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Abstract
My dissertation links two popular revolts in Seville, in 1520-1 and 1652, both of which had as their focus the artisan parish of Omnium Sanctorum, in the Feria district of the city. The first was a local echo of the great Comunero Revolt, while the second was arguably the most serious political uprising in the Crown of Castile after 1520. The symmetry between these events, alongside the fact that La Feria—as it was popularly known—was the most likely source of urban unrest throughout this period, demands a study of the specific local conditions that enabled, structured or defused popular protest in early modern Spain's greatest metropolis. The two central chapters of this dissertation examine, firstly, the meaning and nature of neighbourhood community—including its importance in the articulation of collective action—and, secondly, the silk guild's (Arte de la Seda) petitioning and ideological framework in the seventeenth century (as most of the rebels in 1652 were silk workers). I also discuss the production of memory—the ways in which sixteenth- and seventeenth-century urban historians dealt with the subject of popular uprisings—as well as the role of the asistentes (royal governors) of Seville, above with regard to food provisioning, its relation to concepts of justice and politics. This dissertation thus brings together several lines of inquiry, each with its own particular trajectory and set of concerns, yet bearing direct relation to the questions posed here—the literature on revolt and rebellion in early modern Europe, on Spanish and Mediterranean cities, on the nature and uses of written memory, on urban neighbourhoods and popular politics, on guilds and artisans (above all silk workers), and finally the seventeenth-century 'crisis.' At the confluence of these kindred streams is a more complete understanding of the nature and mechanisms of urban revolt, the popular role in the governance of the city and the kingdom, but also of self-perceptions and alternative visions of the civic Republic nurtured by those who were not meant to have an opinion on such matters.
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INTRODUCTION

On the subject of rebellion in the peninsular territories of the Spanish Habsburgs, J. H. Elliott, the venerable doyen of early modern Spanish (and European) political historians, has not changed his basic position over the course of almost six decades: “Major outbreaks of rebellion did occur, and there was widespread, if sporadic, social unrest, but disorder was generally contained and authority preserved. Stability, not rebellion, was the order of the day.”1 There is apparently very little to argue with here, and indeed by the standards of other large Western European countries in the early modern period, the Crown of Castile in particular was remarkable for its stability. After the Revolt of the Comuneros (1520-1) there was no serious uprising in the Spanish Monarchy’s peninsular kingdoms until the Alteraciones of Aragon (1591), followed by more than four decades of relative tranquility until the outbreak of the Catalan Revolt in 1640. In the Crown of Castile there were no major outbreaks of revolt until 1647-52—over a century of “stability” marked only by sporadic and contained “disorder”. There were indeed few serious and sustained challenges to the authority of the Habsburgs after 1521.

Most of the time open revolt was unnecessary, but the reasons for this have largely been analysed from the perspective of the urban or regional elites who commanded fairly

wide avenues of “legitimate” resistance. The explanations for early modern Castile’s stability given by historians range from a new alliance between the urban elites and the crown in the wake of the Comunero Revolt (1519-21); decentralization enforced by the crown’s growing penury; the effective administration of justice; and the elimination of religious and other forms of dissidence. Partly as a result of the latter, Pablo Fernández Albaladejo has memorably argued that early modern Spaniards were “Catholics before citizens,” adding the scant influence of civic humanism on public life to the list.

However, if Elliott and others are largely correct, what about that “widespread, if sporadic, social unrest?” And surely the relative rarity of major outbreaks of revolt should

---


4 Pablo Fernández Albaladejo, “Católicos antes que ciudadanos: Gestación de una ‘política española’ en los comienzos de la edad moderna,” in Imágenes de la diversidad: El mundo urbano en la corona de Castilla (s. XVI-XVIII), ed. José Ignacio Fortea Pérez (Santander: Universidad de Cantabria, 1997). To explain this, Fernández Albaladejo pointed to, on the one hand, the foundation of politics in a Christian interpretation of Aristotle, and on the other, the origins of cities as political entities created by and subject to the king, rather than independent or autonomous civic republics of the Italian sort. The fifteenth-century civil wars and conflicts only altered the terms of the relationship, but if anything the bond between the monarchy and the cities was strengthened, along with the very manner in which political relationships were conceived. In Spanish political thought, the king was the basis of the political order, and theologians predominated. Although Osma and Roa in their commentaries did at least conceive of the king as merely the first citizen, whose virtue depended on his actions rather than character, showing the influence of Bruni. Francisco de Vitoria, the founder of the famed School of Salamanca, was mainly preoccupied with formulating a response to Luther, the result of which was his universalist appeal to natural laws and the natural order, the civitas Dei above the civitas terrena, which deprived the latter of any real autonomy, and meant that the path to worldly virtue never lay in the vita activa, or civic life, that social and political practice was subservient to precepts that underlay the divine, not the human order, and that—according to Fernández Albaladejo—the inhabitant of the Vitorian republic was not, and could never be, homo politicus but “homo religiosus.” Having said this, it should be noted that this scholastic tradition of political thought also contained an influential and enduring theory of resistance against tyrants. See Harald E. Braun, Juan de Mariana and Early Modern Spanish Political Thought (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); Harro Höpfl, Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540-1640 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).] Also, there are plenty of historians who would disagree that humanism and the vita activa were no longer found among the Spanish urban elites and urban magistrates. See Xavier Gil Pujol, “Ciudadanía, patria y humanismo cívico en el Aragón foral: Juan Costa,” Manuscrits 19 (2001): 92; Daniel A. Crews, “Juan de Valdes and the Comunero Revolt: An Essay on Spanish Civic Humanism,” Sixteenth Century Journal 22, no. 2 (1991); Helen Nader, “The Greek Commander” Hernán Nuñez de Toledo, Spanish Humanist and Civic Leader,” Renaissance Quarterly 31, no. 4 (1978).
make them more, not less, interesting as objects of study. Why and how, in a society as broadly docile as that of Castile, was it possible for the ordinary people, mainly artisans, to rise in protest at all? If the answer is simple desperation, then we only need to return to Elliott’s assessment, that revolt was rare—why, given that the seventeenth-century was almost uniformly calamitous, and that the nadir was in many ways reached in the 1660s and 70s, decades after the last of the Andalusian revolts (1647-1652)? The starting point of this dissertation are two popular revolts in Seville, in 1520-1 and 1652, both of which had as their focus the artisan parish of Omnium Sanctorum, in the Feria district of the city. The former was an echo of the great Comunero Revolt (1520-1), the latter arguably the most serious political uprising in the Crown of Castile after 1520. The symmetry between these events gives us a sense the local conditions that enabled and structured popular protest in early modern Spain’s greatest metropolis—a specific combination of neighbourhood and professional ties that occasionally coalesced into coherent and articulate communities of interest. Beyond this, the moments of revolt -- although exceptional in many ways -- provide a window onto the urban spaces, the social relations, and the ideologies that constituted, and were in turn constituted by artisan world views.5 This in itself may not be a thoroughly novel aim or approach in European early modern historiography, but it may be so in the context of the history of the commons (especially their lower orders) of the Crown of Castile.

The historiography on popular protest in the early modern Crown of Castile is sparse indeed, and this is not simply due to the dearth of “revolutionary” moments and

5 Revolts are, among other things, relatively amply documented, and the narratives and judicial documents they often leave in their wake provide a more direct (if not disinterested), textured, and qualitative sense of the urban lower orders than the types of sources normally generated by and with reference to urban artisans.
movements. Moreover, Spanish historians in particular have almost obsessively focused on the passivity of the general populace in Castile, and its structural, political, religious or psychological roots—the generalised “feeling of impotence among the common people.”

The Comunero revolt is an exception to this rule, and it has generated a considerable historiography, but it is also the exception that proves the rule. It does so quite directly in fact, because its failure and aftermath have been seen by many scholars as one of the main causes of Castilian conformity (or stability). Adding to this important debate is not within the scope of this dissertation, but the Comunero uprising in Seville is interesting because, unlike the more successful uprisings in Valladolid, Segovia, and Toledo, it has been downplayed by historians—beginning with the early modern chroniclers—in much the same way that popular unrest would be in the subsequent decades and centuries.

The seventeenth-century uprisings stand alone and are much better documented. Over a period of five years (1647-1652) the towns and cities of Andalucia rebelled one after another, culminating in the 1652 Feria revolt in Seville. These revolts were often brief, lasting just a few days at a time, but many of them were quite serious, and taken together constitute a major sociopolitical phenomenon if not quite a coherent revolutionary or even reformist movement. There are indications however that at least some of the rebels in Seville had already taken part in revolts in Granada and elsewhere, suggesting that insurrection was becoming a deliberate and preferred outlet for grievances among a growing number of

---

7 In its wake, “the absolutist tendencies of the crown were reinforced.” Joseph Pérez, *Los comuneros* (Madrid: La Esfera de los Libros, 2001), 268. There are exceptions to this broad consensus, for instance Aurelio Espinosa, *The Empire of the Cities: Emperor Charles V, the Comunero Revolt, and the Transformation of the Spanish System* (Leiden: Brill, 2009). Some younger scholars are also reemphasizing the “quasi-republican” ideology and aims of the Comuneros. See, for instance Antonio Suárez Varela, “Celotismo comunal. La máxima política del procomún en la Revuelta Comunera,” *Tiempos modernos* 15, no. 1 (2007).
urban artisans, rather than being simply an eruption of the hungry masses. Yet it is precisely the latter tack that has been invariably adopted by modern historians. The seminal work on the seventeenth-century Andalusian revolts is still *Alteraciones andaluzas* by the great, late Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, originally published in 1973. The work is an exhaustive chronicle of the sequence of revolts, analysing the immediate context and the course of events in the smaller towns like Lucena and Ardales as well as the uprisings in Granada (1647), Córdoba, and Seville (1652). Yet despite the attention he gives to this turbulent period, Domínguez Ortiz sees the revolts as ultimately inconsequential (“sterile”) local events, whose causes are to be sought in the arrogance and lack of “communal spirit” among the urban oligarchies (and not in the ideas and world-views of the artisan rebels, except insofar as they were hungry and desperate). He laments the spontaneity and general lack of coordination or foresight among the rebels, the broadly subservient “mentality,” or the “psychological” factor of “blind obedience” and habitual reverence for authority among the lower social orders. Virtually nothing of consequence was written on the subject until Juan Gelabert’s *Castilla convulsa*, which at least set the reaction of the Andalusian “street” into the context of the Castilian political economy, the formulation and implementation of royal policies, rather than seeing them merely as an index of the price of bread in the marketplace. Yet even Gelabert analyses the problem mainly from the perspective of

---

1 The most dismissive analysis is surely Claude Larquié, “Popular Uprisings in Spain in the Mid-Seventeenth Century,” *Renaissance and Modern Studies* 26, no. 1 (1982).
2 Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, *Alteraciones andaluzas* (Sevilla: Consejería de Educación y Ciencia, 2000).
3 Ibid., Chapter 3: Ensayo de interpretación y síntesis.
Madrid, and while he takes the protests more seriously than others have done, he does not set out to understand the local factors, the communal or the ideological matrix that made the collective action by artisans possible. That, in short, is the objective of chapters 4 and 5 of this dissertation.

City of Light and Shadow

Seville, a city whose outrageous fortune and precipitous decline mirrored that of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain and its empire better than any other, has been studied primarily as a two-sided coin: a brilliant obverse of American gold and silver—the trading activities, lifestyle, cultural and religious patronage of the self-made men who flocked to the city in the Indian galleons’ wake—the reverse a picture of a teeming and infamously desperate, parasitical or resourceful underworld—a rich vein of inspiration for the greatest writers of the age. Spain’s largest and arguably greatest city for most of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the gateway to the Indies, the link between two seas (the Mediterranean and the Atlantic), a magnet for pickpockets, swindlers, and great merchants alike has impressed both contemporaries and modern historians as the archetypal

---

“city of contrasts.” It was a city of “material and spiritual extremes,” or, as Mary Elizabeth Perry put it, “Seville was really two cities”—on the one hand, an oligarchy of nobles, wealthy merchants, and church leaders, and on the other what she defined as “the underworld.” The fascination of modern historians with the latter, the underbelly of the great metropolis owes much to the admittedly seductive, or certainly captivating image of the city presented in picaresque novels and plays of the Golden Age. Time may be the devourer of all things, but modern historians, like sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spaniards, continue to tuck into their Mateo Alemán, Cervantes, and Velez de Guevara for a slice of urban life with characters that seem to live and breathe, repel and fascinate, and remain relevant in a way that even the most colourful tale unearthed in the archives cannot, with honourable exceptions. Moreover, the early modern literary visions of Spanish cities, and Seville, alongside Madrid the greatest of them all, seem congruent with modern perceptions of what makes cities both attractive and repellent places to live. Yet these visions, at least the early modern ones, are not only—and merely—embellished, but they often have a very tenuous link with reality, or at least the urban reality that we, their modern readers, would like them to depict. This is not due to a dullness of senses, or lack of literary skill on the part of Golden Age authors, but, on the contrary, an excess of imagination and wit, and the fact that their objective was never to report, but to astound,

14 Perry, Crime and Society, 12. In the same vein, Juan Ignacio Carmona presents “the dark side of imperial Seville”: Juan Ignacio Carmona García, El extenso mundo de la pobreza: La otra cara de la Sevilla imperial (Sevilla: Ayuntamiento de Sevilla, 1993).
divert, and instruct, and the chaotic, menacing, city was little more than a useful trope—the idea of the real city, the *civitas terrena*.15

Modern historians’ fascination with the Sevillian underworld has been lamented by Guy Lazure, who rightly pointed out that Seville was also a city of culture.16 But in addition to this, and all of the above, Seville was also a city of artisans. These were men (and women) who certainly arrived with hopes of improving their material circumstances and status thanks to the presence of wealthy merchants and clients, but who were also more likely than not to end up among the growing multitudes dependent on public and (mainly) private charity. Yet many, even in the dire seventeenth century, do not easily fit into the category of the indigent poor, but rather flirted with the group of the middling, if not quite rising, with a keen sense of personal and group “honour,” even if the chronicles preferred to identify them with the *picaros* of underworld lore.17 Silk weavers and rebels like Estéban de Torres, the Sedillo brothers, Sebastián Muñoz, and Juan de Espejo were among the lucky few who still made a living through the exercise of their craft (*arte*), in the early 1650s, rented modest but far from the humblest living quarters, and in some cases were proud members of the parish confraternity of the Holy Sacrament.18 Less is known about their Comunero predecessors, but late medieval and early sixteenth-century residents of La Feria were no

17 References to the rebels as “picaros” in *Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y mui leal ciudad de Sevilla*, BCC, MS 59-1-5, 1696 copy, f. 153v; *Lebantamiento de Sevilla*, BCC, MS 57-3-9, [18th-century copy]; *Diligencias practicadas en 1652 para castigar el segundo motín del Pendón verde*, AMS, sección 4, siglo XVII, tomo 28, no. 19, f. 141v. On artisan honour, see MacKay, “Lazy, Improvident People”, 82-4.
less prepared to defend their precarious and yet modestly respectable place in the social order.\textsuperscript{19}

**Sevillian Comuneros**

Seville does not figure prominently in the historiography of the Comunero Revolt even though it experienced a series of disturbances inseparable from the wider political ferment.\textsuperscript{20} This is especially true of the 1521 popular revolt, the *Motín del Pendón Verde*, which took place in the wake of a “Comunero” rising led by Juan de Figueroa, the younger brother of the Duke of Arcos. The popular uprising of 1521 itself has too often been dismissed as a “hunger riot,” and its connection to the broader Comunero movement downplayed. Based on some new evidence and careful reinterpretation of extant chronicles and sources, it is possible to peer behind the thick veil of silence and propaganda to recover the visage of an urban society on the cusp of the greatest period of its history, and yet riven by familiar as well as nascent social tensions and political conflicts. Some of these harked back to fifteenth-century politics and episodes of unrest in Seville, including at least two recorded attempts to establish an autonomous “republic.”

Commoners of all social stripes, and above all artisans, played an active and perhaps even a key role throughout the turbulent second half of 1520 and early 1521. They were

\textsuperscript{19} For an instance of collective action by the parishioners of Omnium Sanctorum: *De los vecinos pobres de la collacción de Omnium Sanctorum de Sevilla. Yncaitación al asyfente de Seuilla*, AGS, RGS, leg. 1492-VII, no. 237, 7 June 1492.

\textsuperscript{20} There have been some recent attempts to reconsider Seville’s role in the Comunero Revolt: Antonio Collantes de Terán Sánchez, “El ‘alboroto’, a título de comunidad, de 1520 en Sevilla,” *Boletín de la Real Academia Sevillana de Buenas Letras* 40 (2012); Miguel F. Gómez Vozmediano, “Historia versus Memoria: la revuelta comunera en las ciudades de Córdoba y Sevilla y su eco en la corografía barroca,” in *Monarquía y Revolución: En torno a las Comunidades de Castilla* (Valladolid: Fundación Villalar, Castilla y León, 2009).
recruited by both noble factions—the ducal houses of Medina Sidonia and Arcos—as well as royal and urban magistrates, but they also acted on their own account. Unauthorized gatherings, or “juntamientos de gente,” raised concerns that Seville might become engulfed in the general insurrection, but concerted efforts to address or dilute popular grievances could not prevent a revolt in March 1521. Led by a carpenter, a public notary, and various “principal men of the parish” of Omnium Sanctorum, the rebels mobilized under a green banner (*pendón verde*) that would come to symbolise a distinctively local strain of popular contrarian tendencies. But more than giving lie to the Duke of Medina Sidonia’s claim that in Seville no “artisan” but a “person of quality and manners” had roused the comunidad, Seville in fact experienced many of the same conflicts over local power and influence seen in other cities. As a result, the elite factional struggles of the past receded seemingly overnight, and the urban oligarchy closed ranks before a popular tide that for a few days threatened to sweep them away. The ensuing political settlement would be subsequently promoted in public ceremonies and urban histories, whose goal was to provide a “composite image” of symbolic integrity, an ideological coherence in which the notion of obedience and loyalty—to the city and the king—was one of the primary organizing features.⁰²¹

Memory and Forgetting

The role of history writing as an instrument of royal power and legitimation in Habsburg Spain has been forcefully restated by Richard Kagan.⁰²² Urban chronicles played a

---

similar role as “the most important vehicle for the assertion of numerous social, political, and spiritual claims” on behalf of their communities.\(^2\) These works proliferated above all in the opening decades of the seventeenth century, when forebodings of decline made it imperative to reconstitute and re-imagine the local community, in real and symbolic terms. The Comunero Revolt was invariably part of these narratives, a subject still capable of inflaming passions a century or more after the event. Unlike royal chroniclers, who for the most part agreed with Pedro Mexía that “everything that was done [at that time] was wrong and evil”, later urban historians applied various shades of ambiguity in depicting these traumatic events. Seville was endowed with some of the most famous laudatory works of this genre, befitting its status as an imperial hub and vision of itself as a ‘New Rome’.\(^2\) Here, the desire to invoke the turbulent enthronement of the Habsburg dynasty was far greater, given the purchasing power of the city’s much vaunted ‘loyalty’. On the other hand, there was a persistent need to defend the city from a ‘black legend’ of its involvement in the revolt, giving rise to vigorous debates, legal suits, inscriptions and elisions.

The embers of the great conflagration were still warm in the 1630s and 40s, the struggle over the memory and the meaning of the Comunero Revolt able to rouse men, urban governments, and the monarchy itself into action. Chapter 2 thus opens with Francisco Morovelli de Puebla’s interrupted siesta—this scion of a distinguished Sevillian family was enraged to find his patria (Seville) casually inserted in a list of rebel cities in


\(^{24}\) Fragments of Pedro Mexía’s unfinished history of his native city circulated widely throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and were relied upon by later chroniclers. Francisco de Peraza’s manuscript history of Seville (ca. 1535–6), along with Argote de Molina’s historical annotations (late 1500s), were passed around with equal avidity. The first published history of Seville was by Alonso Morgado (1587). The seventeenth century brought forth ambitious works of local history by Rodrigo Caro, Espinosa de los Monteros (1629-30), and Ortiz de Zúñiga.
Mártir Rizo’s *History of Cuenca*. He promptly took his complaint to the city council, which in turn appealed to the Royal Council of Castile. The history of the revolt was rewritten in the process, no longer seen as a political challenge to the monarchy by the urban ‘comunidades’, but an uprising of the increasingly menacing plebeian hydra. Beyond such textual traces, the memory of the Comunero revolt endured in political discourse, Cortes debates, aspects of urban ritual, popular memory and was sometimes inscribed in the urban fabric itself—as some recent studies are beginning to show. This was true in Seville no less than the Castilian cities which had played a leading role in the rising. Ortiz de Zuñiga thus lamented the enduring fame of the (ill-remembered) 1521 ‘Feria y Pendón Verde’, which became, among other things, the vernacular and literary shorthand for a type of popular rogue, ruffian or malevolent vagabond. Urban magistrates, for their part, pointed to the “hidden recesses of the city” still inhabited by “vile people” who threatened the peace and stability of the Republic.

**Daily Bread**

To dismiss the popular uprisings of 1521 and 1652 as merely “bread riots” is somewhat disingenuous. In the first place, the significance of bread not only as food but also in the symbolic repertoire of early modern Spaniards cannot be underestimated, and

---

25 *Proposiciones del Sr. Veinticuatro D. Rodrigo Suarez, para castigar á los amotinados de la Feria, conocidos por el Pendón verde*, AMS, sección 4, siglo XVII, tomo 28, no. 18.
27 *Proposiciones del Sr. Veinticuatro D. Rodrigo Suarez, para castigar á los amotinados de la Feria, conocidos por el Pendón verde*, AMS, sección 4, siglo XVII, tomo 28, no. 18, f. 133r.
28 Most recently, in Amanda Wunder’s otherwise excellent account of noble charity in seventeenth-century Seville, Wunder, *Baroque Seville*, 50.
has been recently reemphasized by scholars. Bread was a staple of individual diets, and the communal ovens where it was often baked became “important centers of gathering and communication.” It was also the seal on a number of vital social transactions, whether it was the bread of charity handed over by the rich to the poor, the commensal bread broken by cofradas during their festive meals, or as a symbol of family bonds, of God’s generosity, and of the body of Christ—“a metaphor for spiritual as well as material sustenance.”

Moreover, in the great cities like Seville, unlike in the rural areas and small towns, “sustenance and prosperity were matters of provident institutions and judicious political economy” rather than propitiatory rituals. The adequate provision of grain and bread was one of the most important tasks of the municipal government, and of its head, the asistente of Seville. As Castillo de Bobadilla advocated in his book of advice to urban magistrates, in times of dearth it was permissible to requisition grain from the houses of the wealthy in the name of public good — a responsibility of local government appropriated by the rebels in 1521 and 1652. When the rebels in 1652 marched through the city in a fleeting moment of reconciliation, their cries of “Bread! Bread!” may as well have been, “Justice! Justice!”

Chapter 3 thus looks at the obligations—as they were widely understood—as well as the practices of the asistentes of Seville in the discharge of this duty that was so important to the maintenance of the social order, along with a discussion of the great Alhóndiga (granary) of Seville as the symbol of the success or failure of the municipal government. The

---

29 Jodi Campbell, *At the First Table: Food and Social Identity in Early Modern Spain* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2017), 17. Campbell adds that bread accounted for 70% of the calories consumed by the average person in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, ibid., 15.
30 Ibid.
32 James Casey, *Early Modern Spain: A Social History* (Routledge, 1999), 128. Also see below, chapter 2.
33 Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.
asistente of Seville (the equivalent of the corregidor in other Castilian cities) was an official appointed by the crown in theory less as a governor and more a first among equals. His brief was to guide, cajole or coerce the city council to act in the royal interest, but also for ‘the common good’—two ideals, or goals, that were often contradictory (and the potential for conflict was further increased by some of the asistentes’ keen attachment to their own self-interest). Seville’s importance meant that its asistentes were frequently titled nobles, or prominent members of the Royal Council, but they also faced a uniquely powerful and wealthy city council, and their effectiveness depended upon a careful calibration of local ties of patronage and alliances. As civil and criminal judges in the first instance, and responsible for a vast number of essential tasks—including food provisioning, the regulation of markets, public health, and works—it is hardly surprising that an asistente’s overall performance was crucial to the maintenance of public order. What types of discontent did these “omnicompetent officials” engender on a regular basis, among the urban elites as well as those lower down on the social ladder? How was this opposition manifested, and what recourse was available to the affected groups or individuals? Some of the answers may be found in the records of the juicios de residencia, investigations that all outgoing officials were subject to.

On the other hand, if the supply of daily bread was no trivial matter, it is also true that shortages were frequent, whether due to bad harvests or hoarding, and not every period of dearth however difficult or prolonged inevitably led to a riot or an uprising of the hungry and the poor. On the contrary, as pointed out above, although both revolts (1521 and 1652) were precipitated by the lack or the high price of bread (usually both), these were singular events in the history of early modern Seville. Moreover, the rebels did not desist once their
immediate existential needs had been met, and their communication with the authorities conveyed a solid grasp of the underlying long-term political-economic causes of the subsistence crisis, and proposed their own solutions, contrary to what many modern scholars tend to argue. Clearly, therefore, despite the importance of bread, especially for the poor and even the middling, there was more to these uprisings, not least the fact that both revolts took place at a time of acute political crisis, when the authority of the monarchy itself under attack. What then were the springs of collective action by members of the lower orders in early modern Seville? If the rebels claimed to be acting in the name of the common good, what was the commonalty they had in mind? The pattern of revolt in early modern Seville provides one significant clue: in both 1521 and 1652 it was the neighbourhood—the same neighbourhood in fact—that mobilized in protest and sheltered the rebels. Moreover, La Feria, pressed against the city walls at the point furthest from the urban core to the south, had a distinct socioprofessional character. Certainly by the seventeenth century the neighbourhood stood out for its concentration of silk workers—above all weavers and twisters, but also *pasamaneros*, goldbeaters, cloak makers. These two salient factors are the beacons followed in chapters 4 and 5, which in turn contain the bulk of the archival evidence used in this dissertation.

---

34 For instance, the assessment that the rebels’ “programa era tan simple que los amotinados se conformaban únicamente con solucionar sus problemas más inmediatos, sin plantearse el origen de los mismos ni llegar a cuestionar el orden existente.” José Contreras Gay, “Penuria, desorden y orden social en la Andalucía del siglo XVII,” in *Los marginados en el mundo medieval y moderno: Almería, 5 a 7 de noviembre de 1998*, ed. María Desamparados Martínez San Pedro (Almería: Instituto de Estudios Almerienses, 2000), 214.
City Within a City

When on May 20, 1652, Isidro Hurtado and his companions irrupted into the Plaza de la Feria with the shout of “Long Live the King and Death to Bad Government”, their anger was directed at the city council, whose failings were to blame for the dire situation in which the working men found themselves. Yet the seat of the Cabildo was at the other end of the city, in the opulent parish of San Salvador, not far from the impressive Cathedral. The rebels had instead planted their flag firmly in what they considered their own territory—the barrio of La Feria, centred on the parish and plaza of Omnium Sanctorum at the northern extremity of the city, where many of them lived and worked. They set up their headquarters and fortified themselves with four artillery pieces in the Plaza de la Feria, opposite the parish church, where made their final stand only days later. In these as in many other particulars, the revolt was an almost exact repetition of the popular uprising of 1521, more than a century earlier—the main difference being that in the latter case the rebels brandished an actual rather than a metaphorical flag, the later proverbial green banner of La Feria.

The urban neighbourhood as a vital object of loyalties, and a basis for the assertion of group identities and rights of those excluded from formal politics, artisans or the ‘working poor’, has received a growing amount of attention from scholars of late medieval and early modern Europe.\(^3\) While the importance of neighbourhood varied between as well as within cities, and changed over time, there is increasing evidence that these parochial

---

\(^3\) Relevant here, among others, is the case of Florence, where the peripheral parish of Santa Lucia was also dominated by silk workers, the territory of their symbolic “kingdom” bounded by the piazza, parish church and city gate—as in Seville—and their claims and petitions formulated in the name of the “working poor.” See David Rosenthal, “Big Piero, the Empire of the Meadow, and the Parish of Santa Lucia: Claiming Neighborhood in the Early Modern City,” *Journal of Urban History* 32, no. 5 (2006).
allegiances were not subsumed by wider identities. Early modern Seville, according to the foremost historian of early modern the city’s urban morphology Antonio José Albardonedo Freire, consisted of three clearly differentiated parts based on function and the socioprofessional character of their inhabitants: the southern sector, which was the location of the institutional centres of power, the houses of the nobility and the merchant bourgeoisie; the western neighbourhoods, facing the river and whose residents were mainly dedicated to seafaring and river traffic; and the northeastern sector, encompassing “less important and prestigious _collaciones_, populated by artisans and agricultural workers.”

But we get much closer to a sense of the lived neighbourhood in the rebels’ self-designation as the “lords of the seven parishes” (_los señores mancomunados de las siete parroquias_). Chapter 4 uses a variety of sources (marriage licences, notarial documents, records of the parish confraternity of the Holy Sacrament) to measure the boundaries of this neighbourhood community, which was clearly broader than the parish of Omnium Sanctorum, by tracing the social and professional ties it was based on—and the results roughly bear out the territorial pretensions of the artisan rebels of 1652. More than neighbours, however, many of the rebels were also silk workers, and firmly embedded in that part of the physical urbs that stood in a singular and historically tense relationship with the political and economic centre of Seville—the “cuerpo de la ciudad”—was the _Arte de la Seda_, or silk guild.

---

37 Antonio José Albardonedo Freire, _El urbanismo de Sevilla durante el reinado de Felipe II_ (Sevilla: Guadalquivir Ediciones, 2002), 57.
38 A rebel proclamation reportedly opened with: “Mandan los Señores mancomunados de las siete Parroquias …” As the author of the manuscript account explained, this was a reference to the rebels’ claim to be a coalition of the residents of seven adjacent parishes, although his sneering assertion that “this was not so” is only true in reference to the parish of San Marcos (a special case, discussed in chapters 4 and 6): “Yntitulabanse los Señores mancomunados de las Siete Parroquias porque los que ellos presumian que tenian por suyas eran la Feria, San Gil, Santa Marina, San Marcos, Santa Lucia, San Lorenzo, San Martin, no fué asi porque nunca le ayudaron.” _Lebantamiento_, BCC, MS 57-3-9.
The Threads of Revolt

The manufacture and trade of silk cloths was by the early seventeenth century the most fiercely competitive branch of commerce in Europe, and a successful native industry brought substantial profit as well as immense prestige. However it also required skilled labour, investment, and protection from foreign (and domestic) competition. Silk production had been introduced into the Iberian peninsula by the Muslim conquerors, experiencing a lengthy hiatus before a gradual recovery in the fifteenth century. The one exception was Granada, not conquered by the Christians until 1492, and the most developed and profitable silk industry in Spain until the 1568 Morisco rebellion—itself arguably a response of the conquered community to the fiscal burdens that were destroying its primary source of income. Cities like Toledo, Valencia and Murcia eventually superseded the former Nasrid capital, but Seville had an advantage over these as the gateway to the Indies, and the kingdom’s commercial capital. Curiously, however, its silk industry has not received the same attention. Certainly the silk guild, or Arte de la Seda, was a significantly more vigorous body that many of its local counterparts, judging by its readiness and ability to defend its interests throughout the seventeenth century.

As Ruth MacKay has persuasively argued, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century artisans in general, far from accepting their political marginalization, or internalizing the social disdain prescribed for their supposedly demeaning occupations, were acutely aware of their importance to the health of the body politic, and fully participated in the “discourse of

---

the republic.” This was particularly true of silk workers, in Spain and elsewhere. The silk workers of Seville attempted to direct the economic policy of the crown as far as it affected their own trade, invariably appealing to the ‘common good’ of the city and the kingdom. Occasionally, and in spite of intense rivalries, its spokesmen were able to transcend the city limits in defence of the interests of the entire body of Castilian silk workers. The analysis offered in chapter 5 covers most of the seventeenth century, beginning with a 1624 petition carried to Madrid by a silk weaver, Rodrigo Romero Hurtado, in the name of his own guild as well as those of Cordoba, Granada, and Toledo. It is based on legal disputes involving artisans that could not be resolved at the local level and were remitted to the Council of Castile. It is hardly coincidental, seen from this perspective, that the midcentury revolts were limited to Andalusia, where most of Castile’s silk industry was concentrated.

In Seville, in 1652, by far the most prominent rebels were silk workers, partly as a result of the importance of their trade in the city, which employed thousands in one capacity or another, but also due to a particularly strong sense of corporate identity, and because they were arguably the most experienced in navigating the channels, means, and the language of political communication. It is curious in that regard that the most overlooked aspect of the revolt of 1652 is the rebel ultimatum, delivered to the municipal authorities by the rebel Portuguese cleric Bernabé Filgueira. These demands included a subsidy “for the poor working men” to offset the effects of the economic crisis; the reversal of the currency manipulation; an end to all new taxes (introduced since the time of king Ferdinand); that no

43 With the obvious exception of Toledo, which nevertheless experienced some unrest during this period: Gelabert González, Castilla convulsa. As J. H. Elliott has pointed out, the decline of the textile industry — caused by or reflected in the rising imports of finished cloths, depending on one’s perspective — contributed to the general instability and helped create the conditions for the outbreak of the Catalan revolt in 1640. J. H. Elliott, The Revolt of the Catalans: A Study in the Decline of Spain, 1598-1640 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 55-6.
foreigners or Portuguese would serve on the city council (only Castilians), and that they should not be allowed to name substitutes, or rent out their posts. Perhaps most interestingly, they also demanded that “the plebe” of the city should elect their own representative, who would have a say in the concession of new taxes.⁴⁴

Instead of dismissing popular revolts in Castile for their lack of revolutionary ambition or outcomes, it is worth considering ways in which artisans represented themselves in the public domain, the space they claimed to occupy in the polity, the discourses they appropriated, in what contexts, and the strategies they employed in the defence of their interests. David Rosenthal in his recent study of festive artisan brigades in Florence has argued that these supposedly exceptional and ephemeral moments of social and political inversion should be seen as extensions of ‘normal’ or quotidian social and political relations, whose aim may not have been the subversion of the existing order, so much as to maintain conversation with the political centre, and establish and defend the space that artisans claimed for themselves within the polity which denied them formal participation.⁴⁵

The Sevillian popular revolts, in their patterns, language, choreography, had much in common with the carnivalesque (yet deadly serious) urban rites described by Rosenthal. It is about time, therefore, to move beyond considering their springs or effects only from the perspective of the ruling oligarchy or the royal administrators, but from the point of view of the artisans themselves—the view from the Plaza de la Feria, rather than the city hall, so to speak.

⁴⁴ Also, that all prisoners released from the city jail would be granted an amnesty, that the neighbourhood militias mobilized against them should be disbanded, and that all “nobles and plebeians” who had been involved in the present uprising should be pardoned by the king. Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.
Note on Sources

It should be said at the outset that the most obvious sources that might have served as a foundation for this study have been lost. The parish records (of marriages, baptisms, burials) were the unfortunate casualties of a twentieth-century Feria uprising. Also missing is the archive of the Arte de la Seda, the silk guild of Seville. It is thanks to the archival troves left by the great silk workers’ guilds of Valencia, Toledo, or Murcia that modern scholars have been able to produce exhaustive studies of the silk industry in those cities, often touching on the social and political as well as economic aspects of their respective “communities of silk.” Seville’s silk industry may have been among the most important in Spain in the seventeenth century, but the loss of the guild archive at least in part explains why historians have tended to take contemporary claims of the industry’s size and vitality with more than a grain of salt. These significant lacunae imposed certain limitations on this dissertation, especially in the chapter on silk workers, forcing a somewhat oblique approach to the subject. But some of these diversions into what appeared to be circuitous back channels led through terrain that yielded its own invaluable bounty. For instance, in the absence of parish records, the marriage dispensations (expedientes de matrimonios) in the episcopal archive (AGAS) provided the sort of detailed information and direct testimony

46 Commenting on the loss of the parish archives of Omnium Sanctorum, as well as the nearby San Gil, Santa Marina, San Julián, San Marcos, San Juan de la Palma, and San Roque, Francisco Morales Padrón writes: “The part of the city that was traditionally the scene of social conflicts, the site of the sixteenth-century uprisings, was once again in the 1930s the stage for bonfires that consumed valuable books and papers [including all parish records].” Francisco Morales Padrón, Los archivos parroquiales de Sevilla (Sevilla: Real Academia Sevillana de Buenas Letras, 1982), xi. The Feria neighbourhood was the last stronghold of the Republican forces in 1936, and the parish church suffered a devastating fire.

47 Ángel Santos Vaquero, La industria textil sedera de Toledo (Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 2010); Pedro Miralles Martínez, La sociedad de la seda: comercio, manufactura y relaciones sociales en Murcia durante el siglo XVII (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 2002); Ricardo Franch Benavent, La sedería valenciana y el reformismo borbónico (Valencia: Institución Alfons el Magnánim, 2000); Ricardo Franch Benavent, “La evolución de la sedería valenciana durante el reinado de Felipe II,” in Felipe II y el Mediterráneo, ed. Ernest Belenguer Cebriá (Madrid: Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, 1999). For an excellent study of an urban silk industry, albeit non-Spanish, see Molà, The Silk Industry of Renaissance Venice.
that added a certain qualitative element to the mere drawing of lines between marriage partners, their families, and witnesses. Meanwhile, the analysis of various petitions and lawsuits brought by the Arte de la Seda of Seville before the royal council made it possible to analyse master artisan political discourses—even if it would have been extremely useful to be able to understand the internal hierarchies of the silk guild, its attitude towards immigrant masters (several of the known rebels were silk workers who had moved to Seville from Granada or Toledo), and the socioeconomic condition and status of silk weavers and twisters at various points in the seventeenth century.

Chronicles and histories

Seville is particularly rich in contemporary chronicles and histories, manuscript and published, as well as scattered annotations and ephemera, records of royal visits, festivities and ceremonial processions. Although Ortiz de Zúñiga’s Anales include the only contemporary printed account of the second Feria revolt, several manuscript narratives have survived (and no doubt many more circulated then and are now lost). Partly as a result—though also because in 1647-52 unlike in 1520-1, Andalucía was the centre of upheaval in the crown of Castile—the revolt of 1652 looms larger and strikes the modern scholar as the more serious uprising. Like previous scholars who have studied the seventeenth-century Andalusian revolts, I have taken advantage of these manuscript accounts, most of them located at the Biblioteca Colombina (BCC) in Seville, and at the National Library in Madrid (BNM). The narratives of the revolt are usually inserted into far longer compendia of notable (or simply curious) events, items of news, or information -- often later seventeenth-

48 Among the latter, especially Juan de Mal Lara, Recibimiento que hizo la muy noble y muy leal ciudad de Sevilla a la C.R.M. del Rey D. Felipe II: Con una breve descripción de la ciudad y su tierra (1570) (Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 1992).
century copies of original manuscripts, with some additions. In terms of printed histories of
the city, Ortiz de Zúñiga’s work is an indispensable resource for any historian of Seville, not
only due to its length (5 volumes in the 1795-6 edition), the author’s erudition (at the
Biblioteca Colombina one may also find the manuscript “apparatus” (aparato) used by
Ortiz de Zúñiga in writing his chronicle), but also because the Anales encompass the entire
period studied here, having been written in the second half of the seventeenth century (first
published in 1677). The other great published histories of Seville (by Alonso Morgado,
Espinosa de los Monteros, and Rodrigo Caro) were written in some cases much earlier, and
all of them before the midcentury low watermark of the city’s fortunes, and therefore do
not include the second Feria revolt. Chapter 2 (Memory), in particular, relies on these
urban chronicles (printed and manuscript) of Seville as well as other Spanish cities, but they
are used throughout the dissertation.

Juicios de residencia

Chapter 3, which deals with the asistentes of Seville and the politics of provisioning
the municipal granary and markets, relies mainly on several sixteenth-century juicios de
residencia. These were systematic inquiries into the conduct of the asistentes of Seville, their
lieutenants, and other public officials. These investigations were formalized and became
more or less regular features of urban administration in Castile by the middle of the

49 Diego Ortiz de Zúñiga, Anales eclesiásticos y seculares de la muy noble y muy leal ciudad de Sevilla, metrópoli
de la Andalucía, que contienen sus más principales memorias desde el año de 1246, en que emprendió conquistarla
del poder de los Moros el gloriosísimo Rey S. Fernando III de Castilla y Leon, hasta el de 1671 en que la Católica
Iglesia le concedió el culto y título de Bienaventurado [1677], 5 vols. (Madrid: Imprenta Real, 1795-6).
50 Alonso Morgado, Historia de Sevilla (Sevilla: La imprenta de Andrea Pescioni y Juan de León, 1587); Pablo
Espinosa de los Monteros, Primera parte de la Historia, antiguedades y grandezas, de la muy noble y muy leal
Ciudad de Sevilla (Sevilla: En la oficina de Matias Clavijo, 1627); Pablo Espinosa de los Monteros, Segunda parte
de la Historia y grandesas de la gran Ciudad de Sevilla (Sevilla: En la oficina de Juan de Cabrera. Junto al
Correo Mayor, 1630); Rodrigo Caro, Antiguedades, y principado de la ilustrissima ciudad de Sevilla. y
chorografia de su convento iuridico, o antigua chancillería (Sevilla: Andres Grande, 1634).
sixteenth century. The *juicios* were based on both secret and public denunciations, made by groups or individuals against departing officials, and the subsequent inquiries produced hefty documents, running into thousands of folios of sometimes richly detailed witness testimonies. A careful analysis of even a single *juicio* might provide a fascinating radiographic image of municipal politics (in the broadest sense of the term) over a period of two to three years. One fragment and three complete *juicios de residencia* of Sevillian *asistentes* are found at the state archive in Simancas (AGS) corresponding to the years 1522-23, 1538-42, 1566-69, 1570-72, making it possible to analyse complaints against public officials from a variety of social actors.51

Marriage dispensations

The bulk of the evidence in chapter 4 (on the Feria neighbourhood) comes from the series of marriage licenses (*expedientes de matrimonios*) issued by the Vicar General of Seville, and held at the Archbishop’s palace, or episcopal archive (AGAS). The *expediente de matrimonio* was essentially a marriage licence, required authorization before the relevant parish priests could perform the sacrament itself. The licence was issued by the Vicar General, the bishop’s deputy in charge of administrative matters (*juez oficial y vicario general*), who added his signature to that of the chief notary (*notario mayor*). Judging by the

---

51 Sobre unos capítulos puestos por los jurados de Sevilla en contra del conde de Osorno, asistente de Sevilla, en la residencia que se le tomo, AGS, CR, leg. 661, no. 16, 1524; Residencia a Pedro Navarra, marqués de Cortes, mariscal de Navarra, asistente que fue de Sevilla, a sus tenientes y oficiales, por el licenciado Ortiz, del Consejo y alcalde de Casa y Corte., AGS, CR, leg. 412, no. 1 [Pesquisa secreta], 1540; Residencia a Pedro Navarra, marqués de Cortes, mariscal de Navarra, asistente que fue de Sevilla, a sus tenientes y oficiales, por el licenciado Ortiz, del Consejo y alcalde de Casa y Corte., AGS, CR, leg. 412, no. 4, 1542; Residencia tomada por el licenciado Gonzalo Hernandez de Morales, a don Francisco Hurtado de Mendoza, conde de Monteagudo, asistente que ha sido de la ciudad de Sevilla y lugares de su jurisdicción, a los señores doctores Liébana y Peralta, y el licenciado Egas del Aguila, alcaldes de la justicia; licenciado Arrola, ejecutor de la vara, licenciado Lezcano, teniente de la tierra; al alguacil mayor y sus tenientes y a todos los demás alguaciles; a los alcaides de la hermandad, a los escribanos, y al escribano del cabildo, a los veinticuatro y jurados, a los fieles ejecutores, a los escribanos de los juzgados, civiles y militares, a los escribanos de la alhóndiga, alcaides del río y puentes; mayordomos, almotacenes de Sevilla y lugares de su jurisdicción, AGS, CR, leg. 278, no. 1 [Charges and complaints against officials], 1570.
surnames of the office holders, this was a coveted post—among the vicars general at the turn of the seventeenth century were Don Luis de Melgarejo and Luis Ponce de León, scions of two of the most prominent local families. In the early 1650s the office was held by, among others, Juan Bautista Ortiz de Espinosa, notable for being in the right place to apprehend, and gloat over the capture of one of the chief demagogues of the popular revolt of 1652, the Portuguese friar Bernabé Filgueira.52

The purpose was to establish the identity and residence (parish) of the prospective grooms (contrayentes), and, most importantly, that both were either unmarried, or widowed. Each party was obliged to furnish two witnesses (no more, but no fewer, without exception), although a single individual who was familiar with both the prospective bride and groom could testify twice. As a result, the minimum number of witnesses in a single expediente was two, the maximum, four. Generally speaking these were either family and kin, fellow guildsmen or workers in the same trade (or masters), and neighbours. These were often overlapping categories of course, and virtually all witnesses fall in the latter category to a greater or lesser extent, for when they are not parishioners of Omnium Sanctorum, they are residents of adjoining parishes (especially San Gil, San Martín).

Relatives naturally made great witnesses given that as parents, siblings, uncles, or cousins they could (and invariably did) claim familiarity with the prospective bride or groom since birth (“desde que nació”), often living under the same roof, and therefore in a position where the marital status of the contrayente, and the fate of any previous spouse could not escape them. However the devastating plague of 1649 meant that many of the survivors who sought marriage licences in its immediate aftermath (1649-1655) were less

---

52 The depositions and witness testimonies were nevertheless collected by a lesser notary.
likely to have living parents, or even siblings. Moreover the increased mortality meant that the number of those remarrying for the second (or third) time was also higher—individuals whose parents were generally less likely to be alive.

The witnesses had to know and swear that the *contrayente* was not married, or that she or he had been widowed. This meant living or working with, or in close proximity to the individual in question, and moreover implied frequent interaction—social or professional. Indeed, the most common way to establish one’s credentials in this respect was to claim knowledge of the contracting party based on “much intercourse and communication” (“por mucho trato y comunicación”)—a formulaic phrase used with little variation in the witness statements.\(^{53}\) The number of years during which the witness had known the prospective bride or groom was also given in the vast majority of cases, with few exceptions.\(^{54}\) Others were more specific: doña María de Ávila had known that Francisca de Alarcon and Cristóbal García had lived together as a married couple—before the latter drowned in a well—because their houses were facing each other (“bibian frontero de su casa”).\(^{55}\)

Since fairly intimate knowledge of the parties seeking a dispensation was required, these documents make it possible to delineate an informal community, based on social and professional ties, and straddling several parishes or *collaciones*—a community, the people of

\(^{53}\) AGAS, Vicaría, *Matrimonios Ordinarios*, leg. 335, exp. 17.

\(^{54}\) For example, the joiner Verísimo Caravallo and Juana Mancera, a mason’s widow, both claimed to have known Fernando Rico for “many years” (“de muchos años”). 1106. However this is an exception—the number of years was usually specified, even if frequently qualified by the ubiquitous “poco más o menos” (“more or less”). AGAS, Vicaría, *Matrimonios Ordinarios*, leg. 1106, exp. 21.

La Feria, that largely matches the evidence of other types of available sources, especially those related to the two popular uprisings.\(^{56}\)

In total, 257 *expedientes* were used here, constituting all the marriage dispensations issued for Omnium Sanctorum during two periods roughly fifty years apart, 1597-1607 and 1650-1655.\(^{57}\) The initial aim was to compare two five-year periods to get a sense of the extent to which the composition of the parish had changed by the time of the 1652 revolt. However, due to the relative paucity of the early seventeenth-century records it was necessary to extend the range of years in the first sample, starting with the earliest available dispensations (1597-1607 instead of the planned 1600-1605). The second period was chosen not only because it covers the period of the revolt (and was thus expected to ensnare at least some of the proscribed rebels), but also because of a suspicion that in the wake of the great plague of 1649 more remarriages were to be expected, and thus a larger number of dispensations. This proved to be the case, for this five-year period yielded 188 *expedientes*, including the testimonies of 939 individuals, the majority of whom were parishioners of Omnium Sanctorum (in contrast to 64 *expedientes* and 395 individuals for the earlier—and longer by half—period).

\(^{56}\) The *expedientes de matrimonios* have been used to study social ties among the poor, and between the poor and other social groups in Rafael M. Pérez García, “Los llamados pobres en la Sevilla de Carlos II,” *Cuadernos de investigación histórica* 18 (2001).

Notarial records

This information was supplemented by a selection of documents from Seville’s municipal archive (AMS), as well as notarial documents held at the provincial archive (AHPSE). The latter are drawn from the 1st notarial oficio, whose location was next to the San Juan de la Palma parish church, and turned out to be the one most frequented by residents of Omnium Sanctorum. These apprenticeship contracts, sale and rental agreements, powers of attorney, promissory notes and receipts of payment yielded different kinds of information about 279 individuals (so far), again mostly parishioners of Omnium Sanctorum, and with a bias towards silk workers. Of these, 30 individuals also appeared in the AGAS records (expedientes matrimoniales), making it possible to draw a fuller picture of the social networks and socioeconomic status of certain parishioners. Seven of the known rebels of 1652 show up in these records—four master silk weavers, a gilder, and a goldbeater.

Hermandad de Todos los Santos

In lieu of the missing parish records, another invaluable source of information was the archive of the confraternity of the Holy Sacrament of Omnium Sanctorum (AHTS). The archive has conserved two Membership Rolls covering almost the entire seventeenth century, and listing 585 cofrades—around 50 of whom also appear in either the AGAS or the AHPSE samples (or both), giving a deeper sense of the ties that bound many of the neighbours, particularly in the crucial midcentury years. The confraternity’s account books have also survived, albeit only beginning in 1680. The confraternity’s oldest surviving Rule Book (from 1626, with later seventeenth-century updates) at the episcopal archive (AGAS)
was also used. Finally, fragmentary but nevertheless significant information about the confraternity, including various cabildo meetings and a particularly suggestive bequest (from Miguel Cid), were located in the notarial archive.

*AHN: lawsuits, criminal cases*

Last but not least, the Archivo Histórico Nacional (AHN) is another treasure-trove whose bountiful archival materials undoubtedly include a great number of records pertinent to this study that still lie undisturbed in their *legajos*. Among those that have been used here are mainly lawsuits—between different guilds, between the *Arte de la Seda* of Seville and the city’s foreign merchants, as well as two criminal cases: one against the *arbitrista* and (at the time) envoy of the Sevillian guilds, Francisco Martínez de la Mata over a forged royal *provisión* (1660-1665), and another, against Francisco de León, the smuggler who rallied to the government’s cause during the revolt of 1652, but received his comeuppance anyway a few years later (1648-1654).³⁸

---

³⁸ There are also fleeting references to lawsuits involving the cabildo of Seville’s jurados, as well as other sundry cases.
1.1. Introduction: *Pendón Verde*

Samuel Cohn threw down the gauntlet to historians of late medieval European cities by suggesting that popular revolts were far more frequent, successful and imbued with distinctly political ideologies than previously imagined. He did so by going back to some of the same sources—mainly chronicles—previously used to present a very different picture of late medieval politics, one in which the lower classes were rarely more than shock troops in noble factional conflicts, while “‘real’ struggles for power unfolded among the patricians.”

Cohn focused on the heavily urbanised regions of northern Italy and the Low Countries, areas already more likely to be identified as sites of urban insurrection. Southern Europe, and the Iberian Peninsula in particular, is conspicuously absent from this narrative. Was there a comparable “lust for liberty” lurking between the lines, waiting to be teased out, and were the lower orders in Spanish cities and towns also clamouring for inclusion in urban political structures? While Cohn’s challenge should not spark a frenzied re-reading against the grain of Spanish chronicles in the hope of assembling an equally impressive catalog of popular revolts—not least because the results are likely to be relatively disappointing—it is certainly possible to recover hitherto unappreciated complexities, and apparently minor incidents of enduring significance for the role of the commons in urban unrest.

One such episode is the so-called Motín del Pendón Verde, a 1521 popular revolt that took place a few months following an abortive *comunero* rising in Seville led by a

---

prominent member of the local nobility. While Juan de Figueroa’s failed attempt to seize
power in the city in the name of the comunidad in September, 1520 has been relatively
understudied as peripheral to the main revolt—centred on the Castilian meseta—the
popular uprising of the following year is shrouded in even deeper layers of silence.
Dismissed as a hunger riot of no more than passing interest by Pedro Mexía, native of
Seville and a royal chronicler, his pithy encapsulation of this local “curiosidad” nevertheless
served as a collective mnemonic device of a much deeper elite anxiety regarding the likely
source of any popular disturbance, or direct challenge to the municipal government. Thus,
in a fairly typical manuscript compendium of local history, an eighteenth-century writer
transcribed a seventeenth-century predecessor’s copy of Mexía’s brief, sixteenth-century
account in answer to the question: “Por que se dixo en Seuilla Feria y Pendon Verde [?]”
(The origin of the expression Feria y Pendón Verde).60 The opening lines, “Año de 1521 fue
muy estéril en Seuilla …” (The year 1521 was one of dearth in Seville…), must have filled
early modern erudites with trepidation whenever the city experienced bad harvests or
serious shortages.61 In response to the high price of bread in March of that year, the
residents of the parish of Omnium Sanctorum mobilized under a green banner (pendón

60 “Hallose escrito este suceso de letra del Coronista Pedro Mexia, y yo lo saqué de la copia que escriuí Don
Diego de Góngora.” Enrique Andrade, Casos raros y particulares subcedidas en Sevilla, en diferentes tiempos,
recogidos por Henrique de Andrade … de los que dejaron manuscritos el coronista Pedro Mexia, Dn. Joseph
Maldonado de Avila y Saabedra, y Dn. Diego de Góngora … y otros que han acaesido desde el año de 1690 en
adelante, BAS, MS 33-91(1), 17th-century manuscript. Andrade’s digest is one of a number of surviving
manuscript miscellanea, mostly dating from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries but invariably claiming to
have assembled their material by copying fragments of older chronicles, some of them never published, often by
Seville’s most celebrated historians (Mexia, Alonso Morgado, Argote de Molina, and Rodrigo Caro). These
historical compendia differed in length, level of detail or the chronological period covered, but most were
arranged under rubrics, whether chronological or based on types of events (e.g. festivities, processions, floods,
riots, etc.); some were simply copies of other histories, while others provided commentaries on the latter.
Virtually all those that mention the 1521 Pendón Verde revolt cite Pedro Mexia as a source, and offer a more or
less faithful version of his attenuated account. Andrade’s recapitulation is typical, but others exist, e.g. Memorias
eclesiásticas y seculares de la Muy Noble y muy leal Ciudad de Sevilla, BCC, MS 59-1-3, 1698 copy; Papeles
varios, BCC, MS 59-3-43; Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y muy leal ciudad de Sevilla,
BCC, MS 59-1-5.

61 Dearth was reported in 1520-21, 1547, 1570, 1580, 1626, 1636, 1642, 1647, 1649-52, and 1677-79: Perry, Crime
and Society, 235.
verde) and, after presenting their demands to the city council, fortified themselves in the Feria. The authorities armed themselves, pursued the rebels, reclaimed the parish, and hanged some of the culprits. Yet this neat synopsis obscures much, just as vehement insistence on Seville’s unswerving loyalty throughout this turbulent period elides underlying local tensions and conflicts.

The Comunero Revolt (1520-1) against Charles V, “the largest and most prolonged” urban revolt of early modern Europe, is noted for the active participation of the commons of some of Castile’s greatest cities, as well as an epochal watershed. After 1521 urban revolts were neither frequent nor successful, and as a result Castile has been characterised an essentially “non-revolutionary” society, if not beaten then at least persuaded into submission, and thereafter ‘loyal’ to a fault, its people—nobles, merchants, artisans—inoculated against any contagion by a ‘republican’ or civic sentiment, or simply unwilling to risk social peace for uncertain political or economic gains. This broad consensus had been challenged on certain points, and, more recently, various arguments have been put forward to suggest that political dissent, sublimated into literary satire, and resistance against specific royal policies was never entirely absent, and perhaps became endemic—or even systematic—to the point where open revolt and armed confrontation was rendered

---

62 The barrio de la Feria was roughly coterminous with the collación of Omnium Sanctorum, although the Plaza de la Feria and the Thursday market on Calle de la Feria attracted residents of surrounding parishes, including San Gil, San Martin, Santa Marina and San Marcos.
63 “Ahorcaron algunos por el exemplo.” Andrade, Casos raros y particulares, BAS, MS 33-91(1).
66 Fernández Albaladejo, “Católicos antes que ciudadanos.” On the supposed prostration of the common people and the absence of social protest in Castile, see Lorenzo Cadarso, Los conflictos populares en Castilla, siglos XVI-XVII.
unnecessary. Nevertheless, these various paths of resistance, and the defence of particular interests, were a privilege enjoyed mainly by newly consolidated urban elites. The commons—the plebe, or común—were progressively excluded from any significant role in municipal government, and thus from politics, narrowly defined.

Seville, already the kingdom’s most populous city and on the cusp of its spectacular sixteenth century rise, certainly had the potential to be the tipping point in the struggle between Charles V and the urban oligarchies. However the local Comunero rising was a faint echo of the main rebellion, which apparently failed to resonate with the bulk of the populace. On 16 September 1520, Juan de Figueroa rode through the city on horseback with his followers reportedly shouting “Viva el Rey, y la Comunidad!” in the hope of “seducing” the common people to his cause. They did not stir, though it is debatable whether the reason was their vaunted and “marvelous” loyalty to the king, or simply a lack of affinity for the ringleader Figueroa. This rapidly extinguished rising has traditionally been interpreted in the context of the factional rivalry between the Dukes of Arcos and Medina Sidonia, the two great noble houses of Seville, and only tangentially related to the political ferment that saw the commons seize the political centre stage in so many Castilian cities. This line of inquiry does not appear to have been exhausted yet, although one recent and notable exception has offered a new perspective on the events in Seville in the autumn of

---

67 See Ruth MacKay, The Limits of Royal Authority: Resistance and Obedience in Seventeenth-Century Castile (Cambridge University Press, 1999); Nader, Liberty in Absolutist Spain. For the importance of ‘public opinion’ in the political culture of early modern Castile, and the sensitivity of the royal government to popular sentiment, see Michele Olivari, Entre el trono y la opinión. La vida política castellana en los siglos XVI y XVII[Fra trono e opinione. La vita politica castigliana nel Cinque e Seicento], trans. Jesús Villanueva (Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León, 2004).
69 Presumably they were meant to understand themselves implied in that vision of “comunidad.” Figueroa was the younger brother of the Duke of Arcos, absent from the city at the time.
70 Albeit temporarily.
1520. Yet even here the popular role is discussed primarily as a function of the political allegiances of the various elite groupings, and detailed analysis stops short of the later artisan revolt.

Thus Figueroa’s ill-fated rising has been privileged over the events of the following March (1521), when the artisans and workers of the Feria district of the city mounted their own assault on the municipal government in the midst of widespread hunger and rising prices. While the former played itself out in and around the royal Alcázar and the Cathedral, the Motín del Pendón Verde was focused on the neighbourhood of la Feria, at the northern extremity of the circular urban enclosure. It was an area remote from the city’s administrative, religious and commercial centre yet densely populated, and the location of a marketplace that served several adjacent neighbourhoods. The rebels’ first act was to seize a green banner from inside the parish church, a trophy captured from the Moors in the reign of Alfonso X. As their fortunes turned, they barricaded themselves in the principal square of la Feria with four artillery pieces, where they held out slightly longer (three days) than it took to suppress Figueroa’s sally. Unlike the latter it has been dismissed

---

71 A recent study based on the correspondence of the Duke of Arcos has shifted attention away from the Medina Sidonia faction, whose point of view permeates the most extensive and hitherto most widely used narrative sources. However the role of the commons is still handled in a perfunctory manner, and includes several erroneous or confusing statements on the Pendón Verde popular revolt: Gómez Vozmediano, "Historia versus Memoria." The real breakthrough has been made by a doyen of Sevillian historiography, whose latest offering is the most detailed reconstruction of Figueroa’s rising to date, based on new evidence—though it stops short of an equally painstaking analysis of the Pendón Verde revolt: Collantes de Terán Sánchez, “El ‘alboroto’.”

72 The terms “motín” (mutiny) or “tumulto” (tumult) were most often used by chroniclers to describe this popular uprising; the 1652 Feria revolt was also described as a “levantamiento” (rising). On the terminology of revolt in late medieval Europe, see Cohn, Lust for Liberty: The Politics of Social Revolt in Medieval Europe, 1200-1425, 61.

73 Seville has been cited as an example of “the diffused model” of an urban marketplace, where “many seemingly disjointed commercial spaces scattered throughout the residential fabric.” This was true in the sense that different areas of the city, not necessarily in close physical proximity to each other, specialized in certain types of goods or services, but it was also the case that several more or less autonomous markets served different parts of the city. For a more detailed discussion of this model, see Donatella Calabi, The Market and the City: Square, Street and Architecture in Early Modern Europe (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 75-85.

74 Seized from the residence of the Medina Sidonia.
as an essentially ephemeral event, a reaction of the poorest segments of society to
unprecedented hunger and deprivation, devoid of ideological content. It is thus rarely
analysed in the context of that other, overtly ‘political’ revolt. Yet the popular response to
the crisis of 1520-1 in Seville was not only organised and deliberate, but targeted local
officials who were considered guilty of incompetence, abuse, or corruption—in other words
the common people’s anger was focused on perceived systematic failures behind the
pressing scarcity of food. Moreover, the Revolt of the Green Banner supplied the
symbolism and a pattern of association for a more salient popular role in the political life of
the city.

1.2. Noble and Artisan Rebels

The struggle for control of the city between the Medina Sidonia and Arcos factions
in the context of weakened central authority signified a resurgence of the type of politics not
seen since the early years of Isabella’s reign. Yet if the fifteenth century was marked by
chronic feuding between two powerful noble factions whose clients dominated the
cabildo, it was also punctuated by popular uprisings only partially explicable by ties of
patronage and allegiance. These periodic tumults were frequently occasioned by hunger or
taxes (above all on foodstuffs). In each case however – in 1461, 1463, and 1473, to cite
the most familiar examples – popular collective action was driven by the need to correct the

---

75 The city council.
78 “Lunes 26 de septiembre del [1463] se ayuntó todo el común de Sevilla, armados, y echaron de la ciudad a Pero Manrique, asistente, que venía con demanda nueva de un cornado en cada libra de carne, e de pescado en nuevecientos maravedís …” ibid., 48.
shortcomings or abuses of ‘bad government’, in the process arrogating to itself, the común, the powers and prerogatives reserved for royal or municipal officials. The imperative may not have been revolution, but remedy, and yet this also presupposed that workers and artisans had to some extent appropriated the ideological underpinnings of authority, and considered themselves fit and moreover entitled to intervene under certain circumstances. In 1463, for example, the armed commons of Seville gathered in protest against new royal imposts on meat and fish, and expelled the royal governor (asistente) from the city with the cries of “¡Al ladrón rovador, vaya, vaya…!”.

Moreover, the specific grievances that drove popular collective action in the 1460s and 70s had lost none of their relevance by 1520, a fact recognised by contemporaries who saw value in recycling the memory of those past social upheavals.

As the duke of Medina Sidonia explained, writing to Adrian in the wake of the defeat of Figueroa’s rising: “Mire Vuestra Señoría que esta comunidad no la comenzava a alzar un oficial ni un herrero, como han hecho en otras partes, sino una persona de calidad y manera” (“Let your lordship observe that the comunidad was not called upon to rise [in Seville] by an artisan or a blacksmith, as they have done elsewhere, but a person of quality and manners”). A zealous patriot would later go so far as to deny that any sort of comunero rising had taken place, and made sure that one hapless chronicler would pay

79 “e los mochachos diciendo: ‘¡Al ladrón rovador, vaya, vaya, que oí es el día de San Asistente!’ …” ibid.
80 Geraldine McKendrick has analysed a 1520 edition of the Dança de la muerte, a traditional work to which a number of verses had been added in 1473, replete with specific local references and “consumer complaints” that paralleled real-life grievances, and which the printer, Juan Varela de Salamanca, judged to be sufficiently relevant and worthy of re-publication. Geraldine McKendrick, “The Dança de la Muerte of 1520 and Social Unrest in Seville,” Journal of Hispanic Philology 3 (1979).
dearly for making a passing reference to Seville in a roll-call of rebel cities. All agreed that the people had proven themselves to be incorruptible in 1520, preserving Seville’s vaunted and emblematic ‘loyalty’. Even modern scholars have discounted the importance, in the larger scheme of things, of Juan de Figueroa’s rising—and while the allegiances of the commons have been analysed, scarcely any attention has been devoted to the exclusively popular rising of March 1521. Yet the people, that is to say commoners of all social stripes, and above all artisans, played an active and perhaps even a key role throughout the turbulent second half of 1520 and early 1521. They were recruited by both noble factions—the ducal houses of Medina Sidonia and Arcos—as well as the Tello brothers, royal and urban magistrates, but they also acted on their own account.

Juan de Figueroa’s 16 September rising thus included “cibdadanos e oficiales e vecinos desta çibdat” (“citizens and artisans and neighbours of this city”). On his way to the Plaza de Santa Catalina that morning, the asistente’s lieutenant encountered various armed bands on their way to the Arcos residence, including a gilder accompanied by ten to twelve men who refused to submit to his authority, invoking the comunidad. Figueroa spent that night fortified inside the Alcázar hoping that his actions would find approval among the “el comun y pueblo” (“the commons and the people”) of Seville who would come to his aid. Few answered his call, by the grace of God according to one chronicler,

---

82 On Morovelli de Puebla’s feud with Mártir Rizo, the author of Historia de la muy noble y leal ciudad de Cuenca in which Seville is mentioned as a rebel city, see chapter 2 of this dissertation. A recent study suggests that the Andalusian cities used legal channels and erudite works of history to combat a “black legend” regarding their role in the Comunero revolt: Gómez Vozmediano, “Historia versus Memoria,” 199.
83 “el levantamiento que don Juan de Figueroa con otros caualleros, e cibdadanos e oficiales e vecinos desta çibdat huvieron fecho.” Collantes de Terán Sánchez, “El ‘alboroto’,” 397.
84 “se puso en resystençia con él. Ibid., 340, 403.
85 “aquella noche se aposentó allí pensando que viniera a juntarse con el elcomun y pueblo de esta Ciudad, aprovando lo que avia hecho.” Espinosa de los Monteros, Segunda parte de la Historia, f. 83r.
but more likely because they did not find it to their advantage.\textsuperscript{86} Yet in spite of his failure to appeal to large sections of the lower orders, it seems that either the \textit{asistente}, upon his return to the city, or the \textit{oidores} of the Chancillería of Granada, brought a list of two hundred “\textit{gente menuda}” said to have been implicated in the rising.\textsuperscript{87} An authoritative recent study affirms Figueroa’s revolutionary credentials, and qualifies his rising as a genuine attempt to mobilize Seville in the name of the \textit{comunidad},\textsuperscript{88} as had been done in other Castilian cities—rather than yet another round in the noble factional struggles. Indeed, it may well be that popular grievances were gathering steam, prompting a junior member of the house of Arcos to preempt a disturbance—one that might have had unpredictable consequences—by personally taking charge of a rising. Figueroa’s failure is a reflection of the greater resources and persuasive power of his opponents, who decisively won the battle for the hearts and minds of the people.

The rival Medina Sidonia faction could also count on the adherence of plebeian partisans, but the most successful recruiters appear to have been the Tello brothers, Garci and Juan Gutiérrez. Sons of an alderman of Seville, and related to other \textit{veinticuatro}s and \textit{jurados}, recent discoveries suggest the Tellos acted independently of the House of Niebla, or Medina Sidonia, and were in fact the least dissembling champions of royal authority throughout the critical period.\textsuperscript{89} Months prior to Figueroa’s rising—as soon as news of Comunero revolts in Castile began to filter through to Seville—they were busy “proselytizing” in favour of “the king’s service and his justice,” above all among the artisan population. They visited the homes and workshops of the latter, but also opened their own

\textsuperscript{86} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{87} Exemplary punishments were urged for these rebel commoners, while only tentative steps were taken to reprimand some of the nobles involved. Collantes de Terán Sánchez, “El ‘alboroto’,” 422.
\textsuperscript{88} And thus in opposition to Charles V.
\textsuperscript{89} Collantes de Terán Sánchez, “El ‘alboroto’.”
residence to popular gatherings that may have numbered hundreds, and featured banquets, games, swordplay, assorted gifts as well as overt indoctrination. The esteem and affinity earned as a result were recouped by the Tellos in the form of personal allegiance and support, and explain the subsequent readiness of many artisans to resist Figueroa’s siren call. However, in the brief, violent skirmish in which Figueroa and his followers lost control of the Alcázar, the most substantial armed group mobilized by the Tellos was a troop of “more than one hundred lances” brought from the Feria by the notary Juan de Porras, an artisan contingent that would soon escape the brothers’ control.

Sections of the commons also pursued their own agenda, sought redress for specific grievances, and were able to conceive of an alternative vision of community. If Figueroa’s attempted coup caught many unprepared, even among his own faction, in the months before and after his abortive rising the authorities’ biggest concern was the possibility of popular unrest. As a result of the Comunero tide sweeping through Castile, there were worrying reports of “juntamientos de gente” (“gatherings”), and the “sospecha e fama” (“suspicion and rumour”) of a popular revolt—subterranean murmurings that clearly shaped the subsequent actions of the noble antagonists. The fishermen from the neighbourhood of San Juan de Acre, for example, claimed exemption from certain fiscal impositions, and threatened to “scandalize the people” if their demands were not met, before supposedly

---

90 Ibid., 446-7.  
91 “Especialmente vino el escrivano Juan de Porras, el cual traxo de la Feria mas de cien lanças ...” María Ángeles Durán Ramas, “Discurso de la Comunidad de Sevilla, año 1520, que escribió un clérigo apasionado de la Casa de Niebla,” Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras 22 (1994): 159.  
92 “juntamientos de gente de la comunidad ...” Collantes de Terán Sánchez, “El ‘alboroto’,” 436. “a cabas que en la cibdad de Seuilla se publicavan las nuevas de Toledo, e de Segouia, e otras cibdades que se avían levantado ...” ibid., 439. and “la sospecha e fama que por Seuilla andava de levantamientos ...” ibid., 446.
being pacified by the Tellos, who convinced them to drop the matter.\footnote{The demanded exemption from the \textit{almojarifazgo} and \textit{veintena}, and “si no le fuese concedido lo que pedían, de escandalizar el pueblo.” The Tellos may have used threats rather than blandishments in this case. Ibid., 425.} Immediately prior to Figueroa’s precipitous intervention, the Duke of Arcos himself sent for a certain cloth merchant (\textit{trapero}), Gonzalo Suárez, who was advised to “set down [in writing] all of their grievances,” which they did.\footnote{“al cual le abisó que pusiese en cobro lo que más le doliese, y así todos pusieron en cobro lo que más les dolía …” Durán Ramas, “Discurso,” 151-2.} Many chose to follow their own sense of what was in the general interest, choosing political allegiances over ties of patronage or faction, and there were of course those motivated by pecuniary rewards.\footnote{Some of those normally aligned with the Duke of Arcos repudiated Figueroa’s actions and enlisted with the Tellos or the Medina Sidonia. Thus a carpenter quoted one of the Tello brothers, clearly agreeing with his that “aquí no queremos comunidad, ni León, ni Niebla, sino que biba el rey.” Collantes de Terán Sánchez, “El ‘alboroto’,” 442-3.} Among the former was Juan de Porras and his Feria contingent, who six months following Figueroa’s rising—in which he marched alongside the Tello brothers—emerged as one of the leaders of the Pendón Verde revolt.

The tension scarcely abated following Figueroa’s defeat and flight, and the radicalisation of the Comunero movement in Castile did little to calm fears of popular disturbances, apparently driving the Duke of Arcos into the loyalist camp by October 1520.\footnote{Gómez Vozmediano, “Historia versus Memoria,” 215.} As the price of bread continued to rise, food became scarce, and the complaints of the \textit{gente menuda} overflowed the usual restraints to inundate the whole city. Yet the Pendón Verde revolt of March 1521 was more than a spontaneous outburst of popular fury fuelled by hunger.\footnote{Pérez, \textit{La revolución de las Comunidades}, 387. On the fluctuating price of grain, and hunger in Seville during this period, see Antonio Collantes de Terán Sánchez, “1522: La muerte por hambre en la Sevilla de la opulencia,” in \textit{Os reinos ibéricos na Idade Média: livro de homenagem ao professor doutor Humberto Carlos Baquero Moreno}, ed. Luis Adão da Fonseca, Luis Carlos Amaral, and Maria Fernanda Ferreira Santos (2003).} Anton Sánchez—carpenter and resident of the Feria—and others summoned twenty deputies from each of the adjacent parishes to present their demand for
bread to be made available at reasonable prices to the *asistente*. They jointly approached a local knight (*caballero* Perafán) with this commission, and soon the ringing of the parish church bells brought a large crowd to the Plaza de la Feria. The bare facts alone indicate the existence of informal networks of neighbourhood authority, as well as familiar modes and mechanisms of local mobilization and petitioning that were not dependent on noble prompting. La Feria was a colloquial term for the parish of Omnium Sanctorum, but in times of crisis it would begin to imply the collective actions of men from several adjoining parishes, an ‘unofficial’ neighbourhood extending across formal jurisdictional boundaries.

In spite of promises made by terrified aldermen, the people separated into groups to raid those houses which they suspected of hiding stores of grain. This was not, as one chronicler would have it, a “desordenado furor” (“disordered fury”) unleashed upon the city, for the rebels had a very clear idea of where the supplies were to be found. Soon however their attention turned to freeing the prisoners from the city’s jails, suggesting more deep-seated concerns about the exercise of justice.

A corollary of the notion of a hungry, unbridled and impulsive populace is that the revolt suffered from a lack of leadership. This, too is the product of obfuscation or wishful thinking by later chroniclers. Apart from the carpenter Anton Sánchez, mentioned

---

98 His response is not recorded. Rather than a failure of nerve or initiative, this was an attempt to influence the municipal government through legitimate channels, but only in conjunction with other, more direct pressure tactics. The pattern would be repeated in 1652.
100 In early modern Venice, ‘neighbourhood’ could mean different things, to different people (individuals and groups), in different circumstances, and “unofficial” neighbourhoods reflected “the possibilities of local loyalties both within and across parishes.” Wheeler, “Mediterranean Urban Culture,” 33.
101 Ortiz de Zúñiga, *Anales*, 325. The first targets of these raids were the houses of the parish *jurado*, Alaraz, and his son-in-law. Durán Ramas, “Discurso,” 192. On the role of *jurados*, see below.
102 This pattern would be repeated in 1652, when royal taxes, and the behaviour of royal agents combined with the high price of bread to unleash another revolt in the Feria. The main difference between the two uprisings is that by 1652 the more immediate presence of royal officials, and royal justice (in the form of the *Audiencia* high court) meant that these men and institutions were singled out for attack.
above, it emerges that when the *asistente* entered la Feria with his armed retinue with the intention of suppressing the revolt, he arrested “cinco hombres de los mas honrados de la collaçion” (“five of the most honourable citizens of the neighbourhood”)—and failed to apprehend the public notary, Juan de Porras, previously encountered at the head of one hundred lances.\(^{104}\) This Juan de Porras was the scion of a Sevillian clan which around this time and in decades to follow yielded several hardy Peruvian conquistadores and rebels.\(^{105}\) In various sources he is confused with the *jurado* Diego de Porras, his father, which may suggest a case of unfulfilled ambitions, or an inherited community leadership role.\(^{106}\) Juan de Porras’s house was razed following the popular rebels’ defeat, a common punishment for rebels and traitors.\(^{107}\)

Clearly the 1521 popular revolt was about more than starving, desperate characters acting on the spur of the moment, and without method. In the absence of written manifestos or recorded cries, one must remain cautious in regards to the precise content of the popular grievances, or the extent and ambition of their claims. But there should be no doubt that these were fundamentally political, in the sense of being aimed at perceived failures of government rather than merely their temporary effects. Crucially, the defection of Juan de Porras from the Tello-Medina Sidonia camp, and the nature of the popular revolt of March 1521, suggests that the people could do more than choose between the king and the *comunidad*, and might harbour different conceptions of royal justice, and what this entailed.

---

\(^{104}\) “el asistente con otros bien armados fue a la Feria y prendió a cinco hombres de los mas honrados de la collaçion y fueron en casa del escrivano Juan de Porras; y no lo hallaron; y hallaron en una açotea una espada y un broquel …” Durán Ramas, “Discurso,” 193.


\(^{106}\) “la gente común, principalmente los de la collaçion omnium santorum que es gente rústica acordaron de hazer su capitan al Jurado Diego de Porras y hizieron vn pendon verde …” BNM, MS 20476 [Apuntamientos y relaciones históricas], f. 73r.

\(^{107}\) Durán Ramas, “Discurso,” 195.
in practice. This conceptual matrix may also be inferred from one enduring, inadequately understood visual representation of popular feeling and local identity—the green banner of Omnium Sanctorum.

1.3. Of Flags

Flags were one of the “media” that sustained the social memory of urban craftsmen in fifteenth-century Ghent in their struggle against Burgundian dukes. In contemporary Bruges they also served as symbols of corporate solidarity, not only to maintain a united front against outsiders but also the authority of guild deans. In late medieval Italian urban revolts flags are said to have possessed “magic” properties—rebellious workers and craftsmen in Italian city-states were “obsessed with and utterly dependent on their flags and banners,” to the extent that the loss of a flag might paralyze the entire movement. These often rather elaborate flags (and shields) were sometimes designed by the workers or artisans themselves, and, although most often associated with guilds, they were sometimes neighbourhood banners, flags of the people, or of justice. In early modern Seville some guilds and brotherhoods also had their own flags, expensively made and jealously guarded, but guilds had little autonomous power even over their own members, and it was not guild membership through which vecinos asserted any vestige of political influence, but rather through residence in one of the city’s collaciones (districts or parishes). It is

109 Jan Dumolyn and Jelle Haemers, “‘A Bad Chicken was Brooding’: Subversive Speech in Late Medieval Flanders,” Past & Present, no. 214 (2012): 80.
110 Cohn, Lust for Liberty: The Politics of Social Revolt in Medieval Europe, 1200-1425.
111 José Gestoso y Pérez, Noticia histórico-descriptiva del antiguo pendón de la ciudad de Sevilla y de la bandera de la Hermandad de los Sastres, Clásicos Sevillanos (Sevilla: Área de Cultura, 1999).
therefore appropriate that the most famous banner—after the royal standard and the city’s own—should be forever twinned with the name of its most self-aware neighbourhood.

As the tension between the various competing factions and authorities in Seville diffused through the city streets, churches, workshops and taverns, sharpening tongues and grievances, exploding finally in a series of more or less violent confrontations, the flags and standards fluttering above the shouts and the smoke assumed a critical importance. In the chaos following Figueroa’s taking of the Alcázar, as the duchess of Medina rallied her men, the royal asistente struggled to mobilize a municipal guard, and the wealthy merchants formed neighbourhood defence committees, it became essential to know, or to establish who was doing what, and why. Thus the asistente’s lieutenant insisted that the armed retainers and partisans of the Medina Sidonia faction, the first to arrive at the scene, should march under the royal banner, a symbol of his nominal authority and one that would throw a mantle of legitimacy over their self-interested vigilantism. The royal governor’s lieutenant then convoked the city council, and as they ostensibly gathered in readiness to join the fray, they requested the royal standard to be brought out—traditionally kept in the royal chapel inside Seville’s cathedral, the keys to which were in the archbishop’s possession. Surviving documents paint a picture of urban magistrates waiting stoically on the steps of the cathedral, supposedly primed for battle and a stone’s throw away from the besieged Alcázar yet unable to move until the standard had been handed over to them. The archbishop dithered and the city “dexo de salir con el pendon al tiempo que fue menester a resistir los
dichos alborotos acaescidos y al tomar los dichos alcaçares” (“unable to sally with the [royal] standard in time to resist the said insurrection and recapture the Alcázar …”).

The Feria rebels of 1521 would not be so reticent in seizing their green standard six months later. Even the most pithy description of the events doesn’t fail to mention how they entered the church of Omnium Sanctorum, overlooking the marketplace, and from the chapel of Gonzalo Gómez de Cervantes “deuajo de la Torre, do ay pabezes y pendones antiguos sacaron vn pendon de damasco verde …” (“beneath the tower, from among some ancient shields and banners took one made of green damask”), before marching on the cabildo. The Pendón Verde was an emblem of the neighbourhood, but subsequent events and memory would transform it into an intriguing, enduring symbol of an explicitly local strain of popular contrarian tendencies, and even shorthand for revolt itself. Its role has been explained away rather too neatly as a rebel counterpoint to the royal standard of their adversaries. It was not necessarily intended as a direct challenge to royal authority—rebellions in the early modern Spanish world rarely were—and the contrast with the king’s insignia was, if anything, construed by the authorities. Most likely it represented an alternative or idiosyncratic conception of that authority, both royal and municipal, its obligations and responsibilities. Any meaning that the rebels themselves attached to this

112 “de manera que por no lo dar al tiempo que por la dicha Cabdad fue requerido la Cabdad dexo de salir con el pendón al tiempo que fue menester a resistir los dichos alborotos acaescidos y al tomar los dichos alcaçares a las personas que los tenían tomados y usurpados …” AMS, sección 13, tomo 3, no. 33-38, f. 254r.

Although there is more than a hint of retrospective self-justification in these accusations, it is also clear that the argument was considered perfectly acceptable—that the city magistrates, otherwise ready to intervene, were unable to do so in the absence of the legitimating (royal) standard. Other sources suggest that the rump city council which met on Monday morning, 17th September, could not agree on whether to request the banner from the Cathedral chapter, which caused the delay, and when one of the asistente’s lieutenants finally showed up to collect it, he was met by a hail of stones—not intended to seriously injure the magistrate, according to the canons, but rather because “los que allí se fallaron, que fueron pocos, no sabían la çirimonia con que se sacava [el pendón] …” Collantes de Terán Sánchez, “El ‘alboroto’,” 431-3.

113 “de la capilla de Gonzalo Gomez de Cerbantes, que esta deuajo de la Torre, do ay pabezes y pendones antiguos sacaron vn pendon de damasco verde, en quadirilla fueron a el cabildo de la ciudad …” Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y muy leal ciudad de Sevilla, BCC, MS 59-1-5, f. 156r.

114 Perry, Crime and Society.
banner has not been recorded—except their determination to hold onto it when the Marquis of la Algaba tried to wrest it back\(^ {115}\)—so all that remains is circumstantial evidence.

The banner had been captured in battle from the Moors in the thirteenth century. As a familiar trophy of the Christian reconquest, and given that suspicion of and violence against Jews and *conversos* had become a central feature of popular uprisings since at least the fifteenth century,\(^ {116}\) it is not inconceivable that the artisan rebels tried to mobilize support by appealing to a common Old Christian identity, as a surrogate for atrophied, or still fledgling, civic and corporate solidarities.\(^ {117}\) In this case the green banner might be seen as an expression of “meta-politics” through which an increasingly socially fractured community sought a measure of unity.\(^ {118}\) However it is possible to be even more specific.

The banner was normally on display inside the church of Omnium Sanctorum, in the chapel belonging to the Cervantes clan, local worthies whose remit it was to keep the peace in the parish.\(^ {119}\) Gonzalo Gómez de Cervantes,\(^ {120}\) apparently the last to endow the chapel of Jesus of Nazareth, is listed as the recipient of one of the most generous rations of wheat in the troubled aftermath of the revolt.\(^ {121}\) More than that, as corregidor of Jerez de la Frontera, he

\(^{115}\) Durán Ramas, “Discurso,” 192. The Marquises of la Algaba were a junior branch of the powerful Guzmán noble clan. Their principal residence faced the Plaza de la Feria, opposite the church of Omnium Sanctorum. See chapter 4 of this dissertation.

\(^{116}\) Including Figueroa’s ‘Comunero’ revolt of 1520, which targeted the wealthy and powerful *converso* merchant elite. On the fifteenth-century pogroms, see MacKay, “Popular Movements and Pogroms in Fifteenth-Century Castile.”

\(^{117}\) This would become a generalized tendency in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. See Fernández Albaladejo, “Católicos antes que ciudadanos.”

\(^{118}\) Sánchez León, “Changing Patterns of Urban Conflict in Late Medieval Castile,” 228.

\(^{119}\) *Memorias eclesiásticas y seculares de la Muy Noble y muy leal Ciudad de Sevilla*, BCC, MS 59-1-3, f. 104v.

\(^{120}\) Ibid., f. 105v.

\(^{121}\) Testimonio dado por Aparicio Lopez, receptor de la Chancillería de Granada, de cierta porción de fanegas de trigo que fueron repartidas por esta Ciudad entre los vecinos de sus parroquias: año de 1521, AMS, sección 1, cpta. 175, no. 51.
had been responsible for authorizing numerous shipments of Andalusian grain abroad, a
lucrative practice that was particularly resented during grain shortages.\textsuperscript{122}

Gonzalo Gómez de Cervantes had also been a parish \textit{jurado}.\textsuperscript{123} These local
magistrates served as a vital link between the crown, the urban oligarchy (\textit{regidores}) and the
rest of the population, and were expected to keep their finger on the pulse of their
neighbourhood.\textsuperscript{124} Their ostensible purpose was to channel popular grievances,\textsuperscript{125} as they
would do in the wake of the \textit{Pendón Verde} revolt, when they petitioned the crown to curb
speculation, act to reduce the price of bread, and open formal investigations of outgoing
urban magistrates.\textsuperscript{126} One of the first houses ‘visited’ by the popular rebels in search of grain
was that of \textit{jurado} Alaraz and his son-in-law.\textsuperscript{127} In theory \textit{jurados} were elected by all the
\textit{vecinos} of the \textit{collación}, and these elections, conducted every two years in the parish church,
were the most frequent—and often the only—political act in which many of the lower
classes took part in regularly, while ensuring that local belonging (to the \textit{collación}, or parish)
carried with it a measure of formal inclusion in urban politics, along with other ties that

\textsuperscript{122} In the aftermath of the 1521 revolt, the \textit{jurados} of Seville complained that in spite of incoming supplies the
price of grain refused to come down because of speculators who purchased in bulk and either resold the grain
locally at higher prices, or shipped it abroad, with no “justice to punish them …” \textit{Carta de los jurados de Sevilla
da SSMM suplicándoles que nombrasen Asistente de dicha ciudad y haciendo relación de los perjuicios que se
seguían de estar vacante el cargo}, AGS, Cámara de Castilla, \textit{Diversos}, leg. 43, no. 73, 1521.

\textsuperscript{123} AGS, Cámara de Castilla, \textit{Cédulas}, lib. 2-1, no. 57, 4, 22 March 1495.

\textsuperscript{124} They had their own assembly, or \textit{cabildo}, and had the right to petition the crown directly. One of Seville’s
two representatives in the Cortes, or parliament of Castile, was required to be a \textit{jurado} (the other was an
alderman, or \textit{regidor}). On \textit{jurados} under the Catholic kings, see Marvin Lunenfeld, \textit{Keepers of the City: The

\textsuperscript{125} One authority on late medieval Seville has even suggested that the presence of parish \textit{jurados} may provide an
explanation for the general absence of popular activism in local politics—as long as these officials performed
their role effectively. See, Collantes de Terán Sánchez, “La Andalucía de las ciudades,” 129.

\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Carta de los jurados de Sevilla a SSMM suplicándoles que nombrasen Asistente de dicha ciudad y haciendo
relación de los perjuicios que se seguían de estar vacante el cargo}, AGS, Cámara de Castilla, \textit{Diversos}, leg. 43, no.
73.

\textsuperscript{127} Durán Ramas, “Discurso,” 192.
bound residents to one another in the course of their daily interactions. These elections were also notoriously corrupt and open to manipulation, which invited repeated royal interventions. Another Alaraz, also a jurado and almost certainly a relative of the official who was the first target of popular fury in 1520, had been under investigation for the manner in which he had been elected to the office in 1495. Indeed, the aftermath of the rebel defeat in 1521 was dominated by a conflict in which the two noble factions (Medina Sidonia and Arcos) each tried to have its favoured candidate ‘elected’ to one of the two vacant posts of jurado in the parish of Omnium Sanctorum. It is therefore quite conceivable that the seizure of the green banner was—among other things—an attempt to make some sort of statement in the context of these micro-political machinations, at a time when the office of jurado was well on the way being transformed from a popular tribune to another agent of the municipal oligarchy. At the very least it is unsurprising that men who lived and worked in and around the Plaza de la Feria should mobilize by parish, and the green banner they seized in 1521 would in due course become inextricably associated with this neighbourhood’s potential for violent disaffection.

129 Ibid., 368-70. In 1480, for example, “the asistente of Seville was petitioned by parishioners of S. Miguel that he be present at an election, thus impeding the pressure of certain powerful persons.” Lunenfeld, Keepers of the City: The Corregidores of Isabella I of Castile, 1474-1504, 13. For a more detailed discussion of the office of jurado in Seville, and the various factors that influenced their election, see Blanca Morell Peguero, Mercaderes y artesanos en la Sevilla del descubrimiento (Sevilla: Diputación Provincial, 1986), 187-96.
130 Navarro Sainz, El Concejo de Sevilla, 369.
131 Durán Ramas, “Discurso,” 197. Alaraz had died in the meantime.
132 Morell Peguero, Mercaderes y artesanos, 187-96; Navarro Sainz, El Concejo de Sevilla, 368-73.
1.4. Memory, Identity and Urban Politics

Ortiz de Zúñiga concludes his brief narrative of the Feria y Pendón Verde with the explanation that it was an event of which only “confusas memorias” (“confused memories”) survive, ostensibly suggesting that by the second half of the seventeenth century remembrance had faded into oblivion. However, what the chronicler intended to say was that, in his view, the memory of the revolt was far more enduring that its reality warranted, the fame—fama—of this uprising had been greater than its effect. Indeed the catchword for the popular rising, ‘Feria y Pendón Verde’ had by then entered the symbolic repertoire of political discourse and literature. Seventeenth-century urban officials, scribes and chroniclers, either in dealing with later popular disturbances or inscribing these events in private or public memory, routinely conflated these with the 1521 uprising, leading even some modern scholars astray. In the municipal archives one thus finds a memorandum from a local magistrate related to the prosecution of a 1621 plot, calling for the punishment of conspirators from la Feria, allegedly implicated in a revolt of the Pendón Verde—even though the banner does not appear to have been used after 1521.

Thirty years later, the 1652 Feria insurrection is referred to as the “segundo motín del Pendón verde” in the record

---

133 “suceso de que duran solo confusas memorias llamado de la Feria y Pendón verde. Su fama … fue mayor que su efecto.” Ortiz de Zúñiga, Anales, vol 3, 326.
134 Mary Elizabeth Perry misleadingly suggests, in reference to the pendón verde, that “[t]his traditional trophy … was taken in both revolts without authorization of priests or officials by a group of rebels who carried it as they marched through the streets rallying supporters.” Perry, Crime and Society, 248. There is no mention of the banner in 1652, though in every other respect the parallels were obvious to later chroniclers. See, Ortiz de Zúñiga, Anales, vol 3, 326. More recently Geoffrey Parker has (once again mistakenly) designated the Andalusian urban revolts of 1647-1652—in Cordoba, Seville, and a host of smaller towns and cities—as “The ‘Green Banner’ Revolts,” and so a parish symbol deployed in an early sixteenth-century popular uprising has somehow come to be associated with a regional wave of revolts more than a century later. Geoffrey Parker, Global Crisis: War, Climate Change and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 280.
135 Proposiciones del Sr. Veinticuatro D. Rodrigo Suarez, para castigar á los amotinados de la Feria, conocidos por el Pendón verde, AMS, sección 4, siglo XVII, tomo 28, no. 18. This document is wrongly labelled as referring to events of 1623, when in fact this somewhat bizarre conspiracy took place in 1621, a slip that seems to have misled some modern experts: Ruth Pike, Aristocrats and Traders: Sevillian Society in the Sixteenth Century (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972), chapter 3, 34n.
of the criminal proceedings against one of the accused.\textsuperscript{136} Finally, some of the manuscript annals discussed above seem to be thoroughly confounded by the parallels between the two uprisings, those of 1521 and 1652, naming some of the protagonists of the latter in descriptions of the former.\textsuperscript{137} The image and the reality of this troublesome parish were clearly inseparable in the minds of many officials and observers.

The literary echoes of the 1521 motín are perhaps even more significant, suggesting that a much wider audience would have been expected to grasp the basic connotations of this neighbourhood of Seville and its green banner. In \textit{Don Quixote}, to begin with the most obvious, Sancho Panza is famously tossed in the blanket by two mischievous residents of “la Heria de Sevilla” (La Feria).\textsuperscript{138} But there are even more pointed references elsewhere. Near the end of Luis Vélez de Guevara’s \textit{El diablo cojuelo} (1641), as a city constable is about to make an arrest he is warned that “there is a man [present] … a graduate of \textit{la Feria y el pendón verde}” who was prepared to cut any official down to size.\textsuperscript{139} A native of Seville, presumably Vélez de Guevara expected at least some of his readers in the mid-seventeenth century to pick up on this reference to a supposedly obscure popular rising of 1521. Even if this is taken as a wink aimed at his local, or Sevillian, audience, it suggests that the expression had gained some currency more than a century after the event. Likewise, in the last great picaresque novel, \textit{Estebanillo González} (1646), the eponymous hero explains that

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{136} \textit{Diligencias practicadas en 1652 para castigar el segundo motín del Pendón verde}, AMS, sección 4, siglo XVII, tomo 28, no. 19.
  \item \textsuperscript{137} One later account of the 1521 revolt notes that “caudillabalos un clerigo que desian figueyras, portugues” (“the rebels were led by a Portuguese cleric, Figueiras …”). This Figueras or Filgueira, was in fact a spokesman for the 1652 rebels. \textit{Papeles varios}, BCC, MS 59–3–43, f. 89v.
  \item \textsuperscript{138} Miguel de Cervantes, \textit{Don Quijote de la Mancha}, ed. Francisco Rico (Madrid: Santillana Ediciones, 2007).
  \item \textsuperscript{139} Here apparently a euphemism for the proverbial ‘School of Hard Knocks’, and as such more than a little tongue in cheek, but one should not discount the connection between graduates of ‘real’ universities and government, whether local or national. Even if only indirectly, this might be read as a reference to the readiness of certain types of common people to usurp legitimate authority Luis Vélez de Guevara, \textit{El diablo cojuelo} (1641), ed. Enrique Rodríguez Cepeda, 5th ed., Letras Hispánicas (Madrid: Cátedra, 2007), 179.
\end{itemize}
he was quick to befriend a newly disembarked *cuadrilla* (band) of *bravos* since he had always been partial to “men of heria y pendón verde.” The collective purpose of the rebels of 1521 might have been lost in these literary appropriations, but what survived was an image of courageous, irreverent, even arrogant men ready for anything, and most of all to challenge authority.

In Seville, these words had a material significance, and the green banner could not be disassociated from the neighbourhood of la Feria, or rather the several adjacent parishes populated mainly by artisans: silk workers, tailors, carpenters, shoemakers. Through the intervening years (1521-1652) these marginal neighbourhoods had never ceased to be a source of concern. In 1626, when the city suffered its worst flooding in living memory, after surveying the damage done to the urban fabric by the rising waters of the Guadalquivir river the people were quick to blame the *asistente*, and the incompetence of his deputies. The magistrate was subjected to a “thousand insults,” and it was deemed prudent by the authorities to withdraw precisely from the Feria, where their mere presence almost provoked a riot. The fear of what might come to pass—if the price of food were allowed to spiral out of control, if excessive new taxes were imposed, if justice were perceived to be too severe on those unable to pay, when even a natural disaster, like the 1626 flood, could lead the restless men of the Feria to point fingers at the royal governor—was a constant factor in the decision-making of the urban elites. In this way the common people influenced

---

140 Anon, *La vida y hechos de Estebanillo González: hombre de buen humor*, ed. Antonio Carreira and Jesús A. Cid, 2 vols., vol. 1, Letras hispánicas (Madrid: Catédra, 1990), 179-80. *La heria* was another version of la Feria. The popular rebels in 1463, 1521 and 1652 marched around the city in *cuadrillas*, small groups of at least four men, according to Sebastián de Covarrubias Orozco, *Tesoro de la lengua castellana, o española* (Madrid: Luis Sánchez, 1611), 601.

141 “La culpa de auerse entrado el Rio imputaban al Asistente, y á los Diputados de las puertas que se fueron á dormir. Han dicho al pobre viejo mil injurias, y en la Feria vbo menester retirarse, temiendo algun desacato.” *Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y mui leal ciudad de Sevilla*, BCC, MS 59-1-5, f. 223r.
political life far more directly than through the corrupt elections of parish deputies, even if they never attempted to impose a distinct political vision, or a formal redistribution of power.\textsuperscript{142}

The neighbourhood—\textit{collación, parroquia, barrio}\textsuperscript{143}—in larger cities emerged as the foundation of popular identities in early modern Spain, and the dominant principle of popular collective organization. In seventeenth-century Barcelona, the disenfranchised lower class inhabitants of the city’s largest parish acted as an effective pressure group by developing and manipulating an alternative neighbourhood identity. This in turn was derived from a propensity for direct (and violent) collective action to redress economic and political grievances, whereby residents engaged in what James Amelang has called “the politics of reputation.”\textsuperscript{144} In Seville this phenomenon requires more detailed analysis, but there are sufficient indications that the city fathers never ceased to be exercised by the dense concentration of those men who, in their eyes, were ready for anything in the northern extremities of the city, gathering to buy, sell, drink and socialize in spaces that were beyond

\textsuperscript{142} I. M. W. Harvey was able to offer an affirmative answer to the question—“was there popular politics in Fifteenth-Century England?”—by redefining the concept of “popular politics” to signify “not radical new policies” but changes “in the way things were done.” The growth of popular influence in fifteenth-century politics, evident in more frequent outbreaks of collective violence, and more assertive petitioning of the crown and parliament, was the result of a number of long- and short-term factors, including the enduring memory of the 1381 rebellion. I. M. W. Harvey, “Was There Popular Politics in Fifteenth-Century England?,” in The McFarlane Legacy: Studies in Late Medieval Politics and Society, ed. R. H. Britnell and A. J. Pollard (Stroud, 1995).

\textsuperscript{143} The \textit{collación} was one of the administrative subdivisions of Seville, equivalent to the parish (\textit{parroquia}); \textit{barrio} was a more informal designation, often used in reference to the Feria.

easy reach and difficult to supervise. Apart from traces of these contrarian energies in times of crisis, there is also the fact that some of the most extensive urban redevelopment projects undertaken in early modern Seville—the Alameda de Hercules, a swamp transformed into a tree-lined promenade on the edge of the Omnium Sanctorum parish, and the monumental Hospital de las Cinco Llagas, a model social welfare institution built opposite the Macarena gate—in one way or another brought the elites and the authorities in closer contact with the unruly northern neighbourhoods, while also providing a measure of relief for their inhabitants, in life and death.

1.5. Aftermath

The Revolt of the Comunidades against the young, inexperienced, foreign, and absent Charles of Ghent has been hailed alternately as the first of the ‘modern’ European Revolutions or the last of the late-medieval rebellions; a political-constitutionalist movement or primarily an attempted social revolution; an uprising driven by the energies of a newly confident bourgeoisie, an oppressed peasantry, or a disgruntled nobility. There is indeed a case to be made for all of these at different stages of the revolt. The failure of the

---

145 The makeshift stalls and taverns of the Plaza de la Feria were finally ordered to be dismantled by the city council in the wake of the 1652 revolt, when they were clearly identified as the breeding ground for popular discontent. AMS, sección 10, 1ª escribanía, lib. 59, 29 May 1652.
146 For more details on this project, undertaken by the city’s asistente the Count of Barajas, see Amanda Wunder, “Classical, Christian, and Muslim Remains in the Construction of Imperial Seville (1520-1635),” Journal of the History of Ideas 64, no. 2 (2003).
147 The Macarena gate led into the parish of San Gil, adjacent to Omnium Sanctorum.
Comunidades has been designated as one of the root causes of later Spanish (or Castilian) ‘decline’, a wrong turn on the path to the creation of a ‘modern’ state, or in fact an atavistic reaction against the modernizing Habsburg polity. This search for a wider meaning of the events of 1519-21 shows few signs of abating.\textsuperscript{149}

In the aftermath of the great revolt, the rhetoric of loyalty, elaborated and defended by patriotic chroniclers, manipulated by officials and apologists, served many purposes, from legitimating power structures and relationships (‘loyalty’ in all its forms), underwriting municipal privileges and exemptions, and furthering local interests against those of other cities and communities. But as many scholars have shown, insisting upon it—as many contemporaries were inclined to do—obscures persistent oppositional tendencies within those very urban elites who proclaimed their ‘loyalty’ most vehemently. This was true of seventeenth-century Seville more than other cities: the “most loyal,” it was also the least obedient or pliable in the face of increasingly oppressive royal demands.\textsuperscript{150} The Count Duke of Olivares was thus forced to remind the city aldermen in 1638, exasperated by their reticence in coming to the king’s aid, that when the entire kingdom had risen against its legitimate ruler Seville had repudiated the rebel cause.\textsuperscript{151}

Yet even in Seville, a proverbially loyal city, the commons’ allegiance to the royal or any factional cause could not be securely counted upon, while some, brought together by neighbourhood and professional ties, might even conceive of alternative bases of political organization and action in times of crisis. The 1521 popular revolt also marked the

\textsuperscript{149} Espinosa, \textit{The Empire of the Cities}.
\textsuperscript{150} Gelabert González, \textit{Castilla convulsa}, 82-84, 38-39, 42, 43.
\textsuperscript{151} “que en ningun tiempo ni Historia puede referirse que Seuilla (quando la mayor parte de los Reynos vinieron en esta circunstancia) no solo no fue la primera, sino hizo repugnancia en ello …” \textit{Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y mui leal ciudad de Sevilla}, BCC, MS 59-1-5, f. 245r.
culmination of a subtle shift in the dynamics of local power, which had been evident in the
years prior to the troubled opening of Charles V’s reign. The factional struggles of the past
receded seemingly overnight, and the elites closed ranks before a popular tide that for a few
days threatened to sweep them away. The Pendón Verde—the green banner of the popular
rebels of 1521—became, among other things, literary shorthand for a type of popular rogue,
ruffian or malevolent vagabond. Yet the local association of this term with something more
than crime and delinquency, something more organized, insistent and dangerous for the
social and political order, endured in elite consciousness.

1.6. The 1652 Revolt

A possible connection between the crown’s fiscal policies in relation to the silk
industry and a major rebellion has been suggested for the 1568 Morisco uprising in
Granada. That sort of direct and positive link cannot be drawn in the case of seventeenth-
century Seville, at least not before a more detailed study of the vicissitudes of city’s silk
industry is undertaken. In the event, the revolt was sparked by rising price of bread, and
hunger, which explains the opening sequence in the Plaza de la Feria, the subsequent
emptying of the municipal granary, or Alhóndiga, the searches of the houses of the wealthy
for stores of grain and later attacks on the bakers of Alcalá de Guadaira. It might be
noteworthy in this regard that the expulsion of the Moriscos (1609-10) seems to have left
the Feria neighbourhood with fewer local bakers, and thus more reliant on outsiders from

152 Garrad, “La industria sedera granadina en el siglo XVI y su conexión con el levantamiento de las Alpujarras.”
the town of Alcalá de Guadaira, perhaps adding to the tension.\textsuperscript{153} In any case popular
discontent had been stoked in the weeks preceding the uprising by the royal agent, García
de Porras, whose unscrupulous methods in ferreting out those accused of illegally reminting
the vellón currency caused widespread resentment, and there were calls for his murder early
on.\textsuperscript{154} Clearly there was profound dissatisfaction with the urban authorities’ performance of
one of their primary duties (provisioning the city), and the administration of justice, not
only by the king’s agent but in general.\textsuperscript{155} However the overwhelming desire was not to
punish the authorities for their failings, and not, or not only, to redistribute resources more
equitably, at what the rebels considered to be a ‘just price’.\textsuperscript{156} Rather, they held out for
legislative and structural changes—in the method and not merely the effects of government.

It should be pointed out that while local sacred places and images (parish church,
confraternities, crosses) may have been important elements in neighbourhood bonds (as

\textsuperscript{153} In contrast to the 3 bakers (out of a total of 338 individuals whose profession is given) in the larger, second
AGAS sample used in this study (1650-1655), there were 8 (of 159) in the smaller sample from the earlier period
(1595-1605). Of the 8 bakers in the first sample, at least 4 were Moriscos, residents of Omnium Sanctorum, San
Gil, Santa Marina, and San Julián—all four parishes within the Feria neighbourhood. The other four may or may
not have been Moriscos, and three more Moriscos whose professions are not noted (because they were grooms),
but whose witnesses were the above mentioned Morisco bakers, may also have been of the same occupation. The
Morisco bakers show up in: AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2324, exp. 36; leg. 1318, exp. 67; leg.
760, exp. 34. Other bakers who may or may not have been Moriscos: leg. 2444, exp. 28; leg. 1732, exp. 64. Bakers
in the second sample (1650-1655): AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 349, exp. 161; leg. 1264, exp.
164; leg. 1219, exp. 121.

\textsuperscript{154} On the disruptive and incendiary role played by royal tax-collectors and agents of the state—who, as
outsiders to the community could not benefit from the multiplicity of ties and reserves of trust enjoyed by local
magistrates—in fomenting riots and popular disturbances, see Michael J. Braddick, "Popular Politics and Public
Policy: The Excise Riot at Smithfield in February 1647 and Its Aftermath," \textit{The Historical Journal} 34, no. 3

\textsuperscript{155} Indicated by the burning of the criminal records and the freeing of the prisoners. All of these aspects: price
rises, hunger, and the effect of royal taxation, have been examined already in Gelabert González, \textit{Castilla
convulsa}, and originally in Domínguez Ortiz, \textit{Alteraciones andaluzas}.

\textsuperscript{156} The first observation is a reference to William Beik’s concept of a “culture of retribution”. The Feria revolt
differed from run-of-the-mill urban riots, such as those studied by Beik in France, where the crowd was not
primarily interested in righting wrongs (such as prohibiting exports etc.) but “retribution”, or punishing those
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 53. This element was certainly not absent: at very outset of the
revolt, in the Plaza de Monte Sion, not far from Omnium Sanctorum, Hurtado and his cuadrilla came across the
asistente, knocked him down from his horse and threw his hat in the air, before forcing him to accompany them
in their search for stores of grain. Domínguez Ortiz, \textit{Alteraciones andaluzas}, 348.
discussed in chapter 4), these were not explicitly invoked as symbols of solidarity among the Feria rebels, the way they were for instance in the near-contemporary revolt of Masaniello in Naples (1647). Nor did the post-Tridentine lay confraternities serve as vehicles of political mobilization, as similar brotherhoods may have done in the 1520s. On the contrary, sacred images were used almost exclusively by those intent on restoring order, above all the Capuchin friars, and what stands out in the narrative accounts of the revolt is the apparent anti-clericalism and suspicion of religious imagery and calls for peace and harmony.

This is not to say that some of the millenarian spirit that may have been a key factor in the 1520s was totally absent. Some manuscript chronicles and records of the 1652 popular revolt make reference to the rising popular discontent being fanned by “clamorous preachers”—it happened to be the time of Lent, and therefore plenty of sermons—who went so far as to claim that “they did not need any further sign that the Final Judgement [was nigh], since the anti-Christ was already in Seville, pulling out fingers, breaking arms and legs, and killing people with little justification.” Another manuscript notes that on the first Monday of Lent of 1652, “a religious of a certain order preached in the Cathedral on the words [from John 12:31]: Nunc iudicium est Mundi,” or “Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. Because just as it was said that when the Anti-christ comes before the end of the world, he would drive canes into the nails of the

159 Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.
hands and the feet, and similar torments, it is apt [“ya servia”] that there was one [among us] who tortured by pulling out toenails …” A marginal annotation suggests that the preacher in question was Bernabé Filgueira, who was soon about to play a key role in the popular revolt.¹⁶⁰ Moreover, we have already seen (in chapter 4) that some parish priests and Basilian friars may also have participated in the revolt.

Bernabé Filgueira, who by all accounts played a key role in the military organization of the rebels, in drawing up their list of demands, and as their chief negotiator, deserves more attention. Some sources claim that he was of Portuguese origin, others that he was a native of Granada “of a rowdy and spirit, intelligent, but of poor judgement, albeit a good leader, as he emerged as the one who issued the [rebel] proclamations and orders.”¹⁶¹ He was subsequently condemned to the Presidio of Larache, on the north African coast, having lost none of his rebellious spirit or power of persuasion. Once in Larache, Filgueira “so inflamed the spirits [of the inmates]” that they agreed to rise up against the Spanish garrison and hand over the outpost to the Moors—a plot that was uncovered just in time by the Governor, who was able to forestall the insurrection and head off the Moorish attack.¹⁶²

On May 25, with the city enjoying a few hours of calm amid the tumult, Filgueira arrived in front of the residence of the Regent of the Audiencia, perched Christ-like on a mule and carrying a list of eight rebel demands. These were no doubt the “insolencias que ya sonaban a rebelión mayor” mentioned in one contemporary report.¹⁶³ The contents of

¹⁶⁰ Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y muy leal ciudad de Sevilla, BCC, MS 59-1-5, ff. 152v-53r. Preaching against social and economic injustices was also heard on the eve of the revolt in Cordoba, Domínguez Ortiz, Alteraciones andaluzas, 138.
¹⁶¹ Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.
¹⁶² Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y muy leal ciudad de Sevilla, BCC, MS 59-1-5, ff. 152v-53r.
¹⁶³ Gelabert González, Castilla convulsa, 355.
this manifesto have been largely ignored by historians, but they reveal a much more ambitious programme than the Feria rebels have been given credit for. This included a demand for the commons or “plebe” to be allowed its own elected representative, a “cabeza”, who would have a decisive vote (voto decisivo) and would have to be summoned by the city council whenever the king requested another subsidy (servicio)—since the “plebe were so numerous … and everything that is granted [i.e. taxes] falls on their shoulders, and they pay for it through their work.” This was envisaged as a permanent post, with elections held every year, and parishioners summoned to vote by the church bell.\footnote{Lebantamiento de Sevilla, Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.} However fanciful in retrospect, at the very least it suggests that the rebels felt sufficiently emboldened to address some of their more longstanding grievances, which were of an unambiguously political nature, and to demand a permanent voice in the deliberations of the municipal government—and, indirectly, the administration of the kingdom itself. Also striking is the similarity between the proposed role of this popular tribune and the function that parish jurados already had in theory.\footnote{Jurados were chosen by parish, and as a body constituted the second tier of municipal government, below the Cabildo, which was made up of veinticuatro\footnote{That is to say, the veinticuatro is equivalent of regidores, or aldermen, elsewhere, since the jurados had their own cabildo.}s.} The jurados could still, and sometimes did, find themselves at odds with the city council,\footnote{Thus in 1579 they petitioned the Royal Council to refuse the Archbishop of Seville a licence for exporting 60,000 fanegas of bread, citing “fear” of leaving the municipal granary without sufficient reserves, even in the wake of a good harvest, and the interests of ‘the poor’, or “gente pobre que es la mayor en numero y por quien mas obligacion tenemos de mirar…” In this case the jurados and the Cabildo, or veinticuatro, acted jointly to reduce, at the very least, the amount of bread that the Archbishop was allowed to remove from the province of} and could appeal directly to the crown in defence of what they believed to be ‘the common good’.\footnote{Lebantamiento de Sevilla, Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.} However, they were by the mid-seventeenth
century firmly established as members of the socio-economic elite, sharing its interests and
concerns, and were no longer seen as the voice of (most of) their parish constituents.  

Another part of the rebel manifesto appears to be even more directly related to the
grievances of silk workers. It called for membership of the Cabildo, or city council, to be
limited to Castilians, with foreigners and the Portuguese in particular excluded. This sounds
like the sort of xenophobic impulse sometimes associated with popular unrest—and Castile
was still at war on several fronts. It may indeed have been a way to give patriotic legitimacy
to the rebel’s actions. However, having in mind the bearer of the manifesto, Filgueira (who
was Portuguese), and the composition of the rebel leadership (mainly silk weavers), one
might also see this as aimed at resolving a perennial complaint of silk workers, the
favouritism shown to foreign merchants in return for financial contributions or loans.
Foreigners may not have been to blame for the current crisis, the shortage of bread or the
debasement of the currency,  
but they were certainly held responsible for the general
decline of the silk industry, and they would continue to be well into the eighteenth century,
as Seville fell even further behind its domestic and foreign competitors. There would seem
to be some affinity between this rebel demand and the perceived collusion between

---

Seville: El Cabildo de Jurados de la ciudad de Sevilla con Rodrigo de Castro, arzobispo de la dicha ciudad sobre
que se de licencia para sacar fuera del reino 60.000 fanegas de pan, AHN, Consejos, leg. 27884, exp. 16. Yet most
of their mid-century legal battles seem to have been with the city or the royal Audiencia over privileges and
relative preeminence, as in a case from 1651, when two jurados were imprisoned for insisting too vehemently
that each time the veinticuatro sent deputies to conduct business at Court, they should be accompanied by one
of their own (a jurado): La ciudad de Sevilla sobre el cumplimiento de una Real Provisión por la que se decretaba
la puesta en libertad de los Caballeros Jurados, defensores del patrimonio real y de sus vasallos de la dicha ciudad,
presos por haber publicado un manifiesto, AHN, Consejos, leg. 26444, exp. 54, 1651.

168 To be sure this was a process that began, and was completed, long before the seventeenth century. On the
pervasive corruption that, already by the early sixteenth century, characterized the elections of jurados in
Seville’s parishes, see Morell Peguero, Mercaderes y artesanos, 187-96. Also: Navarro Sainz, El Concejo de
Sevilla, 363-406. Indeed, as mentioned in chapter 1, the machinations involved in the elections of jurados may
have been related to the 1521 Feria revolt.

169 Certainly they were among the wealthy citizens whose houses were thought to contain hidden stores of grain,
but not the only ones; the vellón debasement was a royal prerogative, and while the bakers who bore the brunt
of the popular violence were outsiders, from nearby Alcalá de Guadaira, they were indisputably Castilians.
municipal and mercantile elites over the importation of foreign silk fabrics that were seen to be undermining the local industry, an argument rehearsed in Romero Hurtado’s 1624 petition to the Royal Council, as well as on other occasions before and after the revolt.

One of the main reasons for the decline of Seville’s silk industry has been given as the artisans’ complete dependence on the silk cloth merchants, who supplied the raw material, commissioned all the work, and dictated production based on their needs.\textsuperscript{170} It is impossible to say to what extent these trade-related grievances motivated the rebels, but there are signs of underlying tension. Martin de Urizar, a silk merchant who had a shop in the Alcaicería, but whose home was on Calle Arrayan, running alongside the church of Omnium Sanctorum, was clearly relieved by the rebels’ defeat, and later testified in the defence of the rogue counterrevolutionary, Francisco de León. Along with other volunteers drawn from among the ranks of the mercantile elite, their dependents and servants, he joined a neighbourhood militia that for five months kept vigil over the Feria.\textsuperscript{171}

But just as the friar Filgueira was successfully negotiating a peace treaty with the authorities, some of the rebels were beginning to waver. Back in the Feria, a Capuchin friar “of exemplary life, and a native of Seville,” with a figure of Christ in his hands, “started preaching to pacify the rabble, and admonished them with such rousing words that he softened some of the rebels, and the murmur spread among them that ‘the Padre is right,

\textsuperscript{170} Domínguez Ortiz, Orto y ocaso, 44-53.
\textsuperscript{171} El fiscal contra el capitán Francisco de León preso en Sevilla sobre ciertos delitos, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25608, exp. 3, 1654, 337v–40v. The fact that, even though all of the leaders of the revolt had been executed, or sent to the galleys and North African presidios, the municipal authorities felt the need to maintain an armed garrison in the Feria is a sign of the seriousness of the revolt, and the depth of popular feeling. Francisco de León was in charge of the militia, and the inclusion of his men from San Marcos ensured it was a robust force.
According to one source, the majority were preparing to leave when Filgueira arrived with the news that their terms had been accepted by the governing junta (the archbishop, the regent of the high court, and the city council). This was received by the crowd with palpable relief, and the Capuchin monk was carried and placed on a mule, and more than 500 marched behind him to the Plaza de San Francisco, or dispersed across the city, shouting “Bread, Bread!” At this point they were joined by some nobles, and “all of them fell on their knees before the Holy Christ being carried by the Capuchin, shedding may tears of contentment ... and the bells were ordered to toll, and there was general rejoicing in the city.”

However, the jubilation was not universal. According to one narrative source, some of the rebels responded to the calls for peace with blasphemous imprecations—“we are heretics” and “fewer Christs and more bread.” Some of those in the Feria thus remained suspicious and distrustful, seeing the preaching as a ploy to distract and disarm the rebels, saying “friars and Christs (cristos), this smells of the gallows to me.” The rebel leaders exhorted their followers not to abandon their posts, and that nothing was won yet, because they only had the words of the local magistrates—“and even the king often did not keep his word when it was inconvenient for him.” According to one source, the loudest voice against

172 “un Relixioso Capuchino de exemplar vida, hijo de Sevilla con un Santo Christo en la mano, predicando por reducir á quietud aquella Canalla, y lo que les amonestava, lo decía con tan vivas palabras que enterneció á algunos de los Alborotados, y corrió voz entre ellos, dice vien el Padre, tomemos nuestras Capas, y vamonos, esto fue causa de que se moviese a ello la mayor parte de la gente sediciosa,” Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.
173 Ibid.
174 Ibid.
175 “frayles y christos à horca me huele esto,” Tumultos de la Cyudad de Sevilla el año de 1652, BNM, MS 2383, [1652], f. 152r. The reaction of the Neapolitan rebels may not have been that different in this respect, Peter Burke’s analysis (cited above) notwithstanding. According to Rosario Villari, the processions organized by the ecclesiastical and civic authorities “were badly received by a substantial proportion of the people” (as in Seville), and not simply because they believed God to be on their side—there was a political reason: the people asked, why processions now, and not when the “excessive taxes” were imposed. Rosario Villari, “Masaniello: Contemporary and Recent Interpretations,” Past & Present, no. 108 (1985): 121.
the rejoicing of some was that of an 80-year-old woman, who stood by the door of the houses of the Marquis of la Algaba, next to the armed rebel militia, and—in a highly revealing glimpse of political awareness—shouted: “My sons, don’t believe them, they are just saying it to reassure you, they will not keep their word even if the [royal] pardon comes—I would have believed them in the time of the king’s grandfather [Philip II], but not now!” This apparently convinced some to remain on guard, barricaded in their neighbourhood, while others left.176

As Ethan Shagan has recently argued, in order to take belief seriously, historians must not only acknowledge its presence, and proceed to draw up laundry lists of “beliefs”, but must go further and recognize that individuals and communities did not simply believe—this or that; this, but not that—but constantly struggled with belief, reconciling doctrine with personal experience, allowing the acceptance of received, positive beliefs on certain matters to coexist with personal doubt or reflection on others.177 In this vein, the suggestion here is not that the popular rebels in seventeenth-century Andalusia were really “heretics” in the formal sense, or even wished to challenge the authority of the clergy, or the “natural” social order propounded by theologians and political thinkers, but simply that a degree of skepticism toward the specific prescriptions of the preachers who vied with them for control of the street also had its place in the popular consciousness, even if it only became manifest in times of social or political upheaval, or indeed existential crisis, when other dogmas—the common good, the rights of poor working men, or of taxpayers (pecheros), who were the foundation of the republic—appeared more convincing or useful.

176 Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.
The attempts to restore order also included religious processions, but the most stubborn among the rebels refused all entreaties to lay down their arms—even after their demands had been met, and they had been supplied with an abundance of bread and wine. In any case the authorities were determined to obviate the need for a general pardon, for while it might restore peace without bloodshed it would also leave a stain on the city’s reputation, the memory of which would have repercussions in the urban oligarchy’s future dealings with the crown. As in the case of Lisbon’s rebellion against the authority of Philip II decades earlier, it would be “an eternal mark of disloyalty.” By this point however the authorities felt emboldened enough to stage an assault on the rebel parish, which finally ended the resistance, leading to the execution of the ringleaders. Yet the victory was made possible only by the artisan militias recruited from the city’s other parishes. As an anonymous contemporary pamphlet explained:

La infantería lo hizo,
con bravas resoluciones,
poniendo el pecho al peligro,
y ellos ganaron la Torre.

[...]

Luego vino el Asistente,
y la Nobleza siguióle,
después del choque pasado,
antes no, aunque me perdonen.

---

178 “una llaga tan cruda que quedaría notada para siempre por desleal, que siendo la cabeza del reino se deja considerar el sentimiento perpetuo que de ello tendría” Rafael Valladares, La conquista de Lisboa: Violencia militar y comunidad política en Portugal, 1578-1583 (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2008).
While the manner in which the municipal and royal authorities reasserted their control suggests that they could still count on reserves of loyalty among the commons, not all of the latter were motivated by profound respect for law and order. The key role in the assault on La Feria and the pacification of the city was played by Francisco de León and Francisco Bueno’s militia from the parish of San Marcos, mobilized in secret long before the elite Junta had regained its footing. Prior to his metamorphosis into the saviour of the city, Francisco de León was a notorious and brazen smuggler. He and his retinue apparently thought nothing of ransacking the houses of public officials to recover sequestered contraband, or assaulting and skirmishing with constables in the street—and among the goods they were in the habit of transporting in and out of the city, usually under cover of darkness, were silk cloths. More akin to Monipodio than ‘hombre bueno’, Francisco de León—and his partner Francisco Bueno—were men whose livelihoods depended on the existence of manifold tariffs, duties and impositions, and speculative

---

179 Romance en diálogo entre Bras y Perote, pastores de Brenes y Villaverde, sobre el motín y levantamiento de la Ciudad de Sevilla, BCC, MS 33-5-7 (14).
180 The emergency Junta comprised members of the city council, the asistente, the Regent of the Audiencia, the archbishop and the chief Inquisitor.
181 “metedor público, caueca y caudillo de metedores rouadores y desfraudadores de los derechos reales …” El conde de Villaumbrosa y Castronovo contra Francisco de León sobre alboroto por introducir vino sin derechos, fraude y otras cosas, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25712, exp. 9, 1648, f. 1r.
182 “metedores de plata, sedas, y demas ropas, vino, y aceyte y tienen por cabeza á dos de ellos que se llaman Francisco Bueno, y Francisco Leon hombres briosos, dadivosos, cortesanos y muy amigos de hacer vien …” Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.
183 The fictional head of a Sevillian ‘brotherhood’ of organized crime in Cervantes’ Rinconete y Cortadillo.
hoarding that raised the prices of essential goods. They preferred the authorities to turn a blind eye to such practices, rather than act with exemplary probity.

There were more processions in the aftermath aimed at healing the body social, but the social tensions, and divisions, remained, with other street preachers stoking the embers of popular discontent. In 1660, eight years after the revolt, an alderman of Seville, Don Martín de Ulloa, sent a memorial warning the city council against “a man who is walking around the city in the habit of the Third Order of St. Francis, preaching [and] converting the ignorant” to his cause, “soliciting the guilds and contriving assemblies to collect money” to fund his schemes. One of these schemes was the formation of a Holy Brotherhood of the Guilds and Crafts of Seville, a sort of proto-trades union, which that year petitioned king Philip IV for the approval of its constitution and reform proposals for the city and the kingdom—even though guild confraternities were “justly prohibited in the kingdom.” Not only was “a tiny spark … enough to cause an irreparable conflagration,” and Martínez de Mata was “winning over to his doctrine all those he encountered, but he also had disciples who were doing the same, and they are publishing printed papers, which are distributed among their friends, and were posting placards in the main square next to the City Hall.”184 These placards and papers, like the preaching, warned that popular tumults would ensue if the proposed remedies were not applied.

---

184 Gonzalo Anes Álvarez, ed. Memoriales y discursos de Francisco Martínez de Mata (Madrid: 1971). For more details on the Holy Brotherhood of the Guilds and Martínez de Mata’s involvement, see El fiscal contra los culpables sobre una provisión falsa despachada a los gremios de las Artes de Sevilla, Madrid and Granada, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25847, exp. 11, 1660-1665.
CHAPTER 2. MEMORY: THE COMUNERO REVOLT IN URBAN HISTORIES

2.1. Introduction: The Point of a Quill

One afternoon in early summer of 1629, in a study the precise location of he did not care to mention, Francisco Morovelli de Puebla, the scion of a distinguished Sevillian family of Lucchese origin, had just finished reading a book—the Historia de la muy noble y leal ciudad de Cuenca, or History of the very noble and loyal city of Cuenca by Juan Pablo Mártir Rizo. As he explained:

“To while away the idleness of a siesta, my sleep having been interrupted, I came across this history […] I read through it from beginning to end, without getting up from my place, quill in hand, and left it having underlined so much, and with so many annotations—as many have seen first-hand—and what I said then (to some friends) I believe I may rightly claim upon reflection: [it is a slanderous work].”

What had incensed Morovelli so much that he spent his hours of leisure feverishly underlining and writing in the margins of a book that he had apparently picked up to divert himself? In spite of the outraged reader’s allusion to an abundance of errors requiring frequent interventions of the “quill in hand”, the cause of the offence had been nothing more than a passing reference to Seville on folio 97 of Mártir Rizo’s history, where, in his chronicle of the events of the year 1520, the author had included Morovelli’s ‘patria’ in the list of cities that had rebelled against the young Charles V. Three days later, the reader of
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185 “La ociosidad de una siesta … que estorvò dormilla un corrimiento, me dio a las manos esta historia … Passela toda de una vez, sin levantarme de un lugar, con la pluma en la mano, dexandola tan rayada, y tan notada, como la àn visto muchos y es sin duda, que dice mas luego de repente della (a algunos amigos) que creo que podrè dezir aora de pensado [that it is slanderous] … [aunque] bien me persuado, que esta mi defensa le darà mas fama, que sus escritos …” Francisco Morovelli de Puebla, Apologia por la ciudad de Sevilla cabeza de España, en que se muestra y defiende la lealtad constante que siempre á guardado con sus Reyes. Contra Iuan Pablo Martyr, que en la Historia de la ciudad de Cuenca, que á dado luz este año de 1629 dize falsamente, que Sevilla y Cordova fueron de las que se levantaron por Comunidad contra la Magestad del Emperador Carlos V. A la muy noble y muy leal Ciudad de Sevilla. Pregunta pro Patria. Published in: Mártir Rizo, Historia de la muy noble y leal ciudad de Cuenca (1629).
Mártir Rizo’s *History* sallied forth to defend the honour of his homeland. His complaint was aired before the Seville city council, which promptly took the case to the Royal Council of Castile.\(^{186}\)

At least three aspects of Morovelli’s encounter with Mártir Rizo’s chronicle of Cuenca merit our attention. In the first place, it was no accident that a literate, urbane minor nobleman’s *siesta* should be “whiled away” with a book of local history, a genre that, for a variety of reasons, reached its zenith in Spain precisely during the early decades of the seventeenth century. Furthermore, the historian of Cuenca had, in the opinion of Morovelli and the urban oligarchy, cast a shadow over Seville’s vaunted ‘loyalty’ to its kings, an emblematic feature of its urban identity, and the justification of its privileged status within the Habsburg Monarchy. Although chroniclers of Spanish cities would routinely mobilize episodes from ancient as well as the recent past to emphasize this essential quality, the 1520 revolt of Castilian cities against Charles of Ghent resonated more than any other, not least because the Emperor’s progeny still occupied the throne. Finally, the socio-political conjuncture of 1629, a year that opened a prolonged period of instability leading to a series of seminal revolts inside the composite Spanish Monarchy, rendered the memory of the last great upheaval especially relevant.

Morovelli was a controversial character, or rather one who courted controversy. Nicknamed “Mordelín” for the biting acerbity of his pen, he engaged in heated polemics with the likes of Quevedo,\(^{187}\) made enemies of courtiers and Seville’s powerful cathedral chapter, suffering exile, imprisonment, beatings, and on one occasion, in Zaragoza, the pain.

---

\(^{186}\) AMS, sección 10, 2ª escribanía, [Petición de F. de Morovelli al cabildo de Sevilla], 18 July 1629.

\(^{187}\) Over the patronage of Spain—Morovelli backed St. Teresa of Avila’s case, not least because of his allegiance to Olivares.
and ignominy of being “cut from ear to ear” on the orders of the Duke of Villahermosa (1637). His attack on Mártir Rizo may be explained partly by his “passionate” nature, and the desire to exact revenge for the latter’s ridicule in the debates over the patronage of Spain, but it’s also true that he sought and received extensive favours from the Duke of Medina Sidonia. After all, a public defence of Seville’s loyalty during the Comunidades was an opportunity to recall one of the most signal services rendered to the crown by his patron’s house. Here was yet another reason to keep alive the memory of those years.

Morovelli and Martír Rizo nevertheless shared one point of view, a vision of the city as a single, unified entity, a corporate body, a person. A city divided against itself, in which not only noble factions but various groups were ranged against one another, all professing loyalty to the Crown—and indeed purporting to act in its name—and yet both also bringing their grievances to its ear, whether overtly or indirectly.

Urban chronicles, with frontispieces that resembled the city gates, invited the reader to enter and gaze at the unchanging nature of its social hierarchies and political institutions, but also to observe the various stages in the life of the community, from its foundation by Tubal (or Hercules), through the transient but inescapable reality of Moorish occupation, to the reestablishment of the Christian Republic in its contemporary form; to wander its streets and admire its innumerable sacred buildings, its churches and convents, as well as the lives (and exemplary deaths) of its “varones ilustres,” its nobility, bishops and archbishops;

188 For having spoken ill of the House of Borja. Francisco Morovelli de Puebla, Linaje de Morovelli y otros ilustres de Sevilla, ed. Santiago Montoto (Sevilla, 1918), 7-13. For more on Morovelli de Puebla’s background, character, his role in revealing the “tainted” genealogies of suspected conversos, and his ultimately vain efforts to gain acceptance among Seville’s nobility, see Ruth Pike, Linajudos and Conversos in Seville: Greed and Prejudice in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Spain (New York: Peter Lang, 2000), 72-89, and 94-5. For his characteristically acerbic intervention in the polemic over Spain’s patron saint (defending the cause of Teresa of Avila against her detractors), see Erin Kathleen Rowe, Saint and Nation: Santiago, Teresa of Avila, and Plural Identities in Early Modern Spain (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011), 162-3.

189 Morovelli de Puebla, Linaje de Morovelli y otros ilustres de Sevilla, 12.
its favourable climate, propitious location, the number and wealth of its subject towns and villages and, above all, its loyalty, the source as well as the final proof of all of the city’s particular bounties. Past and present, change and stability, description and chronicle—all of these constituted the metier of the urban historian. Moreover, unlike their counterparts elsewhere in Europe, Spanish city histories did not necessarily define themselves in opposition to chorographic images; there was no division between time and space but instead an emphasis on the unity of “place” and “movement” of the body.190 The urban chronicles were an attempt to subsume, to stitch together a garment that would envelop the entire body politic, the cuerpo místico of the city. As Francisco de Pisa explained in the prologue to his history of Toledo (1605), his “motive” for writing was the fact that the previous such book, ‘tailored’ by Pedro de Alcocer (1557), had become too small for the growing city: “y es precisamente necesario cortarle otra a su medida.”191 The cut of this textual fabric is virtually identical, regardless of the individual pattern: the city in question is “always faithful, always noble and always loyal to its lord [the king]” regardless of the deeds of some individuals.192 The question then, is how these fashioners of urban identity

190 In the case of Venice it has been suggested that chorography developed as a distinctly “visual mode” in contrast to the “narrative function” of chronicles, a division perpetuated by new types of print, such as the fogli volanti of the late sixteenth century: Bronwen Wilson, *The World in Venice: Print, the City, and Early Modern Identity* (University of Toronto Press, 2005), 62. Richard Kagan has proposed a similar division between “communicentric” and “chorographic” images of the Spanish city. The first “tended … in the direction of metaphor and sought to define, via the image of urbs, the meaning of civitas: the idea of the city as a human community or well-governed republic endowed with a character, history, customs, and traditions uniquely its own.” In contrast chorographic images were those that “tended toward completeness and precision” and were usually the work of “professional cartographers, engineers, and surveyors” as well as artists. However, the two approaches and their purposes often overlapped in seventeenth century chronicles, which were more than a record of local events across time, but also offered detailed descriptions of the physical environment, and thus aimed at the sort of “precision and completeness” that is the province of chorography. See: Richard L. Kagan, “Urbs and Civitas in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Spain,” in *Envisioning the City: Six Studies in Urban Cartography*, ed. David Buisseret (University Of Chicago Press, 1998), 77.

191 Francisco de Pisa, *Descripción de la imperial ciudad de Toledo, y historia de sus antiguiedades, y grandeza, y cosas memorables que en ella han acontecido* (1605) (Toledo: Diputación Provincial, 1974), Prologo al lector.

192 Harris, *From Muslim to Christian Granada*, 90.
incorporated the most ill fitting attire of all: the dark mantle of the Comunero revolt in which most of the principal cities of Castile had been implicated.

In his classic work on the Comunidades, Juan Ignacio Gutiérrez Nieto wrote that “few seventeenth century authors paid any attention to the Comunero movement,” and that the topic no longer held any interest for Castilian historians. However, his historiographical survey failed to take into account urban chroniclers, most of whom felt obliged to comment on that most traumatic and violent episode - from the local point of view—of Fray Prudencio de Sandoval’s “siglo inquieto.” Moreover, unlike general histories of the realm, which were apparently on the wane, chronicles of Castilian cities began to appear with unprecedented frequency precisely during the first decades of the seventeenth century. Nieto’s second charge, that the vision of the Comunidades had been “simplified” by the seventeenth century, is equally hard to sustain. The urban histories written during the reigns of Philip III and IV usually devoted substantial segments to the events of 1520-1, and the tensions and divided loyalties of those years are not only present in their narratives, but given a new flavour by the anxieties of the new century. A closer look at some of these chronicles (written for and about cities that had been in the vanguard of the Comunero revolt) reveals this continued preoccupation.

193 Gutiérrez Nieto, Las comunidades, 45. Gutiérrez Nieto is still cited as an authority on the historiography of the Comunidades, including the most recent work on the subject: Castañeda Tordera, “La proyección de las Comunidades.”
194 Prudencio de Sandoval, Historia de la vida y hechos del Emperador Carlos V. maximo, fortissimo, rey católico de España, y de las Indias, islas, y tierra firme del Mar Oceano, 2 vols. (Barcelona: Sebastian de Cormellas, 1625), 1.
195 Gutiérrez Nieto, Las comunidades, 45.
196 One each for Salamanca and Segovia, two for Toledo and Valladolid, as well a counterexample in the form of Morgado’s history of Seville (see bibliography for details). There are also references to Mártir Rizo’s history of Cuenca (which deals with the Comunidades), Francisco Morovelli’s reaction to the latter work, and Rodrigo Caro’s ‘antiquities’ of Seville (a good exemplar of the genre in general).
Royal visits, feasts and receptions as well as military aid provided by the city were some of the staples of Castilian urban panegyrics. Loyalty to the king had to prevail even in those cases when events would suggest otherwise, and the task entrusted to urban chroniclers was to show that the city had stood by the king’s side at every key moment in its history. The Comunero rebellion—“the largest and most prolonged” urban revolt of early modern Europe—was remarkable both for the extent of the breach between king and kingdom (the cities), but also because it had challenged the authority of the ruling Habsburg dynasty. Modern historians, and not a few contemporaries, also frequently refer to the Comunidades as the turning point, the moment when the cities’ relationship with the king had irretrievably changed to the detriment of the former. As such, the revolt presented a potentially insurmountable problem. By the early seventeenth century this theoretical dilemma had to be tackled in the context of a rapidly changing socio-political landscape, as well as new approaches to writing history.

2.2. New City, New History

Despite the efforts of urban chroniclers, after 1600 there was no shortage of those prepared to point out that the body politic in fact had no clothes. For the cities of Old Castile in particular this was a period of demographic collapse and economic stagnation. The century opened with a major plague epidemic, followed by a series of regional famines

---

197 Santiago Quesada, La idea de ciudad en la cultura hispana de la Edad Moderna (Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona Publicacions, 1992), 105.
198 Sánchez León, “Changing Patterns of Urban Conflict in Late Medieval Castile,” 231.
199 The ‘decline’ of Spain is a contentious issue, but even John Elliott’s attempt to contextualise this phenomenon (as part of a wider European trend) and to dispute the reference to ‘Spain’ in this sense, does not seriously challenge the notion that Castile, and above all the hitherto prosperous northern, or ‘Old’ Castile, entered a period of economic, political and military decline. See: J. H. Elliott, “The Decline of Spain,” in Spain and Its World, 1300-1700 (Yale University Press, 1989), 219.
and subsistence crises, foreign wars, as well as the expulsion of the Moriscos (which affected Aragon more directly, but was nevertheless denounced by towns and arbitristas in Castile as the cause of the economic downturn).\textsuperscript{200} The tierras of the major urban centres were becoming separated from their matrices, and dependent towns continued to petition the crown for their own charters. The urban network would not recover the population levels reached in the late sixteenth century for nearly two hundred years, and former Comunero cities like Toledo, Valladolid, and Burgos were disproportionately affected by these negative developments.\textsuperscript{201} Valladolid, for instance, never rebounded from the effects of the court’s move back to Madrid. In terms of Pisa’s corporate analogy (above) the chronicles supposedly made to measure were in fact a “a garment … over-rich and wide” for many of the Castilian cities’ “wearish [withered] and ill-disposed bodies.”\textsuperscript{202}

Image was therefore very far from reality. Fernando Rodríguez de la Flor has described a process of “re-semantisation” of urban spaces,\textsuperscript{203} a multifaceted campaign of re-conquest of the physical environment that gained impetus in the wake of the 1609 expulsion of the Moriscos. We may catch glimpses of this process in the urban narratives, as when certain architects of Seville cast doubt on the fact that the emblematic Giralda tower could have been the work of Moors, “sino que es muy de antes, y de tiempo de Gentiles.”\textsuperscript{204} To prove this, providence apparently intervened, revealing several Latin (i.e. Roman) inscriptions on some accidentally uncovered foundations stones. Such preoccupations had

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{203} Fernando Rodríguez de la Flor, \textit{Barroco. Representación e ideología en el mundo hispánico} (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2002), 124.
\textsuperscript{204} Alonso Morgado, \textit{Historia de Sevilla (1587)} (Sevilla: Ariza, 1887), 275.
\end{footnotesize}
their counterparts on the political plane, with renewed emphasis on one’s *linaje* and *limpieza de sangre* in determining access to the ruling elite, or *regimiento*. Urban chronicles could make a significant contribution to this emerging discourse through the judicious use of stresses and silences aimed at preserving a symbolic integrity. It comes as little surprise that ecclesiastics comprised the most important group among the urban historians, for they were not only the most educated but also the most “adequate” or well-prepared: after all, an essential part of the “composite image” of the city presented in the chronicles is Augustine’s *civitas Christiana*, “the sacred community founded in faith and piety.” Despite—or perhaps because of—the problems plaguing the Castilian *civitas terrena*, the first decades of the seventeenth century were also the “Golden Age” of Spanish chorography, or books about cities. In the throes of an incipient economic (and political) crisis, marked by renewed sparring between the cities, the Cortes and the king over the size and implementation of the Millones, the cities could show that they were indeed still giants with feet of marble, rather than clay (quite literally if one thinks of the obsessive search for Roman monuments and inscriptions exhibited by Rodrigo Caro and others). The chorographic tradition was therefore central to the increasing tendency to re-imagine and re-constitute the local community, in real and symbolic terms.

The turn of the century also brought new approaches to writing and reading history, a mixture of “tradition and innovation” adapted to the particular needs of urban

---

206 Nobles and hidalgos are not far behind in terms of authorship, and this reflects their continued dominance of town magistracies. Quesada, *La idea de ciudad*, 12.
207 Harris, *From Muslim to Christian Granada*, 51.
Above all, what marked the emerging *artes historicae* was a pervasive sense of confidence in the fundamentally new and groundbreaking nature of what was being attempted. Thus, recovering the ancient history of Seville is a path strewn with numerous obstacles, Rodrigo Caro informs his readers, “y no son trillados los senderos por donde se camina, ni yo para este intento llevo a nadie delante ...” The roads referred to by Caro are real, as well as figurative, “porque visite personalmente los lugares de que escriuo” noting down Greek and Latin inscriptions and collecting ancient medals with “estudiosa aficion.”

The importance of writing only that which the eyes were able to confirm was as important for antiquities as it was for descriptions of contemporary cities. Access to primary sources was paramount—a point stressed by all chroniclers—and documents are often reproduced in the text, either in part or in their entirety. However, this was not always sufficient, for one had to know how to interpret the evidence. In the case of the Seville architects, cited above, whose suspicions about the origins of the Giralda were apparently confirmed by visual proof, Morgado’s response suggested caution: The Roman inscriptions may appear to speak for themselves, “pero todo esto es de ninguna prueva.” After all, the Moors had in their time, “as we do in ours,” made use of the columns and stones left behind by the Romans to construct their own edifices. Moreover, one cannot deny the Moors “sus fuertes,
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210 Alcocer thus describes the process by which his history and description of Toledo is put together: “las grandes y notables cosas deste cibdad, assi las que de las historias se colligen, como las que tenemos ante los ojos ...” Pedro de Alcocer, *Hystoria, o description dela imperial cibdad de Toledo: con todas las cosas asconcedidas en ella, desde su...fundacion* (Toledo: Juan Ferrer, 1554), Prologo al lector.
211 For instance, Diego de Colmenares describes an “instrumento en el archivo Catedral de la Iglesia en pergamino y de letra gótica...que descubre muchas noticias importantes a la histori a nuestra ciudad y de Castilla...” including (according to the author) the first mention of the word “maravedis ... nombre sin duda árabe.” Diego de Colmenares, *Historia de la insigne ciudad de Segovia y compendio de las historias de Castilla [1637]*, 2 vols. (Segovia: Academia de Historia y Arte de San Quirce, 1969), 228.
y curiosas fabricas” if one is only able to “read” (i.e. learn from) the high and proud and walls of Africa and Barbary.\textsuperscript{212}

Despite this growing tendency to historicize, the exemplary value of recording and remembering the past was repeatedly underlined. The “purpose” of history is to teach its readers and writers through the record of experience, the “maestra muda”—this was its “public utility.”\textsuperscript{213} As Fernando Bouza has pointed out, even Philip IV was moved to dabble in historical writing, albeit as a translator of Guicciardini, emphasizing the importance of governors learning the lessons of this \textit{magistra vitae} directly, or “ellos por si mismos.”\textsuperscript{214} The \textit{comunero} revolt was an especially important subject to grasp. From the history of antiquity it could be “deduced” that the “greatest plagues” and the ruin of the most “prosperous States” was the product of dissension and “guerras civiles.”\textsuperscript{215} As Sandoval warned, the reason for the triumph of “passions” in Comunero Castile was the fact that “quills” and “tongues” alike had grown “tired,” and so it was essential to keep writing (about the revolt), for the consequences of forgetting (the lessons learned) could be catastrophic.\textsuperscript{216} In addition, the ‘incorporating’ function of urban chronicles meant that historical relativism that had begun to permeate antiquarian efforts (such as Caro’s) did not necessarily translate into works of greater amplitude. As it has been pointed out for contemporary English town chronicles, the important thing was to render time subservient

\textsuperscript{212} Morgado, \textit{Historia de Sevilla} (1587), 278.
\textsuperscript{213} Luis Cabrera de Córdoba, \textit{De historia para entenderla y escribirla} (1611) (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1948), 35.
\textsuperscript{214} Fernando Bouza, \textit{Corre manuscrito. Una historia cultural del Siglo de Oro} (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2001), 307.
\textsuperscript{215} Juan Pablo Mártil Rizo, \textit{Historia de la muy noble y leal ciudad de Cuenca} (Barcelona: Ediciones 'El Albir', 1979 [facsimile of 1629 ed.]), 95.
\textsuperscript{216} Sandoval, \textit{Historia de la vida y hechos del Emperador Carlos V}, 331.
to an essential continuity in the history of the community.\textsuperscript{217} Inconsistencies had to be somehow reconciled with the essentially noble, pious and loyal nature of the city, and this inevitably entailed some form of compromise with the truth.\textsuperscript{218}

Being too close to the events that a historian intended to portray had its own potential pitfalls, as Cabrera de Córdoba warned: “por la irritación de los ánimos que lleva aquí y allí el amor de los suyos, el odio de los enemigos”. For that reason, those who were somewhat removed in time, and writing after the events “son tenidos por más verdaderos.”\textsuperscript{219} Besides which the subject of the Comunero revolt was best avoided during the reigns of Charles V as well as his son, both of who were keen to underplay the turbulence of the 1520s. Only the advent of a new reign (of Philip III) signalled an opportunity to revisit the days when Castilian cities had echoed with the shouts of “Viva, viva el pueblo!”\textsuperscript{220} A combination of factors thus converged to make the first decades of the seventeenth century particularly propitious for tackling the central problem of contemporary urban history: the passage of time, new historiographical trends and the need to reassert communal privileges and identity in the face of economic hardship and fiscal pressures, not to mention new and related tensions in the relationship between the cities and the king.

\textsuperscript{217} Rosemary Sweet, \textit{The Writing of Urban Histories in Eighteenth-Century England} (Oxford University Press, 1997), 77. The golden age of English town histories was the eighteenth century, and so this genre developed later, and under the influence of different socio-political exigencies. However, the remark about the imperative of symbolic unity was made in relation to sixteenth and seventeenth century chronicles.

\textsuperscript{218} As Katie Harris has argued, Bermúdez de Pedraza’s history of Granada proved popular because it offered “the most comprehensive solution to the problems posed by the city’s history.” The lengthy interval between the city’s mythical foundation and its contemporary reality as an exemplary Christian community was presented as a narrative of “a body conceived, developed, sickened and restored.” Harris, \textit{From Muslim to Christian Granada}, 80.

\textsuperscript{219} Cabrera de Córdoba, \textit{De historia}, 73.

\textsuperscript{220} Juan Maldonado, \textit{La revolución comunera: el movimiento de España, o sea historia de la revolución conocida con el nombre de las comunidades de Castilla}, ed. Valentina Fernández Vargas, trans. José Quevedo (Madrid: Ediciones del Centro, 1975), 35.
2.3. Remembering the Comunidades

Alonso Morgado, the late sixteenth-century chronicler of Seville, explained that the Comunero rebellion had brought back memories of the Moorish “destruction” of Spain “según que oymos lamentar a nuestros padres.”

Writing about Toledo almost twenty years later, Francisco de Pisa was moved to add: “…y abuelos.” Indeed, the memory of the Comunidades survived in large part thanks to an “exemplary” oral tradition that retained its vitality throughout the sixteenth century and beyond.

We only have glimpses of this elusive chain of remembrance, and when it is referred to by the authors of urban chronicles, it is rarely, if ever, clear to what extent this communal memory had penetrated into their texts. The composition of these works was guided by powerful hegemonic impulses, resulting in a strong urge to defer to officially approved, authoritative accounts (though not always, or absolutely). One well-known source, the relaciones geograficas commissioned by Philip II has been shown to provide at least some clues. The royal questionnaire often elicited “a spontaneous narrative of the community’s history and ambitions;” however, these responses were mediated in their written form by letrados and local clerics, which at least in part accounts for their exaggerated emphasis on loyalty and the “elision” of rebellion.

It is clear that from the very beginning there was an attempt to fix and circumscribe a particular loyalist version of events, even before typesetters had had a chance to cast their moulds. We are thus told that in Valladolid’s plaza mayor, a royal fiscal
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221 Morgado, Historia de Sevilla (1587), 255.
222 Pisa, Descripción, 245. The chronicler of Cuenca, Mártir Rizo, points out in his account of the Comunero revolt that his grandfather, Pedro Mártir de Angleria, served the royalist side “fidelissimamente.”
223 Castañeda Tordera, “La proyección de las Comunidades,” 281.
224 Nader, Liberty in Absolutist Spain, 281.
“muy bien atavido con unas armas reales,” accompanied by an *escribano de cámara* “hizo una larga relacion del levantamiento sucedido en Castilla” before Charles’ general pardon was announced to the assembled populace.226

The Comunidades could never really been ignored, let alone forgotten: many large and small towns, as well as numerous individuals, petitioned the crown for compensation and privileges based on ‘services’ rendered at that critical juncture. On the other hand, the memory of the revolt was invoked throughout the sixteenth century in the face of the crown’s escalating fiscal demands.227 In Murcia, to cite one example, it was obvious to the local oligarchy that the Comunidades had not been “interred” following the royalist victory at Villalar: the fear of another uprising, as well as the recriminations, continued for decades.228 The continued impact of civic humanism on the political life of Castile, and the defence of the “common good” have been linked with the perennial vestiges of pro-comunero sentiment among sections of the imperial bureaucracy and the intellectual elites.229 It has even been suggested that court factions during Philip II’s reign to some extent traced their differences back to their families’ allegiances during the Comunero revolt.230 As late as 1568 the king ennobled a *regidor* of Toledo, and the usual investigation of his family origins was dispensed with—solely based on the fact that his parents had “valiantly” defended the town of Borox from the Comuneros.231

---

227 Castañeda Tordera, “La proyección de las Comunidades,” 300.
228 John B. Owens, *Rebelión, monarquía y oligarquía murciana en la época de Carlos V* (Universidad de Murcia, 1980), 182.
229 Crews, “Juan de Valdes.”
230 Gregorio Marañón, *Antonio Perez, “Spanish Traitor”* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1954), 63-4. Antonio Feros has noted that Prudencio Sandoval’s monumental history of the reign of Charles V was commissioned by the Duke of Lerma in order to highlight the family’s role in the defence of the king against the Comuneros.
231 Castañeda Tordera, “La proyección de las Comunidades,” 280.
Permanent reminders of the revolt punctuated the urban topography of Castilian cities. Monumental inscriptions were forms of representing and enunciating social power, as well as establishing specific “politics of memory.” A startling example of the function of such inscriptions in the context of moulding collective memory is a letrero strategically placed near the main exit door of Toledo cathedral. The letrero, reproduced by Francisco de Pisa in his history of the city, proclaims that in February 1522 the “single, united body” of clerics, caballeros and “good citizens” secured a victory against “todos los que con color de comunidad.” The victory was achieved with “divine blessing” and in recompense of the damage done by the rebels to the city and the cathedral. Pisa explains that the words affixed to the church wall “confirm” that, “ni la ciudad, y caualleros, ni la santa yglesia, y su Cabildo fueron culpados en esta rebellion, ni desleales al rey.” On the contrary, it was precisely they who had fought and defeated the comuneros. Furthermore, the inscription “clearly” demonstrates that those who had taken part in the disturbances were not the community as such, but rather “algunos particulares” acting on their own accord. On the other hand, individuals—nobles and some regidores—who had remained loyal, and who took some credit for the final victory over the Comuneros in their city, also made sure that their actions were set in stone, so to speak. In Valladolid, the chronicler Antolínez de Burgos informs the reader, a black stone inscribed with golden letters was placed above the doorway of the Admiral of Castile’s residence:

Viva el Rey con gran Victoria
Esta casa y tal reino,

Quede en ella por memoria,
La fama, renombre y Gloria
Que por él a España vino.\textsuperscript{234}

It should be noted that these words signified more than a case of the victors
‘inscribing’ history on the face the city. For all those passersby gazing at threshold of the
Admiral’s house, and above all members of Valladolid’s magistracy, this was a constant
reminder of the compromise struck in the immediate aftermath of the Comunero defeat: in
exchange for loyalty, this “buen amigo y vezino” [the Admiral] would thenceforth intercede
with Charles on the city’s behalf, in order to prevent things from getting out of hand
again—something that was not in either side’s interest (a fact made apparent by the progress
and outcome of the revolt).\textsuperscript{235}

However, it was commonly asserted that “History” conserved the memory of places
and illustrious men “better than statues, paintings, trophies, and other monuments”\textsuperscript{236} The
first written accounts of the Comunero revolt came from those among contemporary
eyewitnesses, such as Antonio de Guevara (in his \textit{Epistolario}), who in turn became the
principal sources for later urban chroniclers. One of the most interesting narratives of this
early period was Juan Maldonado’s \textit{El movimiento de España}, dedicated to Philip II in 1540,
whose obvious sympathy for the \textit{comunero} cause was thinly disguised.\textsuperscript{237} This humanist
from Cuenca\textsuperscript{238} arranged his account in the form of a dialogue between the narrator, two
foreigners (a Frenchman and an Italian) and an anonymous \textit{toledano}—a native of Toledo—

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{234} Antolínez de Burgos, \textit{Historia de Valladolid}, 162-3.
\textsuperscript{235} Sandoval, \textit{Historia de la vida y hechos del Emperador Carlos V}, 421.
\textsuperscript{236} Cabrera de Córdoba, \textit{De historia}, 18.
\textsuperscript{237} Maldonado, \textit{La revolución comunera}.
\textsuperscript{238} There appears to be some uncertainty over his identity and origins, and he may have had ties to Salamanca.
\end{footnotesize}
whose vigorous and impassioned defence of his own city’s part in the revolt would appear
to reveal the author’s own allegiances. Thus, the Comunero leader Juan de Padilla is
described as someone “que miraba muchísimo por el pueblo,” while Charles had ruled
“unjustly” in his first years, being a young man who left the business of government in the
hands of foreigners.\textsuperscript{239}

For the royal chroniclers the Comunidades were generally unambiguous. Pedro
Mexía has been cited as the most representative voice on the subject, and for him the revolt
was “obra del demonio.” He was absolutely anti-comunero and saw nothing legitimate in
the rebels’ position, concluding that, once all was said and done, “todo lo que se hacía era
errado y malo.”\textsuperscript{240} Antonio de Guevara contributed to a “stereotyped” vision of the
Comunidades as a cautionary tale of radical social revolution,\textsuperscript{241} and was no less “openly
regalist or proimperial.”\textsuperscript{242} Sandoval, another frequently invoked authority, emphasized
loyalty and suggested avoiding “temas peligrosas.” However, as others have pointed out,
alongside his undoubted veneration of Charles and his distaste for social revolution, there is
sufficient ambivalence in Sandoval’s description of the Comuneros to suggest at least a
degree of sympathy.\textsuperscript{243} The only possible exception to the rule was Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda,
who began working on his \textit{Historiarum de rebus gestis Carolus} with enthusiasm, but was

\textsuperscript{239} Maldonado, \textit{La revolución comunera}, 71. However, the \textit{toledano} asserts that his fellow citizens, though they
were the first to raise the “seditious” cry, “nada derogaron a la dignidad real, nada quitaron a la monarquía,”
ibid., 34.
\textsuperscript{240} Richard L. Kagan, “Carlos V a través de sus cronistas: el momento comunero,” in \textit{En torno a las comunidades
de Castilla: Actas del Congreso Internacional Poder, Conflicto y Revuelta en la España de Carlos I (Toledo, 16 al
20 de octubre de 2000)}, ed. Fernando Martínez Gil (Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha,
2002), 151.
\textsuperscript{241} Gutiérrez Nieto, \textit{Las comunidades}, 40-1.
\textsuperscript{242} Kagan, “Carlos V a través de sus cronistas,” 151.
\textsuperscript{243} “Los Caualleros cabeças, y defensores de las Comunidades…assí desseuana arriscarlo todo en la ventura de las
armas, que sí la tuvieran, y salieran con la suya en sola vna batalla, sin duda alguna…quedaran con nombre
glorioso de amparadores, y defensores de su patria …” Sandoval, \textit{Historia de la vida y hechos del Emperador
Carlos V}, 331.
quickly discouraged by the obstacles placed in his way by royal secretaries when he wished to consult original documents for his research. According to Richard Kagan, Sepúlveda offered the rebels “a voice” that was denied to them by Guevara and the other official chroniclers. In general, however, it appears that official history was apologist, defensive and glorifying, operating on the assumption that no two interpretations were possible for a single event: there was but “one truth, no more.”

Urban chroniclers, especially by the seventeenth century, would borrow heavily from both Mexía and Sandoval. However, while it is true that Colmenares, González Dávila and others peppered their accounts with citations from the approved sources (i.e. the royal chroniclers), there is a sufficient amount of divergence in tone as well as substance to warrant an examination of their approach and motives. After all, once the Comunidades entered the scope of town histories, the intended function of these works—the defence of local rights and privileges—resulted in the sort of anxiety and bouts of self-examination that royal chroniclers would have considered unwarranted. These chronicles were an attempt to construct an image of independence or autonomy based on notions of the ancient Republic, and yet the defence of privileges always had to be balanced with loyalty to the king. One of the first practitioners of the genre, and the first to write an urban history in Castilian—Gonzalo Ayora de Córdoba—wrote a history of Ávila on the eve of the revolt (1519) that anticipated many comunero arguments. While his seventeenth century colleagues were far more circumspect, the tensions inspired by divided loyalties are never too far below the surface.

244 Kagan, “Carlos V a través de sus cronistas,” 152.
245 Quesada, La idea de ciudad, 5.
246 Ayora de Córdoba apparently “practiced what he preached,” becoming an unrepentant rebel: Harris, From Muslim to Christian Granada, 88.
2.4. Urban History in Early Modern Spain

Histories of Spanish cities began to appear in the late fifteenth century, and were written primarily in Latin. The turning point seems to have been Pedro de Alcocer’s history of Toledo (1554), written in Castilian about one of the most “emblematic” cities of peninsular Spain, one that would serve as an inspiration to later Castilian as well as Aragonese chroniclers. In its wake there was a “dramatic” increase in the number of urban chronicles written in the second half of the sixteenth century, half of which were published. Both the number of works and the proportion that were published rose to new heights in the first decades of the seventeenth century; in fact, the most productive decades of the early modern period were the 1620s and 1630s, which is when the majority of the works under discussion saw the light of day. This was then the “Golden age” of chorography, and it was distinctly more “Spanish” as Latin was replaced by the vernacular. To a large extent the popularity of these works rested upon their function as “the most important vehicle for the assertion of numerous social, political, and spiritual claims” as well as loyalties. Most of these works had only a single edition of (approximately) 500 copies, and their readership was largely, though not exclusively,
local. Its purpose, akin to that of writing any history in the period, was to be a “teacher,” to provide its readers with a “language” to “locate themselves in the world,” and transform inhabitants into citizens with a shared past. Urban chronicles were also a way to define the city itself, and ‘loyalty’ was an indispensable component of this definition. Alcocer’s work might have been the “paradigmatic” text, but at least in one respect the works of the early seventeenth century were not faithful to the template: unlike the chronicler of Toledo, his successors were not silent on the subject of the Comunidades in their cities, and many of them devoted more than a few lines to that traumatic episode.

2.5. The Comunidades in Urban Chronicles

The city’s inclusion in the list of rebel cities was the only mention of Seville in Rizo’s book, but it was quite enough for Morovelli de Puebla to immediately (three days later) begin a formal procedure against the chronicler, which included official letters from the magistrates of Seville, and vigorous lobbying of the crown. The process ended with the censure and confiscation of Rizo’s text by the Royal Council two years later, despite the author’s protestations that he had based his information on reading no less than five (different) histories of Spain—“muchas beças.” Clearly, more than a hundred years after the events, the Comunero revolt was still an open wound and a subject that could inspire literary jousts and lawsuits in equal measure.
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Morovelli was evidently an active patriot, and he reappears as one of the officially appointed readers of Rodrigo Caro’s *Antiquities of Seville* (1634) – a book much more to his liking. Another reader of Caro’s work, Gil González Dávila, endorsed his recommendation unequivocally (and here we begin to see the literary nexus that bound local historians).  

The latter had already made his own contribution to the genre with his *History of Salamanca* (1606), which offers perhaps the most nuanced and multidimensional account of the Comunero rebellion of the chronicles examined here. González Dávila read portions of his unfinished manuscript to (at least) one foreign university student, who noted down in his diary how the “Rationero” (Gil González) came to his house one night “a leggere la Istoria che ha scritto di Salamanca.” We can only speculate if González Dávila read the section describing the Comunidades, or whether, like the inquisitive foreign travellers in Juan Maldonado’s ‘dialogue’, the young Italian might have specifically requested to hear about those fractious years in Salamanca, his home away from home.

González Davila’s work was published shortly after his nocturnal literary excursion, but even in manuscript form urban chronicles could reach their intended audience. Antolínez de Burgos’ history of Valladolid was apparently a bestseller and was widely disseminated during the author’s lifetime, even though it was not published until 1887. The modern editor of the work alludes to the “open” nature of the manuscript circulating in this manner among Valladolid’s lettered elite: based on the surviving nine copies (of the manuscript) it has been possible to conclude that a “series” of (mostly) anonymous authors

---

257 González Dávila was frequently cast in the role as “revisor y consejero.” See: Quesada, *La idea de ciudad*, 13.
added and “even corrected” parts of the original synthesis of the city’s history penned by Antolínez. As Bouza would no doubt suggest, there is something Quijotesque about the countless peregrinations of this manuscript history, not to mention the ubiquity and evident importance of this malleable handwritten form in the age of print. Authors of local histories often acknowledged that they were building upon, or continuing the work of others (see Pisa’s reference to Alcocer’s history above), or expressed the hope that others “more qualified” and with more time at their disposal would continue, and elaborate upon their work. This ostensible humility is understandable, as in spite of the ambition to offer an integrated image of the city’s past and present, unity was elusive, and new clothes once stitched together would soon be outgrown.

What path should a historian take when writing about (relatively) recent events? According to Cabrera de Córdoba, the first thing to be done is to travel to the court, for nothing begins well that is not “de gran señor fauorecida.” After all, was there a better place to collect information about people and events for which no ancient authorities could vouch? The court is where all the “verdaderas narraciones de las cosas más señaladas” arrived on a regular basis. Apart from such disinterested investigative concerns, there was also the centrality of the court as a source of patronage, virtually unchallenged in that role by the seventeenth century. González Dávila, among others, unsuccessfully petitioned for favours, and his History was intended as a weight on that particular scale. But there was another powerful motive for seeking royal support and favour for the publication of urban

---

260 The extent to which this continuous revision, which apparently began in the seventeenth century and was carried on until the nineteenth, modified the original version of Valladolid’s Comunidad, is open to question. Antolínez de Burgos, Historia de Valladolid.

261 Bouza, Corre manuscrito, 16. Francisco Morovelli, in his approbation of Rodrigo Caro’s work on Seville makes no distinction between “algo … impresso” or “manuscrito” that might serve “de ornamento a su antigüedad.”

262 Cabrera de Córdoba, De historia, 70-1.
histories, and it is suggested by Mártir Rizo’s experience with Morovelli. The king could serve as a buffer and a shield against the (inevitable) attacks of one’s rivals: the historians of other cities. Indeed, all but one of the chronicles examined were dedicated to the reigning monarch, and in most cases one of the author’s primary motives for writing was the hope and expectation of royal patronage. Alcocer admits in his prologue that royal favour is indispensable for a work in times as “delicate” as these, “para que no sean maltratados de los que tienen por officio murmurar de los trabajos agenos …”263

Antonio Daza’s brief history of Valladolid is the only one that lends credence to Nieto’s assessment that the Comunidades were more or less ignored by seventeenth century historians. This is partly mitigated by the condensed nature of the whole work, a large portion of which is dedicated to the “life and miracles” of St. Pedro Regalado. Daza - a Franciscan provincial - was supported in his work by the order, and his major focus is therefore a local religious cult. Nevertheless, we are given a hint of the uprising in Valladolid. Daza describes the beauty of the city’s main plaza, the “theatre” where the kings of Spain displayed their greatness, mercy and justice, as well as their “non plus ultra.”264 The only mention of the Comunidades, which had been particularly violent in Valladolid, was a reference to Charles V seated in the plaza on a “tablado muy alto” announcing the general pardon “a todos los que en las comunidades tuuieron alguna culpa.” Daza’s brevity is unusual among the early seventeenth century authors, though it does indicate that he expected his audience to be quite familiar with not only the Comunidades, but also those who had partaken in the rebellion, and therefore “tuuieron alguna culpa.” In this case there

263 “sin hazer fruto ninguno con los propios.” Alcocer, Hystoria, Prologo al lector.
264 Antonio Daça, Excelencias de la ciudad de Valladolid, con la vida y milagros del Santo Fr. Pedro Regalado (Valladolid: Iuan Lasso de las Peñas, 1627), 19r.
was apparently no need to name the guilty party, for they, and their descendants, knew who they were. Needless to say, the other chroniclers were not quite as reticent.

In the remaining works, outsiders and foreigners were often portrayed as the main culprits in instigating rebellion. Thus in Valladolid we are told (by Antolínez de Burgos) that “un hombre de nacion portugues”—a rope-maker—started ringing the bell in the parish church of San Miguel, which prompted 5000 men to gather.265 In Salamanca it was “un Vizcaino … que no importa dezir como se llamaua,” who initiated an impromptu mock investiture (“en alta voz riendose”) of a certain Valloria, who then assumed a leading role in the revolt.266 Diego de Colmenares, who claims that the “vulgar classes” of Segovia were the “worst” to be found anywhere, explains that among this “gente advenediza” and “inquieta, drawn to the city by the profits to be made in the wool trade, “sin que jamás haya alguno de los naturales de la misma ciudad.”267 Vagabonds, “gentes foráneas” and all foreigners “unfamiliar with the laws of the republic” were especially dangerous.268

The suspicion of outsiders, or forasteros, was nothing new in Spanish, and indeed pre-modern European cities; moreover, emphasizing the role of non-citizens in the revolt partially exonerated members of the community. Yet, there was surely another, less immediately obvious lesson to be learned. It is notable that virtually every single one of the urban historians began the section devoted to the Comunidades by excoriating the role played by Charles V’s Flemish and “foreign” advisers, attributing to them perhaps the greatest responsibility for the rebellion. It could not have escaped the reader’s attention that a similar scenario was played out in the cities themselves, and that the ills afflicting the

265 Antolínez de Burgos, Historia de Valladolid, 161.
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nation at large showed symptoms in the local environment. Thus, a veiled critique of the royal authority and a partial justification for what followed runs like a rich xenophobic (or nationalist) vein through most of the narratives, even as the actions of the Comuneros are universally condemned.

But there was perhaps more to this. Xevres and his entourage were not only foreigners, but had endeavoured to extract “por diferentes puertos de Castilla, y lleuado á Flandes mas de tres millones de oro.”\textsuperscript{269} The image of large quantities of gold being surreptitiously siphoned off to Flanders (where else!) would not require a great deal of elaboration for a seventeenth-century audience. The “tears” and the “threats” of the offended Castilian cities thus appear in a decidedly more favourable light. In addition, the reference to three “millones” might well set off another series of alarm bells, given the tension-filled political environment dominated since 1590 by the servicio de mil\textsuperscript{269} (granted first to Philip II and then his son). The notion of Spain, or Castile, “consumed” and “destroyed” by the fiscal demands of the king, coupled with the private ambition of foreigners - first Flemings, then Philip III’s Genoese bankers – was no doubt another useful lesson to be gleaned from this recent history. Writing about the revolt in Segovia, Colmenares could not agree more, declaring that Castile was agitated because of the excesses of the royal tax-farmers (arrendadores), “perniciosos záñanos de las repúblicas,” who were squeezing the land dry.\textsuperscript{270} These are precisely the sorts of depredations condemned by writers such as Juan de Mariana, when he argued (in 1599): “que se atenderá más a la resolución de los pueblos que a la voluntad del príncipe.”

\textsuperscript{269} Mártir Rizo, Historia, 96.
\textsuperscript{270} Colmenares, Historia de la insigne ciudad de Segovia y compendio de las historias de Castilla [1637], 177.
Never too far behind the foreign ringleaders, and invariably summoned in droves by the ringing of the church bells were the “vulgar” classes, the “hombres viles, y de oficios bajos.”271 In Salamanca, for example, the nobles were “expelled,” and those who stayed behind suffered greatly, unable to stop the popular fury where everyone wanted to be king.272 Similarly, the uprising in Valladolid was “la plebe desenfrenada, amiga siempre de noveladas.”273 The spectre of social revolution had lost none of its terrifying potential. Indeed, there were some new overtones discernible in Pisa’s roll call of miscreants, described as “tundidores, sastres, pellejeros, y freneros”274 - and the rest of the picaresque repertoire so familiar to inhabitants of early seventeenth-century cities.275 In spite of this, things are not quite as simple or clear-cut as these often repeated laments would suggest. In Salamanca, one of the heartlands of the revolt, it was not just a case of “los mas viles del pueblo,” or those who suffer most in times of scarcity, and who normally pay a high price in “sweat” and “hard work” for their daily bread: some of the city’s nobility played a crucial role, and acted as “malas guias” motivated by “ambition” and “y apetito de mayor estado.”276 Similarly, in Cuenca “vn Cauallero” (Luis Carrillo de Albornoz) saw the “opportunity” to redress personal grievances, or else allowed himself to be “persuaded” by the “plebs” to become their captain (a decision that he soon came to regret, and finally redeemed the “proverbial loyalty” of his house through the intervention of his wife).277

271 Pisa, Descripción, 245.
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275 One cannot help but think of Quevedo’s La vida del Buscón, where the protagonist describes his father as “de oficio barbero; aunque eran tan altos sus pensamientos … diciendo que él era tundidor de mejillas y sastre de barbas.”
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However, even this unbridled fury of the urban populace could be sublimated (to some extent) into something altogether foreign to the city: quite literally a force of nature, or as González Dávila phrased it, “este mar de la Republica, alterado, y furioso,” a wave that momentarily—and unexpectedly—inundated the streets and plazas of Salamanca. The restoration of peace was therefore akin to taming this natural phenomenon, and the city emerging, effectively rebuilt in this post-diluvial environment.\footnote{González Dávila, \textit{Historia}, 456.} The point is that the revolting element was not the city; there was nothing urban, civilised, or man-made about it, no more than a thunderstorm at sea was the fault of the ship’s captain—in fact this destructive movement was the very antithesis of the city. Elsewhere, the popular fury is described as a “bestia sin freno,” a wild animal brought under control and tamed.

A theme that invariably accompanies this deeply entrenched perception of the role of the lower classes in the revolt is the omnipresence of noise. We thus hear that everything was “vozes, ruido, estruendo”\footnote{Mártir Rizo, \textit{Historia}, 98.} In González Dávila’s Salamanca, the most impressive thing about the stormy sea of the Republic in arms was “el oir de sus tormentas,”\footnote{González Dávila, \textit{Historia}, 456.} and the “sound” of the (Comunero) Junta “filled” the cities.\footnote{Ibid., 459.} Juxtaposed with this deafening roar of the “alborotos” of the Comunidad are “letters,” which were “fruto de la paz”—and, one might add, also the instrument of (social) order.\footnote{Ibid., 459.} What must therefore been particularly shocking is the fact that the Comuneros begin appropriating the mechanisms of government by paper. The role of writing in Spanish urban government was to affirm the hegemony of an oligarchic minority, the “conçejo, alcalldes e alguazil, regidores, cavalleros, escuderos, oficiales e omes buenos de la villa,” and thus to extend the tentacles of social coercion. The
right to issue and receive official documents was jealously guarded. It is for this challenge to locally instituted patterns of authority—as much as the implicit disobedience to the king—that the ‘Holy’ Junta of the Comuneros is designated by all the chroniclers as “esta division diabolica.”

This fear of social upheaval, and the rise of new men into the upper echelons of the municipal power structure were not unique to the early seventeenth century, but one might argue that such apprehensions were even more accentuated in this period. A perennial bone of contention was the sale (by the crown) and increase in the number of municipal offices (such as regidurias and escribanias) – a policy almost universally derided as incompatible with ‘good government’ and the ‘common good.’ González Dávila’s description of the Comuneros’ grievances can thus be read as directed at his contemporaries no less than it was a complaint against former practices: among other things, the rebels lamented that “favour” came before “justice,” offices were sold to the highest bidder, “la virtud y la verdad sin premio, mandarlo, y poderlo todo el dinero …” Mártir Rizo is equally critical of the king’s Flemish officials, explaining that “ambition” is “vn deseo de honores”—a definition imbued with the moral and ethical concerns of his own time. He continues his tirade against all those who are not content with their station in life and are thus occupied with “falsas esperanças … imprimiendo en sus animos nuevas cosas y mayores imaginaciones.” The need to preserve the social order, coupled with a never relinquished right to defend local rights and privileges was the particular predicament of the ruling urban elites. This dichotomy is revealed in the structure of all the narratives of the Comunero revolt discussed
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thus far (Valladolid, Segovia, Salamanca, Toledo and Cuenca): the glaring chasm between the perceived causes of the revolt - invariably associated with the avarice and “ambition” of the Flemings, the pressure of new taxes and impositions, as well as the kings absence (Charles was said to have left “torciendo el rostro a las desdichas de Castilla”\textsuperscript{287} — and, on the other hand, the unwanted course taken by the uprising in the cities once the popular classes had been mobilised, for nothing is “further from the truth” than the “vulgo.”\textsuperscript{288}

Turning our attention to Seville, a city where the Comunero rebellion was nipped in the bud, the ambiguities present in the other works are conspicuous by their absence. Caro’s record of Seville’s antiquities is not concerned with the rest of the city’s history, but Morgado’s chronicle is structurally and thematically much closer to the rest. In his recounting, the Comunero upstarts had chosen disobedience “por falsas querellas” and baseless allegations against Adrian and the Royal Council, determined to “reduce” the kingdom “en forma de Republica.”\textsuperscript{289} Cities were sacked, women “raped” and in general, “todo era robo, confusion, muerte, y discordias.” There are no mitigating circumstances, no sympathy and no further explanation. None, that is, until Morgado gets to his “principal intento,” which is to describe the “strength” and “loyalty” which Seville (unlike its Castilian counterparts) had “always” maintained for the royal crown.\textsuperscript{290} At this point, however, his observations do reflect upon an issue of great significance for contemporaries, and especially his fellow citizens. Seville, like many other large cities, was concerned about challenges to its jurisdiction within its municipal territories, and over the course of the second half of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century, the city lost as many dependent towns as it was
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able to purchase back. In this context one may imagine the intention behind Morgado’s assertion that it was common knowledge, “si Sevilla se alçara en esta sazon, las otras ciudades del Andaluzia la siguieran en ello, como a mas principal, y cabeça.” In this ongoing struggle to assert its regional rights and prerogatives, it would serve as no idle threat to remind the crown that only Seville’s “authority” and “example” had guaranteed the fidelity of Cordoba, Jerez, Ecija, Malaga “y otras ciudades, y Villas desta Comarca.”

2.6. Conclusion

As suggested at the outset, urban chronicles were intended to replicate the essential identity of their subject to the extent that they shared in its very substance. It was thus said of Rodrigo Caro’s book on Seville that he had found its Roman walls in ruins, but had “rendered them eternal with the precise stones of his words.” By writing its history he was in fact re-building the city itself, a city in which there was no rupture between past and present, and whose enduring physical reality could not be disturbed by the passage of time. Alongside the period of Moorish rule, the Comunero revolt had the greatest potential to disrupt the real and symbolic harmony of Castilian cities and their written histories. Whether or not, like Sandoval, the seventeenth century urban chroniclers wished to pass over the latter subject in silence, like the great historian they felt compelled to give their own version of events - as they touched upon their city - and to offer an explanation. While
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the elements used for this purpose were not entirely new—the role of the popular classes, foreigners and Charles’ fiscal demands—the resonance of this established Comunero ‘canon’ was different in the seventeenth-century context of economic stagnation, depopulation, Habsburg insolvency and an ongoing redefinition of communal rights and identities. Thus, despite the most strenuous efforts to underline loyalty, the ostensible result was an intensified veneration of the particular (illustrated by the vehemence of the polemic between Mártil Rizo and Morovelli).

However, others have suggested a “counter-trend” to this localism, in the shape of “sporadic attempts to represent or view Spanish cities as a whole.” James Amelang and Pablo Fernández Albaladejo have traced a sort of “textual chain,” or parallel efforts to integrate the fragments of this political diversity within the sphere of a wider community.

From this point of view, the role and importance of royal patronage in the production of urban histories has already been noted. Equally pertinent is the observation that many of the urban chroniclers avidly read and supported the work of their colleagues in other cities, either through official approbations or otherwise (their competitive instincts notwithstanding). Even the “archival mania” upon which the writing of urban histories rested had assumed a distinctly ‘national’ dimension. Fernando Bouza has described how the fame of Simancas “spread until it came to be identified with the memory of the institution of the monarchy itself and, what is more, as a symbol of the memory of the past in general, to which numerous individuals and groups would come in search of documents

---

as proof of rights or obligations.” Antolínez de Burgos would not challenge this assessment, assuring the reader that “everything” contained in his history of Valladolid “es deducido de las crónicas de España, y de muchos libros auténticos, de manuscritos y de observación de antigüedades.” The written memory of the Comunero revolt in its seventeenth century guise may also be said to have its place in that tentative “blueprint” sketched out for the “edifice” of a “Spanish” history. After all, if a relatively loose and incoherent notion of common aims—derived from belonging to a wider community—had worked against greater coordination between the Comunero cities in 1520, it is undeniable that seventeenth century historians had a far more appreciable sense of the earlier crisis affecting a ‘national’ community, of which their city was—and had always been—only a part (albeit an important, even crucial part).

298 Bouza, Communication, Knowledge, and Memory, 68.
299 Antolínez de Burgos, Historia de Valladolid, Prologo al lector.
300 Fernández Albaladejo, “Materia de España,” 129.
3.1. Introduction: First Among Equals

In the popular revolts of 1521 and 1652 the asistente of Seville was one of the primary targets of popular fury. This is hardly surprising given the wide remit of these crown-appointed officials, whose portfolio included all of the most sensitive aspects of municipal governance. But the figure of the asistente, as the embodiment of the changing relationship between the centre and locality, the crown and the city in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries played a much more complex role in each crisis, and one has to look beyond the personal failings of individual magistrates (though often far from negligible) to the nature of this relationship. Although they had been used with increasing frequency by fifteenth-century monarchs as a sort of Trojan horse to infiltrate the walls, and the halls of power of increasingly wealthy and populous Castilian cities, and in spite of the efforts of the Catholic Kings to turn them into something more than an extraordinary and ephemeral gift of equanimous royal justice, by the end of Isabella’s reign corregidores and asistentes were still viewed with suspicion, and were far from being universally accepted by the cities. The crisis of political legitimacy ushered in by the queen’s death (1504), which intensified after 1516 and eventually exploded in the Comunero rebellion of 1520, was also a crisis of local or urban government, and one of its most enduring outcomes was the general acceptance of the corregidor or asistente—not only due to the crown’s desire to establish the supremacy or royal justice, and restore order to the cities, but the longing of many segments of the urban oligarchies and even the commons to avoid factional strife. This development did not signal the disappearance of all misgivings or opposition to the role of asistentes in local politics—far from it—but the entrenchment of the post was accompanied by increasingly
formalised and regular mechanisms of oversight, or at least redress against accumulated grievances.

### 3.2. Asistentes’ Role in Revolts

A Dance of Death that appeared in Seville in the fateful year 1520, a summons to a macabre terpsichorean gathering, opened its roll-call of public enemies with the municipal officials, beginning with the asistente:

“[T]hou, corregidor, and thou, asistente,/ enter, I order you, join the dance./ You shall not be cured, thieves, of stealing more/ with your clear and pure malice/ for this harm I intend to kill you.”

These lines were among those added to the traditional *Danza general* in the reign of Enrique IV, some sixty years before the updated version was issued by the printer Juan Varela de Salamanca. As Geraldine McKendrick has pointed out, the additions resonated with the social upheavals resulting from Seville’s fifteenth-century economic growth, and the popular poem—its subject matter and its cast of familiar urban types—resonated once again in a time of political upheaval and dearth. The litany of complaints, directed especially food vendors (of bread, meat, fish, and wine) and retailers of clothing items mirrored to a large extent the grievances of the pro-comunero rebels, and above all the artisans, the *gente meunda* among Figueroa’s followers. Indeed, rather than resentment against the presence of *conversos* in the city council—the principal grievance of the noble conspirators—the outrage expressed in the poem is identifiable with the popular resentment against hoarders and

---

301 “vos, corregidor, és vos, asistente,/ entrad, que os lo mando, venid a dançar./ No os cureys, ladrones, de más robar/ con vuestras muy claras y puras malicias/ por este tal daño os entiendo matar.” McKendrick, “The Dança de la Muerte of 1520,” 250.
speculators, especially in basic foodstuffs such as grain and bread. Some of the most notorious of these were men like the wealthy and powerful *converso* Francisco del Alcázar, but also Gonzalo Gómez de Cervantes, the patron of the parish church of Omnium Sanctorum.

Crucially, both in the Dance of Death and by the rebels who marched behind the green banner, the link was made between these economic malpractices and corrupt or negligent public officials, beginning with the asistente. Each crisis opened with a face-to-face encounter between the rebel crowd and the asistente of Seville, whose duty it was to appear in person at the scene of unrest—“to parlay with the plebeians in the plaza”. The Feria rebels’ petition, entrusted by Anton Sánchez and the rest of the parish deputies to the caballero Perafán, was addressed to the asistente, who promised to seek out hidden stores of grain in order to pacify the swelling crowd and gain time. By the evening he was riding at the head of a company of armed men—including the captain of the galleys—in hot pursuit of the leading rebels, or the “principal men of the parish [of Omnium Sanctorum]”. The relatively swift and decisive resolution of the crisis of March 1521 stands in contrast to the confusion and chaos of the previous September. While there are clearly many reasons for this, including the temporary armistice between the Medina and Arcos factions—sealed no doubt by the spectre of social revolt—it is also quite probable that the asistente’s presence in the city obviated much of the uncertainty and bet-hedging among the urban elites. His

---

302 The worst culprit is the *panadera*, in league with the *almotacén*, accused of cheating the weight regulations and raising prices on feast days. As McKendrick points out, “no other character—apart from the usurero—is so irremediably consigned to a merciless fate in hell,” and the *panadera*’s “malpractices … constitute a social sin which is defined as the perpetration of ‘grande daño en la comunidad’ …” ibid., 252.

303 Castillo de Bobadilla, the author of the famous handbook for corregidores, explained that its purpose was to instruct prudent officials how to “hablar en el senado con los Sabios, tratar en la plaça con los plebeyos, y pelear en el campo con los enemigos.” Jerónimo Castillo de Bobadilla, *Política para corregidores, y señores de vasallos, en tiempo de paz y de guerra* [1597], ed. Benjamin González Alonso, 2 vols. (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios de Administración Local, 1978 [facsimile of the edition, Antwerp: Juan Bautista Verdussen, 1704]).

deputy Guerrero was clearly a determined character who did his best to rouse support for royal authority and restore order, though without much assistance from the *regimiento*. Seville was indeed a city that had to be governed by *asistentes* rather than mere deputies.

However the *gente menuda* were not the only ones to hold the asistente responsible for the “great damage to the republic”, nor was the royal magistrate’s presence in Seville invariably seen as a boon to public order. In a strongly worded letter addressed to the regency government (1521), the Duke of Medina Sidonia implored the king to send another asistente in place of Sancho Martínez de Leyva, who had been willfully negligent, biased, and protective of Arcos and his faction, and had thus contributed directly to the rising of September 16, 1520. The asistente was absent as increasing lawlessness disturbed the public order and threatened to escalate into open revolt, and it was only the courage of *alcalde mayor* Vergara that saved the day. However the asistente’s return only made things worse, as he permitted many of Figueroa’s co-conspirators and allies to return, resume their posts and appear in public, refusing to arrest them in spite of Medina Sidonia’s pleas. The Duke even alleged that when his men came to the asistente’s house urging him to act against the ruffians (*malhechores*) set loose about the city by the Arcos faction, Martínez de Leyva positioned some of their number and some scribes behind a curtain to take note of the complaints, in order to sow even greater discord against the two rival houses.305

305 “el dicho asistente se metía en su aposento y dentro detrás los paños tenía a ciertos dellos con escrivano y testigos sus criados e allí por mañas les hizía dezir todo lo que el quería para que los otros lo oyesen e enemistarlos mas con la casa del dicho duque …” Manuel Danvilá y Collado, *Historia crítica y documentada de las comunidades de Castilla*, 6 vols., vol. 3, Memorial histórico español: colección de documentos, opúsculos y antigüedades (Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, 1898), vol. 2 (1898), 177-78. Although the Duke referred to Figueroa’s revolt as “*lo de los alcacares*” (“the Alcázar incident”), his intention was not to diminish the importance or gravity of the uprising—on the contrary, the whole purpose of this letter and the rest of his correspondence with the regency government is to emphasize the key role played by the duke of Medina and his men, not only in the restoration of order in Seville, but as the catalyst for the revival of royalist fortunes in Castile.
Such underhand tactics notwithstanding, it is more than likely that the asistente Martínez de Leyva was merely trying to do what might have been expected from any official in his place—treading carefully to keep both rival clans in check. As Castillo de Bobadilla pointed out, the ultimate end of justice is peace, and to keep the peace between factions it is sometimes necessary to proceed “by paths and ways not inscribed in the laws”—even if a legalistically-minded juez de residencia might condemn the failure to apprehend known troublemakers.  

Alienating the Duke of Arcos completely while he was still hovering within striking distance of the city, his base in nearby Marchena secure in his possession, and his younger brother’s defeat still fresh in the memory—though he had disavowed the latter’s cause—was probably unwise. The balancing act required to maintain a semblance of order and concord between unruly aldermen and haughty aristocrats was difficult enough to perform in times of peace—as the later juicios de residencia amply demonstrate. Moreover, the same could be said about the asistente’s other obligations that touched more directly on the lives and interests of the artisans and the gente menuda: supplying a city as large as sixteenth-century Seville with bread and flour at a just price was a Sisyphean task at the best of times—and the middle decades of the sixteenth century were the best of times in Seville—but doing so in the midst of war and upheaval, with the normal supply lines interrupted, was virtually impossible.

By the mid-seventeenth century the pressures facing the asistentes of Seville were nearly intolerable. The crown’s demands for men and money overtook one another, and yet the state was little more than a passive observer in times of acute crisis and revolt, lacking

---

306 “que avra algun juez de residencia tan atenido al camino ordinario de las leyes, que ponga culpa al Corregidor, porque dexò sin castigo aquel ruydo y desacato, y no considere, que ay negocios de estado, y entre personas calificadas, en los quales se ha de proceder à las vezes por traças y caminos no escritos en las leyes, por evitar escandalo …” Castillo de Bobadilla, Política para corregidores, vol. 2, 105.
effective mechanisms or means to respond effectively, its reaction consisting of little more than instructions for corregidores and city magistrates to adopt all necessary measures.307

In Granada, in 1647, one of the rebels’ first acts was to elect a “popular” corregidor to replace the one they had deposed, whose house was stoned—a pattern followed in other Andalusian cities.308 Five years later (1652), in Córdoba, the weakness of the corregidor, the viscount of Peña Parda, was a major contributing cause to the outbreak of revolt. The city was already a powder-keg, notorious for the unbridled depredations of its nobility and in the midst of grain scarcity and speculators, rendered lawless as a result of his over-indulgence of the nobility.309 In one cited instance that resonates with the perennial grievances of the urban commons, Peña Parda failed to punish a caballero for murdering a constable (alguacil) “to secure his vote in the Cabildo.”310 His failure to administer justice was compounded by the exorbitant price of grain, the result of scarcity as well as rampant speculation. The corregidor’s house was sacked, Peña Parda just managing to escape by climbing the roof and seeking shelter in a convent. The corregidor of Ayamonte was forced to flee the town by a mob “suffering from the affliction of wine,” as he explained in a letter to the asistente of Seville, and decrying the lack of bread, the debasement of the coinage, and the maladministration of justice.311

On the other hand, a steady and competent hand on the tiller could avert a popular uprising, or ensure that discontent was controlled and at least partly channeled. In Córdoba, the fact that Peña Parda was clearly unequal to the task of keeping a lid on popular

307 Domínguez Ortiz, Alteraciones andaluzas, 106.
308 Ibid., 122-26.
309 Though, as Domínguez Ortiz points out, Peña Parda was probably not guilty of all the abuses imputed to him by the cabildo. Ibid., 140.
310 “porque votara en su favor en el Cabildo ...” ibid.
311 Ibid., 175.
discontent in hard times was acknowledged by the Royal Council, but his replacement could not be dispatched in time—though the President of Castile believed that the latter’s arrival might have averted the disaster.\textsuperscript{312} Meanwhile, the corregidor of Tarifa boasted of having managed to keep the price of bread low, in spite of having sent supplies to North African presidios of Ceuta and Larache.\textsuperscript{313}

On 22 May, 1652, following the cry of “Long live the King, and death to Bad Government!,” uttered in the Plaza de la Feria by silk weaver Francisco Hurtado, his band of 20 armed companions drew their swords and marched or ran down the street shouting and urging all those they encountered on the way to do likewise and join them. Only a few steps from the plaza, separated from it by a fairly short street, was an intersection marked by a street cross, the Cruz de Caravaca, inhabited mainly by carpenters. On reaching this local landmark, the rebels, by then numbering around a hundred men, came face to face with the asistente, Pedro Luis de Zúñiga Enríquez, the Marquis of Aguilafuente, his constables and a city alderman (\textit{regidor}). According to various sources the asistente might have been killed, certainly stones were thrown in his direction, he was forced to dismount, and finally compelled to march with one part of the rebel host in search of stores of grain.\textsuperscript{314}

At once the most obvious local embodiment of royal authority and the weightiest member of the municipal council (cabildo), the asistente could be held responsible for outside impositions (fiscal or otherwise) as well as perceived iniquities in local administration. The asistentes of Seville, like early modern Castilian corregidores in general, were “omnicompetent” officials, but as such they were entrusted with a daunting number of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[312] “Si el nuevo corregidor hubiera ido cuando le nombré quizá se hubiera escusado este alboroto.” Ibid., 147.
\item[313] Ibid., 174.
\item[314] Andrade, \textit{Casos raros y particulares}, BAS, MS 33-91(1), f. 54v.
\end{footnotes}
tasks and responsibilities. In theory, thanks to his invariably elevated social status, networks, formal and informal authority, the asistente of Seville was better placed than any other member of the urban elite to forge consensus and forge alliances necessary. Yet even with the aid of two or three lieutenants, the expectations placed on the shoulders of these public officials during their two-year tenure was not infrequently overwhelming. The asistentes of Seville as a group stood out among the corregidores of other cities in the kingdom of Castile for their social origins, and the unique prestige of the position. Yet as the heads of a notoriously wealthy, powerful, and self-consequent body, their powers were also circumscribed in ways that other corregidores were not obliged to countenance. Moreover the presence of a powerful Inquisitorial body and the audiencia (high court) created even greater potential for jurisdictional disputes that plagued all local administration—and increased the likelihood that such conflicts would spill over into the city streets, with unpredictable consequences.

3.2.1. Corregidores and Asistentes

Corregidores and asistentes were magistrates appointed by the crown to preside over city councils, whose role was envisaged as early as the thirteenth century. In theory the corregidor brought the equanimity of royal justice and good government to cities and towns, and helped secure the flow of fiscal and military contributions. They began to appear in earnest in the fifteenth century, and were not immediately or easily accepted by cities. This initial reluctance, and even violent opposition by the cities, and the eventual

---

315 “El oficio de asistente preçede en honra y utilidad a los otros coregimientos de España, es a prouision del Rey, y de ordinario lo exerçen Señores titulados …” Floresta española o Descripción de cosas notables de las ciudades episcopales de España y Portugal, BNM, MS 5989, 47v.
establishment of the post of corregidor as a permanent feature of urban government, has led many modern scholars to analyse this process almost exclusively from the perspective of royal intervention and centralization, which reached its zenith in the reign of the Catholic Monarchs.\textsuperscript{316} It is undeniable that the post began to acquire the habit of permanence in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, and that as royal appointments, corregidores allowed the crown to exert more direct influence over the allocation, and often sale of, municipal offices, urban conflicts and siphoning off money and men.

Yet the corregidor, \textit{asistente}, or governor was neither an agent of bureaucratic centralization nor an innovation of the Catholic Monarchs, although corregidores began to be appointed with greater regularity and in more cities and towns in the latter’s reign, and this by itself translated into greater and more direct involvement in local affairs. The ordinances of the corregidores were not primarily interested in circumscribing the specific functions of the corregidores and \textit{asistentes}, their length of term in office, but rather their loyalty to the monarchy, independence and impartiality. They were royal appointees, and they presided over the meetings of city councils, but they could not rule by decree, nor were they ever envisaged as executioners of orders issued from Madrid. Their function was to ensure that the crown had a voice in the deliberations of municipal councils, a loud voice not easily ignored, to be sure, and to guide the decision making process as much as possible in defence of royal interests.

By the sixteenth century Seville alone was invested with an \textit{asistente} rather than a corregidor, a difference that was more than nominal.\textsuperscript{317} It was at once a more prestigious

\begin{flushright}
\begin{footnotesize}\textsuperscript{316} del Val Valdivieso, “Urban Growth and Royal Interventionism.” \\
\textsuperscript{317} On the differences between corregidores and \textit{asistentes}, see Lunenfeld, \textit{Keepers of the City: The Corregidores of Isabella I of Castile, 1474-1504}, 20-1. Navarro Sainz argues that the difference was a significant one, with
\end{footnotesize}\end{flushright}
office, and, paradoxically, more circumscribed in its judicial powers, which reflected the importance of the city of Seville, and the entrenched power of its oligarchy, able to conserve more of its historic prerogatives in the face of royal encroachment. Resistance to these royal officials was equally manifest here, especially during the turbulent fifteenth century. Thus in 1463 the asistente Pedro Manrique was almost stoned to death. Meanwhile, Diego de Merlo—the first asistente of Seville appointed by Isabella, in 1478—had fallen foul of the Cordoban oligarchy before he was relived of his duties there and transferred to Seville.

Merlo’s appointment was nevertheless a turning point. The asistente’s vote was thenceforth worth as much as one-third of the regidores; appeals from their judicial decisions could only be made to the Royal Council; the asistente had the power to exile anyone, and he was the commander in chief of the urban militia. Had two lieutenants, and neither he or his subordinates could be citizens or natives of Seville. Their reward were posts in the Royal Council or being named viceroys of New Spain or Peru. By the seventeenth century the asistentes of Seville would invariably be drawn from the ranks of the titled nobility, and this would be the most coveted of municipal magistracies for the associated prestige, relatively generous remuneration, and because it often served as a stepping stone to higher posts in the royal administration, the Court, or the American viceroyalties.

asistentes not endowed with exclusive judicial powers, and were appointed only to cities that were particularly resistant to royal intrusion. By the early sixteenth century Seville was the only city in Castile that had an asistente rather than a corregidor. Navarro Sainz, El Concejo de Sevilla, 104-5.

Lunenfeld, Keepers of the City: The Corregidores of Isabella I of Castile, 1474-1504, 17. The stoning of asistente Manrique may have been related to the unprecedented powers granted to him by Enrique IV, Navarro Sainz, El Concejo de Sevilla, 105.

A shift that has been dated to the mid-seventeenth century.

On 13 July 1521 the jurados of Seville urged the king to appoint an asistente as quickly as possible, for the “harm” the latter’s absence was doing to the city, and disservice to his majesty. Although the bad harvest had been partly to blame, the lack of bread in the city—four months following the popular rising—was a direct result of the asistente’s absence. More than thirty ships laden with wheat had unloaded their cargos, but the price of bread had continued to rise. The reason, according to the jurados, was that there were many “regatones” who purchased the wheat wholesale and resold it at higher prices, some of it reexported abroad. There was no “justice” to restrain and punish them, and so in addition to this there were many other crimes and “scandals” were taking place daily. A city like Seville, at a time like the present, should not be left in the hands of “mere lieutenants.” Moreover, Charles was obliged to look after this city’s “good” having in mind its loyalty and services rendered during the Comunero Revolt.

3.3. The juicios de residencia

The residencia was the regular exit investigation that most public officials were subject to. Although established in principle in the thirteenth-century Siete Partidas, like so many other aspects of public administration in Castile, practice lagged behind precept. Nor
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321 “mucho daño a esta cibdad e deseruiçio a V.M. …” Carta de los jurados de Sevilla a SSMM suplicándoles que nombrasen Asistente de dicha ciudad y haciendo relación de los perjuicios que se seguían de estar vacante el cargo, AGS, Câmara de Castilla, Diversos, leg. 43, no. 73.

322 12-13 silver reales per fanega.

323 “esta cibdad no es para estar con solo tenientes de asistente e que siembre es menester que en ella esta asistente e mayormente en tal tiempo como este …” Carta de los jurados de Sevilla a SSMM suplicándoles que nombrasen Asistente de dicha ciudad y haciendo relación de los perjuicios que se seguían de estar vacante el cargo, AGS, Câmara de Castilla, Diversos, leg. 43, no. 73.

324 “V.M. han de tener mucho cuidado del bien desta cibdad segund los seruiçios que ha fecho durante el tiempo del avsençia de V.M. …” Informacion de testigos hecha a instancia de Rodrigo del Castillo, vecino de Sevilla y canonigo de SSMM, sobre los servicios prestados cuando los alborotos de la ciudad y sucesos de Juan de Figueroa y parciales, AGS, Câmara de Castilla, Diversos, leg. 43, no. 11, 1521-1522.
is it possible to draw a (single) straight line between the law codes of Alfonso the Wise and the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century residencia. As Fortea Pérez has pointed out, the perennial concern with the supervision and oversight of public and especially royal officials resulted in several expedients, most of them applied intermittently, and the most prominent of which by the late fifteenth century was the visita—more or less definitively established by the Laws of Toledo (1480). The emergence of the residencia as an independent and separate procedure may be traced back to the 1500 capítulos para corregidores, but the visita remained the preferred option until the middle of the sixteenth century (and survived as an extraordinary measure thereafter).  

After 1550 the residencia supplanted the visita as the standard instrument of oversight of public officials in Castile, but the procedure continued to evolve until the end of the sixteenth century. However in spite of repeated (though in some aspects contradictory) demands by the cities in the Cortes, and the sound recommendations for reform coming from experts, few significant changes affected the conduct of residencias in practice. The cities and the experts at various times requested that the judges of the residencia should not also serve as corregidores while conducting their inquiry; that the outcome of the residencias should determine future appointments; that residencias should take place at regular intervals, and that there should be a time-limit on the duration of the inquest; that the residencia judges should be empowered to sentence the gravest abuses, hitherto routinely remitted to the Royal Council (and often postponed indefinitely); that measures should be implemented to prevent corregidores from influencing proceedings (by

---

discovering the names of their accusers, bribing or intimidating witnesses, or by influencing the selection of judges); finally, that the judges of residencia should be carefully chosen from members of the Royal Councils or Chancillerías (high courts)—and that the right people should be appointed as corregidores in the first place (maintaining a list of eligible candidates was suggested).326

The crown eventually accepted the requirement that residencias should be conducted every 2 years, that officials whose overall assessment was negative could not hold public office in the future, and many of the recommendations regarding the form and duration of the inquiry—but few if any of these measures were implemented.

3.3.1. “Theatres of power”

As a recent study has pointed out, residencias of public officials, and corregidores in particular, have been lauded as potentially bountiful sources of urban history of Castile far more often than they have actually been used as such by historians. In terms of geographic scope, the vast majority of work on visitas, residencias, and pesquisas has focused on these juridical procedures in the Indies, above all in the eighteenth, and to a lesser extent the seventeenth century. Fortea Pérez is more interested in the role of the residencia in the government of the kingdom, or the function of this judicial inquiry in the selection process of crown-appointed officials in Castile and the Indies. Hence his survey of a large sample of

326 Most of these recommendations were based on longstanding concerns voiced by the cities in the Cortes of Castile from 1520 onward, and systematically recapitulated by the royal visitador Francisco de la Trinidad in 1554. The cities changed their stance more than once on issue of appointing separate residencia judges and corregidores (or the alternative of having incoming corregidores perform the residencia investigation of their predecessor’s conduct)—the expense of sustaining two senior judicial officers simultaneously was cited as prohibitive, among other things. The second option appears to have prevailed after 1603 in practice, and after 1640 in terms of legal norm. Ibid., 182-89.
*juicios de residencia* analyses the results—the broad sweep of verdicts reached, whether positive or negative, and how much impact this had on identifying suitable candidates for office. His source does not permit any discussion of the content of the *residencias*.

An older historiographical tradition saw the increasing use of corregidores by Castilian monarchs, and the conduct of *residencias*, as centrepieces of royal absolutism, the peaks of which were spied during the reigns of the Catholic Monarchs and Philip II. Yet throughout the late middle ages, inquests were “not willingly authorized by the Crown without intense communal pressure”, and even after 1480 both *visitas* and *residencias* were “only sporadically applied”. In fact, the years when the *residencia* was most regularly applied coincide with the period when royal corregidores were most willingly accepted by (previously reluctant) Castilian cities. Indeed, there is little doubt that its use—like the appointment of corregidores—could satisfy the demands of urban communities, or their elites, as much as it was proving to be a useful instrument in the crown’s attempts to reorganize municipal government to its own advantage. After all, the two impulses were inextricably linked—delivering “the promise of evenhanded justice”—a key aspect of all legitimating discourses of power—clearly meant greater intrusion into local administration, and to this extent it was welcomed by cities, even as they fought to determine the precise terms of this royal intrusion, and to balance the requirements of peace and justice with the burden placed on the municipal treasury (or indeed their own pockets).

---


328 A peak in the use of the *visita* or *residencia* has been registered from 1488 to the mid-1490s, coinciding with the period of greatest acceptance of corregidores (1485-1494)—Queen Isabella’s second decade on the throne of Castile.

Thus far visitas, residencias and pesquisas have been studied from three perspectives: as mechanisms of control (focus on juridical procedure); for the information they contained, offering a glimpse of the nature of colonial administration in practice; and more recently as the site of social conflicts—not an impersonal bureaucratic procedure, flawed in its design or let down by individual officials, but as a fluid process. The first highlighted the reasons for their ineffectiveness in this sense (venality and local oligarchy). As Herzog points out, this approach is clearly limited due to its focus on the interests and imperatives of the centre. The second sifted through the information gathered by the residencia judges in an attempt to focus on practice, highlighting corruption, particular over public interests. However the focus here was on the results (information collected), not on the process of collection, selection of witnesses, evidence—all of which helped shape the outcome.\textsuperscript{330}

What is missing is a longue duree study that would bring all three of these approaches together.

3.3.2. The Structure of the juicio de residencia

The juicio de residencia might be composed of three parts: a secret inquiry (pesquisa secreta); a public, itemized list of charges (capítulos) formulated by a corporate entity or group of individuals; and a collection of individual demands for redress of very specific and sometimes petty-sounding grievances (demandas). For the purposes of the pesquisa secreta, complaints reached the investigating judge in the form of memoriales and anonymous notes,

\textsuperscript{330} Tamar Herzog, “Ritos de control, prácticas de negociación: Pesquisas, visitas y residencias y las relaciones entre Quito y Madrid (1650-1750),” Nuevas Aportaciones a la historia jurídica de Iberoamérica (CD Rom) (Madrid: Fundación Hernando de Larramendi-Mapfre, 2000).
based on which the juez compiled a list of witnesses to be interrogated. This witnesses were in theory chosen with care, to ensure that any evidence gathered was not weighed in favour of the accusers or the asistente (or indeed any public official), and to ensure this the asistente was allowed to submit a list of those he considered his enemies, or those who might have had any reason to bear him ill will. The purpose of the secret inquest was to ascertain whether the asistente, his lieutenants, or any lesser public official had been negligent in the administration of justice, the provision of markets, public works, street cleaning, and so on, more or less in order of importance. The law permitted 90 days for the completion of all inquiries and the interrogation of witnesses, but the process often dragged on much longer. The pesquisa secreta accounted for the heft of the juicio, its reams of paper tightly bound with leather straps containing the testimonies of dozens of witnesses.

3.3.3. Juicios de residencia in Sixteenth-Century Seville

Three more or less complete residencias survive offering an extraordinarily detailed, if problematic, image of municipal politics and administration in sixteenth-century Seville. Three exhaustive investigative efforts cover the mandates of Pedro de Navarra, Marquis of Cortes (1538-42); Francisco Hurtado de Mendoza, Count of Monteagudo (1566-69); and Fernando Carrillo de Mendoza, Count of Priego (1570-72). An earlier fragment also

331 Bernardo Ares, following an exhaustive search of the local archives, the archives of the high court (Chancillería) of Granada, the Simancas state archive, and the Archivo Histórico Nacional, was able to unearth only 4 (incomplete) juicios de residencia for Córdoba, all of them dating from the second half of the seventeenth century. He was nevertheless convinced that the surviving documents represent an invaluable treasure trove of information on urban politics and social relations in Córdoba. José Manuel de Bernardo Ares, “Los juicios de residencia como fuente para la historia urbana,” in Actas II Coloquios de Historia de Andalucía: Andalucía Moderna (Córdoba, 1980) (1983), 1.
survives: the *capítulos* compiled by the city’s *jurados* against the *asistente* Garcí Fernández Manrique, Count of Osorno (1522-23).

The 1524 *capítulos* contained 39 separate complaints against the *asistente* and his lieutenants; the *residencia* of 1542 contains 2 sets of *capítulos*, with a total of 57 complaints, a minority of which, as in the preceding case, are related to other towns in Seville’s jurisdiction. The *residencias* of the Counts of Monteagudo and Priego (conducted in 1570 and 1572 respectively) do not contain *capítulos*, but a list of questions, many of them no doubt based on public as well as private denunciations.

A general breakdown of the types of complaints lodged in each case might be a first step in understanding something of the expectations placed on the *asistentes* of Seville, the relative importance given by urban groups and individuals to each one of these multifarious responsibilities. The complaints were never formally separated based on subject matter by those submitting them or the investigating judges, but they do lend themselves to some sort of categorization, however tentative and flexible.

Of 39 *capítulos* submitted by the city’s *jurados* in 1524 against the Count of Osorno, by far the most numerous were those pertaining to the *asistente’s* conduct in the cabildo, or city council—in the purely formal sense, including questions of precedence, absence from the assembly, etc.—which accounts for 14 items, wholly or in part. In the case of the Count of Osorno this is explained by the fact that the *asistente* abandoned the city in the grip of a plague epidemic, attempting to govern from a nearby village, and badly at that. These were followed most closely by some serious misgivings over the appointments to various public offices (8). The rest of the *capítulos* are divided between (in sequential order): food supply
(2); partiality or bias toward one or more regidores, ‘powerful men’, or specific public officials (3); corruption or venality (2); the failure to conduct a full or proper investigation into his predecessor’s mandate (1); issues related to Seville’s interests within its immediate limits, and the towns and villages of its jurisdiction (6); the regulation of public markets (1); public health (2); taxes and duties (1); and public works (2).

3.3.4. In the Cabildo

The Castilian corregidor was a “shepherd among wolves”, in Marvin Lunenfeld’s evocative assessment of their often unequal struggle to control intractable city councils, made up of “seasoned parliamentarians” who sought to ensure that the corregidor’s decision-making role was minimal and that “most real business was accomplished in committees” composed of a few regidores.332 This was certainly the case through most of Isabella the Catholic’s reign, although as Lunenfeld shows, the degree of effectiveness varied depending on the individual corregidor’s skills, the support he received from the crown, and the historical conjuncture—hard-won acceptance that ushered in a brief “golden age,” quickly squandered in the wake of the War of Granada. There was at all times a need to understand the local balance of power, and to seek, by any available means, the support of at least a significant number of aldermen. This required a delicate balance between persuasion and coercion, blandishment mixed with stern language and even threats, and at times the corregidor was less shepherd and more yet another wolf striving to lead the pack. Most often however the difficulties inherent in the government of Castilian cities led corregidores

332 Lunenfeld, Keepers of the City: The Corregidores of Isabella I of Castile, 1474-1504, 43.
and *asistentes* to forge alliances with powerful local interests, alliances that involved concessions in the administration of justice, and the provision of public offices, which in turn alienated other sections of the local elite.\(^{333}\)

The heavy-handed approach was apparently not uncommon in sixteenth century Seville, when both the *asistentes* and the crown had a little more room for manoeuvre. The *jurados* of Seville thus alleged that aldermen, clerics, and commoners alike were subjected to harsh and “ugly” words by the Count of Osorno, the *asistente*, and his officials, who demanded to be treated as “something more than officers of justice”.\(^{334}\) This was a common complaint against corregidores. Twenty years later, one of the *capítulos* against the Marquis of Cortes (1542) accused the outgoing *asistente* of governing the city “like an absolute lord rather than a judge”\(^{335}\). He expelled from the cabildo and imprisoned a number of *veinticuatro* for daring to disagree with him, including the Count of Gelves.\(^{336}\) At least three other aldermen, Alonso de Santillán, Francisco de Villacís, and Pedro Mexía (the famous author and royal chronicler), were publicly humiliated by being marched through the city streets to the royal shipyards (Atarazanas), where they were confined for standing up to the accused magistrate.\(^{337}\) While the offence taken by the injured councilmen was evidently great, such measures—silencing, house arrest, and even imprisonment without due

---


\(^{334}\) “an tratado e tratan [...] mal e feamente de palabras ynjuriosas a muchas personas de onrra asy caualleros particulares como del regimiento e de estado de la clerezía e de estado comun sin cabsa ni rrazon alguna dando a entender que les an de rreverençiar e tener mucho más que a Juezes …” *Sobre unos capítulos puestos por los jurados de Sevilla en contra del conde de Osorno, asistente de Sevilla, en la residencia que se le tomo*, AGS, CR, leg. 661, no. 16, f. 5r.

\(^{335}\) “mandar como señor asuluto e no como juez”. *Residencia a Pedro Navarra, marqués de Cortes, mariscal de Navarra, asistente que fue de Sevilla, a sus tenientes y oficiales, por el licenciado Ortiz, del Consejo y alcalde de Casa y Corte*, AGS, CR, leg. 412, no. 4, primeros capítulos, cap. 10.

\(^{336}\) Ibid., segundos capítulos, cap. 19.

\(^{337}\) “hizo prender a muchos Regidores sin cavsa alguna especialmente Alonso de Santillan e a Pero Megia, e a Francisco de Villaçis, mandando los yr desde el cabildo a las atarazanas publicamente por que no le contradixesen en lo que el queria hazer.” Ibid., primeros capítulos, cap. 20.
process—were later readily approved by the author of the most prominent treatise on corregidores, Jerónimo Castillo de Bobadilla. In the latter’s opinion, rooted in his own experience as corregidor, unruly aldermen (regidores) should be separated and allowed to cool off before they could summon their followers, servants, and dependents to join any incipient struggle—the “spark that could burn down the entire city.” Yet even Bobadilla envisaged such extreme measures as a way of preventing internecine conflicts between groups of regidores, not enforcing the corregidor (or asistente’s) will, or silencing dissenting opinion.

The municipal council was divided between two factions, one led by the asistente and aligned to Olivares, the other led by the local nobility (Ortiz, Melgarejo), including the majority of the veinticuatro, opposed to the Count-Duke. One of the objectives of the royal visit was to eliminate this opposition. While Philip enjoyed thirteen days of feasting and entertainment, the Count-Duke chaired a meeting of the Ayuntamiento, where he succeeded in extracting a donation of 30,000 ducats. The opponents of the concession nevertheless attached the blame to the asistente Fariñas, who was the subject of pasquinades and sonnets that appear to have circulated widely:

El Presidente Caifás
Por amor de pretensiones
Ha concedido millones

---

338 “y de no matarse una centella, se viene à quemar una ciudad ...” Castillo de Bobadilla, Política para corregidores, 104.
339 “Quedóse esse día el conde de Oliuares, y estuuo en la ciudad en cabildo y sacó el seruicio de 72 millones con general sentimiento, y partió luego a lleuar la nueba a el Rey. No aceptó esto lo demás del reyno, y cessó.” Francisco Morales Padrón, ed. Memorias de Sevilla (1600-1678) (Córdoba: Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Córdoba, 1981), 38.
Negándolos Barrabás.\textsuperscript{340}

As the diarist Andrés de la Vega explained, the “president” was the \textit{asistente} Fariñas, while Barrabas was the pejorative name for the powerful \textit{veinticuatro}, Don Fernando Melgarejo. Another contemporary sonnet was even more explicit:

\begin{quote}
Mill años ha que perdió \\
A España el torpe Rodrigo \\
Y oy Fariñas su enemigo \\
Segunda vez la vendió. \\
En un Cabildo se dió \\
La batalla con afán \\
Treinta a treinta se lo han \\
Pero venció su injusticia \\
Buelta en caba la codicia \\
Y el Conde en D. Julian.\textsuperscript{341}
\end{quote}

Disputes with local notables could erupt over points of honour or precedence. Thus on Sunday afternoon, 5 September 1628, the Count of Puebla, \textit{asistente} of Seville, received a formal challenge to a duel (“un papel”) from the Marquis of la Algaba—whose urban residence overlooked the Plaza of la Feria, in Omnium Sanctorum.\textsuperscript{342} The quarrel had apparently originated over a seat at the Jesuit church, placed there by the Marquis, or his

\textsuperscript{340} Ibid., 39.  
\textsuperscript{341} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{342} \textit{Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y mui leal ciudad de Sevilla}, BCC, MS 59-1-5, ff. 228v-29r.
men, and removed on the orders of the asistente, due to attend the same function.\textsuperscript{343} The challenge was accepted, and they squared off on St. Sebastian’s day. However, the asistente’s sword was quickly broken, at which point some people intervened (“Acudio gente y medió”). Both the asistente and the Marquis were arrested in their homes by guards sent by the regent of the Audiencia, and an alcalde was dispatched from Madrid to adjudicate. Various opinions (“varios pareceres”) about this duel circulated: whether the asistente, as the acting chief Justice (“siendo actualmente Justicia”) should not have declined the challenge, or if he should have waited to lay down his staff of Justice before accepting, or have renounced his position temporarily in order to do so. Others were of the opinion that in such a delicate matter of honour, the asistente was obliged to trample over all other considerations.\textsuperscript{344}

\textbf{3.3.5. Bias}

Accusations of bias or partiality toward one or more veinticuatros, officials, or other powerful groups and individuals invariably came first, whether heading the list of capítulos against the asistente or the questions devised by the investigating magistrate.

The Count of Osorno (1524) apparently exploited his double role as acting asistente and magistrate responsible for investigating complaints against all public officials under his predecessor’s mandate. He failed to carry out the proper inquiries, as noted above,

\textsuperscript{343} “Dizen se origino el disgusto sobre no permitir que vna silla que estaba en la Casa profesa de la Compañía puesta para el Marques del Algaba, se pusiese allí aueindo el Asistente de asistir á la mesma funcion, y que la hizo quitar, de que tomo el Marques el duelo.” Ibid., f. 229r.
\textsuperscript{344} “si deuio admitirle el Asistente, siendo actualmente Justicia, ò reserbarle para despues que dejase la Vara, ò dejarla para aceptarlo. Otros dezian que en materia tan delicada en el duelo, y tan pvardorosa deuio el Asistente atropellar por todo.” Ibid.
sometimes as a favour to certain officials, to be cashed in later, but in other cases keeping in Damoclesian suspense those who deigned to oppose his motions in the council, their resistance met with the reopening of neglected judicial proceedings.\textsuperscript{345} He had not revised the accounts of the penas de cámara veinticuatro Francisco del Alcázar, and Pedro Coronado, the deputy of Juan de Pineda, \textit{escribano mayor}, the collectors of the money in question.\textsuperscript{346} His motives are made clearer further on, when Osorno’s is accused of collusion with Alcázar, his “brother”, Captain Hernán Suárez, Alonso de Guzmán (\textit{ alguacil mayor}), Juan Melgarejo, Diego de la Fuente, licenciado Céspedes, and “many other \textit{regidores} and \textit{jurados}” to obtain the one-third of votes required for the \textit{asistente} to carry any motion in the council.\textsuperscript{347}

Francisco del Alcázar was the scion of a wealthy and increasingly powerful \textit{converso} clan, and—more to the point—the object of hatred for Juan de Figueroa and his followers during the pro-comunero rising of September 16, 1520. He was undoubtedly one of the most prominent and powerful figures in Sevillian municipal politics over the course of the first half of the sixteenth century. The son of a \textit{veinticuatro}, Pedro del Alcázar, he inherited his father’s office, to which he apparently added that of \textit{jurado} in 1504—a rare combination—and later became the \textit{alcalde mayor} (chief magistrate) and the treasurer of the Casa de la Moneda (Mint).\textsuperscript{348} He still held the latter office in 1542, when he once again stood accused of enjoying the \textit{asistente’s} special favour.\textsuperscript{349} Like so many others during the heady

\textsuperscript{345} \textit{Sobre unos capítulos puestos por los jurados de Sevilla en contra del conde de Osorno, asistente de Sevilla, en la residencia que se le tomo}, AGS, CR, leg. 661, no. 16, f. 5r.
\textsuperscript{346} Ibid., ff. 5r-v.
\textsuperscript{347} Ibid., ff. 5v-6r.
\textsuperscript{349} \textit{Residencia a Pedro Navarra, marqués de Cortes, mariscal de Navarra, asistente que fue de Sevilla, a sus tenientes y oficiales, por el licenciado Ortiz, del Consejo y alcalde de Casa y Corte}, AGS, CR, leg. 412, no. 4.
opening decades of the sixteenth century, he dabbled in transatlantic commerce, but apart from his wealth and formidable collection of public offices—both of which his Old Christian rivals found insufferable—it was his, and his associates’, involvement in the lucrative export of grain that rendered him equally repugnant to the masses.

The protection of the Medina Sidonia faction is said to have been crucial in safeguarding the lives and property of Seville’s *converso* elite in 1520-1, and yet, as shown above, the support and intervention of the *asistente*, or his lieutenant, was just as if not more important. The royal representatives on the municipal council clearly found Francisco Alcázar and the rest of the wealthy *converso* elite as extremely useful allies in their perennial struggle to control and direct the Seville city council, and in return they turned a blind eye to activities that increased the economic and political power of the former. If in the early 1520s this meant, among other things, a deliberate lack of supervision of the collection of fines for petty crimes (*penas de cámara*), the later *capítulos* (1542) accuse the Asistente of not carrying out the inspection of the Mint. When the Marquis of Cortes was finally moved to act by royal promptings, he is said to have sought *letrados* who would deliver the desired verdict, that is to say, who would find nothing amiss in Francisco del Alcázar’s exercise of his office.350 One of the witnesses in the secret inquest (*pesquisa secreta*), don Jorge de Portugal, the Count of Gelves, called for an urgent and thorough inspection of the Mint, alluding to the grievances of unnamed merchants suffered at the hands of the treasurer and his deputy.351

350 “andaba buscando letrados para que determynase el negocio en favor del dho Franciso del Alcaçar …” ibid.
351 “los agrauios que los mercaderes publican que se les hazen por el dicho Francisco del Alçacar e su theniente de thesorero …” ibid., f. 54r.
However, as don Jorge pointed out, the *asistente’s* favouritism hardly stopped with Francisco del Alcázar and pecuniary oversight. Since the day of his arrival, or not long after, the Marquis of Cortes exhibited signs of “great friendship” for the *veinticuatro* Juan de Torres and Francisco del Alcázar, and later allied himself with (*se a confederado con*) with the *alguacil mayor* Hernán Darias de Saavedra, and his deputy, Melchior Maldonado.\(^{352}\) Among other things, don Jorge claimed, in the election of the city’s deputies for the Cortes of Toledo (1538), in order to “please the said Hernán Darias and his lackeys (*debidos*)” the *asistente* lent his weight to ensuring that the former’s preferred candidate, Arias Pardo, was chosen over Garcí Tello.

### 3.4. The People as Plaintiffs?

What was the role of the people, the *gente menuda*, in the process of the *juicios de residencia*, the mechanisms of complaint and redress? They are almost completely absent from the ranks of accusers whose complaints provided the basis for the secret inquiry, or *pesquisa secreta*. In the extremely limited sample at our disposal, they only show up in the records of the inquiry when a particular complaint, originating invariably with a *veinticuatro, jurado*, a cleric, or a noble, happened to involve an artisan or a member of the lower orders. In such cases they were questioned as witnesses for or against the *asistente*, and their testimonies are exercises in deflection, ambiguity, or outright denial of any impropriety on the part of any of the parties involved. They are on the other hand

\(^{352}\) “el dicho marques de Cortes desde que vyno a esta ciudad o pocos dias despues a tenydo por mucho amigo a Juan de Torres veynete quatro e a Francisco de Alcaçar y despues se a confederado con el alguazil mayor Hernan de Arias de Saavedra e con su lugar theniente Melchior Maldonado...” *ibid.*, f. 52r.
prominent in the demandas, the relatively petty complaints where redress involved the return of unjustly levied fines, lost income, or confiscated objects.

3.4.1. Food Supply

Supplying municipal granaries with grain required royal cooperation, in the form of import licences, and provincial and municipal legislation to keep prices low and ban exports of wheat in times of dearth.\textsuperscript{353}

The sixteenth item of the pesquisa of 1542, inquiring into the provisioning of the city, elicited some of the most heated and lengthy responses. The question posed was whether the asistente and his officials had taken “special care” ("especial cuidado") to supply the city’s marketplaces with basic foodstuffs—bread, wine, meat—ensuring that these were available at a “reasonable and just” price ("Razonables e justos precios"), and had conducted regular inspections of the public fish and meat markets, as well as the municipal granary.\textsuperscript{354} An equally important concern was the quality of the grain, bread or meat that entered the city—an issue of public sanitation and “good government” ("buena govenación").\textsuperscript{355}

Seville ordinarily consumed large quantities of meat, the jurados assured the king in 1524, and the city council as a whole had to show unceasing vigilance in ensuring adequate supply. This was accomplished by granting concessions to minor public officeholders or


\textsuperscript{354} Residencia a Pedro Navarra, marques de Cortes, mariscal de Navarra, asistente que fue de Sevilla, a sus tenientes y oficiales, por el licenciado Ortiz, del Consejo y alcalde de Casa y Corte., AGS, CR, leg. 412, no. 4.

\textsuperscript{355} Sobre unos capítulos puestos por los jurados de Sevilla en contra del conde de Osorno, asistente de Sevilla, en la residencia que se le tomo, AGS, CR, leg. 661, no. 16, f. 20r.
merchants who undertook the responsibility of purchasing the meat and having it transported to the city. In 1524 the jurados alleged that the Duke of Osorno and his deputy Pedro Díaz, “did not show the care that is required in the said provisioning”\textsuperscript{356}, rather, either out of self-interest or prompted by some of the aldermen who had joined them in their self-imposed exile from the plague-stricken city, they revoked the commissions held by the jurados who had stayed behind. As a result very little beef was being eaten in Seville, and rather too much mutton and pork—meats that were “harmful to health in times like these”.\textsuperscript{357} Much the same was true of wheat and bread, an even more essential staple.

\textbf{3.4.2. Bread and the Albóndiga}

The great Albóndiga of the Seville, the municipal granary, was one of the principal stages of the collective existential dramas enacted on a regular basis in its vicinity. A granary had existed in some form in Almohad Seville, and was maintained by the Christian conquerors after 1248, although not much is known for certain about its size and precise function. The building was located in the parish of Santa Catalina, at the edge of the wider La Feria neighbourhood. In 1402-3 major repair work and extension of the building was carried out by the city council, although by that date the Albóndiga was well established as an institution with a crucial role in provisioning the city.\textsuperscript{358} It was one of the largest buildings in the city, reconstructed in the early fifteenth century at considerable cost, and

\textsuperscript{356} “no tovieron el cuydado que avian de tener de la dha provisión” ibid.
\textsuperscript{357} “carnes muy dañosas para la salud en estos tiempos” ibid.
the purpose of which was to serve the city and the king.\footnote{The total cost of the reconstruction completed in August 1402 was 82,475.9 maravedís, but further repairs, and expansion (including the purchase of adjacent houses) were necessary as early as 1404-5, and minor repairs and upkeep impinged regularly on the municipal treasury on a regular basis thereafter. Ibíd., 373.} Although its importance and fame throughout the Castile and beyond were already well established by then, it acquired its own ordinances in 1478. In 1506, in the wake of the city oversaw and paid for another major renovation, adding the “most ample and sturdy” grain warehouses that survived well into the seventeenth century, with a capacity for storing “hundreds of thousands of fanegas of what” for the relief of “so great a republic”.\footnote{“Los amplísimos y fortísimos graneros que permanecen, en que […] guardaba pósito considerabilísimo que llegó á exceder cientos de milláres de fanegas, prevención de tan gran república…” Ortiz de Zúñiga, Anales, vol. 3, 207.} However, although the imposing structure may have endured down to Ortiz de Zúñiga’s time, it began to encounter major problems of fiscal sustainability and supply in the closing decades of the sixteenth century, and by the final months of 1599 the municipal granary was completely empty, with debts amounting to 500,000 ducats.\footnote{José Ignacio Martínez Ruiz, Finanzas municipales y crédito público en la España moderna: la hacienda de la ciudad de Sevilla, 1528-1768 (Sevilla: Ayuntamiento de Sevilla, 1992), 181.}

The administration of Seville’s Alhóndiga was entrusted to a llavero mayor and two deputies (a veinticuatro and a jurado) chosen by the cabildo and renewable on a monthly basis, a notary, a receptor, a fiel, seven guards, a casero and an official in charge of weights and measures. There was initially a system of checks and balances between the executive officers (the llavero and his deputies) and the administrative officers (receptor and fiel), who served longer in their posts and were chosen by the vecinos (although the electoral procedure is unknown). However by the end of the sixteenth century ordinary citizens were effectively excluded from the election process (all the officers of the Alhóndiga were chosen by the city council). This arrangement removed yet another avenue through which
those excluded from public offices—all of the lower and most of the middling sort—could exert some formal influence on municipal government, however indirect and attenuated, and made fraud practically inevitable. One particularly serious scandal, when a contractor (asentista) was accused of creating artificial scarcity in order to sell wheat far above its market value—a case that, according to the investigating magistrate, involved “the principal men and public officials of the city” (“honbres principales, ministros y oficiales, de la dicha ciudad”)—led to the removal of the receptor and the appointment of a qualified accountant (in 1585).362

The perennial problem faced by the Alhóndiga, as in the case of all Castilian and Aragonese municipal granaries, was financing this ambitious and costly forms of public welfare.363 The grain was rarely sold at a large profit, and often, especially in times of dearth (due to bad harvests or speculation), at or below cost—and in some cases it had to be distributed free of charge. Additional funds for grain purchases had to be generated through mortgage loans (censos), in theory to be redeemed from the profits derived from the sale of grain. However in practice this never quite worked out, and the Alhóndiga’s indebtedness grew with the years.364 Yet while debates raged in the city council as a result of the difficulties involved in replenishing the granary while keeping the price of wheat fixed at “reasonable” levels, supplies still had to be secured on a regular basis, and the city’s needs increased (in the final two decades of the sixteenth century) just as the Alhóndiga was approaching its nadir (1599). It was a matter of maintaining public order and constituted one of the basic duties of urban government. The crucial importance of this was not lost on

362 Ibid., 182-3.
363 Mateos Royo, “In Search of Wheat.”
364 Martínez Ruiz, Finanzas municipales, 178.
anyone, and the city developed various mechanisms for purchasing sufficient quantities of
grain: directly, through a network of its own agents, primarily in the Tierra de Campos, but
also Lisbon, Sicily and Oran, contracting various foreign merchants (Italians and Flemings),
or making deals with powerful local figures (including the archbishop) who had their own
reserves or channels of supply. Nevertheless, due to the city’s spectacular growth in the
second half of the sixteenth century coupled with increasing demands placed on its
resources (human and material) by the crown, all of these measures could fail.

An emblem and an inscription that greeted all those who entered the Alhóndiga of
Seville reveal something beyond its function as a mere warehouse for municipal grain, and
rather more about its symbolic role in widely shared notions of good government. The final
touch of the reconstruction project of 1402-3 was the painting of the royal coat of arms
above the main entrance to the granary. In 1506, a year when “hunger and dearth” in
Seville engaged the “piety” of “powerful citizens” (“los vecinos poderosos”), above all the
Adelantado of Andalusia, Don Francisco Hernríquez de Ribera, “who succoured the people
with his charity” (“que hizo una gran limosna al pueblo”). His memory was preserved on a
stone plaque mounted on the Alhóndiga building, next to the main entrance:

“In the year 1506 there was such great dearth in Seville that a fanega of wheat was
worth three ducats, for the relief and remedy of which the most illustrious lord Don
Francisco Henríquez de Ribera, Adelantado Mayor of Andalusia, supplied this […]

365 In addition the city could count on the tercias of its reino, the cereals from the towns belonging to the Order
of Santiago (Almedralejo, Calzadilla, Fuente de Cantos, Medina de las Torres, Monesterio and Montemolin),
whose rents were purchased in 1573, and finally the wheat stored in the granaries of the towns and villages of its
tierra. Almedralejo and the towns and villages of the Maestrazgo were of crucial importance: apart from the
warehouses for the bread of the tithe (diezmo), the Seville had constructed 12 grain silos in Almedralejo, as well
as smaller warehouses elsewhere. According to an inquiry ordered by the asistente Francisco de Carvajal (1591)
the towns of Seville’s tierra held 107,000 fanegas at that moment. Ibid., 179-80.
366 A “master painter” engaged for this purpose worked for two days and was paid 35 maravedís. The royal coat
of arms was painted above the Alhóndiga’s main entrance (there were at least three, perhaps four), and was the
last addition before the locks were installed and the first shipment of grain entered the reconstructed building.
The Alhóndiga was not only instituted by royal assent, but it performed an essential role in fulfilling one of the basic responsibilities of government, royal and municipal—feeding the subjects/citizens. Its function was enshrined in ordinances approved by the Catholic Kings (in 1478; revised in 1479 and 1492), indicating that the granary “should always be supplied with bread (wheat), which should be made given and distributed at a reasonable price and to those in the greatest need.” Moreover, the inscription honouring Henríquez de Ribera’s charitable act could also be perceived as the expression of a duty—of the wealthy to provide sustenance for the less fortunate in times of great need. It was also a reminder that the Alhóndiga was not the only grain deposit in Seville, and if its stocks were depleted, or the wheat sold there became too expensive, there were private reserves that could—and should—alter any imbalance in supply or prices, assuming that private purchases and/or exports of grain had not caused the problem in the first place.

Of course not all were prepared to be as generous as Henríquez de Ribera in 1506, but that is where the municipal authorities, and the asistente in particular, were increasingly expected to step in. Castillo de Bobadilla, writing from his own experience as corregidor, noted that on numerous occasions he “had excess wheat removed from the houses not only...”

---


368 “estoviese proveyda de pan continuamente, e aquello se diese e repartiese a precio razonable e por las personas que mas menester lo oviesen” Martínez Ruiz, *Finanzas municipales*, 182.

369 The archbishop, some monasteries and convents, and wealthy veinticuatro had their own, private stores or deposits. Ibid., 178.
of lay people but even of canons and wealthy clergy" to prevent hoarding and dearth.\textsuperscript{370} This was one of those cases where corregidores were compelled to read between the lines of the legal codes in order to act effectively in the public interest. The \textit{asistentes} of Seville were equally cognizant of this need to bend the rules by importuning the rich in times of dearth and famine. A witness in the \textit{pesquisa secreta} of 1542 thus claimed that whenever the lack of bread or meat in the public marketplaces required such measures, the \textit{asistente}'s deputy Calderón with his retinue removed from the houses of the city's merchants and traders “a great quantity of sacks of flour, and had them distributed among those who were in need, and especially the poor.”\textsuperscript{371} One may conclude from the tone and context of this testimony that such actions had recognizably positive connotations, and that they were not rare. It’s also worth noting that the flour was requisitioned from private hands not only for the benefit of the poor: the witness explains that the wheat was distributed to those in need “\textit{and especially} the poor”, indicating that the needy in times of dearth also included those not normally classified as “poor”. It is safe to assume that these groups would have included the artisans and workers found in the vanguard of popular protests.

Such examples of intervention by the \textit{asistente} provide a direct link between the normative performance of municipal government in sixteenth-century Seville and the actions of the crowd in revolt. The obvious parallel is with the \textit{cuadrillas} of rebels who plundered the houses of public officials and wealthy merchants for hidden stores of bread and flour, a feature of both the 1521 and 1652 popular revolts. It seems clear that this act

\textsuperscript{370} Casey, \textit{Early Modern Spain}, 128.

\textsuperscript{371} “el dho tenyente Calderón quando avia la neçesidad de pan o carnes con gente que consygo llevava de casa de los mercaderes tratantes desta Çabdad sacaua mucha cantydad de botas de harina y lo hazia repartir a las personas que la avyan menester especialment a pobres.” Residencia a Pedro Navarra, marques de Cortes, mariscal de Navarra, asistente que fue de Sevilla, a sus tenientes y oficiales, por el licenciado Ortiz, del Consejo y alcalde de Casa y Corte., AGS, CR, leg. 412, no. 1.
should be seen not as simple theft of food from the ‘haves’ by the ‘have nots’, driven by
hunger and desperation, but at once an indictment of the failure of municipal government in
the discharge of one its basic duties, and a manifestation of the popular right to assume the
functions of urban government—in other words, a political act.

In the 1570 residencia, the asistente’s deputy was accused by several veinticuatro of
not policing the food vendors, and allowing prices to rise exorbitantly, causing great “harm”
to the city.372 The complaints were even more vociferous in the earlier inquiries. According
to the 1542 capítulos, a certain Jorge de Negro had been contracted by the Marquis of
Cortes, in the name of the city, to supply a quantity of good quality grain from Cazalla, in
place of which Negro had imported (no doubt cheaper) wheat from Provence that was
“harmful and corrupted” (“trigo dañado e corrompido”). This was deemed acceptable by the
asistente, resulting in “great harm” (“muncho daño e perjuicio”) to the city because much of
the wheat perished, and the rest had to be sold at extremely low prices, or distributed
among the citizenry. According to one witness, Don Jorge de Portugal, this deal in
particular was the subject of “murmuring” among many aldermen and jurados.373 Moreover,
because the officials of the Alhóndiga refused to accept the inferior wheat, the asistente
“dishonoured and abused them” (“los desonrro e maltrato”) and threatened them with

---

372 “a Resultado en esta cidad grande daño e perjuzyio a los vezinos della por que an valido los
mantenymyentos a muy subidos precios por no guardar los que los venden las ordenanças y posturas ...”
Residencia tomada por el licenciado Gonzalo Hernandez de Morales, a don Francisco Hurtado de Mendoza,
conde de Montaegudo, asistente que ha sido de la ciudad de Sevilla y lugares de su jurisdicción, a los señores
doctores Liébana y Peralta, y el licenciado Egas del Aguila, alcaldes de la justicia; licenciado Arrola, executor de la
vara, licenciado Lezcano, teniente de la tierra; al alguacil mayor y sus tenientes y a todos los demás alguaciles; a
los alcaldes de la hermandad, a los escribanos, y al escribano del cabildo, a los veinticuatro y jurados, a los fieles
ejecutores, a los escribanos de los juzgados, civiles y militares, a los escribanos de la alhóndiga, alcaldes del rio y
puentes; mayordomos, almocacen de Sevilla y lugares de su jurisdicción, AGS, CR, leg. 278, no. 1, f. 59r.
373 Residencia a Pedro Navarra, mariscal de Cortes, mariscal de Navarrá, asistente que fue de Sevilla, a sus
tenientes y oficiales, por el licenciado Ortíz, del Consejo y alcalde de Casa y Corte., AGS, CR, leg. 412, no. 4, f.
66r.
arrest, which would have been a “grave insult” to the whole city.\textsuperscript{374} Interestingly, whoever raised this particular complaint went on to denounce the asistente’s venality and bad faith specifically in his dealings with traders and artisans. He allegedly received more than one hundred ducats worth in silverware (“hechuras de plata”) from a Alonso de Oviedo, in return for which (“por amor del”) he arrested a merchant, and kept him in the city jail for many days without cause. More generally he took advantage of “many persons and craftsmen of this city” by not paying for the work done or the items delivered, “mistreating” those who came to ask for it.\textsuperscript{375} The accusation might well have come from a wealthier artisan—possibly a silversmith with a grievance against Alonso de Oviedo—or at any rate someone in a position to know the details of unpaid work.

However another witness, Hernándo López de Chaves, presented the asistente’s conduct in a very different light. He claimed that as a matter of habit (“comunmente”) the Marquis of Cortes, asistente went out every morning—including Sundays and feast days—accompanied by four constables and other men on foot, to inspect the plazas where bread, vegetables, fish and meat were sold respectively.

If there was a lack of bread in the city’s marketplaces, the asistente “momentarily” dispatched three or four constables to the nearby towns of Utrera, Alcalá, and Dos Hermanas for large quantities of bread (“mucho pan”) to be sent to Seville. The roads were not safe however, the surrounding countryside apparently infested with bandits. To prevent the bread from being seized on the way to Seville, the asistente’s deputy would ride out with

\textsuperscript{374} Ibid. On another occasion, “two years ago” (i.e. 1540), the asistente dispatched agents with 400 ducats drawn from municipal funds to purchase wheat and barley in the town of Lebrija, but when the price turned out to be highly favourable (“menos preço como valia”) he had the grain purchased in his own name (presumably to be sold at a profit), and took a very long time to pay the money back to the Alhóndiga. Ibid.

\textsuperscript{375} “se aprouecho de otras muchas personas e oficiales desta çabdad sin les pagar su trabaxo e lo que dellos rrecibia e si se lo pedia los desonrraba e maltrataba...” Ibid.
a company of men to a rendezvous point, from where the consignments from the towns and villages were escorted in convoy to the city. Once inside the gates, the deputy and some of the constables had the bread distributed to the commonalty (“al común desta ciudad”)—presumably in the Plaza de San Francisco—under the watchful eyes of the Marquis of Cortes and his deputy Calderón, who did not leave until all the bread had been sold at the set price. However this was not enough to ensure that supplies of bread reached all of Seville’s teeming “poor”, and a distribution point also had to be set up in each parish, as well as a grain deposit in the Plaza de San Salvador, supervised by a jurado. Similar measures were taken in regards to the sale of fish: the asistente, his deputies and their constables patrolled the riverside, “especially [the places] where sardines and salted fish are sold from boats”, forcing the vendors to keep their prices down “in the interest of the Republic” (“en pro de la República”). Many would have “died of hunger” but for the diligence of the asistente and other public officials.

Thus the city was “governed”, according to López de Chaves—and there is no doubt that food supply, and the maintenance of ‘just’ or ‘reasonable’ prices, was a fundamental aspect of the government of the ‘Republic’, spelled out in principle and precept.

---

376 “no se quytavan de la plaça para que se vendiese al presçio puesto y no a mas…” ibid. López de Chaves insists that the distribution of bread was overseen by a jurado in each parish, while another stall was set up in the Plaza de San Salvador, the city’s second most important marketplace. It stands to reason that the asistente and his deputy would have personally monitored the sale of bread in the Plaza de San Francisco, the Seville’s largest square and the location of the city hall.

377 “por que avya muchos pobres y no alcançavan deste pan…” ibid.

378 The oversight was also extended to the marketplaces inside the city where fish was sold.

379 “sy por el dho marques no fuera y sus tenyentes morian de hanbre muchas gentes…” Residencia a Pedro Navarra, marques de Cortes, mariscal de Navarra, asistente que fue de Sevilla, a sus tenientes y oficiales, por el licenciado Ortiz, del Consejo y alcalde de Casa y Corte., AGS, CR, leg. 412, no. 4.
in the ordinances of Seville, through publication and practice transformed into a vital measure by which the public authorities could be assessed.\footnote{\textit{“hazian que se guardasen las ordenanzas que avya en pro de la republica...”} ibid.}

\section*{3.4.3. Sardines}

The food vendors themselves, so often the villains and the targets of indignation, belonged to that class of the lower to middling sort, largely excluded from even minor public offices in a city like Seville, and therefore from formal politics. Yet, as the \textit{juicios de residencia} reveal, they were able to exploit personal, professional and patronage networks from below—not to mention the notorious venality of public officials—in defence of their interests. One of the accusations followed up in the \textit{pesquisa secreta}, rephrased as a general question whether the \textit{asistente} or any other public official had personally received bribes, or “promises of gold, silver, money or other things” from persons involved in litigation before them.\footnote{\textit{“ayan llevado o recibido por sy o por sus mugeres o otra persona alguna direte o yndirete algunas dadiuas o promesas de oro o plata o dinero o otras cosas por vya de cohecho de las personas que ante ellos litigauan o ayan recibido alguna donacion de algunas cosas por via de cohecho o de otra qual quyer manera ...” \textit{Residencia a Pedro Navarra, marques de Cortes, mariscal de Navarra, asistente que fue de Sevilla, a sus tenientes y oficiales, por el licenciado Ortiz, del Consejo y alcalde de Casa y Corte.,} AGS, CR, leg. 412, no. 1, f. 42v.} Although the language used was vague enough—presumably to avoid leading any witnesses—and no names were mentioned, the reference to “wives or other persons” who may have served as an “indirect” conduit for any cash exchanged, points clearly to the case of Hernando de Morales, a sardine-maker (“\textit{hazedor de sardinas}”), accused of inducing the city council to reverse its own decision abolishing his occupation. The case certainly provoked great controversy in the city council and beyond, judging by the 1542 investigation. The complaint against him was among several grievances that had turned Don
Jorge de Portugal, the Count of Gelves, into an implacable opponent of the asistente, the Marquis of Cortes.

Don Jorge was present when the cabildo was informed that Hernando de Morales “and some of his companions”, sardine-makers, were interfering with the proceeds of the “renta de la sardina”, or sardine duty, said to be the source of “great harm and prejudice to the Republic”. The asistente initially agreed with the council that Morales and the rest of the sardine-makers should be stripped of their right to work. The latter appealed to the Justicia de Grados, but the city’s verdict was confirmed and the sentence carried out. This seemed to have brought the matter to a conclusion. However, in his absence from Seville other members of the council acted to overturn the original verdict. The licenciado de la Barrera, the deputy of the alcalde mayor, and veinticuatro Juan de Pineda ensured that a petition signed by “certain jurados” reached the city council demanding the reinstatement of the sardine-makers, under certain conditions (“en cierta manera”). Pineda and de la Barrera apparently solicited votes among the aldermen (“anduvieron ganando botores de rregidores”) to have themselves named as municipal deputies sent to investigate this possibility.382

Don Jorge conveyed his dismay to the asistente that he should allow further discussion of such a “damaging issue” (“que se tornase a ablar en cosa tan dañosa”), but the decision was taken after he had left for Madrid.383 Upon his return Don Jorge was told that Morales (the sardine-maker) and his companions had given 50 ducats to de la Barrera, 100 to Pineda, and 50 to the Alcalde de la Justicia—and that Morales’ wife had given licenciado Calderon’s wife another 100 ducats. The asistente allegedly turned a blind eye to the bribes

382 Ibid., ff. 55v-56r.
383 His second absence during this time.
because the officials in question were his “friends and allies” ("sus amygos e parçiales"). Meanwhile the sardine-makers ("estos oficiales de la sardina") were going about their business once again and had only been emboldened by their brazen bribery of public officials.\(^{384}\)

The juez de residencia took the accusation seriously and proceeded to interview all of the implicated individuals, beginning with Hernando de Morales himself.\(^{385}\) The latter identified himself as a resident of the parish or collación of Santa Marina, and confirmed that he had been stripped of the office of hazedor de sardinas because of the “hatred” of “many who wished [him] ill”, and who were “envious” of “the succour he offered the fishermen”. However, the Marquis of Cortes (asistente), seeing that he (Morales) was innocent and the accusations against him false, had seen fit to reinstate him ("biendo que no abian tenido razon ny este testigo tenya culpa le bolbio el dho oficio").\(^{386}\) His wife, Catalina Juárez, confirmed the story, although both were asked about their relationship with an esparto grass weaver (espartero), Anton García, said to have acted as the middleman in the bribery. Morales admitted to having known the latter for over twenty years, and that he lived in the Espartería district, by the Triana gate, but denied that García had been involved in any underhand transactions.

Anton García was the next to be interrogated. The question posed to the fifty-year-old was whether Hernando de Morales or his wife had asked ("si rogo") him to plead with ("que rogase") the asistente to restore Morales in his “office” of sardine-maker. He

\(^{384}\) Residencia a Pedro Navarra, marqués de Cortes, mariscal de Navarra, asistente que fue de Sevilla, a sus tenientes y oficiales, por el licenciado Ortíz, del Consejo y alcalde de Casa y Corte., AGS, CR, leg. 412, no. 1, ff. 56r-v.

\(^{385}\) All the interviews were conducted on October 13, 1542.

\(^{386}\) Residencia a Pedro Navarra, marques de Cortes, mariscal de Navarra, asistente que fue de Sevilla, a sus tenientes y oficiales, por el licenciado Ortíz, del Consejo y alcalde de Casa y Corte., AGS, CR, leg. 412, no. 4.
explained that one day, while he was inside the asistente’s house weaving some mats, Morales showed up and asked him to beg the Marquis to “give him justice” (“que le guardase su justiçia”). Later, though he does not say how much later, or whether Morales was still present, when the Marquis happened to pass by (“andandose paseando”), García addressed him, saying “your lordship, give justice to this man, who is my neighbour, in his lawsuit...” — to which the asistente replied nothing. García denied having received any money from either Morales or his wife directly, or through a “woman of colour” (“muger lora”) — nor was he aware that any money had been given to anyone else by Morales for the purpose of suborning any public official. It seems clear however that the asistente’s home served as an informal political arena accessible to a wide range of social types: it was open no doubt to a variety of artisans and lackeys who had work to carry out or services to perform, and these in turn had neighbours, friends, and professional colleagues who were prepared to take advantage of their proximity to the person of the asistente to pass on messages or petitions by word of mouth. One may even infer from García’s willingness to admit to this communication, and his role in it, that it was not something uncommon or worthy of reprimand. On the contrary, there is even a tone of righteous pride in his willingness to speak up for “[his] neighbour” Morales — and indeed an expectation, however faint, that García’s word would carry some weight with the asistente (one can only presume because he had built up some little credit with the Marquis as a result of having worked for the latter for a period of time, or through his professional diligence).388

387 “señor vuestra señoria guarde su Justiçia a este señor que es my beçino en su pleyto, y el marques no respondio nada...” ibid.
388 He appeared to be working unsupervised inside the asistente’s house. 136
Faced with blanket denials, the investigator hoped to get closer to the truth by interrogating Ana Morales, the black slave of Hernando de Morales. She confirmed knowing the espartero Anton García—a neighbour of her mistress—his wife and three daughters. It seems that the suspicion had shifted to the women: Catalina Juárez, Juana de Escobar and her daughters, and the slave, Ana Morales. Had one of Juana’s daughters been in contact with an officer of justice? No. Was she aware of her master’s occupation, and that he had been forbidden to exercise it by the city? Yes to both, but she did not know who had deprived him of his “office”. Ana was also unaware that her master had appealed against the decision, or that he had “agitated for the restitution of his office” (“si trauaxo su señor debolber al ofício”). She had no knowledge of any conversations regarding this matter between her master and his neighbour, the espartero García, or any promises of money made to the latter, his wife, or daughters. At this point the interrogator finally got to the point: wasn’t it true that Ana and her mistress, or the latter by herself, or the wife of Anton García, had gone to the house of the licenciado Calderón, the asistente’s deputy, and gave the official or his wife “some money” (“ciertos dyneros”)?

3.4.4. Demandas

The demandas were individual complaints against specific public officials, or the opportunity to air very particular grievances. Among the four more or less complete juicios

---

389 She gave her age as 25 or 26.
390 “vecino de su ama …”
391 The investigating magistrate did his best not to lead the witness, for example asking whether the neighbour had any children, and when Ana responded correctly (three daughters), he asked for their names, to verify that she was indeed acquainted with the neighbour’s family.
de residencia, a list of demandas survives only in the 1570 residencia of asistente Francisco Hurtado de Mendoza.

Virtually all of the complaints involve perceived miscarriages of justice, whether unwarranted floggings, fines, imprisonment, or confiscation of goods or property. Against the Count of Monteagudo there was only one demanda: Alonso Mexía, vecino of Seville, complained that he had been sentenced to a lashing “without Justice”. This was no doubt because the asistente was less directly involved in much of the day-to-day policing duties and left much of the executive work to his deputies or constables (alcaldes). In this case the brunt of the accusations was faced by Doctors Liébana and Peralta, as well as the licenciate Egas de Águila, alcaldes de la justicia, and licenciate Ariola, the ejecutor de la vara. Of the 19 demandas in total against these officials, 3 were complaints against “unjust” punishments that make no reference to the specific nature of the alleged crime committed, focusing on the officials’ bias: the wife of Domingo Hernández was unjustly condemned for having contravened “a certain ordinance”; Francisco Pinelo had been imprisoned “against the law, due to [Dr. Liébana’s] hatred and enmity” toward him and his family, “because one of [Pinelo’s] relatives had been involved in some altercation with the Doctor’s son”—and he had a lawsuit pending in the royal Audiencia of Granada; Finally, a Portuguese man, Francisco Duarte, claimed that Doctor Peralta had unjustly sentenced him to torture, which

---

392 “sin Justicia le auia sentenciado en pena de açotes y auia hecho esecutar en el la sentencia …” Residencia tomada por el licenciado Gonzalo Hernández de Morales, a don Francisco Hurtado de Mendoza, conde de Monteagudo, asistente que ha sido de la ciudad de Sevilla y lugares de su jurisdicción, a los señores doctores Liébana y Peralta, y el licenciado Egas del Águila, alcaldes de la justicia; licenciado Arrola, ejecutor de la vara, licenciado Lezcano, teniente de la tierra; al alguacil mayor y sus tenientes y a todos los demás alguaciles; a los alcaldes de la hermandad, a los escribanos, y al escribano del cabildo, a los veinticuatro y jurados, a los fieles ejecutores, a los escribanos de los juzgados, civiles y militares, a los escribanos de la albóndiga, alcaldes del río y puentes; mayordomos, almotacenes de Sevilla y lugares de su jurisdicción, AGS, CR, leg. 278, no. 1, f. 188r.
393 “que dezia que auia excedido en çierta hordenança sin thener culpa …” ibid., f. 188v.
394 “contra derecho por çierto odio y enemistad que tenia a el y a sus deudos porque unos dellos auia auido çierto enojo con un hijo del dho dotor …” ibid.
was administered in a way that left him deprived of the use of one arm. In this last case Dr. Peralta was found culpable by the investigating judge and fined 85,000 maravedís.

Another 3 of the 21 demandas against public officials were concerned with public morals, above the behaviour of women and the proliferation of gambling (playing cards, or naipes). Thus Inés de Vega, the wife of the tailor Juan Martín, had been arrested on suspicion of cohabiting with a certain Juan Martínez de la Cosa—she’d started criminal proceedings against Dr. Peralta and two public notaries, and her case was still under review. Meanwhile, Egas de Águila, the alcalde de la justicia, seems to have had a particular knack for ferreting out playing cards. Alonso del Valle was imprisoned “for many days” because cards were said to have been found in his possession, but a similar case involving a public notary and his wife was even more notorious. Pedro Hernández claimed to have been persecuted over a long period of time as a result of a particular “hatred and animosity” harboured by the alcalde de la justicia. His troubles apparently began some two years previously, when the alcalde Egas de Águila had entered Hernández’s home and “opened many small and large chests and caskets” inside one of which he found “two packs of cards which his wife had [placed there] without his knowledge, and which she used to pass the time with her friends”. Hernández was arrested, all of his possessions were confiscated, and—his numerous appeals having been rejected—he remained in prison until he was forced to pay a fine of 100,000 maravedís. And yet the persecution continued: he was later accused of exporting playing cards to the Indies, in a ship owned by Sebastian

395 “diziendo que contra Justicia y estando sin culpa le condeno a tormento y se le dio de manera que quedo manco de un braço ...” ibid., f. 189v.
396 “que el dho dotor la auia mandado prender diziendo que estaua amançeuada con vn Juan Martínez de la Cosa [or Casa] ...” ibid., f. 189r.
Hernández, whereupon the *alcalde* Egas de Águila arrested him and sequestered his goods once again.\(^\text{397}\)

Policing the markets was clearly one of the most important tasks entrusted to public officials, so it’s no surprise that complaints against what was perceived as unjust or heavy-handed treatment should be found among these individual demands for restitution (3). Beatrix Díaz, a shopkeeper (*tendera*) was aggrieved as a result of two punishments handed out for selling sardines “against the ordinances”—her case was ongoing, and she may well have been one of Hernando de Morales’s “companions” who were prohibited from dealing in sardines.\(^\text{398}\) Two other shopkeepers, including Juan González and María Ortiz were aggrieved that they, along with a number of other *vecinos*, had been punished for allegedly not having all the requisite measures for oil, namely those corresponding to one and two *maravedí*, for which they were fined 15 *maravedí* each—the complaint was dismissed.

Several *demandas* (5) referred to items that had been unjustly confiscated by one of the constables—in most cases weapons, usually with no explanation given in the documents of the *residencia*. Swords were taken on separate occasions from Alonso Bermúdez de Camaño, not a resident of the city, and Rafael de Torquemada, the chief customs duty inspector (*sobreguarda mayor de los Almojarifazgos*). The latter complaint was still pending, while the Dr. Liébana was absolved in the former case. More fortunate than either of the above was Francisco Sánchez Hurtado, a royal notary, who complained that Dr. Liébana had entered his house and confiscated a sword that he kept by the head of his bed, “which

\(^{397}\) “abra dos años que entro en las casas de su morada y le abrio munchas caxas e caxones e cofres e que por que auia hallado dos barajas de naipes que su muger tenia sin sauello el con que pasaaua tiempo la dha su muger y sus amigas proçedio contra el …” ibid., f. 190r.

\(^{398}\) “que auia lleuado dos penas por que uendia sardinas contra la hordenança …” ibid., f. 189r.
he could not [rightfully] take”—and which the juez ordered to be returned. Liébana had also incurred the anger of several ironmongers (herravejeros), over a confiscated arquebus in one case, and in another 19 pairs of iron bars, followed by 16 more later on, taken from Alvaro Hernández, who was also arrested because the bars in question were said to have been taken from the royal prison.

The rest (7) may be categorized as miscellaneous complaints, including an innkeeper (mesonero) fined 22 reales by licenciado Ariola “because he found a dead donkey by the entrance to his inn,” a vecino who did not deny failing to hand over a sum of money he was bringing to a friar, but questioned the alcalde’s right to arrest him for business fraud (“negoçio”), being only responsible for criminal matters, and Sebastián de Ayala who happened to “drop some water from a window” which smeared the cape of Agustín de Buiça, for which Dr. Peralta and a constable removed some things from Ayala’s house, he was arrested, and suffered “much abuse”. A silk merchant, Bartolomé Sánchez, also makes an appearance with the sort of complaint that would normally have been handled by the guild authorities. Sánchez had purchased a length of silk yarn which he sent to Hernándo Álvarez, a velvet weaver, who in turn failed to produce 10 of the agreed 18 varas (yards) of velvet—and which licenciado Egas de Águila had been expected to recover. Perhaps the most serious accusation was against Dr. Liébana and a constable of the 20, brought by the

---

399 “el dho dotor Lieuana diciendo que auia entrado en su cassa y le auia tomado una espada que tenia en un aposento a la caueçeria de su cama no se la puediendo lleuar …” ibid., f. 190v.

400 “que el auia mandado sacar de su casa diez e nueue pares de grillos y otras uez diez y seis y que sobre ello le auia hecho prender diziendo que los dichos grillos auian faltado de la carçel rreal …” ibid., f. 188v. Liébana was exonerated in both cases by the juez de residencia.

401 “el auia llebado veinte e dos rreales por que auia hallado un asno muerto a la puerta de su meson …” ibid., f. 191r.

600 maravedís were ordered to be returned to the innkeeper.

402 “no pudiendo conocer sino de negoçios criminales …” The complaint was dismissed. Ibid., f. 190v.

403 “sobre que auia hechado de una ventana de su casa una poca de agua y auia caido sobre una capa del dicho Agustin de Buica le auian sacado çiertos bienes de su casa y lleuado le preso y hecho le munchos agrauios …” ibid., f. 189r. It seems that Ayala was convinced to withdraw his complaint.
licenciado Hernando de Buenos Aires, a vecino of Cazalla de la Sierra. The two Sevillian constables had, with “unbridled greed” (“cobdiçia desordenada”), made a pact with certain members of the city council (“con algunos de el cauildo”) to collect a tribute from the vinters of Cazalla—the city was entitled to a percentage of the value of newly planted vines—a tribute that the constables had no right to collect unless accompanied by a veinticuatro and a jurado. In Cazalla they prosecuted “many” innkeepers, tavern-keepers, grocers, and others.

3.4.5. Conclusion

The struggles in the cabildo over the supply and price of grain, and actions against speculators and hoarders by asistentes, were conducted against the spectre of ‘the people’ whose voice in never heard directly. In the complaints subsumed in the residencia they are mentioned as those most in need of public relief in times of famine or high prices, but they are also implicated in the ubiquitous references to things done, or measures taken “en pro de la Republica”. The actions of the crowd in revolt reveal that ‘the people’ too saw themselves as not only members of the civic republic, but entitled to assume the functions of government, or choose their public officials. They were sought out as witnesses to their own transgressions, or those of others, or brought by others on their behalf—once again a passive role—and yet the substance of the complaints and the subsequent inquiries reveal that in the mid-sixteenth century city awash with newfound wealth, a city bursting at the seams with new arrivals, settlers and transients, a city where, more than in any other urban centre of Castile, money and wealth were the golden keys that unlocked the halls of power.
for the lucky or the intrepid, ‘the people’—or at least some of those excluded from formal politics or even minor public offices—were occasionally able, prepared, and sufficiently cognizant of the rituals and procedures or justice in early modern Castile to manipulate them to their advantage.
CHAPTER 4. PLACE: UNREST IN THE NORTHERN QUARTERS

4.1. Introduction: The Unruly Neighbourhood

In the winter of 1650, apparently on his deathbed, Miguel Çid was deeply uneasy about the life and customs of his neighbours:

“In the Plaza de la Feria is always a great concurrence of people, most of them so blind to divine knowledge that, forgetful of their obligations as Christians, they defame and vituperate against the holy name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of his blessed mother, and of the saints of the celestial court, using such extraordinary curses and so frequently, that they are the cause of wonder and admiration.”

This “evil vice” was so habitual that it sets a bad example for young children, who, “guided by what they hear, absorb it into their games.” The adults meanwhile not only “delight” in their customary blaspheming, but they have no respect for Holy places, or times set aside for abstaining from all vice, such as Lent, for instead of remembering (hacer memoria) the death and passion suffered by the son of God for our redemption, inside the said church [of Omnium Sanctorum] they carry on with such evil vices, turning the holy place into a market (lonja). Such brazen and habitual profaning would surely draw down “great punishment”.

Just over a year later, on 20 May 1652, Isidro Hurtado and his companions irrupted into the Plaza de la Feria with the shout of “Long Live the King and Death to Bad Government.” The rebels fortified themselves in the plaza and the church, whose bellower became a lookout post. Four days later [Friday, May 24], with the authorities still playing for time, “many religious, and especially some Capuchins, went to the Plaza de la Feria to

---

404 AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 542, f. 247r.
exhort [the plebe] and preach to those seditionists holding Images of Christ. But as they placed themselves at various points in the square—because it is [an] impressive [sight] to preach at once in different places—some [of the rebels] were so obstinate in their blindness, saying that ‘these Friars are coming here to preach, but we are heretics,’ and ‘fewer Christs and more bread,’ which was a scandalous thing.”

As the rebels issued demands and negotiated with the municipal authorities from their neighbourhood stronghold, the nearby parish of San Marcos was secretly being mobilized against them. Two inveterate smugglers and local caudillos, Francisco de León and Francisco Bueno, clearly saw a chance to redeem themselves in front of the municipal authorities by coming to their aid at this critical juncture when the rebels seemed to have the upper hand. They gathered their accomplices, followers, and dependents, most of them residents of the collación, in the convent of Santa Paula, even before the cabildo had got around to setting up its own cuerpos de guardia in the various parishes that remained out of rebel hands. On Sunday, May 26, they led the charge that vanquished the Feria rebels. In seventeenth-century Seville, neighbourhood was not only familiar terrain, but a community within a community, with its bonds of family, work, and sociability. It was the rebels’ greatest strength, but also their undoing.

The myth of the premodern European, or occidental city as a unified community is no longer accepted at face value by historians. Representations of community such as city views, urban chronicles, and even the ringing of the cathedral bells were idealized iterations of one kind of political community, and therefore a projection of power—from the centre
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405 Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9, s.f. My italics.
(city or state) over the parts. In fact every city—and even more so a metropolis like Seville—was a more or less coherent whole formed by numerous overlapping communities, formally constituted or largely imagined, varying in their spatial and temporal dimensions. Parishes and neighbourhoods in early modern cities were not necessarily mere administrative subdivisions, abstract demarcations of urban space for the purposes of governance. Instead, they reflect the unstable and permeable boundaries of micro-communities brought into being by webs of personal ties, commercial obligations, religious ritual, the movement of bodies (related to all three), and sensorial experience.

Recent historiography therefore no longer seeks to identify organic and strongly bounded communities in early modern European cities. The tendency is to see community as a set of social processes that involve both conflict and conflict resolution (negotiation) between actors so long as they “are in some sense engaged in the same argument.” Recognition that urban actors identified with multiple, overlapping communities had led to a notion of identity as fluid, and the extent to which choice and changing circumstances and contexts—including the physical environment—affect the relative importance of these communal identities. In this regard there has been increasing emphasis on networks or communities based on “thin” trust between strangers—such as neighbourhoods—in contrast to “thick” trust like kinship and patronage. The neighbourhood—parish, collación—was one of the fundamental forms of association through which urban inhabitants pursued their interests, and staked their claims against other groups. At moments of maximum tension, the various constituent parts of the city—urban groups,

---

associations, or subcommunities—drifted apart, or further apart than they may already have been.

The first problem arises in trying to define such “weak” communities. In the case of neighbourhood, at least in early modern Seville, it is not simply a question of parish boundaries. In the first place, artisans in Seville—although deeply embedded in their neighbourhoods—were not geographically isolated in peripheral and socially homogenous parishes, but also formed wider links through membership in guilds, confraternities, and kinship ties. In the 1652 revolt, although the “ferianos” were barricaded in the parish of Omnium Sanctorum, in the negotiations with the asistente and the city council they styled themselves “the masters (or lords) of the seven parishes” (los señores mancomunados de las siete parroquias). Many of the known ringleaders were in fact residents of some of the adjacent parishes. The Plaza de la Feria, meanwhile, was one of Seville’s most important marketplaces, and the largest in the northern sector of the city. The emphasis on community based on weak ties between strangers interacting in public has led to renewed interest in spaces as “junctions of community,” and as in some way produced through the interaction of human actors with the built environment. Seville’s La Feria should therefore be understood as an informal neighbourhood, defined more by its focal point—the market square (Plaza de la Feria) and the church of Omnium Sanctorum, and which encompassed several adjacent parishes.

For the authorities, meanwhile, the news that “the Feria has risen” could not have come as a complete surprise. The neighbourhood had long since acquired a reputation for recalcitrance, and as a potential hotbed of sedition. To begin with, there was the memory of
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429 Not unlike the situation in Florence. Rosenthal, Kings of the Street.
the abortive Comunero uprising in the city, which, although distant in time, was familiar to an elite steeped in local lore. Indeed, the vulgar or popular character of the Feria, as well as its roguish reputation, were proverbial, and not only in Seville. This was the “heria and pendón verde” invoked by Cervantes, Velez de Guevara, and Quevedo. It was a neighbourhood inhabited by the sort of “people who have always prided themselves on their boldness and rough manners, and have no esteem for the man who prefers peace, and virtuous behaviour, and who does not spend freely on food and drink with his friends.”

Although clearly polemical and written with the benefit of hindsight, it is worth noting the reference to commensal sociability as the crucible of bonds between artisans and neighbours. To be sure, La Feria was not the only neighbourhood of Seville deserving of the epithet “popular,” in the sense of being predominantly populated by the lower sort, and enjoying a certain reputation. In fact, several other parts of the city were much more closely associated with “the people of the underworld,” and with habitual disorder. It did however boast the unique combination of a major focal point of artisan sociability, and a preponderance of silk workers, whose assertive and resourceful craft guild had its seat a stone’s throw away from the Plaza de la Feria.

4.2. Cities and Neighbourhoods

Neighbourhoods, partly “natural” and partly “contrived”, always permeable, loosely bounded, and yet also coherent and surprisingly resilient communities, have been

_410_ “se acomoden en ellas muchos tejedores y oficiales de el arte de la seda, gente que siempre se a preçiado de valientes y crudos, y que estiman en nada el hombre que trata de quietud, y de ser virtuoso, y al que no gasta con sus amigos largamente en comer y beuer …” _Tumultos_, BNM, MS 2383, f. 147r.

_411_ Perry, _Crime and Society_, 22.
vital social, administrative, and, crucially, political units, from the Ancient Roman *vici* to the
*faubourgs* of Revolutionary Paris, in many cases retaining their relevance well into the
modern age. Of particular interest here is the role of neighbourhood as the basis of
political action, and in this sense neighbourhoods have served both as instruments of
control from above, whether by municipal or central authorities, as well as resistance from
below, by those excluded from formal politics for whom neighbourhood provided the
“social coordination that crowd action necessitated.” In Florence, for instance,
neighbourhoods were festive, but also to some extent real “kingdoms” within which the
politically disenfranchised were allowed to claim and display a certain amount of
“sovereignty”, and even informal authority which served to solidify group identities based
around the neighbourhood. Finally, even the extraordinary growth of some European
cities, such as Paris and London, which was supposed to have diminished the importance of
local ties and associations in favour of, first, city-wide attachments andloyalties, and then,
by the end of the early modern period, national ones, does not appear to have tempered the
vitality of neighbourhood relations, and their potential for organizing collective action.

The problem of course is that “neighbourhood” is an amorphous term, and even
limiting ourselves to early modern European cities, it might refer to groups of buildings,
individual streets, parishes (several streets), or groups of parishes, or sections of the city that
comprised parts of different parishes, and had developed a communal identity based on a
variety of factors, often only loosely linked to formal, secular or ecclesiastical, demarcations.
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412 John Bert Lott, *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge University Press, 2004); David Garrioch,
*Neighbourhood and Community in Paris, 1740-1790* (Cambridge University Press, 1986); David Garrioch and
413 Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly, “Neighbourhood Social Change in West European Cities: Sixteenth to
414 Rosenthal, “Big Piero, the Empire of the Meadow, and the Parish of Santa Lucia.”
In early modern Venice, “neighbourhood” could mean different things, to different people (individuals and groups), in different circumstances, and “unofficial” neighbourhoods reflected “the possibilities of local loyalties both within and across parishes.” Yet neighbourhoods often had little to do with discrete or bounded physical spaces, but were rather a social space, or “mental geographies” brought into being by various stimuli, or actions, and informed by history and memory. An important feature of this mental map, based on both fact and fiction, was the opposition between the urban centre and the periphery.

4.2.1. Neighbourhoods in Spanish Cities

In the early modern crown of Castile, neighbourhoods generally played no formal role in urban politics. In Seville, as in some other Andalusian cities, parishes or *collaciones* elected *jurados*, but these posts had long been appropriated by a venal or hereditary elite, sometimes only nominally resident in the parish. The cabildo of *jurados* was merely an advisory body to the city council, the *regimiento*, or cabildo de la ciudad, but having its own *jurados* was nevertheless a prerequisite of the status and “dignity” of *collación*. However, local identities based on a geographic area of the city coalesced around other functions, practices, or shared symbols and representations. As in Florence of the *potenze*, and Venice of the *battaglie*, ritual was a powerful means of asserting a public identity. In Spanish

---

cities these ritual and festive representations of community were more often than not religious in character, albeit often incorporating various ludic or profane elements. In seventeenth-century Madrid, parish eucharistic processions became the basis of social cohesion and a local identity rooted in the territorial units of the city, their prestige--and therefore of the parish and its confraternity—enhanced partly thanks to the injunctions of the Council of Trent, but also thanks to their appropriation by the Habsburg Monarchs for propaganda and legitimation purposes. Likewise, the great Corpus Christi festival in Seville was not only a spectacular demonstration of the city’s wealth and the piety of its citizens, but also a showcase for the numerous subcommunities (ethnic, neighbourhood).

But neighbourhood identity also had its secular iterations. Certain neighbourhoods, such as that structured by the Calle de la Feria in Cordoba, developed a unique and distinguishing culture, language, and value-system that shaped the world-views of its residents and proved remarkably enduring and portable. In Barcelona, the disenfranchised and marginalized residents of the Ribera parish appropriated elite representations of their neighbourhood, and used its reputation to act as an informal pressure group in local politics—described by James Amelang as “the politics of reputation.” In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Seville, the neighbourhood was also crucial to the affirmation of citizenship and belonging,

421 Vicente Lleó Cañal, “Un libro de dibujos inédito sobre el Corpus Christi sevillano en el siglo XVI,” Archivo Español de Arte 48, no. 190-191 (1975).
423 Amelang, “People of the Ribera.”
whether as the source of the required documentary records or witness statements that legitimized one’s claim to vecindad.\textsuperscript{424}

Spanish urban neighbourhoods were in general socially heterogenous, and sometimes, as in Granada in the second half of the sixteenth century, also ethnically mixed.\textsuperscript{425} However, as a Toledan cleric’s 1576 report—in the form of a perambulation through the city’s parishes—suggests, in large cities certain parishes and neighbourhoods (comprising either parts of a larger parish, or a number of neighbouring parishes) often acquired a distinct socioprofessional character. The parish of San Nicolás was thus populated by nobles (“de gente muy noble es poblada”) and had the best houses and shops, not unlike San Salvador and Santa Leocadia; in San Juan Bautista, meanwhile, nobles were joined by wealthy merchants, and in San Pedro, in addition to the first two, there was also a smattering of luxury craftsmen, such as silversmiths.\textsuperscript{426} At the other end of the spectrum, La Magdalena was known for being replete with taverns catering to the poor and forasteros (outsiders, noncitizens) while the parish of San Miguel was almost equally divided between “four types of people … boneteros, silk weavers, señores de heredades, and poor folk sustained by manual labour.”\textsuperscript{427} Silk weavers and bakers predominated in San Cristóbal, though some of the former—probably more prosperous master weavers—as well as dyers


\textsuperscript{425} David Coleman, \textit{Creating Christian Granada: Society and Religious Culture in an Old-World Frontier City, 1492-1600} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 70-2., although this was changing through the middle decades of the century as Moriscos tended to isolate themselves in certain parishes, such as the Albaicín, ibid., 61-2.


\textsuperscript{427} “la parroquia de Sant Miguel, ques poblada de quatro generos de gente casi por ygual, boneteros, texedores de seda, señores de heredades y gente pobre que de la labor de sus manos se mantiene ....” Hurtado de Toledo, “Memorial,” 513.
were found in the more diverse San Andrés, alongside clerics and nobles. Finally, geographic location was a factor in the distribution of trades and social groups, for only “perayles, tundidores, dyers, and tanners” were found in the peripheral parish of San Cebrian. Even the humblest parish however was not without at least one or two noble residences, and some plaza or religious building—whether church, chapel, or shrine—that served as its identifying mark, and a gathering place for its residents.

Since the reconquest of the city in 1248, Seville was subdivided into 27 collaciones, rising to 29 in the late sixteenth century. This abundance of parts redounded to its greatness, according to the sixteenth-century chronicler Luis de Peraza, for if other writers had celebrated the “nobility” of the cities of Toledo and Granada for boasting twenty-three parishes each, then Seville “is that much more of a royal city, and the most distinguished of all with its twenty-seven (collaciones), each one of them very large, for there is a collación with two thousand vecinos, and the smallest one has more than three hundred and ten.”

With a population of around 120-130,000, Seville was slightly better served by parish churches than Barcelona, albeit not as well as Toledo or Salamanca. This large number of parishes did not initially (in the thirteenth century) reflect the spiritual or other needs of the inhabitants, but their creation represented a strategy for colonizing the urban space inherited from the Arabs and developed in the course of the reconquest. However, unlike some Castilian cities, Seville experienced spectacular growth beginning in the fifteenth, and
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428 In San Justo Pastor, beneficed clerics and herederos de viñas y sotos de Toledo.
430 Albardonado Freire, El urbanismo de Sevilla, 62.
431 Peraza, Historia de Sevilla, 50-1.
432 Amelang, “People of the Ribera,” 124.
especially in the sixteenth century, which meant that overcrowding became a problem in many parts of the city.

4.3. La Feria and Omnium Sanctorum: barrio and collación

The largest parishes were the Cathedral parish, or Santa María, and San Salvador, both in the southern sector, and Triana, across the river Guadalquivir. As the city’s population grew in the sixteenth century, the northern sector, and Omnium Sanctorum in particular, would absorb a disproportionate amount of the influx of migrants, so that by the end of the century it was one of the city’s largest, and most densely populated parishes, with a uniformly higher than average number of vecinos per household. Almost exactly a third of Sevillians in the late sixteenth century shared a house with at least one other family (or more), and the majority of these collective residences seem to have been in the wider Feria neighbourhood.

Omnium Sanctorum, despite the importance of its marketplace, was always a marginal parish, far from both the city’s opulent cathedral, city hall, principal marketplaces and the exchange (Lonja), as well as the febrile activity of the riverfront port, the Arenal. Near the centre but closer to the southern limit of the parish stood the church of All Saints, facing the Plaza de la Feria and its market stalls, with its back to the palace-residence of the Marquises of la Algaba—the three focal points of the community, in their different but
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434 In 1588, of the 29 intramural collaciones of Seville—that is, excluding the arrabales of San Roque and San Bernardo, which could expand without the constraint of city walls—the ratio of vecinos to houses is highest in this part of the city, with all the parishes of the wider Feria neighbourhood surpassing the 2.0 mark (Santa Lucía was an outlier, and by far the most overcrowded with 5.3, followed by, in order of density, San Julián, 2.63, Santa Marina, 2.4, San Gil, 2.31, Omnium Sanctorum, 2.07, and San Martín, 2.0. The only other parishes that have a ratio at 2.0 or above are the smaller parishes of Santiago and San Nicolás, whose density was due to the presence of corrales de vecinos (see discussion below). Albardonedo Freire, El urbanismo de Sevilla, 368.
related ways. Most of the streets of the parish extended in straight lines northward from the church, as far as the city wall. The closest gates were the Macarena and the Barqueta. The parish was bounded on its western side by the insalubrious Feria “lagoon,” transformed into the verdant Alameda in 1574.

In the 1570s there was a concerted effort by the authorities to transform these marginal spaces, by paving many of the major streets and building new fountains, but primarily by undertaking two of the most significant construction projects in early modern Seville, the Hospital de las Cinco Llagas, just outside the Macarena gate, and the draining of the Feria lagoon (Laguna de la Feria) and its replacement by the tree-lined Alameda. The construction of the Alameda, with its set of Roman columns at one end, has been analyzed by scholars in various fields almost exclusively for its projection of imperial symbolism, and Seville’s special place in that national triumph as the “New Rome”, or as a spur in the rise of historical consciousness. Yet it is entirely reasonable to suppose that the project of draining this “noxious swamp” that lay within the city walls, and incorporating that perennial source of disease and disorder into the urban fabric was as much about upholding the social order.435

The Hospital de las Cinco Llagas, or de la Sangre, had its origins in the early sixteenth-century bequest for its foundation left by Doña Catalina de Ribera y Mendoza, and two papal bulls. However it was not until the middle of the century that the original hospital was found to be inadequate, and as more ample bequests poured in, work began on the large and impressive building—a triumph of Renaissance architecture in Seville not only

became the city’s largest hospital, but immediately transformed the northern approach to the city. The chosen location was facing the gate through which Charles V entered the city in 1526, the point where the old Roman road, the Via Augusta, became what would thenceforth be known as Calle Real. Yet the magnificent new hospital, a truly regal sentry, a triumph of artistic skill, technical knowhow, and good government, could not distract attention from the worrisome nature of the increasingly densely populated and mainly artisan neighbourhoods that greeted all who passed through the gate of the Macarena.

4.3.2. The Parish of All Saints

Neighbourhood, even in the relatively circumscribed context of early modern European cities, is a notoriously amorphous term, and Seville would seem to have more in common in this sense with a “southern” Catholic city like Milan than northerly Paris, for it is the Andalusian city’s sacred geography—its myriads of religious institutions, chapels, hospitals, lay brotherhoods, street crosses, and the rituals and patterns of sociability that developed around these—which structured relationships between neighbours, movement and boundaries and served as the primary coordinates in the mental landscape that formed the basis of neighbourhood identity.[^436] Seville’s parish churches had been important beacons

[^436]: David Garrioch thus explains the differences noted between the character of neighbourhoods in eighteenth-century Paris and Milan: “Although both cities were Catholic, Paris neighborhoods were overwhelmingly secular through most of the century, whereas in Milan, religious institutions lay at the heart of local interaction until at least the 1780s, when the state forcibly abolished many of them. […] Late eighteenth-century Milanese neighborhoods therefore possessed a religious dimension that Parisian ones did not have. Whereas the French capital had some statues and one or two market crosses—but with no particular local significance—Milan teemed with sacred sites, not only churches and chapels but columns, crosses, statues, and images, many with altars below them bearing lamps that marked them out in the darkest streets. They served as neighborhood landmarks and were surrounded by territories that all the local people recognized. They were part of the way both urban space and urban time were imagined and divided up. They were sufficiently powerful as sacred sites to make the authorities fear that they were diverting the common people away from the parish churches. The
of community since the Christian reconquest of the city in 1248, and the city’s 27 (later 29) parishes were small enough and relatively evenly distributed between the different quarters of the city to provide a foundation for thriving local communities.\textsuperscript{437} The parish as an organizing form was reemphasized by the Council of Trent, though rather than being imposed from above, this reassertion of the parish as the heart of the community owed much to its being embraced by lay parishioners themselves, often in the form of new or newly invigorated parish confraternities (in contrast to guild, ethnic, or other confraternities).\textsuperscript{438} The parish church of Omnium Sanctorum was moreover located at the heart of a particularly crowded and bustling neighbourhood, at a strategic crossroads next to the Plaza de la Feria wherein the produce of the hinterland that was siphoned into the city was collected and sold. It would be a mistake nevertheless to simply take Seville’s parish subdivisions as a map of its lived neighbourhoods.\textsuperscript{439} Parish churches faced competition from a proliferation of other religious institutions, formal and informal associations and brotherhoods (in addition to the parish sacramental confraternities), and sacred landmarks, and if the church of Omnium Sanctorum was an important node, it was also part of a wider network in which the sacred and the secular threads were finely interwoven, and which transcended the boundaries of the parish—albeit still geographically circumscribed in the city’s northern sector.

\textsuperscript{437} Arnaud notes the difference between Bologna, with its 91 parishes vastly uneven in size, distribution, and access to basic services, and Strasbourg, whose 9 parishes were far more uniform in all these respects, and were thus “better structured as communities.” Colin Arnaud, “Mapping Urban Communities: A Comparative Topography of Neighbourhoods in Bologna and Strasbourg in the Late Middle Ages,” in \textit{Cities and Solidarities: Urban Communities in Pre-Modern Europe}, ed. Justin Colson and Arie van Steensel (London: Routledge, 2017), 67.


\textsuperscript{439} The parish of Triana, physically separated from the rest of Seville was an exception in this sense.
The Church of All Saints

The parish church of Omnium Sanctorum, along with the adjacent San Gil, Santa Marina, San Martín and San Lorenzo, was one of seven earliest parish churches built over mosques in the second half of the thirteenth century, in the immediate aftermath of the city’s conquest by Fernando III of Castile. It has been argued that from the very beginning these structures had a symbolic purpose, as an assertion of Christian domination over the conquered Muslim population, as well as a defensive one, in what remained a frontier city well into the late medieval period. In reference specifically to the parish churches of the La Feria neighbourhood, Danya Crites writes that “[These] churches were established not to accommodate large numbers of settlers, but rather to encourage them, by providing social and defensive centers throughout the city.”440 If this was true of the medieval period, the parish churches must have retained something of this function well into the sixteenth century when the city—and above all its peripheral neighbourhoods—was a magnet for new migrants. After Trent, the parish church as elsewhere in Catholic Europe was reasserted as the privileged locus of worship and the administration of the sacraments—rites of passage that marked the lives of neighbours from the cradle to the grave and were important in forging communal bonds.441 Moreover, Trent not only raised the status of parish clergy, but also emphasized—and in many cases determined precisely for the first time—parish boundaries, and insisted on stricter differentiation between parishioners and non-


441 For a recent summary, see Andrew Spicer, ed. Parish Churches in the Early Modern World (Farnham: Ashgate, 2016).
parishioners. The purpose of course was greater control over lay piety and sociability, but it also gave local parish communities greater symbolic and ritual coherence.

According to Ortiz de Zúñiga, the church of Omnium Sanctorum was rebuilt by King Pedro III, “with three wide naves”, in what was by Zúñiga’s time “one of the most populous [parishes]” of Seville. Until the late sixteenth century, the main retable of the parish church of Omnium Sanctorum may have been a simple gothic mural, an image of the Virgin of All Saints. In 1592 a new retable of carved and gilded wood was commissioned by the veinticuatro Diego López Dávalos and his wife doña Teresa Coronado, from the sculptor Andrés de Ocampo, which survived until the 1790s—albeit by then in a decrepit state. The original mural may have served as Ocampo’s model, and it is worth noting that the image facing worshippers in Omnium Sanctorum was that of the titular Virgin surrounded by “all the saints of the names of the parishes of Seville …” This relatively humble church certainly never challenged the primacy of the Cathedral or the collegiate church of San Salvador, but facing the busiest and most important marketplace of the northeastern sector of the great metropolis, it stood out among its peers as a pole of attraction.
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442 Ortiz de Zúñiga, Anales, 259.
444 “todos los santos de los nombres de las parroquias de sevilla eceto san pedro y san juan porque ban en otras partes en el dicho Retablo …” Ros González, “El retablo mayor de estuco,” 168-9. It should be added however that any potential symbolism may have been lost on some parishioners, like for instance Beatriz de Lara (30), who said that she lived in the parish of “Lord (sic) Omnium Sanctorum … next to the said church” (“collacion de señor omnium santorum en la cassa que llaman de barbossa junto a la dicha yglesia …”) AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2391, 1651, exp. 11.
Not much is known about the parish clergy of Omnium Sanctorum. A visita from 1712 reveals a much reduced parish in comparison to its late sixteenth-century zenith.\textsuperscript{445} The two parish priests and an organist about whom information is provided were immigrants—the elder cura, Manuel Martínez de las Cortinas (age 46), “a philosopher” (“es filósofo”), was a Galician (from Oviedo), while his junior partner as well as the organist were natives of the province of Seville (the towns of Marchena and Carmona respectively). Both the parish priests enjoyed chaplaincies and benefices, although Antonio Corso, the younger priest, had been banished from his provincial hometown for the theft of some wheat.\textsuperscript{446} Apart from this, Don Pedro Román, in charge of the visita, reported “no defect … or scandal in the parish.”\textsuperscript{447} We do not have similar reports for the mid-seventeenth century. It is clear however that the parish clergy, apart from their strictly religious duties, were immersed in the life of the neighbourhood and maintained secular ties with their parishioners, as landlords, lenders, legal guardians, and myriad other roles.\textsuperscript{448} It is also likely that many of the parish priests faced some of the same hardships as their neighbours in those difficult post-plague years and identified with many of their grievances. During the revolt of 1652 however, the parish clergy of Omnium Sanctorum seem to have been divided, with some condemning the rebels’ actions (at least after the revolt), and others either tacitly approving or even taking part in the uprising. Juan Manuel de Dueñas, parish priest and member of the Holy Sacrament brotherhood, who lived next to the palace-residence of the Marquises of La

\textsuperscript{445} The number of houses was said to be 616 “according to the register (padrón),” in contrast to 854 just over a century earlier (1588)—a decrease of 28%. AGAS, Gobierno, Visitas, leg. 05182. For the sixteenth-century figures, see Albardonedo Freire, \textit{El urbanismo de Sevilla}, 367.

\textsuperscript{446} “es el sujeto à quien escriui causa por vn hurttillo de trigo que compurgo, con vn destierro de aquella villa que esta aqui Cumpliendo …” He was described as a “gramático.” Cortinas enjoyed benefices worth 300 ducados, and chaplaincies worth 70 ducados. Antonio Corso, 28, enjoyed chaplaincies worth 60 ducados. AGAS, Gobierno, Visitas, leg. 05182.

\textsuperscript{447} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{448} For instance, in 1650 the parish priest Antonio de Sopuerta rented a house on Calle Feria, in Omnium Sanctorum, to the master dyer Miguel Gutiérrez de Aguilar, AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 542, ff. 51r-v.
Algaba, was among the former, at least judging by his testimony in defence of Francisco de León, the smuggler turned militia captain. On the other hand, one manuscript chronicle records a cleric, with a sword in one hand and a shield tied to his waist, marching at the head of a rebel procession, holding on to the reins of the horse carrying Don Luís de Federiqui, the Alguacil Mayor of Seville (whom they forced to release the prisoners from the city jail). Moreover, after the revolt, the archbishop of Seville was reportedly “determined to remove all those clerics of the Feria parish,” although it is not clear whether his anger was due to the priests’ failure to control their charges and prevent the uprising, or because some had gone as far as to join the rebel ranks.

**United in Christian Brotherhood**

The parish church of Omnium Sanctorum was the seat of two parish lay confraternities, the brotherhood of the Santíssimo Sacramento (Holy Sacrament), and of the Ánimas (Souls in Purgatory). These were in theory a vital link between the ecclesiastical parish and the secular community of neighbours, mediating between the sacred and the secular, the everyday experience of neighbourhood and its festive incarnations. Lay confraternities were complex phenomena, and though in one sense they erased differences

---


450 Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.

451 “Tengo resuelto … casi todos los clérigos de aquella parroquia de la Feria mudarlos de allí …” Domínguez Ortiz, Alteraciones andaluzas. Domínguez Ortiz adds that the majority of the ecclesiastical estate did not take sides, instead acting as a moderating influence—but he seems to be referring to the clerical estate in the city as whole, rather than the parish clergy.

452 The words cofradía and hermandad were used interchangeably in early modern Seville, including in the statutes of the Holy Sacrament confraternity of Omnium Sanctorum. Regla de la la cofradía del Santísimo Sacramento de la parroquia de Omnium Sanctorum (Sevilla), AGAS, Hermandades, leg. 09801, 1626, f. 1; Blanca Morell Peguero, “Las hermandades en la sociedad sevillana del siglo XVI,” *Ethnica* 13 (1977): 92.
between neighbours in the name of Christian brotherhood and solidarity, they also helped articulate social hierarchies, practiced forms of exclusion, and gave rise to tensions and conflicts. In the early sixteenth-century, and above all during the great Comunero and Germanías revolts, these quasi-religious associations of laymen were seen to have played a more subversive role.\footnote{Especially in Murcia, and in the parallel Germanías revolt in Valencia. Diago Hernando, “El factor religioso en el conflicto de las Comunidades.”} As a result, the authorities were henceforth suspicious of all “leagues and syndicates” (ligas y monipodios), especially guild confraternities, which were expressly prohibited. Devotional and penitential confraternities continued to thrive, although after Trent there was a concerted effort to promote new arch-confraternities under the direction of parish priests, above all confraternities devoted to the Holy Sacrament and the Souls of Purgatory (every parish in Seville seems to have had at least one of each).

Indeed, Maureen Flynn has suggested that the prevalence of confraternities over craft guilds as forms of popular association encouraged vertical bonds, and spiritual brotherhood (communal integrity), over professional/economic interests, which in turn contributed to the preservation of the social order after 1521.\footnote{Maureen Flynn, \textit{Sacred Charity: Confraternities and Social Welfare in Spain, 1400-1700} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), 78.}

The sacramental confraternities in Seville trace their origins to the early sixteenth century, and owed much to the inspirations and efforts of the noblewoman doña Teresa Enríquez, who visited the city in 1511, and whose devotion to the Holy Sacrament secured a number of indulgences and privileges for the Spanish brotherhoods.\footnote{She arrived in the train of Ferdinand the Catholic and Germaine of Foix. José Roda Peña, \textit{Hermandades sacramentales de Sevilla: una aproximación a su estudio} (Sevilla: Guadalquivir Ediciones, 1996), 26.} By the end of the century, there was a Holy Sacrament confraternity in virtually every parish of Seville, and the Omnium Sanctorum cofradía was among the earliest to receive official approval
The Tridentine resolutions, with their emphasis on eucharistic devotion, were a new stimulus for Holy Sacrament confraternities in Seville as elsewhere, and in the case of the Omnium Sanctorum brotherhood, clearly prompted the rewriting of its statutes. The Eucharist was meant to serve as a symbol of the communal bonds between neighbours, and the 1626 Rule Book drew the link between “unity and harmony between brothers” and the ultimate objective—salvation.

Anxiety over death and the afterlife was manifestly on the rise among Spaniards of all social groups from the sixteenth century onward, and in its wake an “ever expanding preoccupation with intercessory gestures.” While Carlos Eire interprets this “increase in the pomp and circumstance of funerals” and obsession with death rites as an expression of a need to assert status in front of one’s neighbours (as much as to propitiate one’s chosen saintly advocates), even these more earthly motives served to deepen the bonds between neighbours, as the fulfilment of bequests depended on the cooperation of those left behind. Salvation itself was a collective endeavour, and one that left the deceased in purgatory completely at the mercy of his living confreres and neighbours. They in turn were reminded daily by the tolling of the parish church bell not only of their obligations to the dead, but

---

457 The opening lines of the 1626 book of ordinances (Rule Book) of the Holy Sacrament confraternity of Omnium Sanctorum include an explicit reference to Tridentine injunctions: “Hablando el sacro concilio Tridentino del Sanctissimo Sacramento dize que es señal de union y vinculo de amor y simbolo de paz y concordia …” *Regla de la la cofradia del Santisimo Sacramento de la parroquia de Omnium Sanctorum (Sevilla)*, AGAS, Hermanadas, leg. 09801, f. 1.
458 The introductory passage continues: “por un modo marauilloso significa y causa union paz y concordia entre los fieles y los junta, y haze hermanos para que todos avna absolutamente se azerquen y unan con Dios sino tambien sino vniidad y concordia entre los hermanos mayormente quando con sancto celo y buena voluntad se ajuntan para seruir y honrar a nuestro señor Jesuchristo y cumplir las obras de misericordia que segun nuestra fe nos an de ser demandadas el dia del Juicio.” Ibid.
that the hour of their own need was approaching inexorably. The Rule Book of the Holy Sacrament brotherhood listed as one of the main responsibility of the mayordomo to ensure that masses for deceased cofrades were said—a duty that the confraternity was probably called upon to fulfil more frequently in the wake of the devastating 1649 plague. Moreover, following the completion of its chapel in the parish church, the confraternity had petitioned Rome for a bull (buleto) that would grant the privilege that for every mass said in the new chapel “one soul would be freed from purgatory.” Burials of cofrades, too, are listed among the statutes, a customary commitment to mutual aid and one of the raisons d’être of such lay associations.

In addition to the various death rites mentioned above, lay confraternities played a central role in a host of monthly and annual feasts, which were among other things occasions for neighbourhood sociability and representations of group identity. The Holy Sacrament confraternity was in charge of the most important of these festive occasions, the parish Corpus Christi procession, and the attendant “games and dances” (“juegos e Danzas”), that were also marked by competition between parishes and neighbourhoods. The communal meals that were served on such days brought together not only the cofrades

---

460 In the words of Antonio de Guevara (1523): “[the] church bells toll not for the dead, but for the living.” Ibid., 88.
461 Regla de la cofradía del Santísimo Sacramento de la parroquia de Omnium Sanctorum (Sevilla), AGAS, Hermandades, leg. 09801. For instance, plague victims and parishioners of Omnium Sanctorum Mateo Francisco and his wife had left 50 ducados for perpetual masses to be said for them by the confraternity. AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 546, ff. 817r-18v.
462 Regla de la cofradía del Santísimo Sacramento de la parroquia de Omnium Sanctorum (Sevilla), AGAS, Hermandades, leg. 09801. A confraternity more specifically dedicated to this task, the Souls in Purgatory, had merged in Omnium Sanctorum parish following the devastating plague of 1649 that must have decimated the membership of both.
463 Bequests were central to covering the costs, but so was the conscientious management of the confraternity’s property, another one of the mayordomo’s obligations.
but the neighbourhood as a whole. It is no surprise therefore that a regular feature among the expenses incurred by the Holy Sacrament confraternity of Omnium Sanctorum were the costs of Shrovetide celebrations (Carnestolendas).

Yet there was also acknowledgement of discord, and many of the rules were focused on peace and harmony between cofrades and neighbours. To avoid “scandals and upheavals,” insults were prohibited during cabildo meetings on pain of fines and expulsion from the brotherhood. Nor were disagreements confined to the formal gatherings of cofrades, and the mayordomo and the cofrades were enjoined to report any conflict that flared up in the course of daily life to the cabildo so that the differences “might be mended and [the cofrades] reconciled” (“para que luego se remedie y los hagan amigos”). One frequent source of tension were the regular and irregular collections of money from cofrades, by one of their number doing the rounds and going door to door. This is a feature of neighbourhood communities that has been widely observed and commented upon: that propinquity generated rivalries and conflict as much as neighbourly solidarity, but also gave rise to formal and informal mechanisms of conflict resolution. The ultimate punishment for those who refused all forms of mediation and compromise was exclusion from the brotherhood.

465 Campbell, At the First Table, 96.
466 Libro de cuentas, AHTS, 1680.
468 Regla de la la cofradía del Santísimo Sacramento de la parroquia de Omnium Sanctorum (Sevilla), AGAS, Hermandades, leg. 09801.
While the confraternity of the Holy Sacrament maintained its chapel in the parish church, its meetings also took place in its own Hospital in the nearby Calle Tocinos—even in the seventeenth century, long after the numerous small hospitals belonging to the guilds and confraternities had been extinguished. Moreover, the Holy Sacrament confraternity of Omnium Sanctorum was open to residents of other collaciones. The confraternity’s 1626 rules stipulated that in submitting his petition to the cabildo, the prospective cofrade must state “the collación, neighbourhood (barrio), and street where he resides so that he may be called upon when required …”—implying that residence in the parish of Omnium Sanctorum was not a requirement (indeed, this is not mentioned as a prerequisite).

Secondly, although the membership rolls do not—with very rare exceptions—mention the cofrade’s parish, it has been possible to determine the place of residence of 51 of 581 cofrades by referring to notarial and marriage records. While 45 of these were parishioners of Omnium Sanctorum, 6 (12%) were residents of other, adjacent parishes (San Martín, San Lorenzo, San Julian, and San Juan de la Palma). If the Holy Sacrament was the basis of a neighbourhood community, this neighbourhood was not strictly bound to the parish. This, along with some of what follows, may be taken as an indicator that the wider barrio was more important to structuring forms of sociability despite the post-Tridentine insistence of the ecclesiastical authorities on parish structures.

It seems moreover that in the years immediately prior to the 1652 revolt, the Holy Sacrament confraternity was not fulfilling some of its essential duties. Miguel Çid, whose lament over the habitual profanation of the neighbourhood sacred spaces and absence of

---

469 AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 542, f. 27r.
470 Regla de la la cofradía del Santísimo Sacramento de la parroquia de Omnium Sanctorum (Sevilla), AGAS, Hermandades, leg. 09801.
spiritual fibre among the *ferianos* opened this chapter, put his faith in a program of processions and masses for popular edification to be entrusted to the Holy Sacrament confraternity. On the afternoon of each of the six Sundays before Lent, there should be a “solemn feast” of the Holy Sacrament in which its “divine majesty would be manifest, along with a sermon, with chaplains in the choir and altar.” Yet he must have been apprehensive, for he claimed it had been at least sixteen years since the last time that the Holy Sacrament had been taken out in procession, or that sermons were preached on the Sundays of Lent in the church of Omnium Sanctorum, “as is the custom in other parishes”. He had previously, on many occasions approached “various persons with this good intent,” but had found them “neither disposed [to comply], nor devoted.” Now, fearing death, he had taken it upon himself to ensure that the moral laxity should be tackled, and a reformation of customs undertaken at his own cost.

The reasons why the Holy Sacrament confraternity of Omnium Sanctorum might have shown such slackness in its duties are not clear. One might suppose that the devastating plague of 1649 had taken its toll on confraternity membership and resources, but Miguel Çid claim of a sixteen-year hiatus in the pre-Lenten exposure of the Sacrament suggests problems of longer standing. Following Çid’s own diagnosis, one might be tempted to assume a deficiency of zeal and devotion among either the parish priests or the cofrades, or perhaps to read into this a withdrawal by the more well-to-do parishioners into more private, or exclusionary devotional practices, an inward-looking confraternity concerned more with the salvation of its members than the reaffirmation of wider

---

471 AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 546, f. 247v.
472 Ibid., f. 248r.
473 His bequest to the confraternity of the Holy Sacrament was of a *juro* worth 15,049 *reales* in silver, with an annual yield of 942 and a half *reales*, “en la segunda situación de Millones.” Ibid.
communal bonds. Given that the period referred to by Çid covers the low-watermark of the Spanish Monarchy’s fortunes, a time of war, rebellion, and the interruption of commerce, with all the concomitant effects on the economy and society, perhaps the Holy Sacrament confraternity of Omnium Sanctorum was truly struggling to support a fuller devotional programme.474

However that may be, the confraternity’s popularity increased dramatically in the second half of the century, especially after the 1652 revolt—at the same time as it became more independent of ecclesiastical control.475 A total of 581 cofrades are recorded in the Membership Roll. Of these, 158 joined before 1649 and 423 in the subsequent half-century (1650–1696). The difference appears to be between an average of 3.4 new cofrades per year in the first half of the 1600s, and 9, or almost three times as many in the second half. This may be somewhat misleading however. Although it includes the names of cofrades who joined as far back as 1581, the oldest surviving book was begun in 1626 as a replacement for one that had been damaged in the great flood of that year. Thus, not all the cofrades who joined prior to 1626 were recorded, but only those still living (in 1626). Therefore if only the years 1626–1649 are included for being complete, the number of new cofrades is 126 in 21 years, or an average of 6 cofrades per year—still lower than the 9 for the second half of the century. But the contrast is still greater with a fifteen-year period (1662–1676) when the Holy Sacrament confraternity experienced a pronounced spike in membership: 199 new cofrades or 34% of the total for the entire seventeenth century were admitted, for an average of 13 per year. In 1662 alone, 37 new cofrades were seated—easily the highest number in the

474 Although it would still be necessary to account for the apparent ability of other parishes to maintain a cycle of masses and processions such as that proposed by Miguel Çid, assuming that his criticism is justified.
475 What follows is based on the combined records of the two books of cofrades covering the seventeenth-century, held at the Archivo Histórico de la Hermandad de Todos los Santos de Sevilla (AHTS).
seventeenth century. This was of course the year of the great Immaculist celebrations which unleashed a wave of religious festivities in all of the city’s parishes, a fervour that seems to have persisted for the next decade and a half at least.  

This growth was primarily due to an influx of artisans and especially humbler craftsmen in the second half of the century. This is partly explained by the fact that the plague of 1649 decimated the population of the neighbourhood to such an extent that the two main parish confraternities—the Holy Sacrament and the Souls of Purgatory—were forced to merge to make up the numbers. Indeed, after 1662, the second highest influx of new members was in 1650, the year following the epidemic, when 22 new cofrades were inducted. The near absence of clerics and parish priests in the second half of the century is significant however, and combined with the changing socio-professional profile of cofrades suggests that the Holy Sacrament brotherhood was more firmly under the control of laymen, most of whom were artisans. While the post-Tridentine church may have encouraged and undoubtedly took a far closer interest in these lay brotherhoods, their proliferation—even in the case of sacramental parish confraternities traditionally linked with the influence of Catholic Reform—owed far more to new patterns of lay piety and sociability.

476 Wunder, Baroque Seville, 33.
477 The Souls of Purgatory confraternities were generally more open to poorer neighbours although they nevertheless competed for members with the Holy Sacrament brotherhoods. Miguel Luis López-Guadalupe Muñoz, “Asociacionismo cofrade en un barrio granadino: El Realejo,” in Homenaje a don Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, ed. Juan Luis Castellano Castellano and Miguel Luis López-Guadalupe Muñoz (Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2008), 414.
It has often been noted that by combining the apparently irreconcilable principles of hierarchy and equality, confraternities were crucial to the maintenance of the social order. On the one hand the distinction of membership, and in particular the distribution of offices in the confraternity, established social hierarchies at the local level, and thus gave structure and coherence to the teeming and fluid world of artisans, merchants, and professionals—the amorphous third estate—that made up most of the population of the parish and the neighbourhood. But far more important than exclusivity was the integrating function of the parish confraternities, the emphasis on mutual aid, spiritual and material, and on solidarity between neighbours separated by wealth and social standing. According to the Rule Book of the Holy Sacrament confraternity of Omnium Sanctorum, petitions for membership were put to a secret vote in the cabildo, and approval not a foregone conclusion, no doubt depending on the reputation of the prospective cofrade. Entry was also subject to a payment of 5 ducados, along with the stipulation that the cofrade should be “honourable man of means […] and [that] no brother may be a mulatto or a morisco.” In the first half of the seventeenth century it does appear that the parish elite—merchants, minor officials, notaries—along with clergymen were overrepresented among cofrades of the Holy Sacrament. Occupation was rarely noted during this period in the Membership Roll: only in 24 of a total of 233 instances (10%). Of these, only 6 were artisans (25%), 8 were clergymen (33%), three merchants, two military officers, two notaries, a jurado and a caballero. Yet there seems to be a marked shift in the composition of the membership after

481 In 1650 there was dissent from some cofrades over the acceptance of Simón Juan, although the reasons were not noted. Pedro Vargas, on the other hand, was admitted on sight, again without a recorded explanation. AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 542, f. 27r-v.
482 Regla de la la cofradía del Santísimo Sacramento de la parroquia de Omnium Sanctorum (Sevilla), AGAS, Hermandades, leg. 09801.
1650. For the second half of the century, the new cofrade’s profession was noted in 128 of 348 cases (37%). There were 82 artisans (64% of those who occupation was recorded), followed by 19 merchants, only 2 ecclesiastics, and a smattering of the rest.

But even in the first half of the century the Holy Sacrament confraternity was probably more socially diverse than the Membership Roll suggests. Supplementing the confraternity’s own records with evidence from the notarial archives has made it possible to ascertain the occupations of an additional 44 individuals who became cofrades in the seventeenth-century (16 of those who joined in 1600-1650, and 27 who became cofrades in 1650-1696). The enhanced data suggests that that artisans may in fact have been more numerous in the first half the century (11 of 16, in addition to the numbers given above for 1600-1650, which would bring the proportion of artisans in the first half of the century to roughly 43%).

For the second half of the century (1650-1697), all but 3 of 28 additional cofrades whose occupations and known from the notarial archives were artisans, bring their total number in this period to 107 of 156 (69%). Nearly half, or 47 of 107, were silk workers (mainly weavers).

Moreover, even the Rule Book allowed for the admission of those too poor to afford the entry fee, which could be substituted by doing the rounds for collection. An analysis of the seventeenth-century membership records reveals that most such exceptions were made in the second half of the century, or, more precisely, after 1658: only four of 238 (1.7%) new cofradas from 1600-1658 were allowed to substitute payment of the entrada (either in part or in full) for doing two or four additional rounds for collections, in contrast to 93 of a total

483 For the second half of the century, of the additional 27 cofradas whose occupations are known from notarial records, 25 were artisans, and two merchants, raising the proportion of artisans to 69%, or nearly two-thirds.
of 347 (27%) new cofrades in the subsequent 39 years (1658-1696). Nearly one in 3 cofrades in the later seventeenth-century were therefore admitted as “pobres.” It should be noted that during this period the confraternity experienced a period of growth just as the population of the city (and the neighbourhood) entered a period of precipitous decline, suggesting that the brotherhood became more inclusive and gave a truer reflection of the neighbourhood community.

Frequent intercourse in the cabildo of the confraternity, in funeral and festive processions, communal meals and other gatherings created deep bonds between cofrades, and even for nonmembers, “helped to shape the calendar and rhythms of the neighbourhood.” But this was only one of the ties that bound neighbours together. The membership rolls yield only minimal data about the 581 cofrades enrolled in the seventeenth-century—usually only the name, date on entry, and information about fees, averiguaciones, and demandas paid. As noted above, it’s only in the later seventeenth century that the occupation of the new cofrade is mentioned with any frequency. However it has been possible to identify many cofrades among the sample of witnesses in marriage dispensations (AGAS samples from 1598-1607 and 1649-1655), as well as a variety of notarial documents detailing rental agreements, apprenticeship contracts, powers of attorney, and sales. Overlaying these various sources of data had made it possible to not only fill in the blanks and thus get a better picture of the socio-professional background of the cofrades of the Holy Sacrament of Omnium Sanctorum, but also to establish links between them that extended beyond common membership in the parish brotherhood. In

484 Like for instance the tailor Domingo Alvarez who petitioned to be admitted in this way in 1650: “domingo aluarez que pedia se admitiese por hermano desta cofradia por pobre con cargo que hauia de pedir seis meses de noche y el cauildo lo asento …” AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 542, f. 27v.
some cases it is possible to glean fragments of social networks that tied cofrades to one another, and to the rest of the neighbourhood. What the examples below demonstrate is the dense web of associations between cofrades of the Holy Sacrament—already bound to one another in that common enterprise to safeguard their spiritual and material wellbeing—based on occupation, residence, kinship, ethnic or geographic origin.

The silk weaver Juan Beltrán was admitted in 1650. He rented his house of Calle de Ciegos in the Omnium Sanctorum parish from Diego Rodríguez, also a cofrade of the Holy Sacrament. Beltrán also appeared at least three times as a witness in marriage dispensations, and each time the other witness was a fellow cofrade of the Holy Sacrament of Omnium Sanctorum. In two of these cases the fellow witnesses and cofrades were also silk weavers (Gabriel de Liñan and Rodrigo de Espejo), and all three were residents of Omnium Sanctorum. In at least one case, the groom, too, was probably a cofrade.

Pedro Nieto and Antonio Montero were both carpenters, residents of Omnium Sanctorum (on the same street, Calle Feria), and appeared together as witnesses in the marriage dispensation of Francisca Bernal, the daughter of another cofrade, the silk weaver Francisco Bernal, of nearby San Julian parish. Bernal in turn was a witness for Lorenzo Moreno, of Omnium Sanctorum, who married the daughter of yet another cofrade, Marcos

486 AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 542, f. 569r. The price was 45 reales per month, and the lease—probably a sublet—for two years and four months.
487 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2391, exp. 85, 87; AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 1728, 1652, exp. 106.
488 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 1535, exp. 94. Pedro Nieto: Libro de entrada y de averiguaciones 1626-1663, AHTS, lib. ent. XVII-1, f. 236; Libro de entrada y de averiguaciones 1663-1696, AHTS, lib. ent. XVII-2, f. 4. Antonio Montero: Libro de entrada y de averiguaciones 1626-1663, AHTS, lib. ent. XVII-1, f. 236; Libro de entrada y de averiguaciones 1663-1696, AHTS, lib. ent. XVII-2, f. 8. Montero appeared as a witness for Francisca Bernal a second time when she married Pedro Ignacio de Frías in 1654, her first husband Manuel González Borges having died in the Indies (Portobelo). She was 19 at the time of her second marriage. AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 535, exp. 166. Pedro Nieto along with another cofrade, Alonso de Colmenares, joined and resident of Calle de las Boticas in Omnium Sanctorum, was a marriage witness for Tomé Alonso del Villar, also of Omnium Sanctorum. AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 177, exp. 168. Alonso de Colmenares: [AHTS, #2877; ibid., f. 69. 173
Incidentally, the carpenter Antonio Montero (above), sublet his house in Cruz Verde, Omnium Sanctorum to the master gilder Juan Cortés, one of the proscribed rebels of 1652. The links proliferate and intertwine in dizzying patterns.

The silk merchant Pedro Bermúdez, another resident of Calle Feria in Omnium Sanctorum, who had been elected mayordomo of the cofradía for 1650, appeared as a witness in the marriage of Juan Velázquez, also a cofrade and a carpenter of neighbouring San Martín parish. Velázquez, a widow, was marrying Sebastiana de Valdés, also a widow, who seems to have been in charge of her own weaving workshop.

In 1653, the pasamaneros Gabriel de Barbarán and Juan Sánchez de la Vega, both cofrados of the Holy Sacrament brotherhood of Omnium Sanctorum and residents of the parish show up as witnesses in the marriage of another pasamanero, Pedro Sánchez de Aguilar (not a cofrare), also of the same parish. His bride’s witnesses meanwhile were a goldbeater from adjacent San Lorenzo parish and his wife, residents of the Compás de San Clemente—the seat of the silk weavers’ guild. Two years later (1655), the groom, Pedro Sánchez de Aguilar appeared as a witness alongside Gabriel de Barbarán’s wife, Francisca Ortiz, and another cofrade, the glassblower Leonardo Moreno and his wife, also of Omnium Sanctorum, in the marriage dispensation of Pedro de Pineda and Ana Carillo. Five years earlier, Francisca had been a witness for Ana de Barbarán, possibly a relative (albeit not noted as such), in her marriage to the French immigrant Antonio Ricardo, whose

489 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 1795, exp. 89. Marcos Rodríguez: Libro de entrada y de averiguaciones 1626–1665, AHTS, lib. ent. XVII-1, f. 236; Libro de entrada y de averiguaciones 1665–1696, AHTS, lib. ent. XVII-2, f. 52.
490 AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 542, ff. 88r.-v.
491 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 349, exp. 163. For Pedro Bermúdez’s election as mayordomo, see ibid., f. 27v. Pedro Bermúdez: Libro de entrada y de averiguaciones 1626–1665, AHTS, lib. ent. XVII-1, f. 236. Juan Velázquez: ibid.
492 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2340, exp. 153.
493 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 1605, exp. 183.
own witnesses were two silk twisters of San Gil and Santa Marina (adjacent parishes), as well as a tavern keeper of San Román. Finally, that same year (1650), the pasamanero and cofrade Gabriel de Barbarán, Francisca’s husband (mentioned above), took on as an apprentice the thirteen-year-old daughter of the agricultural worker (trabajador) Anton Díaz of Santa Marina parish.

Other confraternities

But if the sacramental confraternity of Omnium Sanctorum was becoming more popular, socially diverse, and was more firmly under the control of ordinary laymen in the second half of the seventeenth century—strengthening bonds between a wider circle of neighbours in the process—it was far from alone. Various devotional confraternities had formed in the course of the sixteenth century around local sacred sites, images, or institutions other than the parish church, while yet others were extensions or surrogates of guilds—and thus in theory just as likely to attract members from across the city. Yet since the city’s reconquest trades and crafts tended to concentrate in particular neighbourhoods, the effect of many of these lay religious associations was not all that different, and there was significant overlap between parish—or, in this case, barrio—and guild ritual calendars. The confraternity of San Onofre, for instance, was a brotherhood of silk merchants and silk workers (masters and journeymen), but by the seventeenth century both groups (and
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494 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 382, exp. 10.
495 AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 542, ff. 940r-v. The contract was for five years. The following year Gabriel de Barbarán took on another apprentice, the fifteen-year-old orphan Gregorio Manuel, whose legal guardian was the same Antonio Díaz. AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 546, ff. 970r-v.
496 Webster, Art and Ritual, 18-19.
497 Morell Peguero, “Las hermandades,” 100.
especially the silk weavers and twisters) were heavily concentrated in La Feria—the parishes of Omnium Sanctorum, San Lorenzo, San Gil, Santa Marina, San Martín. Silk workers were also at the forefront of the so-called Brotherhood of the Guilds (*Hermandad de los Gremios de Sevilla*), which sought to bring together dozens of craft guilds in an ostensibly “Holy” confraternity whose purpose was nevertheless to defend the secular interests of the city’s artisans as a group.498

At least two confraternities were based in the convent of San Basilio. The María Santísima de la Esperanza, founded in 1590, and whose cofrades were predominantly market gardeners (*hortelanos*) was destined to become one of the city’s most emblematic lay brotherhoods, later known simply as La Macarena. It was based in the Basilian convent in Omnium Sanctorum until 1653, the year it moved to the nearby parish church of San Gil (still very much within the Feria neighbourhood), where it constructed its own chapel and obtained important privileges from the archbishop Ambrosio Spínola. Curiously, the move took place a year following the 1652 popular revolt, and also prompted the cofradía to append an extension to its name, “de la Injusta Sentencia de muerte que dieron a Cristo.”499 Sharing San Basilio and marching together with the Esperanza confraternity (at least until 1624) was La Sagrada Cena, founded in Omnium Sanctorum in 1580.500 This penitential brotherhood was apparently formed by discontented members of the parish sacramental confraternity.501
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498 See chapter 5.
499 Jesús Luengo Mena, *Compendio de las cofradías de Sevilla (que procesionan a la Catedral en Semana Santa)* (Seville: Ediciones Espuela de Plata, 2007), 273-4. The Esperanza confraternity merged with Virgen del Rosario in 1793 to form La Macarena.
500 Ibid.
The Basilian order was established in Spain relatively late, in the mid-sixteenth century, and was one of the few—alongside the much more ubiquitous and influential Jesuits—to experience its period of greatest splendour and growth in the late sixteenth and into the seventeenth century. The Sevillian monastery of San Basilio was founded in 1593 by a wealthy merchant of Cypriot origin, Nicolao Griego Triarchi, a resident of the parish of Omnium Sanctorum, who donated not only the funds but also his principal residence to house the new religious community. San Basilio quickly thereafter established itself as a popular place of worship, the seat of various lay confraternities that rivalled the Holy Sacrament and the Animas, and by extension a place of sociability. For the neighbourhood youth, such as Juan Antonio, of Santa Catalina parish, and eighteen-year-old María de Castañeda (or Espinosa, which she insisted was her real name), it was a place of courtship, promises of marriage, and furtive holding of hands as they conversed with other young friends in one of the recessed chapels inside the monastery church. The church itself was “of medium size, but well-built […] and its community [of monks] highly respected for

502 Angela Atienza López, *Tiempos de conventos: Una historia social de las fundaciones en la España moderna* (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2008). The first Basilian monastery in Spain was established in 1540, close to Cambil, province of Jaén, although it was not officially approved until 1561.
503 Ortiz de Zúñiga, *Anales*, vol. 4, 155.
504 According to the testimony of Juan Antonio’s friend, Pedro Vázquez, cordonero, “abra tres años que los dhos Juan antonio y doña maria de Castañeda an tratado de Requiebro y Galaneo para efecto de Casarsse y contraer matrim.” and en diferentes Ocasiones y partes que este testigo acompanado a el dho Joan antonio como su amigo que es a visto que se an dado palabra de Casam.to el vno a el otro prometiendo casarsse y ultima mente ayer dia de San Juan [24 June, 1653] … por la mañana este testigo fue con el dho Joan antonio y entraron a oyr missa en el Conbento de S.t Vasilio desta ciu.d and orando en la yglesia del vieron a la dha doña Maria de Castañeda que estaua en la capilla de la humildad que esta en la Yglesia del dho Conuento y auiendo la uisto el dho Joan antonio se llego a hablarla y la dha doña Maria en presencia deste testigo y de Antonia maria y de Josefa Rodriguez que estauan con ella la dha doña Maria de Castañeda entre otras Razones le dixo a el dho Joan antonio que le daua palabra de Casarse con el y que otro no auia de ser su marido y el dho Joan antonio Respondio que azeta la palabra y se la daua tambien de casarse con ella y ser su marido y que otra no auia de ser su mug.r y dicho esto vio este testigo que ambos se dieron las manos en la dha capilla …” AGAS, Vicaría, *Matrimonios Ordinarios*, leg. 209, exp. 137. Curiously, in 1669 a Juan Antonio and a Pedro Vázquez were among the 10 new cofrades admitted into the Holy Sacrament confraternity of Omnium Sanctorum, making it entirely possible that, one of them having married a silk worker’s daughter from that parish, the two friends from Santa Catalina forged closer ties with that parish. *Libro de entrada y de averiguaciones 1663-1696*, AHTS, lib. ent. XVII-2, f. 197-8.
their exemplary [conduct].” Although Zúñiga’s suggestion is that the Basilian monks had earned this respect for their piety, their local reputation may have been just as much due to a tendency to identify closely with the impoverished artisans who made up the wider neighbourhood. The manuscript chronicles of the 1652 revolt mention a Basilian monk who “fanned the flames, more than any other,” and there is a fleeting reference to the fact that “many of this habit” took part in the revolt.

The sacred landscape

The geography of the parish was bounded on its western side by the convent and plaza of Belén, and two mounted crosses, the Cruz de la Tinaja (atop an earthenware jar) and the Cruz del Rodeo. Other large iron crosses were located not on the outer limits of the parish, but placed on pedestals in the centre of major thoroughfares, such as the Cruz Verde (painted green)—the address given by the rebel gilder Juan Cortés—and the Cruz de Caravaca, in the densely populated Calle de Linos, which may have been installed in 1649 to mark the place of an improvised cemetery during the great plague of that year. In 1652 this cross was a fresh reminder of a traumatic collective memory, of the charnel houses left behind by the great plague of 1649. At least two-fifths (38%)—and probably more—of the
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505 Ortiz de Zúñiga, Anales, vol. 5, 54.
506 Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9. For the Basilian monks preaching against monopolies on other occasions (1635), see Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y mui leal ciudad de Sevilla, BCC, MS 59-1-5, 277r. On the other hand, at least one Basilian religious, Fray Antonio de la Torre, testified in the defence of Francisco de León in 1654, suggesting that he had little sympathy for the rebels. El fiscal contra el capitán Francisco de León preso en Sevilla sobre ciertos delitos, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25608, exp. 3, ff. 405v-07r.
507 At the confluence of San Benito street and the Alameda. Antonio Collantes de Terán Sánchez et al., eds., Diccionario histórico de las calles de Sevilla, 3 vols. (Sevilla: Consejería de Obras Públicas y Transportes, Junta de Andalucía, 1993), 166. Miguel Torres has suggested that the Cruz del Rodeo was most likely erected as a humilladero, “a simple shrine at the entrance of towns and villages, where it was customary to kneel and cross oneself -- and which again reveals the Alameda’s original liminality.” Torres García, Seville, 57.
508 Collantes de Terán Sánchez et al., Diccionario histórico, 259, 352. Another cross, the Cruz de los Desamparados, faced the monastery of San Basilio. Ibid., 254.
parishioners in the 1650-1655 sample were widowers, and almost three-quarters (71%) had lost their spouses to the plague. Although a significant number of the deceased were taken outside the city, most were buried in the parish itself, if not in the church then in common graves such as the one marked by the Caravaca cross. Yet the parish church still maintained its privileged position at the heart of the parish, not last because it overlooked the Plaza de la Feria, where the confluence of people was the greatest. Meanwhile, linked to it by an elevated passageway (tribuna) like an umbilical cord, was the palace-residence of the Marquises de la Algaba, the (literally) overarching symbol of another articulation of neighbourhood, based around noble patronage.

4.4. Nobles and Plebs

As in other large Mediterranean cities, most neighbourhoods in early modern Seville were to some extent a microcosm of urban society. Neighbourhoods were socially mixed, and tended to coalesce around one or more powerful families who exerted a preponderant influence in local life. Their urban palaces dominated the physical space, and ties of kinship or patronage bound many residents to them. This aspect of neighbourhood was sometimes reflected in the local nomenclature, when the web of personal ties centred on a single powerful clan was strong enough. The Sevillian parish of San Miguel, for instance,
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509 Although 937 individuals appear in the sample, 283 were men who appear only as witnesses, and did not declare their marital status. Of the remaining 654, whose marital status (past and present) might be known, 249 (38.1%) declared themselves widowers. Of these in turn 104 mentioned neither the cause nor the approximate length of time since the death of their spouse. That leaves a total of 145 widowers whose testimonies yield some information about the death of their former husband or wife. Among these, 115 died of the plague, or 71%. The majority (41, or 36%) were buried in the parish of Omnium Sanctorum, followed by those who were taken away in carts to be buried in the countryside (36, or 31%).

dominated by the imposing urban residence of the Dukes of Medina Sidonia, was known popularly as the *barrio del duque*. Similarly, what was in the sixteenth century known as the Borceguinería had previously had the name of the *barrio* of Doña Elvira de Ayala, “named after the said lady, whose [neighbourhood] it was, as well as the houses, and the coat of arms in the middle of that plaza …”⁵¹¹ Many of the other *collaciones*, especially the larger ones in the vicinity of the cathedral, city hall, and the central marketplace (San Francisco) were home to at least one, and sometimes more than one principal family. These vertical ties with one or more notable families at the centre of a network of kinship and patronage, was one important sense of neighbourhood, which could be mobilized for political purposes when necessary.⁵¹² Moreover, this form of local authority could also be exerted by a particularly powerful institution or individual in a given neighbourhood. Triana, across the river from Seville and presided over by the gloomy fortress of the Holy Office, was clearly seen as the domain of the Inquisitor General.⁵¹³ However, those who occupied the apex of this neighbourhood hierarchy, or wielded local power most directly at the neighbourhood level were not always urban patricians or powerful officials. The parish of San Marcos, for instance, emerged in the revolt as the fiefdom of two professional smugglers, Francisco de León and Francisco Bueno, who had enough clout to carry the neighbourhood with them. Finally, the parish community also existed as a social network based on mainly horizontal ties between neighbours, and where relative socio-professional homogeneity coincided with

---


⁵¹² The neighbourhoods or the *collaciones* were from the beginning (the city’s reconquest in 1284) to some extent structured as little fiefdoms of the warring urban factions, and in the popular uprisings it was not only the rebels who rallied to the standard of the parish, but also the local notables who reasserted their authority first by taking charge of parish armed bands.

⁵¹³ In the 1652 revolt, the Inquisitor General managed to regain control of his parish after initially being wrong-footed by the rebels. *Tumultos*, BNM, MS 2383, ff. 148v, 50v.
unique spatial features—as in the Feria neighbourhood—the elements were in place of a strong sense of community that could be activated in opposition to the urban authorities.

4.4.1. Lords in the Parish

Fernando III, the conqueror of Seville from the Moors in 1248, died only two years following his greatest feat, and it was left to his son Alfonso X (“The Wise”) to complete the reorganization and resettlement of the city. In 1253, the king issued land grants to the Christian soldiers and settlers, not only the 200 privileged nobles and knights, but the whole “común de Sevilla,” and distributed all the houses left vacant by the Moors. In both cases the redistribution of property was done by *collación*, in the name of fairness and “legitimacy,” two “principal persons” were chosen from every parish to oversee the process, assisted by a scribe. The two men chosen for Omnium Sanctorum were Martin de Muros and Pero Díaz—the latter apparently included among the 200 nobles and knights who were singled out for their contribution to the conquest of the city. Ortiz de Zúñiga suggests that these were the first *jurados*, or representatives of Seville’s *collaciones*, and the first public notaries.\(^{514}\)

Three of these two hundred, including the aforementioned Pero Díaz, either resided or were in some way linked to the parish of Omnium Sanctorum. The other two were Juan Cervant—the ancestor of Gonzalo Gómez de Cervantes, whose chapel in the parish church of Omnium Sanctorum housed the famous green banner, paraded by the popular rebels of

\(^{514}\) Ortiz de Zúñiga, *Anales*, vol. 1, 188.
1521—and Alvar Negro. The latter’s name survived in the local nomenclature—the barrera de Alvaro Negro. The Cervantes clan on the other hand retained a prominent role in the *collación* down to the sixteenth century. In the late fifteenth century the parish churches were used as fortified towers in factional struggles resembling those of the medieval Italian communes, and which suggest a fragmented and contested urban space. These skirmishes between powerful families apparently resulted in the frequent burning of the parochial temples. The Catholic Kings, Isabel and Ferdinand, tried to impose some order on this fractious reality in the late fifteenth century by demarcating spheres of influence, placing each parish church under the protection of a designated patrician family. Omnium Sanctorum was awarded to the Cervantes, who seem to have retained their role as powerful local brokers and patrons. Indeed, it was from the chapel of Gonzalo Gómez de Cervantes inside the parish church that the popular rebels of 1521 seized the famous green banner, the *pendón verde*.

In the later fifteenth century, the primacy of the Cervantes family in the *collación* of Omnium Sanctorum was supplanted by a branch of the Guzmán clan, the lords and later Marquises of La Algaba, whose urban palace in the rear of the parish church seems to have been constructed quite literally on top of the old Cervantes residence. In 1440 they had acquired the lordship of La Algaba, near Seville, in exchange for that of Medina Sidonia, transferred to their powerful Guzmán relatives—who promptly converted it into a...
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515 The latter’s name was preserved in the local toponym, la Barrera de Alvar (or Álvaro) Negro. [...] And indeed the city: Cardinal D. Juan de Cervantes, of the same lineage, was a fifteenth-century Archbishop of Seville, and founder of the Hospital del Cardenal. Ibid., vol. 1, 174-8.
516 *Memorias eclesiásticas y seculares de la Muy Noble y muy leal Ciudad de Sevilla*, BCC, MS 59-1-3, f. 103-4.
dukedom. The second lord of La Algaba, don Luis de Guzmán, was a regidor of Seville, an office that became hereditary in 1478. Three years later he created a mayorazgo consisting of his rural towns and lands, as well as the urban palace-residence in Omnium Sanctorum. The title of Marquis was granted to one of his descendants in 1568 by Philip II, by which time the lords of La Algaba had settled into a life as members of the upper echelons of Seville’s urban aristocracy. In 1570, for instance, the newly minted Marquis of La Algaba was accused of having appropriated public funds and property, and was being protected by the asistente of Seville.

To what extent and how effectively did the Lords and later Marquises of la Algaba perform the role of patrons and brokers for the local community of the parish, or perhaps even the broader neighbourhood of la Feria? This is not an easy question to answer without more research. Only two of the nearly 1,000 individuals in the sample were natives of the town of la Algaba, making it likely that their presence in Omnium Sanctorum is directly linked to the first family of the parish. In terms of their Sevillian presence, all that is known about the Marquises de la Algaba in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is that they
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519 In April, 1481. The mayorazgo included La Algaba, Alaraz, El Vado de las Estacas, and the isle of Ardiles. In 1488 the donadio of Albatán was added. Miguel Ángel Ladero Quesada, Andalucía a fines de la Edad Media: estructuras, valores, sucesos (Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz, 1999), 113; Miguel Ángel Ladero Quesada, Andalucía en el siglo XV: Estudios de Historia política (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1973), Texto impreso, 11.

520 Residencia tomada por el licenciado Gonzalo Hernández de Morales, a don Francisco Hurtado de Mendoza, conde de Monteagudo, asistente que ha sido de la ciudad de Sevilla y lugares de su jurisdicción, a los señores doctores Liébana y Peralta, y el licenciado Egas del Aguila, alcaldes de la justicia; licenciado Arrola, executor de la vara, licenciado Lezcano, teniente de la tierra; al alguacil mayor y sus tenientes y a todos los demás alguaciles; a los alcaldes de la hermandad, a los escribanos, y al escribano del cabildo, a los veinticuatros, y jurados, a los fieles ejecutores, a los escribanos de los juzgados, civiles y militares, a los escribanos de la alhóndiga, alcaldes del río y puente; mayordomos, almotacenes de Sevilla y lugares de su jurisdicción, AGS, CR, leg. 278, no. 1, f. 2r-v. The charge, part of the residencia of the outgoing Asistente, the Count of Monteagudo, states that 10,000 ducados was given to the Marquis on behalf of the city to purchase certain property in Alcalá del Río, expected to yield an income from fishing rights, but that the Marquis had not turned over the lands to the council, and was enjoying the proceeds. Despite being urged by the cabildo to comply with the original agreement “many times” in more than eight months, he could not be compelled due to his “friendship” with the Asistente (el amistad que tenía).
were, like many of their noble peers, enthusiastic patrons of the arts. The third Lord of la Algaba, Rodrigo de Guzmán y Ponce de León, expanded his urban residence, which became a paragon of the typically Sevillian fusion of mudéjar and Renaissance styles. Notably, this transformation of space involved clearing and enlarging the Plaza de la Feria, and thus inadvertently enhancing its role as the focal point of neighbourhood sociability.\textsuperscript{521} The first Marquis, Francisco de Guzmán y Manrique, hosted literary \textit{tertulias} in his urban palace-residence, and retained the services of the poet, musician, and writer Vicente Espinel, who spent a wild year of his youth as the nobleman’s \textit{escudero}.\textsuperscript{522} Meanwhile, his son, the second Marquis, seems to have genuinely cared about the wellbeing of his vassals, judging by the daring letter he sent to Philip III in defence of the descendants of Moriscos in 1611, making him a rare exception among Andalusian nobles.\textsuperscript{523} It is perhaps noteworthy that many of the Granadan Moriscos resettled in Seville after 1568 lived in Omnium Sanctorum and the adjacent parishes, as well as in Triana, until their expulsion in 1610. As for their interactions with the other denizens of Omnium Sanctorum, the only evidence consists of the fleeting mentions in the extant accounts of the two Feria revolts.

In 1521, as the rebels led by the carpenter Antón Sánchez gathered in the plaza outside his residence, the lord of La Algaba seemingly tried to prevent things from getting out of hand. He barred entry to the chapel of Gonzalo Gómez de Cervantes, inside the parish church of Omnium Sanctorum, but the rebels broke in anyway and snatched the green banner. Seeing that they were upset, he then promised to intercede on their behalf,

\textsuperscript{521} Oliver and Pleguezuelo, \textit{El Palacio}.
\textsuperscript{522} Solís de los Santos, “El trasfondo humanista,” 85-6.
\textsuperscript{523} Michel Boeglin, “La expulsion de los moriscos de Andalucía y sus límites. El caso de Sevilla (1610-1613),” \textit{Cuadernos de Historia Moderna} 36 (2011): 104, 07. He was also rather fond of duelling. \textit{Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y muy leal ciudad de Sevilla}, BCC, MS 59-1-5, f. 198r-v, 228-9.
and made sure they were supplied with drink. When the asistente at the head of an armed host arrested five of “the most honourable men of the parish,” the Feria rebels once again confronted the lord of La Algaba demanding that he should keep his word. He promised to “perish or deliver” on his promise to have their grievances addressed, but at the same time dispatched his son to coordinate relief efforts with the asistente.

There are signs that in the aftermath of the 1652 revolt, which after all had its epicentre in their parish, the Marquises of la Algaba may have become more involved in the ritual and charitable activities, as part of a wider effort by the Sevillian patriciate to respond to the acute economic and social crisis. In the second half of the seventeenth century the situation in Seville for the majority of the working population rapidly worsened, and many more formerly middling to prosperous artisans were sucked into poverty and misery. As Amanda Wunder has argued recently, faced with the municipal authorities’ repeated failure to find practical solutions to unemployment and poverty (medios humanos), the Sevillian elites increasingly turned to public piety and private charity mediated by lay religious brotherhoods as a solution to the city’s growing problems. In this turn to salvific rituals and ideals, 1662 was a signal year. In January of that year, news reached the city of the papal proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, already deeply cherished in Seville, which was celebrated with a series of both general festivities—said to have been worthy of the Corpus in their splendour and solemnity—and separate parish celebrations.

524 “como bió el señor del Algaba que iban tan enojados, los lla-mó y los llebó a su casa y les tomó el pendón y les prometió hazer por ellos lo posible y que nadie los enojarla y les mandó dar de beber.” Durán Ramas, “Discurso,” 192.
525 Ibid., 193-4.
526 Wunder, Baroque Seville.
527 “Lunes 16 de Enero de 1662 llegó á esta Ciudad y al Cabildo de la Santa Iglesia la noticia de la expedición del Breve Pontificio … en favor de la Concepción Inmaculada de la Reyna de los Angeles , de cuya alegria hizo luego pública muestra con tres repiques solemnes, disponiéndose fiesta de acción de gracias , que se comenzó
Indeed, the ensuing festivities were a markedly parish affair, as nobles—inspired by the construction of the new parish church of the Sagrario—turned to the renovation of their own parish churches, and elaborate festivities designed to foster neighbourhood pride.\

Wunder discusses what was perhaps the most spectacular of these parish displays of public devotion, or in any case the best documented. We do not know the details of similar efforts in Omnium Sanctorum, but the surviving records of the parish confraternity of the Holy Sacrament offers some tantalizing clues. In 1662 there was a noticeable spike in membership. One of the new members inscribed in 1662 was Pedro Luis de Guzmán, the Fifth Marquis of la Algaba, in what is the only known instance of the first citizen of the parish becoming directly involved in its ritual life. Moreover, major renovations to the family’s urban residence in the seventeenth century involved the construction of a tribuna (hanging passageway) that linked the palace with the parish church. Did this signify that the Marquis and his family left the private chapel in their palace to worship in the parish church, albeit maintaining a sense of privacy and separation from the other parishioners? Finally, the Marquis was also one of the highest-ranking members of the confraternity of the Santa Caridad, founded by Miguel Mañara and the foremost instance of noble charity in

Lunes 6 de Febrero, y se continuó los dos días siguientes con toda la solemnidad que se acostumbra en la del Corpus, asistiendo el Cabildo Secular todos tres días, íntimamente las fueron haciendo todos los mas templos Parroquiales y de Religiosos con grandeza mucha, que duraron casi todo el periodo de este año ...”

Ortiz de Zúñiga, Anales, vol. 5, 146.

528 Wunder, Baroque Seville, 50-76.

529 Libro de entrada y de averiguaciones 1626-1665, AHTS, lib. ent. XVII-1, f. 328; Libro de entrada y de averiguaciones 1663-1696, AHTS, lib. ent. XVII-2, f. 130. Nobles were not usually formally enrolled members of their parish confraternities, but they invariably offered themselves as patrons and protectors. López-Guadalupe Muñoz, “Cofradías y sociedad,” 190-1; Rio Barredo, “Eucaristía y vecindad,” 145-6. This was a question of spiritual benefits as well as the display of status and authority of the noble benefactor, but also propping up local corporations. Inmaculada Arias de Saavedra Alias and Miguel Luis López-Guadalupe Muñoz, “La prelación como conflicto: cofradías y orden en el Antiguo Régimen,” in La vida cotidiana en el mundo hispánico (siglos XVI-XVIII), ed. Manuel Peña (Madrid: Abada Editores, 2012), 138.


531 The example for this might have been provided by Mateo Vázquez de Leca, see Wunder, Baroque Seville.
seventeenth-century—not a parish institution, and one whose membership was sought for the social prestige it conferred, but nevertheless a sign that as well as reaching out to his neighbours, the Marquis of la Algaba also partook of the new ideal of nobility committed primarily to social welfare of the poor.\textsuperscript{532}

This was one vision of neighbourhood, one structured around clan identity and social relations based on patronage. By the mid- and later seventeenth century it had lost something of the martial flavour of the late medieval fortified urban enclaves, such as the one presided over by the Gómez de Cervantes. Yet the nobility continued to stake claim to their neighbourhoods mainly through various rituals that sacralized the space of the parish while linking it with the family. In Granada this revolved around burial vaults.\textsuperscript{533} In Seville, the renovation of the parish church of Santa María la Blanca was a spectacular assertion of the “collective honor of the noble neighbors” who paid for the work. But it was also arguably a reassertion of the parish as the primary locus of community. As Wunder observes, “[t]he procession with the Virgin of the Snows [in celebration of the re-opening of the parish church] marked the ancient neighborhood of Santa María la Blanca as a special, sacred place.”\textsuperscript{534} It “differed markedly from the massive celebration of the Immaculate Conception that had taken place fifty years earlier […] whereas the festival of 1615 had brought all Seville together, the one that took place in August 1665 set the elite neighbors of Santa María la Blanca apart. The outdoor festival decorations showcased the residents’ wealth and designated the blocks around the church as a special zone of Immaculist devotion. The route of the procession on the final day of the festival drew a border around

\textsuperscript{532} Ibid., 102.
\textsuperscript{533} Casey, \textit{Family and Community}.
\textsuperscript{534} Wunder, \textit{Baroque Seville}, 69.
this privileged space within the ‘City of the Most Holy Virgin’ …” One might add that the building projects and public festivities seem to have had the ideological purpose of legitimizing conspicuous consumption and ostentatious public display by the nobility as acts redounding to collective salvation and the common good, and, in a time of heightened social tension, sacralizing social and economic inequalities—emphasizing private wealth as a reward for piety. To what extent did the Marquises of La Algaba partake in this exaltation of neighbourhood as sacred space, and of its noble neighbours’ social authority through displays of public piety and religious patronage is not fully clear, but the clues are there.

4.4.2. Lords of the Seven Parishes

Among the plethora of micro-communities in early modern Seville, jostling with one another, overlapping to a greater or lesser extent, enacted through more or less regular ritual and action, or cohering only under certain circumstances, and often—but not always—successfully integrated into a wider urban identity, neighbourhoods were as important as they are elusive and understudied. Neighbourhoods understood not simply as territorial subdivisions (parishes, or collaciones), but communities based on networks of social and professional ties, continuously remade through interaction in common public spaces. Indeed, not all parishes possessed all the ingredients of such communities based on dense horizontal ties and frequent interaction, and not all neighbourhood communities respected parish boundaries (while still retaining a distinct spatial dimension). Various factors contributed to a greater or lesser sense of separate community. The case of the
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535 Ibid., 69–70.
536 Arnaud, “Mapping Urban Communities.”
extramural parish of Triana, separated from the walled city by the Guadalquivir river, the abode of mariners and agricultural workers, and often prone to asserting its identity as something more than a suburb, is perhaps the most obvious. However the north-western parishes of Omnium Sanctorum, San Gil and their immediately adjacent collaciones, also developed a degree of self-sufficiency imposed by their distance from the centre, while the socio-professional homogeneity of their inhabitants became more defined over time.

The parish of San Marcos in the mid-1600s was the quasi-autonomous fiefdom of a smuggling syndicate led by Francisco de León and Francisco Bueno. These two brazen contrabandists had allegedly turned their parish into a haven for runners and criminals who operated from this base “with insolence” and impunity. They imported contraband goods “from Portugal, France and other enemy Provinces,” and officers of justice and magistrates who deigned to enter their neighbourhood stronghold were invariably prevented from doing so by gangs of men wielding “prohibited firearms.”

According to a 1654 case against Francisco de León brought by the asistente of Seville, the two “caudillos” of this criminal network (Bueno and de León) were not only never punished for their many and repeated subversions of the law, but had even been rewarded with official posts as captains of the urban militia in the wake of the 1652 revolt. A contemporary manuscript chronicle confirmed as much, explaining that “the men of that place (San Marcos) are nearly all smugglers (metedores), and very bold,” while Francisco de León and Francisco Bueno were “the heads and caudillos of that parish […] the most famous smugglers in the city, who have

537 El conde de Villaumbrosa y Castronovo contra Francisco de León sobre alboroto por introducir vino sin derechos, fraude y otras cosas, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25712, exp. 9.
538 Indeed, two years previously they are lauded in the chronicles as two “good citizens” who rallied to the defence of the republic against the rebels. This service rendered was obviously a cynical ploy to ensure that the authorities continued to indulge their transgressions.
usurped his Majesty on infinite occasions, which has made them so powerful.” The two Franciscos sealed their partnership by becoming godfathers to one another’s bastard children (neither one was married), occasions for the display of their wealth and power as well as their mutual bond, with one of them allegedly spending “three thousand pesos” on a baptism. Although the case is obviously exceptional, the elements are less so: a neighbourhood bound by a common enterprise (albeit illicit), personal bonds strengthened by marks of extended kinship, and in this case ties of patronage and obligation at the centre of which were not patricians but two self-made profiteers.

San Marcos was not the only parish that, at least in the imagination of contemporaries, enjoyed a reputation for possessing a character that was *sui generis*. The account of the 1652 revolt cited above opens with the author’s assurance that an understanding of “nature (calidad) of the vecinos of la Feria and their neighbourhood (‘su sitio’) [was required] for better and clearer comprehension of this narrative.”

This community of La Feria was both smaller and larger than the parish of Omnium Sanctorum. In the first place, its web of horizontal ties excluded not only the resident nobles, but also much of the parish elite, including the wealthier merchants and artisans, meaning that the Feria community that cohered during those three days in May 1652 was not reducible to the population of the parish as an undifferentiated whole. Two years following the popular revolt, the inveterate smuggled Francisco de León was on trial for

---

539 “la gente de aquel sitio … son todos casi metedores, y gente de mucho aliento […] franc.co de Leon y francisco Bueno como cabeças y caudillos de los de aquella Parroquia […] siendo los mas famosos metedores de la Ciudad, y que tienen vsurpado a su Magestad vn fin de cuentos, con que están tan poderosos …” *Tumultos*, BNM, MS 2383, ff. 149v-50r.

540 “haziendose el vno al otro compadres de sus hijos (sin estar casados) gastó el vno en el Baptismo tres mil pesos …” ibid., f. 150r.

541 Ibid., f. 147r.
having resumed his profitable vocation. His defence was focused on services rendered to the city and the king during the popular uprising of 1652, and various individuals who were supporters or clients of Francisco—and had been close to the action—were called upon to testify on his behalf. Among them were two clerics and a silk merchant, parishioners of Omnium Sanctorum who had cheered on the rebels’ defeat and must have felt like prisoners in their own neighbourhood during the three days when the latter held sway over it. The silk merchant, Martín de Urizar, had a shop in the silk exchange, the Alcaicería, next to the Cathedral, so that he not only belonged to a different socio-economic stratum than the rebels, many of whom were silk weavers, but his links with the neighbourhood may have been more tenuous as well.

Beginning roughly in the late sixteenth century and above all in the seventeenth, scholars of Mediterranean cities have remarked on the growing social distancing between a consolidating urban oligarchy of wealthy bourgeois and noblemen, on the one hand, and the rest of the urban population, the plebe, on the other. While much of the focus has been on the social and cultural strategies employed by the elites in this process, and the concept of social disciplining that was sustained by both religious and political imperatives, a more recent tendency has been to restore a measure of agency to those below. While many urban

---

542 El fiscal contra el capitán Francisco de León preso en Sevilla sobre ciertos delitos, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25608, exp. 3. The two clerics were Gregorio Ramírez and Juan Manuel de Dueñas. A manuscript chronicle that may have been written in the immediate aftermath of the revolt suggested that the authorities, grateful for his help in suppressing the revolt, had been prepared to turn a blind eye to Francisco de León’s criminal past if he refrained from “defrauding the king’s purse” in the future. However not long after the ferianos had been vanquished, news came of the arrival of the Indies fleet and its cargos of merchandise and silver, which proved too irresistible to Francisco -- and he deemed it worth the risk in spite of having been made Captain by the municipal authorities. Tumultos, BNM, MS 2383, f. 155v.

543 Neighbourhood in the sense of a social network, such as explored below. For a study of the relationship between the location of workplace and residence and active neighbourhood communities, see Arnaud, “Mapping Urban Communities.”. Martín de Urizar also appears as a witness in the 1653 marriage dispensation of Cristóbal Sánchez Valderrama and Antonia Engraciabueno, the former being an obviously well-to-do resident of the central parish of San Salvador. AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2460, exp. 127. The other witness was Pedro Pérez de Urizar, who possessed what appear to have been extensive landholdings in the town of Cazalla, some of which he rented from Seville cathedral. AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 542, f. 223r-v.
neighbourhoods remained mixed, by the seventeenth century the greater strain placed on
the cohesion of these microcommunities did not only result in more control from above,
but also led to development of new solidarities among those below. This parallel
neighbourhood based on more strictly popular forms of sociability often manifested itself in
distinct ritual forms, such as the artisan brigades (*potenze*) of Florence, or the propensity for
direct collective action shown by the poorer, politically disenfranchised residents of the
Ribera neighbourhood in Barcelona.544 But as David Rosenthal has pointed out in his recent
study, these extraordinary forms of festive or political mobilization were inextricably linked
to everyday forms of sociability, and webs of “weak” but proliferating personal ties
between neighbours.

By partially reconstructing this complex network of ties that bound the humbler
residents of Omnium Sanctorum to each other, and to the residents of some of the adjacent
parishes, it may even be possible to measure the extent of that evanescent neighbourhood.
This can be pieced together by overlaying various types of notarial records, in this case
mainly marriage dispensations (*expedientes matrimoniales*) and notarial documents
involving apprenticeship, property rental and transfer, debts, contracts, and payments. For
the purpose of tracing, however imperfectly, the boundaries of the informal neighbourhood
of la Feria, this study has relied on a foundation of all the extant matrimonial dispensations
from the parish of Omnium Sanctorum for the years 1649-1655, or the seven years after the
great plague of 1649. These dispensations are in lieu of the parish marriage records, which
have been lost, but they offer the advantage of providing not only the names of the bride
and groom and their witnesses, but also the latter’s place of residence, profession, and brief

544 Rosenthal, *Kings of the Street*; Amelang, “People of the Ribera.”
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account of the nature and length of their acquaintance with one or both of the marriage partners. These were often formulaic and brief, but sometimes provided more idiosyncratic detail, and make it possible to get a more qualitative sense of relationships and movements of the concerned individuals. This evidence, which is based on 188 expedientes, yielding information about 937 individuals, is complemented by various types of notarial documents.

The Ties that Bind

Future neighbours often migrated to Seville together, and companionship forged in places of origin far and wide, or on the road were maintained upon arrival. Thus two young Frenchmen from Lyons, Llorente Bartolo and Pedro de Peral, “always stuck together” since leaving home as boys, spending three years in Madrid, and finally settling in Seville, in the same corral de vecinos.

Lyons was renowned for its silk industry, and it is striking that

545 There were at least two witnesses, if the couple had mutual friends, but usually four, and as many as six or eight in cases where the authorities had some doubt.
546 Llorente (19) was a witness for Pedro (23) when he sought permission to marry the widow Magdalena Francisca (36) on April 2, 1601. Both were residents of the corral de Inés Pérez, in Calle San Benito, parish of Omnium Sanctorum. AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2323. Others resumed former relations less willingly. Antonio Díaz Calderón, a native of Santa Marta de Ortigueira in Galicia, left his hometown for Seville in order to escape the obligation to marry Catalina Bazán, whom he had impregnated when they served together in a wealthy household (“gozo mi virginidad, dejandome preñada …”). She followed him from their northern home to the great Andalusian metropolis, “more than two hundred leagues” away, and no doubt with the help of some fellow Galicians from Ortigueira, like Antonio himself residing in the parish of Omnium Sanctorum, she had him restrained until he agreed to marry her. The marriage license was duly issued on June 7, 1655. His witnesses were a student from Santa Catalina parish, and an agricultural worker living on Calle Feria, in Omnium Sanctorum. She had only been in the city for two weeks by that point, and her witnesses were a couple who also said they were recent arrivals from her Galician hometown of Ortigueira: Antonio Gómez, a tailor, and Catalina Diaz, both staying in Omnium Sanctorum. AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2504. Interestingly, Catalina and Antonio had married in 1650, five years previously, in Seville, when they both claimed to have resided in Omnium Sanctorum for several years (four and ten respectively). Yet in 1655 they had apparently arrived with Catalina Bazán only fifteen days previously, “to live in this city and the parish of Omnium Sanctorum.” It seems that there was plenty of movement back and forth between their Galician home and Seville, likely depending on economic opportunities and circumstances, but they could obviously rely on a community of family and friends in both places. Antonio Díaz Calderón, Catalina’s runaway groom, claimed to
migrants who ended up in the parish of Omnium Sanctorum and the wider Feria
neighbourhood invariably came from places in Spain and beyond that were also centres of
silk production: Granada, Priego, Genoa, and Puebla, in New Spain. Juan de Pineda, a
native of Puebla, had migrated to Seville in the 1640s with two friends, the tailor Juan de
Vega and the silk weaver Antonio del Castillo. The latter had gone straight to Seville eleven
years previously, and in 1651 was living in the silk workers’ parish of San Lorenzo, while
Pineda and Vega arrived four years later via Granada. They had settled in the upscale
Cathedral parish, but Juan de Pineda’s prospective bride was from the silk community of
Omnium Sanctorum.\(^{547}\) Another pair of silk weavers, Luis Antonio and Pedro de Arenas,
had arrived together from Priego four or five years before Luis appeared as a witness in
Pedro’s marriage dispensation, and were followed a year later by a third companion, Alonso
García. Pedro and Alonso were parishioners of Omnium Sanctorum in 1654, while Luis
Antonio lived in the adjacent parish of San Lorenzo.\(^{548}\) Also arriving together in the 1640s
were three Genoese migrants, among them a silk dyer and a carpenter—another profession
that was associated with the Feria.\(^{549}\) To be sure, sometimes migrants were drawn to the
Feria neighbourhood by the presence of relatives, such as the widow Ana Sánchez, who had
come “with her home (belongings) and clothes” (“con su casa y ropa”) to her brother’s

---

547 Her witnesses were Sebastián de Valdés, a silk weaver from Omnium Sanctorum, and his wife Ana de
Montalvo. AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 1930, exp. 88.
548 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 1516. Pedro de Arenas was on his deathbed when Juana García
applied for the marriage dispensation. He had “twenty-three wounds” on his “body and face (barba)” and
extreme unction had been administered to him by the priests at the hospital of San Hermenegildo. Juana pleaded
to be allowed to marry him before he died to preserve her honour before it was too late, for she had a two-and-
a-half-year-old son by him: “yo quedare desfamada y desonrada por tener como tengo vn hijo de el suso dicho
de edad de dos años y medio ...”
549 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2340.
home, “with the desire to stay in this city, in this parish of Omnium Sanctorum.”550 Their places of origin, occupations, the social and professional bonds they formed, and the neighbourhoods of Seville where most of them settled suggest that the social networks that bound the neighbourhood of La Feria together were renewed through the integration of immigrants who already had some connection with the parish of Omnium Sanctorum.

Yet early modern urban neighbourhoods were not simply villages transported to the city, but the product of a web of relations forged in the urban environment itself, and new solidarities. The inevitable propinquity of crowded neighbourhoods was but one factor, beginning with the house and the street where many neighbours first became acquainted with one another. Many of the witnesses in the expedientes attested that they had known the bride, the groom, or both “since birth” (“desde que nació”), and while these were often family members, sometimes they were not.551 In any case new bonds were forged thereafter, and many witnesses who were no relations recalled knowing the contrayente(s) since childhood, either because they were a friend of the family, a work colleague, or peers of the bride or groom who had grown up together.552 This first acquaintance in turn often morphed into lasting friendship. Mariana de los Reyes (36) of San Lorenzo parish could testify that Marina Martín of Omnium Sanctorum had never been married due to “the particular friendship which she has had and continues to have with her.”553 Even more frequent was language suggesting frequent daily communication and a degree of intimacy.

550 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2332.
551 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2139, exp. 65.
552 “que lo empeço a conosser era muchacho de ocho v nueve años poco mas o menos ” [ella] “desde que era muchacha de hasta quatro años …” AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 333, exp. 4.
553 “lo supiera por la notiçia y particular amistad que con la suso dicha a tenido y tiene…” AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 317-B. The expression was not so common as to obviously fall into the category of bureaucratic formula, but it was used by a few others, for instance the fisherman Francisco Talavera (32) who said
Work was of course an important place of sociability and bonding. Juan Martín (24) was a shipwright whose two witnesses in 1597 were Juan de Barrio (22) and Juan de Herrera (22), both of whom said they had known him since all three served as apprentices in the workshop of master shipwright Miguel Beltrán, in Triana. The agricultural worker Pedro de la Mora (30, O.S.) was in a position to testify on behalf of Pedro Sánchez (40, O.S.) because they “communed frequently in the fields where they worked together …” As in life, so in death the neighbours of La Feria showed signs of the ties that bound them to one another. Francisca Ruíz (30) could confirm that Dominga Sánchez was indeed a widow, and free to marry Mateo Piñero in 1601 because she (Francisca) had gone to the Hospital del Sangre to “take some marzipan” to Amador González, her friend’s husband, and was told there that he had died. Anton González (34) meanwhile had carried the late wife of Alonso García (44)—a plague victim—to her funeral “on his shoulders.” When the blind man Juan Bravo (25) petitioned to marry María Lorenza in May 1651, his witnesses Juan García (56) and Diego de Cobos (38) were also blind. However, while they could not claim to have seen his widow Manuela die from the plague, Diego explained that he was “by her side when she expired, and he felt her with his hands and knew that she was dead, and the following day he accompanied [Juan Bravo] to the Hospital de la Sangre where [the latter] paid the cost of the funeral and the mass that was said [for the deceased].”

---

he was a “particular amigo” of Adrian Martín, born in Flanders. Both were parishioners of Omnium Sanctorum. AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2391.
554 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 272.
555 “le a tratado y comunicado por que an travauid juntos en el campo…” AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2323.
556 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 317-B.
557 “la lleuo a enterrar en sus honbros a el sagrario desta s.ta yg.ª…” AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2512.
558 “no la bido muerta pero se hallo a su muerte de la suso dicha quando espiro y estaua junto a ella i la tento con sus manos i supo como abia muerto i que el dia siguiente de su muerte fue con el contraiente al dicho ospital de
Part of this dense web of relations, in some cases having moved to the city not long before they show up in the records, are some of the proscribed rebels of 1652. Andrés Sedillo and his brother Pedro were both silk weavers and parishioners of Omnium Sanctorum in 1652. We know that in 1650 twenty-two year-old Pedro was issued a dispensation to marry a widow almost twice his age, doña Gerónima de Bañales (38). Despite his youth, Pedro himself was already a widower, having been married to Magdalena Cortés in Granada’s San Ildefonso parish. They had moved to Seville together, before she likely fell victim to the plague of 1649, and was buried in the church of Omnium Sanctorum. Interestingly, Pedro Sedillo and his first wife had settled in the city three years previously, which would mean that they had left Granada in 1647, the year of the popular revolt there -- lending some credence to the claims made in 1652 that the Sevillian uprising was led by exiled silk workers from the former Nasrid capital. Although some widows took over their husband’s workshop following his death, it is quite possible that his marriage to Gerónima was a typical marriage of convenience that would give a young artisan a workshop of his own, while ensuring that the widow’s ownership of the business (and the income) would be placed on a less precarious footing. Thus, although resident in Seville for only three years, he already had at least two significant ties to the city and the neighbourhood: his first wife had been a victim of the devastating plague epidemic and was buried next to the parish church, and had not only remarried but quite possibly acquired a workshop.

---

la sangre donde murio la suso dicha i supo como el contraiente pago los derechos del entiero i misa que se le dixo.” AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 1930, exp. 87.

559 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 1952, exp. 60.
Pedro and Gerónima’s witnesses were two silk weavers, Francisco Vázquez (22), possibly a relative of Gerónima’s first husband, and Andrés Sedillo (34), Pedro’s older brother and another leading rebel of 1652. There were clearly many remarriages in that first post-plague year, and Andrés also appeared as a witness for Antonio Ríbero and Antonia López, alongside another silk weaver, Juan Rodríguez. Andrés Sedillo crops up in the archival record again two years later, on the eve of the 1652 revolt. On April 9, 1652, just over a month before he played a prominent role in the Feria uprising, Andrés took on as an apprentice a nine-year-old girl, Juana de Herrera. The stipulated term of the apprenticeship was 12 years in her case, during which she wished to learn the trade of silk weaving, which master Andrés Sedillo was obliged to impart “without holding anything back,” providing lodging, sustenance and clothing. It’s unclear whether Andrés had any other apprentices, or children of his own, but quite possibly it was due to his expanding household and workshop that he signed a 3-year lease for the rental of a house on Calle Tocinos, in Omnium Sanctorum, for 44 reales per month (he had previously lived nearby, in Calle Ciegos, in the same parish). The Sedillo brothers, Andrés and Pedro, were natives of Granada, and may have been involved in the uprising there. However by 1652 they were both established as master weavers in Seville, still recovering from the devastating 1649 plague. The northern parishes were a natural choice for these recent migrants arrived to take advantage of the labour shortage. House rents here were cheaper, and there was a network of acquaintances, relatives and professional contacts to call upon, judging by the number of social functions the two brothers performed. Thus, contrary to the image projected by the

560 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 382.
561 AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 550, f. 913r.-v.
562 AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 551, f. 142r.-v. This at a time when an average artisan’s daily income may have been around 6 reales: Domínguez Ortiz, Alteraciones andaluzas, 79.
authorities, these were not transient forasteros, but men who had put down deep roots fairly quickly following their arrival.

The gilder Juan Cortés, another rebel, rented his house in Cruz Verde for 30 reales a month from Antonio Montero, a carpenter.\textsuperscript{563} It was six month contract, but his previous residence was also in the parish, in Calle Bancaleros. Cortés in turn, along with Simón de Rueda, a weaver living on the same street, was a witness for Diego Ruíz and Francisca de Madrid.\textsuperscript{564}

The population density in Omnium Sanctorum has already been remarked upon. One typically Sevillian or Andalusian form of communal residence, more common in certain neighbourhoods where they abounded undoubtedly contributed to the population density and propinquity, were the corrales de vecinos, a form of self-contained communal housing that may have been another holdover from medieval Islamic urbanism.\textsuperscript{565} The corrales were still a vital part of the urban workers’ neighbourhoods in the late nineteenth century, and were if anything even more ubiquitous in the early modern period.\textsuperscript{566} The basic structure of these humble residences resembled the stately palace of the Marquises de la Algaba, likewise centred on a rectangular patio, with a fountain or a well in the middle, and surrounded on all sides by corridors with doors to the separate residences.\textsuperscript{567} That is where the similarities ended however. The artisan dormitory was at the other end of the spectrum and the doors that lined the corrales gave into tiny one-room salas, with cooking, washing,
and socializing over food and wine taking place in the communal patio or the corridors. There were 71 of these communal residences in 1571, and some were large enough to hold more than a hundred families.\textsuperscript{568} In a crowded urban environment such as that of seventeenth-century Seville, the nature of these residences only heightened the intimacy between neighbours, and the inescapable extreme familiarity no doubt bred a sense of community and contempt in more or less equal measure.\textsuperscript{569} The extent to which these self-contained residential enclaves, in which dozens of socially homogenous family units lived under circumstances that necessitated daily cooperation and close intercourse in a variety of senses, contributed to the formation of a sense of neighbourhood community requires further study.\textsuperscript{570} This becomes an even more pressing question given that in Seville a greater proportion of residents of certain neighbourhoods lived in corrales or similar shared housing arrangements, such as Triana and the northern parishes around la Feria. Some of the individuals in the expedientes matrimoniales gave as their place residence the name of a particular corral, such as the Corral de Montes Doca, in the Calle de Linos, parish of Omnium Sanctorum (the abode of the agricultural worker Sebastián Rodríguez and his wife Catalina García), but many others likely also occupied these and other similar premises.\textsuperscript{571}

\textsuperscript{568} Pablo E. Pérez-Mallaina, Spain’s Men of the Sea: Daily Life on the Indies Fleets in the Sixteenth Century, trans. Carla Rahn Phillips (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 16. According to Juan Ignacio Carmona, around 1,000 families lived in corrales de vecinos (also known as casas de vecindad), or casas hornos in 1561, including a large segment of the Morisco population, Juan Ignacio Carmona, Mercado inmobiliario, población, realidad social (Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2015), 51.


\textsuperscript{570} In the Spanish colonial context, Alejandra Osorio has identified callejones de cuartos—“mixed housing arrangements” that may be seen as an equivalent of the Sevillian corrales de vecinos—as the loci of urban transculturation, where “physical proximity allowed for a permanent exchange of practices, ideas and behaviours that yielded hybrid urban cultures, albeit with some very Andean features,” Alejandra Osorio, “El callejón de la soledad: Vectors of Cultural Hybridity in Seventeenth-Century Lima,” in Spiritual Encounters: Interactions between Christianity and Native Religions in Colonial America, ed. Nicholas Griffiths and Fernando Cervantes (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 200.

\textsuperscript{571} AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 1516, exp. 167. The shoemaker Manuel Gómez lived in the Corral del Conde, in the parish of Santiago el Viejo. AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 209, exp. 139.
Of the 933 individuals in the sample, 58 resided in the Calle de Linos, a fairly short stretch of what is today Calle Feria, between the parish church and the city wall—which makes it likely that they either lived in the same or another corral, or similarly cramped quarters.\textsuperscript{572}

In the earlier sample (1597-1605), in which the witnesses were generally more forthcoming with specific details and the process was obviously less bureaucratized, 16 of 397 individuals specified a corral, as well as their street and parish. Of the nine corrales de vecinos mentioned, three were in Omnium Sanctorum: the Corral Nuevo (also in Calle Linos), Corral de Inés Pérez (Calle San Bénito), and the Corral de Gallinas (which the silk weaver Diego Hernández described as being “junto a los basílicos,” or next to the Basilian monastery).\textsuperscript{573}

In the wake of the 1652 revolt, the authorities argued that the problem had been the influx of outsiders (forasteros) from Granada and other Spanish cities, as well as foreigners, who had stirred up the discontent. However, the archival evidence suggests that Omnium Sanctorum was if anything more homogenous than most parishes, and was becoming even more so by the mid-1600s. Based on the analysis of marriage licenses, its residents were more likely than half a century before to be born in the city (and the parish), and they were less likely to marry outsiders and relative newcomers. Even in the earlier part of the century, Omnium Sanctorum was less ethnically and socially diverse than the parish of La Magdalena, located in the geographic centre of the city, and considered to be as a sort of

\textsuperscript{572} María Manuela, and Andrea, the wife of bricklayer Diego Pérez, both residing on Calle de Linos in 1651, made a point of emphasizing that they lived “in her own home, alone” (“en su casa sola”) and “in her own home” (“en su casa”), respectively—a rare and seemingly voluntary clarification suggesting that not sharing a residence was a relative luxury on this street. AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 2391.

\textsuperscript{573} The other corrales were Corral de los Negros, in the Pajería, and which was still in existence in Montoto’s time, Corral de Luis Rosel?, near the Puerta de Jérez, and Corral de Barajona, all three in the Cathedral parish; Corral Nuevo in San Nicolás; Corral de Tamaris in San Julián; and the aforementioned Corral del Conde in Santiago el Viejo. AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 272, exp. 12, 13; leg. 317-B, exp. 50; leg. 399, exp. 48; leg. 1318, exp. 60; leg.1731, exp. 24, 32; leg. 2323, exp. 57.
median for the city as a whole. In fact, in the earlier sample (1597-1605) used here for Omnium Sanctorum, there is a clear discrepancy between the parishioners of Omnium Sanctorum and their marriage partners and witnesses from other parishes. While the vast majority (17 of 19) of the latter were born outside Seville around the turn of the century, against 62% of residents of Omnium Sanctorum (39 of 62)—close to the percentage observed for that segment of the (much larger) sample in midcentury.

Yet all of the above—the parish, the aristocratic enclave, the popular neighbourhood—were characteristic of most of Seville’s collaciones, varying only according to the relative proportion of the well heeled to the workers and artisans. These overlapping and sometimes competing sets of ties and relationships help account for the solidarities and understanding of community that allowed the rebels to mobilize, but they do not explain the uniqueness of the Feria. Its key distinguishing feature, the space produced by these relations and which in turn helped to cohere these, was the Plaza de la Feria as a space of sociability.

4.4.3. Plaza de la Feria as a “junction of community”

Urban districts are constituted by the networks of relationships and the life within rather than boundaries, networks that are knit together by spaces or buildings whose functional or symbolic meaning (or both) is comprehensible to those who constitute this local community—indeed, the boundaries of the district may be imagined to exist precisely

---

574 Joaquín González Moreno, *Quince años de enlaces matrimoniales en la Parroquia de la Magdalena de Sevilla (1607-1622)* (Fabiola de Publicaciones Hispalenses, 2002).
575 See Appendix.
where the magnetic force of particular spaces and buildings begins to wane, and that of other urban spatial configurations grows stronger. That the Feria district was fairly extensive, subsuming several *collaciones*, and to the extent that it was both cohesive and at times capable of collective action, was in no small part due to the integrative role of its central public space, the Plaza de la Feria, and its market, which spilled onto the “calle ancha”, or wide street of la Feria, and well as surrounding streets.

According to chronicler Luis de Peraza, sixteenth-century Seville boasted more than eighty large and small plazas.\textsuperscript{576} Each of Seville’s 29 parish churches had at least one and usually two adjoining public spaces, a small *plaza chica*, used for burials, and a larger *plaza grande*.\textsuperscript{577} However the Plaza de la Feria, next to the parish church of Omnium Sanctorum, stood out for its important function as a secondary marketplace, serving not just its own parish, but the whole northern sector of the city. Its Thursday market, sometimes referred to as the “feria de la ropa”, which in the sixteenth century extended from the Plaza de la Feria to the Plaza del Caño Quebrado, attracted all types of vendors, some with stores, others, individuals who had something to sell, and would do so in the middle of the street (much like today).\textsuperscript{578}

The Plaza de la Feria was a fairly irregular clearing between the parish church of Omnium Sanctorum, the palace-residence of the Marquises of La Algaba, and residential housing, bounded on its southern side by “calle ancha” or the “wide” street of La Feria, and on its eastern side by Calle Arrayán (the meeting-place of the Mesta cabildo in the fifteenth century). It was probably not a spacious plaza: Seville had few of those, even in the

\textsuperscript{576} Peraza, *Historia de Sevilla*.
\textsuperscript{577} Albardonedo Freire, *El urbanismo de Sevilla*, 190.
\textsuperscript{578} Ibid., 68.
seventeenth century, thanks to the Islamic street-plan that was only gradually and partially transformed. Moreover it was further crowded by the stalls of food vendors, at least some of which were a permanent fixture of the Plaza, many of them abutting the church or the surrounding houses. Lucía Muñoz, the wife of Alonso Ruiz, a fruit vendor, gave her address in 1597 as “debajo de los portales de la Feria” (“under the Feria arcade”), while two witnesses in 1649 gave their occupation as “tratante en la Feria”.579

Apart from the Thursday market, which still takes place of the stretch of Calle de la Feria close to the square, the plaza itself was a permanent market, autonomous from the city’s main marketplaces closer to the Cathedral and the central parishes, and was the economic hub of precisely those adjacent neighbourhoods whose inhabitants are found colluding in the popular uprisings. The seventeenth-century chronicler Ortiz de Zúñiga refers to a thirteenth-century concession by Alfonso X of two “ferias francas”, both of which had long disappeared in his time, albeit there was a market every Thursday, “que vulgarmente llaman feria,” in certain streets of the parish of Omnium Sanctorum, in the same place where the old fairs used to be.580

There were first of all vendors’ stalls selling food and other essential items abutting the parish church, crucially not only a place of commercial exchange but sociability, attested by the fact that the authorities strongly suspected that the rebels had conspired using the cover of the market stalls, which normally attracted large numbers of people, and were ordered to be pulled down in 1652 as a result. We know the bread vendors were there, because they became the first target of popular fury that year, and there are references in

579 AGAS, Vicaría, Matrimonios Ordinarios, leg. 272 and 1177.
580 Ortiz de Zúñiga, Anales, vol. 1, 208.
other documents to wine and cloth merchants. One measure of the importance of the Feria market is the distribution of bread in times of plague: on 17 April, 1581, a total of 400 fanegas of bread were distributed, of which 300 fanegas was sent to the 29 parishes, 60 fanegas to the Plaza de San Salvador (the city’s main marketplace), 30 fanegas to Plaza de la Feria (presumably in addition to its portion of the total earmarked for the individual parishes), and 10 fanegas to the Plaza de Santa Catalina.\(^{581}\)

The residents themselves articulated the economic importance of the Feria market to the local community. On October 30, 1652, some five months following the revolt, Juan de Carmona Tamariz, alguacil (constable) of the Royal Audiencia for Omnium Sanctorum, petitioned the city council to permit the sale of cod and salted fish in the Plaza de la Feria—the makeshift stalls that had previously been a feature of the square had been ordered dismantled in the wake of the May uprising. The constable Tamariz, in his own name (he was a resident of the parish) and that of his neighbours, argued that as the collación was too distant from the principal market places of Seville, the vecinos were deprived of fish on Fridays, and other “días de pescado”. Tamariz and the vecinos of Omnium Sanctorum requested a licence for a salted fish stall to be set up again in the Feria, which should be placed in charge of a married man “of good life and habits” (this provision, given the recent events, was no doubt meant to reassure the city council).\(^{582}\)

The Feria marketplace was essential to the vitality of the neighbourhood, which was said to be “perishing” in the absence of its regular food vendors—a sign of habitual self-sufficiency that no doubt contributed to the sense of local community. Significantly, this

\(^{581}\) Cook and Cook, The Plague Files, 85.
\(^{582}\) AMS, sección 4, tomo 28, no. 28, Siglo XVII, f. 179r.
neighbourhood community extended beyond the boundaries of the *collación* of Omnium Sanctorum—the petition by alcalde Tamariz included three other parishes, all said to be affected by the prohibition: San Gil, Santa Marina and San Lorenzo, as far as the enclosure of the convent of San Clemente.\textsuperscript{583} These were all adjacent to Omnium Sanctorum, clustered at the northern end of the walled city. San Lorenzo was, along with Omnium Sanctorum, home to the bulk of Seville’s silk workers, and the enclosure or *compás* of San Clemente was the seat, or “house” of the Arte de la Seda. San Gil was the parish located between the Feria and the Macarena gate, and its residents were directly implicated in both revolts (1521 and 1652). It appears to have been closely linked with Omnium Sanctorum, and was also known for the number of silk workers living there. Santa Marina was a smaller parish abutting the latter on their eastern side. These four parishes were not only geographically proximate, with a similar socio-professional structure, but the ties that bound them extended to social relationships, as it will become clear below. It is also significant that in this case, as on other occasions, it was the spokesman of Omnium Sanctorum and its *vecinos* who represented the interests of all four parishes in a formal petition to the city council.

It seems clear that neighbourhood was crucial to collective organization in the case of petitions over specific issues as well as action in times of revolt. It is also undeniable that Omnium Sanctorum was invariably at the heart of such petitions and actions, its residents and usually taking the lead, and able to count on the support of those of some of the adjoining parishes.

\textsuperscript{583} Ibid.
4.5. Neighbourhoods and Collective Action

Urban politics in has been redefined over the past decade or so. A narrow focus on urban elites, and formal structures and institutions is no longer considered sufficient to understand the dynamics of power, or the processes of political and social change. The lower orders, specifically artisans—even where they were both socially and politically excluded—not only developed parallel and competing self-representations faced with an aristocratizing dominant culture, but also mobilized dominant discourses, taking advantage of internal ambiguities and contradictions, as well as contingent political fissures to carve out a civic and political role for themselves. Neighbourhoods, guilds and other officially sanctioned forms of association were crucial in this dynamic. Christopher Friedrichs thus conceived urban politics more broadly as “a process of interest-group formation and problem solving,” a definition that not only gives weight to contingency, but above all acknowledges the role of informal associations, whether based on territory, occupation or some other extra-institutional bond.\footnote{Christopher R. Friedrichs, “What Made the Eurasian City Work? Urban Political Cultures in Early Modern Europe and Asia,” in City Limits: Perspectives on the Historical European City, ed. Glenn Clark, Judith Owens, and Greg T. Smith (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2010), 36.} This broader conception of urban politics has benefitted from new and more flexible approaches to the study of political communication in all its forms, uncovering the importance of urban spaces beyond city hall—plazas, streets, pharmacies—as well as a continuum of interactions that ranges from ritual to protest and
revolt, encompassing both these new spaces as well as a variety of media. This in turn made it possible to move away from the binary of control and opposition, the normative and the exceptional, and to incorporate artisans into everyday forms of politics and political communication. Many of the forms of collective organization, as well as the ritual representations of community and exchanges revolve around the idea of neighbourhood, whether as a formal subdivision of the city, a ritual stage, or a social space.

Petitions by neighbourhoods were far from rare. Often these were calls for the improvement of public spaces, streets, or infrastructure, issues of common interest that brought together neighbours. Such was the case of the expansion of the plaza de Santa Catalina, the site of the city’s main livestock market, finally completed in 1589 as a direct result of years of joint petitioning by neighbourhood residents of all social groups. Sometimes neighbours petitioned as parishioners, seeking to control preaching. For instance, in 1642 the parishioners of San Gil, adjacent to Omnium Sanctorum and part of the wider Feria neighbourhood, were so outraged by the “loose tongue” (desatada lengua) of their Capuchin parish priest, Pablo de Alicante, that they sent a carta-memorial to his successor, fray Melchor de San Bartolomé (Carmelite), protesting the errors committed in the last sermon given by his predecessor. The latter had incurred the wrath of his parishioners for calling some of them out as public sinners, which was far from uncommon, but the parishioners of San Gil went even further “pues calificaron de groseros y deslucidos los modos con los que fray Pablo había querido llamar su atención. ‘Ayer domingo por la tarde […] predicó […] como lo pudo hacer el ombre más grosero: apercibió para este

---

585 Filippo De Vivo, “Public Sphere or Communication Triangle? Information and Politics in Early Modern Europe,” in Beyond the Public Sphere: Opinions, Publics, Spaces in Early Modern Europe, ed. Massimo Rospocher (Bologna; Berlin: Il mulino; Duncker & Humblot, 2012).
586 Rosenthal, Kings of the Street.
587 Albardonondo Freire, El urbanismo de Sevilla, 74.
sermón muchos días antes y que todos trageren pañuelos (para enjugar las lágrimas)—however, they insisted, it was all so coarse that all of his preparations seemed like a “carantoña vien escusada”.

On 7 June 1492—that fateful year—the Catholic Kings, Isabel and Fernando, wrote from nearby Cordoba one of their many missives to the asistente of Seville, Don Juan de Silva, Count of Cifuentes. This particular one was a response to a petition from “the poor citizens of the neighbourhood of Omnium Sanctorum in Seville” (“los vecinos pobres de la collación de Omnium Sanctorum de Seuilla”). The complaint had been brought to the monarchs’ attention by the representative (“procurador”) of the vecinos of the collación. It was founded on the royal favour (“merced”) exempting the citizens of Seville, and of the collación, from service as knights or footmen in Granada, and releasing them from the obligation of sending replacements (to serve in their stead). It seems that contrary to this royal letter, the asistente’s lieutenant had arrested several men of Seville, and residents of the collación (of Omnium Sanctorum), demanding payments in exchange for their release.

The representative of Omnium Sanctorum went on declaim a certain Gerónimo Sánchez, a wealthy parish resident (“ome rico e cuantiosso”) with a fortune of more than 350,100 maravedís—listed among the men of means in the urban census or register (padrón)—and who on past occasions had never contributed less than those with 100,000 maravedís or more, now refused to pay, and his ample share had fallen on the shoulders of “the poor and wretched persons of the collación” (“los […] pobres e misserables personas de

589 De los vecinos pobres de la collación de Omnium Sanctorum de Seuilla. Ynçitaçión al asyntente de Seuilla, AGS, RGS, leg. 1492-VII, no. 237.
la […] collación”). All this was a source of great “injury and harm” (“mucho agravio e daño”) for the residents of the parish. The monarchs urged the asistente to remit the matter to “a good person” (“a vna buena persona”), who would investigate the complaint with due diligence and alacrity, eschewing “lengthy or malicious delays” (“syn dar largas ni luengas ni dilaciones de malícia…”). The vecinos of Omnium Sanctorum should have justice done according to the royal laws, proclamations, and letters, and this should be carried out quickly and thoroughly, to ensure that the parishioners would have no further cause for complaint (“non [tengan] … rrasón de se venir ni enbiar ni [quexar] sobr’ello más [ante Nos]…”).

There is a hint of mild exasperation in the final, closing remarks of the royal letter, suggesting either that this was not the first petition from the collación of Omnium Sanctorum, or that the parish procurador had been unusually persistent in his pursuit of justice for his neighbours. And not only his neighbours. Even though the aggrieved parties are said to be the “poor citizens” (“vecinos pobres”) of Omnium Sanctorum, the petitioners and their representative had been careful to emphasize that the abuses had been perpetrated by the asistente’s deputies against other citizens of the city. Their complaints are directed against the municipal officials, a wealthy neighbour (Gerónimo Sánchez), and invoke royal grants and exemptions. They had been formulated by the residents of the collación of Omnium Sanctorum, who had chosen a representative to take their case to the Catholic Kings—though we are not sure how or on what basis the procurador had been elected.

More specifically, the injured party were the “vecinos pobres”, in this case clearly meant to indicate tax-paying workers, craftsmen and petty merchants—“pecheros”. This is indeed the

590 Ibid.
meaning that the word “pobres” (“the poor”) would assume in the context of similar petitions, appeals, and litigation. All of the elements of organized, collective action by a section of the *vecinos* of Omnium Sanctorum are present—including the claim to speak on behalf of the city of Seville as a whole.
5.1. Introduction: The Weavers of Revolt

On the morning of May 22, 1652, the signal for revolt was given by two silk weavers, Isidro de Torres and Francisco Hurtado, to their 30 or so companions, also weavers, silk twisters, and other artisans whose ranks quickly swelled to 300, and later “more than six thousand” fortified themselves in the Plaza de la Feria. Of the 29 rebel leaders whose names and occupations are known, 12 were silk weavers and 2 silk twisters, adding up to half of the total. Yet in spite of the prominence of silk workers among the rebels of 1652, there has been no attempt by historians to untangle the links between the popular uprising and this group of artisans, the perennial concerns and ideology of silk workers, and the longer history of their political activism in the seventeenth century. Both before and after the revolt of 1652, the silk guild, or Arte de la Seda, was very active in defence of not only the interests of the local silk manufacturing sector, but also more broadly its vision of the “common good” in which craftsmen in general were portrayed as a pillar of the social order and economic prosperity of the city and the kingdom. At least from the early 1620s onward, the Arte pressured Cortes deputies, petitioned the Crown directly, and sometimes its veedores and rank and file members took matters into their own hands, when royal directives left room for argument. Contrary to the view that still persists in historiography, they sought to build broader alliances—with silk workers of other cities,

591 Andrade, Casos raros y particulares, BAS, MS 33-91(1). See also Gelabert González, Castilla convulsa, 345.
592 There were also two each of shoemakers, wool weavers, fritter sellers (buñoleros), as well as a bricklayer, barber, farrier, fishmonger, gilder (dorador de fuego), goldbeater, hosier, liquor seller (aguardentero) and a junior constable of the Holy Brotherhood (Santa Hermandad, the rural police instituted by the Catholic Kings).
such as Toledo and Granada, or other artisans and guilds in Seville—and enlisted the help of arbitristas like Francisco Martínez de Mata, whose sophisticated economic ideas converged with the no less subtle master artisans’ grasp of political economy. By the last decades of the century the Crown itself had finally come round to accepting the need for protectionist measures, as well as officially raising the dignity of manual workers, and silk workers in particular, as part of a wider program of economic and social reform, signalled by the Junta de Comercio of 1682.

The 1652 revolt, led by silk weavers and allegedly hatched in the meeting place of the Arte de la Seda, may be seen as a key point of inflection in this longer narrative. The Feria revolt has been characterized as either an uprising of the desperate and hungry populace, or, by those historians who have made some effort to link it to the wider economic and political context, as a reaction against the Crown’s increasingly disastrous fiscal and monetary policy, and its enforcement by particularly unscrupulous officials. However even in the best cases, the vantage point is from the top (Madrid, or the city council in Seville) down, and any real agency is reserved for state officials and local magistrates, while the people merely react to pressure from above, and usually only when overtaken by the “madness [that] comes from having our stomachs empty and our heads full of air.” There has been no allowance made for an independent, or at least autonomous ideological component to the rebels’ actions in 1652, which would contextualize the revolt.

593 In his recent monograph on the Toledo silk industry, Santos Vaquero still insists on the invariably narrow goals and self-interested character of guild petitions and litigation. Santos Vaquero, La industria textil sedera de Toledo.

594 In his excellent recent study, Juan Gelabert, commendably claims to be interested in the reaction of “the street” to royal fiscal policies, and he demonstrates the role of public opinion and protests, including popular uprisings, in the shaping of royal policy. However he is far clearer and more detailed on the underlying motives and ideologies of the rulers—royal ministers like José González, or the urban oligarchies—than the people in the streets, especially the protagonists of urban riots and revolts. Gelabert González, Castilla convulsa.

not within the narrative of the evolution of state policy, but artisan world-views and political activity.

Little enough is known about Sevillian artisans in general—the majority of the city’s active population—and even less about silk workers and the silk industry, which was one of the most important in Spain. Both demand new research and more profound scrutiny, which is beyond the scope of this work. What is offered here is the sum of available information, drawn from extant historiography and supplemented by the sources used in this study, which amounts to a preliminary sketch that, if nothing else, demonstrates the size and importance of the silk industry in Seville. This is followed by a detailed examination of two lengthy lawsuits. The first was an extension at the local level of petitions and debates in the Cortes (1618-1623), that unfolded over two years, 1623-1625, and pitted the Arte de la Seda against the foreign merchant communities of Seville; the second was related to the attempt in 1659-1660 to form a Brotherhood of the Guilds and Crafts, led by the silk guild, and abetted by Francisco Martínez de Mata—an advocacy that led to him being labelled a dangerous social agitator and a threat to public order. In between came the nadir of the great plague of 1649, and the Andalusian revolts of 1647-1652, with the Sevillian uprising of May 1652 as their culminating point. The specific demands made in writing by the rebels did not directly address the grievances of silk workers, but they went well beyond the immediate outrage over the price of bread, and included an end to fiscal impositions, the repeal of the devaluation of the currency, the exclusion of foreigners from municipal government, and the election of a plebeian tribune to the city council.

On May 14, 1623, the guildsmen of the arte mayor de texer paños de oro y seda gathered in their casa, in the enclosure of the convent of San Clemente, to discuss certain
matters related to the “utility and interest” of their craft, “the common good of the poor”, and the defence of “the preeminences of the said art.”

They had seized on a royal provision that had in turn emerged from the lengthy negotiations between the cities and the king in the Cortes (1618-23), and which the Arte claimed had imposed a ban on imports of finished silk cloths—a ban defied by the foreign merchant communities (the Flemish, German, French, and Italian). They named the master silk weaver Rodrigo Romero Hurtado as their representative, and embarked on a war of petitions and counter-petitions before the Royal Council, of words and threats, before the frustrated artisans quite literally took the law into their hands, and enforced the letter of a royal provision that they claimed had been favourable to their grievances, in spite of later amendments and clarifications, and the ruling of the asistente, all of which modified or annulled the relevant provisions of the royal pragmatic which the weavers had seized upon as the basis of their complaints.

Yet the obstinacy of the Arte de la Seda in 1623-25 was not without method, for the silk workers had gauged the political mood and had plenty of reasons to hope for a favourable hearing in Madrid—even if these hopes would prove to have been misplaced. The moment seemed particularly propitious, given the hopes and expectations attached to the new monarch, Philip IV, in 1621, and his valido, the Count Duke of Olivares, a native of Seville. The reforming impulse, which among other things would consider the protection of Spanish manufacturing as a cornerstone of the monarchy’s wealth and prosperity, was quickly announced as a distinguishing feature of the new regime. While this conjuncture is

596 The convent was in the parish of San Lorenzo, adjacent to Omnium Sanctorum, and part of the informal neighbourhood of La Feria. During the revolt, the maze of streets around the convent and the casa of the Arte served as a hiding place for the rebels in the wake of their defeat.
familiar, what is less well known is the extent to which master craftsmen participated, directly or indirectly, in the formulation, and implementation, of new economic policies.

Forty years later, in 1660, a coalition of craft guilds—the so-called “Holy Brotherhood of the Guilds and Crafts of Seville”—dispatched the arbitrista Francisco Martínez de Mata on a mission to the Court in Madrid with much the same purpose and using more or less the same rhetoric. Once again the silk workers were in the vanguard of a collective effort by the city’s artisans to shape the city’s commercial regulations and royal economic policy. As in the case of the earlier efforts, the collective action had no immediate effect, but a new monarchy—this time of Charles II—brought renewed hope, and finally a genuine and sweeping economic reform program, including protectionist measures consistently called for by the Arte in the seventeenth century, as well as an attempt to loosen the grip of social prejudice upon manual workers and labour. The Junta de Comercio and other schemes conceived in Madrid proved to be yet another false dawn, at least as far as Castilian industry was concerned, and by the mid-1700s lachrymose petitions were still being penned, or, indeed, printed, by the silk weavers’ guild of Seville. Still decrying the (very) slow death of silk cloth manufacturing in the city, the Arte Mayor was by then looking back to the opening decades of the seventeenth century as a veritable golden age.

Sandwiched between these petitions, the 1652 revolt can also be understood as part of this longer history of corporate activism. Yet even though silk workers are known to have played a key role in the uprising, which was centred on the neighbourhoods long associated with them, this knowledge has never prompted a wider reflection on the silk

597 The Spanish Levant, on the other hand, saw the beginning of a genuine revival of industry in the last decades of the seventeenth century. See Ricardo Franch Benavent, “Los maestros del colegio del arte mayor de la seda de Valencia en una fase de crecimiento manufacturero (1686-1755),” Hispania 74, no. 246 (2014).
industry in Seville, the plight of its craftsmen in the seventeenth century, or their role in public life.

5.2. The Spanish Silk Industry

There is no general history of the silk industry in Spain, although the basic contours of its development in the early modern period are more or less well known. Among the late medieval Christian kingdoms, there was a significant silk industry in Valencia and to a lesser extent Murcia, both of which seem to have thrived from the fifteenth century onward under the tutelage of Genoese artisans, and imbricated in Genoese commercial networks. Meanwhile, the Nasrid kingdom of Granada had the longest unbroken tradition of both raw silk and silk cloth production on the Iberian peninsula, and following its conquest by Castile in 1492 it became the dominant centre of production, as well as the most lucrative

598 On the Spanish silk industry in general, see Ricardo Franch Benavent, “El comercio y los mercados de la seda en la España moderna,” in La seta en Europa, sec. XIII-XX, ed. Simonetta Cavaciocchi (Firenze: 1993); Miguel Angel Ladero Quesada, “La producción de seda en la España medieval. Siglos XIII-XVI,” ibid.; Manuel Garzón Pareja, La industria sedera en España: El arte de la seda de Granada (Granada: Archivo de la Real Chancillería, 1972), Texto impreso. The silk industry is also discussed in general surveys of the early modern Spanish economy, in Juan Carlos Zofío Llorente, “La industria en España durante los siglos XVI y XVII,” in La economía en la España moderna, ed. Alfredo Alvar Ezquerra (Madrid: Istmo, 2006); Alberto Marcos Martín, España en los siglos XVI, XVII y XVIII: Economía y sociedad (Barcelona: Critica, 2000). There are a number of monographs and shorter works on some of the leading silk industrial centres in Spain, including Granada, Toledo, Valencia and Murcia. The most recent are on Toledo and Murcia respectively: Santos Vaquero, La industria textil sedera de Toledo; Miralles Martínez, La sociedad de la seda. The classic work on Granada, with some references to other silk manufacturing centres is Garzón Pareja, La industria sedera en España. On Cordoba, the most comprehensive coverage is still in José Ignacio Fortea Pérez, Córdoba en el siglo XVI: Las bases demográficas y económicas de una expansión urbana (Córdoba: Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Córdoba, 1981), Thesis (Ph D ), 312-34. Finally, the most innovative studies, and most up to date with historiography on other parts of Europe, are by historians working on the Spanish Levant, and Valencia in particular. Above all, the work of Germán Navarro Espinach on the silk industry in Valencia in the later middle ages and the early sixteenth-century, as well as the books and articles by Ricardo Franch Benavent, on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. There is not a single book or article on the silk industry of Seville. Germán Navarro Espinach, “Corporaciones de oficios y desarrollo económico en la Corona de Aragón, 1350-1550,” Áreas. Revista Internacional de Ciencias Sociales 34 (2015); Germán Navarro Espinach, “Las ordenanzas más antiguas de velluters, 1479-1491. Auge del comercio sedero y edificación de la Lonja Nueva de Valencia,” in Catálogo de la exposición L’Art dels Velluters. Sedería de los siglos XV-XVI (Valencia: 2011); Franch Benavent, “Los maestros del colegio del arte mayor de la seda.”; Franch Benavent, La sedería valenciana; Franch Benavent, “La evolución de la sedería valenciana.”
for the royal treasury, thanks to income derived from famous silk rent (*renta de la seda*).

However by the second half of the century Granada’s relative decline was becoming apparent, even if the causes are still being debated.\(^5\)\(^9\) By this point, Toledo had transformed itself into the major centre of silk manufacturing in the Peninsula, followed closely by Valencia, and Córdoba in the south.\(^6\)\(^0\) The main difference was that urban artisans in Toledo and Cordoba relied on imported raw materials, while the two older centres, Valencia and Granada, had access to their own supplies of silk. The sixteenth century was a period of demographic and economic expansion, and arguably no urban industry experienced an expansion as spectacular as the silk manufacture. Its success was certainly obvious to contemporaries, due to the social meanings attached to silk garments. Once reserved for the nobility and wealthy urban merchants, thanks to the general prosperity of the times silk was making its way down the social ladder, expanding its consumer base. “It is one of the shameful abuses of our times,” lamented a Cervantes character, for “[n]ot long ago, what silk was found in Granada or Murcia, and in Valencia, was more than sufficient for Spanish uses. Now all of China, and the provinces of Italy, are not enough, it has become so common.”\(^6\)\(^1\) There is no doubt that a thriving silk industry also developed in Seville during

\(^5\)\(^9\) It seems that, contrary to some older assumptions, the Granadan silk industry was not too adversely affected by the Morisco Revolt of 1568. See Zofío Llorente, “La industria en España.” Nevertheless, the fiscal pressure exerted by the Crown prior to 1568 may have been one of the causes of the uprising. See Garrad, “La industria sedera granadina en el siglo XVI y su conexión con el levantamiento de las Alpujarras.”

\(^6\)\(^0\) Although the Valencian silk industry was previously thought to have suffered a precipitous decline following the *Germanías* revolt in 1520–22, the current consensus is that the rebellion was no more than a blip, and the industry continued to develop apace, reaching its sixteenth-century height in the 1570s. See Franch Benavent, “La evolución de la sedería valenciana.”

\(^6\)\(^1\) In the entremés *Los Mirones*, two students wandering the streets of Seville are astonished to see an artisan filing down a horse’s bit in front of his workshop, dressed in velvet and silk. On hearing this, a *licenciado* laments the proliferation of silk among the lower classes: “Ése es uno de los abusos vergonzosos que se ha introducido en este pedazo de siglo en que vivimos. La poca de seda que se cogía en Granada ó en Murcia, y cuando más en Valencia, era sobrada muy pocos años há para lo que en España se gastaba. Hoy fuera de ésta, no basta toda la China ni las provincias de Italia á dar seda á la mano, según se ha hecho común.” Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *Varias obras inéditas de Cervantes, sacadas de códices de la Biblioteca Colombina*, ed. Adolfo de Castro (Madrid, 1874), 49-50.
the sixteenth century, and yet it has scarcely merited a mention even in the most recent surveys.⁶²²

The first half of the seventeenth century was difficult, to say the least, for the Castilian and Aragonese economy and society in general, and the silk industry was no exception, although it may have proved more resilient than most other sectors of the economy. Aside from the general causes of the decline, there were specific problems and obstacles affecting the silk industry. There were external factors, such as changing fashions and markets, and growing competition from foreign centres. Yet Spanish producers were not helped either by the increasingly onerous fiscal pressure imposed as a result of the Habsburgs’ ambitious foreign policy, or the often contradictory, and always short-termist or inadequate economic policies. These provide the background to the petitions of the Arte de la Seda discussed below. It should be noted however that the difficulties experienced by Toledo, Granada and Valencia in the first half of the seventeenth century may have benefitted Seville, which seems to have absorbed at least some of the skilled craftsmen from those cities. Even in this time of crisis Seville remained an attractive destination for migrants, and indeed in 1652 the authorities were at pains to point out that several of the rebel weavers were not natives of the city. However this influx of silk workers from other, struggling Spanish centres can only be speculated upon, like much else about the Sevillian silk industry.⁶²³

⁶²² Montserrat Duran Pujol, “La manufactura textil en la España mediterránea durante el reinado de Felipe II,” in Felipe II y el Mediterráneo, ed. Ernest Belenguer Cebrià (Madrid: Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, 1999); Marcos Martín, España en los siglos XVI, XVII y XVIII; Zofío Llorente, “La industria en España.” The only significant, yet still sketchy, discussion of the Sevillian silk industry is in Garzón Pareja, La industria sedera en España.
⁶²³ Franch Benavent refers in passing to the exodus of Valencian silk workers to Toledo, Seville, Córdoba and Granada. Franch Benavent, “La evolución de la sedería valenciana,” 294-5.
The lack of real protection for native industry, and foreign competition, became an even more acute problem as other European states—Colbert’s France in particular—made silk manufacturing the centrepiece of their mercantilist projects. Spain belatedly followed suit, and under Carlos II there was finally acknowledgement of the need for the state to take on a far more active role in the economy, with a view to the long-term development of its manufacturing rather than expedients aimed at squeezing out short-term fiscal returns. The 1679 *Junta General de Comercio* marked the start of this new approach, and as elsewhere, the textile industry, and silk in particular, was meant to play a major role in the projected economic revival. For this purpose special provincial *Junta* were established precisely in what had once been the main silk cloth manufacturing cities: Granada, and—significantly—Seville. Moreover, the Junta sought the opinions of artisans from the “traditional centres” of production: Toledo, Granada, and, once again, Seville, with two representatives summoned from each city (eventually joined by representatives of the silk guilds of Valencia and Madrid). The impact of the Junta was mixed at best, however, and the modest recovery in the 1680s has been attributed mainly to local factors, and was registered on the eastern periphery rather than Castile. The groundwork was laid, however, and the eighteenth century proved to be the golden age of the Valencian silk industry, which surpassed its sixteenth-century zenith, while Toledo and other Castilian cities largely floundered. However this success was very much due to the more unequivocally mercantilist policies of the new Bourbon monarchy.\(^{624}\)

---

\(^{624}\) Franch Benavent, *La sederia valenciana*, 12.
5.3. The Sevillian ‘Community of Silk’

Was there a silk industry in Seville? The question appears redundant in light of the numbers—and the determination—of the master silk weavers who struggled to protect the interests of their craft throughout the seventeenth century, yet scholars continue to gloss over it in silence, mainly due to the lack of research and specialist works. There is a rather forlorn snapshot of the Alcaicería de la Seda, the once fabled silk market, in a state of abandonment and ruin in the late seventeenth century. An old Moorish quadrangle bristling with locally made and imported fabrics and other luxury goods, located between the Cathedral and the city’s principal market square, the Plaza de San Francisco,605 its wretched state following the mid-century catastrophes, including the devastating 1649 plague, wars and rebellions, as well as the kingdom’s general economic decline, suggests that the complaints of the silk guild were not too wide of the mark in their depictions of splendour turned to dearth and desolation.606 The Arte de la Seda, the silk guild, for its part did not erect any imposing buildings, or leave other material remains behind, unlike many of its European counterparts. Its casa, or seat, was apparently a makeshift one, in the enclosure of the convent of San Clemente, in the parish of San Lorenzo where many silk workers lived—adjacent to Omnium Sanctorum, and part of the Feria neighbourhood. The archives of the Sevillian Arte de la Seda have also not been preserved, depriving historians of an obvious starting point for research.607

606 Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, “La Alcaicería de la Seda de Sevilla en 1679,” Archivo Hispalense 45, no. 139-140 (1966). For the nature of these petitions, see below.
607 Morales Padrón, La ciudad del Quinientos, 154. Studies of the silk industry and trade in Valencia and Toledo, for instance, have benefited immensely from the archival troves of the Archivo del Colegio del Arte Mayor de la Seda de Valencia, and Toledan silk guild. See, for instance, Santos Vaquero, La industria textil sedera de Toledo.
As a result we are left with the “near mythic” status of the Sevillian silk industry, the product of a longstanding polemical tradition dating back to the seventeenth century. Modern historians, albeit none of them directly concerned with the history of Sevillian industry or artisans, have either given or withheld the benefit of the doubt when faced with the claims made by the silk guild and its advocates. Neither tendency is supported by a great deal of evidence, except of the negative sort, or evidence by omission. Nevertheless, a satisfactory picture may yet emerge, although not without a truly herculean labour in the notarial archives and elsewhere. What is offered below is the sum of our scant knowledge of this undoubtedly important industry—of its importance there can be no doubt, for even if its market was only local or even regional, it should be remembered that Seville was a city of 120,000 at the turn of the seventeenth century—augmented by the sort of fragmentary and scattered evidence, the first elements in a more complete picture of the sort alluded to above.

Silk was everywhere in Seville, from the recesses of the Cathedral’s royal chapel on solemn occasions to public processions and festivities; it was donned in some shape or

---

608 Some have even gone as far as to deny the existence of a Sevillian silk industry. See Ramón Carande, Carlos V y sus banqueros. La vida económica en Castilla (1516-1556) (Madrid: Sociedad de Estudios y Publicaciones, 1965), 195.

609 Among the optimists is Morales Padrón, who cites the abundance of regulations concerning the silk industry in the city’s ordinances, as well as the, admittedly inflated, figures of between 3,000 looms and 30,000 workers. García-Baquero González on the other hand argued that Seville was not the industrial centre that some have imagined it to have been, citing the relatively low alcabala contributions of the guilds (never above 11% in total, and 4% for the textile guilds in particular)—although he acknowledges the fact that the Arte de la Seda (silk weavers’ guild) was exempt from taxes—which, in the absence of more concrete evidence, has contributed to the industry’s “near-mythic importance”. He seeks to debunk this myth by citing studies of exports to the Indies from Seville that included plenty of silk fabrics, although none, apparently, that were made in the city itself. Even if true, this does not tell us as much as one might assume, for even if production was strictly for local consumption, Seville, with its unrivalled complement of the fabulously rich, was a lucrative market in its own right. Antonio García-Baquero González, Andalucía y la Carrera de Indias (1492-1824) (Sevilla: Editoriales Andaluzas Unidas, 1986), 73-80.

610 And not only in Seville: “The incredible variety of roles played by silk in countless aspects of everyday life astounded the Europeans of the sixteenth century.” Molà, The Silk Industry of Renaissance Venice, 84.
form by the high- and low-born; it was the source of local pride and perennial anxieties, the latter reflected in sumptuary laws, and reactions to the “seductive and scandalous” tapadas, or veiled ladies. Admittedly, much of the silk was imported, either from other parts of Europe or from Asia. According to Gasch-Thomas the Sevillian elites, more wedded to the fashions and tastes of the court in Madrid, tended to favour Flemish and Italian garments, at least in contrast to their American counterparts, who wholeheartedly embraced the more varied and livelier colours of Chinese silks. On the other hand, Juan Gil has claimed that “massive” shipments of Chinese silks began to arrive in Seville in the opening decades of the seventeenth century. The largest importers were Spanish and Portuguese merchants, although foreigners were also prominent, and the 1614 fleet cargo analyzed by Gil included large consignments belonging to foreigners Luis Clut and Pedro

611 "ricos paños de seda … paño de brocado y seda donde se pusiéron con las armas Reales, y los dichos cuerpos del dicho Santo Rey Don Fernando, y Doña Beatriz, y Rey Don Alonso venían cubiertos con sus paños de tela de oro y seda … y los cuerpos de la dicha Reyna Doña María, é Infantes venían cubiertos con sus paños de carmesí terciopelo … y la caxa donde venían los huesos del dicho Don Padrique, venía cubierta con un paño de terciopelo azul, y encima de el puesto el hábito y encomienda del Señor Santiago de terciopelo carmesí … y el dicho Presidente vestido con una capa de damasco blanco bordada de oro …” Ortiz de Zúñiga, Anales, vol. 3, 103-4. “Llegó primero la Ciudad, y sus Regidores en hábito senatorio, ropas talares, de terciopelo morado forradas en raso blanco, habiendo su Magestad mandado que reduxesen á solo sedas el trage que prevenían de ricos brocados, el vestido interior del mismo género … del mismo modo que los Jurados, diferenciado el color, qué era carmesí … y otros muchos con vestidos de tafetán carmesí, y capas de damasco verde …” ibid., vol. 3, 54.

612 “Don Juan con manga de oían crespo, con borlas de seda de colores; y Don Fernando de tela de plata negra, bordada de seda verde …” ibid., vol. 3, 272. “… asi de los oficiales de manos como otros tienen casi todo lo más de su hacienda en ropas de vestir de seda y paños finos y en muchas joyas de oro y plata…” Morell Peguero, Mercaderes y artesanos, 20-1.

613 Laura R. Bass and Amanda Wunder, “The Veiled Ladies of the Early Modern Spanish World: Seduction and Scandal in Seville, Madrid, and Lima," Hispanic Review 77, no. 1 (2009): 138. Incidentally, some “veiled women,” or “algunas mugeres tapadas” were said to have pointed out to the rebels the houses where they would find stores of grain: Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.


615 Juan Gil, La India y el Lejano Oriente en la Sevilla del Siglo de Oro (Sevilla: Ayuntamiento de Sevilla (ICAS), 2011), History Printed book, 201.
This trend would clearly have an impact on the local industry, and indeed provoked the most vehement opposition from the guild, as we will see.

The monopoly on American trade, and the city’s role as the nerve centre of Atlantic commerce, apparently had no impact on local textile manufacturing, which, with the exception of Granadan silks and Segovian woollens, was almost completely absent from outbound shipments. Yet even if one conceded that Sevillian industry could not be stirred into action and greater dynamism even by the monopoly on the Indies trade held by its merchant consulado for almost two centuries, it nevertheless seems clear that the development and expansion of silk cloth production was the single most significant feature of Sevillian industry in the sixteenth century. Leading historians do not doubt this fact, even in the absence of a great deal of concrete evidence regarding the output or structure of the industry.

The 3,000 looms claimed by the Sevillian guild in the first half of the seventeenth century was, according to Domínguez Ortiz, a reasonable, if still somewhat exaggerated, estimate of the size of silk cloth producing sector. Even with all due caution exercised regarding this polemical figure, it would mean that Seville’s silk industry compared favourably with the Venetian—one of the most important in Europe—which had around

---

616 In the 1614 armada, captained by Antonio de Oquendo, alongside money and other typical Indies merchandise, a total of 8 ships carried 16,893 libras of Chinese silk cloth Some of the biggest consignments belonged to Portuguese or Spanish merchants or family partnerships (companies), but among the most prominent foreigners were Juan de Neve (1,210 libras), Luis Clut (855 libras) and Pedro Sirman (618 libras). It should be noted that a Guillén Clut was the consul of the Flemish merchants named in the 1623-25 suit. The fabrics were mostly damasks and taffeta, but there were some velvets and gasas. According to Gil, Chinese silk appears in notarial records: telas; prendas de vestir; sobrecamas; colgaduras and ropa de cama; sobremesas; cojines; cortinas; pabellones de gasa. Ibid., 202-17.


618 Antonio Miguel Bernal, Antonio Collantes de Terán Sánchez, and Antonio García-Baquero González, Sevilla, de los gremios a la industrialización (Sevilla: Ayuntamiento de Sevilla (ICAS), 2008), Texto impreso, 63.

619 Domínguez Ortiz, Orto y ocaso, 47.
2,400 looms in 1602.\textsuperscript{620} Given the size of the market for luxuries in a city of fabulous riches, and of the fabulously wealthy, at least in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, not to mention the proximity of other important silk producing centres (Cordoba, Granada), this is hardly surprising. In any case, its importance to the city’s economy was far from being a rhetorical chimera of interested petitions, and was fully recognized by the municipal authorities.\textsuperscript{621} At least some of the silk fabrics manufactured in Seville were exported,\textsuperscript{622} and Seville was apparently acknowledged as a silk producing centre by contemporaries, as for instance when the authorities in Gran Canaria sought to establish a local silk manufactory in 1522, they requested a silk spinner, weaver, and dyer to be sent from Castile, either from Seville or elsewhere.\textsuperscript{623}

The weaver Pedro de Palacios, in his capacity as veedor (guild inspector), alleged that in 1624 there were 300 houses inhabited by masters of the Arte, in half of which he and his fellow guild inspectors had found “more than half the looms idle for want of work”—the implication being that more than one loom per workshop was not uncommon at the time. Even the most conservative estimate based on this information would put the total number of looms in 1624 at 300-600, and based on the wording (reference to “more than half” in each case) one might reasonably suppose that there were as many as 1,000 or more.\textsuperscript{624} If these are understood to be broad looms, then the number is compatible with

\textsuperscript{620} Molà, \textit{The Silk Industry of Renaissance Venice}, 17.

\textsuperscript{621} Judging by, among other things, the city council’s thoroughness, care and time taken over the revision of the silk weavers ordinances in 1639: MacKay, “Lazy, Improvident People”, 43.

\textsuperscript{622} Besides the references (below) to the silk woven in Seville for the royal court in Madrid, there are scattered references elsewhere: for instance, the post-mortem inventory of a wealthy Madrid silk master weaver in 1682 included “mantos de seda de Sevilla” and “manto peyne de Sevilla,” José Luis Barrio Moya, “La testamentaria de D. Andrés Gómez de la Real, un maestro del arte de la seda palentino en el Madrid de Felipe IV y Carlos II (1682),” \textit{Publicaciones de la Institución Tello Téllez de Meneses}, no. 75 (2004).


\textsuperscript{624} Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes, \textit{maestros del arte mayor de tejer paños de oro, lana y seda de Sevilla, contra Guillermo Béquer, Guillene Lut y Pedro Gaumón, cónsules de las naciones flamencas, alemana y francesa,}
contemporary claims of 3,000 looms, the majority of which, as Domínguez Ortiz has claimed, may have been the narrow looms used for making silk ribbons and haberdashery. Dyeing, the most costly of the stages of production, and usually only found in the most developed productions centres, was also thriving, at least in recent memory: the dyer Simón de Batres claimed that in the past, more than 30,000 libras of silk passed through his dye-works every year, and that he employed “more than 20 persons, between journeymen, slaves, and apprentices”, but that for the past 16 years the quantity of silk had been reduced by more than half, to 14,000 libras, and during that time he had work enough for no more than three or four men, “and fewer every year”. If we consider that in Toledo, a poor weaver with a single loom required at least 100 libras of silk per year, Batres dyed enough silk each year during his best years to supply roughly 300 modest weavers, or looms (and 140 in each of the 14 years prior to 1624), and not only were there other dyers in Seville (although we do not know how many, or how large their dye-works), but at least some of the silk worked in Seville was dyed outside the city. Bartolomé de Torres, weaver and merchant, also recalled that, twenty years ago “the said Art fared well (andaba bueno)”.

The meeting of the Arte de la Seda on May 14, 1623 (discussed in this chapter) was attended by 60 master weavers, as well as six guild officials, and the document refers to “many more” who were absent. But the numbers of weavers around the time of the 1652 revolt are even more striking, given the context of general economic decline and

sobre que no se permita la introducción en estos reinos de tales géneros si no están fabricados en ellos, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, 1623-1625, f. 102.
625 Ibid., f. 139.
626 Santos Vaquero, La industria textil sedera de Toledo, 108. The figure of 100 libras also crops up in seventeenth-century Murcia, where one of the privileges issued by the municipal government (1611) with the aim of attracting silk weavers was an annual grant of 100 libras of silk free of the alcabala tax, as long as the silk was to be worked by the weaver himself, and—presumably—not resold, or the work subcontracted. This privilege was reconfirmed and expanded to include other rights and benefits in 1624 and 1627. Miralles Martínez, La sociedad de la seda, 41.
627 Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 156.
depopulation. Of the 449 male residents of La Feria who declared their occupation in the marriage dispensations and notarial records (1649-1655) analysed in the preceding chapter, 34 were silk weavers (13.6%), 21 of whom were residents of Omnium Sanctorum. This number by no means includes all the silk weavers resident in the parish or the Feria district, and, while both the parish and the district were distinguished by a heavy concentration of silk workers, the latter were also said to be found in large numbers in several adjacent parishes. The predominance of silk workers in general in the Feria district has been noted in the previous chapter, for apart from silk weavers the sample includes silk twisters, pasamaneros, and silk merchants. The figure of 34 weavers in the La Feria neighbourhood, though only a fraction of the total, is comparable to the total number of weavers in Madrid around the same time. Moreover, a sample of documents from the notarial archives (1650-52) has yielded another 45 master silk weavers, bringing the total to at least 79 master silk weavers active in the years 1650-1655—which still represents only a fragment of the total for Seville, at a time when the industry was undoubtedly at its lowest ebb. Indeed, 

---

628 A further 9 identified themselves only as “weaver” (tejedor), and another 3 as “broad loom weaver” (tejedor de lo ancho), although in both cases they could have been weavers of cloths other than silk.
629 According to Domínguez Ortiz, the parishes with the largest number of looms were Feria, Santa Marina, San Gil, San Julián, Santa Lucía and San Juan de Acre, although he does not provide figures, or cite his sources. Morales Padrón lists the same parishes, with the addition of San Lorenzo, where guild meetings took place. Domínguez Ortiz, Orto y ocaso, 48; Morales Padrón, La ciudad del Quinientos, 155.
630 In addition to the 36 silk weavers, the sample includes 10 pasamaneros (3% of total), 7 silk twisters (2.1%) and 10 silk merchants (3%)—at least some of whom were or had risen from among the ranks of producers—and 14 goldbeaters (4.2%), whose craft was closely intertwined with that of silk cloth weaving. In other words, a fifth of all artisans in the Feria sample (19%) were silk workers (primarily weavers) or merchants, and the number rises to a quarter of the total if we include goldbeaters, who were also prominent among the rebels in 1652.
631 The number of silk weavers in Madrid was 36 in 1646, and 37 three years later, in 1649, going up to 50 by 1654. José A. Nieto Sánchez, Artesanos y mercaderes. Una historia social y económica de Madrid (1450-1850) (Madrid: Editorial Fundamentos, 2006). One of the authors major claims is that Madrid was also a major industrial centre. On the basis of these figures, it was dwarfed by Seville in that respect.
632 Master silk weavers appear in apprenticeship contracts, letters of sale and credit, and rental agreements. AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 542, ff. 101r, 62r, 90r, 405r, 545r, 613r-14v, 45r, 836r; AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 546, ff. 46r-v, 398r-v, 455r-v, 66r-72v, 578r-v, 631r-v, 94r-v, 776r-v, 873r-v, 80r-v, 84r-v, 87r-v, 98r-v (also 976r-v), 14r-v, 50r-v, 73r-v, 78r-v, 79r-v, 1038r-v; AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 549, 1651 (4), s.f., s.f., s.f., 116r-v, 48r-v, 415r-v; AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 550, 1r-v, 42r-v, 108r-v, 636r, 40r, 728r, 31r-v, 914r-v, 1039r-v; AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 551, s.f.
keeping in mind that these figures correspond to a period three decades removed from the
1623-25 suit, and immediately following the great plague of 1649 and the 1652 revolt—that
is to say, the midcentury nadir of the industry—it becomes relatively easy to imagine a silk
industry in Seville that was fairly substantial and robust. What is more, for a complete
picture one would have to go beyond those men who declared their occupation in the
marriage dispensations and include the even greater number of women (married and
unmarried) and children (girls and boys) who constituted the vast majority of the
workforce.633

There is as yet no reliable answer to most questions regarding the nature and
organization of the production of various textiles, and silk in particular. At least five of the
leading rebels, Andrés Sedillo, Estéban de Torres—whose brother Isidro set off the
conflagration—Sebastián Muñoz, Pedro Portillo, and Juan de Espejo, all master silk weavers
except for Pedro Portillo, who was a goldbeater, have left scattered traces in the city’s
notarial archives.634 All five took on apprentices only months or even weeks before the
uprising, an indication that these were perhaps not men on the edge of subsistence—at least
not under normal circumstances.635 Torres assumed responsibility for a fifteen-year-old
youth, while Sedillo took on a nine-year-old girl, Juana de Herrera, in April 1652. The
stipulated term of the apprenticeship was 12 years in her case, during which she wished to

633 The weaver Pedro de Palacios (1623) mentions the “many women and other persons” engaged in winding and
spinning, Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 102. Domínguez Ortiz
states that women constituted the majority of the workforce in the silk industry, but does not provide figures or
cite his sources, Domínguez Ortiz, Orto y ocaso, 48.
634 Andrés Sedillo’s brother was also named among the rebel leaders excepted from the royal pardon.
635 On this latter point, more detailed and rigorous analysis, as well as additional evidence is required before any
definitive judgments can be made on the individual rebels’ socio-economic standing. In Andrés Sedillo’s case, a
month before the revolt, in April 1652, he also signed a 3-year lease for the rental of a house on Tocinos street, in
Omnium Sanctorum, for 44 reales per month. AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 551, ff. 142r-v. This at a time
when an average artisan’s daily income may have been around 6 reales: Domínguez Ortiz, Alteraciones
andaluzas, 79.
learn the trade of silk weaving, which master Andrés Sedillo was obliged to impart “without holding anything back,” providing lodging, sustenance and clothing.\textsuperscript{636} The Sedillo brothers, Andrés and Pedro, were natives of Granada, and may have been involved in the uprising there. However by 1652 they were both established as master weavers in Seville, still recovering from the devastating 1649 plague. The northern parishes were a natural choice for these recent migrants arrived to take advantage of the labour shortage. House rents here were cheaper, and there was a network of acquaintances, relatives and professional contacts to call upon, judging by the number of social functions the two brothers performed.\textsuperscript{637} Thus, contrary to the image projected by the authorities, these were not vagabonds or transient \textit{forasteros}, but men who had put down deep roots fairly quickly following their arrival.\textsuperscript{638}

Weaving in other Spanish and European centres of production was apparently more likely to become dependent on merchant capital, not least because many merchant-manufacturers, as they are often best described, emerged from the ranks of weavers, the most prosperous silk workers. However, while a definitive answer remains elusive pending future research, Seville’s notarial archive does contain numerous contracts between silk weavers and merchants. For instance, Sebastián Muñoz— one of the proscribed rebels of 1652 — and Francisco de Zúñiga, both master silk weavers from the parish of San Lorenzo, signed a typical agreement with the silk merchant Juan Antonio de Vargas in March 1651. The latter was obliged to provide silk thread to be worked by the two weavers on their looms, and to pay the cost of labour, while the silk weavers would work on his

\textsuperscript{636} AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 550, ff. 1r-v, 913r-v.
\textsuperscript{637} Andrés Sedillo appears as a witness in at least two marriage licenses issued by the archbishop, once for his brother, Pedro, a widower who remarried in Seville, and for another resident of Omnium Sanctorum, probably a silk weaver. AGAS, Vicaría, \textit{Matrimonios Ordinarios}, leg. 1952, and leg. 382.
\textsuperscript{638} At one point in the course of the revolt, the distribution of bread was organized by parish, on the pretext of this method being faster and more efficient. The “\textit{forasteros y viandantes}” were assigned to the Feria in order to distinguish between the “obedientes y rebeldes”. Domínguez Ortiz, \textit{Alteraciones andaluzas}, 354-5.
commissions, and be prepared to render their accounts to the merchant “whenever, and as often as he may request it”, in addition to paying back any loans (over and above labour costs) they may receive from him.639 There is nothing unusual in this apparent victory of capital over labour, although these types of documents alone do not tell us much about the political struggles—the “extended negotiations”—or the kinds of compromises they resulted in, that would shed light on the balance of forces between producers and merchants in the seventeenth-century Sevillian silk industry.640

Of the skill of Sevillian silk workers there was no doubt. “In these kingdoms there are great workers (laboristas) and craftsmen (oficiales) of this Art,” claimed one of the witnesses in the 1623-25 suit, “and in particular in this city, where embroidery and new things have been invented that have pleased the court, and other places...”.641 Another witness, Pedro de Palacios, pointed out that “gold and silver (silk) yarns and splendid pasamanos” as well as “many cloths of gold and silver” had been, or were being made in Seville on order from royal household.642 Silk workers in Seville, as elsewhere, certainly had a high opinion of themselves and the value of their work,643 and by the last decades of the seventeenth century their claims would be officially recognized by the Crown. As part of a general effort to reinvigorate commerce and industry, Carlos II issued a proclamation on 15 December, 1682, that “being engaged, or having been engaged in the production of silk,

639 AHPSE, Protocolos Notariales, 550, f. 778r-v. Identical agreements, between two silk weavers and a silk merchant, are found on folios 462r-v and 972r-v.
641 Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 158.
642 Ibid.
643 Cordoba’s silk workers thus argued “that theirs was a noble occupation because it created beautiful objects for the best people”. MacKay, “Lazy, Improvident People”, 43. As a sixteenth-century Italian writer put it: “The silk craft is a very noble art worthy of being plied by any true gentleman, for gentlemen are the ones who use silk ...” Molà, The Silk Industry of Renaissance Venice, xiii.
drapery, fabrics and textiles in general, is not incompatible the status of nobility, its immunities and privileges…” In terms of relations with the crown, not to mention the local authorities, silk workers in general could expect a more sympathetic hearing than most of their fellow artisans. But the Arte de la Seda in Seville was not only notable for its particularly strong corporate spirit and sense of entitlement. Occasionally, and in spite of intense rivalries, its spokesmen were able to transcend the city limits in defence of the interests of the entire body of Castilian silk workers. They also collaborated with, supported, or put pressure on silk merchants—those among them who still relied on local production to fill their orders, rather than imports of foreign cloths, and some of whom at least were entrepreneurial artisans, or had been artisans—to ensure that their calls for protectionist measures were heard regularly in the Cortes, and were among the conditions of the granting of the Millones tax, a key form of leverage that allowed the cities to reclaim the initiative in their dealings with the Crown beginning in the late sixteenth century.

5.4. Cortes (1618-1623)

Less than two years before the Arte Mayor of Seville challenged the ruling of the Asistente and appealed to the royal council to enforce the prohibition on silk cloth imports (1623), the matter was brought up in the Cortes of Castile, where many of the same arguments were put forward by the procuradores of the cities. Four years previously, in 1619, the crown had approved a ban on imports of raw silk in response to demands from the major raw silk producing regions, Granada, Valencia, and Murcia.

644 “el mantener y haber mantenido fábricas de seda, paños, telas y otros cualesquier tejidos no ha sido ni es contra la calidad de la nobleza, inmunidades ni prerrogativas de ella …” Barrio Moya, “La testamentaria de D. Andrés Gómez de la Real,” 377.
This was one of the conditions of the Millones tax, by then the mainstay of royal finances, and its administration and collection in the hands of the Cortes and the cities.\textsuperscript{645} The Crown’s growing financial needs, which by 1598 had led to the first Millones tax, and the accompanying contractual arrangements with the Cortes, which retained almost complete administrative control, gave the Castilian parliamentary body a powerful new source of leverage and reinvigorated the institution, as various scholars have shown. The resulting loss of direct control over the sources of royal finances, and the growth in the power of the Cortes—and by extension the cities whose representatives made up the assembly—would be seen as a dangerous devolution of royal power and prerogative by powerful, reformist chief ministers, starting with the Count of Olivares in 1621. This in turn led to a protracted contest not only over financial issues, but the location of power in the monarchy that would culminate in the political crisis of the midcentury—a crisis that would lead to major revolts in some of the peripheral regions of the Spanish Monarchy, but would also have significant repercussions in Castile itself. While other issues were at the core of the struggle between Olivares, the Cortes, and the cities, it should be noted that some of the most intransigent and rebellious urban oligarchies (and \textit{procuradores}) were precisely those of major silk cloth producing cities, including Toledo and Seville, and whose elites thus had the most to worry about if their largest industries were allowed to collapse. Seville, its hinterland, and Andalusia in general, were also the richest, and therefore the greatest prize in this struggle.\textsuperscript{646}

\textsuperscript{645} Above all through a special supreme commission, the Comisión de Millones, and local comissions in each city.
\textsuperscript{646} According to the Consejo de Hacienda, in 1646 Seville alone accounted for a third of all \textit{alcabalas}, rents and tributes in Castile. Jago, “Política fiscal y populismo,” 927.
This, however, did not go down well with those towns and cities where the manufacture of silk fabrics was the mainstay of the economy, including Seville.\(^\text{\textsuperscript{647}}\) In separate petitions the silk twisters’ and weavers’ guilds of Toledo, for instance, put forward strong arguments that the drying up of supplies of foreign silk would starve Castilian cloth manufacturing, since domestic production was insufficient to fill its needs, and that this was the more lucrative, and therefore important branch of the industry. The enforcement of the prohibition, in the absence of a similar (and effective) ban on the importation of finished fabrics, sealed the “ruin” of Spanish silk cloth manufacturing, according to a modern historian.\(^\text{\textsuperscript{648}}\) This was the stark warning issued by the representatives of cities like Toledo and Seville in the very next meeting of the Cortes, two years after the royal cédula.

In a memorial read before the Cortes on 25 October 1621, the procuradores requested an extension of the ban to finished cloths. The procuradores emphasized the financial cost, both in terms of the unfavourable balance of trade, with precious metals extracted from Spain in exchange for imported textiles, as well as the diminishing tax revenue. The latter was not only a loss for the royal hacienda but also had important economic and social consequences in the affected urban communities, leading to unemployment and ultimately the depopulation of the kingdom, one of the perennial sources of anxiety in a society ensnared by a sense of decline. Moreover, while the ruin of the Spanish silk industry had disastrous consequences for producers—the countless master artisans, journeymen, apprentices, widows, and “the poor” who depended on it for their livelihood—they were not the only ones affected. Consumers were also suffering by purchasing lower quality foreign cloths, which were less durable, and although often

---

\(^\text{\textsuperscript{647}}\) Above all Toledo, Priego, and the Andalusian cities of Cordoba, Jaén, Baeza—and Seville.

\(^\text{\textsuperscript{648}}\) Santos Vaquero, *La industria textil sedera de Toledo*, 90-1.
cheaper, this, too, would eventually change with the inevitable disappearance of local 
competition. Everyone was a loser: the royal and municipal treasuries, holders of 
government bonds (juros), the local merchants, producers, and consumers—and, indirectly, 
the kingdom and the Catholic faith itself were under threat.

The pernicious effect of the entry of “worked” foreign silks ("labradas y 
fabricadas") was emphasized, above all for the cities of Granada, Seville, Cordoba, Murcia, 
Jaén, and Toledo, as well as their respective hinterlands, which were being “lost and 
depopulated” because of the decline of the main industry (“su principal trato”). Apart from 
the obvious consequences of the loss of revenues (royal, municipal, private), the growing 
impoverishment meant that “your majesty’s vassals” were being “sapped of the strength” 
required for the defence of the “Holy Catholic faith and the conservation of your Royal 
Crown.” The situation was so alarming because of the sheer number of communities and 
individuals who depended on the silk industry and trade, many of whom were among the 
most vulnerable members of society, women—including nuns and “needy” widows—the 
poor, and “defenceless orphans.” This social welfare function performed by the silk 
industry in Seville can be verified based on the high proportion of apprentices who were 
orphans. The closing of this avenue or means of escape from poverty was said to lead to a 
number of social ills, or many “offences against our Lord”—no doubt of the sort that so 
preoccupied Miguel Cid in the years prior to the 1652 revolt. Moreover, as the memorial 
also argued, the “poor” silk workers had invested “their entire lives” in learning the craft,

649 “Lo primero, Señor, porque los estranjeros con las sedas que traen, sacan el dinero de España, y se hacen 
ricos, y los basallos de V. M. ban empobreciendo y desflaqueciendo las fuerzas con que le tienen de seruir para 
la defensa de la Santa Fee Catolica y conservacion de su Real Corona.” Actas de las Cortes de Castilla (ACC), 
vol. XXXVII (Madrid: Real Academia de Historia, 1914), 217.

650 “y perecen muchos conuentos de monjas y recogimientos, pobres, biudas necesitadas, huerfanos 
desamparados, que se sustentauan en la ocupacion deste trato, y por las necesidades se hazen muchas ofensas a 
Dios nuestro Señor.” Ibid.
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and could ill afford to learn another, most of them being married, with wives and children to support, and were thus condemned to perish.

If the potential for social upheaval was greatly troubling for the urban elites, the loss of revenues was of wider concern, and would be directly felt by the Crown. Nor was the export of bullion—the bane of monarchies according to prevailing mercantilist dogma—the only effect of the unrestricted influx of foreign silks. The (unfair) competition reduced the production of raw silk as well as the manufacture of silk fabrics in Spain, which reduced imposts payable on both. In the regions mainly dedicated to the production of raw silk (not explicitly mentioned, but referring to Murcia, Valencia, and Granada), the perpetual tributes (censos) attached to the silk trade paid for coastal defences, which would thus be compromised. In Granada, the lower rents and taxes levied on silk would affect the payment of dividends on juros, which in turn would reduce purchasing power and thus further reduce demand for locally-produced silk, decimating the industry and increasing the poverty of his majesty’s subjects. It was a vicious circle. On the other hand, the mere knowledge of a prohibition on imported silks would encourage Spanish producers and foster industry, and would see production rise to such levels that prices would drop to below the cost of imported fabrics (a rather optimistic prediction, one might add).

The third major theme of the memorial was related to another form of “deception” (defraudamiento), and focused on the poor quality and deceptively low price of imported silk and even more so of silk cloths. There seems to be some substance to the habitual

---

651 And, the memorial argued, the cultivation of and trade in Spanish raw silk made a far greater contribution to the royal hacienda.
652 “si los basallos de V. M. sauen que no pueden entrar sedas estranxeras, poblaran las tierras de morales y moreras, y criaran mucha mas y abra tanta que la puedan dar por menos precio que los estranxeros.” ACC, XXXVII, 220.
assertion, also made by the Arte Mayor of Seville, that Spanish silk was of higher quality than that from other sources supplying the Mediterranean centres of production. By contrast, it was claimed that foreign silk arriving in Spanish ports was rotten and “false”—poorly made in the first place, and further deteriorated in the course of the lengthy journey by sea. In fact, it was argued, even when mixed with local (Spanish) varieties these threads yielded an inferior fabric. Since the ban on raw silk from abroad had been imposed precisely for this reason, importing finished fabrics made even less sense, since these were woven exclusively using the poorer quality foreign silk, in addition to also suffering damage in transport. Inspection of the imported merchandise, on the other hand, was virtually impossible because of the many “artifices” employed by foreign producers, and because of lack of qualified masters in Spanish ports of arrival. True, Spanish silk cloths were more expensive, but this was not always the case, and was a temporary effect of adverse climatic conditions; on the other hand, if the native industries were allowed to perish, the foreigners would have a captive market, and would duly raise their prices.

In the last resort, there was an appeal to not only the existing protectionist laws going back to the Catholic Monarchs, but also Philip IV’s reputation as a great king, whose duty it was to ensure the self-sufficiency of his realms. It was, in other words, an appeal not only to economic advantage and good sense, or the need to buttress social peace, but an argument that invoked some of the fundamental principles of the political order, namely the king’s duty to ensure prosperity and defence of his kingdom. The memorial was duly approved by the Reino (cities), and was presented to the king and his counsellors.

654 ACC, XXXVII, 219-20.
655 “y vna de las grandeças de tan gran monarca como V. M. a quien Dios a dado tantas prouincias y Reynos, es tener en ellos todo lo necesario, sin que sea menester traerlo de los estraños, como sera fuerça que se aya de acer si se pierde la cria de la seda de los de aca, que se perdera si esto no se rremedia.” Ibid., 220.
The matter had already been raised by a spokesman for Toledo, don Fernando de Toledo, on July 17 of the same year (1621), part of whose “paper” on the subject was read, and which was said to outline the great harm and inconvenience caused by the entry of foreign silks and other luxuries, which were no better than locally-produced goods, and thus a poor excuse for allowing the export of “gold and silver from these kingdoms.” The details of the Toledan arguments were to be discussed at a later date, alongside the expected report on the issue of imported silks from the Millones commissioners.656

5.5. Arte de la Seda vs. Foreign Merchants (1623-1625)

Demands for protectionist measures were raised with increasing frequency in the final years of the reign of Philip III, and the opening years of that of his son and successor—in the Cortes, in the consultas of the royal Council of Castile, and by the king himself, in a letter circulated among the cities in 1622. This included a ban on the importation of foreign textiles that were “killing the Castilian cloth industry,” and the general the need to protect native industry, which was “the sole basis for the conservation and increase of monarchies,” as well as the related anxiety regarding the depopulation of Castile, “the greatest danger threatening the Monarchy.”657 Behind the rhetoric and the petitions in the Cortes were a few vocal and determined arbitristas like Damián de Olivares, whose native Toledo was particularly hard-hit by the tribulations of Castilian industry—and the textile industry in

656 Actas de las Cortes de Castilla (ACC), vol. XXXVI (Madrid: Real Academia de H Istoria, 1914), 36, 160.
particular—in the opening decades of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{658} However, even for those regidores or urban oligarchs less inclined to acknowledge the moral worth of manual labour or labourers, or whose immediate interests or kinship links were with the world of merchant capital, were sensitive to pressure from below. This awareness, or anxiety, was at least partly behind the vehemence and intransigence of the city’s representatives in the Cortes.\textsuperscript{659} This was often admittedly an intangible factor, but reports of popular discontent, of “murmurings”, of open or clandestine assemblies, and, under extreme circumstances like those that obtained in Seville in 1652, open revolt, must be seen alongside petitioning and litigation as some of the means by which those excluded from formal politics in early modern Spain exerted influence on the municipal and the royal authorities. At the very least, artisans contributed to political discourse, including the definition of fundamental concepts such as “the common good”, the nature and composition of the polity, and the mutual obligations between rulers and ruled.

The negotiations between the Crown and the cities in the Cortes were one thing, but the implementation of any agreements reached in Madrid depended on a number of mostly local factors. It is here, at the local level, once the royal decrees and laws, as well as a river of petitions, memoranda, and transcripts of debates and arguments passed between the king and kingdom in parliament, flowed past the city gates and inundated the streets, plazas, taverns, and meeting places—circulated, copied, read, publicly proclaimed or transmitted

\textsuperscript{658} Olivares, like Francisco Martínez de Mata, whose role as an envoy and advocate for the Sevillian guilds will be discussed below, was genuinely convinced of the importance of a thriving industrial sector in the maintenance of the social and political order.

\textsuperscript{659} In the context of military recruitment, Ruth MacKay has argued that urban neighbourhood gatherings, and “the ever-present threat of violence” from disaffected lower orders, “surely contributed to the frequently critical attitude of ayuntamientos toward military obligations.” MacKay, \textit{The Limits of Royal Authority}, 97.
through less formal channels—that another stage in the dialectic that characterized early modern Castilian political culture unfolded.

In 1623, a royal pragmatic issued in the wake of the last meeting of the Cortes was seized upon by the silk weavers’ guild of Seville as confirmation of their privileges related to the production and sale of silk fabrics (including quality control). Although the royal decree was not unambiguous in its provisions related to textile production and trade, the Arte saw it as a green light to fall upon the warehouses and the homes of foreign merchants, to inspect merchandise that, if imported, was sure in their eyes to fall short of quality standards set out in the guild ordinances, and those of the kingdom of Castile. The foreign merchant communities would of course dispute both the interpretation of the law and the Arte’s right to inspect their stores. The merchants’ first priority was to protect their existing stock as well as shipments that were in transit from zealous municipal and guild officers, and in the long run to challenge the notion that the royal prohibition in fact extended to finished products. The Arte’s arguments were more complex, extending beyond mere technicalities, and were grounded in the artisans’ conception of the political community and their place in it. The actions of the Arte de la Seda of Seville, and its suit against some of the city’s foreign merchants in the aftermath of the Cortes of 1622 reveals that at least the upper echelons of the artisanate were well enough informed, politically aware, and able to mobilize resources and act independently in defence of their claims. However, the dispute should also be seen as another chapter in the silk workers’ struggle to protect their status as masters of the art—with all the social and economic authority that entailed—as independent

662 The Arte had hoped for a ban on importing woven silk fabrics into Seville, which had been demanded by the reino in the Cortes, and would remain a perennial yearning for the silk weavers for more than a century.
householders and citizens, an identity that was threatened in this case by inferior foreign competition, but would be under even more severe pressure by the time of the 1652 revolt.

Taking the law into their own hands: the Arte’s suit against the foreign merchants

On May 29, 1623, the asistente of Seville Don Fernando Ramírez Fariñas received a letter from the Royal Council of Castile—in the name of the young Philip IV—which outlined a petition received from the consuls of three merchant communities in Seville. Guillermo Béquer, Guillene Lut, and Pedro Gaumán were the representatives of the Flemish, German, and French “nations” respectively, which had “the greater part of their fortunes in this city.” The consuls’ immediate concern was to put an end to the manner in which “ordinary justice” had set about executing the provisions of the new royal pragmatic, even carrying out inspections of the merchants’ houses, “undoing casks, barrels, packs, bundles, and crates” in which the merchandise was received—products that were fragile and would lose value if they were thus unpacked and “handled,” or rifled through. Moreover, apart from the goods currently stored and awaiting shipment (the Indies fleet had not yet arrived), more were on way, having been loaded onto ships “in good faith”—for the news of the new prohibitions had not yet reached their points of embarkation (“those provinces”). These ships had to contend with “many dangers” on their long journey (5-6 months), including the constant threat of piracy, and dangerous seas. Unaware of the new prohibitions, they should not be subjected to a search and confiscation of goods upon

661 “vissitando la justicia hordinaria las cassas de los mercaderes y deshaçiendo los toneles varriles pacas fardos y caixas en que Venian las dichas mercadurias … [y] ssi sse handubiesen abriendo y manuseando, seria grande agrauio y daño a los dichos mercaderes…” Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 10r.
arrival, nor should the merchants be deprived of their property and their credit ruined. The consuls pleaded with the king and his council that the registry of stored and incoming goods should be compiled and signed by the merchants themselves.662

The foreign consuls’ priority was to ensure that commerce was not interrupted in the short term, and their credit and standing affected adversely by zealous officials and those in whose interests it was to enforce the new ban on foreign imports—the master silk weavers. To ensure this, they were even prepared to concede that the shipments expected to arrive soon contained goods that may be prohibited by the new regulations, although they should not be treated as contraband. But this was not the end, or the extent of their claims. They went on to explain that the new royal pragmatic did not in fact preclude the entry of finished cloths from abroad. Indeed, the suit between the silk weavers’ guild, or the Arte Mayor, and the foreign merchants, revolved around each side’s interpretation of clauses twelve and thirteen of the pragmatic, which referred specifically to the cloth industry. Upon receipt of the merchants’ petition, the Royal Council solicited the opinion of the fiscal, licenciado Francisco de Alarcon, who was of the opinion that, in the first place, section 12 of the pragmatic only prohibited the sale or purchase of silk or wool cloth that did not conform to quality standards (“marca y ley”), whether manufactured in Castile or outside—but it had nothing to say regarding the entry of such goods (the merchants had claimed, among other things, that most of the cloths in question were intended for re-export). With regard to section 13, Alarcon maintained that the prohibition only applied to finished products, such as garments and bedclothes, and not silk thread and unworked fabrics that would require the labour of master craftsmen and journeymen, and so there was no

662 Ibid., f. 10v.
occasion for opening crates and barrels. Finally, the registers were not meant to include goods awaiting re-shipment that, but only the items put up for sale in the merchants’ shops, “where [goods] are measured and weighed, and sold by piece.”

In spite of the royal fiscal’s interpretations, the King’s left the matter in the hands of the asistente Fariñas, who was enjoined to hear both sides before ruling. The latter, did so almost immediately, without bothering with a formal inquest, and less than two weeks later, on June 8, 1623, a royal proclamation (pregón) announced that the goods affected by the royal pragmática should not be inspected in the houses, stores, or warehouses, but instead that the merchants should provide notarized lists of goods, and those whose declarations are found to be false should be punished. The masters of the Arte were clearly incensed with the asistente’s ruling, and this is what prompted the summoning of the silk weavers’ cabildo (described at the beginning of this chapter), the decision to appeal the decision in front of the royal council, and the election of Rodrigo Romero Hurtado as the guild’s representative in the suit. At this point, in August 1623, the Arte Mayor received support from Ambrosio de Mora, a procurador in the Royal Audiencia of Seville, who intervened in the suit as a “private citizen.” Mora, in the name of the Arte, and Rodrigo de Zaldivar, the foreign consuls’ representative, both summoned witnesses to bolster their case, and what follows is largely based on these witness testimonies.

Zaldivar’s first objection was that the procurador had no right to intervene in the suit, and was in any case misinformed about what was truly useful to the kingdom—commerce, which generated royal rights (derechos), and payment of interest on government

---

663 Ibid., f. 11r.
664 Ibid., ff. 204r-05r.
665 It is not clear what, apart from his stated altruism as a concerned citizen, motivated Mora’s intervention, or what precisely were his links with the Arte or any of the individual producers.
bonds (juros).\textsuperscript{666} The witnesses called by Zaldivar pointed out some of the other inconveniences that would arise from enforcing the import ban on foreign cloths.\textsuperscript{667} Francisco de Ortega, a linen merchant confirmed the impact it would have on royal income and juros, adding that the merchants’ credit and standing would be harmed if officers of justice were seen entering their homes, noting the importance of “opinion” and reputation in trade.\textsuperscript{668} Another linen merchant, Sebastián Diáz, explained that those who saw justices entering the homes of the said merchants, not knowing the reason for this might presume that the individuals in question were being arrested, perhaps for unpaid debts, “which resulted in their loss of credit.”\textsuperscript{669} A total of twelve witnesses were called by Zaldivar, all of them cloth or linen merchants, or corredores de lonja, who said they were speaking from experience, and were well aware of the value and importance of the trade in imported cloths.\textsuperscript{670} Most of the dozen nevertheless gave responses that diverged little in terms of substance or phrasing from the detailed questions that made up the interrogatorio, thus merely giving assent to the claims made therein.

\textit{The common good and the artisan body}

The responses of many of the Arte’s (or Mora’s) witnesses included notably more unsolicited information and opinions, which make it possible to draw some conclusions about the ideological underpinnings of their protest. The arguments extended beyond the letter of the law, which in any case left plenty of room for interpretation, perhaps by design.

\textsuperscript{666} Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, ff. 19.
\textsuperscript{667} Zaldivar’s witnesses’ depositions were taken on 6 and 11 September, 1623.
\textsuperscript{668} Rodrigo Romero Hurtado and consortes, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, ff. 60-2.
\textsuperscript{669} Ibid., ff. 62-64.
\textsuperscript{670} Ibid., ff. 79-81.
From the very beginning, Rodrigo Romero as the representative of the Arte Mayor accused the foreign consuls of “only looking after their particular interest, and not the public and common good of the whole kingdom,” which was precisely the purpose of the royal laws. Appeals to “the common good” were a standard feature of political discourse from the middle ages and well into the early modern period in Europe. It was part of a constellation of kindred concepts or keywords, including “commonwealth”, and “republic”, used by a variety of actors in diverse contexts. Precisely as a result of this flexibility, the meaning of these terms was always contested, for it depended on particular visions of the community and the polity—Whose interests were encompassed in the “common” good? What was the proper relationship between members of the (hierarchical) community? What was the nature of the “good” in question? What was the best way to achieve it? Who had the right to define these terms? In this case, the master weavers were invoking the spirit of the laws, and claimed to discern the ultimate purpose of the royal pragmatic, which was to protect the interests of Castilian producers. Implementing the new laws, and prohibiting the importation of foreign silk cloths, would not only increase royal rents, “because in all parts of these kingdoms there would be striving to produce and work the said merchandise,” but this increased output of the the native industry would yield cloths that were in compliance with Castilian quality standards (“ley y quenta”), which would also benefit consumers. The

---

671 For an extended discussion of these terms, and the various factors that shaped their meaning and usage in the early modern period, including social and political contexts, the rhetorical dimension, and changes over time and across regions of Europe and the colonies, see Early Modern Research Group, ”Commonwealth: The Social, Cultural, and Conceptual Contexts of an Early Modern Keyword,” The Historical Journal 54, no. 3 (2011). On the “common good” as a term invoked by Castilian artisans, the meanings they ascribed to it, and its relation to the legitimacy of royal laws, among other things, see MacKay, “Lazy, Improvident People”, Chapter 1: “The Republic of Labor,” and especially, 28-35. Incidentally, Hercules, the mythical founder of Seville, was the “great guardian of the common good” according to Enrique de Villena: ibid., 31. See also Luis R. Corteguera, For the Common Good: Popular Politics in Barcelona, 1580-1640 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002).

672 “y las partes contrarias tan solamente miran su particular interes y no el público y común de todo el Reyno que se considero en las dichas pragmáticas ...” Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 14r.
kingdom could easily live without the imported fabrics, “as it had done in previous times,” which would also have the benefit of preventing the export of precious metals by the foreign merchants, a “great inconvenience” (“grande incommeniente”), the effect of which was “notoriously harmful”. As a result, the kingdoms (of Castile) would be repopulated, as there would be work for those who presently could not even count on a daily wage to feed themselves and their families. The Arte Mayor and its representative framed perennial corporate grievances—regarding “fraudulent” manufactures which deceived and despoiled the customer, or outside competition that denied employment to local craftsmen—as issues that had grave repercussions for the whole kingdom, and thus of pressing national and royal interest.

The silk weavers were able to measure their contribution to the common-wealth in very precise terms, in the process making the link between private and public profit. Several of Mora’s artisan witnesses provided a more or less identical calculation of the value added to silk thread by workers who turned it into lengths of fabric: each libra of raw silk cost around 40–50 reales, and once it had been worked and woven into cloth, its worth rose to between 140–150 reales—in other words, the working of the silk tripled the value of the raw material. The difference—or profits—remained in the hands of “the masters, journeymen, and poor [silk] workers”, while the Crown benefited indirectly, through taxes and

---

673 “las rentas Reales [...] se aumentaran, porque en todas las partes destos Reynos se animaran a fabricar y labrar las dichas mercaderias con toda quenta y ley que es mas vtil y prouechosso...” ibid. On the craft guilds’ contribution to market transparency, see Maarten Prak, ed. *Early Modern Capitalism: Economic and Social Change in Europe, 1400–1800* (London: Routledge, 2001).

674 The necessary link between population, production, and labour was a standard theme of economic and political thinkers in the first two decades of the 1600s: Pierre Vilar, “The Age of Don Quixote,” in *Essays in European Economic History, 1500–1800*, ed. Peter Earle (Oxford University Press, 1974), 107.

675 The value of the finished fabric depended on the thread, but the value added was invariably around 100 reales, see the testimonies of Pedro de Palacios, master silk weaver, Alonso de Arguello, velvet weaver and guild inspector, and Bartolomé Rodriguez, dyer. *Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes*, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 103, f. 24.
contributions that these otherwise impoverished vassals were able to pay. Incidentally, it was surely not without design that the verb “beneficiar” was used in Mora’s witnesses both to describe the labour of working the silk cloth into garments, as well as the advantage (beneficio) to the kingdom of keeping its manufacturers gainfully employed. The chains of dependence, between master weavers, journeymen, apprentices, and the countless women and children, or between the work of artisans and the health of the royal exchequer, and in turn the king’s ability to defend the faith against its enemies, was a constant theme running through all the testimonies. In Seville, the silk industry was the glue that held together the third estate, and its ruin threatened the collapse of the entire economic and social structure. Many masters were refusing to instruct their children in the craft, and there were no alternatives either, “given the interdependence between [the trades], the silk manufacture being the principal and greatest of them, upon which depend twelve other occupations …” The common good implied not only shared advantages, but also mutual obligations of the tax-paying pecheros and the king. These were the foundations of the commonwealth, and it was the king’s moral duty to uphold the legitimate concerns of the master artisans, rather than the foreign merchants who drained the kingdom of its precious metals and—indirectly—depleted its human resources.

---

676 The same connections and arguments were made in sixteenth-century Venice to defend measures that would protect the silk industry from foreign competition, albeit by loosening regulations to legitimise the production of cheaper, less durable fabrics. See Mola, *The Silk Industry of Renaissance Venice*.
677 *Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes*, AHN, Consejos. leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 90.
678 Bartolomé de Torres, silk weaver and merchant, ibid., f. 103. This failure to pass on the skills or “mysteries” of the craft would have grave repercussions for the community as a whole, according to Luis de Mejía y Ponce de León. In his *Apólogo de la ociosidad y el trabajo* he advised rulers to “procure the very perfect masters in all the arts so that people in your republic wisely use the time they spend learning.” The masters and journeymen in turn should neither be too rich, in order not to disdain their craft, nor so poor as to “be unable to properly teach what they should of the customs and art by which they live and which benefit the republic.” MacKay, "Lazy, Improvident People", 31.
There was more to this economic and, ultimately, political equation, namely the threat to the honour and status of silk masters of the Arte, and thus the social order itself. The industrial decline and want of work left many masters destitute, or forced to abandon their trade, the basis of the master artisan’s personal honour, identity, and his place in society. As the dyer Bartolomé Rodríguez explained, many artisans had left Seville, while those who remained were poor, “and this witness has given alms to some of them, and many have turned to other, more humble occupations, and others are working as wage labourers [bricklayers], which is a great shame and [cause for] compassion, as they were once artisans, and persons with their own homes, and families, and were honourably treated.”679 Another dyer, Simón de Batres, painted an even bleaker picture, claiming that some impoverished silk workers had turned to theft, and had been hanged as criminals, while many women were “lost” (had become prostitutes). Scores of empty houses, and falling rents (for want of artisans to rent them) were testimony to this misery.680 The downward social mobility was a personal catastrophe for those affected, but it had much wider implications for the social and political order itself. Attaining mastership as a silk weaver, the noblest of crafts, held out the promise, and for the most successful masters, the reality, of self-sufficiency, an independent household, being able to support a wife and family, and at least one or two live-in apprentices. This relative independence, however precarious, was in turn the source of self-esteem and social status, sustained by one’s skill as a craftsman, and protected by the collective bargaining power of the guild. Unable to make a living from their craft undermined this self-sufficiency and independence, and therefore not only the ability to pay

679 Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 130.
680 Ibid., ff. 136-39. The more fortunate were migrating to the Indies, or France, Genoa, Milan, and other silk manufacturing centres, according to Lázaro de Higuera, who claimed to have seen many of his fellow weavers leave the city, for Mexico and France in particular, ibid., f. 142.
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royal taxes, but also to maintain an entire social unit, the extended family, with apprentices and servants, as well as journeymen and others dependent in one way or another on the activity of the master artisan’s workshop. The autonomy for the individual master artisans was also a guarantee of the maintenance of the patriarchal and hierarchical social order. A threat to this ideal, however imperfectly unrealized in practice (or even in that mythical past that artisan petitions invariably harked back to)—in other words, this defence of custom and tradition, guaranteed by the guild and enshrined in its ordinances—could, under certain circumstances, become as the basis for political radicalism and upheaval, the consequences of which were anything but predictable. In England, around the time of the Andalusian urban revolts (1647-52), similar and apparently conservative demands for economic regulation, and defence of corporate interests based on the “guild ethos” of fraternity may be seen not as an anachronistic vestige of the Middle Ages, but the enduring vitality of the notion of collective rights, very much a fundamental part of the radical politics of the mid-seventeenth-century.

Finally, the common good was presented by the Arte de la Seda of Seville as the good of the whole kingdom, identified with the interests of the industrial sector. The prohibition of imported fabrics had been solicited by “the kingdoms jointly” in the Cortes of 1621. The deputies, like the present witnesses, were inspired by “zeal for the republic”, and desired nothing but “the general good of all Spain” Many of the

683 Gabriel López de Mendoza’s testimony, *Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes*, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 89.
684 Francisco de Aranda, corredor de lonja, ibid., f. 148.
685 Bartolomé Rodriguez, silk dyer, ibid., f. 128.
witnesses referred to the parallel decline of the silk industry in other industrial centres, including Toledo, Granada, and Cordoba, citing first-hand knowledge, or based on reports and intercourse with manufacturers or merchants from those cities. Mora pleaded for a ban on importing finished cloth, only allowing silk thread to enter the country in order to stimulate Spanish industry and also benefit the Indies. Before woven silks were permitted to enter Castile, he argued, there had been “many dyers, weavers, seamstresses, [silk] twisters, men and women” who made cloths and haberdashery, and were able to supplement their household incomes. Not only the artisans and their spouses, but the kingdoms of Toledo, Murcia, Granada, “and others,” could recover that “greatness and wealth” by promoting their industries, and thus reducing poverty, and depopulation—even in Seville, a city that appeared so populous, “there are presently four thousand empty houses, even in the Plaza de San Francisco,” its commercial centre. It was in the king’s hands to remedy this situation.

686 Alonso de Arguello, velvet weaver and guild inspector, ibid., ff. 126-7. “ssi no se quita y prohiue la entrada de la dha ropa estrangera se hira acabando de todo punto este trato en españa, y esto es cossa muy publica y sauida entre los mercaderes y tratantes offiçiales y otras personas …”
687 The number of individuals—men, women, and children—dependent on silk manufacturing far exceeded the number of master craftsmen, and in some branches of the industry (haberdashery, ribbon-making and silk stocking production) women were indeed predominant. In Toledo, the municipal authorities (cabildo de jurados) estimated in 1575 (more or less the zenith of the local silk industry) that 10-20,000 “poor” depended on silk for survival, out of a total population of around 60,000. Santos Vaquero, La industria textil sedera de Toledo, 52-3.
688 “hauia en estos Reynos muchos tintoreros texedores coxederas torçedores y hombres y mugeres que haçian medias y encanaban y haçian listones, con lo qual ayudaban a las cargas matrimoniales y el Reyno de toledo murçia y granada y los demas estauan muy poderosos y entrando las dhas sedas en rrama o pelo se bolberan a rrestaurar y enriquezer, por que quedara todo el prouecho de la manifatura en estos Reynos y no habra tantas necesidades y pobreças como ay y mucha falta de gente, pues ay en esta çiudad con ssi como es tan poblada habra el dia de oy mas de quatro mill cassas vaçias hasta en la propia plaça de s.n francisco con ser cassi donde se junta todo el comerçio …” Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 17r.
The quality of work and working men

Another key argument reiterated by the Arte and by Ambrosio de Mora was the poor quality of imported silks. The weaver Pedro de Palacios thus claimed that in his capacity as guild inspector he found that foreign cloths in the merchants’ houses were “nearly all false” Although at first sight they appear fine, this was the effect of gums that were applied to them, or they are found to contain threads other than silk, in some cases the weft and woof was “false”, or the colours were not fast enough, or the fabrics stained easily. To make things worse, many silk fabrics arrived rotten following the long seaborne journey, and this was especially true of black cloths. Imported fabrics invariably all bore some defect, which was a cause for complaints from members of “the general public” (“el común que las gastan”), and many customers had returned the purchased cloth to the silk exchange (Alcaicería) after it had been cut and tailored, once the deception had been discovered.

Even if there was some merit to this disparaging of foreign workmanship, the main point was to emphasize the skill and expertise of Sevillian artisans, the masters of the Arte, their worth and status as integral members of the social and political body of the Republic. The quality of Sevillian silks was a surrogate for the quality of the craftsmen, as loyal subjects and taxpayers.

The inverse of this pride in the craft, and local craftsmen, is the poor quality of foreign silks, which “defraud” the consumer as well as the royal fisc, while causing
impoverishment among Castilian workers. Juan Sánchez del Aguila insisted that he had personally seen, in Granada and elsewhere, how foreign silk cloths that at first appeared fine (“tienen buena cara”) later quickly disintegrated (“se rompen y hazen ceniças”).\textsuperscript{693} As Ruth MacKay had pointed out, complaints about the “false” and deceitful, or “deceptive” (\textit{engañoso}) goods being sold to unsuspecting Spanish consumers—frequently used by seventeenth-century Castilian artisans—“imply the breaking of a contract, the creation of discord among peaceful citizens, the transgression of justice, the violation of order. They are words that go beyond corporate bickering. \textit{They are political terms whose meaning resonated within a commonwealth.}\textsuperscript{694} The various forms of deception involved in the trade of foreign silks, whether as a result of their inferior quality, or the evasion of customs and duties, wrought damage to community in a myriad ways.

In the late 1580s, when the importation of finished silk cloths was still prohibited (by a royal \textit{pragmática} of 1552), there had been “great commerce in silk in this city,” according to Gabriel López de Mendoza, and the resulting abundance of people, a scarce quarter of whom were left.\textsuperscript{695} The depopulation as a result of the influx of foreign silk cloths was general, and affected not only Seville but also Cordoba and Toledo. In response, at the Cortes of 1621, the kingdom had petitioned His Majesty for a (new?) prohibition, a task entrusted in the name of all the \textit{procuradores} to Don Juan de Vargas, a \textit{veinticuatro} and representative of Seville. The witness, López de Mendoza, had heard this from Don Juan in person, and others Cortes representatives, who had also given him a draft of the memorial,

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{693} This argument was common in the petitions of Castilian silk weavers’ guilds. The Arte Mayor de la Seda of Toledo, for instance, made the same complaint in 1603. Santos Vaquero, \textit{La industria textil sedera de Toledo}, 93.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{694} My italics. MacKay, “Lazy, Improvident People”, 32-3.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{695} Another witness, Bartolomé de Torres, silk weaver and merchant, recalled that “twenty years ago” there had been plentiful work and the \textit{arte} was thriving: “habra mas de veinte años que se acuerda este testigo que el dicho arte andaba bueno…”\textit{Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes}, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 156.}
\end{footnotes}
of which he had a clean copy made by a servant.\textsuperscript{696} There was no doubt in his mind that the kingdom would greatly benefit from such a ban, and the king’s subjects would not be compelled to leave, for the Indies, France, Genoa, Milan, and elsewhere, as they were presently driven to do for lack of work—silk cloth manufacturing being the principal industry of the cities in question.\textsuperscript{697} The visible evidence of the resulting unemployment were the countless empty houses—“four or five thousand” according to one witness, even in “the most principal streets and plazas” of the city, according to another.\textsuperscript{698}

Depopulation, and the spectre of a diminishing human potential, was worrying enough, and not only for those who daily walked past boarded-up houses or knew some of those who had left, never to return, but also preoccupied the king and his advisors, including the Count Duke of Olivares. Yet those who remained behind, often in desperate straits, and the resulting social ills, were just as great a problem—an anxiety voiced in the Cortes memorial, but emphasized forcefully by Mora’s witnesses.

\textit{The privileges of the Arte and artisanal knowledge}

The emphasis on quality also invoked the question of regulation: of who had the right to inspect the merchandise and where, which was central to the dispute between the

\textsuperscript{696} Moreover he was aware that the original had been composed by the procuradores and signed before the secretary of the Cortes, Rafael Cornejo.

\textsuperscript{697} “los maestros y personas que se hauian de ocupar en este venefficio se ausentaran a las indias y a françia genoba y milan y a las demas partes donde se labran las dichas sedas y en particular se an ydo muchos a mexico e indias y assi lo a visto este testigo y que cada dia se ausentan …” Lázaro de Higuera, \textit{Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes}, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 142.

\textsuperscript{698} “muchas cassas vaçias que no ay quien las avite y en particular ay en esta çiudad en todas las calles della muchas casas cerradas con çedulas que no ay quien las avite ni arriende y en las calles y plazas mas principales …” Juan Martínez, ibid., f. 154.
Arte and the foreign consuls. The guild naturally arrogated to itself the policing function. After all, the “false” fabrics were rarely visible to the naked eye,

The witnesses called for the other side, by Ambrosio de Mora, also spoke from experience, and although some were merchants, several did so as skilled craftsmen of an “art”. Juan Sánchez del Aguila, although a general inspector (visitador general) of the silk rent of Granada, gave his opinion as a former velvet weaver, as someone with valuable practical knowledge. Alonso de Arguello vouched for the value added by working silk “as a master [velvet weaver] and guild inspector” (lo saue este testigo como tal maestro y vehedor…). For Lázaro de Higuera, a velvet weaver and merchant, it was a matter of having mastered the “science” of the art, so to speak. It was also a question of pride, in one’s own work and expertise, but also in the craft, the ingenuity and skill of Sevillian silk workers. “In these kingdoms there are great practitioners (“laboristas y oficiales”) of this art,” claimed the weaver-merchant Bartolomé de Torres, “and above all in this city, where new methods and things have been invented which have gained approval of the [royal] court and other parts.”

Silk workers, and weavers in particular, were highly mobile, not least because their skills and experience were much sought after as competition between silk manufacturing centres intensified, and urban or royal authorities expended money and passed laws to

---

699 The distinction is not always possible, since many combined artesanal and mercantile activities, or claimed to have abandoned the former for the latter at some point—but in both cases they relied on their practical knowledge of weaving or dyeing to support their claims about the poor quality of foreign silks, among other things (see below).
700 Rodrigo Romero Hurtado y consortes, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25497, exp. 2, f. 125. The dyer Simón de Batres likewise invoked his occupation as a source of authoritative knowledge, ibid., f. 139.
701 “Y esto a visto y saue este testigo segun tiene dicho por la ciencia que tiene dello y experiencia y pratica con las personas que tratan del dicho arte de la seda …” ibid., f. 144.
702 “en estos Reynos ay muy grandes laboristas y oficiales deste arte, y en particular en esta ciudad donde se han imbentado labores y cossas nueuas que agradan en la corte y en otras partes, y que oy actualmente se esta labrando ropa para el servicio de la casa Real …” ibid., f. 158.
attract workers, the prerequisite to reviving production or establishing new industries.\footnote{Apart from Lázaro de Higuera, the itinerant Genoese, another weaver, Pedro de Palacios, was well acquainted with the problems faced by the silk industrial sector in Toledo, Granada, “and other parts,” as well as the effect on trade of unrestricted imports in Lisbon “for having been to all of these cities,” ibid., f. 106. The high price of labour in Seville after the great plague of 1649 also led to an influx of silk workers in particular from Toledo, Granada, Cordoba, and elsewhere.} This geographic mobility, allied with the silk weavers’ level of literacy, meant that many weavers gathered extensive knowledge of not only the condition of their craft in any given town or city, but were able to draw connections and make comparisons between places.

One witness named by Mora in support of the Arte’s case was Lázaro de Higuera, a velvet weaver and silk merchant, of Genoese origin, gave a particularly detailed and well-informed account, not only of the issue at hand, but of the relative balance of silk cloth manufacturing and trade in the Mediterranean, and the advantages of fostering a native silk industry. He had himself migrated from Genoa to Valencia some twenty four years earlier, when the abundance of work and commercial opportunities had attracted “more than fifty masters and journeymen with their households and families,” which resulted in a revival of the craft and commerce in general in that city—with a corresponding increase in royal revenues. It was very different now, Higuera claimed, when so many skilled workers were leaving for “France, Genoa, and Milan … and in particular many have gone to Mexico and the Indies.”\footnote{“y así lo a visto este testigo y que cada día se ausentan …” ibid., f. 142.} He makes the explicit connection between the thriving Genoese silk industry, regularly supplied with raw silk from Messina (“in Sicily, Your Majesty’s kingdom …”) in the galleys of the republic, and the wealth and power of the city-state, where “large sums of gold and silver money are in use, which is extracted and taken from these kingdoms [Spain], in exchange for the said woven silks.” The benefit derived from this exchange is such that “an entire street is given over to money-changers’ shops, and precious metals are so
abundant that *vellón*, the copper money that was replacing gold and silver coins in circulation in Spain, and was for many a symbol of the crown’s financial difficulties, was “esteemed more” and a premium paid by those who wished to obtain it. This wealth and abundance was due to the fact that all the silk worked in Genoa was exported to Spain “because there they are used very little because of a certain [sumptuary] pragmatic … and because it is a cold land.” Higuera goes on to illustrate the strength of the various Italian centres of silk cloth production, claiming that in Genoa, “when this witness lived there,” there had been 30,000 broad silk looms, and as many smaller ones, while Lucca boasted 6,000 looms, Florence 3,000 or 4,000, Naples and Sicily “6,000 in each city,” only counting the broad silk looms—and this were only so many reasons why money and men were drawn to those “foreign kingdoms.”

Not only was there a connection between population, employment, wealth, and an overflowing treasury, on the one hand, and a successful silk industry on the other, but, more importantly in the case of Genoa—which Higuera knew from personal experience, and which he claimed was the largest—the industry was actively supported by the state. It was the state which organized the shipments of raw silk in its own galleys on an annual basis, their cargos and expenditures balanced—and financed—by the silver and gold sent from Spain. This practical knowledge acquired by artisans in the course of their work, or through their encounters with the worlds of industry and commerce, as in the case of the well-travelled Genoese silk weaver—not only skill in one’s craft, or in this case, a noble “art”, but also broader knowledge of how the world works, for instance the relationship between political economy and the rise and fall of states, surely falls in the category of an artisanal epistemology that had to some extent enabled even the humblest practitioner of the
mechanical arts to partake in the production of political knowledge, that is to say, that practical experience and not only erudite political theory could be mobilized to surmise ways in which rulers could, or ought to, manipulate human affairs. Recent scholarship, inspired by historiographical trends in the history of science, suggests not only that political knowledge trickled down to ordinary people, and was therefore not confined to the major political theorists and their intended audience, but that artisans, even the humblest among them, could “produce political knowledge,” derived from their experience of work and nature, and their ability to conceptualize this knowledge in ways and using terms that made sense to them. These ideas originating among labourers and the lower strata of society could become part of the wider political discourse, and reflections on the purpose of government and of laws, or on the nature of the common good.  

Moreover, at the heart of this artisanal epistemology, and even more profoundly, the foundation of both the economic and political identity of guild-based artisans, was their skill as craftsmen: not as a mere technical dexterity and transmissible knowledge outside the local context, but a moral quality that served as a bond of trust: between producers and consumers, neighbours, citizens—and thus a political quality. Artisan skill was seen as

---


706 According to Bert De Munck, this link between skill, local knowledge, and pride in, and honour of, the city, or, in other words, the link between “economic personhood” and “political subjectivity” was based on three tendencies in early modern European towns and cities: first, the link between citizenship and mastership, that was especially common and direct in the Low Countries and England; second, the link between skill and the urban context in ritual and visual culture; and finally, quality control, inspections, and seals or hallmarks, which rendered the link between skill and the city (as a political community) in quite literal terms. In relation to this last point, especially relevant to the lawsuit between the Arte de la Seda of Seville and the foreign merchants, de Munck concludes, referring to the practice of sealing fabrics with the image of the city as a guarantee of quality: “the value of the artisans’ skills and technical knowledge was quite literally linked to the city as a political ideal.”
part of a body of local knowledge, including local standards, norms, and values shared by a body of citizens, as members of a mystical corpus. Skill was something intrinsic and singular that bound corporations (and the individuals within them) to one another, and to a particular place. In this sense, skill and the quality of the local product redounded to the honour and fame of the city, and thus the common concern of both the guild and the urban government was to protect the city’s reputation, the probity and quality of its citizens and of the body social and politic—hence the significance of the link between the image or symbol of the city on the seal with which the bolts of cloth were marked, the “sello y marca” repeated like a mantra by the litigants of the Arte.\footnote{Molà, The Silk Industry of Renaissance Venice.}

The Crown ultimately sided with the foreign consuls. The Crown’s dependence on foreigners—and the foreign merchant communities in Seville above all—for everything from credit, to tax farming, and the Indies trade (and thus the silver consignments), is well documented. As a result, the foreign merchant communities had since the middle of the sixteenth century secured a number of exemptions and privileges. 1624 was a particularly sensitive moment in this regard, and Olivares and the young Philip IV spent several months in the city negotiating a financial contribution. Moreover, many foreign merchants had by the 1620s established close ties with the Sevillian social elite, whether through commercial dealings or marriage or both.\footnote{Enriqueta Vila Vilar, “Colonias extranjeras en Sevilla: Tipología de los mercaderes,” in Sevilla, Felipe II y la Monarquía Hispánica, ed. Carlos Alberto González Sánchez (Sevilla: Ayuntamiento de Sevilla, 1999).}
An extended negotiation

The conflict between the Arte de la Seda of Seville and the foreign merchants in the early 1620s was part of a broader dynamic, in which the typical artisan response to the economic crisis then engulfing Castile was to strengthen their corporate organizations—or to form new ones—as a means of weathering the storm. It is increasingly obvious that, rather than a sign of inveterate traditionalism and refusal to change with the times, the vigorous defence of corporate privileges by Castilian craftsmen was a rational response to the growing divergence between wages and prices, the fiscal burden imposed by the state, the waning of the ethos of a “moral economy” and the intrusion of the market, hastened by an increasingly dominant merchant elite, often drawn from the ranks of more prosperous artisans.709 There were winners and losers on all sides. The struggle was as much between various craft guilds, keen to assert their control over one another, as it was between artisans and merchants. There was also a struggle within each guild, between a wealthy artisan elite that monopolised guild offices and access to raw materials, and the rest—so that the insistence on the enforcement of guild ordinances and hierarchies was often detrimental to the interests of the majority of the poorer artisans. What also emerges from this general picture is that regardless of how we judge the role of specific guilds, incorporation, or the strengthening of workers’ organizations, was not simply—or even primarily—an economic act. In other words, the primary motive was rarely organization of industrial labour, but social differentiation, and also a political act.

There was nothing unusual about the revival of corporatism, or the patterns of action through extra-constitutional means, first through the courts, and if this failed, and

709 Nieto Sánchez, Artesanos y mercaderes; Franch Benavent, “La evolución de la sedería valenciana.”
other elements were in place, violence. It was a pattern repeated throughout seventeenth-century Europe, in ‘revolutionary’ as well as ‘non-revolutionary’ polities.\textsuperscript{710} The ideology and goals of the craftsmen was not the main, or even a significant difference between English and Spanish artisans in the mid-seventeenth century, but the wider context that in one case allowed the embers of workers’ discontent to flare up and merge with a general conflagration whose complex origins and goals were not always revolutionary, even if the outcomes threatened to be precisely that. In both cases however, the goals were perhaps limited, but clearly political and communitarian, rather than merely economic.

By the early 1650s these struggles, the crisis which provoked them, as well as war, famine, and plague, had taken their toll on countless individual craftsmen, whose lot—if they were fortunate enough to survive these calamities—was destitution and poverty. But the crisis also affected many crafts and guilds, which either disappeared completely or just barely survived long enough to enjoy a hesitant recovery in the final decades of the century. Those who were best equipped for the trials of the middle decades of the seventeenth century were, first of all, those artisans who were protected, at least to some extent, by their guilds, especially if the guild was as long-established as relatively powerful as silk weavers’ guilds tended to be. Apart from its other functions, which it had in common with other corporations—such as its usefulness to the authorities for more efficient extraction of monetary and human resources, and the maintenance of social order—the silk weavers also constituted the most powerful organization in what was the most important industry—textiles in general, and silk cloth manufacture in particular.

\textsuperscript{710} James R. Farr, \textit{Artisans in Europe, 1300-1914} (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
As in other cities, social inequalities rose dramatically in the first half of the seventeenth century. As Aguado de los Reyes has shown, the contrast between the first and second quarter of the 1600s was stark, with the rich getting richer, the middling classes barely holding on, and the poor getting poorer. Labour grievances, and in particularly within the significant silk manufacturing sector, were central to the simmering discontent. In 1642 the Crown devalued the vellón currency. When the news of the currency devaluation was publicly announced in Seville, there was uproar among the populace that prompted an extraordinary meeting of the city council. The devaluation had the effect of instantly reducing the value of goods being sold in the city, which was cut by half, and even more in the case of silk, which dropped from 60 reales a libra to only 22 reales. “Everyone wanted the devaluation, and later [when it was announced] everyone cried about it,” as a contemporary chronicle noted. It seems that although expected, most were preparing for a more modest reduction in value, along the lines of 1628, and so trade within the city continued, as goods were expected to retain most of their value, even if no major profits could be expected. However the reality proved otherwise, and those who had purchased silk fabrics were most affected.

The crisis of 1652 was brought to a head by the brazen unscrupulousness of the royal agent sent to deal with the illegal minting of coins in Seville that was a widespread response to the devaluation of the vellón currency. According to a contemporary chronicle,

---

712 “Todos deseaban la vaja, y despues la lloraron todos. Y aunque muchos la rezelaban, empleaban el dinero de vellón en generos, presumiendo que no perderían nada en los que viesen comprado, por que no aguardaban la vaja sino â la mitad, con que hacian el computo conforme la vaja de moneda del año de 1628, que en la pieza de moneda de a ocho mrs pechelingue ô gruesa, quedaria como entonces â quatro marau.es y hacian la quenta del valor de las mercaderias conforme este computo, y del dinero qu e avian de perceibir, y discurrian que no auian de perder, aunque no ganasen, y como fue â ochabo cada pieza de a dos quartos la vaja, perdieron muchssimo maiormente quien auia empleado en generos de seda.” *Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y mui leal ciudad de Sevilla*, BCC, MS 59-1-5, 260v.
the fear and uncertainty stoked by García de Porras meant that many merchants refused to trade, resulting in work stoppages and poverty among the workers. The situation was exacerbated by the plague of 1649, when 20,000 are said to have died and the city “was nearly depopulated” (“quedo casi despoblada”), causing a severe shortage of workers and raising the price of labour, which in turn attracted “many [craftsmen] from other cities and towns bringing nothing but their own persons. However given the high prices in subsequent years they were not able to save enough to pay for housing, only enough to afford clothing for themselves and their children and wives.”713 The revolt on May 22 was instigated by a quadrilla of 30 “[silk] weavers, twisters, and other craftsmen” in the Plaza de la Feria, and the first of eight demands presented to the city council by the rebels three days later was a subsidy for all “the poor tradesmen who at present have no work.”714 The issues raised in the 1623–5 lawsuit and petitions, along with the underlying self-perceptions of silk workers as economic and political subjects, would continue to shape the actions of artisans through the middle decades of the seventeenth century, although their strategies varied—influenced also by changing economic and political circumstances. Less than a decade following the 1652 revolt, the craft guilds of Seville elected to form a brotherhood of all the mechanical trades, aided and abetted by the arbitrista Francisco Martínez de Mata, who had taken over the role of friar turned social activist from the disgraced Bernabé Filgueira.

713 “muchísimos de diferentes ciudades y lugares trayendo solamente sus personas y respecto de haver sido los años siguientes caros no havian podido hacer muchas alajas para aposentos pues vastava que se vistiesen ellos sus hijos y mugeres.” Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57–3–9.
714 Ibid.
5.6. Martínez de Mata and 'The Brotherhood of the Guilds' (1659-1663)

In the years following the second Feria revolt, the silk workers of Seville would try
the legal route once more, but this time enlisting the support of not only the city’s other
guilds, but also of those of Toledo—once the foremost silk cloth manufacturing centre in
Castile—and the capital, Madrid. The new initiative began in 1659 with the formation of a
curious and surely unprecedented craftsmen’s association, the Holy Brotherhood of the
Guilds and Crafts (Santa Hermandad de los Gremios y Oficios de Sevilla), under the
leadership of the Arte de la Seda. The new Hermandad drew up its constitution and
outlined a list of recommendations that in the opinion of the tradesmen would lead to the
“restitution of industry and commerce,” and of the kingdom in general, “to their former
wealth and opulence.” These differed little from the claims and demands made by the Arte
de la Seda during its dispute with the foreign consuls in 1623-1625, and which would
continue to be the thrust of petitions until at least the middle of the following century. In
every one of these instances, Seville’s silk workers in this period of economic decline
recognized that they had a stake in the national debate over economic and fiscal policies,
and in particular the perennial problem of raising money without endangering the wellbeing
of the kingdom. They were deeply embedded in one of the antagonistic “ideological
microclimates” that characterized seventeenth-century Castile, and whose confrontation is
at the root of the midcentury socio-political conflicts.

The Hermandad brought together 37 craft guilds (representing at least 39 separate
occupations)—an impressive number that represents for more than half of the occupations

\footnote{All that follows is from: El fiscal contra los culpables sobre una provisión falsa despachada a los gremios de las Artes de Sevilla, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25847, exp. 11.}

\footnote{Jago, “Política fiscal y populismo.”}
in Seville. The initiative was taken by the Arte de la Seda, whose alcalde and two veedores were the first to sign the document empowering Francisco Martínez de Mata as the representative of the Hermandad, on April 30, 1659. Over the next two weeks, the veedores and deputies of another 17 guilds added their signatures, in their own names and those of their fellow guildsmen. Months of approaches and negotiations with other guilds must have followed, for before the end of the year the representatives of a further 20 guilds signed their names in front of the public notary. The alcaldes, veedores, and deputies of the guilds were residents of a total of 14 collaciones, but this hides a salient feature of the guild officers as a group: 41 of 66 (60%) were from the large, wealthy, central parishes of Santa María la Mayor (Cathedral parish) and San Salvador. This does not necessarily indicate that most artisans lived and worked there, but rather that the wealthier artisanal elite tended to reside in the vicinity of the Cathedral, and the commercial centre of the city, where most of the wealthy merchants and the nobility were also concentrated. However, there was one significant exception. Of the 6 veedores of the three silk crafts—the weavers of the Arte de la Seda, silk twisters, and pasamaneros—5 were from the northern districts around La Feria (the parishes of Omnium Sanctorum, Santa Marina, San Martín and San Lorenzo), one silk guild steward was from San Miguel, and none were from the two central parishes (Santa María and San Salvador). This is highly significant since the Hermandad’s meeting place was the casa of the Arte de la seda, in San Lorenzo, and the silk weavers’ veedores were also the

---

717 In addition to the silk weavers, these were the architects and sculptors; box makers (maestros de hacer cajas para joyas, barberos, escribanos y estuches); chair and harness makers; cutlers; embroiderers; founders (latoneros); glovers; goldbeaters; hemp cordmakers; linen weavers (lineros); merchant-manufacturers of woven gold and silver cloth, ribbons and laces (pasamanos); painters and gilders; shoemakers; spinners (torneros); stonemasons (canteros); tailors; and vihuela and guitar makers (violeros).

718 Between November 7 and December 28, 1659, the deputies of the following guilds gave their assent: bonnet-makers (toqueros de rengues); booksellers; builders (albañiles); cabinetmakers; cooperers; esparto weavers; farriers; founders, lampmakers, and and silk, wool and flax comb makers; gold and silver leaf beaters; hatmakers; jug makers (caudaleros de botijas); locksmiths; pastry makers; printers; sackcloth makers; shipwrights; sieve makers; silk and gold ribbon and lace makers (pasamaneros); silk twisters; and tanners.
spokesmen of the brotherhood as a whole. Not only was the silk industry closely identified with the northern quarters of the city, but there seems to have been a willingness on the part of the much more numerous representatives of the other guilds, the vast majority of whose officials resided in the two wealthy parishes near the Cathedral and the Plaza de San Francisco, to accept the leadership of the veedores of the silk guild.

The demands were essentially unchanged: that the existing laws of the kingdom should be respected and enforced, and especially those whose purpose was to protect Castilian industry and workers from the competition of cheaper foreign goods. The Hermandad in its petition highlighted three laws, numbers 10, 61, and 62 in the Nueva Recopilación. These laws were designed to control imports, above all of finished products, to ensure that they could be properly taxed, but also to prevent the drain of silver from Castile—and thus the stipulation most vehemently insisted upon by the Hermandad was that foreign or native merchants were obliged to export the equivalent value in Castilian products. The demands were not new, and constituted a fairly predictable call for protectionist measures, but the rhetoric and ideology of the master artisans is worth exploring in more detail.

Behind the demand for protectionist measures was a distinct and complex vision of community. In the first place, each craft was a minor organism in its own right, made up of not only the masters as its head, but also the apprentices, journeymen, and in the case of silk, an even greater number of women and children who made up the bulk of the workforce. Thus in Seville there had formerly been 3,000 silk looms in operation, but 30,000
people were employed in the silk cloth manufacture, or related occupations.\(^{719}\) Second, “the arts, trades and occupations, and stations of the republic” are interdependent and “in harmony with one another, so that like cause and effect some of them perish when others are lacking.”\(^{720}\) It is this sense of mutual interest that had apparently inspired this proto-trades union, an expression of artisan solidarity that can only be seen as antithetical to the alleged self-interested particularism of the Spanish guilds in the seventeenth century. Third, the fortunes of the republic or the city and all its citizens, and of subjects and rulers, were intertwined. When too many are only acting out of particular and not the common interest, the outcome is “our present disgrace”, manifest in the sight of shuttered shops, empty houses, and “a calamity that has overtaken the Holy Church, parishes, chaplaincies, hospitals, monastic institutions, and public works,” all in ruins for lack of resources. It is for this reason that the Hermandad of the Sevillian guilds had joined its voice with the representatives of the guilds of Toledo and Madrid, recognizing that they were embarked on a common enterprise.

Seville, “once the emporium of the world, today so miserable that it cannot sustain its natives,” and there was plenty of veiled criticism in accounting for the travails. The laws of the kingdom, “established to remedy these harms, are forgotten because there is no one to defend or maintain them. Such is Castile's misfortune that there is no one who demands that its laws be observed, or looks to the Common Good and the conservation of the mystical body of the Kingdom,” which had sunk so low in spite of “having for its government laws that are more holy and copious than those of any province of

\(^{719}\) “se ocupa un en los exerçíçios aderentes a el”. This is the “mythical” figure of 3,000 looms and 30,000 workers that was cited by many later sources, above all those in the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries who wished to press the claims of the Sevillian silk industry and manufacturers.

\(^{720}\) “las demas artes, tratos y modos de viuir de la republica que estan dependientes los unos de los otros con una cierta armonia y comformidad que como causas y efectos perecen los unos quando faltan los otros …”
Christendom, and a Supreme Council made up of men filled with zeal for the good and conservation of this Republic”. This reads like a more diplomatic version of the cry heard at the start of any uprising in the Hispanic world, ‘Long live the King, and death to Bad Government!’ The purpose of the Hermandad was “to show itself as one that cares for the obedience and observance of the laws”, and it is for this purpose that “the craft guilds of Seville have come together,” along with those of Toledo and Madrid. But the laws were good and beneficial not only because they had been handed down by a virtuous Prince and his sage councillors. Industry and trade were not only the foundation of the social and political order, but also defined international relations. “The reason why [different] nations come together in amity is so that their craftsmen would not lack for custom and dispatch of their wares, a reason that prevails in all the provinces of the world—and this is why everywhere the mutual exchange of goods is rigorously observed, for the conservation [of states] depends on it.” The fact that foreigners were importing their goods into Spain without taking local products in exchange was therefore a “covert tyranny” through which the foreigners were “copiously making your majesty’s vassals their own.” Although the Castilian workers remained subjects of the king, as a result of being forced into an unequal exchange with foreigners, they had became the unwilling vassals of the latter. “For if a vassal is one who renders tribute to his lord, and the tributes are derived from the consumption of merchandise that is produced by the vassal.” An equilibrium in commerce between nations was essential not only because the inability to sell their products would inevitably affect the king’s subjects’ ability to pay their taxes (render their tribute), but also because he who only consumes “becomes a vassal even if not a subject [...] and so the subjects of your majesty
are become foreign vassals in the matter of rendering tribute, and he the shepherd of someone else’s sheep, who nurtures them while others enjoy them [later].”

In 1659, the guildsmen sought to secure approval for the new general Hermandad, and its statutes, as well as a royal provision reinforcing certain existing laws of the kingdom that the craftsmen considered particularly beneficial to the “common good”. On January 8, 1660, the guilds entrusted their cause to Francisco Martínez de Mata, the self-proclaimed “servant of the afflicted poor”. Martínez de Mata was deeply implicated in these debates, as someone who knew a great deal about the plight of artisans (and especially silk workers) in Seville. More than yet another arbitrista, Martínez de la Mata was a man of action, a street preacher, social agitator, perhaps even a ‘primitive rebel’. His ideas were based on his knowledge and experience of Seville, the kingdom’s commercial hub, as well as his interpretation of Castilian history under the Habsburgs. He blamed the latter for allowing the uncontrolled influx of foreign merchandise in exchange for precious metals, denounced irresponsible (vellón) currency manipulation, corruption and contraband, and saw the long-term answer to Castile’s problems in the revival of native industry. It is easy to see the affinity between Martínez de Mata’s ideas and the petitions of Seville’s silk workers, and he was a tireless champion of guilds and artisans, whose labour he saw as the foundation of the civic Republic. Like other so-called arbitristas he was interested in the the root causes of Castile’s midcentury “decadence”, but with an eminently practical side, unlike many of his

721 “Porque si el vasallo lo es mediante el tributo que rinde al señor y los tributos se causan mediante el auer quien consuma las mercaderias que fabrican es vasallo aunque no sea subdito el que las consume porque si falta el consumidor dellas an de faltar lo tributos y ansi son subditos de vra mgd en quanto a estar sujetos y vasallos ajenos en quanto a rendir los tributos y viene a ser pastor de ovejas ajenas que las apaçienta y otras las desfrutan.”

peers. Indeed, his ‘preaching’ no less than his *memoriales* was seen as a grave threat to public order by some urban magistrates—who clearly feared a repetition of the events of 1652—leading to his imprisonment and prosecution in 1660.\(^{223}\)

As the guilds Hermandad’s emissary in Madrid, Martínez de Mata set to work immediately petitioning the Royal Council. Since he was confined to a prison cell on account of some unpaid debts in Granada, the go-between was Francisco de Espinosa, a master diamond cutter, who was eager for the opportunity to enhance his reputation with the Sevillian guilds. The king, however, was only willing to issue an ambiguous declaration that “all existing laws of the kingdom should be followed”, without explicit reference to particular laws, or indeed any confirmation of the Hermandad and its statutes—a response that in practice left the *asistente* of Seville plenty of room for manoeuvre. It was certainly far short of what the Hermandad had hoped for, and their representatives at court had expected and promised.\(^{224}\) When Martínez de Mata saw the document, he was reportedly beside himself with anger, threw the royal provision on the floor and exclaimed: “Nothing has been achieved!”\(^{225}\) All seemed lost. Yet when Espinosa arrived in Seville some time after this, the *provisión* he brought with him included both the Royal Council’s approval of the specific laws as well as the Hermandad itself and its ordinances. This unexpected triumph caused a “sensation” in the city—no doubt delight among the guildsmen and perplexity in the *asistente*, the Count of Villaumbrosa, who clearly viewed the mission to the court as a

\(^{223}\) An edited, modern compilation of Martínez de Mata’s writings has been available for some time: Anes Álvarez, *Memoriales y discursos de Francisco Martínez de Mata*.

\(^{224}\) The preamble to the royal provision had stated that, having received the petition and constitution of the Hermandad, the king and his royal council reserved the right “to remove what seems superfluous and add what is necessary”. It’s clear however that the royal redaction was far too comprehensive for the expectant agents of the Hermandad, Martínez de Mata and Espinosa.

\(^{225}\) “auendolo leydo el dicho Francisco Martines Mata y que no hera lo que el pretendia se enpezo a alborotar y a hacer grande sentimiento arrojando la dha probision en el suelo y diziendo que no se auia conseguido nada …” *El fiscal contra los culpables sobre una provisión falsa despachada a los gremios de las Artes de Sevilla*, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25847, exp. 11.
fool’s errand. His disbelief, probably shared by the merchant community, prompted inquiries to be made in Madrid, which revealed that no such provision had been issued.\textsuperscript{726} The royal endorsement of the “so-called” Hermandad and its “purported” constitutions had been appended later, or forged. An investigation was swiftly ordered, as the forged \textit{provisión} “had caused great scandal in the city of Seville, and still greater harm might have followed.”\textsuperscript{727}

The guilds’ initiative thus unravelled, and Martínez de Mata became embroiled in yet another legal suit, along with his alleged accomplice Espinosa. However this was another example of the political activism of the Sevillian master artisans, and of the protagonism of the \textit{Arte de la Seda}, which showed once again that the master artisans at the very least possessed a sophisticated vision of the political community and their place in it. The case of the Hermandad de los Gremios, however, also shows the guilds capable of a degree of solidarity between not only a wide range of different crafts, encompassing a large proportion of Seville’s artisans, but also between the master artisans—in particular silk workers—of different cities (Seville, Toledo and Madrid). What makes this attempt at acting in concert even more remarkable is the timing—the second half of the seventeenth century when by all accounts the guilds in Castile had long begun their retreat into self-interested conservatism, more interested in protecting their prerogatives and privileges against the claims of other guilds. As mention above, behind the rhetorical lamentations were a series of concrete proposals entirely consistent with the silk workers demands since at least the 1624

\textsuperscript{726} When the royal provision and ‘approval’ of the ordinances was presented to him, the \textit{asistente} delayed its implementation by requesting a cover letter from the Royal Council.

\textsuperscript{727} “\textit{… ha resultado mucho escándalo en la ciudad de Sevilla y pudieran apercibido mayores daños y inconvenientes …}”
petition—including the obligation to be imposed on foreign merchants to spend the profits from imported merchandise on locally produced goods.\footnote{Instead of taking precious metals out of the city and the kingdom. El fiscal contra los culpables sobre una provisión falsa despachada a los gremios de las Artes de Sevilla, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25847, exp. 11, ff. 4v-5r.} The rebels of 1652, like the Hermandad de los Gremios a few years later, when the silk workers’ assembly became once more the focus of wider grievances, seem to have been caught between two tendencies, the universal and the parochial. On the one hand they had styled themselves the “Remediers of the Republic,”\footnote{Memorias de diferentes cosas sucedidas en esta muy noble y muy leal ciudad de Sevilla, BCC, MS 59-1-5.} claimed to speak for the city, even the kingdom—or at the very least its working ‘poor’—and sought to exert some influence on royal fiscal and economic policy. On the other hand, they were the “Lords of the Seven Parishes,”\footnote{Levantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.} whose strength and, ultimately, greatest weakness, was their reliance on local neighbourhood solidarity, occupational networks and family ties which, in the case of the silk workers of the Feria and surrounding parishes, allowed them to overwhelm the city and dictate terms to the authorities, albeit for a fleeting moment.\footnote{Until the authorities were able to undermine their support by drawing upon their own, considerable patronage networks.} The nature of the silk cloth manufacturing industry enabled artisans both to maintain a wider perspective, and to see revolt as another—extreme but legitimate—manoeuvre in the sort of negotiating process they were accustomed to being engaged in with the Habsburg monarchy and its administrative bodies. They recognized that beyond the immediate causes, such as the exorbitant price of bread, or the devalued currency, lay deeper problems of mistaken priorities and economic mismanagement.

Seville’s silk industry would never again scale the heights of the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century, but along with a modest eighteenth-century recovery the Arte de
la Seda, like other local guilds, would only become more litigious and jealous of its privileges. In a lengthy, printed 1744 petition, the silk workers’ guild of Seville explained to the Bourbon king that, “although today nearly a corpse, since the conquest of Seville until the present this corporation and metaphorical body has conserved itself, with the name of Arte Mayor de la Seda, its head an alcalde alami, assisted by veedores, and other individuals …” After yet another summary of its historical origins and importance to Seville, the guild moved onto by now familiar grievances: the importation of foreign cloths since the late sixteenth century, not only to satisfy the growing needs of the American colonies, which the city’s native industry was unable to do on its own, but also to undermine the latter, in contravention of various royal decrees, and fiscal impositions for which the guildsmen were made directly or indirectly responsible, and which they considered illegitimate because they never had the consent of the guild, then (in the 1630s) “a considerable body”.

The heads displayed in the Feria in late May and June of 1652 were also part of that “metaphorical body”, and while the revolt owed much to a particularly difficult conjuncture of price rises, hunger and taxation, aggravated by unscrupulous royal agents, the rebels were not merely bodies reacting to material deprivation, nor were they stupefied subjects who suddenly found their voice under extreme pressure. Largely excluded from formal politics,
and to some extent dependent on municipal and royal institutions, the master silk workers never relinquished their right to participate in political dialogue with the kingdom’s governing corporations and institutions, or to nurture their very own “notion of a liberty worth defending.”

735 MacKay, *The Limits of Royal Authority*, 62.
CONCLUSION

Although hardly the first or the last to make this point—albeit with greater eloquence than most—Arlette Farge in describing life in a working-class neighbourhood in eighteenth-century Paris wrote not only of the “subtle hierarchies” even among the humblest sort, but the “petty squabbles, chit-chat and callousness,” the “schoolboy japes” and serious scandal that came with the territory of daily life under the constant watchful gaze of one’s neighbours, and the pervasive violence and conflict engendered by the unremitting precariousness of life. This is a different perspective, one assembled from information collected by or given to the police, and thus errs on the side of suspicion and discord as the dominant features of life in crowded pre-modern urban neighbourhoods. Yet it is a salutary reminder that neighbourhood solidarity was often an evanescent thing, and could evaporate quickly under concerted pressure from the authorities. That much is evident from the aftermath of the Mexico City riot of 1692, when neighbours turned on each other and that ever-present gaze and the talk it generated became for many a death sentence, even if their only crime may have been to have looted some items of clothing in the chaos which they did not necessarily help to unleash. The neighbourhood community of La Feria was also not without its internal divisions, tensions, and conflicts. Some of these may be gleaned from the later trial records, the denunciations of neighbours, and the fact that prominent among those residents of the Feria who clearly disapproved of the rebels’

737 As David Garrioch pointed out in his review, “the choice of sources unintentionally emphasizes both the unchanging and the chaotic, discordant features of life, sometimes conveying the impression that the city was peopled with charlatans, prostitutes, and petty criminals, filled with violence and death …” David Garrioch, *The Journal of Modern History* 67, no. 3 (1995): 723-725.
738 “The threat of betrayal was omnipresent. Under the pressure of an investigation, neighborliness, ethnic solidarity, even friendship went by the boards […] these stresses multiplied and ultimately tore apart the close-knit community of a casa de vecindad.” R. Douglas Cope, *The Limits of Racial Domination: Plebeian Society in Colonial Mexico City, 1660-1720* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1994), 152.
actions were silk merchants and clerics.\textsuperscript{739} Indeed, the rebels seem to have overestimated the degree of solidarity that bound together the neighbourhood community, given that the parish of San Marcos—which the Feria rebels considered to be part of their domain as the “lords of the seven parishes”—was in fact mobilized against them.

More recent historiography, however, rather than seeing artisan neighbourhoods as ghettos of the dispossessed and the disenfranchised, have found what appears to be a process of exclusion or withdrawal—socio-professional concentration was increasingly a feature of early modern Mediterranean cities in the seventeenth century—as in fact related to the re-elaboration of a distinct social and political identity, and territorial identification as being crucial to both, as well as to the consequent sense of empowerment. In the words of David Rosenthal, “a more intense focus on neighbourhood experience, and with it a sense of collectively claimed space, in fact enhanced the potential for [Florentine artisans], overwhelmingly non-citizens, to assert themselves on both a local and a wider, civic stage.”\textsuperscript{740} Informal sociability in neighbourhood “junctions” of community (taverns, bakeries, \textit{piazzas}), “weak” ties, and formal associations such confraternities and guilds that often grew out of these all served as the basis of artisan empowerment.\textsuperscript{741} Indeed, formal exclusion—from politics and mixed associations—became the basis for artisan “countersolidarities” and specifically artisan self-representations (including, in the Florentine case, the festive \textit{potenze}). Indeed, the relative weakening of horizontal ties contributed to the Florentine artisans’ sense of themselves as a separate social and political constituency, not only entitled to hold the authorities to account, but to negotiate the terms

\textsuperscript{739} Diligencias practicadas en 1632 para castigar el segundo motín del Pendón verde, AMS, sección 4, siglo XVII, tomo 28, no. 19. See chapter 2, above.
\textsuperscript{741} Ibid., 23. See also Nevola and Rosenthal, \textit{Urban Communities}.
of their “civic incorporation on the very basis of their exclusion.” The artisan potenze in sixteenth-century Florence were thus not the city’s plebe but rather its representation, the self-designated “lords of the ‘poor’. It is not hard to see a parallel here with the Feria rebels of 1652, who proclaimed themselves the “lords of the seven parishes,” and proceeded to negotiate terms using the shared language of political legitimation, demanding, among other things, a voice in decision-making at the local level based on their sense of collective solidarity and a territory that the rebels “presumed to be theirs.”

One may of course question the extent to which the masters of the Arte de la Seda (silk guild) were representative of the interests and grievances of the lower orders in general, of Seville’s artisans, or even most silk workers. There were certainly many potential fissures: between merchants or master-merchants and the rest of the master weavers, between masters, on the one hand, and journeymen and apprentices, on the other (not to mention the countless women and children who were as elsewhere crucial to various stages of production), or finally between silk workers—and their relatively powerful guild—and other artisans. This is valid objection, and the changing hierarchies, dynamics, and internal alliances and conflicts that characterised the Sevillian silk industry in the seventeenth century require further research.

Luis Corteguera’s fine work on Barcelona artisans was criticized along similar lines by Tamar Herzog, who—while lauding the author’s desire “to rescue the voice of the crowds”—doubted whether the relatively well-off master artisans

---

742 Rosenthal, Kings of the Street, 91.
743 Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9. It should be pointed out that this new vision of the artisan neighbourhood is far more sophisticated than the old models, recognizing the pervasiveness of conflict, as within each artisan potenza there was an ongoing “struggle to define, represent, and ... unify” the local community, as well as the fact that artisans also forged city-wide links, and “experienced several, overlapping, forms of neighbourhood.” Rosenthal, Kings of the Street, 104, 13-14.
744 As discussed in the introduction, this task is made more difficult by the absence of guild records, but not impossible, and a wealth of information about silk workers is buried within the notarial and other local archives.
were “the commoners of the past.” Yet Corteguera’s focus on the artisan confraternities was not only determined by the nature of the extant sources, but also a desire to establish a useful analytical concept of the “popular” in urban politics. For Corteguera, master artisans were representatives of the “popular” in the sense that they diverged from or clashed with the municipal elites on particular issues, such as the hoarding of bread—not unlike some of the cases examined in this dissertation, namely the importation of foreign textiles, the price and supply of food, and taxes. Moreover, in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Barcelona, it was very often not the substance of the dispute or positions taken that mattered most, but the artisans’ direct appeal to the king via their own representatives—in other words, the dispute was over who has the right to speak for the city and in the name of the “common good.” The Barcelona master artisans in Corteguera’s study not only show themselves extremely adept at playing off local institutions against each other—the Consell de Cent (city council), the Diputació, and the viceregal administration (the viceroy and the Audiència)—as well as being ready to appeal directly to the king, or resort to violence if necessary, but each of these bodies in turn frequently appealed to poble menut (little people) in the service of its own agenda. The upshot is that Corteguera wishes to questions the opposition between “popular” politics and politics proper, by showing that master artisans were full participants in the politics of the city and the kingdom, in partnership or opposition to one or more of the governing institutions and bodies.

However Corteguera is a relatively isolated voice as a scholar of artisan politics not as a somehow lower form of politics, something of merely local and ephemeral import, but as an important strand of the political history of the Spanish Habsburgs’ Iberian kingdoms.

Moreover, he is writing about a city and a region (Barcelona and Catalonia) whose “revolutionary” credentials are well established, and the role of the commons in instigating the great 1640 revolt long acknowledged—although Corteguera provides the much needed context to demonstrate that 1640 was no aberration but in many ways consistent with the strategies and aims of “popular politics” at least since the late sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{746} In the Crown of Castile meanwhile the picture continues to look relatively bleak, with no revolution of any kind—social, political, or financial—to give direction and purpose to studies of popular politics. The Andalusian revolts of 1647-52 were the most serious insurrections in the seventeenth-century, but that may not be saying much. Yet, as Xavier Gil sagely pointed out in his comprehensive summary of the previous several decades of European historiography, the paradigm of revolution as the privileged vehicle of social and political change may well be exhausted, or simply one path among many.\textsuperscript{747} It is time therefore to consider the Andalusian seventeenth-century revolts on their own terms, rather than for what they were not intended to be—and in their proper contexts. Juan Gelabert has already done this to some extent by setting these and other popular “convulsions” in the context of the royal government’s fiscal policies of the turbulent 1630s, 1640s, and 1650s.\textsuperscript{748} But they should also be seen from the perspective of those below, of the rebels and artisans more generally, who were not only capable of reacting to government policies they considered unjust, but also formulated their own proposals and grievances, rooted in a shared political culture and ideas, but refracted through the experience of working men—and at times sought to influence government policy in their own interests.

\textsuperscript{746} Gil Pujol, “Más sobre las revueltas,” 363.
\textsuperscript{747} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{748} Gelabert González, \textit{Castilla convulsa}.
To a large extent the Feria revolts of 1521 and 1652 followed a pattern whose ubiquity in early modern European urban settings has prompted many historians to focus on the “ritual” elements of popular protests.\(^749\) According to William Beik, crowds acted in similar ways “because their towns had similar features and authority structures,” and shared a culture of similar forms of thought and behaviour.\(^752\) And yet the fact that both of the Sevillian revolts had as their epicentre the very same parish of Seville (one of no less than 29 more or less comparably sized parishes), does require some sort of explanation. If the main squares or plazas of pre-modern cities have frequently been studied as “contested spaces,” then in Seville it appeared to be a case of “contesting spaces”—a tension between centre and periphery that was partly structural, but also socially and culturally constructed and reinforced. After all, Seville had other peripheries—its arrabales, or extramural suburbs, and the parish of Triana across the river.

It should be pointed out that the Feria revolt of 1652 does not fit Beik’s characterisation of popular protests as driven primarily by a “compelling desire” of seventeenth-century crowds to “punish the authorities.”\(^751\) Although there was an altercation with the asistente at the outset of the Feria revolt, and no doubt he took offence at his treatment by the plebeian crowd, there was none of the quasi-ritual degradation of humiliation of public officials that Beik has noted in numerous French cases. Perhaps if the crowd had managed to get its hands on the royal agent García de Porras, he might have been made to suffer for the pain inflicted, but that is a moot point. Although armed—and not merely with rocks, as in many more or less spontaneous tax or bread riots elsewhere—and

\(^{749}\) Burke, “The Virgin of the Carmine and the Revolt of Masaniello.”

\(^{750}\) Beik, *Urban Protest*, 12.

\(^{751}\) Ibid., 37.
with the city at their mercy, the rebels in fact acted with exemplary restraint, and by far the most violent episode of the whole affair was the storming of the Plaza de la Feria by the loyalist militias and the subsequent repression. By that token, the Sevillian rebels of 1652 also do not fit the pattern observed long ago in sixteenth-century French religious riots by Natalie Zemon Davis, or the urban “tumults” in seventeenth-century Mexico. Although the ideological matrix was different, the overriding aim in both types of riots was destruction—of material objects, property, but also of the religious, ethnic, or social “other.”

On the other hand, the rebels’ seizure of the artillery pieces from the Alhóndiga and the decision to barricade themselves in their neighbourhood appears both as a vestige of the popular memory of the earlier revolt, and a sign of their intention to hold out until specific grievances were addressed and perceived wrongs righted. Moreover, if their manifesto delivered by the friar Filgueira is any indication, their demands extended beyond the immediate issues—the scarcity, price, and quality of bread, and the depredations of the royal tax agent—and sought limited but nevertheless structural change. In other words, the dominant impulse was neither destruction, retribution, or redistribution of goods, although the concept of a “moral economy” does help explain the Sevillian artisans’ sense of justice and legitimacy of their actions. Rather, the ferianos of 1652 sought redress and political reform.

This becomes easier to comprehend if we consider the revolt of 1652 as some sort of natural cataclysm, a flood or a plague, but part of a longer narrative that includes among other things, the silk workers’ decades of litigation, bypassing the city council and

---

attempting to gain royal approval for measures they considered advantageous—something the rebels also banked on—leading to the attempt to create a broader coalition of the city’s artisan guilds. A key role in all these efforts was played by literate and educated middlemen like Ambrosio de Mora, but more especially Bernabé Filgueira and Francisco Martínez de Mata. Yet we should not make a mistake of assuming that all the impetus for reform and the articulation of more ambitious demands is attributable to these men. While Ambrosio de Mora, as a former member of the Audiencia, was no doubt a useful ally, the silk guild nevertheless voted for, empowered, and funded its own representatives to the court in Madrid (Rodrigo Romero Hurtado). Meanwhile, Francisco Martínez de Mata and his artisan sidekick were desperate enough to fulfil the promises they had made to the guilds of Seville that they forged a royal provision—“the most detestable [crime] that can be committed and so harmful to the public good”—suggesting that the cause was very dear to the artisans.753 Moreover, the process of gathering, discussing, and giving formal approval to the Hermandad de los Gremios was a months-long process that required extensive coordination and communication. The same may be observed about the guild’s earlier campaign against the foreign merchants (1620s), which implied that royal provisions were read, discussed, and interpreted by artisans—and of course, the revolt itself, born amid the talk and murmur of the taverns around the Plaza de la Feria. In other words there are many subterranean currents yet to be discovered.

In recent years, Filipo de Vivo has urged historians to consider the material, social, and political contexts of communication, the use of political information by those outside

753 “el delicto de falsedad que se le ynputa a francisco de espinosa es el mas detestable que se puede cometer y tan ofensibo a la causa publica como se dexa considerer …” El fiscal contra los culpables sobre una provisión falsa despachada a los gremios de las Artes de Sevilla, AHN, Consejos, leg. 25847, exp. 11.
the state—including “intelligencers” (a rough equivalent of Spanish *arbitristas*), and even those excluded from formal politics and who had to work for a living. In early modern Spain, the circulation and malleability of manuscripts has fascinated cultural historians like Fernando Bouza, although their focus has been primarily on literary or erudite forms of writing. Others, like Luis Corteguera, have commented on the long tradition of popular participation in the government of towns and cities, as well as the fact that news and information about affairs of state circulated widely, and the people, even humble artisans, understood the connection between civil matters and affairs of state, or between local and national affairs. Yet in the cases discussed in this dissertation, we find not only attempts to communicate with power, but to shape the response.

If the early modern history of Castile after the Comunero Revolt is indeed most striking for its “famed stability,” it was not completely devoid of sociopolitical conflicts, or indeed revolts—however localised and pallid they may appear next to the bloody countenance of more hefty struggles elsewhere. While the stability of the Spanish Habsburg monarchy is now far better appreciated as a curious blend of the crown’s weakness and deftness if forging consensus and compromise with a host of local and regional elites, and this stability is no longer seen as a sign of decadence but a feature of the composite polity that may even count as a relative success, not all conflicts and differences could be dissolved.

---


“in the magma of negotiation and informal politics.”757 Who were then the losers, were they so at all times in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and if not, what were the social, cultural, and ideological matrices that informed and shaped their responses to various degrees of exclusion from the mechanisms of consensus building and compromise, above all when this exclusion was most glaring and hardest to bear, which was the case in the 1640s and 1650s?

When Ortiz de Zúñiga wrote (in the 1670s) that only “confused memories” of the 1521 Feria revolt had survived to his day, what did he mean? Was he commenting on the dearth or relative brevity of written “memorias” that served as the raw material for his own voluminous history of the city? Or was he referring to the persistence of memories of that uprising in urban folklore and popular memory, whose “confused” nature was meant to signify its wrong-headedness. We do not possess chronicles or treatises written by Sevillian artisans, so the revolts in this dissertation serve the purpose that they have served for many other historians, which is to infer from the rebels’ actions and (reported) words in these extraordinary (and well-documented) moments—often by reading between the lines—something about their broader and more quotidian beliefs and practices.758 Once again, recent works on artisans in Italian cities are arguing precisely for this kind of approach, for seeing the so-called moments when the “world [is] upside down” in the context of the “world right side up,” and apparent ruptures in social and political life, such as Carnival,

757 Gil Pujol, “Más sobre las revueltas,” 382.
758 On the uses of written memory, including “official” histories that have little sympathy for the rebels but cannot but reproduce their words, see Andy Wood, The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), chapter 6: “Memory, Myth and Representation: The Later Meanings of the 1549 Rebellions.”.
riot, and popular revolt neither as safety valves or sublimated (or attempted) revolutions, but as part of a continuum of more ordinary interactions between the rulers and the ruled.\footnote{Rosenthal, \textit{Kings of the Street}; Wayne Te Brake, \textit{Shaping History: Ordinary People in European Politics, 1500-1700} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).}

This dissertation is predicated on the notion that, despite the valiant efforts of comparatively few historians of early modern Spain, the lower orders have yet to be properly integrated into the political history of Castilian cities and of the kingdom—and history from below, the social, cultural, and political history of artisans in the Spanish context still lags behind the historiography on the English or Italian urban working classes. One problem of course is the relative lack of evidence, on the one hand, and the fact that the reality of popular participation (whether in revolts or informal politics) is just as complex as that of other groups, and requires the analysis of so many diverse strands. My dissertation was an attempt to move in this direction by bringing together the social, economic, political and cultural elements (neighbourhood, silk guild, and written memory) not only to shed new light on these popular revolts—by placing them in at least some of their proper contexts—but as the first step in seeing ordinary people, or those who designated themselves as the representatives of the city’s \textit{plebe} (master craftsmen and “lords of the seven parishes”), as active participants in the shaping of the early modern Spanish state.
APPENDIX 1

List of rebels excepted from the general pardon (1652):

Agustín de Rivera o Ribera, “texedor de lana” o belero, natural de Moron*†
Andrés Selledo o Zedillo, hermano de Pedro Zedillo, “texedor,” natural de Granada*†
Bartolomé Zapata, hermano de Gabriel Zapata, artillero, “texedor,” natural de Granada*†
Diego Mateos, hermano de Mateo Ignacio, que tiene caídas las narices†
Diego Montaño, buñolero, en la Feria†
Estéban de Torres, “texedor”, natural de Sevilla, hermano de Isidro de Torres*†
Francisco Bobadilla, camarada de Urena*†
Francisco García, “el hogazero”760
Francisco de Urana†
Francisco de Viena*
Francisco Hurtado, natural de Granada [o Toledo761?]*
Francisco Palomino, natural de Carmona, barbero, que vive en la Cruz de Caravaca, en la Feria*†
Francisco Portillo, “tirador de oro”*
Francisco Ruiz de Valduña o Valdivia, “texedor,” natural de Priego*†
Francisco Verdejo, o Berdejo, “texedor,” natural de Cordoba*†
Gabriel Zapata, hermano de Bartolomé Zapata, artillero, “texedor,” natural de Granada*†
Gerónimo Gaytan o Gaitan, “texedor”, natural de Granada*†
Hermenegildo, ó Cecilio su compañero [de Gerónimo Gaitan], mozo amulatado, en la calle de el Arrayan†
Ignacio de Flores, artillero y cabo†
Isidro de Torres, hermano de Esteban de Torres, “texedor” natural de Sevilla*†
José Rodriguez, cabo y gobernador†
Juan Bautista Merchan, albañil†

760 Referred to “Alférez Francisco García, el hogazero”. Arrested the day after, “shamelessly” strolling in C. Francos. Lebantamiento, BCC, MS 57-3-9.
761 Later on, referred to as “el mozo de Toledo” (on his arrest, on 1 June 1652). See ibid.
Juan Calderón, camarada de Simon y Luis López, que anda en comisiones y tiene dientes grandes que se le menean, “texedor”, natural de Granada
Juan Cortes, dorador de fuego, á la Cruz Verde
Juan Diego de la Trinidad, y sus entenados, artilleros que cuidaban de la artillería de la Feria
Juan de Espejo, “texedor”, natural de Priego
Juan de Herrera
Juan Martin
Juan Moreno [oficial de Diego Montaño, buñolero] amulatado, cabello crespo, oyoso de viruelas
Juan Morillo, “zapatero”, natural de Cordoba
Juan Nuñez, “calcetero”, natural de Portugal
Juan Ramírez, “zapatero”, natural de Malaga
Juan Ruiz, herrador, mozo viejo, en la puerta de la Carne
Juan Thome, pescador
Lope Diaz
Luis López, “torcedor de seda” natural de Granada
Marcos de Rivera, “texedor de lana [o de sayales]”, n.l Moron [summarily executed]
Matiás de la Puente, “texedor”, natural de Granada
Pedro Cabrera
Pedro Francisco, “alguacil de la Hermandad”
Pedro Portillo, padre de Juan Portillo, el alcabuceado
Pedro Selledo o Zedillo, hermano de Andres Zedillo, “texedor”, natural de Granada
Sebastián Hernández, hijo de Juana Pinto, aguardentero en la Feria
Sebastian Muñoz, que vive junto al dicho postigo [de Ntra. Sra. de la Estrella]
Sebastian Trujillo, hermano de Tomas Trujillo
Simón López, “torcedor de seda” natural de Granada

762 “Cavo de los Jilenos” (“head of the San Gil parish rebels”). Ibid.
763 Ibid.
764 He was one of the group barricaded inside the church. Ibid.
Tomas Trujillo, hermano de Sebastian Trujillo†
Tomas de Zayas†
Vicente, que vive junto al postigo de Ntra. Sra. de la Estrella†

Sources:
* BCC, MS 57-3-9. “Lebantamiento de Sevilla.” [18th-century copy].
† Diario exacto de la sublevación de alguna plebe de la parroquia de Omnium Sanctorum, vulgarmente llamada el barrio de la Feria. Sevilla: Alvarez y Compañía, 1841.
‡ AMS, sección 4, siglo XVII, tomo 28, no. 19, ff. 138r-62v. “Diligencias practicadas en 1652 para castigar el segundo motín del Pendón verde.”
Figure 1. Sixteenth-Century Seville. Omnium Sanctorum parish church marked in red. Seville Cathedral in green.
Figure 2. Parishes of La Feria.
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