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500 Years of Florida History—The Sixteenth Century: An Introduction

by Connie L. Lester and Daniel S. Murphree, editors

The year 2013 marks the quincentennial of Juan Ponce de León's exploration of lands known for the past five hundred years as Florida. Historians have long noted the consequences of Ponce's activities, interpreted their origins, and offered assessments of the region's past as it related to events taking place in 1513 and the century that followed. Some have focused on European conquistadores, highlighting the exploits of colorful individuals and the institutions they represented. Others have emphasized the lives of Florida's indigenous inhabitants, especially their existence prior to colonization and reactions to foreign invaders in subsequent years. In terms of methodology, scholars from a variety of disciplinary fields have relied on travel accounts, government ledgers, and international correspondence to reconstruct the period while increasingly incorporating other forms of evidence uncovered by processes such as bioarchaeology, climate analysis, and oral traditions. Partially as a result, the historiography of sixteenth-century Florida has shifted in emphasis over the years and highlighted various themes. Yet many questions concerning the period and region remain unanswered, or at least, subject to debate. Rather than provide definitive answers that will endure for another five centuries, this Special Issue of the Florida Historical Quarterly offers understandings of Florida's sixteenth-century past as crafted a half-millennia after Ponce made his momentous journey.

The issue begins with Paul E. Hoffman's historiographic essay that complements and is complemented by Kathleen Deagan's...
discussion of the state of archaeological knowledge about Native American and European settlements and interactions during the sixteenth-century. This pairing arose because the guest editor and Dr. Deagan believe that it is not possible to study the historical record of this period without reference to the archaeological one, and vice versa. These foundational essays are followed by two examples of the newer approaches to the history of sixteenth-century Florida written by a new generation of historians who have recently taken up the study of the time and place. Jonathan DeCoster shows how a careful re-reading of a familiar story can reveal surprising new perspectives, in this case on the interactions of the French and Spaniards with the Timucua of northeast Florida. John McGrath explores the discourse that Europeans constructed during the sixteenth century around what they imagined were Florida’s riches and potentials. Together, these assessments provide both an overview of historiography related to the region over time as well as samples of the newest and best scholarship being produced in 2013.

Much has changed in Florida since Ponce waded ashore five hundred years ago. Similarly, much has changed in how modern historians have evaluated sixteenth century Florida in the recent past. While such changes will continue into the future, the goal of this Special Issue is to provide scholars and non-scholars alike with a sophisticated yet easily understandable snapshot of both previous and contemporary interpretations of the Florida that existed in the years after Ponce’s arrival. These assessments will hopefully spark more debate and research in the future. Their enduring impact notwithstanding, the articles that follow remind us of Florida’s dynamic sixteenth-century past and the continued value of ongoing scholarly interpretations of it.

This publication not only commemorates the quincentennial of Ponce’s encounters but initiates a series of six Special Issues of the Florida Historical Quarterly, each devoted to examining Florida over the previous five centuries. Beginning in 2013, a Special Issue will be published each consecutive year (two in 2016) that provides an overview of current interpretations and evaluation of historiographic trends relevant to the period covered. Next year’s (2014) publication in this series is devoted to the Seventeenth Century and will be edited by Dr. Jane Landers, the Gertrude Conway Vanderbilt Professor of History at Vanderbilt University. Future Special Issues will be edited by Dr. Sherry Johnson (Eighteenth Century—2015), Dr. James Cusick (Nineteenth Century—2016),
Dr. John David Smith (Nineteenth Century—2016), and Dr. Gary Mormino (Twentieth Century—2017).

Publication of this series would not be possible without the continued support of the Florida Historical Society and its members. The editors of this *Special Issue* are especially grateful to Dean José B. Fernandez and the University of Central Florida College of Arts and Humanities for underwriting the 2013 *Special Issue* on the Sixteenth Century.
The Historiography of Sixteenth-Century La Florida

by Paul E. Hoffman

The sixteenth-century history of what the Spaniards called La Florida (roughly the entire Southeastern United States) starts with what to us is a mystery and ends nearly as obscurely after passing a number of well-known and oft-narrated episodes of exploration, Pedro Menéndez de Avilés’ founding of an enduring colony as part of the Franco-Spanish “cold war” of 1559-1593, the martyrdoms of Jesuit and then Franciscan missionaries (1571; 1597 respectively), and finally territorial rivalries as the English began their colonial ventures in eastern North America. Until the 1950s, the historiography of these well-known episodes generally reflected the interests of lay, clerical and professional historians and the shifting historiographical trends of the larger profession as it moved from the mid-nineteenth-century Romantic interest in “heroes” like Hernando De Soto to institutional history (notably the missions) and then to topics from the later centuries of La Florida’s history associated in

---

Paul E. Hoffman is the Paul W. and Nancy W. Murrill Professor at Louisiana State University and is the author of seven books, including *Florida Frontiers*, which won the 2002 Gulf South History Book Award and *A New Andalucia and a Way to the Orient: The American Southeast during the Sixteenth Century*, which won the 1991 Francis Parkman Prize.

1. For diplomatic purposes, the Spaniards sometime claimed La Florida was all of North America as far north as the ill-defined area of the “cod fisheries” and as far west as what is today northern Mexico. But most of the time they meant the peninsula and its Gulf Coast, Georgia and South Carolina, with early interest (1565-72) as far north as Virginia.
some way with the history of the United States. Much of this work remains of value because it is solidly based in archival sources but there is relatively little of it because few United States or Spanish scholars paid much attention to La Florida. However, beginning in the 1960s the familiar episodes again attracted attention from historians like Albert Manucy, Michael V. Gannon, Eugene Lyon, Jerald Milanich, Amy Turner Bushnell, John Worth, J. Michael Francis, Daniel Murphree and your author. These writers use an expanded base of original sources, evidence from historical archaeology, some social-scientific models and ideas, and contextual knowledge of the Spanish empire as a whole. Although not tracking precisely the larger trends of the profession in the late twentieth century—in particular its emphasis on social history—the historical writing of the post 1965 period did begin to develop that story, as well as the colony’s economic history, and interaction with Native Americans. All are more difficult to document than the old “standards.” And even for the “standard” stories, some mysteries remain and many details are still silent in the archives. What follows is an indication of the best current scholarship on these topics, and comments on what remains to be fully studied. We begin with bibliographic guides.


2. Special issues of the Florida Historical Quarterly to be published in 2014 and later years will have discussions of the historiography of the seventeenth and later centuries.

3. I wish to thank John E. Worth and Amy Turner Bushnell for reviewing an early draft of this essay and for helpful suggestions. Needless to say, they bear no responsibility for any omissions or for the judgments I make herein. If I have omitted any important works, I apologize to their authors.


after 1565. Spanish Florida Resources [http://www.uwf.edu/jworth/spanfla.htm] is an on-line bibliography compiled by John E. Worth.

To these bibliographic guides focused on the present state of Florida one might add John E. Simpson’s Georgia History, A Bibliography (1976), James H. Easterby’s Guide to the Study and Reading of South Carolina History (1950) and Lewis P. Jones’ Books and Articles on South Carolina History (1991). Topical searches in JSTOR (if one’s library has a subscription that includes the Journal of American History, The Journal of Southern History, and the William and Mary Quarterly along with journals for the states that were formed out of La Florida) are the preferred route to full texts of articles old and recent as well as reviews of the books noted here. The bibliographies or bibliographic notes in the works discussed here are also guides to the literature.

A reader seeking a single volume history of sixteenth-century Florida has several choices but none is comprehensive. María Antonia Sáinz Sastre’s, La Florida en el Siglo XVI, Exploración y Colonización (2002), covers the story from Ponce de León to Menéndez de Avilés’ death in 1574, with a chapter on Native Americans and a primary focus on Menéndez. The work is based on the standard secondary and printed primary literature for the subjects it covers but adds some materials from the archives of the Condes de Revillagigedo for Menéndez. Unfortunately, Sáinz Sastre did not have access to all the relevant literature in English.

An excellent short account in English is in David J. Weber, The Spanish Frontier in North America (1992) chapters one through three. For a fuller scholarly treatment see Paul E. Hoffman, A New Andalucía and a Way to the Orient (1990) and his Florida’s Frontiers (2002). The first explores the imperial struggles over the southeastern coast


of North America from the 1520s to the 1590s as the Spaniards, French and English pursued the truth of Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón’s tale that it was a “new Andalucia” and Giovanni da Verrazzano’s notion that the Outer Banks were an isthmus on whose western side lay an arm of the Pacific Ocean (“a way to the Orient”) with only minimal attention to the internal histories of the Spanish, French, and English colonies of that period. The second work by Hoffman covers the internal history of the Spanish colonies (St. Augustine and Santa Elena) and their relationship with Native Americans but in only four chapters for the sixteenth century. Uniquely for its time, *Florida’s Frontiers* includes discussion of the geography and ecology—the stage—upon which the story unfolds and how those factors influenced settlement locations and some aspects of the colony’s prosperity. Michael V. Gannon, ed., *The New History of Florida* (1996), provides another set of four chapters that follow the familiar themes of Native Americans, explorations, and settlement but then adds Amy Turner Bushnell’s essay “Republic of Spaniards, Republic of Indians”11 which places late sixteenth and especially seventeenth century Florida in the context of imperial laws segregating the two communities in usually minimally successful attempts to protect the natural rights of the Native Americans. Bushnell’s essay reflects the new emphasis drawn from anthropology, archaeology and subaltern studies on the reality of La Florida’s multi-ethnic colonial society. A revised edition of Gannon’s work titled *The History of Florida* is in preparation and will include chapters on ecology and other aspects of the story not found in the 1996 edition.

Four older works that still serve as general overviews of the sixteenth century, although with the traditional emphases on great men and notable deeds, are John G. Shea, “Ancient Florida,” in Justin Winsor, ed., *Narrative and Critical History of the United States* (1884-89), Woodbury Lowery, *The Spanish Settlements within the Present Limits of the United States* (reprinted 1959), Paul Quattlebaum, *The Land Called

---

Chicora: The Carolinas Under Spanish Rule with French Intrusions, 1520-1670 (1956) and Carl O. Sauer, Sixteenth-Century North America; The Land and the Peoples as Seen by the Europeans (1971). Shea’s work is a 52 page account covering more than just the sixteenth century while Lowery begins with exploration not just of Florida but of all of the so-called Spanish borderlands (Florida to New Mexico in this case) in volume one and then devotes volume two to the story of conquest and settlement of Florida in the 1560s. Both works are based on archival sources, but Lowery is the more thorough and is still a basic resource for scholars interested in the topics he covers. Quattlebaum’s book focuses on the Carolinas but includes St. Augustine and the seventeenth century missions. His end date is the year Barbadians founded Charles Towne. Sauer reviews exploration from Newfoundland to California and includes French and Spanish Florida and the English colonies but his principal interest is in geographic descriptions, not the internal histories of those colonies.

Three colonial era compilations that are sometimes used as sources for sixteenth-century history are Andrés González de Barcía, Chronological History of the Continent of Florida (1723; 1951), Antonio Arredondo, Arredondo’s Historical Proof of Spain’s Title to Georgia (1925), and Inigo Abad y La Sierra, Relación del descubrimiento, conquista, y población de las provincias y costas de la Florida (1785; 1912). All of these eighteenth century works should be used with


caution because their purpose was to show prior Spanish discovery and settlement up to a point ten degrees north of Port Royal Sound viz-a-vie English and U.S. claims. If necessary to serve that end, they bend the chronology or even assert claims that are false.

Useful for parts of the story are Pietro Martiere d'Anghiera [Peter Martyr], *De Orbe Novo: The Eight Decades of Peter Mártir d'Anghera* (1912), Francisco Lopez de Gómara, *Historia general de las Indias* (1954), Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo, *Historia general y natural de las Indias* (1851-55), Juan de Torquemada's *Monarquía Indiana* (1615; 1723), and Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas, *Historia general de los hechos de los Castellanos en las islas y Tierra firme del mar oceano* (1934-37). Martyr has some of the earliest reports of explorations, while Oviedo and Gómara report briefly on those and other events to ca. 1550. Torquemada contains materials on the Luna expedition. Herrera is our principal source for Juan Ponce de León's troubles. Both of the latter, like the eighteenth century compilations, must be used with caution. See John McGrath's essay in this issue for how these and other early authors contributed to ideas about La Florida as a place of possible riches.

As suggested above, the story of Europeans' discovery of La Florida begins with the mystery as to when and by whom the peninsula, Gulf Coast or any part of the coasts of Georgia and the Carolinas were first encountered. We will touch on that and the historiography of particular explorations in a moment. Before doing so, it is helpful to review the general literature on the explorations of La Florida. This literature involves both historical writings and studies of early cartography. These general accounts repeat familiar narratives and add little new information, although some provide excellent reviews of controversial matters.

Modern scholarship on the explorations begins with Henry Harrisse, *The Discovery of North America* (1892; 1961) that examines

the earliest coastal explorations and maps. His work must be used with caution because he sometimes made errors when matching narratives to North American geography.\textsuperscript{16} More reliable with respect to maps and their relationships to early explorations is William P. Cumming, \textit{The Southeast in Early Maps} (3\textsuperscript{rd} Ed., 1998).\textsuperscript{17} This work, revised by Louis De Vorsey for its third edition, is indispensable for its introduction (with notes that discuss the scholarly controversies surrounding some of the early maps such as the Cantino of 1502), for the careful descriptions of 450 maps and for the clear reproductions of twenty of the major sixteenth-century manuscript and printed maps (as part of 24 color and 71 black and white illustrations of maps running to 1775). Also useful for the basic maps and story is W. P. Cumming, R. A. Skelton, and D. B. Quinn, \textit{The Discovery of North America} (1972), which covers more than just La Florida and includes succinct accounts of explorations, colonies and scholarly controversies.\textsuperscript{18} Donald W. Meining, \textit{The Shaping of America, I, Atlantic America 1492-1800} (1986), is also useful.\textsuperscript{19} An extended discussion of the problems of using early maps as historical records is C. Koeman, "Levels of Historical Evidence in Early Maps (with Examples)" (1968).\textsuperscript{20} The gist of it is that they are easy to misinterpret in the absence of other documentary evidence and even when that is available. Geographers have noted that maps are systems of signs, which means that their creators emphasize certain things while trying to show the relationships among them. That is, maps, especially in the sixteenth century, are not literal representations of the facts used.

\textsuperscript{16} Henry Harrisse, \textit{The Discovery of North America} (1894; reprint. Amsterdam: N. Israel, 1961); An example of errors is in his account of Garay’s expedition following up on the Carmago-Alvarez de Pineda 1519 pioneering mapping of the northern Gulf Coast. He says Garay put into the Mississippi but the primary sources indicate a geography that does not match the River's lower course.

\textsuperscript{17} W.P. Cummings, \textit{The Southeast in Early Maps}. 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed., revised and enlarged by Louis De Vorsey, Jr. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998). The only problem with this book is its orientation toward North Carolina and Virginia, Cummings’ particular interest as both a scholar and a collector (the work is based on his personal collection as well as an encyclopedic knowledge of relevant maps).


\textsuperscript{19} Donald W. Meining, \textit{The Shaping of America: A Geographical Perspective of Five Hundred Years of History} 3 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986). Volume I is about "Atlantic America."

\textsuperscript{20} C. Koeman, "Levels of Historical Evidence in Early Maps (With Examples)," \textit{Imago Mundi} 22 (1968), 75-80.
to create them, which is what makes them difficult to use as guides to otherwise poorly documented historical events.


David B. Quinn was one of the more prolific narrators of North American explorations, contributing not only to Cumming, Skelton, and Quinn (1972) but also producing a number of books more or less like his North America from Earliest Discovery to First Settlements: The Norse Voyages to 1612 (1977).\textsuperscript{23} This is a brief account emphasizing the Atlantic, northern latitudes, and the English more than the Spaniards.

Robert S. Weddle, Spanish Sea: The Gulf of Mexico in North American Discovery, 1500-1685 (1985),\textsuperscript{24} begins with the question of first discovery and then covers the expeditions of Ponce de León, Alvarez de Pineda, Garay and his efforts to seize Pánuco (a province in Mexico along the river of the same name), Pánfilo de Narváez-Cabeza de Vaca, De Soto, Fray Luis Cáceres, Luna, and Menéndez de Avilés, to name those of interest for the history of Florida. A work of careful scholarship based on archival sources and familiarity with the Gulf Coast, Spanish Sea is the best account of the events it covers. Weddle argues for the importance of the Gulf of Mexico as the primary Spanish approach to North America before the 1560s, thus challenging the Atlantic orientation of most writers, including your author. See below for critiques of parts of his narrative.

\textsuperscript{22} Jerald T. Milanich, Florida Indians and the Invasion from Europe (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1995).
\textsuperscript{24} Robert S. Weddle, Spanish Sea: The Gulf of Mexico in North American Discovery, 1500-1685 (College Station: Texas A & M Press, 1985). This is the first of a three volume study of exploration and settlement around the Gulf that has as its purpose the history of the imperial contest for Texas. Weddle also contributed "Early Spanish Exploration: The Caribbean, Central America, and the Gulf of Mexico," North American Exploration, Vol. 1, A New World Disclosed, ed., John Logan Allen (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 140-189, as a brief account of his views from Spanish Sea.
In a class by itself is David B. Quinn, ed., *New American World* (1979).²⁵ This compilation in five stout volumes contains over 800 translated documents, including parts of most of the basic narrative accounts of the voyages of discovery and selected materials on the various colonies. Like Quinn’s other books, it places heavy emphasis on the English and the Atlantic coast north of La Florida. Material specifically on La Florida is found in Chapters 19-21 (Ponce de León, Ayllón, Gomés, Verrazzano, Volume 1), 27-41 (Spanish and French Florida, 1526 [Pánfilo de Narváez] to 1574, Volume 2), 42-60 (English ventures including Roanoke Island, Volume 3), 91-99 (Spanish Florida, 1574-1611, Volume 5).

As has been noted, the story of Europeans’ discovery of La Florida begins with the mystery of when and by whom the peninsula or any part of the coast of Georgia and the Carolinas were first encountered. The mystery is “What exactly is that peninsular-like projection from a land mass that is just to the west northwest of Cuba on the Cantino manuscript map of 1502 and that reappears, usually connected to what by position is Central America and northern South America, on the Luso-Germanic (or Waldseemüller) maps of the same image family from the 1507-1520 period?” The general, but not uncontested, scholarly opinion is that it is Florida and the record of an otherwise unknown exploration.²⁶ However, that thesis may be questioned. Samuel E. Morison, after noting that “this controversial feature ... has driven historians


and geographers almost frantic” goes on to state “this outlined coast bears no resemblance whatever to the east coast of Florida in detail or in character.” 27 Moreover, at least one late version of that map image (Waldseemüller 1517) identifies this as part of Asia (although obviously connected by a continuous coastline to northern South America). A skeptic of the Florida thesis might raise questions of geographic orientation (Florida is due north of Cuba, about two thirds of the distance from its eastern end) and the delineation of the coast west and south of the “peninsula” on the Cantino map, the latter an issue not considered in the standard “Florida” discussions. 28 The Cantino chart controversy is an excellent example of the problems that early maps can present when used as the sole source for reconstructing events.

What we know, is that no later than July 1511 (and perhaps as early as late 1508) government officials in Spain and Hispaniola had heard that there was land north of Cuba and west of the Bahamas (“Bimini”) and sent Juan Ponce de León to look for it. 29 Moreover,

27. Samuel E. Morison, The European Discovery of America, The Southern Voyages, 1492-1616 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), 275. He does not accept any of the theories. At one time he suggested that Cantino recorded Duarte Pacheco Pereira’s claim of a 1498 voyage to latitudes north of 28 degrees, only to have that thesis dismissed by a Gago Coutinho, a noted Portuguese scholar. Morison left the matter for some later scholar to resolve.

28. Seymour I. Schwartz and Ralph E. Ehrenberg, The Mapping of America (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1980), reproduction (19, plate 2), the general opinion (23) and Waldseemüller (24-28, 33-34, plate 8). Too, the west coast of this peninsula runs to a bay and is then continuous with land that looks like Central America but which could be just “filler” to tie the discovery to other locations further south. If the peninsula is Florida, then the bay would be the Gulf, which seems to me impossible. For further arguments for Florida see David O. True, “Some Early Maps Relating to Florida,” Imago Mundi 11 (1954), 73-84. Cummins and DeVorsey, Southeast in Early Maps, discusses the scholarship on this issue but ignores True, an eloquent statement of their opinion of his work. See also Giuseppe Caraci, “The Reputed Inclusion of Florida in the Oldest Nautical Maps of the New World,” Imago Mundi 15 (1960), 32-39 for a systematic demolition of True’s logic on certain points.

29. See Anthony Q. Devereux, Juan Ponce de Leon, King Ferdinand, and the Fountain of Youth (Spartanburg, SC: The Reprint Company Publishers, 1993), (88-89, 96) for knowledge of land near the Bahamas and Antilles by mid July 1511. Ferdinand the Catholic in 1506 ordered Juan Diaz de Solís and Vicente Yañez de Pinzón to officially circumnavigate Cuba (thus definitively disproving Columbus’ claim that it was a peninsula of Asia, a claim almost no-one believed). In 1508 Pinzón and Diaz de Solís sailed west from Cuba to the Honduran coast that Columbus had explored on his final voyage (1504) while Sebastián de Ocampo circumnavigated the island from his base on Hispaniola. Whether Pinzón and Diaz de Solís also proceeded north from the Bay of Honduras to see what lay in that direction is disputed (see Weddle, Spanish Sea, 20-22, 36).
the so-called Martyr Map of 1511 shows “Bimini” to the north of Cuba in approximately the correct relationship to it, although as an east-west land mass, not a peninsula. Scholars generally assume that slavers seeking new captives for the mines and agricultural enterprises of Hispaniola had found the southeastern part of the North American mainland by this date, but there is no documentary evidence that proves this. 30

The mystery of otherwise unrecorded voyages that may or may not have found land west or northwest of Cuba before 1511 notwithstanding, Ponce de Leon’s voyage of 1513 to the northwest of the Bahamas is the first unequivocal “discovery” of peninsular Florida. As is well known, Ponce bestowed that name on what he seems to have viewed as an island. Recent scholarship has developed a detailed picture of Juan Ponce de Leon’s life and misadventures, but almost no new light on his voyages to Florida, which are known primarily from Herrera’s Historia general (1598) 31 and a few references in correspondence written on the eve of the second voyage. Among Ponce’s many biographies see Vicente Murga Sanz, Juan Ponce de León (1959) and Aurelio Tio, Nuevas Fuentes para la historia de Puerto Rico (1961). 32 These Puerto Rican biographies (despite Tio’s title, his intent is biographical) are based on the extant documentation of Ponce’s life and preparations for his voyages. The best English biography and study of the voyages, similarly based, is Anthony Q. Devereux, Juan Ponce de León, King Ferdinand, and the Fountain of Youth (1993). 33 A more recent but less

30. The Martyr Map is reproduced in Devereux, Juan Ponce, between pages 104-105 and in R.A. Skelton, Explorers’ Maps (London and New York: Spring Books, 1958), 61, figure 37 (truncated at the top so that the full image of “Isla Bimini Parte” is not fully shown). For a discussion of the possible Native American source of this knowledge see Louis Devorsey, “American Indians and Early Mapping,” in Cummins and DeVorsey, Southeast in Early Maps, 66.


32. Vicente Murga Sanz, Juan Ponce de León (San Juan, Puerto Rico: Ediciones de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1959) and Aurelio Tio, Nuevas Fuentes para la historia de Puerto Rico (San German, Puerto Rico: Ediciones de la Universidad Interamericana de Puerto Rico, 1961).

33. Anthony Q. Devereux, Juan Ponce de León, King Ferdinand, and the Fountain of Youth (Spartanburg, SC: Published in association with Waccamaw Press by the Reprint Co., 1993).
HISTORIOGRAPHY OF LA FLORIDA

reliable biography is Robert H. Fuson, Juan Ponce de León and the Spanish Discovery of Puerto Rico and Florida (2000) which cites mostly secondary sources. 34

The Freducci manuscript map appears to be a record of Ponce’s 1513 voyage. Louis D. Sisco, “The Track of Ponce de León” (1913), David O. True, “The Freducci Map of 1514-15” (1944), and Jerald Milanich and Nara B. Milanich, “Revisiting the Freducci Map” (1996) all discuss this map that shows most of the east coast of the Peninsula and the west coast at least as far north as Fort Myers in correct geographic orientation to Cuba. 35 Milanich and Milanich argue that the first point of contact on the east coast was north of the St. Johns River rather than near Ponce de Leon Inlet, the traditional location.

In the years between Ponce’s first and second voyages to La Florida, a number of other expeditions touched on parts of its coast, although we have certain knowledge of only a few. Paul E. Hoffman, “A New Voyage of North American Discovery: The Voyage of Pedro de Salazar to the Land of the Giants” (1980), 36 musters the evidence for a slaving voyage in these years from the Bahamas to an unknown point on the coast of the Carolinas. This voyage was the inspiration for the better known voyage in 1521 of Pedro de Quejo and Francisco Gordillo, which began Licenciado Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón’s part in La Florida’s history. Slaving voyages from Cuba in the 1515-1516 period are known but an alleged voyage of Diego de Miruelo to the Apalachee Bay area has been discounted as a confusion with the activities of his nephew of the same name, who was a pilot with Pánfilo de Narváez and gave his name to that bay on maps prepared after that ill-fated expedition. 37

37. Weddle, Spanish Sea, 55-56 (slaving from Cuba to the Bahamas), 204 (how Miruelo Bay got its name).
Less equivocal because somewhat better documented is the 1519 voyage heretofore attributed to Alonso Alvarez de Pineda, which scouted the Gulf Coast from Cape Sable to at least Vermillion Bay (in Louisiana) and also parts of the Mexican coast from the Río de las Palmas to Veracruz. Rolena Adorno and Patrick Charles Pautz, *Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca; His Account, His Life, and the Expedition of Pánfilo de Narváez* (1999), show that Diego de Camargo commanded this voyage; the attribution to Alvarez de Pineda is due to Bernal Diaz, writing over 70 years after the fact. The Camargo-Alvarez de Pineda expedition sailed for Francisco de Garay, the governor of Jamaica and a man who, over the next few years attempted, and failed, to “jump” Hernán Cortés’ claims to central Mexico. Weddle’s account in chapter 6 of his *Spanish Sea* (1985) and Adorno and Pautz’s discussions are the best available even though neither used Alonso de Chaves’ “Espejo de Navegantes,” which contains sailing directions derived in part from the Camargo-Alvarez de Pineda voyage. These directions informed the crude sketch map of the Gulf of ca. 1519 and the published “Cortes Map” of 1524 that are the first clear representations of peninsular Florida as part of a continental land mass and in its correct relationship to Cuba and Mexico.  

The activities of Licenciado Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón, 1521-1526, are detailed in Hoffman, *A New Andalucia* (1990) and Quattlebaum, *The Land Called Chicora* (1956). Two central issues in this story are where Pedro de Quejo and Francisco Gordillo (slavers sailing for Ayllón and others) landed in 1521 and where Ayllón placed his colony, San Miguel de Gualdape, in 1526. A consensus


39. *Alonso de Chaves y el Libro IV de su “Espejo de navegantes,“* ed. P. Castañeda, M. Cuesta y P. Hernández (Madrid: Industrias Gráficas España, 1977) hereafter as Chaves, *Espejo de navegantes.* This edition has minor flaws in the transcription from the original that is held in the Real Academia de la Historia in Madrid. For the Gulf Coast and Florida see Chapters 12-13. Richard E. Condrey, Paul E. Hoffman, and D. Elaine Evers, “The Last Naturally Active Delta Complexes of the Mississippi River (LNDM): Discovery and Implications,” forthcoming as chapter 3 in *The Once and Future Delta,* ed. John Day, Paul Kemp, Angelina Dreman, shows how Chaves can be used to understand the sixteenth-seventeenth century maps of the Gulf coast that omit the Mississippi River's delta. The Alvarez de Pineda Map is reproduced in Weddle, *Spanish Sea,* (101) and Cummins, Skelton, and Quinn, *Discovery,* (69, figure 68, with the “Cortes” map of 1524, the first printed map of the Gulf, 68, figure 67).
now holds that the 1521 landing was at the Santee River-Winyah Bay entrance. Regarding the 1526 colony, Hoffman argues for the vicinity of Sapelo Sound; Quattlebaum argues for Winyah Bay and Douglas T. Peck has argued for the Savannah River.\(^4^0\) Earlier scholars who misread the documentary record or had limited access to it selected various landing places for 1521 and placed the colony as far north as the Chesapeake Bay, perhaps in an attempt to link this earliest European colony with the English beginnings of the United States.\(^4^1\) San Miguel de Gualdape failed after only a few months and survivors returned to the Antilles. Its location may someday be determined by archaeological evidence.

Coincident with the Quejo-Gordillo voyage of 1521 that opened up the lower east coast of North America to official Spanish notice, Juan Ponce de León sailed on his final, fatal voyage to what he still insisted was the island, “La Florida.” He was authorized to take the men and animals needed to found a colony and loaded both on his ships. His voyage and an apparent attempt to found a colony in the territory of the Calusa Indians (Fort Myers and points south on the west coast) resulted in his mortal wounding and the deaths of some of his men. He withdrew to Cuba, where he died at Puerto Príncipe in July 1521. Devereaux, *Juan Ponce de León*, gives an account based on Oviedo, Herrera, and certain other materials; Weddle, *Spanish Sea*, devotes less than a page to this voyage.\(^4^2\) For Ponce’s alleged interest in the fountain of youth, see McGrath, this issue.

Equally luckless was Pánfilo de Narváez. Although it is often asserted that he intended to colonize peninsular Florida, that is a misunderstanding of his intention. True, his contract with the Crown included Ponce de León’s La Florida, but the territory he

\(^{40}\) Douglas T. Peck, “Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón’s Doomed Colony of San Miguel de Gualdape,” *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 85, no. 2 (Summer 2001), 193. I do not find his argument nor Quattlebaum’s convincing.


\(^{42}\) Devereaux, *Juan Ponce de León*, 184-198; Weddle, *Spanish Sea*, 48, but see 53 for his usual trenchant discussion of the sources. See also Quinn, *New American World*, 1:246.
was authorized to explore and exploit ran westward as far as the Río de las Palmas (Soto La Marina River) in Mexico and it is quite clear that he intended to settle in Mexico (and likely on the Pánuco River if he could), whose riches and relatively tractable natives were well known, unlike the “low, sterile land” that the Camargo-Alvarez de Pineda expedition had found on their exploration of the west coast of the Peninsula and the upper Gulf coast or the violently hostile Calusa who had repelled Ponce de León. The landing on Florida’s west coast was a consequence of a storm that drove the fleet away from its intended final watering and victualing point, Havana. What we know of this expedition is largely derived from Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca’s account, known as Naufragios, first published in 1542 after he and his two companions returned to the Spanish world. Rolena Adorno and Patrick Charles Pautz (1999) have issued an enface edition of the Naufragios plus a two volume discussion of the details.43 Like most accounts of the Narváez-Cabeza de Vaca expedition, their study concentrates on the Texas into Mexico part of the story, by far the longer part of the history and the most difficult to interpret. Curiously, they argue that the expedition’s pilots at least initially thought that they had landed on the Mexican coast rather than the Florida coast. For a shorter account of just the Florida portion of the expedition’s odyssey, see Paul E. Hoffman, “Narváez and Cabeza de Vaca in Florida,” in The Forgotten Centuries (1994).44 A recent and particularly well-written account based on the Adorno-Pautz volumes is Andrés Reséndez, A Land So Strange: The Epic Journey of Cabeza de Vaca (2007).45

News of Narváez’s misadventure and Cabeza de Vaca in person arrived in Spain just as Hernando de Soto was being persuaded to seek his fortune in La Florida, the one part of North America’s coast south of the cod fisheries of the far northeast that was still largely unexplored.

43. Rolena Adorno and Patrick Charles Pautz, Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca: His Account, His Life, and the Expedition of Pánfilo de Narváez 3 vols. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999). Volume 1 is the text; Volume 2 is commentary, and Volume 3 considers the creation, reception and historical context of the Relación. I find it hardly credible that pilots, even the least experienced, would mistake a North-South coast (Florida) approached from the west for a coast (Mexico) that would have to be approached from the east.


De Soto was fresh from the conquest of Peru but disappointed in his hope of obtaining a separate government somewhere on the west coast of South America or possibly in Central America. A permit to explore North America and then designate 200 leagues (just over 600 miles) of coast in La Florida for such a government was all that he could obtain. Slyly telling some of his relatives that they would be well advised to join De Soto, Cabeza encouraged dreams of riches, dreams in part based on knowledge of Ayllón’s tales of a populous kingdom in the interior of what we know as the Carolinas where “terrestrial gems” and freshwater pearls could be found. Accordingly, De Soto’s contract provided that he had three years to explore as far west as the limits of New Spain before selecting the 200 leagues of coast that would define his new government. The limit of New Spain apparently had recently been set at the Río del Espíritu Santo on the northern Gulf Coast to avoid the problem that Garay had caused with Cortés, and that Narváez would have created had he lived. In both instances the vagueness of geographic knowledge resulted in grants that allowed them to attempt to move in on Hernán Cortés’ conquest via Amichel. 46 In any case, De Soto’s contract consolidated Ayllón’s and Narváez’s contracts and extended the area of exploration to at least 40 degrees north.

Hernando De Soto has sometimes been portrayed as a romantic, tragic hero largely because of how Garcilaso de la Vega, La Florida del Inca (1605; 1993) 47 portrayed his epic journey across

46. This use of the Río del Espíritu Santo as the boundary for Mexico-La Florida is found in Alonso de Chaves, Espeso de Navigantes, Libro IV, (ca. 1537), 119; and Rangel and Viedma, in Lawrence A. Clayton, Vernon James Knight, Jr., and Edward C. Moore eds., The DeSoto Chronicles; The Expedition of Hernando de Soto to North America in 1539-1543 (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1993), 1:228, 231 (Viedma), 1:281 (Ranjel). Amichel was the name of the Native American area along the Pánuco River, whose valley provided a route into Mexico’s central highlands and thus to what had been the Mexica-Azteca empire.

47. Garcilaso de la Vega, El Inca, La Florida, trans. Charmion Shelby, ed. David Bost, with footnotes by Vernon James Knight, Jr., vol. 2, of Clayton, Knight, and Moore, The DeSoto Chronicles. This edition includes Frances G. Crowley’s biography and study of the various editions, political purposes, and modern opinions of La Florida as well as the first English translation of the “Genealogy of Garci Pérez de Vargas,” a chapter that once was part of La Florida. Another commonly used translation is Garcilaso de la Vega, The Florida of the Inca, ed. and trans. by John Grier Varner and Jeannette Johnson Varner (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1951). Sylvia L. Hilton edited the most recent Spanish edition, La Florida del Inca, ed. Sylvia L. Hilton (Madrid: Historia 16, 1986; also as Madrid: Fundacion Universitaria Española, 1982).
the South and his death on the shores of the Mississippi River and because of the desire of Southerners to find an early example of the chivalrous knight to reinforce their own nostalgic romanticism. He was in fact a brutal man.

DeSoto's journey has long been recognized as providing a glimpse of Native American life at or just past the end of the Mississippian period (ca.900-1450 CE) and before old world diseases began to decimate populations whose size is still disputed (see below). John R. Swanton's 1939 account of the expedition (Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission) not only synthesized and sifted the four Spanish accounts of the expedition but also used local tradition and such archaeological evidence as then was available to lay out the expedition's route as part of the celebration of its 400th anniversary. World War II and other interests put the questions of the route and the veracity and intertextuality of the various sources on hold, although archaeological work continued to be done on Native American sites.

The approach of the 450th anniversary of the expedition in 1989-93 produced an outpouring of scholarship and a renewal of the controversies over the route, which state tourism officials and highway departments were eager to mark with signs. Collectively, the bibliographies of the works that follow touch on the voluminous article and “grey literature" scholarship that historians and archaeologists have produced before, during and since the 450th observance.


archaeological studies since 1939. The Alabama De Soto Commission then organized the production of the two volume *The De Soto Chronicles* (1993) which largely supersedes Jerald T. Milanich’s *The Hernando de Soto Expedition* (1991). This key work brought together in annotated English translation the four Spanish accounts of the expedition, a previously unpublished fragment of a fifth account, Swanton’s “Parallel Itinerary of the Expedition,” various documents relating to De Soto, two short biographies reflecting different understandings of the man, and updated bibliographies. In a related effort focused initially on Arkansas but in a second event expanded more generally to the De Soto expedition, the University Museum of the University of Arkansas sponsored two conferences (1988, 1990), whose principal papers were published in 1993 as Gloria A. Young and Michael P. Hoffman, eds., *The Expedition of Hernando de Soto West of the Mississippi, 1541-1543* (1993). Notable among the papers is George L. Langford’s essay (173-191) suggesting that the Spanish accounts of the expedition, especially Garcilaso’s, contain extended sections that have the marks of folk tales, in this case stories told and retold around the expedition’s campfires long before they were written down. Those tales, he suggests, are what “gives Garcilaso’s work the novelistic quality which has led some scholars to conclude that *La Florida del Inca* is a fictional work by a literary scholar” (189). Rather, it should be viewed as a work of folk lore. Also notable is David Henige’s questioning of the way the documentary sources were being used to reconstruct the route (155-172) and Charles Hudson and his students’ reply (255-269). In Spain, the Junta and Universidad de Extremadura organized a congress of Spanish, Peruvian and North American scholars in 1991 to consider various aspects of De Soto’s life in addition to his expedition in La Florida and to visit places associated with him in that seldom visited part of Spain (*Actas, 1993*). Another conference that same year produced


52. *Actas del Congreso Hernando de Soto y su tiempo* (Badajoz: Junta de Extremadura, 1993).
a volume of essays that explored possible intertextuality among the narrative accounts, neglected topics connected with the expedition such as maps and way finding, the effects of the expedition on Native American societies, and the place of the expedition in selected aspects of Euro-American history (Patricia Galloway ed., The Hernando de Soto Expedition, 1997). Separately, José Ignacio Avellaneda published a prosopographical study of the survivors of the expedition (Los sobrevivientes de la Florida: The Survivors of the De Soto Expedition, 1990), probably the only such study for these early exploring ventures that will be possible because participant lists are not known to exist for any of the others. And recently Philip Levy included De Soto’s wanderings (and Narváez’s and Francisco Vázquez de Coronado’s) in Fellow Travelers: Indians and Europeans Contesting the Early American Trail (2007) as an example of a less successful European strategy for utilizing Native American knowledge when exploring.

The discovery of Spanish artifacts of the right time period at the Governor Martin site in Tallahassee in 1986 eventually produced Charles R. Ewen and John H. Hann’s Hernando de Soto Among the Apalachee (1998), a study of the archaeological and documentary evidence that the site was in fact De Soto’s winter camp site in 1539. Related is Jerry Milanich and Charles Hudson’s Hernando de Soto and the Indians of Florida (1993), which mustered archaeological and documentary evidence to, among other things, explain why a Tampa Bay landing is the most likely, as well as detailed consideration of the route in Florida and its effects on Native American societies.

53. The Hernando de Soto Expedition: History, Historiography, and "Discovery" in the Southeast, ed. Patricia Galloway (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997). There are 19 essays in four sections: The Sources (primarily criticism of Garcilaso), The Expedition, The Expedition and Indian History (its place in the transition from the Mississippian to tribal societies), and The Expedition and Euro-American History (Spanish law, Fernández de Oviedo as chronicler, among other topics).

54. José Ignacio Avellaneda, Los Sobrevivientes de La Florida: The Survivors of the De Soto Expedition (Gainesville, FL: P. K. Yonge Library, 1990). The names of not more than a dozen men are known from the earlier expeditions. Menéndez’s expedition may offer a possibility.


As important as *The De Soto Chronicles* volumes and the growing body of archaeological and other studies are, Charles Hudson and his students' new version of the route was the key contribution to the 450th anniversary observance.\(^5^8\) Hudson subsequently published a short account of the expedition with a slightly revised map as "The Hernando de Soto Expedition, 1539-1543" (1994).\(^5^9\) Not surprisingly, Hudson's route touched off controversies in several states, notably in Alabama where Caleb Curren and others disputed the placement of Mabilia and consequently the route through that state. Paul E. Hoffman, "Hernando de Soto: A Review Essay" (2000)\(^6^0\) discusses the literature of these controversies.

Robin A. Beck and others' work on the Berry Site in North Carolina has produced a refinement of the Hudson-DePratter-Smith route to and around Joara. Beck first proposed this revision in "From Joara to Chiaha: Spanish Exploration of the Appalachian Summit Area, 1540-1568" (1997).\(^6^1\) Hudson accepted it in the second edition of his volume on the Juan Pardo Expeditions (see below).

To try to resolve the Mabilia dispute, the University of Alabama held another conference in 2006 that brought together historians, a folklorist, geographers, geologists, and archaeologists to examine what was known about Mabilia and its possible location and how to handle the available evidence. The conference concluded that the documentary sources and archaeology still did not provide a definitive answer. The papers were published in Vernon James Knight, Jr., ed., *The Search for Mabila* (2009).\(^6^2\)

In a more popular vein, David Ewing Duncan, *Hernando de Soto: a Savage Quest in the Americas* (1996) and Charles Hudson, *Knights of

---


61. Robin A. Beck, Jr., "From Joara to Chiaha: Spanish Exploration of the Appalachian Summit Area, 1540-1568" *Southeastern Archaeology* 16, no. 2 (Winter 1997), 162-69. John Worth was kind enough to call this essay to my attention.

Spain; Warriors of the Sun (1997) are solid accounts of the man and his expedition based on the scholarship just noted. Both see De Soto as less than the romantic hero of Southern legend and both pay attention to the resistance that Native Americans mounted to the expedition and the long-term consequences for them of its passing through their territories.

De Soto’s failed attempt at conquest and the rise of demands for the peaceful rather than the violent “conquest” of Native Americans throughout the Americas led to the next tragic attempt to extend Spanish influence into La Florida. Fray Luis Cancer’s failed missionary effort of 1547 on the west coast of the peninsula is adequately covered in Weddle, Spanish Sea (1985), and Quinn’s New American World (1978).

Cancer’s death and the repeated failures of Spanish expeditions seem to have confirmed a general understanding that southeastern North America was not worth further expenditures of men and treasure. However, a counter narrative first glimpsed in Oviedo’s account of the view of some survivors of the Ayllón expedition and renewed as the survivors of De Soto’s expedition gathered in Mexico, held that in fact some of the large Native American societies that De Soto’s men had seen offered possibilities for agricultural settlements, places where a few Spanish lords might exploit the labor of Native Americans for the benefit of New Spain while others searched for mineral wealth in the mountains his men had traversed. This idea fed into a variety of concerns that by 1557 had become the plan for the Luna expedition. The design called for founding a port on the Gulf Coast and then development of a road to the Atlantic coast and another port at the Point of Santa Elena via Spanish settlements at Coosa and Cofitachequi, the

---

63. David Ewing Duncan, Hernando de Soto: A Savage Quest in the Americas (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996) and Charles Hudson, Knights of Spain, Warriors of the Sun; Hernando de Soto and the South’s Ancient Chiefdoms (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997). Hudson’s book was preceded by Joyce Rockwood Hudson, Looking for DeSoto; A Search Through the South for the Spaniard’s Trail (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993), his wife’s account of their trips tracing out the route as Hudson understood it and correcting that understanding by examining the geography and archaeology of various points. The volume has a double page map of Hudson’s route (since slightly altered).

64. The standard but by no means complete account of this demand is Lewis U. Hanke, The Spanish Struggle for Justice (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949).

two places remembered among the De Soto survivors as having abundant foods and populations. The expedition was fitted out in Mexico with both private and royal resources.66

Herbert I. Priestley’s romantic Tristan de Luna: Conquistador of the Old South (1936; 1952)67 still has value although it has no notes. Its value arises from being based on Priestley’s edition of The Luna Papers (1928).68 The Luna Papers are various documents relating to the expedition, except for those in the Mexican treasury records, which detail many of the preparations and the resupply efforts that followed the loss of ships and supplies shortly after the expedition landed in Pensacola Bay. Quinn, New American World (1978), printed selections from the Priestley volumes.69 Charles Hudson, Marvin Smith, Chester B. DePratter, and Emilia Kelley’s “The Tristan de Luna expedition, 1559-1561” (1989) revisited the story with special emphasis on Coosa and whether it had become less populated in the 19 years between the De Soto and Luna visits. They concluded that it had, but Paul E. Hoffman, “Did Coosa Decline Between 1541 and 1560?” (1997) argues that that claim cannot be supported on the basis of a careful reading of the documents, which make it clear that the claim (found in some of them) was fabricated by members of the expedition who wished to abandon the project.70

John Worth and other scholars associated with the University of West Florida are currently reexamining not only the documents in Priestley’s volumes but others and the archaeological evidence that has come from two of Luna’s ships whose wrecks have been found. As yet, the results of this new scholarship have largely been

66. For discussions of the origins of Luna see Weddle, Spanish Sea, 251-284, and Hoffman, New Andalucia, 144-159.
presented as conference papers although a special number of the *Florida Anthropologist* (2009) has reported on some of that work.\(^{71}\)

Even as the Luna project was falling apart due to internal dissent fueled by shortages of supplies and disappointed hopes of an easy imposition of Spanish lords over pliant Native Americans, developments in Europe marked a new phase in Spain’s relationships with France and England, a phase that might be characterized as a “cold war” in which officially peaceful relationships were matched by unofficial, even sometimes proxy, violence in the Atlantic. Henry Folmer, *Franco-Spanish Rivalry in North America, 1524-1673* (1953), provides an overview of the French phase of this cold war. J. Leitch Wright, *Anglo-Spanish Rivalry in North America* (1971), covers the English. Both works cover more than the sixteenth century.\(^{72}\)

The first indication that Franco-Spanish peace in Europe did not mean an end to colonial rivalries and violence in the Atlantic arena was a diplomatic report of 1559 that a Scots-French expedition was being prepared to colonize the Point of Santa Elena on the Atlantic coast of North America. Francisco López de Gómara’s 1552 account of Ayllón’s expedition in his *History General de las Indias* (1954)\(^ {73}\) had identified the Point as to latitude (32 degrees North) and as the entry to Ayllón’s Chicora and its supposed riches. Alarmed, Philip II ordered that part of the Luna expedition’s manpower should move immediately to colonize the Point. Luna attempted to carry out this order but bad weather forced the ships he sent into Havana. Accordingly, when Angel de Villafañe replaced Luna in command of the expedition, he again divided the men and ships and personally set out for the Atlantic coast. Hoffman’s *New Andalucia* (1990) is perhaps the most complete account of what followed, including the failed effort of Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón, The Younger, to create a colony (1563-1565), which would probably have been on the shore of Chesapeake Bay, the home of Paquiquineo, also known as D. Luís de Velasco. Paquiquineo was an Algonquian-speaking Indian, possibly from what was later Powhatan’s confederacy, who was picked

---

71. The Florida Anthropologist 62, nos. 3-4 (September-December 2009).
up by one of the ships sent to resupply Villafañe. Later converted to Christianity while seriously ill in Mexico on his way home, D. Luis became the hope of Dominicans (1566) and then Jesuits (1570-71) who wanted to use him to secure peaceful missionary activity among the Indians of the Chesapeake (see below). He in turn sought to use their interest and that of secular Spaniards like Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, to secure passage back to his home.74

Long before D. Luis succeeded, French Huguenots made good on the threat to colonize at or near the Point of Santa Elena, although if Jean Ribault’s *The Whole and True Discouerye of Terra Florida* (1563; 1927)75 is to be credited, Charlesfort on modern Parris Island was created as a matter of necessity, not policy. That is, Ribault needed to reduce the number of men relative to his remaining supplies before continuing his voyage. Port Royal Sound was an excellent harbor close to the legendary Point of Santa Elena and thus to Chicora and its imagined riches. The Spanish expedition to search for Charlesfort is covered in Lucy L. Wenhold, trans., “Manrique de Rojas’ Report on French Settlement in Florida, 1564” (1959).76 The so-called Parreus Map of 1562 recorded Ribault’s understanding of the Georgia and South Carolina coasts.77 Chester B. DePratter, Stanley South and James Legg, “The Discovery of Charlesfort” (1996), reports the discovery of part of Charlesfort under the later Spanish Fort San Felipe.78

René de Laudonnière’s follow up voyage of 1564 and the French colony at Fort Caroline (near modern Jacksonville) are well known because of how they tie to the Spanish colony at St.

---

77. William P. Cumming, “The Parreus Map (1562) of French Florida,” *Imago Mundi* 17 (1963), 27-40. The copy was made for Spain’s ambassador in France as part of his gathering of intelligence information on the French voyages.

And not to be omitted are Stephen Lorant, ed., *The New World: The First Pictures of America* (1965) and Paul Hulton, ed., *The Work of Jacques le Moyne de Morgues* (1977). Both reproduce Le Moyne’s...
drawings as Theodore de Bry engraved them. Hulton includes discussion not only of the historical setting in which Le Moyne made his drawings but also scholarly critiques of the engravings, which reproduce a number of European tropes as well as aspects of Le Moyne and White’s images of Native Americans. That is, the DeBray engravings are not to be taken as literal representations of what Le Moyne and White drew.

The basic story of Pedro Menéndez de Avilés’ activities in La Florida has been known for some time although the larger imperial and Atlantic contexts of his life still await exhaustive study. Eugene Lyon’s *The Enterprise of Florida, 1565-1568* (1976) and his *Santa Elena: A Brief History of the Colony, 1566-1587* (1984) have replaced Woodbury Lowery, *Spanish Settlements*, volume 2 (1959), as the most reliable account of Menéndez’s activities in Florida. Lyon innovatively uses treasury, judicial and notarial records as well as traditional correspondence, narratives from the time (below) and government policy papers to consider not only what was done in the formative years of La Florida but how the “enterprise”—in a business sense—was funded. Gonzalo Solís de Merás, *Pedro Menéndez de Avilés* (1922; 1964) and Bartolomé Barrientos, *Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, Founder of Florida* (1965) are laudatory accounts of the founding of Spanish Florida written at the time. Additional biographic information on the Adelantado’s career before and during his Florida years is in Alfonso Camín, *El Adelantado de Florida, Pedro Menéndez de Avilés* (1944) and Paul E. Hoffman, *The Spanish Crown and the Defense of the Indies* (1980). Albert Manucy, *Menéndez;
Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, Captain General of the Ocean Sea (1992), is a brief biography. Ciriaco Miguel Vigil, Noticias biográficas-genealógicas de Pedro Menéndez de Avilés (1892) and Eugenio Ruidiaz y Caravia, ed., La Florida: Su Conquista y colonización por Pedro Menéndez de Avilés (1893) are compilations of documents. The letters in Ruidiaz recently were republished without some of Ruidiaz’s defective annotations as Pedro Menendez de Aviles, Cartas sobre la Florida (1555-1574) (2002). Those letters and other materials on Menéndez de Avilés also can be found in Eugene Lyon, ed., Pedro Menéndez de Avilés (1995). Karen Paar’s dissertation, “‘To Settle is to Conquer’: Spaniards, Native Americans, and the Colonization of Santa Elena in Sixteenth-Century Florida” (1999) provides another examination of the history of that town. Still to be fully utilized are the materials in the Revillagigedo Archive (parts of which were used by Vigil, Ruidiaz and Sáinz Sastre), the notarial records in the Archivo Histórico Provincial (AHP) de Asturias, and those in the AHPs of Seville and Cadiz. The Adelantado awaits a modern full-length biography.

A spin off of the colonial effort along the Atlantic coast were Juan Pardo’s expeditions into the Carolina piedmont during 1566-1568.
They are detailed in Charles Hudson, *The Juan Pardo Expeditions: Exploration of the Carolinas and Tennessee, 1566-1568* (2005). This work blends the documentary record (transcribed and translated) with Hudson’s superb knowledge of the archaeology (as of 1990) of the area that Pardo explored. The purpose of the work is to recover the ethnohistory of the area, a history that was of value for reconstructing the De Soto route, which touched on some of the same Native American towns. The *Afterward* in the revised edition incorporates new archaeological information on the location of Joara, the site of a transitory Spanish fort. A related study is Michael V. Gannon, “Sebastian Montero, Pioneer American Missionary, 1566-1572” (1965/66), which details the adventures of a secular priest who accompanied Pardo.

If the initial years of Spanish settlement in La Florida are now well understood because of Lyon’s work, the same cannot be said of the years after 1568. Many aspects of that history still await study, the more so for the years after Menéndez de Avilés’s death in 1574, and even more for the post 1586 period, when Santa Elena’s population was consolidated with St. Augustine’s and the latter was recovering from being burned by Sir Francis Drake and looted by Native Americans. Some progress has been made, at least with regard to the material culture of St. Augustine, but on the whole the last third of the sixteenth century remains almost as mysterious as the question of first encounter.

During the 1970s, The St. Augustine Restoration Foundation Inc. (SARFI) sponsored a research project to determine if it might be possible to create a living history museum for the sixteenth-century town. From that initiative came extensive archival research and at least limited archaeological work on the sixteenth-century.


part of St. Augustine and on Santa Elena and its forts. Various aspects of this work are reported in a special number on sixteenth-century St. Augustine in *Florida Anthropology* 38 (1985). Included in this volume are Kathleen Deagan’s “The Archaeology of Sixteenth-Century St. Augustine,” Albert Manucy’s, “The Physical Setting of Sixteenth-Century St. Augustine,” and several more technical reports that Deagan, herein, will discuss. Here I wish to note the historical accounts that grew from the work the Foundation sponsored although they were not created as part of its project. Hoffman, *A New Andalucia* (1990), was soon followed by Eugene Lyon, *Richer than We Thought: The Material Culture of Sixteenth-Century St. Augustine* (1992). Lyon’s book contains a brief introduction challenging the legend of an impoverished town and noting highlights of the fourteen translated documents that follow which support that challenge. These documents range from an early attempt at a comprehensive list of material culture derived from various records (a product of the SARFI project), through lists of the goods of dead members of the Sancho de Archiniega expedition (1566-68) to the personal property of various officials and of Menéndez de Avilés and his wife. Also related to the SARFI project was Lyon’s *Santa Elena* (1984) study. Related but reflecting other origins is Albert Manucy, *Sixteenth-Century St. Augustine, the People and Their Homes* (1997). While primarily concerned with housing (Manucy’s life-long study) this book also includes information on the early wooden forts and how families of three socio-economic levels might have lived. Manucy used studies of folk architecture in Spain, documents, the 1597 drawing of the city that shows a few buildings, and such archaeology as existed at the time.

96. See Michael V. Gannon, “The New Alliance of History and Archaeology in the Eastern Spanish Borderlands,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series, 49, no. 2 (April 1992), 321-334 and Deagan, this issue, for discussions of how archival and archaeological studies have enriched our understanding of sixteenth (and in Gannon, seventeenth and eighteenth) century La Florida.


In the end, economic realities killed the project of a living history museum. Two films produced from the research were shown in St. Augustine for a time, then consolidated into one and finally abandoned. The research materials gathered for the project are housed at The St. Augustine Foundation.

At the same time that the SARFI project was underway, Stanley South, Chester DePratter and others were excavating Spanish Santa Elena, adding a dimension to our understanding of the material culture of La Florida, 1566-1587, and to the story of Ribault's Charlesfort. Deagan, in this issue, further explores material culture in the region.

For the years after Menéndez de Avilés' governance, the only comprehensive accounts of the Spanish colony are Hoffman, Florida's Frontiers (2002) and Quattlebaum, The Land Called Chicora (1956). For some of the activities of Governor Pedro Menéndez Marques (the Adelantado's nephew) and the years 1570-1590, see Jeannette Thurber Connor, ed., Colonial Records of Spanish Florida (1925-30) and Amy Turner Bushnell, The King's Coffer: Proprietors of the Spanish Florida Treasury, 1565-1702 (1981). The latter traces the Menéndez Marques family as the royal treasurers and how they exploited the situado, or royal payroll, that supported St. Augustine's garrison and (in the seventeenth century) the missions.

A few studies of particular aspects of the late sixteenth century may be mentioned. Mary Ross, "French Intrusions and Indian Uprisings in Georgia and South Carolina, 1577-1580" (1923) covers the wreck of French ship Le Principe near Santa Elena and the subsequent ransoming, capture, and killing of its survivors. James G. Johnston, The Spanish Period of Georgia and South Carolina History 1566-1702 (1923), provides very brief overviews of the Menéndez Marques family's activities and the role of the situado in St. Augustine's garrison.
de Avilés period and the establishment of the Franciscan missions (1590-1606) before moving on to later centuries. Engel Sluiter, *The Florida Situado* (1985), provides the annual figures for this basic economic aspect of the colony’s history but no information on how it was exploited. The military history of St. Augustine in the late sixteenth century is covered in Verne E. Chatelain, *The Defense of Spanish Florida, 1565 to 1763* (1941). Jeannette T. Conner, “The Old Nine Wooden Forts” (1925-26) and Paul E. Hoffman, *The Spanish Crown and the Defense of the Indies* (1980). The former is mostly focused on Castillo de San Marcos and the eighteenth century walls, the second details the forts of St. Augustine prior to the construction of Castillo de San Marcos and the third considers forts, garrison and costs as part of a larger study of the Atlantic and Caribbean. Other aspects of the military history of the sixteenth century are found in Lyon, *Enterprise* (1976), and Hoffman, *Florida’s Frontiers* (2002). Spain’s involvement with the English attempts to colonize Roanoke Island will be considered shortly.

The demographic history of sixteenth-century St. Augustine has yet to be established. The Catholic church’s parish records begin only in 1595 and are incomplete until early in the seventeenth century, so the task will be one of compiling lists of persons documented as being in the town, using contemporary estimates, and inferences from other parts of the Spanish empire to prepare yet other estimates. Hoffman, *Florida’s Frontiers* (2002), has the sixteenth-century estimates.

As with many other aspects of the late sixteenth century, the founding and early history of the Spanish missions have received only spotty treatment. In part this is a function of surviving documentation, but this treatment also reflects the greater interest of historians of the Dominican and Franciscan orders in other topics, especially, for

107. See Hoffman, *Florida’s Frontiers*, 70, 75-76, for the sixteenth-century estimates that have been found so far. ca. 1600 the population was not more than 700 and may have been as low as 500, both figures including the soldiers of the garrison.
the latter, the “martyrs” of 1597 and the subsequent golden age of the Florida Missions. The only comprehensive accounts are Michael V. Gannon’s *Cross in the Sand* (1965), which surveys the history of the Catholic church in Florida from the first priests and friars who accompanied the early explorers to 1870, and Jerald T. Milanich, *Laboring in the Fields of the Lord: Spanish Missions and Southeastern Indians* (1999). Robert Matter, *Pre-Seminole Florida: Spanish Soldiers, Friars, and Indian Missions, 1513-1763*, is a compilation of documents, mostly from the seventeenth century.\(^{108}\)

Of the three orders who had missions in La Florida during the sixteenth century, the Jesuits have provided the best account, backed up with a collection of documents. Clifford M. Lewis and Albert J. Loomie, *The Spanish Jesuit Missions in Virginia, 1570-1572* (1953),\(^{109}\) provides an introduction that tells the story followed by documents from the Vatican archives as well as the Spanish ones to supply supporting detail. The Jesuits started among the Calusa\(^{110}\) and at Santa Elena, but becoming discouraged by a lack of receptiveness on the part of the latter’s Native American neighbors, eventually resolved to make one final effort on the shores of Chesapeake Bay using D. Luis de Velasco (Paquiqueño) as their agent. Velasco and his friends killed the missionaries some months after they set up their mission. Frank Marotti, Jr. used the Lewis and Loomie materials for his thesis, “Juan Baptista de Segura and the Failure of the Florida Jesuit Mission (1566-1572),” (1984).\(^{111}\)

The Dominican missions (1565-1574) are covered in Agustín Davila Padilla, *Historia de la Fundación y Discurso de la Provincia de Santiago de Mexico de la orden de Predicadores* (1596; 1955)\(^{112}\) and

---


112. Agustín Davila Padilla, *Historia de la Fundación y Discurso de la Provincia de Santiago de Mexico de la orden de Predicadores por las vidas de sus varones insignes y casos notables de Nueva España* (1596; Facsimile 3d Ed. Mexico: Editorial Academia Literaria, 1955). This work includes information on Frey Luis Cancer, the Dominicans with Luna, and various other events involving members of that order.

The Franciscan missions that began in the late 1570s and endured into the eighteenth century have generated an extensive literature that focuses on the seventeenth century and issues of cultural change, with only passing attention to the sixteenth century except for the Guale uprising of 1597 that resulted in the deaths of five of the friars. For overviews see Jerald T. Milanich, “Franciscan Missions and the Native Peoples in Spanish Florida” (1994),\(^{114}\) and Hoffman, *Florida’s Frontiers* (2002). John Tate Lanning, *The Spanish Missions of Georgia* (1935)\(^{115}\) used to be the standard account but the works to be noted have revised and expanded it, as has the work of the American Museum of Natural History’s archaeological project at St. Catherin’s Island and John E. Worth (both to be discussed in the special issue for the seventeenth century).

Recent scholarship about the sixteenth-century Spanish-Indian relationship as it was structured around missions is usually found in studies that take the entire mission period as their topics. An exception is Eugene Lyon, “The Failure of the Guale and Orista Mission, 1572-1575,” (1992)\(^{116}\) which covers the first Franciscan attempt. More typical is Grant D. Jones, “The Ethnohistory of the Guale Coast Through 1684” (1978),\(^{117}\) which is primarily about the seventeenth century but has material on the sixteenth. Amy Turner Bushnell, *Situado and Sabana: Spain’s Support System for the Presidio and Mission Provinces of Florida* (1994),\(^{118}\) which also focuses primarily on


the seventeenth century, offers important information about how the missions were supported. Jones and Bushnell’s works were written in support of the St. Catherine’s Island project, but she does not neglect the Timucuan (and Aplachee) missions which are the subjects of John H. Hann in *A History of the Timucua Indians and Missions* (1996), a narrative, diachronic approach that contrasts with John E. Worth’s structuralist, synchronic analysis in *Timucuan Chiefdoms of Spanish Florida* (1998). Worth’s study, more so than Hann’s, focuses on the seventeenth century Spanish-Timucuan relationship. A standard but by no means entirely reliable account of the early Franciscan missions is Luis Jerónimo de Oré, *The Martyrs of Florida* (1936), which is an abbreviated version of his *Relación historica de la Florida escrita en el siglo XVII* (1931-33). A work of propaganda as well as an account of his inspection of the missions in the early seventeenth century, Oré’s account must be used with caution.

The Guale Indians’ uprising of 1597, which figures in Lanning, Oré and most other accounts of the Franciscan missions is covered in J. Michael Francis and Kathleen M. Kole, *Murder and Martyrdom in Spanish Florida; Don Juan and the Guale Uprising of 1597* (2011). This work discusses previous accounts and provides translations of sixteen key documents describing the incident along with commentary on them. These materials hint at political struggles within Guale society of which the Spaniards were largely ignorant. Unfortunately, Francis and Kole did not find the inquiry made in the summer of 1599 after the Crown (November 9, 1598) ordered the principal leaders of the revolt (the Crown presumed there were principal leaders) brought to justice. This inquiry established the “guilt” of the cacique don Juan (“Juanillo”) and his uncle don

---


Francisco of Tolomato and led to their eventual killing by other Guale (op. cit., 138).\textsuperscript{122}

A prologue and sequel to the Guale uprising of 1597 was the prolonged Spanish argument about whether to even continue the Florida missions or move the center of the colony to Guale territory to support the restored missions. Charles W. Arnade, \textit{Florida on Trial, 1593-1602} (1959),\textsuperscript{123} covers most aspects of this argument, but see also Hoffman, \textit{Florida's Frontiers} (2002). The historiographic essay in the special issue of the \textit{Quarterly} for the seventeenth century will guide the reader to other studies of the Franciscan missions during that century.

In a class by itself is Hernando de Escalante Fontaneda's account of his captivity among the Calusa. Primarily an account of their customs, it also discusses the fates of Spaniards shipwrecked in southern Florida and the early missions under Menéndez de Avilés.\textsuperscript{124} Like many such accounts, it has to be used with caution.

Finally, the last notable aspects of La Florida's sixteenth-century history are the English attempts to found a colony on Roanoke Island in 1585-87 and the Spanish response. Paul E. Hoffman, \textit{Spain and the Roanoke Voyages} (1987),\textsuperscript{125} provides a detailed account of how the Spaniards learned about Roanoke and went looking for it. Louis D. Scisco, "Voyage of Vicente Gonzalez in 1588" (1947),\textsuperscript{126} is a briefer

\textsuperscript{122} Dr. Francis recently told me he believes that the interrogation of the seven Indians in July 1598 was the basis for Governor Méndez de Canzo's finding that Juanillo and his uncle were the guilty parties. The study's "Timeline" shows that the Governor did not report that to Philip III until February 1600 (7). The document cited, an agreement between the Governor and the Cacique of Aaso, dated November 27, 1601, states that the conclusion of guilt was reached "[i]n investigations that followed the arrival of this order..." [of November 9, 1598]. A rewriting of history in 1601 is possible but the motive for it is not evident.

\textsuperscript{123} Charles W. Arnade, \textit{Florida on Trial, 1593-1602} (Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press, 1959).


\textsuperscript{125} Paul E. Hoffman, \textit{Spain and the Roanoke Voyages} (Raleigh: America's Four Hundredth Anniversary Committee, North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, 1987).

\textsuperscript{126} Louis D. Scisco, "Voyage of Vicente Gonzalez in 1588," \textit{Maryland Historical Magazine} 42 (1947), 95-100.
account of the main Spanish effort to find the colony. Wright, *Anglo-Spanish Rivalry* (1971) also covers this subject. David B. Quinn has published extensively on these early English efforts in *The Roanoke Voyages, 1584-1590* (1955), documents in *New American World* (1978), and *Set Fair for Roanoke: Voyages and Colonies, 1584-1606* (1985). Other documents, largely from the Spanish archives, are in Irene A. Wright, ed., *Further English Voyages to Spanish America, 1583-1594* (1951). Needless to say, there is a large literature on the English ventures and many theories about what happened to the “Lost Colony.” Most of that material is tangential to the topic of this essay.

This by no means exhaustive survey of the historiography on sixteenth-century La Florida may give the impression that for some topics there is little still to be done. But as I have suggested here and there in this essay, some aspects of the story are still controversial and almost all aspects of these events are in need of additional research in neglected sources such as fiscal, notarial and judicial records in Spain (and possibly Cuba and even Mexico), retelling with new perspectives, and more careful reading of the known sources. Jonathan DeCoster’s essay in this issue is an example of the insights that a close, careful reading of familiar sources can produce.

Among the topics crying out for additional research is the financing of the various expeditions of exploration and attempted colonization. Lyon, *Richer Than We Thought* (2006), is perhaps the most complete account for any of them. Hoffman, *New Andalucia* (1990), provides some information drawn from the Seville notaries’ archives on the two Lucas Vázquez de Ayllóns. José Diaz-Hernández, *Expedición del Adelantado Hernando de Soto a la Florida* (1938), provides tantalizing glimpses of what may still

130. An example of how profitable this can be is Francis and Kole, *Murder and Martyrdom* (2011).
131. José Diaz-Hernández, *Expedición del Adelantado Hernando de Soto a la Florida: Notas y documentos relativos a su organización* (Sevilla: Instituto Hispano-Cubano de Historia de America, 1938). He used Office 10 and found material on two ships and 653 ducats worth of ship biscuit, for a total recorded expenditure of 2,622 ducats, clearly but a fraction of what De Soto and others spent to prepare his expedition.
await discovery in the Seville notarial records on that expedition. He used only one of the twenty-four notarial offices active in that city. The Narváez expedition's fitting at Seville is totally unexplored from this perspective. The notarial records of Cadiz also should be examined for the fitting of these expeditions; Lyon has shown that they have materials for Menéndez de Avilés's enterprise, and likely do for the other expeditions of exploration. A few additional records for Menéndez de Avilés's enterprise may also be in the notarial records in Asturias, as previously suggested. And as noted, the Luna expedition's government funding is contained in Mexican treasury accounts that are in the Archive of the Indies and that have begun to be used by the University of West Florida team. Archives in Mexico have not been examined for what they might reveal about this expedition.

A related subject for the colonial period as such (after 1565), are the economic realities of Spanish Florida. Eugene Lyon's works, both The Enterprise of Florida (1976) and Richer than We Knew (2000), point the way by exploiting judicial as well as accounting records. Sluiter's Florida's Situado (1985) offers a base line for the colony's primary economic input, but does not explore the mechanisms that were developed to translate that funding into economic life. Paul E. Hoffman, The Spanish Crown and the Defense of the Indies (1980), shows how large a share (ca. 20%) of the Crown's 1565-1586 defense spending on its Atlantic empire was taken by Florida, but explores only a few of the implications. All three of these authors draw from the fiscal records (Contratación and Contaduría) in the Archive of the Indies, records by no means fully exploited. The fragmentary notarial records in Havana (they begin ca. 1575) also offer possibilities, and the same may be true for those of the Canary Islands, Asturias, Mexico City, Veracruz and even Madrid. But a caution to anyone not familiar with notarial records: the "yield" from notarial records can be very slender (if important for some stories) compared to the time and resources expended in studying them.133

---

133. I spent most post-siesta afternoons in the fall of 1980 digging through the notarial archive in Seville for materials on Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón the Younger. The results appear as 2 sentences on page 191, a paragraph on page 195, and six paragraphs, pages 196-98 of A New Andalucía (1990). The same amount of work in the Archive of the Indies (AGI) might have yielded at least a chapter's worth of material. The AGI was not open in the afternoon that fall.
Another topic still imperfectly explored is the interaction of Europeans and Native Americans, although that topic has come into better focus in the last generation thanks largely to the work of anthropologists such as Jerald Milanich, John Hann’s numerous volumes, and a more careful reading of the Spanish records (see above). Much of that work, however, focuses on the better documented mission period of the seventeenth century. Levy’s study of Native American and Spanish interactions (Levy, *Fellow Travelers*, 2007) is an example of new approaches to Native American-European interactions.

One area of Euro-Native American encounter scholarship to which historians have contributed is demography. Anthropologist Henry Dobyns’ *Their Numbers Became Thinned* (1983) famously offered a “high count” estimate for Florida of 992,000 Native Americans at first encounter in the 1560s based on a variety of approaches for estimating from what little data is in the documents and on the notion of “virgin soil epidemics” sweeping out of Mexico and destroying up to 90% of North America’s populations before the Spaniards and (later) English got a good look at them. Many students of the subject propose much smaller numbers for the contact population of La Florida and point to the documented epidemics of the early seventeenth century as a period of depopulation from numbers that ran, for the peninsula, in the 100,000-150,000 range, at most. Milanich, *Florida Indians and the Invasion from Europe* (1995), suggests 350,000 at contact.

The social history of Spanish Florida is largely unexplored even though there are rich methods and theories that could be brought to bear to flesh out the odd bits of information in the documentary record. Lyon’s *Santa Elena* (1984) picked up some of the status politics of that place. Kathleen Deagan, “The Archaeology
of Sixteenth-Century St. Augustine” (1985), is an example of how the fragmentary record of the sixteenth century can be read using better attested social information from later periods, in this instance, about the roles of women and material status markers (mostly ceramics). Deagan’s essay in this issue further explores what archaeology can contribute to understanding social history.

Jane Landers, *Black Society in Spanish Florida* (1999), notes a few references to persons of African descent in the sixteenth-century colony. Source limitations may restrict what more could be done about that ethnic group. Analysis of the regional origins of the colony’s Spanish settlers has not been done nor has that topic’s possible cultural and social implications been explored.

Other possible new perspectives are Atlantic and Imperial. Amy Turner Bushnell has written essays placing La Florida in larger Spanish imperial and world systems frameworks but far more needs to be done to understand it in not only those contexts but also as part of the developing Atlantic System(s) with its movements of peoples, products, and ideas among the four continents of the Atlantic World.

Discourse analysis is another new perspective. Daniel S. Murphree, *Constructing Floridians; Natives and Europeans in the Colonial Floridas, 1513-1783* (2006), looks at the discourses of how Europeans came to blame Native Americans, rather than the land, for the formers’ failures while portraying the land as having a healthy environment

---


with rich economic possibilities. Murphree’s exploration of these discourses may not satisfy all readers but it is a bold attempt to move consideration of La Florida’s history beyond the retelling of familiar stories of great men and their deeds. John McGrath’s essay in this issue of the Quarterly also examines aspects of the discourse that Europeans developed to talk about sixteenth-century La Florida.

My own effort to bring ecology to bear (Florida’s Frontiers, 2002) is a more modest effort in the same direction: expanding context as a way of improving understanding. Related is Timothy Silver, A New Face on the Countryside: Indians, Colonists, and Slaves in South Atlantic Forests, 1500-1800 (1990). Silver used mostly English sources from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries but his observations are suggestive for La Florida.

Finally, as Kathleen Deagan shows in the essay that follows, archaeology and anthropology are adding information and perspectives that have eluded historians following the traditional story and using traditional sources.

In sum, the quadricentennial of Florida’s settlement observed in 1965 was followed by a generation of new scholarship on Florida’s colonial era. As a result we now know much more about the early explorations and the first years of settlement. As future issues of this journal will show, we also know more about the seventeenth century missions and aspects of the British and second Spanish periods. Yet the mystery remains as to when Europeans first encountered peninsular Florida, much less the rest of southeastern North America (La Florida). Equally unknown are many details of the social, economic, demographic, and even military history of the colony after 1565 and how it fits into the larger Spanish empire (measured, for example, by revenues expended on its garrisons and missions), the developing Atlantic World of competing empires and

143. The P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History at the University of Florida has microfilm and other photocopies of most of the sixteenth-century governmental documents found in the Archive of the Indies (AGI) at Seville, especially the Santo Domingo section. The Contaduría treasury records for La Florida, which were damaged in a fire in the 1920s, are reported to be currently unavailable to researchers at the AGI due to their fragile condition. They contain materials that can be used not only for economic but also demographic and even social history. The sixteenth-century Contaduría and relevant Justicia and Contratación files were microfilmed for the SARFI project. The films are on deposit at the St. Augustine Foundation.
trans-imperial economic, demographic and ideological exchanges, and, ultimately, into the history of the United States. Many of these matters appear to be knowable even given the limitations of existing documentary and archaeological sources. Perhaps the observance of the quincentennial of Juan Ponce de León’s encounter with La Florida will lead a new generation of scholars to look again at a story at once familiar and still very much unknown.
The Historical Archaeology of Sixteenth-Century La Florida

by Kathleen A. Deagan

Historical archaeology—also known as text-aided archaeology—is the study of the past through the integration of material remains, stratigraphic contexts, and written documents. The use of written documents provides the time frame of historical archaeological research in La Florida—that is, from the date of the arrival of Europeans (ca. 1513) and the written accounts they left. In the same way, the very notion of "La Florida"—a completely European-imposed geographical idea—also assumes a post-1513 chronology, and a spatial boundary that would have been quite alien to the indigenous peoples who lived there.

With that understanding, this essay is intended to survey and assess the historical archaeology of Native American and Spanish La Florida during the sixteenth century, with an emphasis on research that has added to, rather than simply confirmed, the documentary record. The Spanish geographic idea of La Florida during that century included a region extending northward from the Florida Keys to an ill-defined point north of the Chesapeake Bay and westward from the Atlantic Ocean to at least the Mississippi River. The European presence in this region during the sixteenth century, however, was essentially restricted to settlement attempts along the coasts and intermittent explorations into the interior. Consequently, historical archaeological research on the sixteenth century has been largely restricted to those areas.

Kathleen A. Deagan is Distinguished Research Curator Emerita at the Florida Museum of Natural History, a leading archeologist in the Spanish Colonial period, and the author of ten books.
No synthetic archaeological studies of sixteenth-century La Florida in the tradition established by documentary historians (see Hoffman, this volume) have been published. Possibly the most comprehensive overviews of the topic are Charles Ewen’s *The Archaeology of Spanish Colonialism in the Southeastern United States and the Caribbean* (1990), and the 1989 set of essays in *Columbian Consequences Volume 2: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands East* (1989). Both volumes are in series published in observance of the 1992 Columbian Quincentenary, an event that stimulated a number of very active historical-archaeological research programs in the region. However, historical archaeological study of La Florida began well before 1992.

**Early archaeological work**

During its early years, historical archaeology in La Florida was largely restricted to peninsular Florida, and did not begin with an emphasis on the European presence. The historical archaeology of the region instead began with a focus on Native American sites occupied during the post-1513 period. In 1945, John W. Griffin (the first professional archaeologist to work in peninsular Florida) proposed an agenda for historical archaeology that called for a closer collaboration between historians and archaeologists in understanding the location, dates, and societies of Native American sites during the historic period. Hale G. Smith’s publication of *The European and the Indian* (1956) followed this agenda, compiling information on 23 Native American sites in Florida attributable to the sixteenth century. This was an important cultural catalogue; however most of the sites were burial mounds containing European materials, and many were excavated in the late nineteenth century by such pre-professional

1. Charles Ewen’s *The Archaeology of Spanish Colonialism in the Southeastern United States and the Caribbean*. Society for Historical Archaeology Guides to the Archaeological Literature of the Immigrant Experience in America, Number 1 (Gainesville, FL: Society for Historical Archaeology, 1990).
archaeologists as C.B. Moore and Frank Cushing. Their work inspired later professional archaeological interest, but simultaneously inhibited the ability of professional archaeologists to study or fully understand the sites, largely owing to the limitations of nineteenth century excavation and recording techniques.4

Exploration

The multiple Spanish efforts to explore and conquer La Florida during the first half of the sixteenth century are well documented through historical analyses of primary texts.5 Archaeological research has been focused principally on tracking the routes of exploratory expeditions through the Southeastern United States (particularly that of Hernando de Soto) and their impacts on the indigenous people of the region. For example, during the years preceding the Columbian Quincentenary, researchers from throughout the Southeastern United States embarked on intensive programs to identify the route of Hernando de Soto’s expedition of 1539-1543, which at least initially involved some 600 people, 220 horses, and a herd of pigs.6


To date, only a single archaeological site has been verified as a location at which De Soto and his expedition members were actually present. The Governor Martin site in Tallahassee, almost within sight of the State Capitol, is identified as the expedition's encampment at the Apalachee town of Anhaica in the winter of 1539-1540. Over the five months of bivouac in Apalachee, the Spaniards seized and occupied the Apalachee town, raided food supplies, and took large numbers of Apalachee as slaves. Excavations at the site by Calvin Jones and Charles Ewen revealed that the soldiers occupied some existing Apalachee structures and built others themselves. Artifact remains included early sixteenth-century Spanish coins, chain mail fragments, crossbow bolt heads, glass beads and pig remains from the swine introduced to North America by De Soto.

A second site occupied by the Desoto expeditionary forces may have been found near Citra, Florida, on the southern edge of the Orange Lake wetland. Artifacts similar to those from the Martin site have been recovered, and study is ongoing. If the newly discovered site is in fact an encampment, it provides a second important reference point for understanding the route and impact of the De Soto expedition.

Although there is some consensus among archaeologists on the general path of the De Soto expedition, debates over the details of the route remain. Other than at the few places occupied for extensive periods of time, the nomadic expedition left only ephemeral traces in the archaeological record. Archaeologists have traditionally approached this problem by a complex process of identifying sites that contain certain artifacts dating to the early sixteenth century (principally glass beads and brass bells);[7]

9. See Hoffman, this volume, for the Mabilia controversy.
and correlating these sites with documentary descriptions and geographical features. This can be problematical when the movement of such exotic goods throughout Native American networks is considered. Mark Allender, for example, argues that in peninsular Florida nearly all of the glass beads and other items used to identify sites along the proposed De Soto routes could be equally accounted for by Spanish shipwreck remains salvaged by native people. That is, Native American trade networks, rather than the presence of Spanish explorers, may more directly account for the distribution of these artifacts.

The Tatham mound in Citrus County, Florida, is perhaps the best-documented Native American site associated with the De Soto expedition. It lies along the early segments of the expeditionary routes of both Pánfilo de Narváez and De Soto. Excavated in 1985 and 1986, the mound produced a wealth of archaeological information including the skeletal remains of 339 post-contact individuals, along with 150 European glass beads, 298 metal beads and a number of metal artifacts (made by Native Americans using introduced or salvaged European metals). Two disarticulated bones showed trauma thought to be caused by metal (therefore European) edged weapons, underscoring the violent nature of the expedition. The site also contained a mass burial of some 77 people, interpreted as potentially indicating the remains of epidemic victims.

The question of introduced European disease and its impact on Native American demography is one of the central,


12. Much of the work is reported and summarized by Dale Hutchinson, Tatham Mound and the Bioarchaeology of European Contact: Disease and Depopulation in Central Gulf Coast Florida (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2006); Jeffery Mitchem, “Redefining Safety Harbor: Late Prehistoric/Protohistoric Archaeology in West Peninsular Florida.” (PhD. diss., University of Florida, 1989); Mitchem, “Artifacts of exploration.”

if unresolved, issues in the archaeology and ethnohistory of the pre-settlement contact period. The notion that European disease epidemics in La Florida initiated a chain of disruptions and depopulations shortly after, or perhaps even before, the arrival of Europeans (through material/animal vectors) has been widely influential in thinking about the pre-colonial contact period.14 Other researchers contend that epidemic disease was just one component of a complex and lengthy process of colonialism that led to cultural changes and population loss that varied considerably in intensity from location to location.15 Some suggest that indigenous processes of social change and environmental stress began in many areas before Europeans arrived, rendering populations more vulnerable to the effects of disease when it infected them.16 Archaeology’s substantive contributions to the epidemic debate have been largely unrealized owing to a lack of consensus on what comprises evidence of epidemic disease in the archaeological record17 as well as the inherent difficulties


17. This and other archeological issues are considered by Dale Hutchinson and Jeffrey Mitchem in “Correlates of contact: Epidemic disease in archaeological context,” *Historical Archaeology* 35, no. 2 (2001): 58-72.
in not only critically assessing documentary accounts, but also articulating them with archaeological evidence.18

Relatively minimal archaeological attention in La Florida has been paid to the routes and consequences of Spanish explorers other than De Soto. A single archaeological site in the Florida Panhandle, located in the St. Marks Wildlife Refuge south of Tallahassee, is thought to have been associated with the 1528 expedition of Pánfilo de Narvaéz.19 Given that only 11 years elapsed between the Narvaéz and De Soto entradas, it is extremely difficult to distinguish artifacts that may have been introduced by the former from those introduced by the latter expedition. There is some suggestion, however, that XRAY Fluorescence analysis of glass beads may hold the potential for distinguishing individual entradas by the chemical compositions of glass trade beads. Individual batches of beads can have distinctive dyes and glass "formulas," providing a distinctive chemical signature.20

Archaeologists have been somewhat more successful at tracing the 1566-1568 expeditions of Juan Pardo into the interior of La Florida. Pardo was acting on instructions from Adelantado Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, who had recently established settlements at St. Augustine, Florida (1565) and Santa Elena, South Carolina (1566, at what is now Parris Island, South Carolina). Between December of 1566 and March of 1568, Pardo led two expeditions into the region that is today the Carolinas and Tennessee. His objectives were to explore the interior, gain the submission of the region’s Native American population, and find a route from the Atlantic coast to

---

18. Questions of critical analysis and archaeological articulation are usefully explored by Patricia Galloway in her introduction to The Hernando de Soto Expedition, and Rebecca Saunders, “Seasonality, Sedentism, Subsistence, and Disease in the Protohistoric: Archaeological versus Ethnohistoric Data along the Lower Atlantic Coast,” in Between Contacts and Colonies, ed. Cameron Wessen and Mark Rees (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002), 32-48.
the silver mines at Zacatecas, Mexico. 21 The expedition built several small forts along the route, including Fort San Juan in the native town of Joara, which was a major Catawba Indian political center during the sixteenth century. It was also a settlement that had been visited by the DeSoto expedition some 25 years earlier. Pardo left a contingent of 30 soldiers at the fort as the expedition continued onward, but learned some 18 months later that the fort and Spanish encampment had been burned and destroyed by the Indians.

The remains of Fort San Juan were discovered in 1986 at the Berry site near Morganton, North Carolina, and have been excavated intermittently since then. 22 Archaeologists have uncovered four large, rectangular, burned, and apparently related structures. The buildings were constructed using both Native American and European elements including nail fasteners and sill beams notched for uprights using metal tools. The European artifacts from the site are similar to those from the De Soto-related Martin site in Tallahassee, including chain mail, nails, lacing tips, and storage jar fragments, items not normally associated with trade or salvage. The physical identification of Fort San Juan at Joara has provided a reference point for both the De Soto and Pardo expeditions, which in turn has helped to refine the understanding of these exploratory routes through the Native American landscape of La Florida. 23


Failed Settlements

European attempts to establish colonies in La Florida began even before the first Spanish *entradas* intended to explore and control the region. These included Ponce de León’s immediately aborted colony in 1521, generally thought to have been at Charlotte Harbor, and San Miguel del Gualdape, Lucas Vásquez de Alfonso’s ambitious colonization effort on the southern Atlantic coast of La Florida in 1526. Although neither site has been located by archaeologists, a cogent research design for the discovery of San Miguel del Gualdape has been developed and awaits full implementation.24

Archeologists have, however, succeeded in finding traces of three slightly later failed colonial efforts: Tristan de Luna’s attempt in 1559-61 to establish a colony at what is today Pensacola; the French Huguenot settlement of Charlesfort on Parris Island, South Carolina (1562-1563); and a camp of some of the survivors of Jean Ribault’s reinforcement of French Fort Caroline (1565). Fort Caroline itself has eluded archaeological discovery.25

In 1559, Tristan de Luna mounted the most impressive colonization venture until that time in La Florida. With 1,500 colonists and 11 ships, Luna planned to establish a colony at Pensacola Bay (Ochuse) on the Gulf of Mexico.26 Just a month after arriving at Pensacola Bay, and before food and other supplies could be unloaded, all but three of the ships were destroyed in a hurricane. The colonists were forced to withdraw to a Native American town on the Alabama River, and a contingent of soldiers was sent on an exploratory expedition into the Appalachian summit of north Georgia (that is, to Coosa) in search of food.27 The colony was abandoned in 1561. For the historiography see Hoffman, this volume.

In 1992 and 2006 archaeologists with the Florida Department of State and the University of West Florida discovered the remains

of two of the wrecked Luna vessels near Emmanuel Point in Pensacola Bay. Their excavation and study has yielded a wealth of new information about ship construction, material culture, and shipboard life in the mid-sixteenth century.28

Excavations also recovered insect, plant, and animal remains dating to the Luna expedition on the ships. The presence of pre-Columbian-style obsidian blades and Aztec pottery are intriguing, suggesting the continued use of the objects by native Mesoamerican people on the expedition, or the adoption of their materials by the Spaniards.

Archaeologists Chester DePratter and Stanley South have identified the site of Charlesfort in the context of their ongoing research at the Spanish town of Santa Elena (today the Parris Island Marine Base golf course near Beaufort, South Carolina). Archaeological evidence indicates that the Spaniards who established the town of Santa Elena in 1566 built their own Fort San Felipe on the footprint of the earlier French fort, which was apparently still in evidence at that time. French and Spanish artifacts have been recovered from the fort’s interior.29

A second French expedition in 1564 led by René de Laudonnière established Fort Caroline at the mouth of the St. Johns River near what is today Mayport.30 The following year, Spaniards under Pedro Menéndez de Avilés routed the French and won the fort, renaming it Fort San Mateo. Several hundred Frenchmen escaped with Jean Ribault, who had come to Fort Caroline with relief supplies for the settlers, arriving in Florida almost simultaneously with Menéndez.


The contingent was shipwrecked before it reached safety, however, and several hundred Frenchmen were ultimately executed at Matanzas inlet on Menéndez's orders. Others, who were stranded near Cape Canaveral, were picked up and imprisoned, to die of hunger along with many of their Spanish captors.  

Despite repeated archaeological survey and test programs to locate the site of French Fort Caroline, no physical evidence of that settlement has yet been found. This is certainly in large part owing to the dramatic changes in coastal and estuarine morphology and modern development that have occurred over the last four centuries, and particularly during the past century.

A site thought to have been occupied by some of the shipwrecked survivors of the Fort Caroline reinforcement has been located in the Cape Canaveral National Seashore (the Armstrong site). Sixteenth-century French coins, iron tools and nails, and metal objects reworked using European metallurgy techniques suggest that the shipwrecked Frenchmen may have made their encampment there before being found by Menéndez a few months later.

Colonization
St. Augustine, 1565-1572

Pedro Menéndez de Avilés founded the first enduring European settlement in La Florida in 1565 at St. Augustine. The 800 soldiers, sailors, and civilians established themselves at a Timucua Indian
town governed by a cacique named Seloy, principally because of its coastal proximity to the French establishment at Fort Caroline. Once the French were defeated and removed, their fort was renamed San Mateo, and 250 Spanish soldiers were garrisoned there. The remaining Spanish colonists under Menéndez built their own fortified encampment at St. Augustine. Within a few months, Menéndez had placed a second small garrison near the mouth of the Indian River, and in May of 1566 he established a second town at Santa Elena, located on what is now Parris Island, South Carolina (discussed below). This served as the capital of La Florida until 1577, while St. Augustine remained a small military garrison.34

Even before establishing Santa Elena, relations between the Spaniards and the Timucua at St. Augustine deteriorated. In April of 1566, just eight months after they had arrived, the garrisons at both San Mateo and St. Augustine were in rebellion, and Timucua hostilities had escalated. The mutinies were quelled, but the resistance of the Timucua to Spanish presence in St. Augustine led Menéndez to relocate his settlement in May of 1566. The town and fort were rebuilt on what is today Anastasia Island on the east side of Matanzas Bay, and was reinforced by a 1,500 person fleet arriving in May of 1566.35

In 1572 the town and fort were moved from Anastasia Island to its present location, partly because of the disastrous erosion of the island site, and partly because the Timucua in the immediate vicinity of St. Augustine were largely pacified.36 Although no trace of the second town site on Anastasia Island has as yet been found, there have been long-term ongoing programs of excavation both at the site of what is believed to have been the initial encampment at Seloy, and the third, post-1572 town location.

The site of the initial 1565-1566 encampment is today located on the grounds of the Fountain of Youth Park and the Catholic Mission of Nombre de Dios, about one kilometer north of the Castillo de San Marcos.37 Excavations have revealed a series of large, probably

34. The most detailed account of the Menéndez expedition is that of Eugene Lyon, The Enterprise of Florida.
37. The most recent comprehensive summary of the archaeological work at the Menéndez site is in Kathleen Deagan, Fifty Years of Archaeology at the Fountain of Youth Park site (8-Sf-31), St. Augustine (Gainesville: University of Florida, Florida
thatched rectangular structures built on wooden sill beam supports. These are thought to represent housing for the ten-man mess groups (camaradas) into which Menéndez organized his soldiers. Circular post structures in the style of Timucuan buildings were also present at the settlement, some of them clearly occupied during the Menéndez era. A very large, wood-floored structure interpreted as the Casa de Municiones (Store House/Armory) was located at the north end of the settlement. To the north of that, the base of what appears to have been a defensive wall extended some 200 feet along the northern side of the settlement. No evidence for a moat has been found archaeologically and it is likely that the entire encampment—enclosed by the wall on the north and surrounded with water on the other three sides in 1565—served as the initial "fort" of St. Augustine.

Despite the ephemeral nature of that occupation, thousands of fragmentary sixteenth-century Spanish artifacts (including pottery, lead shot, nails, buttons, beads etc.) have been recovered from barrel wells and trash deposits throughout the site. Analysis of food remains reveals that the Spanish diet was overwhelmingly comprised of local fish, shellfish, and plant foods, including acorns and greenbrier root.38

Menéndez-era activity also extended to the south of the encampment, into the grounds of what is today the Shrine of Nuestra Señora de La Leche/Mission of Nombre de Dios.39 A

38. Dietary analysis of floral and faunal remains have been carried out and reported by Elizabeth Reitz and Margaret Scarry and their students. Elizabeth Reitz, "Analysis of fauna from the Fountain of Youth Park site, St. Augustine (8-SJ-31)," (Project report on file, Florida Museum of Natural History, Gainesville, 1988); "Animal Use and Culture Change in Spanish Florida," MASCA Research Papers in Science and Archaeology 8 (1991), 62-77; Kelly L. Orr and Carol Colaninno, Native American and Spanish Subsistence in Sixteenth-century St. Augustine: Vertebrate Faunal Remains from Fountain of Youth (8SJ31), St. Johns Co., Florida (Athens: Georgia Museum of Natural History Zooarchaeology Laboratory, 2008); Margaret Scarry, "Plant Remains from the Fountain of Youth Park Site (8SJ31) St. Augustine" (Project report on file, Florida Museum of Natural History, Gainesville, 1989); Margaret Scarry and Elizabeth Reitz, "Herbs, Fish, and Other Scum and Vermin; Subsistence Strategies in Sixteenth-Century Spanish Florida," in Columbian Consequences vol. 2, 354-358. See also Deagan, Fifty Years of Historical Archaeology, 208-215.

series of posts and trenches dating to the mid-sixteenth century suggest that this may have been the site of the blockhouse erected by Menéndez in 1567 at “Old St. Augustine.” Excavations have also documented a slightly later sixteenth-century occupation related to lime burning, including a potkiln using oyster shell as ore.

The lime burning operation was probably in service for construction activities in the third and final site of St. Augustine, established to the south of the present-day plaza in 1572. The layout of that settlement is still evident in the street plan of the area, conforming to the series of blocks depicted on the Baptiste Boazio drawing of St. Augustine in 1586. Archaeological verification of the church site shown on that image was established by the presence of densely concentrated Christian burials during a construction project in the 1960s. The church provided a point of reference for comparing the 1586 Boazio drawing to the present streetscape, and the buried remains of the town verified the 1586 layout. Since then, excavations by St. Augustine City Archaeologist Carl Halbirt have provided additional detail and have documented the pattern of spatial expansion during the sixteenth century and beyond in St. Augustine.40

During the 1970s, the St. Augustine Restoration Foundation Inc. (now St. Augustine Foundation, housed at Flagler College, St. Augustine) initiated an intensive multidisciplinary research initiative to understand St. Augustine in the late sixteenth century. The program incorporated historical, anthropological, and archaeological research on “St. Augustine 1580” in support of potential reconstruction and interpretation.41


The St. Augustine 1580 project also led to a multi-year archaeological focus (1977-1989) on St. Augustine’s sixteenth-century urban sites, carried out through the State University Field schools, the Historic St. Augustine Preservation Board and the City of St. Augustine Archaeological Program. Excavations tested ten sixteenth-century residential home sites, the parish Church and cemetery of Los Remedios, the town plaza, and the hermitage and cemetery of La Soledad. Despite the heavy disturbances to the sixteenth-century archaeological deposits from 450 years of urban development, this body of research has elucidated the town plan and traced its expansion, confirming that this third site of St. Augustine was laid out on a grid plan according to the long-standing principles for colonial spatial organization codified in the 1573 “Ordinances Concerning Discoveries.”

Archaeological excavation has also documented the architecture and use of space in residential lots. Wattle and daub and post and board building construction techniques were used. Homes were consistently near the front of the lots, usually on the street edges, with walled or fenced lots, gardens, barrel wells, and trash disposal pits located within the walls or fences. Barrel


wells were regularly placed some 12-15 meters apart along streets, probably reflecting the ordinance-designated size of city lots. They seem also to be consistently placed between from 12 and 15 meters back from the streets, behind structures. Other wells farther away from homes were probably used for garden and livestock watering. This pattern of household use of space in the sixteenth century persisted through the first Spanish period (to 1763), revealing a marked conservatism in this aspect of Spanish colonial life.

From the earliest days of settlement in Florida, Spanish soldiers married Native American women, who introduced their own dietary and household management traditions into St. Augustine’s households. The food preparation technologies used traditionally in Spain were replaced by unmodified Native American pots for cooking and storage as well as manos and metates for the preparation of corn and cassava. Little accommodation to Spanish cooking practice can be found in the archaeological record of these sites. Through the entire first Spanish period (1565-1763), pots with traditional Native American design and decoration dominated the “Spanish” kitchens of St. Augustine. Serving and tableware, however, remained nearly exclusively European in origin and appearance.44

The year 1586 was the most notable and destructive time for sixteenth-century St. Augustine, because of both the burning of the town by Francis Drake, and Spanish officials’ decision to abandon the northern town of Santa Elena and consolidate the settlements in St. Augustine (carried out in 1587). Archaeological evidence for what is thought to be the Drake raid has been occasionally located in St. Augustine’s sixteenth-century deposits, most notably the recent find of a burned floor section still bearing the remains of a number of nearly intact, apparently abandoned vessels.45 The simultaneous devastation of the town and the population increase provoked a


rebuilding and expansion of the original town area, a process that is gradually being understood as archaeology continues.

Santa Elena

For the first few years after Santa Elena’s establishment in 1566, the fledgling settlement was plagued by native resistance and soldiers’ mutinies. As the intended capitol, however, civilian settlers were sent to Santa Elena and, by end of 1569, the population had grown to more than 300 people in 40 houses. In 1571, Pedro Menéndez brought his wife and other family members to Florida and established wealthy households at Santa Elena, but Indian conflict led to the burning of the community in 1576. The town was briefly abandoned and ceased to be the capital of La Florida. By late 1580, however, 60 new houses and another fort had been built there. Six years later, the threats of French and pirate attacks, continuing native hostility, and the expenses of maintaining two forts in Florida caused Spanish authorities to abandon Santa Elena and consolidate the garrisons and populations at St. Augustine.

The site of Santa Elena was located conclusively in 1979 by Stanley South of the South Carolina Institute for Archaeology and Anthropology, initiating a multi-year program of archaeological excavation. The settlement covers an area of about 15 acres, extending about 365 meters in length by varying widths. Excavations have uncovered portions of two forts and important

46. Eugene Lyon, Santa Elena: A Brief History of the Colony, 1566-1587 (Columbia, SC: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1984); Karen Paar, "To Settle Is to Conquer": Spaniards, Native Americans, and the Colonization of Santa Elena in Sixteenth-Century Florida" (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1999).

47. Fort San Marcos, one of the last Spanish Forts, had been misidentified as the French Charlesfort since the 17th century. After modification by the US Marines as part of their training camp for World War I, the fort site was excavated by Major George Osterhout (USMC) in 1923. Finding what were in fact Spanish ceramics but mistaking them for French, he published his findings, further cementing the site’s reputation, shortly commemorated by the Huguenot Society of South Carolina with a monument. The site’s Spanish nature was later asserted by Jeannette T. Connor and others, but was not further verified until Albert Manucy examined various artifacts from Osterhout’s excavations in 1957. Knowing Spanish ceramics from his work at St. Augustine, Manucy correctly identified the site. see Paul E. Hoffman, “Sixteenth-Century Fortifications on Parris Island, South Carolina,” (Ms. Report prepared for Joseph R. Judge, Associate Editor, National Geographic Magazine, 1978), 1-4. Collection of the editor of this volume of the Quarterly).
residential compounds dating to the post-1578 occupation. The remains of the forts at Santa Elena are the only European-style sixteenth-century Spanish forts (moated and bastioned) that have been located archaeologically in La Florida (or, for that matter, North America).

Another singular discovery at the site is a sixteenth-century Spanish pottery kiln containing remnants of the last firing load. The vessels were all of a type known as “redware” and several were made in late medieval, Moorish-influenced Spanish forms. No other post-fifteenth century pottery kilns producing European-style vessels have been excavated in Spanish La Florida or the Spanish Caribbean.

The two excavated residential compounds at Santa Elena appear to have been elite households, not only because of the size and configuration of the buildings, but also because of the size of the lots themselves. These adjacent households yielded a very rich assemblage of excavated artifacts. Rare Chinese porcelain, Spanish and Italian glazed pottery, metallic lace, jewelry, ornaments, weaponry and clothing fasteners have been recovered. As in sixteenth-century St. Augustine, so too the residents of these elite Santa Elena households incorporated Native American cooking pottery into their kitchen practices, but at a much lower intensity (31% of all artifacts) than the St. Augustine households of the same period (40%-59% of all artifacts).

In general, the artifacts at Santa Elena are more abundant, more varied, and were originally more costly than the artifacts recovered from contemporary contexts in St. Augustine. As

48. The extensive excavations at Santa Elena are documented in a series of reports published by the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina. See Stanley South, *The Discovery of Santa Elena* (Columbia: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1980); *Exploring Santa Elena* (Research Manuscript Series No. 184, 1982); *Revealing Santa Elena 1982* (Research Manuscript Series No. 188, 1983); *Testing Archaeological Sampling Methods at Fort San Felipe 1983. Research Manuscript Series 190* (1984); *Excavation of the Casa Fuerte and Wells at Fort San Felipe 1984* (Research Manuscript Series No. 196, 1985); Stanley South and William Hunt, *Discovering Santa Elena West of Fort San Felipe* (Research Manuscript Series No. 200, 1986); Stanley South and Chester DePratter, *Block Excavation 1993* (Research Manuscript Series No. 222, 1996); Chester DePratter and Stanley South, *Discovery at Santa Elena: Boundary Survey* (Research Manuscript Series No. 221, 1995).

South and DePratter have noted, "the backyard collection in 38BU162N [a single house lot in Santa Elena] is more diverse and more abundant than that found in all of the [sixteenth-century] St. Augustine collections available for study in 1985." Although there are various mitigating archaeological reasons for this (for example, the continuous occupation of the St. Augustine sites from the sixteenth century to the present, destructive urban development processes, and the sudden abandonment of Santa Elena), the role of Santa Elena as the capital of La Florida and as the home of elite society are the principal factors in its contrast to St. Augustine. Santa Elena vividly underscores the stark social and material inequalities in sixteenth-century Spanish society.

The First Missions and the Hinterland

Even before founding Santa Elena, Menéndez de Áviles established military outposts in at least eight locations throughout peninsular Florida. The principal garrisons were located at Tequesta, in present-day Miami, at Carlos among the Calusa of southwest Florida, and at Tocobaga, in the Tampa Bay region. The former two locations were also the sites of short-lived Jesuit missions. Archaeologists have tentatively identified the locations of these establishments, however no systematic excavations designed to study the European outposts or Native American society during the early contact period have been carried out. This is largely owing to the long history of unscientific excavation and artifact looting at many of the sites, as well as to site destruction by twentieth century development.

The best documented of these outpost-missions is Carlos, the Calusa capitol on present-day Mound Key, where the Jesuit mission of San Antonio de Carlos (1567-1569) was located. Various surface collections and a few non-systematic excavations over the past

51. Such social and material inequality also occurred within the communities. Testing by St. Augustine City Archaeologist Carl Halbirt has located sixteenth-century deposits with relative artifact proportions similar to those at Santa Elena. See Rebecca Barrera "The Impact of Site Formation Processes, Method and Theory: Inter-site Comparisons of 16th Century Spanish Santa Elena and St. Augustine deposits" (MA thesis, University of South Carolina, 2005). Sites at Santa Elena occupied by lower-status inhabitants have not yet been excavated.
century recovered a large collection of European artifacts ranging from the early sixteenth century to the late seventeenth century. Much of the material undoubtedly came from shipwreck salvage, but some may be associated with the sixteenth-century Jesuit missions and the equally unsuccessful Franciscan mission attempt in 1697.

The town of Tequesta, where a Spanish garrison and Jesuit mission were located from 1567-1570, is thought to have been at the Granada site, a large Tequesta habitation site on the north side of the mouth of the Miami River. A large portion of the site (which no longer exists today) was excavated during the 1970s prior to its development. The excavations recovered Spanish artifacts, but the fortified mission settlement itself was not located.

The town of Tocobaga was the political center for the Tocobaga people of the central Florida Gulf coast and is thought to have been located at the Safety Harbor site in Pinellas County. Menéndez established a garrison of 20 men there during 1567 but, like the outposts at Carlos and Tequesta, it was soon abandoned in response to intense native hostility. No sites associated with the Jesuit mission efforts in the northern parts of La Florida (1568-1572) have been archaeologically identified.

The Franciscan missions of La Florida are—both historically and archaeologically—essentially part of the seventeenth century story. Although the first Franciscan friars arrived in Florida in 1573, no missions were formally established until 1587. The first decade of Franciscan mission activity was marked by uncertainty and contraction, and punctuated by the violent revolt of Guale mission Indians in 1597.

---


55. John W. Griffin, ed., Excavations at the Granada site (Tallahassee: Florida Dept. of State, Division of Archives, History and Records Management, 1982), 5-6.


established in 1587 have been located, however only in recent decades has there been renewed archaeological attention to them.58

Mission Nombre de Dios at St. Augustine (1587-1763) was perhaps the first Franciscan mission in Florida, with a church built in 1587 within a settlement of already largely Christian Timucuan people. The late sixteenth-century mission church was discovered in 1933 when workers planting trees found several human skeletons on the grounds of the Fountain of Youth Park. Roy Dickson excavated the burial site in 1934 under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution, and it was left open as a tourist attraction until 1995, when the remains were reburied. The 1934 project remained unreported until the 1950s and the skeletal remains themselves were not studied until 1992, by which time they were largely deteriorated.59

Dickson excavated more than 112 burials, finding that in 26 cases two or more individuals were placed in the same burial pit. Six of these burials incorporated adults and children, perhaps representing family burials and possibly reflecting epidemic disease that eliminated whole families. Grave goods (predominantly shell and glass beads) accompanied the burials of infants and children. Most of the burials were extended in the typical Catholic fashion, however there were bundle (i.e. disarticulated before burial) and


flexed burials among the extended remains. Five burials included an adult accompanied by a single disarticulated human skull.

These non-Christian aspects of the cemetery may indicate the incorporation of traditional Native American burial practices into early mission burial sites, a process that David H. Thomas describes as a "pre-parochial" or intermediate stage of mission development.60 This is particularly well-illustrated at the mission site of Santa Catalina de Guale, which has been the focus of very important, decades-long systematic excavations directed by Thomas.61 Two stages of the mission occupation have been delineated (1587-1597, and 1604- ca. 1650). Excavations have uncovered the remains of the churches, conventos (friars' quarters), a kitchen, wells, the churchyard of the complex and part of the Indian pueblo associated with the mission. The work has provided detailed information about early Franciscan mission architecture and building construction, organization of space, diet, material culture, and economic strategies.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of the site has been the excavation of the 20 by 11 meter wattle and daub church itself, in which more than 400 native people had been buried. The burials were accompanied by an extraordinary array of grave goods, including nearly 70,000 glass beads, religious medallions, gold and silver ornaments, crosses, plaques, Spanish majolica vessels, and some Native American ritual objects. This is a far more elaborate and costly assemblage of objects than any found in La Florida's Spanish


settlements and missions, with the possible exception of Mission San Luis de Talimali, the capitol of the Apalachee Mission province after ca. 1650. Although most of the materials from the Santa Catalina church excavation were from the early seventeenth century occupation, the assemblage is an unprecedented look at the material strategies employed both by Spanish missionaries and by Guale people in the delicate early stages of evangelization and conversion.

Some of the most original and valuable information from this program has been generated by the extensive bioarchaeological studies of the Santa Catalina de Guale skeletal remains, directed by Clark Larsen. Studies of skeletal and dental morphology and pathology, as well as bone isotope analysis, have provided details about health conditions before and after contact in the region, starkly documenting the physical perils of mission life. Bioarchaeologists have also questioned the cultural identities of the people buried at Santa Catalina by comparing them to the remains of prehistoric Guale people in the region. Preliminary work suggests that the mission population differed noticeably from the prehistoric Guale population of the area. They were, however, quite similar to the population of Santa Maria de Yamassee, a seventeenth century mission site on Amelia Island, Florida, that was ethnographically documented to have been occupied by Yamassee Indians. This has raised questions about the true distinctions between populations referred to by the Spanish as “Guale” versus “Yamassee.” Although bioarchaeologists have always assumed these populations to have been members of separate cultural groups, it is suggested that these names may, in fact, have actually reflected geographical locations within essentially the same population.

The intersection of bioarchaeology, archaeological settlement studies, tree ring data, and isotope analysis have demonstrated that sixteenth-century coastal Guale people relied on corn in their diets and were, in general, largely sedentary. This finding directly

contradicts the historical accounts of the Jesuit missionaries in the region, who bemoaned that the Guale people never stayed in one place, and did not farm. Dendrochronological analysis (tree ring studies), however, has revealed that the years 1562-1571 marked a period of severe and prolonged drought along the south Atlantic coast. It seems quite possible that the early Spanish observers in the region were describing a more mobile and temporary way of life that compensated for the difficulty of farming during such a prolonged drought period.\textsuperscript{65}

These and other results of multidisciplinary historical bioarchaeological studies of native peoples throughout La Florida are slowly helping to refine our understanding of the complex and chaotic population movements among indigenous peoples during the second half of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{66}

In recent decades, historical archaeologists studying La Florida have increasingly placed the native people of the region at the center of their efforts. Growing out of studies initially intended to chart the paths of European explorers, a number of researchers (particularly those interested in the interior parts of La Florida) have concentrated on revealing indigenous social and political dynamics, population movements related to shifting power structures, ecological changes, and the emergence of new ethnic identities among Native American groups during the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{67} That is also another story that extends


\textsuperscript{67.} Examples and entrees to the associated literature can be found in the essays in Cameron B. Wesson and Mark Rees, \textit{Between Colonies and Contact: Archaeological Perspectives in the Protohistoric Southeast} (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002); Patricia Galloway, \textit{Choctaw Genesis, 1500-1700}, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995); Marvin Smith, \textit{Coosa}; Amanda L. Regnier, “Stylistic Analysis of Burial Urns from the Protohistoric Period in Central Alabama,” \textit{Southeastern Archaeology} 25, no. 1 (2006): 121-134. The essays in Deagan and Thomas, \textit{From Santa Elena to St. Augustine}, consider issues of Native American identity, interaction, culture change, and movement as revealed in pottery production and distribution.
into the seventeenth century and later; however, it is an area in which archaeology can potentially make original and otherwise unobtainable contributions. One of the difficulties in this emphasis is that in most cases, only those archaeological sites containing European-derived artifacts or animal bones can be confidently dated to the sixteenth century. This presents a potential sampling bias, in that there were undoubtedly many indigenous communities that did not participate in, or perhaps even rejected, the interactions and exchange networks that brought European materials into sixteenth-century Native American settlements.

**Summation**

The contributions of historical archaeology to the study of sixteenth-century La Florida have been most evident in the reconstruction of sixteenth-century explorers’ routes and, consequently, the identification of Native American towns and settlement patterns. Questions about the impact of these explorers on the Native peoples of La Florida, particularly with regard to epidemic disease, remain unresolved (but still under investigation) by archaeology.

As archaeological research has become more interdisciplinary and more technologically sophisticated, new insights into Native American health, genetic relationships, diet, the environment, and work stresses associated with colonization are becoming more apparent. Many archaeologists are turning to questions of political and social processes in native La Florida during the “protohistoric” period in an effort to understand the underlying or predisposing conditions of cultural continuity and change. This emphasis represents a return—albeit in more modern terms—to the earliest concerns of historical archaeology in Florida (John W. Griffin’s 1948 agenda) for closer collaboration between historians and archaeologist in understanding the location, dates, and social organization of Native American sites during the historic period.

Archaeological attention to sixteenth-century European sites in La Florida began somewhat later, with the excavations in sixteenth-century St. Augustine and Santa Elena. The hastily-constructed, mostly coastal, and short-lived sites of much sixteenth-century European occupation have suffered from coastal erosion and modern development and none have been located outside these two principal towns. Excavations in the Spanish towns, however, have revealed a
great deal about colonial life that is not documented in historical records, including details of spatial organization, architecture and building construction, clothing, diet, household life, health, and hygiene. This information, contextualized with documentary evidence, has allowed archaeologists to address questions of gender roles, multi-ethnic interaction and intermarriage, and material expressions of social inequality.

The most glaring omission in these programs is the absence of information from the very earliest periods of occupation (the missing second site of St. Augustine and the first period of Santa Elena) when these social patterns were first solidified. The study of the 1526 town of San Miguel de Gualdape, also as yet undiscovered, would be particularly important in understanding the development of the adaptive strategies of Spanish colonists, sixteenth-century American Indians and, possibly, African slaves. This importance arises because San Miguel was launched from the essentially late medieval Caribbean colony of Hispaniola (rather than from Spain, as Menéndez’s colony was), before there was any substantive Spanish knowledge about the people and landscapes of La Florida.

At the end of the sixteenth century, the Spanish presence in La Florida was much reduced, and there was debate over whether the colony should even exist. It was, however on the brink of a major expansion of missions, garrisons and ranches into the hinterland and entry into a new international arena of conflict in the seventeenth century. That is another, even richer archaeological story.
Entangled Borderlands: Europeans and Timucuans in Sixteenth-Century Florida

by Jonathan DeCoster

In February 1566, grisly news reached the Norman port cities of Dieppe and Le Havre. The French Huguenot colonists, who had left those ports for Florida less than two years previously, had been cruelly slaughtered by Spaniards. An open letter to France's king, purportedly written by the widows and orphans of the victims, was quickly published in an attempt to prod the crown into action. "The blood of your poor subjects, thus treacherously spilt, cries out before God for vengeance," it exclaimed.1 When the crown seemed deaf to the public outcry, a private citizen, Dominique de Gourgues, felt driven to personally avenge his countrymen. An anonymous contemporary text titled The Recovery of Florida tells the

Jonathan DeCoster is a lecturer in History at Brandeis University where he is a Ph.D. Candidate. This is his first publication in the Florida Historical Quarterly.

story of how in 1568 Gourgues convinced a small force of French soldiers and sailors to recapture Florida for France. 2

*The Recovery of Florida* praises the zeal and fearlessness of Gourgues, but it also recognizes the extent to which his success depended on the participation of indigenous allies. According to the narrative, Gourgues knew that the French colonists had befriended some of the natives several years earlier, and he expected them to willingly augment his slim numbers against the Spaniards. As anticipated, when Gourgues encountered Saturiwa, the leader of an alliance of Timucua Indians, Saturiwa professed that he and his allies “had never ceased to love the French because of the good treatment they had received,” and offered to provide the forces necessary to help the French rout the Spaniards. 3 The text celebrates how, after the French victory, Gourgues was greeted as a liberator by the Timucuans. One old woman even proclaimed that “she did not mind dying now that she had once more seen the French in Florida.” 4

In most contemporary and modern accounts of this event, the Timucuan allies of Saturiwa are seen to have eagerly joined Gourgues because of their longstanding friendship with the French and the maltreatment they had received from the Spanish. 5 Implicit to such an interpretation is the assumption that

---

2. The Bibliothèque nationale de France (hereafter BNF) contains at least 7 manuscript copies of *La Reprise [or Reprins e] de la Floride par le Captaine Gourgue*. A variant printed in 1568 residing at the Bibliothèque Mazarine was reproduced in facsimile in 1928 by the Massachusetts Historical Society as *Histoire Memorable De La Reprise De L'Isle De La Floride*, Photostat Americana 220 (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1928). Another variant was included in publications of René Goulaine de Laudonnière, *L'histoire Notable De La Floride* (Paris, 1586). The quotes used in this article are taken from the manuscript Fonds Français 6124, BNF.

3. *La Reprise de la Floride*, Fonds Français 6124, f. 12 recto, BNF.

4. Ibid, f. 27 recto.

5. Eugene Lyon, one of the most important historians of the Spaniards during this period in Florida, typifies the way in which scholars have accepted this premise. He writes, “The enemies of the French had, perforce, become friends of the Spanish, and Indians who had allied with [the French] were now firmly united against the Spaniards,” in *The Enterprise of Florida: Pedro Menéndez De Avilés and the Spanish Conquest of 1565-1568* (Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 1976), 198. While contemporary historians (including Lyon) might be sympathetic to the possibility that native leaders such as Saturiwa exerted some degree of agency in their negotiations with Europeans, most have agreed with him in identifying European rivalry as the primary force behind such colonial interactions. For example, see Paul E. Hoffman, *A New Andalucia and a Way to the Orient: The*
the conflict in Florida was simply a peripheral outgrowth of the rivalry between France and Spain originating in Europe. While the events of the massacre and the reprisal undoubtedly serve as excellent illustrations of how European conflicts were played out on a smaller scale at the periphery of empires, a strict focus on the Franco-Spanish dimension fails to take account of the indigenous people who participated in the conflict. The Timucuans were not simply co-opted by the European rivalry, but instead willingly chose to take part in the Franco-Spanish dispute because of its utility for their indigenous political interests.

Emphasizing this native-oriented dimension allows us to see how the European experience in Florida was shaped not only by intra-European conflicts, but also by intra-Timucuan conflicts, played out in part through European auxiliaries. Such an inversion requires recasting the concept of a “borderland” as not just a peripheral zone separating European empires but also indigenous polities. In the sixteenth century, most of Florida, and indeed the North American continent, remained under undisputed native hegemony. In those places, as Juliana Barr has put it, “the primary power relations were not European versus Indian, but relations among native peoples.”

Would-be colonists arrived on the continent to find themselves amid preexisting rivalries and alliances that conditioned whether natives would choose not only to adapt or resist, but also to assist colonial incursions. Native leaders’ choices had significant effects on European colonies, and we cannot understand them apart from their native political context. As representative examples of the relationships commonly formed at the leading edge of colonial empires, the ever-shifting alliances between Europeans and Timucuans in the sixteenth century help illustrate how these complex and entangled interactions characterized imperial and native borderlands.


The relationship between Saturiwa and Gourgues emerged from a deeper and more ambivalent history between the French and their native neighbors. A year before the massacre in 1564, the French had established their colony in an area inhabited by dense populations of natives labeled by scholars as Timucuans. Anthropological linguists define Timucuan as a distinct language family spoken across a broad swath of northern Florida and southeastern Georgia. It had about a dozen closely-related dialects. Perhaps as many as 20,000 Timucuan-speakers lived in this area in 1564. Their societies were stratified into a hereditary nobility and a class of commoners, although commoners of exceptional ability could rise into the elite class. Europeans recorded the use of the terms holata, utina, and paracoussi to designate Timucuan chiefs, yet it is not clear whether these terms indicated hierarchical levels, local variation, or some other distinction for the Timucuans such as a "peace" or "war" leader. These chiefs and important counselors inherited their offices matrilineally, and while chiefs did not possess absolute authority, they were treated deferentially and enjoyed privileges such as the right to collect tribute and the right to exemption from certain kinds of labor. Men usually filled these roles, though not exclusively. These characteristics have led anthropologists to characterize the Timucuan polities as simple chiefdoms, political entities with one level of hierarchical social institutions above the local community.8

The Timucuan chiefdoms emerged in the context of regional social change generated by the rise of Mississippian chiefdoms in the interior southeast around A.D. 1000. Mississippian societies developed new

---

levels of social stratification and political consolidation that supported
the creation of monumental earthworks, the expansion of agriculture,
and several other traits that scholars identify as markers of Mississippian
culture. They also began to maintain long-distance exchange networks;
Mississippian culture traveled along those exchange networks from the
core Mississippian area in the Mid-South to the Atlantic coast. There, at
the eastern terminus of such exchange, the Timucuans could be said
to inhabit the periphery of the Mississippian world. Although smaller-
scaled and less complex than their Mississippian counterparts, Timucuan
chiefdoms came to encompass between two and ten villages organized
into ranked hierarchies, and temporary alliances could bring together
as many as forty chiefs under a single dominant leader. Anthropologists
and archaeologists estimate that twenty-five or thirty of these chiefdoms
may have existed when Europeans arrived in Florida. But as with other
Mississippian and Mississippian-like cultures, the growth of chiefdoms
displaced populations and increased competition for resources, leading
in turn to a rise in intersocietal conflict. In fact, the name “Timucua”
itself evolved from usage by Spanish colonists in the sixteenth century,
and seems to have been a pejorative meaning “enemy.” Rather than a
self-designation, the term “Timucua” gestures towards the diversity and
competition among Timucuan-speaking polities. These longstanding
rivalries led the Timucuans to recruit the French newcomers as allies in
their intra-native conflicts at nearly every opportunity.

Within and Beyond Northeastern Florida,” *Southeastern Archaeology* 21, no. 2
11. The ethnohistorical evidence employed throughout this discussion
unequivocally points to intra-Timucuan conflict predating the arrival of
Europeans. The archaeological evidence, however, is more ambiguous. For
instance, the artwork of one of the French colonists, Jacques Le Moyne de
Morgues, depicts a palisaded village, a depiction reinforced by numerous
colonial documents. Evidence of palisades is usually interpreted by
archaeologists and anthropologists as a sign of longstanding conflict. See,
for example, George R. Milner, “Warfare in Prehistoric and Early Historic
Eastern North America,” *Journal of Archaeological Research* 7, no. 2 (June 1999):
123-124. However, archaeologists have not located any evidence of palisades
in their limited excavations of eastern Timucuan sites. See Hann, *History of
the Timucua*, 88-89; Milner, 122-125; Rebecca Saunders, “Forced Relocation,
Power Relations, and Culture Contact in the Missions of La Florida,” in *Studies in
Culture Contact: Interaction, Culture Change, and Archaeology*, ed. James G.
Cusick (Carbondale, IL: Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern
The French colonists encountered four major, mutually hostile Timucuan polities during the fourteen months they spent in northern Florida. The French fort was near the mouth of the St. Johns River, where the colonists interacted most intensively with the *paracoussi* Saturiwa and his affiliates. The French were told that he ruled over thirty subordinate chiefs, which would have corresponded to a capacity to field several thousand men if necessary. Further up the St. Johns, the *olata* Outina led a confederacy of some forty village chiefs deeply antagonistic to Saturiwa's alliance. Less is known about the inland Potano chiefdom, but in the 1560s it was considered nearly as powerful as Saturiwa and Outina. When the French arrived in 1564, Outina was already actively at war with both Saturiwa and Potano. Finally, a pair of related chiefs, Houstaqua and Onatheaqua, resided further to the west, beyond the normal range of interaction with Saturiwa but regularly at odds with Outina. Houstaqua and Onatheaqua may have been siblings, and each allegedly possessed a population as great as or greater than Saturiwa's or Outina's polities.13

René Goulaine de Laudonnière, the captain of the French settlement, recognized that military assistance was perhaps the most valuable asset he could offer the Timucuans. He believed that he could exploit their animosity to draw them into alliances, yet avoid alienating himself from their enemies by failing to actually commit to violence. By maintaining favorable relationships with mutually hostile Timucuan rivals, he hoped to retain the ability to trade for food, gather information, and pass across Timucuan borders to sources of gold and silver rumored to lie inland.

His meetings with Timucuans often focused on their rivalries, giving him frequent opportunities to pledge French soldiers to serve native leaders. He concluded his first such alliance with Saturiwa around June 28, 1564, when Saturiwa revealed that he considered Outina "his oldest and truest enemy."14 Quickly making the connection between his desires and Saturiwa's needs, Laudonnière explained that "I understood what he wanted to say.

---

12. Regardless of the locally used term, the French usually used the term *roi* and the Spanish *cacique* to describe native leaders. On the few occasions that an indigenous title was used by the French, it was *paracoussi* Saturiwa and *olata* Outina. It is not clear what the distinction meant to the Timucuans.


And to make him better love me, I promised to join him with all my power when he wanted to fight, something that pleased him greatly." But to Saturiwa’s disappointment, Laudonnière delayed fulfilling his commitment. In fact, the French captain made covert contact with members of Outina’s alliance. In an effort to entice the French into helping him attack Outina, Saturiwa had told them that his rival’s upriver location granted him access to the Appalachian Mountains, the source of the Timucuans’ silver. But Saturiwa’s ploy backfired; this information made Outina appear a more potentially valuable ally than the coastal Saturiwa. Upon making contact, Laudonnière’s lieutenant promised one of Outina’s subordinates that one day the French would bring their forces to join him against Houstaqua and Onatheaqua. The French would eventually make contact with Houstaqua, too, and make a similar offer to join with him and “put all of the rest of the people under obedience to us.” With each step further inland, Laudonnière offered to help the Timucuan leaders against all of their other rivals. The strategy was a house of cards, effective only as long as the French captain could avoid committing to any one of the Timucuans and turning all the others against him.

Frustrated with the delay and possibly apprised of the meetings with Outina, Saturiwa pressed Laudonnière to, as the Frenchman understood it, “carry out the promise that I had made when I had first landed in this country, to show myself a friend of his friends and an enemy of his enemies.” Laudonnière responded by expressing a desire to avoid entanglement in these Timucuan rivalries. “For his friendship I did not want to gain the enmity of another,” he told the disappointed Saturiwa. Laudonnière claimed the role of a disinterested peace broker, yet gaining the friendship of one Timucuan chief at the expense of another was precisely his strategy. He offered that if Saturiwa could be reconciled with Outina, they could both unite with the French against their common enemies, Houstaqua and Onatheaqua. Rather than alienate Saturiwa outright, he still tried to maintain a semblance of the alliance that he knew remained a potent bargaining chip with the Timucuan paracoussi. Laudonnière found this policy difficult.

15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., f. 49 verso.
17. Ibid., f. 76 verso.
18. Ibid., f. 53 recto.
19. Ibid., f. 53 verso.
to sustain, however. Saturiwa ostensibly agreed to the proposal of reconciliation with Outina, but even Laudonnière could read the growing resentment behind the friendly facade.  

In September, Laudonnière dispatched his lieutenants Michel le Vasseur and Thiebaut d’Arlac with ten soldiers to Outina’s village to make peace between the rivals. The Timucuan olata seems to have welcomed the arrival of French soldiers, and he requested they join him in an attack against his rival Potano. Outina may have recognized the difficulty in turning the French against Saturiwa, or he may have been more interested in exerting his power into the interior than downriver into Saturiwa’s coastal plain. For the French soldiers, residence at Fort Caroline had seemed an unjust imprisonment, calculated to rob them of the conquests for which they had come to Florida. Outina had sent enough gifts to the fort to convince the soldiers that he could provide them with better access to the riches they sought than Saturiwa, and they grew restive under Laudonnière’s restraint. Like Laudonnière, they too expected to manipulate native rivalries, but they favored a more active role. “The Spaniards,” they argued, “when they made their gains, always allied with some king to ruin the other.” For both Laudonnière and his men, the exploitation of native conflict was a key strategy. They simply differed on their opinion of how much to commit themselves to a single Timucuan leader.

Although Laudonnière had thus far avoided actual fighting on behalf of any Timucuans, in his absence his lieutenant, D’Arlac, agreed to Outina’s request to provide six French arquebusiers for the attack on Potano. With the French firearms positioned at the front of Outina’s 200 warriors, the combined force easily took the town, with only one Frenchman killed during the fighting. The French captain had intended to avoid entanglement in the Timucuan rivalries, but now the French were finally engaged on behalf of Outina, a commitment that increased the complexity of their relationships with the other Timucuans.
Over the winter of 1564-1565, Outina requested another strike against Potano. Entangled in an increasingly complicated web, Laudonnière hesitated. But fearing the unrest and dissension that already racked Fort Caroline, he submitted to the will of the soldiers. Thirty Frenchmen joined 300 of Outina’s men for a second joint victory against Potano.24 At first this seemed to bode well for the ability of the French to replicate the kind of intercultural cooperation that had led directly to spectacular Spanish successes in other parts of the New World, but in fact the Timucuan rivalries proved difficult to manage. In the aftermath of the victory, Outina dispatched a squadron of messengers to loudly proclaim the victory among the Timucuans. This not only served to spread the word of Outina’s increased military might, but it also alienated the French from any Timucuans who considered themselves Outina’s rivals. Saturiwa had already expressed a growing resentment of Laudonnière’s inconstancy, and as word of the Franco-Outina victory over Potano reached other adversaries of Outina, many sent emissaries to Fort Caroline hoping to turn Laudonnière against his new ally. But with these two strikes, Outina had successfully supplanted his rivals. He had become the only military ally of the French, and the permanent presence of French soldiers now preemptively guarded his village from other Timucuans who would be reluctant to alienate the French colony.

Saturiwa and his cohort now refused to trade with the French. This left Outina as practically their only trading partner, a development that introduced a dangerous sort of dependency for the French colony. Laudonnière had prudently traded for food throughout the fall and stored it for the difficult winter, anticipating the arrival of French supply ships in late spring, but when the ships failed to appear by May, Saturiwa’s rejection left Outina as virtually their only source of food. Laudonnière had previously hoped to avoid this vulnerability by withholding his commitment to any single one of the Timucuans, but now the French were compelled to protect Outina’s village and its stored corn from retaliation by Potano. Their interests had become increasingly entangled, to Laudonnière’s chagrin.25

The French soldiers had hoped that their support for Outina against Potano would stand them in good stead, but Outina’s

24. Ibid., f. 74 recto.
25. Ibid., f. 79 recto-79 verso.
Timucuans now began to exploit the French in their trading, demanding exorbitant rates on the rare occasions they agreed to trade at all. As Laudonnière himself grimly mused, "thus one commonly sees that necessity changes men's affections."\(^{26}\) Furthermore, in the vulnerability of the French, Outina saw an opportunity to further antagonize his Timucuan enemies. He communicated to Laudonnière that he wished to take prisoner a disobedient subordinate named Astina, and he once again requested military assistance. The French would find food at Astina's village, he implied, which they could loot after the completion of their task. Laudonnière agreed to provide the soldiers, but Outina deployed them instead against other enemies. Laudonnière's account leaves unclear the means of Outina's deception or the true target of the French soldiers, but there can be no doubt as to the rage and indignation felt by the French soldiers who had been deceived. Yet still, Laudonnière feared to retaliate.\(^ {27}\) As the colonists

---

26. Ibid., f. 82 verso.
neared starvation, the French captain found himself on the wrong end of his own manipulations. Outina had used his influence over the food supply to dominate the French trading negotiations and strong-arm them into fighting against their will. He had benefitted immensely by welcoming European colonists into his territory and he clearly remained focused on turning French guns against his native rivals. However, French acquiescence was about to end.

Reluctantly, Laudonnière allowed the soldiers in Fort Caroline to persuade him to capture Outina and ransom him for food. The French captain feared inciting the Timucuans further, but he feared his rebellious soldiers more. A French force successfully abducted Outina in late April or early May 1565, but the action failed to generate the hoped-for delivery of food. Instead, Laudonnière recorded the development of a power struggle within Outina’s alliance that diminished French hopes of any ransom. Two factions now competed to name his replacement, and they appeared to show little concern for their former leader (although there is the possibility that this was a strategy in which Outina was complicit). The French believed that the ransom negotiations served only to buy time until an opportunity should arise to capture Laudonnière or attack the French colony, and indeed, on July 27, Outina’s Timucuans ambushed a French party, initiating a period of open warfare.28

The break with Outina failed to accomplish its intended aim of securing food for the colonists, but it did open the door for a rapprochement with Saturiwa and his allies. Soon after Outina’s capture, Saturiwa’s messengers began arriving at Fort Caroline asking that the rival olata be executed or released to them. In exchange, they offered as much food as the French might need. Laudonnière refused to surrender Outina, but he and the other French colonists nonetheless took advantage of the opportunity to obtain food from several villages associated with Saturiwa. After the outbreak of full-blown fighting with Outina in late July, the reunion with Saturiwa seemed complete, and the newly reconciled allies filled the French boats with corn.29

28. Laudonnière, L’histoire Notable, f. 83 recto-90 verso. Hann, History of the Timucua, 45, suggests that the factions were composed of Outina’s son, his patrilineal heir, competing against his eldest sister’s oldest son, his matrilineal heir.
29. Laudonnière, L’histoire Notable, f. 85 recto, 93 recto.
It appeared then that Saturiwa had finally triumphed over Outina. He had regained his position as the primary French ally and trading partner, and French soldiers were now finally willing to fight against his rivals. As helpful as the reconciliation with Saturiwa was for the French, though, they had learned that they could not safely depend on the paracoussi and his food to preserve the settlement, and they would still need reinforcements and supplies from France if they hoped to survive in the long term. With the French ships four months overdue, the colonists lost hope in such deliverance, and they readied their own makeshift boats for the retreat home.\(^{30}\)

As Laudonnière prepared to depart, he regretted the rift with Outina but he argued that his reconciliation with Saturiwa ameliorated, perhaps even compensated, for the failure. With little else to show for his fourteen months in Florida, he held up the alliance with Saturiwa as a triumph, and indeed the primary objective of his enterprise, stating, “Yet, I lost not the alliance of eight neighboring kings and lords, who always succored me with everything that was possible. Indeed, this was the main point of all my designs, to win and hold them, knowing how much their friendship was important for our enterprise.” \(^{31}\) In point of fact, they had not always kept him supplied with all that he needed; that was merely the tentative state of affairs as he planned his departure. Even then, Laudonnière promised that the French would help Saturiwa defeat his rival Timucuans, as he had vowed so many times before, writing “I gave them to understand that within ten moons (as they call their months), I would see them again with such force that I would render them victorious over all their enemies.” \(^{32}\) For Saturiwa, this promise was encouraging, but he pressed for still more. Until their return, he requested that Laudonnière hand over one of the small boats and leave Fort Caroline intact for protection against Outina and other rivals. To this Laudonnière reluctantly agreed, hoping to remain on friendly terms until his departure. Both Laudonnière and Saturiwa tacitly understood that any cooperation between the French and the Timucuans was dependent on its utility for Saturiwa’s rivalries with other Timucuans, and should that utility diminish, the “friendship” would be withdrawn.

In a striking twist of fate, just as Laudonnière waited for favorable winds to carry the colonists back to France, on August 28, 1565 Jean Ribault’s reinforcement fleet arrived. Ribault was

\(^{30}\) Ibid., f. 93 recto-93 verso.
\(^{31}\) Ibid., f. 94 recto.
\(^{32}\) Ibid., f. 98 verso.
followed promptly by Pedro Menéndez de Avilés on September 4. Menéndez was bent on destroying the colony whose inhabitants had so recently decided to abandon it. The violent encounter between French and Spanish colonists in Florida has been treated extensively elsewhere, but a cursory sketch will be helpful here.

Menéndez immediately challenged the French ships anchored outside the mouth of the River of May. Ribault opted to reload all of his best soldiers and fight Menéndez at sea, but a rising hurricane scattered the French fleet. Menéndez managed to disembark his soldiers some forty miles south of the fort (where he established the town of St. Augustine), and, with the assistance of unnamed native guides, took advantage of the hurricane to effect a surprise overland assault on the fort. The wounded soldiers and tradesmen, left behind at the fort because they had been deemed useless for Ribault's fleet, put up little resistance. The Spaniards easily took Fort Caroline. Within days, Indians reported to Menéndez the wreck of the French ships scattered by the storm. Menéndez sent soldiers to meet them, and the remaining French surrendered to the Spaniards in three groups, on September 29, October 11, and November 1. In the first two cases nearly all the prisoners were put to the knife, while in the third Menéndez took captive all who surrendered. The sources disagree about the precise numbers involved, but perhaps 200–300 French were executed, another 175 or so were captured, some fifty escaped to the small French ships in the harbor at Fort Caroline, and as many as 220 voluntarily fled to the Timucuans, preferring their chances with the Indians over the Spaniards.33

33. Lyon, Enterprise of Florida, covers the Spanish perspective comprehensively, as does McGrath the French in Eye of the Hurricane. The most important primary sources are Nicolas Le Challeux, Discours De L'histoire De La Florida, Contenant La Trahison Des Espagnols, Contre Les Subiets Du Roy, En L'an Mil Cinq Cens Soixante Cinq (Dieppe, 1566), 22–54; Laudonnière, L'histoire Notable, f. 99 recto–114 recto; Francisco Lopez de Mendoza Grajales, “Memoria del buen sucesso y buen Viaje que dios nuestro señor fue servido de dar a la armada que salió de la ciudad de caliz para la provinçia y costa de la florida...” 1565, Patronato 19, R.17, Archivo General de Indias (hereafter AGI); Le Moyne, “Narrative,” 1:151–154; Pedro Menéndez de Avilés to King Philip II, October 15, 1565, transcribed in Colección de Documentos Inéditos Para La Historia De España, ed. Marín Navarrete, Miguel Salvá, and Pedro Sáinz de Baranada 112 vols. (Madrid: Imp. de la Viuda de Calero, 1842–95), 14: f. 288 verso–300 recto; “Memorial que hizo el Dr. Gonzalo Sofís de Merás, de todas las jornadas y sucesos del Adelantado Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, su cuñado, y de la conquista de la Florida, y justicia que hizo en Juan Ribao y otros franceses,” printed in Eugenio Ruidíaz y Caravia, La Florida: Su Conquista y Colonización Por Pedro Menéndez De Avilés 2 vols. (Madrid: Imp. de los hijos de J. A. García, 1893), 1:169–226.
The French and Spanish accounts of their clash accord little role to the Timucuans, but in fact, the Indians played key roles in shaping the encounter, and even their absences reveal conscious decisions about their participation in the European rivalry. Befitting the supposed alliance between the French and Saturiwa, the paracoussi’s subordinate ally Emoloa kept Laudonnière informed on Spanish movements. He reported that the Spaniards had seized the houses of the Timucuans at the village of Seloy, about forty miles south of Fort Caroline, a description that implies at least some degree of resistance to the newcomers. In contrast, Spanish accounts record the gracious welcome they received at Seloy and the deep hostility to the French among the natives in its vicinity. It is unclear whether Seloy was considered part of Saturiwa’s alliance, so the meaning of this discrepancy is ambiguous. If Seloy was ostensibly allied to Saturiwa and thus the French, the difference between the representations may indicate an effort by Saturiwa to court both the French and the Spanish, receiving the Spaniards kindly but giving the French the impression that they had been resisted. Indeed, the Spanish found two brothers at Seloy who were very familiar with Fort Caroline, having visited only six days prior, implying the presence at Seloy of at least some Timucuans friendly to the French and Saturiwa.

The Seloy natives apprised Menéndez of the potential size of the French forces and their relationships with various Timucuan leaders, and the two brothers familiar with Fort Caroline volunteered to lead the Spanish expedition as guides. It was also likely Seloy Indians who communicated the location of the French castaways to Menéndez after his capture of the French fort. Unfortunately the Spanish records provide little clarity on the Seloy natives’ motivations, as the Spaniards had not yet learned to distinguish any of the native polities, referring to them generically as “indios” and individual leaders as “caciques” without specific appellation. For the Seloy Indians, alliance with the Spaniards against Saturiwa may have represented an opportunity to strike at an enemy or a tyrannical overlord. If they resented the treatment of the French specifically, they took a risk helping the Spanish, an unknown

entity, supplant the French, who had recently been brought under control by Saturiwa.37

Without the guidance of Timucuans living south of Fort Caroline, the Spanish fleet could not have located the French settlement before Ribault unloaded his reinforcements and supplies, nor could Menéndez have orchestrated his surprise overland raid. But perhaps more significant is the complete absence of Saturiwa and his allies from the conflict. The Timucuans in the area clearly understood that the Spaniards planned to attack the fort, and Saturiwa’s ally Emoloa obviously had access to news coming from Seloy, yet Saturiwa made no effort to assist the French against the Spaniards. Furthermore, the Seloy guides’ familiarity with Fort Caroline, located in the heart of Saturiwa’s territory, might imply that they acted with his consent or under his direction. In either case, if Saturiwa did not encourage the Spanish capture of the fort, he did not try to prevent it either. His alliance with the French apparently did not extend to protecting them from their European rivals, at least not until it became clear who was likely to prevail.

The abrupt termination of the French colony has led to an oversimplification of its relationship with Saturiwa. Saturiwa, the French, and the Spaniards all perpetuated the fiction that Saturiwa and his allies “had never ceased to love the French” because it fit well into the narratives they each created to explain subsequent events.38 Modern historians have generally accepted this static interpretation, but the evidence indicates otherwise.39 The relationship had evolved over its first fourteen months from a promising alliance, through a period of tense hostility, and finally into a tepid agreement for Saturiwa to provide food for the French to maintain their war against Outina. Had the French remained, it doubtless would have continued to change. But because the relationship was cut off, the impression given in the autumn of 1565 became essentialized as an enduring friendship. Furthermore, the Spanish fear of retaliation bred a persistent belief in such an alliance, even in the face of contradictory evidence.

37. Mendoza Grajales, “Memoria del buen suceso,” f. 6 verso–7 recto; Menéndez de Avilés to Philip II, September 11, 1565, in Navarrete, Colección, 14:f. 285 recto; Menéndez de Avilés to Philip II, October 15, 1565, in ibid., f. 289 recto, 290 recto; Menéndez de Avilés to Philip II, December 5, 1565, in ibid., f. 300 verso.
38. La Reprise de la Floride, f. 12 recto.
39. See note 5 above.
Menéndez estimated that 150 French colonists had escaped him and found refuge with the Timucuans, and he believed that the ongoing potential of a combined Franco-Saturiwa retaliation posed a grave threat. Because of this, he immediately began negotiating with Timucuan leaders to have the French captives turned over to him, and he fretted constantly about the supposedly friendly relations between the French and the natives. This concern, however, was temporarily eclipsed by the need for provisions for his newfound colony. Menéndez believed that the danger of the French alliances with Florida’s natives would only be magnified if French reinforcements arrived, but he also recognized that starvation would compel his own soldiers to alienate the Timucuans. Of all the hazards for a new settlement, he considered a shortage of food the most pressing, and he left in November to procure supplies in Havana. 40

As he prepared to depart, Menéndez still held out hope that Saturiwa could be peeled away from the French. “On this river there are large settlements of Indians, and they all are great friends of the French that were there ... [but] all the Indians do not have such perfect peace with them that they cannot have a firmer one with us, because I will not allow a grain of maize to be taken from them,” he reported to Philip II. 41 Menéndez’s reports to the crown missed few opportunities to laud his own singular abilities, and the ease with which he expected to win native allies reveals some of the credulity to which he was sometimes given, particularly when Indians told him what he wanted to hear. But he had real reason to feel encouraged by what he had seen in his short encounter with the Timucuans. From September to November of 1565, the relationship between the Spaniards and Saturiwa’s Timucuans was apparently intimate enough to encourage many of the Indians to relocate their dwellings closer to the former French fort now renamed San Mateo, presumably for better access to European trade goods. Also, around September 20, Saturiwa turned over to Menéndez several of the Frenchmen who had sought refuge with him. All signs indicated that the Timucuan paracoustis’s dedication to his French friends was less than absolute, despite Menéndez’s

40. Menéndez de Avilés to Philip II, October 15, 1565, in Navarrete, Colección, 14:f. 289 verso, 291 verso, 293 recto–293 verso, 298 verso, 299 verso; Menéndez de Avilés to Philip II, December 5, 1565, in ibid., f. 301 recto, 303 recto.
41. Menéndez de Avilés to Philip II, October 15, 1565, in ibid., f. 293 recto–293 verso.
persistently voiced fear of their close friendship and potential for combined retaliation.42

While Menéndez wintered in Spain, however, the soldiers in Florida appear to have undermined whatever goodwill had been earned. They repeatedly antagonized Saturiwa and his people, eventually killing three of his high-ranked allies. Relations had so deteriorated that when some of Saturiwa’s Timucuans captured the Spaniard Rodrigo Troche in March 1566, the paracoussi ordered his heart torn out of his living chest. By May, Saturiwa had killed over 100 Spaniards and burned the fort at St. Augustine. The constant attacks forced the Spaniards to relocate St. Augustine to a more removed location at the entrance to the bar, a stark contrast with the Timucuans’ own desire to live closer to the Spaniards at San Mateo only half a year before.43

Menéndez, the frustrated commander, attributed the conflict largely to the unruliness of the common soldiers who seem to have lived in a near-constant state of rebellion. The chronic food shortages that plagued French and Spanish Florida in these years also suggest that demands for food likely played a central role in the soldiers’ depredations. However, it may be significant that while Saturiwa made multiple overtures for an alliance during the autumn, Menéndez neglected to follow up on the opportunity. Preoccupied with exploring the rest of his newly-won territory, he failed to make any contact with Saturiwa until late August 1566, a year after his arrival in Florida. At that point he was rudely rebuffed by Saturiwa’s subordinates without even meeting the paracoussi, who may have resented the failure of the Spanish governor to respond to his friendly gestures. Rejected by Saturiwa, within days Menéndez found Outina cautiously willing to accept an alliance with the Spaniards. Thus, by the time Menéndez finally met Saturiwa in person for the first time in March 1567, he had neglected the paracoussi for a full year-and-a-half after settling in the heart of his territory. Saturiwa surely had noticed that by then Menéndez had already been allied with Outina for six months.44

42. Lyon, Enterprise of Florida, 123; Solís de Merás in Ruidíaz y Caravia, La Florida, 1:181.
43. Solís de Merás in Ruidíaz y Caravia, La Florida, 1:181, 217–221.
44. Menéndez de Avilés to Philip II, October 20, 1566, in John H. Hann, Missions to the Calusa (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1991), 358; Solís de Merás in Ruidíaz y Caravia, La Florida, 1:248–251, 256–257.
Regardless of whether Saturiwa’s hostility stemmed from such a perceived insult, his first meeting with Menéndez quickly soured. According to Gonzalo Solís de Merás, Menéndez’ brother-in-law, Saturiwa angrily revealed “that though he had many times said to the captains of [Menéndez] that he was his friend, he had not said this with a pure heart, because he held all the Christians for enemies, and that [Menéndez] and his soldiers were hens and cowards.”45 If true, this obviously had not prevented Saturiwa from seeking advantageous relationships with either the French or the Spaniards, but it helps explain his willingness to quickly abandon any inter-cultural alliance when it threatened to outlive its usefulness, and it undermines the characterization of the Franco-Timucuan alliance as an enduring friendship forged in united opposition to Spanish cruelty. Of course, it simplified matters for the Spaniards to characterize Saturiwa as duplicitous and inexorably antagonistic to Europeans, and we have only their account of this “confession.” But the fact remained that Saturiwa had not defended the French from the initial Spanish attack, and had instead sought an alliance with Menéndez. Far from being subsumed by the European conflict, Saturiwa dissimulated and chose opportune moments when participation on either side might serve his own ends.

Menéndez left for Spain on May 18, 1567, not long after his ill-fated attempt to reconcile with Saturiwa.46 In a meeting with Philip II on July 20, he tried to marginalize his native problems, claiming that he had befriended all of the leaders within 300 leagues of St. Augustine with the sole exception of the paracoussi Saturiwa.47 But contrary to his depiction, it appears that it was in fact Outina who was isolated from the other Timucuans, not Saturiwa. At nearly the same time that Menéndez met with Philip, the Spanish chaplain Mendoza Grajales wrote a letter to the absent Menéndez explaining that the Spanish garrisons had been forced to send eighty soldiers to protect Outina from the united attacks of Saturiwa, Nocoroco, Potano, and others. Although brief, Mendoza Grajales’ reference implies a unification of Timucuans who had not

45. Solís de Merás in Ruidíaz y Caravia, La Florida, 1:300-301.
46. Bartolomé de Barrientos, Vida y Hechos de Pero Menéndez de Avilés, printed in Dos antiguas relaciones de la Florida, ed. Genaro García (México: J. Aguilar Vera y Comp., 1902), 144.
47. Barrientos in García, Dos Antiguas Relaciones, 145; Solís de Merás in Ruidíaz y Caravia, La Florida, 1:317.
previously cooperated with one another and had in fact functioned as rivals. His vagueness only hints at the true extent of cooperation against the new Spanish-Outina alliance, but clearly some kind of new opposition had coalesced. 48

Without question the Spanish colony provoked this disruption of the pre-existing Timucuan political economy, and the Spanish forts served as the targets of much of the aggression of Saturiwa and his new allies. But in the incident mentioned by Mendoza Grajales, many of the Timucuans targeted Outina, not the Spaniards. Potano, who had been repeatedly attacked by the combined Outina-French forces in 1564 and 1565, had little to gain from making enemies of the Spanish but much to gain from the defeat of Outina. “As he saw himself harassed he sent for help and as a friend we sent it to him,” wrote the chaplain, demonstrating how the Spaniards, under constant assault from Saturiwa, nonetheless felt compelled to dispatch a large force of soldiers to defend Outina from Potano. 49

Unwittingly echoing Laudonnière, Menéndez had written of the Indians that “I have not wanted to befriend any [leader] in order to make war with his enemy, even though he might also be my enemy,” but this proved impossible in the Timucuan borderlands. 50 Europeans invariably found themselves tangled in the web of political relationships tying the Timucuans together.

While the Spaniards tried to navigate these political relationships, outrage steadily built in France over Menéndez’s actions in 1564. One of the survivors, the carpenter Nicolas le Challeux, published a lurid description that proved particularly effective in galvanizing the public. His narrative held a special resonance for Dominique de Gourgues, a minor gentleman who had served the French crown for twenty years in Scotland, Piedmont, and the Levant. He had once been captured by the Spaniards and imprisoned as a galley slave, and this doubtless added to his spirited

50. Pedro Menéndez de Avilés to Diego Avellaneda, October 15, 1566, printed in Monumenta Antiquae Floridae (1566-1572), ed. Félix Zubillaga (Rome: Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu, 1946), 93.
response to the news. He had previously made several voyages to Africa and South America, so he would not have attracted especial notice when he left Bordeaux on August 2, 1567 to "make war on the negroes" in Benin.\textsuperscript{51} From Africa he made his way to Cuba, where he surprised his soldiers and crew by revealing his ultimate aim: to take revenge on the Spaniards in Florida. He needed to convince his men to take on the challenge, but he carried one of the former colonists with him as a guide and interpreter, proof that he had planned the scheme in advance. He reached Florida in mid-April 1568, just after Menéndez departed Spain with a small relief fleet for the colony.\textsuperscript{52}

The Recovery of Florida, the anonymous French text sometimes attributed to Gourgues himself, emphasizes his cleverness in taking advantage of native allies to effect his revenge. "When he [Gourgues] arrived in Florida," it reads, "he shrewdly associated with the savages and well understood how to make use of them and thus to make up for the scarcity of men he brought."\textsuperscript{53} The French commander fortuitously landed at the village of Tacatacuru, an ally of Saturiwa.\textsuperscript{54} Tacatacuru enjoyed a particularly odious reputation among the Spaniards for allegedly slaying the Jesuit priest Pedro Martínez, and he stood accused of several other Spanish deaths. Before leaving for Spain, Menéndez had left specific instructions that Tacatacuru be hunted down and killed.\textsuperscript{55} As a specially-targeted enemy of the Spaniards, then, Tacatacuru presented Gourgues with an ideal accomplice for his avowed strategy of using the Indians to defeat the Spaniards.

Gourgues fit equally well into the plans of Tacatacuru and his Timucuan allies. The text records that Gourgues was greeted warmly as a liberator, first by Tacatacuru, then by a hastily-called assembly of Saturiwa and his allies. According to the French text, Saturiwa complained to Gourgues of the ills they had suffered "because of the friendship they had contracted with the French," yet he assured Gourgues that "they had never ceased to love the French because of the good treatment they had received from them when

\textsuperscript{51} La Reprinse de la Floride, f. 4 verso.
\textsuperscript{52} Charles La Roncière, Histoire de la marine française (Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit, 1899), 64; La Reprinse de la Floride, f. 3 verso–9 verso.
\textsuperscript{53} La Reprinse de la Floride, f. 30 recto.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., f. 10 recto.
\textsuperscript{55} Barrientos in García, Dos Antiguas Relaciones, 141.
they commanded there.” Indeed, the fear of a Franco-Timucuan alliance had kept the Spaniards on edge, but the actual interactions between the Spaniards and the Timucuans were more ambivalent than the Spaniards generally represented. Saturiwa and Menéndez had both demonstrated interest in an alliance that had failed to coalesce primarily because of Menéndez’s extended absences, not because the Franco-Saturiwa alliance proved an inviolable bond. But the anonymous narrative, like the writings of the Spaniards, perpetuates the myth of an ongoing Franco-Saturiwa relationship.

The register of the assembly taken by the French author conspicuously omits any mention of Potano or Nocoroco, Saturiwa’s allies as recorded by Mendoza Grajales, or any other Timucuans outside of the immediate vicinity of San Mateo. The broader coalition that had attacked Outina the previous summer may have been too distant to assemble on short notice or simply uninterested in joining an assault on the Spanish fort. The latter is the more likely explanation because, contrary to the French text, Spanish sources record that Saturiwa and Tacatacuru did not await the appearance of the French for deliverance, and had already assembled their forces before Gourgues’ arrival. The Spaniards had suffered sporadic attacks by Saturiwa and his allies for well over a year. According to one Spanish official, less than two weeks previously 400 Indians had made a concerted assault on San Mateo. This ongoing conflict offers a more convincing explanation for their eagerness to attack the Spanish than any lingering loyalty to the French. “Have no fear,” said the gathered allies of Saturiwa to Gourgues, “we wish them more ill than you do.”

The combined forces of 400 Timucuans and 100 Frenchman attacked San Mateo and two small blockhouses, routing their inhabitants and killing every Spaniard they laid hands on. While Outina was not directly involved in the Franco-Saturiwa attack on San Mateo, there are hints that the Spaniards’ ongoing affiliation with Outina might have partly motivated Saturiwa and his allies to join with Gourgues and the French soldiers. Upon receiving word of the assault, Esteban de las Alas, an official at St. Augustine, pled for help from Outina, indicating that their alliance was still quite intact. Unaware that the fort had already been lost, Las Alas

56. *La Réprisade la Floride*, f. 12 recto.
57. Esteban de las Alas to Philip II, May 5, 1568, Patronato 254, N.1, G.2, R.1, AGI.
58. *La Réprisade la Floride*, f. 13 recto.
asked Outina to send six men to deliver messages to the besieged Spaniards under the cover of darkness. Yet before Las Alas had even dispatched his request to Outina, a small contingent of panicked Spanish soldiers had already gone to Outina’s village seeking refuge. Several years later, two Timucuan leaders tied to the Spaniards complained that their villages had been attacked by Saturiwa and his allies during the assault. This might imply that the assault on the fort offered an opportunity to settle intra-native conflicts not directly related to hostility against the Spaniards or friendship with the French.

In the aftermath of the victory, Gourgues had no intention of replanting a French colony in Florida. He chose not to challenge the other Spanish settlements at St. Augustine and Santa Elena either. Instead, after briefly reveling in his triumph, he joined Saturiwa’s Timucuans in razing the fort and then departed. Surprisingly, despite Saturiwa’s central role in the destruction of San Mateo, in the ensuing months the Spaniards still entertained the prospect of reconciliation. Saturiwa’s close ally Emoloa made overtures to them just two months after Gourgues’ visit, leading the Spaniards to believe that a turnabout for Saturiwa still might be possible.

In fact, the Spaniards may have pursued peace because Saturiwa no longer figured as the leader of their opposition. Rumors reached St. Augustine that Gourgues had intended to build a permanent fort at the village of Tacatacuru, and by the end of 1568 that was where the Timucuans hostile to the Spanish presence gathered. The island on which Tacatacuru lived may have offered a more strategic site from which to mount a defense, or Tacatacuru’s polity may have begun to eclipse Saturiwa’s as the dominant power and the leader of the opposition in the region.

59. Esteban de las Alas to Philip II, May 5, 1568, Patronato 254, N.1, G.2, R.1, AGI.
A Spanish source from 1602 documents the preeminence of Tacatacuru, and the transition may have occurred earlier. When the Spaniards finally retaliated over the winter of 1568–1569, this was where they directed their efforts, implying that Saturiwa was no longer their primary concern. Outina or his successor must have been pleased to see Saturiwa's power wane, even in the wake of the Franco-Saturiwa victory at San Mateo. In the long run, Outina had reaped a greater benefit than his rival from his relationships with the European colonists.

Gourgues vowed to Saturiwa that he would return within a year, but neither he nor any other French ships visited Florida for eight years. Dozens of French sailors and soldiers shipwrecked in the aftermath of Fort Caroline's capture still lingered among the Indians, but few were with the Timucuans any longer, having dispersed further north among the Timucuans' northerly neighbors, the Guale and Orista.

 Until 1578 it appeared that Spain's European rivals had abandoned their designs on Florida. In that year, a French ship foundered off the coast inhabited by the Guale and Orista. Around 100 French castaways were captured, and although the Native Americans enslaved them, the captives allegedly conspired with the Guale and Orista to contact the Timucuans and suggest a joint campaign against Spanish St. Augustine. The Guale and Orista had already destroyed the Spanish settlement nearest them, Santa Elena, and if the allegation of an impending alliance with the Timucuans was true, were willing to overcome their own differences with the Timucuans to expel the Spaniards from their last major stronghold in Florida. But the Timucuans rejected them. "The Indians here were not willing to consent to this, saying that they had peace and quietude with us and did not want any strife," wrote Pedro Menéndez Marqués, now the governor of Florida.

A similar event occurred in 1580, when two French ships tried to
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encourage another pan-Indian alliance centered in the territory of
the Guale and extending into Timucuan lands.68 Rivalries between
the Guale and Timucuans worked against an alliance with the
French, and some of the natives sided with the Spaniards in their
successful repulsion of the French frigates.69

It is difficult to say precisely why the Timucuans, who formerly
rallied around Saturiwa, now proved unwilling to join the French
and Guale in destroying St. Augustine. As historian John Hann
pointed out, violent Spanish retaliation for previous offenses, the
removal of Saturiwa and Tacatacuru as leaders (Tacatacuru was
executed in 1569 and Saturiwa fades from the historical record),
and longstanding Timucuan-Guale hostilities probably all played
a role.70

Yet Governor Menéndez Marqués’ depiction of an entirely
subjugated Timucuan population near St. Augustine failed to
capture the reality. There were evidently divisions among the
Timucuans, even in the near vicinity of St. Augustine. On June
6, 1586, Francis Drake arrived at St. Augustine after committing
devastating raids at Santo Domingo and Cartagena. Confronted
by forty-two ships and 2,500 Englishmen, Menéndez Marqués and
his eighty soldiers gamely defended their fort for a few hours, but
as he explained to Philip II, “as soon as the English came down
upon the fort, the Indians began to burn the town.”71 Not all of the
Indians welcomed the English attackers, though. Drake allegedly
tried to solicit one village near the fort, but found the village

68. Historians disagree about whether the Gualequini, the primary partners
targeted by the French in 1580, were Guale or Timucuan. See Hann, History of
the Timucua Indians, 70; and Amy Turner Bushnell, Situado and Sabana: Spain’s
Support System for the Presidio and Mission Provinces of Florida, Archaeology of
Mission Santa Catalina De Guale 3 (New York: American Museum of Natural
History, 1994), 63.
69. Bushnell, Situado and Sabana, 63; Officials of Florida to Philip II, October 12,
1580, Santo Domingo 229, f. 26 recto, AGI.
70. Hann, History of the Timucua Indians, 70; Paul E. Hoffman, Florida’s Frontiers: A
History of the Trans-Appalachian Frontier (Bloomington: Indiana University Press,
2002), 57-59.
71. Gabriel de Luxan and Diego Fernández de Quiñones to Philip II, July 1, 1586,
translated in Irene Aloha Wright, Further English Voyages to Spanish America,
1583-1594: Documents from the Archives of the Indies at Seville Illustrating English
Voyages to the Caribbean, the Spanish Main, Florida, and Virginia, Works Issued by
for the Hakluyt Society, 1951), 184-185; other details from Pedro Menéndez
Marqués to President of the House of Trade, June 17, 1586, translated in ibid.,
163-164.
abandoned, its residents having fled to the woods. These “friendly Indians” were supposedly protecting 200 Spanish noncombatants, but Menéndez Marqués apparently placed little faith in their loyalty. “The friendly Indians came down upon a certain estate at a distance from the fort, where the women and children had taken refuge,” wrote a Spaniard, “in view of which, and finding himself surrounded by the enemy and Indians, Pedro Menéndez Marqués withdrew and abandoned the fort.” Once again, the sources fail to specify exactly which Timucuans joined the English destruction of St. Augustine and which abstained, let alone why. But some Timucuans who had been unwilling to join the proposed alliance with the French six years previously eagerly joined Drake. Perhaps they were convinced by an overwhelmingly superior English force, or perhaps they preferred the absence of Guale auxiliaries.

Where collaboration was required in the borderlands, quick, decisive strikes like those of Gourgues and Drake proved far easier to accomplish than sustained partnerships. We know almost nothing about Drake’s interactions with the Timucuans, but Gourgues and Saturiwa had a relatively straightforward and manageable, if mistrustful, relationship. Both the Frenchman and the Timucuan opposed the Spanish-Outina alliance, so they found it relatively easy to work together for a brief period of time. Gourgues’ predecessor, Laudonnière, had found it far more difficult to turn the intra-Timucuan rivalries to his own ends over the long term. Similarly, Saturiwa had been unable to persuade Laudonnière to take action against his enemies, and may have had difficulty holding together a pan-Timucuan opposition to the Spanish-Outina alliance. Adding to this tension, frequent ruptures in borderland partnerships provided continual opportunities for new, short-term collaborations. When the falling out between Outina and Laudonnière forced the French into fighting against Saturiwa’s old rival, the paracoussi took full advantage of the rift for the short time the French remained in Florida. Similarly, the Spaniards found that the Saturiwa-Outina rivalry made it easier to cooperate with Outina when relations were at their worst with Saturiwa. This may also explain why the Spaniards felt they could turn to Outina when they faced the combined Franco-Saturiwa attack.

Evaluating the impact of these relationships from the Timucuan perspective presents numerous challenges. The
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hostility of the Spaniards' immediate neighbor, Saturiwa, probably limited the ability of the former to acquire information about interactions among the Timucuans. We therefore know less than we would like about how their participation in the Franco-Spanish conflict affected them. Additionally, Spanish interests spanned an enormous geography, and during this period they generally prioritized their interactions with the Guale and the Calusa rather than the Timucuans. When, at the end of the sixteenth century, the Spaniards began to establish missions among the Timucuans, thereby bringing them into greater familiarity, they found that the Outina, Potano, and Saturiwa polities, as well as their webs of alliances, had altered significantly. Saturiwa's heirs had lost their pre-eminence to Tacatacuru, Outina's subordinates had begun to peel away, and Potano's chiefdom had largely collapsed, its main village destroyed.74

The presence of European soldiers, missionaries, livestock, and microbes doubtless wreaked significant, often catastrophic changes, and the overall Timucuan population seems to have declined after the arrival of Europeans in the sixteenth century. But the temptation to attribute this change solely to European intervention should be avoided, as such an interpretation rests on an implicit premise of a static pre-contact equilibrium. Quite to the contrary, the Timucuans lived in an inherently dynamic and volatile political world, and European intervention had the potential to accelerate or retard pre-existing changes as much as initiate new ones. Furthermore, an overemphasis on the transformative role of the Franco-Spanish clash threatens to efface the reciprocity of relationships between Europeans and Timucuans. Saturiwa demanded that Laudonnière "show himself a friend of his friends and an enemy of his enemies," and indeed it was those intra-Indian political dynamics that drove Timucuans not merely to adapt or resist European incursions, but rather to actively pursue partnerships with would-be colonists.75
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Sixteenth-Century Florida in the European Imagination

by John McGrath

What we call Florida today is the nearest part of the American mainland to the spot where Columbus landed in 1492, while North America’s east coast is also the closest part of the New World to Europe’s Atlantic ports. Despite the proximity, Florida remained a mysterious, perplexing land throughout the sixteenth century. For over a century, rumors and legends of various kinds of riches promised rewards to those who could find them, yet successive attempts to explore and settle were frustrating or even disastrous. By 1600, the only lasting European footprint in Florida was St. Augustine, a small outpost that had been established and maintained at a great human and monetary cost.

In an age before the invention of the telescope, sailors found it difficult to detect the low elevations of the Florida peninsula on the horizon, even from the top of a ship’s mast. Its shallow coastal waters were treacherous, and sixteenth-century navigators who did make a closer inspection found a flat, swampy and heavily forested expanse that had few distinguishing characteristics. Who lived there, if anyone, was probably also hard to determine. Five hundred years ago, most of the peninsula’s native inhabitants lived
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a seminomadic existence, raising corn and other crops, hunting, fishing, and gathering, with few, if any, large settlements.\footnote{Jerald T. Milanich, *Florida Indians and the Invasion from Europe* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1995), 1-2.}

Historical tradition has it that Juan Ponce de Leon “discovered” Florida during a quest to locate the “Fountain of Youth.” While it makes a quaint tale, this idea was a later embellishment by sixteenth-century writers. The story started with the Italian scholar, Peter Martyr d’Anghiera, one of America’s most effective early publicists, three years after Ponce’s first voyage. In an early published letter he linked Florida to this ancient Old World legend. Only after Ponce’s death did later historians assert that the quest for the mythical fountain was his primary purpose.\footnote{A clear explanation of the origin of this legend can be found in Douglas T. Peck’s “Anatomy of an Historical Fantasy: The Ponce de León-Fountain of Youth Legend,” *Revista de Historia de America*, no. 123 (1998), 64-68. The “Fountain of Youth” concept derives from medieval traditions that include Amazon warriors and the Seven Cities of Cibola, both of which also found places in the folklore surrounding European explorations in the New World. Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo, the official chronicler of the Spanish American Empire, wrote in 1534 that finding the Fountain of Youth was the explicit purpose of Ponce’s voyage, something that Martyr had implied but not stated in 1516 (after Ponce’s initial voyage). Peck states that “It was this one unfounded, unsubstantiated, untrue, and almost casual remark by Oviedo that became the initial source for the Ponce de León legend that persists to this day!” (Peck’s italics). For Martyr’s explanation, see Richard Eden, *The First Three English Books on America*, ed. Edward Arber (London, 1885) book 3, 345. At a later date, Francisco López de Gómara reinforced this misperception in the 1560 edition of his *Historia General*. Other Spanish chroniclers in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries uncritically repeated the claim.}

If not the Fountain of Youth, what, then, was Ponce seeking? Since historical evidence suggests prior European discovery of what Ponce named “La Florida,” it is far more likely that he was searching for northern lands that had been reported by others during the previous two decades of European presence in the Caribbean.\footnote{Carl Ortwin Sauer, *Sixteenth-Century North America: The Land and the People as Seen by Europeans* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), 25-26; Henri Harrisse, *Découverte et évolution cartographique de Terre-Neuve et des pays circonvoisins* (Paris: H. Welter, 1890), 9-11.}

Due to the prevailing currents and winds, ships departing from the Spanish outposts had a difficult time setting out towards the east, and instead needed to sail north to get favorable winds that would take them to a latitude where they could pick up winds to propel them to Europe.\footnote{Jan Rogozinski, *A Brief History of the Caribbean* (New York: Plume, 1994), 7-8; Sauer, 25-31.} By the year of Ponce’s first expedition to Florida,
the number of returning ships was a dozen or more annually; a slight navigational error, a sudden change of wind, or simple curiosity might have brought any of them to Florida's shores. Moreover, numerous Spanish settlers who were disappointed by the riches found in the Caribbean launched seaborne expeditions to seek more lucrative areas, while others went in search of slave labor. Such voyages seldom left records, and it is reasonable to expect that one or more of these had arrived in Florida before Ponce, possibly even before 1500.

Probably as a result of such a voyage, or voyages, at least three influential early European maps made before 1513 are said to contain remarkably accurate depictions of Florida. The first of these was the Cantino Planisphere of 1502, which was smuggled out of Portugal by an Italian diplomat. This large map was perhaps best known for presenting the coast of Brazil for the first time, which it did with considerable accuracy. Some scholars also believe that it contains the earliest known European cartographic representation of a northern America, including an accurate depiction of the Florida peninsula in the corner northwest of Cuba. This placement suggests that the land mass in question is part of a larger mainland. Whether this feature was based on firsthand exploration or mere conjecture is impossible to determine with certainty, since before 1502 the only known Portuguese who had explored north of the Caribbean were the Corte Real brothers, who almost certainly did not get any further south than New England.

The Cantino "proto-Florida" was not an isolated cartographic curiosity. The same image or land mass in the same position relative to Cuba was soon found in Martin Waldseemüller's *Universalis Cosmographia* of 1507, the wall map that bestowed the name "America" on the New World. Waldseemüller was hardly one to engage in guesswork; his cartography was based on a solid familiarity with most of the important voyages of discovery until that
time, and this map has been described as "the most comprehensive and most nearly correct representation of the world known to have been constructed up to the year 1507."9

A differently drawn northern landmass appeared in another of the best known publications of the era, the 1511 map that accompanied Martyr's early writings on America. On this map, land is shown above Cuba, on the northern border of the map, labeled "illa de Beimeni." The place name "Beimeni," of various spellings including "Bimini," may have had its origin in the mythology of the Tainos who inhabited the West Indies at Columbus's arrival. Whether this name was applied to a feature observed by European navigators, or on the basis of Taino reports, is impossible to determine.10

Together, these maps suggest that the existence of land north of Cuba—whether it was a large island or a mainland—was something close to common knowledge among European navigators by 1513. Each of these individuals—Cantino, Waldseemüller, and Martyr—had connections to the same relatively intimate circle of geographers in Northern Italy, Portugal, and Castile, a circle that had access to the reports and charts of the Cabots, Vespucci, and the Castilian House of Trade.11 Somewhat ironically, while it can hardly be doubted that Ponce did in fact land in present day Florida, he himself may have died before learning for certain that "La Florida" was part of a larger continent instead of an island. In fact, his second contract in 1514 authorized him to occupy and govern "the islands of Bimini and Florida."12 And like other explorers of his time, he hoped to find human and natural resources, not just a "fountain of youth," that could be exploited.

10. Douglas T. Peck provides a likely logical explanation in a detailed article on his website. See New World Explorers, "Misconceptions and Myths Related to the Fountain of Youth and Juan Ponce de León's 1513 Exploration Voyage," http://www.newworldexplorersinc.org, (accessed July 24, 2012) 6-8; see also Peck's article cited previously, 70-72; a readable reproduction of this map can be found in Wroth, Voyages of Verrazano, plate 11.
12. Ponce's official patent (charter) issued by the crown is found in Martín Fernández de Navarrete's Collection de documentos inéditos del Archivo de Indias, and has been translated by J. A. Robertson in the Florida Historical Quarterly, 14, no. 1 (1935): 1-49.
Determining the physical extent of this landmass was more difficult because neither Ponce’s first voyage in 1513, nor his second in 1521, was conclusive in this regard. Too, by 1513, when Balboa became the first known European to set his eyes on the “Great South Sea,” the Pacific Ocean, Spanish explorers had already turned their attention towards the lands lying to the south and west, first to Panama and then the Yucatán and Mexico. In 1519, as Hernán Cortez began his assault on the Aztec empire, the navigator Alonzo Alvarez de Pineda conducted an eight-month journey from Jamaica, into the Florida Keys, and then westward to Mexico along the Gulf Coast, establishing that Ponce’s “La Florida” could not be an island by virtue of its connection to the unbroken coastline trending west. The voyages of Ponce, Alvarez de Pineda, and others had firmly established that it was a southward trending peninsula. In the same year (1519), Martín Fernández de Enciso’s Suma de Geografía presented the first systematic description of the lands discovered in America, reporting that northwest of Cuba was “a great countrie [sic], it is thought to be a firme lande [sic].” But for Ponce the possibilities that such a “firme lande” might hold were not to be. His attempt to establish a permanent colony in Florida met with disaster in 1521. Most of the subsequent sixteenth-century efforts to do the same resulted in similar outcomes.

Shortly thereafter, critical events transformed European designs on the New World. The survivors of Magellan’s circumnavigation reported that “America” was in fact a great distance from Asia, across a vast sea that was christened the “Pacific Ocean,” and that the Americas must therefore comprise a distinct continent or continents. This was disappointing news to many. Even as Cortez’s conquest of Mexico reawakened Spanish hopes of finding vast riches in America, many rulers and merchants alike considered trade with Asia to be a higher priority than the discovery of new...
lands. Magellan’s discoveries established definitively that America was not part of Asia, and many began to see it as a troublesome barrier to profitable trade with the wealthy East.\textsuperscript{16}

Martyr had first proposed the idea that a sea passage to Asia might be found somewhere through the landmasses that had been discovered.\textsuperscript{17} Magellan’s voyage made this issue—whether or not there existed a “Western Passage” leading into the Pacific—one of urgency among European kingdoms. Alvarez de Pineda had already shown that no such passage existed between Mexico and Florida, while other navigators, including Vespucci and Magellan, had failed to find one along South America’s east coast, aside from the perilous Strait of Magellan, which lay many thousands of miles from Europe. This left only the northern regions of the New World as the possible location of a more convenient route to Asia. Numerous early maps between 1502 and 1524 had already speculated that open water capable of providing a passage into the Pacific might be found here, somewhere between the Caribbean settlements and the areas reached by John Cabot and the Corte Reals around the turn of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{18}

Only a systematic coastal reconnaissance could determine this with certainty. Shortly after Magellan’s return, the navigators Estavão Gomes, sailing for Spain, and Giovanni de Verrazzano, sailing for France, set out to do that. Both missions intended to ascertain how far to the north “La Florida” extended, and whether it connected to the northern lands already visited.\textsuperscript{19} The Verrazzano and Gomes voyages, conducted separately but almost concurrently along the east coast of North America, helped to settle some of the uncertainties concerning the nature of this northern continent’s northeastward trending Atlantic coast. This was reinforced by a north to south coastal reconnaissance from Labrador to the Caribbean, in 1527, by the navigator John Rut, sailing for England.\textsuperscript{20}


\textsuperscript{17} Allen, 508; Quinn, North America from Earliest Discovery, 124.


\textsuperscript{19} Wroth, Voyages of Verrazzano, 45.

\textsuperscript{20} McDermott, 98-99; Quinn, North America from Earliest Discovery, 165-166.
Florida’s reputation was also enhanced by the failures of three major Spanish expeditions launched into Florida’s interior during the 1520s and 1530s. None of them found the great wealth they sought, but each contributed to the mystery of what might be found there. Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón, a judge in the colonial capital of Santo Domingo, organized the first of these. After a Spanish slave hunting voyage of 1521 had reported a northern territory containing giant men and other strange creatures, he sought a royal license for a project to conquer the new discovery when he traveled to Spain in 1523 on official business. Accompanied by a captured Indian he called Francisco of Chicora, he regaled the royal court with promises of a fertile and wealthy land of great potential that he promised he could transform into a “New Andalucia.”²¹ Among Ayllón’s audience in Spain were Martyr and the royal chronicler Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdez, both of whom spread the idea of “Chicora” or the “land of Ayllón” through their widely disseminated later publications.²² The story likely influenced the Hernando de Soto expedition in the next decade and, even later, left an important legacy for future French expeditions to Florida in the 1560s.

Despite Ayllón’s failure on Florida’s east coast (1526), another expedition was launched shortly thereafter on the west coast. Though it proved hardly more rewarding, it did contribute further to the mysteries surrounding Florida. Pánfilo Narváez, who felt that he had been inadequately rewarded for his part in Cortez’s conquest, was determined to find his own Tenochtitlan and the riches and fame that came with it. He received a royal license to settle the Gulf Coast between Mexico and Ayllón’s territory, stretching from the Rio de las Palmas (the modern Soto La Marina) to the west coast of Florida. In 1528, he sailed with some six hundred men for Mexico but because of a storm that hit his fleet as it sailed near Cuba, ended up near a large bay (today’s Tampa Bay) on Florida’s west coast.²³ He then made the fatal mistake of separating his forces and marching his soldiers on a frustrating odyssey into the interior while his ships were


²². Oviedo’s Historia General de las Indias was published in 1535, 1547, and 1557. Its final version was published by the Royal Academy in Madrid in four volumes between 1851 and 1855. See Kathleen Ann Myers, Fernández de Oviedo’s Chronicle of America: A New History for a New World (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007), especially 1-40; Hoffman, New Andalucia, 84-86.

²³. Weber, 42-44; Milanich, 115-125.
sent to look for the bay and get supplies. The failure of the soldiers to reconnect with their ships ultimately doomed the mission. Very few of Narvaez’s soldiers ever made it back to Spain.  

De Soto, a veteran of the conquest of Peru, received yet another license to settle Florida (1538). He, too, was convinced that he could find rich kingdoms like those of the Aztecs and Incas. Accompanied by over a thousand men, he landed near Tampa Bay and explored coastal and inland areas of the southeast United States. Despite ruthlessly plundering villages, enslaving the local Indians, and leaving epidemic disease in his wake, his quest for precious metals was as resounding a failure as Ayllon’s and Narváez’s had been.

On the basis of the reports accumulated by these seaborne and overland expeditions, the European maps that began to appear by the 1520s steadily filled in some of the gaps, literally and figuratively, in knowledge of the southeastern part of North America. The “Land of Ayllón” appeared on the Juan Vespucci map of 1526, and is featured prominently on the 1529 world map of Diogo Ribeiro, Pilot Major of the Spanish House of Trade. By then, European maps typically depicted an unbroken eastern coastline of North America, affixing the label “La Florida” to its southern extremity.

Oviedo contributed another legend to Florida that attracted the attention of later explorers, that of the mountain (or mountain range) of “Apalache” that was supposed to have copious supplies of gold. Oviedo’s account of the Narváez expedition’s fate was largely based on the testimonies of survivors, including that of Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, who had reached Northern Mexico after a remarkable eight-year overland journey.

24. Robert S. Weddle, Spanish Sea: The Gulf of Mexico in North America Discovery, 1500-1685 (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1985) provides a short account. For additional studies see Hoffman, this volume.
25. Charles Hudson’s Knights of Spain, Warriors of the Sun: Hernando de Soto and the South’s Ancient Chiefdoms (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998) is a thorough history of this effort; see also Milanich, 127-136.
27. Cumming et al, displays Juan Vespucci’s 1526 map on pages 86-87, figure 87, as well as the Ribeiro 1529 map, figure 115; see also Wroth, Voyages of Verrazano, 53, 174-177.
28. Herbert Davenport provides a translated version of the relevant chapters of Oviedo’s chronicle in “The Expedition of Pánfilo Narváez by Gonzalo Fernández Oviedo y Valdez,” Southwestern Historical Quarterly 28, no. 2 (October 1924): 120-163. In his foreword, he explains the sources used by Oviedo. See also Myers, 12-32.
published account told how the local Indians had informed Narváez that "far from there, in a province known as Apalache, there was a great deal of gold." Oviedo suggested that this was the reason behind Narváez’s insistence, against the wishes of his subordinates, on leading his soldiers inland and separating them from their ships, which ultimately led to Narváez’s ruin. Hence, "Apalache" joined the "Fountain of Youth" and "Chicora" as an objective of European explorers, and published works in various languages regularly referred to all three for the rest of the sixteenth century.

By midcentury, while European navigators and geographers had a firm sense of both Florida’s western and eastern coasts, a significant uncertainty remained. This was a complication that arose from an observational error made by Verrazzano, who apparently had mistaken Pamlico Sound for the Pacific Ocean. On the basis of his report, some Europeans suspected that "La Florida" was connected to the northern areas only by a narrow isthmus, beyond which lay a "Verrazzanian Sea" that could provide the sought-after passage to the Great South Sea and Asia. The Verrazzanian Sea appeared most often on French maps, including Pierre Desceliers’ 1544 world map, an early product of the “Dieppe School” of cartographers in Normandy. This map not only featured a detailed depiction of “Canada,” based on the observations of the Cartier expeditions, but also showed a river just north of Florida that appeared to connect this imagined western sea to the Atlantic Ocean. A significant number of other European maps also contained a Verrazzanian Sea or some equivalent, including those of the German Sebastian Münster, whose mid-century cosmographies were among the most popular and influential printed works of the sixteenth century. The hope of finding the Verrazzanian Sea, and/or a western passage to Asia stubbornly persisted, stimulating coastal explorations north of Florida well into the next century.

Despite the early failures, Florida continued to captivate the European imagination. Much as the story of “Eldorado” endured in

29. Davenport, 131.
32. The idea of a “Verrazzanian Sea” influenced English maritime efforts especially, including the Frobisher expeditions. Skelton, 78-94; Harrisse, 93-99; Wroth, Voyages of Verrazzano, 188.
South America, the legends of "Chicora" and "Apalache" extended the hope that the region might yet yield riches. In Europe, advances in printing and the spread of literacy reached a growing number of Europeans eager to read about exotic locales and kingdoms of great wealth. In addition to Oviedo's royally sponsored works, Cabeza de Vaca's *Relacion*, which publicized the Narváez expedition and the author's subsequent journey, appeared in Spain in 1542. Nine years later, the Spanish chronicler Francisco Lopez de Gómara's *Historia General de las Indias* enthusiastically promoted the exploits of Cortez and other conquistadors, relying on Martyr's accounts of the early expeditions to Florida. Meanwhile, shortly after midcentury, Giovanni Ramusio, the official cosmographer of the Venetian Republic, published his comprehensive collection *Navigationi et Viaggi*, which contained versions of Verrazzano's own account of his voyage along the east coast.33

By then, some of the most significant works dealing with Florida were starting to appear for an English readership increasingly interested in what the New World had to offer. In 1541, Roger Barlow, who had sailed with Sebastian Cabot to the New World, translated Enciso's *Suma de Geografia* into English for Henry VIII's Admiralty, who employed it as a comprehensive guide to New World navigation for the training of English pilots.34 Perhaps even more influential were the publications directed by Richard Eden, who translated the most popular works of Martyr, Oviedo, and Munster into English.35 In doing so, he introduced an English readership to the possibilities suggested by the Fountain of Youth, the land of Ayllón, Apalache, and the Verrazzanian Sea.

Meanwhile, other developments would guarantee that Florida would become a Spanish imperial priority; indeed, that it would even be worth fighting over. Even as de Soto's expedition became the latest Florida initiative to disintegrate, other conquistadors were

---

33. Delle navigazioni e viaggi raccolto gia da M. Gio. Battista Ramusio... The first volume, which contains the Verrazzano report, was published in Venice in 1563; additional volumes appeared in 1583 and 1606.


35. These were first published together in London (1885) by Edward Arber as *The First Three English Books on America*.
having more success exploring, conquering and settling South and Central America. In the long term, perhaps the most important consequences of this era took place in Northern Mexico and at Potosí in the Bolivian highlands, with the discovery and development of silver deposits of extraordinary capacity. The Spanish Crown—challenged in Europe by the Ottoman Turks, the French, and later the Dutch and English—quickly became dependent on this flow of American bullion to finance its military forces. During the 1550s, the Spaniards began to develop a regularized convoy system to transport American silver safely to Spain. Because of the prevailing Atlantic wind and current patterns, these fleets, or flotas, sailed north from their departure point of Havana, using the Gulf Stream to pass along Florida’s east coast. Though the strong current allowed the flota to pass through quickly, this first stretch of the homeward-bound journey, through the Florida Strait, presented both natural and manmade dangers. It also made “La Florida” a region of critical strategic importance.

French corsairs were the most significant of the manmade dangers. Ships from France’s Atlantic ports, such as Dieppe, St. Mälo, Bayonne, and La Rochelle, had been venturing into the Atlantic for half a century. Their journeys took them across the North Atlantic for fishing and whaling, to Portuguese-claimed Brazil to trade for timber and dyestuffs, and, increasingly, on predatory raids against Spanish shipping and Caribbean settlements as part of the on-going Franco-Spanish wars of the first half of the sixteenth century. Though private merchants provided much of the backing for such expeditions, the French royal government was also directly involved on a regular basis. The French did not recognize the 1494 Tordesillas treaty, instead asserting their right to claim areas
of the New World that were yet "undiscovered" and, later, areas that were "unsettled." 40 After midcentury, French raiders, many of them Protestant, were launching orchestrated attacks that threatened both Spanish settlements and the precious flotas. 41 Persuaded by the colonial authorities of the danger the French presented to the silver fleets, young king Philip II, who had taken the throne after his father Charles' abdication, began to take additional steps to protect them. 42

In 1557, the Viceroy of New Spain (today's Mexico) initiated the largest project yet undertaken in Florida. He appointed Tristán de Luna y Arellano, who had accompanied the Coronado expedition into the Southwest, to lead a fleet of thirteen ships and almost 1,500 men to Florida's Gulf Coast. The ambitious plan was designed to accomplish a number of objectives simultaneously, including the establishment of permanent bases on both Florida's Gulf and Atlantic coasts and an overland route that connected them. Luna's forces encountered many of the same problems experienced by earlier explorers, such as inadequate supplies, the hostility of the natives, and internal dissension, and his effort was finally abandoned in 1561. 43

By then, the French had become the next victims of Florida's ephemeral charms, launching attempts to claim and settle the region during the early 1560s. 44 As always with such undertakings, it is difficult to determine motives with precision, due to the variety of parties involved and situations that evolved over time. In this case, the organizer of these missions, Admiral Gaspard de Coligny,
had numerous purposes. Diplomatic and strategic advantages in France's troubled relations with Spain were major considerations, though exactly how seizing Florida would yield those advantages remains a matter of speculation. Undoubtedly, participation by the French maritime community was helped by the fact that the proposed settlement might be used as a base from which to prey upon the Spanish *flotas*. There also seems to have been a religious element, since most of those who took part were, like Coligny himself, French Protestants in an increasingly divided Europe.

Yet the quests for riches and a passage to the Far East were also prominent features of these expeditions. The overall leader, Jean Ribault, was a Norman Protestant who had spent several years during the 1540s working for the English Admiralty planning missions to America and Asia. In doing so, Ribault had become familiar with much previously confidential geographic knowledge brought to England by Sebastian Cabot, which included the material provided by Roger Barlow and Richard Eden. Ribault's own published account of the first voyage of 1562 makes frequent references to his efforts to learn from the Indians he encountered where gold and silver might be found. It specifically mentioned both "Cibola" (Sevola) and "Chicora" (Checcere), as well as indicating his wish to find a passage to the Great South Sea. On reaching the area near Port Royal Sound, Ribault wrote "This is the land of Checcere [Chicora] whereof some have written, and which many have gone to find out, for the great riches they perceived by some Indians to be found there." Other surviving firsthand accounts of these missions also prominently mentioned Chicora and Apalatci, emphasizing the lure of gold and other riches as both a reason for traveling to Florida in the first place and as a main activity of the Fort Caroline colonists in 1564 and 1565. Although the French


were no more successful than the Spaniards had been in locating either precious metals or a western passage, the accounts they left behind make clear how much effort they put into doing so.\(^{48}\)

Ultimately, the French were driven out of Florida by the forces of Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, who founded St. Augustine in the process of expelling them. Although his ambitious plans included a network of forts and mission stations, and in time a landed estate and maybe even sugar plantations, most of the settlements Menéndez tried to establish in and around La Florida had to be abandoned due to lack of support.\(^{49}\) During extensive explorations into the Appalachians during 1566 and 1567, his subordinate, Captain Juan Pardo, created a series of inland garrisons stretching hundreds of miles west, but none of these lasted very long.\(^{50}\) In short, from the late 1560s onward, the Spaniards had no more luck than the French had had in finding precious metals. By the end of the century, only St. Augustine remained as the single lonely Spanish outpost in La Florida.

Meanwhile, England also began to act upon its interests in the New World. While an alliance with Spain during the first half of the century had discouraged English incursions into America, Elizabeth Tudor’s accession to the throne in 1558 and the continuing religious strife in Europe began to change this.\(^{51}\) During the 1560s and 1570s, John Hawkins and his relative Francis Drake, among others, made illicit, often predatory voyages to Spanish settlements in the Caribbean and Panama, while Drake even looted the coast of Peru during his circumnavigation of 1577-1580.\(^{52}\)

---

48. The DeBry/LeMoyne account alone has seven specific references to the “mountain of Apalatci” or mountains of gold (Brevis Narratio eorum quae Florida Americae, in The Work of Jacques LeMoyne de Morgues: A Huguenot Artist in France and England, ed. Paul Hulton (London: British Museum, 1977), 1:120, 122-126, 129, 152. In the Laudonnière histories published by Hakluyt, there are five specific references to “Apalatci” and another half dozen references to cities, kingdoms, or mountains further up the River of May that supposedly contained “christal, golde, and rubies, and diamonds” (Principal Navigations, 8: 462, 466-467; 9: 12, 14, 20, 55, 76). Principal Navigations even reprints two Spanish depositions, one of a shipwrecked Spaniard and one of a French prisoner, that refer specifically to “Apalatci.” “The Relation of Pedro Morales...,” 9:112-113; “The Relation of Nicholas Burgoignon...,” 9:113-114.

49. On Menéndez’s efforts after his victory over the French, see Lyon, 131-219.


52. Among recent works on Drake’s life and career are John Cummins, Francis Drake: The Lives of a Hero (New York: St. Martin’s, 1996); John Sugden, Sir
As English maritime capability expanded and diplomatic tensions with their former ally, Spain, rose, Richard Hakluyt the Younger, an Oxford graduate from a politically influential family, emerged as the Elizabethan era’s major publicist of overseas colonization. As had Eden in the previous generation, so now Hakluyt collected and published travel and discovery accounts for an English reading public thirsty for information about the outside world, and most specifically, America. His early work, *Divers Voyages Touching the Discoverie of America* (1582), included not only Verrazzano’s own account of his voyage along the east coast, but also Ribault’s rendering of the first French voyage to Florida in 1562, which emphasized the promise of precious metals and the fertility of the land. Taken altogether, the *Divers Voyages* texts accomplished a number of purposes, including stressing the wealth to be discovered, asserting the likelihood of a passage to the east, and even making the case for a legitimate English claim to America, based on first discovery.

Yet the *Divers Voyages* was only the beginning of Hakluyt’s campaign to captivate Englishmen with the promises of North America. While resident in France during most of the 1580s, Hakluyt arranged for the publication of René Laudonnière’s narrative of the Fort Caroline settlement in French. He also interviewed surviving participants in the Cartier/Roberval missions made half a century before. By 1589, Hakluyt had begun publishing his classic and vastly influential *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589–1600). This included an English translation, by Hakluyt himself, of Laudonnière’s lengthy narrative, as well as shorter French and English firsthand accounts of Florida. This remarkable compendium of travel literature energized a generation of English sailors, explorers and merchants to undertake missions of settlement in the regions of America lying north of the Spanish Caribbean. Meanwhile, in France, other

---


publications appeared, often with distinct religiously-partisan views, that also publicized North America, and Florida in particular, as promising destinations for European settlers. These included Lancelot Voisin de La Popelinière’s 1582 *Les Trois Mondes*, which revived the idea of Chicora.\(^{56}\)

Complementing Hakluyt’s literature promoting American settlement, his associate, the Protestant engraver Theodore de Bry, also published a landmark collection of accounts on America, starting in 1590. De Bry too helped to publicize Florida as a destination.\(^{57}\) Among his most widely read publications was Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues’ account of the 1564 mission to Florida, which Hakluyt had encouraged de Bry to put into print.\(^{58}\) Le Moyne had served as the expedition’s cartographer under Laudonnière’s command, and after escaping Menéndez’s forces, he composed both a written account and a collection of paintings of Florida. The latter, which de Bry published as woodcut engravings, depicted plants, animals, native activities, and key events, often in meticulous detail. De Bry also published Le Moyne’s map of Florida, which contained both Chicora, located north of Charlesfort, and “Apalatcy,” just south of a Verrazzanian Sea. One of Le Moyne’s engravings published by de Bry featured Indians panning for gold in a river running from the “mountains of Apalatcy.”\(^{59}\)

By the time de Bry’s works appeared in print, in 1591, Le Moyne was three years in his grave. Considering that neither Frenchmen nor Spaniards had enjoyed any success in locating Chicora, Apalatcy, or a Western Passage, it is surprising that his

---


\(^{57}\) Quinn, *North America from Earliest Discovery*, 556-557.


\(^{59}\) Hulton, *The Works of Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues*, II, plate 133. The legend on the engraving, as translated by Hulton, reads: “*A long way from the place where our fort was built there are high mountains, called the Apalatci in the Indian language, where, as may be seen from the map, three large streams rise and wash down silt in which a lot of gold, silver, and copper is mixed. For this reason those who live in this area make channels in the river beds, so that the silt, which is borne along by the water, may sink into them because of its weight. Carefully removing it from there they take it to a certain place, and some time afterwards they again remove from the channels the silt which has fallen and gather it together. They put it in canoes and transport it down a great river, which we named the River of May and which flows into the sea. The Spaniards now know how to exploit the wealth which comes from this source.*”
map should have been so definitive about these elusive objectives. Perhaps Le Moyne genuinely still believed in their existence, despite eight decades-worth of contrary evidence. Whatever the case, his publications certainly could not have failed to attract interest in the settlement efforts that Hakluyt, Walter Raleigh, and the English Crown were then planning. Both Hakluyt and de Bry, like Martyr, Oviedo, Gómara, and others before them, confidently continued to encourage the belief—or at least the hope—that Florida offered vast rewards to men of courage and initiative.

By 1600, Europeans had already spent a century exploring and trying to establish permanent settlements in the bewildering land Ponce had named “La Florida.” While much of its coastline was well-known, Florida’s interior remained largely a mystery. Despite several impressive initiatives led by some of the most capable and ambitious individuals of the age, it had yielded neither great civilizations to conquer, silver and gold mines to exploit, nor any other resources that Europeans might find even remotely lucrative, aside from limited amounts of arable land. Yet as events in the
following century would demonstrate, many people in England, at least, still hoped and believed.

For Spaniards, however, the more southerly parts of the Americas had been far more rewarding than Florida. The latter represented a northern frontier that had proved disappointing, and during the sixteenth century, and afterward, it attracted minimal Spanish investment and settlement, especially compared to Mexico, Peru, or even Cuba. In 1600, St. Augustine remained the sole Spanish outpost in Florida. Its inhabitants faced challenges meeting even their most basic needs, and largely owed their survival to the maintenance of a maritime lifeline connecting them to the more developed parts of the Spanish New World empire. Their only neighbors were natives who had learned that Europeans meant them no good, and who might have ejected them forcefully had their own numbers not already begun to suffer precipitous decline from the effects of disease. As noted historian Amy Turner Bushnell put it,

As far as the Crown itself was concerned, Florida’s purpose was strategic. It was first a captaincy general, second a mission field, and only by sufferance a colony of settlers ... Had Spain not been concerned about the return route of the silver galleons, Florida, with its semi-sedentary, demanding Indians, its poor soils and piney woods, and its modest maritime resources, would undoubtedly have been left to itself.

60. There also were a few Franciscan missions in coastal northeast Florida and southern Georgia.
Book Reviews

Daniel Murphree, Book Review Editor


Over the years, I have visited Florida on many occasions and, during some of those trips, visited the old Spanish fortress at St. Augustine, Fort Barrancas, Fort Pickens, the Naval Air Museum in the Pensacola area, and the Air Armament Museum near Eglin Air Force Base. Over time, I have gathered some understanding of the military history of Florida. I knew that Britain had established the colony of Georgia in 1733 as a bulwark against Spanish raids from St. Augustine and that the US Army had fought the Seminoles in several wars in the 1820s and the 1830s. I also knew that the US Army had constructed several brick and masonry forts at several key locations along the Florida coast before the Civil War. However, I did not know the complete breadth of Florida’s military history until I read this book, which documents that history from its early French and Spanish colonial beginnings to the present, well beyond the places that I have visited.

The authors, Rodney Carlisle and Loretta Carlisle, have put together a comprehensive, easily read, well-illustrated, and useful guide to twenty-three of Florida’s military historical sites. Dr. Carlisle is a professor emeritus at Rutgers University where he taught history from 1966 to 2002 and served as the chair of the history department. He is a founding member of History Associates and the author, coauthor, and editor of more than thirty books on a variety of topics. Ms. Loretta Carlisle, who
took the photographs for this book, is a professional photographer whose images have been published in a wide range of book series. The two together have created an outstanding guide to the forts, military outposts, and other historical facilities related to Florida’s military history.

Forts of Florida begins with an introduction in which Dr. Carlisle provides a very good summary of the military history of Florida. This introduction ends with a listing of the military historical sites described in the book by historical period. The rest of the book is divided into four parts based on geographical sections of the state. Each part consists of chapters in which the author provides information about the forts and outposts found in each geographical section. The synopsis for each site begins with the information a tourist would need to find and visit the site. The rest of the site summary is a history of the site, the role it had in the history of Florida, and the current status (as of the publication date of the book) of the site.

This book has much to offer to most groups of readers. It was obviously written with the tourist in mind, as the author states in the introduction. Each chapter begins with detailed instructions about the “logistics” of visiting the twenty-three historical sites mentioned in the book: location, driving directions, hours of operation, fees, phone number, and/or web site. However, such specific information will change as economic conditions change, which some people in the near future may possibly take as a drawback to the book, as often happens with any guidebook.

The book would also appeal to readers interested in a very good but balanced (not too general or not too detailed) military history of Florida, specifically the history involving land forces. Between the introduction and the details in the chapter summaries of the forts and military outposts, it becomes very evident that the military history of Florida is very extensive and had a significant impact on the history of the state, the South, and, to some degree, the country. Given the guidebook’s focus on army installations, it is surprising that the authors did not mention several current military installations, such as the various US Air Force and US Navy installations in the state, though the book does provide excellent sections on the Air Armament Museum and the Naval Air Museum. Several current installations, such as Eglin Air Force Base and Naval Air Station Pensacola, have also had substantial impact on the military history of the state, region, and country.
An outstanding plus for the guide is the excellent photographs and other historical images found in the book. It has numerous current photographs of each site as well as images of historic prints, drawings, and maps taken from a variety of documentary sources. The numerous illustrations not only serve to break up the monotony of continuous text but also provide the means for the reader to visualize the historical context and physical attributes of each site.

Overall, *Forts of Florida* is well researched, using original and secondary sources, including appropriate web sites. It is an excellent guidebook to most of Florida's military forts and outposts for the tourist and a good source for a general military history of Florida for the casual reader or military history buff. It also provides a good starting point for someone who endeavors to obtain greater depth into specific aspects of Florida's military history.

Robert B. Kane


In this most recent volume of *The Papers of Andrew Jackson*, the editors have presented a fascinating body of documents illuminating the personality of the man and representing many significant events of Jackson's presidency. Covering the year 1830, Volume 8 finds Jackson, then entering the second calendar year of his presidency, engaged in correspondence advancing his political agenda as well as investigating and confronting his political and social enemies.

The editors of *The Papers of Andrew Jackson* have done an excellent job making the most of the limited space in a selected edition. For official communications by Jackson as president, the editors have provided a table outlining which communications have been previously printed in serial sets, and have focused instead on reproducing less readily available manuscript drafts relevant to Jackson's presidency. The current volume includes a draft of Jackson's May 6 message to the Senate that conveyed a treaty of the Choctaws' agreement pertaining to their removal
along with Jackson’s proposed version of the treaty. Also of interest are draft versions of a message which accompanied Jackson’s veto of the Maysville Road bill as well as un-submitted messages related to his pocket vetoes of the Louisville and Portland Canal and the Lighthouse bills, all of which flesh out his arguments on the authority of the federal government relative to internal improvements. Extensive drafts of Jackson’s Second Annual Message to Congress also provide insights into his presidential priorities. The editors have selected correspondence carefully, reinforcing the centrality to Jackson’s presidency of the removal of the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, and Creek Indians as well as his antipathy to federally funded internal improvements and the Second Bank of the United States.

Jackson’s letters from 1830 also illuminate his personality well, most notably his tendency to take offence and willingness to hold a grudge. As he attempted to rehabilitate the reputation of Margaret “Peggy” Eaton, the wife of Secretary of War John Henry Eaton, Jackson responded vehemently to her detractors, met with various cabinet members whose families were reluctant to socialize with the Eatons, and frequently hectored his own family on the subject. Jackson engaged in a burst of increasingly emotional letters with his nephew and secretary, Andrew Jackson Donelson, regarding the willingness of Donelson’s wife Emily, Jackson’s White House hostess, to receive Mrs. Eaton socially. Jackson’s campaign on Peggy Eaton’s behalf showed a stubborn sense of loyalty, outrage at the disobedience of his family, and a determination to get his own way.

Volume 8 also includes Jackson’s increasingly hostile correspondence with his vice president, John C. Calhoun, concerning Jackson’s behavior during the Seminole War. Jackson confronted Calhoun with a copy of a letter written by William H. Crawford which claimed that, during service in 1818 as secretary of war, Calhoun called for Jackson’s punishment for overstepping orders by entering and capturing Florida. Jackson, Calhoun, and Crawford argued in minute detail the circumstances that produced the 1818 instructions issued to Jackson and the intent behind them. Calhoun’s lengthy explanation failed to placate Jackson, who thereafter likens him repeatedly to Brutus. As 1830 winds on, Jackson seemed more and more suspicious of the jealousies of Calhoun, Crawford, and Henry Clay, all of whom were accused by Jackson’s friends of working against him. The differences between Jackson
and Calhoun seemed harder and harder to reconcile as 1830 progresses. In both the Eaton affair and his growing rift with Calhoun, Jackson received testimony and opinions from interested parties and sent copies of letters back and forth in a flurry. Here is a man who wanted to know who his enemies were, what they were up to, and was perfectly willing to confront them with evidence and demand an explanation.

Throughout the volume the editors concentrate on providing excellent transcripts of Jackson’s letters, with minimal annotation intended primarily to enhance understanding. Editorial head notes associated with significant documents do an excellent job contextualizing letters and frequently point ahead to related documents later in the volume to provide an effective road map for readers. The editors could further help their audience by specifying in the source note of documents where else in the volume particular documents were enclosed. Jackson was so accustomed to confronting correspondents with written testimony that this could give a much broader sense of who the principals were in a given conversation, and it would be especially helpful for the majority of readers who will access this volume through the index rather than reading it chronologically. It would also be helpful if the index pointed explicitly to biographical identifications of correspondents where they occur either in document-level annotation or in the front matter. The editors have very helpfully included a chart outlining Jackson’s extended family and a brief summary of principal figures in the volume. Unfortunately, neither of these aids is included in the index.

*The Papers of Andrew Jackson* uses a largely literal style of transcription that is both highly readable and maintains much of the original flavor of Jackson’s correspondence. While authorial interlineations are silently inserted in the text of documents, the editors do restore and strike through text deleted by authors wherever possible to give a sense of some of the changes made during composition. In sum, the editors have created a definitive and lasting tool for accessing Jackson’s written works. By selecting significant documents for publication, calendaring all known documents, and providing repository, microfilm, and published locations for Jackson’s documents, they have created an invaluable resource for the study of Jackson and his era.

Ellen C. Hickman  
*Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Retirement Series*
Jonathan Walker was among those few celebrated abolitionist heroes, including Elijah Lovejoy, Charles Torrey, and Calvin Fairbank, who were public figures for a short time but are largely forgotten today. A humble man who lived by the Golden Rule and did not seek the fame that resulted from his hand being branded in Pensacola, Florida, for attempting to take slaves to freedom, Walker is the subject of a recent biography by journalist Alvin Oickle.

Oickle primarily uses Walker’s autobiographical writings and period newspaper articles to create a compelling portrait. He traces the influences that shaped Walker’s character and beliefs, and provides anecdotes that support this picture. The book opens appropriately at the scene of the branding, where the initials “SS” – short for “Slave Stealer” – were burned into the palm of his hand and for which Walker would thereafter be known. Oickle writes: “Some of the men who were in the courtroom in Florida that dark morning in November 1844 later claimed they heard the skin on Jonathan Walker’s right hand sizzle when the United States marshal pressed the branding iron against the fleshy palm beneath the thumb. . . .”

The story then unfolds in flashback to Walker’s beginnings in Cape Cod. A descendent of the Pilgrims and a Revolutionary War veteran, Walker was strongly influenced by evangelical Christianity and fit the mold of many New England abolitionists. Walker had been a seaman for six years and had sailed across the seas to places as distant as India by the time he first personally observed slavery. Brought up with principles of equality and liberty, he was instantly appalled upon seeing the practice first hand.

Walker led a restless life as a seaman and boat builder until his arrest. Five times he nearly met his death during his years on the high seas because of accidents or illness. The last occasion was on an expedition in 1835 during which he took his twelve-year old son to meet with the famed abolitionist Benjamin Lundy, who was attempting to form a colony in Mexico where fugitive slaves could live in freedom. This was during the war of independence between Texas and Mexico. After arriving in the region, they were attacked by bandits and forced to abandon ship and nearly drowned. They never met Lundy and eventually returned to Cape Cod.
The following year, Walker took his entire family to Pensacola, Florida, looking for job opportunities. They lived there for five years before moving back to Cape Cod. However, it was not the end of Walker’s Florida adventures. Returning there in 1844 without his family, he was approached by the slaves who requested him to take them to freedom. A lengthy journey followed that led them down the west coast of Florida, only to be captured rounding the peninsula in the Florida Keys. After being released from jail about a year later, with the help of friends in the North, Walker became a celebrity on the abolitionist lecture circuit for a time. He finally ended his lecture career because of lack of funding to support his family. They soon moved west to Wisconsin in 1852. There he was active in progressive reform movements and contributed letters to *The Liberator*. Finally, in 1864, he moved to Michigan, where he and his wife lived out their lives.

Oickle uses the autobiographical sketches and personal commentaries of Walker to good effect. However, his limited knowledge of the abolitionist movement sometimes causes him to miss the significance of an event. For example, while he reports Walker’s move to New Bedford and informs the reader of the community’s openness to African Americans, he fails to mention that this Quaker seaport became a major Underground Railroad stronghold and also fails to explore how the move there in 1822 influenced Walker’s development as an abolitionist and may have affected his decision to help the seven fugitive slaves that eventually led to his arrest, conviction, and branding.

This failure, in part due to Oickle’s lack of historical context, results in superficial and sometimes inaccurate commentary on people and events during the antebellum period. This is evident in his use of sources, like the biography written by Henrietta Buckmaster. Though Buckmaster is Harriet Tubman’s first important biographer, knowledge not only of Tubman but also the Underground Railroad has advanced far beyond her work. This lack of historical background also led to inaccurate statements. For example, based on Walker’s report of lectures in central New York, Oickle writes that Abby Kelley Foster was the source of abolitionist sentiment there as a result of lectures she made in the early 1840s. In actuality, the New York State Anti-Slavery Society had formed in central New York in 1835, and as early as 1837, the state boasted 274 local and regional antislavery societies, many of them in central New York. Another minor misrepresentation is the author’s characterization of Lewis
Tappan as a reader of Garrison at a time when Tappan was a leader of a competing abolitionist wing that published its own antislavery publication, *The Emancipator*. The author also fails to understand Walker's satirical reference to a tavern as the James K. Polk Tavern, which was a dig at Polk's proslavery policies, as temperance was closely associated with antislavery. Oickle commits a bigger faux pas when he says of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850, "that no longer could a fugitive find sanctuary and legal freedom in states that had made slavery illegal" (212). The earlier Fugitive Slave Law of 1793 already had accomplished that, but it was too weak and easy to circumvent, leading to the second, more forceful law.

All historians make errors, but Oickle's greatest fault is neglecting to provide documentation. This will be missed by scholars and researchers. Nevertheless, the merits of this biography outweigh its shortcomings. Through the words of the subject and the accounts of the day, Oickle presents a credible portrait of a saintly, righteous man, whose deeds should not be forgotten and who should serve as an inspiration for those who believe in freedom, justice, and equality.

Tom Calarco

*Altamonte Springs, Florida*


At the beginning of the American Civil War, Florida politics deeply divided the state's population. Jonathan Sheppard argues in *By the Noble Daring of Her Sons* that the military service of the six Florida regiments that became the Florida Brigade in the Confederate Army of Tennessee helped to heal these political divisions and unite the state like never before. Starting in 1861, Sheppard traces the history of these Florida regiments both before and after they became a part of the Florida Brigade. Utilizing a wealth of primary materials, Sheppard deftly weaves a narrative that intimately shows the connection between the Florida home front and the men in the ranks.

As an introduction, the author follows the narrative of the early settlement of Florida, emphasizing the Southern nature of
the state as settlers streamed in from South Carolina and Georgia. Relating the story of secession and emphasizing slavery as the cause of disunion in the state, Sheppard then seamlessly follows disunion with war as the Florida regiments began to form in the early months of the war. After illustrating the usual rituals of company and regiment formation, Sheppard follows the First Florida Battalion to the Battle of Shiloh and then returns the narrative to Florida to cover the raising of the rest of the other regiments that eventually became a part of the brigade. Eschewing traditional battle narratives, the author instead focuses on a bottom-up approach, relating the feelings and thoughts of the Floridians through their letters and diaries.

In the middle of his narrative, Sheppard devotes a chapter of the book to exploring the motivations of Floridians for fighting in the Civil War. He demonstrates that even though less than two percent of Floridians owned slaves, slavery and defending their society based on the "bedrock" of slavery dominated the minds of Floridians as they went off to war. He makes a convincing argument that slaveholders often led as officers, mirroring the social structure of antebellum Florida.

After Shiloh, more Florida regiments reached the front and participated in the western campaigns in 1862 and 1863, fighting at the Battles of Perryville, Stones River and Chickamauga. At Perryville, the 1st and 3rd Florida regiments distinguished themselves and they were joined at Stones River by the 4th Florida Infantry and eventually the 6th and 7th Florida Regiments by the time of Chickamauga. Sheppard does a good job of chronicling the revivals in the camps of the Florida regiments in the spring of 1863. After Chickamauga, all of the Florida regiments, the 1st, 3rd, 4th, 6th, and 7th Infantry Regiments and the 1st Florida Dismounted Cavalry, came together for the first time under Colonel Jesse J. Finley. Finley and his brigade fought together for the first time at the Battles for Chattanooga on November 25, 1863, where they acquitted themselves well.

During the Atlanta Campaign, Finley's Brigade fought in the division of Brigadier General William Bate. After the wounding of Finley at Resaca, Colonel Robert Bullock took command of the unit and led them well as they fought in the Battle of Atlanta. In August 1864, Bullock received a wound that temporarily put Colonel Lafayette Kenan in command of the brigade until both Finley, who had returned, and Kenan fell wounded in the Battle of Jones-
bоро. After Jonesboro, Finley never again commanded the Florida Brigade most associated with his name.

Following the Atlanta Campaign the Florida Brigade fought in the Tennessee Campaign of 1864, both the bloodletting at Franklin and the twin Confederate disaster at Nashville. At the Battle of Nashville, Federal troops overwhelmed the Floridians as they held the key position atop Shy's Hill on December 16, precipitating the ignominious rout of Hood's army. Finally, what was left of these Florida regiments surrendered at Greensboro, North Carolina, in April 1865.

Throughout the course of the book, Sheppard addresses the thoughts and feelings of the men in the ranks, their unit politics and their reactions to consolidation in 1863. He does a good job of relating their experiences to the home front, at least early in the war, though he often neglects larger topics like desertion and Confederate nationalism. The reader is often left wondering how these Floridians fit into the larger themes of the war. Furthermore, the final chapter is somewhat choppy, as Sheppard provides very brief biographical notes on the fate of the more prominent men of the brigade but fails to put these experiences into a more coherent narrative. That said, By the Noble Daring of Her Sons is a worthy contribution to the literature of the Civil War in the Western Theater. With so many top-down studies of the generals and their strategies, the historiography of the Western Theater desperately needs more bottom-up unit studies that emphasize the experiences of the common soldiers to complete our picture of the Confederate Army of Tennessee.

John R. Lundberg
Collin College


The rationale behind this volume is simple but compelling—even as Americans navigate through the Civil War's sesquicentennial, our understanding of the conflict remains strangely imprecise and elusive. The incoherent nature of Civil
War memory among Americans today reveals itself most clearly when considering the straightforward question of why the war happened. Common responses include a myriad of answers ranging from slavery to states’ rights, from Lincoln’s election to tariffs. Ignorance is never charming, but the authors believe that our ignorance about the Civil War is especially dismaying. Over the past 150 years Americans have largely accepted the Lost Cause interpretation of the war—the post-war effort by white Southerners to redefine and remember the conflict as a war about rights rather than race. Loewen and Sebesta admit that they are “frustrated” with the American public’s “basic misconceptions” about the Civil War, and this reader is intended to expose the distortions that exist in our memories of the war (3). To counter the influence of the Lost Cause, the authors propose a “Great Truth” — that the history of the Civil War, from its origins to its commemorations, hinged on the southern desire to perpetuate white superiority, at first by defending the institution of slavery, and then, even in defeat, by upholding the principle of white supremacy.

To prove the validity of the “Great Truth,” Loewen and Sebesta choose to confront the Lost Cause mythology directly. This reader is an extensive collection of primary source documents that range from the Constitutional Convention in 1787 to Confederate heritage propaganda from the past decade. The juxtaposition of these sources powerfully shows that for over 200 years white Southerners supported (and then mourned the loss of) slavery while shielding racism with the seemingly benign façade of protecting states’ rights. The most effective section of the book deals with the secession crisis. The authors include the 11 Confederate states’ declarations of secession. All of them, with the exception of North Carolina (the last to secede), explicitly announce that the defense of slavery requires secession (111-166). And while Loewen and Sebesta are mostly content to let these documents speak for themselves, there are valuable insights to be gleaned from their introductory comments to each source. One particularly revealing section covers the transformation of the phrase “waving the bloody shirt” from its original context of white Democratic violence against Republican sympathizers during Reconstruction to the more familiar (and Lost Cause-influenced) contemporary use of the phrase to mean the persistent rehashing of the Civil War by Republican politicians on the campaign trail (306-307). The cumulative impact of these sources demon-
strates that the Lost Cause pattern of obfuscation and distortion was (and is) an attractive way to understand the Civil War, but also that the Lost Cause memory does not match the historical reality of the conflict.

Although Loewen and Sebesta succeed here in dispelling much of the Lost Cause mythology, the volume’s effectiveness is undermined by several problems. One concern involves the pacing of the book; the antebellum and Civil War eras are well-represented here, but the briefer post-war sections feel more impressionistic than definitive. Perhaps, in fairness to the authors, this results from the larger time-span and greater variety of source material to choose from. There are also some curious sequencing choices made when the editors occasionally abandon their chronological approach to organizing the material, for example, including a discussion of a 1998 statue of Nathan Bedford Forrest in their chapter on Reconstruction (247). Also, at times potentially illuminating passages from documents are edited out, no doubt due to space constraints (40-54). But the most serious drawback to this volume is that at roughly 400 pages, this book, while convincing, will also be awkward for its intended audience to use. Loewen and Sebesta know that these documents are already familiar to most professional Civil War historians, and so their focus here in creating this collection is to provide a convenient resource that educates teachers, presumably at the high school level (7-11). Teachers tend to read books that they can assign, however. Despite the clear value of this work, relying on it to teach the Civil War era, given its exclusive focus on the white South’s defense of slavery and white supremacy, will yield an incomplete understanding of the war that minimizes both white northern attitudes and the black emancipationist tradition. And these perspectives are just as central to an educated grasp on the Civil War’s significance. In short, the book is too short to satisfy professional historians who will want even more documents at their fingertips and too long to be used effectively in the classroom at the high school or even undergraduate level. But the authors should be congratulated for challenging the enduring Lost Cause memory of the Civil War and any reader drawn to the conflict by the sesquicentennial will find much of interest to ponder.

Benjamin G. Cloyd

Jackson, Mississippi
Joe Knetsch and Nick Wynne undertake an ambitious examination of the state and the nation in the late nineteenth century, culminating in a study of Florida’s role as the staging ground for the United States military intervention into the Cuban War of Independence in 1898. Their study’s fourteen chapters do not contribute to a single argument; instead, readers receive snapshots of topics ranging from the downturn of Florida’s economy, national newspaper coverage of Spain’s disastrous re-concentration policy, and daily life in US Army camps. The book’s clear thematic structure helps overcome the absence of an index, but problems of organization do stymie the investigation of some subjects. For example, a discussion of the rising violence that white Floridians directed at African Americans is fastened onto the chapter entitled “Cubans, Florida, and Cuba Libre.” Similarly, the absence of footnotes or a bibliography obscures any understanding of where Knetsch and Wynne contribute fresh insights. English-language newspapers and other published works stand out as the primary sources that receive direct scrutiny. Although the book is richly adorned with period photographs and maps, most are only loosely associated with the text. The final two-page chapter tells us that the War of 1898 had a profound and lasting impact on the Sunshine State, but readers are left to determine that influence themselves.

Students of Florida history may be frustrated by the authors’ principal interest in military history. The book offers a thorough explication of the origins of the modern US Navy and the state of military preparedness in 1898. Unfortunately, this focus shines an analytical spotlight on national decision makers, frequently relegating Floridians to the shadows. Knetsch and Wynne do offer intriguing glimpses of city and state politics that warrant further investigation. Articles in the *Tampa Morning Tribune* support the authors’ account of urban boosters campaigning actively to make Tampa the army’s port of embarkation for the invasion of Cuba. The ensuing competition with Mobile and New Orleans can be situated comfortably in the state’s long history of courting outside developers, sometimes to the detriment of local populations. Too often, though, the authors present Florida as a stage where notable Americans performed, leaving locals unnamed and their lives un-
explored. Knetsch and Wynne incorrectly posit a significant role for Clara Barton in procuring Red Cross nurses for army hospitals in Florida, and the attention paid to this famous figure leads the authors to neglect the women who animate historian Nancy Hewitt’s impressive study of female activism in Tampa. Similarly, the passing mention of dockworkers’ protests in Tampa and attacks on black civilians by soldiers in Miami intrigued me, and I was left wondering to what degree the book’s topical breadth (or perhaps the publisher’s page limitations) hindered Knetsch and Wynne from providing a more in-depth examination of local and state history.

Ultimately, it is neither the state nor the nation but the geography of the Caribbean that receives the least attention from the authors’ interpretive framework. As Louis A. Pérez Jr. has demonstrated, the coastline of late-nineteenth-century Florida did not denote the boundary between the United States and Cuba; instead, much of the state marked contested borderlands, and Cubans continued to claim Florida as an extension of the island. Although Knetsch and Wynne acknowledge the creation of the Cuban Revolutionary Party in Tampa, their attention to Florida’s emerging place in US strategic planning ignores the fact that the urban landscapes of Key West and Tampa were as much battlegrounds of the Cuban revolutionary struggle as any place on the island where Antonio Maceo led insurgents in 1895. In other words, the removal of “Cuban” from what historians now typically call the “Spanish-Cuban-American War” is less an issue of semantics than it is a geographical privileging, one that underestimates the central significance of Florida in the events that reshaped the Caribbean in the 1890s, of which the US blockade and invasion constituted only one part. In a similar vein, historians Mariola Espinosa and Rebecca Scott have shown that chronic yellow fever outbreaks and the constant movement of peoples in multiple directions did more than the territorial claims of nations and empires to define the region’s geography, and these phenomena also anchored the US gulf south firmly in the Caribbean. Knetsch and Wynne recount Florida Senator Wilkerson Call’s statements to Congress that disease and migration went hand in hand, necessitating an end to Spanish colonial authority and the establishment of a new international public health regime. I would have liked to see the authors engage Espinosa’s argument that public health actually weighed heavily in the decision making that led to the US declaration of war and the
institution of American imperial control over the island. Instead, the authors generally eschew engagement with current scholarship on the United States and the Caribbean in favor of studies in US military history. Historians will still find much of value in the disparate details and vivid anecdotes that Knetsch and Wynne pack into this slim volume, and it offers myriad starting points for a continuing conversation on the significance of Florida in the War of Cuban Independence and the War of 1898.

Charles McGraw
University of Tampa


For years, I’ve had this quotation from John Edgerton’s *Speak Now Against the Day* (1994) hanging above my desk: “In a manner of speaking, there are essentially three kinds of history: what actually happened, what we are told happened, and what we finally come to believe happened.” I was reminded of those lines many times while reading Gilbert King’s *Devil in the Grove*, which focuses on Thurgood Marshall’s involvement in the Groveland rape case, one of the more controversial episodes in Florida’s civil rights history. King, a journalist, is a skilled wordsmith but sometimes struggles with the pacing of the Groveland narrative and tends to oversimplify a very complex story.

The book fits in the genre of creative non-fiction and is intended for a general audience, although King includes extensive notes. Florida historians will find few new details about the Groveland case, which was thoroughly documented in this journal 26 years ago (“Groveland: Florida’s Little Scottsboro,” by Steven Lawson, David Colburn, and Darryl Paulson, *FHQ*, July 1986). Still, King argues that Groveland was the “most deadly and dramatic case” (32) in Marshall’s career and fundamentally shaped Marshall’s “perception of himself as a crusader for civil rights” (4).

King’s most significant research coup was gaining access to the NAACP Legal Defense Fund’s Groveland papers at the Library of Congress. He also obtained some “unredacted” FBI files on Groveland.
The villain of the book is Sheriff Willis McCall of Lake County, undoubtedly the most notorious lawman in Florida history, who served from 1944 until 1972 when Governor Reubin Askew suspended him after the sheriff was indicted for allegedly kicking a black inmate to death. McCall was acquitted of the murder charges, but lost the ensuing election.

What reminded me of John Edgerton's quote about "three kinds of history" was King's use of two popular, yet annoying, techniques in contemporary non-fiction: (1) attributing words, thoughts, and feelings to historical figures in dramatized scenes; and (2) making claims of "historical fact" based on a single source or opinion without acknowledging contradictory sources or opinions.

King even fictionalizes the precipitating event in the Groveland saga: on Friday evening, July 15, 1949, Willie and Norma Padgett, a young married couple temporarily separated, went together to a square dance near Groveland. In King's rendering: "[Norma] pushed the wedding ring back on her finger; tossed a compact, powder, and perfume into her purse; and sauntered outside....Willie's eyes went right to Norma's bare legs as she slid her thin body across the tattered seat" (33). Of course, King has no idea if any of that happened.

He also fictionalizes a scene in which Harry T. Moore supposedly attended a Miami meeting, in December 1951, where Thurgood Marshall spoke about the Groveland case: "Moore parked his sedan not far from Mount Zion Baptist Church. He relished the energy in the early evening air as he walked toward the [building]" (269). Ironically, while King often cites my biography of Moore (Before His Time, 1999), I wrote that Moore was noticeable by his absence in Miami.

It is one level of poetic license to invent thoughts and feelings for historical figures in actual events, but it is quite another when the person was not even there.

More troubling is King's tendency to elevate a single source—whether a newspaper article, subject interview, or book—to the level of unquestioned truth. But newspapers are often wrong. Subjects' memories are sometimes flawed or contradicted. And one incorrect citation can set off a daisy-chain of repetition until it becomes "accepted fact."

Too often, King issues sweeping certitudes with none of the standard qualifiers: "allegedly," "reportedly," or "according to." This is particularly suspect with the Groveland case because, even
today, no one knows what really happened that July night in 1949 on an isolated country road between Groveland and Okahumpka.

The Padgetts claimed that on their way home, around 2:00 a.m., their car stalled and four African-American men stopped to help. An altercation ensued, the men attacked Willie, kidnapped Norma, and then drove her down a dirt road, where all four raped her.

After that, all hell broke loose in Groveland. Three black men—Sammy Shepherd, Walter Irvin, and Charles Greenlee—were arrested, and a fourth, Ernest Thomas, fled Lake County (he was later killed by a posse). A lynch mob descended on the county jail, but Sheriff McCall had already moved the three prisoners to Raiford State Prison. For the next few nights, hundreds of carloads of white men, including many Ku Klux Klansmen, caravanned through Groveland’s black neighborhoods, shooting and burning several homes and one café. Groveland’s black residents fled to Orlando, and Governor Fuller Warren called out the National Guard to restore order.

But that was just the beginning.

For the next three years, the Groveland case roiled Lake County. Thankfully, there is more clarity about these later events, which King recounts skillfully: the three defendants were brutally beaten by McCall’s deputies, the crime scene investigation was terribly botched, plaster imprints of tire tracks and footprints were likely faked, the doctor who examined Norma Padgett found “no spermatozoa” and concluded “I don’t know” if she had been raped, the September 1949 trial was a Hollywood caricature of southern justice which led to the convictions and death sentences of Irvin and Shepherd being overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court. A new trial was scheduled and Thurgood Marshall flew to Florida to lead the defense. And then, almost unbelievably, Willis McCall shot Irvin and Shepherd on their way to a hearing, killing Shepherd and critically wounding Irvin. McCall claimed that the handcuffed prisoners had attacked him, trying to escape. But Irvin claimed that McCall had simply yanked them out of the car and started firing.

It is that first night, however, when the Padgetts’ car stalled on that country road, that eludes King’s grasp. As Lawson, Colburn and Paulson wrote in 1986, “What happened after that remains a mystery” (9). It still is. Although one would not know it from King’s book.

There are at least five different versions of that event, in opposition to the “official” one reported by the Padgetts, McCall, and
most Florida newspapers. Some surfaced immediately in 1949 and were published by northern, liberal, or African-American papers, the NAACP, and the Workers' Defense League. But new versions have even appeared in the past decade. Irvin, Shepherd, and Greenlee swore—in affidavits for the NAACP, the FBI, and at trial—that they never stopped to help the Padgetts and were nowhere around. But the Chicago Defender, citing "unnamed sources" in Groveland's black community, reported that the three defendants had stopped to help. In April 1950, St. Petersburg Times reporter Norman Bunin corroborated Irvin and Shepherd's alibi that they were miles away, in nightclubs in Orlando and Eatonville. In 1985, attorney Franklin H. Williams, who defended them at their first trial, suggested that Irvin and Shepherd (plus Ernest Thomas) had, in fact, stopped to help the Padgetts and then continued home. (Franklin Williams Interview, February 11, 1985, UF Oral History Archives). In 1989, Thurgood Marshall told his authorized biographer that he was "convinced that while Irvin may have had sex with [Norma Padgett], he had not raped her" (Juan Williams, Thurgood Marshall: American Revolutionary, 1998, 155). Most startlingly, Walter Irvin's sister, Henrietta, told researchers Robert H. Thompson and Gary Corsair in 2001 that Irvin and Shepherd not only had stopped to help the Padgetts, but Norma had offered them a drink of whiskey, which led to an altercation between Shepherd and Willie Padgett. Then, shockingly, Henrietta Irvin claimed that Norma had voluntarily left with Irvin and Shepherd in their car.

So what really happened? The only living person who knows is Norma Padgett, who has insisted, as recently as 2002, that she told the truth in 1949. Gilbert King tries to paint Irvin and Shepherd in the best light by selectively picking details from these alternative theories, while ignoring their contradictions.

Besides his excesses of certitude, King also makes some significant research errors. For instance, he asserts that Florida recorded more lynchings than any southern state (109). In truth, from 1900-1930, Florida did have the highest per capita rate of lynching, but fewer numerically than Mississippi and Georgia (David R. Colburn and Richard K. Sher, Florida's Gubernatorial Politics in the Twentieth Century, 1980, 13).

He also describes Stetson Kennedy being at the scene in Lake County the night McCall shot Irvin and Shepherd (237), but Kennedy's contemporaneous reporting in 1951 had him arriving several days later. King can be excused for this error, however, as Ken-
nedy’s stories grew proportionally over the years. With Kennedy’s recent passing, hopefully there will be a thoughtful reassessment of what he actually did.

Finally, describing the investigation of Harry T. Moore’s murder, King claims that the FBI “named four likely [Klan] suspects” and indicted seven Klansmen for perjury “in regard to their whereabouts that Christmas night” (357). However, the only “four likely suspects” ever named were by Charlie Crist in 2006, three weeks before the Republican gubernatorial primary, when he claimed to have “resolved” the Moore murders. But the Crist investigation was roundly criticized by former FDLE investigators, editorial boards, and Moore experts (including me). And the seven perjury indictments had nothing to do with the Moore bombing, but were for lying about other violent acts.

Despite its failings, King’s book may teach the historical importance of the Groveland case to a wider audience. Those failings are summarized best by another quotation, from Julian Barnes’ novel *The Sense of an Ending* (2011): “History is that certainty produced at the point where the imperfections of memory meet the inadequacies of documentation.”

Ben Green

*Florida State University*

**Wish You Were Here: Classic Florida Motel and Restaurant Advertising.**


*Wish You Were Here* is a beautiful, oversized, coffee table-worthy text of twentieth-century Florida promotional materials for motels and restaurants. It is a compendium of visual and material ephemera for a general audience interested in nostalgia and the development of post-Second World War popular culture and roadside landscape. For the academic reader the study offers documentary evidence of advertising logic in popularizing Florida as a tourist destination. The title is the latest publication of the prolific travel writer and is the companion-text to *Selling the Sunshine State: A Celebration of Florida Tourism Advertising* that appeared in 2008.

The historic content in the book is based on Hollis’s extensive private collection, accumulated by his family over a lifetime. His interest in collecting travel memorabilia began as a child when his
family took annual summer automobile vacations to Florida and other destinations in the 1960s. Hollis suggested that the volume is a celebration of classic Floridiana in the twentieth-century; and the artwork is stunning. The clichéd title references the ubiquitous postcard as the most common form of hospitality and leisure advertising in the collection. The introductory essay reprises the highlights of Florida tourism history: Henry M. Flagler hotels and railroads on the east coast, the democratization of automobile ownership and the emergence of “tin can tourists” in the 1920s, and the transition from roadside camping to cabins to motels and the rise of motel chains. Hollis noted that the first Holiday Inn in the state opened in 1957 and within ten years there were almost fifty.

The subsequent seven chapters correspond to the geographic areas the state tourism department delineated in 1966. The Miracle Strip, or more recently the Emerald Coast, identified the panhandle sites of Panama City Beach, Fort Walton Beach, and Pensacola. The Big Bend described the panhandle turned south on the Gulf and north to Tallahassee. Tourism in the state originated in the northeast corner, Florida’s Crown, at Jacksonville. The region extended to St. Augustine, Lake City and Gainesville. The Grove Coast included Daytona Beach inland to Ocala, Silver Springs, Clermont and the Citrus Tower, and Orlando. The Sun Coast on the Gulf is the largest region and included Tampa, St. Petersburg, Sarasota, Lake Wales, Cypress Gardens at Winter Haven, Bradenton, Haines City, the Singing Tower, and Bartow. The Tropicacoast counted Miami Beach, Ft. Lauderdale, and Ft. Pierce. Finally, the Everglades and Paradise Islands included Miami to Ft. Myers on the Gulf coast, and the coast south of Miami and the Florida Keys. Each of these chapters contains reproductions of material artifacts.

The images and representations that comprise the content of the book suggest several themes of national, Southern, and regional tourism, hospitality and leisure studies, automobility, and advertising historiography: local economic displacement and the tension between natives and neo-natives; tourism as a marker of middle-class status and American nationalism; the categories of the environment, pseudo-attractions, museums, gardens, and other cultural and heritage sites; and race and technology. But despite these historiographical intersections, Hollis did not provide an interpretive text to accompany the visual narrative. He neglected an opportunity to combine a popular edition with scholarship that could serve multiple audiences and uses. Nor did he pose critical
questions. His reliance on contrived humor was awkward through seven geographic areas. Nevertheless, his oeuvre engaging Florida promotional memorabilia is impressive.

The contribution of the Hollis text to an interdisciplinary scholarship is a visual record of the golden age of Florida motel and restaurant advertising. The ephemera preserve the memory of the expansion of the local hospitality industry after the Second World War along with the rise of motel chains. The memorabilia also measures the redefinition of the South in Florida advertising in the period following the Civil Rights Movement. Additional critical contributions of the text include opportunities to examine the content for considerations of tourists and gender; lists of lodging amenities; the interesting nomenclature of independent, locally-owned motels and restaurants and what they suggested; and markers of political and regional conservatism. Finally, Wish You Were Here is part of a long tradition of Florida travel writing. From George M. Barbour, Sidney Lanier, and Harriet Beecher Stowe to Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings, Stetson Kennedy, and Zora Neale Hurston, from Ernest Hemingway to Ethel Byrum Kimball (Kim’s Guide to Florida) to Hampton Dunn and Carl Hiaasen, the lush Florida landscape and therapeutic climate have inspired its visitors and residents.

Fon L. Gordon

University of Central Florida


The Encyclopedia of Southern Culture, published in 1989 by the Center for the Study of Southern Culture and the University of North Carolina Press, immediately became an important and respected reference work in the field of Southern cultural studies. In one 1,600-page volume edited by Charles Reagan Wilson and William R. Ferris, entries by many prominent scholars of the South were organized into broad sections on topics such as religion, history, and literature. A generation later, the Center for the Study of Southern Culture and the University of North Carolina Press are partnering again to update and significantly expand their
Encyclopedia. Under the direction once more of Charles Reagan Wilson, this New Encyclopedia of Southern Culture is organized into twenty-four individual volumes, each of which expands on one of the topics of the original Encyclopedia, or contributes something new (Volume 7: Foodways, for example). These twenty-four volumes began publication in 2006 and a handful of volumes have been added each year.

In 2011, Education became the seventeenth volume in the series. Education is a key to understanding southern culture. From the South’s individualistic approach to educating its youth before the Civil War to its schools and colleges serving as an epicenter of the Civil Rights movement, education is deeply significant in the South. This updated collection of essays and short entries is not only an excellent addition to the New Encyclopedia as a whole, but is a considerable improvement over the “Education” section of the original work. Clarence L. Mohr, Chair of the Department of History at the University of South Alabama, edits this individual volume; he also contributes a thirty-page introductory essay to the volume that provides an excellent context for the entries that follow. Mohr’s introductory essay is so well-written, interesting, and wide-ranging in its scope that this volume is worth reading for his piece alone. Mohr’s essay is then followed by twenty-five shorter essays by various scholars on broad thematic topics such as “Academic Freedom,” “Military Schools,” and “Religion and Education.” Many of these topics appeared in the original work, but are expanded in the New Encyclopedia; for example, there is much more material on desegregation and busing in the new volume. The thematic entries are of high quality and up-to-date. While all of these entries are quite good, some would be more useful to students and scholars if they included more references in the bibliography which follows each entry. The entry on “Athletics and Education,” for instance, is fascinating but, with only one work in the bibliography, those who are interested in the topic receive little direction for further research.

The thematic essays are followed by over one hundred brief entries devoted to southern educators, universities, and narrower topics such as “One-room Schools.” It is in this section of Education that the greatest amount of new material has been added, with over fifty new entries. Some new entries, like “Homeschooling,” reflect topics that are more prominent today than they were in 1989. It is remarkable that other new entries, such as the ones on the Scopes
trial and on Booker T. Washington, were not part of the original encyclopedia. Eight of the new entries cover important African-American educators like Washington, a welcome improvement to the earlier edition. One of these new entries covers John Chavis, a Revolutionary War veteran who was “the first African American to receive a college education in the South” (193). The entry on Chavis is also wanted because it adds more colonial-era material on education to the *New Encyclopedia*. More coverage of the colonial South would have provided the historical depth needed to evaluate later trends in southern education. It was disappointing, for instance, not to see material on the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (S.P.G.), which did much charitable work to educate both whites and blacks in the colonial South. Other colonial-era topics, like the Yates and Eaton free schools in colonial Virginia, are glossed over in Mohr’s introduction, but are worthy of more attention. Of course, not every relevant topic can be included, and the new entries are all quite good.

About fifty of the brief entries cover topics that originally appeared in the first edition of the encyclopedia. Many are updated and some completely rewritten. The entry on Richard M. Weaver, the controversial conservative critic, is an example of one that was rewritten by a new author (the original author, the also-controversial Melvin E. Bradford, is now the subject of a new entry). Unfortunately, some of the entries that should have been updated and revised were not. For instance, the entry “Kappa Alpha Order” is nearly identical to its 1989 counterpart. The new entry includes the same statistics as the entry from 1989, listing 114 undergraduate chapters and about 100,000 initiates. Certainly, those figures have changed in the intervening twenty years; indeed the North-American Interfraternity Conference reported in 2009 that Kappa Alpha had just celebrated its 150,000th initiate and had 124 active chapters. While many of the revised short entries are excellent, they are not all of uniform quality.

Those who study Florida history will find much to interest them. There is a brief entry devoted to the University of Florida, and another on William N. Sheats, the “Father of Florida’s Public School System” (291). There are also fruitful references to Florida’s educational history scattered throughout the thematic essays, especially the piece entitled “Urbanization and Education,” which discusses the “Florida phenomenon” of urban college creation in the 1950s and 1960s (132).
Education is highly recommended to those with interests in southern education. It is a thoughtful, readable, useful work that will undoubtedly serve, as did its predecessor, to help shape twenty-first century thinking about the role of education in shaping southern culture.

Jennifer Oast
Bloomsburg University


A few years ago I was wandering the Gettysburg National Military Park and noticed a lone re-enactor, dressed in an 1860s Federal blue uniform, sitting under a tree reading a book. Eventually, a passer-by asked him what he was doing, and he replied that he was reading Walt Whitman poetry about the Civil War. As a conversation began, more people gathered round, and the re-enactor explained— in first person, as if he was from the 1860s— that he had come to the battlefield not long after the war to pay his respects to fallen comrades and family.

First person enactment is a difficult type of history performance to create successfully, but this re-enactor did so with aplomb. He held a group of history tourists enthralled and explored topics not the usual terrain of battlefield re-enactments— family, death, memory, literature, post-war reconstruction, and politics, to name a few. This simple vignette showed me how intimacy and the visceral nature of performance could work as a way of generating historical context and understanding, rather than the usual fare of costumed theatrics and gunpowder fireworks displays that we come to associate with historical re-enactments.

The essays in Enacting History engage with this potential for the performance of history. They also engage with the problems and pitfalls of staging performed historical events. Editors Scott Magelssen and Rhona Justice-Malloy have bought together a variety of essays that cover the form, practices, sites and historical representation of the surprising number of history performances in the arenas of public commemorations, private recreations, historical theme parks, and theatre that deals with history.

Leigh Clemmons’ essay on a series of commemorative battle re-enactments in Texas critiques the practices of battle re-enactors
and offers some important broader considerations for military re-enactments in general. Whilst Clemmons sees some engagement with history in these re-enactments, the dangers of such performances as reinforcements of certain preferred contemporary versions of origin and identity are paramount.

The subjects and places under discussion in the collected essays are diverse. Lindsay Adamson Livingston’s essay on re-enactments of the history of the Mormon Church pays particular attention to the effects of the sites where history is performed. Amy M. Tyson takes a somewhat irreverent look at the use of authenticity as a workplace surveillance tool at Historic Fort Snelling in St. Paul, Minnesota. Here, the drive for authenticity in costumed interpreters’ actions and speech often collides with the need for the niceties of the service industry of historical tourism. It also creates a hierarchy of knowledge of the “authentic” that can be deployed to discipline a workforce — as the oft-repeated re-enactors’ phrase goes; “but they wouldn’t have done it like that.” Tyson also takes a critical look at another “re-enacterism” — the perceived and actual authority gained in the real world by those who dress up as military officers.

Richard L. Poole reflects on the issues of history as theatre in writing a play for the 2004 Lewis and Clark bicentennial celebrations in Sioux City, Iowa. Aili McGill analyses the introduction of museum theatre into the Conner Prairie outdoor history museum in Fishers, Indiana, where first person presentation held sway for many years.

Again in the realm of theatre that deals with history, Patricia Ybarra’s thought-provoking essay on the play Jesus Moonwalks notes how the commemoration of particularly traumatic or contested historical events such as slavery needs more than just monuments. Often it needs performances that highlight the presentness that is always in the past.

Other essays on diverse topics include historical theatre at the Boston Science Museum, a medieval-themed episode of a television cooking show filmed at the Maryland Renaissance Festival, and Scott Magelssen’s account of the immersive recreation for tourists of the Caminata Nocturna. This night-time simulation of an illegal crossing of the U.S.-Mexico border established in the tourist resort of Parque EcoAlberto in Hidalgo, north of Mexico City is an interesting example of a growing phenomenon of history attractions that immerse tourists as characters in historically based, fictive scenarios.
Overall, the essays in this collection form an excellent survey of history as it is performed across the United States (and in Magelsen’s case, Mexico) and raise important questions for those who seek to “re-stage” the past. They interrogate whether this is indeed the object at hand in history performances.

Until relatively recently, historical re-enactments and the practices of amateur history enactors (or re-enactors as they call themselves) have seen little academic analysis. Cultural critics have tended to focus on the ways enactors have created both official and unsanctioned performance spaces for their contemporary social, and often political, needs. Much analysis has focused on the staging of history as a nostalgia for experiencing history, rather than learning it. However, scholars in performance studies and public history in particular have begun to interrogate historical re-enactments and performed histories in terms of what they might offer theorizing history, authenticity, and performance.

*Enacting History* appears at an important time. From 2011 to 2015, the 150th anniversary moments of the Civil War will be re-staged in many parks and historic sites across the United States. Such a thoughtful and insightful collection, as the editors suggest, should appeal to both theorists and practitioners of history performances. The range of sites and types of performances studied here will be most useful to anyone contemplating historical pageantry, theatre, commemorative performances, re-enactments, or any other of the vast array of costumed, historical performances that seem to proliferate around significant anniversary moments.

The performance of history is probably best served in the first instance by story selection – by interrogating the stock, standard tales that seem eminently performable and to work out whether these “perform” because of audience expectation or from contemporary political desires about the past. This is one of the most important elements shared by the essays in this collection and a lesson that still needs broader understanding if performances of history are to really engage with, rather than sanitize, the past.

Stephen Gapps

*Sydney, Australia*
End Notes

FLORIDA FRONTIERS: THE WEEKLY RADIO MAGAZINE OF THE FLORIDA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

*Florida Frontiers: The Weekly Radio Magazine of the Florida Historical Society* is a weekly, half-hour radio program currently airing on public radio stations around the state. The program is a combination of interview segments and produced features covering history-based events, exhibitions, activities, places, and people in Florida. The program explores the relevance of Florida history to contemporary society and promotes awareness of heritage and culture tourism options in the state. *Florida Frontiers* joins the *Florida Historical Quarterly* and the publications of the Florida Historical Society Press as another powerful tool to fulfill the Society’s mission of collecting and disseminating information about the history of Florida.

Recent broadcasts of *Florida Frontiers* have included visits to Fort Christmas Historic Park and the Harry T. and Harriette V. Moore Cultural Complex. Discussions about the St. Augustine Foot Soldiers Memorial and the life of Stetson Kennedy have been featured. We’ve talked with authors including Martin Dyckman, James Clark, Harvey Oyer III, and Rachel Wentz. We’ve previewed plans to recognize the 500th anniversary of the naming of Florida and the 450th anniversary of the establishment of St. Augustine. Upcoming programs will cover the 125th anniversary of the founding of Eatonville, the first incorporated African American town in the United States; and the 75th anniversary of the Zora Neale Hurston novel *Their Eyes Were Watching God.*

Florida Historical Society Executive Director Ben Brotemarkle is producer and host of *Florida Frontiers,* with weekly contributions from assistant producers Janie Gould and Bill Dudley. From 1992-2000, Brotemarkle was creator, producer, and host of the hour-long weekly radio magazine *The Arts Connection* on 90.7 WMFE in Orlando. In 2005, Gould became Oral History Specialist at 88.9 WQCS.
in Ft. Pierce. Since 1993, Dudley has been producing an ongoing series of radio reports for the Florida Humanities Council.

The program is currently broadcast on 90.7 WMFE Orlando, Thursdays at 6:30 p.m and Sundays at 4:00 pm.; 88.1 WUWF Pensacola, Thursdays at 5:30 p.m.; 89.9 WJCT Jacksonville, Mondays at 6:30 pm; 89.5 WFIT Melbourne, Sundays at 7:00 a.m.; 88.9 WQCS (HD2) Ft. Pierce, Wednesdays at 9:00 a.m.; 89.1 WUFT Gainesville, Sundays at 7:30 a.m.; and 90.1 WJUF Inverness, Sundays at 7:30 a.m. 90.1 WGCU Ft. Myers airs the program as hour-long "specials" for several months of the year. Check your local NPR listings for additional airings. More public radio stations are expected to add Florida Frontiers to their schedule in the coming year. The program is archived on the Florida Historical Society web site and accessible any time at www.myfloridahistory.org.

Florida Frontiers: The Weekly Radio Magazine of the Florida Historical Society is made possible in part by the Florida Humanities Council; the Jessie Ball duPont Fund; the Kislak Family Fund, supporter of education, arts, humanities, and Florida history; and by Florida’s Space Coast Office of Tourism, representing destinations from Titusville to Cocoa Beach to Melbourne Beach.

**FLORIDA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY PODCASTS**

The Florida Historical Quarterly has entered a new era of media. Dr. Robert Cassanello, Assistant Professor of History at the University of Central Florida, is the coordinator for podcast productions. In conjunction with the Public History programs at UCF, Dr. Cassanello will produce a podcast for each issue of the Quarterly. Each podcast will consist of an interview with one of the authors from the most recent issue of the Quarterly. The podcasts are uploaded to iTunes University and are available to the public at [http://publichistorypodcast.blogspot.com/](http://publichistorypodcast.blogspot.com/).

Dr. Jack E. Davis on his article “Sharp Prose for Green: John D. MacDonald and the First Ecological Novel,” which appeared in Volume 87, no. 4 (Spring 2009).

Dr. Michael D. Bowen on his article “The Strange Tale of Wesley and Florence Garrison: Racial Crosscurrents of the Postwar Florida Republican Party” appeared in Volume 88, no. 1 (Summer 2009).

Dr. Nancy J. Levine discussed the research project undertaken by her students on the Hastings Branch Library that appeared in Volume 88, no. 2 (Fall 2009).
Dr. Daniel Feller, 2009 Catherine Prescott Lecturer, on “The Seminole Controversy Revisited: A New Look at Andrew Jackson’s 1819 Florida Campaign,” Volume 88, no. 3 (Winter 2010).

Dr. Derrick E. White, on his article “From Desegregation to Integration: Race, Football, and ‘Dixie’ at the University of Florida,” Volume 88, no. 4 (Spring 2010).

Dr. Gilbert Din was interviewed to discuss his article “William Augustus Bowles on the Gulf Coast, 1787-1803: Unraveling a Labyrinthine Conundrum,” which appeared in Volume 89, no. 1 (Summer 2010).

Deborah L. Bauer, Nicole C. Cox, and Peter Ferdinando on graduate education in Florida and their individual articles in Volume 89, no. 2 (Fall 2010).


Dr. Rebecca Sharpless, “The Servants and Mrs. Rawlings: Martha Mickens and African American Life at Cross Creek,” which appeared in Volume 89, no. 4 (Spring 2011).


Dr. Samuel C. Hyde Jr., Dr. James G. Cusick, Dr. William S. Belko, and Cody Scallions in a roundtable discussion on the West Florida Rebellion of 1810, the subject of the special issue of the Florida Historical Quarterly Volume 90, no. 2 (Fall 2011).

Dr. Julian Chambliss and Dr. Denise K. Cummings, guest editors for “Florida: The Mediated State,” special issue, Florida Historical Quarterly Volume 90, no. 3 (Winter 2012).

Dr. David H. Jackson, Jr., on his article “‘Industrious, Thrifty and Ambitious’: Jacksonville’s African American Businesspeople during the Jim Crow Era,” in the Florida Historical Quarterly Volume 90, no. 4 (Spring 2012) and Dr. Tina Bucuvalas, 2012 Jillian Prescott Memorial Lecturer and winner of the Stetson Kennedy Award for The Florida Folklife Reader.

Dr. Claire Strom, Rapetti-Trunzo Professor of History at Rollins College, on her article, “Controlling Venereal Disease in Orlando during World War II,” Florida Historical Quarterly Volume 91, no. 1 (Summer 2012).

Dr. Matthew G. Hyland, on his article, “The Florida Keys Hurricane House: Post-Disaster New Deal Housing,” Florida Historical Quarterly Volume 91, no. 2 (Fall 2012).
The Florida Historical Quarterly is now available to scholars and researchers through JSTOR, a digital service for libraries, archives, and individual subscribers. JSTOR editors spent more than a year digitizing FHQ volumes 3-83; it became available to academic libraries and individual subscribers in August 2009. The FHQ has reduced the 5-year window to a 3-year window for greater access. More recent issues of the Quarterly are available only in print copy form. JSTOR has emerged as a leader in the field of journal digitization and the FHQ joins a number of prestigious journals in all disciplines. The Florida Historical Quarterly will continue to be available through PALMM, with a 5-year window.

FLORIDA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY NOW ON FACEBOOK

Join the Florida Historical Quarterly on Facebook. The FHQ Facebook page provides an image of each issue, the table of contents of each issue, an abstract of each article (beginning with volume 90, no. 1). There will be a link to the Quarterly podcasts and the Florida Historical Society.
GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSIONS TO THE
FLORIDA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

The Florida Historical Quarterly is a peer-reviewed journal and accepts for consideration manuscripts on the history of Florida, its people, and its historical relationships to the United States, the Atlantic World, the Caribbean, or Latin America. All submissions are expected to reflect substantial research, a dedication to writing, and the scholarly rigor demanded of professionally produced historical work. Work submitted for consideration should not have been previously published, soon to be published, or under consideration by another journal or press.

Authors should submit an electronic copy in MS Word to the Florida Historical Quarterly, at Connie.Lester@ucf.edu.

Manuscripts should be typed and double-spaced (excluding footnotes, block quotes, or tabular matter).

The first page should be headed by the title without the author’s name. Author identification should be avoided throughout the manuscript. On a separate sheet of paper, please provide the author’s name, institutional title or connection, or place of residence, and acknowledgements. Citations should be single-spaced footnotes, numbered consecutively, and in accordance with the Chicago Manual of Style.

Tables and illustrations should be created on separate pages, with positions in the manuscript indicated.

In a cover letter, the author should provide contact information that includes phone numbers, fax number, email address, and mailing address. The author should provide a statement of the substance and significance of the work and identify anyone who has already critiqued the manuscript.

Images or illustrations to be considered for publication with the article may be submitted in EPS or PDF electronic format at 300 dpi or higher. Xeroxed images cannot be accepted. All illustrations should include full citations and credit lines. Authors should retain letters of permission from institutions or individuals owning the originals.

Questions regarding submissions should be directed to Connie L. Lester, editor, addressed to Department of History, 4000 Central Florida Blvd, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL 32816-1350, or by email to Connie.Lester@ucf.edu, or by phone at 407-823-0261.
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