

Vol. 10 · n.º 2 · Winter 2012

e-journal
of PORTUGUESE
HISTORY

Table of Contents

Volume 10, number 2, Winter 2012

[ARTICLES]

- Why Was It Nearly Forgotten?**..... 1
The 1304 Agreda Treaty between Fernando IV of Castile and Jaime II of Aragon
Bernardo de Sá-Nogueira
- The Last King's "Naturais":**..... 23
Nobility and *Naturalidade* in Portugal from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Century
Antonio Terrasa Lozano
- Rethinking the Fifth Empire:**..... 58
António Vieira and the *Clavis Prophetarum*
Maria Ana T. Valdez
- The Vicar and the Earthquake:**..... 76
Conflict, Controversy, and a Christening during the Great Lisbon Disaster of 1755
Mark Molesky

[BOOK REVIEWS]

- Costa, L.F.; Lains, P.; Münch Miranda, S. *História Económica de Portugal (1143-2010)***..... 95
Lisbon: Esfera dos Livros, 2011
ISBN: 978-989-626-346-1
Nuno Palma
- Monteiro, R.B.; Feitler, B.; Calainho, D.; Flores, J. [eds.]. *Raízes do Privilégio***..... 99
Mobilidade Social no Mundo Ibérico do Antigo Regime.
Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2011
ISBN: 9788520010228
Roberta Stumpf

Why was it nearly forgotten? The 1304 Agreda Treaty between Fernando IV of Castile and Jaime II of Aragon

Bernardo de Sá-Nogueira¹

Abstract

In 1304 the kings of Portugal, Aragon and Castile, the latter through his uncle Prince Don Juan, and the bishop of Zaragoza were judges in two complex arbitrations that resolved two old conflicts between Aragon and Castile, namely, the claim to the throne of Castile by the Infantes de la Cerda, whose rights were upheld by Jaime II of Aragon, and the demarcation of the border between Aragon and Castile in the region of Murcia. Following the arbitrations, they signed the Treaty of Agreda. This paper reviews the existing bibliography while clearing up misunderstandings and approaching the subject from a slightly different angle.

Keywords

Agreda, treaty, arbitrations, Portugal, Castile, Aragon.

Resumo

Em Agosto de 1304 os reis de Portugal, Aragão e Castela, este através do Infante D. João seu tio, e o bispo de Saragoça, foram juizes em duas complexas arbitragens que vieram resolver dois antigos conflitos entre Aragão e Castela, a saber, a reivindicação do trono castelhano pelos Infantes de Lacerda, cujos direitos eram defendidos por Jaime II, e a demarcação da fronteira entre Aragão e Castela na região de Múrcia. Após as arbitragens, assinaram o Tratado de Agreda. Este artigo passa em revista a bibliografia existente, esclarecendo equívocos e abordando o tema de uma perspectiva ligeiramente diferente.

Palavras-chave

Agreda, Tratado, arbitragens, Portugal, Castela, Aragão.

¹ University of Lisbon. E:mail: bsanogueira@netcabo.pt

Introduction

In 1304, from the 30 July to the 12 August, high-level royal delegations of Aragon, Castile and Portugal met on both sides of the Castilian-Aragonese border—more precisely in the territories of Agreda (on the Castilian side) and Tarazona (across the border, in the old Roman territory of *Caesarangusta*, Zaragoza, now the center Crown of Aragon). The kings themselves headed the courtly retinues, composed of senior lay and church dignitaries.

Most primary source data collected for this text was published by Ángeles MASIÁ DE ROS (Masiá, 1994). The first document, dated 30 July 1304, marks the beginning of the peace talks proper, with both parties appointing proxies to hear and ratify the arbitration sentences (Masiá, 1994, I, p.121). The last document, dated 12 August 1304, contains the ratification by King Jaume II of Aragon of the arbitration sentences dated 8 August and the peace agreement signed on the 9 August by the said Jaume II, together with King Fernando IV, King Dinis and Prince Juan of Castile (Masiá, 1994, II, pp.136-137). On the 13 August, Jaume II was already informing the frontier municipalities of Valencia, Calatayud, Daroca, Teruel and Albarracín of the peace agreed with Castile on occasion of the recent meeting, ordering them to publish the document and respect the truce (Masiá, 1994, II, pp.125-126). The biography of Fernando IV by César GONZÁLEZ MÍNGUEZ makes extensive use of chronicles to approach the 1304 juncture (González Mínguez, 1995).

The main short-term objective of this meeting was to formally solve, by way of arbitration, two closely related political problems that had seriously affected the relationship between the Aragonese and Castilian crowns since the death of Alfonso X, el Sábio, in 1284. First, the succession to the throne of Castile and Leon, claimed by Don Alfonso de la Cerda, the son of Fernando who was himself the eldest son of Alfonso X, against his uncle King Sancho IV. Second, the demarcation of the border between the two kingdoms in the area of the former Muslim kingdom of Murcia. The meeting additionally focused on achieving the much desired long-term objective of establishing a long-lasting peace between the crowns of Castile and Aragon (Costa, 1981).

Why was Portugal involved? Portuguese historians have already underlined the key role played by King Dinis as arbiter at these meetings—as well as during the preceding period, namely after the death of Castilian King Sancho IV in 1295 and the invasion of Murcia by King Jaume II in 1296.

The Portuguese historiographic tradition stems from a narration by Conde Dom Pedro de Barcelos, himself a member of his father's retinue, completed by late-fifteenth century chronicler Rui de PINA (Tarouca, 1952-1953, II, pp.48-58; Pina, 1945, pp.59-74). As regards the Castilian sources, while the *Crónicas de Afonso X* and his successors pay very little attention to the subject matter, the Chronicle of Fernando IV extensively covers it (Lindley-Cintra, 1990, pp.515-516; Benevides, 1860, *apud* Lopes, 1967, p.288). In the opening section of Part Sixth of *Monarquia Lusitana*, dedicated to the period of King Dinis's reign subsequent to 1303, Francisco BRANDÃO reviews the previous historiography and carefully reports the events, writing a brief description of the political context in which they took place (Brandão, 1980, pp.38-56). In modern times Félix LOPES was the author who more closely reviewed the political history of the reign of King Dinis (1279-1325), devoting in-depth studies to this period based on extensive Aragonese documentation which had never been used until then (LOPES, 1962-1963, 1963, 1964, 1967). As regards modern synthesis books we can only mention José MATTOSO and more recently José Augusto PIZARRO, who make reference to the peace process of Agreda-Tarazona. MATTOSO takes stock of all main articles by Félix LOPES, except "Actividades pacificadoras..." (Mattoso, 1993, pp.150-153). PIZARRO devotes a large section of his biography of D. Dinis (titled "D. Dinis, árbitro peninsular") to this subject-matter, but refers to one single sentence, issued by one tribunal – instead of two sentences, given by two collective tribunals, as shown below. In the final chronology of the book however the author refers to two agreements (Pizarro, 2005, pp.115-124).

The arbitration sentences of Tarazona of the 8 August 1304 and the ensuing Pact/Treaty of Agreda of the 9 August 1304 were highly significant at the time, but their importance was subsequently diminished and nearly forgotten in the long run—likely due to political convenience. In this paper we revisit their context, scrutinising a number of points and seeking to find out why the Portuguese crown was so keen on this peace process, especially at such high expenditure. We want to take a step further in our interpretation of the main Portuguese source on these events, i.e. Book Five of King Dinis's Chancery.

A short note on Book Five

Book Five of King Dinis's Chancery, contrary to what the archivist's classification may suggest, is not a register book. It is an authentic cartulary, more precisely a chancery cartulary (Bautier, 1993). It consists of charters regarding, among other themes, the newly acquired ownership by the crown of river Tagus' polders (*lezírias*), the richest farming land in Portugal, issues related to Knights Templar property, the Agreda Treaty and other minor subjects. It was drafted between 1305 and 1315 by Lisbon notary-public Lourenço Eanes

and two scribes working for him, at the request of the king's vice-chancellor, Lisbon canon Afonso Martins, and by order of two consecutive bishops of Lisbon, João Martins de Soalhães and Friar Estêvão Miguéis.

This note on Book Five is a very short summary of the introductory study preceding the publication of its full text (Sá-Nogueira, 2003). The codex consists of 74 transcripts in public form drawn up by a notary-public. We think the documents can be ranked hierarchically: 30 of them are "principal documents", as the remaining 44 ("subsidiary documents") were included in the manuscript as back-up to the respective "principal". (For example, principal document no. 14, an exchange of property between King Dinis and Lisbon's Monastery of São Vicente de Fora has three subsidiary documents subordinated to it – numbers 15, 16 and 17, included to prove the previous transactions of the said property, prior to its transfer to the Crown). All principal documents are transfers of property to the Crown – by way of donation, sale, exchange or sentence. All but three. The first is the bull *Pridem compositionem*, dated 28 October 1289, in which Pope Nicholas IV absolved King Dinis of the excommunication sentence issued against his father by Pope Gregory X. The second is the bull *Cum summus pontifex*, dated 8 September 1301, in which Pope Boniface VIII granted the dispensation required for the Portuguese Crown Prince Afonso to marry the Castilian princess Beatriz – as they were relatives in a degree forbidden by canon law. Finally, the third document is the 1304 Agreda Treaty (mentioned as *concordia*).

The principal document at the head of the book is precisely the Agreda Treaty of the 9 August 1304. Formally speaking it has 5 subsidiary documents, but transcript number 4 consists of two documents—therefore there 6 in all. Not surprisingly, their transcription by Portuguese-speaking writers slightly altered the original Castilian.

We list them chronologically, indicating their ordering number in the book.

20 April 1304 (no. 6)—Prince Alfonso de la Cerda and King Fernando IV of Castile and Leon (by his proxy, his uncle Infante Don Juan) undertake to accept the sentence on the conflict that opposed them in connection with the rights to the throne of Castile, to be given by the King of Aragon, Jaime II, and the King of Portugal, Dinis, the arbiters respectively appointed by each of them.

20 April 1304 (no. 3)—King Jaime II undertakes to accept the sentence given by King Dinis, Infante Juan of Castile and Don Jimeno de Ahe (of the Luna family), bishop of Zaragoza, judge-arbiters appointed to decide upon the conflict that opposed him to King Fernando IV regarding the Kingdom of Murcia, handing to them as hostages the castles of Ariza, Berdejo, Somed, Borja and Malón.

21 April 1304 (no. 4a)—King Jaime II promises the judge-arbiters not to take any military action against the castles handed to them as hostages [cf. no. 3].

3 May 1304 (no. 2)—King Fernando IV undertakes to abide by the arbitration of King Dinis, Infante Juan of Castile and Don Jimeno de Ahe, in the conflict that opposed him to the King of Aragon, handing to them as hostages the castles of Alfaro, Cervera, Autón, San Esteban and Atienza.

7 May 1304 (no. 4b)—King Fernando IV appoints his uncle Infante Don Juan as proxy to represent him in the conflict that opposed him to Prince Alfonso de la Cerda and to accept the decision given by King Dinis.

10 June 1304 (no. 5)—King Fernando IV informs King Dinis of the terms agreed with King Jaime II regarding the demarcation of the former Kingdom of Murcia and the land lordship of Don Alfonso de la Cerda, which should be incorporated by both arbitration colleges in their respective sentences.

The chronology of these “subsidiary” documents corresponds to the final stage of negotiations, which started on 20 April, with a meeting at Tarazona. In this meeting, aimed at preparing the peace talks, the King of Aragon, the King of Castile, through his uncle Infante Juan whom he had appointed his proxy for these affairs on 20 February 1304 (González Mínguez, 1995, p.128), and Don Alfonso de la Cerda, formally appointed the judge-arbiters, as they had previously agreed to solve the conflicts by way of arbitration (Masiá, 1994, I, p.117). Contrary to what Masiá indicates, King Fernando IV did not attend this meeting and Infante Juan represented him (Masiá, 1994, II, pp.99-100). The last stage of negotiations ended on 10 June 1304 (information sent by King Fernando IV to King Dinis concerning the terms agreed with King Jaime II). We believe that both the form and content of the *Vistas* were then agreed and the date of 15 August established as deadline for finishing the business.

Documents in Book Five were not transcribed in chronological order. Therefore the primacy granted to the texts concerning the Agreda Treaty possibly means that, as we have stated before, in the mind of the men responsible for making the manuscript, the other documents included in the book corresponded to facts associated with, or stemming from, the pact signed at Campillo/Agreda on 9 August 1304 (Sá-Nogueira, 2003).

Facts

On 8 August 1304, on the Aragonese side of the border, “en el logar de Torrijos, sitiado cerca de Tarazona,” two arbitration tribunals passed two separate sentences. The first set forth the destiny of Don Alfonso de la Cerda. The second defined the new border

between the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon in the territory of the former Muslim Kingdom of Murcia.

MASIÁ DE ROS publishes the first arbitration sentence, on Don Alfonso de la Cerda, dated 8 August 1304, incorporated in her Appendix with number 69 (Masiá, 1994, II, p.109). She rejects the place name “Torrellas” proposed by Zurita (Masiá, 1994, I, p.120). This distinction between “Torrijos” and “Torrellas” is idle and the existence of two similar place-names in the same territory (i.e. Tarazona) cannot be accepted. It must be the same place, the name varying according to its Castilian or Catalan spelling, respectively.

The seventeenth-century historian F. Brandão gives a clear synthesis of the previous historiographic tradition:

There were two suits; i.e. one opposed the Kings of Castile and Aragon and concerned the division of the Kingdom of Murcia. King Dinis, Infante Don Juan and Bishop Don Ximeno were appointed its judge-arbiters. The second concerned the claim of Don Alfonso de la Cerda to the throne of Castile and Leon and was judged by the two brothers-in-law, King Dinis and King Jaume

[Duas erão as contendas nesta occasião: huma dellas tocava aos Reis de Castella & Aragão que era sobre a partição do Reyno de Murcia e nesta forão Iuizes arbitros os tres nomeados, El Rey D.Dinis, Infante D.Ioão, & o Bispo D.Ximeno. A segunda era acerca da pretenção que D.Afonso de la Cerda tinha aos Reynos de Leão, & Castella, na qual forão Iuizes os dous cunhados El Rey D.Dinis, & El Rey de Aragão D.Iaime] (Brandão, 1980, p. 38).

In spite of such straightforward description, modern historians still hesitate, either mixing the two suits, or stating that the two were decided upon by way of a single sentence.

MASIÁ DE ROS summarizes document no. 69 of her Appendix, mentioned above, as follows: “Arbitration sentence on the boundaries of the Kingdom of Murcia, given by Infante Juan, King Dinis of Portugal and the Archbishop(sic) of Zaragoza” [*Sentencia arbitral sobre los limites del reino de Murcia, pronunciada por el infante Don Juan, el rey de Portugal Dionis y el Arzobispo de Zaragoza.*] Oddly the text published under this title is the arbitration sentence given by King Dinis and King Jaume II on the landed estate of Don Afonso de la Cerda, saying nothing about the demarcation of Murcia (Masiá, 1994, II, pp.108-109). In turn MATTOSO generally states that one sentence was given, “onde D.Dinis pronunciou a sua sentença sobre as questões em litígio” (Mattoso, 1993, p.152). GONZÁLEZ MÍNGUEZ, although drawing the distinction

between the Murcia border affair and the heritage of the Infantes de la Cerda, systematically refers to a single arbitration sentence (González Mínguez, 1995, pp. 134-137).

The demarcation of the Kingdom of Murcia was a much more important matter indeed. The pleas, though linked, were different and definitely considered separately. Let there be no doubt as to this separation. On 1 August 1304, already in Agreda, King Fernando IV appointed Ferrench Gómez, chancellor and high notary of the Kingdom of Toledo, and Diego García, chancellor of the king's chamber and steward of Queen Constança, as his proxies to hear and ratify the arbitration sentence regarding the Kingdom of Murcia on his behalf. Infante Juan was appointed to hear and ratify the sentence regarding Alfonso de la Cerda (Costa, 1981, pp.35-36).

In the first plea King Dinis of Portugal and King Jaume II of Aragon, judge-arbiters appointed respectively by King Fernando IV of Castile and Don Alfonso de la Cerda, defined the landed domain that should be awarded by Fernando to Alfonso until the 11 November 1304. In the second, arbitration regarding the division of the Kingdom of Murcia between the Kings of Castile-Leon and Aragon was assigned to the Portuguese King Dinis, Don Jimeno de Ahe (or Luna), bishop of Zaragoza, and the Castilian Infante Juan.

Prince (*Infante*) Juan, son of King Alfonso X, was born in 1264. The will of his father (dead in 1284) made him King of Badajoz and Seville, although subject to his overlord Don Alfonso de la Cerda—the King of Castile and Leon appointed by Alfonso X. Already a widower in 1287, Infante Juan opposed the almighty Lord of Biscay, Don Lope Diaz de Haro, at the court of Castile, but ended up marrying his daughter and heir, Maria López de Haro. He did not suffer the fate of his father-in-law, assassinated by order of King Sancho IV on the 8 June 1288 (*Vistas de Alfaró*), because Queen Maria de Molina spoke on his behalf. Between 1288 and 1291 he remained a prisoner at the castle of Curiel, but was eventually released from jail after Don Juan Nuñez de Lara pleaded for him. His political heyday came in 1295, when King Dinis of Portugal recognised him as King of Leon. From 1295 to 1300, during the regency of queen-widow Maria de Molina, he permanently rebelled against the King of Castile, in articulation with King Dinis, King Jaume II and Don Alfonso de la Cerda, as detailed below. From June 1300 onwards, after an agreement signed at the *Cortes of Valladolid*, he made peace with King Fernando IV and became his right arm. He was judge-arbiter at Agreda in this capacity (Suárez Fernández, 1981).

The pleas then addressed by the two arbitration tribunals were closely related, i.e. the solution of the second plea, though much more important, could only be found after

addressing the first. Both stemmed (the first directly, the second indirectly) from the complex succession of *The Wise*.

The will of Alfonso X, dead in 1284, assigned to the King of France the task of protecting the rights to the Castilian crown of his grandsons born of his eldest, but late, son Fernando (the so-called Infantes de la Cerda). Nevertheless on the 13 July 1288 an agreement was signed at Lyon that had been secretly negotiated by kings Sancho IV of Castile and Philippe IV of France. The latter gave up on his rights pursuant to the will of Alfonso X and promised to never again back up the Infantes de la Cerda, his nephews. Once deprived of the protection of the French king, the Infantes de la Cerda turned to the Aragonese monarchs for support. In September 1288, the eldest, Don Alfonso, was sworn King of Castile in Aragon and promised King Alfonso III to never make separate peace with Sancho IV of Castile. In 1296, the successor of Alfonso III on the Aragonese throne, his brother Jaume II, conquered the largest part of the former Muslim kingdom of Murcia (extending his conquest to Lorca, between 1300 and 1301). From then on, Jaume II made the negotiations on the Murcia border depend upon a solution for the Infantes de la Cerda's case.

Therefore two instruments bear the date of 8 August 1304, corresponding to two arbitration sentences.

We have the full text of the first sentence, as stated above. But the second's does not exist, or at least modern historiography no longer has it at hand. Still its provisions are enunciated (in full, we assume) in a letter sent from Burgos by King Fernando IV to King Dinis on the 10 June 1304, briefing him on the terms in which the King of Portugal should arbitrate each of the two conflicts – and specifying the composition of each arbitration college (Brandão, 1980, pp.39-40).

The text of the Agreda Treaty, dated 9 August 1304, states that “sentences”—not one sentence, had already been passed. So we assume they were issued on the same day.

“In their capacity as arbiters, they [King Dom Dinis and Infante Don Juan] and Don Ximeno bishop of Zaragoza put them [the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon] in peace, passing sentences as evidenced in the charters of such sentences.” [“E como arbitros ellos [D.Dinis e o infante D.João] e don Ximeno obispo de Çaragoça pusieron lo [os senhorios de Castela e Aragão] a assesego dando hy sentencias assy como es continido en las cartas de las ditas sentencias” (Sá-Nogueira, 2003, pp. 43-44)].

On 9 August 1304, once the arbitration had concluded, the party moved to the Castilian side of the border, “en Agreda” (more specifically in this town’s territory, “en el lugar que es dicho el Campiello [i.e. Campillo], en el qual fueron las dichas vistas”).

In the version of the agreement extant in Book Five (Sá-Nogueira, 2003, p. 45), the location is mentioned only as “en Agreda”. The large place-name data is found in the ratification of the arbitration sentences by King Fernando IV of Castile, done on the same day and place (Masía, 1994, II, p.111—Appendix, document 70).

At Agreda, King Jaume II of Aragon and King Fernando IV of Castile, now on political speaking terms, associated with them two of the judge-arbiters, King Dinis of Portugal and Infante Juan. The four then signed a treaty of peace and friendship extendable to their respective successors.

“And in order to secure loyalty between us, King of Castile and King of Aragon, and better secure what has been established, agreed and signed by us, we decide, for our good and advancement, to include in this agreement the said King of Portugal and Prince Don Juan, so as to be closer to each other, as well as our successors, in loyalty and peace, thus remaining friends of our friends and foes of our foes.” [*“E por guardar se uerdadero amor entre nos reyes de Castiella e de Aragon e por que se guarde melhor lo que es feyto e ordenado e firmado antre nos tenemos por bien e por nostra pro meter en este feyto con los ditos rey de Portugal e el infant don Johan por seer mas ensemble nos e nuestros successores de un amor e de un acuerdo, e que seamos amigos de amigos e enemigos de enemigos”* (Sá-Nogueira, 2003, p. 44)].

The Agreda Treaty, or Peace of Agreda, marked the end of the prolonged conflict between Castile and Aragon in connection with the partition of the Kingdom of Murcia, made more complex by the older pending issue of the Infantes de la Cerda, but it did not achieve a global solution for the highly intricate political game played at the court of Castile and Leon.

Some authors call it Torrellas Pact because of the two arbitrations that preceded it, which had taken place in this village of the Tarazona bishopric, on the Aragonese side of the border (Álvarez Palenzuela, 2003). No pact however was signed at Torrellas; as stated above and below in this text, Torrellas was the venue of the arbitration process where two sentences were passed on the 8 August. The King of Castile however had remained on Castilian soil, his uncle and other officials acting on his behalf as proxies. Fernando IV’s ratifying signature on the next day, 9 August, at Campillo, Agreda, on the Castilian side of the border, in the presence of the

King of Aragon, King Dinis and Infante Juan, these two formally made parties on equal terms, constituted the treaty (or pact, or *concordia*) proper.

Special reference should be made, among other unaddressed issues, to the litigation over the lordship of Biscay, claimed by rivals Infante Juan and Don Diego López de Haro. Equally unaddressed remained the lawsuit on the lordship of Albarracín, claimed by Don Juan Nuñez de Lara from the King of Aragon. Jaume II had seized this lordship and incorporated it into the Crown of Aragon in 1300, following a reconciliation between the Lord of Lara and King Fernando IV (Masiá, 1994, p.82).

Even if Jaume II was the key driving force behind the treaty (Álvarez Palenzuela, 2003, p.7), still the Portuguese mediation had helped Castile and Aragon solve most of their pending problems and formalize peace, after more than four years of negotiations filled with ups-and-downs and hesitations.

Portuguese mediation in the conflict between Aragon and Castile (1300-1304)

According to Frei Fernando Félix Lopes, the Portuguese mediation (first covering domestic Castilian affairs, then extended to conflicts between the crowns of Castile and Aragon) became unstoppable after the *Vistas de Ciudad Rodrigo*, held in late March, early April 1300. In spite of the scarce sources available on this meeting, the sequence of events seems to suggest that the Portuguese king persuaded Infante Juan to recognise Fernando IV as king at the *Cortes de Valladolid*.

The closely connected chain of events points at a cause-effect relationship; between May and October 1299 King Dinis had waged war against his brother Infante Afonso, rebelled against the king his brother in his lordship of Marvão and Portalegre (Sá-Nogueira, 1991). Infante Afonso welcomed to his territory (adjacent to the border) the armies of Infante Juan. This Castilian prince being an enemy of his king Fernando IV, the then prevailing rationale behind any political alliance automatically made him enemy of the king of Portugal who was then friends with the Castilian king – or better with his mother, queen-regent Maria de Molina.

Meanwhile Infante Afonso had married his elder daughter Isabel to Don Juan el Tuerto, son of Infante Juan. Furthermore he had married his other daughter, Maria, to Don Telo Alfonso de Molina, nephew of the Castilian queen-regent Maria de Molina. The demarcation of the old Kingdom of Murcia also concerned Infante Afonso, as his wife was Doña Violante Manuel

(daughter of Infante Don Manuel, brother of King Alfonso X of Castile, a sister of Don Juan Manuel), lady of the towns of Elda and Novelda, close to the town of Villena. On several occasions Ángeles MASIÁ makes reference to this Portuguese prince, uncle of Queen Constança, but fails to identify him properly, although he was a vassal of Fernando IV and confirmed at least one document in 1304 as such (Coria, 1999, p.168). This mistaken identification jeopardises her interpretation of the facts, as she calls him “Afonso Sanches” and says that he was a bastard son of King Afonso III (Masiá, 1994). Afonso Sanches, indeed a bastard son, but of King Dinis, had married to Dona Teresa, daughter of the lord of Albuquerque, João Afonso de Albuquerque. This Castilian nobleman had moved to Portugal in 1295, following the death of King Sancho IV, and King Dinis made him first Conde de Barcelos. He died in May 1304 (Brandão, 1980, p.30).

At the *Vistas de Ciudad Rodrigo*, in March-April 1300, King Dinis had met with Queen Maria de Molina at her request. In June Infante Juan was already a vassal of King Fernando IV, ceasing his support to King Jaume II. He had been in total rebellion against the King of Castile since the death of Sancho IV, in 1295, claiming his rights to the Lordship of Biscay, supporting Alfonso de la Cerda as heir to the throne of Castile and letting himself be hailed King of Leon. After 1300, however, Infante Juan became the king’s right arm and played a pivotal role as negotiator of the peace between Castile and Aragon.

Thus the affairs included in the political negotiations at both the *Vistas de Ciudad Rodrigo* and the *Cortes de Valladolid*, between February and July 1300, probably outreached the strict scope of the Kingdom of Castile and Leon. This juncture probably marked the kick-off of the process of appeasement of the Castile-Aragon relationship, which would continue until 1304.

In this period (February 1300) began the ceaseless to-and-fro travels, between kings Jaume II and Dinis, ending only in 1304, of the key person in the negotiation process leading to Tarazona-Agreda – i.e. Ramón de Montrós, clerk of the King of Aragon and archdeacon of the Guarda see in Portugal (Péquignot, 2009; biography of Ramon de Montrós in Annex I, notice 225). Franciscan historian Félix LOPES was the first to underline the important role played by Ramón de Montrós in the period of 1300-1304 (Lopes, 1967, pp. 292-293).

Also in July 1300 the Portuguese Infante Afonso made peace of his brother King Dinis. In the light of the data mentioned above, this sequence of events cannot be interpreted without linking them to each other.

According to Ángeles Masiá, the meeting (*Vistas*) of Ciudad Rodrigo did not mark the beginning of the Portuguese mediation. She further states that King Dinis's declared wish to intervene in the conflict between Castile and Aragon "no fue consecuencia de las vistas". But she does not fail to quote, among the scarce documentation available on these *vistas*, a letter addressed by Portuguese queen Isabel to her brother King Jaime II, informing him that the Count of Barcelos, João Afonso de Albuquerque, in charge of organising the meeting, had sent her information by hand of the archdeacon of Guarda, Ramón de Montrós (Masiá, 1994, I, p.80). Likely the *Vistas de Ciudad Rodrigo* were not at the root of the mediation. They may none the less have strengthened it and rendered it viable, given the chronology of the intervention of players important in such mediation.

From the summer of 1300 to the early 1302, however, the Crown of Aragon did not commit to find a quick solution for the conflict, frustrating the political success of the initiatives developed by the Portuguese mediation. On the contrary, open conflict loomed and almost became real at the end of 1300.

A truce between Castile and Aragon, negotiated by Portugal and made public on the 18 September 1300, with a view to organising a meeting (*vistas*) of the parties, was never respected. The representatives of King Dinis, the Count of Barcelos, João Afonso de Albuquerque and the Byzantine princess Lady Vatatsa, senior lady of the house of Portuguese Princess Constança, future queen of Castile, did not manage to get the envoys of Castile and Aragon to speak to each other at Ariza. In October 1300, Jaime II informed the King of Granada, then his ally, that he was willing to resume hostilities, and Don Alfonso de la Cerda also developed intense political bargaining with the monarch of Granada until the end of the year. The King of Granada and Don Alfonso de la Cerda were the least interested parties in promoting a stable relationship between Castile and Aragon, as Ángeles MASIÁ wisely stated (Masiá, 1994, I, p.93). On the 18 December 1300, Jaime II attacked the Kingdom of Murcia and conquered Lorca. The military action taken by the King of Aragon was countered by the siege of Murcia by the Castilian forces, ordered by Queen-Regent Maria de Molina. Apparently the Castilian withdrew on initiative of Infante Juan and Infante Enrique. These conflicts broke another truce meanwhile agreed by mediation of Portugal, to prepare a meeting for solving the conflict (Masiá, 1994, I, pp.84-87).

The Kingdom of Aragon likely anticipated that a normalisation of the relationship between Portugal and Castile, moreover involving the loss of an ally as important as Infante Juan, could weaken the succession odds of the Infantes de la Cerda and, consequently, diminish the probabilities of having the Kingdom of Murcia incorporated in the territory of the Kingdom of Aragon.

The political stand of Queen-Regent Maria de Molina had been strengthened since the summer of 1300 by the stabilized relationship of the Crown of Castile and Leon with the Portuguese monarch and Infante Juan. The firm support of King Dinis to Don Juan certainly opened good prospects – both internally and externally. In the first quarter of 1301 the *Cortes de Burgos* granted the Queen-Regent the funds required for Maria de Molina to seek and obtain from the Pope the legitimisation of her marriage with King Sancho IV and, consequently, of the royal couple's children. Thus Pope Boniface VIII, between 6 April and 8 September 1301, going against strong pressure from the King of Aragon, awarded the regent various bulls that recognised the marriage and the legitimacy of her royal children, also granting the dispensation for the forbidden degree of consanguinity that enabled her son Fernando IV to marry Infanta Constança, daughter of the Portuguese King. Jaime II talked Philip the Fair of France into breaking the 1288 Treaty and putting pressure on the Pope to refuse the requested legitimisation (Masiá, 1994, I, pp.88-89). The Pope granted another dispensation for sanctioning the union between the heir to the Portuguese crown, Infante Afonso, and the Castilian Infanta Beatriz (Masiá, 1994, I, p.92; Lopes, 1967, p. 20).

By then King Jaime II was bracing himself for another inevitable change in the political scene, i.e. the majority of Fernando IV, who came of age on the 5 December 1301. In January 1302 the young monarch married the Portuguese Infanta Constança (Mattoso, 1993, p.153), a marriage probably consummated later that year (Baquero Moreno, 1998, p.647), rendering even more intricate the already complex chessboard of Castilian governance. The Kingdom of Aragon was then looking for other trumps to wield and establish an advantageous position in the negotiations of its top priority in peninsular politics, i.e. the definitive annexation of the old Kingdom of Murcia.

Jaime II, perhaps to gain even more political clout, offered his services to arbitrate the conflict between Fernando IV and Dinis over the lordship of the castles of Serpa, Moura, Castelo Rodrigo, Sabugal, Campo Maior, Olivença and others. Perhaps also to avoid such influence the Castilian king refused, on the 13 July 1302, to accept such mediation, stating that neither the Aragonese king nor the Pope had the power or the authority to confirm the sentences and decisions taken (Masiá, 1994).

In turn, as had been made clear in the end of 1300, the Castilian monarchs were not willing to waive their rights to the old kingdom of Murcia. The Lord of Murcia Don Juan Manuel, first cousin of King Fernando's father, was vassal of the King of Castile.

The Crown of Aragon, eager to secure the definitive annexation of the Kingdom of Murcia, went on manoeuvring and manipulating to its own benefit the ambitions of the great Castilian magnates. Jaime II had suffered a severe blow upon the legitimisation of the

children of Sancho IV and Maria de Molina by Pope Boniface VIII, as the Infantes de la Cerda were thenceforth worth much less as a political trump. But the claims to the Castilian throne of Don Alfonso de la Cerda were still backed up in Castile by a large party, headed by Infante Enrique, El Senador, grand-uncle of King Fernando IV. Upon his death in 1303, however, the project vanished into thin air – Don Alfonso had lost the support of the King of France his uncle in 1288 and by then only the King of Aragon stood for him.

Portuguese interference in Castilian politics (1295-1312)

Medievalists tend to diminish the role played by Portuguese King Dinis at this juncture as irrelevant, stating that his actions merely followed his brother-in-law Jaime II's strategy. Whilst this may be partly true, the fact remains that Dinis had a political agenda of his own and successfully accomplished his goals vis-à-vis Castile.

The period ranging from the death of King Sancho IV to the death of King Pedro I (1295-1369) was marked by an objective novelty in the relationship between the kingdoms of Portugal and Castile-Leon, i.e. a systematic organized interference of the Portuguese court in the affairs of the Castilian-Leonese court.

In this text we address the Portuguese leading role only to understand the pre-eminence and commitment of King Dinis in the arbitration sentences of Tarazona and the Agreda treaty. We therefore restrict our reflection to the reign of Fernando IV, leaving outside the time of Alfonso XI and Pedro I (1312-1369). But we must take a step back to the 1267 Treaty of Badajoz to give the framework for our interpretation (González Jiménez, 1998).

We deduce Portugal's influence from the consecutive marriage of two Portuguese princesses (Constança and Maria, respectively daughters of Portuguese kings Dinis and Afonso IV) to two kings of Castile and Leon (Fernando IV and Alfonso XI).

This influence became palpable when King Sancho IV was still alive. On the 15 September 1291 kings Dinis and Sancho IV agreed at Ciudad Rodrigo on a double marriage, i.e. Dinis married the heir to his throne, future Afonso IV, to the Castilian princess Beatriz, and his daughter Constança to the Castilian crown prince, future Fernando IV (Lopes, 1967, p.290). This agreement was so important to the Portuguese king that the materialisation of both marriages, only possible after 1301, seems to have been the main cause for his (sometimes violent and winding) interventions in the political affairs of the Kingdom of Castile and Leon. From 1295 onwards Infante Juan apparently became a decisive ally in enforcing the strategy developed by King Dinis, whose military and political action in the border yielded the

Portuguese monarch major territorial acquisitions under the Treaty of Alcanices, signed with the Castilian-Leonese regency in 1297.

Obviously Portugal's influence cannot simply be gauged only by the actions taken by the Portuguese king or crown. Moreover the activity developed at that juncture can be explained by other factors, not only in the light of "Portuguese" objectives.

Consider, for example, the precarious legitimacy of Sancho IV, his marriage to Maria de Molina and his children. It should be remembered that the second-born of the Wise King had seized power in 1276—from his father, alive until 1284—with the help of a nobility coup sanctioned by the Cortes.

Upon the death of his first-born son Fernando, in 1275, Alfonso X had tried to force the kingdom to accept the sons of Infante Fernando as heirs to the throne. The group of Castilian institutions and magnates who had opposed the alliance with France, materialized in the marriage of the said Infante Fernando, disagreed and gave their support to the second-born Sancho, future Sancho IV. Widespread instability structurally marked political life in the Kingdom of Castile and Leon between 1276 (seizure of power by Infante Don Sancho, future Sancho IV, depriving Alfonso X of the throne and the rights of his nephews, sons of his older brother, Fernando de la Cerda) and 1369, first year of the new Trastámara dynasty, following the assassination of King Pedro I. In between central government had been weakened by two consecutive minorities—first of Fernando IV (1295-1301) and then of Alfonso XI (1312-1325).

King Dinis's policy with regard to Castile was guided by the unshakable purpose of imposing the commitments agreed with King Sancho IV at Ciudad Rodrigo on the 15 September 1291, contracting the "double" marriage between Infante Fernando, heir to the Castilian throne, and Portuguese Infanta Constança, on one hand, and of Portugal's crown-prince, Infante Dom Afonso, and Castilian Infanta Doña Beatriz, on the other. Castile's commitment to deliver this agreement simply disappeared after the death of Sancho IV and the 1295-1300 political juncture in Castile, corresponding to Fernando's minority, was marked by constant pressure exerted by King Dinis to secure confirmation of the two promised marriages.

One important issue, among many to be addressed by the new Castilian monarch, was certainly the relationship with Aragon. This had never been good since the death of Alfonso X, in 1284, when the Infantes de la Cerda were placed under the guardianship of the Aragonese king. The relationship between the two kingdoms had consecutively worsened in 1288 (Don Alfonso de

la Cerda sworn King of Castile in Aragon), 1296 (Conquest of the Kingdom of Murcia by Jaume II) and 1300-1301 (Conquest of Lorca). Two other highly complex conflicts over the lordships of Albarracín and Biscaye continued to simmer. The first had been seized by King Pedro III of Aragon in 1284 from its lord, Juan Nuñez I de Lara, and definitely incorporated into the Crown of Aragon in 1300 following the reconciliation of Juan Nuñez II de Lara, son of the last lord, with King Fernando IV of Castile. The conflict over the lordship of Biscaye, opposing Infante Juan as husband of Maria Diaz de Haro and Diego López de Haro her uncle, would be solved in 1306 (González Mínguez, 1995, p. 168-171).

After the two marriages took place, in 1302, King Dinis became the father-in-law of Fernando IV. After the death of Infante Enrique, el Senador, in 1303, the Portuguese monarch, due to his close personal relations with the kings of Castile and Aragon, seemed the best suited person to act as arbitrator and secure a commitment capable of putting an end to the two major conflicts that opposed the two most important peninsular kings – i.e. Fernando IV of Castile and Jaume II of Aragon.

Arbitration was chosen as method of mediation in the last days of 1303. After a series of misunderstandings, Jaume II finally persuaded his brother-in-law King Dinis to accept the role of arbiter in both conflicts and sent his envoys to Rome for engaging the Pope in the process (Costa, 1981). Over the first half of 1304 all steps were taken to prepare the meeting. Then diplomatic formalities began on the 30 July at Torrijos (Torrellas, in Catalanian), a village in the periphery of Tarazona (city belonging to the territories of the Crown of Aragon). On the 8 August 1304 two arbitration sentences were passed, i.e. King Dinis (on behalf of his son-in-law, Castilian King Fernando IV) and King Jaume II (on behalf of Don Alfonso de La Cerda) decided upon the matters pertaining to the heritage of the challenger to the throne of Castile; then King Dinis (this time on behalf of his brother-in-law, King Jaume II), Infante Juan (on behalf of his nephew King Fernando IV) and the Bishop of Zaragoza, Don Jimeno de Ahe (president of the tribunal - elected by the other two judges, with the back-up of the papacy? And/or chosen because of the ecclesiastical regional pre-eminence of his diocese, made archdiocese in 1318 by Pope John XXII?) established the definitive demarcation of the border between Castile and Aragon, along the former kingdom of Murcia (Costa, 1981, p.31).

The first conflict was solved by almost entirely granting the King of Aragon the jurisdiction and lordship of the former kingdom of Murcia, north of the Segura river, save the city of Murcia and Molina, with its territory, up to the southernmost point of the territory of Villena. This town remained the property of its Castilian lord, Don Juan Manuel, but under jurisdiction of the King of Aragon.

Don Juan Manuel, lord of Villena, was the son of Infante Don Manuel, a brother of King Alfonso X of Castile, and of Beatrice of Savoy. His father, lord of the conquest of Murcia, had died prematurely. He inherited the office of “adelantado de Murcia”, given by the King of Castile, as well as a very large estate in the Kingdom of Murcia. In 1296 Jaime II of Aragon took advantage of the agitated political juncture generated by the death of Castilian King Sancho IV occurred in 1295 and, after strengthening his grip over Corsica and Sardinia through the Treaty of Anagni, signed with Pope Boniface VIII that very same year, he conquered the territories of Murcia. As a result the Lord of Villena lost the jurisdiction of Elche and received the town of Alarcón as compensation from Infante Enrique – uncle of the late king Sancho IV, whose “party” he belonged to. Thus when King Fernando IV came of age in 1301 Don Juan Manuel feared that he might lose his position at the Castilian court, from then on dominated by Infante Juan – head of the party that opposed Infante Enrique. Following Don Enrique’s death in 1303, however, Don Juan Manuel approached the King of Aragon and negotiated his marriage with the daughter of Jaime II, Princess Constanza, simultaneously threatening to back up the claim of the Infantes de la Cerda to the Castilian throne. He was the true protagonist of the Tarazona negotiations, joining forces with Infante Juan. In 1306 he confirmed his promise to marry Doña Constanza. Don Juan Manuel was the younger brother of Doña Violante Manuel, married to Infante Afonso, brother of the Portuguese King Dinis.

Elche, Alicante and Orihuela, plus Cartagena, south of river Segura, were thus integrated into the lordship of the Crown of Aragon. Lorca belonged to the lordship of Castile. In this region the border between the two kingdoms was almost definitively established. The second dispute was addressed by way of a sentence, which granted Don Alfonso de la Cerda a vast landed lordship dispersed through the kingdoms of Castile and Leon (González Mínguez, 1995, p.136). The heir to Don Fernando de la Cerda finally gave up his claim to the throne of Castile – a feud that had de-stabilized Castilian politics since 1284, when Alfonso X proclaimed in his will that his succession line (i.e. Don Fernando’s) was the only legitimate.

On 9 August 1304, at Campillo (a village in the jurisdiction of Agreda), the two kings signed a pact of friendship and non-aggression that bound themselves and their successors. Let us call it the Peace of Agreda, although it would be equally correct to label it the Peace of Agreda/Tarazona, as it resulted from the arbitration sentences given at the second city on the eve. In order to simultaneously consolidate the established peace and, most likely, to reward the mediators who made the arbitration possible, the two kings invited King Dinis of Portugal and Infante Juan to join them, as full partners in the arrangement. Which was the visible part of such reward? To be considered parties to the treaty, on equal footing. In order for that to be possible, their suzerain king, Fernando IV

of Castile, had to release them from all oaths and loyalty pacts that bound them to the Castilian monarch—in the case of Infante Juan, King Fernando had moreover to free him from the bonds of a subject proper, as citizen of Castile.

Paraphrasing the wording of the treaty, its text clearly says that in order for the King of Portugal to be able to sign the pact “without breaching any pledge, homage, oaths and loyalty” (*sem nenhum quebrantamento dos preitos e homenagens, das juras e das fidelidades*) that bound him to the King of Castile a long time ago and forever (*ya pieça ha pora venir*), the said King of Castile, in his name and of his successors, “for the sake of good peace and good love” (*para boa paz e bom amor*) freed him and his successors from such commitments, “inasmuch as this reason and this plea are concerned” (*quanto é por esta razão e por este feito*). With regard to the remaining donations, exchanges, definitions and pacts agreed between them they remained firm and valid. As to Infante Juan, a vassal and citizen born in the kingdom of Castile, King Fernando IV freed him from his vassalage and citizenship obligations, as well as any oath, homage and pledge possibly made to him.

Doubts stemming from the interpretation of the arbitration sentence regarding demarcation of the border in Murcia were clarified and solved until the Treaty of Elche of 19 May 1305. For example Don Juan Manuel had his donation of Alarcón in exchange for Elche confirmed without conditions, while his sister Doña Violante Manuel and her husband Infante Afonso of Portugal received Medellín and Arroyo del Puerco (Cáceres) for Elda and Novelda. Juan Nuñez II de Lara tried once more to recover his lordship of Albarracín, definitively lost since 1300 to Jaime II, who refused to give it back in spite of the insistence of Fernando IV (González Mínguez, 1995, pp.140-146).

Conclusion

Our report covers the juncture of 1304, in which King Dinis played the outstanding role of arbiter among Iberian kings, dismissed by most historians. In order to have the ability to play such role, the King of Castile had released him of vassalage commitments which are currently difficult to ascertain. In fact our ancestors, both historians and citizens at large, found it impossible in their hearts and minds to acknowledge that such commitments had simply existed.

What pledges, homage, oaths and loyalty were these that had bound Portugal for so long that they had to be formally untied so that the Portuguese King could become a party to the Pact of Agreda, on equal foot with the others? Maybe they were mere feudal

formalities required at that time on such occasions. Moreover we have no documents that support our reflection – an absence that is, *per se*, food for thought. Be that as it may, conjecture is not risky in this case.

They were all related with key steps in the consolidation of the Portuguese Crown, taken in the reign of Portuguese king Afonso III (1248-1279); both/either his marriage to Beatriz, the daughter of Castilian king Alfonso X, in 1253, and/or the 1264 Agreement of Seville on the Portuguese-Castilian border and/or the 1267 Treaty of Badajoz. Pursuant to contracts and agreements then signed, the Portuguese king was entrusted with the Kingdom of the Algarve (which he had himself conquered in 1249) as pledge of his loyalty to his father-in-law (Ventura, 1998, pp.46-49). Several magnates of the Portuguese court, mostly related to the Military Order of Saint John of Jerusalem, remained guarantors to this pact.

But future generations would care little about the memory of this pact signed at Agreda—which was only mentioned again by historian Francisco Brandão in the mid-seventeenth century. On the side of Portugal, neither the dynasty of Avis (1385-1580) nor its junior branch, the dynasty of Bragança (1640-1910), were ever interested at all in recalling the treaty. In truth to lay emphasis on evidence that Portugal had been released from vassal bonds to Castile was, *ipso facto*, to recognize that such bonds had existed in the past—a remembrance that the Portuguese side did not want to keep, either in 1385 or in 1640. By the same standard, on the Castilian (later Spanish) side, I suppose no author, of no time, would care to pay much attention to the document by way of which King Fernando IV legally put an end to Castile's suzerainty over Portugal.

In a book covering the theme of diplomatic relations, more exactly treaties, between Spain and Portugal, eminent Spanish medievalist LADERO QUESADA makes no reference to the Treaty/Pact of Agreda, dedicating only 6 lines to the 1304 Arbitration of Torrellas as a mere extension of the Treaty of Alcañices and forsaking the 1981 paper of MARÍA-MERCEDES COSTA (Ladero Quesada, 2006). Equally GONZÁLEZ MÍNGUEZ, author of the biography of Fernando IV, considers the events of the 9 August at Agreda as mainly a ratification of the two arbitration sentences by Fernando IV and Jaime II, dismissing the Treaty signed by the two kings, plus King Dinis and Infante Juan, as “the signature of a few other commitments or peace agreements among them, in which the King of Granada was also included”. In truth the King of Granada could only be a party to any agreement after the one signed on the 9 August (i.e. the Treaty of Agreda) and that indeed happened on the 10 August, as the author states afterwards (González Mínguez, 1995, pp. 138-139).

A final question. If the document could harm Portugal's best interest, why was it not simply destroyed? There is one possible answer, so down-to-earth and utilitarian that some will deem it too pragmatic and politically realistic to be acceptable. The document none the less contained the proof of the realm's release from Castilian subjection. Thus and therefore, perhaps it was better to keep it, but not to show it—let alone divulge its existence.

Historical facts, unlike people, are not biological and consequently last much longer. But they only remain alive in the memory of future ages if they are mentioned. Otherwise oblivion becomes their guardian, by the hand of those who carefully choose such guardianship.

Bibliographical References

- Álvarez Palenzuela, Vicente Álvarez (2003). Relations between Portugal and Castile in the Late Middle Ages – 13th to 16th centuries. In *eJPH*, Vol 1, number 1.
- Bautier, Robert-Henri (1993). Cartulaires de chancellerie et recueils d'actes des autorités laïques et ecclésiastiques. In *Les Cartulaires. Actes de la Table Ronde organisée par l'Ecole nationale des chartes et le G.D.R. 121 du C.N.R.S. (Paris 5-7 décembre 1991). Mémoires et Documents de l'Ecole des Chartes* (39), Paris, École des Chartes, pp.363-377.
- Benevides, Antonio (ed.) (1860), *Corónica del rey Fernando IV*. Memorias de Don Fernando IV de Castilla, 1, Madrid.
- Brandão, Francisco (1980). *Monarquia Lusitana. Parte Sexta*. Facsimile edition by A. Silva Rego et alii. Lisbon, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda.
- Coria, Jesús – Santiago Francia (1999). *Reinado de Fernando IV (1295-1312)*. Colección de documentos para la Historia de Palencia. III Palencia, Aretusa Ediciones S.L.
- Costa, María-Mercedes (1981). Los reyes de Portugal en la frontera castellano-aragonesa. In *Medievalia*, 2, pp. 27-50.
- González Jiménez, Manuel (2000). Las relaciones entre Portugal y Castilla durante el siglo XIII. In *As relações de fronteira no século de Alcanices. IV Jornadas Luso-Espanholas de História Medieval*. Actas. Vol. 1, pp. 1-24.
- González Mínguez, César (1995). *Fernando IV (1295-1312)*, Palencia, Diputación Provincial de Palencia.
- Ladero Quesada, Miguel Ángel (2006). El tratado de Alcañices (1297): la frontera más antigua. In *Encontros e Desencontros Ibéricos – Tratados Hispano-Portugueses desde a Idade Média*.
- Lindley-Cintra, Luís Filipe (ed.) (1990). *Crónica geral de Espanha de 1344*. Vol. IV, Lisbon, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda.
- Lopes, Fr. Fernando Félix (1962-1963). Das actividades políticas e religiosas de D. Fr. Estêvão, bispo que foi do Porto e de Lisbon. In *Lusitania Sacra*, 6, pp. 25-90.
- Lopes, Fr. Fernando Félix (1963). Data e circunstâncias do casamento da rainha Santa Isabel. In *Itinerarium*, Ano IX, 40, pp. 193-219.
- Lopes, Fr. Fernando Félix (1964). O infante D. Afonso, irmão de el-rei D. Dinis. In *Itinerarium*, Ano X, 44.
- Lopes, Fr. Fernando Félix (1967). Actividades pacificadoras de Santa Isabel de Portugal, nos dissídios entre Castela e Aragão, de 1300 a 1304. In *Itinerarium*, Ano XII, 57.
- Masiá de Ros, Ángeles (1994). *Relación castellano-aragonesa desde Jaime II a Pedro el Cerimonioso*, 2 vols., Barcelona, CSIC.
- Mattoso, José (1993). A formação da nacionalidade no espaço ibérico (1096-1325). In *História de Portugal. II - A Monarquia Feudal (1096-1480)*, Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, pp. 9-309.
- Moreno, Humberto Baquero (2000). As relações de fronteira no século de Alcañices (1250-1350): o Tratado de Alcanices. In *As relações de fronteira no século de Alcanices. IV Jornadas Luso-Espanholas de História Medieval*. Actas. Vol. 1, pp. 641-653.
- Péquignot, Stéphane (2009). *Au nom du roi. Pratique diplomatique et pouvoir Durant le règne de Jacques II d'Aragon (1291-1327)*. Madrid, Casa de Velázquez.
- Pina, Rui de (1945). *Crónica de D. Dinis*. Lisbon, Livraria Civilização.
- Pizarro, José Augusto de Sotto Mayor (2005). *D. Dinis*. Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores.
- Sá-Nogueira, Bernardo de (1991). A constituição do senhorio fronteiriço de Marvão, Portalegre e Arronches em 1271: antecedentes regionais e significado político. In *A Cidade*, Portalegre, nova série, 6, 19-45.

- Sá-Nogueira, Bernardo de (2003). *O livro das lezírias d'el-rei D. Dinis*. Lisbon, Centro de História da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Suárez Fernández, Luis (1981). Infante de Castilla Juan. In *Diccionario de Historia de España*. Vol. 2, Madrid, Alianza Editorial, pp.574-5.
- Tarouca, Carlos da Silva (Ed.) (1952-1953). *Crónicas dos sete primeiros reis de Portugal*. 3 vols., Lisbon, Academia Portuguesa da História.
- Ventura, Leontina (2000). A fronteira luso-castelhana na Idade Média. In *As relações de fronteira no século de Alcanices. IV Jornadas Luso-Espanholas de História Medieval. Actas*. Vol. 1, pp.25-52.

The Last King's “*Naturais*”: Nobility and *naturalidade* in Portugal from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Century¹

Antonio Terrasa Lozano²

Abstract

This article considers the evolution of the importance of nativeness, which is just one of the meanings of the Portuguese word *naturalidade*, according to the different interests of the nobility and merchants from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. By analyzing early modern Portuguese Codes, as well as some petitions sent to the *Cortes*, and the strong bonds that existed between the Castilian and Portuguese nobility from the Middle Ages onwards, I propose an interpretation of the evolution of the modern concept of nativeness, not in its absolute sense, but instead according to the nobility or the lack of it of individuals considered to be either natives or foreigners.

Keywords

Nobility, nativeness, foreigner, border, codes, privileges, merchants, court, royal marriages

Resumo

Neste artigo considera-se a evolução da importância jurídica da naturalidade em função dos diferentes interesses da nobreza e dos comerciantes durante os séculos XV, XVI e XVII. Através da análise das ordenações portuguesas da época moderna, de algumas petições em Cortes e dos fortes laços que ligaram, desde a Idade Média, as famílias da nobreza castelhana e portuguesa, propõe-se uma interpretação da evolução do conceito moderno de naturalidade, não em sentido absoluto, mas sim em função da nobreza ou da falta dela dos indivíduos considerados naturais ou estrangeiros.

Palavras-chave

Nobreza, naturalidade, estrangeiro, fronteira, códigos, privilégios, mercadores, corte, matrimónios régios

¹Translated by Mary Solari.

²CIDEHUS—University of Évora. Postdoctoral researcher of FCT, SFRH/BPD66015/2009; member of the research team “Circulación, patrimonio y poder de élites en la Monarquía Hispánica (1640- 1715)” (GECOFIN 8015: HAR2009- 12963-C03-01/HIST). E-Mail:aterrasa@gmail.com

1. Introduction. Nobility, the crime of lese majesty and treason: change and continuity.

In the year 1660, Dom Raimundo de Lencastre, the fourth Duke of Aveiro (c. 1620-1666) traveled secretly to Brest and from there to Madrid to meet his Castilian mother, Doña Ana Maria Manrique de Lara, as well as his French wife, Doña Luisa de Ligné, the daughter of the Prince of Ligné.³ That escapade sealed the process of severance between the House of Aveiro and the new royal dynasty of Portugal. Since 1640, when the Duke of Bragança was proclaimed King of Portugal, the Aveiros, his eternal rivals,⁴ had afforded the Restoration⁵ regime a tepid reception. Tried *in absentia*, the Duke of Aveiro was found guilty of the crime of lese majesty in August 1663. He was therefore sentenced to capital punishment—executed in effigy—and both his personal possessions and the estate belonging to his lineage were confiscated and returned to the Crown.⁶ Although several of Dom Raimundo's relatives who had remained in Portugal claimed to be his heirs,⁷ the Crown Procurator decided to deny their claims and recognize only Dom Raimundo's sister, Dona Maria Guadalupe de Lencastre (1630-1715) and his uncle, Dom António⁸ as heirs to Dom Raimundo. Since Dom João IV's (1640-1656) accession to the throne, the Crown had implemented an efficient system, fueled by the Portuguese nobility's flights to Castile, to regain possession of huge and wealthy manorial estates. The anti-Bragança conspiracy of 1641 had allowed the Crown to confiscate the luxurious estates of the Marquis of Vila Real and the Duke of Caminha.⁹ In March 1642, the jurisdictions and estates of the Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo were added, and in the following years the Crown recovered the lands of the marquissate of Porto Seguro—belonging to a second-

³Torres (1904: 873).

⁴The founder of the House of Aveiro had been Dom João II (1481-1495), *O Príncipe Perfeito*, who, in his will and testament had established that entailed estate for his bastard son, the *maestre de Avis*, thus creating a noble house which would only be surpassed in rank and riches by the House of Bragança. It was the same Dom João II who, at the height of the purges implemented against the nobility during his reign, had the Duke of Bragança's throat slit in Évora in 1483.

⁵In 1640, when Dom João IV was proclaimed King of Portugal, Dom Raimundo was not yet of age and still under the tutelage of his Castilian mother, Doña Ana Maria Manrique de Lara. In 1641, obeying his mother, and due to a supposed indisposition, the Duke of Aveiro did not attend the *Cortes* summoned to swear allegiance to the new monarch. This event led to the confinement of both mother and son in Coimbra. Valladares (1998: 237-239).

⁶*Allegação*: 34.

⁷At different moments, these claimants were the Marquis of Porto Seguro, his younger brother Pedro de Lencastre, the future General Inquisitor, the Count of Figueiró, the Countess of Faro, the Marquis of Gouvea, and his mother, the Marchioness.

⁸For the lawsuits brought to prevent the House of Aveiro reverting to the Crown of Portugal, see Terrasa Lozano (2009a: 227- 243).

⁹For the 1641 conspiracy and the repression of the noblemen involved in it, see Costa and Cunha (2006: 105-128).

born branch of the House of Lencastre—and the estates of the earldoms of Tarouca, Assumar, Lumiar, Figueiró, Armamar, Basto and Arcos. Such vast territories were not added to the Crown in one single set; rather, they were divided among several Houses belonging to different members of the Royal Family. Thus, the House of Bragança was reserved for the Crown Prince; the House of the Queen (*Casa da Rainha*) was re-established in February 1642 in order to provide queen consorts with their own property, and in August 1654 the powerful House of the Infantado was created for the second-born son of each king. The possession of a vast estate administered through the queen and the princes guaranteed the Crown indirect control of large tracts of Portuguese territory in a period of political turmoil and war with neighboring Castile.¹⁰

The Crown's interest in recognizing Dona Maria Guadalupe's rights at such a point in time and in the context of the policies implemented for the recovery of royal possessions (which actually intensified in the period 1654-1665)¹¹ was perfectly understandable: having betrayed Dom Afonso VI (1656-1683) and departed to the Court of Castile in the middle of the war, she was also guilty of treason and would therefore have to consider her rights to the dukedom, as transmitted by her elders, to have been lost forever. Together with her, all her relatives would also be affected, whether they remained loyal to Dom Afonso VI or not. Such a situation was established by the laws of the kingdom, which stated that, just like the rights of succession to primogeniture, treason was also transmitted by blood lineage, and spread like an infectious disease from parents to children.¹²

After Dom Raimundo's death sentence in 1663, Dom Pedro de Lencastre, the uncle of the fugitives and the future Inquisitor General in Portugal, sued both the Portuguese Crown and his nephews and nieces in order to be recognized as Duke of Aveiro. To prevent the Lencastre estate falling into the hands of the Crown, Dom Pedro's lawyers disputed the doctrine by which the treason of one family member tarnished the whole lineage:

O que cometeu delicto, porque seus bens devem ser confiscados, só perde os bens seus propios & liures, & nam aqueles que ficaram de seus antepasados, & que se ham de restituir a

¹⁰For the strategies devised to return the lands to the Crown after the accession to the throne of Dom João IV in 1640 and the foundation of the House of the Infantado, see Lourenço (1995b: 25-33). For the House of the Queen, see Lourenço (1995a) and Lourenço (2005).

¹¹It was during these years that the largest number of lands were incorporated into the estate of the House of the Infantado. Lourenço (1995b: 49).

¹²The *Ordenações Manuelinas*, and later the *Ordenações Filipinas*, clearly stated the seriousness of betraying the king and the way in which this stain was transmitted to the traitor's descendants.

os seguintes, que nelles tem vocaçam. [...] aonde o neto, nam perde a dignidade do Avoo pello crime do Pay.¹³

Aside from the complexities of that lawsuit, what I am interested in now are the accusations and defamatory remarks that Dom Pedro's allegations voiced against his niece. In 1666, after Dom Raimundo's death, his sister Dona Maria Guadalupe, proclaimed herself the fifth Duchess of Aveiro from her exile in Madrid. Her uncle was to state against her that she was, "incapacitada & inhabilitada para succeder por huir pera Castela Reyno inimigo, que está em guerra com esta Coroa, ou fosse mandada por sua vontade, por ella assi pedir, ou contra sua vontade, por assim o pedir a razam de Estado,¹⁴ he certo que esta desnaturada deste Reyno de Portugal."¹⁵

Consequently, just like her brother (whose civil death had been established in effigy), as far as her heritage and succession rights were concerned, Dona Maria de Lencastre was like an aborted child or a child who had died before his or her parents, that is to say, a nobody. Because, from the moment she betrayed her king and her homeland, Dona Maria "perdeo a cidade & Reyno, & esta feita Peregrina pella deportaçam [...] & ficou incapaz de successam [...] & por esta razam, nem pode o deportado ser instituido por herdeiro, nem adquirir causa alguna do testamento de outrem."¹⁶

From the moment this lady, already over twenty-five years of age and deaf to the requirements to return to Portugal, had fled to Castile, "perdeo o ser natural deste Reyno quo ad omnes effectus pois deixando a sua patria originaria, se passou para Castella fora des terras da jurisdiçam de Portugal sojeitandose a obediência de Castella."¹⁷ Furthermore, those who "se passam de hum Reyno a outro, o qual nam esta sub dictione ejusdem Principis, mais de outro inimigo, & ibi domicilium constituunt, que se reputem como

¹³"Those who have committed a crime, because their estate must be confiscated, only forfeit their own free goods and not those inherited from their ancestors, and which must be returned to the following (heirs) who have a right to them. (...) where the grandson does not forfeit the title of the grandfather due to the father's crime." *Allegaçam*: 23.

¹⁴We do not know whether an argument of this sort would have been used by Dona Maria in her lawsuit to justify fleeing to Madrid, although it would not have been surprising, given the justifications put forward by some of the Portuguese families exiled at Felipe IV's Court. About this type of justification, see Terrasa Lozano (2009b).

¹⁵"Disqualified and unable to succeed for having fled to the enemy Kingdom of Castile, which is at war with this Crown. Whether she was sent there willingly because she had asked for it or against her will because it was necessary for reasons of state, the truth is that she has lost her nativeness of this Kingdom of Portugal." *Allegaçam*: 131.

¹⁶"(...) lost her city and her Kingdom and has become a pilgrim through deportation (...) and she has been disqualified from inheritance (...) and for that reason the deported cannot be considered an heir, nor have any claim upon the will of another person."

¹⁷"She ceased to be a native of this Kingdom quo ad omnes effectus, since by leaving her country of origin she moved to Castile outside the territory of Portuguese jurisdiction, subjecting herself to obedience to Castile."

estrangeiros pera nam poderem ter dignidades no Reyno que deixaram.”¹⁸ It is indisputable therefore that any benefits proceeding from the loss, in this case Dona Maria de Lencastre's rights to succession, were also forfeited. In conclusion, “como a senhora Dona Maria se foi pera Castella Reyno estranho, & inimigo, & ahi tenha seu domicilio deixando sua patria em guerras tam acezas com Castella, ex dictis perdeo a origem & ficou alienigena, com que o que nam pode ter em este Reyno dignidade, ou bens alguns, assim he de direito Divino [...] como de direito Comum.”¹⁹

The succession to the dukedom of Aveiro was not resolved until judgment was passed on the lawsuit on 20 October 1679, that is to say, after Dom Pedro's death, the end of the war and the recognition of the independence of Portugal by Carlos II (1665-1700). The victor was Dona Maria Guadalupe, but under certain conditions. Before taking possession of her estate she had to return to Portugal, establish residence there and swear allegiance to the King of Portugal, thereby regaining her nativeness. Her return to Portugal was nevertheless somewhat complicated, for, since 1665, she had been the wife of Don Manuel Ponce de León, the sixth Duke of Arcos. Although she had forfeited her Portuguese nationality because of her betrayal and exile before getting married, her marriage to a foreigner in whose kingdom she lived, where she had her residence and where her children had been born, all of which were necessary conditions for obtaining a new “nativeness,” complicated her legal situation even further. The definitive solution was not reached until some years later: the Dukes separated and, in 1681, the Duchess of Aveiro *in pectore* received Carlos II's permission to return to Portugal and regain possession of her estate.²⁰

The switching of allegiance from the King of Portugal to the King of Castile had been common practice among the Portuguese and Castilian nobility since at least the fourteenth century. During the Middle Ages, what had mattered for the nobility, even in their power conflicts with the kings, was their bond with the monarch, the loyalty they offered him in exchange for the guarantee of titles and lands in Castile or Portugal. This was a common relationship in the early modern period, based on service, grace and favor.²¹

¹⁸“(…) go from one Kingdom to another, which is not sub dictione ejusdem Principis, but of another enemy, & ibi domicilium constituent, are considered foreigners so that they cannot have privileges in the Kingdom that they have left.” *Allegaçam*. 134.

¹⁹“As Dona Maria has left for Castile, a foreign and enemy kingdom, and has taken up residence there, leaving her homeland in such bitter wars against Castile, ex dictis she has forfeited her origin and has become a foreigner, so she cannot have a title or any possessions in this kingdom, which is so by both divine and common law.” *Allegaçam*. 134-135.

²⁰Torres (1904: 872-873).

²¹On the subject of grace and favor, in addition to the pioneering and prolific study by Mauss (2008) [1950], there is an interesting bibliography. It is important to mention the fundamental work by Olival (2001). See

Such ties between lord and king had been a feature of the discourse of the nobility throughout the early modern period, while the concept of being a *native* ("natural") of the kingdom, with all of its legal implications, had gained in complexity and had become a crucial factor in determining membership of the political community and ensuring access to certain trading privileges. In the mid-seventeenth century, the Duke of Aveiro's defection was considered not only a crime of lese-majesty but was also an act of treason against the kingdom of Portugal. What, in the fifteenth century, would have been considered an act of treason against the legitimate sovereign in accordance with Natural Law, had, by the time of Dom Afonso VI, turned into a loss of nativeness by becoming a foreigner. Nevertheless, leaving aside this rhetoric, once peace had been reached between the kings of Portugal and Castile, the Dukes of Aveiro recovered their lands and estates, as had been the case several centuries before. When, in 1479, Dom Afonso V of Portugal (1438-1481) made peace with the Catholic Monarchs and signed the treaty of Alcáçovas, they did not neglect to include a clause in which, "es acordado e asentado que los dichos señores rrey e rreyna de Castilla e Leon, e cétera, ayán de rremittir e perdoar a todos los caualleros e escuderos e otras personas, naturales e non naturales de los dichos sus rreynos e señoríos y a sus fijos, de qualquier estado e calidad que sean, que pública e notoriamente están con los dichos señores rreyes de Portugal e príncipe, su fijo, así en el dicho rreyno de Portugal commo en los dichos rreynos de Castilla o en otra qualquier parte, de todos los casos e enojos e cosas pasadas."²²

In order to avoid getting lost in translation, I will briefly make some conceptual remarks. This article deals with the Portuguese concept of *naturalidade* and the Spanish one of *naturaleza*. Amongst the meanings of these polysemic notions are nativeness, municipal citizenship and, when used to refer to a king, his legitimate sovereignty in accordance with Natural Law. As a matter of fact, it is impossible to translate all the meanings of *naturalidade* and *naturaleza* into one single English word or concept for two reasons: first, because such a word simply does not exist in English; second, because the English legal vocabulary belongs to the Common Law tradition while the Portuguese and Spanish legal systems were built on the framework of Roman Law. Therefore, in this article when dealing with

also the works by Esteban Estúgana (2012) and Guillén Berrendero (2012) for this subject's relationship with the discourse of the nobility.

²²"It is agreed and established that the said king and queen of Castile and Leon, et cetera, will pardon and forgive all the knights and squires and other native and non-native people of their kingdoms and dominions and their children, whatever their status or quality, who publicly and notoriously are with the said king and queen of Portugal and the prince, their son, both in the kingdom of Portugal and in the kingdoms of Castile or anywhere else, of all cases and disturbances and past things". Cited in Fonseca and Ruiz Asensio (1995: 86).

naturalidade and trying to translate it, I will specify which meaning I am referring to in each case.

From this point of view, and assuming that the concept of *naturalidade* evolved polysemically, perhaps we should consider that until the late modern period, both for the nobility and the monarchy, the status of being a native was neither solely nor essentially the reason for belonging to a kingdom. As the *Partidas Castellanas de Primera Instancia* stated, it was “debdo que han los homes unos con otros por alguna derecha razon en se amar et se querer bien.”²³ There were ten reasons whereby one enjoyed this nativeness:

la primera et la mejor es la que han los homes con su señor natural, porque tambien ellos como aquellos de cuyo linage deceden, nascieron, et fueron raigados et son en la tierra onde es el señor; la segunda es la que viene por razon de vasallage; la tercera por crianza; la quarta por caballeria; la quinta por casamiento: la sexta por heredamiento; la setena por sacarlo de cativo, ó por librarlo de muerte ó de la deshonra; la ochava por aforramiento de que non rescibe prescio el que lo aforra; la novena por tornarlo cristiano; la decena por moranza de diez años que faga en la tierra maguer sea natural de otra.²⁴

All the meanings that the term comprised therefore had some common features which ensured a deep connection—with a monarch or a kingdom—originating from different causes, all of which created rights and duties.

The studies about *naturalidade*, nativeness, immigration and naturalization in the early modern period have assumed that the first was essentially a synonym for the recognition of belonging to a kingdom, with all the privileges attached to it. If, as has so far been the case, we do not consider what *naturalidade* and being a *natural* might have meant for the nobility—in both practical and ideological terms—then the study of these concepts is incomplete. Or else, to use Skinner's terminology,²⁵ any attempt to reconstruct the genealogy of the *natural* concept will be incomplete as the historian rules out one of its branches, the one that ended up being extinguished, for purely teleological reasons. In this article, I will focus on the study of the connection of the concept of *natural* with the

²³“the duty that men have towards each other, for some lawful reason, to love one another and to be concerned for their well-being.”

²⁴“The first and the best reason is the [connection] that men have with their natural lord, because they too, as well as those of the lineage they descend from, were born and were rooted in and belong to the land where the lord is; the second connection is that which comes through vassalage; the third through upbringing; the fourth through chivalry; the fifth through marriage; the sixth through inheritance; the seventh by being released from captivity, or by being freed from death or dishonor; the eighth by being made a freeman with the one who frees him receiving no price for this; the ninth by becoming a Christian; the tenth by living on the land in spite of being a native of another.” *Partidas*, Tit. XXIV, *Leyes* I and II.

nobility,²⁶ understood as being equivalent to the entitlement to membership of a kingdom in the Portuguese legal texts of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Bearing in mind what is stated above, I will maintain that the evolution of one meaning of the concept of *naturalidade*, i.e. nativeness, its legal development, and the need to see it recognized, was a minor question for the nobility until well into the early modern period, whereas, for other groups, particularly tradesmen, merchants and businessmen, it became a crucial matter. As Maria Inés Carzolio wrote in relation to the concept of *vecindad* (municipal citizenship), and a definition that I consider perfectly applicable to nativeness, the nobility insisted "on trying to continue being ruled by personal privileges and not by territorial jurisdiction."²⁷ And such a bifurcation in the history of *naturalidade* (nativeness) into two paths, the noble one and the non-privileged one, took place in Portugal sometime in the fifteenth century, at the same time as the process that would end up turning vassals into natives was taking place, in other words during the century when Portugal and Castile controlled the trade on their borders with iron fists and reinforced the commercial routes with which they were attempting to delimit their respective areas of expansion overseas.

With the configuration of the borders and the attempt to close the Iberian areas overseas, legal nativeness became more important from the practical point of view for merchants, tradesmen and bureaucrats, an importance that would increase even further during the union of the crowns of Portugal and the Catholic Monarchy from 1580 to 1640.²⁸ During this centuries-old process, *naturalidade* gradually lost some of its meanings and came to be essentially understood as relating to membership of a particular community and the enjoyment of its exclusive rights.²⁹ It was in this final part of the process to which we are now referring that modern nativeness started to become an inconvenience for the aristocracy, which until then had relied on royal graces and favors to prosper and grow. The union of Portugal with the Catholic Monarchy and the agreement with Tomar's restrictive conditions, together with the laws which sought to prevent traditional marriages between Castilian and Portuguese lineages, began to pose a problem for the strategies of

²⁵As Professor Skinner recently mentioned, "*When we trace the genealogy of a concept, we uncover the different ways that may have been used in the past. When retrieving these uses, we also gain a useful tool for reflection on how this concept is used today*," Skinner (2011 [2008]: 9).

²⁶In this article, I will refer to the nobility as a whole, without breaking it down into categories. For the categories established for this group at the end of the Ancien Regime, see Monteiro (1987).

²⁷Carzolio (2002: 651).

²⁸For an analysis of the adaptations and conflict between the different legal nations of the Catholic Monarchy, see Gil Pujol (2004).

²⁹According to Tamar Herzog's definition for Castile, nativeness "*was a status that appeared in Castile in the late medieval period and was immediately distinguished from vassalage and subjection. By the fifteenth century, it defined a particular community of people who enjoyed exclusivity in office holding and in the use of ecclesiastical benefices in the kingdom*". Herzog (2003: 8).

important families on either side of the border. According to a Law of 9 June 1595, later included in the *Ordenaciones Filipinas* (Philippine Ordinances), it was established that, “esta ley [referring to an earlier one, of June 5, passed in order to prevent primogeniture unions in Portugal] queremos e mandamos se entenda não somente casando as pessoas destes Reynos e Senhorios de Portugal com outras naturaes delles, mas que tambem haja lugar nas pessoas que casarem fóra dos ditos Reynos com pessoas estrangeiras e não naturaes: por maneira que em nenhum tempo se possam ajuntar, nem ajuntem as ditas casas e Morgados deste Reyno, com os outros de outro Reyno de fóra deste, senao na forma desta Ley.”³⁰ Clear examples highlighting the harsh process of becoming aware of the importance of nativeness as a practical issue for the nobility were the lawsuits and disputes which, in the first decades of the seventeenth century, Don Diego de Silva y Mendoza (1564-1630), the Count of Salinas,³¹ the Marquis of Alenquer and Viceroy of Portugal,³² had to face. Firstly his rivals in the Council of Portugal and then the political enemies he had among the representatives of the Portuguese Crown (taking advantage of the importance that nativeness requirements had acquired after 1580) denied him his rights both to the positions he had and the titles Felipe III had given him during his reign, as well as to his right to succeed in Portugal to his family's Portuguese estates because he was born and lived in Castile. He, on the other hand, did everything within his power to be acknowledged as a legal and natural citizen of Portugal, but in vain.³³

It has again been pointed out recently that, in the early modern period, identities were multiple and capable of adapting to one another according to circumstances,³⁴ in the same way that there were several imaginary communities³⁵ to which the individuals of the *Ancien Régime* could feel that they belonged. In my opinion, this is undoubtedly most fertile ground for analyzing the relationship between nobility and *naturalidade* in the early modern period. Nevertheless, in this article, my purpose is to study the legal reflections of the very

³⁰“We desire and command this law to be understood to apply not only to people from these kingdoms and dominions of Portugal who marry other natives from the same places, but also to people who marry outside the said kingdoms to foreign and non-native people, so that at no time can those houses and entailed estates of this kingdom be joined together or be united with those of another kingdom outside this one if not in accordance with this law.” Ord. Filip., Lib. IV, Tit. C, 14.

³¹For a biography of the Count of Salinas, see the works of Trevor Dadson, which are fundamental. It is important to mention that there is a recent compilation of some of these in Dadson (2011).

³²For the public career of the Count of Salinas in the Council of Portugal and his viceroyalty, as well as the problems that the accusations of not being Portuguese caused him, see Gaillard (1982).

³³For the speeches and debates in which the Count took part in order to match the different nationalities of the Monarchy in the context of his lawsuits under the reign of the Catholic king, see Terrassa Lozano (2012b). For the lawsuits and the general difficulties that the Silvas faced in seeking to inherit their ancestors' estate in Portugal, as a result of their not having Portuguese nativeness, see Terrassa Lozano (2012a).

³⁴For a reflection on this subject, see Pulido Serrano (2011: 130- 142).

³⁵As has been defended by recent historiography in several areas by recovering the concept coined in the 1980s by Benedict Anderson. Anderson (1991) [1983].

secondary position that the connection with *naturalidade*—now meaning mainly nativeness—occupied in the nobility's economic, political and family practices. In spite of the criticism directed against historical research that focuses too heavily on legal texts, the importance of the latter cannot be denied because, as António Manuel Hespanha has pointed out, legal texts are a compact way of expressing the political, theological and philosophical concepts that are produced by and about different societies, as well as a way of reinforcing the social spread of those same concepts.³⁶ Therefore, without seeking to investigate aristocratic imagery at this point, I will focus on the study of nativeness, not as an element of identity, but as a legal requirement, as a need to access or enjoy privileges. And, furthermore, this will be done bearing in mind Tamar Herzog's warning that very seldom were efforts made to define nativeness in the legislation of both kingdoms, something that was, in fact, only referred to in relation to conflictive contexts in their respective codes.³⁷ In fact, nativeness, natives and foreigners are concepts that were taken as given and were only mentioned in connection with privileges, prohibitions and recognitions, or the lack thereof.

Starting then from these premises, I will try to prove my hypothesis in the following way: first, I will discuss the dual process taking place in Portugal in the fifteenth century, which included closing the borders and imposing trading restrictions on outsiders, while the nobility were able, without much difficulty, to pursue their political and family strategies as if the border of Castile did not exist. Then, through an analysis of the relationship between the concepts of native, foreigner or other origins in the *Ordenações Afonsinas*, *Manuelinas* and *Filipinas*, I will attempt to determine the importance that this characteristic had had for merchant groups since at least the reign of Dom Duarte (1433-1438), whereas, for the nobility, it remained of little relevance practically until the accession of Felipe II in 1580.

2. Absolute Royal Power, borders and commercial affronts.

The fifteenth century, as the historiographical cliché states, was a turbulent time in most Western European kingdoms, which ended after various periods of violence and civil wars with the consolidation on the throne of strong monarchs able to pursue policies that would help them to reassert their royal power. This was the case with Henry VII (1485-1509) in England after the War of the Roses and Isabel *la Católica* (1474-1504) in Castile

³⁶Hespanha (1993: 27).

³⁷Herzog (2003: 4).

after the civil war that followed the death of her brother Enrique IV (1454-1474). In their disputes, conflicts and temporary alliances with the nobility, the Church and the urban oligarchy, these strong monarchs, just like their weaker predecessors, sought to use their alleged absolute royal power as the legitimizing element. Through this reasoning, the monarch could take decisions that ran counter to the legal codes of their kingdoms, which could help potential allies. The importance that the acceptance of this authority had for the consolidation of royal power is obvious. As has been noted in the case of France at the end of the Hundred Years' War (1337-1453),³⁸ as well as in the Castile of the Trastamaras in the fifteenth century,³⁹ a transcendental phenomenon had begun to take place, by means of which the royal power would play an important and conflictive role: the consummation of the direct bond between the monarch and his or her subjects, leaving aside the intermediate relationships of vassalage⁴⁰. In the mid-fifteenth century, the bond of *naturalidade*—assimilating being *natural* with being a native of the kingdom—had been established everywhere, although as we will see below this did not mean that vassalage was to lose its importance. In the reign of Juan II of Castile (1406-1454), it had already been established that, in general, nativeness came from birth and that when this did not exist, it could be obtained through the *Cortes* if a person's roots or residence in any city of the kingdom could be proved. However, if anyone that was powerful and lacked those requirements wished to obtain *naturalidade*, they could approach the monarch, appealing to his absolute royal power and his grace and favor. This procedure, the ability to grant nativeness in an exceptional and irregular way, normally as a reward, became part of the repertory of pardons that a monarch could bestow.

The dynastic crises of the fifteenth century in both Castile and Portugal merely reinforced the notion of nativeness in contrast to the more traditional personal ties.⁴¹ In Portugal, it was Dom João II (1481-1495) who crucially made the ability to bestow nativeness an important part of the armory that monarchs could call on when administering pardons. The use of absolute royal power in bestowing *nativeness* must have met with great resistance from the beginning, particularly when a weak monarch tried to do this, as is shown by the contrast between the excessive forcefulness with which Juan II of Castile produced his *nativeness* letters when compared with the simple rhetoric of the ones

³⁸Krynén (1993).

³⁹Nieto Soria (1998).

⁴⁰Nieto Soria (1998: 197).

⁴¹Gutiérrez Nieto (1995: 23).

bestowed by Dom João II of Portugal. Thus, for example, at the end of his turbulent reign, Juan II of Castile was to bestow letters of nativeness, with the privileges that this implied,

non embargantes quales quier leys e fueros e dichos ordenamientos, fazzanas, costumes, estilos e toda otra cosa de qual quier natura, vigor e misterio que en contrario sea o pueda. Ca yo, de mi çierta çiencia e proprio motu e poderio real avsoluto, lo abrogo e derogo en quanto a esto atanne, e dispenso contra todo ello e contra cosa e parte dello, e espeçialmente contra las leys e ordenamientos que dizen que las cartas dadas contra foro o derecho deven ser obedeçidas e non complidas aunque contengan qualquier clausulas derogatorias e que las leys e fueros e derechos non pueden ser derogatorias e que las leys e fueros e derechos non pueden ser derogados, salvo por Cortes.⁴²

For his part, Dom João II of Portugal, at the end of his reign, and from a position of uncontested power, when he granted nativeness to the Castilian apothecary Alfonso Alvarez, a resident of Setúbal, limited himself to letting it be known “que nos queremos fazer gracia e honor,”⁴³ to the said apothecary, to make him a native of his kingdoms, with all the rights pertaining to his natives.⁴⁴ During the reign of Dom João II, special naturalizations of foreigners were channeled through his Chancellery, as can be seen in its files. With the creation of the *Desembargo do Paço*⁴⁵ at the end of his reign and its organic constitution in 1521, in the reign of Dom Manuel I (1495-1521), those files were to become its jurisdiction. This new office, made up of the high court judges presided over by the king, had as its main area of competence to decide on matters of grace and favor, among which the naturalization of foreigners may have played a predominant role. Among the requirements asked of those who applied for Portuguese nativeness was the applicant's occupation,⁴⁶ which undoubtedly supports my hypothesis that those interested in being or not being identified as natives or foreigners, or in becoming natives, were by no means mainly the members of the nobility.

⁴²“notwithstanding any laws, jurisdictions and said ordinances, exploits, customs, and any other thing of whatever nature, strength and mystery that is or might be otherwise, I, in my certain knowledge and through my own free will and absolute royal power, rescind and repeal all that relates to this and discharge against all this and against each and every part thereof, and especially against all the laws and ordinances that say that the letters given against the jurisdiction or right must be obeyed and not complied with although they may contain any derogatory clauses and that the laws and jurisdictions and rights may not be derogatory and that the laws and jurisdictions and rights may not be derogated, except by Parliament.”. Nieto Soria (1998: 142).

⁴³“that we wish to make a grace and favor...”.

⁴⁴ANTI, Chancelaria de Dom João II, Liv. 15, f. 34v.

⁴⁵For this institution, we follow Rodrigues (2000: 13-53) and Subtil (1996).

⁴⁶The other requirements for nativeness related to birth, religion, length of residence in the kingdom, place of residence and the reason for the request. Rodrigues (2000: 53).

So, nativeness and its acquisition, or its granting, were first of all a matter that depended on the strengthening of royal power. Nativeness brought with it economic and commercial privileges, obviously affected by the difficult relations between Portugal and Castile throughout the fifteenth century. When the Treaty of Alcañices (1297) almost definitively shaped the frontiers of Portugal, the border between the two kingdoms became a major feature of both Castilian and Portuguese laws and their *Cortes* received petitions to either facilitate or impede (depending on the circumstances), the trade of goods, animals and people. This issue has in fact merited the attention of a great many historians because of the considerable body of information it has left behind.⁴⁷ Throughout the Middle Ages, a series of rules were produced in order to control the traffic of goods, and to regulate or sometimes forbid the export of products that were considered too valuable; they also established the location of customs houses and their duties.⁴⁸

Furthermore, during most of the fifteenth century, the border between Castile and Portugal was a hot spot where open war broke out on several occasions. The treaties of Medina del Campo (1431), Almeirim (1432) and Alcáçovas (1479) were only precarious islands of peace in a highly conflictive sea. In those years, both for reasons of economic policy and retaliation against the wars being fought, there started to appear at the *Cortes* discriminatory petitions and regulations against the "foreign" merchants in much larger numbers than can be identified in the files preserved from the fourteenth century.⁴⁹ From the beginning of the fifteenth century onwards, there were a lot of petitions presented against outsiders, which indicates a clearly hostile environment towards them. It is worth dwelling on some of these petitions to understand the increasing inconvenience that those wishing to do business faced if they were foreigners in Portugal. The *Cortes* of Santarém in 1418 requested that foreign merchants should be inspected before they left for their countries, in order to prevent them taking away their gold and silver, and so did the *Cortes* of Leiria-Santarém in 1433.⁵⁰ At the *Cortes* of Évora in 1436, it was petitioned that foreign merchants loading merchandise onto Portuguese ships should be obliged to repay the kingdom the profits from their sale within a year;⁵¹ at the *Cortes* of Lisbon in 1439, it was requested that foreign merchants should be declared unable to hold positions in the courts

⁴⁷Cardoso (2000: 1).

⁴⁸Cardoso (2000: 315). For a list of these laws in Portugal between 1253 and 1482, see Cardoso (2000: 349) and, for their rendering in Spanish, see Cardoso (2000: 359-360). To see the petitions made under these laws in the Portuguese *Cortes* between 1385 and 1390, whether or not they were approved by the king, see Sousa (1990).

⁴⁹For information about the Portuguese *Cortes* in the mid-fourteenth century, see Marques and Dias (1982), Marques and Dias (1986), and Marques and Dias (1990).

⁵⁰Sousa (1990: 274-311).

or the treasury and that the cities where they could sell retail goods should be controlled;⁵² at the *Cortes* of Santarém in 1451, the demand was that they should declare the goods that they intended to sell in the kingdom.⁵³ At the *Cortes* of Lisbon in 1455, the dispute which the Portuguese wanted to avoid by hampering foreign merchants' activities was finally made clear: obviously it was related to the increasing importance that was being given to overseas trade. Thus, it was requested that "o rei não dê os seus traustos a mercadores estrangeiros sem primeiro contactar os nacionais"⁵⁴ and at the *Cortes* held in the same city in 1459 that "o rei não dê a mercadores estrangeiros exclusivos de exportação de nenhuma mercadorias por nenhuma espécie de contratos mesmo ventajosos; que todas as mercadorias do reino sejam exportadas exclusivamente por mercadores nacionais; que sejam expulsos do reino os mercadores estrangeiros."⁵⁵ At the *Cortes* held in Coimbra/Évora in 1472-1473, the king was asked to take measures against the foreign merchants in the kingdom who, thanks to wholesale transactions, received large amounts of gold and silver, which they then exported.⁵⁶ In the same *Cortes* and on the eve of the war with Castile, in an atmosphere of open hostility, the king's authority was requested so that "os naturas do reino possam, a titulo de justa compensação, resarcir-se nos castelhanos dos roubos e furtos que eles lhes fazem por mar e por terra."⁵⁷ In a war or pre-war atmosphere, retaliatory petitions of this nature were common and, in every case, the power to grant them was always a royal matter.⁵⁸ The situation was the same in Castile, and, when the monarch bestowed such a right, he did so based on the premise that, as an act of war, the retaliatory action could be exercised against anyone having the same nature as the offenders. Thus, for example, in August 1478, the Catholic Monarchs granted Juan García Menayo, a resident of Badajoz, the petition of retaliation which he had requested against some Portuguese who had stolen his cattle and goods during the truce with Portugal. The Catholic Monarchs Isabel and Fernando thus ordered,

⁵¹Sousa (1990: 322).

⁵²Sousa (1990: 330-333).

⁵³Sousa (1990: 345).

⁵⁴"The king should not grant his business to foreign merchants without first contacting national merchants." Sousa (1990: 352).

⁵⁵"The king should not give foreign merchants exclusive rights to the export of any goods through any kind of advantageous contracts; all of the realm's goods should be exported exclusively by national merchants; foreign merchants should be expelled from the realm." Sousa (1990: 366).

⁵⁶Sousa (1990: 399).

⁵⁷"Natives of this realm may, by way of just compensation, seek redress from the Castilians for the robberies and thefts that they have committed on land and at sea." Sousa (1990: 434).

⁵⁸Albuquerque (1972: 853).

a todos e cada vno de vos, que dexedes e consyntedes libremente al dicho Juan Garcia, e al que su poder ouiere, fazer prendas e represarias en el dicho reyno de Portugal e en qualesquier vezinos e moradores del dicho reyno e en sus gentes e bienes e mercaderias, doquier que los pudieren aver, e se entreguen dellos e de los dichos sus bienes, e de los dichos seys asnos con sus cargas de sardina que le tomaron, e del dicho rescate que le lleuaron, e de los dichos veynte mill maravedis de su estimacion, con las costas que a fecho e fiziere, fasta los cobrar de todo bien e conplidamente, que le non mengue ende cosa alguna.⁵⁹

The antagonism displayed towards foreign merchants during peacetime reached its peak at the *Cortes* of Évora/Viana of 1481-1482, when it was requested “que o rei determine um prazo dentro do qual todos os mercadores estrangeiros estantes no reino se vao embora; que todos os estrangeiros vindos ao reino para mercadejar regressem nas naus e navios em que vieram, sob uma pena taxativa.”⁶⁰

Unless made during wartime, these petitions seldom gained royal approval. From the fourteenth century onwards, international trade, and maritime trade in particular, had reached such a level of complexity that a mechanism had been established to minimize the impact which possible periods of war might have on it.⁶¹ Nevertheless, during the fifteenth century and particularly between Castile and Portugal in the context of their overseas and dynastic rivalry, this rudimentary form of commercial protection almost always failed to achieve its purposes. In any case, and under certain particular circumstances, nativeness had acquired exceptional importance by the end of the century, above all since the fact of not being a native might lead to limitations being imposed on the business intended to be carried out in Portugal. The signing of the treaties of Alcáçovas (1479) and Tordesillas (1494), later ratified by the renowned papal bulls, formally meant a long period of peace between Castile and Portugal. But they also meant the creation of a new privilege for the natives of each of those kingdoms—or for the foreigners who managed to obtain a favor from either the Castilian or the Portuguese monarch—namely the permission to trade in

⁵⁹“each and every one of you to allow and freely consent that the said Juan Garcia and whoever is empowered to act on his behalf may make seizures and reprisals in the said kingdom of Portugal upon any neighbors and residents of the said kingdom and upon its people, goods and merchandise, of whatever possessions they may have, and recover from them their said goods, and the said six donkeys with their loads of sardines that they took from him, and the said reward that they received from him, and the said twenty thousand maravedis of their price, together with the costs that he has incurred and will incur, until he has received everything well and completely, and that he is not prejudiced in any way.” De la Torre and Suárez Fernández (eds.) (1958: 167- 169).

⁶⁰“(…) that the king should fix a period within which all foreign merchants existing in the kingdom should leave; that all foreigners coming to the kingdom to engage in trade should return to the ships and vessels in which they came, under pain of restraint.” Sousa (1990: 478).

⁶¹On this subject, see Ferreira (1995: 33-57).

their new overseas world, delimited by the renowned line drawn at 370 leagues from Cape Verde,⁶² and to partake directly in its riches and opportunities.

At the end of the fifteenth century and during the first half of the sixteenth century, the border between Portugal and Castile was no longer an area of conflict and began to flourish as the trading area which it had always been⁶³. But by then the difference between being a native or not, and the privileges and contingent inconveniences which each of those conditions entailed, had become firmly consolidated. It is easy to understand that nativeness of the kingdom had started to be of great importance for merchants and businessmen alike. But the question that must now be answered is when and how did that condition become equally useful or necessary for the nobility?

3. Wandering nobility, a few vassal princes and double *naturalidade*.

After the Treaty of Alcañices (1297), and during and after the wars of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the frontier between Portugal and Spain did not mean anything to the Castilian and the Portuguese nobility, although the possibility of changing their natural king did, as well as the idea of supporting either Iberian king depending on the situation. Referring to early modern nobility, António Manuel Hespanha has pointed out that if native-born nobles belonged to the titled nobility, to the *fidalgos* of the noble houses and to those inscribed in the registers of the Royal Household,⁶⁴ as long as there was a king to guarantee those sources of nobility, little did it matter which crown he was wearing or which kingdom his subjects were native to.

From the fourteenth century onwards, Castilian and Portuguese noblemen had been crossing the border for the most varied reasons—fleeing from a betrayed king, seeking prosperity by offering vassalage to another king—which allowed them to establish a family network on both sides of the frontier.⁶⁵ The same trend was continued at the beginning of the fifteenth century with the accession to the Portuguese throne of the House of Avis.⁶⁶ By the end of the fifteenth century, there were few Portuguese noble families who did not have Castilian blood in their veins and vice-versa. In 1486, Fernando

⁶² An excellent digital version of the Treaty of Tordesillas can be found at http://www.mcu.es/archivos/docs/Documento_Tratado_Tordesillas.pdf 14/04/2012.

⁶³See Braga (2001).

⁶⁴Hespanha (1994: 344- 345).

⁶⁵On this subject, see the studies made by Regina Fernández (2005) of the comings and goings of some fourteenth-century branches of important Portuguese families, such as the Castros, Albuquerque, Pachecos, and Teles de Menezes.

⁶⁶Cunha (1996).

del Pulgar published his celebrated *Claros varones de Castilla*, dedicated to Queen Isabel la Católica. The chronicler, driven by his "amor de mi tierra" (love for my land) set to "escribir de algunos claros varones, perlados e cavalleros, naturales de los vuestros reinos."⁶⁷ In that list of illustrious males from Castile, there were three of Portuguese origin who enjoyed considerable power in the kingdom of the Catholic Queen. One was the Marquis of Villena, Don Juan Pacheco "de nación portuguesa, de los más nobles de aquel reino, nieto de Juan Fernández Pacheco, uno de los cavalleros que vinieron de Portugal a Castilla al servicio del rey don Juan, el que fue vencido en la batalla de Aljubarrota;"⁶⁸ the second was Don Juan de Silva, the Count of Cifuentes, "fijodalgo de limpia sangre,"⁶⁹ whose grandparents "fueron naturales del reino de Portugal;"⁷⁰ and the third one was none other than the famous Archbishop of Toledo, Don Alonso Carrillo, who was "de los fidalgos e de limpia sangre del reino de Portugal. Su avuelo fue un cavallero portugués que vino a Castilla al servicio del rey don Juan, el que fue vencido en la batalla de Aljubarrota."⁷¹

Contrary to what was happening with merchants and tradesmen, the nobility did not find their realm's *naturalidade*, meaning that concept the love which bound them to their king, to be an obstacle. The turbulent fifteenth century was particularly propitious for emigrations from one side of the border to the other and, in all cases, the most important thing was the strength of their loyalty to the king—or its weakness—and knowing how to choose the right one, rather than having the status of a "native" of one of the two realms. There are numerous examples that could be provided, but we are going to focus here on two from 1475, one of which illustrates certain practices for the establishment of ties, while the other shows that, in the long run, there was a latent close connection between *naturalidade* and political necessity, even in the sphere of the privileged minority.

As is known, when Enrique IV of Castile died in December 1474, his sister Isabel hurried to proclaim herself Queen of Castile in advance of her niece Juana, known as *La Beltraneja*, who was willing to marry Dom Afonso V of Portugal. This dynastic conflict would be the cause of two wars, a civil one in Castile and another one against Portugal. From the very first moment, the king of Portugal sought to procure for himself and his

⁶⁷"writing about some illustrious men, prelates and knights, native to your kingdoms." Pulgar (2007 [1486]: 73).

⁶⁸"of Portuguese nationality, one of the most noble of that kingdom, the grandson of Juan Fernández Pacheco, one of the knights who came from Portugal to Castile in the service of the king Don Juan, the one that was defeated at the battle of Aljubarrota." Pulgar (2007 [1486]: 121).

⁶⁹"a pure-blooded nobleman".

⁷⁰"were natives of the kingdom of Portugal". Pulgar (2007 [1486]: 137).

⁷¹"one of the most pure bred noblemen in Portugal. His grandfather was a Portuguese knight, who came to Castile in the service of the king Don Juan, the one who was defeated at the Battle of Aljubarrota." Pulgar (2007 [1486]: 178).

future wife the support of the high nobility who had sided against Queen Isabel. On March 29, 1475, Dom Afonso V signed an agreement with the son of the Marquis of Villena through which, in exchange, he would receive his support and the recognition of himself and Juana la Beltraneja as the monarchs of Castile,

ofrecia y prometia guardar la Persona Casa y estado de dicho Sr. Dn. Diego [hijo del marqués de Villena] y en confirmarle todas las mercedes de las Ciudades Villas y lugares que hubiese tenido en tiempo del Sr. Dn. Enrique [IV], y que le faboreceria con todas sus fuerzas para que consiguiesse el Maestrazgo de Santiago y ayudaria con sus gentes contra todas las personas del mundo, aunque expusiese su Persona y estado R[ea]l. Y que le tendria cerca de si en su Casa, Corte y Consejo, y governazion dandole en todo esto el mejor lugar, y que haria de dicho sr. mayor confianza que de otro alguno: Y que asi mismo guardaria y conserbaria las Personas Casas y estados del M. de Calatraba, y del Conde Don Juan sus primos, y del Marques de Cadiz.⁷²

This deal was not exceptional in the least and it did nothing more than continue the tradition of negotiating an agreement whereby the Castilian nobility would support a possible accession of Dom Afonso V to the Castilian throne,⁷³ an idea that came from the turbulent years of Enrique IV's reign, with many of them being rendered single by civil war, in which Portugal had sometimes intervened. The relationships—loyalties and betrayals—between the king and the noblemen were frequently not a question of nativeness (and now we are referring to the fifteenth century), but more a matter of the recognition of legitimate sovereignty and mutual convenience. The chronicler Garcia de Resende, talking about the habits of Dom João II, says that, “*não soamente fazia merces a seus criados, e naturales, mas nos Reynos estrangeiros de Castella, Aragoão, França, Roma, e outras muytas partes, muytas e grandes pessoas recebiam delle em cada hum anno muytas e grandes merces secretamente.*”⁷⁴ The

⁷²“He offered and promised to keep the Personal House and estate of the said Don Diego (son of the Marquis of Villena) and confirm all the favors from the Towns and places that he should have had in the reign of Don Enrique (IV) and that he would favor him with all his strength so that he would obtain the Grand Mastership of Santiago and would help with his people against everyone in the world, even risking his own Self and Royal estate. And that he would have him near to him in his House, Court and Council, and governance, giving him in all of these the best place, and that he would have in the said gentleman greater trust than in any other, and that we would also keep and preserve the Personal Houses and estates of the Marquis of Calatraba, Count Don Juan his cousins and the Marquis of Cadiz.”

⁷³In May 1469, when Enrique IV was still alive, he had made a similar deal to the one made with the son of the Marquis of Villena in 1475 with the Archbishop of Seville, the Marquis of Villena, the Count of Plasencia, the Marquis of Santillana and Don Pedro Velasco, the son of the Count of Haro. AHN, Frías, c. 16, d. 23. AHN, Frías, c. 16, d. 30.

⁷⁴“He not only granted graces and favors to his servants and natives, but also in the foreign kingdoms of Castile, Aragon, France, Rome and many other places, many great people secretly received from him many great favors each year.” Garcia de Resende (1798 [1545]: XIX).

economics of grace and favor, therefore, did not establish bonds only between the natural king and his natural vassals. Going back to Dom Afonso V, it is clear that he was willing to pay a substantial price in order to be considered a natural king by the Marquis of Villena's son if that might have meant his being recognized as king of Castile. Hence, on occasions, the nobility had quite a lot of leeway for deciding which king or queen they would consider their natural monarch, and what they would receive in exchange for that, regardless of whether or not this monarch had already been recognized by his or her own kingdom.

Through the *Anales de Aragón* by Zurita—presumably unaltered—we have access to a manifesto by Juana *la Beltraneja* to the Castilians, signed in Plasencia on May 30, 1475, just two months after her royal consort had promised the earth to the Marquis of Villena's son and his relatives. It is important to note the defense that Doña Juana makes of the legitimacy of her husband at the end of this important and illustrative document. The strongest point that *la Beltraneja* makes is that the king of Portugal, the third monarch of the House of Avis, “mi señor es natural destos mis reynos: e que de la casa real de Castilla: e descende del Rey don Enrique el segundo de gloriosa memoria; e del Rey don Juan su fijo visaguelo del dicho Rey mi señor, e padre que Dios aya.”⁷⁵ The fact that Dom Afonso V of Portugal was declared a native of the kingdoms of Castile and Leon was a clear indicator of the importance which that legal category was beginning to gain in the increasingly strong Iberian monarchies and a sign of the importance which that status would have for the nobility when the moment came to inherit estates in kingdoms of which they were not natives.

For a certain time, nevertheless, nativeness of a kingdom, the bond with the natural king, and also vassalage, would continue to be a concept that depended on a confederacy of diffuse borders and was placed at the service of the nobility's strategies for preserving their estates. And we are not only talking about the strategies of the nobility. It is important to mention, albeit only briefly, that the declaration made by a non-European prince of *naturalidade* and vassalage to the king of Portugal could mean—and in fact implied—the effective control of a strategic territory. In 1490, the *caíd* of Azamor in North Africa let it be known to the king Dom João II through his “cavaleiros naturaes e vassallos” (native knights and vassals), Joham Froez and Martym Reynell, that it was the will of the whole of his Republic (sic) to take him as

⁷⁵ “My lord is a native of these kingdoms of mine; and of the Royal House of Castile: he descends from the King Don Enrique the second of glorious memory; and from the King Don Juan, his son, the great-grandfather of the said King, and the father that God now holds.” Sousa (1948: 83).

their lord; he therefore asked him to treat him and his subjects “como vossos naturaes e vassallos.”⁷⁶ All this was, of course, done in exchange for a series of military, commercial and territorial concessions. This was common legal practice in both Iberian overseas worlds, which I just mention here in order not to omit one of the most important meanings that *naturalidade* was beginning to gain in connection with early modern social elites, including those of non-European territories assimilated by the conquistadores.

So far, we have seen the ease with which the Portuguese and Castilian nobility were able to switch allegiance from one monarch to the other thanks to the permeability of the Portuguese-Castilian border. In this process, the granting of nativeness, or the lack thereof, did not seem to have any importance in the host kingdom. Nevertheless, treason was not the only cause of emigration for those Iberian nobles. There was another and very significant one, between the mid-fifteenth and the mid-sixteenth century, which implied considering nativeness as a measure of grace, and was nothing other than the many marriages agreed between the Castilian and Portuguese royal houses.

After almost seven decades since the last Castilian marriage—that of Dona Beatriz, the daughter of Fernando I of Portugal (1367-1383) to Juan of Castile (1379-1390) in 1383—there began once more, in 1455, to be marriages between the Portuguese and Castilian royal houses.⁷⁷ That year, Enrique IV of Castile married Princess Joana, the sister of Dom Afonso V of Portugal. This was just the start of a practice that ended up becoming almost customary. Leaving aside the fleeting marriage between Dom Afonso V and Juana *la Beltraneja* in 1475, in 1490, Princess Isabel, the daughter of the Catholic Monarchs, married Prince Afonso of Portugal. On his death, she married Dom Manuel I, who, in turn, on her death, married firstly the Castilian princess Maria (1501) and then Leonor (1509). In 1525, Isabel of Portugal, the daughter of Dom Manuel I, married Carlos V (1516-1556), and João III of Portugal (1521-1557) married Catarina de Austria, the sister of the Emperor. In 1543, there was a marriage between their daughter, Princess Maria Manuela of Portugal and the future king Felipe II (1556-1598). The last Portuguese-Castilian marriage took place in 1552 between Prince João, the son of Dom João III of Portugal and Juana de Austria, the daughter of Carlos V. These ten marriages in the space of a century led to the non-stop

⁷⁶ “As your natives and vassals.” Rego (1960: 26-28).

⁷⁷ Though perhaps we might bring that date forward to the year 1447, when Princess Isabel of Portugal, the daughter of Prince Dom João, married Juan II of Castile.

transfer of nobility from one kingdom to the other, a situation that inevitably sheds light upon the relationship between the aristocracy, nativeness and the acquisition thereof.

In the matrimonial capitulations of 1453 of the first of the mentioned marriages, which joined together the future king Enrique IV of Castile and Princess Juana of Portugal, the bride was granted a series of rents and rights in Ciudad Rodrigo and Ciudad Real. In order to exercise her authority and collect her dues, she was allowed to “poner en los castillos e fortalezas dellas alcaydes mayores castellanos o portugueses o otros de qualquier naçion que sean quantos ella quisere e por bien touiere q a nos sean gratos e q a ella fagan dellos omenaje simplemente sin cautela ni condiçion, siempre salua e yrda da lealtad e verdat al señor Rey mi padre e a nos.”⁷⁸ So, in the mid-fifteenth century the queen was afforded the difficult privilege of appointing alcaides who were not natives of the kingdom, as long as they were loyal to the king. Within a few decades, the privileges of nativeness would improve considerably both in Portugal and Castile and become a channel of promotion and prosperity for the nobility.

In September 1479, shortly after the end of the war between Castile and Portugal, the first matrimonial capitulations were signed to marry the eldest daughter of the Catholic Monarchs, Princess Isabel, to a son of Dom Afonso V. In them, there was included for the first time—to our knowledge—a clause which would become canonical in the future capitulations between members of the Houses of Avis and Trastámara—and Austria when the time came. Once married, Princess Isabel would by virtue of that clause,

haveda por natural de los dichos Reynos de Portugal y haya todos los privilegios y honrras y libertades q han las Reynas de Portugal, pero si algunos privilegios son otorgados a las Reynas estrangeras de los quales no gozan las naturales de los dichos Reynos que ella los haya y goze dellos como estrangera. E assimismo todos los hombres y mugeres de qualquier condicion que sean que con la dicha señora Infante fueren puesto que sean estrangeros sean havidos por naturales de los dichos Reynos de Portugal como si fuessen verdaderamente naturales dellos y hauran los dichos privilegios y libertades como los naturales y estrangeros.⁷⁹

⁷⁸“(…) place in her castles and fortresses Castilian or Portuguese alcaides or others from any nation, as many as she should wish or want, who are acceptable to us and who pay homage to her simply, without caution or condition, always greeting and showing loyalty and truth to the said King, my father and us.” Braga (2001: 135).

⁷⁹“Be considered as a native of the said Kingdoms of Portugal and have all the privileges and honors and freedoms that the Queens of Portugal have, but, if any privileges are granted to foreign Queens which the natives of those kingdoms do not have, she should have them and enjoy them as a foreigner. And, similarly, all the men and women of any condition whatsoever who, with

The same clause was repeated in the capitulations between Princess Maria and Dom Manuel I in 1500;⁸⁰ in the ones agreed between the latter and Leonor de Austria in 1518;⁸¹ in those of 1524 between Dom João III and Catarina of Austria⁸² and, in 1543, between Prince João and Juana of Austria.⁸³ Such a decision was reciprocal and both Isabel of Portugal, in 1525,⁸⁴ and Princess Maria Manuela of Portugal, in 1543,⁸⁵ as well as her servants, became Castilian natives under the same conditions as the Castilian brides and servants had been granted Portuguese nativeness.

Being a member of the royal entourage was, without doubt, a great opportunity for prospering in the neighboring kingdom. Queens did their best to arrange good marriages for the servants who had recently become natives. Nativeness provided a career within the palace structure, helped to connect those who enjoyed this status with good native families, and could even mean the beginning of a promising ecclesiastical career in the host kingdom. Proof of this is to be found in the analysis made by Maria Paula Lourenço, in the House of Queen Catarina of Austria, of the careers of several Castilians who had become natives when arriving in Portugal in her entourage. Thus, the Bocanegra, Velasques and Aguilar families managed to build significant alliances which helped them consolidate their position within the House of the Queen during her long reign; and Don Julián de Alva, the new Queen's confessor and almoner, ended up being promoted to the Episcopal See of Portalegre, in 1550, being awarded a seat on the Royal Council.⁸⁶ In conclusion, the possibility of having both the privileges of the host kingdom and of the kingdom of origin—and therefore none of their inconveniences—certainly made the nobility aware of the advantages of achieving legal nativeness. In fact, when Portugal was annexed to the Catholic Monarchy, and that road to prosperity and double nativeness became blocked, the nobility tried to retain some of the advantages that the Portuguese-Castilian marriages had brought them. Among the conditions presented to Felipe II in Tomar, was the one that, "la

the said Infanta, were classed as foreign should be considered natives of the said Kingdoms of Portugal as if they were truly natives thereof and had the same privileges and freedoms as the natives and the foreigners." AGS, Patronato Real, leg. 49, doc. 36, f. 145v.

⁸⁰AGS, Patronato Real, leg. 49, doc. 49-2, f. 285v.

⁸¹AGS, Patronato Real, leg. 50, doc. 32, f. 108.

⁸²AGS, Patronato Real, leg. 50, doc. 39, f. 151.

⁸³AGS, Patronato Real, leg. 50, doc. 58, ff. 245- 245v.

⁸⁴Sousa (1948: 118.)

⁸⁵Gonzalo Sánchez-Molero (1998: 380).

⁸⁶Sousa (1948: 118).

Reyna se servirá ordinariamente de Señoras y Damas Portuguesas, y que las casará en la Patria, y en Castilla.”⁸⁷

4. Natives and Foreigners in Early Modern Legal Codes (15th-17th century).

In this section, I will analyze the scant references made to natives and foreigners in the three main Portuguese early modern legal codes, the *Ordenações Alfonsinas*, *Manuelinas* and *Filipinas*. The study of the different codes in which they appear and the people to whom they are applied will allow me to confirm the trend noted in the sections above, where we saw the immediate connection between trade and the need to be a native of the respective kingdom, as well as to analyze the progressive convergence of the nobility towards that same process. The conclusions I come to will constitute a theoretical framework for the future analysis of nativeness and the deprivation of nativeness, practices that I intend to develop in my present research project.

The Afonsine Ordinances were already in force by the mid-fifteenth century and therefore listed laws that dated back even to before the reign of Dom Duarte (1433-1438), as well as more recent ones promulgated by Dom Afonso V (1438-1481) in 1454. In the laws collected in that code, in the headings and pleas, there coexist expressions such as our vassals, *pessoas de nossos Reynos* (people of our Kingdoms) and our natives, a proof that the nativeness meaning of *naturalidade*, without having reached any hegemony, had achieved maturity in the sense which interests me in this article. Of course, the word was also used in the more restricted sense of belonging or living in a village, town or city, or being from a “*terra*” or a royal or manorial estate. Thus, for example, a Law issued by Dom Duarte establishes that “*vizinho se entenda de cada hua Cidade, Villa, ou lugar aquelle que delle for natural ou em elle tiver alguua dignidade, ou officio nosso, ou da Raynha muito amada, e prezada Mulher, ou d’outro alguu Senhor da terra.*”⁸⁸ In my analysis, I will omit those generic references, as they are, generally speaking rhetorical in nature and do not contribute in any way to answering the questions we are facing here.

In the first of these ordinances, but not as overwhelmingly as was to be the case in the following two, which were to govern life in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, nativeness started to gain in importance as an element to be used for distinguishing between

⁸⁷ “*The Queen will normally have at her service Portuguese Ladies and she will have them married in Portugal and in Castile*”. Lourenço (2002-2003: 370-371). That was one of the clauses Felipe II swore to respect in Tomar, as stated by Faria e Sousa (1687: 322).

the merchants belonging to the kingdom and foreign merchants, stating the privileges corresponding to the latter. The Afonsine Ordinances included a law introduced by Dom Fernando I (1367-1383) with the significant title of *Dos Mercadores Estrangeros, como ham de comprar e vender suas mercadarias*.⁸⁹ The sole purpose of that law was to protect “os Mercadores nossos naturaaes,” “dos nossos Regnos, e naturaes,” and “todolos nossos naturaaes”⁹⁰ from the always shady, quick-witted and opportunistic “Mercadores Estrangeiros” (foreign merchants); or as stated in a law by João I (1385-1433) about cloth, from the “Mercadores, e outras qualquer pessoas de fora de nossos Regnos.”⁹¹

At that moment, the laws and the king himself as a lawmaker reflected an identity somewhere between the condition of being a native of the king and a native of the kingdom and, in that context, the classification can be applied to both the noble and the plebeian. *Naturalidade* still implies a community in which the kingdom's political structure and the political body of the monarch intermingle. In this regard, the beautiful heading of Title III of Book III of the Afonsine Ordinances is highly illustrative. It refers to those who cannot be called to Court, where we read, “a Corte d'ElRey he chamada em Direito terra comu a todos os naturaes desse Reyno, assi como a corte de Roma a todos os Christaos do Mundo.”⁹² The court was the place where the king was found; it was therefore his presence that determined the state of the nation, the common territory of all his natives, the natives of the kingdom. Within this concept, in which the bond with the monarch was predominant, the nobility could feel comfortable when being qualified as natives. In fact, contrary to what was to happen in the subsequent codes, the link between native and noble in any of its categories was quite frequent in the Afonsine Ordinances.

In fact, a law passed by Dom Fernando I,⁹³ and designed in theory to instill harmony between his direct vassals and his vassals' vassals, but in practice to tie them all to him through a bond of vassalage, uses a kind of rhetoric which proves that being a native of the king is not the same as being a native of the kingdom. In the already mentioned law, Dom Fernando I refers to his “*naturaees e Vassallos*,” natives and vassals, when issuing laws about the duties of vassalage that were to be paid either to him or to his princes, and describing the cases that were exempt from that formality. In item eight of that law, those

⁸⁸ “a neighbor is understood to be of each city, town or place a person that is a native thereof or holds there any rank or position of ours or of our beloved and most esteemed queen or of any other lord of the land.” Ord. Alf.L. II, tit. XXX, 2.

⁸⁹ “Of Foreign Merchants, how they should buy and sell their goods.” Ord. Af. L. IV, tit. III.

⁹⁰ “Our native merchants”, “those from our kingdoms and natives”, and “all our natives”.

⁹¹ “Merchants and any other people from outside our kingdoms.” Ord. Af. L. IV, tit. III, 10.

⁹² “The King's Court is called in Law common land to all the natives of this Kingdom, just as the court of Rome is common to all the Christians of the world”

⁹³ Ord. Af., L. IV, Tit. XXVI.

subject to the law are more clearly specified, the “Fidalgos nossos naturaees, e outros que vivem no nosso Senhorio [...] [que] servirem em defensom da terra, d’hu som naturaees, ou em que vivem, e devem a todo o tempo estar presentes;” in conclusion, “quaaesquer Fidalgos, que em nossa terra e Senhorio vivem, ou daqui em diante viverem, que sejam nossos Vassallos, ou do Ifante, ou dos nossos Vassallos maiores, que de nós teem lugar, e estado per a esto.”⁹⁴ At that moment, or at least at the end of the fourteenth century—and still respected in the mid-fifteenth century—what determined the power of the nobility to become natives of the king and to enjoy the political and territorial power which this entailed was not the identity of the realm to which they belonged, but their bond with the monarch, contrary to what was already happening with merchants.

In fact, and leaving aside the names of native vassals, we have found only one peculiar kind of nativeness among the nobility. At the *Cortes* of Elvas (in 1361), the clergy lodged a complaint with Dom Pedro I (1357-1367) about the abuse of the nobility who occupied churches and monasteries, organized feasts and invited whoever they wanted, taking wines and cattle and even using the rooms of abbots and priors.⁹⁵ The *fidalgos* claimed they had a right to perpetrate what the clergy called abuses, since they were “naturaees desses Moesteiros e Igrejas” (natives of these monasteries and churches). On the subject of what it might mean to be a native of a church or monastery, we have found a clue in a law recorded in the books of the Chancellery of Juan I (1385- 1433), which also appears in the Afonsine Ordinances⁹⁶ where it is stated that,

alguus Fidalgos apropiarm a sy muitas Igrejas, e Moesteiros, dizendo que ham em elles pousadias, e comedorias, e de feito as tomam, e constragem os Abades, que lhas dem, e constrangem-nos dizendo que esto ham de’aver porque jazem enterrados em esses Moesteiros, e Igrejas, e dizem, que a elles pertence a enliçom per enlegerem Abade como os Clerigos, e Coonegos, e Fraires, que em essa Igrejas, e Moesteiros stam; e fazem outras cousas, que parecem agravo a essas Igrejas, e Moesteiros.⁹⁷

⁹⁴“Our native fidalgos and others who live in our dominion (...) [who] serve in the defense of the land, from where they are natives, or where they live and where they must be present at all times.” In conclusion, “any fidalgo who lives or henceforth will live on our land and in our dominions, be they our vassals or those of the Infante or those of our more important vassals, whom we have given a place and estate for this purpose.”

⁹⁵Ord. Alf., L. II, Tit. V, XXV y XXVII. A significant number of complaints regarding this matter were made at those Courts. Marques and Días (1986: 24- 28).

⁹⁶Ord. Af., L. II, Tit. XVII, 1.

⁹⁷“Some fidalgos appropriate many churches and monasteries, saying that they have accommodation and food therein, and in fact many take them and force the abbots to give these places to them, and they force them by saying that they should have them because their ancestors lie buried in these monasteries and churches and they say they have the right to choose the abbot, priests, canons and friars who are in these churches and monasteries; and they do other things which seem an offence to those churches and monasteries.” Ord. Alf., L. II, Tit. XVII, 1.

It can be inferred from Juan I's law that the monastic nativeness of the nobility –to give it a name—was related to the kind of connection that their lineages had with those religious institutions where their ancestors lay buried and which would undoubtedly display their families' coats of arms; the fact that the present religious communities were not willing to recognize that authority any longer was beside the point. In any case, as the example shows, at the end of the fourteenth century and until at least the mid-fifteenth century, for the nobility, *naturalidade* referred to a personal and family tie which connected with their lineage and the monarch, and had little to do with the legal requirements of belonging to the kingdom (nativeness), a consideration that was starting to become important for tradesmen and merchants.

TABLE I

References Made to Natives and Foreigners in Manueline Ordinances (1521 edition).

Nativeness requirement for position.	Trials and lawsuits. Murder victims. Diplomatic Immunity.	Foreigners Tramps Gang members	Pilots, Sailors, caravel building	As a proof of cavalry	Ban on dueling	Overseas trade restrictions and deals with infidels	Cattle and meat control	Tradesmen
1. Lib. I, I.	1. Lib. I, I	1. Lib. I, LIV, 6	1. Lib. V, LXXXVII I 11	1. Lib. II, XXXVIII, 3	1. Lib. V, XCIII	1. Lib. V, LXXXI	1. Lib. V, LXXXVIII, 7	1. Lib. III, XLV, 17
1. Lib. I, LVI	1. Lib. I, II.	1. Lib. V, LXXVII	1. Lib. V, XCVIII, 2			1. Lib. V, LXXXI, 2	1. Lib. V, LXXXVIII, 8	1. Lib. IV, II
1. Lib. I, LVI, 5.	1. Lib. II, XXIX					1. Lib. V, LXXXI, 3	1. Lib. V, LXXXIX, 5	1. Lib. IV, II, 3
1. Lib. II, XXIX	1. Lib. III, III.					1. Lib. V, LXXXI, 4	1. Lib. V, LXXXIX, 6	1. Lib. IV, II, 4
	1. Lib. V, XLII.					1. Lib. V, LXXXII	1. Lib. V, LXXXIX, 18	1. Lib. IV, XXIV, 2
	1. Lib. III, III, 2.					1. Lib. V, LXXXVIII, 3	1. Lib. V, LXXXIX, 19	
	1. Lib. V, LXXIII, 4					1. Lib. V, LXXXVIII, 5		
						1. Lib. V, CXII, 1		
						1. Lib. V, CXIII.		
Total: 4	Total: 7	Total: 2	Total: 2	Total: 1	Total: 1	Total: 9	Total: 6	Total: 5

This trend was to become more noticeable in the laws drawn up in the reign of Dom Manuel I, known as the Manueline Ordinances, the final and official version of which, after the withdrawal of the 1512, 1513. and 1514 editions, was published, as is known, in 1521.⁹⁸ In this document, as shown in Table I, most of the references to natives and foreigners are found in questions relating to legal procedures with tradesmen and merchants, and the Crown's control over the trade in cattle and overseas products. Of the thirty-seven times that natives and foreigners are mentioned, in only two cases is there a clear reference to native or foreign nobles: in the law forbidding duels and in the regulations governing the award of knighthoods overseas, which contains a questionnaire that the fortunate person has to answer and which includes a question about his nativeness, although it is not clear in this case if the question refers to the kingdom, the town or the city of the knight *in pectore*.

A remarkable novelty that we find in the Manueline Ordinances, which was to become important in the course of the century and even more so from 1580 onwards, is the requirement of nativeness in order to be elected for certain positions and public situations, which would affect the small nobility. Thus, to be elected as a Councilor of Justice for the *Casa de Suplicação*, one of the main legal positions in the kingdom, in addition to proving nobility, virtue, goodness and fear of God, a man "deue seer Nosso natural."⁹⁹ In the same way, as far as the mayors of towns and cities in Portugal were concerned, it was established that they "nom sejam estrangeiros, mas naturaes de nossos Reynos, e Senhorios,"¹⁰⁰ whereas with council officials there was greater flexibility, since it was requested that they should be "naturaes, ou moradores."¹⁰¹ Likewise, the Governor of the *Casa do Civel* also had to be "Nosso natural."¹⁰²

I believe that the inclusion of the nativeness requirement for access to certain positions and public offices in Portugal was closely linked to a remarkable situation that lasted from 1498 to 1500, the length in fact of the life of Prince Miguel, the son of Dom Manuel I, *O Venturoso*, and his first wife, Queen Isabel, and the grandson of the Catholic Monarchs. Known as a child of feeble health, he was the heir to Portugal, Castile and Aragón between 1499 and 1500. Given the possibility of an Iberian Union under the reign

⁹⁸For earlier versions of the Manueline Ordinances than those of 1521, see Alves Dias (1995) and Alves Dias (2002). As far as matters concerning nativeness and vicinity are concerned, there are not any great differences between the first versions of the Manueline code and those of 1521. The most important law regarding this matter is the one concerning vicinity, which is literally copied under heading XIX of the second book in the ordinances of both 1512-13 and 1521.

⁹⁹"*must be a native of our land.*" Ord. Man., Lib. I, Tit. I.

¹⁰⁰"*They must not be foreigners, but natives of our kingdoms and dominions.*" Ord. Man., Lib. I, Tit. LVI.

¹⁰¹"*natives or residents*". Ord. Man., Lib. I, Tit. LVI.

of Prince Miguel and because of the pressure that he was under from his subjects, Dom Manuel issued a royal charter stating how Portugal should be governed in such an eventuality.¹⁰³ In that document, it was written for the first time that all the important positions in the kingdom, absolutely all of them, would always be reserved for the Portuguese: viceroys and governors, all the positions of justice, *los veedores da fazenda* (treasury officials) and high-ranking accountants, military positions (constables, admirals, standard-bearers, marshals, captains) and overseas captains. The premature death of Prince Miguel rendered all of these instructions ineffective, but the awareness that the day might come when the Portuguese would share a king with natives of other kingdoms undoubtedly gave a significant push to the recognition of nativeness as a criterion for reducing the number of competitors in the bureaucratic, judicial and military careers.

It is nevertheless worth pointing out—though it is also absolutely logical—that side by side with this tendency to impose the requirement of nativeness for positions and situations that we might call bureaucratic and related to the administration of justice, there should coexist the extraordinary importance of loyalty to the king in military appointments, a requirement that was also in force. It was required of the *Alcaldes Mayores* (the governors of castles), that, in addition to being of good lineage, having military competence and the ability to mobilize men and resources for the defense of royal fortresses, not they should have the status of natives of the kingdom, but that they should demonstrate loyalty.¹⁰⁴ Of the governors that they should appoint to defend the king's castles in the case of their necessary and inexcusable absence, it was requested, in addition to *fidalgia*, that “nom aja feita traiçam, nem aleiue, nem venha de homes que a ouuessem feita.”¹⁰⁵ In fact, when they occupied their position, they had to pledge allegiance to the very powerful Dom Manuel, “meu verdadeiro, e natural Rey, e Senhor.”¹⁰⁶

Thus, according to what the Ordinances showed, in the transition from the fifteenth to the sixteenth century, there began to be a bifurcation of the evolving etymology of *naturalidade* in the sense that interests me in this article. The first one, connected with legally belonging to the kingdom (nativeness), was to grow in importance for non-privileged classes whose economic activities could be affected by their condition of being either natives or foreigners; and the other one, which more clearly retained the original

¹⁰²“A native of our land”. Ord. Man., Lib. II, Tit. XXIX.

¹⁰³The full text of this royal charter can be found in Dias (2001: 26- 35).

¹⁰⁴Ord. Man., Lib. I, Tit. LV.

¹⁰⁵“They have not committed treason, nor any defamation, nor descend from men who have done so.” Ord. Man., Lib. I, Tit. LV, 1.

¹⁰⁶“my true and natural king and lord”. Ord. Man., Lib. I, Tit. LV, 4.

sense of having a bond with the monarch that stretched beyond borders and legal territories. The evolution of this dual process would become a source of conflict in the following years.

TABLE II
References Made to Natives and Foreigners in the Philippine Ordinances.

Nativeness requirement for position	Trials and lawsuits involving native and foreign tradesmen and sailors	Native defense, book publication, requisition and control	Threat of being deprived of nativeness	Definition of native	Ban on dueling	Restrictions on exports,, overseas trade and dealings with infidels	Control of Successions
1. Lib. I, XXXV.	1. Lib. I, XLIX-3	1. Lib. I, XIII, 3.	1. Lib. II, XIII.	1. Lib. II, LV.	1. Lib. V, XLIII	1. Lib. III, LIX, 19	1. Lib. II, XXXV.
1. Lib. I, LXXV	1. Lib. I, LII.	1. Lib. II, XXVI, 7	1. Lib. II, XV		1. Lib. V, LXXX- 6	1. Lib. IV, II, 2	1. Lib. IV, XCVI, 17
1. Lib. I, LXXXI.	1. Lib. I, LII, 2	1. Lib. V, CII.				1. Lib. V, LXXXVI, 1	1. Lib. IV, C, 5
	1. Lib. I, LII, 4.					1. Lib. V, LXXXVI, 4	1. Lib. IV, C, 14
	1. Lib. III, XX, 6.					1. Lib. V, LXXXVI, 7	
	1. Lib. V, CXXII, 7.					1. Lib. V, XCVII	
						1. Lib. V, CVI,	
						1. Lib. V, CVI, 7	
						1. Lib. V, CVIII.	
						1. Lib. V, CIX.	
						1. Lib. V, CXII.	
						1. Lib. CXII, 5.	
						1. Lib. CXIII	
Total: 3	Total: 6	Total: 3	Total: 2	Total: 1	Total: 2	Total: 13	Total: 3

The uncoded decrees essentially promulgated by Dom Manuel I and Dom João III are not relevant to this research; all the regulations relating to foreigners merely refer to special courts for national groups, such as Germans,¹⁰⁷ or repeat the same old ban on Castilian exports of cattle.¹⁰⁸ The Philippine Ordinances (1603) did, however, contain a series of laws of great relevance relating to nativeness and its relationship with the nobility. As shown in Table II, the laws that most frequently referred to natives and non-natives were those which, for different reasons, imposed restrictions on exports and overseas trade. Nevertheless, the most significant was a series of laws which, although not large in number, were of great relevance for the subject under study here. Firstly, it is worth mentioning Title LV of Lib. II, *Das pessoas que devem ser havidas por naturaes destes Reinos*.¹⁰⁹ This was the first time that Portuguese laws had revealed the need to establish who could

¹⁰⁷Leyes Extravagantes, Tit. II, ley V. License of May 4, 1563.

¹⁰⁸Leyes Extravagantes, Tit. IV, ley II. License of November 3, 1529.

legally claim Portuguese nativeness and the requirements that had to be met in order to do so. Those laws, promulgated by the new Habsburg dynasty after the Iberian Union, were a response to the growing demands for nativeness in the kingdom. As Felipe II had agreed at the *Cortes* of Tomar, viceroys and governors and all those holding legal and financial positions now had to be Portuguese, as well as those working for the royal household, those holding military positions on land and at sea, and the beneficiaries of secular and religious prebends and of jurisdictional and royal allowances.¹¹⁰ Further proof of the importance of nativeness is shown by the fact that, for the first time, it was established that renouncing one's nativeness would be a punishable offence when the intention was either to gain some benefit from the kingdom or to protest to the Holy See against royal privileges.¹¹¹

Even though the nobility might feel that being a *natural* represented a loving bond with their monarch, it was obvious that after 1580 they could not close their eyes either to the meaning of nativeness, which had become hegemonic, or to its consequences. The unification of the two dynasties had ended the freedom of movement and the alliances which the nobility had enjoyed, as if the border between Spain and Portugal did not exist. Part 14 of Heading C of Book IV of the Philippine Ordinances, the famed law of 1595, restricted, for the first time, marriages and the joining together of estates between members of the nobility who were natives of different kingdoms. Many different strategies would be devised in order to get around those obstacles, among them taking part in debates about what was involved in being a vassal of the Catholic king in any of his kingdoms.¹¹² But the truth is that no longer was being a native of the kingdom a matter that only concerned merchants.

Epilogue

On August 25 1770, Dom José I (1750-1777) issued an *alvará* declaring that Dom Estêvão Soares de Mello, the lord of the Casa dos Donatários de Mello, and his sister, Dona Teresa de Mello, had been deprived of the *naturalidade* of their family, whom, as the

¹⁰⁹*Of the people who must be considered natives of these Kingdoms.*"

¹¹⁰Faria e Sousa (1687: 321- 322).

¹¹¹Faria e Sousa (1687: 321- 322).

¹¹²For those strategies devised, for example, by the Earl of Salinas, see Terrasa Lozano (2012b); for an analysis of this type of discourse within the framework of the Spanish West Indies at the time of the union of the two crowns, see Cardim 2008.

king justified, they had insulted so much with their behavior.¹¹³ Unfortunately, the royal decree provides no more details about the indignities of the siblings of the House of Mello; nevertheless, some have become public thanks to other sources. For example, we know that Dona Teresa once pretended to be pregnant by her fiancé in order to be released from the Encarnación convent, where she lived in seclusion. Also, she accused her brother Dom Estêvão of being a deserter from war.¹¹⁴ These actions made them unworthy of representing the memory of their glorious ancestors so, once they had been divested of their family's *naturalidade*, and being *reputados por estranhos*,¹¹⁵ the Mello siblings and their descendants were divested of all the Crown property and Military Orders¹¹⁶ that they held. According to the genealogist Felgueiras, this stripping of the family's *naturalidade* was tantamount to their being deprived of their status of being natives of the kingdom.¹¹⁷

In spite of the historian's temptation to tell lineal stories and draw clear genealogies with lines which reach our days, the example of the Mello siblings and the concepts involved in the deprivation of their *naturalidade*- meaning nativeness and family belonging- prove that, at least in connection with nobility and despite what has been stated above, polysemy remained in Portugal until the end of the Old Regime. In the history of *naturalidade*, in its slow elaboration, it is clear that the legal aspects were relevant; but as it is demonstrated by the dissolute Mello siblings that in order to reach an accurate understanding of the full meaning of being *natural* and what it entailed to be deprived of it in that period, it is important to go on researching along the path of identities, imaginaries and conflictive practices in the kingdoms of early modern Europe.

¹¹³ANTT, SP 3567 (61), f. 339.

¹¹⁴Gayo (1992 [1938]: 130).

¹¹⁵"Considered foreign"

¹¹⁶ANTT, SP 3567 (61), f. 339.

¹¹⁷Gayo (1992 [1938]: 130). Dom Estêvão de Mello was exiled to Angola but, in the reign of Dona Maria I, his family's *naturalidade* was restored and returned to him. Gayo (1992 [1938]: 130).

Bibliographical References

- Allegação de direito por o senhor Dom Pedro, sobre a sucessão do Estado, Caça, Título do Duque de Aveiro* (1666). Lisbon, Oficina de Domingos Carneiro.
- Albuquerque, Ruy, (1972). *As Represálias. Estudo de história do direito português (sécs. XV e XVI)*. Lisbon: R.M. Albuquerque.
- Anderson, Benedict (1991) [1983]. *Imagined communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso.
- Braga, Isabel Mendes Drumond (2001). *Um Espaço, Duas Monarquias. (Interrelações na Península Ibérica no Tempo de Carlos V)*. Lisbon: Centro de Estudios Históricos, Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
- Cardim, Pedro (2008). "Todos los que no son de Castilla son yguales. El estatuto de Portugal en la Monarquía española en tiempos de Olivares". *Pedralbes*, 28 (2): 521-552.
- Cardoso, Isabel Vaz de Freitas Botelho (2000). *Uma fronteira entre mercados. A Norte do Douro na Idade Média*. Porto: Universidade de Porto, PhD Thesis.
- Carzolio, Maria Inés (2002). "En los orígenes de la ciudadanía en Castilla. La identidad política del vecino durante los siglos XVI y XVII". *Hispania*, LXII/2 (211): 637-692.
- Costa, Leonor and Cunha, Mafalda (2006). *D. João IV*. Rio de Mouro: Círculo de Leitores.
- Cunha, Mafalda Soares (1996). "A nobreza portuguesa no início do século XV: renovação e continuidade". *Revista Portuguesa de História*, 31 (2): 219- 252.
- Dadson, Trevor (2011). *Diego de Silva y Mendoza. Poeta y político en la corte de Felipe III*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Dias, João José Alves (1995). *A primeira impressão das Ordenações Manuelinas, por Valente Fernandes*. Lisbon: Colibri.
- Dias, João José Alves (2001). *Cortes Portuguesas. Reinado de D. Manuel I (Cortes de 1499)*. Lisbon: Centro de Estudos Históricos, Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
- Dias, João José Alves (2002). *Ordenações Manuelinas. Livros I a V. Reprodução em fac-símile da edição de Valentim Fernandes (Lisboa, 1512- 1513)*. II. Lisbon: Centro de Estudos Históricos, Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
- Esteban Estringana, Alicia (ed.) (2012). *Servir al Rey en la Monarquía de los Austrias. Medios, fines y logros del servicio al soberano en los siglos XVI y XVII*. Madrid: Sílex.
- Faria e Sousa, Manuel (1687). *Epítome de las historias portuguesas. Adornado de los retratos de sus Reyes con sus principales hazañas*. Brussels: Francisco Foppens.
- Gayo, Manuel José da Costa Felgueiras (1992) [1938]. *Nobiliário de famílias de Portugal*. VI (18). Braga: Carvalhos de Basto.
- Ferreira, Ana Maria (1995). *Problemas marítimos entre Portugal e a França na primeira metade do século XVI*. Cascais: Patrimonia Historica.
- Fonseca, Luís Adão y Ruiz Asensio, José Manuel (1995). *Corpus documental del tratado de Tordesillas*. Valladolid: Sociedad V Centenario del Tratado de Tordesillas y Comissão Nacional para as Comemorações dos Descobrimentos Portugueses.
- Gaillard, Claude (1982). *Le Portugal sous Philippe III d'Espagne. L'action de Diego de Silva y Mendoza*. Perpignan: Université des Langues et Lettres de Grenoble.
- Gonzalo Sánchez-Molero, José Luis (1998). "La formación de un privado: Ruy Gómez de Silva en la Corte de Castilla (1526-1554)". In José Martínez Millán (dir.), *Felipe II (1527- 1598). Europa y la Monarquía Católica*. Madrid: Parteluz, 379- 400.
- Gil Pujol, Xavier (2004). "Un rey, una fe, muchas naciones. Patria y nación en la España de los siglos XVI y XVII". In Álvarez-Ossorio, Alvariño and García García, Bernardo

- (eds.), *La Monarquía de las Naciones. Patria, nación y naturaleza en la Monarquía de España*. Madrid: Fundación Carlos de Amberes, 39-76.
- Guillén Berrendero, José Antonio (2012). "Com muito perigo das suas vidas. La teoría nobiliaria y la imagen del servidor en el imperio portugués en tiempo de los Felipes". *Historia Social*, 72: 3-21.
- Gutiérrez Nieto, Juan Ignacio (1995). "Guerras dinásticas y nobleza en Castilla y Portugal al finalizar la Edad Media". In Luis Suárez Fernández and Juan Gutiérrez Nieto (coord.), *Las instituciones castellano-leonesas y portuguesas antes del Tratado de Tordesillas*. Valladolid: Sociedad V Centenario del Tratado de Tordesillas, 21- 26.
- Herzog, Tamar (2003). *Defining nations: immigrants and citizens in early modern Spain and Spanish America*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Hespanha, António Manuel (1993). "A Nobreza nos Tratados Jurídicos dos séculos XVI a XVIII". *Penélope. Fazer e desfazer a História*, 12: 27- 42.
- Hespanha, António Manuel (1994). *As vésperas do Leviathan. Instituições e poder político. Portugal-séc. XVII*. Coimbra: Almeida.
- Krynen, Jacques (1993). *L'empire du roi. Idées et croyances politiques en France, XIIIe-XVe siècle*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Lourenço, Maria Paula Marçal (1995a). *Casa, corte e património das rainhas de Portugal (1640-1754)*. Lisbon: PhD Thesis for the University of Lisbon.
- Lourenço, Maria Paula Marçal (1995b). *A Casa e o Estado do Infantado, 1654-1706. Formas e Práticas Administrativas de um Património Senhorial*. Lisbon: Junta Nacional de Investigação Científica e Técnica.
- Lourenço, Maria Paula Marçal (2002-2003) "Mulheres e Homens ao serviço da Casa de D. Catarina de Áustria: estatuto, prestígio e poder (1525-1578)". *Revista Portuguesa de História*, 36 (1): 367-390.
- Lourenço, Maria Paula (2005). "The Household of Portuguese Queens in Modern Times: Patronage and Powers". *Mediterranean Studies*, 14 (1): 17-26.
- Marques, António Henrique, Rodrigues, Maria Teresa Campor and Dias, Nuno José Pizarro Pinto (eds.) (1982). *Cortes portuguesas. Reinado de D. Afonso IV (1325-1357)*. Lisbon: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica.
- Marques, António Henrique Oliveira and Dias, Nuno José Pizarro Pinto (1986). *Cortes portuguesas. Reinado de D. Pedro I (1357-1367)*. Lisbon: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica.
- Marques, António Henrique Oliveira and Dias, Nuno José Pizarro Pinto (1990). *Cortes portuguesas. Reinado de D. Fernando I (1367-1383)*. Volumen I (1367-1380). Lisbon: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica.
- Mauss, Marcel 2008 [1950]. *Ensaio sobre a dívida*. Lisbon: Edições 70.
- Monteiro, Nuno Gonçalo (1987). "Notas Sobre Nobreza, Fidalguia e Titulares nos Finais do Antigo Regime". *Ler História*, 10: 15-51.
- Nieto Soria, José Manuel (1998). "El poderío real absoluto en el siglo XV". *La España Medieval*, 21: 159-228.
- Olival, Fernanda (2001). *As ordens militares e o estado moderno. Honra, mercê e venalidade em Portugal (1641-1789)*. Lisbon: Estar.
- Pulido Serrano, Juan Ignacio (2011). "Plural identities: the Portuguese New Christians". *Jewish History*, 25: 129-151.
- Pulgar, Fernando (2007) [1486]. *Claros varones de Castilla*, ed. M. A. Pérez Priego. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Rego, António de Silva (1960). *As Gavetas da Torre do Tombo (1960)*. Vol. 1. Lisbon: Centro de Estudos Históricos Ultramarinos.
- Regina Fernández, Fátima (2005). A nobreza, o rei e a fronteira no medievo peninsular. *En la España medieval*, 28: 155-176.

- Resende, Per Garcia (1798) [1545]. *Chronica dos valerosos, e insignes feitos del rey Dom Joam II de Gloriosa memoria, em que refere sua Vida, suas Virtudes, seu Magnanimo Esforço, Excellentes Costumes, e seu Christianissimo Zelo, com outras Obras que adiante se seguem, e vay acrescentada a sua Miscellania*. Coimbra: Real Officina da Universidade.
- Rodrigues, Ana Maria do Rosário (2000). *Desembargo do Paço. Inventário. Volume I. Repartição das Justiças e Despacho da Mesa. Repartição da Corte, Estremadura e Ilhas*. Lisbon: Instituto dos Arquivos Nacionais/Torre do Tombo.
- Skinner, Quentin (2011) [2008]. *Uma Genealogia do Estado Moderno*. Lisbon: ICS.
- Sousa, Armindo (1990). *As Cortes Medievais Portuguesas (1385-1490)*. Porto: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica.
- Sousa, António Caetano (1948). *Provas da História Genealógica da Casa Real Portuguesa*. Coimbra: Atlântida.
- Subtil, José Manuel Louzada Lopes (1996). *O Desembargo do Paço (1750-1833)*. Lisbon: Universidade Autónoma de Lisboa.
- Terrasa Lozano, Antonio (2009a). *Patrimonios aristocráticos y fronteras jurídico-políticas en la Monarquía Católica: los pleitos de la Casa de Pastrana en el siglo XVII*. Florence: PhD thesis, European University Institute.
- Terrasa Lozano, Antonio (2009b). "De la raya de Portugal a la frontera de guerra: los Mascarenhas y las prácticas nobiliarias de supervivencia política durante la guerra de la Restauração". In Bartolomé Yun Casalilla (dir.), *Las Redes del Imperio. Élités sociales en la articulación de la Monarquía Hispánica, 1492-1714*. Madrid: Marcial Pons, 233-258.
- Terrasa Lozano, Antonio (2012a). *La Casa de Silva y los duques de Pastrana. Linaje, pleito y contingencia en el siglo XVII*. Madrid: CEEH y Marcial Pons Historia.
- Terrasa Lozano, Antonio (2012b). "Por la polémica gracia del Rey Universal. Las mercedes por servicios de Felipe III en el reino de Portugal: debates y conflictos". In Alicia Esteban Estríngana (ed.), *Servir al Rey en la Monarquía de los Austrias. Medios, fines y logros del servicio al soberano en los siglos XVI y XVII*, Madrid: Sílex., 297-319.
- Torre, Antonio de la y Suárez Fernández, (eds.) (1958). *Documentos referentes a las relaciones con Portugal durante el reinado de los Reyes Católicos*. Valladolid: CSIC.
- Torres, João Romano (1904). *Dicionário Histórico, Corográfico, Heráldico, Biográfico, Bibliográfico, Numismático e Artístico*, Lisbon: João Romano & Cía.
- Valladares, Rafael (1998). *La rebelión de Portugal, 1640-1680. Guerra, conflicto y poderes en la monarquía hispánica*. Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León. Afonso, António Jorge (1998).

Rethinking the Fifth Empire: António Vieira and the *Clavis Prophetarum*¹

Maria Ana T. Valdez²

Abstract

It is this paper's purpose to introduce António Vieira's model of the Fifth Empire and to contextualize it within the biblical exegesis tendencies of his time. Vieira's conceptualization is of utmost importance for understanding the intellectual and religious environment of seventeenth-century Portugal: a disturbed time, during which people searched for answers in biblical prophecies to explain the reasons behind so much suffering. Vieira's systematization, however, was first viewed as a possible heresy by the Portuguese Inquisition and was only later, and in part, rehabilitated by Antonio Casnedi. The *Clavis prophetarum* is also an expression of an eschatological hope common to the Iberian world, although it focuses mostly on Portugal.

Keywords

António Vieira, *Clavis prophetarum*, Fifth Empire, Apocalyptic Literature, Portugal

Resumo

Este artigo propõe analisar e contextualizar o modelo de *Quinto Império* proposto pelo Pe. António Vieira de acordo com os modelos de exegese bíblica praticados no seu tempo. A conceptualização vieiriana é fundamental para a compreensão do ambiente intelectual e religioso do século XVII português: um período conturbado durante o qual as pessoas procuravam compreender as razões do seu sofrimento à luz de profecias bíblicas. A sistematização efectuada por António Vieira, apesar de inicialmente tida como uma possível heresia por parte da Inquisição portuguesa, foi mais tarde reabilitada pela *sententia* de Antonio Casnedi. É necessário relembrar que a *opus magnum* vieirina—*Clavis prophetarum*—é um dos melhores exemplares de literatura escatológica daquela época, e que coloca a tónica no papel a realizar por Portugal e pelo monarca português com vista ao estabelecimento do reino divino de Deus na Terra tal como prometido nos textos bíblicos. Como tal, não é de estranhar que o Papa e o Rei português sejam descritos como “vigários de Cristo na Terra.”

Palavras-chave

António Vieira, *Clavis prophetarum*, Quinto Império, Literatura Apocalíptica, Portugal

¹ This paper is part of the research undertaken for the PhD thesis in History, presented by the author to the University of Lisbon in December of 2008. It would not have been possible without the financial support of FCT, through the program *POCI 2010*.

² CHUL, University of Lisbon and Yale University, Department of Religious Studies. *E-mail* – ana.valdez@yale.edu

Many historians have devoted their life's work to the study of phenomena such as prophecy, millenarianism, and apocalypticism, and in particular to its emergence, development, and influence, as well as the reasons why at times such phenomena appear to have vanished from the collective mind. It is our belief that R. Rusconi is on the right track when he underlines the originality of Iberian intellectual movements, especially after the beginning of Maritime Expansion (Rusconi, 1999: 132).

Therefore, and risking jumping immediately to a conclusion, I have to say that it is my belief that the Iberian Peninsula, including its overseas territories, does indeed represent an original intellectual phenomenon regarding the issue of political prophecy. Vieira's work, and particularly the *Clavis prophetarum*, represents a major contribution to the reinterpretation of a biblical concept used not only by the Church, but also by the broader community of Christians, as if it held the key to the promised kingdom of God.

It is, nonetheless, necessary to remember that Vieira is not introducing a new subject at all. He is reinterpreting, according to his own beliefs and agenda, the theory regarding the end of time and the consequent achievement of the eschatological kingdom as it was first introduced by Daniel and later developed by the Christian author of the Book of Revelation. Moreover, because the achievement of the kingdom of God was so important for Christians, many theologians over the centuries attempted to interpret these texts in a way that would permit them to tell their communities how close, or not, they were to the end of the world, and, consequently, to the new beginning. Authors such as Josephus, Jerome, Hippolytus, Augustine, and Fiore, among many others, should be counted among these theologians.

a) *Daniel*

In the Book of Daniel (c. 2nd century bce), we find two different accounts of historical periodization based on the scheme of four succeeding empires. The first is found in Chapter 2 in the description of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, while the second account, in Chapters 7-8, is concerned with the description of the four beasts, and, in particular, with the depiction of the last two periods of the four-age schema, using the images of the ram and the he-goat.

The first account of the theory of the four empires in the Book of Daniel is considered by scholars as the introductory chapter to the visions of the apocalyptic section. For example, regarding this issue, Hartman writes that: "(...) once independent stories that

the compiler of the Book of Daniel prefixed to his apocalyptic visions are made up of a theme within a theme” (Hartman and Di Lella, 1978: 142).

It is only during the second part of this tale that the scheme of the four kingdoms is introduced. In accordance with the revelation that Daniel received in a night vision following previous prayers to the God of Israel, he told the king that he (the king) had seen an enormous and frightening statue. This statue was composed of different materials: the head was gold, the chest and arms were silver, the middle and the thighs were bronze, the legs were iron, and the feet a mixture of clay and iron. The king then saw how a stone had destroyed the entire statue, first hitting the feet. Afterwards, the same stone became a great mountain and filled the entire world. Following this description of the dream, Daniel explains its meaning to the king. First, he notes that Nebuchadnezzar was king because he had been chosen by Yahweh (Daniel, 2:37). He explains after this that the different materials represented successive empires, the golden one (the Babylonian Empire) being the first. At the same time, he describes how Babylon and Nebuchadnezzar’s successors were condemned to be defeated and how their supremacy would be destroyed in the future. Empires were predestined for destruction until the appearance of the “feet,” a mixture of clay and iron that represented the weakness of that last kingdom. From this last and weak kingdom however, a stronger one would rise up in the future. This kingdom was predicted to last forever and to be indestructible by the will of God, the same god who had given the dream to Nebuchadnezzar.

The succession of empires forecast in this dream can also be interpreted in the light of historical events (Rowley, 1959: 161-73). It is common to read into this description the succession of empires in the Ancient Near East down to the 2nd century bce. According to this theory, the golden head would represent Babylon, the silver arms and chest, Media, the bronze middle and thighs, Persia, and the iron legs, Greece.³ Although scholars take the mixture of clay and iron portrayed in the statue’s feet to refer to the division of Alexander’s empire after his death, most would agree that the iron mixed with clay refers to the policy of intermarriage existing between Ptolemies and Seleucids. Moreover, from the point of view of Jewish resistance during the reign of Antiochus IV, the stone was also understood by the text’s editor to represent the eschatological Jewish kingdom still to come.

The future would cause this schema to be continuously reinterpreted. From the 1st century CE onwards, the emphasis of the interpretation was placed on Rome instead of

³ Although Josephus points to Rome as the last empire, the chronology of the book does not permit us to reach such a conclusion.

Greece. In accordance with this subsequent interpretation, the sequence of empires would be Assyria, Media and Persia (understood as part of the same unity), Greece, and, finally, Rome as the last empire.

The text of Daniel, Chapter 2, does not, however, specify the names of the empires, thus allowing for the theory of the four-kingdom scheme to be widely applied in the future when many reinterpretations were to follow. In fact, it seems more plausible that the sequence of empires represented in Daniel would have been one of Iranian origin, which was well known in the Near East and obviously did not contain references to Rome or Greece (Collins, 1984: 280-94).

The author of this text was interested in history only when it served his own interests. In a word, history was significant insofar as it accentuated the importance of the Jewish people and their religion – that aside, the events that were reported could be mere fiction. Therefore, the different empires were depicted in accordance with their relationship with Israel, which may explain the correlation with the different metals and their inherent quality. In reality, this review of world history suggests to the reader a vision of a declining world about to reach its end.

Daniel, Chapter 7, marks the beginning of the apocalyptic section of the Book of Daniel and occupies what J. Collins calls a “*pivotal place*” because it links the two parts of the book (Collins, 1984: 277). We find once more in this chapter a dream/vision concerning the four kingdoms, though this time represented by four beasts that came from the sea.⁴ This new section of the book, however, makes explicit mention of some current historical events, and therefore the context of the two texts is different.

To conclude, the motifs in Chapter 7 are comparable to the ones described in Chapter 2, especially those relating to the progress of historical time. In the first account, History was described as a human statue divided into body parts composed of different materials, which were destined to succeed each other until the complete destruction of the statue was achieved; in the second account, time is compared to a succession of four empires. In truth, the two stories describe the same division of time into four smaller units followed by an additional one of eschatological characteristics. In addition, some authors recall that the statue’s toes in Chapter 2 can be taken as a parallel to the tenth horn mentioned in Chapter 7. The two images are destined to be destroyed and replaced at a

⁴ The motif of the sea monsters is a common theme in the Ancient Near East, representing a threat to the instituted power. Probably the best known texts outside the Bible are the Ugarit myths, in which Yamm (the sea) tries to defeat Baal. In the biblical texts, we have some references to Leviathan, who is continuously defeated by Yahweh.

later date. These two entities, the stone and the horn, would then be the last to reign before the establishment of the divine kingship of God on earth, which would make them surpass all previous rulers in power. Simultaneously, the last beast, or the last period of time, should be understood as representing the climax of the opposition to the chosen people.

Probably one of the most important features of this book is the fact that its author made the first real attempt to date the precise time of the end of the world. In fact, when reading the end of Chapter 12, one is informed that the events described as anticipating the end would last for 1290 days (Daniel, 12:11) or 1335 days (Daniel, 12:12). As said in the text, this is the period “From the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away and the abomination that maketh desolate set up” (Daniel, 12:11). Therefore, the intention of the author is clear. By setting the limits of this distressing period, he is, at the same time, explaining that its end has already been predefined in chronological terms by God. At the same time, Daniel’s author is also “opening the doors” to a possible future resurrection when he writes that “Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt” (Daniel, 12:2).⁵ The latter passage gave rise to different interpretations by subsequent interpreters. Some ancient authors like Porphyry and Jerome still regarded it as a metaphor intended to describe some sort of military reaction, as had happened during the Maccabean revolt. Most scholars today view it differently, however. In fact, it is commonly accepted that, in this passage, “(...) Daniel is referring to the actual resurrection of individuals from the dead, because of the explicit language of everlasting life” (Collins, 1993: 392). Nevertheless, we can say that the author of Daniel envisages two different temporal stages: one in this world and another in the world to come, characterized by eternity. In fact, it is at this precise point that the author introduces the concept of the reward of an afterlife. What may be discussed is whether this resurrection was to be a bodily one, especially because there is no explicit reference to the nature of such resurrection in Daniel (Nickelsburg, 1972: 301). Daniel’s author envisages resurrection to be partial, i.e. reserved only for some, which thus transforms “resurrection” into a process of special selection. In this particular case, it is reserved for the faithful and for the wise (the *maskilim*) as a reward for their deeds and endurance during such a disturbed period. On the other hand, those not favored by it will

⁵ Before Daniel, the common view of death in Israel was that the dead would live a shadowy life in Sheol, a place renowned, for example, for not allowing people even to pray to God. The only known exceptions of people who had not been sent to Sheol after dying were Enoch and Elijah, who had exceptionally been taken to God. In fact, not even the description of the valley of dry bones in Ezekiel, 37, or the sense of restoration expressed in Hosea, 6:2, are taken as implicitly describing a possible afterlife. Therefore, Daniel’s text marks

awake “to shame and everlasting contempt” (Daniel, 12:2). Hence, this reward of an afterlife was reserved for those who had remained steadfast and faithful during the distressing events reported in the book.

b) Revelation

As Yarbrow Collins writes, “the primary purpose of the book is not to impart information” (Collins, 1984: 144). In fact, the author of Revelation appeared to be far more interested in explaining to his companions why they needed to commit and be faithful to God if they wanted to achieve their final goal than he is in explaining anything else. Hence, the perspective of history that is expressed in this text is that of the Christian people, and does not correspond to a universal view. At the same time, John refers to the existence of a messianic kingdom expected to last for a thousand years (Revelation, 20:4), and his words allow us to accept that, for him, that period has already begun. Therefore, the present corresponds to the time before the messianic kingdom, while the judgment and the establishment of the divine kingdom represent the future.

It is necessary to realize that this author had a certain historical sense, even if he did not express it as clearly as Daniel or 1 Enoch did. In fact, there is a gap between his time and the time to come that permits us to identify this messianic kingdom with an intermediate period, one that would terminate with the judgment of the dead. Although these 1000 years represent a limited period, their importance lies in the symbolism of the figure rather than the period of a thousand years itself. Another aspect to be considered when analyzing the different ways of mentioning and understanding time used by this author is the fact that he also describes a sequence of rulers: in this particular case, we have a sequence of Roman emperors (Revelation, 17:9). This may, however, be considered as a chronology rather than a philosophy of history. The sequence of chronological events reported by John also implies the question of the antichrist, and it is in this perspective that the references to Nero and Babylon are sometimes understood, especially when commentators analyze the symbolism of the number achieved by the sum of the letters of the emperor’s name. The express reference to the existence of an antithetic character opposing that of the Messiah in a time considered to be intermediate represents the

an important change in attitude and perspective regarding death, although he was not the first to mention the existence of a judgment of the dead. This matter is found mainly in 1 Enoch, 22.

beginning of the ancient question regarding the identity of the antichrist: a king, a pope, or someone else? Likewise the cities: Babylon and/or Rome versus the New Jerusalem.

In Revelation, the author attempted to expound a theory that divided time into two different ages (one in the past and one in the future), to which he added an intermediate period representing the present. The result is a universal history of the cosmos, not just a portrait of a small unit of time and/or space. This happens not only in the case of the messianic kingdom, but also with the description of the sequence of kings, where we find a clear distinction of the three periods (the past kings, the king that is, and the one that has yet to come). We do know that Chapters 20 and 21 translate a view of the future world and of the world that would anticipate the Last Judgment. Furthermore, there is an explicit account of the existence of two distinct deaths at two different moments in time (cf. Revelation, 20:5, and Revelation, 21:8), which is different from the one that we normally read in earlier apocalyptic texts. For example, in Daniel, we have an account of the judgment, where it is said that the people whose names were inscribed in the Book of Life would be raised, but there is no explanation regarding what is supposed to happen to the remainder. In Revelation, we have at first two different groups of people: one with the mark of the Lamb and the other with the mark of the Beast. The first ones are entitled to live in the earthly kingdom of God that is going to be created after the thousand-year period—the New Jerusalem—while the others would suffer a second death and be thrown into the lake of fire, where they would join the Dragon, the False Prophet, and Satan. In a certain way, Revelation is more detailed and explicit than previous texts, thus expressing the increasing power of imagery in the mind of Christians.

From the millennial period described in Revelation, 20:1-6, during which the Dragon was supposed to be imprisoned (albeit to be released later), we move to the final battle described in Revelation, 20:7-10, when the Dragon was to be released and would gather an army, to later be defeated and thrown into the lake of sulphur. Finally, there is an account of the last judgment in Revelation, 20:11-15. Everyone whose name was not inscribed in the Book of Life would also be thrown into the lake of fire, and this judgment was meant to be total and take place when Sea, Death, and Hades would deliver up their dead for judgment. After this, the chosen ones, i.e. the people whose names were inscribed in the Book of Life, would start enjoying this new age with the kingdom of God on Earth and a New Jerusalem without a temple. After all, being the city of the living God is in itself equivalent to being a living temple, so there was no need to build another one.

This was the New Age, and although it implied a formal cut with the past, or the old age, it was not a complete cut. In short, Revelation does not contain many explicit details about what is supposed to happen to the world or when, but it offers the listener a reasonable idea of how some events were supposed to take place during the intermediate period. Again, the author manipulates the existing tension between Christians and Romans, and even Jews, in order to achieve a level of anguish in which he could more easily explain that what was happening was the result of a divine plan, something predetermined by God, and that the reestablishment of the kingdom of God in the very near future was also a reality. He confirms this by saying in the last verses: "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last" (Revelation, 22:12-13), substantiating the sense of totality and ensuring that everything that was happening was part of a divine plan, especially History.

c) *António Vieira*

Raymond Cantel, the scholar who devoted his life to the study of Vieira's prophetic and messianic tendencies, confirms L. de Azevedo's theory that the time of the Portuguese Restoration, i.e., the period around 1640, was the key moment for Vieira's public introduction of his eschatological system (Cantel, 1960: 44-45). Going further, Cantel mentions how Vieira was truly persuaded that Bandarra's *Trovas* were, in fact, a divinely inspired text, as some of his forecasts appeared to be taking place (Cantel, 1960: 45).

Although we cannot discuss here in detail the different theories about when it was that Vieira first started thinking in eschatological terms, we must say that, when Vieira began speaking of a theory of the *Fifth Empire*, he was creating a peculiar, specific, and original system of thought. This system—a system indeed, no fear to call it that—is perfectly coherent and follows the logic of his time (Cantel, 1960: 45). The originality of such a model is not only based on the aspirations of his century. Vieira goes further and does, in fact, create a new model based on the traditional system of the ages of the world and of the succession of empires described by Daniel and Revelation.

It thus appears possible to accept that, for Vieira, this systematization became his life's purpose. Yet we have to agree that the author envisaged that his broader work/system should be known at many different levels. For that reason, we would say, he first wrote a

personal letter, then a work in Portuguese addressed to the Portuguese, where we notice a sort of panegyric of the Portuguese people, and finally a work in Latin destined to disclose his theories to the Roman men of culture of his time. It is as if Vieira had planned a crescendo of revelation of his own ideas, parallel to his awareness that the Portuguese people needed to be warned about their contents. Only in that way could his project be fully completed. We speak of a project, but what Vieira had in mind, particularly in the *Clavis prophetarum*, was certainly the realization of a divine plan, in which Portugal and its king would play a key role in the establishment of the divine kingdom prophesized since the time of the Old Testament, and also one that the New Testament and the Church Fathers continued to follow.

As was current practice at that time, the Inquisition examined Vieira's manuscript of the *Clavis prophetarum*. Fr Casnedi, however, wrote in his counter-evaluation that Vieira's treatise consisted of three books (Azevedo, 1931, vol. II: 375).⁶ Book I was devoted to the nature and quality of the Kingdom of God consummated on earth; Book II was dedicated to its earthly consummation; and Book III was about the time when these events should take place and for how long they would last. Casnedi denies any possibility of moral imperfection in Vieira's book. While underlining the physical imperfection of the manuscript, he mentions that it was not clear whether this had been caused by the author, who did not finish his work (Azevedo, 1931, vol. II: 375), or if it had been caused by the copying and transmission processes.

Concerning Book I, Casnedi describes it as perfect. It contained eleven booklets divided into twelve chapters. Casnedi describes it in the following words: "he admirável, erudito e rasoável" [it is admirable, erudite and reasonable] (Azevedo, 1931, vol. II: 378). Books II and III appear to be the more problematic ones for Casnedi. Book II deals with the consummation of the kingdom on earth and is described as imperfect and incomplete. Fr Casnedi also mentions the famous section of the *Clavis* in which Vieira digresses about the conversion of the Jews and resuming the sacrifices of the ancient law in the temple. L. de Azevedo, however, says in a footnote, that the manuscript he used ignored that particular section where the temple of Ezekiel was mentioned, thus allowing us to question whether this section belonged to this particular booklet of the *Clavis* (Azevedo, 1931, vol. II: 384, n. 1). Vieira's argument is related to the need to resume the ancient law to accomplish the fulfillment of the vision of Ezekiel. Therefore, the sacrifices that had once

⁶"As the Author says at the beginning of his work". In Azevedo, J. L. d. (1931). *História de António Vieira*. 2nd ed. Lisbon: A. M. Teixeira.

been established by God, which explained why the Jews could not be called idolaters, should be resumed for the benefit of the Universal Church.

All taken together, it is apparent that the only part of Vieira's work that may have posed more problems for Casnedi was the latter part, since the remaining parts appeared to him "perfect and in accordance with the laws of the Church," as mentioned above.

The first problem Vieira faced concerned whether or not it was legitimate to wonder about the future, especially given Christ's sentence in Acts, 1:7. According to Vieira, this would have determined the path of several of the most important names in the history of the Church, such as Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Augustine. In fact, these authors underlined that only God could know the future, consequently creating a distinction between God's power and that of Christ. Besides, Vieira recalls that not even the sacred texts could verify beyond doubt all the forecast events, thus allowing for their authority to be questioned. At the same time, Vieira writes that if such important names⁷ were not able to find a reliable interpretation of the information provided by the sacred texts, not even deciding about the age of the world, then how could they possibly know when those same events would take place? Moreover, he says, most of the temporal references found in the Bible are not to be taken literally,⁸ which in the final analysis represents an *a priori* reason preventing us from finding any real dates within the biblical texts.

Nevertheless, and although Vieira confirms all this, he has a different opinion regarding the possibility of knowing the future in advance, which he explains through the existing distinction between revealed events and revelation in itself, i.e., between the thing and its essence. Therefore, he warns us that not always are either the revelation of the event or its timing clear in the message, and that, at other times, part of the information is not given. Consequently, it is impossible to determine with any great precision when was the moment mentioned in those revelations, or even the complete meaning of what had been revealed to the seer. Nonetheless, Vieira emphasizes that, when time and event are revealed, it is as justifiable as it will ever be to search for the knowledge relating to the actual date in which those same events would take place. This could be done, according to Vieira, in texts such as Daniel and Revelation, where days could mean years, as already mentioned by Augustine and Theodoret of Cyrrhus. Besides, when time was not revealed

⁷As an example, Vieira cites names such as Josephus, Philo, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Orosius, Cassiodorus, Isidore of Seville, and Beda, among others. (cf. Vieira, A. (2000). *Clavis prophetarum* = *Chave dos profetas*. 1st ed. Lisbon: Biblioteca Nacional.).

⁸Cf. the ongoing discussion about the symbolism of time in Yarbrow Collins, A. (1996). *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. Leiden/New York: E.J. Brill, where the author discusses at length the meaning and value of each word, and its eventual significance.

and could not be understood except through the interpretation of signs and circumstances, this should also be analyzed. Moreover, an attempt to establish the moment of the predicted events should be pursued. Vieira, as usual, goes further than this and writes:

(...) sed diserte pronuntiatur a Deo sciri non posse, adhuc licet de eodem tempore conijcere ac disputare et quod probabile videatur, non quidem praecise ac definite sed indeterminate asserere. (Vieira, 2000: 50)⁹

Furthermore, Vieira mentions that it was Christ who wanted humankind to search for the date of the end of the world, at least to determine whether it was close to the present or not. This appears to be a controversial affirmation unless one remembers the existence of several signs concerning the end of time, with the specific purpose of reminding us how close the end was and how the faithful should get ready. Clear examples of this can be found, once again, in Daniel and Revelation. Albeit with the purpose of justifying his affirmations, Vieira cites the names of those, such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Jerome, Isidore of Seville, the Cardinal of Cuse, Pico della Mirandola and Cornelius, who in the past followed similar paths to the one that he was about to take.¹⁰ In this manner, ancient authorities and their works became the models followed by Vieira in the *Clavis*.

The path suggested by Vieira does, in part, contradict the one that is normally pursued, i.e., he foresees a line of explanation based on an interpretation of the present with a view to the future, and not the common interpretation of the present based on the past. This interpretational shift was, according to Vieira, needed in order to accurately define the time of the kingdom of Christ and of the universal conversion to Christianity.

Vieira was preparing to demonstrate how evangelization was closely linked to the knowledge of the size of the world and to the resources made available to preachers and missionaries in order to reach such goals in those lost corners of the world. Based on this distinction, Vieira demonstrated the key role played by the Portuguese. Defining the limits of the known world, with which Vieira begins his exposition, was the only possible way to solve the problem concerning the supposedly universal preaching of the Gospel in the past by the Apostles.

⁹“(…) when a future event is revealed and not only the time is omitted, but yet God proclaims loudly that it is not possible to know it, even though it is acceptable, concerning that same time, to conjecture, dispute and affirm what appears to be probable, not with precision and in a definite way, but in an indeterminate fashion.”

¹⁰ Each time Vieira cites *authorities*, we can question whether he does so only with the purpose of showing how others have already used the same arguments, or if he really is attempting to protect himself from an eventual condemnation by the Inquisition.

Another subject that Vieira deals with concerns the Lost Tribes of Israel, whose location was unknown. Besides, as he says, these peoples similarly did not possess any type of knowledge regarding Christ. They would, however, have to be found before the end, which could only take place when the entire world was known, something that was not yet a reality at the time when Vieira was writing, although rapid progress was being made.

Vieira resumes his arguments about this theme by saying that there were no people who did not believe that the Gospel was not being preached to the entire world at that moment (Vieira, 2000: 50), thus confirming how evangelization was still an ongoing reality of his time.

For universal evangelization to take place it was necessary to remember the power of the word and of the grace of performing miracles, with which God would have favored the Apostles, besides sending them the Holy Spirit. In Book III, Chapter VII, § 2, Vieira begins by listing the ones possibly chosen by God to perform such universal evangelization. The first one chosen would certainly be the *Pastor Angelicus* (Vieira, 2000: 50), i.e. the pope, who would have twelve apostles at his disposal, just as Christ had. His main task would be to reform the Church in such a way that it could regain its original splendor. This is also the way Vieira uses to introduce his readers to his theories regarding the future kingdom of Christ being consummated on earth and the time of the antichrist. The latter would be confronted by the pope and by temporal princes. To underline his argument, Vieira cites Cornelius à Lapide on how a temporal prince would play a fundamental role (Vieira, 2000: 588-590).

Vieira was explicitly emphasizing the importance of temporal power for the establishment of the divine kingdom on earth, while demonstrating that this was exactly how it had been forecast by biblical prophecies. If this did not happen, then God would question and punish those temporal princes who did not follow His orders. Therefore, Vieira joins temporal and spiritual powers together in one single and unbreakable alliance, whose main purpose is the world's subjection to Christianity and later the achievement of eternal salvation.

In Book III, Chapter VIII, §3, Vieira writes that “(...) non tamen omnes universim homines esse credituros” [not all men will believe], immediately bringing to mind his previous theories concerning the Jews and the need to make mutual concessions (Vieira, 2000: 618). To further reinforce his statement, he writes that it was not necessary for all men to believe, because there was nothing in the sacred texts that said that they would have to convert within the time of the Church. The necessary conversion could take place *a*

posteriori (Vieira, 2000: 620). By adding this to the verses of Daniel, where it is mentioned that only the chosen ones would be saved, Vieira builds a stronger argument that allows him to explain how the Jews were part of the universal and final conversion. This interplay between the present time and the one that was to come gave him what he needed to argue that the end was about to happen, although it was not yet possible to speak of a universal evangelization.

Vieira describes a time in the future without ever being precise about it in chronological terms, although he allows us to foresee that universal conversion does not have a linear interpretation, since it will also take place at different moments in time and on a different level. To a certain extent, the God who created everything would be praised by all His creatures, even after Christ ordered the Apostles to shift the evangelization efforts toward the gentiles, instead of concentrating on the Jews, the first chosen nation.

As we can see, the *Fifth Empire* described by Vieira appears to have some very particular characteristics, which were not found in earlier authors. Vieira assumes that attaining perfection is necessary in order to achieve the kingdom of God and the time of the Last Judgment, but this was a common opinion in his time. He continues to remember the narrative of Daniel, 2:31-36, where the destruction of the statue of Nebuchadnezzar's dream is described, thus implying a form of historical progress towards the time of the end of the world. Vieira identifies the destructive stone, commonly regarded as the eschatological kingdom, with the *Fifth Empire*, which was supposed to take place before the Last Judgment. Consequently, this empire represented *per se* a stage of perfection that was not only more complete than that of the Roman Empire, but which would also encompass all worldly peoples. In truth, Vieira viewed the Roman Empire as decadent, which to a certain extent is equivalent to another well-known theory of his time, and according to which the world was aging and about to collapse. Therefore, the *Fifth Empire*, as Vieira understood and described it, represented the next step in the history of the world, while it was still a natural heir to the Roman Empire (Cantel, 1960: 134).

Moreover, the *Fifth Empire* would be the result of the defeat of the Beast described in Revelation, and consequently of the millennial kingdom. However, Vieira never mentions in his writings the possible second release of the beast, its final defeat, and the 45 days that would precede the Last Judgment as described in Revelation. To some extent, Vieira's *Fifth Empire per se* represented an endless period in which Christ would reign through the pope and the emperor. This is certainly one of the major innovations proposed by Vieira for the apocalyptic scheme introduced in Revelation.

Vieira understood History as being composed of different times, which together represented a description of historical progress toward the establishment of the divine kingdom on earth. At the same time, Vieira tells his reader how he considered the present to still be a time of imperfection, and in need of improvement before the end of time could be reached. This description and interpretation of the length of time is very similar to the one introduced by Joachim of Fiore. It is, however, important to underline that such “imperfect time” runs counter to Augustine’s theories regarding the pre-existence of the *City of God* within the scope of the earthly city.

For António Vieira, the *Fifth Empire* was undoubtedly the Kingdom of Christ and of the Christians, as he frequently states in both the *História do futuro* and in the *Clavis prophetarum*. What is questionable is whether this kingdom was to be earthly or heavenly, and how necessary it was that the second coming of Christ should happen before its consummation.

Consequently, it is necessary to confirm right away that what Vieira is proposing does not follow the traditional interpretation. In fact, it appears that this fifth period is more likely to be the Millennium than the kingdom of the antichrist. One remark, however, needs to be made at this point: for his particular interpretation Vieira uses the multitude of horns with which the last monster is described in the second section of the Book of Daniel, as if they were a sign that its power would be divided up and spread among many smaller kingdoms. Although this is not entirely new, the novelty here has to do with Vieira’s identification of this last empire with Christ and not with the antichrist.

Vieira was aware that he was entering dangerous waters in which the opinion of the ancient theologians was law and where it was unsafe to propose a different reading. He does not, however, appear to have run away from his responsibilities and, as always, expounded his arguments quite convincingly. Therefore, the reader has no doubts concerning the fact that the *Fifth Empire* as elaborated by Vieira was a combination of the two types of power: spiritual power (the Church) and temporal power (the *Imperium*). The author was aware that this combination could preclude the eternity that the kingdom of God implied, since this empire as described by Vieira is similar to the intermediary period identified with the Millennium. It is not possible, however, to state whether Vieira was considering a second release of the antichrist or not, as described in Revelation, and its following decisive defeat by God, because of the unfinished character of the *Clavis*.

Vieira once again uses the text of Daniel to say that even if one should only understand the Empire of Christ and of the Christians to be earthly, then it was still

necessary to remember that “eternity” was not necessarily “duration without an end”, but should be understood as “continuity and permanence over a long period of time” (Vieira, 1992: 287). This type of phraseology appears confusing in the sense that we cannot explicitly and without doubt say that this *Fifth Empire* is limited in time, as we might have expected. According to Vieira, Christ’s power was temporal because it included power over the entire humankind, and all earthly things, similar to the one that temporal kings held over their subjects (Vieira, 1992: 300). One could not, however, forget the special character of Christ’s kingdom: one that was necessarily spiritual in nature. Consequently, it was obvious for António Vieira that this Empire would necessarily combine the two types of power in order to become universal. Christ, who had already been called a king in the past,¹¹ would resume his temporal power, while exercising his spiritual power. His kingdom, the *Fifth Empire*, would combine Christians as well as all the remaining earthly peoples, since universal evangelization would take place during two distinct moments.

It thus appears possible to confirm that this Empire would be a continuation of the Church, although its leader would change from the pope to Christ. Since Vieira never expressed the need for a second coming of Christ in order for this kingdom to begin, and even introduced the pope and the emperor as the “vicars of Christ on Earth,” it is possible to question whether he thought it necessary for there to be an actual return of Christ to Earth, or if an apparently endless Millennium would take place. For him, the antichrist, personified by the Turks (the Ottoman Empire), would be definitively defeated by the Portuguese king at sea, and there is no mention about any second release/appearance of this character. Furthermore, at this moment, it appears possible to state that the spiritual power of the Church, and later of Christ, can also be understood in the light of Augustine’s theories regarding the earthly city. One cannot, however, forget that, for Vieira, this empire was supposed to happen within history as Joachim of Fiore said.

António Vieira primarily uses Daniel to explain how the *Fifth Empire* would be established, although he mentions the text of Revelation several times. This combination of the two texts, and how he apparently reconciles them, is certainly something of which one should be aware when analyzing his work. It is clear that, when he describes the *Fifth Empire*, he says that it will be established after the defeat of the antichrist and when universal conversion is achieved (Vieira, 2000, Chapter IX, *passim*). Vieira, however, also proposes the existence of two different conversions, while saying that the *Fifth Empire* began when Christ died on the Cross. Therefore, it is difficult to confirm whether this

¹¹ Vieira recalls several times how Christ had been called “King of the Hebrews” during his lifetime.

Empire is equivalent to the Millennium described in Revelation, or if it may be of endless duration.

As Vieira begins to describe the statue of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, the reader is immediately warned that he thought the last kingdom, the fourth, to be that of the Romans (Vieira, 1992: 252). The division of the Roman Empire was based on a description of the historical and political circumstances of Vieira's own time. Therefore, it is not very difficult for a brilliant mind like that of Vieira's to use biblical prophecies to his own advantage. Thus, he begins by narrating his century's history, underlining the fratricidal nature of the power struggles between these kingdoms, and describes how these same struggles were weakening an eventual defense of Christianity against the Ottoman Empire.

After this long interlude about Vieira's conception of the *Fifth Empire*, one of the questions still to be answered relates to the time of this new kingdom. Was it to be within or beyond History? Vieira answers this question in a very clear way: the kingdom of Christ began when Christ died on the cross, and therefore it is part of History.¹² In fact, Vieira describes this *Fifth Empire*, the eschatological kingdom, to be realized on earth and to be led by the supreme earthly leaders: the pope, representing spiritual power, and the emperor, representing the temporal power over all nations.

Furthermore, if it included the pope and the emperor as its leaders, then this kingdom could not lie beyond History. We do not know, however, whether Vieira also considered this kingdom to be eternal. It appears, nevertheless, that Vieira is in a very particular way conjugating the interpretations about the nature of this kingdom of earlier exegetes such as Augustine and Joachim of Fiore. From Augustine, Vieira used this author's theories about the existence of an earthly empire of Christ, since Christ had been incarnated and represented after His death by the Church. António Vieira, however, did not support Augustine in the matter of the end of this world and the creation of another one, as the concept of the *City of God* foresaw. Instead, he followed Joachim of Fiore, and, because of that, we can say that we find traces of Joachimism in his work.

Vieira supports an earthly kingdom that would combine spiritual and temporal power, and in which the pope and the emperor would act as Christ's vicars on earth. By following such a line of thought, we can say that his theories are based on an extension of historical time, demonstrating historical continuity rather than rupture. The world would change, but, because universal evangelization had not yet been reached, it was still

¹² Cf. ANTT, *Conselho Geral do Santo Ofício*, Ms. 122, f. 129 v. and ff. (Book 1, Chapter, VI) and *História do Futuro*, Book II, Chapter II.

impossible to consider the existence of a heavenly kingdom. Moreover, Vieira's theorization is not explicit about what is to happen after the "*ultimam*" conversion takes place, except to say that the final kingdom of Christ would then be achieved.

Consequently, many questions concerning the essence of António Vieira's *Fifth Empire* remain unanswered. Future analysis of the text of the *Clavis* will certainly enable us to further confirm Vieira's originality with regard to the interpretation of the biblical concept of the *Fifth Empire*. It is, however, already clear that Vieira combined the descriptions of Daniel and of Revelation in a scheme that served the intentions of both the new Portuguese dynasty and the Portuguese Jesuits. Vieira was not casting aside his faith, to which he remained faithful until the last moment, but he certainly interpreted a religious theory according to the political demands and expectations of his century, particularly those of the Portuguese. As such, his work, and in particular the *Clavis prophetarum*, should be identified as pertaining to the literary genre of political prophecy.

Bibliographical References

- Azevedo, J. Lúcio de (1931). *História de António Vieira*. 2nd ed. Lisbon: A. M. Teixeira.
- Cantel, Raymond (1960). *Prophétisme et méssianisme dans l'oeuvre d'Antonio Vieira*. Paris: Éditiones Hispano-Americanas.
- Collins, John J. (1984). *Daniel, with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans.
- Collins, John J. (1993). *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel with an Essay "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament"*, by Adela Yarbro Collins. Edited by F. M. Cross, Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Hartman, Louis Francis and Alexander A. Di Lella (1978). *The Book of Daniel*. 1st ed., Garden City, New York.: Doubleday.
- Muhana, Adma. "Book Reviewed: Vieira, António.Clavis Prophetarum. Chave dos Profetas Livro III. Edição crítica, fixação do texto, tradução, notas e glossário de Arnaldo do Espírito Santo. Lisbon: Biblioteca Nacional, 2000", *Luso-Brazilian Rev.* June 20, 2003, 40,122-126.
- Rowley, Harold Henry (1959). *Darius, the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel: a Historical Study of Contemporary Theories*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board.
- Rusconi, Roberto (1999). *Profezia e profeti alla fine del medioevo*. 1st ed. Vol. 9, Opere di Gioacchino da Fiore. Rome: Viella.
- Vieira, António (1992). *História do futuro*. Edited by M. L. C. Buescu. 2nd ed., Biblioteca de autores portugueses. [Lisbon]: Imprensa Nacional/Casa da Moeda.
- Vieira, António (2000). *Clavis prophetarum = Chave dos profetas*. Edited by A. d. Espírito Santo and M. V. Mendes. 1st ed. Lisbon: Biblioteca Nacional.

The Vicar and the Earthquake: Conflict, Controversy, and a Christening during the Great Lisbon Disaster of 1755

Mark Molesky¹

Abstract

This article examines five letters written by Richard Goddard, an Anglican pastor from Swindon, England and a survivor of the Lisbon earthquake. Produced on faded paper in a legible cursive script, they offer a personal, detailed, and highly revealing description of the events of All Saints' Day (November 1) 1755, discussing not only the earthquake and tsunami, but also the great fire that began almost immediately after the first tremor and burned for more than a week. In one notable and well publicized episode at the time, Reverend Goddard is forcibly baptized into the Catholic Church by a crowd of pious *Lisboetas* in the hour after the earthquake.

Keywords

Lisbon Earthquake of 1755, Richard Goddard, anti-Catholicism, religious toleration, eighteenth century; natural disaster

Resumo

Este artigo analisa cinco cartas escritas por Richard Goddard de Swindon, Inglaterra, um pastor anglicano e um sobrevivente do terramoto de Lisboa. Produzido em papel desbotado, em escrita cursiva legível, eles oferecem uma descrição pessoal, detalhada e altamente reveladora dos eventos do Dia de Todos os Santos (1 de Novembro) de 1755, discutindo não só o terramoto e tsunami, mas também o grande incêndio que começou quase imediatamente depois do primeiro tremor e continuou durante mais de uma semana. Num episódio notável e bem divulgado na época, o Reverend Goddard foi batizado à força na Igreja Católica por uma multidão de Lisboetas devotos na primeira hora após o terramoto.

Palavras-chave

Terramoto de Lisboa de 1755; Richard Goddard; anti-catolicismo; tolerância religiosa; século XVIII; desastre natural

¹ Department of History, Seton Hall University. E-Mail: Mark.Molesky@shu.edu. The author would like to thank the Earhart Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities for their generous support.

The Lisbon Earthquake of November 1, 1755 was a cataclysm of decidedly international impact. Originating along a fault line several hundred kilometers southeast of Cape St. Vincent in the Atlantic Ocean—and registering between 8.5 and 9.1 on the moment magnitude scale (M_w)—the mega-quake was felt across much of western Europe and the northwest coast of Africa, while the resultant tsunami ravaged stretches of the Spanish, Portuguese, and Moroccan shoreline, sending shock waves as far as England, Ireland, Canada, Brazil, and the West Indies. Much of the damage and most of the deaths, however, occurred in Lisbon, the capital of a vast trading empire and home to a large and diverse community of foreign merchants, craftsmen, and sailors. In the aftermath of the disaster, many of the survivors of this non-native population wrote home to inform family, friends, and business associates of their survival and recount their experiences. These foreign accounts constitute a sizeable proportion of all extant eyewitness testimonies to the earthquake.² Unfortunately, many remain unstudied (or undiscovered) in archives and personal collections throughout the world.

This article will comment on five letters written by earthquake eyewitness Richard Goddard, the vicar of Lacock Abbey in Wiltshire, UK.³ Produced on faded paper in a clear cursive script, they present a detailed and deeply personal description of the events of All Saints' Day (November 1) 1755, discussing not only the earthquake and tsunami, but also the great fire, which began almost immediately after the first tremor and burned without interruption for more than a week. Unlike the vast majority of eyewitness accounts which offer a single composite view of the tragedy, Goddard's letters follow the progression of events in Lisbon over a period of several months, providing a valuable new perspective on each stage of the tragedy and its aftermath.

Most significantly, they offer a unique window into the world of British Lisbon, as seen through the eyes of a visiting brother of a local British merchant. Of particular interest is an intriguing episode in which Goddard, a Protestant minister, is forcibly baptized into the Roman Catholic Church by a crowd of fervent Portuguese earthquake survivors immediately after the disaster. Illustrative of the complex and precarious relationship

² With several notable exceptions (António Pereira de Figueiredo's *Commentario Latino e Portuguez Sobre o Terremoto e o Incêndio de Lisboa*, Joachim José Moreira de Mendonça's *História Universal dos Terremotos*, Miguel Tibério Pedegache's *Nova e Fiel Relação que Experimentou Lisboa, e Todo Portugal no 1 de Novembro de 1755*, and Manoel Portal's *Historia da Ruína* [...]), only a few *Lisboetas* who survived the earthquake felt the need to commit their personal experiences to paper in any extended fashion. The reasons for this remain unclear. Perhaps the shared nature of the disaster among survivors (the earthquake was felt throughout Portugal and the tsunami impacted almost the entire Portuguese coastline), as well as the fact that many people fled to the homes of relatives across the country, made such communication unnecessary. *Lisboetas* did, however, produce a substantial quantity of poems, essays, histories, and commentaries on the earthquake disaster.

³ Richard Goddard was the vicar of Lacock from 1753 until his death on May 2, 1758.

between Catholics and non-Catholics in mid-eighteenth-century Lisbon, as well as an example of how disasters can transform human behavior, this episode will be the primary, although not the only, concern of this article.

Perhaps because of their relatively recent entry into the public domain, Goddard's letters have never been the subject of study and have only been quoted once before, in Edward Paice's *Wrath of God: The Great Lisbon Earthquake of 1755* (2008). Four of the five letters were donated to the Manuscripts Collection of the British Library by Capt. John Goddard in 1990 (the same year that the most comprehensive assemblage of British sources on the Lisbon earthquake, *O Terramoto de 1755 Testemunhas Britânicas The Lisbon Earthquake of 1755 British Accounts*, was published). A fifth letter resides in the Swindon and Wiltshire History Centre, National Archives, UK.⁴

Unlike most eyewitness narratives of the earthquake, which were written by authors who left little or no record of their existence (many of the accounts are anonymous), Goddard's letters were produced by someone with a traceable past. Although he was not a man of conspicuous accomplishments or fame, Goddard was widely known in the upper strata of British society because of his pedigree. The scion of the prominent and well-established Goddard family of Swindon, England, he was born in 1728, the son of Ambrose Goddard MP and his wife Elizabeth.⁵ On August 30, 1746, at the age of eighteen, he matriculated at New College, Oxford (UK). In 1753, he received his Bachelor of Civil Law degree and was appointed the vicar of Lacock, Wiltshire (whose medieval abbey has served over the years as a picturesque backdrop in numerous films, including several in the Harry Potter series). Two years later, Goddard sailed for Lisbon on a "packet ship," a common eighteenth-century conveyance which carried mail, goods, and passengers between embassies and colonial possessions throughout the empire (Foster, vol. II, 1891: 532).

⁴ Numbered in order of the date that they were written for the purposes of this article, Letters #1, #3, #4, and #5 (Dated October 22, 1755, November 18, 1755, February 10, 1756, and March 30, 1756 respectively) reside in the Manuscripts Collection of the British Library (Add. 69847), while Letter #2 (dated November 7, 1755) can be found in the Swindon and Wiltshire History Centre, National Archives (1461/2732). Letters #3 and #4 are contemporaneous copies written by Richard Goddard. The recipient of Letter #3 is unknown, while Letter #4 was probably written to John Ivory Talbot, the owner and renovator of Lacock Abbey. When Talbot expressed his intention of rebuilding the Abbey's Great Hall in 1753, it was Richard Goddard who suggested the architect Sanderson Miller. Miller's subsequent work on Lacock Abbey is considered a pioneering example of Gothic revival architecture. See Goddard's letter of introduction to Miller in *An Eighteenth-Century Correspondence*, Lilian Dickins and Mary Stanton, (eds.) (New York: Duffield & Co., 1910), 301-302. J. Nozes, introduction, translation, and notes, *O Terramoto de 1755 Testemunhas Britânicas The Lisbon Earthquake of 1755 British Accounts* (Lisbon: Lisóptima Edições, 1990).

⁵ A Goddard family pedigree can be found in the Manuscripts Collection of the British Library, Add. 23237.

Why did he go? As Goddard explained in his first letter (dated October 22, 1755) to his eldest brother Thomas (the inheritor of the family's Swindon estate), the "principal Errand" of his journey was his "Health," although he also wished to check up on the progress of his younger brother Ambrose, a local merchant and principal of the firm Jackson, Branfill & Goddard (Sutherland, vol. 3, no. 3, 1932: 373, 378-379). "I ... found Brosius [as Ambrose was known by his family] very well by his own Account," he wrote Thomas, "and I think to all Appearances as well as I ever knew him" (Letter #1, BL, Add. 69847). The Goddard family had followed the longstanding tradition of the British landed gentry whereby the firstborn son inherits the country estate (in this case Thomas, who became a Member of Parliament like his father), the second son enters the clergy (Richard), and the third is set up in business or commerce (Ambrose).

Unfortunately for him, Richard Goddard's voyage had been anything but pleasant. At Falmouth, his ship had been detained for three weeks due to "contrary Winds," and although the journey from "Land to Land" had only taken ninety-seven hours, the weather had made it unusually rough. "I had not been an Hour on Board," he wrote, "before I was forced by my Sickness to betake myself to my Cabbin [sic], and I had neither Spirits not Inclination to leave it ... it was the most intolerable Dungeon imaginable." When the ship finally arrived at the mouth of the Tagus, his elation was tempered by the appearance of the surrounding countryside, which had been "burnt up with the Heat of Summer" and thus afforded "the most dreary barren and uncomfortable Scene imaginable." Nevertheless, the ailing young minister was in remarkably good spirits as he disembarked in the Portuguese capital, where he hoped to spend an agreeable and uneventful winter away from the cares of his vicarage.⁶

While in Lisbon, he would reside with Ambrose, a member of the flourishing British merchant community known as the British or English Factory (*Feitoria Inglesa*).⁷ Formed in the seventeenth century as a result of the bilateral treaties of 1642, 1654 and 1661, which gave British merchants in Lisbon both freedom of trade and the right to practice their Protestant faith without fear of harassment from the Portuguese Inquisition, the Factory was both the commercial and social center of British Lisbon.⁸ As a result of

⁶ Letter #1, BL, Add. 69847.

⁷ Ambrose Goddard (1729-1815) was educated at Winchester School. He was agent for the Post Office in Lisbon until 1772 and later a Member of Parliament for Wiltshire (1772-1806), where, according to the *Monthly Magazine*, "his diffident habits and the state of his nerves precluded him from public speaking." L. Namier and J. Brooke, *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1754-1790* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1964), 508. See his obituary in *The Monthly Magazine, or British Register*, vol. XL, part II (London & Boston, 1815), 370-71.

⁸ See Isabel M.R. Mendes Drumon, *Os Estrangeiros e a Inquisição Portuguesa (XVI-XVII)* (Lisbon: Hugin, 2002).

the lucrative export trade (mainly textiles), many British merchants would amass substantial fortunes and build palatial homes in Lisbon's best neighborhoods.⁹ Although successfully ensconced in a merchant house which bore his family's name, Ambrose had not, it seems, been in Lisbon very long before Richard's visit (Factory records indicate that he was first officially admitted to the Factory on February 2, 1756, three months after the earthquake) (Walford, 1940: 72). Yet, in the wake of the disaster, Ambrose's signature, as well as that of his business partner Benjamin Branfill, appear on several Factory petitions pleading for economic aid from King George II.¹⁰ Lisbon's British merchants would suffer significant economic losses as a result of the earthquake (those of *Jackson, Branfill & Goddard* were, according to Richard Goddard, "uncommonly severe"). (Letter #2, SW (Swindon and Wiltshire), 1461/2732). Even so, the British Factory would survive well into the nineteenth century.

However, the close political and economic bonds between Britain and Portugal predate the Factory by more than five centuries. During the Hundred Years' War (1337-1453), Portugal provided valuable support to England; and, in 1386, the two small maritime nations sealed their friendship in the Treaty of Windsor, regarded by many as the oldest diplomatic alliance still in existence. In 1703, both countries signed the famous Methuen Treaties, which would define the economic and diplomatic relationship between Britain and Portugal in the half century before the earthquake. In it, the British were given the right to sell textiles and other goods at a reduced duty in Portugal, a country that had few industrial products of its own.¹¹ In return, the British granted privileged status to Portuguese wine (primarily Port) in its markets and agreed to use its formidable fleet to safeguard Portugal's New World trade and ensure its continued independence from Spain. The former had become increasingly important since the 1690s when gold was discovered in enormous

⁹ See Walford, *The British Factory*, and R. Lodge, "The British Factory at Lisbon," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th Series, vol. XVI (London, 1933), 211-247; L.M.E. Shaw, *Trade, Inquisition and the English Nation in Portugal, 1650-1690* (Manchester: Carcanet, 1989); J.B. de Macedo, *Problemas de História da Indústria Portuguesa no Século XVIII* (Lisbon: Associação Industrial Portuguesa, 1963); idem., *A Situação Económica no Tempo de Pombal: Alguns Aspectos*, (2nd edition, Lisbon: Moraes Editores, 1982); C.R. Boxer, "Brazilian Gold and British Traders in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century," in the *Hispanic American Historical Review*, vol. XLIX, no. 3, August 1969; H.E.S. Fisher, *The Portugal Trade: A Study of Anglo-Portuguese Commerce, 1700-1770* (London: Methuen, 1971); S. Sideri, *Trade and Power: Informal Colonialism in Anglo-Portuguese Relations* (Rotterdam: Rotterdam University Press, 1970); J.D. Tracy, *The Political Economy of Merchant Empires: State Power and World Trade, 1350-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); John Delaforce, *The Factory House at Oporto*, 2nd edition (London: Christie's Wine Publications, 1983).

¹⁰ The National Archives of the UK (TNA); Public Record Office, State Papers (Portugal), SP 89-50, 173, 224-5.

¹¹ See A.D. Francis, *The Methuens of Portugal* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); José Luís Cardoso, et al., *O Tratado de Methuen (1703) diplomacia, guerra, política e economia* (Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 2003); José Vicente Serrão "O Quadro Económico," in *História de Portugal*, José Mattoso, (ed.) (Lisbon: Editorial Estampa, 1992-3), Vol. 4 (of 8), *O Antigo Regime* (1620-1807), 71-117.

quantities in the central Brazilian plain of what would later be known as Minas Gerais. Thirty years later, diamonds and other precious gems were found (Boxer, 1962: 30-60, 204-225). By 1755, Lisbon was (once again) one the wealthiest cities in the world and the third busiest European port after London and Amsterdam—though much of the gold that arrived there ultimately found its way to the British Isles, where it would play an important role in financing the early stages of the Industrial Revolution (Birmingham, 1993: 2).¹²

While Richard Goddard's sojourn in Lisbon was more personal than economic, it would be inaccurate to say that he was on holiday, for he had agreed to provide assistance to the chaplain of the Factory, the Reverend John Williamson, during the length of his stay.¹³ On the Sunday prior to the earthquake, Goddard had preached to the Factory's congregation (Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847); and on the Saturday morning of the disaster, he was slated to help Williamson with the service (November 1 was a "Church Day" for the Factory).¹⁴ However, in the hour or so beforehand, Goddard was "tempted by the Beauty of the Morning" to take a stroll along the viewing platform atop St. George's Hill, the highest point in the city. It was a decision, he would later admit, to which he owed his "Preservation," for the platform was (and still is) an expansive open area largely devoid of any large structures that might have collapsed on top of him (Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847).

When the first tremor began, Goddard, like many earthquake eyewitnesses, attributed the noise and shaking to the approach of "several Coaches." However, he was "most dreadfully undeceived," for the "motion of the earth increased so much," he had difficulty staying on his feet. Only by grabbing a nearby flagstaff was he able to keep himself from falling (Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847). Because Rev. Goddard was wearing a watch, he is able to provide us with a uniquely authoritative time for the beginning of the earthquake of two minutes after "three quarters after nine," i.e., 9:47 a.m. Many twentieth-century scholars—following the testimony of a single eyewitness account in Francisco Luís Pereira de Sousa's seminal study *O Terremoto de 1 de Novembro de 1755 em Portugal e um Estudo*

¹² See also Virgilio Noya Pinto, *O ouro brasileiro e o comércio anglo-português* (São Paulo, 1979); and Kenneth R. Maxwell, *Conflicts and Conspiracies: Brazil and Portugal 1750-1808* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

¹³ Reverend Williamson was Factory chaplain from 1749 until 1763, the year of his death (Nozes, *O Terramoto de 1755*, 256).

¹⁴ A merchant states that Saturday, November 1, 1755 "was a Church-Day to the *English* Factory". Anonymous, *An Account of the Late Dreadful Earthquake and Fire which destroyed the city of Lisbon, The Metropolis Of Portugal. In a Letter from a Merchant Resident there, to his Friend in England*, Second Edition (Boston: Green & Russell, 1756), 17.

Demográfico—give the time of the beginning of the first tremor at 9:40, several minutes earlier.¹⁵

From his vantage point overlooking the city, Goddard saw the Castle of St. George, which stood atop the hill that had given it its name, fall—after which a great “Cloud of Dust” arose, obscuring what he remembered as “the brightest sun I had ever seen.”¹⁶

No Words can express the Horror of my Situation at that Instant, involved in almost total Darkness, surrounded with a City falling into Ruins, and Crowds of People screaming, and calling out for Mercy, while from the violent and convulsive Motions of the Earth, we expected every Moment to be swallowed up. Such a Situation I apprehend is not easily to be imagined by those who have not felt it, nor to be described by those who have. God grant you may never have a just Idea of it, which is to be had only by Experience. (Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847)

When the shaking ceased, Goddard knew that his troubles were far from over. He spoke little Portuguese and had only the slightest acquaintance with the geography of the city, which was now in ruins. More importantly, he had no idea how to locate his brother, who had left that morning on several business errands, and little hope of finding his way back to Ambrose’s house without being injured by falling debris. “It is not easy to imagine,” he wrote, “how much I suffered from this complicated Distress” (Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847). Besides the general physical ruin that lay all about him, he was immediately confronted with the equally unsettling scene of hundreds of terrified Catholics running amuck, many believing the world was coming to an end. As they ran through the streets kissing “their Crucifixes [and] the Images and Pictures of their Saints,” he could not suppress his disgust. As a respectable Protestant clergyman, he admitted that he was “greatly scandalized by the large Mixture of Idolatry and Superstition;” nevertheless, he did not “doubt the Sincerity of their Devotion on such an Occasion.”¹⁷ When the crowds started to congregate around him and ask him questions in a language that he did not understand, he began to fear that as a non-Catholic or “Heretick,” as he put it, he would be blamed for the catastrophe and flung to his death from the platform.¹⁸

¹⁵ Francisco Luís Pereira de Sousa, *O Terremoto de 1 de Novembro de 1755 em Portugal e um Estudo Demográfico*, vol. 4 (Lisbon: Tip. do Comércio, 1919), 516.

¹⁶ One eyewitness, a Mr. Braddock, referred to this obscuring of the sun by the “prodigious clouds of dust and lime” as an “Egyptian Darkness.” Charles Davy, *Letters Addressed to a Young Gentleman Upon the Subject of Literature*, Vol. 2 (of 2) (London: Bury St. Edmunds, 1787), 17.

¹⁷ Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847.

¹⁸ For a discussion of British Anti-Catholicism, see C. Haydon, *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-Century England, c. 1714-1780: A Political and Social Study* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993) and R. Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Goddard's distress was not completely unfounded, for although Protestant residents of Lisbon were generally treated humanely by their Portuguese neighbors, incidents of abuse (mainly verbal) did occur from time to time, especially on religious holidays. According to an article in the *London Magazine* in December 1755:

[because] insults are frequently offered to Protestant strangers, if met in the streets [on All Saints' Day], most of the gentlemen of the English factory go the night before to their country houses, and do not return till the second of November, when everything is quiet. To this unhappy bigotry, which brings many of the country inhabitants to Lisbon to see the show, the great loss of the Portuguese, and, on the other hand, the preservation of the English, is said to be owing. (*The London Magazine*, Dec. 1755: 587)

Several British earthquake survivors expressed similar fears that they would fall victim to a Catholic population that, in their opinion, had been whipped into a religious frenzy. In the words of British merchant Thomas Chase, who found himself in the Terreiro do Paço on November 2,

The fear ... that my condition [as a British Protestant] might kindle up their piety, at such a time as this, when all government was at a stand, and it was impossible to guess what turn their furious zeal might take against that worst of criminals a *Heretic!* this made me dread the approach of every person. (*The Gentleman's Magazine*, February 1813, Vol. LXXXIII: 110)

Another British merchant, while escaping the post-earthquake chaos in a low-lying house, reported "the sudden Entrance of some *Portuguese*, whose malicious and revengeful Countenances [and] Whisperings, ... seemed to bode no Good to Strangers [i.e. foreigners], and whom I found but too ready to impute this awful Judgment to their Government's suffering such a Number of *Heriticks* to reside among them" (*Two very Circumstantial Accounts...*, 1756: 10). Fleeing to the Rossio, he:

found several Gentlemen of the *English* Factory, and among them a certain Noble Lord, whom, with myself, the superstitious *Portuguese* obliged to fall down upon our Knees, and kiss the Cross; and even proceeded so far as to insist upon his Lordship's performing this idle Ceremony without his Wig. Which last Circumstance, together with the mad Behaviour, stern Countenance, and incessant Murmurs of the People, giving me too much Reason to apprehend they might soon carry Matters to a more enormous length, I advised his Lordship and the other Gentlemen to retire as fast as possible: Which we happily found Means to do, glad to escape with our Lives from an

infatuated Mob, whose cruel Principles naturally led them to believe they might appease the Wrath of Heaven by our Destruction. (*Two very Circumstantial Accounts*, 1756: 11-12).

In the eyes of many Europeans, eighteenth-century Portugal was a dangerous, intolerant place still mired in its barbaric past. Jews and Catholic heretics continued to be burnt at the stake in elaborate *autos-da-fé* in the Rossio and the Terreiro de Paço (though their frequency had diminished considerably over the decades); and Enlightenment *philosophes* like Voltaire frequently skewered the Portuguese for their religious bigotry.¹⁹

This image of Portugal was undoubtedly on Goddard's mind when, following a severe aftershock at 11 a.m., a crowd of more than one hundred and fifty *Lisboetas* suddenly "surrounded and seized ... [him] in the most violent Manner." They began to ask him a series of questions which he could not comprehend. When one priest recited to him what he thought was the Apostles Creed, Goddard attempted ("as much as was in my Power") to convey that he was indeed a Christian—but to no avail. When the cleric finally uttered a phrase that he did understand—"Vis Baptizari?" ("Will you be baptized?")—the crowd immediately began to encourage the Englishman to respond in the affirmative by chanting "*Volo, Volo, Volo*" ("I do"). Not wanting to antagonize the crowd with his "Refusal," Goddard remained "passive and affected not to understand them." In spite of this, the priest forged ahead and baptized the Englishman "in Form," that is, without Goddard having provided his "Formal Assent" (Letter, #4, BL, Add. 69847).

At this point, the "Mob," as Goddard referred to them, began to celebrate without restraint, "almost killing me with their Embraces; several Priests falling down before me, embracing the Knees and kissing the Feet of their New Convert." They apparently believed, explained Goddard, that in helping to save an infidel's soul they had earned "a Fund of Merit sufficient to atone for the most profligate Life" (Letter, #4, BL, Add. 69847). This jarring—and somewhat comic—contrast between Goddard's initial terror (caused as much by his reflexive anti-Catholic bigotry as his poor grasp of Portuguese) and the wild celebrations of the Portuguese in the midst of Lisbon's almost complete destruction is a deeply ironic testament to the extraordinary nature of the day. It may also reveal a disparity between British perceptions of the Portuguese and the actual reality.

¹⁹ See Voltaire, *Candide*, trans. Daniel Gordon (Boston, 1999), 52: "When this earthquake, which had destroyed three-quarters of Lisbon, came to an end, the wise men of the land could think of no more effective way of avoiding total ruin than to give the people a fine auto-da-fé. The faculty of the University of Coimbra had concluded that the spectacle of roasting several persons over a slow fire in a ceremonious fashion is an infallible secret for preventing the earth from quaking."

From what Goddard had previously heard about Portuguese intolerance, he was clearly surprised that they had not physically mistreated him.

Indeed, I must do them [i.e., the Portuguese] the Justice to observe that their Moderation in this Respect was much greater than could have been expected on such an Occasion, considering their excessive Bigotry. For except what happened to me, which was entirely owing to my Ignorance of the Language, there is scarcely an Instance to be produced of their having interfered with the Strangers [i.e., foreigners] on the subject of Religion. (Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847)

In this, he appears to have been correct. There are no extant accounts of any violent attacks on Protestants on the day of the disaster or in the weeks and months afterwards.

Perhaps this should not seem unusual. By the mid-eighteenth century, merchant communities from Great Britain, Sweden, Berlin, Hannover, and other predominantly Protestant centers, were well established in the Portuguese capital. Many of their members lived in the *Baixa*; and most regularly and peaceably interacted with the city's inhabitants. Of course, not all non-Catholics were accorded the same level of toleration. In May 1756, little more than six months after the earthquake, Lisbon's general council (*Conselho Geral*) proposed the transfer of 10 or 11 prisoners (most likely suspected Jews) to the city of Évora where they would be directed to "the first available *auto-da-fé*" (Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo, *Inquisição de Évora*, L^o 46, fl. 162).²⁰

Although greatly relieved by his survival, Goddard remained so disturbed by the incident that several days later he personally reported it to the Papal Nuncio, Filippo Acciaiuoli, whose own multi-letter account of his earthquake experiences was recently discovered in the Vatican Library.²¹ It is significant that Acciaiuoli was (according to Goddard) entirely sympathetic to his viewpoint, expressing particular outrage at the unknown Catholic priest who performed the baptism. "If he could be found out," Acciaiuoli declared to Goddard, "he deserved to be severely reprimanded for his Ignorance as well as his Presumption and Impertinence, for he ought to have known that the Council of Trent has declared the Baptism of Hereticks valid." Acciaiuoli's unqualified repudiation of the actions of the priest appears to indicate that relatively close relations existed between high Catholic officials in Lisbon and their social equals in the British Protestant community, possibly reflecting the fact that in many, if not most, circumstances, class

²⁰ I wish to thank Prof. Fernanda Olival for this reference.

²¹ See A.P. Cardoso, "O Terramoto de Lisboa (1755) Documentos do Arquivo do Vaticano," *Revista de História das Ideias*, 18 (1996), 441-510, and idem., ed. and trans., *O Terrível Terramoto da Cidade que foi Lisboa: Correspondência do Núncio Filippo Acciaiuoli (Arquivos Secretos do Vaticano)* (Lisbon, 2005).

identity among eighteenth-century European elites trumped religious affiliation. Therefore, social snobbery may also underlie the reactions of Goddard and the Nuncio towards the simple priest and the Portuguese “Mob.”

The elements that make Goddard’s enforced baptism so compelling to the modern reader were also, it seems, of great interest to his contemporaries, for reports of the “Affair” or the “Adventure,” as it was referred to, appeared in at least two separate published accounts of the earthquake disaster (it is also briefly alluded to in a footnote on page 36 in Kendrick’s *The Lisbon Earthquake* of 1956). Although the first account (by an anonymous British merchant) in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* is brief and Goddard’s name is never explicitly mentioned, it is an unmistakable reference to the incident.

Some willing to do a meritorious act on this occasion, laid hold of a young English gentleman, who could not speak a word of the language, and christened him by force. It was happy their frenzy went no further; which some principal gentlemen had reason to fear; for, in their presence, the people were taught it was a judgment for suffering heretics among them, and they were obliged to many compliances for their safety. (*The Gentleman’s Magazine*, Vol. xviii, February, 1756: 94).

The second and more extensive version, written by another anonymous British merchant, is remarkable both in its faithfulness to Goddard’s narrative and for the suggestion, in the following humorous addendum, that the story was internationally known.

I shall end my Account of this Adventure with acquainting you, that the word Minister in the Language of this Country as well as ours, is used in a double sense; when the Affair began to be noised abroad, the Abbess of a Nunnery wrote a congratulatory Letter to the British Envoy on his Conversion [The British Envoy to Portugal from 1749 to 1757 was Abraham Castres], and desired, as a Testimony of his true Catholicism, a suitable Charity for the Sisterhood under her Care; by which means, the Holy Mother encountered a Rebuke, and lost, by the claim of Piety, the Contribution which Humanity might otherwise have afforded. (Anonymous, *An Account of the Late Dreadful Earthquake ...*, 1756: 19).

How was this merchant able to provide such an accurate account of Goddard’s story? Perhaps he had direct contact with him. Both the merchant’s letter (dated 20 November 1755) and Goddard’s Letters #2 and #3 (dated 7 November and 18 November 1755, respectively) were written in Marvila, then a rural parish to the east of Lisbon. It is known that the British Consul and several prominent members of the British Factory were residing at Marvila during this time. An article published in the *Whitehall Evening Post* addressed from

“Marvilla, near Lisbon” (dated 20 November 1755) refers to a letter presented to José I by the “Consul-General ... Merchants, [and] Subjects of his Britannic Majesty” offering “Condolences” and their resolve to “prosecute ... a Commerce so particularly necessary at this Time, and always so advantageous to the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Portugal” (*The Whitehall Evening Post*, 27 December to 30 December 1755: No. 1536).

In Letter #4, Goddard expands his narrative with a discussion of the two other principal elements of the disaster: the tsunami and the fire.²² Not long after escaping the crowd of pious Portuguese, Goddard heard “a Report that the Sea was breaking in and all the lower Part of the City already under Water.” Soon, people began to stream up the sides of St. George’s Hill for safety, including one family of the British Factory “consisting of several Gentlemen and Ladies”. On the Tagus, “the Water ebbed on a sudden in such a Manner that the boats were all aground,” wrote Goddard of the tsunami, “but on looking down the River the Sea appeared to be breaking in, in such mountainous Waves over the Bar as astonished the older Sailors, and seemed to threaten the City with inevitable Destruction.” Here, Goddard relates the recollections of sailors that he communicated with in the weeks and months after the disaster. (Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847). Goddard also discusses the disappearance of the imposing Stone Quay (*Cais de Pedra*) that had recently been constructed along the Terreiro do Paço, as well as the widely held belief that hundreds of earthquake survivors who had been standing on top of it were swept away to their death by the tsunami.²³

Although Goddard admitted to knowing little of Lisbon (and thus refrained from providing a detailed list of the principal structures destroyed), he did mention having witnessed the partial collapse of the city’s cathedral, *Santa Maria Maior*, on the southwestern face of St. George’s Hill. He also spoke at great length of the great fire, which, from his vantage point overlooking the city, he “saw break out in several Places at the same time.”²⁴ From its inception, he realized that Lisbon was doomed.

²² Since he had a copy of Letter #3 in his possession and since both letters contain passages that are practically the same, he undoubtedly used it while composing Letter #4.

²³ There is some disagreement about the manner in which the *Cais de Pedra* (Stone Quay) was destroyed. See Kendrick, *The Lisbon Earthquake*, 57-58, and Moreira de Mendonça, *História Universal dos Terremotos* (Lisbon, 1758), 134. Moreira de Mendonça argues that the quay had already been shattered by the earthquake before the tsunami pulled it into the river. One eyewitness claims that more than 900 people died on the Stone Quay and in the Tobacco Garden. Sousa, *O Terremoto...*, 539. From a manuscript in the Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal: Fundo Geral, Codice no. 1772.

²⁴ See Mark Molesky. “The Great Fire of Lisbon, 1755,” Chapter 7 in Greg Bankoff, Uwe Lübken, and Jordan Sand, (eds.), *Flammable Cities: Urban Conflagration and the Making of the Modern World* (Madison, WI: University Of Wisconsin Press, 2012).

Had the City been only shook to Pieces [sic] by an Earthquake, everything of value might have been recovered from the Ruins; but in the present Case everything must be given up to Destruction, for 'twas impossible to put a stop to the Progress of the Fire, and there was scarce any Body that would venture to save their Effects for Fear of a Return of the Earthquake. (Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847).

It was the threat of the fire that convinced Goddard to attempt to flee the city for a country house two miles away (possibly in Marvila) with a group of Englishmen that he had met on St. George's Hill. En route, they met Edward Hay, the British Consul and the chief representative of British trading interests in Lisbon, who related to them the harrowing escape of his wife Mary (née Flower), who was carried naked from their collapsing house by a nurse.²⁵ This story has never appeared before in any known account. After encountering Hay, Goddard would receive the happy news that his brother Ambrose had also survived the earthquake and was now safe aboard the British packet ship. Eventually, Goddard and his party would reach their destination in the countryside, although smoke on the horizon convinced him "that nothing would be able to escape ... [the fire's] Fury" (Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847). Goddard's belief that "about 30,000 persons ... perished" in Lisbon can be added the list of contemporary and admittedly conjectural estimates of the number of earthquake deaths and is well within the range given by the majority of survivors (Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847). The Papal Nuncio, Filippo Acciaiuoli, for example, believed that there were forty thousand victims.²⁶

In his final letter (dated March 30, 1756), Goddard reported that, because the Factory Chaplain had not found an acceptable replacement, he (Goddard) was considering remaining in Lisbon through the summer and possibly through the following winter.²⁷ In a reflection of his high social status within the British community, he added that he was lodging with Consul Hay and his wife, "where I suppose I shall continue during the Remainder of my stay in the Country" (Letter #5, BL, Add. 69847). After this last

²⁵ Edward Hay (1722-1829), Consul to Portugal 1754-1757, Envoy 1757-1767, Governor of Barbados 1772-1779. See R. Macaulay, *They Went to Portugal* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1946), "Envoy and Consul Mr. Castes and Mr. Hay [1755]," 277-282. Unlike the Envoy, who was frequently abroad, the Consul was the true representative of British trading interests and the leader of the British community in Lisbon. Many meetings of the Factory took place at his residence. The Hay baby, born on October 20, 1755, was named Margaret. See Egerton Bryces, *Collin's Peerage of England*, vol. VII (of 9) (London, 1812), 211-212.

²⁶ See A.S. Pereira, "Opportunity of a Disaster: The Economic Impact of the 1755 Lisbon Earthquake," *The Journal of Economic History* (2009), 69: 466-499. While some scholars accept Moreira de Mendonça's relatively conservative estimate of ten thousand victims in his *História Universal dos Terremotos* (five thousand on the first day and another five thousand who died during the first month due to injuries, gangrene, etc.), others embrace much higher numbers, usually between fifteen and forty thousand. For Acciaiuoli's estimate, see Cardoso, "O Terrível Terramoto," 48.

²⁷ SP 89-50, f. 243. In a letter to Whitehall dated May 8, 1756, Edward Hay states, "Mr. Williamson his Majesty's Chaplain to the Factory is gone home for his health... He is a most worthy Man, & will deserve your acquaintance & Esteem."

communication, Richard Goddard's actions and whereabouts are unknown. In his second letter from Lisbon, he wrote that Lisbon's climate was beginning to have "the most desireable [sic] Effect" on his health—that is, until the earthquake intervened and scuttled his plans for a peaceful convalescence. He would die three years later in England on 2 May 1758, at the age of twenty-nine or thirty (Letter #2, SW (Swindon and Wiltshire), 1461/2732).

On account of their extraordinary content, Goddard's five letters constitute a valuable historical source for one of Europe's greatest natural disasters. As an Oxford-educated clergyman, a gentleman from a wealthy and well-connected family, and the brother of an English merchant, Goddard brought a unique worldview to his description of these events. In the complex, multi-cultural world of eighteenth-century Lisbon, the earthquake severely tested the relationships between groups of different religious, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds. Although Goddard's anti-Catholic bigotry and snobbery are palpable, it is, ultimately, his compassion for the Portuguese as fellow survivors of the disaster that prevails in his letters. Indeed, he expresses his sincerest hope that their "mistaken Piety might be accepted [by God]" (Letter #4, BL, Add. 69847).

While this attitude was surely reflective of Goddard's own humanity, it was also partially derived, one suspects, from changing views in Britain concerning Catholics and Catholicism. Sermons preached in Britain in the months after the disaster show this plainly.²⁸ In one sermon delivered in Daventry, England, on December 7, 1755, the Rev. Samuel Clark discussed the meaning of the Lisbon Earthquake to his Protestant worshipers. While acknowledging that the Catholic Church was in error, Clark emphasized the common bonds that connected the British people with the Portuguese victims of the disaster.

Are they [the Portuguese] not *Men*? Are they not our *Brethren*, the Children of one common Father, Partakers of the same nature, and designed like ourselves for Immortality? ... Are they not *Christians*? Though unhappily fallen into many Errors; yet do they not acknowledge the *same* God, and are they not Disciples of the *same* Jesus with ourselves? ... Let us pray, that the Survivors may be supported under this heavy Trial; that the Father of Mercies would look down upon them with Pity in this their low Estate and afford them all needful Succor and Relief. (Clark, 19-21).

²⁸ See João Almeida Flor. *Sermões ingleses sobre o desastre de Lisboa*. In Helena Carvalhão Buescu and Gonçalo Cordeiro (eds.), *O Grande Terramoto de Lisboa. Ficar Diferente* (Lisbon: Gradiva, 2005).

In his *Serious Thoughts Occasioned by the Earthquake at Lisbon* (1756), the Anglican cleric John Wesley found it perfectly logical that God had chosen to destroy the seat of the *Inquisição*. But he also dared to imagine himself a pitiful Catholic inhabitant of Lisbon on the morning of All Saints' Day. "It comes!" he wrote. "The Roof trembles. The Beams crack! The Ground rocks to and fro. Hoarse Thunder resounds from the Bowels of the Earth. And all these are but the Beginning of Sorrows" (Wesley, 13). He certainly did not believe that his fellow Protestants were safe from the ultimate judgment of God. "Supposing the Earthquake which made such Havock [sic] at Lisbon should never travel so far as London, is there nothing else which can reach us?" he asked. "What think you of a Comet? Are we absolutely out of reach of this?" (Wesley, 14). In Wesley's eyes, Catholics and Protestants were united as Christian sinners in a fallen world.

For their part, the Portuguese had also shown tolerance. Their first inclination on St. George's Hill had been to save Goddard's soul, not, as he had first feared, murder him for his heretical views. Although the Inquisition was still in operation in mid-eighteenth-century Lisbon, its role in Portuguese life had declined markedly over the previous century (and it would be further marginalized after the post-earthquake rise to power of the future Marquês de Pombal). Although still preoccupied with religion, the city that Richard Goddard visited in October 1755 was no longer the seat of fanaticism and intolerance that many (especially in the Protestant world) believed it to be. While the old divisions of the Reformation still lived on in various forms in both Portugal and Britain (it had been only ten years since the Second Jacobite Rebellion and was twenty-five years before the Gordon Riots), much of the underlying animosity had begun to drain away.

Curiously, Reverend Goddard never discusses the role that God may have played in causing the disaster (as many clerics did in countless sermons delivered in Britain and throughout Europe), nor does he engage in any extended philosophical or scientific speculation on the possible causes of the event, though he does admit to having "Pretentions to Philosophy" (Letter #3, BL, Add. 69847).²⁹ He is instead content to relate

²⁹ For works on the great Lisbon Earthquake debate, see T.D. Kendrick, *The Lisbon Earthquake* (London: Methuen & Co., 1956); *O Grande Terramoto de Lisboa. Ficar Diferente*, H.C. Buescu and G. Cordeiro, (eds.) (Lisbon: Gradiva, 2005); U. Löffler, *Lissabons Fall – Europas Schrecken* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999); *Das Erdbeben von Lissabon und der Katastrophendiskurs im 18. Jahrhundert*, G. Lauer and T. Unger, (eds.) (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2008); G. Quenet, *Les tremblements de terre aux XVII et XVIII siècles: La naissance d'un risque* (Seyssel, France: Champ Vallon, 2005); J.P. Poirier, *Le tremblement de terre de Lisbonne* (Paris: Odile Jacob, 2005); *The Lisbon Earthquake of 1755: Representations and Reactions*, T.E.D. Braun and J.B. Radner, (eds.) (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2005); *O Terramoto de 1755: Impactos históricos*, A.C. Araújo, J.L. Cardoso and N.G. Monteiro, (eds.) (Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 2007); I.M.B. Campos, *O Grande Terremoto (1755)* (Lisbon, 1998); Maria Fernanda Rollo, Ana Isabel Buescu, Pedro Cardim, Coordinators, *História e Ciência da Catástrofe: 250 Aniversário do terramoto de 1755* (Lisbon: Colibri, 2007); *1755: Catástrofe, Memória e Arte*, H.C. Buescu, M.

his dramatic experiences in a straightforward and modest manner. “I beg Pardon,” he writes at the conclusion of Letter #4, “for having been so long the Hero of my own Story.” Hopefully, future research will uncover more information (and more letters) concerning Richard Goddard’s eventful Lisbon sojourn.

Carvalho, F.G. Costa, and J.A. Flor, (eds.) (Lisbon: Edições Colibri, 2006); and S. Neiman, *Evil in Modern Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

Bibliographical References

- Anonymous (1756). *An Account of the Late Dreadful Earthquake and Fire which destroyed the city of Lisbon, The Metropolis Of Portugal. In a Letter from a Merchant Resident there, to his Friend in England*. Second Edition, Boston: Green & Russell.
- Anonymous (1756). *Two very Circumstantial Accounts of the late dreadful Earthquake at Lisbon*. Account II, Reprint, Boston: D. Fowle and Z. Fowle.
- Araújo, A.C., J.L. Cardoso, N.G. Monteiro, W. Rossa, and J.V. Serrão (eds.) (2007). *O Terramoto de 1755: Impactos históricos*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.
- Bassnet, Susan. Sobre terramotos e o seu impacte. In Helena Carvalhão Buescu and Gonçalo Cordeiro (eds.) (2005). *O Grande Terramoto de Lisboa. Ficar Diferente*. Lisbon: Gradiva.
- Boxer, C.R. (1956). *Some Contemporary Reactions to the Lisbon Earthquake of 1755*. Lisbon: Faculdade de Letras, Universidade de Lisboa.
- Idem. (1962). *The Golden Age of Brazil 1695-1750*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Idem. (August 1969). Brazilian Gold and British Traders in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century. In the *Hispanic American Historical Review*, vol. XLIX, no. 3.
- Braun, T.E.D. and J.B. Radner (eds.) (2005). *The Lisbon Earthquake of 1755: Representations and Reactions*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation.
- Bryges, Egerton (1812). *Collin's Peerage of England*, vol. VII (of 9) London.
- Buescu, Helena Carvalhão and Gonçalo Cordeiro (eds.) (2005). *O Grande Terramoto de Lisboa. Ficar Diferente*. Lisbon: Gradiva.
- Idem, M. Carvalho, F.G. Costa, and J.A. Flor (eds.) (2006). *1755: Catástrofe, Memória e Arte*. Lisbon: Edições Colibri.
- Campos, Isabel Maria Correia de (1998). *O Grande Terramoto (1755)*. Lisbon: Parceria.
- Cardoso, Arnaldo Pinto (1996). O Terramoto de Lisboa (1755) Documentos do Arquivo do Vaticano. *Revista de História das Ideias*, 18.
- Ed. and trans. (2005). *O Terrível Terramoto da Cidade que foi Lisboa: Correspondência do Núncio Filippo Acciaiuoli (Arquivos Secretos do Vaticano)*. Lisbon: Alêtheia Editores.
- Cardoso, José Luís, et al. (2003). *O Tratado de Methuen (1703) diplomacia, guerra, política e economia*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.
- Clark, Samuel (1756). *A sermon preached at Daventry, December 7, 1755, on occasion of the late earthquake at Lisbon, November, 1, 1755*. London: [James Buckland](#).
- Davy, Charles (1787). *Letters Addressed to a Young Gentleman Upon the Subject of Literature*, Vol. 2 (of 2). London: Bury St. Edmunds.
- Delaforce, John (1983). *The Factory House at Oporto*, 2nd edition, London: Christie's Wine Publications.
- Dickins, Lilian and Mary Stanton (eds.) (1910). *An Eighteenth-Century Correspondence*. New York: Duffield & Co.
- Drumon, M. R. Mendes (2002). *Os Estrangeiros e a Inquisição Portuguesa (XVI-XVII)*. Lisbon: Hugin.
- Figueiredo, António Pereira de (1756). *Commentario Latino e Portuguez Sobre o Terremoto e o Incêndio de Lisboa....* Lisbon: Officina de Miguel Rodrigues.
- Fisher, H.E.S. (1971). *The Portugal Trade: A Study of Anglo-Portuguese Commerce, 1700-1770*. London: Methuen.
- Flor, João Almeida. Sermões ingleses sobre o desastre de Lisboa. In Helena Carvalhão Buescu and Gonçalo Cordeiro (eds.) (2005). *O Grande Terramoto de Lisboa. Ficar Diferente*. Lisbon: Gradiva.
- Foster, J. (1891). *Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1715-1886*, vol. II, Oxford: Parker and Co.

- Francis, A.D. (1977). *The Methuens of Portugal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The Gentleman's Magazine*.
- Haydon, C. (1993). *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-Century England, c. 1714-1780: A Political and Social Study*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kendrick, T.D. (1956). *The Lisbon Earthquake*. London: Methuen & Co..
- Lauer, G. and T. Unger (eds.) (2008). *Das Erdbeben von Lissabon und der Katastrophendiskurs im 18. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag.
- Lodge, R. (1933). *The British Factory at Lisbon*. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th Series, vol. XVI, London.
- Löffler, U. (1999). *Lissabons Fall – Europas Schrecken*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- The London Magazine*.
- Macaulay, R. (1946). *They Went to Portugal*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Macedo, J. B. de (1963). *Problemas de História da Indústria Portuguesa no Século XVIII*. Lisbon: Associação Industrial Portuguesa.
- Idem. (1982). *A Situação Económico no Tempo de Pombal: Alguns Aspectos*, 2nd edition, Lisbon: Moraes Editores.
- Maxwell, Kenneth R. (1973). *Conflicts and Conspiracies: Brazil and Portugal 1750-1808*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Idem. (2005) *O Terramoto de Lisboa de 1755*. In *1755 O Grande Terramoto de Lisboa Volume 1 Descrições*. Lisbon: FLAD e Público.
- Idem. (2006) *Lisbon 1755: The First 'Modern' Disaster (but if modern, how is it so?)*. Paper presented at the conference "The Treaty of Windsor and 620 years of Anglo-Portuguese Relations," St. Peters College.
- Mendonça, Joachim José Moreira de (1758). *História Universal dos Terramotos*. Lisbon, Antonio Vicente da Silva.
- Molesky, Mark. The Great Fire of Lisbon, 1755. In Greg Bankoff, Uwe Lübken, and Jordan Sand, (eds.) (2012). *Flammable Cities: Urban Conflagration and the Making of the Modern World*. Madison: University Of Wisconsin Press.
- The Monthly Magazine, or British Register*.
- Namier L. and J. Brooke (1964). *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1754-1790*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Neiman, S. (2002). *Evil in Modern Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Nozes, J. (1990). introduction, translation, and notes, *O Terramoto de 1755 Testemunhas Britânicas The Lisbon Earthquake of 1755 British Accounts*. Lisbon: Lisóptima Edições.
- Paice, Edward (2008). *The Wrath of God: The Great Lisbon Earthquake of 1755*. London: Quercus.
- Pedegache, Miguel Tibério (1756). *Nova e Fiel Relação que Experimentou Lisboa, e Todo Portugal no 1 de Novembro de 1755*. Lisbon: Officina de Manoel Soares.
- Pereira, A.S. (2009). Opportunity of a Disaster: The Economic Impact of the 1755 Lisbon Earthquake. In *The Journal of Economic History*, 69: 469-499.
- Pinto, Virgílio Noya (1979). *O ouro brasileiro e o comércio anglo-português*. São Paulo: Editora Nacional/MEC.
- Poirier, J.P. (2005). *Le tremblement de terre de Lisbonne*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Portal, Manoel. *Historia da ruina da cidade cauçada pello espantozo terremoto e incendio que reduzio a pó e cinza a melhor e maior parte desta infeliz cidade* (manuscript), Biblioteca da Arte, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon,
- Quenet, G. (2005). *Les tremblements de terre aux XVII et XVIII siècles: La naissance d'un risqué*. Seyssel, France: Champ Vallon.
- Rollo, Maria Fernanda, Ana Isabel Buescu, and Pedro Cardim, coordinators (2007). *História e Ciência da Catástrofe: 250 Aniversário do terramoto de 1755*. Lisbon: Colibri.

- Serrão, José Vicente (1992-93). O Quadro Económico. In José Mattoso (ed.). *História de Portugal*. Lisbon: Editorial Estampa.
- Shaw, L.M.E. (1989). *Trade, Inquisition and the English Nation in Portugal, 1650-1690*. Manchester: Carcanet.
- Sideri, S. (1970). *Trade and Power: Informal Colonialism in Anglo-Portuguese Relations*. Rotterdam: Rotterdam University Press.
- Sousa, F.L.P. de (1919). *O Terremoto de 1 de Novembro de 1755 em Portugal e um Estudo Demográfico*, vol. 4 (of 4), Lisbon: Tipografia do Comércio.
- Sutherland, L. Stuart (April 1932). The Accounts of an Eighteenth-Century Merchant: The Portuguese Ventures of William Braund. *The Economic History Review*, 3 (No. 3): 367-387.
- Tracy, J.D. (1991). *The Political Economy of Merchant Empires: State Power and World Trade, 1350-1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tumbleson, R. (1998). *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Voltaire (1999) [1759]. *Candide*, trans. Dan Gordon, Boston: St. Martin's Press.
- Walford, A.R. (1940). *The British Factory in Lisbon & Its Closing Stages Ensuing upon the Treaty of 1810*. Lisbon: Instituto Britânico em Portugal.
- Wesley, John. (1756) *Serious Thoughts Occasioned by the Earthquake at Lisbon*. London. *The Whitehall Evening Post*.

**Costa, Leonor Freire, Pedro Lains, and Susana Munch
Miranda. *História Económica de Portugal (1143-2010)*. Lisboa:
Esfera dos Livros, 2011. ISBN 978-989-626-346 -1.**

Nuno Palma¹

História Económica de Portugal (2011) is a mostly balanced book about Portugal's long-run political and economic development. In addition to the emphasis placed on economic history, there are several aspects that set it apart from more standard histories of Portugal. The book's most innovative feature is its constant emphasis on a comparative perspective. It shares this ambition with the most recently published general history of Portugal (Ramos, Sousa and Monteiro, 2009), but actually achieves it in a more consistent manner. In fact, these books complement each other very well, the first focusing on long-run social, political and institutional development and the second on their economic and financial counterparts. For non-experts interested in Portuguese history, reading both provides a balanced and competent overview of over 800 years of Portuguese history. It goes without saying that such an overview is necessarily incomplete and naturally colored by the authors' own biases and particular expertise, but nevertheless the combination of these two works constitutes the best choice for "everything one needs to know in no more than two volumes."

História Económica de Portugal is filled with updated references both to the international literature on economic history and to the literature on Portuguese topics. A major advantage is the way in which the authors consistently make relevant citations from the most recent research in this area. An English version is being prepared for Cambridge University Press, a move that is to be congratulated, as international scholars who need an English language reference work on the economic aspects of Portuguese history have no other choice than to resort to that of Marques (1972), which, despite its merits, clearly displays the marks of age. The book is a clear improvement over Marques, both due to its references to more recent scholarship and because of its own more idiosyncratic merits, including that of placing the Portuguese case in comparative perspective and interpreting its evolution within the context of the most recent views on the development of the European economy since the early modern period.

¹ Nova School of Business and Economics. Email: see <https://sites.google.com/site/npgpalma/contact>

Overall, this is a high-quality work, but naturally this does not mean that there are no weak points. There is a distinct feeling that some sections are better written and more concise than others. My feeling is that the discussion of the early modern period is the strongest. A key feature of the text is its emphasis on the anchoring provided by Reis's (2010) data on wages, rents and productivity for early modern Portugal, which truly has the potential to revolutionize our understanding of Portuguese history since 1500. However, despite providing much useful information, the chapters on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries feel rather unbalanced at times. After a good discussion of the *Belle Époque*, the Great War and the interwar period, the text suddenly jumps to the post-WW2 era; the 1939-1945 period itself gets no coverage at all (380-81). This is hard to justify, and it is difficult to escape the feeling that the authors simply never got round to writing it.

The book presents an idiosyncratic viewpoint on several topics, which is natural enough, given the authors' research interests and points of view. The authors are not afraid to take a stance on several issues, and while this inevitably creates room for disagreement, their interpretive efforts are to be congratulated. At the same time, more standard viewpoints sometimes deserved more credit and discussion. For example, it is a commonplace for many Portuguese (not to mention Brazilians) that the gold windfall of the eighteenth century was a lost opportunity for development—or worse. While the authors duly cite Borges de Macedo, there is little discussion of the Dutch disease or the institutional resource curse. In my own personal view, the authors have an overly benign view of the Brazilian gold episode, but I must insist that my criticism here is limited to the fact that I wish they had provided a little more discussion of the alternative view; overall, the discussion is filled with useful data and presents a legitimate viewpoint.

In chapters 5 and 6, dedicated to the modern and contemporary periods, the analysis of the consequences of openness in terms of both growth and welfare reveals a great deal of thought. Nevertheless, simplifying matters to a certain extent, it is hard to escape the feeling that the authors argue that for the nineteenth and much of the twentieth century, openness was a “bad” thing and protectionism a “good” thing, while from roughly 2000 onwards it has been the other way around. Perhaps what is being argued is that the correct trade policy is conditional on a country's level of development, but if so this could be expressed in a more explicit way. Furthermore, at times, too much attention is paid to this topic: the discussion on nineteenth-century protectionism is given 22 pages (318-340), despite the fact that the authors are well aware that the reasons for Portugal's persistent backwardness are less bound up with the external sector than is commonly perceived. The

causes for the absence of those elements that could serve as the economy's growth engine—including advances in internal productivity, institutional efficiency, and incentives for human capital accumulation—receive less attention (although they do show up at times, 320). To a large extent, this certainly results from a lack of existing research and empirical evidence on these topics, which necessarily constrains the authors' choices.

In another example of an idiosyncratic viewpoint, the authors argue that the Methuen Treaty proved useful during the time of the French invasions (253). But such a claim is questionable: even with a similar secular evolution to that of the Portuguese economy during the eighteenth century in the counterfactual absence of Methuen or a similar treaty, it seems likely that, when faced with the continental blockade, the English would have provided military assistance anyway. Just as countries find it easy to justify defection when it serves their interests, the converse is true. Finally, while I agree with the point of view that the effect of politics on the economy is too often taken for granted (430), it is also difficult to believe that the country's institutions ended up benefiting from every single crisis, as is claimed two pages later; for instance, much of Portugal's labor legislation over the last 30 years, not to mention the constitution, has retained strong elements that still remain from 1975 and may have had a persistently negative effect on the economy ever since.

The analysis generally shows a good understanding of economics. Nevertheless, at times, some rather striking statements are made: for example, that the central bank is able to keep real interest rates low for investment purposes over a long period of time (421). More systematically, there are problems with the way the authors quote nominal prices without reference to an aggregate price index. This is done frequently throughout the text (112, 192, 262-63, 276, 285-86, 341) though at times a relative measure is given, or quantities are explicitly discussed in real terms (180, 243). It is also not true, for instance, as claimed on page 296, that the loss of exclusive control of the Brazilian market meant that only the export-oriented industrial sectors suffered; such a static, partial equilibrium calculation overlooks both the dynamic and the general equilibrium effects resulting from that loss. Furthermore, the existence of such a market easily generates spillover externalities on the internal front, which are not discussed. Finally, there is the question of expectations over future revenues. Certainly, with the benefit of hindsight, it should be clear to anyone today that the loss of Brazil as a privileged market was inevitable over a sufficiently long period of time, so its role as an engine for Portugal's development was in any case necessarily limited.

The book includes a helpful timetable of important events at the end, but because these events are listed yearly, there is a bias towards revolutions and political events, which it is possible to point out in a precise way. I am sure the authors would agree these are not necessarily more important than other events, which by their very nature tend to happen in a more diffuse way. As far as editing is concerned, some of the tables seem to have occasional typos (113, 192), and this has not been remedied by the current (second) edition. The book also lacks an index, and, while this is a fairly common feature in Portuguese publications, it would nonetheless be useful to include one.

Perhaps in this review I have focused too much on the negative aspects—it is easier to criticize than to praise—but despite its minor shortcomings, this work is of a very high quality overall. It presents a valuable contribution which includes well-informed analysis and original conclusions. This book should be of great interest to economists, historians, and even to those members of the general public who have a casual interest in the economic history of Portugal.

Bibliographical References

- Costa, Leonor, Pedro Lains and Susana Miranda. *História Económica de Portugal*. Lisbon: Esfera dos Livros, 2011.
- Marques, A. H. de Oliveira. *History of Portugal: From Lusitania to Empire*. Columbia University Press, 1972.
- Ramos, Rui, Bernardo Vasconcelos, and Nuno Monteiro. *História de Portugal*. Lisbon: Esfera dos Livros, 2009.
- Reis, Jaime, ed. *Prices, Wages and Rents in Portugal 1500-1900*. Research Project, Lisbon: ICS, 2010.

**Monteiro, Rodrigo Bentes, Bruno Feitler, Daniela Calainho,
and Jorge Flores (eds.). *Raízes do Privilégio: Mobilidade
social no mundo ibérico do Antigo Regime*. Rio de Janeiro:
Civilização Brasileira, 2011. ISBN 9788520010228.**

Roberta Stumpf¹

Following the international colloquium held at the Fluminense Federal University, in Rio de Janeiro, in June 2009, *Raízes do Privilégio: Mobilidade social no mundo ibérico do Antigo Regime* was published in 2011 by Civilização Brasileira. It is the third book produced by *Companhia das Índias*, an academic group created in 1998 and designed to bring together researchers from this university's postgraduate program and their peers from other institutions of higher education in Brazil and abroad. As was the case with the previous two books, *Raízes* benefited from the collaboration of about twenty historians who had gathered together to discuss a common theme. Most of the researchers came from institutions in Rio de Janeiro, but there were also several participants from other Brazilian states, as well as foreign scholars who are conducting similar research into Iberian societies of the modern age in such countries as Argentina, Mexico, USA, Spain, Italy and Portugal.

So, we are not talking about a work produced by a closed group. On the contrary, this attempt to broaden the academic debate, including its internationalization beyond the group's original proposal, deserves to be applauded, even if most of the contributions are made by Brazilian researchers, and the Portuguese world is the main object of study over the book's 667 pages.

Perhaps this emphasis explains the allusion suggested by the title, namely the book *Raízes do Brasil* by Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, even though this allusion is not an obvious one. In their introduction to the book, the editors rightly acknowledge that the differences between the two works are easier to recognize than their similarities, starting with the fact that there is no correspondence between these objects of study in relation to either time or space. Not even the methodologies that are used are similar, and, however much the editors may claim that the approach followed in most of the texts was one of comparative history (just as in Holanda's book), in *Raízes do Privilégio* the approaches focus on very specific topics, and only occasionally do some authors attempt to think about spaces other

¹ CHAM/UNL (Centro de História de Além-Mar/New University of Lisbon), FCT scholarship. *E-mail*: robertastumpf@gmail.com.

than those normally covered by their own research. Furthermore, the interpretive vigor of the famous historian from São Paulo (who, in 1936 believed that a thorough knowledge of Brazil's origins would finally eradicate the roots that linked the country to its archaic past) is not present. Times have changed, and so have our epistemological notions, which are far less likely to inspire a passionate thesis for discussion, and which are much less essayistic in nature.

Despite so many differences, there is nonetheless a purpose behind this evocation of Holanda's work. Besides providing a well-deserved tribute to his contribution to historiography (particularly that of a social nature), this book also underlines the extent to which "current historical research" is more "aware" of the "problematics of the social hierarchies in the Iberian world of the Ancien Regime," which is its main theme. Consequently, by being less bound up with the vocabulary of the present, more focused on its subject-matter, and more conscious of the importance of documentary sources, the historical research that has lately tended to predominate gives priority to empirical rigor, although this in no way compromises the almost consensual use in *Raízes do Privilégio* of a style of writing that is remarkable for the lightness of its tone. This approach is not just simply about being skilled in the use of words—something that largely depends on each author—but rather it is about the kind of narrative that social history can provide when case studies are adopted as a methodology. This reduced scale of observation, which is found in many chapters, does not result in a groundbreaking analytical approach to Brazilian historiography, as is well known, but its explanatory potential is enhanced by its continued reference, through a process of territorial concentration, to both the general and abstract models of a social order based on privilege, a phenomenon that was already well studied by Antonio Manuel Hespanha, among many others. This way of interpreting history, which emphasizes the specific location, is firmly advocated by Guilherme Pereira das Neves who alone attempts to combine theoretical considerations with an empirical analysis of the sources, specifically those that reveal the path followed by the Cavalcante de Albuquerque family, one of the leading households in Pernambuco in the eighteenth century.

But to what extent can the singularity of each case be said to illustrate the social dynamics of the Ancien Regime (476-477)? How is it possible to form an overview of this phenomenon by gathering together a series of separate texts about the paths/careers of leading figures, who came from such different backgrounds and lived in such variable contexts? Conscious of the fact that they are offering the public a varied and plural work,

the editors immediately warn readers in the introduction that the authors' intention was to "produce a large-scale inventory (always an open-ended and incomplete one) of the social hierarchies of the Iberian world of the Ancien Regime" (23). The book does, however, lack a text that reviews what has already been written about these matters, mainly in Portuguese and Spanish historiographies.

Still, there is one particular premise that serves as a link between chapters, namely that in societies such as these, which are presumed to have been exceptionally hierarchical, upward social movement was coveted by all and achieved by many. Even in the first three chapters by Richard Kagan, Ana Paula Megiani, and Rodrigo Bentes Monteiro (co-authored by Pedro Cardim), which differ from the rest by focusing on the analysis and description of contemporary sources, rather than on the leading figures of that time, the essential question was to show the important role played by the literature (in its broadest sense) in recording past glories, whether true or false, without which it was not possible to gain social authority or maintain that which had already been acquired.

Although the editors only acknowledge this idea as representing a summary of the second part, it is possible to say that almost the whole of the book suggests that social mobility was a tangible reality, despite the "apparently static logic that ruled the social ethos of the [Iberian] Ancien Regime" (14). And this desire to move upwards in social terms remained latent, even for those already belonging to a prestigious institution. The agents of the Inquisition, for example, continued to covet more honorable roles and, as shown by Bruno Feitler, the success of this career advancement depended on different standards from those required for admission to the ranks of the Inquisition. It might seem exaggerated to associate the bureaucratic model at the state level with this process of internal ascension, but the author helps to clarify the methodology used when proposing that the criteria governing the formation of hierarchies in the Ancien Regime differed according to the institutional context, as is also suggested by Célia Tavares in her study of the native clergy in Goa. In turn, when examining the malleability of the Inquisitorial Court with regard to the requirements for admission into their ranks, Georgina dos Santos manages to explain very clearly why the criteria used for social ranking ultimately continued to be effective. The men were different, but their behavior remained unchanged.

The theme of upward mobility in an apparently rigid social world is also the underlying theme of all the chapters in the book. In Part III, men who possessed theoretically unfavorable "features" (such as mulattos, Jews, New Christians or mechanical officers) not only sought a better position, but they also obtained one, as demonstrated by

Júnia Furtado, Ronald Raminelli, Ronald Vainfas, Guilherme Neves and Daniela Calainho, respectively. All this, of course, with the compliance of those responsible for maintaining the excellence of standards, and of the current political culture at that time, such as the king himself, the main protagonist in the story of this already-mentioned social mobility, mainly because he was at the head of a service economy.

The idea of serving the crown and receiving the due income as a feature of social mobility is in fact central to this book. The strategies adopted for advancement were similar in many cases: marriage, academic background, experience or even wealth, because these were features that reinforced the importance of both individuals and households. But all of this was powered by services performed on behalf of the monarchy, whose remuneration allowed for the distribution of privileges and prerogatives to vassals, whether in return for their good performance in the offices of the Republic, or (as was mainly the case) in wars, as shown, for example, by José Javier Ruiz Ibáñez and Darío G. Barrera. There were also others who were rewarded for their financial support, an important topic investigated by Gaetano Sabatini, which may lead us to rethink the role played by wealth as a social springboard.

The analyses that have been made of the situation of Portuguese bankers in the kingdom of Naples in the first half of the seventeenth century, or of exiles and traitors in the territories of the Hispanic monarchy at the end of this same century, have undoubtedly helped to temper the idea of political loyalty that deserved to be rewarded and would consequently raise the benefactors to higher social levels. In the light of this, the sexual favors offered to noblemen, or even to the constantly lampooned Portuguese king Dom João VI, as studied by Luiz Mott (even if at first this may seem like an exaggeration) summarize with some irony one of the mechanisms by which this society of gift and counter gift operated.

However, it can be seen that until now authors have been working primarily with the hierarchies established in the civil order by the monarchy, i.e., with those that translated into legally recognized privileges. "Public" fame and "hearsay" are not highlighted here. The social authority that was conquered locally, and which did not depend directly on royal consent, is not considered important within the group studied here. It emerges only indirectly as a requirement for obtaining distinctions from the Crown.

In the first three parts of the book, the overseas territories are seen as places where the social order resulted from a more or less peaceful adaptation of the order existing in the cities, as if the social hierarchies in the conquered lands reflected only a slight adjustment of

the criteria dictated by the authorities of the Iberian kingdoms. Some chapters, however, focus on environments where “conformity” was ignored and gave way to tensions, a situation that was provoked by those who had already conquered social power and were beginning to see their privileges dwindle in favor of other factions. Except for the three chapters in this section that discuss Spanish America and also cover this same topic, the remainder are gathered together in Part IV, the last section of the book, where only the chapter by Marcia Motta differs from a geographic perspective and in terms of its subject-matter. The text challenges a preconception and questions the nineteenth-century idea that a *morgadio* (an entailed estate) was of little relevance in Brazil. But the answers provided are not sufficiently clear for us to understand which way to respond to this question.

Moreover, the remaining chapters reflect on possible mismatches in territories under Portuguese sovereignty, where there was a higher density of native populations. Here, according to the authors, we can see that the conflicts that arose amounted to more than just a simple resistance to the “colonial incorporation” of the territories (as Hal Langfur claims). What we are shown is the conflict that was generated by the adaptation of the native population to Portuguese culture, especially in terms of an economy that was based on a reward for services rendered. In their eagerness to pursue a rising local career, Hindu interpreters in Goa (Jorge Flores), local clerics in the State of India (Célia Tavares), and Indians in the Amazon region (Barbara Sommer), were rewarded by the monarchy because they were deemed useful. However, the pursuit of this same path proved difficult for other internal groups vying for royal privileges. Being clearly identified by their native culture, they were not able to rise very high, ending up in “social limbo,” the term that Flores uses to define the condition of those who, whether or not they had undergone a process of acculturation, were also encumbered by the weight of the past or even of a locally-rooted present (as in the case of the *casados* in Goa, analyzed by Andréa Doré).

But these are not the protagonists that are mentioned by the editors when they claim that, within these Iberian societies and particularly in the colonial territories, “it was possible to move upwards, gaining better positions and unimaginable privileges” (18). It seems certain that, in Spanish America, at least until the second half of the eighteenth century, local autonomies and the rise of the *criollas* elites were favored by royal guidelines, as can be inferred from the text written by Oscar Mazín. Yet, as far as the Portuguese monarchy was concerned, there was no absolute form of social mobility that enabled people to gain such high distinctions. And this was not due to any systematic opposition towards American natives. The question of identity seen under these terms rarely appears

in the documentation, even in the eighteenth century. What must be stressed is that, despite the existence of social mobility (including downward movements), the higher echelons still remained only a remote possibility for most people. Of all the cases studied by the authors, only two analyze the trajectory of people who either truly occupied or came close to occupying higher offices, or were rewarded with prestigious honors, whether at the political center or in America (Maria Fernanda Bicalho and Guilherme Neves).

Raízes do Privilégio is a book that helps us to understand the approaches that Iberian-American historiography has adopted towards the study of the Iberian societies of the Ancien Regime. Many topics are recurrently discussed by the different authors, but it is still difficult to find a clear unity in this book, despite the efforts of the editors. Nevertheless, there is a common thread that runs through its pages and constantly brings our attention back to the title. It is no longer a question of establishing an analogy with the work of Sérgio Buarque, nor is it a book about a sometimes overly intensified form of social mobility. Instead, it is about adopting the analytical paradigm of the Ancien Regime and transposing it to the tropics in order to understand the nature of societies at that time. It is this once controversial idea, backed by a number of thought-provoking partial contributions that are very well documented and narrated, that makes this book an important work of historiography dedicated to the social universe of the Ancien Regime.