

# Fight Against Corruption: The Case of Francisco Gómez de la Madriz (1700-1703)

---

Aníbal Chajón Flores

## Resumen

La corrupción es uno de los problemas más serios que enfrenta la sociedad guatemalteca y es la que produce más pobreza e inseguridad en la población. En este artículo se describe un incidente en el que el juez Francisco Gómez de la Madriz intentó, entre 1700 y 1703, exponer actos de corrupción en el gobierno del reino de Guatemala. Madriz obtuvo el cargo como todos los funcionarios, por contactos personales, pero fue nombrado para una Audiencia en España, por lo que intentó hacer un buen trabajo en Guatemala. Al final, fracasó porque su principal apoyo en España, el gobernador del Consejo de Indias falleció, en la misma época que cambió la dinastía gobernante. Esto permitió que los funcionarios en Guatemala, junto con la élite capitalina, lograran expulsarlo y acusarlo de sublevación contra el rey. Como referente teórico se utilizaron conceptos tomados sobre administración hispana de Clarence Haring, Roger Merriman, José Ots Capdequí, y sobre corrupción, de Pilar Leiva. El objetivo general de este trabajo fue: identificar los procedimientos por los que los funcionarios y las élites capitalinas lograron deponer al juez Francisco Gómez de la Madriz; mientras que los específicos fueron: establecer qué causas impidieron a Madriz cumplir con la aplicación de la justicia en Guatemala; determinar el papel de las élites capitalinas en los incidentes y documentar la percepción de universitarios en el siglo XXI sobre lo ocurrido a principios del siglo XVIII.

Todos fueron alcanzados y, para la percepción de los jóvenes se realizó una encuesta con 8,138 participantes, cuya amplia mayoría opinó que debe lucharse contra la corrupción.

**Palabras clave:** Corrupción, justicia, administración, Gómez de la Madriz, Real Audiencia.

## Abstract

Poverty and insecurity in Guatemala are product from the corruption. This article is about incidents occurred between 1700 and 1703, when the Judge Francisco Gómez de la Madriz tried to expose corruption in Guatemalan government. He wanted to do an excellent job because he had an important position in Spain. But he failed because his main support in Spain, the governor of the Council of the Indies passed away, at the same time that the ruling dynasty changed. So, the authorities and the commercial elite in Guatemala expelled him and accused him of revolt against the king. For the theoretical reference in this article, were used concepts about Hispanic administration from Clarence Haring, Roger Merriman, José Ots Capdequí, and from Pilar Leiva, for corruption. The general objective was: to identify the procedures by which the authorities and elites deposed the Judge Francisco Gómez de la Madriz; what causes prevented the justice application; determine the role of the elite in the incidents and document the perception of young university

students in the 21st century about what happened at the beginning of the 18th century, by a survey with 8,138 participants. The majority of whom opined that corruption should be fought.

**Keywords:** Corruption, justice, administration, Gómez de la Madriz, Real Audiencia.

## Introduction

Guatemala society is in need of corruption-free governments. The current government system, despite having a long development process from 1821 to 2021, inherits its structure from the Spanish rule between 1524 and 1821. Consequently, there is a proposal to present to modern society the concerns that have persisted in the pursuit of transparency, with the participation of groups outside the elite. During the Hispanic period, three mechanisms for controlling the authorities were implemented in the Indian Territory, as the American continent was referred to during the 16th and 17th centuries by Spanish authorities. These mechanisms were: the Trial of Residency, visits and investigations or “*pesquisas*”. They were conceived as opportunities to prosecute officials that had exceeded their duties, generally focusing on the use of Crown funds. From the *corregidores* to the mayors, officials were under scrutiny at the end of their terms. Nevertheless, these procedures didn’t achieve their goal; in most cases, officials accused of corruption were pardoned, and sometimes punished with fines that weren’t equivalent to the abuses committed, including the mismanagement of public funds. In that context, in 1700, a judge appointed by the Council of the Indies to inspect the management of two Audience presidents arrived in Santiago, Guatemala. However, local authorities found a way to outsmart the legal procedures, and instead of being punished, they managed to detain and harm the judge. The judge was Francisco Gómez de la Madriz (also written as De la Madrid, Lamadrid,

and Lamadriz, as used in this article the judge’s signature), who was in the territory until 1702. This serves as an explicit example of the impunity that prevailed in the government system established by the Spanish in the American Continent.

The objective of this research is to explain the resources used by the officials and the capital elite, as well as the futile attempts of Madriz to impose the law and repair the damages done to the non-elite population.

The case exposed in the article can serve as a reference to understand other similar phenomena in the recent history of the country. As recent publications state, in 2015 a change occurred in the apparent tolerance of corruption in the country: “Since then, Guatemalan society has expressed an energetic rejection of corruption and has demanded profound changes to guarantee transparent public management” (Melgar, Contreras & Monzón, 2015, p. 7). Based on this article, compliance with the legislation regulating the *Universidad de San Carlos* and the *Centro de Estudios de las Culturas en Guatemala* is achieved, as well as with the K’atun 2023, promoting culture as a revitalization element of the cultural network.

Regarding this topic, the author conducted research (Chajón, 2000), in which he addressed documentary material from the 17th and 18th centuries. However, he couldn’t consult the collection of the General Archive of the Indies related to the power struggles between the elite and the peninsular official. Consequently, documents that were not accessible at the time could be used for this opportunity. Another publication on the topic is by María del Carmen León (1988), who examined the involvement of the official in Soconusco, while similar cases were found in the Indian legislation (Garriga, 2017), Quito (Leiva, 2017), Panama (Andújar, 2017) and Chile (2017).

The general objective of this work was to identify the procedures through which officials and capital elites managed to depose the residence judge Francisco Gómez de la Madriz. The specific objectives were to establish the causes that prevented Madriz from fulfilling the application of justice in Guatemala, to determine the role of the capital elites in the incidents and to document the perception of university students in the 21st century about what occurred at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

The research process involved conducting a bibliographic review of works related to the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, consulting available collections on the topic in historical archives, and conducting a survey to obtain the general perception of the character.

### Theoretical framework

For the theoretical framework, Clarence Haring's (1990) categories on the Indian government were employed, including its characteristics, challenges, and issues, as well as the responses that facilitated Spain's dominance over such an extensive territory. Upon the Castilian invasion of the American lands, the dimensions of the territory were unknown, but it was evident that it would be incorporated into the Castilian Crown, a political entity separate from Aragon. As a result, all Castilian institutions, including legislation, were transferred, and territorial units were organized and conceptualized as kingdoms, since Castile had been formed from the union of these entities: León, Galicia, Toledo, Seville, Cordoba, and others. When the geographical dimensions could be ascertained, an administrative entity was established: the Royal and Supreme Council of the Indies, or simply the Council of the Indies, in 1524. Additionally, Roger Merriman (1959) highlighted the role played by the coroners, who were royal

inspectors tasked with preventing officials from abusing their power. Moreover, the concept of a ruler replacing the king or viceroy was soon adopted, as was done in Sardinia in 1323. According to José Ots Capdequí (1941, 1945), the supreme legal institution, the Audience, was also transplanted to the West Indies. It was modeled after the Chancelleries of Valladolid and Granada, comprising a president and several magistrates, known as judges. Furthermore, visits or trials were established for officials based on complaints of fraud or power abuse. The Trial of Residency, was conducted at the conclusion of a government term, and investigations or "*pesquisas*" were also carried out for specific accusations, albeit for informational purposes. Simultaneously, the functions of the Audience were expanded, granting it the authority held by the Castilian Council, as its members also constituted the Royal Agreement. It must be considered that, for the people, the primary duty of a ruler was to administer true justice, and in the Indies, it was expected that the Royal Audience would fulfill this role (Chiquín, 2019).

The excessive power that officials could acquire outside the monarchical control led to a constant struggle against corruption, as interpreted by Carlos Garriga (2017) as a perversion contrary to divine order. An official seeking enrichment was incapable of implementing measures with justice. In the 21st century, corruption is generally understood as the misuse of public office for private gain. However, this definition encompasses a broader understanding prevalent during the 16th and 17th centuries, incorporating a moral dimension. Since the 14<sup>th</sup> century, legal literature has made clear the expectation for officials to embody justice, akin to a priest, striving for utmost perfection. Within this context, Pilar Leiva (2017) highlights that during this period, corruption could be facilitated by various factors, mainly in business

(including the bribability or sale of a public office), personal relationships, prejudices and, above all, familial ties. Such circumstances promoted private individuals to seek advantage alongside a corrupt official. Numerous examples can be observed in the following text.

## Corruption in the West Indies

The primary issue affronted by the governments from the 16th and 17th centuries was financial. Spain rapidly became reliant on loans to maintain its hegemony in Europe, their monarchs determined to retain territories that sought autonomy, causing significant expenditures on wars. It is widely known that the vast quantities of gold sent by the conquerors to Spain were often pre-committed to bankers in Northern Europe upon arrival. The constant scarcity of resources pushed them to take desperate measures. In 1591, the sale of positions began, though they had less decision-making power, and selling positions to merchants was prohibited. However, due to the constant need for money, in 1604 and 1608, orders were issued to sell the saleable positions to merchants, leading to constant bidding for them, and the pursuit of privileges for the holders and associates' circle. By 1611, it was evident that Spain lacked the financial capacity to protect their vast dominions, and the situation worsened with the increasingly significant role of France. The crisis erupted in 1674 when the French invaded the Franche-Comté and the Spanish Netherlands, almost any position was for sale. To this situation was added the obstinacy of the merchants of Seville to maintain a monopoly over the Indies, since they were unable to satisfy the demand for products. The merchants of the major Indian cities imitated Seville: Mexico and Lima, creating a very difficult situation for the authorities, people who had obtained the position by purchase. They had to decide between obtaining income for defense or

applying laws that limited trade. As a result, the magistrates of the audiences generally sought to enforce trade restrictions, while the presidents, who were also governors, supported the merchants; since, on many occasions, they were merchants themselves (Webre, 1987). In turn, the highest authority, the Council of the Indies, continued to expand, and eventually, its positions were also up for sale (González, 1978). There was a failed attempt to reform it in 1691, but it did not succeed due to the outbreak of another war, in which Spain aided Austria against the French, Hungarians (led by Emerico de Tequeli), and Turks, for which it was essential to obtain income. An example of the appointment of positions is provided by Pedro Núñez de Prado (1638-1699), a member of a family of lawyers who held a position in the Valladolid chancellery, who had the support of the confessor of Carlos II, the Dominican friar Pedro Marilla. Núñez was granted the title of 1<sup>st</sup> Count of Adanero, and served as the governor of the Council of the Indies between 1695 and 1699. During his tenure, he secured a position for his son, although his son could only assume it until reaching the age of 25, as he was a minor when it was obtained and had not yet graduated in law. Another case is about José María de la Cerda, son of Tomás de la Cerda, former viceroy of New Spain, who was granted a position in the Council at the age of three, although he held it until he was 18 (Infante, 2019). With the arrival of the first Bourbon monarch, Philip V, the situation in the administration of Spain was tense, as a foreign king was coming who had to maintain stability in the midst of a war against England and its allies, who did not accept the French ruler. Therefore, attempts were made to maintain the previous structure, but noticeable changes began from 1703 (De Bernardo, 2006). However, there was an attempt to dismantle the Council of the Indies from the beginning, it was deeply weakened from 1701 and even more so in 1717 (González, 1978).

As a result, some well-known cases of corruption in the Hispanic government correspond to the

reign of Charles II (1665-1700), which can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Some corruption cases in the Indies		
Years	Characters	Incident
1667-1670	Pedro Miranda Santillán (1623-1670). Fiscal of the Audience of Guatemala	The “alcabala” (a tax on commercial transactions) was established in 1604. Between 1607 and 1667, it was acquired by the City Council for 5 thousand pesos annually, in order to prevent a contractor from calculating the true percentage and passing on the payment to medium and small merchants. In 1667, the fiscal awarded the collection to the Audience, resulting in doubled income, and by 1670, it quintupled. The elite sought the help of the president, Sebastián Álvarez Alfonso Rosica de Caldas, who accused the fiscal of bribery, prosecuted him with the assistance of lawyer Carlos de Coronado y Ulloa (brother-in-law of wealthy landowner Domingo de Arrivillaga), and sentenced him to exile in the San Felipe del Golfo Dulce Castle (Izabal), where he died, in a judicial process that concluded within weeks. Rosica was accused by the magistrates Juan de Gárate y Francia and Benito de Noboa Salgado in hidden letters between fabrics, sent to Mexico, to be forwarded from there to Spain. Therefore, Caldas was deposed, although he died during the trial. Among those implicated with Caldas were his nephew Sancho Álvarez de las Asturias y Nava and José Agustín de Estrada y Azpeitia, both prominent members of the Santiago elite.
1678-1685	Agustín Mesa y Ayala (1649-1700). Accountant of the Royal State in Quito	He obtained the position for 11 thousand pesos, provided by his uncle Juan Muñoz Chamorro and his uncle's partner, Antonio de la Chica Cevallos. Thus, Chica's debts were removed from the official list. In 1678, the Chilean Mercedarian José Hurtado de Mendoza wanted to collect 298 pesos on behalf of an uncle. Mesa demanded proof of his uncle's being alive; unable to provide it, Hurtado denounced him, with information provided by the internal treasurer, the Limeño Felipe Matalinares, burdened by personal debts, and with the support of the Gaditan Andrés de Amaral, who desired Mesa's position. The former accountant was arrested, and the process lasted more than eight years. Hurtado managed to collect more than 10 thousand pesos. In 1685, Mesa was acquitted and received 6 thousand pesos in compensation, to be paid by the magistrates and the president of Quito. He handed them over to the king to obtain the position of accountant in Bogotá.
1692-1700	Tomás Marín de Poveda (1650-1703)	He obtained the position of governor of Chile for 44 thousand pesos. He was the son-in-law of an important Basque merchant in Lima. He appropriated the money to pay the troops in Chile, known as “Real Situado”. He gave the soldiers vouchers that could only be exchanged for the fabrics he supplied, at the price he set, and appropriated the “Real Situado” with apparent legibility. As a result, the troops were poorly supplied, and Poveda enriched himself.

Continues...



Table 1. Some corruption cases in the Indies		
Years	Characters	Incident
1698-1717	Juan Antonio Rocha Carranza (1657-h. 1726)	<p>He bought the position of governor of Panama for 45 thousand pesos for eight years, when the salary was 4,500 pesos annually. In 1699, he ruled for five months. In 1702, he was sentenced and prohibited from holding public positions. The sentence was revoked in 1703. In 1704, he partnered with Dutch financiers to supply weapons to an infantry company in Spain. He was appointed again to Panama in 1707 but was removed from office due to a debt of 79 thousand pesos with the Dutch. He was also accused of withholding 400 thousand pesos from the Crown. He was reinstated in 1716 and dismissed again in 1717. Finally, he was acquitted in 1725. Before he died, he wrote a memorial to collect cash, in which he made clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He provided 6 thousand pesos to his nephew for him to receive the village of Huamalíes, Peru, from which he expected to receive 300 thousand pesos.</li> <li>• For the village of La Paz, he expected to receive 100 thousand pesos.</li> <li>• He lent 7 thousand pesos to Ambrosio Tomás Santaella Melgarejo to secure the fiscal position in Guatemala.</li> <li>• He lent 9 thousand pesos to the Count of Cañete for him to obtain the viceroyalty of Peru.</li> <li>• He lent 17,500 pesos to the Prince of Santo Buono for him to receive the viceroyalty of Peru.</li> <li>• A Mercedarian owed him more than 13 thousand pesos for the purchase of flour.</li> <li>• A merchant from Panama owed him more than 3 thousand pesos for the purchase of slaves.</li> </ul> <p>The way to come out unscathed: friendship with the officials to whom he lent money, but primarily due to the support of his brother-in-law, Diego Manrique de Lara, who was a member of the Council of the Indies. Each time he was dismissed, Manrique was out of the decision-making process.</p>

Source: Webre, 1987; Ocampo, 1650; Chajón, 2000 a; Leiva, 2017; Rodríguez, 2017; Chajón, 2000 a

The cases are only a few documented, but it is obvious that the system in which the positions were for sale promoted corruption. In the Miranda case, the fiscal was a mortal victim of the system. In the Mesa case, although he was not a transparent person, his accusers had worse intentions. In Rocha's example, it is clear how family relationships and the desperate search to recover the investment, while Poveda is an example of apparent legality in the official's actions. It was in

This context that the case of Francisco Gómez de la Madriz occurred, as it will be seen below.

### An ill-favored judge

Madriz received, in 1699, instructions to investigate, judge and sentence the government officials of Jacinto de Barrios Leal, between 1688 and 1695, and Gabriel Sánchez de Berrospe, since

1696. Shortly after his arrival, he discovered the abuses committed by the officials against the mestizo and indigenous population, which caused him to become turn against the investigated officials and the capital's elite. Allied and very well organized, they managed to depose Madriz from his functions and expel him to Spain. The main source of information throughout the 20th century has been the chronicle written by the Dominican friar Francisco Ximénez. Due to the descriptions left by the friar, in 1964, the physician Carlos Martínez Durán wrote:

The inspector Don Francisco Gómez de la Madrid was a true madman. There are enough proofs of his madness, and we could almost make a diagnosis if we analyze all the incidents of his life. However great the bias of historians might be, there are always truthful arguments in favor of the inspector's madness. The ambition and cruelty of the inspector transcended the bounds of normality and were often illogical and absurd. His actions were not directed against specific individuals or institutions but against the entire population. His persecutions unfolded in a delirious manner, and the hypertrophy of his personality knew no limits. He believed himself to be the owner of the Captaincy General of Guatemala, and at the pinnacle of his delirium, he fancied himself capable of dethroning the King of Spain and altering the Spanish monarchy (Martínez, 2010, p. 233-234).

The opinions of the physician are based on the descriptions provided by the Dominican friar, who was a witness to the events but not impartial, as he had opposed Madriz, even violently. Later authors, such as Domingo Juarros in 1809 (1981), relied on Ximénez, who was a contemporary of the events. In the 20th century, Carmen León Cázarez (1988), building on Ximénez's account but also on extensive official documentation, added:

Young and ambitious, he aspired to become a judge in one of the chancelleries of the Peninsula, without having sufficient academic preparation or previous bureaucratic experience. He engaged in all sorts of matters, whether civil or ecclesiastical in jurisdiction, and carried out various diligences that affected multiple interests and seemed aimed only at enriching himself and increasing the number of his supporters (pp. 12 and 16).

As we will see later, the involvement of different individuals in these incidents also reveals business relationships, friendships, prejudices, and family connections.

For Madriz, the incidents began when he was appointed on June 15, 1699:

The King. Because of just considerations of my service, I have resolved to send to the province of Guatemala a minister for the investigation and inquiry into various matters occurring there, particularly regarding what happened with the people of the neighborhood of Saint Jerome on the thirtieth of June of sixteen ninety-seven, when they took up arms over whether or not to enter the president's palace on guard duty, putting the city at risk of falling. I have been pleased to appoint graduate Don Francisco Gómez de la Madriz, who I have also deemed worthy of the position of judge in one of my chancelleries in Valladolid or Granada, so that upon his return from the trip, having concluded the matters for which he is going and it being clear that he has acted with rectitude, justice, and disinterest, he may enter the service of whichever chancellery is assigned to him (Sierra Alta, 1699, f. 12).

So, after performing well in his commissions, the official would assume the position of judge in Spain. In July of the same year, he embarked for Veracruz from Cádiz, accompanied by the scribe Manuel Sánchez Trebejo, "tall, of good stature, red and somewhat bulging"; the constable Juan de Oribe Salazar, and two servants: Juan Antonio Quijano, "of medium build, long-nosed, thin-faced

and black-haired, aged twenty years", and Antonio Sandín, "of medium build, tender-eyed, thin-faced, long brown-haired, aged twenty-six years" (Gómez de la Madriz, 1699, f. 3-4). The fleet's general was Manuel de Velasco. Before embarking, he questioned Ignacio, Felipe, and Bernardo de Barrios in Cádiz, wealthy individuals in the city and brothers of former president Jacinto de Barrios Leal. They arrived in Veracruz on October 7, 1699, with the documents they were given and through interrogations, Madriz concluded that 28 thousand pesos had been extracted from the royal coffers of Sonsonate and more than 30 thousand from Guatemala. Therefore, he wanted to investigate if there were goods belonging to the Barrios on two ships traveling from Veracruz to Cádiz. He requested the documents, but the ship's master, Francisco Blanco, consulted with Velasco, who opposed providing information. Madriz ordered Blanco's arrest, but Velasco helped him escape, resulting in fines of 2 thousand and 2,500 pesos respectively (the fine was waived in 1703). Faced with this, Velasco threatened to use his troops against Madriz, preventing him from continuing the investigations. The Barrios did not provide information in Cádiz, but it was later notified that the heiress of Jacinto de Barrios was Ana Vaquedano, his maternal grandmother (Gómez de la Madriz, 1699a). Vaquedano was alive in 1693 and, in 1699, could be at least 79 years old. After this rough start to his activities, Madriz headed to Guatemala. The individuals Madriz was to investigate were:

- Jacinto de Barrios Leal (1656-1695): son of Diego de Barrios, a wealthy merchant from a family of Jewish converts, whose fortune was based failed and died on relations between Cádiz and the Indies. Diego lent 80,000 pesos to the Crown, and shortly after, his son was appointed president of Guatemala. Jacinto arrived in Honduras in 1687 along with the judges Pedro Enríquez de Silva, Francisco de

Valenzuela Venegas, Manuel Baltodano, and José de Scals, as well as many other people, including the Dominican friar Francisco Ximénez, who was 21 years old at that time. Upon reaching Lake Izabal, they were surprised by pirates. Barrios lost 200,000 pesos worth of merchandise and the rest, 100,000 pesos. He assumed the presidency in 1688. Four months later, Silva suffered an assassination attempt to prevent him from properly collecting the "*alcabala*" tax. Silva was supported by the judges Bartolomé de Amézquita and Scals. Barrios, on the other hand, allied himself with the city's commercial elite and indirectly with Bishop Andrés de las Navas y Quevedo. In 1690, a denunciation was filed in Cádiz against Diego de Barrios for Judaizing. Under these circumstances, the accusation against Jacinto for engaging in commerce, which was prohibited for his position, progressed, and he was removed by the inspector Fernando López de Ursino. The accusers were the judges Antonio de Navia Bolaño, Francisco de Valenzuela, and Manuel Baltodano. Silva was sent to Guadalajara, New Spain, and the perpetrator of the assassination attempt, the merchant Melchor Ortiz de Sandoval, was sentenced to death in absentia as he fled. Among those associated with Ortiz were Juan López de Azpeitia, who posted bail, and the mulatto Manuel de Agreda, servant of the president's confessor. In 1693, Barrios was reinstated, and Ursino was fined 4 thousand pesos. To restore his military image, Barrios undertook the conquest campaign of Itzá (Petén) in 1695 but upon his return (Moreau, 2007; Webre, 1993).

- Manuel Baltodano (circa 1655-1719): A member of a Sevillian family of lawyers, he graduated from Salamanca and Oviedo. In 1687, he was appointed as a judge for



Guatemala, and was removed from office in 1699. In 1719, the assets he owned in Guatemala were distributed (Burkholder, 2018).

- Antonio de Navia Bolaño (circa 1649-1697): A graduate of Salamanca, he was assigned to Guatemala as a judge in 1680 and in 1695 to Mexico, though he later relocated (Burkholder, 2018).
- Francisco Valenzuela Venegas (circa 1640-1718): A native of Madrid, the son of a member of the Council of the Indies, he was appointed as a judge overseeing textile workshops in Querétaro in 1668, and later as a judge for Guatemala in 1686. In 1695, he was appointed as a judge for Mexico, although he assumed the position some time later (Burkholder, 2018).
- José de Scals (1658-circa 1710): A native of Valencia, he graduated from Salamanca. He was appointed as a judge for Guatemala in 1687 and was given instructions to return to Spain since 1697. By 1701, he was already in Madrid, and in 1705, he became a fiscal at the Council of the Indies. He had conflicts with the Bishop of Chiapas, Agustín Núñez de la Vega, in 1690, due to his orders to suppress brotherhoods. Navia and Valenzuela excluded him. After Barrios's death, he assumed the interim presidency and led another campaign against

Petén, which was suspended by the new president. He was interrogated by Madriz in Veracruz in 1699 before arriving in Guatemala (Gómez de la Madriz, 1699; Burkholder, 2018).

Although not directly related to Madriz, it is important to note that the inspector who investigated Barrios was Fernando López de Ursino y Orbaneja (circa 1640-1702). A graduate of Salamanca, he was appointed as a judge for Guadalajara, New Spain, in 1680, and in 1686, for Mexico City. During his journey to Guatemala in 1691, he met Ximénez. During his stay, judges Valenzuela, Navia, and Baltodano allegedly received bribes to issue judgments, including from the miner Juan de Bustamante from the Corpus mine in Choluteca; illicit trade by the treasurer of Sonsonate was allowed, and the mayor of San Vicente paid 7 thousand pesos to remain in his position (Burkholder, 2018; Cabezas, 2017). As can be observed, there was an outlook among several officials who aspired to better positions than the ones they held. There are data regarding Barrios' indirect purchase of his position, as well as his clear relationship with the merchants of the city, who needed to evade taxes, and with the judges who sought their own benefit. However, in Madriz's commissions, priority was given to what happened with the mulatto militiamen of the Saint Jerome neighborhood in the city of Santiago de Guatemala.

### **The riot of Saint Jerome in 1697**

Like all historical events, the riot was not a sudden phenomenon but rather the result of various antecedents, which are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Social background of the inhabitants of Saint Jerome	
Date/Year	Event
1694	Smallpox and typhus epidemic in the city's neighborhoods.
1695	Reinstatement of Barrios, dispatching of militiamen to conquer the Itzá. Barrios's attempt to regain prestige in Spain, leading one column himself. The other column led by Bartolomé de Amézquita. Presidency passed to José de Scals, apparently for supporting him during Ursino's visit. Expedition failure and Barrios's death (45 years old).
1696	New outbreak of epidemic and typhus. Second expedition against Itzá, led by Amézquita. Arrival of President Gabriel Sánchez de Berrospe, order for Amézquita to return, great economic losses for the militiamen, artisans in neighborhoods like Saint Jerome.
1696	Complaint against artisans who sold their products without belonging to guilds and therefore did not contribute to the expenses of religious festivals, burdening the guild members, including the artisan-militiamen of the Saint Jerome neighborhood.
1697	Request from indigenous authorities (including Saint Jerome) for new censuses, due to the death of many taxpayers. Economic difficulties for groups outside the elite.
03/11/1697	Armed opposition by the militiamen of Saint Jerome. The sergeant of the company, blacksmith Juan Corzo, and the ensign Francisco de Cárdenas were arrested. Report from Berrospe to Spain.
6/30/1697	Armed opposition by the militiamen of Saint Jerome. The sergeant of the company, blacksmith Juan Corzo, and the ensign Francisco de Cárdenas were arrested. Report from Berrospe to Spain.
9/15/1697	Second armed action: The militiamen of Saint Jerome violently freed their sergeant, blacksmith Juan Corzo, and the ensign. The militiamen were repelled by troops under the command of the mayors Tomás de Alvarado and Domingo de Ayarza.
9/18/1697	Extraordinary council meeting, mayors Francisco Antonio de Fuentes y Guzmán, José Fernández de Córdova, and José Estrada y Azpeitia agreed to organize a company of 50 Spaniards to apprehend the "lowly and despicable rabble." Berrospe reported to Spain. Dominican friar Francisco Ximénez accused the judges Bartolomé de Amézquita and Pedro de Ozaeta y Oro.
11/5/1697	The City Council proposed the organization of the company of 50 Spaniards, at the expense of entry fees and Barlovento.
1698	Authorization to establish the School of Jesus Crucified, for isolated Franciscan missionaries of the Propaganda Fide (denied in 1685), in the Saint Jerome neighborhood, probably to generate employment and improve control over the mulatto population. Donations from Berrospe for the building.
1699	Confiscation of meat from mulatto vendors for purchasing products from a supplier with an expired contract.
1699	Prohibition of retail meat sales, causing harm to vendors, including those of mulatto origin.

Source: Alvarado, 1697; Espinosa, 1702; Anónimo, 1697; Ximénez, 1973; Fuentes, 1932; Pardo, 1984; Samayoa, 1962.

As it can be seen, several factors harmed groups of mestizos and mulattos, including those unrelated to any governmental decision, such as epidemic outbreaks. However, the consequences of deaths from disease inevitably led to poverty and scarcity. Mulatto militiamen saw the campaign against the Itzá as an economic opportunity, imagining, perhaps, returning with some loot, but it ended in failure. Therefore, the decision to force them to guard the palace was not to their liking. Among the witnesses, Sergeant Major Francisco López de Albizuri described the process for guarding the palace: 12 men per shift, involving 100 militiamen, so each shift repeated every two and a half months, for him, "the inconvenience was not great" (Espinosa, 1702, piece 4, f. 41). On June 30, according to the scribe Diego Coronado, at the neighborhood barracks, while with Albizuri: "we saw that the Spanish infantry company of said neighborhood was deployed in a formation, and all their men armed," indicating that "they did not want to take their guard duty unless they were paid." Albizuri indicated that there were no resources, so the militiamen fired their weapons into the air (f. 42), threatening the sergeant. Neither the scribe nor the sergeant took into account the needs of artisans who dedicated part of their time to the militias without salary. Mayor Domingo de Ayarza ordered the imprisonment of Ensign Francisco de Cárdenas and Sergeant Juan Corzo. On September 15th, around 3 p.m., a group of about a hundred residents from the neighborhood demanded the release of both prisoners. Councilor Agustín de Estrada y Azpeitia acted as spokesperson for Berrospe. Around five in the afternoon, they withdrew. However, they returned in the evening and attacked the Cabildo jail; they were repelled by the Spaniards with rifles and swords and had to hastily retreat from the square. The bishop sent priest Pedro López de Ramales, with the Blessed Sacrament, to the atrium of the Cathedral and requested the release of the prisoners, but they were not set free. Instead, Madriz argued:

the company of the neighborhood of Saint Jerome, which was the first where the guard of the palace was started... are the poor officers of the neighborhoods of that city, who, as it is most notorious, go around naked and all without having anything to eat other than what they earn from their personal jobs and trades, recognizing the bad deed that was being done to them by not giving them anything for said guards... which gave rise to the tumult" (Sánchez, 1700, f. 602).

This was one of the most severe criticisms in the account of the Dominican Francisco Ximénez. The inspector understood the situation of the mulattoes and mestizos; he "aligned" himself with them against the authentic authority, the capital elite. In the end, the case of the militiamen was concluded by 1707: Corzo was sentenced to four years of exile in Granada, despite being of advanced age by then; Cárdenas does not appear in the final sentence, so he probably had already passed away. Other accused individuals were the weaver Matías de Morales, exiled to Acasaguastlán for four years; the shoemaker Pedro Chinchilla, and the blacksmith Matías Zedillo.

### **Madriz's visit**

The presence of the inspector should not have affected the activities of the administration or the city, but the circumstances were tense. In Table 3, a sequence of events is presented.

Table 3. Events during Madriz's visit	
Date/Year	Event
1/18/1699	Berrospe was in Escuintla, taking baths, but had to quickly return to the capital due to a disturbance that occurred during the election of the Dominican provincial, when Francisco Ximénez was the order's procurator.
6/15/1699	Appointment of Francisco Gómez de la Madriz as inspector, with special attention to be paid to the Saint Jerome riot of June 30, 1697, and the Corpus mineral in Choluteca.
12/30/1699	Madriz's arrival in Guatemala. He had arrived in Veracruz on the same ship as the judges Gregorio Carrillo Escudero and Pedro de Eguaras Fernández de Híjar. He had received letters from Bishop Andrés de las Navas y Quevedo, from the provisor José Sánchez de las Navas, nephew of the bishop, and from the judge Bartolomé de Amézquita.
1/5/1700	Obedience by the Royal Council. Departure of Amézquita and Ozaeta from the city. In Ximénez's narration, Madriz immediately allied himself with them, whom he did not appreciate, probably because they arrived as professors from the University and displaced the Dominicans. Official documents state that there was no such alliance.
1/11/1700	Order to the scribes Pedro Pereira, Diego de Argüello, Nicolás de Valenzuela, and Pedro Roldán to deliver all documents regarding riots that occurred between 1690 and 1700. They delivered documents concerning the Corpus mines in Tegucigalpa, Ahuachapán, Granada, the Chamber Secretary, the War and Militia Board, lists of mulatto and indigenous militiamen, Spanish infantry and cavalry, books of the Royal Council, and Royal Treasury Boards. According to Ximénez, between January and March, Madriz attempted to intervene in religious orders, fined some indigenous intermediaries in the wheat trade, and even fined the Lady of Mercy for receiving an inheritance as a pious work; furthermore, he unduly favored mestizos, mulattoes, and indigenous people. None of this is documented in official records.
2/19/1700	Berrospe, in the city, increased the number of troops at his service. Madriz ordered him to leave the city and demanded the keys to the armory. In Ximénez's account, Berrospe was forced to leave the city to harm him, but it is clear that he was attempting to threaten Madriz.
2/20/1700	Judge Gregorio Carrillo Escudero as president. The most senior judge was Duardo, but he was at the Corpus mine. Ximénez clarifies that he was a friend of Duardo.
3/12/1700	Judge Juan Jerónimo Duardo as president, appointed by the Audience. Duardo ordered the lock of the armory to be changed.
3/22/1700	Carrillo and Eguaras demanded Madriz to show his commissions. As a result, Madriz fined the Audience 2 thousand pesos.
3/29/1700	Request to Madriz to exhibit his commissions. According to Ximénez, Madriz ordered the posting of a visitation edict to all officials of the kingdom.
March 1700	During this time, news of the death of Charles II and the inheritance to Philip V, French, spread, as well as uncertainty about the fate of the Spanish empire, which could be distributed among European powers (the Spanish War of Succession was about to begin).

Continues...

Table 3. Events during Madriz's visit

Date/Year	Event
4/1/1700	Madriz summoned Amézquita and Ozaeta, apparently to balance decisions in the Royal Council. According to Ximénez, he organized the militias of Saint Jerome, which he was supposed to judge (this portrays him as a traitor, drawing a parallel with Tequeli).
4/3/1700	During the night and the following dawn: Madriz ordered the arrest of Duardo, sent to Soconusco. Amézquita became president. According to Madriz, Duardo issued a decree for the soldiers not to obey him and why he arrested the captain of the armory. In Ximénez's chronicle, Madriz intended to arm the militias of Saint Jerome.
4/4/1700	Palm Sunday. Carrillo, Eguaras, and the council demanded that Madriz suspend his activities. Faced with the threat of violence, Madriz took refuge in the Jesuit Company college. Members of the elite took up arms, including the nephew of former president Caldas, Sancho Álvarez de las Asturias y Nava, and the Dominican Francisco Ximénez, who asked for a sword to support Berrospe. The Council ordered the arrest of Amézquita and appointed Carrillo as president. Duardo was released.
4/5/1700	Eguaras ordered the fortification of the plaza. Ecclesiastical interdict.
4/6/1700	Request from the City Council to suspend Holy Week activities to prevent people from going out with covered faces, such as penitents, or visiting the tabernacles at night. According to Ximénez, it would have been the bishop's idea, but documents state that it did not happen as the chronicler reported. Berrospe was reinstated by the Royal Council, who returned from Panajachel. Clerics and Mercedarians supported Madriz, while Franciscans and Dominicans supported Berrospe.
4/14/1700	Madriz's departure. The Council gave him 4 thousand pesos for the journey and 12 men as escort. According to Ximénez, the money was lent by Juan de Langarica. Additionally, in the Dominican chronicle, Sánchez traveled to Spain with 80 thousand pesos to obtain the bishopric of Guatemala and the presidency for the bishop. The other nephew of the bishop, Manuel, remained as the provisor of the bishopric. Escort consisted of 30 mulatto militiamen; luggage on 40 mules and 60 indigenous carriers. Berrospe would have decreed a general pardon. However, it is recorded that Amézquita sought refuge in the Company and Ozaeta in Bethlehem. According to Ximénez, Berrospe pardoned Ozaeta.

Source: Sierra Alta, 1699; Gómez de la Madriz, 1700; Sánchez, 1700; Carrillo, 1700; Sánchez de Berrospe, 1700; Roldán, 1700; Cabildo, 1700; Ximénez, 1973; Sáenz, 1973; Pardo, 1984.

In the table 3, some data appear that may help clarify what happened. The Order of Preachers had an internal division at the beginning of that year, which had to resolve the presence of the vice royal patron. This motivated Ximénez's adherence to Berrospe throughout the account, since he became a provisor, and if anything had happened to the titular, he would have become provincial. Still, the official testimonies clarify some points. Faced with the expulsion of Duardo:

the judges Carrillo and Eguaras summoned, on the fourth day of April of this year, the ordinary mayors and councilors, the council clerk, and the field master to Carrillo's house, and from there they went to

the inspector's house. Carrillo with a general's baton and Eguaras with a large entourage of people, of which the judge was notified through a servant, and he said they were going to arrest or kill, as Eguaras stated, telling them to take him prisoner... [Madriz] took more pistols to defend himself, asking for favor and exclaiming against them for the treason and boldness they intended to execute. With this, they went down to the street and surrounded his house, with a large crowd of people having gathered... causing the city to riot... Judge Amézquita was called... Some clergymen came out of the Cathedral, wanting to take out the Blessed Sacrament, which the inspector did not allow, to prevent further commotion (Sánchez, 1700, f. 1317-1318).



The Cabildo secretary, Nicolás de Valenzuela, added:

between six and seven o'clock in the morning, on this Palm Sunday, said inspector came out of one of the most secluded rooms of the house, in a furious state, with two pistols in his hands... the said Don Antonio Sandin with a blunderbuss [to defend himself] (f. 573)."

The bishop convinced Madriz to take refuge in the Jesuit college:

During this time, it is documented that the palace was surrounded and manned by soldiers and armed people... in the corridors, there were many firearms and drawn ropes... under interdiction [by the bishop] not to violate the immunity of the Church... the provisor stayed with him, in the college, along with a large number of ecclesiastics and Mercedarian friars; all of this took place from Palm Sunday morning until Holy Tuesday afternoon, when the president and Judge Duardo returned to the city (f. 1318).

According to the official document, Duardo, Carrillo, and Eguaras were particularly violent. Madriz reported:

On the seventh day of this month, I consulted Your Grace, providing you with the royal news regarding the strange events in the city of Guatemala... a state of tumult and uproar to hinder the said visit from me... the president and judges of that city took action... I have neither had the time nor the opportunity to fulfill such a precise and punctual obligation... to risk my life to provide the news that I could... the boasts of the said Don Pedro de Eguaras, the threats made to the scribe Don Diego de Argüello because he assisted me (f. 599).

To understand the tumult provoked by the judges in 1700, the information provided in Table 4 may be useful, especially where the term coined by Ximénez to refer to Madriz, "Tequelí," is used and explained.

**Table 4. Supporters in the 1700 visit**

Side	Members
Of Madriz or <i>tequelíes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bartolomé de Amézquita (1648-1712): Sevillian lawyer, graduated from Salamanca and Oñate. In 1686, he obtained the chair of laws at the newly founded University of San Carlos, with the right to the position of judge, which he held in 1693. In 1708, he served as rector of the University. He died in office, without fortune.</li> <li>Pedro de Ozaeta y Oro (circa 1670-1716): Limean, graduated from Salamanca. Alongside Amézquita, he received the chair of Canons, later assuming the position of judge, which he obtained in 1693. He arrived in Guatemala in late 1687. He died in office.</li> <li>Andrés de las Navas y Quevedo (1632-1702): A Mercedarian, originally from Baza, Granada, born into a family of modest means. He was appointed Bishop of León, Nicaragua, and consecrated by Bishop Juan de Ortega y Montañés in Guatemala. He assumed the miter in 1679, and in 1682, he was transferred to the diocese of Guatemala to replace Ortega, who was sent to Michoacán. His nephew, José Sánchez de las Navas, served as provisor of the bishopric and priest of Zapotitlán, while another nephew, Manuel Sánchez de las Navas, served as priest of Atehuan or Ateos. Between 1686 and 1696, he made numerous donations of silver objects to temples in his hometown. He desired the curacy of San Sebastián for one of his nephews, but Berrospe assigned it to his godson, Antonio de Ochaita. Ximénez described him as "ragged and without pants who came from Spain... a bumpkin from the city of Baza."</li> </ul>

Continues...

Table 4. Supporters in the 1700 visit

Side	Members
Of Madriz or <i>tequelíes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Francisco Núñez de la Vega (1634-1706): Dominican, originally from Cartagena de Indias. In 1679, he traveled to Spain to defend the interests of his order against the Jesuits. In 1682, he was appointed Bishop of Chiapas and took office in 1683.</li> <li>• Pedro de los Reyes Ríos de la Madriz (1657-1714): Benedictine monk, appointed Bishop of Yucatán in 1700. He had strong conflicts with the Franciscans. Upon his death, he was accused by the governor of Yucatán of plundering his diocese, leading to the confiscation of 31,345 pesos from his nephew, Isidoro Mesa de la Madriz, in Veracruz. Ultimately, it was proven that the money belonged to Mesa and not the bishop. The delay in restitution allowed Mesa to sell positions in Chiapas, Quetzaltenango, Tlaxcala, Peru, and Charcas.</li> <li>• José Colindres de Puerta, Mercedarian, elected provincial in 1697. According to Ximénez, Colindres hoped to carry out personal vendettas against other friars of his order.</li> <li>• Juan de Rivera, Franciscan, godson of Madriz, to whom he allegedly assigned the curacy of San Juan del Obispo.</li> <li>• Bernardo de O'Connor, Dominican, whom Friar Francisco Ximénez did not appreciate, probably due to his Irish origin and because he tried to challenge the election of the provincial, which would have harmed the position of provisor held by Ximénez. Upon O'Connor's death in 1700, Ximénez gained access to correspondence in which O'Connor informed Madriz about the provincial. This further fueled animosity against Madriz, leading Ximénez in his chronicle to accuse him of organizing, along with Amézquita, a plot against the Dominican provincial.</li> <li>• Ignacio de Azpeitia, rector of the Jesuit college, whose order faced a dispute over damages to sugar cane fields in Amatitlán filed by the Dominicans, with Ximénez being responsible in his position as general procurator of the order.</li> <li>• Support from Augustinians and secular priests.</li> </ul>
Of Berrospe or <i>Berropistas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fray Francisco Ximénez (1666-1730), a native of Écija, Andalusia, arrived on the same voyage as Jacinto de Barrios Leal. He completed his studies in Guatemala and Chiapas. He is the author cited in all works about Francisco Gómez de La Madriz. However, as Carmelo Sáenz indicates, Ximénez harbored antipathy towards La Madriz due to several prejudices: because La Madriz was of Asturian origin, because he only graduated from the Arts course, because he had studied with the Dominican Froilán Díaz (successor of the Dominican Pedro Matilla), confessor to Charles II, who believed the king was bewitched, and because when Fray Bernardo O'Connor died, Ximénez saw documents revealing that La Madriz had been appointed because he was the son-in-law of Antonio de Ablitas, agent of the Count of Adanero, who was then president of the Council of the Indies. It was Ximénez who called La Madriz "Tequelí," alluding to the Hungarian Count Emerico de Tequeli (1657-1705), whose biography was published in 1693. Ximénez sought to draw a parallel between La Madriz, who did not favor the Dominicans, and a Lutheran who fought against Austrian Catholic rule under the motto "for freedom and justice." Both were defeated. According to the chronicler, Ximénez wrote a report that was taken to Spain by the Dominican Rafael del Castillo, which harmed La Madriz.</li> <li>• Gabriel Sánchez de Berrospe (circa 1650 - circa 1720) was appointed president of Guatemala in 1694 due to the trial against Barrios, but he assumed the position only in 1696. He suspended the campaign against Petén, which had cost 85 thousand pesos. Within four months of taking office, he reinstated the Milpa judges, which harmed the indigenous people, and allowed hindrance of retail trade, damaging mestizos and mulattos.</li> </ul>

Continues...

**Table 4. Supporters in the 1700 visit**

Side	Members
Of Berrospe or <i>berrospistas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Juan Jerónimo Duardo (circa 1650 - circa 1710): He studied in Puebla, graduated in 1680 from the University of Mexico, and became a lawyer in that city in 1685. In 1687, he served as legal advisor in Veracruz. He was recommended in 1706 to continue in the Royal Treasury of Guatemala by Toribio de Cossío y Campa, president between 1706 and 1716, who had been a merchant from Cádiz and factor towards New Spain until 1695. Duardo had purchased the position of judge of Guatemala thanks to a loan of 8 thousand pesos received from Diego de Villatoro, Marquis of Castillo, the "agent par excellence, champion of the Indian benefit system, and perhaps even the instigator of the very office" of purchasing blank positions for resale to the highest bidder (Sanz, 2009, 106).</li> <li>• Gregorio Carrillo Escudero (1663-1727): Son of a cloth merchant from Salamanca, he graduated in that city. He was appointed judge of Guatemala in 166 and arrived in 1700, along with Madriz and Eguaras. In 1720, he was appointed judge in Mexico.</li> <li>• Pedro de Eguaras y Fernández e Híjar (1673-1712): Graduated in Zaragoza in 1687. He was in the Archbishop's College of Salamanca until 1699 when he was appointed to replace Bartolomé de Amézquita. He arrived in Guatemala with Madriz and Carrillo. He was granted the title of Marquis of Eguaras in 1703. In 1705, he became a criminal judge in Mexico.</li> <li>• José Osorio Espinosa de los Monteros (circa 1640 - circa 1715): Descendant of conquerors, he graduated from the University of Mexico. He obtained the position of judge of Guadalajara for 8,100 pesos, but had to relinquish it in 1692. In 1697, he paid 10 thousand pesos for the position of judge in Mexico, was a prosecutor in 1700, and in 1701, he was an inspector to Guatemala. In 1704, he was appointed as an inspector of officials in Mexico.</li> <li>• City Council: Mayors Juan Lucas de Hurtarte and Lucas de Larrave; councilors José de Estrada y Azpeitia, Francisco Navarro, and Alonso Gil Moreno; Captain Lorenzo de Montúfar.</li> <li>• Fray Juan Bautista Álvarez de Toledo, a Franciscan who wished to become provincial.</li> <li>• Juan de Ortega Montañés (1627-1708): A priest who graduated from the University of Alcalá. He was appointed as prosecutor of the Inquisition for Mexico in 1662, bishop of Durango in 1672, bishop of Guatemala in 1675, bishop of Michoacán in 1682, and archbishop of Mexico in 1699. He served as interim viceroy in 1696 and between 1701 and 1702. During his time in Guatemala, he clashed with President Francisco Fernando de Escobedo (1625-1688), accusing him of bribery, hindering provincial elections, selling offices, neglecting tax collection, engaging in contraband, illicit businesses, and other offenses. In 1691, a final judgment was issued, compelling the heirs of Enríquez to pay 48,300 pesos.</li> </ul>

Source: Burkholder, 2018; 2018 a; 2018 c; 2018 d; Pardo, 1984; Lázaro, 2020; Burgos, 2014; Sáenz, 1973; Baeza, 2018; Sanz, 2009; Burkholder y Moreno, 2018; Cabezas, 2017; Osorio, 1704; Le Clerc, 1693; León y Ruz, 1988.

Among Madriz's findings, the following can be enumerated:

1. Under the pretext of the 1697 riot, a cavalry battalion was organized using resources from Barlovento, at a cost of 12 thousand pesos per year. Berrospe appointed his brother-in-law, Alonso de Mendoza, as captain with an annual salary of 1,200 pesos.
2. Berrospe had been collecting 20 thousand pesos per year since 1696 and had not turned over the funds to the royal coffers.
3. The whereabouts of over 27 thousand pesos deposited by Ursino during the visit to Barrios Leal were unknown.
4. Barrios Leal had left more than 45 thousand pesos to his brother Ignacio, so Duaro tried to intervene in the amount without having jurisdiction to do so when he was president.
5. In order not to deliver the money collected to the royal treasury, rumors of Scottish attacks on the kingdom were circulated. In reality, it was the Scottish invasion of the Panamanian coast, which was expelled in 1699. Duaro had managed to take out around 60 thousand pesos in 1697, and that was the real reason for needing the protection of the militiamen in the palace. There was evidence that Duaro had received 500 pesos under those circumstances.
6. For the election of councilors, the price was reported at 500 pesos, when they were sold for 7 to 8 thousand pesos. The appointed ones handed over 2 or 3 thousand pesos in cash to Berrospe. Among them, Manuel Solórzano continued with his commercial activities, and Manuel Fariñas, who was a servant of Berrospe. When they realized they were discovered, they invented that Madriz wanted to strip the councilors, which is the information presented by Ximénez in his chronicle.
7. The same thing happened in El Realejo. Juan Lucas de Hurtarte paid more than 6 thousand pesos, but only 500 were reported. Once in office, Hurtarte received mercury and sent goods to Peru. In 1700, he was still in office, reelected by Berrospe.
8. Other officials whose payments were not delivered to the royal coffers included: Pedro Carrillo, corregidor of Escuintla; Pedro Luis de Colmenares, governor of Nicaragua; Diego Ramírez, corregidor of Sutiaba; Francisco Somarriba, corregidor of El Realejo, who had pending lawsuits in 1700; Antonio Gómez de Sandoval, corregidor of Sébaco, who paid 1,500 pesos but had paid 15 thousand pesos to retain the position; similar to Francisco Mella, corregidor of Huehuetenango.
9. Former mayor of Guatemala Domingo de Ayarza, involved in the incidents of 1697, had committed fraud with Juan de Quintana.
10. In the embezzlement at the Corpus mineral mine, Choluteca, Duaro received income for favoring Nicolás Vivar.
11. José del Solar, secretary of Berrospe, had traveled to Peru with merchandise.
12. The support of the Dominicans for Berrospe stemmed from José de Arria's will, and the beneficiaries spread the false information that Madriz would depose Fray Miguel de Velasco. Fray Bernardo O'Connor, who supported Madriz, had died, apparently violently. Berrospe owed the convent more than 10 thousand pesos, and Duaro, 6 thousand, so it was not convenient for them for these officials

to be dismissed or prosecuted. It is probable that Ximénez was unaware that Madriz did not intend to remove Velasco or interfere with the inheritance, but he was aware of the economic risk of losing the amounts owed by Berrospe and Duardo.

13. The Franciscans supported Berrospe because Fray Juan Bautista Álvarez de Toledo wanted to be provincial and had used almost 15 thousand pesos of the 30 thousand left by María Ventura de Arrivillaga. Berrospe had participated in spending 8 thousand pesos of those funds. Quintana was found with documents showing debts of 4 thousand pesos, including to Santa Clara, so the Franciscans could not allow him to be arrested, for fear of losing that money. Therefore, Álvarez was one of those who defended Berrospe from the pulpit.

14. After the incidents of April 1700, Berrospe organized a guard of 100 men, but they were at Berrospe's service.

15. Another issue considered by Madriz, which seemed completely normal to all inhabitants of the kingdom, including Ximénez:

one of the biggest frauds... [is that] there are countless Indians, men and women, who reside as servants of ministers, mayors, councilors, and other neighbors, keeping them in pure and perpetual slavery...

they are outside their towns... they have been taken from a very young age... your majesty [is] losing its tributes... more than eight thousand pesos of contribution... they told me they just wanted to return to their towns and pay tribute to your majesty (Sánchez, 1700, f. 619).

Given the presented data, two scenarios emerge: either Madriz sought to uphold the law or he harbored ambitions of enriching himself. If we consider the former scenario, Madriz attempted to establish order according to the letter of Spanish laws rather than the corrupt practices of authorities in the West Indies. This approach likely angered Ximénez, who believed that the status quo was acceptable, as he had lived in that environment for 13 years, which personally benefited him. Madriz aimed to fulfill his commissions correctly, and upon leaving the city, he did not return to Spain but instead continued his investigations. Consequently, the president, the judges, and the capital elite had to react. However, if Madriz behaved like the majority or entirety of officials of his time, he might have sought to enrich himself, which would have also displeased those already established in Guatemala. Further insights into this aspect will be provided by the data presented in Table 5, summarizing the events between 1700 and 1708.



Table 5. Summary of the events between 1700 and 1708

Date/Year	Event
April - May 1700	Madriz headed with his companions to Soconusco. He obtained the support of the Bishop of Chiapas, the Dominican Francisco Núñez de la Vega.
June - October 1700	He settled in Guadalcázar de Tehuantepec (part of the indigenous uprising that occurred between 1660 and 1661, in which the Tehuantepec people freed themselves from Spanish rule for over a year, until they were deceived and betrayed). Accused of intercepting mail bound for Guatemala, the Audience of Mexico ordered him to relocate to another place.
November - December 1700	Madriz settled in the town of Tehuantepec, San Francisco del Mar, and later in Escuintla de Soconusco. He had the support of the governor of Soconusco and several landowners who were upset with the authorities in Guatemala due to land measurements. He awaits the resolution of the Council. In Spain: a critical situation due to the change of king and dynasty, instability in the Council of the Indies. According to Ximénez, the governor of Soconusco hoped to be exempted from high debts. Berrospe's supporters spread rumors in Guatemala that there would be an indigenous uprising, causing fear.
1/7/1701	Madriz was declared a traitor by the Audience of Guatemala. To avoid being assassinated, Madriz ordered the militiamen not to obey Berrospe or the judges. He was placed under interdict by the bishop of Guatemala.
January - february 1701	Eguaras was sent to capture Madriz. According to Ximénez, Berrospe stayed behind to prevent an uprising in the capital, although the text insists that the entire population "loved" Berrospe; Eguaras led 500 men, although official documents only record 100. Also in the official documents is the correspondence from indigenous authorities of San Pedro Sacatepéquez, Asunción de Tacaná, Concepción Tutuapa, San Miguel Ixtahuacán, Santiago Tejutla, San Bartolomé Sipacapa, and Concepción Chiquirichiapa de Quetzaltenango; San Francisco Motozintla, Mazapa, Magdalena Tectitán, Santiago Chimaltenango, and Cuilco, in Huehuetenango; Yayahuita and San Pedro Chicomuselo, in Los Llanos de Chiapa; Tuxtla, Tonalá, Huehuetán, and Mapastepec, in Soconusco, and Tamulté de las Sabanas, in Tabasco, offering their support to Madriz. Similarly, the infantry companies of mulattos from Petapa, Amatitlán, San Diego La Gomera, and from the capital itself. General unease: the corruption of the mayors and Corregidor's. Preparation for armed attack from Guatemala, information received from indigenous villages. Indigenous concerns about having to supply the Guatemalan troops (as in 1695 and 1696).
January 1701	From Sololá, troops led by José Antonio Dighero were dispatched. They reached Tuxtla and demanded supplies, but were attacked and repelled by the indigenous people. Other troops set out from Huehuetenango under the command of Alonso de Gamboa, where they attacked the population of Ixtahuacán, forcing them to provide supplies. In Motozintla, it was the priests who halted Gamboa's troops. Gamboa himself was captured and sent before Madriz. The captured money was distributed by Madriz to the villages, which encouraged others. Berrospe supporters spread the false news that Madriz had crowned himself king. The mayor of Quetzaltenango, Sebastián de Loaysa, ordered lashes for people in San Pedro Sacatepéquez, leading to a violent reaction; militiamen killed several people, but the indigenous people made them all flee. A similar situation occurred in Chicomuselo, where although militiamen killed indigenous people, upon their victory, the indigenous forgave them; the same happened in Cuilco. Meanwhile, the judge Eguaras arrived at San Antonio Suchitepéquez with 100 men, recruiting more as they reached Ayutla on January 31st. Faced with ecclesiastical censorship, Eguaras forced the priest to kneel and sent letters to intimidate the villages.

Continues...

**Table 5. Summary of the events between 1700 and 1708**

Date/Year	Event
February 1701	Eguaras and his troops entered Tapachula on the 10 <sup>th</sup> , which had been abandoned. On the 16 <sup>th</sup> , they took control of Huehuetán. Eguaras was captured, his life was spared, and he defeated them. With the majority fleeing, Madriz escaped to Campeche to save his life and the documents, seeking support from his uncle, the Bishop of Yucatán, Pedro de los Reyes Ríos de la Madriz. Eguaras' troops looted Huixtla and Escuintla in Soconusco, which had also been abandoned. Throughout February and March, Eguaras focused on pursuing anyone suspected of supporting Madriz. It was reported that Eguaras was responsible for over 60 deaths, and his troops engaged in looting, robbery, statutory rape, and violations. He was placed under interdict in Ciudad Real de Chiapas on February 21 <sup>st</sup> . Eguaras threatened the bishop, but this would have only escalated the issue. The Audience sought approval from the Archbishop of Mexico, interim viceroy, and former bishop of Guatemala, Juan de Ortega Montañés.
3/30/1701	Return of 100 militiamen under the command of Eguaras. Approval of expenditure: 15,400 pesos. The Bishop of Chiapas excommunicated Eguaras.
July 1701	A dispatch was received in Guatemala from the viceroy and archbishop of Mexico, Juan de Ortega Montañés, former bishop of Guatemala, ordering the lifting of ecclesiastical censures in Santiago de Guatemala and Ciudad Real and to remove Amézquita and Ozaeta from their hiding places and arrest them.
February 1702	Royal decree sent to Ortega to apprehend Madriz. Berrospe abandoned Guatemala; his successor was Alonso de Ceballos y Villagutierre.
March 1702	Eguaras attacked the mulatto militiamen of La Gomera and Chipilapa, but he was defeated and had to take refuge on a hacienda. The mulattos supported Madriz because he had restored their fishing rights, which they had since the founding of the town in 1612 in Sipacate. These rights had been obstructed by a Spanish rancher with the approval of the Audiencia. Ximénez referred to them as "scoundrels."
August 1702	Requests to Navas to lift the interdict (on days 9, 29, 30, and 31). He refused.
September 1702	Requests to Navas to lift the interdict (on days 6, 13, and 14), but he opposed. Ortega ordered Martín de Urzúa y Arizmendi to capture Madriz, which he carried out at the archbishop's palace. Reyes excommunicated him and ordered the interdict to be imposed. According to Ximénez, Madriz would have kept 24 thousand pesos.
10/24/1702	The substitute inspector of Madriz, the judge of Mexico José Osorio Espinosa de los Monteros, arrived in Guatemala. Legal proceedings were conducted against José de Molina, Francisco Javier Folgar, Nicolás de Escobar, Crisanto Martín de Cabrera, Marcos de Ávalos, and Miguel Jerónimo González. The mulattos of La Gomera were pacified, according to Ximénez, as well as in Soconusco.
11/02/1702	Bishop Navas passed away.
12/14/1702	Madriz imprisoned in the court jail of Mexico.
1703	The bishops of Yucatán and Chiapas handed over Madriz's documents to Osorio for safekeeping. Madriz, while in prison, requested to settle his case.
1706	Amézquita and Ozaeta were reinstated as judges.
1708	The process against Madriz continued, and he never returned to bureaucratic activity.

Source: Pereira, 1700; Sánchez de Berrospe, 1701; Loaiza, 1715; Ortega, 1701; Espinosa, 1708; Aperregui, 1701; Real Audiencia, 1701; 1701 a; Espinosa, 1706; Ximénez, 1793; Pardo, 1984; León, 1988; Sáenz, 1973; Ruiz, 2017; Cabezas, 2017; Lokken, 2008.

Regarding the incidents of 1701, Bishop Navas wrote:

On the seventh day of the month of January of this current year, before seven in the evening, my provisor, Bachelor Don Manuel de las Navas y Navarrete, left this city... accompanied by a large number of soldiers and much military equipment and noise... and firearms, very much resembling a state of war, which surrounded my residence from all sides, obstructing and completely closing off the passage... a great outcry arose in the street... 'Break down those doors or set them on fire'... 'Cut off all the water pipes so that no water enters this house'... my provisor... ordered the interdict to be declared, and it was only declared in the church of San Pedro, adjacent to my house... the other churches did not comply... the keys to the bell tower of the Cathedral were handed over to an ordinary mayor... an individual known to him aimed a shotgun at a cleric who was reading a censure on the steps of the Cathedral... it is highly reprehensible that the dean and incumbent of my Cathedral... did not come to my house... but they did go to the secular palace... I was seriously ill... a few days earlier guards were placed inside and outside my house. (Navas, 1701, f. 692-693).

Given the documented evidence, if Madriz truly wanted to enrich himself, he wouldn't have distributed the captured money during the few victories of the peasants who saw him as a genuine envoy of a benevolent king (completely unaware of King Felipe V, who was reigning at that time). Additionally, Ximénez overlooks an important argument: unlike all the officials who were in Guatemala, including himself, Madriz didn't intend to stay in the Indies; he had secured a position as a judge in the Peninsula, where he could have had a long and fruitful career. This suggests that his main motivation was to do what was right in order to enter his duties with full approval. Undoubtedly, the crisis facing the kingdom, the

War of Succession, and the scrutiny by the Council of the Indies, as well as the death of the count of Adanero, prevented the judge from obtaining the necessary support that figures like Rocha Carranza had. Therefore, he failed in his mission and in his career. However, the indigenous and mulatto population was aware that the measures implemented by Madriz favored them and seemed just.

### Current perspectives

The work was undertaken with the assumption that most of the information presented in the preceding lines is unfamiliar to young people, while corruption, which has dominated much of the mass media in the past seven years, is not.

To gather the opinions of young Guatemalans on corruption, a digital survey was conducted from June 1st to July 31st, 2021. A total of 8,138 respondents participated in the survey, representing various areas including Guatemala City (zones 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 18), La Antigua Guatemala, San Lucas Sacatepéquez, Barberena, Mixco, Amatitlán, San José Pinula, Villa Nueva, Santa Catarina Pinula, San Miguel Petapa, San Juan Sacatepéquez, Santa Elena Barillas, Zacapa, Puerto de San José, Iztapa, Tactic, Cobán, Carchá, Palín, and Escuintla. The respondents' data is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Respondent's data		
<b>Edad</b>	18-22	2612
	23-27	2019
	28-32	1588
	More than 32	1919
<b>Gender</b>	Female	4371
	Male	3767
<b>Education</b>	Undergraduate	3407
	Bachelor	3144
	Postgraduate	1587

Source: Chajón, 2021.

All the respondents were university students, of whom 76.4% were under 32 years old and 54% were women. These individuals, who kindly

responded to the survey, were questioned with 7 closed-ended questions, the results of which are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Answers		
Questions	Yes	No
Do you believe it is necessary to fight against corruption in Guatemala?	7896	242
Did you know that, during the Hispanic period, there were trials for officials accused of corruption?	3973	4165
Do you believe that in those cases corrupt officials were punished?	4040	4088
Do you believe that, during that time, if a judge tried to administer justice, they could have been expelled through an agreement between officials and the elite?	5695	2443
Would you have felt disappointed by that expulsion?	5924	2214
In 1700, the lawyer Francisco Gómez de la Madriz attempted to administer justice but was expelled from the capital and persecuted.		
Had you heard about him?	414	7724
Do you think there are similarities with more recent cases?	5884	2254

Source: Chajón, 2021.

Although it was a closed form, one person added: "It's a political survey," suggesting that they did not find it to be an abstract university topic, but rather related to current affairs. As can be seen, 97% considered it necessary to fight against corruption; more than 51% expressed unawareness that trials against corrupt officials existed during the Hispanic period; 50.2% opined that they should not have received any punishment, likely influenced by media reports about current officials accused of corruption; however, almost 70% believed that if the elite had reached an agreement, they would have been capable of expelling a judge attempting to administer justice, as indeed happened in the incidents narrated; nearly 73% expressed they would have felt disappointed by that expulsion; only 5% reported having heard about Francisco Gómez de la Madriz, although the percentage is likely lower, as there is a possibility that respondents, due to their educational level, may have been reluctant to admit their lack of information; finally, 72% would have related it to a more recent case.

## Discussion of results

As noted in the theoretical framework, managing a territory as vast as the West Indies, with the communication systems of the 16th and 17th centuries, amidst numerous European rival powers, was indeed a remarkable feat for Spain. There's no doubt that legislation was enacted to ensure transparency, particularly in the administration of justice and the management of the royal treasury; notably because the ruler's mission was to dispense justice and give each their due. However, the Spanish monarchs' stubbornness in maintaining hegemony in Europe blinded them to the tremendous opportunities they missed in the "Indies," as they called the American continent. Thus, after 1674, the sale of nearly all public offices made it practically impossible to prevent any act of corruption. As it has been observed, having strategic allies in Spain, especially in the Council of the Indies, seemed to favor officials, as in the case of Rocha Carranza, in contrast to figures with few allies, like Miranda Santillán. Francisco Gómez de la Madriz was one such case. Upon

arriving in Guatemala, he had hoped to have that crucial support for his career. However, there was no way to overlook the death of the king or that of his protector, the Count of Adanero, especially with the change of dynasty, where the new monarch, with a French background, sought to transform and gradually eliminate the Council. From what has been indicated, it seems that Madriz attempted to play a role of justice. This can be inferred from the words of his main detractor: the Dominican Francisco Ximénez (who, on another note, is an author of great importance, especially for his discovery and translation of the Pop Wuj). Among the accusations made by the friar, it stands out that Madriz physically punished some indigenous wheat traders, but he remains silent about their patrons, likely individuals from the capital's elite who, due to their various economic activities, could have been the same Dominicans. He also accuses him of fining the Lady of Mercy, but since official documents have not been located, it could be a judgment against a deceased person, as justice operated in that manner during that time, as has been seen. However, the strongest argument is his constant surprise and disdain for the fact that Madriz supported indigenous people, mestizos, and mulattos. In the documented case of the residents of La Gomera, when the town was founded around 1612, they were granted fishing rights in the Sipacate bar, so they would have resources to pay taxes. Shortly before Madriz's arrival, the Audience, illegally, allowed a Spanish individual to prevent them from fishing, so Madriz administered justice by returning the use to its rightful owners. On the other hand, Madriz did not ally himself with the militiamen of Saint Jerome; he understood their circumstances and opposed the abuses of Berrospe. This is what Ximénez deemed as the judge's unworthy behavior, preferring mulattos to

Spaniards. It should be noted that what happened in Soconusco was similar. This explains the support provided by disadvantaged groups against the Hispanic corruption system. Furthermore, if it hadn't been for the use of weapons ordered by Berrospe, it is likely that his corruption network would have been uncovered. This network benefited the Dominican order, which sought to claim damages from the Jesuits for their lands in Amatlán and, above all, not to lose the loans made to Berrospe and other officials. Indeed, although legislation aimed to prevent corruption, any official who wanted to succeed had to learn how to keep it within their sphere of influence and, if possible, benefit from it.

### Final comment

To conclude this article, it can be affirmed that the causes preventing Madriz from fulfilling justice in Guatemala have been established: he attempted to challenge a well-established economic network among officials, which included the commercial elite and some religious figures, and lost the support he needed in the Council of the Indies (which had been so beneficial to officials like Rocha Carranza). The role of the capital elites in the incidents could also be determined: to preserve their economic advantages, members of the capital's commercial elite, including financiers (like Langerica), and extensive family networks (like Azpeitia, Álvarez de las Asturias, and others), gathered in the Cabildo, allied with the judges and the president, who were officials with multiple personal interests in enrichment. Additionally, the perception of university students in the 21st century regarding the events of the early 18th century was documented: 97% of the 8,138 respondents believed that combating corruption is necessary. Finally, the general objective was achieved: to identify the procedures by which officials and capital elites managed to



depose the judge of *residencia* Francisco Gómez de la Madriz. They achieved this through the use of weapons. When they changed the lock of the armory, they left the official without the ability to defend himself, and he had to take refuge with the Jesuits. With military control of the city, they were able to expel him. However, as he continued his investigations in Soconusco, he unexpectedly received support from indigenous communities, which led authorities to fear a military action. In anticipation of an attack, they decided to take action themselves with weapons and trained troops. These incidents ended any possibility of defense for Madriz in the Council. Furthermore, they had an unwavering ally during the critical moments of the change of dynasty in Spain: the Archbishop Viceroy of Mexico, the former bishop of Guatemala, Juan de Ortega Montañés, who had significant alliances in Santiago de Guatemala, which emerged when he managed to depose President Francisco Fernando de Escobedo.

Lastly, it seems clear that the differences between the early 18th century and the 21st century regarding corruption are similar, as the accusations made against officials in the past are the same: the illicit pursuit of personal enrichment. In the words of Stephen Webre, the Spanish administration: Created a political tradition in which interests were manipulated through personal contacts and laws were seen, at most, as norms or ideals that perhaps deserved respect in theory but that, in reality, did not need to be taken seriously if they conflicted with one's own vital interests. This colonial legacy survived after Independence and continues to plague Central American nations today (Webre, 1987, p. 35).

## Bibliographic references

- Alvarado, T. (1697). *Cabildo extraordinario*. Guatemala: AGCA A1 legajo 1785, expediente 11779 f. 114-116.
- Andújar, F. (2017). Interpretar la corrupción: el mar- qués de Villarrocha, capitán general de Panamá (1698-1717). Madrid: *Revista Complutense de Historia de América*, No. 43, pág. 75-100.
- Anónimo. (1697). Testimonio (*incompleto*). Guatemala: AGCA, A1, legajo 4772, expediente 41190, f. 1.
- Aperregui, M. (1701). *Real cédula al obispo Navas y Quevedo de Guatemala*. AGCA, A1, legajo 4594, expediente 39547, f. 78-346.
- Baeza, A. (2018). Toribio José Miguel de Cossío y Campa. *Real Academia de la Historia*. Recuperado en: <https://dbe.rah.es/biografias/15116/toribio-jose-miguel-de-cos-sio-y-campa> (21 de agosto de 2021).
- Burgos, G. (2014). *Gobernar las Indias, venalidad y méritos en las provisiones de cargos americanos, 1701-1746*. El Ejido: Universidad de Almería.
- Burkholder, M. (2018). Bartolomé de Amezqueta y Luargain. *Real Academia de la Historia*. Recuperado en <https://dbe.rah.es/biografias/63264/bartolome-de-amezqueta-y-laurgain> (21 de agosto de 2021).
- Burkholder, M. (2018 a). Pedro de Ozaeta y Oro. *Real Academia de la Historia*. Recuperado en: <https://dbe.rah.es/biografias/63597/pedro-de-zaeta-y-oro> (21 de agosto de 2021).
- Burkholder, M. (2018 b). José Scals. *Real Academia de la Historia*. Recuperado en: <https://dbe.rah.es/biografias/63382/jose-scals> (21 de agosto de 2021).
- Burkholder, M. (2018 c). Gregorio Carrillo Escudero. *Real Academia de la Historia*. Recuperado en: <https://dbe.rah.es/biografias/63343/gregorio-carrillo-escudero> (21 de agosto de 2021).

- Burkholder, M. (2018 d). José Osorio Espinosa de los Monteros. *Real Academia de la Historia*. Recuperado en: <https://dbe.rah.es/biografias/63592/jose-osorio-espinosa-de-los-monteros> (21 de agosto de 2021).
- Burkholder, M. (2018 e). Manuel Baltodano. *Real Academia de la Historia*. Recuperado en: <https://dbe.rah.es/biografias/63295/manuel-baltodano> (22 de agosto de 2021).
- Burkholder, M. (2018 f). Antonio de Navia Bolaño. *Real Academia de la Historia*. Recuperado en: <https://dbe.rah.es/biografias/63559/antonio-de-navia-bolano> (22 de agosto de 2021).
- Burkholder, M. (2018 g). Francisco Valenzuela Venegas. *Real Academia de la Historia*. Recuperado en: <https://dbe.rah.es/biografias/63761/francisco-valenzuela-venegas> (22 de agosto de 2021).
- Burkholder, M. (2018 h). Fernando López de Ursino y Orbaneja. *Real Academia de la Historia*. Recuperado en: <https://dbe.rah.es/biografias/63485/fernando-lopez-ursino-y-orbaneja> (22 de agosto de 2021).
- Burkholder, M. y Moreno, I. (2018 c). Pedro de Eguaras y Fernández de Híjar. *Real Academia de la Historia*. Recuperado en: <https://dbe.rah.es/biografias/53481/pedro-de-eguaras-y-fernandez-de-hijar> (21 de agosto de 2021).
- Cabezas, H. (2017). Gobernantes de Guatemala, siglo XVII. Recuperado en: <https://josecal.wordpress.com/2017/02/02/libro-digital-gobernantes-de-guatemala-siglo-xvii-de-horacio-cabezas-carcache/>
- Cabildo. (1700). *Actas*. Guatemala: AGCA, A1, legajo 1785, expediente 11779, f. 246-256.
- Carrillo, G. (1700). *Autos*. Guatemala: AGCA, A1, legajo 4704, expediente 40688.
- Chajón, A. (2000). *El motín del barrio de San Jerónimo, en la ciudad de Santiago de Guatemala, 1697-1701*. Tesis de licenciatura. Guatemala: Universidad Francisco Marroquín.
- Chajón, A. (2000 a). Mecanismos de control administrativo en el reino de Guatemala. *Revista Estudios, IEHAA, USAC*, No. 42, pág. 82-123.
- Chiquín, S. (2019). *Administrar la justicia en la provincia de Guatemala: ministros, tribunales y jurisdicciones (siglos XVI-XVII)*. Tesis de grado. Guatemala: Escuela de Historia, USAC.
- De Bernardo, J. (2006). Tres años estelares de política colonial borbónica (1701-1703). Buenos Aires: *Cuadernos de Historia de España*, No. LXXX, pág. 171-196.
- Duardo, J. (1708). *Méritos*. Sevilla: AGI, Indiferente, 133, N.93.
- Espinosa, J. (1706). *Informe sobre la causa contra Gómez de la Madriz*. Guatemala: AGCA, A1, legajo 4704, expediente 40693, f. 2-910.
- Espinosa, J. (1702). *Autos contra Francisco Gómez de la Madriz*. Sevilla: AGI, ESCRIBANÍA, 377B, pieza 4, f. 44.
- Espinosa, J. (1708). Cobro por visita a Soconusco. Guatemala: AGCA, A1, legajo 4705, expediente 40704, f.13.
- Fuentes, F. (1932). Recordación florida. Tomo I. Guatemala: Sociedad de Geografía e Historia.
- Fuentes, F. (1933). Recordación florida. Tomo II. Guatemala: Sociedad de Geografía e Historia.
- Garriga, C. (2017). *Crimen corruptionis*. Justicia y corrupción en la cultura del *ius commune* (Corona de Castilla, siglos XVI-XVII). Madrid: *Revista Complutense de Historia de América*, No. 43, pág. 21-48.
- Gómez de la Madriz, F. (1699). *Autos*. Sevilla: CONTRATACION, 5459, N.202.
- Gómez de la Madriz, F. (1699 a). *Autos*. Sevilla: AGI, GUATEMALA 38, R2, N22.

- Gómez de la Madriz, F. (1700). *Autos*. Guatemala: AGCA, A1, legajo 4704, expediente 40687, f.13
- González, A. (1978). El Consejo de Indias en la crisis de los consejos y en el nacimiento de la estructura contemporánea. Barcelona: *Boletín Americanista*, No. 28, pág. 165-177.
- Haring, C. (1990). *El Imperio Español en América*. México: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, Alianza Editorial Mexicana.
- Infante, Lucas. (2019). *El Consejo de Indias en la monarquía hispánica de Carlos II, 1665-1700*. Tesis doctoral. Madrid: Universidad Complutense.
- Juarros, D. (1981) Compendio de la historia del Reino de Guatemala, 1500-1800. Guatemala: Piedra Santa.
- Lázaro, M. (2020). Patronazgo artístico del obispo Andrés de las Navas y Quevedo en Baza (Granada). Granada: *Quiroga*, No. 18, pág. 94-105.
- Le Clerc, Jean. (1693). *Historia del conde Emerico de Tekeli o memorias para servir de por vida*. Colonia: Jaques de la Verité.
- Leiva, P. (2017). Acusaciones de corrupción y prácticas sociales infamantes. Quince años en la vida de Agustín Mesa y Ayala (1670-1685), contador de la Real Hacienda de Quito. Madrid: *Revista Complutense de Historia de América*, No. 43, pág. 49-74.
- León, M. (1988). *Un levantamiento en nombre del Rey nuestro señor*. México, Centro de Estudios Mayas, UNAM.
- León, M. y Ruz, M. (1988). Estudio introductorio. *Constituciones diocesanas del obispado de Chiapas*. México: UNAM, pág. 21-86.
- Loaiza, S. (1715). *Memoria de daños por los mulatos de La Gomera*. Guatemala: AGCA, Tierras, Paquete 1, expediente 1, San Jerónimo Baja Verapaz.
- Lokken, P. (2008). Génesis de una comunidad afro-indígena en Guatemala: la villa de San Diego de La Gomera en el siglo XVII. Guatemala: *Mesoamérica*, No. 50, pág. 37-65.
- Macleod, M. (1980). *Historia socio-económica de la América Central española, 1520-1720*. Guatemala: Piedra Santa.
- Martínez, Carlos. (2010). *Las ciencias médicas en Guatemala*. Guatemala: Editorial Universitaria.
- Melgar, Carlos; Contreras, Alejandra; Monzón, José. (2015). *La corrupción, sus caminos, su impacto en la sociedad y una agenda para su eliminación*. Guatemala: INCEF, OXFAM.
- Merriman, R. (1959). *La formación del imperio español en el Viejo Mundo y en el Nuevo*. Vol. I. Barcelona: Juventud.
- Moreau, J. (2007). ¿Un caso de solidaridad judeo-conversa? Diego de Barrios, vecino de Cádiz. Málaga: *Baetica*, No. 29, pág. 367-384.
- Navas, A. (1701). Carta. Sevilla: AGI, GUATEMALA, 287.
- Ocampo, A. (1650). *Pruebas de limpieza de sangre de Pedro Miranda Santillán*. Sevilla: Archivo Colegio Santa María de Jesús, ES ES 41091 AHUS 1.2.5.1.Seminario 018-12 (Fols. 0984-1032)
- Ortega, J. (1701). *Carta al obispo de Guatemala*. Guatemala: AGCA, A1, legajo 5887, expediente 49904.
- Osorio, J. (1704). *Comisión recibida*. Sevilla: AGI, ESCRIBANIA, 379B.
- Ots, J. (1941). *El Estado español en las Indias*. México: El Colegio de México.
- Ots, J. (1945). *Manual de historia del Derecho español en las Indias y del Derecho propiamente indiano*. Buenos Aires: Losada
- Pardo, J. (1984). *Efemérides de la Antigua Guatemala, 1541-1779*. Guatemala: AGCA, Biblioteca Nacional, CNPAG, IAH.
- Pereira, P. (1700). Auto de la Audiencia. Guatemala: AGCA, A1 legajo 4648, expediente 39668.
- Real Audiencia. (1701). *Acumulación de pruebas contra Gómez de la Madriz*. Guatemala: AGCA, A1, legajo 4704, expediente 40692, f.2-18.

- Real Audiencia. (1701 a). Vacante del puesto de Miguel Jerónimo González. Guatemala: AGCA, A3, legajo 2104, expediente 31888.
- Rodríguez, Antonio. (2017). La administración del Real Situado en tiempos del gobernador Tomás Marín de Poveda: corrupción en detrimento del Ejército de Chile (1692-1700). Madrid: *Revista Complutense de Historia de América*, No. 43, pág. 101-126.
- Roldán, P. (1700). *Inventario*. Guatemala: AGCA, A1, legajo 4704, expediente 40690, f.1.
- Ruiz, C. y Castillo, N. (2017). La rebelión de Tehuantepec de 1660. México: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.
- Sáenz, C. (1973). Introducción. Historia de la provincia de San Vicente de Chiapa y Guatemala, Orden de Predicadores. Guatemala: Sociedad de Geografía e Historia.
- Samayoa, H. (1962). *Los gremios de artesanos en la ciudad de Guatemala (1524-1821)*. Guatemala: Editorial Universitaria.
- Sánchez, M. (1700). Autos. Sevilla: AGI, GUATEMALA, 285.
- Sánchez de Berrospe, G. (1700). *Protesta*. Guatemala: AGCA, A1, legajo 4704, expediente 40689, f. 3.
- Sánchez de Berrospe, G. (1701). *Aprobación de gastos*. Guatemala: AGCA, A3.1, legajo 3, expediente 45, f. 5-17.
- Sanz, A. (2009). ¿Corrupción o necesidad? La venta de cargos de gobierno americano bajo Carlos II (1674-1700). Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Sierra Alta, M. (1699). *Real cédula de comisión*. Guatemala: AGCA, A1, legajo 4708, expediente 40735, f. 12-129.
- Webre, S. (1987). Política y comercio en la Guatemala del siglo XVII. Heredia: *Revista de Historia*, No. 15, pág. 27-41.
- Webre, S. (1993). La crisis de autoridad en el siglo XVII tardío: Centroamérica bajo la presidencia de don Jacinto de Barrios Leal, 1688-1695. Heredia: *Revista de Historia*, No. 27, pág. 9-28.
- Ximénez, F. (1971). *Historia de la provincia de San Vicente de Chiapa y Guatemala, Orden de Predicadores*. Tomo I. Guatemala: Sociedad de Geografía e Historia.
- Ximénez, F. (1973). *Historia de la provincia de San Vicente de Chiapa y Guatemala, Orden de Predicadores*. Tomo III. Guatemala: Sociedad de Geografía e Historia.