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ABSTRACT

Six European artifacts are documented from 41SP11 (McGloin Bluff). One is a coin initially attributed as Spanish and dating to post-1536. Additional investigations have determined it to be an Elizabeth I silver English sixpence, dating between 1560 and 1571. The only documented English activity in the Gulf in this period was the Third John Hawkins’ Expedition defeated at the Battle of San Juan de Ulua in September 1568. Only two of eight ships survived the encounter with the Spanish. Francis Drake escaped with one ship eastward and returned to England. Hawkins’ ship escaped north up the Mexican coast. Overburdened with men, Hawkins landed nearly 100 men. Seventy men marched south and were captured by the Spanish, imprisoned, subjected to the First Mexican Inquisition, and only three ever returned to England. Twenty-nine men led by sailor David Ingram marched north. Ingram and two others returned to England a year later in 1569 claiming to have made a pedestrian transit from Mexico to Nova Scotia. They were rescued by French fishermen and returned to England via Le Havre. The recovery of an Elizabethan coin from 41SP11 lends potential credence to Ingram’s transit.

INTRODUCTION

McGloin Bluff (41SP11) is an archaeological site located on the northeastern side of Corpus Christi Bay along the central Gulf Coast of Texas (Figure 1). 41SP11 is a single component Rockport phase site dating from ca. A.D. 1250/1300 (see Ricklis 1996, 2004, 2010). There are six documented artifacts of European origin from McGloin Bluff. Initial interpretations of these historic artifacts associated them with the Spanish who had an occasional to dominating presence in Texas from 1519 to 1820. One of
these artifacts is a coin that was initially attributed as possibly being from a Spanish mint on Hispaniola and dating to post-1536 (Ricklis 2010a:121). In an attempt to make a definitive attribution of the coin Ricklis provided images to me in 2009. During the course of the next five years, intermittent searches resulted in an August 2014 determination that the coin was an Elizabeth I hammered silver English sixpence, dating between 1561 and 1582.

Archival and historical research indicates that the only recorded English undertakings during this period in the Gulf of Mexico and circum-Caribbean were the three John Hawkins’ Expeditions. The third, which met with disaster at the Battle of San Juan de Ulua in September 1568, is the potential origin of the coin. Of the eight English ships in the battle, only two survived the encounter with the Spanish Plate Fleet. The Judith, commanded by Hawkins’ cousin Francis Drake, escaped essentially unharmed and returned to England. Hawkins’ ship, the Minion, burdened with over 200 men, escaped north up the coast, where, realizing the insufficiency of their supplies, Hawkins’ released some 100 men. Most of this shore party marched south where they were captured by the Spanish. However, a party, consisting of some 30 men under the sailor David Ingram, marched north. Of these 30 men, three, including Ingram, returned to England some 11 months later and stated that they had made a pedestrian transit of North America, arrived near Cape Breton in Nova Scotia, and there joined themselves to French fishermen. Through these fishermen they were able to return to England in October-November 1569. The archaeological recovery of an Elizabethan silver sixpence from McGloin Bluff lends potential credence to Ingram’s transit. It also provides an opportunity to reassess the remaining historic artifacts from McGloin Bluff and reexamine possible interactions between the English and Native Americans of the central Texas Coast.

LOCATION AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

The McGloin Bluff site is located in San Patricio County, Texas, along the northeastern shore of Corpus Christi Bay. The site is a vegetated sand dune some 10 meters above sea level and some 70 meters distant from the shoreline of Corpus Christi Bay. The stable portion of the dune containing artifact-bearing deposits is some 180 meters long and ranges in width from as little as 10 meters to as wide as 40 meters (Ricklis 2010a:6-7). The bluff is a visually prominent topographic feature and densely covered in native salt-tolerant halophytic plants. The climate of the central Texas coast is humid and subtropical, with average summer highs often exceeding 32°C (above 90°F). Winters are usually mild with average nighttime lows near 10°C (50°F); however, the area does experience occasional freeze conditions (Bomar 1983:234-237). Average annual rainfall is 810 mm (32 inches) but the area is also susceptible to semi-annual intermittent hurricanes and tropical storms that can drop considerably larger amounts of precipitation.

The archaeological site, 41SP11, was first recorded by James E. Corbin in 1963 as one of a number of sites along the northern shoreline of Corpus Christi Bay (Corbin 1963:6-14; Ricklis 2010a:2). Corbin’s surface collection from 1957 to 1962 indicated that the site consisted almost exclusively of Rockport phase artifacts. The collection included Rockport Ware ceramics and contemporaneous diagnostic projectile points (Corbin 1963:6-14). Also recovered was a single blue glass bead that Corbin deduced as indicative of trade/contact with Europeans during the early historic period, dating from ca. 1684-1750.

A cultural resources survey conducted by Coastal Environments Inc. (CEI) in 2004 verified the presence of the Late Rockport phase materials at 41SP11. Further testing by CEI determined that the site dated from A.D. 1300-1700 (Ricklis 1995, 2004, 2010:4). These results became the impetus for large-scale data recovery undertaken by TRC Environmental Corporation in 2008-2009 and reported on by Ricklis (2010). These excavations produced four radiocarbon assays of Lightening Whelk shells (Buscyon perversum) that returned mixed marine and atmospheric calibrated 2-sigma dates ranging from A.D. 1250-A.D. 1700 (Ricklis 2010b:12).

In addition to the single blue glass trade bead collected in 1962, five other European artifacts were recovered from excavations at the site by TRC Environmental Corporation (Ricklis 2010a). These artifacts included what appeared to be a very worn and corroded copper coin, a pipe bowl fragment, a modified pewter fragment, an iron nail or spike, and a small iron strap (Figure 2). These artifacts, plus the single blue glass bead collected by Corbin, are presumed to have accumulated at McGloin Bluff.
sometime between A.D. 1492 and A.D. 1700, and overlapping with the final part of the Late Prehistoric period Rockport phase. The question is how these artifacts arrived at 41SP11 and who the Native Americans were who occupied the site at that time.

The Native Americans of the Rockport phase are directly associated with the historic Karankawa Indians resident in the area during the colonial period, 1530-1750 (Campbell 1960). The term Karankawa, in this case, denotes more than one particular coastal tribe. Herein it is used to denote a number of tribes living within the central coastal zone of Texas. Ricklis (1996:4) includes five major tribes along the central Texas coast that were identified by the Spanish ca. 1720: the Carancaguases, Cocos, Cujuanes, Guapites, and Copanes. Late Rockport phase material culture is characterized by sandy paste ceramics often coated or accented with decorations in

Figure 2. Colonial artifacts from McGloin Bluff: a, fragment of pewter; b, European coin; c, pipe bowl rim fragment; d, iron spike; and e, corroded iron strap. Adapted from Ricklis (2010a:Figure 8).
asphaltum (a natural tar or pitch produced by seeps in the Gulf of Mexico that is regularly found along the Texas coast). In addition to utilitarian ceramics, cylindrical ceramic smoking pipes are also recovered. The lithic assemblage consists of Perdiz arrow points (Turner et al. 2011:206), unifacial scrapers, beveled flint knives, and modified marine shell (Ricklis 2004:172). Historic artifacts, often of Spanish origin, are also found in Late Rockport sites and Late Rockport artifacts are also found in Spanish sites (e.g., Ricklis 2000, 2010). These sites date to ca. 1720 and later. The Rockport phase is geographically delimited and ranges from the north side of Baffin Bay and up the central Texas coast as far as the mouth of the Colorado River and some 40 kilometers inland (Ricklis 2004:156). The McGloin Bluff site has all of the classic Rockport material culture as well as the six recovered European artifacts. A description of the historic artifacts from 41SP11, their measurements, condition, and initial identification was made by both Corbin and Ricklis. Reanalysis of these artifacts between June 2014 and May 2016 has produced new attributions, new interpretations, and provided for additional avenues of research.

**DISCUSSION OF ARTIFACTS**

The first historic artifact from 41SP11 is the small blue glass bead collected from a surface context by Corbin sometime between 1957 and 1962. Corbin described it as a small blue glass bead 3 mm thick and 4 mm in diameter typical of 18th century European trade beads (Corbin 1963:13). Corbin concluded that “The trade bead certainly indicates contact with Europeans” (Corbin 1963:14). The Corbin Collection is held by the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory, but a review of the collection in November 2015 determined that the bead is no longer present.

The reported size of the Corbin bead places it in what is commonly referred to as the “seed bead” category of glass beads. These are so-called because of their small size. These beads came in a variety of colors with blue predominating. The Corbin bead’s size and color is similar to beads recovered from the French shipwreck of *La Belle* that sank in Matagorda Bay in 1686. Both the Corbin and *La Belle* beads are similar to the Kidd and Kidd bead classifications Ia18 and Iia55 and identified by Perttula as *La Belle* Variety 8 and 1, respectively (Kidd and Kidd 1970:227, 229; Perttula and Glascock 2017:Table 22.2). As LaSalle explored both westward and eastward from Fort St. Louis in an attempt to determine his location east or west of the Mississippi River, he undoubtedly interacted with Native Americans. It is also known from Henri Joutel’s diary that La Salle carried trade beads with him for just such encounters (Joutel 1998:135, 137). Lack of access to the original 41SP11 bead and a subsequent comparison or chemical analysis prevent any determination, final attribution, or association with the French in 1685-1687.

The second historic artifact with a potentially important attribution is a fragment of a European pipe bowl originally identified as being made of kaolinite, a clay mineral. The fragment is from the bowl of the pipe and includes the rim and a portion of the straight-barreled wall (Figure 3). The fragment measures 22.19 x 15.47 mm and is 1.57 mm in thickness. Ricklis noted the presence of kaolinite pipe fragments from a number of southern Texas Spanish mission contexts as well as from 41VT4, the first site of Presidio de Nuestra Señora de Loreto (often referred to as Presidio La Bahía for its proximity to Matagorda Bay), and Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga Mission, founded in April 1721 and 1722, respectively (Ricklis 2000, 2010a:119). Both of these sites are in Victoria County, Texas, on Garcitas Creek and 120 kilometers north and west of 41SP11. The presidio was located on the same site as LaSalle’s failed French settlement (Bolton 1908; Weddle 1973). Ricklis posited that these mission sites could account for the pipe fragment at 41SP11 or, like the coin, the fragment could have also have been recovered from a shipwreck or shipwrecked seaman (Ricklis 2010a:119).

The pipe bowl fragment has the potential for a clear attribution based on morphology and composition. A significant number of pipes from the late 16th through the 18th century were made from kaolinitic clays. Kaolinite and white clay pipes and pipe fragments are ubiquitous in North American historic sites of the 17th and 18th century and are directly associated with the English tobacco market developed during the same period. Close inspection of the pipe fragment from 41SP11 under 20x magnification has demonstrated that the pipe is not made from kaolinite; rather, it is a light tan clay with numerous fine siliceous inclusions. This clay differs mineralogically from both kaolinite and white ball clay and may indicate a non-English origin. Morphologically, the pipe conforms most closely to English styles of
the late 17th century, ca. 1680-1700 (Dr. B. Straub, personal communication, November 18, 2015).

The first introduction of both tobacco and pipe smoking to England was recorded by John Sparke, the chronicler of the Second John Hawkins Expedition of 1564-1565:

The Floridians when they travell, have a kind of herbe dried, who with a cane and an earthen cup in the end, with fire, and the dried herbs put together, doe sucke thorow the cane the smoke thereof, which smoke satisfieth their hunger, and therewith they live foure or five dayes without meat or drinke, and this all the Frenchmen used for this purpose (Sparke 1565:125-126).

The French, as noted by Sparke, were already “drinking” tobacco by this point and no doubt Hawkins’ crew also took up the practice, for as early as 1571 L’Obel mentions tobacco use: “You see many sailors, and all those who come back from America, carrying little funnels made from a palm leaf or a reed in the extreme end of which they insert the rolled and powdered leaves of this plant” (L’Obel 1571). The pipe fragment from 41SP11 may be contemporaneous with the coin and represent an unusual early English pipe; a French pipe obtained by one of Hawkins’ crew during their documented encounters with the French at Fort Caroline on the Atlantic coast of Florida; or from one of the two French ships that joined Hawkins during the Third Expedition (Sparke 1565; Hawkins 1569; Hortop 1591). Likewise, the pipe could also be associated with the later French presence. No final determination has been made as to origin or date on the pipe fragment.

The third historic artifact recovered and described by Ricklis was initially identified as a fragment of pewter, an alloy of tin, lead, and related elements (Figure 4). This specimen is 26.2 mm in length, 11.96 mm in width, and 4.38 mm in thickness. X-ray fluorescence (XRF) analysis by the Texas A&M University Conservation Research Laboratory in 2019 determined that the artifact was a modified fragment of lead, rather than pewter, based on its elemental composition being predominantly lead (Pb) and related carbon family elements (selenium, Sn, and Cadmium, Cd) with traces of copper (Cu) and tin (Ti) (Dostal 2019). The XRF analysis was performed using a Bruker AXS Handheld S1PXRF Spectrum instrument. The artifact was abraded to
a fine point and Ricklis (2010a:122) posited that it had been reworked by a site inhabitant for use as an arrow point. The lead fragment’s modification is analogous to similar marine shell projectiles manufactured from shell columella, and most likely it represents a repurposing of the lead fragment for an indigenous use.

Lead was utilized for numerous purposes in the period from 1600 to 1800 but one of the more common uses was to form musket balls or shot. The modification of this fragment precludes specific attribution of the object’s original purpose or specific temporal origin as the English, French, and Spanish all utilized lead shot for their rifles and pistols.

The fourth and fifth historic artifacts are both iron objects. The first is a hand wrought iron spike 106.9 mm in length, with a head diameter of 34.59 mm and a shank with a diameter of 14.91 mm. The second object is a bent/folded thin iron strap 51.58 mm long, 16.84 mm wide, and 2.1 mm thick. These iron items are of definite European origin, but particular attribution is difficult given the ubiquity of iron from colonial deposits, regardless of country of origin. The iron spike, based on its dimensions, appears to be hand wrought, as would be expected from deposits dating from the early 18th century and prior. Ricklis (2010:122) was less confident about the dating of the strap as it had no discernible or identifying features.

Potentially the most illuminating artifact is the coin recovered in the 2008-2009 TRC excavations. It was described as made of copper based on its greenish color and corroded appearance. It is roughly circular in shape, 23.34 x 23.3 mm and

Figure 4. Lead fragment abraded to form a projectile.
0.66 mm in thickness. Ricklis noted that the coin bore “…stamped impressions consisting of largely unreadable lettering around the outer margins, and a saw-tooth-edged circle inset from the edge” (Ricklis 2010a:121). Ricklis admitted that due to its poor condition the coin could not be identified with any degree of certainty but that it most closely resembled the 4 Maravedis coins minted at Santo Domingo, Hispaniola, after 1536. Supposing this attribution, it was surmised that a coin of this type could have arrived at McGloin Bluff as shipwreck jetsam collected by local natives (Ricklis 2010a:121).

**ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE COIN**

Although initially described as copper and potentially Spanish, the coin has been determined through conservation and x-ray fluorescence analysis (Texas A&M 2016) to be made of silver and that it is an English hammered silver sixpence from the reign of Elizabeth I, who ruled from 1558-1603. The delay in identification was a direct result of the improbability of it being English. Following a number of years of failure to identify the coin, I posted images to the “coincommunity” bulletin board and the initial attribution was made within hours. The obverse and reverse of the 41SP11 specimen are shown in Figures 5a-b, adjacent to an example of an Elizabethan sixpence dated 1562. Both images are at 2x magnification. While no date is discernible on the 41SP11 specimen, there are several areas that are key to its identification and are those originally noted by Ricklis (2010), namely the “largely unreadable lettering around the outer margins, and a saw-tooth-edged circle inset from the edge.” For ease of comparison and identification these are labeled “Obverse 1” and “2” in Figure 5a; and “Reverse 1,” “2,” “3,” and “4” in Figure 5b.

Additional images taken under 75x magnification of these particular areas assist the confirmation of this identification (Figure 6a-b’). The abbreviated Latin legend on the type coin obverse reads: ELIZABETH D(EO) G(RATIA) ANG(LIA) FR(ANCIA) ET HIB(ERNIA) REGINA, in English, “Elizabeth, by the Grace of God, Queen of England, France and Ireland.” Half of the “E,” the majority of the “LI,” and a portion of the letter “Z” of ELIZABETH are discernible on the 41SP11 specimen obverse (Figure 6a). Additionally, portions of the “TH,” “D.,” “G.,” and “AN” are also noted (Figure 6b).

The Latin legend on the reverse reads: POSUI DEU(M) ADIVTORE(M) MEU(M), and translates in English to “I have made God my helper.” The lower portion of the “D”, most of the “IV” and “O” of ADIVTORE(M) are discernible on the reverse (Figure 7a-a’). What few letters remain visible provide time diagnostic information for the coin. The placement of the “D” in ADIVTOREM abutting the fleur, and the placement of the other discernible letters on both the obverse and reverse, distinguishes it as coming from the 3rd to 5th coinages and dates the coin to sometime between 1561 and 1582 (Brown 1957:583). The legend on Elizabethan sixpences changed after 1582 and the 41SP11 specimen does not match the later coin legends. Elizabethan sixpences came in both a milled and hammered variety and are separated by their appearance: the milled variety being nearly perfectly circular and most often well struck while the hammered variety coins are often irregular in shape and less well struck (Challis 1978:10-20; Brown 1957:577).

As can be seen from the comparison images there are multiple areas of congruence between the 41SP11 specimen and the type specimen. In particular, the limited legible letters on the 41SP11 specimen correspond to those on the type specimen and the beaded/saw-toothed circle, pierced by the fleurs at the ends of the cross, also match. The size of the coin (an average of 23.2 mm in diameter and 0.66 mm in thickness); weight, 2.2 g; material (silver); and visible design elements are comparable to the size variation of Elizabethan hammered sixpences of the 3rd to 5th coinages.

**ATTRIBUTION OF ARTIFACT DEPOSITION AT MCGLOIN BLUFF**

How these six artifacts came to 41SP11 is a matter of conjecture. Five of the six do not have a definitive attribution. The five currently non-attributable items could be associated with the Spanish, French or English and range in date from 1520 to ca. 1700 based on probable opportunity, the material culture remains from 41SP11, the calibrated radiocarbon dates, and the Late Prehistoric Rockport phase cultural material remains. These artifacts could have come to 41SP11 as shipwreck jetsam, trade between natives and Europeans putting into the coast, or have been traded from other natives. Likewise, these artifacts could have multiple origins and from different times. While 41SP11 is a single component site, the
period of its use could easily span 300-400 years. The artifacts themselves could have been variously deposited at any point during the historic period from 1520 to 1700.

Possible 16th century European interactions could have included the survivors of the Panfilo de Narvaez expedition to Florida who were shipwrecked on the Texas coast in 1528, among whom was Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca (Cabeza de Vaca in Bandelier [1972]). The remnants of the Hernando de Soto expedition also passed down the Texas coast in 1542-1543 on a series of improvised rafts (Bolton 1949; Clayton et al. 1995). These men undoubtedly landed at various locations along the coast during their transit for rest and sustenance.

A potential source for English interaction
during this period was the purported transit of North America, via Texas, of the English sailor David Ingram in the winter of 1568-1569. Ingram and his party were participants in the Third John Hawkins Expedition (Markham 1878; Williamson 1927, 1949, 1969). The late 16th century also saw activity by both English and French privateers, pirates and corsairs who preyed upon Spanish shipping and coastal settlements (Gerhard 2003). All six of the artifacts from 41SP11 could potentially have come from any of these sources.

Rivalry between the Spanish and French during the late 17th century created a number of encounters between Europeans and Native Americans in Texas. In 1685 the Frenchman Rene-Robert Cavelier Sieur de La Salle made an attempt to found a colony along the Mississippi River to establish French claims. However, he overshot the river and landed on the Texas coast at Matagorda Bay near Port Lavaca in Victoria County, some 120 kilometers north of Corpus Christi Bay. There La Salle founded the short-lived Fort St. Louis on Garcitas Creek. La Salle was subsequently killed by one of his own men, Pierre Duhaut, in March 1687 as he was attempting to reach the Mississippi. The colonists remaining at Fort St. Louis were subsequently attacked by Karankawas in December/January 1688-1689 and, with the exception of four young children, all were

Figure 6. Coin at 75x magnification: a, Northeast quadrant of type coin obverse at 75x magnification – “ELIZ” and beaded border; a’, 41SP11 coin; b, lower right quadrant of type coin obverse at 75x magnification – “TH,” “D.,” “G.,” “AN,” and beaded border; b’, 41SP11 coin.

Figure 7. Silver coin: a, Lower quadrants of type coin reverse (orientation flipped), reverse “D.”, fleur, “IVTOR,” and beaded border; a’, 41SP11 coin.
slain. Spanish expeditions under Alonso de Leon in 1690 and Domingo Teran de los Rios in 1691 were sent out searching for La Salle’s, by that time, failed settlement (Bolton 1930; Hatcher 1932). While the coin from 41SP11 clearly antedates these events, it is possible that the other artifacts, in particular the blue seed bead, may have mid- to late 17th century associations with either the French or Spanish.

Only the Elizabethan sixpence’s origin can be clearly associated with a specific European nation during a specific time period: England, sometime between 1561 and 1582. The coin could have been deposited at 41SP11 during or after this period. We need to consider the recorded English enterprises in the Gulf of Mexico during the mid- to late 17th century and the potential for these undertakings to account for the coin. The English had only successfully established colonies on the northeast coast of North America in the early 17th century, the first at Jamestown, Virginia, in 1607. This English enterprise is too geographically and temporally distant to be a viable and potential source for the coin at 41SP11. However, there were the English trade expeditions under Hawkins (Sparke 1565; Hawkins 1569; Hakluyt 1589) and, after 1575, English privateers and pirates who preyed upon Spanish fleets, merchants, and coastal settlements (Gerhard 2003). Any of these English undertakings could be considered possible sources for the coin at 41SP11.

**THE HAWKINS EXPEDITIONS**

The best documented English enterprises in the Gulf of Mexico during the 16th century are the three John Hawkins Expeditions in 1562-1563, 1564-1565, and 1567-1569 (Markham 1878; Williamson 1927, 1949, 1969). Hawkins’ First Expedition called only in the Spanish Caribbean and did not make a North American landfall, most likely ruling out this as a potential source for the coin. Hawkins’ Second Expedition did make landfall on the Atlantic coast of Florida at the French Fort Caroline but he made no landfall along the Gulf coast, let alone in what was to become Texas (Sparke 1565). Hawkins’ Third Expedition made landfall both near modern day Veracruz and Tampico, Mexico. At the latter location, he was forced to leave men ashore (Hawkins 1569:39; Hakluyt 1589:560-561). The second and third expeditions, and in particular the third and final expedition, are possible sources for the coin recovered at 41SP11.

**Hawkins’ Background History**

Hawkins was the first Englishman to commercially engage in the trans-Atlantic slave trade (Kelsey 2003). All three of his expeditions had as their primary purpose profit from the capturing and/or purchasing of slaves on the Guinea coast of Africa and in turn selling them in the Spanish possessions of the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico littoral (Gosse 1930; Unwin 1960; Williamson 1969; Kelsey 2003). The first two of these expeditions ended in financial success for Hawkins but the third ended in the defeat and the near annihilation of his fleet by the Spanish in September 1568.

Hawkins was born at Plymouth in 1532. The Hawkins family was one of the most prominent merchant ship-owning families of the 16th century (Williamson 1949; Gosse 1930). There are a number of images of Hawkins. Two of the most well-known are an oil portrait from 1581 by an unknown artist that now hangs in the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, England, and the second is a small ivory bust held by Hawkins’ descendants.

Hawkins lasting renown derives from his co-admiralty of the English fleet with Francis Drake and the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 (Stow 1598:806-807). Both men were knighted by Queen Elizabeth I as a result of their exploits. However, long before Hawkins was knighted he had made a name for himself through his mercantile shipping, and in particular through the slave trade.

**Hawkins’ Three Slaving and Mercantile Expeditions 1562 to 1569**

John Hawkins became a noteworthy merchant and set up business in London in 1561. It was in London that Hawkins promoted the idea of trade along the Guinea coast “…there to buy, or procure by other means, cargoes of negroes, and then to carry them to the West Indies to sell for gold, pearls and other valuable merchandise” (Gosse 1930:5). This proposal resulted in three expeditions between 1562 and 1569. His first expedition was entirely privately supported but his second and third voyages were a combination of both State ships of the Tudor fleet as well as private ships subscribed and supported by English merchant investors. Both the Crown (Elizabeth I) and moneyed elites invested in Hawkins’ final two expeditions in anticipation of returns on those investments.
It is important to note that the Third Hawkins Expedition is surprisingly well documented. It is also unique in both the number and origin of firsthand accounts. There are no less than six from the English perspective: Hawkins (1569), Miles (1582), Ingram (1582), Hortop (1591), the Cotton MS Author (1567-1568), and Robert Barrett’s deposition found in the Spanish Archives (1568). The Cottonian manuscript is a partial account of the Third Expedition written by an unknown crew-member, discovered in the Cottonian Library of the British Museum, studied, and reported on by James A. Williams in 1927. Hawkins, the Cotton MS Author, and Barrett were educated and not commoners. An account from Hawkins is to be expected as the leader of the endeavor, and of course, Barrett’s account is a deposition. The firsthand accounts from three common men are also part of what makes the history of this failed enterprise so unique as it provides a perspective often lacking in narratives of the period. Additionally, Wright’s published translation of documents from the Archivo Nacional in Seville, Spain, in 1929 have provided not only the copy of Barrett’s deposition (Wright 1929:153-160) but also numerous firsthand accounts from the Spanish perspective on the events leading up to the Battle of San Juan de Ulua and their aftermath (Wright 1929).

Hawkins’ three voyages all followed the same pattern. He would take a small flotilla of ships and sail for the African Guinea coast. Once there, he would obtain slaves through raiding, barter, or expropriation from Portuguese slavers. Hawkins would then sail with this cargo to the Spanish Indies where he would trade these slaves for gold, silver, or other commodities. However, Spanish Crown policy forbade trade outside of the Spanish mercantile system except with permission, duties, and tariffs (Wright 1929:6-8). Hawkins thwarted that system by requiring, often under duress, the issuance of licenses by Spanish officials. In many instances these licenses were granted, and Hawkins commenced hostilities if they were refused. Spanish archival documents only translated and published in 1929 document some of the methods used by Hawkins in his trading. What follows is a copy of the letter sent by Hawkins to the Spanish official at Borburata on the Venezuelan coast in April 1565 during his second expedition:

Very Magnificent Sir: I, John Hawkins…appear before your honor in the manner most advantageous to my interests, and state that: Whereas by order of Elizabeth, queen of England, my mistress, whose fleet this is, I cleared on a certain voyage, and was by contrary winds driven to these coasts where, since I have found a convenient harbor, it behooves me to repair and refurnish my ships and continue my voyage; and whereas to do this I have need to sell the slaves and merchandise I carry;…I petition your honor to grant me license to sell my cargo…If this petition be not granted, I shall seek my own solution…let not your honor anger me nor move me to aught that I should not do, as will be inevitable if your honor refuse me the license I ask. I protest that if from its refusal harm and damage follow, the fault and responsibility will be your honor’s. (Document 11, Petition from John Hawkins to Licentiate Alonso Bernaldez, Borburata, Venezuela).

In the Borburata case cited above, Hawkins was granted permission provided he paid the required tariffs; however, he subsequently refused to pay them and landed a party of men threatening war (Wright 1929:85). The Spanish authorities thus acquiesced to his demands and released him, in writing, from the import restrictions and duties. Hawkins then demanded two hostages as surety (Relacion of Hawkins’ advance on Borburata, April 19, 1565, as translated by Wright [1929:86]). By the time of Hawkins’ Second and Third Expeditions the Spanish were well aware of his trading methods. The City Council of Cartagena petitioned the Spanish Crown on September 30, 1568, remarking that:

…we received word from Cabo de Vela (Puerto Cabello, Venezuela) that John Hawkins, English corsair, with eleven powerful ships and a large force of men and heavy armament of artillery, under cover of selling certain slaves and other merchandise he had, was doing damage along the coast where the towns refused to buy on his terms what he offered for sale. He occupied the town of Rio de la Hacha and did the same with the city of Santa Marta. (Cabildo de Cartagena to the Crown, as translated by Wright [1929:125]).

Local Spanish officials generally wished to do business with Hawkins and would often collude to
effectuate trade. However, such was the tenden-
tious nature of these schemes that often the Spanish
authorities would countermand them:

…Governor don Pedro Ponce de Leon arrived
in this province in May 1566 and investigated
the administration of Licentiate Alonso Ber-
dez…and because the licentiate issued a permit
to trade with the said Englishman (Hawkins)
his sentence him to be fined to the value of the
negroes and other merchandise which changed
hands (Diego Ruiz de Vallejo to the Crown, New
Segovia, April 21, 1568, as translated by Wright
[1929: 113]).

So great were Hawkins’ depredations during his
second voyage that the Spanish Ambassador to Eng-
land requested and received assurances that Hawkins
would be prevented from another sortie in the Gulf
of Mexico and Spanish Caribbean (Gosse 1930: 44-
45). These assurances were in vain for Hawkins
outfitted a third expedition, again with Elizabeth I’s
approval, for she provided the Jesus of Lubeck and
the Minion, both capital ships of the Tudor Navy.
This expedition consisted of a total of six ships and
over 400 men that sailed from Plymouth on October
2, 1567. Hawkins’ young cousin Francis Drake also
sailed with the expedition.

The Disastrous Third Expedition

True to form, Hawkins again proceeded to the
Guinea Coast where in the course of several months
he obtained a cargo of some 500 slaves through a
combination of purchase, capture, and expropriation
(Hawkins 1569:6-7; Barrett in Wright [1929: 154-
155]). With this cargo aboard, he set sail for the
Spanish Main on February 7, 1568. His small flotilla
had gained four additional ships while in Africa: one
Portuguese caravel obtained off Cape Blanco, two
French ships and their captains who had joined them-
selves to his party near Cape Verde, and a Portuguese
barque purchased at Rio Grande (Cotton MS in Wil-
Hawkins first called at Dominica, then subsequently
at Margarita, and then Borburata, where, despite his
actions there during his Second Expedition in 1565
and the presence of the new Governor don Ponce
de Leon, he stayed for two months (Cotton MS in
Williamson [1927: 515-516]). While Governor de
Leon “…did not formally permit trade he at least did
nothing to prevent it” (Williamson 1969: 122-123).

Hawkins then repaired to Rio de la Hacha and
Santa Marta as he had done in 1565 and in both
instances the same collusion between the parties and
the pretense of force allowed a brisk trade between
the English and Spanish (Cotton MS in Williamson
[1927: 522-528]). Following the successes at the pre-
vious five ports, Hawkins was frustrated upon reaching
Cartagena and being denied trade and victualing
by the Spanish Governor there (Wright 1929).
Hawkins’ fleet was reduced by two ships on leaving
Cartagena as he had no use for the Portuguese barque
(having disposed of most of his merchandise) and
one of the French ships departed seeking its own
fortune. Hawkins then resolved to return to England
and proceeded to the Florida Channel where some
three weeks later they were forced to turn back west
due to foul weather. The fleet lost a third ship, the
William and John, which became separated during
difficult weather off Cuba and sailed on to England
alone (Cotton MS in Williamson [1927: 530]; Miles
in Hakluyt [1969:400]).

With leaking ships, principally the Queen’s
ship the Jesus of Lubeck, and supplies running
low, Hawkins made for the Yucatan coast where he
happened upon a group of three Spanish ships. He
overtook one of the ships and in conversation with
her Captain discovered that the only ports he could
make for were at Campeche and San Juan de Ulua.
As the waters off Campeche were too shallow and
treacherous for his larger ships, he resolved to make
for the harbor at San Juan de Ulua (Cotton MS in
Williamson [1927: 531]). There he hoped to repair
and refit the ships and to obtain the supplies neces-
sary for the crossing to England (Hawkins 1569:9).
Hawkins then added the Spanish ship to the fleet,
making a total of eight ships.

The fort of San Juan de Ulua was the port of
entry for the Viceroyalty of Mexico. The fort was
little more than a small island with deep harborage
protected by several gun emplacements. The island
was some 220 meters long and some 450 meters off
the Mexican coast. It was here that Hawkins arrived
on September 15, 1568, in the company of three
additional Spanish ships that were also bound for
the port. “He gave orders to strike all the crosses of
St. George and to display only the royal standard
on the topmast of the Jesus and foretopmast of the
Minion” (Cotton MS in Williamson [1927: 532];
Williamson 1969:135). To the Spanish at San Juan
de Ulua, the seven ships of the English flying no
regular English ensigns, the single French ship still remaining presumably doing the same, and the four Spanish ships, looked like the expected Spanish Plate Fleet. Through this ruse, Hawkins was able to make port and through cajoling and threats reach a compromise that he could repair and re-outfit before leaving for England (Hawkins 1569:11). Hawkins’ desires were thwarted when the following morning the 13 ships comprising the Spanish Plate Fleet appeared off San Juan de Ulua. Both fleets were in a predicament: Hawkins could not leave San Juan without engaging the plate fleet, and the plate fleet could not enter San Juan without striking a deal with Hawkins. The period from September 16 to the 21st was spent arranging a compromise: the Spanish would enter but Hawkins would retain control of the island; further, the Spanish and English exchanged 10 hostages as surety (Hawkins 1569:11-13; Cotton MS in Williamson [1927:532-534]; Barrett in Wright [1929:159-160]; Miles in [Hakluyt 1969:403-405]). Thus, the port of San Juan became choked with over 30 ships: the eight ships of Hawkins’ group, the three Spanish ships Hawkins had attached himself to on entry, the 13 ships of the plate fleet, plus eight Spanish merchant ships already at anchor there.

**The Defeat of Hawkins at San Juan de Ulua**

Exactly what happened next is shrouded in Spanish and English propaganda of the period. Nevertheless, the result was that five days after coming into harbor at San Juan, the Spanish attacked the English, and after a desperate battle, only two ships of the English fleet escaped the harbor: the *Judith* under the command of Francis Drake and the *Minion* under John Hawkins. The *Jesus of Lubeck*, Hawkins’ command ship provided by Elizabeth I, had to be abandoned. Also abandoned or lost in the fight were some 150 men. As Hawkins remarked in his subsequent account:

…verie hardly was I receaved into the Minion. The most part of the men that were left a lyve in the Jesus made shift and followed the Minion onely and the Judith (a small barke of fiftie tonne) we escaped, which barke the same night forsooke us in our great myserie (Hawkins 1569:22-23).

Following the defeat, Drake and the *Judith* escaped under cover of darkness, leaving Hawkins and the *Minion* to an unknown fate. The *Judith* had its usual compliment of sailors on board along with some level of provisions. The *Minion*, however, was overloaded with some 200 men on a ship designed to carry no more than 80. The ship was woefully under-provisioned in both water and food as Hawkins had taken aboard the *Minion* as many men as he could from the stricken *Jesus of Lubeck*. With this large compliment of men, Hawkins beat north along the Mexican coast for the next 12 days. Job Hortop, a gunner’s mate, recorded their plight:

…our victuals waned scant, insomuch as we were compelled through hunger to eate hides, cats, ratters, mice, parats, monkies and dogges, besides many other things which we were not accustomed unto, all of which wee esteemed as verie good meate, and greatly praised God for the same. By reason whereof our Generall (Hawkins) was constrained to divide his companie through extremetie of hunger, and many of us desired rather to be on shoare among wild beastes than to famish on shipboard through hunger, whereupon our Generall set on shoare of our companie, foure score and sixteen and gave unto everie of us, five yards of Roan cloth, and monie to those that did demand it (Hortop 1591:9).

Hawkins, after providing the men with cloth and coin, then gathered water but was delayed by storms for three days from regaining the ship. Once back aboard the *Minion* he and the remaining 100 men then departed for England on October 16, 1568. In his account published in 1569 Hawkins makes no mention of stopping along the Gulf Coast of what is now the United States, rather he stated “…God be praysed wee were cleere from the coast of the Indians, and out of the Channell and Goulfe of Bahama…” by the 16th of November (Hawkins 1569:39).

**The Remainder of the Fleet**

Both the *Judith* and the *Minion* made it back to England (the *William & John*, earlier separated from the fleet off Cuba, returned via Ireland in February 1569). Of the *Judith* there is little account other than her return to Plymouth on January 22, 1569.
However, the Minion, even with 100 men put ashore, was still dangerously under-provisioned. The Minion encountered bad weather upon leaving the Gulf of Mexico and in Hawkins’ recounting of the voyage he stated “…our men being oppressed with Famine, died continually, a(nd) they (who) were left, grewe into such weakness that we were scantly able to manure oure ship” (Hawkins 1569:39). The Minion made it back to England with less than 15 of her original crew on January 20, 1569. Of the six ships and more than 400 men who had left Plymouth in October 1567, only three ships and some 70 men returned. The journey for Hawkins was ended and the Third Expedition was his last slaving voyage in which he took an active part. The journey for the men left behind in Mexico, however, was just beginning.

The Men Left Behind in Mexico – the Southern Party

Job Hortop and Phillip Miles were among the men put ashore on October 8, 1568, near the Panuco River some 320 kilometers south of the current international border between the Mexican State of Tamaulipas and the U.S. State of Texas. The party ashore numbered approximately 100 men. Job Hartop records 96 men and Philip Miles 114 men (Hartop 1591:10; Miles in Hakluyt [1965:412]). The group at first resolved to march south and surrender to the Spanish but were set upon by Chichimecas who presumed them to be Spaniards and killed eight of the party and robbed them of the roan cloth (Miles in Hakluyt [1965:411]). After several more days of hardship the party divided, with about half resolving to turn north and attempt to reach the French Fort Caroline on the Atlantic coast. This group then divided again a few days later and 29 of these men, under the nominal command of the sailor David Ingram, continued on their northward trek while the others returned south and joined their companions (Hortop 1591:11; Miles in Hakluyt [1965:409-412]).

Hortop and Miles were among the original group who headed south and were captured by the Spanish. These men were marched overland to Mexico City before finally escaping to Spain and thence to England. In total, he spent 23 years as a captive (Hortop 1591). Phillip Miles was sentenced to serve in a monastery for five years and following that term he spent the next six years planning his escape via Guatemala, thence to Spain, and finally returning to England in February 1582 (Hakluyt 1969:444). These two men and one other, Anthony Goddard, were the only men of the approximately 200 captured in Mexico who ever returned to England (Conway 1928:iv-v).

The Men Left Behind in Mexico – the Northern Party

The ultimate fate of the majority of the 29 men who headed north from Panuco is unknown. Philip Miles wrote in his account published in Hakluyt in 1589:

… and as Ingram since hath often told me, there were not past three of their company slaine, and there were but sixe and twenty of them [remaining]…so that of the company that went Northward, there is yet lacking, and not certainly heard of, the number of three and twenty men. And verily I doe thinke that there are of them yet alive, and married in the said country, at Cibola… (Miles in Hakluyt [1965:412]).

What is known is that in October 1569 three of those 30 men, David Ingram, Richard Browne, and Richard Twide, returned to London via Le Havre, France (Hakluyt 1969:557). These three men told of their walk across North America to the vicinity of Cape Breton where French fishermen brought them back to France and they made their way back to England from there shortly after (Hakluyt 1969:561). Not counting the sea voyage, the shortest pedestrian trek would have been some 4,000 to 5,000 kilometers, depending on route, and all of it accomplished in approximately seven to nine months by men with no knowledge of the North American interior. Their goal on setting out was the French settlement at Fort Caroline on the Atlantic coast. They had previously visited this site in July 1565 during Hawkins’ Second Expedition. Ingram and his companions were unaware, however, that Fort Caroline had been destroyed by the Spanish in September 1565 (Bennet 2011:42-43). The average distance
travelled per day would have been between 15 and 20 kilometers, a seeming impossibility considering their unfamiliarity with the landscape. Coupled with Ingram’s own statement that they stayed in some places “…three or foure dayes…” (Ingram in Hakluyt [1965:557]), this only increases the average distance required to be covered on travelling days.

Ingram’s partial account of his adventure was not recorded until 13 years after his return when he was interviewed by the English Admiralty in 1582 with questions propounded by Secretary of State Sir Francis Walsingham and Sir Humphrey Gilbert. This account was published the following year, but no copy of it survives. The only surviving portion of Ingram’s account was not published until 1589 when it was included in Richard Hakluyt’s The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation, which is in a narrative or story-telling format. Portions of the actual deposition manuscript are also extant in the Bodleian Library and differs from Hakluyt’s account in that it contains the questions asked of Ingram (Quinn et al. 1979).

**Ingram’s Accounts**

Ingram’s account in Hakluyt consists of only six pages and covers the entirety of his 12 month journey. At the time of his interview by the Admiralty his fellow survivors, Browne and Twide, had both passed away and whatever contributions they could have made were therefore lost. In addition to a lack of corroboration from Browne and Twide, Ingram’s account is full of fantastical statements regarding cities “Ochala, a greate Towne a mile long. Balma, a rich Citie, a mile and a halfe long” (Ingram in Hakluyt [1965:559]). Ingram also spoke of “rubies four inches long and two inches broad” and “pieces of gold as big as a man’s fist” (Ingram in Hakluyt [1965:557, 559]). As noted by numerous other commentators on the subject, Ingram’s account is full of impossible fabrications and hyperbole, but many of those critics and others also cannot deny that portions of his account clearly indicate some knowledge of the North American interior (DeCosta 1883; Quinn 1940; DeGolyer 1941; Unwin 1960; Ogburn 1979). Ingram fairly accurately describes weather phenomena such as violent thunderstorms and tornadoes:

*Touching Tempests and other strange monstrous things in those partes, this Examninate sayeth,*

that he hath seene it Lighten and Thunder in sommer season by the space of foure and twentie hours together: the cause whereof he judgeth to be the heate of the Climate.

He further saith, that there is a Cloud sometime of the yeere seene in the ayr, which commonly turneth to great Tempests, And that sometimes of the yeere there are great windes in manner of whirlwinds (Ingram in Hakluyt [1965:560-561]).

Ingram describes numerous animals, the majority of which seem beyond belief but several of which appear to match North American fauna. Ingram provides what may be the first European description of the American Bison, albeit as an amalgam of fantasy and reality:

*There is very great store of those Buffes, which are beasts as big as two Oxen, in length almost twenty foot, having long eares like a Blood hound, with long haires about their eares, their horns be crooked like a Rams horns, their eyes blakke, their haires long, blakke, rough and shagged as a Goat: The Hides of these beasts are sold very dear (Ingram in Hakluyt [1965:560]).*

Ingram also described a “…kinde of Graine, the eare whereof is as big as the wrist of a mans arme : the Graine is like a flat pease, it maketh very good bread and white” (Ingram in Hakluyt [1965:560]), which describes American maize fairly accurately.

The shorter manuscript version of the Admiralty deposition includes much the same information with a few notable differences and emendations. Of interest is the fact that the manuscript version lists the questions as well as the answers and reads more like the deposition that it actually was rather than as a story as was presented by Hakluyt. Secondly, the manuscript version has the following caveat added: “Divers other matters of great importaunce hath he [Ingram] confessed (yf they be true) which he sayeth that upon his lyfe which he offereth to goe to the place, to approve the same true” (Quinn et al. 1979:3:213). It is apparent that even at the time of Ingram’s deposition in 1582 his narrative was doubted on particulars and portions of it dismissed.

The purpose of Ingram’s interview with the Admiralty was part and parcel with efforts to colonize the Atlantic seaboard of North America. Attempts at planting English colonies failed until the
settlement at Jamestown, Virginia, in 1607. While the specific cause is unknown, Ingram’s account of his journey was dropped from Hakluyt’s subsequent 1599 edition of The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation. Samuel Purchas who continued publication of the work after Hakluyt’s death commented that “As for David Ingram’s perambulation to the north parts, Master Hakluyt, in his first edition [1589], published the same; it semeth some incredibilities of his reports caused him to leave him out of the next impression, the reward of lying not to be believed in truths” (Purchas 1625:179).

THE POSSIBLE ASSOCIATION OF THE MCGLOIN BLUFF SIXPENCE WITH INGRAM’S TREK

Despite Ingram’s fabrications and the improbability of his trek, the one incontrovertible fact is when and where Ingram and company began their sojourn and when and where they ended it: October 8, 1568, on the Mexican coast near the Panuco River and October 1569 when he, Browne, and Twide appeared in London and subsequently presented themselves to Hawkins “...and unto ech of them he gave a reward” (Ingram in Hakluyt [1965:561]). Much ink has been spilt on the possibility and conditions of Ingram’s purported transect with many arguing in the affirmative (DeCosta 1883; de Golyer 1941; Ogburn 1979) and others that he, Browne, and Twide must have attached themselves to a French vessel along the Gulf or lower Atlantic shore (Quinn et al. 1979; Williamson 1927, 1969). The purpose of this article is not to try and resolve the question of Ingram’s “long walk.” Rather, it has been to account for the origin of the artifacts at 41SP11, and in particular the Elizabethan hammered sixpence from the site.

The argument in favor of a possible Ingram attribution is as follows:

1. The 2 sigma calibrated radiocarbon assays obtained by Ricklis (2010a) returned calibrated mean ranges between A.D. 1290 to 1670. This suggests a 95.4 percent chance that 41SP11 dates to the late Rockport phase that ended ca. A.D. 1700.
2. The Spanish and the French only had a land-based presence in the central coastal area beginning in 1683 (Fort St. Louis) and 1722 (Mission Espiritu Santo and Presidio de La Bahia). Both of these places were occupied beyond the calibrated 2 sigma radiocarbon range.
3. The coin is from the 3rd to 5th coinages of Elizabeth I and was minted sometime between 1561 and 1582 (Brown 1955:583).
4. The only recorded English ventures near to Texas in this period are the Third Hawkins’ Expedition and limited numbers of English pirates and privateers, but only after 1575 (Gerhard 2003).
5. The Third Hawkins’ Expedition put around 100 English sailors ashore near Panuco with “…five yards of Roan clothe and monie…” on October 8, 1568 (Hawkins 1569:15; Hortop 1591:9-10).
6. Hawkins makes no mention of stops along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico (Hawkins 1569).
7. A party of 29 men led by David Ingram marched north from Panuco and entered into what is now Texas sometime in the winter of 1568-1569 (Miles in Hakluyt [1965]; Ingram in Hakluyt [1965]).

These seven factors support the hypothesis that the disputed Ingram transcontinental trip is a possible source for the coin at 41SP11 and that it was obtained either directly or through subsequent second-hand trade from a member of David Ingram’s group of English sailors who traversed the Texas Gulf coastal plain from October to December 1568. There are other possibilities: Later 16th century English pirates or privateers; French corsairs who may have carried English coinage and other goods; or an item recovered from wreckage, from a castaway, or from an unknown and unrecorded incident. Each of these is also a possible explanation of the coin’s presence at McGloin Bluff.

Attribution of the coin from 41SP11 to David Ingram’s party provides the only recovered physical evidence of his reported transit of North America, at least as far as the central coast of Texas. The recovery of this artifact from within a recorded and professionally excavated archaeological site provides reliable and contextual information that would be otherwise missing had it been recovered by happenstance. The presence of the coin, and the possible English attribution of the pipe and pewter fragment, indicate that further archaeological investigation into Late Prehistoric sites along the Gulf and Atlantic littoral of the United States may provide additional insight into early interactions between Native Americans and Europeans.
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