

Vol. 9 · n.º 2 · Winter 2011

e-journal
of PORTUGUESE
HISTORY

Table of Contents

Volume 9, number 2, Winter 2011

[ARTICLES]

- The Flight of the Eagle:**1
An Island Tribute to the Universal Iberian Monarchy at the End of the Sixteenth Century
José Damião Rodrigues
- An Aristocratic Economy in Portugal in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century:** 35
The House of the Marquises of Castelo Rodrigo
João Paulo Salvado
- Dutch Nautical Sciences in the Golden Age:** 68
The Portuguese Influence
Richard W. Unger

[BOOK REVIEWS]

- Chambouleyron, Rafael. *Povoamento, Ocupação e Agricultura na Amazônia Colonial (1640-1706)*.** 84
Belém: Editora Açaí, 2010
ISBN: 978-85-61586-16-4
Daniella Nicole Mak
- Tengwall, David Lewis. *The Portuguese Revolution (1640-1668)*.**..... 89
A European War of Freedom and Independence.
Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2010
ISBN: 978-0-7734-3614-5
Rafael Valladares
- Hatton, Barry. *The Portuguese. A Modern History*.**..... 96
Northampton: Interlink Books, 2011
ISBN: 978-1-56656-844-9
José Miguel Sardica

[IN MEMORIAM]

- Vitorino Magalhães Godinho and the Annales School:**105
History as a Way of Thinking
José Luís Cardoso

The Flight of the Eagle: an Island Tribute to the Universal Iberian Monarchy at the End of the Sixteenth Century

José Damião Rodrigues¹

Abstract

During the sixteenth century, one of the axial moments in the reflection and production of *utopias* in what concerns the universal monarchy and the topic of the *traslatio imperii* was the Iberian Union. Nevertheless, the process of empire formation, in general terms, remains under-theorized. This paper presents a text by a chronicler, the Azorean priest Gaspar Frutuoso, who, by the end of the sixteenth century, after the integration of Portugal in the Catholic Monarchy and the conquest of Terceira in 1583, compared the Portuguese and the Spanish expansion and glorified the universal monarchy patronized by Philip II who joined together both empires.

Keywords

Empire; universal monarchy; Charles V; Philip II; Azores

Resumo

No século XVI, um dos momentos axiais na reflexão e produção de utopias em torno da monarquia universal e do tópico da *translatio imperii* foi a União Ibérica, processo que, de um modo geral, não tem sido suficientemente considerado no quadro de uma teorização sobre os impérios. Assim, pensamos ser pertinente apresentar um texto do cronista e sacerdote açoriano Gaspar Frutuoso que, no final do século XVI, após a integração de Portugal na Monarquia Hispânica e após a conquista da ilha Terceira, em 1583, comparou as expansões ibéricas e elogiou a monarquia universal de Filipe II, que uniu os dois impérios.

Palavras-chave

Império; monarquia universal; Carlos V; Filipe II; Açores

¹ University of the Azores/ Centre for Overseas History (CHAM). *E-mail*: damiao@uac.pt

1.

In the sixteenth century, Iberian expansion and, in particular, the power of the Habsburgs contributed to the centrality of the imperial paradigm in terms of political ideas, and to the debates on universal monarchy and the classical topic of *translatio imperii*, a theme that would continue to be present in many texts written in the following centuries.² In that same century, one of the axial moments in the reflection about and production of utopias associated with the universal monarchy was the creation of the Iberian Union (1580–1640) when Portugal was integrated into the Spanish monarchy. Generally speaking, this process has not been sufficiently studied within the framework of the theory of empires, although Serge Gruzinski has more than once drawn attention to the “mixed worlds” of the Catholic Monarchy,³ and Sanjay Subrahmanyam has produced proposals for a comparative study of the *connected histories* and interdependence of the Iberian empires, considering even that the two political formations constituted “articulated entities.”⁴

Now, as we witness a renewal of the history of the empires, which includes comparative analyses and texts that seek to question the very object of the “empire,”⁵ it is nevertheless surprising that there has been no major study so far examining the long-term object of the “parallel Iberian empires,” both of which were born of the dynamics of the

² On the universal monarchy, it is essential to consult Franz Bosbach, *Monarchia Universalis. Storia di un concetto cardine della politica europea (secoli XVI–XVIII)*, Milan, Vita and Pensiero, 1998 [original edition: 1988].

³ Cf. Serge Gruzinski, *Les quatre parties du monde. Histoire d'une mondialisation*, s. l. [Paris], Éditions de La Martinière, 2004.

⁴ Cf. Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “Holding the World in Balance: The Connected Histories of the Iberian Overseas Empires, 1500–1640,” *American Historical Review*, vol. 112, nr. 5, December 2007, 1359–1385, *maxime* 1363. In addition to this text, see also Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “Sobre comparaciones y conexiones: notas sobre el estudio de los imperios ibéricos de Ultramar, 1490–1640,” in Roger Chartier and Antonio Feros (dir.), *Europa, América y el mundo: tiempos históricos*, Madrid-Barcelona, Fundación Rafael del Pino-Fundación Carolina-Colegio Libre de Eméritos-Marcial Pons, 2006, 239–262.

⁵ Cf. David Armitage (ed.), *Theories of Empire, 1450–1800*, “An Expanding World, Volume 20,” Aldershot-Burlington, Vt., Ashgate, Variorum, 1998; Michael W. Doyle, “Impérios revisitados,” *Penélope. Fazer e desfazer a história*, Lisbon, nr. 21, 1999, 159–175; Anthony Pagden, *Peoples and Empires: Europeans and the Rest of the World, from Antiquity to the Present*, London, Phoenix Press, 2002 [original edition: 2001]; Jonathan Hart, *Comparing Empires: European colonialism from Portuguese expansion to the Spanish-American War*, New York-Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2003 and, by the same author, *Contesting Empires: Opposition, Promotion, and Slavery*, New York-Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2005; Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “Imperial and Colonial Encounters: Some Reflections,” *Nuevo Mundo Mundos Nuevos*, Debates, 2005, posted online on 8 February 2005 [URL: <http://nuevomundo.revues.org/index433.html>], consulted on 27 January 2009; Philip Pomper, “The history and theory of empires,” *History and Theory, Theme Issue*, 44, December 2005, 1–27; John E. Elliott, *Imperios del Mundo Atlántico. España y Gran Bretaña en América (1492–1830)*, Madrid, Taurus, 2006 [original edition: 2006]; Susan Reynolds, “Empires: a Problem of Comparative History,” *Historical Research*, vol. 79, nr. 204, May 2006, 151–165; Peter Turchin, Jonathan M. Adams and Thomas D. Hall, “East-West Orientation of Historical Empires and Modern States,” *Journal of World-Systems Research*, vol. XII, nr. 11, December 2006, 219–229; C. K. Woodworth, “Review Article. Ocean and Steppe: Early Modern World Empires,” *Journal of Early Modern History*, vol. 11, nr. 6, 2007, 501–518; John Darwin, *After Tamerlane: The Global History of Empire Since 1405*, New York, Bloomsbury Press, 2008 [original edition: 2007]; Peter Turchin, “A theory for Formation of Large Empires,” *Journal of Global History*, vol. 4, issue 2, July 2009, 191–217; and Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2010, to mention just a few examples.

fourteenth- and fifteenth-century expansion, which peaked for the first time in the sixteenth century. The fact is that it was the Iberian empires with their shared cultural matrix that first combined the use of specific concepts inherited from Rome—*dominium* and *imperium*—with new practices and indicated the road to follow, giving rise to reactions from other European powers that disputed their coveted military and diplomatic supremacy.⁶

I consider it pertinent, then, to present a text that is little known outside its special area of production, the Azores, which compares both the competition and the articulation between the Portuguese and Castilian expansions. Following a brief synthesis of the ideological matrix of early modern empires and the consequences of the voyages of Christopher Columbus and Ferdinand Magellan, which are essential for contextualizing the analysis, I will focus my attention on the work of an Azorean chronicler, the São Miguel priest Gaspar Frutuoso. In the late sixteenth century, when Portugal had already been integrated into the Hispanic monarchy and the Marquis de Santa Cruz had conquered the island of Terceira in 1583, Frutuoso wrote a tribute to the universal monarchy of Philip II, which had finally united the Portuguese and Spanish empires under one master.

⁶ Cf. Elizabeth Mancke, “Negotiating an Empire: Britain and Its Overseas Peripheries, c. 1550–1780,” in Christine Daniels and Michael Kennedy (eds.), *Negotiated Empires: Centers and Peripheries in the Americas, 1500–1820*, New York–London, Routledge, 2002, 235–265, *maxime* 236.

2.

When we speak of an empire, we cannot forget that its existence implies an emperor, a single monarch, the guarantor of universal harmony. In the Middle Ages and in the Early Modern Age, the political and cultural matrix of the Roman Empire fused with Virgil's messianic tradition—the *Aeneid*—and with Christianity.⁷ The sacred nature of the Roman Empire was established when God, through Jesus, chose its reign to manifest the Incarnation, and the imperial heirs of Rome reinforced that sacred mark.

While the political and cultural matrix of the Roman Empire was undoubtedly the basis of the imperial ideologies that we find in medieval and early modern times, the empire of Charlemagne (742–814) was key to the transmission of that model, although his coronation in 800 was associated with other concepts of empire (Frankish, Papal and Byzantine).⁸ The official language of the documents and Charlemagne's later actions do not make clear what the emperor understood to be the meaning either of his coronation in 800 or of the empire. Several authors, however, have suggested that, although Charlemagne is acknowledged as the "Emperor of the Romans," he did not see himself as a Roman emperor and his conception was mainly religious and Christian.

Setting aside the pure idea of rule, power or lordship, i.e., the so-called *ius imperii*, the idea of the "empire" in the Middle Ages referred to a political formation including various subunits, such as autonomous cities and small kingdoms connected to a *rex regnum* (in the mid-tenth century, for example, the English king Aethelstan gave himself the title of "*imperator regnum et nationum*"), and was also included in the line of the *renovatio* of the Western Roman Empire. In the first meaning, we refer to the *imperium*, which is the original concept, dating from republican Rome, that designated the power of the *paterfamilias* and the power of command over the army during the military campaigns, which the *populus* delegated in the proconsuls. Later, this power was also attributed to other magistrates, such as consuls, praetors and dictators, and, in addition to the power to command armies, it included the power to convene the Senates and the assemblies that undertook the administration of both the people and the justice system. This led to an *imperium* that was not a simple *potestas*, but also a mystical force embodying a Roman idea of dominating virility, and which was marked by the virtues of honor and fidelity. In the second meaning, we refer to an emperor who was considered "*dominus et monarcha totius mundi*," leading to the conclusion that "*sub Imperatore sunt omnes reges et principes mundi*," as explained

⁷ Cf. Marie Tanner, *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: The Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1993.

⁸ Cf. James Muldoon, *Empire and Order: The Concept of Empire, 800–1800*, Basingstoke, MacMillan Press, 1999.

by the jurist Bartolo da Sassoferrato (1314–1357).

Also important within the framework of our essay is the reference to Dante Alighieri (1265–1321), the noble Florentine poet who supported the Guelphs and who, during the difficult times of the Avignon papacy and following a pessimistic and negative personal vision of his time,⁹ wrote the treatise *De Monarchia* in the 1420s, in which he theorized a universal monarchy or empire as a Christian temporal monarchy, the political instrument that would best ensure the union and happiness of the human species.¹⁰

It is important to underline here and now that Dante resorted to the concept of “monarchy” and not “empire.” In his formulation, which was influenced by his “master” Virgil, with quotations from the *Aeneid* and references to the history of Rome,¹¹ the universal monarchy was seen as a necessity for the “good state of the world,”¹² a principality above all others in the world, for, in the likeness of God, the prince of the universe, men should have one single politically independent monarch, the defender of the Christian faith and the guarantor of concord and universal peace. Within the framework of Dante’s Christian universalism, his idea of temporal monarchy—with the emperor at the apex of the Christian world—inverted the hierarchy devised by the Papacy and by medieval canonists (Dante considered that the power of the emperor preceded that of the Popes both through divine right and through natural right),¹³ and distinguished the Empire from the Church, to which he attributed a merely spiritual purpose with no type of temporal power: “Only the Monarch, among every mortal, can be the most sincere subject of justice.”¹⁴

In *The Divine Comedy*,¹⁵ Dante also considered the question of empire and of Rome in particular. In effect, in *Paradise*, Dante encounters the Emperor Justinian who tells him the story of the Roman Empire through the symbolism of the imperial eagle, a bird that

⁹ Cf. Charles T. Davis, “Dante’s Vision of History,” *Dante Studies, with the Annual Report of the Dante Society*, nr. 118, 2000, 243–259.

¹⁰ Cf. Dante [Alighieri], *Vida Nova—Monarquia*, translation from the Italian and Latin originals and of the preface by Carlos de Soveral, “Filosofia e Ensaios,” Lisbon, Guimarães Editores, 1954, 97–213; Frances A. Yates, *Astrea. L’idea di Impero nel Cinquecento*, “Piccola Biblioteca Einaudi, 121,” Turin, Einaudi, 2001 [original edition: 1975], 14–18; Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c. 1500–c. 1800*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1995, 16, 26, 29 and 31; and Ronaldo Rebello de Britto Poletti, *Elementos para um conceito jurídico de império*, doctoral thesis submitted to the Law Faculty of Brasília University, Brasília, 2007, *passim* and “Apêndice,” 8–9 and 18–27.

¹¹ Cf. Dante [Alighieri], *op. cit.*, 131–171; Cf. Charles T. Davis, “Dante’s Vision of History,” *loc. cit.*, 243–259, *maxime* 244–246.

¹² Cf. Dante [Alighieri], *op. cit.*, 110.

¹³ Cf. Dante [Alighieri], *op. cit.*, 180–213; Ronaldo Rebello de Britto Poletti, *op. cit.*, “Apêndice,” 22.

¹⁴ Cf. Dante [Alighieri], *op. cit.*, 116.

¹⁵ Cf. Dante Alighieri, *A Divina Comédia*, translated by Vasco Graça Moura, Lisbon, Quetzal, 2011.

also appears in other passages of the *Comedy*.¹⁶ As there is no single interpretation of the meaning of the eagle as a symbol, it is pointed out that, according to the exegetes of the Florentine poet's text, as a bird of Jupiter and a bird of God, the eagle represented the Roman Empire, temporal justice and divine grace, and announced the Eagle of Divine Justice,¹⁷ aspects that Dante wished to highlight in the context of his conception of the relations between the Empire and the Papacy. I will merely add that the symbolism of the imperial eagle, and in particular of the two-headed eagle, retained its vigor in the following centuries. It was also used in Portugal until the eighteenth century as an emblem of the empire of Christendom and in the context of providential readings of history.¹⁸

In addition to the authors who wrote about the empire or the universal monarchy during the Middle Ages, we should recall here the fact that the imperial idea first appeared with varying degrees of intensity in central Europe, Burgundy, France and the Iberian Peninsula. In the Frankish region, people remembered the anointment of Clovis and the coronation of Charlemagne. Yet Charlemagne's lineage was not restricted to the kingdom of France. The Dukes of Brabant also claimed that same origin, and furthermore said that they were descendants of Clovis and Aeneas. A chronicle dating from 1268 presents Duke John I as the heir to Charlemagne through primogeniture and consequently the legitimate heir to the French Empire. This genealogy reached its zenith in the following century with Charles IV (1316–1378), Duke of Brabant and the Holy Roman Emperor. In the fifteenth century, Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy and of Brabant, claimed the imperial title on the death of Charles IV's children, but with no success. In the meantime, the marriage of Mary of Burgundy, granddaughter of Philip the Good, to Maximilian I in 1477 placed Burgundy solidly in the middle of the dispute for the imperial crown and justified the ambitions of Charles of Ghent in the early sixteenth century.

Charlemagne, however, had also been *rex Francorum*, King of the Franks, and in *Chanson de Roland* he is referred to as the "Emperor of the Franks" and "Emperor of France. So, some chroniclers designated the kings of France as emperors, which was further enhanced by the title of *Rex Christianissimus*, derived from their being anointed with Holy Oils at the time of their coronation. Throughout the Middle Ages and the first Early Modern Age, ambition and the imperial idea were never far from the horizons of French

¹⁶ *Idem*, 636–645 and 756–775.

¹⁷ Cf. Warren Ginsberg, "Dante's Dream of the Eagle and Jacob's Ladder," *Dante Studies, with the Annual Report of the Dante Society*, nr. 100, 1982, 41–69, *maxime* 57 for the symbolism.

¹⁸ Concerning the presentation of the use of the two-headed eagle in Portugal, see Jaelson Bitran Trindade, "O Império dos Mil Anos e a arte do "tempo barroco": a águia bicéfala como emblema da Cristandade," *Anais do Museu Paulista*, São Paulo, Nova Série, vol. 18, nr. 2, Jul.–Dec. 2010, 11–91.

essayists and monarchs, and a messianic idea of medieval origin, refreshed by Renaissance erudition, upheld some French kings' claims to the imperial crown.¹⁹

At the turn of the fifteenth to the sixteenth century, the Papacy was willing to support the French candidacy to the Empire, and Alexander VI summoned Louis XII to Italy to receive the imperial crown. This was deemed an affront by Maximilian I, who replied in the most extraordinary form: he laid claim to the title of Emperor of Byzantium and considered seizing the papal tiara. In a letter which Maximilian wrote to the Bishop of Trent, dated 10 June 1507, he said he was willing to go to Rome and simultaneously take the titles of Emperor and Pope.²⁰ This episode clearly reveals French ambitions regarding the empire and anticipated the last chapter of the Gallic claims in that regard, which were played out by the failed candidacy of Francis I in 1519, although in France monarchic propaganda had continued to feed the discourse of an imperial *renovatio*, whose themes would continue to be displayed on various festive occasions, such as royal entrances or processions, until well into the seventeenth century.²¹

In the Iberian Peninsula, an imperial ideology with a dual Christian and Jewish basis was adopted by the monarchs of Castile and Leon, from Alfonso V and Alfonso VI, crowned Emperor (*Hispaniae Imperator*) in 1135, to Alfonso X and Alfonso XI, one of the victors of the Battle of Salado in 1340. But it was at the end of the fifteenth century in Castile and in Aragon under the Catholic Monarchs, and in Portugal under Dom Manuel I, that the imperial dream glittered most brightly. As Alain Milhou recalled, the monarchy of the Catholic Monarchs projected a whole number of messianic prophecies onto Isabel and Ferdinand that presented the sovereigns as the restorers of Christianity.²² Ferdinand the Catholic was seen as a king predestined to unify the world under his command; the tribute produced after the victorious campaigns led by the Catholic Kings against the Muslims or in the context of their fight against the kings of France is proof of "official messianism," as well as of an imperial discourse and symbolism.²³ It should also be stressed that from the time of Ferdinand the Catholic to Philip III the messianic dream of regaining Jerusalem

¹⁹ Cf. Frances A. Yates, *op. cit.*, 147–152; Alexandre Y. Haran, *Le Lys et le globe. Messianisme dynastique et rêve impérial en France aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles*, Seyssel, Champ Vallon, 2000.

²⁰ Cf. Marie Tanner, *op. cit.*, 100.

²¹ Cf. Gaston Zeller, "Les rois de France candidats à l'Empire: Essai sur l'idéologie impériale en France," in *Aspects de la Politique Française sous l'Ancien Régime*, Paris, PUF, 1964, 12–89; Frances A. Yates, *op. cit.*, 153–241.

²² Cf. Alain Milhou, *Pouvoir royal et absolutisme dans l'Espagne du XVI^e siècle*, "Anejos de *Críticón*, 13," Toulouse, Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 1999, 88–89.

²³ *Idem*, 33–43; Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: [...]*, 41; Juan Gil, "A apropriação da ideia de império pelos reinos da Península Ibérica: Castela," *Penélope. Fazer e desfazer a história*, Lisbon, nr. 15, 1995, 11–30.

was always present.²⁴ As for Dom Manuel I, the sixth male child of the Infante Dom Fernando, Lord of the House of Viseu–Beja, who became Duke of Beja and then King of Portugal on the death of all those who preceded him in the line of succession, he was educated in a mystical environment—his tutor, Diogo da Silva Meneses, was close to the Observant Franciscans—and he himself believed he was predestined. Some of the king’s men even suggested that Dom Manuel should take the title of emperor. As the king in 1499, he took the title of “Lord of the Conquest” and nourished the ideal of a messianic crusade, which, based on Portugal’s military expansion into the Maghreb and in the East and recovering previous projects of Latin Christianity, aspired to conquer Morocco and liberate Jerusalem.²⁵

This crusading and messianic dream was not exclusive to the king of Portugal, for, at around the same time, Charles VIII, at the start of the Italian Wars, also espoused these aims, as noted by Fernand Braudel and Alexandre Y. Haran, bringing together representations and practices, ideals and policies, and lucidly stating that in France there was also an imperial dream.²⁶ The imperial ambition of France or of some sectors of the French social and political elites remained active in the coming centuries. At the turn of the fifteenth to the sixteenth century, however, both the idea and the discourse can be identified with the matrix of universal vocation,²⁷ developed in the Iberian kingdoms as a result of the dynamics of overseas expansions and conquest.

Trade, diplomacy and conquest all helped to found the Portuguese formal and informal empire²⁸ that was sung about in sixteenth-century Portuguese chronicles, histories, iconographies, and poetry.²⁹ Despite the tensions and the differences in tone that one notes in the works published in Portugal during the first half and the middle of the

²⁴ Cf. Alain Milhou, *op. cit.*, 33–43; Miguel Ángel de Bunes Ibarra, “El Imperio otomano y la intensificación de la catolicidad de la monarquía hispana,” *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia*, Pamplona, nr. 16, 2007, 157–167, *maxime* 166.

²⁵ Cf. Luís Filipe F. R. Thomaz, “L’idée impériale manuélina,” in AAVV, *La Découverte, le Portugal et l’Europe*, Actes du Colloque, Paris, 26–28 mai 1988, Paris, Fondation Calouste Gulbenkian, Centre Culturel Portugais, 1990, 35–103; João Paulo Oliveira e Costa, *D. Manuel I (1469–1521). Um príncipe do Renascimento*, “Reis de Portugal, XIV,” Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 2005, 175–179.

²⁶ Cf. Fernand Braudel, *O Mediterrâneo e o Mundo Mediterrânico na época de Filipe II*, “Anais, 2,” Lisbon, Publicações Dom Quixote, vol. II, 1984 [original edition: 1949; new amended edition: 1966; 4th edition, revised and amended: 1979], 19; Alexandre Y. Haran, *op. cit.* (cf. *supra*, note 18).

²⁷ Cf. Serge Gruzinski, *op. cit.*, 36–38.

²⁸ For an important reflection on the informal empire, see, for the Portuguese case, Malyn Newitt, “Formal and Informal Empire in the History of Portuguese Expansion,” *Portuguese Studies*, vol. 17, nr. 1, January 2001, 1–21; for the case of Latin America, see *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, vol. 27, nr. 1, March 2008: *Informal Empire in Latin America: Culture, Commerce and Capital*, edited by Matthew Brown.

²⁹ For the Orient, it is important to consult the study by António de Vasconcelos Saldanha, *Iustum Imperium. Dos Tratados como fundamento do Império dos Portugueses no Oriente. Estudo de História do Direito Internacional e do Direito Português*, Instituto Português do Oriente, Fundação Oriente, Lisbon, 1997.

sixteenth century, often reflecting opposing views of the processes that were being followed, it is possible from the Manueline reign onwards to identify the existence of a “literature of international propaganda,” in which the king of Portugal is presented as the lord of an *imperium* acquired through conquest and military might.³⁰ Given the success of the Portuguese, it is hardly surprising that the humanist doctor of Coimbra University António Ferreira (1528–1569) should have written a letter in the form of a poem dedicated to Pêro de Andrade Caminha, stating in triumphant tones that “The Portuguese *império* that by sea masters so many people, teaches, conquers and tames many barbarians.”³¹

In the case of the Indian Ocean, Luís Filipe Thomaz considered that, in the main, the Portuguese crown afforded continuation to an imperial project rooted in the late fifteenth century and centered above all on controlling the maritime trade networks rather than controlling spaces and populations. So, the relationship established with the so called “neighboring kings” was more one of *suzerainty* than *sovereignty*, although, as this historian also defended, the “appropriation of the sea” corresponded “to an eminent right to the control of communications, which is imperial rather than real, for it pointed to a sort of universal monarchy.”³²

Now, more recently, and I believe quite convincingly, Ângela Barreto Xavier suggested that in the mid–sixteenth century the *Estado da Índia* experienced an imperial re-foundation, amounting to a reconfiguration of the Portuguese Empire. While criticizing the application of the traditional concept of “crisis,” the author suggested that in addition to the imperial model that had prevailed thus far, based on thalassocratic power, a new model inspired on the imperial Roman model was established in the reign of Dom João III, mostly through the contacts and interchange of ideas and models between the courts of Dom João III and Charles V, who furthermore were bound by close family ties. Accordingly, the political and administrative reforms were carried out under an *idea of empire*.³³

It is hardly surprising therefore that, despite the criticism of the expansionist

³⁰ Cf. Diogo Ramada Curto, “A literatura e o império: entre o espírito cavaleiroso, as trocas da corte e o humanismo cívico,” in Francisco Bethencourt and Kirti Chaudhuri (dir.), *História da Expansão Portuguesa*, vol. 1: *A Formação do Império (1415–1570)*, Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 1998, 434–454, *maxime* 442–443.

³¹ Cf. António Ferreira, *Poemas Lusitanos*, critical edition, introduction and comments by T. F. Earle, Lisbon, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2000 [original edition: 1598], 279–287, “A Pero de Andrade Caminha,” *maxime* 285 (my italics).

³² Cf. Luís Filipe F. R. Thomaz, “O Projecto Imperial Joanino (*Tentativa de interpretação global da política ultramarina de D. João II*),” in *De Ceuta a Timor*, “Memória e Sociedade,” Lisbon, Difel, 1994, 149–167, *maxime* 166.

³³ Cf. Ângela Barreto Xavier, *A Invenção de Goa. Poder imperial e conversões culturais nos séculos XVI e XVII*, Lisbon, Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 2008, 40–50 (on the issue of the “crisis”) and 64–70 (on the issue of the imperial reconfiguration).

process, the discourses of imperial ambition should have continued throughout the second half of the sixteenth century, keeping pace with the dynamics of the Portuguese Empire, which, in addition to the Asian spaces, now turned more decisively towards South America. The Portuguese monarchy under Dom Sebastião adopted the formal attributes of an empire: the king introduced into Portugal the use of the word “Majesty” as a form of treatment and also the use of the closed crown, which symbolized the empire and the eminent power over kings.³⁴ It was also Dom Sebastião who recovered the ambition of territorial conquest in Morocco, which had peaked with Dom Manuel I, and who ended up perishing in the 1578 expedition, defined as the “last crusade of Mediterranean Christendom.”³⁵

In any case, in sixteenth-century Christendom, the imperial paradigm was mainly defined by the House of Habsburg and its dream of a *monarchia universalis*, which brought together two imperial traditions and seized both the topic and the representations of the *translatio imperii*, reinforcing the identification between the House of Austria and the Empire.³⁶ When Charles of Ghent became Charles I in 1516 and then Charles V in 1519, later being elected emperor on 28 June of that year and crowned King of the Romans in Aix-la-Chapelle on 23 October 1520, what remained of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation? A vague notion, a fiction, as Joseph Pérez³⁷ wrote. Yet Charles V and various members of his circle (possibly even more so than the emperor himself) took the idea of empire extremely seriously and wished to breathe new life into it.³⁸

Great prominence has been given to chancellor Mercurino Gattinara, one of the members of the imperial circle and an admirer and student of Dante and his *De Monarchia*, who had supposedly told Charles V about the universal monarchy in 1519. However, despite the studies produced so far, historians are not unanimous in their interpretation of Gattinara’s role or Dante’s possible influence on the birth of an imperial idea.³⁹ In fact, the

³⁴ Cf. António de Vasconcelos Saldanha, *op. cit.*, 330.

³⁵ Cf. Fernand Braudel, *op. cit.*, vol. II, 558.

³⁶ Idem, vol. II, 35; Frances A. Yates, *op. cit.*, 6–36; Franz Bosbach, *Monarchia Universalis. [...]*, 41–75 for the universal monarchy of Charles V; Franz Bosbach, “The European Debate on Universal Monarchy,” in David Armitage (ed.), *Theories of Empire, 1450–1800*, 81–98, *maxime* 84–92.

³⁷ Cf. Joseph Pérez, *Carlos V, soberano de dos mundos*, “Biblioteca de bolsillo Claves, 12,” Barcelona, Ediciones B, 1998 [original edition: 1994], 87.

³⁸ Cf. Jaime Vicens Vives, “Imperio y administración en tiempo de Carlos V,” in *Charles-Quint et son temps*, Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 30 September–3 October 1958, Paris, Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1972 [original edition: 1959], 9–21, *maxime* 20 for the quotation; Carlos José Hernando Sánchez, *Las Indias en la Monarquía Católica: imágenes e ideas políticas*, “Breve Historia, 1,” Valladolid, Secretariado de Publicaciones e Intercambio Científico, Universidad de Valladolid, 1996.

³⁹ Cf. Frances A. Yates, *op. cit.*, 29 and 34; Franz Bosbach, *Monarchia Universalis. [...]*, 54–57 and 63–67; Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: [...]*, 40; José Antonio Escudero, “El gobierno de Carlos V hasta la

imperial political project found its inspiration in various sources. Nevertheless, the Holy Roman Empire as an entity lacked a doctrinal framework, an ideological and administrative backbone, while Charles V remained firmly anchored in old-fashioned principles, such as the ethics of medieval chivalry, which led him to don his armor and march at the head of his troops to fight in battles, and also to challenge Francis I to a duel, thus solving the dispute between them without shedding the blood of their peoples.

In order to encourage and materialize the hegemonic projects associated with an imperial vision, Charles V's circle developed an imperial propaganda policy and devised a complex strategy of conquests and diplomatic and matrimonial alliances. As far as ideology and propaganda were concerned, the identification between the empire and the expansion of the faith was consolidated, and Charles V came to be considered as the heir to Aeneas and the Roman Empire through Charlemagne, being presented as the knight-emperor of Christendom.⁴⁰ Although, on several occasions, the emperor denied that ambition, and while not all Castilian essayists agreed that Charles V should present himself as the *dominus mundi*, many of his supporters defended that they were living a *translatio imperii* in favor of the Austrian monarchy, which confirmed the prophecies of the Book of Daniel, an interpretation that runs through the whole sixteenth-century Hispanic epic.⁴¹

Even before being elected and crowned emperor, Charles had assumed both his mythological lineage and heritage and his global ambition when he adopted the Pillars of Hercules as his emblem and "Ne Plus Ultra" as his motto. As a symbol, according to later readings, it both expressed and enhanced a dynamic expansionist policy that, when transposing the Mediterranean frontier of the ancient empires, gave a modern and overseas dimension to the empire, expressing the wish to bind the Old to the New World. However,

muerte de Gattinara. Canciller, consejos y secretarios" and Manuel Rivero Rodríguez, "La Corona de Aragón, metáfora de la monarquía de Carlos V. Gattinara y sus ideas sobre el gobierno (1519–1520)," in Bernardo J. García García (dir.), *El Imperio de Carlos V. Procesos de agregación y conflictos*, s. l., Fundación Carlos de Amberes, 2000, 83–96 and 97–110, respectively; Giuseppe Galasso, "Lettura dantesca e lettura umanistica nell'idea di impero del Gattinara" and Peer Schmidt, "*Monarchia universalis vs. monarchiae universales*. El programa imperial de Gattinara y su contestación en Europa," in José Martínez Millán (coord.), *Carlos V y la quiebra del humanismo político en Europa (1530–1558)*, Madrid, Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, 2001, vol. I, 93–114 and 115–129, respectively; Manuel Rivero Rodríguez, *Gattinara: Carlos V y el sueño del imperio*, Madrid, Sílex, 2005; Antonio-Miguel Bernal, *Monarquía e imperio*, vol. 3 of *Historia de España*, directed by Josep Fontana and Ramón Villares, Barcelona-Madrid, Crítica-Marcial Pons, 2007, 89.

⁴⁰ Cf. Frances A. Yates, *op. cit.*, 29–30; Marie Tanner, *op. cit.*, 67–118.

⁴¹ Cf. Daniel, 2, 44, in *Biblia Sagrada*, version of the original texts, 4th edition, revised, Lisbon-Fátima, Difusora Bíblica, 2003, 1426: "No tempo destes reis, o Deus dos céus fará aparecer um reino que jamais será destruído e cuja soberania nunca passará para outro povo. Esmagará e aniquilará todos os outros, enquanto ele subsistirá para sempre;" Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: [...]*, 42–43. For the relationship between the sixteenth-century Hispanic epic and imperial propaganda, see Lara Vilà i Tomàs, *Épica e imperio: Imitación virgiliana y propaganda política en la épica española del siglo XVI*, doctoral dissertation in Philology, Barcelona, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2001, photocopied text.

some historians have recalled that, when Charles V went to Naples after the Battle of Algiers in 1542, he was honored as the *monarcha mundi* of only three continents, the three biblical continents, whereas the Castilian Indies merited no reference in the emperor's will.⁴² The fact is that the iconic representation of the Pillars of Hercules was reproduced in buildings, books, engravings and other works of art and became "Europe's most enduring symbol in the bid for universal theocratic monarchy."⁴³

Diplomatic and matrimonial alliances were promoted and realized at the service of a dynastic policy.⁴⁴ Charles V's son Philip played a central role in this construction, although the dynamics of history had the effect of stopping the Habsburgs' plans for imperial hegemony from coming to fruition. The division of the Habsburg Empire into two branches after Charles V's abdication did not constitute a moment of a "separation of destinies,"⁴⁵ but the territorial complex of the Holy Roman Empire split into two political formations which had some similarities but also many contrasts. Wim Blockmans stresses that: "The big difference between Charles' empire and that of his son was the Roman Empire."⁴⁶ Or, should we wish to invert the order of the factors, we could say that the major difference between Charles V's empire and Philip II's empire, which did not have the title of imperial, lay in the Castilian Indies, i.e. in the overseas empire and the need to carry out its administration, ensure its defense and justify the conquest and possession of new territories, an issue that was still very much to the fore after Portugal's incorporation into the Hispanic Monarchy.

Despite the heraldic device of the Pillars of Hercules, the conquistadores, Ferdinand Magellan and the "question of the Moluccas,"⁴⁷ Charles V's attention was focused on the Holy Empire and the Mediterranean.⁴⁸ So, it was only with Philip II and above all with the incorporation of Portugal and its empire into the Habsburg monarchy that the latter finally acquired a planetary dimension, which from a Hispanic perspective legitimized the *dominium totius orbis* and confirmed the *imperium sine fine*. As far as the new

⁴² Cf. Peer Schmidt, "*Monarchia universalis vs. monarchiae universales*. [...]," *loc. cit.*, 115–129, *maxime* 125; Carlos José Hernando Sánchez, *op. cit.*, 46; Antonio-Miguel Bernal, *op. cit.*, 2 and 102.

⁴³ Cf. Marie Tanner, *op. cit.*, 113 and 155–156, *maxime* 155 for the quotation; Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: [...]*, 40.

⁴⁴ Cf. Antonio-Miguel Bernal, *op. cit.*, 79–80.

⁴⁵ Cf. Henry Kamen, *Imperio. La forja de España como potencia mundial*, 2nd edition, Madrid, Aguilar, 2003 [original edition: 2003], 197.

⁴⁶ Cf. Wim Blockmans, *Carlos V. La utopía del Imperio*, "Alianza Ensayo, 173," Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 2000, 215.

⁴⁷ On the "Moluccas Issue," see António de Vasconcelos Saldanha, *op. cit.*, 238–242.

⁴⁸ Cf. Pablo Fernández Albaladejo, "Imperio y administración bajo Carlos V: una reevaluación," in *Hernán Cortés y su tiempo*, Actas del Congreso *Hernán Cortés y su Tiempo. V Centenario (1485–1985)*, Mérida, Junta de Extremadura, Editora Regional de Extremadura, 1987, 520–527; Antonio-Miguel Bernal, *op. cit.*, 89–102.

geography of the Americas was concerned, the definition of the boundaries between the areas of expansion of the Iberian monarchies in the antipodes, and even the competition between the French, English and Dutch, raised hitherto non-existent problems that jurists and diplomats sought to resolve.

This, in effect, was a central issue in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. American geography did not exist in the texts inherited from Antiquity or in the Bible, so that the intellectual, cartographic and ethnological construction and invention of the Americas was based on the voyages and explorations, as well as on direct observation, it is true, but also made use of the cultural repertoire available to the historic agents. In this context, although not always regularly, the classics and Roman imperial law, as well as medieval canonistic law,⁴⁹ provided chroniclers, jurists and treatise writers with a topical tradition. These were the classical topics of rhetoric and the elements that fed encomiastic histories (often to celebrate the Romans being surpassed by the Iberians, but also to reassess the Roman model), ranging from the critical appreciation and debate taking place on the right (*ius*) to the conquest and possession of the lands of the New World. From the Castilian and Iberian viewpoint, this right, to which the concept of *res nullius* or *terra nullius*⁵⁰ could not be applied, had been legitimized by Papal bulls.

Despite the vivid controversies that marked this discussion, the incorporation of the new territories into the political corpus of the Castilian monarchy did not take long.⁵¹ When the crowns of Castile and Portugal were united at the end of the sixteenth century, and once the resistance by the supporters of Dom António, Prior of Crato, on the island of Terceira in the Azores between 1581 and 1583 had been overcome, Philip II's monarchy was truly the greatest empire in history, the first on which the sun never set. Although the constitutional organization ensuing from the Cortes in Tomar enshrined the separation between the Portuguese and Spanish overseas dominions, the union of the Iberian monarchies increased the number of references to the overseas territories and the dreams

⁴⁹ Cf. James Muldoon, *Canon Law, the Expansion of Europe, and World Order*, "Variorum Collected Studies Series, CS612," Aldershot, Ashgate, 1998.

⁵⁰ Cf. Antonio Gómez Robledo, *Fundadores del Derecho Internacional: Vitoria, Gentili, Suárez, Grocio*, Mexico, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1989; Anthony Grafton, with April Shelford and Nancy Siraisi, *New Worlds, Ancient Texts: The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery*, Cambridge, Ma., Harvard University Press, 1992; Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: [...]*, 46–62 and 63–102; David A. Lupher, *Romans in a New World: Classical Models in Sixteenth-Century Spanish America*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 2003; and, more specifically, Lauren Benton and Benjamin Straumann, "Acquiring Empire by Law: From Roman Doctrine to Early Modern European Practice," *Law and History Review*, vol. 28, nr. 1, February 2010, 1–38.

⁵¹ On this issue, and to place Portugal in comparative perspective in the context of the territories incorporated into the Hispanic monarchy, see José Javier Ruiz Ibáñez and Gaetano Sabatini, "Monarchy as Conquest: Violence, Social Opportunity, and Political Stability in the Establishment of the Hispanic Monarchy," *The Journal of Modern History*, Chicago, vol. 81, nr. 3, September 2009, 501–536.

of the *monarchia universalis* recovered the force of the preceding decades, although only for a short while.⁵² While the annexation of the kingdom of Portugal could not be compared in meaning with the victory of Lepanto,⁵³ in fact, various “universalist” pamphlets saw in Dom Sebastião’s disappearance a manifestation of Divine Providence and the Dominican preacher Brother Hernando del Castillo was even of the opinion that, with the union of the kingdoms of Portugal and Castile, Philip II would be “the most powerful lord and king in the world.”⁵⁴

⁵² Cf. Carlos José Hernando Sánchez, *op. cit.*, 114–115; Geoffrey Parker, “David o Goliath: Felipe II y su mundo en la década de 1580,” in Richard L. Kagan y Geoffrey Parker (eds.), *España, Europa y el mundo Atlántico. Homenaje a John H. Elliott*, “Historia. Coediciones,” Madrid, Marcial Pons Historia-Junta de Castilla y León, 2001, 321–346, *maxime* 321–326; Henry Kamen, *op. cit.*, 352–354.

⁵³ Cf. Lara Vilà i Tomàs, *op. cit.*, 303.

⁵⁴ Cf. Geoffrey Parker, “David o Goliath: [...]” *loc. cit.*, 325.

3.

In the last few decades, our historiographic knowledge about the process of Portugal's incorporation into the Hispanic Monarchy has deepened significantly, and, in this context, the initial resistance on the island of Terceira, its later conquest and what this represented to the parties involved, has been highlighted, although with some differences.⁵⁵ After the death of Dom Henrique, the defeat of the armies of Dom António, Prior of Crato, and Philip II's swearing in as king of Portugal at the Cortes in Tomar on 15 April 1581, the king lived in Lisbon from 25 July 1581 to 11 February 1583, during which period he was able to keep a close eye on the military efforts to conquer and pacify the Azores. As an important geographic landmark and an essential port of call on return voyages from the Orient, Africa and the Americas—after 1518 the Castilian ships also stopped off in the bay of Angra—the location of the Azores meant that the islands played a key role in supporting navigation in the Atlantic.

Portugal's incorporation into the Hispanic Monarchy meant that the Azores could be an important operational base under Castilian control, representing a serious threat to the projects of England under Elizabeth I, but also to the French, who desired to conquer a position in South America.⁵⁶ So, in May 1581, Elizabeth I decided to send Sir Francis Drake to the Azores, where he was to occupy Terceira, the island where there was a pocket of resistance to Philip II and support for Dom António, who had settled there. The English captain and seafarer met with Dom António in early July to prepare a plan known as the "first enterprise"⁵⁷ and, although the Queen of England later withdrew from the project, support for Dom António and his supporters was not denied. Accordingly, we note the presence of Captain Henry Richards on the island of Terceira in 1581 and 1582, helping Dom António's local supporters, while guns and munitions were sent from England to the Azores in the early days of 1582, together with permission for Dom António to charter English men of war.

Should there be any doubts remaining in the Elizabethan court concerning the

⁵⁵ On the issue of Portugal's incorporation into the Hispanic Monarchy, see among others Fernando Bouza Álvarez, *Portugal en la Monarquía Hispánica (1580–1640): Felipe II, las Cortes de Tomar y la génesis del Portugal Católico*, doctoral dissertation in History, Madrid, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 1987, 2 vols., photocopied text; Jean-Frédéric Schaub, *Portugal na Monarquia Hispânica (1580–1640)*, "Temas de História de Portugal," Lisbon, Livros Horizonte, 2001; and Rafael Valladares, *A conquista de Lisboa. Violência militar e comunidade política em Portugal, 1578–1583*, Lisbon, Texto Editores, 2010 [original edition: 2008].

⁵⁶ On this issue, see José Damião Rodrigues and Artur Boavida Madeira, "Rivalidades imperiais e emigração: os açorianos no Maranhão e no Pará nos séculos XVII e XVIII," *Anais de História de Além-Mar*, Lisbon, vol. IV, 2003, 247–263.

⁵⁷ Cf. Harry Kelsey, *Sir Francis Drake: The Queen's Pirate*, "Yale Nota Bene," New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2000 [original edition: 1998], 233.

central position occupied by the Azores, and Terceira in particular, in the system of navigational routes and within the framework of naval operations in the Atlantic, a letter dated 13 October 1581, addressed to Elizabeth I by Brother Simão de Barros, who supported the Prior of Crato, dispelled all hesitations:

“And so that Your Most Christian Majesty may with more resolution come to the aid of such a justified need, know that there is some mystery as to why Our Lord God should support this island for its natural King with so many miracles, because the importance of this land is so great that I venture to say that without it the King of Portugal cannot be King in his Kingdom, that with King Philip against him he cannot securely be King not even of the Kingdom of Castile. This is the key to all Spanish navigation and whosoever has it will have no need to travel to the Indies nor go beyond the southern sea, given that, had there only been four English galleons this summer, we might have collected more than ten *contos* in gold.”⁵⁸

Consequently, in the context of the imperial rivalries and the dispute over control of the sea, which extended to the territories outside Europe, the Azores’ geostrategic centrality transformed the archipelago into the privileged scenario for military and naval operations.⁵⁹ An armada was sent to the Azores in 1581 under the command of Dom Pedro de Valdés, after which another Castilian soldier, Dom Lope de Figueroa, was also ordered to sail for the Azores to support the former’s armada. Dom Lope de Figueroa sailed at the head of a force of more than 4,500 men, with the aim of conquering Terceira. However, the defeat of Dom Pedro de Valdés at the Battle of Salga, a setback which the Spanish commanders had not expected, led the Castilian forces to return to Lisbon. The following year, however, the victory obtained at the important naval battle of Vila Franca do Campo on 26 July 1582, won by the Marquis de Santa Cruz, who defeated the French army commanded by Filippo Strozzi, helped to reverse the situation. Philip II’s subjects received news of this victory with great rejoicing, and in Madrid some even said with evident exaggeration that “not even Christ was safe in Paradise, for the Marquis would go

⁵⁸ Cf. David Beers Quinn, *England and the Azores 1581–1582: Three Letters*, “Série Separatas, CXXIII,” Lisbon, Junta de Investigações Científicas do Ultramar, Centro de Estudos de Cartografia Antiga, 1979, 13. See also G. V. Scammell, “The English in the Atlantic Islands c. 1450–1650,” in *Vice-Almirante A. Teixeira da Mota: In Memoriam*, Lisbon, Academia de Marinha-IICT, vol. I, 1987, 329–352, *maxime* 329.

⁵⁹ On this situation and the conquest of the Azores, see Avelino de Freitas de Meneses, *Os Açores e o Domínio Filipino (1580–1590)*, vol. I: *A Resistência Terceirense e as Implicações da Conquista Espanhola*; vol. II: *Apêndice Documental*, Angra do Heroísmo, Instituto Histórico da Ilha Terceira, 1987.

there to get him and crucify him again.”⁶⁰ These and other successes clearly show the strategic importance of the Azores and the contenders’ commitment to ensuring control of the islands, thereby guaranteeing control over the surrounding maritime spaces and, through them, of the Atlantic.⁶¹

The resistance of Dom António and his supporters on Terceira was finally overcome in 1583. The Battle of Vila Franca do Campo and the “Azores campaign,” as the Marquis de Santa Cruz’s expedition to conquer the island became known, were immortalized in the Battle Room in El Escorial, located in Philip II’s private quarters, and in contemporary texts,⁶² nurturing a utopian imagination that underlined the messianic nature of Philip II’s monarchy, the confirmation of Daniel’s prophecy and the installation of the centre of power in the Catholic monarchy. Voices were also raised in support of the universal monarchy in the territories of the Portuguese kingdom, although this issue has not been widely publicized and, generally speaking, is not included in the Iberian historiographic debate.⁶³ It is highly pertinent, then, to present here one of the Portuguese texts, which, based on a common political culture, was written in praise of the empire, particularly if we consider the fact that, in the early modern period, the idea of a “universal empire” was similarly expressed in other, non-European spaces.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Cf. Geoffrey Parker, “David o Goliath: [...],” *loc. cit.*, 333–334.

⁶¹ Cf. Guida Marques, “La dimension atlantique de l’opposition antonienne et l’enjeu brésilien (1580–1640),” *Anais de História de Além-Mar*, Lisbon, IV, 2003, 213–246; Antonio-Miguel Bernal, *op. cit.*, 739–740.

⁶² See, for example, Antonio de Herrera, *Cinco Libros de Antonio de Herrera de la Historia de Portugal, y conquista de las Islas de los Açores, en los años de 1582 y 1583. Dirigida à don Lúys Carrafa de la Marra Príncipe de Stillano, En Madrid, En casa [de] Pedro Madrigal, Año de 1591*; Agustín Bustamante García, “Espejo de hazañas: La historia en El Escorial de Felipe II,” *Revista Virtual de la Fundación Universitaria Española, Cuadernos de Arte e Iconografía*, Tomo IV–7, 1991 [URL: <http://fuesp.com/revistas/pag/cai0718.html>]; Jonathan Brown, *La Sala de Batallas de El Escorial: La obra de arte como artefacto cultural*, Salamanca, Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1998.

⁶³ See, for example, Antonio-Miguel Bernal’s silence on this matter in the work published in 2007 (cf. *supra*, note 38).

⁶⁴ Cf. Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “Connected Histories: Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia,” in Victor Lieberman (ed.), *op. cit.*, 289–316, *maxime* 292–293 and 315.

4.

The author on whom we will now concentrate our attention, Gaspar Frutuoso, was born in Ponta Delgada on the island of São Miguel in 1522, and died in Ribeira Grande on the same island in 1591.⁶⁵ He studied at the University of Salamanca from 1546, the year when he was first enrolled, until 1558,⁶⁶ the year when he obtained the degree of Bachelor of Arts and Theology and also that of Doctor, although we know not where. It is noteworthy that one of his teachers was Brother Domingo de Soto, a Dominican theologian who had taken part in the controversy of the Indies.⁶⁷ Having returned to his native island in about 1560, Gaspar Frutuoso then set sail for the mainland and Bragança to serve Bishop Dom Julião de Alva, to whom he had been recommended by Brother Domingo de Soto. He later received a letter confirming his position as vicar of the parish church of the town of Ribeira Grande in São Miguel, dated 20 May 1565, where he was sworn in on 15 August of that same year. From that date onwards, he was a priest in Ribeira Grande, having also served as a “*visitador*” or inspector of the monastery of Santo André in Ponta Delgada. Having witnessed the remarkable events of 1580–1583, he began writing his magnum opus, *Saudades da Terra*, in the mid-1580s, and, almost until the time of his death, this priest and chronicler wrote and updated the six books that make up his narrative. His treatise was no doubt written for publication, but it remained unpublished until the nineteenth century, either because the author died before he had completed the final wording of his text or because of the events in Iberian history in the seventeenth century, which made a tribute to the Iberian universal monarchy under the Habsburgs an undesirable item of history and rhetoric in the Portuguese context, after the dynastic turnaround in 1640.⁶⁸

The manuscript of *Saudades da Terra* has 571 pages. Let us take a brief look at the structure of the work. Book I, with 53 pages, begins with Truth in exile on the island of São Miguel. Following a dialogue between Truth and Fame, who flew to the island, Truth tells her companion the general history of Iberia and of the Atlantic, emphasizing the archipelagos of the Canaries and Cape Verde, the islands of Castile and, of greater interest

⁶⁵ Cf. Rodrigo Rodrigues, “Notícia Biográfica do Dr. Gaspar Frutuoso,” in Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, s. ed., Ponta Delgada, Instituto Cultural de Ponta Delgada, 1984, XV–CXV.

⁶⁶ Cf. Joaquim Veríssimo Serrão, “Portugueses no Estudo de Salamanca (1250–1550),” *Revista da Faculdade de Letras*, Lisbon, 3ª Série, nr. 5, 1962, 5–515, *maxime* 408.

⁶⁷ Cf. Rodrigo Rodrigues, “Notícia Biográfica do Dr. Gaspar Frutuoso,” in Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, XXX.

⁶⁸ For the history of the manuscript of *Saudades da Terra*, which is kept on deposit at Biblioteca Pública e Arquivo Regional de Ponta Delgada (BPARPD), see João Bernardo de Oliveira Rodrigues, “O manuscrito original das «Saudades da Terra»,” in Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, CXVII–CLXXII.

to us here, the issues relating to the partition of the “conquest” between Portugal and Castile, a problem that worsened after Ferdinand Magellan’s voyage and would only be resolved when the kingdom of Portugal was incorporated into the Hispanic Monarchy. It is important in this respect to underline that these events are omitted in Book I, which he began writing quite soon after the facts that opposed Philip II’s supporters to those of Dom António. Attentive to the political reality of his time, Gaspar Frutuoso knew that the Portugal of the Habsburgs had been born of a difficult combination of negotiation and conquest. He was therefore aware that, despite sharing a common culture and despite the loyalties to the Hispanic Monarchy, there were elements of discord and pockets of resistance in Portugal to the Habsburgs, not to mention the activity of the Dom António and his supporters. Accordingly, he circumvented this difficulty of alluding to the question of the Portuguese succession after the deaths of Dom Sebastião and Dom Henrique in the opening book by opting for a temporal ellipsis in his exposition, which is consequently silent on this sensitive matter.

As for the other books, Book II concentrates on the history and geography of Madeira and is based on the narrative of Jerónimo Dias Leite, Dean of Funchal Cathedral, who wrote a text for Gaspar Frutuoso at the latter’s request.⁶⁹ This book describes the islands of Madeira and Porto Santo and introduces the lives of the captains of the three Madeira captaincies (Funchal, Machico, and Porto Santo), and the genealogies of the main houses of the local elite. The book, namely Chapter XLII, also contains some interpolations, in the form of a tribute addressed to the Bishop of Funchal, Dom Luís de Figueiredo e Lemos, who supported Philip II.⁷⁰ Book III follows the same pattern and describes the island of Santa Maria, the easternmost island and the first to be settled; Book IV, which covers the island of São Miguel, is the most elaborate of them all and the richest in detail; it contains considerable genealogical, social and economic information. Book V, known as the “Story of Two Friends on the Island of São Miguel,” is a fictional text, which makes a break in the previously developed historical narrative. Finally, Book VI concentrates on the central and western group of islands in the Azores, strongly emphasizing the episodes which occurred between 1580 and 1583 during the struggle for control of the island of Terceira.

⁶⁹ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Segundo das Saudades da Terra*, 2nd ed., Ponta Delgada, Instituto Cultural de Ponta Delgada, 1995, 404. Note that this second edition refers to the Azorean edition, for in 1873 Álvaro Rodrigues de Azevedo published this book in Funchal.

⁷⁰ *Idem*, 305–322.

Book I is what interests us here. The author demonstrates his erudite education and his knowledge of both classical authors (Plato, Aristotle, Herodotus, Thucydides, Cicero, Virgil, Tacitus, Strabo and Fulgentius) and contemporary authors, such as João de Barros,⁷¹ Damião de Góis,⁷² António Galvão,⁷³ the humanist historian Paulo Jóvio (1483–1552), the chronicler of the Indies of Castile, Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo (1478–1557),⁷⁴ Dom Alonso de Ercilla y Zuñiga (1533–1594), the “grave poet” and the author of *La Araucana*, a work that is explicitly quoted,⁷⁵ the “universal, most learned and most diligent” Basque chronicler (“Cantabro”) Esteban de Garibay y Zamalloa (1533–1599),⁷⁶ and Jerónimo Cardano. Appearing throughout his work, such references clearly place Gaspar Frutuoso among the Portuguese cultural elite of the time. Note that the repertoire of classical references is richer and more recurrent in Book I than in the following books and that, despite his respect for the authorities and his peers, Gaspar Frutuoso did not hesitate to criticize Plato about Atlantis or to introduce the corrections he considered necessary, as he did with regard to Damião de Góis.

Although he had studied in Salamanca and been a student of Domingo de Soto, it is interesting to note that the authors of the School of Salamanca are explicitly absent from this narrative. As I see it, this fact is due to the general objectives behind the drafting of *Saudades da Terra*. Book I, in fact, clearly shows that Gaspar Frutuoso’s intention⁷⁷ was to write a tribute to the Iberian universal monarchy, beginning by explaining the origin of the

⁷¹ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, 68, 71–73, 76, 176, 187, 198, 205, 209, 216, 225 and 299.

⁷² *Idem*, 176, 302 and 304. Gaspar Frutuoso presents Damião de Góis as the author of the chronicles of Dom João II and Dom Manuel, and describes him as “a learned, renowned and worthy chronicler of such high and mighty kings” (*idem*, 304).

⁷³ *Idem*, 66, 243, 296, 298 and 310. Gaspar Frutuoso explicitly refers to António Galvão and his work with much praise: “how the noble and remarkable captain António Galvão by his hand and pen, worthy of perpetual remembrance, in the Treaty he wrote of various discoveries” (*idem*, 243). Cf. António Galvão, *Tratado dos Descobrimentos*, 4th ed., Porto, Livraria Civilização, 1987 [original edition: 1563]. O *Tratado dos Descobrimentos* claimed to be a history of the geographical discoveries up to 1550, for which the author called on his experience—he had been in the East three times and was governor of the Moluccas—and combined it with knowledge acquired through reading and from the news that circulated. However, Luís de Albuquerque considers that this is a “mediocre” work with errors in the dates and that it records legends acritically. Cf. Luís de Albuquerque, “Galvão, António,” in Luís de Albuquerque (dir.), *Dicionário de História dos Descobrimentos Portugueses*, Lisbon, Caminho, 1994, vol. I, 444–446.

⁷⁴ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, 296. Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo is quoted because of the discovery of the Antilles and New Spain.

⁷⁵ *Idem*, 204.

⁷⁶ *Idem*, 248, 272, 279 and 297. The quotation is from 272.

⁷⁷ I am referring here to the theoretical formulations by Quentin Skinner and J. G. A. Pocock. Cf., among others, Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, vol. 1: *Regarding Method*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002; and J. G. A. Pocock, *Historia e Ilustración. Doce estudios*, “Historia,” Madrid, Marcial Pons Historia, 2002, and *The Discovery of Islands*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005. A synthesis of these formulations can be found in Annabel Brett, “Que é a história intelectual hoje?” in David Cannadine (coord.), *Que é a história hoje?*, “Trajectos, 67,” Lisbon, Gradiva, 2006 [original edition: 2002], 151–172.

controversies between the Portuguese and Spanish monarchies about the overseas lands and then, in providential form, describing how “God intervened in this dispute, uniting these kingdoms under one crown.”⁷⁸ It was hardly the most appropriate moment to recall other discussions that questioned the Castilian monarchy’s right to the possession of new territories. Nevertheless, we shall see how the author’s Salamancan education, and in particular his neo-Thomist influences, crop up in some passages of the text.

Gaspar Frutuoso very clearly included the Azores in the overseas, Atlantic and insular worlds of the sixteenth century and applauded the universal monarchy of Philip II, stating that the monarch “is now the greatest lord in all the environs.”⁷⁹ Just like other contemporary authors who wrote within the framework of the Catholic Monarchy, the object of the discourse is *local* but its horizon is *global*.⁸⁰ Creating a narrative that was more a discursive geography of the islands⁸¹ than a “chorography” (in the Renaissance sense of the word), the Azorean priest had another aim in mind: to exalt the Azores and its people, particularly those of a higher level. *Saudades da Terra* was thus an instrument designed to promote the archipelago to the Catholic Monarchy, within the context of the new political and social organization, underlining the union between the Portuguese and the Spanish and minimizing the resistance in Terceira to the reigning monarch, in spite of the fact that the chronicler devoted a considerable portion of Book VI to describing the events relating to the resistance led by Dom António and the subsequent conquest of the island.⁸²

Having made use of his intellectual training and his vast network of contacts, Gaspar Frutuoso produced a narrative through which the islands of Azores are fully integrated into the late sixteenth-century imperial context. Accordingly, we can only agree in part with Miguel Tremço de Carvalho when he says that Frutuoso’s text “denotes a globalizing view of the Atlantic, on the one hand and, on the other hand, a knowledge of the existence of an insular world.”⁸³ As we can mainly see in Book I (but also confirmed by the other books), although, in his genealogical digressions, the author presents us with the

⁷⁸ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, 226.

⁷⁹ *Idem*, 216.

⁸⁰ Cf. Serge Gruzinski, *op. cit.*, 238–239.

⁸¹ On the relationship between cartography and narrative in the context of sixteenth-century imperial expansion, see Richard Padrón, *The Spacious Word: Cartography, Literature, and Empire in Early Modern Spain*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

⁸² Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Sexto das Saudades da Terra*, 2nd ed., Ponta Delgada, Instituto Cultural de Ponta Delgada, 1978. The author dedicates chapters twenty to thirty-one to the succession of events concerning the background to 1580–1583. On this type of text, see the comments of José Javier Ruiz Ibáñez and Gaetano Sabatini, “Monarchy as Conquest: [...]” *loc. cit.*, 501–536, *maxime* 530–533.

⁸³ Cf. Miguel Tremço de Carvalho, *Gaspar Frutuoso—O Historiador das Ilhas*, Funchal, Centro de Estudos de História do Atlântico, SRTC, 2001, 77.

natives of the islands who took part in building the Portuguese Empire from Morocco to the Far East, his narrative is also a spatial and temporal perception of Portugal's maritime experience within the context of universal history, recounted either through biblical stories, classical mythology or Iberian history.

Note that his concern with the events involving European expansion runs through the entire text, with particular incidence in Book I. Thus, the chronicler also resorted to "living memory," consulting older people who were contemporary or direct witnesses of certain episodes so as to correctly record the actions of the "modern people of today."⁸⁴ For example, we can cite the case of Manuel Martins Soares, "a rich and wholesale merchant and a man of delicate understanding,"⁸⁵ born in São Miguel and who was living in London in 1582, whose testimony Gaspar Frutuoso used to describe the long voyage of circumnavigation of the globe (1577–1580) undertaken by Sir Francis Drake, and also the house that the seafarer bought in Plymouth on his return to England.⁸⁶

In Book I, the pretext for the exposition explaining how the Iberian empires were united is a question asked by Fame about the existence in the "great Ocean Sea" of islands peopled with Portuguese and others with Castilians, as Fame states that "I do not understand this mixture, how this sea had two different masters."⁸⁷ Truth—Gaspar Frutuoso—begins by answering that "the kings of Portugal for some years controlled the sea of the West until the time of King Dom João, the second of his name, when there was a change which I will tell you about later;" he presents two reasons for possession of the islands and other territories, which are the principle of "*primo occupanti conceditur locus*," established in Roman law⁸⁸ and in the Papal bulls,⁸⁹ and then, pursuing a chronological line and anchoring his narrative in various "languages"⁹⁰ (chronicles, "chorographies," Renaissance emblems), he presents the geography and history of the Canaries, Cape Verde and the Antilles, finally exposing the chronological landmarks that opposed Portugal and

⁸⁴ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, 217.

⁸⁵ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Quarto das Saudades da Terra*, 2nd ed., Ponta Delgada, Instituto Cultural de Ponta Delgada, vol. I, 1977, 330.

⁸⁶ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, 218–223.

⁸⁷ *Idem*, 65.

⁸⁸ Cf. Antonio Gómez Robledo, *op. cit.*, 20.

⁸⁹ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, 65–66.

⁹⁰ Cf. Francisco José Aranda Pérez and José Damião Rodrigues, "Claves, fundamentos y debates para una política hispánica," in Francisco José Aranda Pérez and José Damião Rodrigues (eds.), *De Re Publica Hispaniae: Una vindicación de la cultura política en los reinos ibéricos en la primera modernidad*, "Sílex Universidad," Madrid, Sílex, 2008, 19–58, *maxime* 30–33.

Castile in the demarcation of their conquests before their union under Philip II, and concluding with the Azores and the legend of Atlantis.⁹¹

The initial year of that tour was 1344, starting with the conquest of the Canaries, and the author also refers to the years of 1393, 1417 and 1424 when talking about those same islands, the process of their conquest and the beginning of the partition of the lands.⁹² Having explained how the Canaries had fallen into the hands of the kings of Castile, he provides information about the language of the islands and presents a description of every part of the islands, relating the more significant events of recent history. The core of Frutuoso's narrative can be found in the chapters dedicated to Christopher Columbus and Ferdinand Magellan, for amongst other things the consequences of their voyages implied protracted and complicated negotiations between the Iberian monarchies; these culminated in the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494 and in the Treaty of Saragossa in 1529, which in theory at least (and as was understood by the Iberian monarchs) established the division of the globe between two separate spheres of action.⁹³

It was precisely Magellan's voyage of circumnavigation that caused more disagreements between the crowns of Portugal and Castile about the so-called "Moluccas issue" and the definition of the line dividing the Portuguese and Spanish spheres of influence in the antipodes. Speaking through the voice of Truth, the author considered that Portugal was fully entitled to possession of the Moluccas, "acquired and sustained with so much work of the Portuguese." However, given the doubts and the reasons presented by both parties regarding the "partition of these conquests," in the end it was divine will that decisively settled the dispute. In a brief summary of historic events, Gaspar Frutuoso renews his praise for Philip II, presenting him as a protégé of God, who "in His hidden wisdom" handed the kingdom of Portugal to the "most Catholic, high and powerful King Dom Philip, so that he not only became king of all Spain, but of the East Indies, where the Moluccas are, and of the West Indies," so that he was "now the greatest lord in all the environs."⁹⁴ In this passage, note how the author took care to emphasize the providential dimension of the union of the two monarchies, which guaranteed the true universal nature of the Catholic Monarchy through its new geographical dimension, bringing him into line

⁹¹ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, 66–312. Gaspar Frutuoso criticizes Plato in the exposition that he developed to show that the Azores were never linked to Europe, nor are they what is left of Atlantis, whose existence he denies (239–312).

⁹² *Idem*, 66–69.

⁹³ *Idem*, 185–237; Sanjay Subrahmanyam, "Holding the World in Balance: The Connected Histories of the Iberian Overseas Empires, 1500–1640," *loc. cit.*, 1359–1385, *maxime* 1360.

⁹⁴ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, 211–216.

with the Spanish jurists who theorized about the universal empire of the Spanish monarchy.⁹⁵

Following the discoveries of Columbus and Magellan, and on the subject of the Habsburg's imperial heraldry, the chronicler spoke of the inclusion of the Pillars of Hercules in the arms of Charles V to underline that the Emperor's enterprise had exceeded those of every single one of the other kings and princes of the past and present and acquired a new overseas dimension with the conquest of the West Indies⁹⁶. This is when the priest begins to develop some thoughts on the symbolism of the imperial eagle. In our view, this passage is a core moment in the narrative. Gaspar Frutuoso, in fact, intertwines his description of the symbolism of the eagle with the question of *translatio imperii*, going back as far as Aeneas, and, in doing so, anchoring the explanation for the present in the past, thus giving readers the interpretive key that places Philip II at the apex of the mythical and historical lineage of the emperors.⁹⁷

Basing himself on Virgil and on the "Book of the Aeneids" which he quotes explicitly, Gaspar Frutuoso states that, ever since the time of Julius Caesar, emperors had used the eagle in their arms, and that they had taken it from Aeneas, from whom they were descended. For that reason, Charles V had taken the eagle and, in particular, the divided or two-headed eagle:

"Emperor Carlo [sic] the fifth had the eagle on his arms because the truth is that just as the eagle is the queen of all birds, so the emperor is the supreme monarch of all kings and lords. And because Emperor Charles V had divided the conquest of the world into two, some say that he also has the eagle on his arms divided."⁹⁸

This is clearly a statement of the superiority of the empire; the aim of the explanations given about the symbolism of the eagle, starting with Virgil, passing through Pindar, Fulgentius, Aeneas Vico and Alessandro d'Alessandro (1461–1523), the author of *Geniales Dies*, quoted by Gaspar Frutuoso, and ending with Emperor Constantine, is merely to place Charles V—and after him Philip II—in the direct lineage of a mythical genealogy that, following the logic of *translatio imperii*, began in Aeneas and went via Rome,

⁹⁵ Cf. Pablo Fernández Albaladejo, *Fragmentos de monarquía. Trabajos de historia política*, Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 1992, 67–72 and 168–184; Alain Milhou, *op. cit.*, 92–94.

⁹⁶ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, 227–228.

⁹⁷ *Idem*, 230–237.

⁹⁸ *Idem*, 230–231.

Constantinople and the Empire of Charlemagne.⁹⁹ Because the emperor was the temporal head of Christianity, the reference to the division of the Roman Empire into East and West merits some attention, for “the Emperor’s arms were two eagles in one body, or one eagle with two heads, which means the Empire of Christianity, which had the two heads of the Church, the Roman and the Greek, situated in two cities, namely Rome and Constantinople.”¹⁰⁰

Following this digression and having already presented the episode recounted by Pindar about Jupiter sending two eagles to discover where the middle of the world was,¹⁰¹ Gaspar Frutuoso wrote that Emperor Charles V had removed the Pillars of Hercules and placed them on his coat of arms, thus symbolizing the definitive expansion of the geographic limits of the ancient empires confined to the west by the Ocean Sea, and also noted that the emperor had settled the pillars in the sea, for the Spanish had sailed to the Antilles, to Peru and to the Moluccas. Accordingly, Charles V’s imperial eagle flew much further than its predecessors. And, as the Iberian monarchies were at odds with one another, the imperial eagle flew towards the west and found Portugal in the East, in the Moluccas, “flying like eagles, not of Jupiter, a deceiving god, but of Christ, the true God.”¹⁰² So, the two eagles, the symbol of the two kingdoms that would later become united, met:

“both together and incorporated in one heart and one body and one will, with a perpetual knot of love forever, so that through God this perpetual peace and true union will be preserved before these kings and their kingdoms, both united by the insoluble link of Christian charity.”¹⁰³

The wish formulated by the São Miguel chronicler and priest, uniting the Iberian empires in concord, in virtuous harmony through royal and divine love¹⁰⁴ and the will of God, was plainly in agreement with the Habsburgs’ project to found their empire, their

⁹⁹ *Idem*, 230–235.

¹⁰⁰ *Idem*, 235.

¹⁰¹ *Idem*, 231.

¹⁰² *Idem*, 235.

¹⁰³ *Idem*, 236–237.

¹⁰⁴ On the importance of the language of love in the early modern period, see the important study by Pedro Cardim, *A Política dos Afectos. Ordem amorosa e dinâmica política no Portugal do Antigo Regime*, doctoral dissertation in History, Lisbon, Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 2000, photocopied text.

monarchia universalis, on truth and the image of the Cross.¹⁰⁵ Similarly, it coincided with the Salamancan neo-Thomist thinking that defended the empire as a means to attain *concordia hominum*, the basis of any community, and considered charity, “Christian charity,” as the basic political bond.¹⁰⁶ Finally, Gaspar Frutuoso also aligns himself with the same tradition of the Castilian epic of the sixteenth century, which presented the universal monarchy as a guarantee of concord and peace among men, and with contemporary texts such as the *Diálogo llamado Philipino* by the Licentiate Lorenzo de San Pedro, who, through iconography, also defended concord among the kingdoms of Castile and Portugal, presenting Philip II as the *Defensor Fidei*.¹⁰⁷ Both works are part of a larger corpus fed by a utopian imagination that underlined the messianic nature of Philip II’s Catholic monarchy, presented by Gaspar Frutuoso as the “pillar and upholder of the Catholic faith and of all Christian republics that have flourished and still flourish with marvelous triumphs,” conquering infidels, heretics and schismatics.¹⁰⁸ In fact, this was the claim that the providential monarchy would ensure the expansion not of Christianity, but of the Catholic faith, under the command of Philip II, the protector and defender of the faith, the *Fidei Protector ac Propugnator*, conceived by Domingo de Soto, and it seems to find an echo here.¹⁰⁹

So, following the reasoning developed in his narrative, Gaspar Frutuoso concludes Book I by recalling that, according to some,

“In the year one thousand five hundred and thirty-five before Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Spanish sailed the *Mare Magnum*, until they reached the beaches of the Indias, Arabia and its coasts, from where they took and brought back many different goods. And they undertook this trade and others through various parts of the world in great ships, so it is no wonder that those same Spanish returned to these navigations, mainly the Portuguese first to the East and the Castilians then sailing to the part of the West.”¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Marie Tanner, *op. cit.*, 183–206, *maxime* 202.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Sandra Chaparro, “Pasiones políticas e imperialismo: la polémica entre Ginés de Sepúlveda y Bartolomé de las Casas,” *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma*, Serie IV, *Historia Moderna*, t. 14, 2001, 149–171, *maxime* 156 and 160.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Fernando Bouza, *Imagen y propaganda. Capítulos de historia cultural del reinado de Felipe II*, “Akal Universitaria, 200,” Madrid, Ediciones Akal, 1998, 74–83.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, 103. See also Geoffrey Parker, “The Place of Tudor England in the Messianic Vision of Philip II of Spain: The Prothero Lecture,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, vol. 12, 2002, 167–221; Ricardo Padrón, “The Blood of Martyrs is the Seed of the Monarchy: Empire, Utopia and the Faith in Lope’s *Triunfo de la fee en los reynos de Japón*,” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol. 36, nr. 3, Fall 2006, 517–537.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Alain Milhou, *op. cit.*, 92.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, 311–312.

The political message is quite clear. The author goes beyond the identities of the communities, the “nations” of the Portuguese and the Castilians, by placing both under a broader and more aggregating identity, the Spanish, coinciding with *Hispania* and the Iberian territories of Philip II’s monarchy. Just as the eagles had flown away and met in the East, so he asserts that the Portuguese and the Castilians would also sail to dominate the seas and confirm the supremacy of the universal Hispanic monarchy. What he defended, in fact, was Iberian mobilization and, through this example of unity, the expansionist and regenerating capacity of the Catholic Monarchy.¹¹¹

¹¹¹ Cf. Serge Gruzinski, *op. cit.*, 36–38; Jean-Frédéric Schaub, *op. cit.*, 11.

5.

From the above, it is quite clear that when we raise the issue of identities and loyalties within the context of the Catholic Monarchy, we can place Gaspar Frutuoso amongst those Portuguese who were favorable to the “Hispanic solution” embodied by Philip II.¹¹² So, Gaspar Frutuoso’s *Saudades da Terra* was “a text in context” and as such the writing of it was an illocutionary act.¹¹³ In his work, the author praises the monarchy of Philip II which had united the two Iberian empires in one “composite empire,”¹¹⁴ i.e., a plural, transcontinental body politic. However, his faith in its possible perlocutionary effect was lost, for, after the death of the São Miguel priest, the manuscript was entrusted to the College of the Society of Jesus in Ponta Delgada, where it remained until the expulsion of the Order in the eighteenth century. Thus Frutuoso’s narrative cannot be considered as the work of propaganda that it possibly set out to be. Although the manuscript was often consulted by members of the local elites, they did so in order to seek out the genealogical information it contained and, after 1640, it was no longer wise to remember that the “father” of Azorean historiography had praised the glory of the universal Hispanic monarchy.

The example of *Saudades da Terra* reminds us that, during the initial period of the Iberian Union and despite some resistance, many Portuguese wrote laudatory speeches in praise of the Catholic Monarchy, contemporary with more famous examples. We believe the time has come to recover the knowledge of those and other texts without which we will be unable to write a comparative and interconnected history of the empires of Castile and Portugal.

¹¹² Cf. Fernando Bouza, *D. Filipe I, “Reis de Portugal, XVIII,”* Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 2005, 142–143.

¹¹³ Cf. David Boucher, *Texts in Context. Revisionist Methods for Studying the History of Ideas*, New York-Heidelberg, Springer, 1985. See also the works by Quentin Skinner and J. G. A. Pocock.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “Holding the World in Balance: The Connected Histories of the Iberian Overseas Empires, 1500–1640,” *loc. cit.*, 1359–1385, *maxime* 1383.

References:

Printed sources:

- Alighieri, Dante, *Vida Nova—Monarquia*, translated by Carlos de Soveral, “Filosofia e Ensaaios,” Lisbon, Guimarães Editores, 1954.
- Alighieri, Dante, *A Divina Comédia*, translated by Vasco Graça Moura, Lisbon, Quetzal, 2011.
- Bíblia Sagrada*, 4th ed., revised, Lisbon-Fátima, Difusora Bíblica, 2003.
- Ferreira, António, *Poemas Lusitanos*, critical edition, introduction and comments by T. F. Earle, Lisbon, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2000 [original edition: 1598].
- Frutuoso, Gaspar, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, s. ed., Ponta Delgada, Instituto Cultural de Ponta Delgada, 1984.
- Frutuoso, Gaspar, *Livro Segundo das Saudades da Terra*, 2nd ed., Ponta Delgada, Instituto Cultural de Ponta Delgada, 1995.
- Frutuoso, Gaspar, *Livro Quarto das Saudades da Terra*, 2nd ed., Ponta Delgada, Instituto Cultural de Ponta Delgada, vol. I, 1977.
- Frutuoso, Gaspar, *Livro Sexto das Saudades da Terra*, 2nd ed., Ponta Delgada, Instituto Cultural de Ponta Delgada, 1978.
- Galvão, António, *Tratado dos Descobrimentos*, 4th ed., Porto, Livraria Civilização, 1987 [original edition: 1563].
- Herrera, Antonio de, *Cinco Libros de Antonio de Herrera de la Historia de Portugal, y conquista de las Islas de los Açores, en los años de 1582 y 1583. Dirigida à don Luys Carrafa de la Marra Príncipe de Stillano*, En Madrid, En casa [de] Pedro Madrigal, Año de 1591.

Works:

- Albuquerque, Luís de, “Galvão, António,” in Luís de Albuquerque (dir.), *Dicionário de História dos Descobrimentos Portugueses*, Lisbon, Caminho, 1994, vol. I, 444–46.
- Aranda Pérez, Francisco José; Rodrigues, José Damião, “Claves, fundamentos y debates para una política hispánica,” in Francisco José Aranda Pérez and José Damião Rodrigues (eds.), *De Re Publica Hispaniae: Una vindicación de la cultura política en los reinos ibéricos en la primera modernidad*, “Sílex Universidad,” Madrid, Sílex, 2008, 19–58.
- Armitage, David (ed.), *Theories of Empire, 1450–1800*, “An Expanding World, Volume 20,” Aldershot–Burlington, Vt., Ashgate, Variorum, 1998.
- Benton, Lauren; Straumann, Benjamin, “Acquiring Empire by Law: From Roman Doctrine to Early Modern European Practice,” *Law and History Review*, vol. 28, nr. 1, February 2010, 1–38.
- Bernal, Antonio-Miguel, *Monarquía e imperio*, vol. 3 of *Historia de España*, directed by Josep Fontana and Ramón Villares, Barcelona-Madrid, Crítica-Marcial Pons, 2007.
- Blockmans, Wim, *Carlos V. La utopía del Imperio*, “Alianza Ensayo, 173,” Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 2000.
- Bosbach, Franz, “The European Debate on Universal Monarchy,” in David Armitage (ed.), *Theories of Empire, 1450–1800*, “An Expanding World, Volume 20,” Aldershot–Burlington, Vt., Ashgate, Variorum, 1998, 81–98.
- Bosbach, Franz, *Monarchia Universalis. Storia di un concetto cardine della politica europea (secoli XVI–XVIII)*, Milan, Vita e Pensiero, 1998 [original edition: 1988].
- Boucher, David, *Texts in Context. Revisionist Methods for Studying the History of Ideas*, New York–Heidelberg, Springer, 1985.

- Bouza Álvarez, Fernando, *Portugal en la Monarquía Hispánica (1580–1640): Felipe II, las Cortes de Tomar y la génesis del Portugal Católico*, PhD in History, Madrid, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 1987, 2 vols., unpublished.
- Bouza, Fernando, *D. Filipe I*, “Reis de Portugal, XVIII,” Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 2005.
- Bouza, Fernando, *Imagen y propaganda. Capítulos de historia cultural del reinado de Felipe II*, “Akal Universitaria, 200,” Madrid, Ediciones Akal, 1998.
- Braudel, Fernand, *O Mediterrâneo e o Mundo Mediterrânico na época de Filipe II*, “Anais, 2,” Lisbon, Publicações Dom Quixote, vol. II, 1984 [original edition: 1949; new edition: 1966; 4th ed., revised: 1979].
- Brett, Annabel, “Que é a história intelectual hoje?” in David Cannadine (coord.), *Que é a história hoje?*, “Trajectos, 67,” Lisbon, Gradiva, 2006 [original edition: 2002], 151–72.
- Brown, Jonathan, *La Sala de Batallas de El Escorial: La obra de arte como artefacto cultural*, Salamanca, Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1998.
- Bulletin of Latin American Research*, vol. 27, nr. 1, March 2008: *Informal Empire in Latin America: Culture, Commerce and Capital*, edited by Matthew Brown.
- Bunes Ibarra, Miguel Ángel de, “El Imperio otomano y la intensificación de la catolicidad de la monarquía hispana,” *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia*, Pamplona, nr. 16, 2007, 157–67.
- Burbank, Jane; Cooper, Frederick, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Bustamante García, Agustín, “Espejo de hazañas: La historia en El Escorial de Felipe II,” *Revista Virtual de la Fundación Universitaria Española, Cuadernos de Arte e Iconografía*, Tomo IV–7, 1991 [URL: <http://fuesp.com/revistas/pag/cai0718.html>].
- Cardim, Pedro, *A Política dos Afectos. Ordem amorosa e dinâmica política no Portugal do Antigo Regime*, PhD in History, Lisbon, Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 2000, unpublished.
- Carvalho, Miguel Tremoço de, *Gaspar Frutuoso—O Historiador das Ilhas*, Funchal, Centro de Estudos de História do Atlântico, SRTC, 2001.
- Chaparro, Sandra, “Pasiones políticas e imperialismo: la polémica entre Ginés de Sepúlveda y Bartolomé de las Casas,” *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma*, Serie IV, *Historia Moderna*, t. 14, 2001, 149–71.
- Costa, João Paulo Oliveira e, *D. Manuel I (1469–1521). Um príncipe do Renascimento*, “Reis de Portugal, XIV,” Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 2005.
- Curto, Diogo Ramada, “A literatura e o império: entre o espírito cavaleiroso, as trocas da corte e o humanismo cívico,” in Francisco Bethencourt and Kirti Chaudhuri (dir.), *História da Expansão Portuguesa*, vol. 1: *A Formação do Império (1415–1570)*, Lisbon, Círculo de Leitores, 1998, 434–54.
- Darwin, John, *After Tamerlane: The Global History of Empire Since 1405*, New York, Bloomsbury Press, 2008 [original edition: 2007].
- Davis, Charles T., “Dante’s Vision of History,” *Dante Studies, with the Annual Report of the Dante Society*, nr. 118, 2000, 243–59.
- Doyle, Michael W., “Impérios revisitados,” *Penélope. Fazer e desfazer a história*, Lisbon, nr. 21, 1999, 159–75.
- Elliott, John E., *Imperios del Mundo Atlántico. España y Gran Bretaña en América (1492–1830)*, Madrid, Taurus, 2006 [original edition: 2006].
- Escudero, José Antonio, “El gobierno de Carlos V hasta la muerte de Gattinara. Canciller, consejos y secretarios,” in Bernardo J. García García (dir.), *El Imperio de Carlos V. Procesos de agregación y conflictos*, s. l., Fundación Carlos de Amberes, 2000, 83–96.
- Fernández Albaladejo, Pablo, “Imperio y administración bajo Carlos V: una reevaluación,” in *Hernán Cortés y su tiempo*, Actas del Congreso *Hernán Cortés y su Tiempo*. V

- Centenario (1485–1985)*, Mérida, Junta de Extremadura, Editora Regional de Extremadura, 1987, 520–27.
- Fernández Albaladejo, Pablo, *Fragmentos de monarquía. Trabajos de historia política*, Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 1992.
- Galasso, Giuseppe, “Lettura dantesca e lettura umanistica nell’idea di impero del Gattinara,” in José Martínez Millán (coord.), *Carlos V y la quiebra del humanismo político en Europa (1530–1558)*, Madrid, Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, 2001, vol. I, 93–114.
- Gil, Juan, “A apropriação da ideia de império pelos reinos da Península Ibérica: Castela,” *Penélope. Fazer e desfazer a história*, Lisbon, nr. 15, 1995, 11–30.
- Ginsberg, Warren, “Dante’s Dream of the Eagle and Jacob’s Ladder,” *Dante Studies, with the Annual Report of the Dante Society*, nr. 100, 1982, 41–69.
- Gómez Robledo, Antonio, *Fundadores del Derecho Internacional: Vitoria, Gentili, Suárez, Grocio*, México, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1989.
- Grafton, Anthony, with April Shelford and Nancy Siraisi, *New Worlds, Ancient Texts: The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery*, Cambridge, Ma., Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Gruzinski, Serge, *Les quatre parties du monde. Histoire d’une mondialisation*, s. l. [Paris], Éditions de La Martinière, 2004.
- Haran, Alexandre Y., *Le Lys et le globe. Messianisme dynastique et rêve impérial en France aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles*, Seyssel, Champ Vallon, 2000.
- Hart, Jonathan, *Comparing Empires: European Colonialism from Portuguese Expansion to the Spanish-American War*, New York-Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2003.
- Hart, Jonathan, *Contesting Empires: Opposition, Promotion, and Slavery*, New York-Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2005.
- Hernando Sánchez, Carlos José, *Las Indias en la Monarquía Católica: imágenes e ideas políticas*, “Breve Historia, 1,” Valladolid, Secretariado de Publicaciones e Intercambio Científico, Universidad de Valladolid, 1996.
- Kamen, Henry, *Imperio. La forja de España como potencia mundial*, 2nd ed., Madrid, Aguilar, 2003 [original edition: 2003].
- Kelsey, Harry, *Sir Francis Drake: The Queen’s Pirate*, “Yale Nota Bene,” New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2000 [original edition: 1998].
- Lupher, David A., *Romans in a New World: Classical Models in Sixteenth-Century Spanish America*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 2003.
- Mancke, Elizabeth, “Negotiating an Empire: Britain and Its Overseas Peripheries, c. 1550–1780,” in Christine Daniels and Michael Kennedy (eds.), *Negotiated Empires: centers and peripheries in the Americas, 1500–1820*, New York-London, Routledge, 2002, 235–65.
- Marques, Guida, “La dimension atlantique de l’opposition antonienne et l’enjeu brésilien (1580–1640),” *Anais de História de Além-Mar*, Lisbon, IV, 2003, 213–46.
- Meneses, Avelino de Freitas de, *Os Açores e o Domínio Filipino (1580–1590)*, vol. I: *A Resistência Terceirense e as Implicações da Conquista Espanhola*; vol. II: *Apêndice Documental*, Angra do Heroísmo, Instituto Histórico da Ilha Terceira, 1987.
- Milhou, Alain, *Pouvoir royal et absolutisme dans l’Espagne du XVI^e siècle*, “Anejos de *Criticón*, 13,” Toulouse, Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 1999.
- Muldoon, James, *Canon Law, the Expansion of Europe, and World Order*, “Variorum Collected Studies Series, CS612,” Aldershot, Ashgate, 1998.
- Muldoon, James, *Empire and Order: The Concept of Empire, 800–1800*, Basingstoke, MacMillan Press, 1999.
- Newitt, Malyn, “Formal and Informal Empire in the History of Portuguese Expansion,” *Portuguese Studies*, vol. 17, nr. 1, January 2001, 1–21.

- Padrón, Ricardo, "The Blood of Martyrs is the Seed of the Monarchy: Empire, Utopia and the Faith in Lope's Triunfo de la fee en los reynos de Japón," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol. 36, nr. 3, Fall 2006, 517–37.
- Padrón, Richard, *The Spacious Word: Cartography, Literature, and Empire in Early Modern Spain*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Pagden, Anthony, *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c. 1500–c. 1800*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1995.
- Pagden, Anthony, *Peoples and Empires: Europeans and the Rest of the World, from Antiquity to the Present*, London, Phoenix Press, 2002 [original edition: 2001].
- Parker, Geoffrey, "David o Goliath: Felipe II y su mundo en la década de 1580," in Richard L. Kagan y Geoffrey Parker (eds.), *España, Europa y el mundo Atlántico. Homenaje a John H. Elliott*, "Historia. Coediciones," Madrid, Marcial Pons Historia-Junta de Castilla y León, 2001, 321–46.
- Parker, Geoffrey, "The Place of Tudor England in the Messianic Vision of Philip II of Spain: The Prothero Lecture," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, vol. 12, 2002, 167–221.
- Pérez, Joseph, *Carlos V, soberano de dos mundos*, "Biblioteca de bolsillo Claves, 12," Barcelona, Ediciones B, 1998 [original edition: 1994].
- Pocock, J. G. A., *Historia e Ilustración. Doce estudios*, "Historia," Madrid, Marcial Pons Historia, 2002.
- Pocock, J. G. A., *The Discovery of Islands*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Poletti, Ronaldo Rebello de Britto, *Elementos para um conceito jurídico de império*, PhD, Faculdade de Direito, Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2007, unpublished.
- Pomper, Philip, "The History and Theory of Empires," *History and Theory, Theme Issue*, 44, December 2005, 1–27.
- Quinn, David Beers, *England and the Azores 1581–1582: Three letters*, "Series Leaflets, CXXIII," Lisbon, Junta de Investigações Científicas do Ultramar, Centro de Estudos de Cartografia Antiga, 1979.
- Reynolds, Susan, "Empires: a Problem of Comparative History," *Historical Research*, vol. 79, nr. 204, May 2006, 151–65.
- Rivero Rodríguez, Manuel, "La Corona de Aragón, metáfora de la monarquía de Carlos V. Gattinara y sus ideas sobre el gobierno (1519–1520)," in Bernardo J. García García (dir.), *El Imperio de Carlos V. Procesos de agregación y conflictos*, s. l., Fundación Carlos de Amberes, 2000, 97–110.
- Rivero Rodríguez, Manuel, *Gattinara: Carlos V y el sueño del imperio*, Madrid, Sílex, 2005.
- Rodrigues, João Bernardo de Oliveira, "O manuscrito original das «Saudades da Terra»," in Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, s. ed., Ponta Delgada, Instituto Cultural de Ponta Delgada, 1984, CXVII–CLXXII.
- Rodrigues, José Damião; Madeira, Artur Boavida, "Rivalidades imperiais e emigração: os açorianos no Maranhão e no Pará nos séculos XVII e XVIII," *Anais de História de Além-Mar*, Lisbon, vol. IV, 2003, 247–63.
- Rodrigues, Rodrigo, "Notícia Biográfica do Dr. Gaspar Frutuoso," in Gaspar Frutuoso, *Livro Primeiro das Saudades da Terra*, s. ed., Ponta Delgada, Instituto Cultural de Ponta Delgada, 1984, XV–CXV.
- Ruiz Ibáñez, José Javier; Sabatini, Gaetano, "Monarchy as Conquest: Violence, Social Opportunity, and Political Stability in the Establishment of the Hispanic Monarchy," *The Journal of Modern History*, Chicago, vol. 81, nr. 3, September 2009, 501–36.
- Saldanha, António de Vasconcelos, *Iustum Imperium. Dos Tratados como fundamento do Império dos Portugueses no Oriente. Estudo de História do Direito Internacional e do Direito Português*, Instituto Português do Oriente, Fundação Oriente, Lisbon, 1997.

- Scammell, G. V., "The English in the Atlantic Islands c. 1450–1650," in *Vice-Almirante A. Teixeira da Mota: In Memoriam*, Lisbon, Academia de Marinha-IICT, vol. I, 1987, 329–52.
- Schaub, Jean-Frédéric, *Portugal na Monarquia Hispânica (1580–1640)*, "Temas de História de Portugal," Lisbon, Livros Horizonte, 2001.
- Schmidt, Peer, "Monarchia universalis vs. monarchiae universales. El programa imperial de Gattinara y su contestación en Europa," in José Martínez Millán (coord.), *Carlos V y la quiebra del humanismo político en Europa (1530–1558)*, Madrid, Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, 2001, vol. I, 115–29.
- Serrão, Joaquim Veríssimo, "Portugueses no Estudo de Salamanca (1250–1550)," *Revista da Faculdade de Letras*, Lisbon, 3rd Series, nr. 5, 1962, 5–515.
- Skinner, Quentin, *Visions of Politics*, vol. 1: *Regarding Method*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Subrahmanyam, Sanjay, "Connected Histories: Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia," in Victor Lieberman (ed.), *Beyond Binary Histories: Re-imagining Eurasia to c. 1830*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 2002 [original edition: 1999], 289–316.
- Subrahmanyam, Sanjay, "Holding the World in Balance: The Connected Histories of the Iberian Overseas Empires, 1500–1640," *American Historical Review*, vol. 112, nr. 5, December 2007, 1359–1385.
- Subrahmanyam, Sanjay, "Imperial and Colonial Encounters: Some Reflections," *Nuevo Mundo Mundos Nuevos*, Debates, 2005, online on 8 February 2005 [URL: <http://nuevomundo.revues.org/index433.html>], accessed 27 January 2009.
- Subrahmanyam, Sanjay, "Sobre comparaciones y conexiones: notas sobre el estudio de los imperios ibéricos de Ultramar, 1490–1640," in Roger Chartier and Antonio Feros (dir.), *Europa, América y el mundo: tiempos históricos*, Madrid-Barcelona, Fundación Rafael del Pino-Fundación Carolina-Colegio Libre de Eméritos-Marcial Pons, 2006, 239–62.
- Tanner, Marie, *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: The Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1993.
- Thomaz, Luís Filipe F. R., "L'idée impériale manuéline," in AAVV, *La Découverte, le Portugal et l'Europe*, Actes du Colloque, Paris, 26–28 mai 1988, Paris, Fondation Calouste Gulbenkian, Centre Culturel Portugais, 1990, 35–103.
- Thomaz, Luís Filipe F. R., "O Projecto Imperial Joanino (*Tentativa de interpretação global da política ultramarina de D. João II*)," in *De Centa a Timor*, "Memória e Sociedade," Lisbon, Difel, 1994, 149–67.
- Trindade, Jaelson Bitran, "O Império dos Mil Anos e a arte do "tempo barroco": a águia bicéfala como emblema da Cristandade," *Anais do Museu Paulista*, São Paulo, New Series, vol. 18, nr. 2, Jul.–Dec. 2010, 11–91.
- Turchin, Peter, "A theory for Formation of Large Empires," *Journal of Global History*, vol. 4, issue 2, July 2009, 191–217.
- Turchin, Peter; Adams, Jonathan M.; Hall, Thomas D., "East-West Orientation of Historical Empires and Modern States," *Journal of World-Systems Research*, vol. XII, nr. 11, December 2006, 219–29.
- Valladares, Rafael, *A conquista de Lisboa. Violência militar e comunidade política em Portugal, 1578–1583*, Lisbon, Texto Editores, 2010 [original edition: 2008].
- Vicens Vives, Jaime, "Imperio y administración en tiempo de Carlos V," in *Charles-Quint et son temps*, Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 30 Septembre–3 Octobre 1958, Paris, Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1972 [original edition: 1959], 9–21.
- Vilà i Tomàs, Lara, *Épica e imperio: Imitación virgiliana y propaganda política en la épica española del*

- siglo XVI*, PhD in Philology, Barcelona, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2001, unpublished.
- Woodworth, C. K., "Review Article. Ocean and Steppe: Early Modern World Empires," *Journal of Early Modern History*, vol. 11, nr. 6, 2007, 501–18.
- Xavier, Ângela Barreto, *A Invenção de Goa. Poder imperial e conversões culturais nos séculos XVI e XVII*, Lisbon, Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 2008.
- Yates, Frances A., *Astrea. L'idea di Impero nel Cinquecento*, "Piccola Biblioteca Einaudi, 121," Turin, Einaudi, 2001 [original edition: 1975].
- Zeller, Gaston, "Les rois de France candidats à l'Empire: Essai sur l'idéologie impériale en France," in *Aspects de la Politique Française sous l'Ancien Régime*, Paris, PUF, 1964, 12–89.

An Aristocratic Economy in Portugal in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century: The House of the Marquises of Castelo Rodrigo

João Paulo Salvado¹

Abstract

This article examines the main characteristics of the economic governance of the estate of the Marquises of Castelo Rodrigo, one of the largest Portuguese noble houses of the first half of the seventeenth century. Themes such as the formation of the house's patrimony and its management, the source of its income, and its spending and investment strategies, are all analyzed here, based on two accounting surveys that were produced by the house itself. It is hoped that in this way a contribution may be made towards a better understanding of the economic aspects of Portuguese aristocratic estates in this period.

Keywords

Marquises of Castelo Rodrigo; noble household; patrimony; rents; Portugal; sixteenth and seventeenth centuries

Resumo

O presente estudo examina as principais características do governo económico da casa dos marqueses de Castelo Rodrigo, uma das maiores casas nobiliárquicas portuguesas da primeira metade do século XVII. Temas como a constituição do património e sua gestão, a matriz dos seus rendimentos, as estratégias de dispêndio e investimento encontram aqui espaço de análise, construído a partir de dois instrumentos contabilísticos produzidos pela própria casa. Assim se espera contribuir para um conhecimento mais aprofundado da dimensão económica das casas senhoriais portuguesas neste período cronológico.

Palavras-chave

Marqueses de Castelo Rodrigo; casa senhorial; património; rendas; Portugal; séculos XVI–XVII

¹ The School of Education of the Polytechnic Institute of Portalegre; CIDEHUS—University of Évora. *E-mail:* jsalvado@uevora.pt

Introduction

Despite the considerable increase in the number of studies on the nobility produced in Portugal over the last few decades, noble households have rarely been afforded due attention by historians. Except for the study by Nuno Gonçalo Monteiro (1998) of the last phase of the *Ancien Régime*, there are few monographs dedicated to the study of aristocratic houses and even fewer focusing on their material bases and economic management (Sena 1987; Lourenço 1995; Cunha 2000; Salvado 2009). There are various reasons for this lacuna, and perhaps the main one is related to the disappearance of family archives, a statement that is particularly valid for the period prior to the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Although this lack of primary sources makes it difficult to investigate their economic life, there is no doubting the relevance of such studies. In fact, throughout the *Ancien Régime*, the aristocratic houses controlled a substantial part of national resources, so that any investigation of the economic dynamics of the sixteenth to the eighteenth century must take into account their management options as well as their spending and investment strategies (O'Brien 2005).

This article examines the case of the House of the Marquises of Castelo Rodrigo, which is seen here as an opportunity to obtain an all-encompassing view of a seigniorial economy. Having been created in the context of the Union of Crowns of Castile and Portugal (1580-1640), this house was undoubtedly the largest and most prestigious of the new noble houses that appeared during that period. Its steady rise cannot be dissociated from the events that led to the Spanish rule of Portugal and the decisive involvement in this process of Dom Cristóvão de Moura (1538-1613), the first Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo, as well as the role that he later played in its governance. In what was to be a quite distinct set of circumstances, his son, Dom Manuel de Moura Corte Real (1592-1651), also achieved prominence in the service of the Spanish Habsburg dynasty, largely continuing along the path that had been laid by his father. Just as rapidly as it had risen to prominence, this house was brought suddenly to an end during the maelstrom of events that followed the enthronement of King John IV. The analysis here will therefore focus on the sixty years of the house's existence in the kingdom of Portugal, with the examination being based on two accounting surveys written during the course of the administration of the second Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo: namely a survey of the house's income and another of its

expenditure.² Produced in 1630 and 1631, these two documents enable us to form a unique view of various aspects of the house's patrimonial management.

The first section of this article outlines the essential features of the political and social trajectory of the first and second marquises and the chronology of the additions that they made to their patrimony, underlining the important role that royal endowments played in this process. The second section provides a simultaneously static and dynamic view of the implantation of their estate, the exercise of their jurisdictions and the economic governance of their affairs, in order to identify the different aspects affecting the management of an aristocratic estate. In this section, aspects such as the scope of their powers, the administrative framework, and the different forms of economic management and of collecting rents and taxes are analyzed. The third section examines the house's annual income, in order to place it within the context of the economic hierarchy of the Portuguese and Spanish aristocracy, breaking down this income into its different sources and, at the same time, considering the nature of the house's assets and their geographical distribution. Based on the highly fragmentary data available, the fourth and last section deals with the main items of current and extraordinary expenditure and the productive investments that were made, in order to gauge the financial pressure that the house was subjected to and to address the topic of its indebtedness.

² BNP, código 3377 and ANTT, Manuscritos do Convento da Graça, Pecúlio, cx. 5, tomo II.

1. Origin and consolidation of the House of Castelo Rodrigo

The details of Dom Cristóvão de Moura's political career have long been known, thanks to the pioneering study by Danvila y Burguero (1900), as well as those by Queirós Veloso (1946, 1953), and more recently the studies by Fernando Bouza (1987, 2000, 2008) and Santiago Martínez Hernández (2009, 2009a, 2010, 2011 and 2011a). The participation of the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo in the government of Portugal has also been indirectly highlighted in several studies devoted to the reigns of Philip II to Philip IV, the Union of the Crowns or the Portuguese Restoration (Elliott 1986; Luxán Meléndez 1986; Valladares 1998, 2000; Schaub 2001; Olival 2008). Therefore, the following lines will only mention the most relevant aspects of the political career of the Mouras, which are essential for understanding the way in which their estate was formed and consolidated.

While still an adolescent, Dom Cristóvão de Moura moved to Spain in the retinue of Juana of Austria, the mother of the future king Sebastian and the sister of Philip II, remaining under her protection until her death (1573). In the meantime, he was transferred to the house of Don Carlos, Prince of Asturias, in 1564 and then, after its dissolution, to the house of Philip II. In the service of Juana of Austria, he undertook his first missions in Portugal, gathering information about the health and progress of the young prince Sebastian. In the course of his travels between the courts of Madrid and Lisbon Dom Cristóvão de Moura served as a go-between in delicate family matters, at the request of the queen Catherine and Philip II. He was later entrusted with new duties at the Portuguese court in the service of Philip II and was made executor of the will of Juana of Austria in Portugal. In his performance of these tasks, Dom Cristóvão de Moura displayed a remarkable capacity for overcoming obstacles and demonstrated unique skills in the field of political negotiation. He showed these same characteristics again throughout the process that led to the incorporation of the Portuguese crown into the Spanish monarchy (1578-1581).

Within the context of the new political situation, Dom Cristóvão rapidly became one of Philip II's leading ministers, having been appointed a member of the Council of Portugal in Madrid as early as 1583.³ His growing influence and the trust that he inspired led him to the Council of State and the Council of War, both of which he joined in 1587,

³ Strictly speaking, the Spanish Habsburg kings who governed Portugal from 1580 to 1640 should be referred to as Philip I, II and III. However, as in this text these monarchs are referred to both as kings of Portugal and as kings of the other crowns and territories that were under Spanish rule, preference has been given to the use of their Spanish titles (Philip II, III and IV).

while he was also afforded access to the house of the new Prince of Asturias, whom he served as *Sumiller de corps* (1589) and, for a brief period, as Lord Chamberlain (1598). In the house of Philip II, Dom Cristóvão combined the positions of Gentleman of the bedchamber and *Sumiller de corps* from 1592 onwards (Martínez Hernández 2010: 27). The change of king and the rise of the Marquis of Denia did, however, lead to an enormous decline in the political influence that he enjoyed in the court. He was forced to resign as Lord Chamberlain and, shortly afterwards, he was transferred to the post of viceroy of Portugal, an appointment that was regarded by many of his contemporaries, including himself, as a form of exile. He was to perform the duties of viceroy in Lisbon from 1600 to 1603, but, when his three-year period of governance came to an end, he only received permission to return to Madrid four years later. He remained there for only a short while, however, since by February 1608 he was once again back in Lisbon to serve another three-year period as viceroy. This was to be his last major post. On finishing his appointment in 1612, he returned to Madrid, where he died on 28 December 1613.

This unusual career and the corresponding reward of the many services that he provided largely resulted in the estate of the House of Castelo Rodrigo. While his service to the monarchy represented his main means of acquiring property, the first substantive addition to his estate was, however, achieved through marriage. It was through his marriage to Dona Margarida Corte Real, in 1581, that Dom Cristóvão de Moura took his first step towards amassing his fortune, since, at that time, all that he had of his own was a commandery from the Order of Calatrava (Puertollano) and a lifelong stipend of 750,000 *maravedís* (800,000 *réis*).⁴ And, although he was the heir to his father's estate, he expected to obtain little from this. In fact, in his childhood, he had been made fun of because of the poverty that his clothes revealed (Cunha and Monteiro 2009: 68). Due to her brother's death in the Battle of Alcácer-Quibir (1578), Dona Margarida had become the heiress and successor to the House of the Lords of Terra Nova (Newfoundland), whose estate was composed of entailed property (*bens de morgadio*) and crown property as well. The entailed estate of the Corte Real family, founded in 1518, consisted of a significant number of houses and stores close to Ribeira das Naus in Lisbon, a handful of rural and urban properties located on the island of Terceira (in the Azores) and the Quinta de Queluz, a country estate halfway between Lisbon and Sintra (ANTT, Chanc. de Dom João III, liv. 10, fls. 175-181). As far as the crown property was concerned, the bride's father's house had

⁴ Around 1600, the income from the commandery of Puertollano was valued at 486,187 *maravedís* (518,600 *réis*) (Gómez Centurión 1912: 386). The stipend had been bequeathed to him by Juana of Austria (Danvila y Burguero 1900: 200 and 205).

owned the donatorial captaincy (*capitania-donataria*) of Angra in the island of Terceira, on a perpetual basis, since the fifteenth century. The family also owned the captaincy of the island of São Jorge, as well as the presumptive right to Terra Nova. These donations were confirmed by Philip II as belonging to Dona Margarida, in direct contravention of the principles enshrined in the *Lei Mental*.⁵

Further endowments made by Philip II definitively catapulted Dom Cristóvão de Moura into the restricted group of the richest noblemen in Portugal. Thus, by 1581, he had already been appointed overseer of the Treasury (*vedor da fazenda*), and, the following year, he was awarded the captaincy of Praia, thereby becoming the lord of the whole island of Terceira (ANTT, Chanc. de D. Sebastião, liv. 45, fl. 159 and Chanc. de Filipe I, liv. 4, fls. 72-74). This was followed in 1583 by the award of the commandery of Zalamea of the Order of Alcantara, valued at 890,000 *maravedís* (950,000 *réis*), which was replaced in 1588 by the chief commandery of the same order, providing a further income of ten thousand ducats (4,000,000 *réis*) (Danvila y Burguero 1900: 693). On the death of his father in 1588, he inherited the chief governorship (*alcaldaria-mor*) of Castelo Rodrigo and the following year was appointed *Sumiller de corps* of the Prince of Asturias. In 1591, he received an extraordinary award of ten million *maravedís* (10,666,670 *réis*) and three years later received the title of Count of Castelo Rodrigo, which was given to him together with the village of the same name (Danvila y Burguero 1900: 717; ANTT, Chanc. Filipe I, liv. 31, fl. 48). That same year, he was also given the lordships (*senhorios*) of Cabeceiras de Basto, Lumiares, Lamegal and Paços de Ferreira, together with all of their jurisdictions and a part of their rents; with the permission of the crown, he was to buy the remaining rents for 16 million *réis* (ANTT, Chanc. de Filipe I, liv. 25, fls. 178-184). This important cycle of donations made by Philip II culminated in 1596 in the award to Dona Margarida Corte Real of the soap factories of the islands of Terceira and São Jorge (ANTT, Chanc. Filipe I, liv. 30, fl. 105-105v.^o).

In the following reign, Dom Cristóvão de Moura was once again granted new privileges, at two distinct moments: in 1598, as part of the compensations that were granted to him for renouncing the position of Filipe III's Lord Chamberlain, he was given the Paul de Trava, a rich marshland, and the title of Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo; and, at the time of his second appointment as viceroy, in 1607, the king awarded him the title of

⁵ The *Lei Mental*, a royal edict of 1434, regulated the inheritance of crown property, according to the principles of primogeniture, masculinity, legitimacy, inalienability and indivisibility. On this subject, see Hespanha 1994: 402-414.

Count of Lumiares, which was intended to be used by the heirs and successors of the house (ANTT, Chanc. de Filipe III, liv. 11, fls. 133v.^o-134v.^o and liv. 7, fls. 32v.^o-33v.^o).

It was this group of assets that the first Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo was to pass on in their entirety to his successor, who in turn would be able to transmit them to subsequent generations, thanks to an extraordinary set of grants, which included several extra lives (*vidas mais*) in the assets that were donated on a lifetime basis and several exemptions of the *Lei Mental* (ANTT, Chanc. de Filipe III, liv 5, fls. 257-258v.^o and liv. 7, fls. 32v.^o-33v.^o). Under these terms, the continuity of the House of Castelo Rodrigo was guaranteed, whether or not there were any male heirs, because the transmission of the estate through the female or collateral line was safeguarded. If we consider the rigidity of the principles that shaped the succession of the crown's property in Portugal, this was undoubtedly an advantage that guaranteed the house's stability from the very outset.

The rapid social ascent that saw the page of Princess Juana of Austria rise to Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo must be considered surprising when compared with what had been the customary practice in the last few decades of the Avis dynasty. Not only was the hierarchy of the nobility highly restricted at the top—with 19 titled houses and approximately a hundred lords of jurisdictions (*senhores de jurisdições*)—but also, according to the rules laid down by the crown, there were serious limitations in the access to the upper echelons, and progression within this group was very slow indeed. The fact that, on the eve of the Iberian Union, there only existed two dukedoms (Braganza and Aveiro), both of which had family connections with the royal household, and one marquisate (Vila Real), is a clear indication of the restricted nature of the upper nobility. In the case of the House of Vila Real, it is worth remembering that it took sixty-five years before the countship was raised to a marquisate. In comparison, the rapid rise of Dom Cristóvão de Moura from Count to Marquis, which he achieved in only four years, must also be understood in the light of the changes introduced by the Spanish monarchs into the dynamics that had marked the relationship between the crown and the group of the high nobility since the fifteenth century. Because of the need to reward individuals who had backed the Iberian Union and the extension to Portugal of the more liberal remunerative practices that were followed in the Spanish monarchy, the Spanish kings were responsible for broadening the group's upper echelons and speeding up the processes of aristocratic advancement. As has already been noted, the number of titled houses in Portugal had risen to 59 by around 1640, with Philip III and Philip IV in particular making a sizeable contribution to this greater number (Monteiro 2007: 262). Such an increase was felt by the houses that had

been founded before 1580 as upsetting the balance within the Portuguese aristocracy, so that Dom Cristóvão de Moura's successful social, political and economic advancement inevitably gave rise to much discontent.

The role that Dom Cristóvão de Moura played in the government of Portugal was largely continued by his son. In 1615, Dom Manuel de Moura Corte Real entered the house of the Prince of Asturias to occupy the position of Gentleman of the bedchamber, and it was there that he managed to draw closer to the Count of Olivares, becoming associated with the faction that was opposed to the Duke of Lerma. When Philip IV ascended the throne, Dom Manuel was awarded the status of a Grandee of Spain, but the strengthening of the power and influence of Don Gaspar de Guzmán was unfavorable to him. Far from supporting his fellow partisan, Olivares thought he should limit him to the sphere of the government of Portugal. After being elected to the Council of Portugal in Madrid in 1623, it was in this town that the second Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo was to concentrate his political activity until the middle of 1628.

Meanwhile, his relationship with Olivares had been further strained by an additional source of tension, following the incident involving the chief commandery of the Order of Alcántara, which occurred in 1623. At the request of his *valido* (favorite), Philip IV had forced Dom Manuel de Moura to renounce this commandery in favor of Don Gaspar de Guzmán, granting him in return the chief commandery of the Order of Christ, an episode that was regarded by the second Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo as an insult. Thereafter, Dom Manuel de Moura never ceased to oppose Olivares and to plot his downfall. It is probably within this same context that we should view his removal from Madrid. In 1628, he was sent to Lisbon with instructions to oversee the preparations of the fleet that was to sail to India, remaining there from June 1628 to the end of December 1630, when he was ordered to return to Madrid. But he was to live in the Spanish capital for only a very brief period, since, at the end of July 1631, he left the city once more, this time heading to Rome to take up the post of ambassador to the Holy See, where he lived until January 1641.⁶ Consequently, he was at the Vatican when he learned of the palace coup that had brought the Duke of Braganza to the throne of Portugal.

With the embassy to Rome, a new cycle was to begin in the life of Dom Manuel de Moura and, in a certain sense, in the history of the Moura family as a whole, since this was the first time they had occupied a position outside the Iberian Peninsula. For the second Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo, it was also the beginning of a long absence of almost sixteen

⁶ For more information on the time spent by Dom Manuel de Moura Corte Real in Rome, see Connors 1991 and García Cueto 2007.

years, in the course of which a great deal was to change in his personal life and in the history of Spain. Once his diplomatic mission to the Vatican was completed, he was to move to Regensburg and Vienna (1641-1644) as Philip IV's ambassador to the Holy Empire, and finally to Brussels, to take up the post of assistant governor of the Spanish Netherlands (1644-1647). On his return to Madrid in January 1648, in order to perform the role of the king's Lord High Steward (*mayordomo mayor*), he was to find the court already without Olivares, who had fallen into disgrace some years earlier. He was to remain in Madrid until his death in 1651.

From the economic standpoint, the life of the second Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo was indelibly marked by the ascent to the throne of King John IV, and by his own refusal to recognize the new Portuguese king, which ended up proving fatal for the survival of the house. In fact, many of the estates that the Mouras had accumulated, both their 'fully owned' and the crown's property, were situated in Portugal, with the Portuguese share of its patrimony having greatly increased since 1625, with the enforced replacement of the chief commandery of Alcantara by the chief commandery of the Portuguese Order of Christ.⁷ When the Duke of Braganza was acclaimed king, this group of assets was subjected to a first seizure in 1641, and, in view of Dom Manuel de Moura's insistence on not recognizing the new king, it was definitively confiscated in 1642. The crown's property and the commanderies that had been in the hands of the House of Castelo Rodrigo would later be partly incorporated into the House of Infantado, created in 1654. As far as the Mouras' own estates were concerned, after the signing of the peace agreement between the two Iberian kingdoms in 1668, the successors to the House took several steps towards regaining possession of their patrimony, in a process that continued into the 19th century (Bouza 1998 and Gomes 2003). Meanwhile, in 1646, with the award of the Italian duchies of Trani and Matera, the first steps were taken towards reconstituting the patrimony of the House of Castelo Rodrigo, which thereafter only continued to exist in Spain and in the Italian territories of the Spanish monarchy (Martínez Hernandez 2009: 27, 30).

⁷ Besides the chief commandery of the Order of Christ, the second marquis was given another twelve commanderies and a chief governorship (*alcaldaria-mor*) of the same military Order, in order to make up the same income as the one that he received from the Spanish commandery. The process of incorporating the commanderies began in January 1625 and was completed in November of that same year (ANTT, Chanc. da Ordem de Cristo, liv. 12, fls. 47-60v.º, 62-63, 64-66v.º and 73-74v.º).

2. Patrimony and governance of the house

Around 1630, the patrimony of the House of Castelo Rodrigo was to be found distributed among four of the six provinces into which mainland Portugal was divided, as well as in the Azores. In Estremadura, Dom Manuel de Moura had urban properties in the city of Lisbon, a handful of rural properties in Queluz, and the Paul de Trava in the district of Santarém. In the province of Beira, more precisely in the coastal region of Beira, the House had six commanderies: Dornes and Santo Estêvão de Pussos, close to the River Zêzere; Alencarces,⁸ Ega (the chief commandery of the Order of Christ) and São Martinho do Bispo in the surroundings of Coimbra; and, finally, the commandery of Arganil. Further inland was the commandery of Nossa Senhora do Castelejo, belonging to the diocese of Guarda. Continuing on towards the region of Beira Alta and the border with Castile, the Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo was the Lord of Lamegal and, in the province of Trás-os-Montes, of Castelo Rodrigo, of which the Mouras had been the chief governors since the mid-sixteenth century. In Beira Alta, continuing to head in a west-northwest orientation, he controlled the village of Lumiares, the commandery of São Martinho de Cambres and the royal domain (*reguengo*) of Sanfins. Returning to the province of Trás-os-Montes, he held the commandery of Santa Eugénia da Ala, belonging to the diocese of Miranda, which was also the House's most northerly possession. Further westwards in the same province, Dom Manuel controlled yet another commandery, São Nicolau de Carrazedo, and two other royal domains, Vila Pouca de Aguiar and Ribeira de Pena. Finally, the other properties that he administered in the kingdom were in the province of Entre Douro e Minho, where he was the lord of Cabeceiras de Basto and Paços de Ferreira, also possessing another two commanderies, Santa Maria de Airães and São Salvador de Unhão. In the Azores, Dom Manuel de Moura Corte Real administered four of the five islands in the central group of the archipelago: Terceira, with its two captaincies (Angra and Praia), São Jorge, Pico and Faial, these latter two islands having been incorporated on a perpetual basis in 1614.

The House of Castelo Rodrigo enjoyed a wide range of rights and prerogatives over this highly diverse estate, which ranged from the political and jurisdictional governance of its lordships (*senhorios*) to the collection of taxes, but also included exercising rights of patronage. To fulfill these tasks, the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo created an administrative structure of their own, served by a permanent communications network, in order to connect the various nodes to the House's headquarters in Lisbon and from there to Madrid

⁸ Nearby Alencarces, the House also owned the *alcaldaria-mor* of Soure.

or, from 1631 onwards, to Rome. At the same time, they established a set of rules to be observed, not only in terms of financial administration, but also in the provision of servants and offices or even in the exercise of their respective jurisdictions. The goal of this administrative organization was to guarantee the fulfillment of higher orders issued by the marquises and to mobilize the resources needed for the social reproduction or for royal service. The administrative framework set up by the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo tended to separate the management of their income from the exercise of their seigniorial jurisdictions, which doesn't mean that the two didn't overlap here and there. This is the question that the following sections will examine.

2.1. The exercise of the jurisdictions

In its ten lordships, the House of Castelo Rodrigo exercised a variable set of powers, according to the terms of the donations that were made by the crown. A common feature to them all was the exercise of justice as a court of second instance. Furthermore, in the Azores, the House still had some military duties to perform and enjoyed the power to appoint officers, but there is no record of it presenting and confirming the respective municipal councils. In the kingdom of Portugal, in turn, it was exempt from visits by the *corregedor* (royal magistrate) and had the right to appoint its own judges and officers. Both in the Azorean lordships and in those of the kingdom itself, the heads of the House sought to exercise these rights in full, not only because of the symbolic importance associated with them, but also because of their implications in the political and economic control of their *senhorios* and in the formation of their own networks of clients. Under these terms, *ouvidores* (seigniorial judges) and *lugar-tenentes* (lieutenants), the latter being appointed for the Azores, were key figures in the administration of the lordships.

As was to be expected, the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo showed themselves to be particularly attentive to the administration of justice in the second instance. For this purpose, five *ouvidorias* were established by Dom Cristóvão de Moura: one in Cabeceiras de Basto, whose jurisdiction extended to Paços de Ferreira and Lumiares; another in Castelo Rodrigo whose jurisdiction also extended to Lamegal; two in the island of Terceira (one in the captaincy of Angra and the other in the captaincy of Praia) and one in São Jorge. Dom Manuel de Moura added a sixth *ouvidoria* to these five when he incorporated the islands of Faial and Pico, with the seat being installed in the former.

At the head of each of these judicial circumscriptions, the first and second marquises of Castelo Rodrigo placed *ouvidores* with quite distinct characteristics. In the Azorean context, possibly following a practice adopted by previous grantees (*donatários*), they resorted to individuals without any academic qualifications, whereas in the kingdom of Portugal the choice fell exclusively upon bachelors or licentiates qualified for the exercise of royal magistratures, just as happened in the great Portuguese houses.⁹ For their *ouvidorias* of Cabeceiras de Basto and Castelo Rodrigo, they succeeded in attracting individuals who were already members of the crown's magistratures, by virtue of that other privilege that they had, according to which the time that they had already spent in service in their *ouvidorias* was taken into account for their advancement in their judicial careers.

The marquises of Castelo Rodrigo also jealously guarded and fulfilled their right to present and confirm the municipal councils of Cabeceiras de Basto, Castelo Rodrigo, Lumiares, Lamegal and Paços de Ferreira, for the reasons that have already been mentioned. After 1625, this prerogative was further extended to two villages that had previously been annexed to the commanderies of the Order of Christ: Ega and Dornes (BNP, código 3377). The way in which they exercised this prerogative did, however, vary from place to place, depending on the importance that those centers had for the house and their position within the administrative framework.

Thus, in Castelo Rodrigo and Cabeceiras de Basto, Dom Manuel de Moura intervened actively, working in close conjunction with his *ouvidores*, participating not only in the drawing up of the lists of individuals who were eligible for the main municipal offices, but also in confirming their respective elections. And he did the same thing in Ega and Dornes, notwithstanding the fact that he did not have an *ouvidor* there. In Lumiares, Lamegal and Paços de Ferreira, however, he delegated this responsibility to his *ouvidores*. In any case, in the group of villages under his lordship, the second Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo always sought to accept the result of the elections, provided that the legal requirements were met when holding them and that the main council offices were preferentially filled by individuals originating from the urban centers in detriment to the rural peripheries.

As far as the award of offices was concerned, the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo had a vast range of positions to offer on their lordships. On the one hand, there were the offices of local justice, such as scribes, while, on the other hand, there were the seigniorial offices that were necessary for the *ouvidorias*. *Ouvidores* and *lugar-tenentes* played a

⁹ For the House of Braganza, see Cunha 2000: 222-229.

fundamental role in filtering the positions that were normally attributed to the sons of the previous owners. These offices therefore functioned as a privileged means of building up clientele. The impact that these clienteles had on the lives of the populations is proved by the complaints that the representatives of the council of Angra presented to the *Cortes* of 1642, protesting against the power that Dom Manuel de Moura's *lugar-tenente* had over the appointed officials (Maldonado 1990: II, 261).

The last remark in this section relates to the military obligations that the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo had in the Azorean context. In accordance with the original donation charters from the fifteenth century, the military defense of the islands was the responsibility of the grantees and these duties were never explicitly revoked. However, the absenteeism of the captains, the increase in the naval pressure on the islands, their strategic interest in the context of the transatlantic routes and the enormous expenses involved with the military garrisons soon caused the crown to become increasingly involved in the organization of their defense. In effect, the captains' responsibilities gradually diminished, so that, by the mid-sixteenth century, they only appointed a handful of commanding officers, while also conserving the title of captains and chief governors. In the case under study here, this reduction in military responsibilities further coincided with the uprising on Terceira, in 1581, which led to the formation of a general military government and the suspension of the powers of the captains in this domain. Despite their being reintroduced in the 1590s, the Mouras' military powers were limited to the areas that had been established in the middle of the century.

2.2. Economic governance

Given the characteristics of their patrimony and the vocation of aristocratic economies, it is not surprising that the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo organized the economic administration of their estates around one fundamental aspect: the collection of rents and seigniorial dues. In order to guarantee the performance of this task and overcome the challenges presented by the scattered nature of its patrimony, the House created a network of administrative units (*almoxarifados*), controlled from its headquarters in Lisbon. At the head of each of these administrative districts was a receiver (*almoxarife*) appointed by the House, who played an irreplaceable role in establishing local connections. Besides the collection of rents and dues, his duties also included the renting or leasing of the House's property and assets, the sale of the agricultural produce and the payment of local expenses.

In the Azores, despite the difference in their nomenclature, these same duties were performed by the *lugar-tenente*. Based upon the economic administration of the kingdom, this seems to have been the model adopted by some of the great noble houses in the Iberian Peninsula, albeit with different names. Amongst such houses, were the House of Medina Sidonia (Salas Almela 2008: 156-159), the Spanish House of Infantado (Carrasco Martínez 1991: 302-316; 2011) and the House of Braganza which, in 1563, had as many as ten *almojarifados* (Cunha 2000: 268).

Around 1630, the peripheral administrative network of the House of Castelo Rodrigo consisted of seven *almojarifados*. The one in Lisbon managed the urban property that Dom Manuel owned in the city, as well as the rural properties of Queluz, and collected the wages and rents that were assigned to the royal *almojarifados* of the city (the stipend of the four slaves, the commandery of the *Casa da Índia* and his wages and fees as overseer of the treasury). In Estremadura, Paul de Trava formed its own separate district, whose existence was explained, on the one hand, by its distance from Lisbon, and, on the other hand, by its high income and the complexity of its management. In Beira Litoral, the House had two *almojarifados*, one with its headquarters in the village of Ega and another in Dornes. Besides the chief commandery of the Order of Christ, the first of these also controlled the commanderies of Alencarces, São Martinho do Bispo and São Gens de Arganil, as well as the *alcaldaria-mor* of Soure; while the second included the commanderies of Dornes and Santo Estêvão de Pussos. In turn, the municipal council of Cabeceiras de Basto was the seat of the House's most important *almojarifado*, which controlled the assets of the province of Entre Douro e Minho, part of those of Trás-os-Montes (Vila Pouca de Aguiar, Ribeira de Pena, the commanderies of São Nicolau de Carracedo and São Martinho de Cambres), as well as part of the rents of Beira Alta (Lumiães and Sanfins). In Trás-os-Montes, the *almojarifado* of Castelo Rodrigo was responsible for collecting the rents in this village and in Lamegal, the rents of Vilar Maior and the stipends corresponding to the titles of count and marquis assigned in the royal *almojarifado* of Pinhel. Lying outside this administrative network were just two commanderies—Santa Eugénia da Ala (Trás-os-Montes) and Nossa Senhora do Castelejo (Beira)—which were managed by the House on a casuistic basis.

In turn, the islands of the Azores under the House's administration formed a large district, which was subdivided into two. The headquarters was located in Angra, which controlled the most significant part of the property that the Mouras owned, both in the island of Terceira and São Jorge. The islands of Faial and Pico composed the second sub-

group of the management of the family's assets, unified through the agency of the only steward (*feitor*) known to operate within the context of the House's organization.

This network of administrative units was headed by the *almoxarifado* of Lisbon, which simultaneously performed duties of both a local and a central nature. It was charged with the task of coordinating and managing the operations of this organizational network, supervising tax and rent collection and ensuring the regular flow of its revenues to Lisbon. It is therefore not surprising that this *almoxarifado* was led and controlled by the House's main officer, whose position and responsibilities can be considered equivalent to those of a chief steward/overseer. As the central hub of the whole network, it was through him that the marquis's instructions were channeled, as well as all the information produced by the peripheral extensions. To this end, use was made of the ordinary couriers who linked Lisbon to Madrid and Lisbon to the different parts of the kingdom, or the extraordinary couriers that were specially organized for this purpose. Equally fundamental was this officer's involvement in the circulation of the revenue produced by the *almoxarifados*: after the local expenses had been paid, the net balances had to be transferred to Lisbon, which could be effected in the form of goods, bills of exchange, or through the direct payment of rents in Lisbon; and then from Lisbon they were transferred in part to Madrid, making use of the networks of Portuguese merchants operating between the two kingdoms. A second area in which this officer intervened was that of the administrative supervision of the receivers, including the *lugar-tenente* of the Azores. This involved the auditing of their accounts, in order to prove the legitimacy of the transactions that they had made. Only after these audits had been carried out were the accounts sent to Dom Manuel de Moura, in order to discharge the receivers of their responsibility.

In performing these duties, the chief steward/overseer received the help of a scribe, who controlled the House's registry, where all information relevant to its governance was stored, as well as the help of a treasurer who, besides centralizing the revenues, audited the accounts of the receivers. This structure was completed with one last officer, entrusted with the task of selling on the market the agricultural produce sent from the Azores, Queluz and Paul de Trava.

In this brief examination of the House's economic governance, it is also important to mention the uses to which the land was put and the forms of tax collection that were adopted and which can be identified in the static view for 1630. Generally speaking, the rural properties were leased out by way of short-term rental agreements or long-term contracts (*emphyteusis*). However, the choice between one form of lease or another

depended on the nature and the characteristics of the property whose use was being leased out. Thus in the case of the House's 'fully owned' entailed property, most of this was leased through short-term rental agreements, which were applied to the estates that provided high income. Emphyteutic leases, on the other hand, were rarely agreed for such property, being used only for the urban and rural properties that provided a low income. In turn, the twelve commanderies of the Order of Christ that consisted of rural properties provide a rather diverse picture: rental agreements did not exist here, with a widespread use being made of long-term lease contracts, in keeping with an age-old tradition. While it was common practice for the House to lease the right to exploit the land, it is worth noting one exception to this situation: as a result of the heavy investment that had been made by Dom Manuel de Moura, the Quinta de Queluz was the only estate that was maintained under a system of direct exploitation, certainly due to its use as a leisure residence.

As far as tax and rent collection was concerned, two distinct trends can be identified. In the case of the properties donated by the crown, the collection of their seigniorial rights and rents varied between receiving them directly, through the network of *almoxarifados*, and leasing them out. The choice between these two forms of collection depended on the opportunities and interests pursued by the House at a given time. Included in this category of revenue are production monopolies, retail monopolies (*estancos de venda*), seigniorial rights and ecclesiastic tithes. This form of alternating between different ways of collecting revenue was not to be found in the commanderies of the Order of Christ. In these properties, the collection of revenue had always been leased out, as was the case with most grantees of commanderies since at least the last quarter of the sixteenth century. In return for the renting of such collection, the leaseholder undertook to directly deliver the price of the contract in cash in Lisbon. Such a practice, which, as far as the case under study is concerned, seems to have overlapped with the duties of the local receivers, must be understood in the light of the financial pressure to which the budgets of the noble houses were subject and their wish to forestall the problems associated with the collection, storage and sale of agricultural produce.

3. Revenue

From his assets, Dom Manuel de Moura received an annual income, in 1630, of around 17.1 million *réis*, an amount that was sufficient to place him among the richest noblemen in Portugal (Table 1).

Table 1¹⁰
Income of the House of Castelo Rodrigo (1630) (in *réis*)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10,135,513	100,000	4,982,000	15,217,513	1,529,410	400,000	1,929,410	17,146,923
59.11%	0.58%	29.05%	88.75%	8.92%	2.33%	11.25%	100.00%

1. Crown property. 2. Stipends. 3. Property of the Order of Christ. 4. Total of columns 1 to 3. 5. Entailed property. 6. Private interest. 7. Total of columns 5 and 6. 8. Total income of the House.

Source: BNP, códice 3377.

In the hierarchy of the aristocracy, that amount was only surpassed by the amounts received by the Dukes of Braganza and Aveiro, which were reckoned to be 48 and 20 million *réis* respectively in 1615 (Silva 1867: III, 497). Below this figure was the income of the Marquis of Vila Real, who received 13.6 million *réis*, followed a long way behind by all the counts of the kingdom, the first of whom did not receive more than 8 million *réis* (Silva 1867: III, 497 and 503). Outside the nobility, the annual income of the House of Castelo Rodrigo was only matched by the revenue of Portugal's largest dioceses. Thus, according to an estimate made in 1619, the archbishopric of Évora produced an income of some 24 million *réis*, the diocese of Coimbra 17 million, the archbishopric of Lisbon 16 million and that of Braga 14.2 million *réis* (Serrão 1979: 290-291). Extending the comparison to the aristocracy of the Iberian Peninsula, the revenue of the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo still places them in a leading position. Their 38,868 ducats, which would be the value of the 17,146,923 *réis* converted into the Castilian currency, were clearly above the average estimated income of the houses of Spanish counts and marquises in 1630, which amounted to 21,100 ducats and 23,400 ducats respectively (Atienza Hernández 1987: 63, 56).

¹⁰ The House's sources of income were distributed into two main groups. The first includes the aggregate income from properties donated by the monarchy on a perpetual or lifetime basis, which can be divided into three categories: crown property, stipends and the property of the Order of Christ. The second includes the income from the House's 'fully owned' property, which can be divided into the revenues from estates (rural or urban) and those originating from interest on capital. On the criteria for this classification, see Monteiro 1998: 254-257.

Nonetheless, their income was still far below the average income of the houses of the dukes of the Spanish kingdoms, which amounted to approximately 90,000 ducats (Atienza Hernández 1987: 51).

If we look at the sources of the House's income, we can see that the overwhelming majority of its income (roughly 89%) came from properties that had been donated by the crown, as was, in fact, also the case with the Houses of Braganza, Aveiro and Vila Real. And, under this broad heading, it is worth noting the clear prevalence of the income originating from the crown's property over that originating from the Order of Christ, due to the large amounts that Dom Manuel de Moura took from his ten lordships under the form of monopolies, seigniorial rights and patronage. In fact, it can be said that the amount listed under the first heading could be even higher, if we consider that included in it is the conversion of the 410 *moios*¹¹ of wheat, collected on the island of Terceira,¹² which were normally sold in the local market or used to supply the Portuguese fortresses in North Africa. In fact, this wheat could be worth much more if it were exported to Lisbon, as happened in 1630, in the exceptional period of 1628-1631, when its price oscillated between 19,000 and 48,000 *réis* per *moio* (Mauro 1983: 376 and 388). Under these circumstances, Dom Manuel may have obtained between 7.9 and 19.2 million *réis* for the sale of the wheat, as opposed to the 2.5 to 3 million *réis* (the amount accounted for in the table), which would have been the value of the transaction in Azores in a situation of stable prices. However, the export of wheat to Lisbon does not seem to have been a regular option, in view of the resistance of Azorean municipalities. In any case, it is reasonable to admit that the income of the House of Castelo Rodrigo could have been more than 17 million *réis*, whenever it was possible to export part of the wheat to Lisbon, where its selling price on the market was, on average, three to four times higher.

From the Order of Christ, the House of Castelo Rodrigo received roughly the same income as that of the House of Braganza from its 34 commanderies, and half of what the House of Aveiro received from the Order of Santiago (Falcão 1859: 243-246 and 250-259).

Under the category of entailed property, the rent from the houses and stores that the House owned in Lisbon was by far the main source of income of Dom Manuel de Moura. This sizeable urban income, which arose from the incorporation of the entailed estate of the Corte Real family, contrasts with what is known of the other aristocratic

¹¹ An old Portuguese measure of weight that, on the island of Terceira, corresponded to approximately 792 litres.

¹² Three quarters of these 410 *moios* came from the seigniorial dues levied on the 23 windmills that the House of Castelo Rodrigo owned in the two captaincies of the island of Terceira and the remaining $\frac{1}{4}$ from its *redízimas*.

houses, where rents from rural properties predominated. The second largest contribution came from the annual interest that the Counts of Tentúgal paid from the dowry of Dona Leonor de Melo, the second Marchioness of Castelo Rodrigo. In any case, these assets did not represent more than 11.3% of the house's overall income.

One final remark should be made about the significance of the assets that Dona Margarida Corte Real brought in her dowry and which, as has already been said, represented the first important addition to the estate of the Mouras. Notwithstanding the successive donations of the crown, in 1630, the assets belonging to the house of the Lords of Terra Nova were responsible for almost 24% of the income received by Dom Manuel de Moura.

It is worth taking a look at the geographical distribution of the income, as a factor that could potentially explain the strategies set out by the House in terms of its economic governance (Table 2). The *almoxarifados* of Cabeceiras de Basto and Angra appear as the main contributors, being followed, at some distance, by the *almoxarifado* of Lisbon. Overall, these three administrative units were responsible for 60.7% of the House's income, which suggests that there was a concentrated structure as far as the formation of the House's income was concerned. Inevitably, the marquises' attention was directed towards the two most profitable *almoxarifados*.

Table 2
Origin of the Income of the House of Castelo Rodrigo by *Almoxarifados* (1630) (in réis)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2,575,000	1,000,000	1,894,000	1,052,000	3,950,569	1,625,704	3,891,410	1,158,240	17,146,923
15.02%	5.83%	11.05%	6.14%	23.04%	9.48%	22.69%	6.75%	100.00%

1. Lisbon. 2. Trava. 3. Ega. 4. Dornes. 5. Cabeceiras de Basto. 6. Castelo Rodrigo. 7. Angra. 8. Income not attributed to any *almoxarifado*. 9. Total income of the House.

Source: BNP, código 3377.

But it is through the comparison of the centers of expenditure that we can best understand the limits that this division imposed and the solutions that were found to overcome them. As was the case with other aristocratic houses, the costs were concentrated in the main residences, in this case Madrid and Lisbon until 1631 and thereafter Lisbon and Rome. This means that there is no correspondence to be noted between the central headquarters—Lisbon—and the most profitable *almoxarifados*. In view of the impossibility of assigning its income to local expenditure, as the crown did, the net

balances flowing from the periphery to Lisbon, and from there to Madrid, were vital for the House's upkeep. In order to keep the central headquarters supplied with the funds that it needed, one of the solutions was to lease out the entire collection of rents and other sources of income. As already noted, this was the expedient that was normally used to collect the money and kind due by the long-term leaseholders (*foreiros*) of the commanderies. The advantages were obvious: in exchange for a sum of money previously agreed upon and delivered in Lisbon, Dom Manuel transferred the responsibility for the collection of the agricultural produce of the whole commandery to a leaseholder, thus freeing himself from the costs arising not only from its collection, but also from the storage and transport of the goods to the market. If we consider that this practice was also extended, alternating with direct collection, to the rents and seigniorial rights of the ten lordships, it seems reasonable to admit that this was an expedient intended to ensure regular cash flows, regardless of the rhythms and contingencies of agricultural production.

However, transferring the surpluses remained a constant problem, due to several interferences in the links between Lisbon and the *almoxarifados*. Perhaps the main difficulty was to be found in the behavior of the receivers and their ability for interfering in the House's revenue, which took various forms. One of these was their resistance to administrative control. By delaying as much as possible the audit of their accounts, the receivers sought to keep hold of the net balances of the revenues collection and use them to their own advantage. This was, for example, the customary practice of the receiver of Cabeceiras de Basto, whom the House's overseer accused of using the money of rents and seigniorial rights in commercial operations that were highly profitable for him, gambling with the fluctuation in prices. In order to counter this practice, Dom Manuel de Moura insisted on the need for auditing the accounts of his receivers annually. Nonetheless, there are recurring references in the documentation to delays in the administrative inspection, as well as the existence of debts on the part of the receivers. But fraudulent practices in the appropriation of agricultural produce also meant that part of the income owed to the House of Castelo Rodrigo never reached the central headquarters. An example of this is the decrease noted in the collection of Azorean wheat, which Dom Manuel suspected to have been caused by a manipulation of the ledgers by the *lugar-tenente*. It was, in fact, commonly believed that gaining access to the position of *lugar-tenente* was a surefire way of becoming rich (Chagas 1989: 423). A similar situation was also detected in the *almoxarifado* of Cabeceiras de Basto, where some officers had clearly amassed fortunes in the service of the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo.

Thus, the physical distance between the *almoxarifados* and the central treasury was further compounded by the autonomy of the officers and the frequent practices of embezzlement, and such obstacles inevitably affected the appropriation of the income that was due to the House.

4. Expenditure, investment and indebtedness

The picture that can be formed of the pattern of expenditure of the Marquises of Castelo Rodrigo is at best a somewhat fragmentary one. There are various reasons for this. First of all, there is the scattered nature of the expenditure, arising from the configuration of the administrative system and its peripheral network, but also due to the existence of several centers of spending, linked to the upkeep of their residences, respectively Madrid and Lisbon until 1631, and thereafter Lisbon and Rome. This reality is further exacerbated by the fact that none of the ledgers of these centers of spending have survived until the present day, and much less the accounting balances produced for the House's expenditure as a whole. This makes it impossible to make an overall estimate of its spending. Nonetheless, it is possible to make out some of the features of its current and extraordinary expenditure.

As is known, at that time, a very large part of the current expenditure of Western Europe's aristocratic houses related to the kitchen, stables and servants.¹³ Also to be added to these expenses were clothing, personal expenses, the monthly allowances paid to consorts and children and the expenses incurred with the payment of debts. From the little information that has survived to the present day, it is possible to detect some signs of this pattern in the House of Castelo Rodrigo. At least this is what is suggested by the report of the payments made by the Lisbon treasurer, probably between January and 31 July 1631, at a time when Dom Manuel was already to be found in Madrid and the journey to Rome was being prepared in Lisbon (Table 3). Consequently, it must be borne in mind that, besides the fact that the report is only a partial one, some of the items of expenditure are also undervalued.

Table 3
Payments made by the Lisbon Treasury (Jan.-July 1631) (in *réis*)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2,026,086	828,338	320,380	64,400	590,590	447,425	1,251,219	1,038,190	174,036	6,740,664
30.06%	12.29%	4.75%	0.96%	8.76%	6.64%	18.56%	15.40%	2.58%	100.00%

1. House. 2. Stables. 3. Wages of the house's officers and servants. 4. Taxes. 5. Costs incurred with the debt? 6. Graces and favors, pious legacies and alms. 7. Building work. 8. Journey to Rome. 9. Sundry expenses. 10. Total.

Source: ANTT, Manuscritos do Convento da Graça, Pecúlio, cx. 5, tomo II.

¹³ For the English aristocratic houses, see Stone 1965: 548.

In the first category of Table 3, expenses of a very diverse nature have been lumped together, although they do have as their common denominator the acquisition of goods that were necessary for the expenditure of the residence and its staff (payments to merchants, purchase of clothes and shoes, household and bed linen, kitchen utensils). It should be noted that the kitchen is underrepresented here, not only due to the absence of the marquises, but also due to the prevalence of the house's consumption of its own agricultural produce originating from the Quinta de Queluz, from Paul de Trava, and possibly even from the Azores. In Madrid, the expenses incurred with the kitchen and stables would have been proportionally much greater, as the house did not have any rural properties, nor any sources of taxation in Spain that could result in the provision of agricultural produce. As far as the payments to the servants are concerned, it should be said that these only include those servants who were linked to the Lisbon residence, as well as those who had stayed behind to prepare the journey to Rome. It is not possible to quantify them, but undoubtedly this was a minority group, so that we should avoid any extrapolation regarding the relative share that the servants had in the house's budget. Despite these limitations, all together, the expenses incurred with the household, stables and servants represented almost half of the spending made by this treasurer.

The primary sources also allow us to capture some aspects of the expenditure related to the upkeep of its organizational structure. This is the case with the wages of part of the administrative and judicial officers for 1630 (Table 4).

Table 4
Partial cost of the administrative structure of the House of Castelo Rodrigo (1630) (in réis)

1	2	3	4	5	6
30,000	97,000	98,000	108,000	271,900	604,900
4.96%	16.04%	16.20%	17.85%	44.95%	100.00%

1. Quinta de Queluz. 2. Paul de Trava. 3. Castelo Rodrigo. 4. Cabeceiras de Basto. 5. Azores. 6. Total.

Source: BNP, código 3377.

Left out of this table are the wages paid to the officers linked to the *almoxarifados* of Lisbon, Dornes and Ega, which, if added together here, could raise the total of this item to a million réis. It therefore seems reasonable to admit that the relative share of this wages bill would be around 6% of the house's annual income. In any case, it is difficult to estimate

the total costs of the house's administration. Expenses of a very varied nature, such as the repairs to productive infrastructures, collection costs or legal charges are not always broken down and identified in the primary sources, or in some cases they already appear as having been completely deducted from the revenue. The only exception is the *almojarifado* of the Azores, where the administrative costs (including the wages bill) amounted to roughly 11% of the whole of the income collected in the islands (Table 5).

Table 5
Administrative costs of the House of Castelo Rodrigo—Azores (1630) (in *réis*)

<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
271,900	58,000	90,000	4,000	423,900
64.14%	13.68%	21.23%	0.94%	100.00%

1. Wages. 2. Collection costs. 3. Repairs to productive infrastructures. 4. Other expenses. 5. Total.

Source: BNP, código 3377.

As far as extraordinary costs are concerned, it is possible to identify a group of items that would have represented a highly significant share of the budget of the Marquises of Castelo Rodrigo. These were: royal service, the dowries of their daughters, investment in property and their policy of religious patronage. In fact, these are more or less the same expenses that were to be found in other contemporary noble houses in Spain (Yun Casalilla 1990). Even though the pressure of these items on the house's budget may have varied over the decades, it seems undeniable that they ended up absorbing quite sizeable sums of money.

While, for the Mouras, the monarchy represented a fundamental source of income and of grants and favors, it is also quite clear that, through royal service, it also came to represent a constant source of expenditure, as also happened with many Spanish houses (Yun Casalilla 1990: 530). It should, however, be borne in mind that, despite the fact that the Marquises of Castelo Rodrigo held positions of great importance within the government of the monarchy and the Spanish royal household, it was only after 1631 that they were appointed to posts that were traditionally considered to be ruinous, as was the case with the most important embassies of Spain (Rome and Vienna), due to the high cost of the expenses associated with ceremonial diplomacy. However, since the upkeep and growth of the noble houses depended on their satisfactory fulfillment of these duties, those who occupied these positions ended up regarding them as an essential expense to be paid

in return for future grants. Dom Manuel de Moura himself accepted the diplomatic representation of Spain at the Holy See with his eyes firmly fixed on one of the Italian vice-royalties (Sousa 1975: 308). This was a legitimate expectation, given that, as a general rule, those who passed through the embassy to Rome were later rewarded with an appointment to one of these vice-royalties, where they would have the opportunity to recover part of the expenditure made in the previous position (Yun Casalilla 1990: 532). But Dom Manuel was aware that this embassy could signify his ruin (Sousa 1975: 308). And, in fact, he did accumulate a colossal debt with this embassy. On the secession of Portugal, and because of the suspicions that had been aroused regarding his involvement with the Lisbon rebellion, instead of the Italian vice-royalty, he ended up being appointed to the embassy of Vienna, another highly costly post.

Similarly, the strategy adopted by the first and second Marquises of Castelo Rodrigo of establishing matrimonial ties with some of the main Portuguese aristocratic houses, and occasionally with the Grandees of Spain, also had a significant impact on their finances. In order to achieve that aim, father and son did not hesitate in providing for all of their female descendants who reached adult age, which meant five marriages in three and a half decades. For all of their daughters, the marquises benefited from donations of the crown of a greater or lesser size, but even so this did not exempt them from having to provide the respective dowries.¹⁴ In this particular regard, Dom Cristóvão de Moura was the one who placed the heavier burden on the house's budget. During his lifetime, he married one daughter and amassed the necessary resources to guarantee the dowry of the others, whose marriages he expressly commissioned his successor to carry out in his will (ADL/ANTT, 7.º CNL, liv. 61, fls. 12-28). Dona Beatriz, the first-born, married the heir presumptive to the House of the Duke of Alcalá de los Gazules (1598), Dona Margarida de Moura married the sixth Count of Portalegre (1614), while the third daughter Dona Maria married the fourth Count of Vimioso in 1616. It is only in the case of this last marriage that we know the amount and composition of the dowry, which amounted to 43.2 million *réis* distributed in the following manner: 34.7% in private interest; 26.9% in jewels, dresses, furniture, tapestries, etc.; 22.4% in money; 14.2% in debts owed to the first Marquis of Castelo

¹⁴ Among the graces and favors granted by the crown to the daughters of the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo, three important ones should be mentioned here: the crown's renunciation of the succession to the marquise of Tarifa for the marriage of Dona Beatriz de Moura to Dom Fernando Enríquez de Ribera, the third Duke of Alcalá de los Gazules (Danvila y Burguero 1900: 746); the royal decree of lady (*alvará de dama*) granted to Dona Margarida de Moura (ADL/ANTT, 7.º CNL, liv. 61, fl. 23); and finally, for the marriage of Dona Mariana de Castro to Dom Miguel de Noronha, Philip IV implicitly undertook to grant the marquise of Vila Real to the groom and to recognize him as the second Duke of Caminha (ANTT, Chanc. Filipe III, liv. 32, fl. 282v.º and liv. 29, fl. 331).

Rodrigo; and 1.8% in real estate.¹⁵ It should be noted that this amount was roughly three and a half times greater than the sum that Dom Manuel was himself to receive from the dowry negotiated with the House of Tentúgal, when he married Dona Leonor de Melo in 1613.¹⁶

A few years later, it was the turn of the second Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo to amass the capital needed for yet another dowry, this time for the marriage of his daughter Dona Margarida de Melo to Dom Miguel de Noronha, the nephew of the first Duke of Caminha. When Dona Margarida died in 1631, Dom Manuel hurriedly arranged a new marriage for his son-in-law, who at that time appeared increasingly likely to be the successor to the House of Vila Real, proposing his second-born daughter, Dona Mariana de Castro, as his bride (Sousa 1975: 220). It is likely that the first dowry was extended to this second marriage, held in 1634 and ending abruptly with the death of Dona Mariana in 1635 (Sousa 1975: 227). Plans were also made for a third marriage with Dom Manuel's last daughter, but this did not take place due to the bride's death.

Even though we lack information about most of these dowries, it seems reasonable to admit that overall, because of the social standing of the grooms, the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo spent around one hundred million *réis*, between 1598 and 1634.

In this brief look at the main items of the house's extraordinary expenditure, we must finally refer to the great financial investment made by the first and second marquises of Castelo Rodrigo in the building or refurbishment of their Portuguese residences, and, to a lesser degree, the spending involved in the patronage that Dom Manuel de Moura afforded to the construction of several religious buildings.¹⁷ For their residences, the drain on their capital began as early as 1585 with the beginning of the construction of what was to become one of the most emblematic buildings in Lisbon: the Corte Real palace. By the end of the 1610s, it was this residence that absorbed most of the family's investment in building, together with the building campaigns that were directed at the refurbishment of the palace of Castelo Rodrigo. After this, there came the project for the transformation of the Quinta de Queluz into an Italian-inspired leisure residence, which replaced the Lisbon palace as the major drain of resources (Gomes 2003).

¹⁵ Sousa 1952 [1746]: V (2.^a parte), 376-389. On the value of the dowries of the nobility in Portugal throughout the sixteenth and sixteenth centuries, see Monteiro 1998: 99-125. On the matrimonial alliances between the Portuguese and Spanish houses during the Union of the Crowns, see Cunha 2009.

¹⁶ ADL/ANTT, 7.^o CNL, liv. 61, fls. 2-12. The dowry agreed between the parties amounted to 12 million *réis*, of which 6.4 million *réis* were paid in cash and the rest in the form of jewels, dresses, etc.

¹⁷ On the practices adopted by the Portuguese houses in this field, see Cunha and Monteiro 2011: 202-211.

As far as the contribution made by the second Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo to the construction of religious buildings is concerned, a special mention should be made of his intervention at São Bento o Novo. At this Lisbon church, Dom Manuel de Moura sought to erect the pantheon of the Moura family, and for this purpose acquired the rights to the crypt and chancel for 12 million *réis* in 1619 (ANTT, Chanc. de Filipe III, liv. 38, fl. 53v.^o). In fact, he commissioned for them a project by Borromini, for which the first materials were sent from Rome in around 1635, but the work was never completed (Connors 1991; Gomes 2003: 54-59). Besides São Bento o Novo in Lisbon, the second marquis also sponsored the church of Santo Antonio de los Portugueses in Madrid and, during his stay in Italy, the convents of San Carlino alle Quattro Fontane and San Isidoro on the Pincian Hill in Rome (Connors 1991; Gomes 2003: 54-62; García Cueto 2007: 11-14).

It seems clear that the pattern of the house's spending not only reflects the customary patterns of consumption of the aristocratic houses at that time, but also the pursuit of investment strategies that were indissociable from a plan for the family's rise in social terms. While these statements are, generally speaking, true for the house's two administrations, there are, however, some differences to be noted. In the case of Dom Cristóvão de Moura, one can detect a concern with ensuring the house's social reproduction, building its symbolic image and guaranteeing the expansion of its material base. To this end, he made large profit-earning investments: he bought the rents and the royal rights to Cabeceiras de Basto and Aguiar de Pena in 1594 for 16 million *réis* and spent 15 million *réis* on *padrões de juro* (public debt) purchased from the houses of Braganza and Vila Nova de Portimão, which ended up forming part of the dowry of Dona Maria de Mendonça.¹⁸ From the social and symbolic standpoint, the first marquis was also responsible for the investment made in the marriage of his three daughters and in the building and rebuilding of the Portuguese residences. Despite this extraordinary expenditure, everything points to the fact that, at the time of his death in 1613, the house was no longer burdened with any great financial commitments. Not only had the debts been paid, but a new *morgadio* was established.¹⁹

Dom Manuel, on the other hand, allocated far fewer funds to expanding the house's material base. Except for the purchase of two rural properties in Sintra in 1630,

¹⁸ ANTT, Chanc. de Filipe I, liv. 25, fls. 178-184 and Sousa 1952: V (2.^a parte), 376-389.

¹⁹ ADL/ANTT, 7.^o CNL, liv. 61, fls. 12-30. The entailed estate was established by the joint will of Dom Cristóvão de Moura and Dona Margarida Corte Real. It was composed by the *terças* of the founders, the 'fully owned' property and interest existing at their death, the improvements made to the houses in Lisbon and the rents of Cabeceiras de Basto that they had bought from the crown. The successors in this entailed estate would in turn entail their *legítimas* and their *terças*.

which together were worth around a million *réis*, he is not known to have made any other investments of this nature (ADL/ANTT, 15.º CNL, liv. 241, fl. 55-55v.º). The other extraordinary expenditure that he made until 1631 did not deviate from the trend that had already been foreshadowed in the previous administration. In other words, there were also a great number of investments of a symbolic nature, such as the creation of a built heritage, the perpetuation of the memory of the lineage or the arrangement of alliances through marriage. However, it was with the second Marquis that the first signs began to appear of greater pressure on the house's financial resources, which were to reach their turning point after 1631. The reasons for this must be sought, on the one hand, in an eventual increase in current expenditure. If we consider that, between the death of his father and his own departure for the Rome embassy in 1631, Dom Manuel lived for thirteen years in Madrid, it seems reasonable to admit that the house was confronted with a growth in the expenses of representation and the upkeep of his residence, at a time when the displays of ostentation at court were increasing. On the other hand, the demands of royal service related to the embassy in Rome in 1631, gave rise to a level of indebtedness that was quite unusual for the house. In the ten years that he remained in Rome, the second Marquis must have spent close on 150 million *réis* and incurred some fairly heavy costs (Connors 1991: 439).

Conclusion

In less than two decades (1581-1598), Dom Cristóvão de Moura managed to amass an immense wealth, mainly composed of property belonging to the crown and the religious orders, which enabled a modest middle-ranking nobleman from a secondary lineage to form what was to be the third largest house in Portugal. It seems obvious that the singular nature of Dom Cristóvão's social ascent was due to the part that he played in bringing about the incorporation of the Portuguese crown into the Spanish monarchy, which brought him an ample reward. His rapid accumulation of grants and favors was unusual in the light of the traditional practices to be found in the kingdom of Portugal, so that it must also be understood within the framework of the remunerative policy practiced in Spain, which was much more generous than the one that was followed by the members of the Avis dynasty. In this context, the case of Cristóvão de Moura was certainly a most extreme one. Despite his successful political career, his son, Dom Manuel de Moura, did not manage to receive any sizeable endowments until 1640, so that, under his administration, the house largely continued to be run on the fortune built up by his father.

It is difficult to say whether the marquises managed to show greater or lesser effectiveness in the management of their patrimony and income, in comparison with other aristocratic houses. It would be necessary to carry out a larger number of studies in order to be able to establish comparisons. But it seems clear that Dom Cristóvão de Moura demonstrated a great organizational capacity. He was responsible for putting together the network of officers (*ouvidores* and *almoxarifes*) which would administer his *senhorios* on his behalf as well as be responsible for the collection of his revenues. As the central and unifying link in this chain, Lisbon was the natural choice, given the double link of both the Mouras and the Corte Real family with the city, among other political and patrimonial reasons. It should be noted that added responsibilities were placed upon this administrative centre, and that no other house in the Portuguese context was so closely linked to the need to maintain constant flows of income to Madrid or Rome.

As we have seen, the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo made use of their sizeable income to establish their house among both the Portuguese and Spanish aristocratic hierarchies. Both the first and the second marquis sought to create a series of alliances with the leading Portuguese houses and with some of the noble houses in Spain, as well as to construct a symbolic image of what was, at the outset, a secondary lineage. In this sense, the Mouras were most successful, and their income proved to be sufficiently elastic to give

substance to that strategy. The new demands of royal service after 1631 were to subject them to a tremendous pressure and would set in motion a spiral of expenditure and indebtedness. After ten years of diplomatic service at the Holy See and of great financial expenditure, Dom Manuel was also confronted with the effects of the secession of Portugal and the confiscation of all his property. The reconstruction of his patrimony was to come later within the Spanish possessions in Italy. But, by that time, the life of the marquises of Castelo Rodrigo was already exclusively circumscribed to the Spanish monarchy.

Abbreviations:

ADL / ANTT—Arquivo Distrital de Lisboa / Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo (Lisbon District Archives / National Archives of Torre do Tombo)
 ANTT—Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo (National Archives of Torre do Tombo, Lisbon)
 BNP—Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal (Portuguese National Library, Lisbon)
 Chanc.—Chancelaria (Chancellery)
 CNL—Cartório Notarial de Lisboa (Lisbon Notary's Office)
 fl. / fls.—fólio / fólhos (folio / folios)
 liv.—livro (book)

Bibliography:

- Atienza Hernández, Ignacio and Simón López, Mina (1987). Patronazgo Real, Rentas, Patrimonio y Nobleza en los Siglos XVI y XVII: Algunas notas para un análisis político y socioeconómico. In *Revista Internacional de Sociología*, 2.^a Série, 45 (1): 25-75.
- Bouza, Fernando (1987). *Portugal en la Monarquía Hispánica, 1580-1640. Felipe II, las Cortes de Tomar y la Génesis del Portugal católico*, 2 Volumes. Madrid: Universidad Complutense.
- Bouza, Fernando (2000). *Portugal no Tempo dos Filipes. Política, Cultura, Representações, 1580-1668*. Lisbon: Edições Cosmos.
- Bouza, Fernando (2008). *D. Filipe I*. Lisbon: Temas e Debates.
- Carrasco Martínez, Adolfo (1991). *El Régimen Señorial en Castilla Moderna. Las tierras de la Casa del Infantado en los siglos XVII y XVIII*. Madrid.
- Carrasco Martínez, Adolfo (2011). *El poder de la sangre. Los Duques del Infantado*. Madrid: Actas.
- Chagas, Fr. Diogo das (1989). *Espelho Cristalino em Jardim de Várias Flores*. Ponta Delgada: Secretaria Regional de Educação e Cultura / Universidade dos Açores.
- Connors, Joseph (1991). Borromini and the Marchese di Castel Rodrigo. In *Burlington Magazine*, 133: 434-440.
- Cunha, Mafalda Soares da (2000). *A Casa de Bragança, 1560-1640. Práticas Senhoriais e Redes Clientelares*. Lisbon: Editorial Estampa.
- Cunha, Mafalda Soares da (2009). Títulos Portugueses y Matrimonios Mixtos en la Monarquía Católica. In Bartolomé Yun Casalilla (dir.), *Las Redes del Imperio. Élite sociales en la articulación de la Monarquía Hispánica, 1492-1714*. Madrid: Marcial Pons, 205-231.
- Cunha, Mafalda Soares da and Monteiro, Nuno Gonçalo (2010). Aristocracia, Poder e Família em Portugal, Séculos XV-XVIII. In Mafalda Soares da Cunha and Juan Hernández Franco (orgs.), *Sociedade, Família e Poder na Península Ibérica. Elementos para uma história comparativa*. Lisbon-Évora: Edições Colibri / CIDEHUS, 47-75.
- Cunha, Mafalda Soares da and Monteiro, Nuno Gonçalo (2011). Os Espaços da Vida Privada. As grandes casas. In Nuno Gonçalo Monteiro (ed.), *História da Vida Privada em Portugal*, Vol. II. Lisbon: Temas & Debates, 202-243.
- Elliott, J. H. (1986). *The Count-Duke of Olivares. The Statesman in an Age of Decline*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Falcão, Luís de Figueiredo (1859). *Livro em que se contém toda a fazenda e real patrimonio dos reinos de Portugal, India e ilhas adjacentes e outras particularidades*. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional.
- García Cueto, David (2007). Mecenazgo y Representación del Marqués de Castel Rodrigo durante su Embajada en Roma. In Carlos José Hernando (coord.), *Roma y España*.

- Un crisol de la cultura europea en la Edad Moderna*, Vol. II. Madrid: Sociedad Estatal para la Acción Cultural Exterior, 696-716.
- Gomes, Paulo Varela (2003). *Damnatio memoriae*. A arquitectura dos marqueses de Castelo Rodrigo. In Paulo Varela Gomes, *14,5 Ensaios de História e Arquitectura*. Coimbra: Almedina, 47-87.
- Gómez Centurión, José (1912). Jovellanos y las Órdenes Militares. In *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 60: 322-364 and 370-431.
- Hespanha, António Manuel (1994). *As Vésperas do Leviathan: Instituições e Poder Político (Portugal, Século XVI)*. Coimbra: Livraria Almedina.
- Lourenço, Maria Paula Marçal (1995). *A Casa e o Estado do Infantado, 1654-1706. Formas e práticas administrativas de um património senhorial*. Lisbon: Centro de História da Universidade de Lisboa—JNICT.
- Luxán Meléndez, Santiago (1986). *La revolución de 1640 en Portugal. Sus fundamentos sociales y sus caracteres nacionales. El Consejo de Portugal, 1580-1640*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- Maldonado, P.^o Manuel Luís (1990). *Fenix Angrense*, Vol. II. Angra do Heroísmo: Instituto Histórico da Ilha Terceira.
- Martínez Hernández, Santiago (2009). Os marqueses de Castelo Rodrigo e a nobreza portuguesa na monarquia hispânica: estratégias de legitimação, redes familiares e interesses políticos entre a agregação e a Restauração, 1581-1651. In *Ler História*, 57: 7-32.
- Martínez Hernández, Santiago (2009a). Fineza, lealtad y zelo. Estrategias de legitimación y ascenso de la nobleza lusitana en la Monarquía Hispánica: los Marqueses de Castelo Rodrigo, 1582-1675. In Manuel Rivero Rodríguez (coord.), *Nobleza Hispana, Nobleza Cristiana. La Orden de San Juan*, Vol. II. Madrid: Editorial Polifemo, 913-959.
- Martínez Hernández, Santiago (2010). Ya no hay Rey sin privado. Cristóbal de Moura, un modelo de privanza en el Siglo de los Validos. In *Libros de la Corte*, 2, 2: 21-36.
- Martínez Hernández, Santiago (2011). Don Manuel de Moura Corte-Real, Marqués de Castelo Rodrigo. Propaganda, mecenazgo y representación en la Monarquía de Felipe II. In Oliver Noble Wood, Jeremy Roe and Jeremy Lawrence (dirs.), *Poder y Saber. Bibliotecas y bibliofilia en la época del conde-duque de Olivares*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Europa Hispánica, 97-120.
- Martínez Hernández, Santiago (2011a). D. Cristóvão de Moura e a Casa dos Marqueses de Castelo Rodrigo. Proposta de investigação e linhas de análise sobre a figura do grande privado de D. Filipe I. In Santiago Martínez Hernández (dir.), *Governo, política e representações do poder no Portugal Habsburgo e nos seus territórios ultramarinos, 1581-1640*. Lisbon: CHAM, 69-96.
- Mauro, Frédéric (1983). *Le Portugal, le Brésil et l'Atlantique au XVII^e Siècle, 1570-1670. Etude économique*. Paris: Centre Culturel Portugais—Fondation Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Monteiro, Nuno Gonçalo (1998). *O Crepúsculo dos Grandes. A Casa e o Património da Aristocracia em Portugal, 1750-1832*. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional—Casa da Moeda.
- Monteiro, Nuno Gonçalo (2007). Nobility and Aristocracy in Ancien Régime Portugal (Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries). In H. M. Scott (ed.), *The European Nobilities in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Vol. I. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 256-285.
- O'Brien, Patrick K. (2005). Final Considerations: Aristocracies and Economic Progress under the *Ancien Régime*. In Paul Janssens and Bartolomé Yun Casalilla (eds.), *European Aristocracies and Colonial Elites: Patrimonial Management Strategies and Economic Development, 15th—18th Centuries*. Burlington: Ashgate, 247-263.
- Olival, Fernanda (2008). *D. Filipe II de Cognome, o Pio*. Lisbon: Temas e Debates.

- Salas Almela, Luis (2008). *Medina Sidonia. El poder de la aristocracia, 1580-1670*. Madrid: Marcial Pons.
- Salvado, João Paulo (2009). *Nobreza, Monarquia e Império. A Casa Senhorial dos Almotacés-mores do Reino, Séculos XVI-XVIII*. Lisbon: Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
- Schaub, Jean-Frédéric (2001). *Le Portugal au Temps du Comte-duc d'Olivares, 1621-1640. Le conflit de juridictions comme exercice de la politique*. Madrid: Casa Velázquez.
- Sena, Maria Teresa (1987). *A Casa de Oeiras e Pombal. Estado, Senhorio e Património*. Lisbon: Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
- Serrão; Joaquim Veríssimo (1979). *História de Portugal*, Vol. IV. Lisbon: Verbo.
- Silva, Luís Rebelo da (1867). *História de Portugal nos Séculos XVII e XVIII*, Vol. III. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional.
- Sousa, D. Manuel Caetano de (1952) [1746]. *História Genealógica à Casa Real Portuguesa. Provas*, Vol. V (2.^a parte). Coimbra: Atlântida.
- Sousa, Manuel de Faria e (1975). *The Fortuna. An autobiography*, ed. Edward Glaser. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Stone, Lawrence (1965). *The Crisis of Aristocracy, 1558-1641*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Valladares, Rafael (1998). *La Rebelión de Portugal: Guerra, Conflicto y Poderes en la Monarquía Hispánica, 1640-1680*. Madrid: Junta de Castilla y León.
- Valladares, Rafael (2000). *Portugal y la Monarquía Hispánica, 1580-1668*. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Veloso, José Queirós (1946). *O Reinado do Cardeal D. Henrique*. Lisbon: Empresa Nacional de Publicidade.
- Veloso, José Queirós (1953). *O Interregno dos Governadores e o Breve Reinado de D. António*. Lisbon: Academia Portuguesa da História.
- Yun Casalilla, Bartolomé (1990). La situación económica de la aristocracia castellana durante los reinados de Felipe III y Felipe IV. In John Elliott and Angel García Sanz (coords.), *La España del Conde Duque de Olivares. Encuentro Internacional sobre la España del Conde Duque de Olivares Celebrado en Toro los días 15-18 de Septiembre de 1987*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 517-551.
- Yun Casalilla, Bartolomé (2002). *La Gestión del poder. Corona y economías aristocráticas en Castilla*. Madrid: Akal.

Dutch Nautical Sciences in the Golden Age: the Portuguese Influence

Richard W. Unger¹

Abstract

It was a revolt against the king of Spain who was later also king of Portugal that created the Dutch Republic. Success at sea through the application of various aspects of nautical science, including shipbuilding and navigation, generated prosperity in the small state and ensured its survival. Dutch mariners and shipwrights owed a great debt to their Iberian counterparts. Even though the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were marked by decline in the peninsula features of knowledge, approaches and practices in nautical science borrowed from Spain and, even more, Portugal formed a basis for the prosperity in the United Netherlands.

Keywords

Oliveira, shipbuilding, cartography, Mercator, navigation

Resumo

A república Holandesa é fruto de uma revolta contra o rei de Espanha que, mais tarde, foi também rei de Portugal. Os diversos êxitos alcançados por mar através da aplicação de vários aspectos da ciência náutica, v.g. construção naval e navegação, deram lugar à sua prosperidade e asseguraram a sua sobrevivência. Os marinheiros e os construtores de navios Holandeses estavam, assim, em dívida com os seus parceiros Ibéricos. Apesar de ser conhecido que, entre os séculos XVI e XVII os avanços no conhecimento científico na Península Ibérica não acompanharam o ritmo que antes alcançaram, é certo que as bases da ciência náutica holandesa – ponto de partida para o progresso dos Países Baixos - têm as suas raízes em Espanha e, sobretudo em Portugal.

Palavras-chave

Oliveira, construção naval, cartografia, Mercator, navegação

¹ University of British Columbia, Department of History. *E-mail:* Richard.Unger@ubc.ca

In the seventeenth century the Dutch Republic for a short period was the leading maritime state in Europe. The “Golden Century” saw a prodigious expansion in all phases of the economy. Though agriculture enjoyed considerable improvement the growth in output and employment was based heavily on commerce. It was trade, goods carried on Dutch ships, which was the source of the prominence of the northern Netherlands on the economic stage of Europe. It was the trade or more precisely the taxable income generated by that trade which made the rickety, complex and clumsy government a major player on the political stage of Europe. Indeed, Dutch economic success was based firmly on shipping, both in nearby waters and increasingly further afield in other parts of Europe and then around the world.² Dutch achievements were the envy of Europe. Many states, most notably France and England, embarked on a whole range of policy initiatives which did not even stop at war to outdo the Dutch and try to supplant them from their position of leadership. While the sources of the sudden expansion of the Dutch economy has long be a subject absorbing first contemporary policy makers and then historians a recurrent theme among them is technical advance and especially in nautical sciences.

The Republic was the product of a revolt against the duly constituted sovereign of the lands. Philip II of Spain had received the seven northern provinces of the Netherlands from his father when the latter retired to a monastery in 1556. Phillip’s efforts at reform of the episcopal system and more generally to rationalize and simplify the existing hodgepodge of jurisdiction, created by more than a century of marriage alliances, purchases and warfare, led to a strong reaction among the nobles. In addition his efforts to revitalize Roman Catholicism and to eliminate the Protestant danger led to a strong reaction among those people Phillip perceived as religious deviants. The reaction was as great or greater among the many merchants of what was the most urbanized region in northern Europe who relied for their livelihood on contacts and exchange with Protestant merchants in Britain and Germany. Religious and political reforms displeased different groups in Netherlands society but Phillip’s efforts to raise taxes led to a strong reaction from virtually everyone. The revolt which began already in 1567 took a number of twists and turns with the result that by the 1580s there was an uneasy division of Phillip’s lands more or less along the line of the great rivers, the various mouths of the Rhine. Though that *de facto* split between the northern and southern Netherlands would not be acknowledged until the

² De Vries, Jan, and A. M. van der Woude. *The first modern economy : success, failure, and perseverance of the Dutch economy, 1500-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997; Israel, Jonathan I. *Dutch primacy in world trade, 1585-1740*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989; Bavel, Bas J. P. van, and Jan Luiten van Zanden. “The jump-start of the Holland economy during the late-medieval crisis, c.1350–c.1500,” *The Economic History Review*, 57, 3 (2004): 503–32.

Peace of Westphalia in 1648 the northern provinces had in the closing years of the sixteenth century formed a republic which would survive until 1795 and one which prospered in the otherwise economically depressed seventeenth century.

During the course of the Revolt Phillip II inherited another kingdom: Portugal. Technically and very often in fact the Dutch Republic was at war with both of the Iberian kingdoms until Portugal itself revolted successfully against rule from Madrid after 1640. The continuing conflict led at times to prohibitions of trade with Dutch ships banned from Iberian harbours, though such restrictions were short-lived. Despite the common state of war prevailing between Iberia and the Netherlands interchange, commercial and intellectual, continued. In fact the ties that began to develop between Portugal and the Low Countries in the first half of the sixteenth century strengthened through the years of war. Before 1580 there was no direct political or dynastic tie between the Netherlands and Portugal but in maritime affairs and more specifically in nautical sciences influence in various forms from the South on practices in the Low Countries was considerable.

The economic success of the Dutch Republic, which also had roots in the sixteenth century, was accompanied by great accomplishments in science and even more in technology in its “Golden Century.”³ Advances in shipping, shipbuilding and navigation were hallmarks of the scientific achievements. Even before the revolt of the Low Countries, map makers had acquired the skills which would carry them to be the leading producers, both in terms of quality and quantity, of maps in seventeenth century Europe. The rapid improvement in cartography in the Netherlands, both northern and southern, depended on borrowing from practices in Iberia and more specifically from Portugal. The very rapid advances of Portuguese map makers in the years around 1500 offered more than simply a model for cartographers in the Low Countries. Portugal had seen rapid progress in map making. There was apparently little or no map production in Portugal before the 1450s but by the first half of the sixteenth century cartographers there were producing some of the best and most influential maps in the world. Portugal proved that with a proper scientific base and an interest on the part of seaman as well as governments in compiling representations of the seas, a great deal could be accomplished in a short time. The Dutch imitated the Portuguese not just in moving rapidly from little in the way of map making to European leadership. The methods introduced and the thinking about mapping and navigation in the northern Low Countries also had roots in Portuguese practice. The same can be said at least to some degree of shipbuilding although with that aspect of

³ Davids Carolus Augustinus. *The rise and decline of Dutch technological leadership: technology, economy and culture in the Netherlands, 1350-1800*, Leiden: Brill, 2008.

nautical science the pattern was somewhat different and more complex.

The condemnation of Catholic Portugal and Spain as backward, even “medieval” in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries translated into a view that Iberian science and technology were also inferior. The mechanical arts and the understanding of nature were just other parts of society that suffered from the shackles imposed by popery that kept the people and governments of the peninsula from becoming part of the emerging modern world. Even if later historians may not have noticed, in fact contemporaries in the Protestant Dutch Republic recognized the superiority of Portuguese practices and borrowed them. Though many aspects of nautical sciences found their way from Iberia to the Low Countries, four seem obvious, noteworthy and of considerable importance in the long run. Three came from navigation and the fourth had to do with building vessels to sail the oceans of the world. First, the Dutch first took over the Portuguese practice of integrating theoretical speculation with practical information generated from observation. Second, Dutch cartographers looked to Portugal for theory about how to make maps. Third, Dutch maps took up the forms of illustration and decoration pioneered by Portuguese cartography. Fourth in both the practices of shipbuilding but more so in the discussion and description of how to build ships there were clear signs of Portuguese influence on Dutch nautical science. The learned as well as the practical tradition showed signs of exposure to what was being done and said in Iberia. Dutch cartographers may offer the most obvious and most graphic case of reliance on Portuguese precedent for their own scientific advances but that pattern should be taken as an indication of something considerably broader and deeper.

A revival of interest in Iberian science and technology has marked the twenty-first century. It turns out that Catholics and even Jesuits were not simply prejudiced, letting their faith get in the way of learning about nature, but in fact they were capable of significant accomplishments in a wide variety of scientific fields. Often their work was connected with European expansion and with the discovery of new plants and animals, so the attention of historians has turned to developments in the empires of the Iberian states, making the work of those Roman Catholic scientists and their networks another facet of global history. That is, however, the tip of a large iceberg. Even before the new attention devoted to scientific work in Iberia historians of Portugal had typically understood contributions to science there as being contributions to nautical science.⁴ Recent

⁴ Fontes da Costa, Palmira, and Henrique Leitão. “Science During the Portuguese Maritime Discoveries A Telling Case of Interaction Between Experimenters and Theoreticians,” in: Daniela Bleichmar, Paula De Vos,

historiographical developments have not changed and if anything have underlined that view.

Onésimo Almeida, a scholar of history and philosophy and keen student of Lusitanian culture, has argued that the Portuguese were especially good at integrating practical and theoretical work and so generated highly productive interaction between experimenters and theoreticians. A group of men in the sixteenth century, most notably Duarte Pacheco Pereira (?–c. 1430), D. Joao de Castro (1500–48), Pedro Nunes, (1502–78), Garcia de Orta (1501/2–68) and Fernando Oliveira (c. 1507–c.1585), valued and promoted empirical knowledge, experience, as superior to received knowledge from the surviving texts by ancient authors. While they did not reject entirely the value of classical learning, something supremely valued among Renaissance humanists, they did believe that data collected by seamen for example should be transferred to land and that such experience was more reliable for knowledge of nature than any other source.⁵ The principal features of their work Almeida identifies as rejection of the authority of the Ancients per se, the acceptance of experience as the key criterion of truth, the development of a scientific outlook and methodology, the interface of theory and practice and of scholars and artisans, and lastly an overall awareness of the importance of new knowledge acquired by Portuguese navigation in the opening of new frontiers.⁶ It is not surprising that his most telling example comes from the world of navigation and the exchanges between the mathematician Pedro Nunes and the sailor and author of sailing instructions Joao de Castro. The latter travelled extensively in the Indian Ocean and gathered data while Nunes stayed home in Portugal examining the collected information and proposing theories to give coherence to what de Castro reported. “These interactions are emblematic of the relationships maintained by the leaders and masterminds, thinkers and entrepreneurs involved in the overseas voyages of discovery.” At the end of the set of sailing instruction for the Lisbon-Goa route de Castro said that if he had a problem he could not solve he would ask his teacher, that is, Nunes. Nunes’ writings included responses to the problems of sailors. Sometimes he reacted to a specific question. He also made new instruments and

Kristin Huffine, and Kevin Sheehan, eds., *Science in the Spanish and Portuguese empires, 1500-1800*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009: 37–43.

⁵ Almeida, Onésimo T. “Science During the Portuguese Maritime Discoveries A Telling Case of Interaction Between Experimenters and Theoreticians,” in: Daniela Bleichmar, Paula De Vos, Kristin Huffine, and Kevin Sheehan, eds., *Science in the Spanish and Portuguese empires, 1500–1800*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009: 79.

⁶ Almeida, Onésimo T. “Portugal and the Dawn of Modern Science,” in *Portugal, the Pathfinder: Journeys from the Medieval toward the Modern World, 1300-ca. 1500*, George D. Winus, ed., Madison, WI: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1995: 343–44.

suggested new navigational methods, which were then tried out by sailors. In some cases the innovations even worked.⁷

In the Netherlands exactly the same process, pioneered by that group of talented Portuguese practitioners, became the norm. On the vexing question of measuring longitude, something which bothered seamen and theoreticians alike through to the eighteenth century, the government of the Republic enlisted scientists to examine the problem and to use the information which sailors had started to gather in voyages to Southeast Asia. The polymath Petrus Plancius (1552–1622) was not alone among men consulted at the end of the sixteenth century on how to integrate theory and practical knowledge.⁸ Well before that though, even before the revolt, men from the northern Netherlands were taking information gathered at sea to improve their charts. The remarkable Amsterdam artist and cartographer Cornelis Anthoniszoon (c. 1505–53) produced a marine guide to the routes, tides, and so on of the Baltic complete with coastal elevations, the first time that had been done. A set of marine instructions like his came to be called a rutter in English, the word borrowed from the Portuguese *roteiro* or French *routier*. A third edition of Cornelis Anthoniszoon's book published in 1558 included instructions on celestial navigation which he presumably got from a Spanish or Portuguese handbook.⁹ He also produced a portolan chart with the title *Caerte van Oostlant* in 1543. In the 1540s and 1550s Cornelis Anthoniszoon travelled to Algiers, in that case in the service of his monarch Charles V, but more critical for his work on navigation were his travels to the Baltic. The second edition of the map of 1548 and the third of 1553 show significant improvement, the voyages to the Baltic presumably having helped in generating a higher degree of cartographic accuracy. The map was certainly closely tied to the book of sailing instructions he did. The goal was to show sea routes and so the concentration in the rutter is on coastlines and ports.¹⁰ That goal is obvious in the map as well. The *Caerte van Oostlant*

⁷ Almeida, "Science During the Portuguese Maritime Discoveries": 84–90; quotation at 84.

⁸ Davids, Carolus Augustinus. *Zeevezen en Wetenschap De wetenschap en de ontwikkeling van de navigatietechniek in Nederland tussen 1585 en 1815*, Amsterdam: De Bataafsche Leeuw, 1986: 69–78.

⁹ Burger, C. P. Jr. "Oude Hollandsche zeevaart-uitgaven", *Tijdschrift voor boek- en bibliotheekwezen*, VII, 1–16; Dubiez, F. J. *Cornelis Anthoniszoon van Amsterdam; 1507-1553*, Amsterdam: H.D. Pfann, 1969, 22–4; Lang, Arend W. *Die 'Caerte van oostlant' des Cornelis Anthonisz. 1543 : arte Nordeuropas und ihre Segelanweisung, Schriften des Deutschen Schifffahrtsmuseums Bd. 8*, Hamburg: Kabel, 1986: 60–87.

¹⁰ Smith, Catherine Delano. "Cartographic Signs on European Maps and their Explanation before 1700", *Imago Mundi*, vol. 37 (1985): 18–19; Dubiez, *Cornelis Anthoniszoon*, 9–15; Haase, Yorck Alexander. *Alte Karten und Globen in der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel*, Wolfenbüttel: Druck: Heckners Verlag, 1972: 42–44; Keuning, Johannes. "XVIth Century Cartography in the Netherlands", *Imago Mundi*, vol. 9 (1952): 37; Lang, *Die 'Caerte van oostlant'*, 19–56; Mörzner Bruyns, W. F. J. "Leeskaarten en paskaarten uit de Nederlanden Een beknopt overzicht van gedrukte navigatiemiddelen uit de zestiende eeuw", in: *Lucas Jansz. Wagbenaer van Enckhuysen: de maritieme cartografie in de Nederlanden in de zestiende en het begin van de zeventiende eeuw*, Enkhuizen:

marked the arrival of the portolan chart in northern Europe. The method of production was perhaps more sophisticated than with its Mediterranean predecessors because of the cartographer's use of triangulation in a way that was improved by Gemma Frisius (1508-55), a prominent scientist who worked for Emperor Charles V and taught at the University of Leuven in the southern Netherlands. Though the technique of triangulation dated from the 1450s it was not until the early sixteenth century that it came into use and not until the mid sixteenth century that information about how to make the best of the method became widely available.¹¹ The *Caerte van Oostlant* was significantly better in the depiction of the Baltic coast than any predecessor, another case where the knowledge of seamen was joined with theory of the day to generate more useful maps for navigation. Cornelis Anthoniszoon, like his Portuguese counterparts, transferred sailing instructions to a portolan chart, giving visual expression to collected data.¹²

The second way in which Portuguese nautical science influenced that in the Dutch Republic was in the theory of map making. The cross-fertilization and interaction of empiricists and theoreticians in Portugal generated the best maps produced in sixteenth century Europe and by any measure. They were superior in transmitting information, in promoting certain visions of the world, in political advocacy and as works of art. There was, thanks to exploration and to government support, a great interest in how best to make maps and translate findings at sea to representations on parchment. Divisions of territory, both terrestrial and oceanic, by Iberian monarchs, as in the Treaties of Alcáçovas-Toledo (1479) and Tordesillas (1494) promoted an interest in and respect for cartography.¹³ It was only logical that map makers in the Low Countries should rely on Iberian precedents. The extreme example and the one with the longest lasting effect was Gerard Kramer's (1512-1594) development of a projection which created loxodromes, lines which intersect all meridians at the same angle and so show the true course of a ship. Under his Latinized name of Mercator his projection, first used by him in 1541, became standard. He produced that pioneering attempt just four years after Pedro Nunes had discussed in his

Vereniging Vrienden van het Zuiderzeemuseum, 1984: 11-20; Schilder, Günter. *The Netherland nautical cartography from 1550 to 1650*, Lisbon: Instituto de Investigação Científica Tropical, 1984, 4-5.

¹¹ Lang, *Die 'Caerte van oostlant'*, 41-54; Niël, Maikel. "De perspectivische ruimteweergave van het Gezicht in vogelvlucht op Amsterdam van Cornelis Anthonisz." *Caert-Thresoor*, 19 (2000): 110.

¹² Crone, G. R. *Maps and their makers: an introduction to the history of cartography*, London, New York: Hutchinson's University Library, 1953: 105; Lang, *Die 'Caerte van oostlant'*, 15; Lang, Arend W. "Traces of lost North European seacharts of the 15th century", *Imago Mundi*, XII (1955): 31-32; Spekke, Arnolds. *The Baltic Sea in ancient maps*, tr. A. J. Grinbergs and others, Stockholm: M. Goppers, 1961: 72.

¹³ Sandman, Alison. "Mirroring the World Sea Charts, Navigation, and Territorial claims in Sixteenth-Century Spain.", in: *Merchants & marvels: commerce, science, and art in early modern Europe*, Pamela H. Smith and Paula Findlen, eds., New York: Routledge, 2002: 83-108.

Tratado da Sphera the mathematics of how to do just what Mercator did. Nunes knew about the problem from reports of sailors returning from voyages to India and the Rio de la Plata so his findings were another case of the intermixing of the theoretical and the practical.¹⁴ It was with the support of the scientist Gemma Frisius that Mercator pursued the application of ideas emanating from Portugal. He followed up on the implications of those findings in the large number of maps he produced over the following decades. Nunes wrote in Portuguese so sought something more than only a learned audience but he did write in such a way to make his work of direct use to practical men such as captains or pilots. Though he may have just refined and put into use what Nunes had only speculated about it was Mercator who incorporated those ideas in widely disseminated representations of the physical world. The man born in Flanders and who spent much of his career in Duisberg in Westphalia not far from the border with the Netherlands saw himself not just as scientist or map maker but also as a merchant. He chose the Latin translation of that job description for his professional name. He was deeply interested in selling the products of his press and was able to make a handsome profit for himself. In the process he won an enduring reputation for innovation, one based squarely on theory generated in Portugal.¹⁵

The third and most obvious way, at least to the eye, in which the Dutch imitated Portuguese practice was in forms of illustration and decoration of maps. While the earliest surviving products of Portuguese cartography show no sign of decoration by the early years of the sixteenth century the use of various forms of illumination at sea as well as on land had come to be the norm. The practice may have been pioneered by Catalan cartographers as early as the fourteenth century, borrowing from what was done on large *mappaemundi* which were known in northern Europe. Portuguese makers of atlases and large maps adopted wholeheartedly the idea of using decoration both for artistic and didactic purposes and impressed the value of such practices on the rest of Europe. The most obvious case was that of the Dieppe school of cartography in Normandy which relied directly on skilled personnel imported from Portugal in the mid sixteenth century.¹⁶

¹⁴ Cortesão, Armando. *Contribution of the Portuguese to scientific navigation and cartography*. Coimbra: Junta de Investigações Científicas do Ultramar, 1974, 28; Cortesão, Armando. *History of Portuguese Cartography*, Coimbra: Junta de Investigações do Ultramar- Lisboa, 1969: 108.

¹⁵ Kyewski, Bruno. "Über die Mercatorprojektion," *Duisburger Forschungen Schriftreihe für Geschichte und Heimatkunde Duisburgs*, Stadtarchive Duisburg in Verbindung mit der Mercator-Gesellschaft, vol. 6, Duisburg-Ruhrort: Verlag für Kultur Werner Renckhoff KG., 1962: 116–17; Albuquerque, Luís de. *Portuguese Books on Nautical Science from Pedro Nunes to 1650*, Lisbon: Instituto de Investigação Científica Tropical, 1984: 5–6.

¹⁶ La Roncière, Monique de, and Michel Mollat. *Sea charts of the early explorers: 13th to 17th century*, New York: Thames and Hudson, 1984: 30; Putman, Robert. *Early sea charts*, New York: Abbeville Press, 1983: 30–31, 84–85, 108–9; Pelletier, Monique. *Cartographie de la France et du monde de la renaissance au siècle des lumières, Conférences Leopold Delisle*, Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2001: 16–17.; Harris, Henry. *The Dieppe world maps, 1541-1553*, Göttingen: University Printing Press, 1899: 1–2.

The most impressive early example of the Portuguese practice of illuminating maps is the Miller Atlas of about 1519. The work is in fact one of the finest example of Renaissance map making and certainly an outstanding case of sumptuous as well as pertinent illustration. It may be that in fact it was a man from Holland who painted the multiple and varied illustrations. Many artists in early sixteenth century Portugal were from the Low Countries and so the presence of a Dutchman in the making of the Atlas is not surprising. The historian Alfredo Pinheiro Marques has recently argued, and persuasively, that it was in fact one António de Holanda who was responsible for the illumination which makes the Atlas so unique. While the argument is not without flaws it still seems likely that in fact already in the early sixteenth century there was exchange between the Netherlands and Portugal in matters of what to put on maps.¹⁷ The transfer of Portuguese practice to Normandy came through the direct import of cartographers. Local map makers, though, quickly developed the skills of their Portuguese teachers and the style and appearance of their maps was exactly like that of Lusitanian products.

The ways maps were made and the ways they were illuminated transferred from Portugal to Normandy and then to the Low Countries as well but in the latter case it was without the migration of Portuguese cartographers. Dutch maps, like that of Cornelis Anthoniszoon, already had ships sailing the seas in imitation of Portuguese practice. That was only the start. Lucas Jansz. Waghenaeer (1533/4–1606) was an experienced pilot who took up work on shore and turned his hand to town views and to charts. His *Spiegel der Zeevaerdt*, produced at the new Christoffel Plantijn press in Leiden in 1584–1585, had an overview chart and 45 detailed charts to a uniform scale of the coasts of western Europe from the Straits of Gibraltar to Norway and Finland.¹⁸ With each chart there were sailing instructions. It was a major improvement over previous works. It included coastal profiles across the top of the double-page charts, both charts and profiles covering the same coasts. The *Spiegel der Zeevaerdt* was the precedent for sea atlases of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, so much so that “waggoner” became a common noun in English by 1700 meaning a book of charts for nautical use. Waghenaeer brought out a modified version of

¹⁷ Marques, Alfredo Pinheiro, “The outstanding artistic value of the *Atlas Miller*, a masterpiece by Lopo Homem, Pedro Reinel, Jorge Reinel and António de Holanda”, in: *Atlas Miller*, Barcelona: M Moleiro Editor S. A., 2006: 141–45.

¹⁸ Waghenaeer, Lucas Janszoon, *Spiegel der Zeevaerdt Leyden 1584–1585*, Amsterdam: Meridian Publishing, 1964; Bos-Rietdijk, E., “Het werk van Lucas Jansz. Waghenaeer”, in: *Lucas Jansz. Waghenaeer van Enckhuysen : de maritieme cartografie in de Nederlanden in de zestiende en het begin van de zeventiende eeuw*, Enkhuizen: Vereniging Vrienden van het Zuiderzeemuseum, 1984: 21–46; Koeman, Cornelis, “Lucas Janszoon Waghenaeer: A Sixteenth Century Marine Cartographer”, in: *Miscellanea Cartographica*, Günther Schilder and Peter van der Krogt, eds., Utrecht: HES Publishers, 1988: 49–66.

the *Spiegel* called the *Thresoor der zeevaart* in 1592.¹⁹ He too included illustrations of animals and ships on his charts. They were not necessary but still he followed the fashion created by Portuguese pioneers. By the end of the century such illustration had become standard with skilled engravers in Amsterdam being called on to embellish their maps with illumination. Jan Doetecum in the 1590s proved among the most talented but was by no means alone. He and others set the standard for the following one hundred years. Certainly by the early seventeenth century Dutch mapmakers had advanced beyond the work of their Portuguese forebears but the foundation of that aspect of nautical science in the Republic had roots in the Iberian kingdom.

A fourth category of nautical science in which there was influence from Portugal on the northern Low Countries was in shipbuilding. That trade always finds a place among the list of fields in which Dutch practitioners excelled. Dutch ship design and construction were the envy of seventeenth-century Europe, a target of industrial espionage for the French and a target for violence for the English and a source of capital goods for the Venetians who simply bought Dutch ships outright. Jean-Baptiste Colbert, the minister of finance to Louis XIV, sent spies to Dutch shipyards to find out how builders produced superior vessels.²⁰ He also offered jobs to tradesmen from those yards so they could bring Dutch technology to France, literally embodied. Oliver Cromwell in England once in power after the deposition and execution of King Charles I, in 1651 took his country into the first of three wars against the Dutch Republic. The goal was to undermine Dutch commerce and to capture Dutch ships so that those prizes could be incorporated into the English merchant marine. As far as seventeenth century Europeans were concerned superior ship design was obviously a critical factor in the success of Dutch shipping.²¹ The variety of vessel designs that came from Dutch yards as well as the scale of production have served, however, to obscure the accomplishments of other European states of the seventeenth century and before.

Contemporaries as well as historians have minimized Iberian accomplishments in shipbuilding. There was and is still a tendency to project back in time into the Middle Ages what happened in the years after 1600 and so largely ignore what went on in the fourteenth, the fifteenth and even much of the sixteenth century when ships from Portugal and Spain were conquering the oceans of the world. It is hard to sustain a claim of Iberian

¹⁹ Waghenaeer, Lucas Janszoon, *Thresoor der zeevaart*, *Leyden*, 1592, Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1965.

²⁰ Ferreiro, Larric D., *Ships and Science The Birth of Naval Architecture in the Scientific Revolution, 1600–1800*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2007: 64–65.

²¹ Richard W. Unger, *Dutch Shipbuilding Before 1800: Ships and Guilds*, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1978.

technical inferiority in light of the voyages of discovery and the establishment of regular lines of communication across thousands of miles of ocean, all done before there was a Dutch Republic. It is also hard to sustain such claims given the degree to which other Europeans spent much of the early modern period trying to emulate the practices and accomplishments of late medieval Iberians. Spain and Portugal were magnets for Italian technology, talent and investment and were also sources of skilled people as well as ideas for France, England and the Low Countries.

Shipbuilding in Spain and Portugal is one aspect of science and technology which has served to revive the reputation of those Iberian kingdoms. Among others Carla Rahn Phillips has contributed to that revival through her book on the construction of galleons at the end of the sixteenth century. Both Carla and William Phillips have forced a closer look at Iberian shipping through their study of the export of Spanish wool, especially export by sea to northern Europe from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century. Their work along with that of a number of others, including Pablo Emilio Pérez-Mallaína Bueno and Regina Grafe, has served to rectify the negative view of Iberian seafaring.²² While recent research may have favored reviving the reputation of Spanish seafaring the implication is that Portuguese shipping, shipbuilding and nautical science need to be understood in a more positive way as well. The close ties economically and culturally between the two kingdoms both before and after the political union in 1580 suggests the two moved closely together and especially in matters maritime.

Portuguese and for that matter all Iberian and Mediterranean shipbuilding practices differed considerably from those of the northern Netherlands at the close of the Middle Ages. A number of those differences persisted through to the end of the age of sail. Many distinctions were obvious to the naked eye. In the Dutch “Golden Century” the ships of the two looked very different. The approach to building hulls in the Republic involved starting with fitting a few planks close to the keel in place before setting up the frames.²³ That remnant of shell-first construction, the standard method in the North before 1500 where the outer planks of the hull were put in place first and the internal framing added later, was nowhere to be found in Iberia. There it was keel first, then frames and finally hull

²² Phillips, Carla Rahn. *Six galleons for the king of Spain Imperial defense in the early seventeenth century*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986; Phillips, Carla Rahn, and William D. Phillips, *Spain's golden fleece: wool production and the wool trade from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century*, Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997; Pérez-Mallaína Bueno, Pablo Emilio. *Spain's men of the sea : daily life on the Indies fleets in the sixteenth century*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998; Grafe, Regina. “The Strange Tale of the Decline of Spanish Shipping,” in: *Shipping and Economic Growth 1350–1850*, Richard W. Unger, ed., Leiden: Brill, 2011: 81–115.

²³ A. Rålamb, *Skepps Byggerij eller Adelig Öfnings*, 1691.

planks. In features of rig much earlier than the Iberians the Dutch moved away from a triangular sail at the stern, gave up on ships with deep waists and increased the number of sails while making each individual one smaller and so easier to handle. The Dutch tended toward a large number of independent builders and were much slower about establishing big state or company-owned shipbuilding wharves than the Iberians. So the two parts of Europe deviated one from the other in shipbuilding in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and deviated in accomplishments with the late sixteenth and even more the seventeenth century being a period of unmitigated decline in Iberia and unprecedented expansion in the Dutch Republic.

The differences had their roots in long established traditions of construction, different in the two parts of Europe but the differences even more can be traced to the kinds of trades that dominated in the Netherlands and in Portugal. The kinds of commerce placed specific constraints on local shipbuilding. The Dutch handled heavy bulky goods in largely peaceful and often protected waters using shallow harbours and in cold climates where the freezing of harbours made shipping in winter impossible. The Portuguese carried high value goods over long distances in areas prone to violence visiting deep harbours accessible all year round but subject to severe weather conditions like the hurricanes of the Caribbean. They operated in warm waters where shipworm thrived and so they had to sheath the hulls of their ships.²⁴ The maritime and the economic environments were dissimilar as was the political one with greater regulation in the Iberian kingdoms. The fact that shipbuilders chose different paths in the two parts of Europe is no great surprise. On the face of it Dutch shipbuilding and navigation were not like Iberian. When the Dutch found it possible to outdo Iberians even in their own Empires in the seventeenth century it suggested a distinctive and superior approach to maritime practices among the Netherlands. The differences between the two may be more apparent, and apparent especially to Protestant historians, than real.

The Dutch relied heavily on Iberian techniques and had for centuries. Trading relations and then subsequent political ties made easier the transfer of advanced methods in shipbuilding from the South to the Low Countries in the late Middle Ages and beyond. It was from the Portuguese that Low Countries shipwrights learned the method of building their ships frame first. In 1439 the Duke of Burgundy, Philip the Good, imported Portuguese craftsmen to build a ship for him, probably on the Zenne near Brussels. They produced an example of the carvel-building method, new to the North, where builders first

²⁴ Phillips, *Six galleons for the King of Spain*, 24.

sett up the keel and then the frames and tacking on the hull planks to those frames last. The approach had the advantage of producing a lighter ship with less skill required by the carpenters in the shipyard. The form of hull construction meant that if there was damage to the outer planks there was no threat to the integrity of the ship, only to its watertightness. Holes in the hull could of course present extremely serious problems to a ship at but such damage was relatively easily repaired compared to vessels made with the older hull-first or clinker-building method. Incidentally the vessel those Portuguese shipwrights built for Philip the Good was lost to Catalan pirates on a voyage to the Mediterranean in 1446.²⁵ In 1457 two Flemish towns rented an Iberian ship for convoy duty. It had the new full rig which combined square and triangular or lateen sails, something that was novel in the Low Countries and an example soon to be followed not just in the Netherlands but by all European shipbuilders.²⁶

The greatest Dutch success was with flat-bottomed bulk carriers, best suited for trade to the Baltic. Those fluyts had a relatively high ratio of length-to-breadth which was a feature of Iberian ships, but the Dutch type did not reach the length limits explored by Iberian builders. The greatest Spanish success was with galleons, best suited for the open seas and for dangerous waters. Though possibly derived from a Venetian model and probably based on features of Mediterranean galleys, the Spanish galleon was a sleek defensible vessel for trans Atlantic commerce.²⁷ Spanish and for that matter Portuguese captains were not above making variations and employing different rigs on their ships. Dutch captains would, as they travelled to other parts of the world, consider varied options as well. For the late Middle Ages and through the sixteenth century typically Dutch building techniques lagged behind those of Iberia. In time though the Dutch did follow the Iberian or Mediterranean model of having the shipbuilder create designs and supervise workers on the wharf rather than have him as a participant in the shaping of wood.²⁸ It was another transfer of technology from Portugal to the Dutch Republic.

At the end of the sixteenth century the biggest difference between the Netherlands and Iberia then was not technical leadership but the type of shipping services which the merchant marines supplied. The Dutch concentrated on Baltic trades using slow cheap bulk carriers and the Spanish concentrated on trans Atlantic and the Portuguese on trans Indian Ocean trades. When the Dutch traded in the Mediterranean, though, they did so

²⁵ Beylen, Jan van. *Schepen van de Nederlanden*, Amsterdam: P. N. Van Kampen & Zoon N. V., 1970: 7–8.

²⁶ Unger, *Dutch Shipbuilding*: 32.

²⁷ Phillips, *Six galleons for the King of Spain*: 40-2.

²⁸ Unger, Richard W. *The Art of Medieval Technology: Images of Noah the Shipbuilder*, New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, 1991: 58-60.

with ships built much like Portuguese ones. The Portuguese had gigantic carracks which they used in the India trade where carrying capacity was the most important consideration. The Portuguese also had smaller and more lightly built ships for trades to northern Europe and to the Atlantic Islands which supplied both wine and sugar. There is no denying that the Dutch proved capable of producing purpose-built ships which lowered shipping costs. That ability, however, did not necessarily indicate technical leadership but could also show more effective ways of meeting demand for shipping services. In technical matter it was rarely if ever a matter of Dutch independent invention since in many aspects of ship design Low Countries shipwrights relied on Iberian precedents. That reliance on what had been done before in Iberia was even more impressive in the learned tradition, in thinking about matters to do with building a ship.

Shipbuilding was a practical trade throughout the Middle Ages but starting in the fifteenth century people familiar with practice began writing about the trade, describing design work. The manuals they produced like that of Michael of Rhodes and Zorzi “Trombetta” da Modon in Venice were not necessarily very helpful or even accurate and they were not intended as guides on how to build ships.²⁹ In the sixteenth century and especially in Iberia written works were more closely related to work on wharfs, just when Iberians became the leaders in writing about the shipbuilding trade. The first printed book which described how to build a ship came from Havana, that in 1587. It was one of a number of how-to books produced for people in the growing empire who lacked the pool of skilled artisans that existed in Europe and who needed practical and useful knowledge to create their mini-Europes in other parts of the world. The combination of a rising interest in day-to-day practice among people of leisure and the needs of an expanding society moved books about shipbuilding in the direction of explaining how the job was done and away from ex-post descriptions of the final result. That was obvious in the major shipbuilding treatise that came from Portugal, the *Liuro da Fábrica das Naus* by Fernando Oliveira dating from 1580. Fernando Oliveira was another of those Portuguese learned men identified by Onésimo Almeida as leaders in advancing science and technology in tandem.

While the Dutch might have taken the lead in shipbuilding they were slow to produce books on how to build ships. Cornelis Van Yk’s 1697 book was a work by a practical man writing down what he learned from a lifetime of working in Dordrecht shipyards. The only earlier effort and the first in the Dutch Republic was by a prominent

²⁹ In general on treatises Ferreiro, *Ships and Science*, 46-49.

and wealthy Amsterdam politician, Nicolas Witsen. He never practiced the trade so in his “Former and Contemporary Shipbuilding...” he recorded what an anonymous experienced Amsterdam practitioner of the trade told him. When Witsen wanted to describe the general progression of the shipbuilding process he went to the library of Leiden University and there he found a copy of Fernando Oliveira’s 1580 book. He copied exactly what he found, even the drawings, saying he was describing the trade in 1520.³⁰ Intellectual property rights were not an issue in the seventeenth century. Witsen felt no compunction in representing Oliveira’s work as his own. It was for him a matter of relying on the best source of knowledge, even if he did get the date wrong. So when it came to shipbuilding the Dutch learned tradition, even more than in practice, relied on Portuguese roots.

The conclusion that the Dutch were successful and the Portuguese failed in seafaring in the aftermath of the Middle Ages is hard to sustain. Despite their apparent differences in performance there were close connections between the two. Differences in religion, in the role of Jesuits, in government structure, in the kinds of trades in which they specialized all had an impact on the performance of shipping and shipbuilding in the two parts of western Europe. The differences had a powerful impact on the kinds of ships built and used in Spain and the northern Low Countries but when Dutch authors came to discuss shipbuilding in tracts and lengthy texts it was Iberian models which they followed. That was true in the kinds of works they produced and more specifically, in the case of Nicolaas Witsen, there was direct copying from the learned tradition of Portugal. Even if Dutch practice was different from Iberian, thinking about shipbuilding in the two parts of Europe showed some significant similarities. It was easy to borrow and the Dutch sought precedents, background and insight from the burgeoning nautical science that emanated from Iberia. By the end of the seventeenth century the learned tradition in the highly successful Dutch Republic was turning to and basing work on practical experience as van Yk’s book showed. There the gulf between theory and practice had finally narrowed but already in the late Middle Ages that gulf was being bridged among Portuguese mathematicians and map makers and sailors and by the sixteenth century among writers and practitioners of the art of shipbuilding. It took a while but Portuguese experience did over time influence practice and thinking in the Dutch Republic.

“The Dutch Republic originated in the opposition of the rational elements of human nature to sacerdotal dogmatism and persecution - in the courageous resistance of

³⁰ Vogel, Walther. “Ein neu entdecktes Lehrbuch der Navigation und des Schiffbaues aus der Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts,” *Hansische Geschichtsblätter*, XVII (1911): 370–74.

historical and chartered liberty to foreign despotism.”³¹ So wrote John Lothrop Motley in his 1856 *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*. That member of Boston’s intellectual, cultural and Republican elite found the sources of American democracy in the Dutch Republic.³² To him the torch had passed from the residents of the sixteenth-century northern Netherlands to the Puritans in the English Civil War and then to the American Founding Fathers. The Iberian empires collapsed along with the economy over the long term and the center of global politics and the economy, justly, moved and in the first instance to the Dutch Republic. Motley’s sharp distinction between the Iberian lands of Phillip II and the Netherlands may but only may possibly have been true for religion and politics but in matters maritime and especially in nautical science no such divide existed.

Despite all reasons for the differences between apparently successful Dutch and failed Iberian seafaring in the aftermath of the Middle Ages there were close connections between the two. Differences in religion, in the role of Jesuits, in government structure, in the kinds of trades in which they specialized all had an impact on the nautical science in the two parts of western Europe. Even if Dutch practice was different from Portuguese, thinking about navigation and how to do it better in the regions showed some significant similarities. The learned tradition of science in the highly successful Dutch Republic turned to and based work on practical experience in the seventeenth century. The gulf between theory and practice narrowed but already in the late fifteenth century Portuguese mathematicians and map makers and sailors worked on bridging that gap. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries what had started in Iberia among theoreticians and practitioners, what had been done in applying mathematical ideas to cartography and what was the norm in decorating maps among other aspects of the art of nautical science became part of the fabric of Dutch success.

³¹ Motley, John Lothrop. *The Rise of the Dutch Republic A History*, London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1913 [1856]: liv.

³² See Guberman, Joseph. *The life of John Lothrop Motley*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.

Rafael Chambouleyron. *Povoamento, Ocupação e Agricultura na Amazônia Colonial (1640-1706)*. Belém: Editora Açai, 2010. 172 pp. Summary, Abbreviations, Introduction, Maps, Figures, Pictures, and Bibliography. ISBN: 978-85-61586-16-4.

Daniella Nicole Mak¹

In his article on the production of Brazilian colonial historiography, the late historian A.J.R. Russell-Wood lauded “Brazilian scholars [who] have developed a historiography that reflects ... broader changes in historical studies, while pursuing them within a Brazilian context.”² Rafael Chambouleyron’s *Povoamento, Ocupação e Agricultura na Amazônia Colonial (1640-1706)* exemplifies this statement. His work is based on extensive archival research carried out over many years in a wide range of both Brazilian and Portuguese archives. The crux of Chambouleyron’s book entails revised research from his 2005 doctoral dissertation, *Portuguese Colonization of the Amazon region, 1640-1706*, written while at Cambridge University.³ Chambouleyron’s book is a valuable contribution, offering new perspectives for scholars working on both colonial Amazonia and colonial history at large.

Colonial Amazonia—which roughly corresponds to the State of Maranhão and Pará after Filipe II partitioned Brazil into two separate polities in 1521—has often been depicted within both history and literature as “geographically isolated,” a backward area that “suffered the crown’s neglect and remained economically underdeveloped,” and an area that “stood at the periphery of colonial Brazil.”⁴ Recent work by the American historian Walter Hawthorne maintains that the Marquis of Pombal “put great effort into bolstering Portugal’s economy ... [and that] part of his plan involved developing Amazonia” during his time as Prime Minister from 1750 to 1777.⁵ Brazilian scholars like Ciro Flamarion Cardoso and Luiz Felipe de Alencastro have similarly characterized the State of Maranhão as one marked by poverty and abandonment until the reforms of the

¹ ISCTE–Lisbon University Institute, Portugal. E-mail: daniella.mak@gmail.com

² Russell-Wood, A.J.R., “Brazilian Archives and Recent Historiography on Colonial Brazil,” *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (2001), 75–105.

³ Chambouleyron, Rafael, *Portuguese Colonization of the Amazon region, 1640-1706*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cambridge (Cambridge, 2005).

⁴ Patai, Daphne and Aluísio Azevedo, *Mulatto* (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1990), 12.

⁵ Hawthorne, Walter, *From Africa to Brazil: Culture, Identity, and an Atlantic Slave Trade, 1600-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 45.

Marquis of Pombal in the mid-eighteenth century.⁶ *Povoamento, Ocupação e Agricultura na Amazônia Colonial (1640-1706)* can be situated within a broader historiographical debate about whether or not the Marquis of Pombal's tenure marked the beginning of Amazonian colonization. Chambouleyron disputes the interpretation that a clear colonial policy in Amazonia only existed with the advent of Pombal's administration.

Chambouleyron's work is driven by two issues within contemporary scholarship that he finds problematic: first, the notion of abandonment, which overseas counselors tended to use in their descriptions of colonial Amazonia; and second, the neglect of the State of Maranhão in explanatory models about the formation of colonial Brazil within Brazilian and Brazilianist historiography. Chambouleyron suggests that such studies emphasizing the region as "peripheral," "isolated," and marked by "imaginary dominion" (15) are not conducive to an understanding of its economy and society. Instead, he argues, we should approach the history of the State of Maranhão and Pará "from within" via an internal logic of occupation and colonization. According to Chambouleyron, using such a "history-from-within" approach allows us to more productively frame the social and economic history of the State of Maranhão and Pará—which was administratively separate from the State of Brazil at the time—in terms of its independent connections and relations with the rest of the Portuguese empire, both in the Atlantic and the Indian Ocean.

The author proposes an argument that accounts for the complexity of Portuguese occupation in the region and the diversity of the State of Maranhão and Pará. There are some key assumptions in the author's conceptual framework. First, rather than dismissing Amazonia as a "peripheral area" in comparison to the colonial "dynamic areas" that were rich in sugar production and mining activity, Chambouleyron suggests that we should instead seek to understand the internal dynamics of colonial Amazonia. Second, the author warns against projecting the same logic of occupation onto the State of Maranhão used to characterize the State of Brazil. Despite this, he argues that the histories of the two states are interconnected and that the earlier conquests in the State of Brazil helped to shape the conquest of the State of Maranhão. Third, the author asserts that his conceptual framework seeks to undermine the *sertão/litoral* dichotomy, which masks the unique diversity and spatiality of Maranhão and Pará. Instead, Chambouleyron argues that it is crucial to contextualize the State of Maranhão and Pará within a general framework marked by (i) the decline of Portugal's power in India and the displacement of the central axis of the

⁶ See: Cardoso, Ciro Flamarion S., *Economia e sociedade em áreas coloniais periféricas, Guiana Francesa e Pará, 1750-1817* (Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1984); Alencastro, Luiz Filipe de, *O trato dos viventes. Formação do Brasil no Atlântico Sul. Séculos XVI e XVII* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2000).

Portuguese empire to the Atlantic, and (ii) the consolidation of the Bragança dynasty, characterized by relative political stability and a return to a well-defined process of political decision-making.

The first premise of this argument is that the importance of the State of Maranhão to the Crown stemmed not from its production, but rather (i) from its status as a frontier region marked by intermittent conflict between European powers, thus causing the Portuguese Crown to maintain its influence in the area, and, paradoxically, (ii) from its poverty, leading to greater government intervention in order to control and reorder social and economic life. The second premise is that the economic depression from the sugar, tobacco, silver, and slave trade crisis in Brazil led to increased efforts on the part of the Crown to revitalize the “periphery.” In the case of Amazonia, this meant the development of spice crops. The third premise is that the Portuguese Overseas Council described the State of Maranhão as little more than an “imaginary dominion” in 1673 because discussions concerning the economy and settlement of the region were dominated by these very worries. The author argues that this is understandable given the extent of the territory, the nature of its frontiers, and the constant threats that plagued the State of Maranhão and Pará. Specifically, Chambouleyron sets out to discuss the role of the Portuguese Crown in the development of Amazonia in three key areas: population, land occupation, and agriculture. *Povoamento, Ocupação e Agricultura na Amazônia Colonial (1640-1706)* is thus divided into three chapters, each focusing on these respective issues in greater depth.

Chapter 1, *Povoadores, degredados e soldados*, argues that the Portuguese Crown played an active role in populating Maranhão and Pará. The population increase was linked to a greater number of economically productive subjects, and therefore a more robust economy. Chambouleyron explores the different types of migration to the region in detail, as well as the different groups of incomers. His analysis covers voluntary Portuguese migration, the forced migration of soldiers and convicts, mass migration from the Azores, and the influx of Irish settlers. The chapter offers a thorough analysis of the Crown’s role in populating the region, and is careful to distinguish between different spatialities, temporalities, and migrant characteristics.

Chapter 2, *Capitanias, sesmarias e vilas*, links the issue of population from the previous chapter to territorial occupation. The basis for this is that populating the State of Maranhão and Pará also implied exploiting the territory for both the Portuguese Crown and the residents of towns and cities. The author argues that historiography has traditionally favored a narrative whereby military forces, religious missions, and the search

for spice and slaves determined the conquest of Amazonia. Yet, for Chambouleyron, the territorial domination of the region cannot only be analyzed from the narrow viewpoint of military troops, missionaries, and frontiersmen. He contends that other elements were equally important in the territorial occupation of colonial Amazonia. The author draws our attention to the role played by private captaincies, systematic cultivation of the region, the distribution of land grants among settlers, and the establishment of villages.

Chapter 3, *Açúcar, tabaco e o cultivo das drogas*, focuses on the role of agriculture and mining practices in the economic occupation of Amazonia. The chapter discusses the incentives for sugar production granted by the Crown, such as tax exemption, imported African slaves, judicial privileges, and an administration for indigenous people (127). Sugar production, in particular, was seen as vital for the economic fertility of the region. The chapter also describes the tobacco privileges awarded by the Crown, which maintained an active interest in developing tobacco farming in the region (145). Lastly, the author deals with the growing of cocoa, which mostly began in the 1670s and was promoted by the Crown. However, Chambouleyron also emphasizes that cocoa only became a key export of Maranhão and Pará in the 1730s, and in particular after 1755, when the Marquis of Pombal established the General Trading Company of Grão-Pará and Maranhão (168). Despite this caveat, the author tries to establish clear links between the “civilizing process” and the region’s economic development. The chapter provides rich analysis of the economy and the Crown’s active role in encouraging mining practices.

Chambouleyron’s work offers an important contribution to the study of colonial Amazonia. Rather than simply accepting previous interpretations of Maranhão and Pará as a “peripheral” state, Chambouleyron challenges scholars to understand lived experience within the state through an “internal logic of occupation.” Chambouleyron also makes impressive use of archival documentation to show how one cannot take this notion of abandonment as a *prima facie* condition, and how contrary to what one might expect, the Portuguese Crown systematically intervened in the area. The author’s work is empirically rooted in social and economic history. In this respect, *Povoamento, Ocupação e Agricultura na Amazônia Colonial (1640-1706)* also provides an excellent synthesis of how questions of population, land and economy are linked to one another.

Conceptually, the author’s premise that Maranhão’s status as a frontier region and its poverty were conditions that led to valorization of the area by the Portuguese Crown could be better argued. It seems debatable that the main value of the region derived from external threats and a desire to revitalize the region, as opposed to any intrinsic value that

the area had in and of itself. This interpretation seems to conflict the author's later proposition that the value of the region also arose from the *drogas do sertão* and the slave trade.

Having said this, *Povoamento, Ocupação e Agricultura na Amazônia Colonial (1640-1706)* is an admirable book. Chambouleyron offers a fresh perspective and important methodological insight, by showing how we should understand the State of Maranhão and Pará, and indeed other regional areas when conducting our own research, in light of their internal dynamics.

David Lewis Tengwall, *The Portuguese Revolution (1640-1668). A European War of Freedom and Independence*. Lewiston, The Edwin Mellen Press, 2010, 482 pp. ISBN: 13: 978-0-7734-3614-5.

Rafael Valladares¹

Prudent readers know they should be wary of the first impression that may be created by a book's title. First because the author of a work is not always responsible for choosing the title—the policy of publishing houses normally manages to impose itself—and second, and most importantly, because even when authors are free to choose their own title, there is always some doubt as to whether they have successfully managed, with just a few magic words, to convey the dense and complex message that a book contains.

I believe that the work by David L. Tengwall, Professor and Chair of History and Political Science at Anne Arundel Community College in Arnold (Maryland, United States), fits into the second hypothesis. On innumerable occasions from the beginning to the end of the book, Tengwall repeatedly uses the enticing words that are found in the title: “revolution” (and “revolutionary”), “freedom” and “independence”—to which we might also add the word “nationalism”. So, there is no room for any confusion, since the reader is clearly informed about the thesis that the author defends: that the separation of the crown of Portugal from the Spanish Monarchy, achieved between 1640 and 1668, amounted to a revolution that can be considered equivalent to others that took place in seventeenth-century Europe, insofar as that process represented a radical change, not only because of the recovery of independence on the part of the Portuguese, but also because of the internal transformation that Portugal experienced with the new dynasty of the House of Bragança. The triumph of this revolution, which until today had remained hidden from the world of historiography, consisted of installing in Portugal a “limited monarchy” (143) of a participatory and constitutional nature: “Portugal emerged,” Tengwall concludes, “as a truly modern European state” (391).

The author is also clear about the theoretical bases (the readings and models) that led him to defend this thesis. However, the few authors that he quotes in the introduction in order to justify his concept of “revolution” and then apply it to the Portuguese

¹ Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), Institute of History, E-mail: rafael.valladares@cchs.csic.es

revolution of 1640 cannot be taken very seriously, not because these names are unrepresentative in the world of political science, but because their claims relate to the contemporary age.

The effect that is caused is thus an unacceptable conceptual anachronism. We must therefore search in Tengwall's own professional career for the reasons why he is drawn to the model of Revolution. Nonetheless, this alternative procedure is difficult to perform because of his somewhat limited theoretical production, even despite his being a senior researcher: we know about his PhD thesis (completed in 1978), three articles and various papers presented at conferences that have not yet been published. The best clue would undoubtedly be his thesis, supervised by Francis Dutra—who wrote the preface to this book—a professor at California University and a specialist in the Portuguese Military Orders. The thesis had the title of *The Portuguese Military in the Seventeenth Century*, but it was never published, which makes any value judgment rather difficult.

Nonetheless, because of the date when it was completed—1978—we can form an idea as to the main historiographic currents on which he based his writing at that time, and which continue to inform his view of the problems: the theory of the general crisis of the seventeenth century, which was formed in the 1940s, but continued to be adhered to in the 1970s, and the model of a *military revolution*, which appeared in the 1950s and still shows signs of good health even today.

In this way, it can be understood that Tengwall's work is not, as one might think, a provocation in the light of the enormous developments that took place in studies of Modern Portugal after 1980, when the author finished his thesis, but simply an antiquated and rather unprofessional book that one reads with a mixture of surprise and irritation. The surprise is caused by the concepts on which he bases his interpretation of the “restoration”, some of which have already been pointed out: “nationalism”, “national revolution”, “national spirit”—deriving from *volkegeist*, a term that the author quotes literally in order to apply it to the Portuguese of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (8 and 200)—“revolutionary leader” (used to refer to the king Dom João IV, 107), “military revolution”—which, in turn, would have given rise to a rather eye-catching “Portuguese Revolutionary Army”—or “freedom”, a word that, when used by an American professor of Political Science might be expected to appear in a specific context and not be bandied around with such a generic meaning.

The specialist reader immediately knows that Portugal in 1640 was different from the United States in 1776, but, once again, the dangers of anachronism dominate the book,

beginning with its actual title. Because, through its association with the term “independence”, the word “freedom” leads to the serious risk of our interpreting a rupture from the seventeenth century, influenced by the political culture of the Baroque, as a colonial rebellion at the end of the 18th century, which was largely the fruit of the Enlightenment. The problem lies in the fact that this seems to be Tengwall’s intention, no matter how frequently he places the terms between inverted commas. Unfortunately, in historiography, punctuation marks are not sufficient to characterize scientific concepts; on the contrary, these require a complementary intellectual effort that one does not find in this book.

Nor can one blame the work’s failings on the choice of models already mentioned—the general crisis of the seventeenth century and the military revolution. Some of the points of view stated in these models may have been surpassed in recent times, but there is no doubt that both models have evolved in their respective research fields with quite remarkable results. What is surprising about Tengwall is his continuing loyalty to the first manifestations of these currents of thought, as well as the rigidity with which he incorporates his knowledge in the field of Contemporary Political Science, which, if considered as a comparative reference for the modern age, could also have helped him to become aware of the great conceptual distance that exists between the present-day world and the Portugal of the Bragança dynasty. Thus, the problem is not only, nor even mainly, that of the method chosen to define a “revolution”, but instead that he did not even accept that this word might have had other possible meanings in the seventeenth century.

The first aspect is a serious one and immediately directs our attention to the introduction, where the author tries to convince us that the four necessary requirements for cataloguing an event such as a revolution—the existence of a stable society and economy, the outbreak of occasional deep crises, the ineptitude of the government and the alienation of the “intelligentsia” (4–8)—were the predominant fare in Portugal on the eve of 1640. But the second aspect is even more alarming. And it is particularly surprising in the sense that the use of the word “revolution” in the contemporary documents at the time of the Restoration invites us to investigate what our ancestors actually meant by it. If he had followed this path, the author would inevitably have discovered another type of “revolution” (which, in my view, would have been much more interesting), such as the one that Olivares tried to bring to bear in Portugal with his reforms. In fact, “the heroes of 1640” were so precisely because they attained their objective: to prevent the revolutionary policy of the Count-Duke from achieving its goal. But Tengwall seems to reject everything

that does not fit into his single class of “revolution”, such as, for example, when he refuses to see the Portuguese 1640 as a *coup d'état* promoted by an elite that had no real effects on the country—or, in other words, it did not provoke a revolution. Tengwall’s lack of interest in its complexity—and his reluctance to describe the Restoration as (shall we say?) a *conservative* or traditionalist movement—inevitably filters through to the reader, who finds himself faced with a closed and biased account, running from the very first chapter in the book to the twelfth and last one, without finding any room for stimulus or for other hypotheses.

This determinism is what causes our initial feeling of surprise to change to one of general irritation. The lack of *possible* unforced models for analyzing a European revolution in the seventeenth century represents only the first warning that there are other distortions affecting the proposed chronology, discourse categories, sources, bibliography, absences and writing.

Thus, although the years that appear in the title refer to the period of 1640-1668, the book does, however, begin in 1578 with the dynastic crisis that was opened up by the death of the king Dom Sebastião, after which we are presented with the reigns of Filipe II and Filipe III (without any mention of the twelve-year truce of 1609, of capital importance for the presentation of his reign) and Filipe IV, until we arrive at 1 December 1640 (“The Spanish Captivity”).

This beginning is correct and, furthermore, necessary since the political process that historiography knows as the “Portugal of the Filipes” forms a *continuum* without whose horizon any argument loses its coherence. But, seen from this perspective, it isn’t possible to close this process with the signing of the Peace Treaty in 1668. Without paying at least minimum attention to the experiences of the generation that came after this treaty, one runs the risk of considering the end of the war as the end of the Restoration, when, in reality, the two processes were different, although they were related. Undoubtedly, the war ended in February 1668, but the Restoration—i.e. the consolidation of the new political regime installed in 1640—did not.

Tengwall, who could have made use of more colorful categories in order to improve his argument sadly did not do so. On the contrary, what he gives us is a dual combat between “Spain” and the “Spanish” and “Portugal” and the “Portuguese”, and, even worse, he does not distinguish “nation” and “love for one’s country”—which were typical cultural and emotional concepts of the seventeenth century—from the “nationalism” of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—which is a political theory.

Because at this moment we know that the cultural differences between peoples and the identities *as a nation* that these differences generated—such as the ones that naturally existed between Castilians and Portuguese—did not necessarily lead people to consider belonging to the Habsburg monarchy as a tragedy (as a “captivity” from which it was important to free oneself). At least not everyone thought in this way. The author presents the Portuguese nation without the slightest chink in its armor, as a bloc, especially in the countless pages devoted to military operations—where his training as a military historian is clearly shown in the comfort that he feels whenever he is explaining tactics and battles.

In this book, not one single word is devoted to the attractive phenomenon of exile that was widely practiced by a very important sector of the aristocracy and the Portuguese nobility in Madrid during the Restoration. Nor is there any mention of possible shared identities—the Portuguese of the seventeenth century might feel a certain revulsion for the Castilians, but they could also proudly consider themselves to be *Spanish*, i.e. sons of Hispania. In the case of “Spain”, it is even worse, since its presence in the work is really an absence, amounting to nothing more than a fuzzy caricature without any distinguishing features, being just something to be roughly described as an imperial power without any other plan than to dominate the periphery. Given that Tengwall accepts the point of view of the *Restorers* of 1640, he does not bother to waste any time exploring the nature of that highly complex Hispanic monarchy, nor to reflect on the constitutional culture on which it was based, and in which the Crown of Portugal—and not Portugal—represented just one of the pieces, alongside others that were similarly filled with tradition (and conflict). We can therefore deduce that the anachronistic model of the “nation-state” followed by Tengwall was the reason why the Habsburg monarchy was reduced to a similarly anachronistic “Spain”, in the same way that this premise allows us to understand why the author erased Overseas Portugal from his physical and conceptual map; except for a few accidental references to Brazil, neither this territory nor the *State of India*, nor any other point of the Portuguese Empire appear in the book. The consequences that arise from this unfortunate amputation are quite evident.

Taking into account the rigidity of the author’s thesis, his method and the categories that he uses, it is easy to understand that there is little to be gained by referring here to the sources and bibliography on which Tengwall constructed his argument. Naturally, there is abundant information of a documentary and bibliographical nature (the latter group of data being much more sizeable than the former), but one is left with the impression that these references were used with the aim of demonstrating erudition rather

than coherence. The fact that the author did not consult any Spanish archive is a negative sign that needs no further comment. I draw attention to the fact that, in the prologue to the book, Dutra quite rightly criticizes the abusive way in which historians dealing with the 1640 revolution tend to quote the Count of Ericeira's *Portugal Restaurado*, particularly because the reader is shortly to discover that Tengwall is no exception. Some footnotes are so disproportionately long that they interrupt the rhythm of our reading. On other occasions, the references tend to pile up without any critical explanation being provided. This leads to another of the more serious problems that affect *The Portuguese Revolution*: sometimes we don't know whether we are reading a monograph on the Restoration or a History textbook on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This strange and uncomfortable mixture of a monograph and textbook directs the reader's attention towards subordinate analyses, and, in many cases, takes him on an exhausting journey into the world of uncertain erudition—I say “uncertain” because I have the impression that Tengwall does not have a very solid grasp of Portuguese, and, even more seriously, he quotes works without having read or completely understood them.

This is not the first time—nor will it be the last—that a historian has confused the narrative method with the chance to tell us everything that he knows. Narrating history consists in explaining a complex process with a chronological order, but also stopping at opportune moments in order to make analyses. Although this is a technique, there is no denying that it also requires a certain amount of *art*, in other words making endless revisions and corrections before considering a text to be definitive.

Tengwall does not seem to have devoted to his work the amount of time that such a crucial theme of European modern history required, resulting in some lamentable errors caused by carelessness.

There are abundant mistakes to be noted in the works quoted in the notes and in the final bibliography. The numbering of the footnotes between pages 36 and 45 is wrong. The map of the provinces of Portugal in the seventeenth century is repeated (it appears twice, on page 183 and on page 238). Like most Portuguese and Iberian kings, Dom João IV was not, strictly speaking, “crowned”, but instead acclaimed (136–40). Edgar Prestage was not a “noted Portuguese historian” (141), but a British one—although he did live in Portugal and was certainly a well-known author. Finally, Dom Luis Méndez de Haro, Filipe IV's favorite, who replaced Olivares, was never called “de la Paz” (338). These are all slips (and there are many more) that could easily have been avoided. If I highlight them here, it's

not because they are exceptional in the editorial world, but because the price of this book—over 100 dollars—converts them into a lack of consideration for the reader.

The appearance of a text in English on the Portuguese Restoration should always be a reason for rejoicing among the specialists writing on the subject. Not only does it help to spread interest in this fascinating chapter in European history, but it also makes it possible to disseminate the results obtained in this historiographic area among the widest possible audience. However, sadly, what *The Portuguese Revolution* gives rise to is a feeling of great concern, because of the serious insufficiencies that have been pointed out, and above all because of how unrepresentative this book is of the progress that has been made in relation to the *Portugal of the Habsburgs* in the last two decades.

I am seriously afraid that the appearance of this book in English will not help to win over new fans to the scientific study of the Restoration, but that it may in fact help us to lose them. This is a dreadful pity, because (and in this regard I am in full agreement with Tengwall) Portugal deserves to occupy a prominent place in comparative historiography in general, and in European historiography in particular, and it is disheartening to notice more and more that this has not happened.

But I am also convinced that a work such as *The Portuguese Revolution* will not contribute towards Portugal being taken into greater account in the circuits of European and world historiography; on the contrary, this is one of the ways in which it will be expelled from them.

**Barry Hatton, *The Portuguese. A Modern History*. USA,
Northampton and Massachusetts: Interlink Books, 2011. xvi
plus 261 pp., ISBN 978-1-56656-844-9**

José Miguel Sardica¹

In 1925, Fernando Pessoa wrote a small book aimed at teaching the tourist what he should see in Portugal in which he lamented that “for the average British, and, indeed, for the average anything (except Spaniards) outside Portugal, Portugal is a vague small country somewhere in Europe, sometimes supposed to be part of Spain.” Since then, the lack of knowledge denounced by Pessoa has been gradually overcome, but, whenever someone from Portugal hits the news outside their homeland, this small country located in Europe’s periphery and assigned a secondary role in international economic and political affairs, still remains an “illustrious unknown” within foreign public opinion, despite its much-acclaimed hospitality. It is true that, lately, interest in Portugal has boomed, albeit not for the best of reasons: international organizations and political decision-makers keep a close watch on the country due to its difficult financial situation and the foreseeable risks of this contaminating the rest of the current globalized world. A pattern does emerge then: foreign interest in Portugal consists of long periods of silence and short bursts of intense observation, resulting in a persistent ignorance about both what has previously happened and what is now happening in the extreme south-western corner of the continent that shaped world history. Portugal’s rich and striking past does not seem to count today, hardly warranting a mainstream case-study in international historiography or political science, even though Portugal is itself one of Europe’s oldest countries and the birthplace of one of the world’s most widely spoken languages.

In light of this situation, all contributions that help to deepen and spread knowledge about Portugal outside its borders should be noted and welcomed, especially when such texts are written by foreigners. Barry Hatton’s book *The Portuguese. A Modern History* falls into this category and fulfils that task. Its reading is highly recommended, both for foreigners who wish to learn more about Portugal and for all Portuguese nationals seeking to reflect upon and/or remember the country’s past. Barry Hatton is a British citizen, who has been living in Portugal for the last 25 years: he arrived in 1986 as a

¹ Faculty of Human Sciences. Portuguese Catholic University. E. Mail: jsardica@fch.lisboa.ucp.pt

freelance journalist, fresh from his course in literature at London's King's College. He raised a family in his new country and is today an Associated Press correspondent in Lisbon, covering national political, economic and sports news. These circumstances have turned Hatton into a special observer, halfway between a simple tourist, with a detached and eccentric gaze, and the native Portuguese. The former's powers of observation can sometimes be rather superficial and too opinion-based, while the latter's can tend to be somewhat biased, oscillating between patriotic self-defense and a desperate form of self-criticism. Hatton's approach is a very personal one, but it is nonetheless remarkably clear and professional, being based on a trained journalistic analysis, punctuated with a style of reporting that cleverly combines the proximity and empathy he undoubtedly feels towards his "second" country with the distance of "another's gaze," allowing him to scrutinize Portugal from the "outside." The above-mentioned quotation from Pessoa is actually included by Hatton at the very beginning of his book as a device for achieving the three main goals he set for himself in this "pocket-history" on Portugal and the Portuguese: "to shine a light on this enigmatic corner of Europe, describe the idiosyncrasies that make this lovable and sometimes exasperating country unique, and seek explanations by surveying the historical path that brought the Portuguese to where they are today" (viii).

Hatton's book is not just a mere abridged history of Portugal from the medieval time of its foundation and independence to its uncertain present at the dawn of the twenty-first century. While nonetheless encompassing all of that, it is also a work that intermingles historical analysis with journalistic sketches of the present in order to contextualize specific problems and features by tracing their origins and comparing past and present times. Hatton's writing is fluid and, both in some of his anthropological and sociological considerations about the Portuguese and in the judgments he makes about Portugal's tourist heritage, he is remarkably perceptive and accurate, exhibiting an undeniable sense of criticism, and indeed satire. Everything that has worked and still continues to work poorly in the country is mercilessly exposed, although he also takes time to recognize and praise national historical and civic achievements at the political, cultural or individual level.

Another great merit of the book is the wide diversity of the readings and authors who are quoted and used as sources of information, although the final bibliography, which is nothing more than a short "Further Reading" section, fails to show this adequately. Hatton is familiar with a large number of foreign figures from the past who have written about Portugal—from Nicolas Cleynaert and Voltaire to Henry Kissinger and Frank Carlucci, not forgetting William Beckford, Lord Wellington, Lord Byron, Hans Christian

Andersen, Miguel de Unamuno, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, Winston Churchill and Calouste Gulbenkian—as well as with the most important names in the Portuguese historical panorama—from Gil Vicente and Camões to Amália and Lobo Antunes, but also including Gomes Eanes de Zurara, Father António Vieira, Dom Rodrigo de Castro, Almeida Garrett, Alexandre Herculano, Antero de Quental, Eça de Queirós, Cesário Verde, Teixeira de Pascoaes, Fernando Pessoa, António Sérgio and Miguel Torga. He also reveals his close attention to the production of Portuguese historiography, philosophy and literary essays, and to the new names that have more recently transformed the country's musical, literary and cultural landscape.

Barry Hatton employs a paradox to introduce the Portuguese problem or enigma. Several voices nowadays talk about an “irrelevant” and “disappearing” country, one that is struggling “in a limbo” for survival and recognition, described by the *Economist* as “the sick man of Europe,” and responsible for only 1% of the EU's GDP. All of this is true. But the spectacle of the typical Portuguese bullfight is used by Hatton to remind all those skeptics and catastrophists (and how many among them are Portuguese!) that “any country which wrestles bulls for fun can never be written off.” If only for purely literary reasons, “*Wrestling with bulls*” (the title of the book's Introduction) could have been used as its overall title, metaphorically identifying “bulls” as the many difficulties and obstacles the country has had to overcome over the eight centuries of its rich and diversified history.

Chapter one offers a geographic description of all the diverse contrasts of a small country compressed into a tiny strip of land measuring 561 by 218 kilometers and extending deep into the Atlantic Ocean with its two “island idylls”—Madeira and the Azores. Chapter two begins by evoking the small marble map in front of the Monument to the Discoveries (in the riverside area of Belém in Lisbon) that all tourists can see and walk over, and on which every continent and place that the Portuguese discovered and first set foot on are marked. Hatton's purpose is to recall the country's origins, its struggles against neighboring Spain, and also the lights and shades of the “golden age” of the maritime discoveries, during which Portugal both inspired and led the world's first attempts at globalization. In the same way, Prince Henry the Navigator is credited with the merit of giving humanity “the world in 3D,” through the groundbreaking scientific advances of the “Sagres School” (“the Silicon Valley of the day”). Hatton is, however, quick to remind us how, by becoming so widespread and suddenly endowed with the riches of the world, “the Portuguese were the architects of their own decline.”

Before the author proceeds with the diachronic narrative of Portuguese history, a further two chapters present us with his reflections and synthesis of the nation's cultural and diplomatic history. Chapter three is all about the Portuguese-speaking world. The main legacy of the Portuguese diaspora of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was the foundation of a culture of miscegenation without "racial friction," today symbolized in a language that is spoken by some 200 million people—and whose defense and enlargement should and would be more active were it not for the meager results that Hatton sees in the activity of the Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries (CPLP). Chapter four highlights the dynamics and problems of the historical relationship maintained by Portugal with its two most important international counterparts: Spain—leading the author to explore the origins and the present relevance of the "Iberian question"—and Great Britain, leading to a couple of pages on the main tensions that Lisbon has experienced with its "oldest ally" in the past.

Chapter five, which seeks to explore the dynamics of "Portugal's long decline and fall" and to discover the reasons for this, demonstrates the author's familiarity with some of the more classical Portuguese historical references. He begins by mentioning the famous conference, organized by Antero de Quental in 1871 in order to discuss the causes of the decadence of the Iberian countries. Hatton goes backwards and forwards in time, exploring comparisons that, though they fail to explain everything about Portugal's backwardness from a historical point of view, are useful for establishing intertemporal links between some of the nation's more pervasive and continuous impediments to its development: the relationship between the repressive anti-Semitic conservatism of the Inquisition and the closed, stifling and censored world of Salazar's Portugal; the relationship between the centralizing pattern adopted by the Absolutist regime and the continuing excessive weight that the State has in Portuguese society; and, finally, the relationship between the fading influence of the Discoveries, with their quick and easy profits, and the extravagant spending that has resulted from the misuse of the European funds that have been pouring into the country since Portugal's accession to the EEC in the 1980s. The space devoted to an analysis of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the early twentieth century of republican Portugal, is too short, and Hatton could certainly have given more attention to those issues, expanding on his brief notes about the international impact of the Lisbon earthquake of 1755, the importance of the French Invasions and the "Brazilian question," the increasing indebtedness of the period of *fontismo*, or the economic dire straits of the Republican regime of 1910-1926, together with all the "assassinations, murders,

kidnappings, strikes and violent street demonstrations” that marked the day-to-day agenda of the early twentieth century.

Chapters six, seven and eight constitute a triptych on the instability of twentieth-century Portugal. The first of these deals with the “Salazar years,” defining the regime of the *Estado Novo* as a “walled enclosure where authoritarianism triumphed,” the dictator himself—in what is indeed a fairly effective portrait—as “a forbidding blend of finger-wagging schoolteacher and finger-pointing priest,” and the ill-fated “Caetano Spring,” which brought the nation to an impasse with its “deliciously absurd concept” of “renewal through continuity,” while allowing the atrocities of the war in Africa to continue until the very end of the regime. Hatton’s fascination with the “Carnation Revolution” of 1974 is obvious in Chapter seven. His description of the events occurring between 1974 and 1976 is almost cinematographic in its quality and is permeated with curiosities—the origins of the Carnation flowers that gave their name to the revolution, an hilarious note on the all too frequent use of the word “*pa*” (!) in the revolutionary lexicon, or the ideological contradictions of the PREC (the revolutionary period) in itself, keenly demonstrated in the famous TV documentary on the takeover of the *Torre-Bela* country estate. In this particular chapter, the geostrategic turnaround that began with the African decolonization and ended with Portugal’s accession to Europe in 1985-86 could have been explained in more detail, by affording greater prominence to the crucial decade of democratic normalization (1976-1986). Chapter eight deals with Portugal in Europe, beginning in 1986, or more precisely it examines the European influx *into* Portugal, and describes how that general input was badly misused. The *cavaquismo* of the 1980s signaled the arrival of “consumerism” and began a process of material improvement that was sufficient enough to grant Portugal the image of a modernizing country “on the move.” The economy boomed and, under the Socialist government of António Guterres, which followed on from Cavaco Silva’s Social Democratic consulate, the *annus mirabilis* of 1998, heralding the Universal Exposition in Lisbon, showed that “everything seemed possible.” But, as Hatton stresses, echoing what is now the consensual analysis of this period, “much of the change was cosmetic,” being based on “a credit-fuelled spending spree.” And, since after every “party” there inevitably comes a “hangover,” “if the EU aid was supposed to act like an injection of a growth hormone, it also had the effect of a narcotic. Sated by abundance, Portugal grew fat instead of building muscle.” The recent outcome of this illusion largely explains the “hard times” of the heavily overcast present moment, in which the country finds itself once again.

Chapters nine, ten and eleven leave history behind and are written in a more lighthearted and funnier journalistic style, employed by the author to chronicle some of the odd but characteristic habits of everyday Portuguese life, report on the cultural panorama of the music world, or enumerate, almost in the typical tone of a tourist guide, the specialties of Portuguese cuisine and gastronomy. Hatton thinks the Portuguese are “gentle anarchists,” who tend to live in a state of “peaceful disorder,” listing the many idiosyncrasies that together make up the national way of life: among other features, the average Portuguese is always late, excruciatingly formal, drives and parks like a madman, evades responsibility whenever possible, shows a “smart-alec” (or “*chico-esperto*”) attitude towards law and authority and hates paying taxes. Recalling the historical stereotype of “*Zé Povinho*” (a Portuguese cartoon character who appeared regularly in the nineteenth-century press), Hatton summarizes the people he chose to live with by using a string of alternate terms: “They are amiable but also irascible, deferential but indomitable, apathetic and humble, tough and dauntless, compassionate but grouchy, submissive and beleaguered, always waiting for fortune to smile on them, good company, conciliatory and tactful as well as effusive and spontaneous, given to blowing their top but eminently reasonable, with a sadness in their soul but joviality in their nature.” This very particular—Latin and “*Sebastianist*”—way of being and of doing things translates itself into *Fado* music (the theme dealt with in chapter ten), explaining why that specific musical genre can be summed up as “a celebration of ‘Portugueseness’.” It’s all about fate, sentiment and “*saudade*,” “the Word that cannot be translated,” as Hatton recognizes. Not many people are aware of the hard numbers that inspire chapter eleven: Portuguese people spend more than twice the EU average on eating and drinking, and the country has three times more restaurants per capita than the rest of the EU. What they like to eat and drink constitutes a flavorsome banquet—as “tasty” as it is “heavy”—that has already attracted the attention of both *Vanity Fair* and the *Wine Spectator*, with dishes ranging from *bacalhau*, *sopa da pedra*, *cozido* and tinned sardines to the more delicate *doce conventual* or *pastel de Belém*, to be accompanied by top-of-the-range wines and “the best coffee in Europe, alongside Italy,” says Hatton most effusively.

Returning to more serious business, the two closing chapters offer us a sharp contrast between the pessimistic and the optimistic approach to present-day Portugal. Chapter twelve tackles the issue of how “old problems,” feeding a “new crisis,” have recreated “that sinking feeling.” As “an analog country in a digital age,” Portugal’s last years have been marked by a “fall” into one of its “grimmest economic periods in living

memory.” Alongside the crude numbers, there is a qualitative problem that still lingers and “conspires to shackle the country.” As Hatton reminds us, “globalization, which the Portuguese initiated in the fifteenth century, rewards flexibility and innovation”; the thing is that Portugal seems to be ill-prepared for the twenty-first-century challenges, still revealing “bad habits”—“non-participation,” a “terror of reprisals for stepping out of line,” a State that has “a suffocating effect on the whole of society,” a general “lack of enterprise,” a legal system that works “at a glacial pace” or “low education levels.” Chapter thirteen, in contrast, builds on how—despite all of this – “adaptability,” “resilience” and “resourcefulness” are being brought to the fore by “the EU generation,” the youngsters who will conduct Portugal in the coming future, “unscarred by dictatorship and uncompromised by revolution.” Hatton is kind enough to point out how the Portuguese are their own worst enemies by always underestimating themselves, reminding the reader of all the things that actually work and show a better Portugal nowadays—from new technologies to new cultural landscapes and projects, from a renewed tourism (now a worldwide phenomenon) to a renewed outlook on Africa, from excellent national brands and corporate groups to individual achievements that cause the name of “Portugal” to echo all over the world. It is perhaps time—as Hatton says in his concluding remarks—for that old national “asymmetry” of being “self-defeating at home and excellent abroad” to wither away.

A book review on *The Portuguese. A Modern History* would not be complete without mentioning that there are some minor mistakes that occasionally accompany a text whose overall scope is truly praiseworthy. Most of these can be easily corrected in future editions and a few are the natural result of Hatton not being completely familiar with certain specific Portuguese historical debates. These include, for example, stating that Dom João VI “deserted” metropolitan Portugal or “fled” to Brazil in 1807 (page 91 or page 107), which doesn’t do full justice to what was a longstanding geostrategic plan first devised in the seventeenth century, if not earlier, and had existed ever since the small and tiny Portugal was deemed the lesser part of a transatlantic monarchy whose “jewel” was located in South America. The ideological characterization of Salazar’s *Estado Novo* oscillates between its being labeled an “authoritarian” regime and the statement (128) that the dictator’s preference leaned towards “fascism.” In fact, Salazar’s fascist “convictions” were nothing more than a disguise that never compromised his firm belief that Portugal’s only true partner had to be the UK. There is also a certain simplicity in the argument that “there was nothing sentimental about the refusal to leave [Africa in the 1960s and 1970s],”

implying that the huge burden of the colonial war was simply a question of “economic calculation.” As historiography has already pointed out, at the beginning of the 1970s, both imports from, and exports to, Europe (EEC and EFTA), represented almost 50% of all Portuguese foreign trade, while trade with Africa no longer amounted to more than 10 to 15%. The refusal to leave, then, had much more to do with ideological (i.e. political and historical) reasons arising from 500 years of colonial heritage than with any financial arguments.

Some of the minor mistakes that will need to be dealt with in a future edition are as follows: Wellesley landed in Portugal for the first time in 1808, not 1809 (90); the national anthem never had an original line that said “Against the Britons, march on!” (this is one of those false but enduring legends!) (92). Beresford was not sent to Brazil in 1820 because of the liberal military insurrection in Porto (108); rather, the military coup was out on the streets because he was absent from Lisbon, having sailed to Brazil to meet Dom João in Rio de Janeiro a couple of months earlier. The Portuguese Constitution of 1822 was never “consented to by the King and liberals alike” (108); it is true that the monarch did swear allegiance to the text upon returning to Lisbon, but he only did so to save his throne in an act that had been imposed upon him by the liberal radicals who presided over the political situation after the 1820 revolution. It is doubtful whether Dom Carlos I ever said that Portugal was “a dump” (110); republican propaganda sometimes cannot be taken as a proven historical fact. The first republican government (a provisional one) did not take office in 1911 (112), but on the very same day (5 October 1910) that the monarchy was ousted by the republican coup. In 1971, there was no longer either PIDE or Salazar, but their successors DGS and Marcelo Caetano (118). In view of the Paris Commune of 1871, perhaps the sentence “Western Europe witnessed its first revolution since 1848” with the Portuguese coup of 1974 ought to be reviewed (141). It is also somewhat problematic to consider that the PPD (the Social Democratic Party) was “right-of-centre” back in 1974 or 1975 (153). Its founder and first leader, Francisco Sá Carneiro, initially struggled to place it in the position where Nordic social democracy still stands today—to the left of centre. It was the continuing promotion of communism during the Portuguese revolution that pushed the Socialists and Social Democrats to the centre and right of the party spectrum. In Portugal, the President is not a “figurehead” (158). According to the semi-presidentialist Constitution, he certainly isn’t as powerful as his French or American counterpart, but he has much more power than the German one or, for the sake of the argument, the British Head of State, the Queen. António Guterres did not present his resignation as prime

minister in 2002 (181) but in December 2001, just after being defeated in the local elections. Fernando Dacosta is not a “late nineteenth-century writer” (202); he was born in 1945 and is still alive! Finally, the graphic chart of Portuguese economic indicators inserted on page 228 is simply incomprehensible since it offers no key to its reading.

All of this should not, however, be allowed to detract from the various merits of this book and the distinguished place that it will occupy among the few books written on Portugal by foreign observers and designed to be read by foreign readers (a Portuguese translation is already available, and is selling successfully). And the timing of its publication was also perfect: for better or worse, Portugal is making, and will continue to make, international headlines in the months and years to come, and Barry Hatton is keen to show that the country cannot be seen only in black and white. An eight hundred-year-old nation has a multitude of shades that it is sometimes difficult to grasp and fully understand, this book being a prime example of that. And for the Portuguese, it happens to be flattering, in this day and age, to read such a claim about us: “I do not doubt for a moment that the Portuguese will persevere despite hard times. There is as much chance of Portugal ‘disappearing’, as some have warned, as there is of a snowflake settling on an Algarve beach. The Portuguese remind me of those ancient olive trees you come across around the country—bent out of shape by bigger forces, flawed and suffering, but robustly surviving with an unusual beauty” (253–54).

Vitorino Magalhães Godinho and the *Annales* School: history as a way of thinking

José Luís Cardoso¹

1. Introduction

Vitorino Magalhães Godinho (1918-2011) was one of the leading Portuguese historians of the 20th century. His books and essays, his devotion to the teaching profession and his civic activities, the influence that he left on many of his disciples and followers – both in Portugal and in Brazil – are lasting marks of a life that was dedicated to thinking and writing about Portugal, the Portuguese, their history and their coming into being as a nation. Students of his work have available to them the vast legacy of his writings, which cover a wide and diversified range of subjects: from the theory and methodology of history and the social sciences to the history of the Portuguese expansion and the discoveries; from the dissemination and analysis of sources to his essays speculating on the problems faced by Portugal as an Atlantic, Iberian and European country.

Among the many tributes that have already been paid to his work, special mention should be made of the book *Estudos e Ensaios* (1988), published on the occasion of his retirement from the New University of Lisbon, which is a collection of papers written by some of the most prominent disciples and admirers of the historian's profession that Vitorino Magalhães Godinho had served for so long. More recently, there was also the special issue of the journal *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Calouste Gulbenkian* (2005), which was a collection of the papers presented at a conference held in his honor. Also worthy of mention is the special issue of the journal *Review, Fernand Braudel Center* (2005), in which it is expressly regretted that, because of language barriers, the work of Magalhães Godinho is so little known among Anglo-Saxon historians. In fact, this is a serious impediment to a wider dissemination and sharing of his work by modern international historiography, which is why it is always worth talking about his work when addressing a broader linguistic universe.

¹ Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon. E-Mail: jlcardoso@ics.ul.pt

In the collections referred to above, besides the sense of a tribute, we also find a clear presentation and analysis of the various themes and problematics that Vitorino Magalhães Godinho dealt with throughout his vast and fruitful career. Not forgetting the express intention of honoring his memory, this present text has a purposefully limited scope and only explores one of the various perspectives in which one can recognize the value of Vitorino Magalhães Godinho's contributions: his relationship with the historiographic current of the *Annales* School.

2. Vitorino Magalhães Godinho's links with the *Annales* School

Vitorino Magalhães Godinho's first contact with the *Annales* School came about after he had severed his ties to the Faculty of Letters of the University of Lisbon in 1944, for reasons that were clearly marked by the political reaction of the official historiography and ideologues of the *Estado Novo* to the innovation that he brought to historical research into the overseas expansion and its economic significance. Vitorino Magalhães Godinho had dared to take his analysis beyond the spread of faith and the spirit of adventure that were conventionally associated with the heroic feat of the maritime discoveries.

The enforced silence led him to spend time in an academic wilderness, although this situation did, however, enable him to engage in an intense period of translation and publishing activity. Dating from this period are his first reflections on the Portuguese expansion, the discoveries and the world economy, both through the publication and organization of sources (Godinho 1943-46) and through essays that intelligently identify the problems of this period's multiple historical meanings (Godinho 1944). It was also during this time of withdrawal from university affairs that he published an important work of methodological reflection on history and its making (Godinho 1946), in which he reveals an indisguisable admiration for the work of Lucien Febvre and the first (and of course, at that time, the only) generation of the school or movement of historiographic renewal that was centered on the journal *Annales d'Histoire Économique et Sociale*, created in 1929.

When, in 1947, after an exchange of letters that involved both Febvre and Braudel, he moved to Paris to continue his studies with a view to obtaining a doctorate, Magalhães Godinho set forth armed with the knowledge and anticipated sharing of a view of history that he would never again abandon. He was young, but he was no novice: he had developed, in a hostile environment, a solid adherence to the founding principles of the

Annales School. He was prepared to join a movement, and not to limit himself to being a mere spectator of the innovations already taking place.

This first phase of his stay in France continued until 1960. That year, he was to return to Portugal, and he would later head back to France once more, for reasons connected with his political dissidence, in 1970, remaining at the University of Clermont Ferrand until 1974. During his first stay (from 1947 to 1960), he was in close contact with authors such as Marcel Bataillon (whom he had met in Lisbon and who had played an important role in his move to Paris), Lucien Febvre, Fernand Braudel, Ernest Labrousse, George Gurvitch, Carlo Cipolla and Frédéric Mauro, among others. He benefited from the atmosphere of the newly-created 6th section of the *École Pratique des Hautes Études*, an institution that, as is known, allowed for a more fluid assimilation and reproduction of the historical knowledge disseminated by the journal of the *Annales* School and its mentors.

In 1955, he completed his postgraduate dissertation with a work that was greatly inspired and guided by the ideas of Labrousse (Godinho 1955), exploring a line of quantitative research that also characterized an important hub of activity at the *Annales* School. Four years later (in 1959), he presented the dissertation for his State doctorate entitled “The Economy of the Portuguese Empire, 15th and 16th Centuries”, later published in Portuguese with a different title (Godinho 1963), with Labrousse and Braudel acting as the examiners on his jury.

It should also be noted that it was during his stay at the *École Pratique des Hautes Études* that Magalhães Godinho visited the University of São Paulo in 1954, as a member of the French mission that, in 1937 with Braudel, had initiated in Brazil the first of what were to become frequent contacts in the field of history. This mission played an extremely important role in the renewal of Brazilian historiography.

3. The messages drawn from the *Annales* School

3.1. Interdisciplinarity and total unified history

As is well known, one of the most distinctive features of the *Annales* School is the cross-fertilization that it has achieved between history and the subjects, theories and methodologies of the other social sciences. Without any doubt, this was also one of the most distinctive and recurrent (almost obsessive, I would say) aspects of Vitorino Magalhães Godinho’s way of understanding history, as we can see from his work.

Disciplines are useful because they define problems, procedures, solutions and specific audiences. However, when they are left to their own devices, they can lead to an excessive narrowing of the angles of perception. For this reason, interdisciplinarity is also a good thing, when practiced in an informed manner, and provided that it is not being used to shun the responsibility of not being a specialist in anything at all. It is not a question of denying the advantages of specializing in disciplinary fields, but rather of underlining the benefits of overlaps and complementarity in these fields.

In Godinho's work, interdisciplinary dialogue is not only called for in the exercise and practice of a total history in which there is a cross-fertilization between the approaches of geo-history, historical economics and sociology (expressions that he prefers to those of economic and social history), psycho-history and historical anthropology, to mention just the most relevant areas. In his view, it is also essential to break away from the static vision that characterizes each of these disciplines, which was the reason why he defended the teaching of social and human sciences without any artificial barriers being raised between fields of knowledge that mutually enrich one another. The following recent testimony provides a good example of the concern that always motivated him in his work:

Economics has ceased to be a scientific construction that is adapted to the different realities that we find in epochs and societies, politicology has shielded itself in the linking together of political facts with other political facts, anthropology delights in "symbolic representations" and has forgotten about watermills and ploughs, factories and coal, men and their ways of feeling, thinking and acting, the geographical space in which their lives are led, the dialectics between social roles and personality; sociology has become monographic and doesn't concern itself with long-term processes or complex structures. Multidisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity have been proclaimed, but will they be put into practice? (Godinho 2008, p.13)

3.2. History as a conceptual elaboration

Without ever losing his passion for the archives, his respect for the sources or his concern with taking great care of the documents, the history that Vitorino Magalhães Godinho pursued in keeping with the practices of the *Annales* School is particularly demanding in terms of the process of theoretical construction and the elaboration of

concepts that it requires, and which allow for a better understanding of the succession of events. Magalhães Godinho never made any concessions to the acritical positivism of many historians of his generation.

History cannot be reduced to a narrative sequence of facts that have been positively assessed and linked together without any causal explanation. Events that have been painstakingly reported and reproduced from secure and trustworthy sources have to be seen in a long-term perspective, and above all require an effort of interpretation that makes use of the capacity of rational understanding based on the construction of ideal types (in the best Weberian tradition) or on the formulation of problems that require the historian to provide both an explanation and a solution. Two examples taken from his work help us to understand his positioning and his close adherence to the spirit of the *Annales* School in relation to this matter.

The first example relates to the concept that he himself invented of a “historical-geographical complex”, through which he sought to discern the linking together of spatial or territorial structures located in space but defined in a time that has rhythms and cadences, allowing for the capture of both short and long terms (or, in other words, spaces that change to the rhythm of history). A complex where economic, social and political flows and relations are established in different spatial scales (local, regional, national, worldwide), where actors and institutions (with their own directions but joint dynamics) interact, where cultural and ritual practices are defined, affording specificity to the historical realities analyzed (cf. Godinho 1966). His study of the trading networks and commercial fleets in the Indian and South Atlantic Oceans, within the broader perspective of the study of markets at a worldwide level, allowed Vitorino Magalhães Godinho to develop the heuristic validity of this concept in which we find intertwined the dialectic relations and tensions between space and time, conjuncture and structure, short and long term, micro and macro analysis. It is, therefore, a concept that makes it possible for him to explore paths that lead to a better historical understanding of complex social phenomena.

In this sense, to take one of his more preferred themes as an example, merchant fleets are, above all, the group of boats of which they are comprised. But they are also the cargoes that they transport, the men that sail the vessels and the men that build them, equip them and fit them out, the institutions and powers that decide upon and pay for the voyages and trade, the science that helps navigation, the risks and insurance that make them either difficult or feasible, the markets that allow goods in and out, the currencies in

which goods are transacted, the bills of exchange that are in circulation, the myths that they are faced with, the purpose and the vision that motivate them.

The second example relates to the concept of Portugal as a “blocked society”, which Magalhães Godinho developed in one of his more remarkable (and also more controversial) essays (Godinho 1971). He was able to use this notion to coherently explore the vicissitudes of blockades at different moments in Portuguese history, which illustrate or provide a pretext for studying the problems of backwardness, dependence and decadence, wastage or misuse of resources, mentalities and cultures that are little given to innovation and the advance of knowledge. The analysis of particular moments and episodes is subject to a contextualization served by well-constructed hypotheses for reflection, even though they may be refuted.

In one of the last texts that he published, he had the opportunity, led by his analysis of Alexandre Herculano’s major work, to return to the ancestral dilemmas of the Portuguese economy and society, and not only during the *ancien regime*. And he summed up the question perfectly: “Our problem is the future, and the dilemma of freedom-inequality” (Godinho 2010b, p. 96).

3.3. Other constructions of history

Nowadays, are the methodological and theoretical guidelines of the *Annales* project still valid and deserving of unconditional approval? Do the teachings of the first generation (Bloch-Febvre) and the second generation (led by Braudel, but also enjoying the invaluable collaboration of Labrousse and Le Roy Ladurie) still remain intact and protected in the new history being produced by the authors of the third generation in the field of collective representations and mental representations (Jacques le Goff, F. Furet, Philippe Ariès, Robert Mandrou, Georges Duby, Daniel Roche, Roger Chartier, among so many others)?

Answering these questions in relation to the work of Vitorino Magalhães Godinho obliges us to focus on the prudent way in which he himself always regarded deviations from the initial trajectory that he had developed with Febvre, Braudel and Labrousse, his main references and mentors. And here it is also worth paying attention to two examples drawn from his reflections about objects of study that are ever present in his work.

The first example relates to the construction of the field of economic and social history (historical economics and sociology) and the clear affirmation of the vitality and defense of the primacy of the tradition of the *Annales* School as a counterpoint to an

economic history that is cliometric in nature. Without ever openly declaring his hostility to such a vision, Magalhães Godinho shielded himself in the practice of a quantitative and serial history that does not correspond to the vision that modern economic history has been constructing, being progressively transformed into a sophisticated branch of economic theory. Through the studies that he produced, it can be concluded that the use of price series or the use of instruments of quantitative analysis should not be confused with econometric techniques that are identical to the ones used in the calculations of economists. In keeping with his vision, which is, after all, the vision of the *Annales* School, economic history cannot be a mere rational reconstruction of the past, an analytical exercise based on stylized facts whose existence is proved only by its capacity to model variables, test hypotheses and prove pre-established certainties.

Another elucidatory example relates to the field of the history of mentalities and collective representations, which he clearly illustrated in many of his texts (Godinho 1990), or, in other words, his concern with the sphere of ideas and symbolic objects.

In the best tradition of the *Annales* School, there remains no doubt that the consolidation of history as an intellectual discipline implies a recognition of the importance of studying institutional, cultural, political, economic and social contexts for both material production and the production of ideas. However, for some historians who are more receptive to the postmodern message and its turning point, instead of making the history of “some thing” that they have always been able to clearly identify, it seems preferable to study the way in which that “thing” was transformed into a historical object, without a permanent and transcendental identity. Thus, everything becomes susceptible to isolated historical understanding, from the smallest and meanest individual motivation to the most noble and sublime demonstration of the human spirit.

The importance of analyzing symbols, rituals, writings, historical artifacts, social arrangements and systems of beliefs never ceased to be evident in the work of Vitorino Magalhães Godinho, just as it has always been in the best tradition of the *Annales* School. But this clear presence cannot be considered to be equivalent to reducing these objects to simple “texts” that are only read and questioned in their semiotic structure and internal consistency. In other words, ideas are not mere linguistic, mental or social events, but instead complex intellectual phenomena.

4. History as a reading of the present and the future, in the light of the past

Besides the attributes highlighted earlier (history as a problem, history as a conceptual construction, history as a rigorous exercise of comparison and discovery), for Vitorino Magalhães Godinho, history was always a field that brought together disciplines and people from a wide variety of backgrounds, a center for interdisciplinary debates, a heuristic instrument for the study of the present and the past of human societies, always with an idea of the future in mind. History is a program that serves to strengthen citizenship.

History is also made through the retrospective projection of intentions defined for the present time that subtly imposes research agendas, rhythms of scientific production, and pretexts for a more in-depth study of specific themes. This is a particularly important aspect of the path followed by Magalhães Godinho, who never abandoned the civic purpose of his mission as a historian. Equally relevant is the transposition of interpretations from the past into the present, which is shown not to be immune to the influence of a historiographic legacy that is capable of renewing itself. In this incursion of his into history as a civic apprenticeship, he was greatly influenced by the generation that had helped to shape his thinking, namely by António Sérgio and Jaime Cortesão.

This means that our understanding of the past benefits from events that come after it, while at the same time we recognize that our vision of the present conditions our reading of the past. The overlapping of layers and interpretive restorations is in no way anachronistic. Nonetheless, it is essential to bear in mind that, in explaining the ideas of the past with our own ideas, used as instruments of retrospection, we cannot accept that the authors of the past might play a leading role in the world in which we live today. One thing that is acceptable is to gauge the potential provided by the arguments of past ideas through our present visions and ideas. But it is unacceptable for us to admit that we only understand the ideas of the past because they are the precursors of the ideas of the present or are contained in them.

Vitorino Magalhães Godinho always regarded this matter as the *raison d'être* of history itself, as part of a civic project that the authors of the *Annales* School had also made their own. The following and final excerpt, taken from one of the last texts that he bequeathed to us, clearly shows the consistency and coherence of his vision of history as a way of thinking about the human condition:

We have to be capable of seizing today's problems in order to be capable of seizing yesterday's problems or those from even further in the past, and we have to take those agitated times into account if we wish to penetrate into

the heart of those that we are living now. History is a way of thinking about all of mankind's problems and about what is the human condition. (Godinho 2010a, p.10)

“History is a way of thinking about all of mankind's problems and about what is the human condition.” Repeating these words is the best way of remembering and paying tribute to the project of History and life that was deeply ingrained in the academic and civic career of Vitorino Magalhães Godinho.

References

- Godinho, Vitorino Magalhães, 1943-46. *Documentos sobre a Expansão Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Editorial Gleba e Edições Cosmos. (New edition: Lisbon: INCM, 2011).
- _____, 1944. *A Expansão quatrocentista portuguesa*. Lisbon: Empresa Contemporânea de Edições. (New edition: Lisbon: Dom Quixote, 2008)
- _____, 1946. *A crise da História e as suas novas directrizes*. Lisbon: Empresa Contemporânea de Edições.
- _____, 1955. *Prix et Monnaies au Portugal, 1750-1850*. Paris: Librairie Armand Collin.
- _____, 1963. *Os descobrimentos e a economia mundial*. Lisbon: Arcádia.
- _____, 1966. Complexo histórico-geográfico. In: Joel Serrão (org.), *Dicionário de História de Portugal*. Lisbon: Iniciativas Editoriais, Vol. I, pp. 644-49.
- _____, 1971. *A Estrutura da Antiga Sociedade Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Arcádia.
- _____, 1990. *Mito, Mercadoria, Utopia e Prática de Navegar*. Lisbon: Difel.
- _____, 2008. Preface to the new edition of *Expansão Quatrocentista Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Dom Quixote, pp. 9-14.
- _____, 2010a. Preface to the new edition of *Ensaaios e Estudos*, Volume II, *Compreender o Mundo de Hoje*. Lisbon: Livraria Sá da Costa, pp. 7-23.
- _____, 2010b. Introduction to *Alexandre Herculano, o Cidadão e o Historiador*. Lisbon: INCM, pp. 7-96.

About Vitorino Magalhães Godinho:

- AA.VV., *Estudos e Ensaaios em Homenagem a Vitorino Magalhães Godinho*. Lisbon: Livraria Sá da Costa, 1988.
- Le Portugal et le Monde, lectures de l'oeuvre de Vitorino Magalhães Godinho. *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Calouste Gulbenkian*, Volume I, 2005.
- Review*, *Fernand Braudel Center*, Vol. 28:4, 2005.