

# ANTONIO DE MENDOZA OR THE LONG SHADOW OF A SILENT SEDITION<sup>1</sup>

---

**María Jesús Torquemada Sánchez**

Prof. Titular Departamento de Derecho Romano e Historia del Derecho, Facultad de Derecho  
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

**Correspondence:**

mariajesustorquemada@der.ucm.es

---

## How to cite this paper

Torquemada Sánchez, M.J. Antonio de Mendoza or the long shadow of a silent sedition. *Spanish Journal of Legislative Studies*. 2021, (4), p1-50. DOI: 10.21134/sjls.vi3.1470

<sup>1</sup> Translated and glossed by Neil and Beryl Solomon. The New Zealanders Neil and Beryl Solomon have become expert researchers after having devoted several decades to the study of the genealogy and life trajectory of the Sephardic Mendoza family. In Enrique Álvarez Cora y Victoria Sandoval Parra (Eds.) *Sedición, Rebelión Y Quimera En La Historia Jurídica De Europa*. Madrid: Dykinson, 2020, pp. 361 – 414. ISBN. 978-84-1377-119-9.

## SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION; THE MENDOZA CONVERSOS AS THEY APPEAR TODAY; JUAN ANTONIO DE CASTRO, ALIAS ANTONIO DE MENDOZA, ALIAS JUAN DE CASTRO Y MENDOZA, ALLEGED ALIAS DAVID DE MENDOZA; THE INQUISITORIAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST JUAN ANTONIO DE CASTRO / ANTONIO DE MENDOZA; THE EMERGENCE OF OTHER MEMBERS OF JUAN ANTONIO'S FAMILY; CONTINUATION AND OUTCOME OF THE CASE AGAINST JUAN ANTONIO DE CASTRO / ANTONIO DE MENDOZA; THE POSSIBLE ESCAPE OF JUAN ANTONIO DE CASTRO / ANTONIO DE MENDOZA AND ITS MYSTERIOUS SEQUEL; CLUES PROVIDED BY MIGUEL DE MENDONÇA VALLADOLID; ANTONIO/DAVID DE MENDOZA AND JUAN ANTONIO DE CASTRO: ONE AND THE SAME PERSON? ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST; CONCLUSIONS; BIBLIOGRAPHY

*“Con un pueblo estás malquisto,  
por lo que te apartas del.  
Otro no te juzga fiel  
por lo que fingir te ha visto”<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>2</sup> The author of these lines was Miguel de Barrios y Valle or Miguel Daniel Leví de Barrios y Valle, born in Montilla, Córdoba, Spain in 1635. This man was a Sephardic writer, a descendant of Spanish conversos who moved first to Portugal and then on to Amsterdam where he died in 1701. Here Miguel is writing from his own experience while on the Iberian Peninsula. In this couplet he is expressing feelings: You, a new Christian, don't feel comfortable among your own people, the Jewish community, and consequently you avoid contact with them. The others, old Christians, don't consider you true to the faith because they suspect you have been practicing Jewish rites and customs.

## INTRODUCTION

Before presenting this study<sup>3</sup> I would like to thank people from different fields who have assisted in its development through the provision of useful data and evidence, so enabling the results that are reflected throughout these pages.<sup>4</sup>

This work focuses on the analysis of many documents, the aim being to show that a man prosecuted by the Spanish Holy Office was the same person as a Sephardic Jew who is considered today by some if not many as the patriarch of the Jewish Mendoza lineage<sup>5</sup>. This man was known as Juan Antonio de Castro, alias Antonio de Mendoza, aka Antonio de Castro y Mendoza, alias Juan de Mendoza and his family settled in several European territories after leaving the Iberian Peninsula.

Archived documentation is extensive but confusing and contradictory. The distinction between data that can be scientifically verifiable and data provided as evidence and that should not be accepted without discussion is problematic.

All this revolves around the identity and experiences of the crypto-Jews from both Spain and Portugal who had to flee the Inquisition, but with

the added interest that the roots of these people can be decisive today when it comes to enjoying certain civil rights that are not negligible, which is the case of obtaining an Iberian nationality that acknowledges them as European citizens.

Spanish and foreign historians have written a wealth of material about the persecution that took place against false converts while the Holy Office exercised its jurisdiction in the territories belonging to the Spanish and Portuguese crowns. This is due to the extraordinary nature of the expulsion that was implemented in 1492<sup>6</sup>. Nothing like this happened in any other European country. Many works have focused their attention on various aspects related to the subject and have done so from different perspectives<sup>7</sup>.

In that year the Catholic Monarchs decided to achieve religious unity on the basis of Catholicism by all available means. Their aim was to guarantee stability through better social control in every area of the monarchy. To achieve this goal they resorted, as is well known, to giving their many Jewish subjects the choice of enforced baptism so as to include them within the Catholic flock. The alternative was banishment for those who decided to continue practicing their Jewish religion.

3 This work is part of a research project entitled *Conflicto y Reparación en la Historia jurídica Española moderna y contemporánea* (COREHJE), financiado por MCIN/AEI/ PID2020-113346GB-C22.

4 I must mention and thank Sarah Feltes and Meltem Kamalvand from the UK. Jesús Zapata has also been of great help with researching the documents kept at the Archivo Histórico Diocesano de Jaén.

A literal rendering of the work being translated would have it that Juan Antonio de Castro a man of many aliases, was "the same person as the Sephardic Jew regarded today as the patriarch of the Jewish Mendoza line." To avoid confusion, in this paper he is referred to as Juan Antonio throughout. Later sections of this work indicate that this is by no means certain, hence our qualified translation both here and throughout. That said, there is certainly good genealogical evidence to show that some of his children did escape to Amsterdam and beyond and these and related matters are further discussed in the addendum to this paper.

5 Translator's note: A literal rendering of the work being translated would have it that Juan Antonio de Castro a man of many aliases, was "the same person as the Sephardic Jew regarded today as the patriarch of the Jewish Mendoza line." To avoid confusion, in this paper he is referred to as Juan Antonio throughout. Later sections of this work indicate that this is by no means certain, hence our qualified translation both here and throughout. That said, there is certainly good genealogical evidence to show that some of his children did escape to Amsterdam and beyond and these and related matters are further discussed in the addendum to this paper.

6 The Decree relating to the expulsion of the Jews was proclaimed in Granada, a stronghold newly recovered from Islamic hands, on 31 March 1492. Torquemada was the architect of that decree and the monarchs consented to the terms established by him as Grand Inquisitor.

This edict brought with it countless social and economic consequences as many professions relating to public finances were at that time in the hands of the Jewish population. Many of these people chose to leave Hispanic territories in the face of harassment by civil and religious authorities. Others, however, chose to be baptized. Even so a good number of those who nominally and ostensibly embraced Catholicism continued to practice their Jewish religion in secret.

The character who plays a pivotal role throughout these pages answers to the classical description of a crypto-Jew, both in terms of its origins and in terms of his activities in order to earn a living. Hence the inevitable misgivings about him on the part of the Holy Office. Like many other of his co-religionists, he would maintain close ties with other Judaizers of Portuguese origin, ultimately setting his sights on other European countries where his religion could be practiced freely. But while he remained in Spain he did not cease his efforts to surreptitiously undermine the new imposed regime, dedicating himself to practicing and expanding Judaism among all those around him while at the same time covering up for other Judaizers.

He, like so many who were in the same situation, practised and fostered a silent sedition against the prevailing order and the norms imposed by religious unity in Spain, this under the banner of Catholicism for all. As already stated, the monarchy sought the acceptance of the Cath-

olic faith at all cost, this in the conviction that this unity of creed guaranteed social peace.

Militancy in organizations and activities that oppose the prevailing authorities or promote resistance to the bodies of power is in itself at the heart of sedition. Such practices can be considered all the more dangerous the more surreptitiously they are carried out. In this regard there were some Jewish religious teachers who moved throughout the Spanish territories where religion was a matter of state. For this reason the protagonist of these pages, together with many others who followed his example, became the main objective of the deadliest weapon put in the hands of the Spanish monarchy: the Holy Office who persecuted the Marranos or crypto-Jews simply because they had undergone a fake baptism to conceal their Judaizing practices. But more serious, if possible, was the proselytizing of the Law of Moses by promoting the organization of its adherents into groups whose secret practices could undermine the confessional foundations on which the socio-political order implanted in Spain was established since the reign of the Catholic Monarchs. That is why we can call these behaviours silent and underground sedition. Both the persecution and the punishment of this criminal activity were invested in the Holy Office at its establishment, initially its primary task. This function of the Inquisition continued over the centuries: it remained in force with greater or lesser intensity, depending on the territories and the times.

---

7 It would take too long to list all that has been published on a subject that is so nuanced and still arouses passions. Several Spanish and foreign authors have focused their attention on this controversial issue without fully unravelling the spirit underlying such a drastic and dramatic event. Here we cite but a few generalist works on the expulsion of the Jews: AMADOR DE LOS RÍOS, J. *Estudios históricos, políticos y literarios sobre los judíos en España*. Madrid, Imprenta de D. M. Díaz, 1848; CARO BAROJA, J. *Los judíos en la España moderna y contemporánea*, v.3, Madrid, Arión, 1962; DOMÍNGUEZ ORTIZ, A. *Los judeoconversos españoles en la España Moderna*. Madrid: Mapfre, 1992; Same author: *Judeoconversos en España y América*. Madrid: Istmo, 1995; SUÁREZ FERNÁNDEZ, L. *Documentos acerca de la expulsión de los judíos*. Valladolid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1964; Same author: *La expulsión de los judíos. Un problema europeo*. Barcelona: Ariel, 2012; BAER, Y. *Historia de los judíos en la España cristiana v.2*, published in Hebrew and translated by José Luis Lacave. Madrid, Al-talena, 1981; PÉREZ, J. *Historia de una Tragedia: la expulsión de los judíos de España*, Barcelona, Crítica, 1993. Same author: *Los Judíos en España*, Madrid, Marcial Pons, 2005.

Broadly examining the presence of Jewish populations on the Iberian Peninsula, from at least the 3rd century and according to Christian writings there has been a relatively numerous contingent of Jews in this area<sup>8</sup>. Their presence was apparently for commercial reasons.<sup>9</sup> Clearly, the stigmatization of Jews and its reflection in Hispanic law started well before the 15th century. The *Liber Iudiciorum*, which became the most important of the Visigothic legal texts and which was promulgated by Recesvinto in 654, already contained a number of laws aimed at suppressing Judaism. Such controls escalated over the years that followed<sup>10</sup> as the arrival of the Muslims in 711 was not because of Jewish inhabitants but as a kind of relative liberation, given the mistreatment to which they were being subjected by the Visigothic authority.

Despite this early suspicion towards those who professed Judaism, the major misadventures for Sephardic Jews began, as noted, from the moment when their beliefs were described as heresy. This made them liable to persecution by the Spanish Inquisition following the creation of the Holy Office in 1478. Thus began a major diaspora across the European and American continents, not forgetting that a good number of Sephardic Jews also moved to North Africa and the near East

These pages recount the history of some family groups that, like so many others, remained faithful to their secular and religious traditions, this despite their forced conversion to Catholicism. Although from the outside their members were fully integrated into the society that wel-

comed them through baptism, in private they continued to perform those rites which were true to their creed. In spite of the secrecy necessary and the caution with which Jewish ceremonies were held, those who practised Judaism were often discovered. In this way they became prisoners of the Inquisition, a Court born mainly to standardise an entire society under principles that sought to establish political and religious power.

## THE MENDOZA CONVERSOS AS THEY APPEAR TODAY

From a legal point of view, surely the most interesting thing about the members of the Jewish Mendoza line that suffered at the hands of the Inquisitors concerns the consequences of such processes. Throughout the period of the Inquisition, many Spanish and Portuguese Jews pretended to convert to the Catholic faith. Later, if they had the means to do so, many then tried to escape the areas where the Holy Office increasingly exercised its jurisdiction. Those who were successful established themselves and their families in other European countries where their religious practices were tolerated by the authorities. The character of the Sephardic Jew is born from this diaspora. The descendants of these Jews, native to the Iberian Peninsula, are now spread throughout the world.

Over the centuries many of these Sephardic people have shown a natural interest in establishing their origins. In this regard it is said that some families retained and still retain after centuries of absence, the keys to their now-updated peninsu-

8 VIVES, J. *Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda*. Barcelona, Balmesiana, 1942, pp.144-145.

9 PÉREZ MARTÍN, A. Observaciones a *Liber Iudiciorum* 11.3. In: *Historia, Instituciones y Documentos*, 14 (1987), pp. 141-159; p. 145. This author points out that during the Visigothic era there were already important Jewish communities in the main commercial cities of Hispania Toledo, Elvira, Mérida, Sevilla, Tarragona, Tortosa, Zaragoza.

10 CORDERO NAVARRO, C. El problema judío como visión del «otro» en el reino visigodo de Toledo. *Revisión historiográfica*. In: *En la España Medieval*, 23 (2000), pp. 9-40. From pages 19 to 30 this author details the growing hostility towards Jews that is evident in Visigothic legislation from the time of Recaredo's conversion to Catholicism in 589 to the revision of Ervigio's *Liber Iudiciorum*, dated between the years 680-687.

lar houses in the hope of returning to them one day.

Legislation enacted in 2015 granted the option of obtaining a European Union passport to those people able to prove their Sephardic ancestry, an important attraction for descendent people based in many other countries throughout the world. Further, the emergence of Brexit into the European landscape has encouraged certain sectors of the British population with Jewish ancestors to research their Iberian origins so as not to be excluded from gaining the perceived advantages. Many have now been granted membership of the European Union, notably British people who have been living in Spain and Portugal for a number of years.

The truth is that historians and genealogists have proliferated, some probably obtaining a handsome economic benefit by dedicating themselves to the study and inquiry of the Sephardic origins of their clients. Others have simply approached the subject matter at hand from a genealogical perspective, in order to provide information about

the character who stars in these pages<sup>11</sup>.

The advantages of the new regulations extend to Jews originating from the Iberian Peninsula, both from Spain and Portugal. In the Spanish case, the law granting dual nationality to all persons who meet certain requirements dates back to 2015.<sup>12</sup> Not only does that door open for Europeans settled on Hispanic soil, it is also a hugely interesting regulation for citizens of some Asian territories, such as Turkey where there is a significant Sephardic descendent community, and for many nationals of Ibero-American countries. All such people could choose to obtain a European Union passport through this route.

Overall the result has been an ever-growing interest, shared by potential beneficiaries of this legislation and by the media who have reported on the unpredictable long-term aftermath of what centuries ago was a relentless persecution of Iberian crypto-Jews<sup>13</sup>.

Another notable aspect that fosters interest in Sephardic culture focuses on the outcome of

---

11 The genealogist Matthew Hovious of Madrid has undertaken research aimed at clarifying certain facts about the Judeo-convert David/Antonio de Mendoza, this for a British television program about the well-known British television personality Mark Wright - the latter being an alleged descendant of David/Antonio:

<http://matthewhovious.blogspot.com/2019/09/my-work-on-mark-wrights-mendoza.html>  
(accessed 17/09/2020).

Also involved as a researcher of this subject is the London-based genealogist David Mendoza who also claims to be a descendant of Patriarch Antonio/David de Mendoza:

<https://www.sephardi.org.uk/about/administrative-staff/david-mendoza-2/>  
(accessed 17/09/2020)

12 Official State Gazette No. 151 of June 25, 2015, Law 12/2015, of June 24, 2015. The deadline for applicants was later extended until 1 October 2019. Portuguese Law 30-A/2015 of 27 February did not set a deadline for submitting applications, being, in general, more lax legislation than that of Spain. Given that most of the Spanish Jewish converts in the diaspora generally had a relationship with the Portuguese; it is still relatively easy to obtain the necessary certification for those interested in obtaining a European Union passport.

13 <https://www.economist.com/britain/2019/07/04/british-jews-trace-iberian-heritage-to-retain-eu-citizenship>  
(accessed 07/09/2020). "A year before the Brexit referendum of 2016, Portugal and Spain passed laws which offered Sephardic Jews—those whose families once lived on the Iberian peninsula—a path to citizenship. Each country intended the gesture to act as recompense for the forcible exile of Jews in the 1490s, in one of the first acts of the Spanish Inquisition. But the two countries have unwittingly offered a lifeline for remainders anxious to retain EU citizenship after Britain leaves the bloc. «I really want to be European, I want my kids to be European», says Dr. Rachamim. To guarantee her three children's ability to live and work across the continent, she has sought Spanish passports for them, on top of her own application to Portugal. The cost will run to more than £10,000 (\$12,650)".

descendants of Spaniards who fled to avoid prosecution by the Holy Office. Some are founders of a whole line of noteworthy individuals, among whom we can find one whose descendants have gained notoriety in the world of entertainment in general and boxing in particular. Here we are talking about the well-known actor Peter Sellers who is accepted as one of the many descendants of the man who fled Iberia to become David de Mendoza of Amsterdam and later London.<sup>14</sup>

A recent British television series, a mixture of historical reporting and entertainment, has already been mentioned. In September 2019 an episode featured the family tree of a British celebrity who narrated the tortuous journey of an ancestor, a man who had had to deal with the Spanish Inquisition for carrying out heretical activities related to the prohibited observance of Mosaic law.<sup>15</sup>

A great number of Judaizers were persecuted, tried and punished by the Inquisitorial Courts in both Spain and Portugal. The man who is the subject of particular interest in these pages has the peculiarity of having left behind him a trail of associations for his descendants, as mentioned above<sup>16</sup>.

However, it must be pointed out that there are doubts about the subject's own flight and the fate of some of his relatives, especially his descendants. That said, it is possible to document the difficulties and misfortunes suffered by a son or nephew of his, and other members of his family who fell into the hands of the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions. Other data on the extensive kinship of Judaizers intertwined with each other by marriage or blood ties can only be offered by genealogist experts, although never guaranteed on the basis of Inquisitorial records.

---

14 <https://www.geni.com/people/Peter-Sellers/6000000009429249423>

(accessed 28/07/2020). "Born Richard Henry Sellers in Southsea, Hampshire, England, his parents worked in an acting company run by his grandmother. His father, Yorkshire-born Bill Sellers (1900–1962), was Protestant and his mother, Agnes Doreen 'Peg' née Marks (1892–1967), was Jewish. He was the great-great-grandson of the boxer Daniel Mendoza, his maternal roots in the Sephardic Jewish community that settled in London. [According to GENI Peter Sellers is Daniel 'Abraham' Mendoza's first cousin four times removed.]"

The entire family tree of the Mendoza line of Peter Sellers can be checked at

<https://www.geni.com/people/Peter-Sellers/6000000009429249423>

(accessed 29/07/2020). This website outlines the curious circumstance that, in a well-known film, an actor plays the character of Inspector Clouseau within the series *The Pink Panther*. There can be seen, hanging on the walls of the inspector's house, engravings showing an ancestor of his who was also a descendant of David /Antonio de Mendoza. This ancestor was, named Daniel Mendoza, a famous pugilist who developed his career in the boxing ring during the nineteenth century:

"Mendoza, Daniel, Joseph Jacobs & Frank H Vizetelly: English pugilist born 1763 in White-chapel, London; died Sept. 3, 1836. Champion of England from 1792 to 1795, he was the founder of a distinct school of boxing which marks a period in the history of pugilism. / A note of interest is that in the "*Pink Panther*" films, these prints can be seen on the wall in the apartment of Inspector Jacques Clouseau, played by Peter Sellers. Daniel and Peter were 1st. cousins 4 times removed."

15 <https://www.whodoyouthinkyouaremagazine.com/episode/mark-wright/>

(accessed 07/02/2020) The author of these pages was consulted during the production and filming of this episode within the BBC television series "*Who Do You Think You Are?*" There, the ancestry of the former footballer, actor and presenter Mark Wright is investigated. The London-based genealogist who led the narrative claimed that he is a descendant of the Judaizer who stars in the Inquisitorial process analysed throughout these pages which took place at the end of the seventeenth century before the Court of the Inquisition of Seville. This being the case, Juan Antonio de Castro y Mendoza would have been Mark Wright's ninth great-great-grandfather.

16 Several people of Sephardic descent who have contacted the writer of these pages claim to be among the descendants of the aforementioned convert who was born in Jaén in the mid-16th century.

At the end of the sixteenth century and throughout the seventeenth century there was an increase in the activity of the Holy Office against crypto-Jews. Many of these family lines were originally from Jaén, first fleeing to Portugal after the initial onslaughts of the Spanish Holy Office, then re-establishing around Jaén when conditions worsened for them in that neighbouring country. Therefore, many of the families whose members were judged by the Inquisition during that later time came from Portugal, although their founders were born and raised in Spain. It was a boomerang effect: from the moment certain cohorts of crypto-Jews residing in Portugal felt confident that they could go home to their places of origin they did not hesitate to return to Spain, especially to the regions and localities where their ancestors once lived, and many of them came from the ancient kingdom of Jaen<sup>17</sup>.

When they returned to their ancestral homes they often gathered in Jewish neighbourhoods. Some were artisans, such as tailors, shoemakers, etc. Others were shopkeepers among whom were lessees of tobacco or salt franchises, and a few became rent and tax collectors.

The character who suffered one of the many processes that took place against the so-called Marranos and who features in these pages is typical of a crypto-Jew.

It was commonly known in Spain throughout the 17th century that Jews, formerly refugees in Portugal and then returned to their places of origin in Spain, had never abandoned the faith of their ancestors, even though they were baptized so as to go unnoticed amid the mass of mostly Christian people. Of all the localities to which these Jews returned from Portuguese territory, Jaén was the one that housed the greatest number of Jews as it had the most extensive and important Jewish quarter and because many of those who did return had ancestors who came from that city.

### **JUAN ANTONIO DE CASTRO, ALIAS ANTONIO DE MENDOZA, ALIAS JUAN DE CASTRO Y MENDOZA, ALLEGED ALIAS DAVID DE MENDOZA.**

Juan Antonio de Castro, later a man of many aliases, was born in Jaén<sup>18</sup>. Given his strong and

---

17 CORONAS TEJADA, L. *Judíos y Judeoconvertos en el reino de Jaén*, Jaén, Universidad de Jaén, 2003.

There are quite a few books about the tobacco monopoly in Spanish history. See, for instance:

ESCOBEDO ROMERO, R. *El tabaco del Rey. La organización de un monopolio fiscal durante el Antiguo Régimen*, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra. EUNSA, Pamplona, 2007.

LIZANA FERNÁNDEZ, S. *Administración y administradores del tabaco en la segunda mitad del siglo XVII en Castilla*. In: *Castilla, Tabaco y Economía en el Siglo XVIII*, Agustín González Enciso and Rafael Torres Sánchez, coords., 1999, pp. 289-318, p. 299.

BELVIS COSTES, Francisco Xavier, *En torno a J. Bautista Carrafa, primer fabricante de tabaco*. In: *Tiempos Modernos: Revista Electrónica de Historia Moderna*, Vol. 7, nº 25, 2012/2, 33 pp.

Notably this last author claims that the general rule was to put the tobacco trade monopoly in the hands of Jewish-converts. In this regard he quotes a work by CUÉLLAR Y VILLAMOR, J. *Arte de Reynar*, Burgos, 1702, p. 19: "Poner en los estancos de la Corte, y todo el Reyno, personas de su Nación" (. . . to engage Jewish converts as tobacconists in Madrid and throughout the Kingdom of Spain). Later in the present article it will be seen that the brother-in-law of the man who is our subject of particular interest held the tobacco franchise for Pastrana, a medieval town in the Guadalajara province, a noble Mendoza area that is quite close to Madrid.

18 As recorded later, information contained in Inquisition documents states that Juan Antonio de Castro was born in Jaén. The aforementioned BBC programme within the *Who Do You Think You Are?* series has him as being born in Jaén on 21 February 1660 and baptised the following day in Jaén's Cathedral as Antonio, son of Pedro de Castro and Ana de Morales his wife. On the basis of claims made within the programme this Antonio subsequently fled Spain around 1700, to become David de Mendoza of Amsterdam, the man considered by some if not many to be the patriarch of a broad line of both Jews and Gentiles now spread throughout the world.

athletic build, in adulthood he practised, among other occupations, as a master-of-arms. This was a profession with a certain difficulty at entry as initial training was by members of the royal household, this to ensure the proper handling of swords and other weapons. Over time this responsibility was extended to people not directly attached to royalty but also those legally qualified to be able to carry and use such weapons – like Juan Antonio – but from Inquisition records it appears that this was not the only activity by which he earned his living.

It should be noted that although Juan Antonio is considered by some to be the patriarch of the prolific Jewish Mendoza dynasty that gradually extended beyond Iberian borders, with descendants now spread throughout the world, it is difficult to come up with a plausible network for genealogical purposes.<sup>19</sup>

However the greatest difficulty in reliably establishing Juan Antonio as a patriarch lies in his use of aliases, a tactic used by Iberian crypto-Jews as a means of confusing the Inquisitors. This was certainly the case with Juan Antonio who publicly professed one religion and secretly practiced another. On the one hand, crypto-Jews received the name given to them at the time of 'necessary' Christian baptism and also, surreptitiously, the one they were given within the covert Jewish

community. Later it was the Jewish names that were invariably used following escape. For this reason it is very difficult to track and connect a vast number of the individual crypto-Jews who fled Iberia.

This study does not attempt to cover the many aspects and consequences of the diaspora caused by the prohibition of Jewish practices in Iberia, rather to simply describe the outcome as it relates to one individual crypto-Jew who suffered at the hands of the Holy Office, highlighting the consequences that carry through to the present day.

The Court of the Inquisition of Seville, represented at the time by the Inquisitors Francisco Portero de la Vega, Cristóbal de Henestrosa and Matías de los Reyes Valenzuela, proceeded to arrest Juan Antonio de Castro y Mendoza within the context of an extensive cohort of crypto-Jews who were related to one another. This was common in proceedings against the Judaizers and makes sense given that this kind of religious dissent was a group practice with family involvement.

Most of the personal data we have about our central character is recorded in documents held at the Archivo Histórico Nacional (AHN) in Madrid and date back to 1696<sup>20</sup>.

---

19 Following the broadcast of the programme within the *Who Do You Think You Are?* Series, a considerable number of people have contacted the writer of this article, from places as distant as Canada and New Zealand. For genealogical reasons they have been keen to gather more extensive information about Juan Antonio de Castro y Mendoza, being convinced that they are descendants of the Jewish Mendoza clan originating in the Iberian Peninsula.

20 Archivo Histórico Nacional (desde ahora AHN), Inquisición, libro 522, fol. 16. This dossier contains two letters, the first drawn up by order of Inquisitor Cardona of the Supreme Court and dated 11 April 1696 in Madrid. Here, in view of the information provided by the Seville Inquisitors about Juan Antonio de Castro, the Supreme Court ordered that his case should continue until a definitive sentence was passed. The other letter was sent by the Seville Inquisitors to the Supreme Council so that it could order the so-called *Recorrección de Registros* from other Courts of the Holy Office, this to gather new information and testimony about the defendant. This was granted, with the corresponding orders included in the margin of the documents, enabling the process to follow its due course.

The letter of 11 April 1696 reads as follows -

"En las Cárcelas Secretas de ese Santo Oficio se halla preso con secuestro de bienes y que se siga su causa hasta la definitiva por culpas de fautoría, D. Antonio de Mendoza, alias Don Juan Antonio de Castro y Mendoza, natural de la Ciudad de Jaén y al presen-

When considering Juan Antonio's age as stated at the time of his detention, we are facing a real dilemma. As previously footnoted, the *Who Do You Think You Are?* programme has it that Juan Antonio was born in 1660 while from this Inquisition record his stated age would have his birth year as around 1653. This seven-year difference becomes an important difficulty when setting data from Inquisition records against data from his possible later life. For example, some references to him that appear on various genealogy websites prefer to place his birth year as early as 1650<sup>21</sup>.

Within the correspondence maintained by the Court of the Inquisition of Seville, this with the

Supreme Council which was based in Madrid, the Seville Inquisitors record that Don Antonio de Mendoza, alias Don Juan Antonio de Castro was being held in secret prisons. At that time the Inquisition had not yet ruled on what it considered should be the legitimate name of the prisoner. The Holy Office had already seized Juan Antonio's property to cover his upkeep, this according to the Inquisitorial style in such cases. He was accused of the crime of *fautoría*, a seditious activity that basically consisted of promoting the spread of heresy by aiding and abetting other heretics and assisting them to avoid the clutches of the Holy Office<sup>22</sup>. Initially there were suspicions about the prisoner's observance of the Law of Moses. Later on it was suspected that he was trying to re-

---

te vecino que dice ser de Badajoz y de tránsito en la del Puerto de Santa María adonde fue preso. Y lo más del tiempo ha vivido en Cádiz, donde tiene a su mujer, Doña María de Rivera, de quien ha andado apartado, tratando ilícitamente con Doña Ángela de Montalván en dicha ciudad de Cádiz y en esa de Sevilla, con oficio de Maestro de Armas, y en la de Granada y Riogordo, y ha sido cabo de la Puerta de Tierra en el Presidio de Cádiz. / Es hijo de Pedro de Castro, alias de Castilla, y de Ana María de Torres, vecinos que fueron de Jaén y de Arcos, hermano de Gaspar de Castro y Torres, reconciliado que fue por esta Inquisición por judaizante. / Es de edad de 43 años, alto de cuerpo, blanco y sonrosado de rostro, ojos pardos, pelo corto, entrecano con entradas. Trafa cabellera postiza y tiene una señal sobre la ceja izquierda."

Here, in April 1696, it is recorded that Juan Antonio claimed to have been born in Jaén, from his age as stated around 1653, and that he was the son of Pedro de Castro, alias de Castilla, and Ana María de Torres. These and other matters recorded in this letter are discussed shortly. The second letter, drawn up in Seville on 23 April 1696 needs no further explanation –

"Suplicamos a V M se sirva de mandar se recorran los registros de ese despacho en cabeza de (unreadable) y se nos avise o remita lo que resultare con lo que sea del agrado de VM a que asistiremos con muy buena voluntad. / Guarde. D. a VM. / Inquisición de Sevilla a 23 de abril de 1696." Signed by Inquisitor Porteros.

<sup>21</sup> These are three websites (accessed 17/09/2020) where David's year of birth is reported as "David/Antonio de Mendoza in 1650". However, none provide any evidence in support:

<https://www.geni.com/people/David-Mendoza/6000000002674432566>

<https://gw.geneanet.org/lynnlewis16?lang=en&n=mendoza&oc=0&p=david+de>

<https://gw.geneanet.org/emouillefarine?lang=en&pz=france+marie&nz=mouillefarine&p=david&%20n=de+Mendoz>

<sup>22</sup> Although an in-depth study of how this crime was dealt with in the Courts of the Inquisition is yet to be completed, some works provide insights, for example CARO BAROJA, *Los Judíos*, cit., p. 390:

"En el lenguaje técnico Inquisitorial se llama «fautores» a los que favorecían la evasión de personas perseguidas por el Santo Oficio, a los que no delataban los delitos que éste castigaba y a los que ocultaban los bienes confiscados por el mismo. Los casos de pura *fautoría* no son tan abundantes como pudiera suponerse. Los hay de muy diversas épocas... (Esos delitos) costaron la pena de galeras a más de uno".

Translation: "In the technical language of the Inquisition, *fautores* are those who aided and abetted the escape of people persecuted by the Holy Office, those who did not denounce the crimes it punished and those who hid goods from confiscation by it. Cases of pure *fautoría* are not as abundant as might be supposed. There are examples from different periods (and these crimes) resulted in more than one person being committed to row in the galleys."

See also BOUREAU, A. *Satan hérétique: l'institution judiciaire de la démonologie sous Jean XXII*. In : *Médiévaux*, 44, 2003, pp. 17-46. This author deals with the origins of the crime of *fautoría* during the early Middle-Ages, at the time of Pontiff John XXII. *Fautoría* was adjudged to be committed by those who refrained from denouncing the presence of heretics or who hid them, those who attended heretical meetings or those who became their supporters. CONTRERAS, J. has also referred to this in *Historia de la Inquisición española (1478-1834)*, Arco/Libros S.L., 1997, p.29.

ruit others to practise Judaism, including helping co-religionists to escape. Consequently he was considered an active propagandist and promoter of heretical behaviour.

Asked about his parents he claimed to be the son of Pedro de Castro, alias Pedro de Castilla, and Ana María de Torres<sup>23</sup>, the former from Jaén and the latter from the Cadiz town of Arcos.

If the information provided here was true there would be no basis for him using the surname "Mendoza" since it did not correspond to that of his father or that of his mother. The strategy of altering surnames was often used by the crypto-Jews, also called Marranos, to confuse the Holy Office

When first interrogated Juan Antonio did not mention other relatives who had also had to deal with the Inquisition and we will refer to them shortly.

From the documents it is obvious that the Inquisitors had uncovered a whole family network of crypto-Jews, so that when one person was caught it soon became relatively easy for them to trace relatives who engaged in similar heretical behaviour. Note here that, as inquiries progressed, a fundamental part of interrogations to which every accused was subjected consisted of meticulous inquiries regarding their antecedents, descendants, collaterals and spouse.

It is striking to note the difference in surnames recorded in many documents when referring to members of the same family, even when they

were siblings and apparently children of the same father and same mother. However, this was a time when there were still no strict rules regarding the forced adoption of the paternal surname, and it was relatively common to opt for the mother's surname. This inconstancy was used almost systematically and deliberately by crypto-Jews in order to evade the vigilance of the Inquisition for, as already stated, the Holy Office was aware that the Judaisers usually organised themselves into large groups

This is how the de Castro brothers Juan, Gaspar, Juan Antonio and Blas, even as children of the same parents, appear in the files of the Holy Office with different surnames. In addition, naming rites were carried out within crypto-Jewish communities so that members invariably had both Christian and Hebrew given names, the latter being used exclusively among themselves. This is why it is very difficult to identify individuals if they managed to leave Iberia. Once they fled to settle in less hostile lands they almost always abandoned the name they were given at forced Christian baptism, the result being that, from that point on, documents referring to these people invariably record only Jewish given names<sup>24</sup>.

So it is that before escaping the obligatory appearance of being orthodox Catholics, many crypto-Jews simply used the given and surnames of their choice. This was not a problem since, as already indicated, during the centuries when the Inquisitors were most active, there were no strict rules when it came to officially assuming paternal or maternal surnames. Further, as also previously mentioned, as converts were always under the

---

23 AHN, Inquisición, libro 522, fol. 16. In a 11 April 1696 letter from the Seville Inquisitors to the Supreme Court in Madrid it is recorded that Juan Antonio stated that his mother's surname was Torres whereas in other documents, almost certainly relating to the same man, his mother's name is stated to be Ana María de Morales.

24 Typically, and when it came time to record themselves in places accepting of Jews, Christian names such as Antonio, Juan, Francisco, Gaspar, etc. were transformed into traditional Jewish given names such as Daniel, David, Aarón etc. The same applies to women, recorded in Inquisitorial documents with names such as María, Ana, Isabel, etc. who became Rachel, Abigail, etc. on arrival in more tolerant lands.

eye of the Inquisition they often sought to hinder the investigations of the Holy Office by altering the order of their various chosen names. Consequently and for example, it is not unusual to find that the alias Antonio de Mendoza is mentioned in the Inquisitorial documents when, as we later see, the Inquisitors thought he should have been using the name Juan Antonio de Castro.

The Inquisitors were most adept at following any thread that might lead them to exposing other Jews. For this reason it was always very important for them to thoroughly investigate the whole family of each prisoner, the reason being that its officers knew from experience that relatives usually held the same beliefs and followed the same practices as the accused person. In Juan Antonio's case they probably would have suspected him following a clue provided during the interrogation of his brother, Gaspar de Castro y Torres. Gaspar had previously been prosecuted by the Holy Office and reconciled before the Inquisition, just because he was a Judaizer<sup>25</sup>.

While Inquisition records do not usually reflect psychological data relating to accused people, the

personal description within the previously footnoted letter of 11 April 1696 gives us information about the lifestyle and mentality of Juan Antonio de Castro, sometimes Antonio de Mendoza, in addition to his physical traits.

In accordance with the usual procedural style the Seville Inquisitors present us with a picture of the prisoner, this from the aforementioned document of 11 April 1696. There, Juan Antonio is stated to have been 43 years old at the time of his arrest<sup>26</sup>. Other information describes him as a good-looking man, tall, with white skin, thick lips and a rosy complexion. His eyes were brown and his hair was short, grey and with a receding hairline - but the meticulous approach of the Inquisitors does not overlook the fact that when he was arrested he was wearing a wig and that he had a scar above his left eyebrow. Thus the aforementioned letter of 11 April states that Juan Antonio was 43 years old at the time of his arrest while other papers in the dossier indicate that he was only aged 36 at that time<sup>27</sup>. This difference is key in determining which of the papers allegedly relating to him can be considered credible and which may have been in error or even refer to a

---

25 Reconciliation was a very frequent solution to the ending of trials for crimes of heresy. It meant that, after the defendant had abjured the errors that the Inquisitors considered he had committed, the Church was able to welcome back those whom it considered to have strayed from the Catholic doctrine. This generally happened during the celebration known as an Auto de Fe. In the case in question, as in others related to the crime of Judaizing, one of the requirements for achieving this reconciliation involved the willingness of the defendant to declare before the Inquisition everything they knew about relatives or acquaintances who might also have been involved in the commission of such 'crimes'. It is therefore not surprising that individual defendants even identified entire families of crypto-Jews.

26 All the *Relaciones de Causas* drawn up by the Seville Inquisition state that the prisoner was 36 years old, while the letters exchanged between the Court of Seville and the Council of the Inquisition state that he was 43 years old.

27 It is worth noting that in this, the first document, Juan Antonio is recorded as being 43 years old whereas in all the subsequent *Relaciones* papers sent by the Seville Court to the Supreme Court his age at the time of arrest is repeatedly stated as 36 years.

Was this the result of an error, this then being carried forward in succeeding *Relaciones*? If we look at other records relating to one of his brothers whose age is expressly stated, we find that this brother, Juan, was at least 29 years old when he went to the 1680 Auto de Fe held in Madrid. It can be assumed that he would have been some years older at this time since the Inquisitorial processes normally lasted for a relatively long period while the age of prisoners was recorded at the time of their arrest, generally without the figure being changed in the subsequent papers. Consequently, it would appear that in 1696, that is at the time of Juan Antonio de Castro's arrest, his brother Juan would be over 45 years old. The two brothers would have been about two years apart in age if we accept that Juan Antonio was 43 in 1696, while they would be more than 9 years apart if we give him the age of 36. The allusion to the "grey and receding hair" could lead us to think that those who attributed 36 years of age to him were mistaken, being more likely that he was in his forties - but we cannot be sure.

different individual.

The apparent good physical condition of Juan Antonio should not surprise us given the profession by which he made a living for he worked as a “master-of-arms”. This implies that he practised assiduously the art of handling swords while transmitting his knowledge to others. He claimed to have taught in the cities of Cadiz, Seville and Granada, as well as in Riogordo which is in Malaga. His bearing and skills in the handling of such weapons had also enabled him to be employed as a guard at the Puerta de Tierra, a gate of the prison in Cadiz.

Throughout the interrogations he had also provided the Seville Court with quite a few details about his life. He said he was born in Jaén but declared himself to be a resident of Badajoz. Then, when arrested in El Puerto de Santa María, he said he was temporarily living in that city.

We are not told of the circumstances of his arrest. It is well-known that this town was a port from where many crypto-Jews escaped when fleeing from the Holy Office, but the fact that he was later accused of the crime of aiding and abetting seems to indicate that it was not he who intended to flee at the time, rather that he was organizing and facilitating the escape of co-religionists. Then, in the light of the emerging evidence against him, the accusation of *fautoría* was added to that of the crime of practising Judaism.

Juan Antonio also declared that he had lived for quite some time in the city of Cadiz, along with his wife María de Rivera. If this man did subsequently escape to become David de Mendoza, a number of genealogy sites claim that his wife was called Ana María/Abigail de la Peña Castro.<sup>28</sup>

By the time the Holy Office in Seville wrote the letter containing the details of Juan Antonio’s life the Inquisitors had already discovered intimate details about him. We see that he had confessed that he had been separated from his wife for some time and that, since then and up to the time of his arrest, he had been living unlawfully with a woman called Ángela de Montalván in the cities of both Cádiz and Seville.

Apparently it was a relatively frequent practice among the crypto-Jews to leave their usual home and family and seek cover in the house of a co-religionist, this in order to evade the Inquisitors’ investigations. One might think that the adultery confessed to in this case would be a useful strategy to distract the Inquisitors’ attention from the crimes of Judaism and *fautoría* - today it seems excessive to resort to such an extreme solution as confessing to adultery simply to justify the fact of not living with one’s legitimate wife at the time of arrest. But note – in those times adultery was another crime in the eyes of the Inquisitorial Court.

The evidence set out above was more than enough to set in motion the inexorable machinery

---

28 There are doubts about Juan Antonio’s wife’s name. In his statement to the Inquisitors, Juan Antonio declared that her name was María de Rivera. If he did escape to become David de Mendoza, some genealogical sites have his wife named as Ana María/Abigail de la Peña y Castro.

See, for example, <https://www.geni.com/family-tree/join?name=> (accessed 25/05/2020) and

<https://gw.geneanet.org/lynnlewis16?lang=en&n=mendoza&oc=0&p=david+de> (accessed 24/09/2020).

Note that on both these sites David/Juan Antonio’s wife appears with her Jewish given name - Abigail. Also his nephew Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid, to whom we will refer later in more detail, declared before the Inquisitors of Lisbon that his uncle Antonio de Mendoza’s wife was called Ana María. Archivo Torre do Tombo, Lisboa, (PT/TT/TSO-IL/028/09973-m0648).

Here again, if in fact we are dealing with the same woman, we see a confusion of given and family names without original sources being cited on these genealogical sites..

of the Holy Office<sup>29</sup>. This was precisely what the Seville Inquisitors wanted when they provided their information about the defendant to the Supreme Council in Madrid. According to the canons of the Inquisition, given the transient nature of the accused's activities up to the time of his arrest the Council was asked to order the so-called *recorrección de registros*. This edict provided for the gathering of further evidence about a defendant from other Inquisitorial Courts in the areas where the accused had previously been residing or working. Letters would then be sent to these District Courts for this purpose. If the result was positive and accusations or evidence pointed to his guilt were found, these other Courts would be ordered to examine witnesses who might once have been in contact with the defendant.<sup>30</sup> In this way, when a suspected heretic had been active in territories under the jurisdiction of other Inquisitorial tribunals, it was the Supreme Court that directed further inquiries in a centralised and coordinated way. In Juan Antonio's case, all the proceedings would have then been sent back to the Court in Seville so that it could finalise matters.

Each Inquisitorial court was obliged to send regular routine reports on the progress of the proceedings in its district. Thanks to these so-called *Relaciones de causas* we learn more about the misfortunes that Juan Antonio de Castro had to suffer before the Seville Holy Office, especially in the way in which his trial was developing. This is because the complete record of his trial has been lost. *Relaciones de causas* were drawn up in the form of a file covering a specific period, the

defendants being grouped according to the crime of which they were accused. It is from such a file that we see that Juan Antonio was the only prisoner accused of the crime of *fautoría* and being held in the Seville Inquisitorial prison at the same time him. As mentioned above, his crime was the concealment of or aiding the evasion by persons who were being prosecuted by the Inquisition, most unusual given that *fautoría* was a fairly frequent accusation against crypto-Jews.

## THE INQUISITORIAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST JUAN ANTONIO DE CASTRO / ANTONIO DE MENDOZA

The first information from AHN documents about this man appears in the *Relación de Causas* that were pending or that had been concluded before the Inquisition of Seville between 1 April and 31 August 1696.<sup>31</sup> There, in the surviving papers of the early period of proceedings against him, Juan Antonio is stated to be age 36 for the first time. Other information about him is consistent with that recorded in the preceding chapter. However it must be noted that in this and later reports the Inquisitors insist on calling him Juan Antonio de Castro, the name they considered legitimate, and not Don Antonio de Mendoza, the name he had chosen to use when first captured - he no longer appears as Don Antonio de Mendoza, simply as Juan Antonio de Castro, the former name including the title "Don" was simply stripped from him, seemingly because these had

---

29 In view of the alleged crimes of Juan Antonio the Inquisitor Cardona of the Supreme Court in Madrid ordered the Seville Inquisitors, "to investigate its case to its final conclusion", this at the beginning of the aforementioned document dated 11 April 1696.

30 AHN, *ibidem*. In the case of Juan Antonio, this request was made in the aforementioned letter of 23 April 1696.

31 From the tenor of AHN, Inquisición, libro 522, fol. 16 it can be deduced that, using the alias Antonio de Mendoza, Juan Antonio was mentioned in previous accounts that have subsequently been lost for, having consulted file 3015 of the National Historical Archive, the accounts prior to the one under analysis do not appear.

been fabrications on his part.<sup>32</sup>

These papers also inform us in detail of the procedural actions that had been carried out up to the time when the *Relación* report was written. They include information regarding the stay in prison of a man who, seemingly by Inquisitorial order, should henceforth be referred to by his proper name, Juan Antonio de Castro.

As was customary in such cases, immediately after his admission to prison following his arrest in El Puerto de Santa María he was given an allowance, known in Inquisitorial idiom as a ration. The Inquisition tried, as far as possible, to ensure that prisoners could support themselves while their trial took place. For this reason, after arrest it was established whether or not the accused had any assets of his own with which to maintain himself while in prison. Juan Antonio de Castro had resources and was awarded a daily ration of three reales, this being currency which was taken from his assets for food and incidental expenses.

The prisoners of the Seville Court were taken to the Castle of San Jorge, a fortress next to the Guadalquivir River and that still exists today. At that time it was the seat of the Inquisitorial Court of the district. The so-called secret prisons were located there because of the privacy that had to be maintained by all those who entered or who

were employed in them, and including those accused who were kept incommunicado. Each cell had its own name, which is why the document examined states that the prisoner was held in the *cárcel de San Juan*. Shortly afterwards, the investigation of his case began.

On 31 March 1696, just two days after his arrest, he was summoned by the Inquisitors and subjected to interrogation. He was asked about his personal details, his profession, marital status and, crucially in the case of all crypto-Jews, his family connections. He was also expected to answer even guileful questions, for example whether he knew or suspected why he was being restrained in the secret prisons.

From the time of arrest and when the Holy Office considered it appropriate to continue proceedings against a defendant, this determined by its assessors, the Inquisitors of the District Court before which a particular case was being heard were obliged to send accounts to the Supreme Council. This was normally two monthly, to report on the state of all proceedings in progress or already completed. These accounts were the previously mentioned *Relaciones de Causas*. They were sent in the form of files in which the different defendants being prosecuted were systematically classified according to the crimes attributed to them, giving precise information on

---

32 Most of the documentation we have about Juan Antonio comes from papers filed in the *Archivo Histórico Nacional (AHN)*, *sección de Inquisición*, legajos (leg.) 3016-3019.

The following is from leg. 3016, fol. 4v, *Relación de causas de fe pendientes o concluidas ante el Santo Oficio de la Inquisición de Sevilla desde el 1 de abril hasta el 31 de agosto de 1696 – Nº 14: Fautores: "Juan Antonio de Castro, Alias Don Antonio de Mendoza, natural de Jaén, vecino de Badajoz, residente el tiempo de su prisión en la ciudad del Puerto de Santa María, de oficio maestro de Armas, de edad de 36 años, preso en cárceles secretas con secuestro de bienes en 29 de marzo de 1696. / Negativo, Cárcel de San Juan, ración tres reales. Tiene bienes. / Quedó la última relación en que en 31 de marzo: primera audiencia y monición / En 12 de abril, segunda monición. / En 18 de junio, tercera monición. / En treinta de dicho, acusación. / En 5 de julio, audiencia de prueba."* Translation: "Juan Antonio de Castro, Alias Don Antonio de Mendoza, born in Jaén, resident of Badajoz, living at the time of his imprisonment in the city of Puerto de Santa María, master-at-arms by profession, aged 36, imprisoned in the secret prisons with seizure of goods on 29 March 1696 / negative, San Juan Prison, ration three reales. He has assets. / Report of 31 March: first hearing and monition / On 12 April: second monition. / On 18 June: third monition. / On 30 June, accusation. / On 5 July, hearing of evidence." It is signed by the Inquisitors Llanes and Campomanes.

the status of their respective cases. Each prisoner was named under a heading which described the alleged offence. Then were listed details of the prisoner's identity, physical appearance and personal circumstances. This was followed by a continuing update of the status of their proceedings. It seems that the drafting of these documents was out methodically, with each scribe faithfully reproducing the heading and data that appeared in the previous list, this followed by an ever-lengthening summary of subsequent events. Consequently, once an error occurred it could easily just be repeated. Seemingly, this is why Juan Antonio de Castro's age is first recorded as 43 years in the correspondence between the Inquisitors of Seville and the Suprema in Madrid whereas in all the *Relaciones* lists his age is given as 36 years.

The first document we have records that, from his capture in Puerto de Santa María<sup>33</sup> on 29 March and up to 31 August 1696, this being the date on which the report to be sent to the Supreme Court was drawn up, Juan Antonio de Castro had not confessed his guilt before the Inquisitors. This is why he was repetitively classified as *negative*, a term used in Inquisitorial jargon for those who did not acknowledge their crimes. Hearings could be called at the initiative of the Court or the prisoner. After each hearing, unless the prisoner confessed to allegations he was warned of the advisability of doing so for his own good. These warnings were called *monitions*. After the third monition,

and without Juan Antonio still having stated what the Inquisitors expected to hear, he was formally accused of his crimes and a few days later his case would have been sent for trial.

So it is that, with the prisoner already confined in the secret prisons of the Seville Inquisition, it became necessary to continue investigations for the offence of *fautoría*.

Examination of other documents provides detailed information on the development leading up to Juan Antonio's trial before the Inquisition. These documents reveal how the case against him was proceeding while he was being held at the Castle of San Jorge. In the *Relación* covering the period from 1 September to 31 December 1696, the Seville Inquisitors informed the Supreme Court of having sent a letter to the Granada Inquisitorial Court, this to ratify the statements made against the prisoner by some witnesses who were in that district. It is also noted that they had written to Cadiz, probably to the Inquisitorial commissioner stationed there to ratify other testimony. The Court in Granada was not, as far as can be seen, very diligent in carrying out formalities, as the Seville Inquisitors report that, despite their request, they had still not had an answer at the time of writing to the Supreme Court.<sup>34</sup>

In the next *Relación*, which covers the period between 31 December 1696 and 29 March 1697, the Seville tribunal reported to the Supreme Court

---

<sup>33</sup> It is noted that El Puerto de Santa María, in the province of Cadiz, was one of the favoured locations of crypto-Jews who had chosen to flee to escape the Inquisition. A significant number sailed from there, all the way to America. Portugal's proximity made flight easier too, from Lisbon to other countries where important Jewish communities existed, such as the Netherlands and England.

<sup>34</sup> AHN, Inquisición, leg. 3016. *Relación de causas pendientes o concluidas entre el 1 de septiembre hasta el 31 de diciembre de 1696, fol. 4v.* "Escribióse a la Inquisición de Granada para la ratificación de algunos testigos, que estaban en aquel distrito, y a Cádiz para ratificar a otro, que se tuvo noticia de que se hallaba ahí, y aunque se hizo recuerdo en 4 de diciembre a dicha Inquisición de Granada, se está esperando despacho, por no haber aun venido".

Here it is said that a letter was sent to the Inquisition of Granada requesting the testimonies of some witnesses who were in that district, and also to Cadiz to ratify another by a person who was known to be there. Although on 4 December a reminder was sent to the Inquisition of Granada a dispatch was still awaited as a reply had not yet arrived.

that on 7 January 1697 the Granada tribunal had sent the required witness testimonies. However, as then recorded, the Seville Inquisitors considered these invalid for procedural purposes because the testimonies had not been made according to Holy Office requirements. These required attestation of witness statements before 'honest people', that is individuals qualified to take such statements. Despite having formally requested that the testimonies be sent back to them once they had been made in accordance with the law they had still not been received back by the end of March.<sup>35</sup> A certain hostility between the Inquisitorial Courts of Granada and Seville is apparent throughout this sequence of events. Such squabbles between the various Courts and Tribunals within the Holy Office did nothing to speed up the case for prisoners and, meantime, Juan Antonio de Castro just remained imprisoned in the Castle of San Jorge.

This is how the months went by for Juan Antonio, little by little consuming his savings by the continuous trickle of the three reales per day that were being taken to cover his living expenses while in prison. It was a perverse system of financing for the Inquisitors had no interest in speeding up proceedings as long as prisoners had remaining assets. In the case of prisoners who lacked resources, their support was paid for by the Treasury. This led to a certain judicial impa-

tiency, which in many cases accelerated the outcome of proceedings, as can be seen later when, after a long stay in prison, Juan Antonio de Castro's assets were finally exhausted.

But for the time being we find him unharmed in his cell called San Juan, without making the confession required by the Inquisitors despite the constant hearings and formal monitions, as well as the Court's warnings to convince him that admitting his crime of *fautoría* would bring him certain benefits.

At last, in April 1697, the attestations of the witnesses called to testify before the Court in Granada were received in the proper form. Here, and after about four months in the asking, was the information that the Seville Inquisitors needed to continue their case against Juan Antonio de Castro.

After the arrival of these new testimonies, Juan Antonio's hearings followed, one after another, sometimes on the Court's own initiative and sometimes on the defendant's. On 7 May he was summoned to an extraordinary hearing to encourage him to repent and confess, which he did not do. Later it was he who asked to appear before the Court to present new arguments in his defence, a request that was granted as was common practice in the Holy Office.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> *Ibidem*, leg. 3017. *Relación de causas pendientes o concluidas entre el 31 de diciembre de 1696 y el 29 de marzo de 1697*, fol. 4v. "Fautores: En 7 de enero de 97 se recibieron de la Inquisición de Granada las ratificaciones y habiéndose visto para sacar la publicación, se reconoció no venir en forma por no se haber hecho coram honestis personis, y se volvieron a remitir a dicha Inquisición en 21 de dicho mes. No han venido todavía. 15 de enero de 1697, fol. 5v. Fautores. Juan Antonio de Castro...Se está esperando despacho (de Granada)".

Here we see that on 7 January 1697 the testimonies were received from the Inquisition of Granada and, having reviewed them, they were not in the correct form as they had not been sworn *coram honestis personis*. This meant that they had to be sent back to the Granada Inquisition but by 21 January they had not come back. Then, within the 15 January 1697, fol. 5v. Fautores, for Juan Antonio de Castro there is a note to the effect that the Seville Inquisitors were still awaiting news from Granada.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibidem*, leg. 3017. *Relación de causas pendientes o concluidas entre el 29 de marzo de 1697 y el 20 de mayo de 1697*. "El 22 de abril de este año se recibieron de la Inquisición de Granada las ratificaciones. / En 7 de Mayo se le dio Audiencia extraordinaria para una reconvencción. / En 20 de dicho pidió y se le dio Audiencia en que articulaba nuevas defensas."

Reads: On 22 April 1697 the ratifications were received from the Inquisition of Granada. Then, on 7 May, Juan Antonio was given an extraordinary hearing for a counterclaim. Next, on 20 May he requested and was given a hearing in which he presented new defences.

Time just ticked by for the arrested Juan Antonio de Castro, with the record of his trial slowly growing with the addition of new testimonies from the various places where he had lived. This did not exactly work in his favour as the accusations usually referred to the heretical activities he had carried out during his stay in various towns in the provinces of Jaén, Cádiz, Granada, etc. For this reason, from time to time he requested an audience with the Inquisitors, to try to counteract the negative effects of the accusatory testimonies that kept coming.

At this point, the transmission of case reports from Seville to the Supreme Court continued to take place on a more or less bimonthly basis. The next list of interest covers the period from 21 May to 23 July 1697. It reports that the accused had been granted a hearing on 1 June in order to present new defences in view of the accusations against him, of which the Court had duly notified him. Thus, just two days later, he requested another hearing in which he identified several witnesses for his defence who lived in Extremadura. This is not surprising given the abundance of Judeo-converts living in these regions, almost all of whom were of Portuguese descent, and Juan Antonio de Castro himself came from a family of Portuguese Jews who settled in Jaén, where

many of them ended up. No doubt he hoped that some friends in Extremadura would be willing to testify on his behalf.

So it was on that same day that the Court in Seville sent an official letter to the Court in Llerena with instructions to carry out the necessary interrogation of the witnesses mentioned by the accused. The questions they were to answer in their testimonies were even enclosed.<sup>37</sup> The same procedure was then followed as before, in a territory over which the Granada Court exercised its jurisdiction. This included the validation of witnesses.

In the month of August, the accused asked again and was granted a new voluntary hearing. But the network of crypto-Jews with which Juan Antonio was involved was too extensive to prevent other members, many related to him and who were being or had already been tried by the Holy Office, from bringing new accusatory testimony against him. Thus, in addition to the crime of *fautoría*, another crime of which he had not been formally accused until then was added. After a testimony for the crime of Judaism, this time coming from another Inquisitorial Court, the Seville Court was obliged to add this new criminal offence to its charge sheet.<sup>38</sup>

---

37 *Ibidem*, *Relación de causas...entre el 21 de mayo y el 23 de julio de 1697*. "En 1 de junio de dicho año pidió audiencia y en ella articuló nuevas defensas / En 3 de dicho se le dio Audiencia de Comunicación de nuevas defensas / En dicho día se remitió a la Inquisición de Llerena despacho con copia del interrogatorio de defensas, para que se examinasen los testigos citados por este reo, que residen en el distrito de aquella Inquisición."

Reads: On 1 June 1697 Juan Antonio asked for a hearing to present new defences. Next, on the 3rd he was given a defence hearing. On the same day a dispatch was sent to the Inquisition of Llerena with a copy of the interrogation regarding his defences. This was done so that the witnesses cited by Juan Antonio and who resided in that district of that Inquisition could be examined.

38 *Ibidem*, *Relación de causas...entre el 23 de julio y el 16 de septiembre de 1697*. "En 12 de agosto pidió y se le dio audiencia voluntaria. / Por haberse recibido nueva testificación contra este reo, por delitos de Judaísmo en la Inquisición de Corte, se está sacando para ponerle nueva acusación". Se adjunta a la relación un papel suelto fechado el 2 de septiembre de 1697 donde los Inquisidores de Sevilla remiten al Consejo 25 folios con los autos de sendos procesos incoados "contra Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza y Don Blas de Castilla, alias Castro, su tío, vecinos de esta ciudad y Don Antonio de Castro y Mendoza, preso en cárceles secretas de este Santo Oficio, por fautor de herejes, apóstata judaizante, votada en la forma que VA lo mandará ver, para que en su vista mande VA lo que fuere servido. Guarde D. a VA, Inquisición de Sevilla, y Agosto a 27 de 1697". Firman los Inquisidores Porteros, Henestrosa y De los Reyes. Una nota al margen de ese documento dice: "Volvióse con lo acordado el 3 de septiembre de este año".

This is how the unrelenting machinery of the Spanish Holy Office worked, as it tried by all means to encourage individuals to testify against others who might be party to the same crime. The offer of procedural advantages or, where appropriate, the threat or carrying out of torture, were variously used to obtain the desired information. It has already been mentioned that other members of the Castro-Mendoza clan were being tried before the Inquisition at the same time as Juan Antonio. Collaboration between different tribunals is evident in cases such as his, where even at this stage of the trial against him we find four of his cohort already mentioned in Inquisition records.

## THE EMERGENCE OF OTHER MEMBERS OF JUAN ANTONIO'S FAMILY

Things were not looking good for the master-of-arms as the number of charges against him

kept increasing, especially after he was indicted with the new offence of Judaizing. From that moment on the Seville Court halted its investigations and referred the case against the master-at-arms to the Supreme Council in Madrid, this by order of the latter.

It is within this context that the Seville Inquisitors wrote a letter to the Supreme Court in which they provided new information on a family network of crypto-Jews. Here we are referring to the just mentioned Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza and Don Blas de Castilla, alias Castro, the latter being another brother of the master-at-arms. Blas was 50 years old at the time of his arrest and these two men were being tried by the Seville court at the same time as Juan Antonio de Castro.<sup>39</sup> In fact they appear in the *Relaciones de causas*, where the master-at-arms had been listed since August 1697, but in the section dealing with the crime of Judaism, not that of *fautoría*.

From the documents concerning Juan Francis-

---

In this *Relación* we see that, on 12 August, Juan Antonio requested and was given a voluntary hearing. This was because new testimony had been received against him for crimes of Judaism. This testimony had come by way of the Inquisitorial Court of Madrid and resulted in a further charge being brought against him. Then we read that attached to this *Relación* was a loose paper dated 2 September 1697. This records that the Inquisitors of Seville had sent the Council 25 pages detailing the proceedings initiated against Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza and Don Blas de Castilla, alias Castro, his uncle, both residents of Seville, and against Don Antonio de Castro y Mendoza, prisoner in the secret jails for being a heretic and Apostate Judaizer. Clearly, Juan Antonio had already been judged that way by the Suprema. A note in the margin of this document reads "Returned as agreed on 3 September of this year" - a quick turnaround indeed.

<sup>39</sup> AHN, Inquisición, Lib. 522, fols. 150-151.

It records a letter from the Sevillian Inquisitors addressed to the Supreme Court and dated June 18, 1697 regarding Blas de Castro, alias Castilla, denounced for Judaism, born in Jaén and 50 years old. In it it is explained that his brother Gaspar had already been judged and reconciled by the Inquisition of Seville. It is reported that his brother Juan de Castro was also imprisoned. The Supreme Court was asked to order the verification of the records on Blas. A later missive includes another letter from the Inquisition of Seville reminding the Supreme Court that they have not had any news of the aforementioned verification of the records.

Regarding the fact that Blas de Castro was 50 years old in 1697, it can be considered as another clue that his brother Juan Antonio was hardly 36 years old when he was arrested in 1696. This would be a quite remarkable difference with respect to his brothers Juan and Blas. The 43 years seem to us to be more in keeping with the age range of the aforementioned brothers. If Juan was 29 years old around 1680, he would have been around 46 in 1697.

Translator's comment: Considering the fact that Blas de Castro was 50 years old in 1697 could indicate that his brother, Juan Antonio, was unlikely to be only 36 years old when arrested in 1696 for this would mean that there would have been a fourteen year age difference between these two brothers. On the other hand, a 20 to 25 year age range for a sibling set is biologically acceptable. Yet another brother who we meet shortly, Juan, was around 29 years old when paraded at the *Auto de Fe* in Madrid in 1680. He would have been around 46 in 1697 so, on balance, age 43 at the time of arrest for Juan Antonio seems to be more

co and Blas we understand the family better for in one of the papers it is recorded that Blas de Castilla was the brother of Juan Antonio de Castro, who is referred to there as Don Antonio de Castro y Mendoza. Another brother, Juan de Castro, is listed. He had already been prosecuted and reconciled by the Holy Office,<sup>40</sup> and had appeared at the famous Auto de Fe held in Madrid in 1680 when he was just over 29 years old. His wife and brother-in-law appeared there too. We refer to this Juan de Castro again later.

As it became apparent that these three men were related, despite their use of three different surnames, the new accusation of Judaism against Juan Antonio de Castro determined that from this point on all three were to be processed conjointly. It has already been mentioned that the so-called Don Blas de Castilla was in fact Blas de Castro, brother of Juan Antonio, while Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza, now fully confirmed as a nephew

of Blas, would have been a blood nephew of them both if his mother was also a de Castro sibling.<sup>41</sup>

By this time the prisoner had been in the secret prisons of the Castle of San Jorge for about 17 months and the records of the proceedings against him consist of around 25 pages. From this point on they run hand in hand with those of the sons of Pedro de Castro alias de Castilla, Blas de Castilla, his brother Juan Antonio,, and Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza. With both Blas and Juan Francisco residing in Seville, this appears to result from the investigations relating to Juan Antonio that had been carried out in August.

Returning to the distortion of the surname de Castro, now obviously shared by Juan Antonio and Blas and with the latter transforming it into "Castilla". "Castro" is of Galician-Portuguese origin and is more or less equivalent to the Castilian "Castillo" or "Castilla". The latter has much nobler

---

40 *Ibidem*, fol. 177. Letter from the Inquisition of Seville to the Supreme, dated 27 August, 1697: "Para seguir las diligencias que en la sumaria que en este Santo Oficio está recibida contra Don Blas de Castro y Castilla y contra Don Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza y contra Don Antonio de Castro y Mendoza, hermano de Juan de Castro, reconciliado que fue en este despacho por delitos de judaísmo, necesitamos del proceso original de la reconciliación del dicho Juan de Castro, y saber si se sacó de la testificación general que el susodicho hizo contra cómplices y si se votaron dichos cómplices para ella o a continuación de dicho proceso, para que si la testificación general y votos están separados, se sirva V.M. mandar se nos remitan con dicho proceso, que uno y otra volveremos con la brevedad posible y a todo cuanto sea del agrado de V.M. acudiremos con buena voluntad, guarde D. a V.M. / Inquisición de Sevilla, 27 de agosto de 1697". Signed by Inquisitors Porteros, Henestrosa y De los Reyes. This letter was received on 2 September, 1697 and the the case files were forwarded to the court of Seville on the following day.

In the first part of this 27 August 1697 letter from the Seville Inquisitors, again addressed to the Supreme Court, it is stated that to further investigate the proceedings against Don Blas de Castro y Castilla, Don Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza and Don Antonio de Castro y Mendoza, brother of Juan de Castro, it would be necessary to refer to the case records of the latter who had already been reconciled for crimes of Judaism. It is clear from Del Olmo (p.236 no. 61) that this would have been Juan de Castro y Torres who appeared at Madrid's celebrated Auto de Fe in 1680. See:

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.31822043008788&view=1up&seq=274> (accessed 25/05/ 2021).

41 AHN, Inquisición, leg. 3017, Letter dated 29 August, 1697. "Con esta remitimos a VA en 25 hojas útiles el proceso causado en esta Inquisición contra Don Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza y don Blas de Castilla alias Castro su tío vecinos de esta ciudad y Don Antonio de Castro y Mendoza preso en cárceles secretas de este Santo Oficio por Fautor de herejes Apóstatas judaizantes votado en la forma que V.A. lo mandará ver para que en su vista mande V.A. lo que fuere servido. Dios guarde et. Agosto 29 de 1697. / Francisco Portero de la Vega, Don Cristóbal de Henestrosa y D. Matías de los Reyes Valenzuela".

In this, a cover letter to 25 pages and dated 29 August 1697, it is recorded that Don Blas de Castilla alias Castro was the uncle of Don Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza, both being residents of Seville. We also read that, along with Juan Antonio, all three were being held in the secret cells as Apostate Judaizers. It will be recalled that Juan Antonio and Blas were brothers, with two further named siblings, Juan who had appeared at the Auto da Fe in Madrid in 1680, and Gaspar. Within this now identified sibling set of four brothers it is considered likely that there would have been at least one sister, this accounting for the stated uncle/nephew relationship between Blas and Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza. In fact, under these circumstances Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza would have been a blood relative of all four brothers.

connotations, more typical of the Old Christians than “Castro”, which was always suspected of Jewish origins from Portugal.

This is a good example of how the crypto-Jews played with their surnames to evade investigation by the Inquisition, by using surnames relatively similar to their authentic ones but in such a way that they could not easily be linked to their kinsmen. At this point Blas and Juan Francisco had not been imprisoned by the Holy Office, merely suspected of being part of an important crypto-Jewish network. Thus it would only be a matter of time before documents mentioning the three members of the same family were being held in the prisons of Seville’s Castillo de San Jorge.

So it is that, on 12 September 1697, we find Juan Francisco Díaz imprisoned in the cell of San Antonio in the Castillo de San Jorge, lengthen the lists of Judaizers within the *Relaciones de causas* drafted by the Inquisition of Seville.<sup>42</sup>

## CONTINUATION AND OUTCOME OF THE CASE AGAINST JUAN ANTONIO DE CASTRO / ANTONIO DE MENDOZA

Returning to the plight of Juan Antonio de Castro, the *Relaciones* for the period 16 September to 19 November 1697 record that a new charge had been laid against him, this for the crime of practicing Judaism and being in addition to the crime of *fautoría*. He learnt of this on 5 October but denied the charge, this leading to an evidentiary hearing some two days later.<sup>43</sup>

Back to square one - Juan Antonio’s new trial began on 7 November 1697, this time for practising as a Jew. The next month he was given a hearing when the new testimonies were presented and the next day he was summoned to organise his defence, this for a hearing on 23 December.<sup>44</sup>

By this time proceedings against the master-of-arms had grown significantly, as can be seen

---

42 AHN, Inquisición, leg. 3018, *Relación...entre el 19 de noviembre de 1697 y el 13 de enero de 1698: Juan Francisco Díaz is listed among the judizers: “Juan Francisco Díaz, natural de Cádiz y vecino de Sevilla, de 26 o 27 años. Sin oficio. Preso en las cárceles secretas con secuestro de bienes desde el 12 de septiembre de 1697 por judaizante. Cárcel San Antonio, 3 reales. No tiene bienes. El 19 de septiembre se le dio la primera audiencia y monición. Negativo. / El 5 de octubre segunda monición. / El 7 de octubre tercera monición”. Side note: “Antes de ponerle la avitación se debió poner la inspección”. “En 16 de octubre se le puso acusación / En 16 de octubre se le dio audiencia de prueba. Se cometieron las ratificaciones a D. Fernando Osorno, portero del tribunal.”*

Here we read that Juan Francisco Díaz, born in Cadiz and resident of Seville, was 26 or 27 years old and without employment. Since 12 September 1697 he had been held in the cell of San Antonio in the Castillo de San Jorge as a suspected Judaizer. His assets had been confiscated and he was on a *ración* of 3 reales per day. On 19 September he was given a first hearing and monition - negative. On 5 October, second monition, on 7 October, third monition and on 16 October he was given an evidentiary hearing but by the time the *Relaciones* were written it appears that his assets had run out. A side note indicates that he was not searched before he was put in his cell.

43 AHN, Inquisición, leg. 3017, *Relación de causas...entre el 16 de septiembre y el 19 de noviembre de 1697. “Quedó la última relación, que habiéndose recibido del despacho de corte, nueva testificación contra este reo por delitos de Judaísmo, se quedaba sacando a su proceso. / En 5 de octubre de este año audiencia en que se le puso nueva acusación por Judaizante. Negativo. / En 7 del dicho, audiencia de prueba.”*

44 AHN, Inquisición, leg. 3018. *Relación de causas...entre el 19 de noviembre de 1697 y el 13 de enero de 1698. “Quedaba la última relación, que en 7 de octubre de 1697 se le dio audiencia de prueba sobre el delito de judaizante de que fue testificado y se le había puesto nueva acusación. / En 4 de diciembre de dicho año se le dio audiencia de publicación / en 5 de dicho audiencia de comunicación de defensas / en 23 de dicho audiencia en que articuló defensas”.*

from a letter sent by the Seville Court to the Council in Madrid, this dated 28 January 1698.<sup>45</sup> This correspondence requested an order from the Suprema regarding what to do with the defendant, Juan Antonio. Such action was normal practice when Inquisitors disagreed, even when facts were proven, and indicates that in Juan Antonio's case the Seville Inquisitors could not agree on the terms of the sentence to be handed down to him for his transgressions.

The problem lay in the fact that the crime of *fautoría*, for which he had initially been prosecuted, had now been joined by formal allegations that he was a practising Jew, this following the new evidence that had been presented. In such cases the Supreme Council had the final word and it is worth noting that in this letter, contrary to the stated age of 36 which was repeatedly recorded for the defendant in *Relaciones* reports, the Seville Inquisitors now reported that Juan Antonio was 43 years old.

The often praised exactness that is evident within Inquisition archives must be called into question here for, in this and other cases when it comes to accurately establishing the age of an accused, confusion often arises. This is because months, and sometimes years went by while individual trials proceeded, yet the age of the defendant as recorded in documents did not change.

In the surviving papers recording the case against Juan Antonio de Castro it is obvious that

there are two distinct lines. As already noted, in the *Relaciones* he is repeatedly recorded as being age 36, seeming the result of a repeating error. Meanwhile, in other documents, he is stated to have been quite a bit older, for example here in the correspondence between the Suprema and the Seville Inquisitors where his age is recorded as 43. As already explained as well, further confusion arises given the passage of time, in Juan Antonio's case from when he was first arrested (no later than the middle of 1696) until his trial is lost (this shortly after he was sentenced at the end of 1698). So it is that, at the end of 1698, Juan Antonio must have been around 39 if we follow the headings of the *Relaciones*, or 46 if we prefer to be guided by the correspondence between the Court in Seville and the Supreme Court in Madrid. This difference in age seems relatively unimportant in the context of his trial but gains considerable significance when we try to establish his fate after apparently fleeing Iberia, this shortly after sentencing. Attaining the age of sixty conferred a certain dignity within the Jewish community.<sup>46</sup> This means that if Juan Antonio is taken to be age 43 at the time of his arrest he would have been what is called *Ha-Yashish* in 1713, the year when some self-claimed descendants place him as living in the city of Amsterdam. Conversely, if only age 36 at that time it seems that he would not have been *Ha-Yashish*.<sup>47</sup>

The case against Juan Antonio continued its protracted course. We know this from the *Relaciones de causas* drawn up for the period 19 No-

---

45 *Ibidem*, loose letter addressed by the Court of Seville to the Supreme on 28 January, 1698 and received on 3 February: "Con esta remitimos a VA en 179 fojas útiles el proceso causado en esta Inquisición contra D. Juan Antonio de Mendoza alias Don Antonio de Mendoza natural de la ciudad de Jaén, residente en esta ciudad, de oficio Maestro de Armas, de edad de cuarenta y tres años preso en cárceles secretas de esta Inquisición por delitos de Fautoría y sospechas de judaísmo. Votado en definitiva como V.A. siendo servido mandara hacer. Que Dios Guarde a V.A. Inquisición de Sevilla Enero 28 de 1698. / Dr. Don Cristóbal de Henestrosa y D. Matías de los Reyes Valenzuela."

46 DAVIS, D. The Jewish Cemetery at Kalkara, Malta. In: *Transactions and Miscellanies*, 28 (1981-1982), Jewish Historical Society in England, pp. 145-170.

47 In Jewish culture, the quality of *Ha-Yashish* is given, in general opinion, to males who have turned 60 years old. However there are some who claim that, centuries ago when people's life expectancy was shorter, that dignity could possibly be achieved before age sixty.

venber 1697 to 13 January 1698 by the Court in Seville for on 23 December 1697 he was summoned to present his defences.

Then followed the obligatory break over the Christmas period when a draft sentence was prepared. Here, in the next *Relaciones* report it is recorded that the Inquisitors of Seville voted *en discordia*, this implying that there was dissent as to how the defendant should be punished. As a consequence they needed to consult the *Suprema* in Madrid for a solution and this required them to assemble various papers - the votes of the district Inquisitors, the records of the trial in question, and the content of the proposed resolution that had been drawn up and which had been voted upon. All this was sent to Madrid.<sup>48</sup>

But unluckily for Juan Antonio, either inadvertently or deliberately the Seville Inquisitors had neglected one of the vital steps in the usual procedure for cases like his. When the documents from Seville arrived in Madrid it was realised that the proposal for a resolution had been sent too soon as no torture test had been carried out. This was an essential part of the process necessary to resolve such charges as those laid against Juan Antonio because he had not confessed his guilt, meaning that his innocence or guilt could not be reliably demonstrated. For this reason, on 4 February the application of torture was declared unavoidable and, in a letter received a week lat-

er, the Court in Seville was charged with taking immediate action. Probably Juan Antonio's age, stature and fitness made him the ideal candidate to experience torture, leading all to believe that there would be no irreparable damage to his body.

In addition to their being reprimanded by the Madrid Council for their omissions to this point, further negligence on the part of the Seville Inquisitors is evident in their delay in carrying out the orders that they had received for torture *ad arbitrium* was not applied immediately,<sup>49</sup> rather left until 19 April as we now see.

In this way the unavoidable step in the eyes of the Supreme Court was finally completed on 19 April, but without a confession being obtained.<sup>50</sup> Regarding the untoward delay in the application of torture there is an interesting letter filed among the *Relaciones*, this sent by the Seville Court to the Council in Madrid. Here they sought to exonerate themselves after having been reprimanded on several occasions for being too slow, among other things when executing 'the torment'. In their defence the Seville Inquisitors argued that they were in charge of some 80 prisoners and that they could not even cope with the required number of hearings. They even mentioned the old age and apparent senility suffered by the Inquisitor Porteros whose attendance at Tribunal proceedings embarrassed his companions, for example his talking to the wall during torture ses-

---

48 AHN, Inquisición, leg. 318, *Relación de causas...entre el 13 de Enero y 5 de marzo de 1698*. "En 4 de enero de este presenta año (1698) se votó por el Inquisidor Doctor Don Cristóbal de Henestrosa y por el ordinario de este Arzobispado Doctor D. Juan Ignacio de Alfaro, conformes que a este reo en Auto público de Fe habiéndole de próximo, y si no en una iglesia, estando en forma de penitente, se le lea su sentencia con méritos, abjure de levi, sea gravemente reprehendido, advertido y conminado, y desterrado de la villa de Madrid, y de esta ciudad y la de Jaén, por tiempo de tres años, y privado perpetuamente de llegar a los puertos de mar y doce leguas en contorno, con que antes de ejecutarse se remita a V. A."

49 *Ibidem*. "En 29 de dicho se remitió el proceso a V.A. En 11 de febrero se recibió el voto de V.A. de 4 del mismo, por el cual se sirve de mandar, que este reo sea puesto a cuestión de tormento *ad arbitrium*. / Que este tormento se debía haver dado. Que se ejecute luego."

Torture *ad arbitrium* meant that the choice of torture was left in the hands of the Seville Court.

50 *Ibidem*, *Relación de causas...entre el 5 de marzo y el 30 de abril de 1698*. "El 11 de febrero se había recibido el voto de VA en que se ordena tormento / *ad arbitrium*. / En 19 de abril se ejecutó el tormento. Negativo."

It is not specified what form of torture was applied on 19 April but it seems most likely that Juan Antonio had to experience the rigors of the rack, which he seemingly did given that no confession to the allegations made against him was forthcoming.

sions, believing that he was addressing the prisoner and so causing considerable embarrassment to the other officials in attendance.<sup>51</sup>

The proceedings against the accused wound on but still Juan Antonio did not confess to any of the charges laid against him. Time came when it was appropriate for the Seville Inquisitors to pronounce on the allegation that he was a Judaizer, a charge that had been added to the crime of *fautoría* as already discussed. However, when they found him guilty of this further crime they were once again unable to agree on the appropriate punishment. Again the terms of the disagreement had to be sent to Madrid so that the Suprema could rule on the solution to be adopted. By this time the record of Juan Antonio's trial had grown from the initial 25 pages to a total of 189.<sup>52</sup> It can be taken from the course of the trial that, rather than rule on two separate charges, the Holy Office preferred to pass a joint verdict and to simultaneously punish Juan Antonio de Castro for both crimes, that of *fautoría* and practising as a Jew, seemingly meaning that the proposed sentence for *fautoría* alone was momentarily suspended.

In the *Relaciones* for the next period it is recorded that Juan Antonio's case for the two crimes of which he was accused was voted in discord by the Seville Inquisitors on 13 May but the definitive solution prescribed by the Council was not received back in Seville until 1 June.<sup>53</sup> This meant that over a fortnight had passed, from the time that the ruling in dispute had been sent from Seville to the time that the pronounced sentence was received back from Madrid. The next *Relaciones* also mentions him<sup>54</sup>, but the complete content of Juan Antonio's sentence does not appear until the *Relaciones* for the period 21 October 1698 to 19 January 1699. By this time some of the terms and sanctions prescribed on 1 June had already been carried out.

As in most similar cases the original document containing the judicial decision is missing, but in Juan Antonio's case its exact wording is recorded, thanks to its transcription to these later papers recording his fate.<sup>55</sup> Here we see a sentence typical of those handed down by the Inquisition to people convicted of practising as Jews, with the now named Juan Antonio de Castro alias Antonio de Mendoza being recorded as never confessing.

---

51 *Ibidem*, *Relación de causas...entre el 23 de julio y el 16 de septiembre de 1697*.

This includes a loose piece of paper being a letter signed by the Inquisitors of Seville on 15 April 1698 and addressed to the Supreme Court in Madrid.

52 *Ibidem*, *Relación de causas...entre el 5 de marzo y el 30 de abril de 1698*. Loose letter from the court of Seville to the Supreme concerning the alleged crimes of judaism attributable to Juan Antonio de Castro: "Con ésta remitimos a VA. en 189 fojas útiles el processo causado en esta Inquisición contra Don Antonio de Mendoza natural de Jaén por culpas de Judaísmo votado en la conformidad que VA mandará ver y a nosotros lo que devemos ejecutar. Guarde Dios a Vuestra Alteza. Inquisición de Sevilla, Mayo 13 de 1698. Dr. Don Cristóbal de Henestrosa y D. Matías de los Reyes Valenzuela."

53 *Ibidem*, *Relación de causas...entre el 30 de abril y el 22 de junio de 1698*. "Quedó la última relación en que se le dio tormento el 19 de abril. Negativo. / En 13 de mayo se remitió a V.A. este processo en discordia. / El 1 de junio se recibió el voto de VA en que se sirve mandar que este reo (salga) en Auto público de Fe, habiéndole de próximo, y si no en una Iglesia estando en forma de penitente con San Benito de media aspa, se le lea su sentencia con méritos, abjure de vehementi; hábito y cárcel por seis meses y perdimiento de la mitad de sus bienes, y sea desterrado de Madrid, Sevilla y Jaén y diez leguas en contorno por seis años y privado perpetuamente de llegar a los puertos de mar y secos y doce leguas en contorno, y que no use el apellido de Mendoza, sino los que tiene por sus padres pena de 200 azotes."

54 *Ibidem*, *Relación de causas...entre el 23 de junio y el 25 de agosto de 1698*.

"Quedó la última relación que el primero de junio se recibió el voto de VA por el que se sirve mandar que a este reo..." No ha habido novedades y se reproduce la solución decretada por la Suprema el 1 de junio."

55 *Ibidem*, *Relación de causas...entre el 21 de octubre de 1698 y el 19 de enero de 1699*. "Y que en 1º de junio se recibió el voto de V.A. en que se sirve mandar, que este reo salga en auto público de fe habiéndole próximo, y si no en una iglesia, estando en forma de Penitente, con San Benito de media aspa, se le lea su sentencia con méritos, abjure de vehementi, con perdimiento de

This denial seems to be the reason why his sentence was not too severe. As in so many similar cases, the verdict in his case contained both spiritual and non-spiritual penalties.

To begin this phase of proceedings against Juan Antonio the Seville Court was ordered to require the prisoner to appear at a public *Auto de Fe*, but only if its Inquisitors were planning to hold such an event in the near future. Otherwise, he would need to appear in the more secluded environment of a Church, so dispensing with the pomp of a public *Auto*. At that time, the Inquisitorial coffers no longer enjoyed the large inflow of revenue that they had seen during the 16th century so the Suprema, aware of the enormous expense involved in holding a public *Auto*, offered the other and far more economical option.

This was the type of ceremony in which Juan Antonio de Castro appeared, along with other prisoners. All were taken from their cells in the Castillo de San Jorge to the nearby church of Santa Ana. Once there and in turn, each prisoner would have been read their sentence *con méritos*, that is to say at length, with a full account of all the heretical acts attributed to them, the evil they contained and the evidence that supported conviction. For Judaisers such as Juan Antonio it would then have been ordered that the *sambenito*, a tunic decorated with a St Andrew's cross both front and back, be worn. This was one of the symbolic penalties that characterised crypto-Jewish penitents in the times of the Inquisition in Spain.

Another of the punishments included in Juan Antonio's sentence was that of *abjuración de vehementi*. This required him to formally renounce the heresy of which he had been found guilty, Ju-

daism in his case. The word *vehementi* implies that there was very good evidence to confirm his conviction on that charge. Following certain formalities, this declaration would have been made by him during his appearance at the Church.

The sentences of a non-spiritual nature are then recorded, these being rulings that directly affected his wealth and person. In this regard he was first required to forfeit half of his assets. This seems to indicate that, despite the more than notable loss he must have suffered from the impost of three *reales* per day since capture, even after well over two years in prison he might still have had at least limited assets. Certainly money would be needed as a further part of his sentence required him to remain in the Penitentiary Prison for a period of six months, during which time he would have to continue to wear the *sambenito*.

Following this, and to prevent him from returning to places where he carried out his alleged criminal activities and could therefore more easily relate to other co-religionists, a further sentence was added: this was the penalty of exile. First, perpetual exile from the Court in Madrid and its surroundings was invariably stipulated since in this locality it was easy to go unnoticed and continue committing crimes. Additionally, Juan Antonio was banished from other large towns in which he had at some time lived, these including Seville, Jaén and Puerto de Santa María. Here exclusion was not perpetual, rather for a period of six years. A distance of ten leagues was set down as the exclusion zone around each of these cities.<sup>56</sup> Then, as Juan Antonio had been caught and imprisoned in an important sea port and that there was a well-founded suspicion that he would try to escape from Spanish territory once he had served his sentence in the Penitentiary Prison,

---

*la mitad de sus bienes, hábito y cárcel por seis meses, y desterrado de Madrid, Sevilla, Jaén y Puerto de Santa María y diez leguas en contorno por seis años, y privado de llegar perpetuamente a los puertos de mar y secos, y doce leguas en contorno, y que no use del apellido de Mendoza sino del que le toca por sus padres, pena de doscientos azotes.*"

56 The area closed to him was marked by a radius of about fifty kilometres from the centre of each of these towns.

a further territorial prohibition was prescribed. In this regard he was forbidden for life from approaching within twelve leagues of border posts whether they be river ports, the so-called “dry ports”, or maritime.<sup>57</sup> Experience had shown that the Judaizers who had suffered the harshness of the Inquisition often tried to escape from Spain, along with their relatives. To this stage Juan Antonio’s sentence is not unusual.

However, Juan Antonio’s sentence then contains a distinct peculiarity: as the last mandate and from that moment on he was formally prohibited from using the surname Mendoza, for it was not even his maternal surname.<sup>58</sup> Rather he was forced to use the surname de Castro, this having far more Jewish connotations. If he relapsed on this matter he stood to be punished with two hundred lashes.

This sentence meant immediate re-imprisonment of our protagonist, this after almost three years in the secret prisons given the length of his trial. Now he would have to suffer six more months in the so-called Penitentiary Prison, among others who had been sentenced.

The *Relaciones* and some loose papers attached to them give us an account of other events that took place around this time. Especially rele-

vant is a letter sent by the Inquisitors of Seville to the Council in November of 1698. Judging by the contents of this letter, Juan Antonio’s financial situation had changed dramatically after he was forced to support himself out of his own assets given the long time it had taken for his case to be resolved.

Thanks to these documents, another circumstance that we know of is the limited means available to the Seville Court to spend on the many inmates who were housed in its overcrowded prisons. The overload at the Castillo de San Jorge and the dwellings of some of the members of the Seville Inquisition encouraged the latter to ask the Supreme Court to order the holding of an *Auto de Fe* for approximately thirty inmates who, once sentenced and taken to the ceremony, would be able to leave the secret prisons. This was because they were prisoners whose cases were already in the final stages of processing, so they were firm candidates to be taken to such an *Auto* just as soon as they were sentenced. They argued that this plan would free up the space needed for new prisoners who kept on arriving. They also argued that it would mean saving the cost of maintenance for the many inmates who were poor. Juan Antonio de Castro is specifically mentioned, with the Inquisitors saying that he hardly had enough money left to support himself.<sup>59</sup>

---

57 Here each exclusion zone is almost 58 kilometres in radius.

58 According to what he declared in the first hearing before the Seville Holy Office, Torres was the surname of Juan Antonio’s mother. In other documents, seemingly related to this man, his mother’s surname is shown as Morales. It is possible that the surname Mendoza might have been that of another of his paternal or maternal ancestors but, if so, it is considered most unlikely that the Suprema would have forbidden Juan Antonio from using Mendoza as his surname.

59 AHN, Inquisición, leg. 3018. *Relación...entre el 23 junio y el 25 de agosto de 1698*. Nothing new is inserted there concerning Juan Antonio de Castro. However, attached is a letter sent by the court of Seville to the Council dated November 10, 1698: “*Halándonos con cinco causas votados con consulta de V.A. que son las de D. Antonio de Castro y Mendoza; el hermano Alonso de Jesús; Alonso Martín Canales; Manuel Mandinga; Luis Valero, que los cuatro los sustenta el fisco por pobres; y a Don Antonio de Castro le queda muy poco de que alimentarse nos ha parecido se podrá disponer auto dándonos V.A. licencia para ello y que de las causas que hoy remitimos votadas se podían agregar a dicho auto las seis causas de las Santanderes hermanas por no tener dependencia con la complicidad y estarlas sustentando el fisco a las cinco que están vivas y tener necesidad de cárceles así para las que votaremos y remitiremos a V.A. el correo que viene, como para ser treinta reos fuera del castillo y casas de ministros; y aunque Manuel de Santander hermano de las dichas no se le ha podido dar la publicación que se está acabando, está confitente y testifica a sus hermanas y contra otros cómplices está diminuto; y la causa de Gerónimo Gutiérrez Díaz nos parece se podía agregar a dicho auto porque su madre y hermanos a quien testifica hicieron fuga del Puerto de Santa María para fuera de los*”

There is a note in the margin of this letter. It states that, in view of the reasons given, the Council in Madrid agreed to the request made by the Seville Court.<sup>60</sup> Thus, the Seville Inquisitors gained permission to celebrate an Auto de Fe that would allow the partial clearance of the Castillo de San Jorge.

And so it was done, with the *Relaciones* recording that the planned Auto de Fe took place just three days before Christmas 1698 in the nearby church of Santa Ana.<sup>61</sup> It is this document that gives us the last precise information about Juan Antonio de Castro. Other defendants are also mentioned, although fewer than the Seville Inquisitors had initially envisaged. And it is during this ceremony that Juan Antonio recanted his heresy in accordance with the sentence he had been given.<sup>62</sup>

Again it is documents attached to the *Relaciones* that give us a good idea of the precautions that needed to be taken by the Seville Inquisitors because of the conditions at their Penitentiary

Prison. In the usual course of events Juan Antonio would have been sent to this prison immediately after the Auto de Fe, this being a requirement of the rules set down by the Holy Office. When the Seville Inquisitors were preparing to lock him up there for six months as ordered by his sentence, Juan Antonio argued that this would put his life at risk. He claimed that this was because others at the prison (he did not specify whether he was referring to inmates or jailers) might want to take revenge against him for some confrontations and fights in which he had been involved some years before. It was not for nothing that he was a man skilled in the handling of weapons for, among other jobs he had held was the position of *Guarda de Millones*, that is to say a tax collector. For obvious reasons this was not a job that endeared him to his fellow citizens.

Juan Antonio went so far as to speak of some violent events and recounted that on one occasion he had been wounded with a gun, and that on another he had cut the face of one of his attackers.

---

*Reinos según la sumaria que tenemos; y antes de testificarlos el susodicho ejecutaron la fuga; y también nos parece podían salir en dicho auto Antonio Rodríguez y Feliciano Rodríguez su hermana vecinos de La Campana porque los dos hermanos a quienes testifican residentes de estos reinos que están votados a cárceles secretas con consulta de V.A. la hermana está presa en la Inquisición de Valladolid y el hermano no ha podido ser asido por no saberse donde está, y tampoco tienen bienes para alimentarse; y los procesos de Diego López Duro y María de Herrera su mujer nos parece se detengan hasta ver si resulta alguna cosa de los Procesos de Antonio Gómez y María de Castro su mujer y Josefa de Santillana presos en la Inquisición de Córdoba quien nos tiene avisado estar dadas las publicaciones y estar negativas hacia algunos cómplices; VA mandará lo que debiéramos ejecutar. Guarde Dios a V.A. Inquisición de Sevilla Noviembre 10 de 1698. / Dr. Don Cristóbal de Henestrosa y D. Matías de los Reyes Valenzuela.”*  
60 *Ibidem*, According to a note in the margin, the letter from the Sevillian court was received at the Supreme on November 18. On November 20, another note was written in Madrid in the margin of the missive to follow up on what was requested from Seville: “Sus excelencias Señores Miguélez, Segura, Soto. Escribanles que reconociendo que no resulta inconveniente pueden ejecutar lo que les pareciese”. Another note in the margin states that the order has been complied with: “Escribiose”. There is also a loose letter dated November 20 addressed by the Supreme Court to the Sevillian Inquisitors where they are granted permission to celebrate the Auto Particular de Fe as requested by the Inquisition. From Seville they answer that an Auto Particular de Fe will be celebrated in the church of Santa Ana on September 21: “Se hará en Santa Ana de Triana el día de Santo Tomás, 21 del el presente mes de diciembre y que salen al Auto 13 reos habiendo dado cumplimiento a las órdenes asegurando las prisiones de las personas mandadas prender por VA en las testificaciones generales de Ángela de Santander, una de las reos que sale al referido Auto”. Firman los Inquisidores Henestrosa, De los Reyes, Colodrero y Llanes.

61 *Ibidem*, *Relación...* “entre el 21 de octubre de 1698 y el 19 de enero de 1699. “En domingo 21 de diciembre de dicho año se executó así en auto particular de fe que se celebró en la iglesia parroquial de Santa Ana de Triana.”

62 *Ibidem*, Document in which the Sevillian court gives an account of certain details of the celebration of the Auto de Fe on December 21 in the Church of Santa Ana. The convictions of the prisoners who came out to the ceremony were specified and Juan Antonio de Castro was listed as an offender who had abjured de vehementi. Along with him came out, among others, the “Santanderes sisters”, belonging to another family of judaizers, and some bigamists.

He said that all these things had happened when he was in charge of the collection of tax while serving the Count of Montellano, José de Solís y Valderrábano.<sup>63</sup> The *Millones* was a tax much reviled by many citizens as it was levied on various common consumer goods that were considered essential.<sup>64</sup> Such unpopular jobs as collecting this tax were often undertaken by Judeo-converts. The fact that our Master-of-arms had made inadequate use of his skills on occasion, that he had been found guilty of being a Judaiser and that his job as a tax collector obviously made him an odious character to many. Somehow he managed to sow doubt among the Seville Inquisitors concerning his survival should he be put in their Penitentiary Prison. Moreover, displaying both intelligence and cunning, Juan Antonio himself must have suggested the solution of his being transferred to another prison, this relatively close to Seville but located in a town where he was not so well known. In this regard we venture to suggest that he mentioned the prison where prisoners punished in the Inquisitorial Court of Llerena were taken.

Given the situation just outlined the Seville Inquisitors again wrote to the Supreme Court, this in a letter dated just two days before Christmas. They listed all the above information and asked how they should act - without forgetting to suggest that Juan Antonio could serve out his six months sentence in the prison of the Court

of Llerena in Extremadura. This was a serious mistake for, as already mentioned, Juan Antonio seemingly had friends and acquaintances in this region. Proof of this is obvious for, at his request, testimonies of exoneration had been sought from the Court in Llerena during his trial.

Once again Juan Antonio spent Christmas in the prison of San Jorge, a waiting period while the Holy Office interrupted its administrative and bureaucratic activity until after Epiphany.

In cases like that of Juan Antonio the Holy Office had to trust the opinion of the district Inquisitors as they were invariably more familiar with their prisoners and the conditions in which they were to be held. Finding no obstacle to the proposed transfer to the prison in Llerena the reply informed the Seville Inquisition to that effect, this by letter dated 7th January 1699.<sup>65</sup>

The next piece of information about the fate and subsequent adventures of Juan Antonio de Castro can be found in certain Inquisitorial documents dating from 1701. The tribunals of the Holy Office were in permanent contact with the Suprema as they had to give regular updates regarding the state of their trials and the prisoners who were serving their prison sentence. As well, the personal details of those who should have been imprisoned but had managed to escape and were at an unknown address were also required to be

---

63 This man was an eminent figure during the reigns of Charles II and Philip V. He held the posts of Assistant of Seville, President of the Casa de Contratación, President of the Council of the Indies and Viceroy of Sardinia

64 This was an indirect tax approved by the Court of Castille on 4 April 1590. It was levied on the consumption of wine, vinegar, oil, meat, soap and tallow candles.

65 AHN, *Inquisición*, leg. 3018. Letter from the Sevillian court to the Supreme dated on December 23, 1698. "Habiéndose celebrado el auto de fe de que damos cuenta a V.A. en carta de la fecha de esta, habiendo salido en él Antonio de Castro alias Mendoza con San Benito de media aspa al entregarle al Alcayde de la cárcel de la Penitencia nos representó el riesgo con que se hallaba en esta ciudad por haber sido Guarda de Millones en ella en tiempo del Conde de Montellano en el cual le tiraron unos carabinazos, y por otras travesuras, y haber cortado a uno la cara dice hallarse en conocido riesgo de la vida, y nos pidió le pusiésemos donde el Tribunal gustase para que cumpla los seis meses de cárcel de penitencia al que fue condenado, y respecto de estar tan cerca la Inquisición de Llerena nos parecía se condujese a aquella Inquisición para evitar el riesgo, que ha significado. Vuestra Alteza nos mandará lo que debemos ejecutar. Guarde Dios a Vuestra Alteza. Inquisición de Sevilla Diciembre 23 de 1698. (signed by) Cristóbal de Henestrosa, Dr. D. Matías de los Reyes Valenzuela, Dr. D. Antonio Llanes Campomanes." "En el Consejo a 7 de Enero de 1699. Remítanle a la cárcel de la Penitencia de Llerena como les parece."

notified.

The latter reason caused the Seville Inquisitors to send a report to the Suprema. Surprisingly, this was six weeks after approval to relocate Juan Antonio had been given. Attached was a list of the names and other details of people whose arrest had been ordered so that they could be restrained and sent to the so-called *Cárceles Medias*. These prisons were for crypto-Jews who had been sentenced by the Holy Office but who had not been captured or who had simply fled after being sentenced. As recorded in the next paragraph, Juan Antonio's name appears on such list, along with a warrant for his arrest.<sup>66</sup> Clearly, at some point he had managed to escape but it is not stated if this was before or after his intended transfer to the prison in Llerena, as had been approved less than two months previously. The next step would have been for the Suprema to arrange for a search to be carried out in the geographical areas where fugitives might possibly to be found, in Juan Antonio's case areas covered by Inquisitions of both Castile and Portugal.

It is pertinent to note that the last name on the just mentioned attached list is that of Juan de Castro alias Mendoza, master-of-arms. We believe this to be Juan Antonio, master-of-arms, the man who used many aliases and was forbidden by the Inquisition to use Mendoza as his surname. Note also that this is the first and only time that our man was named in this way as Juan de Castro. Further, this is the only occasion on which the Inquisitors took the trouble to update

the age of our man of many aliases, indicating that after their long and thorough investigations they now believed him to have been born around 1660.<sup>67</sup>

To better understand what might have happened to him after he seemingly escaped we have to go back to the *Relaciones de Causas* and attached documentation, this to give us information about some members of his apparent extended family who, as Judaisers, also suffered the rigours of the Inquisition. What is known of this Mendoza clan and whose members variously shared many other surnames results from the hunt orchestrated by the Holy Office throughout the second half of the 17th century and the first third of the 18th

It would take too long to cover all the details contained in the discovered documents relating to the different members of this extended cohort, especially in an article which is dedicated to Juan Antonio de Castro, alias Antonio de Mendoza who, at least for some, is the patriarch of London's 18<sup>th</sup> century Jewish Mendoza family. For this reason the information provided hereafter refers only to those relatives through whom we can gain a possible glimpse of the fate of Juan Antonio after the Seville Inquisitors obtained permission from the Council to transfer him to the prison in Llerena where, it was intended, he serve out the six months sentence given to him for allegedly practising as a crypto-Jew and for supporting others of similar bent.

---

66 AHN, Inquisición, Lib. 524, fols. 151-152 rº: These documents include a letter from the Inquisition of Seville to Madrid and a list of persons, some of them imprisoned in the Secret Prisons and the others pending to be located and arrested: Letter from the Inquisition of Seville dated February 22, 1701 received in Madrid on March 2 of the same year: "Con esta remitimos a VS la Memoria adjunta de las personas que están mandadas prender en Cárceles Medias del Santo Oficio por delitos de judaísmo y otros indiciados de dichos delitos, en cabeza de todos los cuales se ha ordenado por los Señores del Cº se recorran los registros de las Inquisiciones de Castilla y Portugal. Suplicamos a VS se sirva dar providencia para que en ese Secreto se ejecute esta diligencia y se nos dé aviso de lo que resultare della con más ocasiones de su agrado, a que asistiremos con voluntad. / Gde. Dios a Vs M. A. / Inquisición de Sevilla a 22 de febrero de 1701." Signed by Henestrosa, De los Reyes y Gómez Colodrero.

67 Ibidem, fol. 152 rº.: Dentro de la "Memoria de las personas detenidas en Cárceles Medias de este Santo Oficio de la Inquisición de Sevilla y otras en cuya cavessa están mandados recorrer los registros", con el número 39 figura "Juan de Castro, alias Mendoza,

## THE POSSIBLE ESCAPE OF JUAN ANTONIO DE CASTRO / ANTONIO DE MENDOZA AND ITS MYSTERIOUS SEQUEL.

We do not know exactly at what time or under what circumstances this man, who was sentenced by the Holy Office, managed to flee the Iberian Peninsula – if he did. That said, the previously mentioned *Who Do You Think You Are?* programme records that an Antonio de Mendoza, master-of-arms, and his family were living in Amsterdam several years after his sentencing. The Holy Office did not always take note of the outcome of escapes. These were frequent and were carried out by organised networks of Jews established in maritime cities in both Spain and Portugal. These networks were closely linked to Jewish communities living in other European territories, especially in the Netherlands and England.

What we possibly know about the life of Juan Antonio after January 1699 comes from other Inquisitorial documents, this time Portuguese. Discussion regarding these documents is best left until the next section of this paper. Meantime it is worth examining available information about Juan Antonio's relatives who were tried before the Inquisition as part of the same group of Judaisers to which the master-of-arms belonged.

As was common practice among the crypto-Jews, during early hearings Juan Antonio did not mention all his brothers who also had had dealings with the Inquisition. Among them was

the aforementioned Blas de Castro, alias Blas de Castilla<sup>68</sup> who is subsequently mentioned in a document relating to another brother called Gaspar. This document refers to yet another brother, the aforementioned Juan de Castro who had taken part in the famous Auto de Fe held in Madrid in 1680. Judging by all this, these four brothers would all appear to have been sons of Pedro de Castro alias Castilla and Ana María de Torres. This Juan de Castro was also born in Jaén and declared that his family originated in Portugal. He said that he was 29 years old and unemployed when proceedings against him began and was living in Madrid at the time of his imprisonment. It is recorded in the Relación of the aforementioned Auto de Fe that the said Juan de Castro y Torres was paraded as a confessing Judaizer, wearing the *sambenito* as an act of penance. After renouncing his errors he was reconciled and condemned to confiscation of his goods, which he did not have, and to continue to wear his *sambenito*. Additionally he was sentenced to life imprisonment. His wife, Ana María de Orobio, alias Doña Ana Navarro, and her brother, Antonio de Orobio, alias Antonio de Hinojosa, alias Antonio Navarro, a tobacconist in Pastrana, were also paraded in this Auto. Ana María was sentenced to the same penalties as her husband. Her brother Antonio was punished with the confiscation of goods and a six months prison sentence. Like his brother-in-law and sister he was also required to wear the *sambenito* and was banished from the towns of Madrid and Seville, the latter being where he was born. Finally he was required to stay at least eight leagues away from the town of

---

68 AHN, Inquisición, Lib. 522, fols. 150-151. Aforementioned letter from the Inquisition of Seville to the Supreme Court, dated June 18, 1697, requesting that the Council order the rectification of records to carry out further inquiries about Blas de Castro. He was also a native of Jaén and had been denounced for Judaism. Shortly after, the Inquisitors of Seville complained in another office for not having had news about these investigations.

Pastrana for a year<sup>69</sup>.

As can be seen from this narrative, the then crime of practising Judaism was committed within families and extended families, with such cohorts being gradually exposed as investigations progressed. This is certainly clear from the records of the trial of Juan Antonio de Castro where some of his cohort were being tried by the Holy Office at the same time, for example his brother Blas de Castro, while others like Gaspar, and another brother, Juan and his wife and her brother, Antonio de Orobio, had been tried some years previously.<sup>70</sup> Obviously the Inquisition had been slowly hunting down a family network of crypto-Jews, so that when one member was captured they set out to identify other relatives who were likely to have been carrying out similar heretical activity. To this end and during interrogations, the genealogy session to which every accused was subjected involved meticulous questioning regarding antecedents, descendants, spouses and other relatives. Then, having centrally retained records of all past trials, the Inquisitors were able to cross check evidential statements, this to their

considerable advantage as time went on.

Fifteen years before Juan Antonio de Castro was imprisoned, his brother Juan de Castro y Torres, that brother's wife Ana María de Orobio and her brother Antonio de Orobio had been judged. They were sentenced by the Madrid Court as confessed Judaizers. Of special interest here is Juan de Castro y Torres, alias Don Juan de Castro. He was born in Jaén but of Portuguese descent, and was unemployed. It is recorded that he was 29 years old at the time of his arrest by the Inquisition and had been living in Madrid when he was taken to the Auto de Fe held there in the Plaza Mayor in 1680.

It has already been highlighted that the Inquisitorial documents invariably carried the same defendant's particulars forward, even after the passage of time. Consequently, it seems probable that Juan de Castro was over 29 years old at the time of the Madrid Auto de Fe, meaning that this brother would have been at least 45 years old when the younger brother, Juan Antonio, was tried in 1696.

---

69 Relación histórica del Auto General de Fe que se celebró en Madrid en el año de 1680 con Asistencia del Rey D. Carlos II. AYUNTAMIENTO DE MADRID, Madrid, 1820. pp. 48-49 (nº 61, 62 y 63 related, respectively, to Juan de Castro y Torres, Ana María de Orobio y Antonio de Orobio).

70 AHN, Inquisición, Lib. 522, fol. 177. Letter from the Inquisition of Seville to the Supreme dated August 27, 1697, requesting the original process of Juan de Castro, the other brother who had already been processed and reconciled by the Holy Office: "Para seguir las diligencias que en la sumaria que en este Santo Oficio está recibida contra Don Blas de Castro y Castilla y contra Don Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza y contra DON (JUAN) ANTONIO DE CASTRO Y MENDOZA, HERMANO DE JUAN DE CASTRO, reconciliado que fue en este despacho por delitos de judaísmo, necesitamos del proceso original de la reconciliación del dicho Juan de Castro y saber si se sacó de la testificación general que el susodicho hizo contra cómplices y si se votaron dichos cómplices para ella o a continuación de dicho proceso, para que si la testificación general y votos están separados, se sirva V. M. mandar se nos remitan con dicho proceso, que uno y otro volveremos con la brevedad posible y a todo cuanto sea del agrado de V. M. acudiremos con buena voluntad, guarde D. a V.M. / Inquisición de Sevilla, 27 de agosto de 1697". The letter was received at the Consejo de la Suprema on September 2 of that same year and on September 3 the documentation requested by the Inquisition of Seville was sent.

The crypto-Jewish cohort discussed to this point are the four de Castro brothers Blas, Gaspar, Juan Antonio, and Juan. There is then a connection through Juan's wife Ana María to her brother Antonio de Orobio and yet another through Blas to his nephew, Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza. Regarding the latter, we have already postulated that he was probably a son of a sister in the de Castro sibling set. For convenience and in support of these connections we here list the previous footnotes 39,40,41,42, 70 and 71, as well as this one and the next.

For this reason, it is restated that the age of 36 attributed to Juan Antonio at the time of his arrest could have been an error which was then carried forward in the Inquisition's *Relaciones de Causas*. If so, this could account for the noticeable difference in age between these two brothers and, in the case of Juan Antonio, support the possibly more plausible age of 43 years at the time of his arrest in El Puerto de Santa María. The same logic applies when Juan Antonio's likely age is compared with that of his brother Blas who, according to the Inquisitorial records was age 55 at the time of his arrest.

In summary, we are dealing with a group of crypto-Jews made up of individuals linked by kinship ties. Despite the onslaught of the Inquisition in both Portugal and Spain, their clandestine activities, at that time having heretical overtones, would have extended over decades. Juan Antonio de Castro may well have played an important role within this family network, he being the person who helped others to escape.

It has already been mentioned that his brother Juan, together with Juan's wife and her brother, had preceded him by well over a decade in being brought to account before the Holy Office in Madrid. Then there is the information about other members of the cohort who were imprisoned by the Seville inquisitors, this shortly after the master-of-arms. Here, from November 1697 onwards, we have Juan Antonio de Castro toge-

ther with his brother Blas and at least the latter's nephew, Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza, in the same lists of cases drawn up by the Seville court. Unlike the other two prisoners, both only accused of Judaism, Juan Antonio was at least initially accused of the crime of *fautoría*. This charge could well have included helping others to escape even though he also ended up being tried for practising Judaism, as new adverse testimonies were gradually added in the course of his trial.

Additionally, in the aforementioned letter sent by the Seville inquisitors to the Council on 29 August 1697, the master-of-arms is mentioned in connection with his brother Blas and Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza, recorded as being Blas's nephew. Here the Díaz y Mendoza surname indicates that this relationship resulted from a blood connection - Blas or Blas's sister appears to have married into the Díaz y Mendoza family. Bearing in mind that Blas de Castro was undoubtedly Juan Antonio's brother, although no mention of this relationship is made in the aforementioned letter, it is apparent that the three relatives, Juan Antonio, Blas and Juan Francisco, were in the Inquisition prison in Seville at the same time. It may well be that Blas and Juan Francisco were arrested as a result of information that reached the Inquisitors in the course of the trial of Juan Antonio.<sup>71</sup>

In that letter of August 1697, which reports on the proceedings had been initiated against Juan Francisco and his uncle Blas, Juan Antonio de Cas-

---

71 AHN, Inquisición. leg. 3018. Carta remitida por los inquisidores de Sevilla a la Suprema fechada el 29 de agosto de 1697: "Con esta remitimos a VA en 25 hojas útiles el proceso causado en esta Inquisición contra Don Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza y don Blas de Castilla alias Castro su tío vecinos de esta ciudad y Don Antonio de Castro y Mendoza preso en cárceles secretas de este Santo Oficio por Fautor de herejes Apóstatas judaizantes votado en la forma que V.A. lo mandará ver para que en su vista mande V.A. lo que fuere servido. Dios guarde etc. Agosto 29 de 1697. / Francisco Portero de la Vega, Don Cristóbal de Henestrosa y D. Matías de los Reyes Valenzuela".

As just footnoted, a sibling relationship between Blas and the mother of Juan Francisco appears as the most likely explanation for the uncle/nephew relationship identified here.

tro is also mentioned. However, here his name is shown as Antonio de Castro y Mendoza, only adding to the confusion that frequently arises in the many inquisitorial papers relating to our cohort of interest. However, undoubtedly this is Juan Antonio given the reference to his alleged crime of *fautoría* and the fact that it is also recorded that a sentence had not yet be passed, this given that there were also indications of Judaism as already explained. In addition, the letter shows yet again that the use of aliases within the de Castro family, here Blas using de Castilla as his surname. As already explained, the Spanish surname Castilla lacks the same Jewish connotations as the Galician-Portuguese surname de Castro.

Regarding Blas's nephew Juan Francisco Díaz y Mendoza, the second surname Mendoza appears in this letter but not in the *Relaciones*. It is not possible to determine with any degree of certainty whether the uncle/nephew relationship extended to all the de Castro brothers or whether it was limited to Blas, a result of his marrying into the Diaz y Mendoza family – though the former seems more likely. When the August letter was written, that is at the end of August 1697, Blas and Juan Francisco had not yet been imprisoned. A few months later we find Juan Francisco in the same prison as his possible uncle Juan Antonio<sup>72</sup>.

Blas is mentioned in a later account, this giving his personal details. It states that Blas said that he was aged 55 and born in Jaén, and that he now lived in Seville but was unemployed. At this time his property had already been confiscated and he was being held in the secret prisons.

However, unlike his relatives who were locked up in the cellars of the Castle of San Jorge, Blas was being held in the so-called *Cárcel de Familiares* which were on the upper floors of this building. Perhaps Blas was deemed to have greater dignity or perhaps there was simply not enough space in the ordinary cells. It is recorded in the documents that Blas had assets and that, like Juan Antonio, after his arrest he was allocated three reales a day for his keep<sup>73</sup>.

As was the case with Juan Antonio, Blas did not confess to his alleged misdeeds.

## CLUES PROVIDED BY MIGUEL DE MENDONÇA VALLADOLID

While the information on the relatives of Juan Antonio de Castro that we have just reviewed is interesting, more decisive in terms of the fate of the master-at-arms is the information on Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid. He was the son of Juan de Castro and therefore the nephew of Juan Antonio de Castro, but once again he presented himself in society with the surname Mendoza (*Mendonça* in the Portuguese version), related to his parentage but which did not correspond to that of his father or his mother. The records of his lengthy trial are preserved in their entirety<sup>74</sup>. For our purposes, it is worth noting that Miguel de Mendoza's father, known to the Spanish Holy Office as Juan de Castro, appears in Portuguese inquisitorial documents as Joao de Mendonça, hence the surname used by his son<sup>75</sup>. It is clear that the surname Mendoza was frequently used among members of the Castro family to cover up their convert origin.

---

72 *Ibidem*, *Relación ...entre el 19 de noviembre de 1697 y 13 de enero de 1698*.

73 AHN, Inquisición, leg. 3018, *Relación...entre el 23 de junio y el 25 de agosto de 1698*.

74 Reference has already been made to the documents relating to the lengthy trial of Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid in the Arquivo Nacional Torre do Tombo, Tribunal do Santo Ofício, Inquisição de Lisboa, proc. 9973. (PT/TT/TSO-IL/028/09973).

75 *Ibidem*, m0017.

He was married and apparently about 34 years old when a warrant was issued for his arrest on 10 April 1728<sup>76</sup>. He was living with his wife and daughters in Brazil at the time of his fall from grace before the court of the Holy Office in Lisbon. He was born in Valladolid, where we know that other members of the same family group had been living for some time. Like many other Jews of Portuguese descent, he was engaged in trade with the American colonies, which is why he ended up settling with his family in a town called Nossa Senhora de Penha de França, belonging to the bishopric of Rio de Janeiro.

Miguel de Mendonça was arrested by the Portuguese Inquisition on 26 November 1729 in Brazil, many years after the events concerning his uncle Juan Antonio de Castro (alias Mendoza). After being taken to Lisbon by the Portuguese Holy Office, he was finally tried and sentenced to the penalties of confiscation of property, major excommunication and relaxation. This last punishment involved handing the penitentiary over to the secular justice system to be executed at the stake. He left to fulfil his fatal destiny at the Auto de Fe held in Lisbon on 17 June 1731.

The life and inquisitorial process of this convert have been the subject of some specific studies<sup>77</sup>, and his adventures are worthy of being narrated in a novelistic tone.

Our interest in Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid focuses on his relationship with the master-at-arms, his uncle. Thanks to Portuguese inquisitorial documents we know what may have become of Juan Antonio de Castro after his trial before the Sevillian Inquisition.

Once imprisoned, Miguel de Mendonça was taken to Lisbon and there he appeared in successive hearings before the inquisitors. His long stay in prison led him to confess to certain Judaizing practices along with several members of the Castro-Mendoza family, although he never repented of them, which led to his sad end.

According to the documents of his trial, he was given his first hearing before the Holy Office on 8 March 1730. In it, as was customary, he related who his parents, brothers, uncles, uncles, cousins, etc. were, and he identified them all as practitioners of the Law of Moses<sup>78</sup>.

At one point in the hearing he alluded to a brother of his father called Antonio de Mendoza (Mendonça in Portuguese), a master-at-arms by trade, married and living in the city of Cádiz. In that first hearing he declared that he did not know the name of Antonio's wife nor where she was from, but he did refer to a son of his uncle also called, to add to the confusion, Miguel de Mendoza, single and with no known trade, who also lived in Cadiz. He declared that he had no uncles

---

<sup>76</sup> *Ibidem*, m0013.

<sup>77</sup> RODRIGUES, C. has dealt with Miguel de Mendonça in several works, including:

-*Fonte para o Estudo da Historia colonial: leitura paleografica de um processo da Inquisição portuguesa referente ao Brasil. Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid*, Lisbon, 1999.

-Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid: um mercader cristiao-novo. In: Lina Gorenstein and Maria Luiza Tucci Carneiro (Orgs.), *Ensaio sobre a Intolerancia. Inquisição, marranismo e antisemitismo. Homenagem a Anita Novinsky*, Associação Editorial Humanitas, 2nd ed., 2005, pp. 217-224.

<sup>78</sup> Arquivo Nacional Torre do Tombo, Tribunal do Santo Oficio, Inquisição de Lisboa, PT/TT/TSO-IL/028/09973- m0276. It should be noted that Miguel de Mendoza's father, known to the Spanish Holy Office as Juan de Castro, appears in Portuguese inquisitorial documents as Joao de Mendonça, hence the surname used by his son.

on his mother's side, which later turned out not to be true, as we shall see<sup>79</sup>.

As usually happens in this type of process, the statements made in that first hearing are contradicted by others that he made in later hearings. All this information provided by Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid must be taken into account when assessing other information that has been adduced to locate the whereabouts of Juan Antonio de Castro between 1729 and 1731.

Almost three years had passed since Miguel de Mendonça's imprisonment when, precisely the day before he left for the fateful Auto de Fe, he was given a final hearing before the inquisitors. At this hearing, which probably took place in the hope that his death sentence could be reversed at the last moment, and which was held on 16 June 1731, the condemned man gave many more detailed and meticulous details about his family and his wanderings as a Judaiser in various countries. However, it can be said that at no time did he regret his beliefs. What is more, he claimed to have continued to practise them throughout his imprisonment, even observing the prescribed fasts.

In this confession, allusions reappear to his father's brother, whom he calls "Don Antonio de Mendonça", with whom he said he had been living in Holland. Nothing of what he had declared about his paternal uncle in 1729 was still standing

at that point. First of all, Juan Antonio de Castro (Antonio de Mendoza according to his nephew) no longer presented himself as an inhabitant of the city of Cádiz, as it appeared from the first declaration, but as a resident in Amsterdam together with some members of his family for about twenty years. After being imprisoned for more than two years, he seems to have remembered the name of his uncle's wife, Ana María, together with the names of some of his sons: Miguel, whom he had already referred to at the first hearing, Pedro and Daniel. He said that they were all born in Jaén. The first two remained single and the third was married. He also mentioned a cousin of his called María. The defendant confessed to having lived with them, practising Judaism for a period of four years<sup>80</sup>.

In his wanderings as a merchant, he also confessed to having been living with other Jewish relatives in different European locations. One of them was Juan Francisco Orobio, brother of his mother Ana María de Orobio, alias Ana Navarro, alias Ana María de Castro. The latter is the maternal name declared by Miguel de Mendonça at the first hearing. Another brother of the mother called Antonio de Orobio has been referred to above for having appeared at the Auto de Fe of Madrid in 1680 together with his sister, Miguel's mother, and his brother-in-law, Juan de Castro, brother of Juan Antonio de Castro. It is clear from Miguel de Mendonça's last statement that Juan Francisco

---

79 *Ibidem*, m0277: "E que elle se sabe que por parte de seu Pay teusse hum tio chamado Dom Antonio de Mendonça X N mestre de armas casado nam sabe con quem natural nam sabe donde e morador na Cidade de Cadis e tene hum fillo chamado Miguel de Mendonça sem officio solteiro nam sabe donde natural e morador na cidade de Cadis. E que por parte de sua May na sabe que teusse tio algum".

80 *Ibidem*, m0647-0649: "Perguntado pera que pedio audiencia, disse que pera confessar as suas culpas en estes termos: Disse que a crença da Ley de Moyses lle durara athe agora, e inda hontem vevia nella maliciosamente. Disse mais que avera de dezaseis pera desasete anos na Cidade de Abstardao, Estado de Olanda, e achou com seu tio inteyro Dom Antonio de Mendonça e sua mulher Ana Maria, e seus fillhos Miguel, e Pedro e Daniel, aquelles solterros e ese cazado nao sabe com quem, e outra filha dos mesmos, Maria todos professores do Judaismo naturais da Cidade Gaen, reino Castella, todos moradores na dita Cibdade de Abstardao, e todos com elle confitente viverao profesoires da Ley de Moyzes por tempo de quatro anhos".

de Orobio had settled with his family in a small town in Portugal near the village of Covilha<sup>81</sup>.

The day before he was executed, Miguel also confessed that he had been living in the French town of Bayonne with a cousin, the daughter of another of his mother's brothers called Antonio Navarro<sup>82</sup>. This was one of the aliases used by Antonio de Orobio, who went to the Auto de Fe in Madrid in 1680 along with his sister and brother-in-law. After his unpleasant experience before the Holy Office, he had settled in France. The declarant had also lived with him for a certain period of time<sup>83</sup>. In short, Miguel was untruthful at the first hearing when he stated that he had no uncles on his mother's side.

In all his statements he emphasised that he had practised Judaism with these relatives while living with them, thus seriously compromising those who still lived on the Iberian Peninsula.

All these last-minute confessions were of little use to him. Moreover, he put his relatives and co-religionists on the spot. He went to the

Auto de Fe held in Lisbon on 17 June 1731 and was released to secular justice to perish at the stake on the same day<sup>84</sup>. However, his desperate attempt to soften the inquisitors at the last moment serves to draw a clearer picture of the dark web of dissidents formed by all the members of his kinsmen, at that point already identified by the authorities as an anti-system cell with seditious overtones where some covered up and helped others to continue practising their forbidden religion or, if necessary, to leave the territories subjected to the implacable inquisitorial control.

In short, it is clear from the declarations of Miguel de Mendonça, made the day before he was executed in the Auto de Fe of Lisbon on 17 June 1731, that Juan Antonio de Castro, despite the prohibition to approach any sea port or land customs that had weighed on him since he was sentenced by the Holy Office in 1699, had managed to flee, finally settling in Amsterdam, where he had lived with his family for at least twenty years, judging by the confession of his nephew Miguel<sup>85</sup>. In this case, the collaboration treaties between the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions

---

81 *Ibidem*, m0650-0651: "Disse mais que haverá quatorze pera quinze annos em hum logar legoa e meya distante de a villa de Covilham a que nao sabe o nome, e caza de seu tio Joao Francisco Orobio X.N. sem officio, casado nao sabe con quem, natural tambem de Castella, e morador no ditto lugar prezo no Santo Officio se achou com o mesmo e com hua filha de le que lhe parese se chama Anna Maria X.N. solteyra e natural de Fundao e moradora no dito lugar nao sabe que fosse preza o apresentada e estando todos tres a saber elle confitente e os ditos seu tio e prima Joao Francisco Orobio e Anna Maria entre praticas se declararao por crentes e observantes de ley de Moyses e por sua observancia disserao que guardavao o Sabado e faziao a paschoa de pao asmo e faziao os jejuns do Dia Grande e Esther e nao passarao mais".

82 *Ibidem*, m0649: "dize mais que haverá quinze annos na cidade de Bayhona e caza de una prima Rachel filha de seu tio Antonio Navarro, mercador, nao sabe nome da may nem de quem he viuva natural da Cidade de Gurda (Guarda), e moradora na ditto Cidade de Bayhona, e com ella viveo publico profesor da ley de Mozes por tempo de tres meses".

83 *Ibidem*, m0650-0651: "disse mais que haverá quatorze annos na Cidade de Guarda en caza de seu tio o ditto Antonio Navarro x.n. mercador casado nao sabe con quem, naturalde Castella nao sabe donde, e morador na ditto Cidade, e a presentado no Santo Officio se achou com elle, e com a mulher do mesmo entre praticas se declarao todos crentes e observantes da ley de Moyses, e por sua observancia disserao que faziao a Pascua de pao asmo, e guardavao o Sabado, e nao passarao mais".

84 *Digitarq.* PT-TT-TSO-CG-002-313. Auto de Fe de Lisboa which took place on 17 June 1731. Image 313. Miguel de Mendonça came out with the number 37 among the *Pessoas relaxadas em carne*. "Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid X.N. tratante natural da cidade de Valladolid, reyno de Castella, en morador do sitio Nossa Senhora de Penha de França, districto da cidade de S. Paulo, bispado do Rio de Janeyro, convicto, ficto, falso, simulado, confitente diminuto e impenitente". Given that the prisoner, in the opinion of the inquisitors, concealed information during his trial and that he did not repent of his practices as a Judaiser, he was sentenced to the Auto as a diminutive and impenitent prisoner.

85 AHN, Inquisition, Lib. 524. Condemned n° 36 and n° 39: Petition to all the Inquisitions of Spain and Portugal from the Inquisition of Seville for "huidos" (fugitives).

had been of no use in preventing such escapes<sup>86</sup>.

From this point the main problem arises when it comes to establishing with certainty the details of the trajectory of the man known to the inquisitors as Juan Antonio de Castro or Antonio de Mendoza y David de Mendoza, the Jewish name under which he supposedly moved among his co-religionists.

Thus, many of the individuals belonging to the family that became known as Castro-Mendoza and the network of related false converts that had proliferated in the territories of Spain and Portugal between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, acted as a truly rebellious and seditious cell. Their members coordinated skilfully in order to cover for each other and to be able to continue practising Judaism at all costs, some of them maintaining their beliefs to the point of coming to a tragic end rather than renounce their religion, as in the case of the aforementioned Miguel de Mendonça. Up to this point, the stories of these characters and the documents on which they are based offer little new.

The peculiarity of the trajectory of these Judaisers lies in the large number of individuals who made up the clan and the extraordinary capacity of some of them to evade Inquisitorial controls, managing to flee the Iberian Peninsula to settle in other European and American territories, so that their descendants can be traced to the present day and whether or not they belong to this lineage is a matter that arouses passions, as well as moving certain economic and social interests.

The advice given by the writer of these pages

to the producers of an episode of the aforementioned BBC television series aroused my interest in knowing to what extent certain historical-genealogical information presented in that programme by some experts and historians, all of them versed in the Diaspora of the Jews from the Iberian Peninsula, can be fully contrasted and credible, can be completely verifiable and credible, since there are many inconveniences and obstacles that arise in the way of those who try to reliably relate the identities of former Judeo-converts from Spain and Portugal with those of many members of the Jewish communities that emerged during the 17th and 18th centuries in the current territories of Holland and the United Kingdom.

The fact is that a man of Sephardic origin known among his Jewish co-religionists by the name of David would have travelled to Holland and England at the beginning of the 18th century, being presented by many experts as the same person who in his day escaped after suffering a bloody inquisitorial process under the name of Juan Antonio de Castro, master-at-arms. Thus, David de Mendoza, the famous patriarch of the prolific Mendoza lineage, would be none other than our convict by the Seville Inquisition in the opinion of several foreign historians and genealogists.

From this point onwards, the approach of this paper consists of adducing the grounds alleged by the defenders that the identity between the two subjects coincides, and then providing some reasons to question this assertion.

---

<sup>86</sup> Some authors have referred to this collaboration between the two inquisitions, although they tend to confine themselves to the period between the 15th and 17th centuries:

LÓPEZ-SALAZAR CODES, A.I. La relación entre las Inquisiciones de España y Portugal en los siglos XVI y XVII: objetivos, estrategias y tensiones. In: UNED, *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma*, Serie IV, Historia Moderna, t. 25, 2012, pp. 223-252.

SOYER, F. The extradition treaties of the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions (1500-1700). In: *Estudios de Historia de España*, X, Buenos Aires, 2008, pp. 201-238.

## **ANTONIO/DAVID DE MENDOZA AND JUAN ANTONIO DE CASTRO: ONE AND THE SAME PERSON? ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST.**

The great doubt about the coincidence between the two individuals, namely our master-at-arms and the patriarch David de Mendoza, arises from the fact that we have not been able to access any reliable document in our opinion that proves such a circumstance.

We have already explained above that the Sephardic Jews moved between two personal identities that corresponded to different names, one received within the Jewish community and the other a Christian one obtained at the baptismal font. Therein lies the real challenge facing those who seek to trace the crypto-Jews repressed by the Inquisition once they managed to escape its clutches to settle in territories where they could practise their creed freely. We are therefore missing the key document that somehow records that David de Mendoza was previously known as Juan Antonio de Castro, Juan de Mendoza, Antonio de Castro y Mendoza or Antonio de Mendoza. Therefore, we can only speculate on certain incontestable data which, from our point of view, do not lead us reliably to the aforementioned conclusion.

From the outset, it is important to express the great respect we have for the opinions expressed by recognised experts who have defended and continue to defend Juan Antonio de Castro and David de Mendoza as being one and the same person. These scholars are reputed specialists when it comes to following in the footsteps of the Judaisers who fled from Spain and Portugal. But sometimes it seems that certain specific data reflected in the inquisitorial documents have been ignored, which, in our view, enjoy a remarkable reliability due to the proverbial meticulousness of the officials who informed and wrote them.

Those who claim that Juan Antonio de Castro, our master-at-arms, and David de Mendoza were one and the same person adduce various records dated mostly in the years after 1699 and found in certain repertories belonging to synagogues and other Jewish institutions in England and Holland. Also mentioned are papers presumably relating to the baptism of the man who would later be known as Antonio/David de Mendoza, together with some marriage and circumcision certificates found in the archives of the Jewish communities that were established in the aforementioned countries.

Those who have researched the origins of David/Antonio de Mendoza searched the parish records of Jaén for a baptismal certificate dated 1660, as they followed the trail of the cause reports, which repeatedly attributed to him 36 years of age at the time of his arrest in 1696. We shall see to what extent it is incontestable that he was that age when he was imprisoned by the Holy Office.

These same experts assume that the father of the master-at-arms was named Pedro de Castro. Examining the baptismal certificates in the Diocesan Historical Archive of Jaén, we find a document that refers to a newborn child baptised in the parish church of San Lorenzo on 22 February 1660 and given the name Antonio. Juan Antonio de Castro's father, in fact, was called Pedro de Castro, as stated in his declaration before the Sevillian Inquisition. Later on, we will clarify certain doubts raised by the baptismal register in question.

After alluding to this document from Jaén, these researchers make an important leap in time to follow the trail of Juan Antonio de Castro/Antonio de Mendoza, master-at-arms, and from around the beginning of the 18th century they refer to him as "David de Mendoza".

The main obstacle, in our opinion, consists in the apparent inexistence of any reliable document which shows beyond doubt that both subjects, Juan Antonio de Castro and David de Mendoza, were the same person. The concession is made that, once he had fled from Inquisitorial control and reinserted himself into the Jewish community, the rebellious master-at-arms would have publicly assumed his Jewish name: David.

In this way, some genealogists and scholars try to justify that, despite the prohibition of approaching the coast or any border post that weighed on Juan Antonio de Castro after his inquisitorial condemnation, he would have managed to flee the Iberian Peninsula between 1700-1710, appearing since then as David de Mendoza. Documents in the *Gemente Amsterdam Stadsarchief*<sup>87</sup> relating to what is known as 'Sedaca' in Hebrew terminology and to some circumcisions performed on the men of the Mendoza family are provided for this purpose. The word 'sedaca' refers to an aid granted by the synagogues to Jews who were in distress and intended to settle in territories beyond the reach of their persecutors. It generally covered the travel, food and lodging expenses of families who travelled from the Iberian Peninsula to other countries, usually Holland or England. The books of the synagogue of the Portuguese in Amsterdam where circumcisions were recorded are useful because the notes usually give the names of the father and the circumcised. All these pa-

pers generally refer to Sephardim from Portugal.

Examining these records, some documents allude to converts of Portuguese origin who appear with the surname Mendoza. These have been used by some historians and genealogists to identify Juan Antonio de Castro with the patriarch David de Mendoza.

Reviewing them in chronological order, the first of these refers to the aid granted in 1698. The extensive list of beneficiaries includes the wife of a man named Juan de Mendoza and his 10 children who arrived from Portugal, who were awarded a substantial sum to return to London<sup>88</sup>. The grant included travel expenses as well as food and lodging for three days after the ship carrying the beneficiaries arrived at their destination. On this occasion they were bound for London<sup>89</sup>.

In the aforementioned Dutch archive there is a document of *sedaca* granted to a certain Jacob de Mendosa in 1708<sup>90</sup>. There is also a note dated 1710 where two men named David de Mendoza and Isaac de Mendoza were granted aid<sup>91</sup>.

Another document in the same Dutch archive, this time dated 1712, lists the circumcisions that took place that year and mentions a circumcised man named Salomón, who would be the grandson of David de Mendoza through his son Daniel<sup>92</sup>. It also mentions another circumcision document of

---

87 The most important documents correspond to the following references (both accessed 16/10/2020):

<https://archieff.amsterdam/inventarissen/details/#PIGA00111000002>

<https://archieff.amsterdam/inventarissen/details/#PIGA00111000023>

88 Archief.Amsterdam PIGA00111000023: "D.D. a Mer. De Juan de Mendossa with 10 fos. Vindos de Portugal p<sup>a</sup> Bolver a hir a Londres".

89 *Ibidem*, A01505000318. Year 5468 in Hebrew chronology and 1708 in Christian chronology: "Termo de Algumas pessoas nouamente admitidas ...na sedaca..." Among others is Jacob de Mendosa.

90 *Ibidem*, A01505000318. Year 5468 in Hebrew chronology and 1708 in Christian chronology: "Termo de Algumas pessoas nouamente admitidas ...na sedaca..." Among others is Jacob de Mendosa.

91 *Ibidem*, A01505000341. Fol. 520. The document is also in Portuguese and alludes to the aid obtained by some Jews who are granted in place of other allottees who "were dismissed or died". Year 5470 in Jewish chronology, 1710 in Christian chronology. Among them are two people with the surname Mendoza: David and Ishack "de Mendosa".

92 *Ibidem*, KLAC00532000012. Fol. 16. Year 5472 of the Hebrew chronology and 1712 of the Christian chronology: "196. Selomoh de Daniel de Mendosa". 7 Elul. 8 Sept. 5th day".

a certain Daniel de Mendoza, circumcised at the same time as Salomón de Mendoza, who could be Salomón's brother. It is also dated September 1712. But in this case only the surname Mendoza of the father who presents him for circumcision appears, without the name being inserted in the document, even though the others who appear together with him do express it<sup>93</sup>. In short, these are merely somewhat confusing notes that contribute little to the clarification of the Mendoza family network.

It is therefore speculated that the first record referred to above shows that the family of Juan Antonio de Castro had travelled to London before 1698, while the father and husband were imprisoned by the Inquisition in Seville, and then returned to Portugal for some reason. Later the wife and her children would ask for help to return to England. Antonio/David de Mendoza, according to this version would appear under the name of Juan de Mendoza in the aforementioned book of *sedaca*, would be married, although the wife's name is not mentioned, and would be the father of ten children.

From that date onwards, marriage certificates and circumcisions involving people with the surname of Mendoza multiplied in the records kept in the Jewish communities. It is possible to follow their trail up to the present day. It is another thing to assert that the patriarch David de Mendoza was the same as Juan Antonio de Castro, alias Antonio de Mendoza in the inquisitorial archives, or that the person who the records of *sedaca* call Juan de Mendoza is also our master-at-arms.

Two points in favour of this theory are to be found in what in our opinion is the only document that links Juan Antonio de Castro and a Sephardic Antonio present in Holland at the beginning of the 18th century. We refer to the valuable and often quoted records of the inquisitorial process against Miguel de Mendonça<sup>94</sup>. Thanks to them we know that the master of Arms, named Antonio and brother of Juan de Castro y Torres, father of the one known as Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid, was living in Amsterdam with his family for some years at the beginning of the 18th century. He also mentions the name of his aunt, Antonio's wife, referring to her as Ana María, although he does not express her surname<sup>95</sup>. In any case, the name does not coincide or bear any resemblance to the name declared in court by the former prisoner of the Sevillian Inquisition. However, if we take into account the information we know about the sentimental life of the master-at-arms, we cannot be surprised that the first wife, María de Rivera, had broken off her relationship with her adulterous husband, so that the latter, after his dalliances with Ángela de Montalván and perhaps with some other woman, would have rebuilt his life once he was firmly established in the Jewish community, marrying the aforementioned Ana María de La Peña according to Mosaic law. The canonical marriage celebrated in the first instance with María de Rivera, for whom he secretly Judaized, would have had little value<sup>96</sup>. But it is all conjecture.

Thus, those who identify David de Mendoza and Juan Antonio de Castro provide a series of documents in the Portuguese synagogue in

---

93 *Ibidem*, KLAC00555000036. "5472----27 Ylul-28 setº. 1712: hum fº a \_\_\_\_\_Mendoza, Daniel".

94 Arquivo Nacional Torre do Tombo, Tribunal do Santo Ofício, Inquisição de Lisboa, proc. 9973. (PT/TT/TSO-IL/028/09973).

95 According to those who claim that David and Antonio were the same person, the wife was called Ana or Ana María de La Peña y Castro, while he declared before the inquisitors that her name was María de Rivera.

96 There may be other explanations for this lack of coincidence in the names. An admissible one would be that both María de Rivera and Ana María de la Peña were two different women, successive wives of a presumed widower, Antonio/David de Mendoza, but, once again, there is no documentary evidence of this.

Amsterdam relating to the aforementioned aids (sedaca)<sup>97</sup> and the aforementioned records of circumcisions performed on men with the Mendoza surname. But these are very sparse notes that do not manage to clarify the relationship between those involved and the people who are of particular interest to us.

These are basically the data and documents used by those who claim personal identity between Juan Antonio de Castro, master-at-arms in Spain prosecuted by the Holy Office, and David de Mendoza, the patriarch of the extended Sephardic Mendoza family.

However, from our point of view, all these arguments and the documents on which they are based lack sufficient foundation to support the claim that the master-at-arms and the patriarch David de Mendoza were the same person.

We will address from a chronological perspective the indications that seem to point in a different direction.

The baptismal certificate of the person who is the subject of these pages would be in the city of Jaén, where he was born according to all the information available to us. There are no discrepancies as to his place of birth. That is not much to say considering the abundance of Judeo-converts

originating in that town since the expulsion was decreed at the end of the 15th century. They were joined by many others from Portugal who had migrated to that country during the 16th and 17th centuries, believing themselves safe from the Spanish Holy Office, but who returned to their place of origin on Spanish soil when the Portuguese Inquisition attacked them even more virulently than the Spanish.

If we follow the inquisitorial interrogations, it appears from them that Juan Antonio de Castro, alias Antonio de Mendoza, was the son of Pedro de Castro and Ana María de Torres, which would be congruent with the information that is certain about his brother Juan de Castro (alias de Castilla) and Torres<sup>98</sup>. However, the mother who appears on the baptismal certificate dated 22 February 1640, which some researchers and genealogists present as the master-at-arms' own, was named Ana de Morales. So we come back to the problem of the names and surnames of the converts<sup>99</sup>.

With regard to the aforementioned baptismal certificate provided by those who claim personal identity between Juan Antonio de Castro and David de Mendoza, kept in the Diocesan Historical Archive of Jaén, it should be remembered that the child who receives the sacrament in the aforementioned baptismal certificate was not baptised as Juan Antonio, but as Antonio, an extraordi-

---

97 This is an aid or sedaca granted to a certain Jacob de Mendoza, supposed son of David de Mendoza, dated 1708. But there is no formal evidence of his connection with the family in question. Archief.Amsterdam A01505000318.

98 AHN, *Inquisición*, lib.522, fol. 16. Letter from the Inquisitors of Seville to the Supreme Court on 23 April 1696.

99 This is a document found in number 4 of the books containing the baptisms celebrated in the Parish of San Lorenzo, entitled *Libro de los bautismos que se hacen en la Iglesia del Sr. Sto. Laurencio de Jaén desde primero de marzo de mil y seiscientos veinte y tres, siendo dignísimo Sr. Prior de ella el Doctor don Diego de Jódar Pacheco*. On fol. 164 the parish priest of San Lorenzo attests to having baptised a child son of Pedro de Castro and Ana de Morales. He was given the name of Antonio: "En esta Parroquia de S. Laurenzº de esta ciudad de Xaen a 22 días del mes de febrero de Seiscientos y sesenta años yo el Mtrº Xtobal Guttz. De Olivares, cura, bapcticé a un hijo de Pedro de Castro y Ana de Morales su mujer. Púsosele por nombre Antonio. Fue su compadre Pedro Cobo el qual fol. 164 vº: dixo que dicho baptizado nació a 21 días del dicho mes y año, de que doy fe y lo firmé". Translation: "In this Parish of S. Laurenzº of this city of Xaen on the 22nd day of the month of February in the year six hundred and sixty, I, Mtrº Xtobal Guttz. De Olivares, priest, baptised a son of Pedro de Castro and Ana de Morales his wife. He was named Antonio. It was his Godfather Pedro Cobo who, fol. 164 vº: said that the said baptized person was born on the 21st day of the said month and year, which I attest and sign it."

narily common first name at the time. And his mother's surname was Morales, not Torres, on the baptismal certificate. We have noted that conversos sometimes played with their surnames, transforming them into others different from their father's or mother's but seeking a certain similarity in terms of semantic content, for example by substituting Castro for Castilla, both words relating to a fortification, but avoiding the Galician-Portuguese term, impregnated with more Judeo-Converso connotations. However, this is not the case. Morales is far from the appellative Torres in terms of its intrinsic meaning. In addition, both the names Pedro and Ana or Ana María were very frequent during the period in question and are repeated incessantly in the documents of the time<sup>100</sup>.

Why did he falsify his mother's surname in his first statement to the inquisitorial tribunal, which in our opinion is more plausible than other documents in which the master-at-arms is related to David de Mendoza? From our point of view, Juan Antonio de Castro was intelligent enough not to try to mislead the inquisitors with a crucial piece of information about his genealogy that could be easily checked by the Holy Office at any time. All civil and religious authorities were obliged, under severe penalties if they failed to do so, to provide the Holy Office with all the information available to them to help the inquisitors whenever they were required to do so. The parish priests were no exception, and in the case of the converts, the baptismal certificates kept in the corresponding parishes were fundamental pieces of information

to carry out the investigations regarding the origin and relatives of the Judaisers.

Not even the mother's surname was Mendoza according to any of the documents examined<sup>101</sup>. We have already seen that the inquisitors, when issuing their sentence, obliged him to use the surname of his parents, which implicitly implies that he was not using the surname of either of them. He was henceforth authorised to choose either his father's or his mother's. But he never chose, according to the documents. But he never chose, according to the documents in the synagogues, either Castro, Morales or Torres. It is difficult to understand why, after escaping from the clutches of the Inquisition and fleeing with the help of the Jewish community, he clung to the surname Mendoza, a surname with which the Holy Office could locate him more easily after his escape and the use of which carried a heavy fine in the event of his re-imprisonment. However, he would not have had the slightest problem in changing his Christian given name to David, or in making himself known in the *sedaca* documents as Juan de Mendoza instead of David or Antonio. This may also raise doubts about the possibility that the patriarch and the master-at-arms were one and the same person.

It should not surprise us that Juan Antonio avoided using the surname Castro, as it was also very common among the New Christians, having a clear Galician-Portuguese origin and many Jews having settled in Portuguese territory since ancient times. It would have been less suspicious if

---

100 Examining all the baptismal records of the parishes kept in the Diocesan Archive of Jaén relating to the period under study, namely: San Andrés, San Lorenzo, San Miguel, San Ildefonso, Santiago and San Pedro, we can observe the repetition of some names such as Juan, Juan Antonio, Antonio, María, Ana, Ana María, Pedro, etc. As far as surnames are concerned, being relatively small communities, many of the parishioners were related to each other and shared many surnames. Torres and Morales are very frequent, especially the latter. There are also Mendozas. In the book of baptisms carried out in the parish of San Lorenzo there are several mothers of the baptised called Ana de Torres, to give an example. And in the parish of San Ildefonso there is a mother called Ana de Morales, but the rest of the information in these baptismal records does not correspond to what we know about Juan Antonio de Castro.

101 His second surname would be Morales, if we follow the baptismal certificate provided as proof by some genealogists of David Mendoza, or Torres, if we prefer the declarations made by the former prisoner of the Sevillian Inquisition.

he had chosen Torres, his mother's surname as he declared before the inquisitors, although if we follow the aforementioned baptismal certificate dated 1660, his mother's surname would have been Morales, not Torres. But whatever his mother's surname was, he apparently resisted using both.

Moving forward in time, we know some information about the life of the man the inquisitors called Juan Antonio de Castro from his own statements before the Sevillian court and from the information provided to the court by some of the people who testified in his trial. As mentioned above, he had worked in different trades, almost always related to his skill in the use of weapons. From teacher who taught how to handle them to guard at the gates of a prison to tax collector who on more than one occasion had to make use of such skills to neutralise the antipathy of those who refused to pay the so-called rent of *millions*.

As for his sentimental life, he himself had declared that he was living together out of wedlock with a woman called Ángela de Montalván at the time of his imprisonment in 1696. According to what the prisoner said in the hearings before the Holy Office, this was not just a passing affair, but apparently a consolidated relationship.

We are thus presented with the image of an adventurous man who was far from leading a sedentary home life that would justify his having generated an extensive offspring with his legitimate wife between the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. However, this is the case of the man who is presented to us as the patriarch David Mendoza.

The document in which the aforementioned

aid is granted for the wife of a certain Juan de Mendoza, according to some the master-at-arms, to go to London from Portugal with her ten children in 1710, seems to ignore all the above-mentioned vital circumstances. In 1710, according to the trial papers of the nephew Miguel de Mendonça, the master-at-arms was already settled in Amsterdam with his family. If we were to identify this Juan de Mendoza with a relative of Juan Antonio de Castro, we prefer to suppose that it was his elder brother, the one who was sentenced by the Court and who had to appear at the Auto de Fe held in Madrid in 1680. However, he is never mentioned with the surname Mendoza in the other documents, and some of those examined also contradict this, as we shall see below.

Regarding Juan de Castro, brother of the master-at-arms, a detailed study of the baptismal documents in the Diocesan Historical Archive of Jaén once again raises serious doubts about the baptismal certificate attributed to Juan Antonio de Castro. In the books of the parish of San Lorenzo, where the master-at-arms was presumably christened as the son of Pedro de Castro and Ana de Morales, it was to be expected that the baptismal certificates of some of those recognised by the Holy Office as his brothers, Blas, Gaspar or Juan, would appear within a range of about ten years around 1660. However, this is not the case. There is only one record of the baptism of another son of the couple Pedro de Castro and Ana de Morales, considered to be the parents of Juan Antonio de Castro. The neophyte was given the name Juan, which was quite common at the time. But the child was born in 1658, about two years before Antonio<sup>102</sup>. The Holy Office considered it proven that Juan de Castro y Torres, who was sentenced before the Court Inquisition

---

102 n°. 4 of the books containing the baptisms celebrated in the Parish of San Lorenzo, entitled *Libro de los bautismos que se hacen en la Iglesia del Sr. Sto. Laurencio de Jaén desde primero de marzo de mil y seiscientos veinte y tres* (cit.), fol. 158: "En la Parroquia de S. Lauren. Desta ciudad de Jaén a 28 días del mes de abril de mil y seiscientos y cinquenta y cinquenta y ocho años yo el mtrº Xtobal Guttez.... cura de dicha parroquia bapcticé a un hijo de Pedro de Castro y de Ana de Morales su mujer. His name was Juan, his compadre was Pedro Cobo, who said that the said baptised was born on the 20th day of the said month and I signed it..." Nor does Antonio or any of the aforementioned brothers appear in the list of confirmations at the end of the parish book.

in 1680, was the brother of the master-at-arms, which he never denied. It would be impossible for this Juan de Castro to be the same one whose baptism is recorded in the records of the parish of San Lorenzo, as this would imply that at the date of the famous Auto de Fe of 1680, to which he had to appear, Juan de Castro would have been 22 years old and not 29 or more as the inquisitorial documents state. Therefore, he must have been someone else.

On the other hand, there is no record in the *sedaca* repertoire that Juan de Mendoza's wife went to join her husband in England, although it cannot be ruled out that this was the case. But even admitting that they were different individuals, both the patriarch David de Mendoza and our master-at-arms seem to have chosen the city of Amsterdam as their final destination.

The only document that proves that our Antonio de Mendoza alias Juan Antonio de Castro lived in Amsterdam can be found in the procedural declaration of Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid, the unfortunate nephew of the former master-at-arms. In fact, Miguel de Mendonça reports having resided in Amsterdam with his uncle Antonio before the inquisitors of Lisbon, as we saw earlier. But he never refers to him as David de Mendoza or Juan de Mendoza.

The aforementioned nephew declared to have lived with his uncle in the said city in Holland when he was a teenager for a period of four years. At this point it should be clarified that some British scholars have translated the phrase

*avera de dezaseis pera desasete anos* in the document as meaning that the defendant Miguel de Mendonça would have spent a period of time of 16 or 17 years with his uncle Antonio, when the logical translation from Portuguese indicates that the defendant is reporting the age he would have been approximately when the events took place, sixteen to 17 years, not the time he spent with his relatives<sup>103</sup>.

The importance of this statement is crucial, as Miguel de Mendonça provides other information about his uncle Antonio, our protagonist, once he had fled and settled in Amsterdam.

If it is recorded that Miguel, Juan Antonio de Castro's nephew, was born in 1694 and was 16 years old when he met his uncle in Amsterdam, the cohabitation between the two would have taken place approximately between 1710 and 1714.

Note that this nephew does not place him in London in 1710, as would be logical judging by the document in which the travel aid granted for the wife and children of a certain Juan de Mendoza in 1710, later known as David de Mendoza according to some, is recorded. Would this Juan de Mendoza be the brother of the one known as Antonio/David de Mendoza? Let us remember that he had also been sentenced by the Holy Office and may have had 10 children. What seems rather unlikely is that this Juan de Mendoza was the master-at-arms.

In addition, 10 children are attributed to him in that same year of 1710. However, on 8

---

103 Arquivo Nacional Torre do Tombo, Tribunal do Santo Ofício, Inquisição de Lisboa, proc. 9973: PT/TT/TSO-IL/028/09973-m0647-0649: "Perguntado pera que pedio audiencia, disse que pera confessar as suas culpas en estes termos: Disse que a crença da Ley de Moyses lle durara athe agora, e inda hontem vevia nella maliciosamente. Disse mais que avera de dezaseis pera desasete anos na Cidade de Abstardao, Estado de Olanda, e achou com seu tio inteyro Dom Antonio de Mendonça e sua mulher Ana Maria, e seus fillhos Miguel, e Pedro e Daniel, aquelles solterros e ese cazado nao sabe com quem, e outra filha dos mesmos, Maria todos professores do Judaismo naturais da Cidade Gaen, reino Castella, todos moradores na dita Cibdade de Abstardao, e todos com elle confitente viverao profesoeres da Ley de Moyzes por tempo de quatro anhos".

March 1730, just before he was executed, Miguel declared that he had been living in Amsterdam with the master-at-arms, his wife Ana María and his four children: Miguel, Pedro, Daniel, the only one married, and María. And this cohabitation would have taken place precisely since 1710. It also says that they were all natives of Jaén<sup>104</sup>. This, then, does not coincide exactly with what we know about the family that sailed to London, where the offspring were much more numerous<sup>105</sup>.

In favour of those who identify the patriarch David with the master-at-arms is the coincidence between the names of several of his sons according to the statement of his nephew Michael. But once again, this coincidence should not be considered conclusive for several reasons. Firstly, because the names are too frequent in the Judaic community and, secondly, because the genealogists themselves may have taken Miguel de Mendonça's statement as a basis for giving a name to the patriarch's sons, on the assumption that the master-at-arms must be identified with David de Mendoza.

Among other children of David de Mendoza, experts and genealogists specialised in this family mention a daughter named Raquel. However, Miguel de Mendonça does not include her in his statement to the inquisitors, although at the time he lived in Amsterdam with his uncle Antonio this cousin was also in the house at the tender age of 9 or 10.

This daughter therefore poses some problems. She is often mentioned in genealogical studies, but it is difficult to admit that she could be the daughter of the master-at-arms. According to these reports, Rachel would have been born in 1699, only months after her presumed father was sentenced<sup>106</sup>. This, although not impossible, would be quite improbable in view of the sentence passed against Juan Antonio de Castro. One of the terms of the sentence condemned him to six months imprisonment. We have already mentioned that he made a sly and cunning request to serve them in the penitentiary prison of Llerena, claiming that his life was in serious danger in the Sevillian jail. We know that the Holy Office was looking for him after he escaped without having served his prison sentence in view of the search and arrest warrant for him dated 22 February 1701. This assumes that he fled at some point between the Auto de Fe that took place on 21 December 1698 and 22 February 1701. What is certain is that the search warrant does not give any information about the circumstances or the exact time when the prisoner fled. Only if he had escaped before being transferred to Extremadura with the permission of the Inquisition or if he had managed to escape when he was on his way to the prison in Llerena in the province of Badajoz, even if he had fled immediately after his imprisonment, would it be possible that Raquel was his daughter, admitting that she was born in 1699, as the genealogies state. On the other hand, it is true that the genealogical references

---

104 *Ibidem*.

105 Although Miguel de Mendonça's statement only mentions four of his cousins, it is true that their names coincide with most of what several genealogists consider to be the names of the sons of the patriarch David de Mendoza. But one of the sons who, according to Miguel de Mendonça, was also called Miguel, is not listed as such.

<https://www.geni.com/people/David-Mendoza/600000002674432566> (accessed on 30/06/2020)

On this page, Daniel, Moses, Samson, Peter, Jacob, Rachel and Mary are mentioned as children of David de Mendoza.

106 <https://www.geni.com/people/David-Mendoza/600000002674432566> (accessed 19/06/2020)

<https://gw.geneanet.org/lynnlewis16?lang=en&p=rachel+david+de&n=mendoza> (accessed 22/06/2020)

<https://gw.geneanet.org/lynnlewis16?lang=en&p=rachel+david+de&n=mendoza> (accessed 22/06/2020)

These are just three of the online references to Raquel (Rachel), daughter of David de Mendoza, where she appears or 1699 as her year of birth. Unfortunately, none of them include the exact date.

mentioned above place her birth in Extremadura, more specifically in Badajoz, which is consistent with the possibility that Juan Antonio de Castro joined his wife immediately after his escape, perhaps from the prison in the town of Llerena in Badajoz, where the Seville court intended to send him to serve his prison sentence. It should not be forgotten that those who identify the master-at-arms with the so-called Juan de Mendoza in the *sedaca* document, place his wife on the point of travelling to London in 1698. This would imply that the journey never took place or that she suddenly returned from the European capital to join her husband.

The name Raquel was also very frequent in Jewish families at that time as it is today. If we go back to Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid's statement, always somewhat enlightening on several aspects that are presented as particularly murky, we find that he mentions a cousin of his called Raquel with whom he would have been living in French Bayonne for some time<sup>107</sup>. However, this Raquel was not the daughter of his uncle Antonio de Mendoza, master-at-arms, but of a brother of his mother's whom he calls Antonio Navarro. According to the Holy Office, this name was one of the aliases of Antonio de Orobio, alias Antonio de Hinojosa. We have already mentioned on several occasions that he paraded in the *Auto de Fe* of 1680 together with his sister Ana María de Orobio, alias Ana Navarro, and his brother-in-law Juan de Castro y Torres. Perhaps after the deplorable experience before the Holy Office, Antonio de Orobio, alias Antonio Navarro, had decided to settle in France with his family, where the former tobacconist in Pastrana worked as a merchant. Is it possible then that this Raquel is the one that certain genealogists consider to be the daughter

of David/Antonio de Mendoza? This would explain why the Raquel so often mentioned as the daughter of the patriarch Mendoza does not appear in the list of children of the master-at-arms listed by the nephew Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid in his declaration before the inquisitorial court. This would be one more inaccuracy of those that seem to abound in the genealogies circulating online.

It is difficult to believe that the same Raquel who once hosted Miguel de Mendonça was the daughter of his uncle Antonio de Castro, master-at-arms, when on the dates indicated, that is, at the time the two lived together in Bayonne, the declarant would have been about fifteen years old and Raquel, if she was the one so often mentioned as having been born in 1699, would have been about ten years old.

One can only speculate that Miguel de Mendonça may have maliciously or mistakenly altered the name of the only daughter mentioned to be the daughter of his uncle the master-at-arms, referring to Raquel when he should have been referring to María<sup>108</sup>.

As if all the above was not enough, Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid alluded to another son of the master-at-arms also called Miguel. He does not appear as such in any genealogy, although it is possible that he appears under a Jewish name.

All these intertwined pieces of information further plunge us into a sea of doubts. Bearing in mind that we have no documentary evidence of the moment when the man who was known as Antonio de Mendoza, master-at-arms, decided to assume the Jewish name and publicly call himself David de Mendoza, we find ourselves lost in a se-

---

107 Torre do Tombo Archive, Lisbon (PT/TT/TSO-IL/028/09973- m0649). "Disse mais que haverá quinze annos na Cidade de Bayhona e Caza de huna prima Rachel filha de seu tio Antonio Navarro, mercador, nao sabe nome da May nem de quem he viuva natural da Cidade da Gurda (Guarda), e moradora na ditto Cidade de Bayhona, e com ella viveo publico professor da ley de Moyzes por tempo de tres mezes."

108 *Ibidem*, m0647-0649. "Dom Antonio de Mendonça e sua mulher Anna Maria, e seus fillos...e outra filla dos mesmos Maria".

ries of clues where the only thing we can be sure of is that the master-at-arms escaped the prison sentence imposed by the Holy Office and that he ended up living in Amsterdam.

If we go back to the previous stages experienced by the man who underwent a long process before the Holy Office in Seville at the end of the 17th century, we see that the cathedral records of Jaén lead us down different paths to those traced by certain specialists who have established a genealogical tree that leads to identifying the Antonio born to Pedro de Castro and Ana de Morales with none other than Juan Antonio de Castro y Torres in the eyes of the Holy Office, brother of Blas, Juan and Gaspar, also known Judaisers in the inquisitorial forum.

Anyone who looks at the Jaén baptismal documents from the period under study will see that, as in all historical periods, there is a fashion for first names, so that the appellatives chosen by parents for their offspring are repeated incessantly in these baptismal certificates. As for surnames, it should not surprise us that they are also repeated throughout the city of Jaén during a period when its inhabitants were often related to each other, given that there were not so many families living there<sup>109</sup>.

The personal identity between the master-at-arms and the patriarch David de Mendoza, who lived in Amsterdam during the first third of the 18th century, cannot be categorically denied. In fact, we can confirm that our man, who had been sentenced by the Sevillian Holy Office, ended up in that Dutch city. However, it can be affirmed that many of the details given in the usual genealogies

concerning his age, his siblings, parents, wife, children, etc. do not correspond to documents that are reliable from our point of view.

So why do so many genealogists and scholars of the Mendoza clan cling to identifying David/Antonio de Mendoza with the master-at-arms known as Juan Antonio de Castro in the inquisitorial forum?

To begin with, it is certainly tempting to admit, based on the fact that he was 36 years old at the time of his arrest in 1696, that the baptismal certificate of 1660 recorded in the parish books of San Lorenzo is none other than that of the man who was to become a master-at-arms, even ignoring the fact that the newborn's mother appears with a very different surname from the one that the accused himself would confess to before the Inquisition. There is no need to recall here that the names and surnames in a city like Jaén in the mid-17th century were repeated with surprising frequency in the records consulted, so that the coincidence with the name and surname of the father should not be considered definitive, as both are very frequent. The same is true of the mother's given name. There is an overabundance of women called Ana or Ana María in all these ecclesiastical documents.

It was then necessary to examine the baptismal records of the parish of San Lorenzo and other parishes in Jaén, following a different trail. That of his possible birth in the year 1653 instead of 1660 if we stick to the inquisitorial documents other than the reports of causes, a possible origin of a misunderstanding prolonged over time. It has already been pointed out that the correspon-

---

109 In the baptismal records of the parish of San Andrés, there are repeated names such as Ana, María and Pedro, or surnames such as Torres and Morales, especially the latter. There is also some Mendoza. Among those baptised, the name Juan Antonio is quite common.

In the aforementioned book of the parish of San Lorenzo there are several women called Ana de Torres and in the contemporary book of San Ildefonso there is a mother of the baptised called Ana de Morales different from the one who appears in the record of 1660 (fol. 48). The same can be said of the rest of the baptismal registers corresponding to other parishes in Jaén.

dence between the Council of La Suprema and the court of the Sevillian Holy Office insistently repeated that the age of the defendant Juan Antonio de Castro was 43 years and not 36.

The scrutiny of the baptismal certificates of that year 1653 available for consultation in the records of San Lorenzo and other parishes in Jaén does not yield any positive results. No child baptised under the name of Antonio or Juan Antonio appears in them, his parents being Pedro de Castro and Ana María de Torres, as the defendant declared at the time before the Inquisition<sup>110</sup>.

Both for the advocates of a birth in 1660 and for the option of dating it in 1653 there is a serious obstacle consisting of the loss of quite a few parish books relating to the period under study. In any case, the absence of notes relating to some of those we know as members of the same family, who should appear with the surnames Castro y Torres or Castro y Morales, is suspicious. Not only of Juan Antonio, but also of his brothers Blas and Gaspar, not to mention the often-mentioned Juan de Castro who was taken out of the Auto of 1680 when he was at least 29 years old and who cannot be the son of Pedro de Castro and Ana de Morales, also called Juan and born in 1658. Neither does either of them appear in the lists of those confirmed at the end of these books. This leads us to think that they were registered in another parish whose registers are no longer

preserved today<sup>111</sup>.

Perhaps it would be possible to locate the marriage certificate between Pedro de Castro and Ana de Torres in one of the parish books where these marriage registers are preserved, although not the baptismal registers. But some attempts made ignoring the date or, at least, the specific year are unsuccessful, especially when the parents of our protagonist could well have married outside the city of Jaén, since there is no allusion to the place where they were married in any of the documents that have been examined for this study<sup>112</sup>. In fact, Juan Antonio de Castro declared before the inquisitors that his mother came from the town of Arcos, where his parents may have married<sup>113</sup>.

## CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, it is only worth highlighting the scarce traceability that in our opinion exists to be able to affirm the reliability of the genealogies presented by certain specialists, given that these are mainly aimed at linking the Sephardim of the Mendoza lineage with some subjects who suffered the rigours of the Inquisition in Spain and Portugal. This is because there is a gap resulting from the lack of continuity between Inquisitorial documents and those kept in the records of the Jewish communities. The victims of the Inquisi-

---

110 We have examined the registers relating to the parishes of San Lorenzo, San Andrés, San Miguel, San Ildefonso, Santiago and San Pedro between 1645 and 1670.

111 The books of four others are missing, where perhaps the baptisms of the master-at-arms could be listed together with those of his known brothers. Namely: San Juan, Santa Cruz, Santa María (El Sagrario de la S. I. Catedral) and Santa María Magdalena.

112 Examination of the books containing the marriage certificates of some parishes such as San Juan, San Lorenzo, San Pedro and El Sagrario between 1645 and 1660 has revealed no marriage certificates between Pedro de Castro and Ana de Torres or between Pedro de Castro and Ana de Morales. But also in these books, the repetition of names such as Ana, Pedro or Juan together with the surnames Torres, Morales and Castro is striking. Incidentally, the surname Castro must have been considered equivalent to Castillo, as evidenced by a note from the parish of San Lorenzo regarding a marriage in 1634 where the bride and groom appears in a marginal note as Pedro de Castro and in the extensive wording of the act appears as Pedro del Castillo. Curiously, the bride was called Manuela de Morales, which gives us an idea of how frequent such names and surnames were in Jaén during this period.

113 AHN, Inquisición, lib. 522, fol. 16. Letter of 11 April 1696: "He is the son of Pedro de Castro, alias de Castilla, and Ana María de Torres, former neighbours of Jaén and Arcos..."

tion who managed to flee to an exile that provided them with a better future did not hesitate to assume another identity and other appellatives different from the ones they had obtained at the forced baptism as soon as the new life circumstances made it advisable.

For all these reasons, those who research certain clans made up of heretical Judaisers have serious problems in tracing them while they lived and coexisted on Hispanic soil. It is even more difficult to trace them when they left their homeland and their Christian identity, and it is much easier to trace their genealogies from the moment they came to light as practising Jews in other European countries tolerant of their religion. But the fact that there is no documentary data on how and when the change of denomination *erga omnes* took place in order to assume the Jewish nomenclature after abandoning the name imposed at the baptismal font, plunges scholars into an ocean of doubts which, as can be seen, are difficult to clarify in view of the scarce and often contradictory documents on which these genealogical constructions are based. Even the documents of the Holy Office, reputed to be the most meticulous of the time when they were written, sometimes incur inaccuracies and errors due to the elusive and difficult to trace identity of the Judaisers, who over the centuries became expert mockers of their inquisitorial persecutors.

Considering the important influence that some members of the well-known Mendoza clan have had over the centuries and still have today, as well as the interests that have been and still are at stake, it will probably be difficult to settle the controversy about Juan Antonio de Castro and Antonio/David de Mendoza definitively in the near future. It is best to draw one's own conclusions in the light of the data examined.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

AMADOR DE LOS RÍOS, J. *Estudios históricos, políticos y literarios sobre los judíos en España*. Madrid, Imprenta de D. M. Díaz, 1848.

AYUNTAMIENTO DE MADRID, *Relación histórica del Auto General de Fe que se celebró en Madrid en el año de 1680 con Asistencia del Rey D. Carlos II*. Madrid, 1820. pp. 48-49.

BAER, Y. *Historia de los judíos en la España cristiana v.2*, published in Hebrew and translated by José Luis Lacave. Madrid, Altalena, 1981.

BELVIS COSTES, F. X. "En torno a J. Bautista Carrafa, primer fabricante de tabaco", *Tiempos Modernos: Revista Electrónica de Historia Moderna*, Vol. 7, nº 25, 2012/2, 33 pp.

BOUREAU, A. *Satan hérétique: l'institution judiciaire de la demonologie sous Jean XXII* in *Mémoires*, 44, 2003, pp. 17-46.

CARO BAROJA, J. *Los judíos en la España moderna y contemporánea*, v.3, Madrid, Arión, 1962.

CONTRERAS, J. *Historia de la Inquisición española (1478-1834)*, Arco/Libros S.L., 1997, p.29.

CORDERO NAVARRO, C. "El problema judío como visión del «otro» en el reino visigodo de Toledo. Revisiones historiográficas", *En la España Medieval*, 23 (2000), pp. 9-40.

CORONAS TEJADA, L. *Judíos y Judeoconvertos en el reino de Jaén*, Jaén, Universidad de Jaén, 2003.

CUÉLLAR Y VILLAMOR, J. *Arte de Reynar*, Burgos, 1702, p. 19

DAVIS, D. "The Jewish Cemetery at Kalkara, Malta", *Transactions and Miscellanies*, 28 (1981-1982), Jewish Historical Society in England, pp. 145-170.

DOMÍNGUEZ ORTIZ, A. *Los judeoconversos españoles en la España Moderna*. Madrid: Mapfre, 1992.

ESCOBEDO ROMERO, R. *El tabaco del Rey. La organización de un monopolio fiscal durante el Antiguo Régimen*, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra. EUNSA, Pamplona, 2007.

LIZANA FERNÁNDEZ, S. "Administración y administradores del tabaco en la segunda mitad del siglo XVII en Castilla", *Castilla, Tabaco y Economía en el Siglo XVIII*, Agustín González Enciso and Rafael Torres Sánchez, coords., 1999, pp. 289-318, p. 299.

LÓPEZ-SALAZAR CODES, A.I. "La relación entre las Inquisiciones de España y Portugal en los siglos XVI y XVII: objetivos, estrategias y tensiones", UNED, *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma, Serie IV, Historia Moderna*, t. 25, 2012, pp. 223-252.

PÉREZ MARTÍN, A. "Observaciones a *Liber ludi-diorum* 11.3", *Historia, Instituciones y Documentos*, 14 (1987), pp. 141-159; p. 145.

PÉREZ, J. *Historia de una Tragedia: la expulsión de los judíos de España*, Barcelona, Crítica, 1993.

- *Los Judíos en España*, Madrid, Marcial Pons, 2005.

RODRIGUES, C. *Fonte para o Estudo da História colonial: leitura paleografica de um processo da Inquisição portuguesa referente ao Brasil*. Miguel de Mendonça Valladolid, Lisbon, 1999.

- DE MENDONÇA VALLADOLID, M. "Um mercader cristiao-novo", Lina Gorenstein and Maria Luiza Tucci Carneiro (Orgs.), *Ensaio sobre a Intolerancia. Inquisição, marranismo e antisemitismo*. Homenagem a Anita Novinsky, Associação Editorial Humanitas, 2nd ed., 2005, pp. 217-224.

SOYER, F. "The extradition treaties of the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions (1500-1700)", *Estudios de Historia de España*, X, Buenos Aires, 2008, pp. 201-238.

SUÁREZ FERNÁNDEZ, L. *Documentos acerca de la expulsión de los judíos*. Valladolid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1964.

- *La expulsión de los judíos. Un problema europeo*. Barcelona: Ariel, 2012.

VIVES, J. *Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda*. Barcelona, Balmesiana, 1942, pp.144-145.