, had a value of 500–600 *pesos*.¹⁰¹ Selling enslaved people across different areas of Spanish America could increase the price. Those sold in Peru, for example, fetched 800–900 *pesos*, presumably because the challenge of transporting human cargo overland to Peru increased costs, while the proximity of the Potosi mines created a demand for labour.¹⁰² Foulas knew these valuations, he recounts, because he had engaged directly in the slave trade in the Caribbean, Mexico and Peru. To set this in context for his English examiners, he offered an exchange rate by saying that each *peso* (*de oro*) was worth 13 *reales*, which were worth 6*s* 8*d* or 7*s* dependent on location.¹⁰³ An enslaved person sold for the price of 900 *pesos* would therefore be equivalent to £315.¹⁰⁴ Hawkins said he lost fifty-seven enslaved people, described as ‘Ethiopians of the best stature’, worth 400 gold *pesos* (*peso de oro*) each, for which he claimed £9,120.¹⁰⁵ This means that Garrard and Hawkins valued the enslaved at £160 each. If we take Foulas’s highest rate of 7*s* per *peso*, the cost of fifty-seven enslaved people sold in the Caribbean would be £140–£210 each, depending on their condition, age and skills. Indeed, one of the other deponents, William Clarke, stated in his testimony that prior to 1568 he knew that slaves had been sold in Veracruz for 350 gold *pesos* (£122 10*s*), and in other parts of the West Indies for 150 gold *pesos* (£52 10*s*).¹⁰⁶ Foulas’s testimony was important here because through his independent valuation he increased the amount Hawkins

Encounters in the Age of Columbus (New Haven, CT, 2008), p. 259. *Bozale* was also a term applied to ‘frightened’, and therefore more easily ‘trained’, people sold in Lima: see F.P. Bowser, *The African Slave in Colonial Peru, 1524–1650* (Stanford, CA, 1974), p. 79.

101. Wheat, *Atlantic Africa*, ch. 6, discusses in detail the differences between *Ladinos* and *bozales*. It is argued that many Spaniards in Peru preferred to purchase a *bozale* because they were terrified of their situation and were more easily cowed into slavery (Bowser, *African Slave*, p. 79 and Appendix B). *Ladinos* on the other hand knew too much about Iberian culture and forcing them to accept slavery was more challenging. Indeed, decrees banning *Ladinos* entering the New World were issued in the 1520s, 1530s and 1540s. Green, *Rise of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade*, p. 189, n. 59.

102. On arrival in San Juan de Ulúa many of the enslaved would often have to recover in hospital, or lodgings, and required better food and medicine to improve their health before transport and sale within New Spain. For example, travel from San Juan de Ulúa to highland cities in Mexico would take between two and five weeks and required a large network of agents and other support staff to facilitate the trade. Presumably the extra costs increased the price of the enslaved; see P.M.S. Silva, ‘The Slave Trade to Colonial Mexico: Revising from Puebla de los Ángeles’, in Borucki, Eltis and Wheat, eds, *From Galleons to the Highlands*, pp. 73–102.

103. Hawkins applied a higher rate of 8*s* per *peso* for some of his claims, so Foulas slightly undervalues the exchange rate here, although arguably his knowledge of the rate ‘on the ground’ was more nuanced.

104. If Garrard and Hawkins chose to apply the exchange rate of 8*s* per *peso* the highest value of the enslaved at 900 *pesos* was £360.

105. TNA, SP 12/53, fo. 7r. The health of the enslaved is unknown. On this third voyage many of the enslaved died or were weakened through disease, and in 1569 the Spanish claimed Hawkins exaggerated his losses; see Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, pp. 69, 91. Interestingly, William Clarke states that only forty-five enslaved people (TNA, SP 12/153, fo. 18v) were lost, although it seems he was unaware more were aboard the *Minion*: John Tornes, for example, says there were forty-five, with a further ten or twelve on the *Minion* (TNA, HCA 13/16, fo. 466v).

106. TNA, SP 12/53, fo. 19r; HCA 13/16, fo. 441v. Applying a higher rate of 8*s* per *peso* would give the following prices: 350 gold *pesos* = £140; 150 gold *pesos* = £60.

could claim for each enslaved person while still making sure the prices were not exaggerated. The potential profits to be gained from the slave trade were clearly considerable. On his previous voyage, Hawkins had paid a mere £3 for each enslaved person at Rio Tagarín (Sierra Leona), and we know that in 1565 he had sold enslaved people in Borburata for £22 each, and in 1568 for £18 per person at Río de la Hacha.¹⁰⁷ If these prices of sale are correct, Hawkins was considerably undercutting officially licensed Spanish slavers; if Foulas and other 'official' slave traders were selling slaves at £140–£315 each, Hawkins offered an alternative supply at an irresistible price.

After providing his valuations of the sale prices of enslaved peoples in the Americas, Foulas offers costs for types of cloth (*ordinardas* and *presilias*).¹⁰⁸ These relate to item nine in the schedule of damages, which are 30 bales of linen cloth lost in the *Jesus* and three other ships, worth 3,000 *reales*, for which Hawkins and his backers claimed £2,250.¹⁰⁹ Foulas says that a fardel of *ordinardas* or *presilias* sold for 250 *pesos*, which means that each fardel was worth £87 10s at the rate of 7s per *peso*.¹¹⁰ The 30 bales were thus equivalent to approximately 26 fardels.¹¹¹

The next items of value were 'margaritas'; item eleven in the claim.¹¹² These were pearls which, according to the testimony of Clarke, Turren and Hampton, were loaded onto the ships before they sailed for West Africa.¹¹³ Hawkins said he carried 400 pounds of pearls for which he claimed £100. Foulas stated that at Veracruz the usual price for a pound of pearls was 18–20 *reales*. This means pearls sold at Veracruz fetched

107. Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 334, n. 23; Andrews, *Spanish Caribbean*, p. 128.

108. Probably dyed linen/cotton cloth; see P.A. Nemnich, *An Universal European Dictionary of Merchandise in the English, German, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, Polish and Latin Languages* (London, 1799). Also see the testimony of William Clarke who refers to some of the cargo being *pintados*, or painted cotton cloth, in Klein, 'Minion and its Travels', p. 53. Beazley transcribes *ordinardas* as 'ordmardas' (*An English Garner*, ed. Beazley, I, p. 107). In the State Papers version, the opening letters could be taken as 'ordm'; however, in the HCA prize book record there is clearly a title over the 'i'.

109. TNA, SP 12/53, fo. 7r. Hawkins therefore valued each bale at £75.

110. Or £100 per fardel at the 8s rate.

111. Fardel relates to a quantity of cloth and other items assembled as a bale or bundle with no standard dimensions: R.E. Zupko, *A Dictionary of Weights and Measures for the British Isles: The Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia, PA, 1985), p. 127. Foulas also provides a value for Roncs (Rouen) cloth, but this was worth less (226 *pesos* or £79 2s per fardel) than *ordinardas* and *presilias*.

112. TNA, SP 12/53, fo. 7r. N. Cox and K. Dannehl, 'Pear–Pekoe tea', in *Dictionary of Traded Goods and Commodities, 1550–1820* (Wolverhampton, 2007), available via *British History Online*, at <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/traded-goods-dictionary/1550-1820/pear-pekoe-tea#h2-0003> (accessed 14 Dec. 2023). According to the dictionary, pearls were referred to by their Latin name of margarita when used in medicine.

113. Hawkins had collected pearls at Puerto de Plata in 1562, so he had previous experience of dealing with this commodity; see R.A. Donkin, *Beyond Price: Pearls and Pearl-Fishing, Origins to the Age of Discoveries* (Philadelphia, PA, 1998), pp. 328–9. For evidence that these were loaded before setting sail from England, see the Admiralty depositions of Clarke (TNA, HCA 13/16, fo. 438v); Turren (HCA 13/16, fo. 421v); and Hampton (HCA 13/16, fo. 445v).

approximately 10s per pound. Interestingly, for their claims, Garrard and Hawkins used a lower estimate of 5s per pound.¹¹⁴ If they wanted to attach some credibility to their claim, adopting the lower figure was sensible, as Foulas cautions that only on certain occasions could a higher price of 3 *pesos* (21s) per pound be obtained.

The next set of items were pewter vessels and Hampshire and northern kerseys (a kind of woollen cloth); items twelve and fourteen in the schedule. The price of pewter was given by Foulas according to the pound weight. We are told that a pound (16 oz) could be sold for 4 or 5 *reales*. Hawkins and Garrard said they had 300 lbs of pewter which at Foulas's prices should have fetched approximately 2–3s per pound.¹¹⁵ They claimed their pewter was worth £30, which means they stuck to the values provided by Foulas (i.e. 2s per pound). Hawkins and Garrard said they had four bales of Hampshire and northern cloths, but Foulas provides the value in length not weight or capacity, although helpfully he says that 17 English yards was equivalent to a kersey.¹¹⁶ A Hampshire kersey should have weighed 22 lbs, while a northern kersey was supposed to be 19 lbs.¹¹⁷ Hampshire kerseys were usually of good quality while northern kerseys had attracted criticism for being overstretched.¹¹⁸ It is also possible from Foulas's testimony to see the relative values of each type of cloth. He states that Hampshire kerseys sold for 36 *ducats* per kersey, and northern kerseys for 21½ *ducats*.¹¹⁹ In their claim, Garrard and Hawkins give the amount of these goods in bales, which they say were worth £8 each, and claimed a total of £340, the latter figure being the price they could have sold them for in Spanish America.¹²⁰ Given that four bales at £8 each would only equate

114. TNA, SP 12/53, fo. 7r.

115. *Ibid.* He claimed £30 and stated that pewter was worth 2s per pound in weight.

116. According to Foulas there were 17 English yards to 18 *varas*, and a kersey equalled 18 *varas*. According to a decree in 1536 the *vara* in New Mexico was equivalent to 3 feet. Therefore, 1 *vara* was approximately 1 English yard: see Stampa, 'Evolution of Weights and Measures'. Bales are difficult to measure precisely as the capacity varied depending on the commodity; see *Bristol's Trade with Ireland and the Continent, 1503–1601: The Evidence of the Exchequer Customs Accounts*, ed. S. Flavin and E.T. Jones (Bristol, 2009), p. 943.

117. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series, Elizabeth: 1601–03, with Addenda, 1547–1565* (London, 1870), p. 544.

118. J.T. Swain, *Industry before the Industrial Revolution: North-East Lancashire, c.1500–1640* (Manchester, 1986), p. 126; E. Kerridge, *Textile Manufacture in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 1985), pp. 16, 20. 'Hampshire' cloths were most likely produced in Surrey and Sussex, especially in Guildford, Godalming, Farnham and Chichester; see P.J. Bowden, *The Wool Trade in Tudor and Stuart England* (New York, 1962), pp. 50–51.

119. There are clearly some issues with the entries for this item (no. 14 in the table). Throughout his testimony, Foulas says that a *ducat* is worth between 11 and 13 *reales*, and he says 13 *reales* is equivalent to 7s. If a kersey was equal to 17 English yards and each yard was worth 11–13 *reales* the value of each kersey would be approximately £5 19s. However, 36 *ducats* at approximately 7s per *ducat* would make each kersey worth over £12. Interestingly, in his testimony, Humphrey Fones says kerseys could be sold for 18 gold *pesos* (i.e. £6 6s per kersey: TNA, HCA 16/16, fo. 472r). Given that Fones and Foulas broadly agree that a kersey is worth £6, we must conclude that the value of 36 and 21 *ducats* per kersey mentioned in this item is incorrect. As noted in the main text above, item 14 clearly contains scribal errors.

120. TNA, SP 12/53, fo. 7r. They claimed to have 4 bales.

to £32 there is clearly a scribal error here in either the value of each bale, the number of bales, or the total cost claimed.¹²¹ However, using the value for a kersey provided by Foulas's testimony, £340 would equal 55–60 kerses, although the proportion of each type of cloth is impossible to know.¹²²

After discussing cloth, Foulas turns his attention to cotton, item fifteen in the list.¹²³ The term 'cotton' was often used to describe different types of cloth, but in England it usually referred to pure woollen cloth, probably Manchester cottons.¹²⁴ Foulas claimed he could sell 61 *vara* of cotton for 30½ *ducats*, or 5½ *reales* the *vara*. This means the cotton Foulas was discussing sold for approximately 3s per yard. This cotton was therefore not as valuable as the Hampshire or northern kerses valued at 6–7s per yard. Garrard and Hawkins claimed a total of £90 for 6 bales of cotton, which, based on Foulas's valuation, suggests he had 600 yards of this fabric.¹²⁵

Next, Foulas provides values for wax (item seventeen), which he says could be sold at Veracruz for 40 *ducats* per hundredweight (quintal).¹²⁶ Garrard and Hawkins claimed the ships carried 12 hundredweight of wax with a total value of £120 (i.e. £10 per hundredweight). Through his deposition Foulas tells us that 13 *reales* is equal to 7s, and a *ducat* is worth 13 *reales*, making a ducat worth 7s. Based on their claim for £120, Hawkins and Garrard used a value of only 5s per ducat. This demonstrates that they were careful to make their claim plausible by not overvaluing the wax.

The final commodity for which Foulas provided values was wine (item twenty-two).¹²⁷ Hawkins and Garrard stated that they lost 20 barrels of Cretan and Spanish wines (malmsey and sack wine), for which they claimed £300.¹²⁸ That Foulas only provides the price of sack wine suggests that Garrard and Hawkins already had good information on the values of malmsey. Foulas says each butt of sack wine could be sold for 100 *pesos*, making a butt worth £33 6s 8d, or £35, depending on whether the higher or lower rate is applied. Sack and malmsey wines

121. If each bale were worth £8, Hawkins's ships would have carried approximately forty-two bales, not four. Alternatively, if there were only four bales then each bale would be worth £85.

122. Foulas's valuations would make each kersey approximately £5 19s. Interestingly, Humphrey Fones provides a similar figure of 18 gold *pesos* per kersey (i.e. £6 6s per kersey): TNA, HCA 16/16, fo. 472r.

123. TNA, SP 12/53, fo. 7v.

124. Given that northern and Hampshire cloths are treated as a separate item, the cargo in question must have been a different form of woollen cloth.

125. TNA, SP 12/53, fo. 7v. Each bale would therefore have contained 100 yards of cotton.

126. *Ibid.*, fo. 7v.

127. *Ibid.*, fo. 7v. Foulas was also asked to provide a value for item sixteen, which was a chest containing 30 decorated swords, but he replied that he knew nothing about the costs of these items.

128. *Ibid.*, fo. 7v. They say they lost 20 barrels which was equal to 20 butts. *A Tudor Book of Rates*, ed. T.S. Willan (Manchester, 1962), p. xiii, suggests a butt was equivalent to ½ tun or 130 gallons.

were Spanish or Mediterranean fortified wines which could keep for longer, were generally sweeter and stronger than other wines, were high-value items and very much in demand.¹²⁹

In analysing Foulas's testimony, and the commodity prices he provides, some historians have suggested that Garrard, Hawkins and the other financiers exaggerated their claims for compensation because they knew they would be reduced during negotiations with the Spanish.¹³⁰ Comparing the claims for losses set out by Garrard, Hawkins et al. with Foulas's testimony, however, shows that, overall, they stuck close to Foulas's valuations. Only in relation to the enslaved people did they seemingly exaggerate their losses. True, based on Foulas's evidence, the enslaved were not overvalued, but if Andrews and Kelsey are correct and Hawkins was able to purchase slaves at £3 and sell them for £18–22, he and his backers significantly increased their stated losses. One explanation might be that in his last slaving voyage Hawkins did pay more for enslaved people in West Africa. However, by 1568 Hawkins had established contacts in that region; and there seems to be no reason why the backers of the 1568 voyage would pay a much higher price than they had on earlier voyages. Most likely, Garrard, Hawkins and his financiers were not claiming for the sum the enslaved people were purchased for at source, but for the prices they fetched in the Spanish Americas.

V

The Hawkins voyages of the 1560s centred on the need for enslaved labour in Spain's New World territories. The demographic collapse of indigenous populations and the discovery of silver increased the demand for this labour, and encouraged a group of London merchants and John Hawkins to enter into this trade, undercut licensed Spanish traders and make a quick profit. Unfortunately for Garrard, Hawkins and the other financiers this method of engaging with the trade networks of the Atlantic arm of the Global Spanish Monarchy ultimately failed, and their forays into the transatlantic slave trade ended abruptly. How long they believed they could work outside the official licensing system without confrontation with Spain is difficult to tell. After the failure of the 1567–9 voyage, Francis Drake, who had participated and gained from it a deep loathing of what he saw as Spanish treachery, abandoned Hawkins's method and became far more bellicose, a stance which had some semblance of backing from the English Crown. Thus, from the 1570s, in what has been termed the 'third phase' of Anglo-Spanish relations in the Caribbean, English voyages to Spanish colonies became

129. A.D. Francis, *The Wine Trade* (London, 1972), p. 40; S. Rose, *The Wine Trade in Medieval Europe, 1000–1500* (London, 2011), also contains relevant information on sweet and malmsey wines. As a comparison, in the 1560s in England, French wines sold for £6 per tun; see *Book of Rates*, ed. Willan, p. xiii. This means sack and malmsey would sell for £66 13s 4d per tun.

130. Kelsey, *Sir John Hawkins*, p. 101.

more aggressive and piratical in nature.¹³¹ Yet it is important to recognise that many Englishmen, including Hawkins, continued to trade illicitly with the West Indies without recourse to violence.¹³²

No doubt the voyages of Hawkins, and his methods for undercutting Spanish prices, sent large ripples across the networks of English merchants working within the regulations that governed trade within the Global Spanish Monarchy, and of Spanish merchants living in England. Drake's more aggressive voyages of the 1570s added to the complexities. The fallout from the Hawkins voyages almost certainly led the Spanish to place English merchants trading in the New World under extra scrutiny. Similarly, Spaniards born in England, or those who had lived in England for some time, doubtlessly also received closer attention if they remained in, or returned to, Spain.

This might explain why, in 1569, Gillernio Foulas, a man who had operated within the Spanish transatlantic trade networks, was in England. We cannot be entirely sure of his place of birth and parentage, but almost certainly he came from an important subset of the population—people of mixed national origin—as can be seen from his designation in the port books and how he chose to sign his name. No country's population, of course, has ever consisted of people entirely of one 'nationality' or ethnicity. People of mixed national heritage, be they immigrants such as merchants or the children of parents with different origins, had existed in England for centuries, especially those from the other nations of the British Isles and near European neighbours.¹³³ Nevertheless, for people of mixed national origins, and aliens living in what to them was a foreign polity, there were undoubtedly challenges. Alien merchants resident in England, for example, were second-class citizens in many respects, as evidenced by their exclusion from London trading guilds and payment of higher customs duties than native merchants performing the same tasks.¹³⁴ The sixteenth century brought added religious complications, particularly for Spaniards, or those born to Spanish or Anglo-Spanish parents living in England, especially if they were, or were suspected of being, Catholics. The same was true of people of English origin in Spain, especially in times of heightened political and/or religious tensions.¹³⁵

Whatever his history prior to 1569, Foulas's experience within the Spanish trading system in the Americas was invaluable to William Garrard's and John Hawkins's claim for compensation. It allowed the London and Devonshire traders to cement their claims for compensation from the

131. *Documents Concerning English Voyages to the Spanish Main, 1569–1580*, ed. I.A. Wright (London, 1932), p. xvi.

132. *Ibid.*, pp. xvi–xviii.

133. See, for example, P.J. Geary, *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton, NJ, 2002), throughout but esp. pp. 1–14.

134. Yungblut, *Strangers Settled*, pp. 40–44, discusses the often-hostile attitude of Londoners towards aliens.

135. Croft, 'Trading with the Enemy', p. 290, notes that many English factors left Spain in the 1580s.

Spanish Crown at valuations that were in line with current market prices—not at vastly inflated rates, as has been claimed by previous scholars. At the same time, Foulas provided the English Crown with intimate knowledge of how trade operated within the Atlantic arm of the Global Hispanic Monarchy, from which those who were inclined to do so could develop strategies to subvert it. This may be another potential explanation as to why a copy of the Admiralty Court's proceedings were made for Cecil.

Hawkins's failure in 1567–9 made it more difficult for English traders hoping to engage with Spanish–Atlantic trade, but it certainly did not deter them. In 1570, Lionel Duckett presented a plan to Cecil which offered the opportunity of building a fort on the Gold Coast, and by the 1580s a group of Exeter merchants linked with the Portuguese pretender Don António began voyages to the Petite Côte (a stretch of coast in present-day Senegal), but now the principal cargoes were hides, ivory, wax, rice and, later, camwood.¹³⁶ While English involvement in the transatlantic slave trade was temporarily diminished by Hawkins's failure, it proved to be only a temporary setback; it unfortunately picked up again in later decades and centuries at a depressing frequency and scale.

University of Southampton, UK

GARY PAUL BAKER

University of Southampton, UK

CRAIG LAMBERT

APPENDIX

TNA, HCA 13/17, fos 2r–4r¹³⁷

[fo. 2r] Die Sabbati ultimo die¹³⁸

[*margin*: Querela Domini Willelmi Garrard et aliorum pro submercione navium Anglicarum in partibus Indie facta.] Willelmus Fowler ville de

136. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth: Addenda, 1566–1579* (London, 1871), pp. 246–7; M.A. Nunes Costa, 'D'António e o Trato Inglês da Guiné (1587–1593)', *Boletim Cultural da Guiné Portuguesa*, viii, no. 32 (1953), pp. 683–797, contains materials related to these later voyages. The Exeter ships leaving for the Petite Côte can be found here: TNA, E 190/935/11; E 190/935/12; E 190/935/13. See Blum, 'Empire Later', chs 2 and 3, for more details on the costs and returns of the voyages.

137. Please note the following editorial conventions. 1: Modern punctuation (e.g. capital letters, full stops and commas) has been applied to the text where appropriate. 2: Capitalisation of words within sentences in the original text has been retained, even if this is not the practice in modern English. 3: Italicisation in the original text has been retained. 4: Contractions within the original text have been expanded, with the omitted letters underlined. 5: Marginal notes are provided in square brackets at the appropriate point in the text as follows [*margin*: ...]. 6: Capital 'F' which appears as 'ff' in the original has been changed to the modern capital 'F'. 7: Editorial insertions (e.g. '*sic*') have been included in [square brackets]. 8: Roman and Arabic numerals are presented as they are in the text.

138. Saturday the last day [of April 1569].

Ratcliffe regni Anglie mercator etatis circiter viginti octo annorum testis in hac parte super predictis articulis productus nigratus et examinatus dicit et attestatur prout sequitur.

[margin: Repetitum die lune coram magistro Lewes iudice hc (ht; ec)¹³⁹] Ad undecimum articulum summarie petitionis [sic] et ad [fo. 2v] primum, secundum, tercium, quartum, quintum, sextum, et septimum articulos schedule annexe: he cannot otherwise depose but that he knowethe shippinge to be verie dere both at *Civille* in *Andolozia* in Spayne, and at the harborough of la *Vera Crux* in the *West Indias*. For, as he seythe, the tonne freight ys commonlie xxx ds [ducketts] after xi Rialls of plate the duckett from *Civille* to la *Vera Crux* aforesaide, and so muche money more from la *Vera Crux* to Civill, whiche ys in the whole lx ds [60 ducats] the tonne freight; for he this deponent seythe that he hathe traded from *Civille* to the saide porte of la *Vera Crux*, *Mexico*, and other places in the *West Indias*, and there hathe ben six severall tymes and hathe carried wares to and from the same places, and hathe paide for freight after the like rate. And likewise knowethe that the marchants doe commonlie pay for ther freight of the like rate per tonne to and from the places of *Civille* and la *Vera Crux* aforesaide.

Ad octavum articulum dicte schedule dicit: That by experience of the trade whiche he hathe had to and at the saide place called *Vera Crux*, and other the cheiffe of the *West Indias* as ys aforesaid, this deponent knowethe that a Negro of a good stature and yonge of yeres is worthe, and ys commonlie bought and soulede there at *Mexico*, and the maine lande of the *West Indias*, for iiiic, v^c, and vi^c [400, 500, and 600] pesos; for yf a negro be a *Bossale*, that is to say ignorant of the Spanishe or Portugale tonge, then he or she ys commonlye soulede for iiiic and iiiic^d [400 and 450] pesos. But yf the negro can speake anye of the foresaide languages, any thinge indifferentlye whiche ys called *Ladinos*, then the same negro ys commonlye soulede for v^c and vi^c [500 and 600] pesos, as the negro ys of choise and yonge of yeres. And this deponent seythe that the best trade in [fo. 3r] those places ys of Negros. The trade whereof he this deponent hathe used and hathe soulede Negros at the saide places, and seen other marchants likewise sell ther Negros there divers tymes, and thereby knowethe that the common price of negros ys as before ys deposed, whiche Negros beinge caried into the inner and farder partes of the mayne lande of *Peru* in the *West Indias* be commonlye sold there for viii^c and ix^c [800 and 900] pesos. Whiche this deponent knowethe to be true by his experience, for as he seythe havinge ben within that contrye and Region hathe seen them soulede so, and hathe soulede him self one negroe for ix^c [900] pesos. The *peso* being worthe (as he seythe), at la *Vera Crux* xiii Rialls of plate of the Spanishe coyne, being vi^s viii^d [6s 8d] sterling. And in the other places of *Mexico*, *Peru*, and mayne lande the saide *peso* ys worthe xiiii Rialls which is vii^s [7s] sterlinge.

Ad novum articulum dicte schedule dicit: That a fardell of Lynnen clothe called *Ordinardas* [Ordmaradas] or *Presilias* ys worthe and commonlye soulede at la *Vera Crux* for CCL [250] pesos of xiii Rialls the *peso*, whiche ys after the

139. The last abbreviation is difficult to be precise about. It could refer to honourable/honoured (i.e. honourable Judge Lewes; or it could mean 'hc' for high court, or equally as likely it could be 'ec' for etc. In the Hawkins testimony (TNA, HCA 13/16, fo. 456v) the same abbreviation is used three times in the marginalia, which makes 'etc.' more likely.

rate of 3250 Rialls the fardel. And the lynnene clothe called Rones¹⁴⁰ ys soule there after the rate of 226 *pesos* the fardel, whiche ys after the rate of 2940 Rialls of plate; for this deponent as he seythe hathe solde, and seen other merchants sell dyvers tymes lynnene clothe after that rate, bothe at la *Vera Cruz* and *Mexico*, whereby he knowethe that that kinde of wares be so commonly soule and worthe in the places aforesaide.

Ad undecimum articulum dicte schedule dicit: That a pounce of margaritas ys worthe at la *Vera Cruz* xviii and xx [18 and 20] Rialls, for this deponent as he [fo. 3v] seythe hathe soule and seen other marchants soe sell there commonly after that rate. And thereby knowithe the common price of the pounce of margaritas to be at the saide place as aforesaid. Notwithstandinge, this deponent seythe that he hathe soule a pounce of *Margaritas* at la *Vera Cruz* for xxx [30] Rialls, and sumtyme for thre *pesos* at xiii [13] Rialls the *peso*.

Ad duodecimum et decimum quartum articulos dicte schedule dicit: That pewter vessell and Carsyes¹⁴¹ called hanisherres and northens be commonly worthe and soule at la *Vera Cruz* for the severall prices following: viz [vide-licet] the pounce of pewter at foure Rialls of plate, and some tyme ys soule for five Rialls, the pounce beinge xvi [16] ounce. The good hamshere Karsey conteyninge commonlie xviii [18] vares, whiche is aboute xvii [17] Englishe yards, at xxxvi [36] ducketts at xi [11] Rialls the duckett, and the northen carsey for xxi [21] ds [ducketts] and half, whiche is after xiii [13] Rialls the vare; for this deponent hathe soule so there him self and seene other merchants soe commonly sell.

Ad decimum quintum articulum dicte schedule dicit: That a pece of cotton of lxi [61] vares in lengthe ys worthe and ys commonly soule at la *Vera Cruz* for xxx [30] ducketts and a half, whiche is after v [5] Rialls and a half the vare, for this deponent hathe soe soule there and also hathe seene other marchants sell commonly there after the like rate.

Ad decimum sextum nescit deponere.

Ad decimum septimum articulum dicit: That the Kintall¹⁴² of wex ys worthe commonly at la *Vera Cruz* xl [40] ducketts for he and other merchants have [fo. 4r] soe commonlie soule there at, and for, the like price.

Ad xxii [22nd] articulum dicte schedule dicit: That a butt of secke¹⁴³ is worthe commonly at la *Vera Cruz* one hundred *pesos*, the *peso* worthe xiii [13] Rialls as ys aforesaide. For this deponent and other marchants have commonly soule secks after that rate in that place of *Vera Cruz*.

[Signature] Gillernio Foulas

140. Possibly Rouen cloth (usually linen of varying quality); see Andrews, *Spanish Caribbean*, p. 77, n. 24.

141. Kersey.

142. Quintal: equal to a hundredweight: Zupko, *Dictionary*, p. 342.

143. Sack wine.