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Letter to the Editor

Editor,

In TPH 38:1 (February, 2016) Gilberto Fernandes writes that, “it is generally accepted today” that Cabrillo was Portuguese (37). Harry Kelsey’s recent (1986) carefully researched, scholarly biography rejects claims by Antonio de Herrera (1615) and Visconde de Lagoa (1958) that Cabrillo was Portuguese as unsupported by any evidence (4-11). Kelsey says that Portuguese scholars continue to assert it anyway (7), ignoring several scholars’ inability to find any evidence whatever for it. Exact documentation of Cabrillo’s birthplace is limited: some slight evidence suggests that Cabrillo may have moved to Seville from Cuellar, in Spain (11). But it is not “generally accepted today” that Cabrillo was Portuguese. Kelsey’s book is too significant to be ignored, and I’m surprised that neither your author nor your reviewer caught the omission.

A. C. W. Bethel

Author’s response:

Mr. Bethel,

Thank you for bringing Harry Kelsey’s work to my attention. My article did not set out to declare Cabrillo’s (or Cabrilho’s) national origins one way or another but to discuss some of the reasons why Portuguese American heritage advocates tried to claim him as an ancestor; the means and resources they used for that purpose; and how they were generally successful in doing so—otherwise, Kelsey would not have felt the need to disprove them. By “generally accepted” I meant to say “popularly known,” a subtle yet important nuance. Thank you for pointing it out.

Gilberto Fernandes