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This dissertation examines how Moriscos (Spanish Muslims forcibly converted to Catholicism, and their descendants) responded to religious prosecution and assimilationist policies with both legal action and noncompliance. The Morisco problem was the failure of the early modern Spanish Crown and Church to assimilate the Moriscos into Catholicism in the wholesale and controlled manner desired by those institutions. Central to this problem was their identification: the determination of their individual and communal legal statuses and corresponding privileges, related but not equivalent to their religious “identities.” This dissertation focuses on two groups living in the Castilian city of Valladolid: Castilian Moriscos native to that region and Granadan Moriscos resettled there after 1570. Chapter One looks at the Castilian Moriscos’ legal fight to remain in their long-time residential enclave, Valladolid’s Barrio de Santa María. The second chapter, “Petitioning for Grace,” explains how they mitigated Inquisitorial prosecution by petitioning the king for Edicts of Grace and negotiating with the Inquisition an annual monetary tribute designed to protect their property from confiscation. Chapter Three, “Contested Relocations,” examines how Granadan Morisco deportees relocated to Valladolid challenged prohibitions on their mobility. The fourth chapter, “Litigating for Liberty,” focuses on Moriscos enslaved as children during the Granadan rebellion and war who later won their freedom.
in courts of law. The final chapter, “Resisting Expulsion,” shows how Moriscos resisted and disrupted the process of their final expulsion from the Spanish Kingdoms in 1609-1614. This project’s critical intervention in the field is its focus on the textual record Moriscos generated through legal action, sources that include court records, leases, petitions and claims, tax settlements, licenses, passports, charters of Old Christian status, and letters of manumission. This thesis argues that the identification of the Moriscos was a process of negotiation in which they themselves took part. It challenges the traditional narrative of the marginalization of the Moriscos: for all the prosecution and prohibitions they faced as suspected heretics and dissidents, these documents tell a tale of significant economic industry, civic integration, and legal agency.
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Introduction

The Morisco problem was the failure of the early modern Spanish Crown and Church to assimilate the Moriscos into Catholicism in the wholesale and controlled manner desired by those institutions. Central to this problem was their identification — the determination of their individual and communal legal statuses and corresponding privileges, related but not equivalent to their religious “identities.” Moriscos were Spanish Muslims forcibly converted to Catholicism and their descendants. Collectively suspected of insincere Christianity and in some cases of political disloyalty, they were subject to Inquisitorial investigation and prosecution, registration and surveillance, special taxes and tributes, prohibitions on their mobility and on carrying weapons, and, ultimately, deportations, as well as a host of policies which aimed to control and assimilate them. This dissertation focuses on two groups living in the Castilian city of Valladolid and its surrounding district: the Castilian Moriscos native to that region and the Granadan Moriscos resettled there after 1570. Rather than presenting a comprehensive history of the Moriscos in Valladolid, this dissertation investigates a series of encounters between them and Church and State institutions in Valladolid and demonstrates how Moriscos responded to religious prosecution and assimilationist policies with both legal action and noncompliance. Through litigation and petitioning they aimed to protect their property, to determine their places of residence, to defend their communities and privileges, to preserve pre-conversion social structures, and to secure exemptions from deportations and associated prohibitions. I argue that the identification of the Moriscos was a process of negotiation in which they themselves took part.

At play were the politics of belonging, a controversy over the proper place and official identification of conquered and converted peoples in Catholic Spanish society. The Morisco problem involved more than the predicament of their alleged religious heterodoxy. It revealed shifts in the meaning and measure of belonging in the sixteenth-century Spanish world. Confirmation that a baptized, nominally Catholic Morisco was a true Christian certainly depended on observed orthopraxy, including church attendance, knowledge of prayers, and participation in Catholic worship through the sacraments and public devotion (for example, following the procession of the Eucharist). However, also under scrutiny was an evolving catalogue of cultural, social, and genealogical requirements. Among other things, these took into account language, diet, residency, marriage, reputation, and association; New Christians needed to speak Castilian and not Arabic, to be seen eating pork and drinking wine, to reside among Old Christian neighbours and
not in Morisco districts, to marry and socialize with Old Christians and not other Moriscos, and to disassociate themselves from all forms of Morisco religiosity. As discussed below, the tightening of the requirements of genealogical “purity” signaled the production of difference, as “[r]eligious deviance by Spaniards of Muslim descent came to be denoted by cultural deviance, or heterodoxy in respect to customs, and eventually by genealogical deviance, or heterodoxy in respect to lineage, or ‘purity of blood’.”¹ The appraisal of this matrix of criteria was contentious, deliberated at many levels of authority, and articulated in confrontations with the Moriscos themselves.

While some individual Moriscos presented evidence of their Catholic faith, the majority of the Moriscos in and around Valladolid defended their belonging in different ways. Distinct from these “good Christian Moriscos,” some asserted themselves as Old Moriscos (antiguos) or Old Christian Moriscos: loyal and baptized subjects bearing privileged status on the basis of hereditary “Old Christian” titles, regional provenance, or corporate belonging. Others, such as Granadan Moriscos with no such titular inheritance, demonstrated legal agility in securing freedoms and protections granted to them in royal orders. Their petitions and lawsuits reveal an understanding of belonging within Spanish society that required little emphasis on personal faith and had more to do with status: as baptized Christians, as loyal subjects to the king, as active and contributing citizens, as indigenous, and as honourable descendants of willing converts to Catholicism. Over the course of the Morisco century, the official qualifications of belonging shifted in response to this approximation of sameness.² By the early seventeenth century, even a small number of Moriscos living in Valladolid with impeccable reputations as Catholics and supported by the enthusiastic testimony of Old Christian friends, neighbours, and local priests were denied exemption from the final expulsion.³

The long Morisco century — from the first forced religious conversions in 1502 to the final expulsion in 1609-1614 — had roots in 1492, when the Nasrid Sultanate of Granada, the last Iberian Muslim state, was conquered by the Catholic Monarchs Isabel I of Castile (1451-1504) and Fernando II of Aragon (1452-1516) and annexed to the Crown of Castile.⁴ Though the

² See below and Christina Lee, The anxiety of sameness in early modern Spain (Manchester University Press, 2016).
³ See Chapter Five.
⁴ This was the final phase of a long series of military encounters between 1482 and 1492. For more on this topic, see the work of Miguel Ángel Ladero Quesada, including Castilla y la conquista del Reino de Granada (Granada:...
capitulation treaties promised religious freedom to the Mudejars in the Kingdom of Granada, tensions soon escalated in the face of repressive policies and pressure to convert to Catholicism.\(^5\) The ensuing Mudejar revolt turned into a war fought between 1499 and 1500, with fighting centered in the Alpujarras mountain range south-east of the city of Granada. Royal forces defeated the Mudejars, whose rebellion was considered a violation of the 1492 capitulation treaties. Consequently, on February 12, 1502, the Catholic Monarchs ordered the Muslims of the entire Crown of Castile to choose between expulsion to North Africa and conversion to Catholicism.\(^6\) However, in practical terms this was “a simulacrum of choice.”\(^7\) Zones of departure were limited to the borders and seaports of the Basque region and Moriscos were prohibited from taking with them gold, silver, or other valuable belongings.\(^8\) This nearly impossible exit strategy combined with the hardships of leaving home and the likelihood of separation from loved ones. For many, the choice was made by the prospect of leaving their preadolescent children behind in Spain. Moreover, many Castilian Moriscos did not speak Arabic, and it was unlikely that they could integrate into North African societies. For all of these impediments, the 1502 order of expulsion was analogous to a forced religious conversion. Mudejars became baptized New Christians, called *nuevos convertidos de moros* (newly converted moors), *antiguos mudéjares* (former Muslims living under Christian rule), or *moriscos*.\(^9\) The Mudejars of the Crown of Aragon (the kingdoms of Aragon and Valencia and the principality of Catalonia) were likewise forcibly converted to Catholicism in 1525-1526.

---

5 Muslims living in Christian-ruled territories in the medieval Spanish kingdoms were called Mudejars, or *mudéjar*es in Spanish. Serafín de Tapia Sánchez explains, “Etymologically, Mudéjar comes from the Arabic ‘muda’y y’, which signifies ‘people of permanence’, ‘one who has been allowed to stay’, ‘one who pays tribute’, ‘domesticated’.” *La comunidad morisca de Ávila* (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1991), 45, n.1.


8 “Provisión de los Reyes Católicos ordenando la expulsión de los musulmanes del reino (1502, febrero, 12.),” in Carrasco Manchado, 235.

9 Newly converted from Moors” is the common designation in contemporary sources. “Morisco” could mean “Moorish” in the medieval era, and came to refer to the new converts in the course of the sixteenth century. I find the term “Morisco/a” throughout all of my primary sources. For an excellent parsing of these historical appellations, see Chapter One of L.P. Harvey, *Muslims in Spain: 1500-1614* (University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 2005).
Despite the increasing territorial consolidation of a succession of Spanish monarchs, the premodern Iberian kingdoms remained culturally and linguistically diverse. Morisco populations were likewise regionally distinct. Small, mostly urban, minority Morisco communities dotted the Castilian landscape, while large, rural Morisco populations dominated the Kingdom of Aragon as well as vast regions of southern Spain and the Mediterranean coast. Moriscos in Castilian towns such as Valladolid spoke Castilian Spanish and, as will be discussed in Chapter One, had attained a degree of economic and civic integration with the majority Old Christian society; still, they remained distinct in social patterns such as residential segregation, customary professions, and endogamous kinship. In the Kingdom of Granada, Moriscos were distinguished from Old Christians by their language and speech patterns, their style of dress, and the taxes they paid (the farda), in addition to their endogamy and common economic activities (such as the silk industry). Vernacular Arabic was known as algarabía and was entrenched in the Granadan countryside. Post-conquest, Castilian language and fashions did have an effect on Granadan Morisco ways, although less so in rural areas. Islamic culture was not a foreign element in Granada, nor was it the rest of the Spanish kingdoms, for that matter. Barbara Fuchs’ work illustrates how “moorishness” was an “unavoidable component in the construction of Spain’s national identity [in the sixteenth century], whether embraced or stigmatized.”

Regardless of the personal religious devotion of individual Moriscos, royal, ecclesiastical, and popular opinions held that all Moriscos were secret Muslims. Therefore, various policies and

---

10 By the late sixteenth century, the Iberian peninsula was ruled by a single Spanish monarch, the Habsburg King Philip II (r. 1554-1598). The Crowns of Castile and Aragon had been united politically by the marriage of the Catholic Monarchs in 1469; their takeover of Granada in 1492 ended the centuries-long “reconquest” of Spain. Castile annexed the Kingdom of Navarre in 1515 and the Kingdom of Portugal between 1580 and 1640. It is worth noting that the concept of reconquista is a product of the Spanish Catholic claim to a pre-existing Spanish Catholic nation and tends to gloss over the complexity of hundreds of years of warring and other more peaceable interactions between Muslim and Christian kingdoms in medieval Iberia between 711 and 1492. Thomas F. Glick and Oriol Pi-Sunyer derive this point from Américo Castro, who was “insistent on the recognition and demarcation of diachronic cultural boundaries, such as that between the Visigoths and the medieval Spaniards. The former, he takes pains to reiterate, were no more Spaniards than the Franks were French, a point too little appreciated by contemporary Spanish medievalists” See Glick and Pi-Sunyer, “Acculturation as an Explanatory Concept in Spanish History,” Comparative Studies in Society and History 11,2 (1969): 146.
11 Miguel Ángel Ladero Quesada explains the “phonetic peculiarities” that marked Granadan Morisco speech, as described in sixteenth-century accounts. See Granada, historia de un país islámico (Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1989), 294.
12 Barbara Fuchs, Exotic nation: maurophilia and the construction of early modern Spain (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 138-139. For more on the impact of Islamic minorities on medieval Iberia and Europe, see Brian A. Catlos, Muslims of Medieval Latin Christendom, c.1050-1614 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
edicts aimed to make sincere, practicing Catholics of the nominally Christian Moriscos throughout the sixteenth century. Crown and Church authorities perceived Morisco cultural practices informed by and associated with religious traditions, such as language, diet, dress, bathing, music, and the naming of children, as proof of their illicit adherence to Islam and as obstacles to their sincere incorporation into the Catholic fold. The Valladolid priest Andrés Martínez articulated these correlations when he described Morisco dietary customs and continued residential segregation as indicators of their insincere conversion to Catholicism: “These outward signs of belief indicate that their inner states are even worse.” In Granada, Francisco Núñez Muley famously disassociated Morisco cultural practices from Islamic faith in his 1567 Memorandum, written in defense of his fellow Granadan Moriscos and in opposition to King Philip II’s 1567 royal edict that banned the Arabic language and Morisco dress and customs. Núñez Muley argued that the Arabic language and Morisco traditions were not inherently at odds with the Catholic faith, and that Christianity was not co-extensive with Castilian culture. Among other arguments, he used the example of Christians in the Middle East, who spoke Arabic and lived their lives according to different customs but who were nonetheless faithful to the Church. It was Núñez Muley’s opinion that Granadan Moriscos could live as loyal Christian subjects while retaining their language, baths, dress, diet, and other customs they had practiced for centuries.

Núñez Muley’s arguments did not sway the monarchy. As I discuss in Chapter Three, the implementation of Philip II’s 1567 royal edict provoked a second Morisco rebellion. Protests against these laws started in the Albaicín, the predominantly Morisco district of the city of

---

13 In Granada, these attempts included efforts at evangelization undertaken by various religious orders (Franciscans, Dominicans, and Jesuits) and the establishment of colleges (such as Talavera’s school in 1526 and the Society of Jesus’ Casa de la Doctrina in the Albaicín in 1559). See Darío Cabanellas Rodríguez, “Los Moriscos: vida religiosa y evangelización,” La incorporación de Granada a la Corona de Castilla : actas del symposium conmemorativo del Quinto Centenario (Granada, 2 al 5 de diciembre de 1991). Ed. Miguel Ángel Ladero Quesada. (Granada: Diputación Provincial de Granada, 1993), 497-511, as well as David Coleman, Creating Christian Granada: Society & Religious Culture in an Old-World Frontier City, 1492-1600 (Cornell University Press, 2003). On attempts to employ the Arabic language in the evangelization of Granadan Moriscos in the early sixteenth-century, see Mercedes García-Arenal and Fernando Rodríguez Mediano, Un Oriente español: los moriscos y el Sacromonte en tiempos de Contrarreforma (Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia, 2010). The Spanish Inquisition established a tribunal in Granada in 1526; this tribunal’s activity rose in the 1560s, during which time 80-90% of the penitents in Granadan autos de fe were Moriscos. See Ladero Quesada, Granada, historia de un país islámico, 309.

14 Archivo Histórico Nacional, Sección Inquisición, legajo 2136, expediente 3 (May, 1561): “Sobre la conversion de los moriscos.” As priest of the Iglesia de Santiago, Martínez counted the Moriscos of the Barrio de Santa María among his parishioners. See Chapter Two.

Granada, and quickly spread throughout the kingdom; the Albaicín and the Alpujarras mountain region again became rebel strongholds. The king responded with military action. The resulting confrontation is known as the second Granadan War, or the War of the Alpujarras (1568-1570). The king’s forces prevailed, and Philip II ordered the expulsion of the Moriscos from the kingdom. The deportation of the Moriscos of Granada was a consequence of both their revolt and of the perceived incommensurability of Old Christian and Morisco cultures. Rather than solving the Morisco problem, these drastic measures complicated the project of managing Morisco populations throughout Castile.

The king's forces prevailed, and Philip II ordered the expulsion of the Moriscos from the kingdom. The deportation of the Moriscos of Granada was a consequence of both their revolt and of the perceived incommensurability of Old Christian and Morisco cultures. Rather than solving the Morisco problem, these drastic measures complicated the project of managing Morisco populations throughout Castile.

The distinction between Old and New Christians was also one of blood. Old Christians had no known Jewish or Muslim heritage and therefore had something that New Christians did not: purity of blood (*limpieza de sangre*). Limpieza was an important concept in late medieval and early modern Spain; it became a requirement for many judicial and government offices and was central to contemporary notions of honour. The first limpieza statutes were implemented in Toledo in 1449 to bar *conversos* from public office. Similar statutes were established over the next century, though this process was “complicated, contested … gradual, [and] piecemeal.”

A person’s “purity” — or “impurity” — could be verified through an investigation into their genealogical inheritance, often by the Spanish Inquisition. Based on “some of the gendered and temporal principles operating in canon law’s treatment of the descendants of heretics,” purity of blood statutes required a person to be two or three generations removed from their Jewish forefather to meet the requirements of limpieza; this equation was known as the four corners (*cuatro costados*). In both official expectation and in self-presentation, limpieza was often idealized. Still, many religious and lay institutions came to require such proof of their members, and the

---


18 Martinez, *Genealogical fictions*, 50.
requirements of *limpieza* were eventually applied to the case of the Moriscos. Purity of blood was also a requirement for traveling to the Americas.\(^1^9\)

The concept of purity evolved as it became central to the politics of belonging in the early modern Spanish world. It was fundamental to producing a “society obsessed with genealogy and in particular with the idea that having only Christian ancestors, and thus a ‘pure lineage,’ was the critical sign of a person’s loyalty to the faith.”\(^2^0\) Allowing for divergence between institutions, sixteenth-century purity of blood statutes generally identified all conversos and Moriscos as contaminated by the Jewish or Muslim blood of their forebears. This was because most statutes discarded the “patrilineal and generational formulas” of purity, meaning that there was no limit on how far back on either side of a person’s family tree one could excavate proof of “impurity.”\(^2^1\) There was therefore little ground for Moriscos to claim purity of blood during this era. Yet, as I demonstrate throughout this dissertation, lineage remained fundamental to how Moriscos themselves claimed status. For example, the Moriscos *antiguos* of the Barrio de Santa María represented themselves as indigenous and loyal citizens of honourable ancestry.\(^2^2\) Many Granadan Moriscos claimed to have inherited Old Christian status and privileges; the interrogatories they submitted for the questioning of witnesses in court presented family histories featuring ancestors who were willingly baptized before the conquest of Granada or before the mass conversion of 1502, all loyal servants of the Catholic Monarchs of Spain.\(^2^3\)

This project’s critical intervention in Morisco historiography is its focus on the textual record that Moriscos generated through legal action. These sources include court records, leases, petitions and claims, tax settlements, licenses, passports, charters of Old Christian status, and letters of manumission. The majority of the records in this legal genre were penned by notaries and lawyers but engendered by Moriscos in their legal proceedings, either individually or collectively. Together, these records constitute a significant Morisco documentary production belying the long-held assumption that the Moriscos of Old Castile left little to no textual legacy of


\(^{2^0}\) Martínez, *Genealogical fictions*, 1.

\(^{2^1}\) Martínez, *Genealogical fictions*, 52.

\(^{2^2}\) See Chapters One, Two, and Five.
their own, such as the _aljamiado_ texts of Aragonese Moriscos, or the “lead books” of Granada.\textsuperscript{24} While my sources clearly differ from these famous records authored by anonymous Moriscos, they are likewise historical records of Morisco words and actions. Moreover, the documents generated by Morisco legal action functioned as identity papers, stating who the Morisco individuals or communities were and to which privileges they were entitled. It is vital to realize the materiality and legal power of these documents, which could certify status, endow privileges, or guarantee access or exemption, many on a hereditary basis. Once issued, such documents were the very tools that Moriscos wielded in their negotiations with the authorities. As material objects, these papers — passports, licenses, leases, charters — were endowed with great judicial power to bestow privileges upon the bearer. With these methodological and analytical approaches, this thesis challenges the traditional narrative of the marginalization of the Moriscos: for all the prosecution and prohibitions they faced as suspected heretics and dissidents, these documents tell a tale of significant economic industry, civic integration, and legal agility. This argument does not deny or downplay the severity of the prosecution, violence, and exile endured by the Moriscos; rather, it seeks to include the voices and actions of the Moriscos in the history of their encounters with Church and State.\textsuperscript{25}

To historically situate the encounters between Moriscos and State and Church institutions, I analyze official orders and policies pertaining to Morisco populations, records of the surveillance and registration of Moriscos, and the opinions of clergymen and government administrators, as well as reports of Morisco noncompliance with mandates from the Crown and Church. I trace the development of official attitudes and plans for managing Morisco populations by reconstructing two important sets of correspondence: the communication between two levels of Inquisitorial authority (the Valladolid Tribunal and the Suprema) and between two levels of state authority (municipal and royal). My research therefore includes a close reading of the extant records of the


\textsuperscript{25} As such I agree with Barbara Fuchs, who argues that “reading of Morisco interventions into the culture that ostracized them cannot aim at a heroic recuperation of agency. The historical record of the suffering and loss surrounding the expulsions is too blatant to disregard in such a fashion.” See Fuchs, “Virtual Spaniards: The Moriscos and the fictions of Spanish identity,” _Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies_ 2,1 (2001): 13.
Valladolid Tribunal at the National Historical Archive of Spain. While the records of the Spanish Inquisition traditionally dominate histories of converted peoples in the premodern Spanish kingdoms, I incorporate a variety of archival materials from distinct collections at the General Archive of Simancas, the Archive of the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid, the Provincial Historical Archive of Valladolid, Municipal Historical Archive of Valladolid, as well as select sources from the Spanish Royal Academy of History and the Diocesan Archive of Valladolid. Using this range of sources from multiple archives, many of which interrelate, I present a local history of Morisco legal negotiation in early modern Castile.

The production and survival of this documentary record warrant further scrutiny. The abovementioned pen-wielding scribes and notaries lurk, only partly in view, in each of these encounters. Beside them are a host of lawyers, procurators, and judges whose involvement in these cases was fundamental and yet is imperfectly known to us today. When possible, I describe in the following chapters the specific contributions of some of these men, such as Juan Fanega, the city clerk responsible for compiling and retaining the registries of Granadan Moriscos in Valladolid, and Galaz de Burgos, a special procurator appointed the “defender of the Moriscos” in the city.

Yet much of the legal culture of Valladolid, including the connections and views of individual legal actors, remains behind the scenes. Kathryn Burns problematizes the ubiquitous truth claims of early modern scribes, who commonly signed documents “in testimony of the truth” (en testimonio de la verdad), in her analysis of writing and power in the archives. The mediation of scribes and legal representatives is clear in my sources, but many questions remain. What were the barriers, financial or otherwise, to Moriscos in obtaining legal counsel and due process? In what ways did Moriscos engage with court officials? How was the testimony of Morisco witnesses represented in official records? My narration of these encounters is also curtailed by incomplete documentation. In many cases, I find in the archives one piece of a larger case, perhaps a record of a Morisco carrying licence or passport, a power of attorney secured to commence litigation, or a note in a register that an individual was engaged in a court case. My focus on the processes of Morisco legal action is in part a product of the materials in my hand; these records often point to

---

26 See Chapters Three and Five.
26 See Chapter Two for a full list of sources consulted at the Archivo Histórico Nacional.
27 See Fanega in Chapter Three and Burgos in Chapter Four.
migrations and lawsuits in progress, to ongoing negotiations to secure titles and privileges. Taking
the legal action of Moriscos in Valladolid as my central object of study requires me to focus on
their documentary production in a new way, as Burns recommends, to “look at … as well as
through” archives and sources.²⁹

Valladolid is a “city of archives” because it was a centre of authority in the early modern
Crown of Castile.³⁰ It was a royal city, administered by a corregidor who oversaw a municipal
committee of councilmen (regidores) and answered directly to the king.³¹ In a way, Valladolid
was a hometown to the Spanish royal family, where Fernando and Isabel married in 1469, and
where Philip II was born in 1527. It was the de facto Spanish capital in the era of itinerant royal
courts, when political power was invested in the person of the monarch and the monarch was
commonly in Valladolid. The frequent presence of the court bolstered the local economy and
supported a number of occupations, such as the production of luxury goods. In 1561, a large part
of the city centre of Valladolid was devastated by a fire. Philip II moved his court to Madrid while
his royal architects rebuilt the city.³² Philip III (r.1598-1621) returned the royal court to Valladolid
briefly, between 1601 and 1606, but this restoration did not last and Madrid eventually became the
capital city of Spain. Despite its losses, sixteenth-century Valladolid endured as a central place of
authority in Old Castile. It was home to a prestigious university (established in the thirteenth
century), linked to key trade networks centered on the nearby market of Medina del Campo, and
the seat of the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid. The city was also a centre of religious authority
as the headquarters of the Valladolid Tribunal (active after 1500) of the Spanish Inquisition.
Construction began on the cathedral of Valladolid in 1589 and the Diocese of Valladolid was
established in 1595 (though the cathedral remains unfinished to this day). As Elizabeth Lehfeldt
notes, “in an era of momentous social, economic, political, and religious change, it would be

²⁹ Burns, 125.
³⁰ Marcos Martín Alberto, Valladolid, ciudad de archivos (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, Secretariado de
Publicaciones e Intercambio Editorial, 2011). The dominant histories of premodern Valladolid are Bartolomé
Bennassar’s Valladolid en el Siglo de Oro: una ciudad de Castilla y su entorno agrario en el siglo XVI (Valladolid:
Ayuntamiento de Valladolid, 1989; translated from the 1967 French original) and Adeline Rucquoi’s Valladolid en la
Edad Media: Genesis de un poder: 1265-1367 (vol. 1) and El mundo abreviado, 1367-1474 (vol. 2) (Valladolid: Junta
de Castilla y León Consejería de Educación y Cultura, 1987).
³¹ Corregidores (“correctors”) were officers of the Crown in charge of royal cities for two-year terms. See Marvin
Lunenfeld, Keepers of the City: The Corregidores of Isabella I of Castile (1474-1504) (Cambridge University Press,
1987).
³² See Rosa Sanz Hermida and Jacobo Sanz Hermida, Historia y Literatura del Incendio de Valladolid de 1561
fruitless to search for a ‘typical’ or ‘representative’ city. Yet… Valladolid… lends itself well to a consideration of the upheaval of the period from 1450-1650; it was a city that symbolized both the power and the rapid changes that Spain was experiencing at that time.”

The Moriscos’ regular recourse to legal action was not atypical. In general, early modern Castilians were notorious for their zealous utilization of the courts. The presence of the Royal Chancery Court in Valladolid meant the company of a great number of lawyers and notaries, and people in the Valladolid region made use of their proximity to the highest court north of the Tagus River. Valladolid chancery records reveal a steep increase in litigation over the century; 530 executive writs were issued for completed trials in 1500, whereas almost 1,400 were produced in 1580. Contemporaries noticed and noted this change during their lifetime. The Valladolid notary Gabriel Monterroso y Alvarado wrote, "lawsuits and conflicts among the populace are growing daily […] already, the world is so engulfed and involved in these disputes that almost nothing is resolved except by the cloth of legal judgment." In addition to formal lawsuits at the Royal Chancery Court, the legal action of Moriscos in Valladolid took place in ordinary court (presided by the corregidor) and in the submission of petitions and claims to various levels of authority. These actions included the hiring of notaries and lawyers, and the intervention of procurators of various kinds (see Chapter Four); these extensive engagements indicate significant Morisco legal and civic integration. In the following chapters, I describe the legal processes of these encounters to better illustrate both the relationship between Moriscos and the state and the legal culture of early modern Castile. In these terms, the case of Valladolid was likely quite representative of the Morisco experience in Old Castile, though on a larger scale in terms of population size and access to legal institutions.

Morisco studies is a growing field, enriched by recent work commemorating the four hundredth anniversary of the expulsion of the Moriscos from the Spanish kingdoms. Early  

33 Elizabeth Lehfeldt, Religious women in golden age Spain: the permeable cloister (Burlington, Ashgate, 2005), 9.  
35 Kagan, 3. Monterroso y Alvarado’s Práctica criminal y civilm e instrucion de scrivanos was published in 1566. For more on this work, see Burns, Into the Archive, 29-38.  
36 For example, “Los Moriscos y su expulsión: nuevas problemáticas,” a special issue of Areas: Revista Internacional de Ciencias Sociales 30 (2012); Valeriano Sánchez Ramos, “Importancia historiográfica de los moriscos granadinos,” Anuario de historia de la Iglesia 18 (2009): 325-346; José M. González García, “Cultural Memories of the Expulsion of the Moriscos,” European Review 16,1 (2008): 91-100: “In 2009 it will have been 400 years since Philip III expelled the Moriscos from Spain. It is therefore time to consider what remains of this tragedy in present-day Spanish collective memory …” Useful overviews of Morisco historiography include Miguel Ángel de Bunes Ibarra, Los moriscos en el pensamiento histórico: historiografía de un grupo marginado (Madrid: Cátedra,
historiography was dominated by debates between defenders and critics of the Moriscos. Trevor Dadson’s recent monograph overviews some major historiographical turns: Pascual Boronat y Barrachina’s 1901 hostile portrayal of the Moriscos and his apologist view of the expulsion; Henry Charles Lea’s 1901 study, “much more sympathetic to the Moriscos and their plight,” which remains a classic in the field; the “scholarly rigour” and lasting impact of Henri Lapeyre’s 1959 Geography of Muslim Spain; and the significant contributions of Antonio Domínguez Ortiz and Bernard Vincent. Despite other differences, the historical literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries understood the Moriscos as “inassimilable.” Dadson’s work on the Campo de Calatrava is revisionist in its consideration of Morisco assimilation; he cites an increase in regional Morisco histories as contributing to the necessary revision of outdated historical models. Increasingly, local historical studies generate a more detailed, nuanced and critical understanding of Morisco communities across the Spanish kingdoms. For example, Mary Halavais’ study of southern Aragon challenges the history of the Moriscos “as a history of rebellion and resistance” and argues that this “constructed” identity is an invention of the Spanish Inquisition. Many


37 Anwar G. Chejne describes these past debates in Islam and the West. He writes, "For instance, Llorente, Historia, and Lea, Moriscos and History point to the excesses and intolerances of the Inquisition. One may also mention the Spanish scholars Fernández y González, Estado social, and Janer, Condición, both of whom bring out the plight of the Moriscos. However, Janer considers the expulsion of the Moriscos both necessary and unavoidable in the light of the excesses of both Christians and Moriscos." (173, n.1) and "Contemporary historians such as Aguilar, Aznar, de Cardona, Bleda, Fonseca, Gauldaljara, Mármol, Rohas, Ripol, Zapata, and others showed little sympathy for the Moriscos. They were followed in the nineteenth century by Sangrador, Monoz y Gaviera, Dánvila y Boronat. For one, Dánvila, Expulsión, who was followed by Boronat Moriscos, produces ample documentation only to show that the Moriscos got what they deserved, and that their expulsion was overdue and justifiable for securing the unity and security of church and state … Menéndez y Pelayo, Historia, II, 632, considers the expulsion not only a necessity but ‘an indispensable compliment of historical law; and it is only regrettable that it took so long to achieve.’" (173-174, n.2)


39 Dadson, Tolerance and Coexistence, 4. See also Dadson, Los moriscos de Villarrubia de los Ojos (Siglos XV-XVIII): historia de una minoría asimilada, expulsada y reintegrada (Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 2007).

scholars are turning their attention to more critical forms of analysis on Morisco communities and themes of exile, gender, identity and self-representation. Medieval continuities are also important here, and Morisco studies build on scholarship concerning Christian-Muslim-Jewish relations in medieval Iberia and the Mediterranean world — research that also investigates vital questions about the relationships between religious minorities and the state, and about the nature of boundaries between groups of different confessional identities.

Previous studies have focused in various ways on the Moriscos of Valladolid. J.P. Le Flem’s 1965 article on Moriscos in north-west Spain was the first systematic treatment of Inquisitional sources for this region. The Moriscos also appear in Bennassar’s grand study of sixteenth-century Valladolid; first published in 1967, it remains an important work on the city in “golden age” Spain. In 1970, Bernard Vincent published an article on the resettlement of deported Granadan Moriscos and included the case of Valladolid. Published in 1988, Luis Fernández Martín’s detailed study of notarial protocols at the Provincial Historical Archive of Valladolid yielded a useful survey of cases pertaining to Granadan Moriscos in that city. Serafín de Tapia Sánchez’s 1991 monograph, an admirable and thorough study of the Morisco community of Ávila, is likewise vital to this research; the Morisco population in the nearby city of Ávila was

41 Among many others, see the work of Mercedes García-Arenal and Gerard Wiegers, Manuel F. Fernández and Rafael M. Pérez García, Mary Elizabeth Perry, Enrique Soria Mesa, Santiago Otero Mondejar, and William Childers. There is also excellent scholarship on the Moriscos in recent edited collections, including Kevin Ingram, ed., The Conversos and Moriscos in Late Medieval Spain and Beyond. Volume One: Departures and Change (Brill, 2009) and Volume Two: The Morisco Issue (Brill, 2012)
44 Bennassar, Valladolid en el Siglo de Oro.
comparable in many ways to that of Valladolid and formed part of the same Inquisitorial jurisdiction. Tapia Sánchez’s findings are therefore relevant for context and also directly pertain to the Moriscos of Valladolid, notably in terms of Inquisitional data. María Soledad Arribas’ 1991 article helpfully brings to light temporal and institutional dimensions of the deportation of Granadan Moriscos to Valladolid. Manuel Moratinos García and Olatz Villanueva Zubizarreta’s article on the 1502 decree of conversion in Valladolid was central to the development of my narrative of the fight for the Barrio de Santa María in Chapter One. María del Mar Gómez Renau has written numerous works on the Mudejar and Morisco communities of Valladolid. While I differ from her approach and analyses in many ways, I agree with her argument about and illustration of the importance and integration of Mudejars/Moriscos in the labour force, economy, and infrastructure of late medieval and early modern Valladolid.

Also relying primarily on sources from Valladolid is James B. Tueller’s scholarship on the Moriscos and religious identity. Tueller emphasizes the geographical and chronological diversity of the Moriscos. Importantly, his work challenges the view of all Moriscos as secret Muslims, and takes as his object of study the similarities between Moriscos and their Old Christian neighbours rather than focusing on their differences. His research focuses more on the late Morisco century, with special attention paid to the final expulsion and the debates preceding it. In his analysis of Moriscos who claimed to be Old Christians, Tueller comes to the conclusion that many Moriscos claimed to be Old Christians...
were “good and faithful Christians.” I do not deny the likelihood that some Moriscos were devoted Catholics, especially a century after their forebears were converted to Christianity. In fact, I identify some such individuals in Chapter Five, in my discussion of the Bishop of Valladolid’s 1610 examination of evidence of the Catholic sincerity and commitment of certain people of Morisco heritage. Nevertheless, I disagree with Tueller’s argument that most Morisco claims to Old Christian status were “accommodations to Christianity.”\(^\text{52}\) These particular claims are not evidence of religious belief or practice, nor were they made as proclamations of such. They were formal assertions made in negotiation of hereditary legal statuses and in response to specific historical circumstances which I investigate critically in this dissertation. I argue that while not mutually exclusive, the concepts of Old Christian Morisco and good Christian Morisco were neither synonymous nor co-extensive.\(^\text{53}\) At the same time, I believe Tueller’s intervention is important. His insistence on seeing “good Christian” Moriscos is a challenge to the inquisitorial monopoly over the determination of Morisco identities.

Crucially, this dissertation does not adopt an inquisitorial optics that aims to resolve whether Moriscos were secret Muslims or sincere Christians. There was no single Morisco identity, and across time and space there most certainly were degrees of participation in and adaptation to Christianity among New Christians. In fact, as I discuss in Chapter Two, New Christians were not alone in neglecting to learn the prayers and teachings of the Catholic Church; Old Christians, too, commonly failed to meet the standards of Catholic orthodoxy, and were increasingly censured by religious authorities in the era of Trent. Importantly, William Christian Jr. has proven the endurance of local forms of religion in the early modern Spanish kingdoms, while Stuart B. Schwartz has demonstrated how popular attitudes of tolerance survived in an era of rising religious intolerance and an official rejection of pluralism.\(^\text{54}\) Rather than attempting to determine the confessional allegiances and identities of the Moriscos, I investigate historical processes of identification by asking how statuses and privileges were negotiated in light of this climate. Useful in my articulation of research questions about Morisco identification is Tamar Herzog’s study of community and citizenship (vecindad) in the Early Modern Spanish world, in

\(^{52}\) Tueller, “The Assimilating Morisco,” 177.

\(^{53}\) See Chapters Three and Five.

which she "abandon[s] the quest for 'identity' and examine[s] instead 'identification', that is, the processes through which people claimed to be or were identified as member of a community."\(^{55}\) In line with this approach, the history of Morisco legal action in Valladolid provides valuable insights into the shifting dynamics of identity-making and the politics of belonging in the early modern Spanish kingdoms. Karoline Cook presents similar findings in her work on the Spanish Americas, where

Through debates over the position of Moriscos at the imperial level, and individual negotiations of status in the courtroom, it becomes possible to identify competing conceptions of identity: some commentators advocated the immutability of characteristics like blood, while others promoted more malleable and fluid conceptions of status shaped by exemplary public actions and reputation.\(^{56}\)

Scholarship on the production of difference in the early modern Spanish world is vital in articulating the significance of this dissertation and in situating it in broader historical processes. In “Speaking Christian: Orthodoxy and Difference in Sixteenth-Century Spain,” Deborah Root locates key chronological shifts in the "production of the Moriscos as an internal other and of Morisco culture as something deviant, to be recognized and rejected by the community."\(^{57}\) Citing Root, Barbara Fuchs argues,

The very presence of the Moriscos challenged the notion of a homogeneous Spain; even as they were persecuted and repressed, they approximated ‘Spanishness’ in a way that undermined the ostensible transparency of the category. The similarity of the Moriscos forced the Spanish state, via the Inquisition, to keep raising the bar of national identity, from conversion to Christianity, to adoption of ‘Christian’ cultural practices, to genealogical purity.\(^{58}\)


\(^{58}\) Fuchs, “Virtual Spaniards,” 13. William Childers comes to a similar conclusion about the rising bar of national identity. He writes, “At an early stage after the Conquest of Granada, the monarchy encouraged crossing over from one group to another; later, the Hapsburg bureaucracy found it necessary to clarify who belonged on which side of a bright line between the two … the state's need to differentiate the legal status of individuals undermined intercultural dialogue, leading instead in the direction of a more rigid racialization of the Moriscos” See “Disappearing Moriscos,” *Cross-Cultural History and the Domestication of Otherness,* eds. Michael Jan Rozbicki and George O. Ndege (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 51.
My work is in line with Fuchs’ determination that “the Moriscos crucially affect the debates over Spanish national identity, primarily by blurring the neat distinctions on which hegemonic identity depends.”

Building on this research, Christina Lee uncovers a corresponding process which she names the anxiety of sameness: “a cultural phenomenon that stems from the insecurity and distress generated when boundaries that differentiated and separated the dominant and the marginal of society could be breached, diminished, or even forgotten, sometimes to the point of changing the very identity and meaning of belonging to the dominant group.” The extreme example of this were those Moriscos who “passed” as Old Christians. In Chapter Five I introduce a number of individuals living in Valladolid in 1610 whose Old Christian friends and neighbours were unaware of their Morisco descent. Others shed their Morisco status through legal means. William Childers calls such individuals “disappearing” Moriscos, those who “successfully negotiated their status as not belonging to the rejected minority.” Such cases — which, as I demonstrate throughout, were exceptional in Valladolid — reveal how the presence of the Moriscos was polemical because both the similarities and differences between Moriscos and Old Christians complicated contemporary visions of a homogeneous and Catholic Spanish realm. This dissertation provides everyday examples of how the Moriscos’ legal negotiations over their statuses and corresponding privileges were formative sites for the construction of identity categories in early modern Spain.

The first two chapters of this dissertation illustrate how the native antiguo Moriscos of Valladolid defended their community through collective opposition to the dismantling of their neighbourhood, to the confiscation of their property, and to the prosecution and imprisonment of their kin and Morisco neighbours by the Spanish Inquisition. Chapter One, “The fight for the barrio,” looks at their legal dispute to remain in their longstanding residential enclave, Valladolid’s Barrio de Santa María. Religious and lay leaders implemented a series of assimilationist policies for the management of the Morisco community of Valladolid soon after their forced baptism in April of 1502. Authorities were confident that the physical dispersal of the Moriscos and their residential integration among the Old Christian majority would be necessary in order to achieve the social, cultural and religious assimilation of the Moriscos. This conviction became an enduring

---

60 Christina Lee, The anxiety of sameness in early modern Spain (Manchester University Press, 2016), 4.
61 Childers, “Disappearing Moriscos,” 51.
foundation for royal and Church policies throughout the long Morisco century; as discussed in Chapter Three, the same reasoning would lie behind the deportation of the Moriscos from the Kingdom of Granada and the subsequent rules of their resettlement. To this effect, priests and royal officers in Valladolid took aim at the closed community of the Morisco Barrio de Santa María, formerly the Muslim quarter of the town. Beginning early in the century, they challenged Morisco tenancy in their long-term homes and contrived to tear down the barrio walls as a way to “open” the neighbourhood. Priests recommended the dispersal of the Moriscos throughout Valladolid so that the New Christians might live, marry, and attend church alongside sincere Catholics. Yet the Moriscos of Valladolid refused to relocate. Furthermore, they mounted a collective legal challenge to this project and won, resulting in the writing of new, individual leases to their properties. Despite ongoing pressures to dismantle the neighbourhood, the Barrio de Santa María remained a Morisco district until their expulsion from the Spanish kingdoms in the early seventeenth century.

Assimilationist policies went hand-in-hand with religious prosecution. Beginning early in the sixteenth century, Inquisitors worked to uncover and eradicate heretical “Moorish” practices, compelled by an unwavering belief in the insincerity of the forcibly converted Moriscos. Tensions heightened in 1540 with the discovery of an alleged Morisco conspiracy in the Valladolid region. In the 1560s, parish priests and Inquisitors in Valladolid decried the Moriscos’ lack of church attendance, knowledge of Catholic prayers, and insufficient social and cultural incorporation among Old Christians. Chapter Two, “Petitioning for Grace,” explains how Moriscos mitigated Inquisitorial prosecution by petitioning the king for Edicts of Grace and negotiating with the Inquisition an annual monetary tribute designed to protect their property from confiscation. Like in their fight for the Barrio de Santa María, this was collective legal action undertaken by leaders in the name of the community. The Moriscos asserted their loyalty to the king and the Church and claimed ignorance and insufficient Christian education in response to allegations of insincere Catholicism. Even after these assertions, there is no record of increased Morisco attendance at church or any evidence that they attempted to comply with plans for their religious and cultural assimilation. Yet their negotiations were successful, to an extent: the king granted their requests for Edicts of Grace, and under the agreement called the situado the Inquisition agreed to moderate

62 There is little information on the purported attempts to evangelize the Moriscos in Valladolid, either in 1502 or after 1570. In Chapter Two, I discuss how their parish priests claimed to try to teach them, and the instructions in 1560s to convene Morisco for midday religious education, yet I have no evidence of how or whether these plans were put into action.
its prosecution of Moriscos for minor offenses in return for substantial tributes, to be paid collectively by Morisco communities throughout the Inquisitorial district. It is difficult to measure the full, quantitative impact of these developments because the trial records of the Valladolid Inquisition have not survived. The extant correspondence between the local tribunal and the Suprema reveals that the prosecution and punishment of Moriscos continued, buttressed by elaborate public ceremonies (such as *autos de fe*) intended to socially isolate and shame the New Christians.

The arrival of thousands of Granadan Morisco deportees complicated the Morisco problem in Old Castile. Following the Morisco rebellion and war in the Kingdom of Granada, these deportees were resettled in villages, towns, and cities across the Crown of Castile. They were subject to registration, surveillance, and strict orders not to live among the local *antiguos* Moriscos; they were banned from relocating, traveling, or carrying weapons without express and individual licence. It is this fraught legal status of Granadan Moriscos resettled in Valladolid that the third and fourth chapters turn to. In particular, I look at the ways in which legal status was continuously renegotiated by Moriscos themselves. Chapter Three, “Contested relocations,” examines how many Granadan Moriscos subverted and challenged prohibitions on their mobility. Some became absen -ees — fugitives from their places of resettlement who either joined deported relatives in other locations or returned to Granada. Those with the grounds to do so took legal action: Granadan Morisco merchants and carters requested passports to travel for trade; the impoverished, unemployed, widowed, or elderly and unable to work solicited licenses to relocate in the hopes of reuniting with relatives who could support them. The Crown also received a great number of Morisco claims to exemption from the prohibitions on their mobility on the basis of hereditary Old Christian titles and privileges. These “Old Christian Moriscos” demonstrated their inheritance of privileged status with witness testimony, genealogical information, evidence of faithful service to the Crown, and legal documents already in their possession. As described below in Chapter Five, the early seventeenth century saw an upsurge in Morisco claims to Old Christian titles and privileges when the orders of expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain were announced.

I have found no record of interaction between the *antiguos* Moriscos of the Barrio de Santa Maria and the Granadan Moriscos living in Valladolid after 1570. Philip II’s 1572 orders for resettling the Granadan deportees decreed that they live dispersed among Old Christians and not
reside in one neighbourhood together. I have not encountered evidence of intermarriage between local and newcomer Morisco populations, nor signs of joint litigation; for example, there was no evident cooperation between Castilian and Granadan Moriscos in the merchant class action cases discussed in Chapter Three nor in the efforts to ransom enslaved Granadan Moriscos, as discussed in Chapter Four. Of course, these groups may have communicated or interrelated in many ways off the record. Yet, as I demonstrate throughout, the *antiguos* Moriscos of Valladolid presented themselves as a long-standing local community loyal to the king, and when the Granadans arrived they had recently secured some respite from Inquisitorial prosecution through a contractual agreement. It stands to reason that the *antiguos* would have been wary of open or extensive association with the Granadans, who had been collectively declared rebels and deported from their homeland. On the other hand, the Granadans’ knowledge of the Arabic language and Islamic traditions, the very things that Philip II’s 1567 edict attempted to stamp out, may have been attractive to any *antiguos* who wanted to know more about their Muslim heritage. As I show in Chapter Four, local Inquisitors suspected Castilian Moriscos of receiving Granadan Morisco children in their homes in hopes of learning Arabic from them.

The fourth chapter, “Litigating for Liberty,” focuses on Moriscos enslaved as children during the Granadan rebellion and war. In 1572, a royal declaration was issued by order of Philip II making the capture and enslavement of Morisco minors illegal. Still, many Morisco boys and girls under the age of ten were captured, and many sought legal manumission in the courts. I examine their legal action against their Old Christian masters, notably at the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid. These cases are slaves’ bids for liberty, seeking legal manumission through formal channels in accordance with the king’s decree. I have located records of the litigation of eighteen enslaved Granadan Morisco minors in Valladolid; many similar cases can be found across the Crown of Castile. The majority of these plaintiffs in Valladolid won their lawsuits and their legal freedom with the representation of appointed procurators, including the “Defender and Administrator” of the Moriscos. I argue that the Spanish monarchy authorized and facilitated the legal manumission of Morisco youths captured during the Granadan War in order to turn the

---

63 See Chapter Three and Philip II, “Pragmatica y declaracion sobre los moriscos del reyno de Granada, y la orden que con ellos se ha de tener” (October 6, 1572, Madrid) in Francisco Izquierdo, *La Expulsión de los moriscos del reino de Granada: (pragmáticas, provisiones y órdenes reales)* (Azur, 1983), 34.

64 I discuss the *antiguos* Moriscos’ claims to loyalty, indigeneity, and honour in Chapters One, Two, and Five. See Chapter One and Two for their *situado* contract with the Valladolid Tribunal of the Inquisition.
children of heretical rebels into proper Christian vassals. Deported Granadans, meanwhile, worked to reunite liberated Morisco youths with their families and communities.

Between 1609 and 1614, the entire Morisco population was ordered to leave the Spanish kingdoms; this enormous, forced migration saw approximately 300,000 Moriscos expelled — overland via France from the north and by sea from the south — mostly to Ottoman territories across the Mediterranean. The final chapter, “Resisting Expulsion,” investigates how both Castilian and Granadan Moriscos disrupted the process of their final expulsion from Valladolid. Their actions included both petitioning and noncompliance; reports to and from the king’s Council of State reveal that these were widespread trends across the kingdoms. In Valladolid and elsewhere in Castile, many Moriscos initially refused to leave their homes, while others sold their property illicitly to keep its value for themselves and avoid its confiscation by the Crown treasury. Meanwhile, petitioning was the primary legal action they took in response to the expulsion, and it took many forms. The Morisco community of the Barrio de Santa María asserted that their forefathers had lived in Valladolid for over eight hundred years and claimed that their status as honorable and indigenous Old Moriscos (antiguos) exempted them from the expulsion. Others claimed exemption as Old Christian Moriscos; just like those cases illustrated in Chapter Three, this was a privileged status inherited from a forefather who converted before conquest or decree. There were also some individual Moriscos who claimed their personal religious sincerity as a legitimate basis of exemption from the expulsion. I examine the records of the Bishop of Valladolid’s official investigation into the lives of these good Christian Moriscos, isolated incidents that reveal significant aspects of Old Christian-Morisco relations in Valladolid and of the shifting requirements of belonging.

This dissertation studies encounters between Moriscos and institutions of State and Church in sixteenth-century Valladolid that were fundamentally about the politics of belonging. These were confrontations over Morisco residency, property, and community structures, religious prosecution and deportation, mobility and status, and the enslavement of Morisco minors. I argue that in defense of their communities, privileges, and property, Moriscos took significant legal action to protect themselves from religious prosecution and to evade policies aimed at their assimilation. The resulting negotiations reveal that Morisco status was malleable and multiform. They also reveal the construction of identities, communities, and boundaries in early modern Spain. The Morisco century coincided with the early era of overseas Spanish exploration and colonialism; central to these encounters were deliberations over the ideal order of a society that
included an increasing number of peoples conquered, converted, and colonized by the early Spanish imperial regime.65 This work is vital beyond Morisco studies; it is an example of the remarkable ways in which subaltern peoples participated in the negotiations over status and identification in the early modern era.

Chapter 1
The fight for the barrio

After their baptism, the Moriscos of Valladolid were collectively served with an eviction notice. The 194 households of Muslims-turned-Christians lived in the Muslim quarter (morería), a neighbourhood called the Barrio de Santa María after its residents converted to Catholicism in 1502.\textsuperscript{1} The landlord and namesake — the chapter of the collegiate church of Santa María la Mayor — claimed their communal lease to be void as a result of the change in their religious identity: they had lost their “moorishness” and were no longer the same group that had first entered into the contract. The resulting, lengthy lawsuit was followed by attempts to dismantle the walls of the barrio and numerous orders to relocate the Moriscos throughout the town. Local authorities, priests, and the king himself agreed that the Moriscos should live among Old Christian neighbours and learn by their example. The closed nature of their neighbourhood facilitated endogamy and strong community ties among the New Christians, who were suspected of collectively being secret Muslims under the cover of their residential enclave. Therefore, the continued segregation of the Moriscos was seen as a major obstacle to their assimilation into Old Christian society. Residency signified religious identity, alongside a shifting set of social, cultural, devotional, and hereditary requirements for belonging in Catholic Castile which this dissertation traces throughout the long Morisco century.

The Moriscos of Valladolid refused to leave the Barrio de Santa María, and early attempts to dismantle the neighbourhood became part of a century-long project to disperse them. The Moriscos consistently resisted these plans for their assimilation and actively defended their residential and communal spaces. First, they challenged the eviction order and secured new leases through collective litigation at the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid. In this legal action they also sought reparations for their demolished mosque. In the following decades, they protested the demolition of the walls and buildings that enclosed the barrio. Eventually, the Moriscos also introduced a clause protecting their tenancy into broader negotiations protecting their property from confiscation by the Inquisition. Despite the best efforts of religious and secular authorities,

\textsuperscript{1} The 194 Morisco heads of household in Valladolid were named in a 1506 census. This list is published in Manuel Moratinos García and Olatz Villanueva Zubizareta, “Consecuencias del decreto de conversión al cristianismo de 1502 en la aljama mora de Valladolid,” \textit{Sharq Al-Andalus} 16-17 (1999-2002): 135-138.
the Barrio de Santa María remained the home of the Moriscos until their final expulsion from the Spanish kingdoms in the summer of 1611. Both the noncompliance and legal action of the Moriscos are remarkable as evidence of their resistance to assimilationist policies. These encounters also demonstrate the Moriscos’ use of legal recourse to defend both their pre-conversion community structures and their residential spaces.

The Moriscos’ legal action produced documents, including censuses, leases, and legal records. These sources, along with official correspondence related to these events, reveal that while the Barrio de Santa María remained a Morisco enclave it was not in every way a world apart. It was a working part of early modern Valladolid — a town in the process of identifying itself as a royal city, a seat of justice, and a centre of religion and learning. To illustrate the integration of the barrio in the city and of the Moriscos in wider society, I locate and describe Morisco spaces in an evolving Valladolid. I take into consideration the economic participation and civic incorporation of the Moriscos: they worked as carpenters and in a number of trades; they served the city as the local fire brigade; they owned and rented property within Valladolid and its district. Morisco civic integration included their legal agency: they engaged the services of notaries and lawyers and litigated at the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid. After their mass baptism, the Moriscos were citizens of the city and nominal Catholics. Yet they were converts, and their incorporation into the Catholic fold came with reservations. As New Christians, they were subject to the jurisdiction of the Spanish Inquisition and their religious sincerity was continually suspect. The requirements of purity of blood (limpieza de sangre, discussed in the introduction) determined their exclusion from the upper echelons of society. Moriscos were not permitted to hold important judicial offices or positions of honour, including those that might be attained with a university education: for example, they had been barred from attending or graduating from the University of Valladolid in 1509.

---

2 See Introduction.
3 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folios 15-16. The Inquisition prohibited the Universities of Valladolid and Salamanca from accepting New Christians to their universities in 1509. These institutions were not permitted to graduate New Christians as licenciados, masters, or doctors; any who had already been given entry were not to be accepted to teach (catedras) or given the honours of their degree. A hint of dissent echoes in a later order from the Inquisition that prohibited those in charge of universities, monasteries/convents, and churches from arguing (in disputations, sermons, or public acts) that descendants of Jewish or Muslim converts should not be excluded from higher education and honours. This act in 1570 specifically called out the deacons and college rectors in the Faculties of Theology at the Universities of Valladolid and Salamanca; it opposed their giving any public or private opinion to this effect. See AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folio 280. Licenciado Diego Gonzalez and Doctor Guilermo Mercado on November 18, 1570.
Hence, the problem of Morisco assimilation was not that there was total separation between Old and New Christians. Rather, it was that Morisco integration did not take the forms desired by Church and Crown, and that their participation in civic life took place predominantly outside of the control of those institutions. The integration of the Moriscos was not new; pre-1502, the Mudejars litigated, participated in the economy, and contributed to maintaining the infrastructure of Valladolid. The central difference was the post-conversion push for Morisco assimilation — meaning the adoption of the religious practices and cultural norms of the Old Christian majority as well as the abandonment of Islamic forms of devotion and of cultural traditions and social patterns associated with Islam. For these processes to occur, the institutions of ecclesiastical and secular government deemed necessary the absorption of the Moriscos into the majority Old Christian population through marriage, social association, and residential proximity. The paradox posed by the Morisco question is that they simultaneously belonged and were other. They were integrated into local communities, as had been their Muslim forebears. Yet once converted, the Moriscos posed a threat to contemporary visions of a homogeneous Spanish Catholic society. The multidimensional problem of Morisco assimilation spanned the sixteenth century throughout the Spanish kingdoms, and played out in regionally different ways. In Valladolid, it was first manifested in what I call the fight for the barrio.

Building on this chapter, Chapter Two shows how the Moriscos largely declined to participate in parish life. Priests and Inquisitors observed that the Moriscos of Valladolid did not attend church on Sundays or Holy Days and did not know the required Catholic prayers — charges commonly laid against Moriscos across the Spanish kingdoms. For these men of the church, the problems of Morisco residency and religion were deeply connected. Moriscos continued to live in the Barrio de Santa María in a way that was overly reminiscent of the pre-conversion morería. Valladolid priests complained that the Moriscos used the cover of their closed residential quarter to retain Islamic dietary customs and religious traditions, as well as endogamous marriage patterns that allowed them to preserve kinship structures established during the Mudejar period. These points were the heart of the argument for moving the Moriscos out of the Barrio de Santa María. This approach was common throughout the Spanish kingdoms. As I illustrate in Chapter Three, the same guiding principle dictated the deportation of the Moriscos from the Kingdom of Granada. In the wake of their rebellion (1568-1570), Granadan Moriscos were expelled from their kingdom — both to remove the perceived, yet unsubstantiated, danger of a ready-made army of rebels who
would support an Ottoman invasion and to force the integration of the Granadan Moriscos by dispersing them throughout Old Christian Castilian society. Philip II pronounced:

To avoid the inconveniences that have and could occur from their being together, and so that they might be better indoctrinated and be Christians, we are resettling them in cities and towns and places in our kingdoms, separated and divided so that there are no more than one or two in each parish of each town, or according to the disposition and accommodation of each place …

Deportees began arriving in Valladolid in 1570. The king’s orders prohibited them from living among the local Morisco population. Philip II’s royal pragmatic in 1572 included further regulations for their resettlement, many of which aimed to control the residency and limit the mobility of Granadan Moriscos living in Castile. Although native Castilian Moriscos and the exiled Granadans had different statuses and were subject to different rules, religious and lay authorities viewed residential proximity between any Moriscos with suspicion and disdain. The noncompliance and legal action of both groups were remarkable acts of resistance against the assimilationist policies of Crown and Church.

The residential segregation of the Moriscos was first imposed upon their Mudejar forebears in a royal order separating Muslims and Jews from Christians. A brief overview of this community is useful here. Though the history of the Mudejars in medieval Castile is not well documented, historians agree that most lived in urban areas and ranked among the lower socio-economic orders. The Mudejar community of Valladolid has been traced back to at least the twelfth century. Archaeological evidence supports the scant documentary record of a Mudejar population in the town and surrounding region during this era. Gómez Renau describes an "important Mudejar nucleus" in the neighbourhood of the Church of San Martín in mid-twelfth-century Valladolid.

---

4 AGS, CC, Legajo 2159, folio 7. Philip II from Madrid on December 11, 1570: “porque para escusar los yeonbienentes que destac juntos a auido y podrian sucder y para que se Puedan mejor dotrinar y ser xpianos a parecido que se repartan y pongan en las ciudades villas y lugares destos nuestros reynos por menudo apartados y diuididos por manera susiendo posible no aya mas de vno v de dos En cada Perrochia de cada Pueblo o los que Pareciere segun la dispusicion y comodidad que huviere En el.” I discuss the resettlement of the Granadan deportees in Chapter Three, “Contested Relocations.”

5 See my Chapter Three and Philip II, “Pragmatica y declaracion sobre los moriscos del reyno de Granada, y la orden que con ellos se ha de tener” (October 6, 1572, Madrid) in Francisco Izquierdo, La Expulsión de los moriscos del reino de Granada: (pragmáticas, provisiones y órdenes reales) (Azur, 1983), 27-38.

6 L.P. Harvey writes, “in spite of the excellence of recent scholarship, our information on Mudejars in all areas and of all periods is sporadic and incomplete. In general we hear of the Mudejars in the period immediately following the initial conquests, and in the final period after 1492, but almost everywhere there are long gaps in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.” See Islamic Spain, 1250-1500 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 68. Tapia Sánchez confirms, “little is known of the history of Castilian Mudejars.” (La comunidad morisca, 45.)

7 Moratinos García and Villanueva Zubizarreta, “Consecuencias,” 118.
verified by the location of a Muslim necropolis in that section of the city. The Muslim community of Valladolid likely dated to a much earlier era; in a 1611 plea to avoid expulsion, the *antiguos* Moriscos of Valladolid claimed that their forefathers had resided in the region for 800 years.

Like many medieval Castilian towns, Valladolid was home to both a Muslim and a Jewish *aljama*. Adeline Rucquoi argues that although Vallisoletano Muslims and Jews were not considered vecinos (a legal status of citizenry which I discuss below in more detail) in chancery court records, they had so much in common with the Christians of the town that it is difficult to consider these religious minorities as social outsiders. Jews and Muslims enjoyed royal protection, freedom to practice their religions, and a certain level of communal autonomy. Muslim experts in Islamic jurisprudence called *alfaqís* had jurisdiction over Castilian Mudejar communities, including in Valladolid. The purview of *alfaqís* extended to cases of religious law (*shari'a*, encompassing family law and civil suits), but not over all matters of criminal law. The Mudejars of Valladolid had their own Muslim magistrate (*alcalde*), appointed for life by the king to hold administrative and some judicial functions; this position brought privileges and tax exemptions normally reserved for Christian gentlemen (*caballeros*), merchants and artisans.

Though the Muslim population of Valladolid had been small and marginal in the mid-fourteenth century, this community became integral to the town’s economy and society by the fifteenth century. Muslims enjoyed certain levels of prosperity in Valladolid: some owned property within

---

9 Henri Lapeyre, *Géografía de la España morisca* (Valencia: Diputación Provincial de Valencia, 1986), 127, n.5: “[AGS, Estado] Leg. 235, minuta de la session del Consejo 19-4-1611: ‘dieron un memorial en que se refieren que ha más de 800 años que residen en Valladolid.’” I located this document and discuss it in more detail in Chapter Five, “Resisting Expulsion.”
10 An *aljama* was a community of Muslims or Jews (a legal and corporate entity). These communities often lived in Moorish quarters (*morerías*) or Jewish quarters (*juderías*), respectively.
12 For example, a 1496 case located by Tapia Sánchez refers to the *alfaqís* of Valladolid, Arévalo and Ávila. *Comunidad Morisca*, 60, n.77. (For this case, he cites AGS, Sello, 2 de febrero de 1496, fól. 177.) See also a document regarding Abraham Xarafi, called the alcalde of all of the *aljamas* of the kingdom of Castile, and the *alfaqí* of Palencia, Ali Alvar Ruiz. (AGS, RGS, Legajo 149603, 41) For more on this topic, see Kathryn Miller, *Guardians of Islam: religious authority and Muslim communities of late medieval Spain* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008).
and outside of the town and occupied important positions in the region as master carpenters, among other professions.  

However, the active participation of Jews and Muslims in Vallisoletano society caused consternation among ecclesiastical authorities. For reasons both political and religious, Jewish and Islamic communities became targets of religious antagonism throughout the Spanish kingdoms during the late fourteenth and throughout the fifteenth century. Rucquoi argues that although Vallisoletano Mudejars were subject to similar restrictions as the town’s Jewish population (including obligations to wear distinctive clothing and being barred from public office), they were never subject to the same levels of hostility directed at the Jews of Valladolid. Still, official anxieties over contact between conversos and Jews led to policies of enclosure for both Jews and Muslims. In 1412, Queen Catalina de Lancaster issued a royal edict that ordered the segregation of Jewish and Muslim communities from Old Christian populations. This edict was promulgated in the Valladolid cortes in 1405 and published in 1412; the Mudejars of Valladolid took up residence in the Muslim quarter in 1413. Their neighbourhood was established on land leased

\[\text{\textsuperscript{16} Rucquoi presents evidence of Mudejar property ownership in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Valladolid; see }\textit{Valladolid en la Edad Media II, 502-503. Mudejar master carpenters are the focus of Gómez Renau’s “Alarifes Musulmanes en Valladolid,” 223-238.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{17} Rucquoi, }\textit{Valladolid en la Edad Media II, 485.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{18} Violent attacks against Jewish communities, most famously the pogroms of 1391, occurred throughout the Spanish kingdoms in the late fourteenth-century. The first attack on the Jewish community of Valladolid was in 1367 after Enrique de Trastámara took the town of Valladolid during the Castilian civil war, 1366-1369. (Rucquoi, }\textit{Valladolid en la Edad Media II, 485.) Because of widespread violence in 1391 and the pressure of Catholic preachers such as Vincent Ferrer, sections of the Spanish Jewish population began to convert to Catholicism. These converts were nominal Catholics called conversos who for the most part continued to practice Judaism secretly. The Spanish Inquisition was established in 1478 to eradicate Judaizing from the converso population. The motivation for the establishment of the Inquisition has been a topic of historiographical debate. As explained by Helen Rawlings, Benzion Netanyahu (The Origins of the Inquisition, 1995) argued controversially that the Inquisition was established in "purely anti-semitic terms" and that most of the conversos were actually sincere Christians. To the contrary, Haim Beinart (Conversos on Trials: The Inquisition in Ciudad Real, 1981) and Yitzhak Baer (A history of the Jews in Christian Spain, Vol. 2, 1961), "both affirmed that the Inquisition was set up to resolve a specific socio-religious problem created by the expansion of a \textit{converso} class and was not anti-semitic in nature. In their view, inquisitors were correct to regard conversos as Judaizers, many of whom continued to practice their former faith in secret." See Rawlings, }\textit{The Spanish Inquisition} (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 8-10. While most went into exile, many Jews converted rather than be expelled from the Spanish kingdoms in 1492; with this expulsion the monarchy primarily aimed to end Jewish influence on the conversos.\]


\[\text{\textsuperscript{20} Moratinos Garcia and Villanueva Zubizarreta, “Consecuencias,” 118-120.}\]
from the collegiate church chapter of the Iglesia de Santa María la Mayor.\footnote{AGS, CJH 496, 4.18, “Sobre la pretension que la Iglesia Mayor de Valladolid tiene a las casas del barrio de Santa María.” (July 17, 1611)} It was built on two fields near the southern entrance to the city: one field had been donated to the church by Teresa Sánchez, the other acquired by sale from García Pérez.\footnote{The Diocese of Valladolid was established in 1595 by Pope Clemente VIII, by request of Philip II. (http://www.archivalladolid.org/territorio/catedral) Before that time, Santa María la Mayor was the most important church in Valladolid. It was an iglesia colegial: a collegiate church overseen by an abbot, a central church that filled the role of a cathedral in the absence of a bishopric or archbishopric. A church chapter (cabildo) is an official ecclesiastical body in charge of a collegiate church or cathedral, run by canons and an abbot, bishop, or archbishop. (See “Iglesia colegial” and “cabildo,” Real Academia Española, “Diccionario de la lengua española.” http://dle.rae.es. Accessed January 15, 2016.). Construction of the Cathedral of Valladolid began in 1589 and has never been completed; the ruins of the collegiate church of Santa María la Mayor are adjoined to the cathedral.} The Muslims of Valladolid signed their lease on January 3, 1414, agreeing to pay an annual rent of forty gold florins.\footnote{Rucquoi, Valladolid en la Edad Media II, 487. The Jewish quarter (judería) was established on August 18, 1413, with the signing of a lease held between the Jewish aljama and the convent of San Pablo and the establishment of annual payments of 35-40 gold florins. Rucquoi provides a map showing the locations of the judería and morería in 1450. (p.557) She also explains that 1 florin was worth 65 mrs. after the 1442 royal ordinance on the value of currency. (p.539)} Their alcalde Ali acted as a signatory, and was one of four procurators acting on behalf of the Muslim aljama of Valladolid.\footnote{Tapia Sánchez, La comunidad morisca, 61. By 1495, there were 103 Mudejar households in the town of Valladolid. Harvey writes, “in 1495, pechas (a community-based tax reflecting in some way relative community sizes) were being paid by 251 households in Ávila, 107 in Arévalo, and 103 in Valladolid. Besides such relatively large morerías, medium sized groups were to be found in Burgos, Barco de Ávila, and Piedrahita, and small numbers in places such as Carrión, Medina del Campo, Palencia, Sahagún, and Sepúlveda." L.P. Harvey, Islamic Spain, 1250-1500 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 69.} Throughout the fifteenth century, the Mudejar community of Valladolid was one of the three largest in Old Castile, the other two being the Muslim aljamas of Ávila (the largest) and Burgos.\footnote{The “Provisión” required exile or baptism by April, 1502; see Carrasco Manchado, 235. Moratinos García and Villanueva Zubizarreta provide the evidence that the Mudéjares of Valladolid were baptized in April of 1502. See “Consecuencias,” 124. I have not located other specific details about the forced baptism of the Mudejares of Valladolid. I found no mention of the conversion in the Libros de Actas for April 1502 in the records of the Municipal Archive of Valladolid, nor did I find a record of this significant occasion in any of the archival collections I consulted. Similarly, Tapia Sánchez did not locate official records of the mass baptism of the Mudejares of nearby Ávila. He opines that local high dignitaries (clerical and noble) most likely stood as godparents at these baptisms. He also notes that local Old Christians celebrated the conversion of the Mudejares of Ávila with a running of the bulls and other festivities. This was not organized by municipal authorities, but probably by the public and perhaps by clerics. (La comunidad morisca de Ávila, 140)}

In Valladolid, the baptism of the Mudejars took place in April of 1502, the deadline set by the Catholic Monarchs.\footnote{The “Provisión” required exile or baptism by April, 1502; see Carrasco Manchado, 235. Moratinos García and Villanueva Zubizarreta provide the evidence that the Mudéjares of Valladolid were baptized in April of 1502. See “Consecuencias,” 124. I have not located other specific details about the forced baptism of the Mudejares of Valladolid. I found no mention of the conversion in the Libros de Actas for April 1502 in the records of the Municipal Archive of Valladolid, nor did I find a record of this significant occasion in any of the archival collections I consulted. Similarly, Tapia Sánchez did not locate official records of the mass baptism of the Mudejares of nearby Ávila. He opines that local high dignitaries (clerical and noble) most likely stood as godparents at these baptisms. He also notes that local Old Christians celebrated the conversion of the Mudejares of Ávila with a running of the bulls and other festivities. This was not organized by municipal authorities, but probably by the public and perhaps by clerics. (La comunidad morisca de Ávila, 140)} Their tenancy in the Muslim quarter, christened the Barrio de Santa María, was legally challenged as a result of the change in their official, communal religious...
identity. As landlord, the church chapter of Santa María la Mayor argued that the perpetual lease was a contract it had held with the Muslim community of Valladolid, and understood the terms of agreement to have ended because the residents had lost the condición de moriscos, their “moorishness,” upon conversion to Catholicism. This claim purported that the Moriscos were not legally entitled to the contract that they had entered into as Muslims. The Moriscos, who held a lease in common and paid rent, asserted their right to remain, resulting in a lengthy legal confrontation. More than a simple property dispute, this was an effort to dismantle the segregated, closed community of the recently baptized Moriscos. The collegiate chapter desired the dispersal of the New Christians among the majority Old Christian population and the destruction of their Islamic house of worship, the former mosque called the almaxi y casa de bodas; almaxi derives from al-masjid (Arabic for mosque) and casa de bodas means “wedding house”. Both the close-knit quarters of the walled neighbourhood and the mosque were tangible and symbolic ties to the Islamic past of the Moriscos, so recently severed. In the eyes of local religious authorities, these were dangerous impediments to the full assimilation of the baptized New Christians. To the Moriscos themselves, this fight was bigger than the matter of losing their homes; the old morería’s walls and mosque were limited but standing safeguards of their community and Islamic traditions in the aftermath of their coerced conversion.

When the landlord and tenants were unable to agree on a course of action, the case was taken before the judges of the royal chancery court of Valladolid. The resulting lawsuit lasted from 1505 to 1537. By 1506, the church chapter had confiscated the mosque; it was soon demolished (exactly when is unclear), along with several unidentified residential properties. The Morisco community — the 194 Morisco households of the Barrio de Santa María — litigated as co-plaintiffs with the aim of remaining in their homes. The confiscation and destruction of the almaxi y casa de bodas was perceived as an attack on their community, so they also pursued a claim to the property on which the mosque had stood; they later sought the return of the wood from the

---

27 The barrio was renamed after the church of Santa María la Mayor. Juan Agapito y Revillo notes that Santa María was a common name bestowed upon the neighbourhoods of converted Muslims or Jews. He also notes that the central street of the neighbourhood was called de Santa María. See Las calles de Valladolid.
28 The details of this dispute are addressed in Moratinos Garcia and Villanueva Zubizarreta’s “Consecuencias,” 117-139.
29 It appears the case was active between 1505-1507 and 1526-1537.
demolished mosque. The Moriscos also submitted a letter dated February 6, 1502 from the Catholic Monarchs to the Muslim community of Valladolid. Preceding their baptism by two months, this letter encouraged the Muslims of the city to convert to Catholicism in accordance with the decree they had issued on February 2; it acknowledged the potential for a property dispute and urged religious and secular authorities in Valladolid not to force the Mudejars out of their residences if and when they were to convert to Christianity. Clearly the monarchs expected controversies of this nature to arise, having dealt with similar situations in the management of Jewish conversos.

The chancery judges ruled in their final verdict, dated July 20, 1537, that the Moriscos could remain in residence in the barrio. They ordered that new lease contracts be signed by individual tenants, instructing “each citizen of the said Barrio de Santa María to make and authorize a contract for the part he has in the said neighbourhood within a certain term.” Any Morisco who instead sold his house had to give fifty percent of the sale price to the church chapter. In 1538, 124 Morisco heads of household signed leases on a total of 154 properties in the Barrio de Santa María. The contracts for the new leases each described the lawsuit and the property in question. For example,

That all who see this letter of obligation and long-term lease contract know that I, Ana la Serrana, widow of Luis Castaño, deceased potter, citizen of this noble town of Valladolid in the Barrio de Santa María of this town of Valladolid, say: that as there is a lawsuit between the most reverend sirs of the priory and church chapter of the collegiate church of Nuestra Señora Santa María la Mayor of this town of Valladolid as masters of the property [with] direct dominion of the said Barrio de Santa María, on the one hand, and on the other the citizens and masters of the houses and possessions of the said neighbourhood who reside in the said town. Sentences were pronounced en grado de revista and an executive

---

30 AHPV, PN 13 (Cristobal de Montesinos, Año 1538). Moratinos García and Villanueva Zubizarreta call the appropriation and demolition of these buildings a “real insult” to the Moriscos of Valladolid. They locate the mosque and casa de bodas between the calle de la Carnicería and the calle de la Ronda, between houses on one side and a lane called ‘del almají’ on the other. (“Consecuencias”, 131, 133.)

31 The letter is addressed to the “Aljama, alfaquíes, alguacil, viejos buenos hombres moros de la villa de Valladolid”; in part, it reads, “Nos somos informados que vosotros o algunos de vos tenéis buena voluntad de vos convertir a nuestra santa fe católica, de lo cual habemos habido mucho placer porque deseamos la salvación de vuestras animas … nos vos rogamos que queráis poner en obra de vos convertir, certificando vos que allende del servicio que en ello haréis a nuestro Señor y bien provecho a vuestras animas …” (Transcription in Moratinos García and Villanueva Zubizarreta, “Consecuencias”, 122-123).


33 AHPV, PN 13, folio 565. “[ue] cada un vezino del d[ic]ho barrio de Santa María faga e otorgue contrato de censo por la parte [ue] tiene en el d[ic]ho barrio dentro de cierto termjno.” This description is part of a recap of the case in a Morisco petition.

order (carta de ejecutoria) to the effect that among other things they ordered that all of the citizens of the Barrio de Santa María and persons who have houses, lots, and possessions in the said Barrio de Santa María make and authorize contracts of long-term leases ... and it falls to them to pay the rent of forty florins that the church and chapter, every year forever more, on the said neighbourhood ... it is necessary to refer to these because I, the said Ana la Serrana, possess in the said Barrio de Santa María a house on the calle de la Carpinteria with its exit and door on the calle Mercado, bordered on one side by the house of Ana la Sesuina, widow of Antonio Padell and on the other the house of Gonçalo del Trigo, a potter, with the calle del Mercado behind the house and the calle de la Carpinteria in front of the house.  

Communal spaces in the old morería remained contested after the resolution of the lawsuit. After the creation of new leases for Morisco residences in 1537-1538, it remained to settle the matter of the former mosque and also the butcher's shop, which had provided the Mudejars with permissible meat slaughtered according to Islamic law. Halal requirements, notably avoidance of pork and wine, were signifiers of Muslim difference and were points of Inquisitorial investigation into the daily lives of Moriscos. These places were therefore direct links to the Islamic past of the barrio and its residents. In 1537, the landlord was ordered to pay damages to the Moriscos and to return to the community the wood from the demolished mosque. In addition to this, the Moriscos wanted the lease to the plot on which it had stood. Six Morisco men acted on behalf of their community, with legal power of attorney, to seek restitution: these were Juan Serrano, Francisco Andado, Alexo Ramires, Sancho de Pinedo, Hernando de Viras and Francisco Pinoner — all citizens, and all carpenters by trade. They made the case that the Moriscos had held up their end of the court’s orders by making and authorizing leases and paying their forty florins in rent every year. They argued that the executive order of the chancery judges would remain unfulfilled until a lease was signed for every plot in the neighbourhood, including the “mosque and wedding house and butcher’s shop and other possessions.” These six men proposed to ratify a lease for the plot

35 AHPV, PN 13, folio 143. I translate “Censo perpetuo enfitéutico” as a long-term lease contract. I translate “señores” as masters in regards to the ownership of space and property in the contract. Other papers in this set of documents include records and conditions of inheritance and legal representation (such as power of attorney; curaduria de menores).

36 Moratinos García and Villanueva Zubizarreata, “Consecuencias”, 129.

37 They are named in various documents, including AHPV, PN 13, folio 565. Another, dated March 11, 1539 (s.f.), shows that these six men “jointly have the power of the whole Barrio de Santa María” (“juntamente tiene poder de todo el d[ic]ho barrio de s.m. …”) This was not the first group of Moriscos men to speak and act on behalf of their community within this lengthy court case. The names of earlier representatives are listed in Villanueva Zubizarreata’s “Consecuencias.”

38 AHPV, PN 13, folio 565. “almaxi e casa de bodas e carniceria e otras posesyones”
of the mosque in the name of four Moriscos of the barrio: Gaspar de Mendoza, a plasterer, and his wife Beatriz la Serrana, with Diego de Segovia, also a plasterer, and his wife Ana de Benavides.\(^{39}\)

This case of the Moriscos of Valladolid reveals conflicting contemporary visions of community. Their 1502 baptism had dissolved the Muslim \textit{aljama}. An \textit{aljama} was a formal legal and corporate entity, an officially recognized community of Muslims or Jews in medieval Spain. To their landlord, the dissolution of the \textit{aljama} meant the end of the communal lease contract for the barrio; this was one consequence of the radical alteration of the juridical identity of this community upon their religious conversion. But the residents of the barrio did not disband when they converted; rather, the Moriscos responded as a united front. They litigated as a group, naming a succession of men from among themselves to speak for them jointly, authorized with the power to act on their behalf in court and in legal documents. This was more than a convenient assembly over common goals. This was collective action toward a shared cause. 1502 saw the formal end of the \textit{aljama}, but not the termination of the familial and community network behind the title. As I argue here and reinforce in the following chapters, collective legal action was a survival tactic, a central way in which Moriscos defended their property and their communities. It was also a common way in which Moriscos worked to preserve pre-conversion social structures; scholars have described similar efforts in other regions of Iberia.\(^{40}\) It is significant, then, that the legal resolution of this matter required the Moriscos to sign individual leases. They were not permitted to retain their communal lease because that would have legitimated a kind of community structure no longer permissible or officially recognized. Collective Morisco legal action was not a break with the past; rather, it aimed to continue a form of representation no longer sanctioned by the state.

Across the Spanish kingdoms, plans for dismantling old \textit{morerías} and dispersing Morisco populations were widely attempted but found limited success. A comparable situation occurred in

\(^{39}\) AHPV, PN 13, s.f. (March 11, 1539). The exact resolution of the matter of this lease is unclear to me, just as the full extent of the transformations in the Barrio de Santa María during the sixteenth century is not known. The Inquisition came to co-hold a lease for the plot of land where the mosque had been. The plot of land (called \textit{almaxi}) where the mosque had stood was co-leased in a \textit{censo} of 3000 maravedis by a plaster merchant and citizen of Valladolid named Alonso Gutierrez (no indication of whether or not he was a Morisco) and the Valladolid Tribunal of the Inquisition. In June of 1573, the tribunal proposed to pay out 45 ducats to Gutierrez to end their partnership and transfer the lease to him alone. The Suprema approved this decision in that same month. See AHN, Inquisición, Legajo 3191, exp. 171 (1573).

\(^{40}\) For example, Natalie Oeltjen argues that after their baptism and the dissolution of their \textit{aljama}, the conversos of Majorca re-formalized their corporate ties by establishing a Catholic brotherhood. See “A converso confraternity in Majorca: La Novella Confraria de Sant Miquel,” \textit{Jewish History} (2010) 24: 53-85.
Ávila, where authorities remarked on the difficulty of assimilating *morería* dwellers into the wider Christian population and were unable to disperse the resistant local Morisco population.\(^{41}\) The common aim of these plans was to bring about the assimilation and sincere conversion of the New Christians. They found precedents in the case of the Judeo-conversos, who were ordered by the Council of the Inquisition in 1499 to leave their shared residential spaces and to live among Old Christians.\(^{42}\) In 1529, Charles V wrote to his *corregidores* ordering them to meet with Morisco leaders in each town and city to discuss how to move New Christian populations out of their old *morerías*. Inquisitor-General Manrique wrote to all local tribunals with similar instructions. The project yielded few results, yet consultations and reports continued through the mid-sixteenth century.\(^{43}\) In 1531, the Inquisition of Valladolid ordered that Moriscos in their jurisdiction live among Old Christians.\(^{44}\) Likewise, the 1543 Edict of Grace the Inquisition extended to the Moriscos required as a condition of their pardon that they live apart from one another and reside among Old Christians.\(^{45}\) As I show in Chapter Three, the Crown imposed similar policies of residential separation upon the deported Granadan Moriscos living in Castile.\(^{46}\) These commands were clearly never obeyed in the Barrio de Santa María, as the Moriscos resided there together until their ultimate expulsion in July of 1611.\(^{47}\)


\(^{42}\) AHN, INQ Libro 1245, f. 15-16, “Provision hecha en Granada en seis de agosto 1499 dada por Don Martin Ponçe, Arçobispo de Meçina y Don Alonso del Fuente el sauze [?] del consejo dela general Inquisición.” This provision stated that conversos had to provide proof of their baptism and must not live together, but rather must live mixed among Old Christians. Those who had been rabbis and "letrados en la ley de Moysen" had to leave their homes to live in other places, where they had to attend a church or monastery (of those new places) every Sunday and holiday to hear "divine offices." For context see Meyerson, *Jewish Renaissance*.


\(^{44}\) Tapia Sánchez, *La comunidad morisca de Ávila*, 224-225.

\(^{45}\) Tapia Sánchez, *La comunidad morisca de Ávila*, 232. I discuss Edicts of Grace in Chapter Two, “Petitioning for Grace.”

\(^{46}\) Here I can confirm some things left uncertain in Lea, *The Moriscos of Spain*, 154. Referring both to plans to disperse Morisco homes through the city and to tear down the walls of the barrio, Lea writes, “How the matter terminated we have no means of knowing, but it is fairly safe to assume that the Moriscos were left undisturbed in their barrio until the final expulsion. In 1572 Philip II recursed to the idea and ordered the Moriscos to live among Old Christians in order that they could be watched and denounced to the Inquisition, but no attention seems to have been paid to the commands, and I have met with no trace of further efforts in this direction.” The 1572 order to which Lea refers was directed at the Granadan Morisco deportees, who, furthermore, were not allowed to reside among the Moriscos of the Barrio de Santa Maria.

\(^{47}\) See Chapter Five for more on the final expulsion of the Moriscos (1609-1614). The order of expulsion was read in Valladolid by January 2, 1610. (AGS, Estado, legajo 227, s.n. “Aviso de la publicacion del Vando y registro de los
We get a glimpse at the Barrio de Santa María in a contemporary illustration of the city. Georg Braun and Frans Hogenburg’s engraving of Valladolid (one of many places they depict in their *Civitates Orbis Terrarum*) is a landscape portrait of the city in 1572.\(^{48}\) It shows Valladolid at a distance, church spires dominating the skyline, with the fields of the Puerta del Campo (Campo Grande) in the foreground. On a modern map of Valladolid, the Campo Grande is a distinctive green triangle, a park in the middle of the city. This space was *extramuros* in the sixteenth century, just outside the southern and primary entrance to the city, gates also known as the Puerta del Campo.\(^{49}\) Valladolid was a growing and prominent place in this century, and the Puerta del Campo saw the reception of kings and dignitaries. Its archway, also called the Arco de Santiago, marked the crossing of calle Zuñiga with the main public road, called calle del Campo between the fields and the city and calle de Santiago from the gate to the Plaza Mayor.\(^{50}\) The Barrio de Santa María was bordered by these streets (*calles*) and was situated just inside the Puerta del Campo. There is some (albeit contested) evidence to suggest that the medieval Muslim burial ground had been in fields of the Campo Grande.\(^{51}\) This space outside city limits was also where religious confraternities conducted processions and where secular authorities executed people condemned as heretics (including Moriscos) by the Spanish Inquisition. Those condemned in the infamous 1559 Lutheran *auto de fe* were paraded on the backs of donkeys down the calle de Santiago, through the Puerta del Campo, and were put to death in the Campo Grande.\(^{52}\)

The Barrio de Santa María was a Morisco space within the city. It was bordered by the calle del Campo and calle de Santiago to the west and calle Olleros to the east; it lay south of the Plaza Mayor/del Mercado and north of the Campo Grande. Central streets running through the


\(^{49}\) There was a public fountain and various other public edifices outside of the Puerta del Campo in this era. By the end of the sixteenth century there were “civic and religious” buildings bordering the Campo Grande, which had become an “ordered space.” See Maria Antonia Fernandez del Hoyo, *Desarrolo Urbano y Proceso Histórico del Campo Grande de Valladolid* (Valladolid: Ayuntamiento de Valladolid, 1981), 136-137 and 146.

\(^{50}\) This area and the entrance itself were called the “Puerta del Campo” until at least the eighteenth-century, according to a very good Valladolid art history blog. See Javier Baladrón Alonso, “Monumentos Desaparecidos: La Puerta del Campo o Arco de Santiago,” *Arte en Valladolid*. Published November 25, 2011. Accessed October 30, 2015: http://artevalladolid.blogspot.ca/2011/11/el-arco-de-santiago-y-la-puerta-del.html

\(^{51}\) Fernandez del Hoyo explains various historical viewpoints on this matter in *Desarrolo Urbano*, 25. On the other hand, Rucquoi shows the Jewish cemetery in the Campo Grande, and places the Muslim cemetery outside the eastern wall of the medieval town. See *Valladolid en la Edad Media II*, 489.

barrio were the calle de Santa María (perhaps sometimes called calle de Moriscos) and calle Alfareros, as well as a number of smaller roads. The location of the barrio is described in various registers of Moriscos and their property. The 1538 leases show that the old morería was a walled neighbourhood with only one entrance, situated on the calle del Mercado. This configuration reflects the specifications of the 1412 order to segregate religious minorities, which stipulated that their quarters should have only one main entrance. Public places included the mosque (until c.1506, after which its former site remained a landmark) and three taverns or inns (mesones). There was also the butcher’s shop, adjacent to the former location of the demolished mosque. A central structure in relation to the Barrio de Santa María was the Moriscos’ parish church, the Iglesia de Santiago. This fifteenth-century church still stands in downtown Valladolid, south of the Plaza Mayor on calle Santiago, emblazoned with Saint James the Moor-slayer (Santiago Matamoros) carved in stone on the exterior wall of the apse. The popularity of Matamoros iconography in early modern Castile is evident in the legacy of the churches that remain from this era across the region. This representation and others depict Santiago Matamoros in legendary reconquista battle mode: astride his horse, cross and sword held high, trampling turbaned Muslims underfoot. The Valladolid Matamoros faces what was the Barrio de Santa María: this was the face of the church

53 See AHPV, PN 13, the 1538 individual long-term leases for the Barrio de Santa María. See also AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110, expediente 2, “Apeos de las haziendas de los moriscos” (1565), a registry of Morisco citizens obliged to pay the situado and a survey of the property they owned. See also AGS, Estado 227, ”Memorial de los antiguos vecinos y orijinarios del Barrio de Santa María de esta ciudad de Valladolid y que al presente residen en ella.” This list of Morisco vecinos prepared in 1610 in anticipation of their expulsion does not provide addresses for each family, but does name those who lived on calle Santiago, calle del Campo, and calle Olleros. There are maps illustrating the location of the Barrio de Santa María in Gomez Renau (Comunidades marginadas, 1993) and Rucquoi (Valladolid en la Edad Media II, 557). Rucquoi’s maps points to the location of the morería in 1450; assuming the parameters she marks are accurate, the space occupied by the Mudejars-turned-Moriscos expanded northward, toward the Plaza Mayor, in the ensuing century. Neither of these maps provides a comprehensive or detailed picture of the barrio in the sixteenth century.

54 Moratinos García and Villanueva Zubizarreta, “Consecuencias”, p. 118 and n.3: “todos los judíos, moros y moras del reino vivan separados de los cristianos en lugar retirado de las ciudades y villas donde habiten, formando un barrio aparte que había de estar circunvalado por una cerca o muralla y en ésta debía de haber una sola puerta para el servicio.”

55 Moratinos García and Villanueva Zubizarreta, “Consecuencias”, 129-130. The inns were del Arco (calle del Corrillo), de la Rua (la calle Carpentería), and del Tresillo (behind the calle Carnicería).

56 St. James is the patron saint of Spain. He is most often represented as either a Moor-slayer or as a pilgrim en route to Santiago de Compostela in Galicia. The Cathedral at Compostela houses what are said to be Santiago’s remains, entombed in an ornate silver casket that is visited by the multitudes of pilgrims who still make the trek along the Camino de Santiago in the present day. For more on this topic, see Nicolás Cabrillana Ciézar, Santiago Matamoros, historia e imagen (Malaga: Diputación Provincial de Málaga, 1999).
to its Morisco parishioners. The carving was completed at the turn of the sixteenth century, just before their forced conversion to Catholicism.\(^{57}\)

Amid the succession of threats to dismantle former Muslim quarters across Castile and on the heels of the 1537 final verdict regarding the Moriscos’ tenancy in the Barrio de Santa María came proposals, beginning in 1541, to demolish the walls surrounding the old *morería* of Valladolid. The demolitions of the barrio walls and some of its buildings were discussed from at least 1541 to 1573: mid-sixteenth-century correspondence between the Valladolid Inquisition Tribunal and the Suprema reveals that there were ongoing attempts to demolish certain houses in the Barrio de Santa María in order to extend the Calle de Campo (a central road at the entrance to the city) through the neighbourhood. Municipal officers, local Inquisitors, and the president of the royal chancery court were all involved in the decision-making; they inspected the site and debated the merits of the project.\(^{58}\) However, the project faced a series of practical delays, financial setbacks, and opposition from the Morisco inhabitants of the barrio. Once work was finally set to begin in 1549, after years of negotiating the funding for the project, a physical confrontation broke out between Morisco residents and the workmen hired to tear down the walls. After this fight, the project was delayed and never recommenced.\(^{59}\) Valladolid’s town council quarreled over the plan as late as November 1572, and the project gathered some momentum throughout the following year.\(^{60}\) Yet there is no evidence the walls were torn down before the expulsion of the Moriscos.

The infrastructure and architecture of Valladolid underwent major changes when the city was rebuilt following a fire that destroyed the Plaza Mayor and much of the city centre in 1561.\(^{61}\) Valladolid had been a walled town in the Middle Ages; walls were torn down and rebuilt in various places while the town expanded in the late medieval era. Some remained standing in the sixteenth century, and one defensive tower remained at the gates of the Puerta de Campo by 1589.\(^{62}\) Midcentury was a period of urban growth and building projects, many under the direction of Philip


\(^{58}\) See AHN, Inquisición, Libro 574 (1540-1555), folios 243 and 246; AHN, Inquisición, Legajo 3189 (1568); AHN, Inquisición, Legajo 3191, expedientes 101 (1572), 107 (1572-73), 152, 162, 167, 171 (1573).


\(^{60}\) AHN Inq Legajo 3191. The fight in council (“pelotero”) is reported in Exp. 101.


II’s architects. The Barrio de Santa María bordered the Plaza Mayor, and knocking down the walls of the barrio would have opened the neighbourhood to through-traffic. But plans to “open” (abrir) the barrio were about more than urban planning. Like the legal challenge to the Moriscos’ tenancy, this project can be interpreted as an attempt to take apart the closed physical and social space of the Moriscos. This segregation, first imposed upon the Muslims in the early fifteenth century, came to be seen by secular and religious authorities as an impediment to the social and spiritual incorporation of Moriscos into the majority Catholic community. Plans to open the Morisco neighbourhood and to disperse its residents went hand in hand.

The physical boundaries of the Barrio de Santa María can be ascertained through a 1565 registry of Morisco houses in Valladolid. This record reveals that Moriscos and Old Christians were neighbours on the perimeter of that space. For example, the Morisca Mari Velez (widow of Beltran de Abandides) lived on the calle Mercado at the calle Carpinteria; her neighbours were the Morisco Gaspar de Mendoza and also Juan Xaques, apothecary to the prince.63 Xaques — who, with such an occupation, was likely an Old Christian — was also a neighbour of Francisco Andado and Gaspar Hurtado, both Moriscos.64 The Morisco Baltasar de Robles’ house was in the Barrio de Santa María but was next to the Monastery of the Holy Spirit (Monasterio de Sancti Spiritus); Martin Guisado and his wife were also Morisco neighbours of the monastery. The Morisca Ana la Enamorada was neighbour to “Velasco, former warden of the prison of the town”; said Velasco’s neighbour on the other side was the Morisco Bernardino Ginete. The Morisco Gaspar Moreno’s daughters inherited his properties: a house in the Barrio de Santa María, and another just north of the barrio in the Plaza Mayor, on the corner near the chandlery and at the juncture of calle Olleros.65

We can also situate the Barrio de Santa María within the larger Santiago parish that encompassed this neighbourhood. Its demographic makeup is detailed in a report on the sixteen parishes of Valladolid in 1571, when the city was home to approximately 30,000 people (smaller

---

63 AHN, Inquisición 2110.2 (1565): “Apeos de las haziendas de Moriscos de Valladolid, Medina del Campo, Arévalo, y Ávila.”: “yten apearon los d[ic]hos apeadores unas casas q[ue] son de la de beltran de abanades biuda q[ue] son sitas en el d[ic]ho barrio de sancta maria q[ue] salen a la calle de la carpinteria las quales son en la calle del Mercado q[ue] tienen por linderos de la Una parte casas de Juan Xaques boticario del prínripe n[uestro] señor e por la prota parte casas de gaspar de mendoça e por delante la calle [publi]ca del Mercado.”
64 AHN, Inquisición 2110.2. We learn in the entry for Francisco Andado that Joan Xaques acquired the property from Marcos de Murcia.
65 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110.2.
than Seville and Toledo, on par with Granada and Cordoba).\(^{66}\) Compiled by the Valladolid corregidor Licenciado Ximénez de Cabredo, this register provides a socio-economic layout of the city by listing the professions and offices of the *vecinos* in each parish.\(^{67}\) In total, 597 *vecinos* were listed in the parish of Santiago in 1571, making it the second largest by citizen population.\(^{68}\) Seven clergymen lived in the parish and there attended to their congregation. Sixty-seven titled and wealthy landowners resided in Santiago – the highest number in the city. They were described as “knights and squires and people who make a living from rents and their estates.”\(^{69}\) Six widows likewise lived on the income from rents and estates. The parish was home to nine lawyers, thirty-nine scribes (“del numero y real”) and receptors, and eight university-educated men (*letrados*) who worked in the faculties of canon law and medicine at the University of Valladolid. By far the largest number of citizens in the parish of Santiago (317 men) worked in trades: apothecaries, tailors, hosiers, carpenters, carvers, smiths, esparto workers or sellers, cobbler, bakers, crossbowmen, metal workers, saddlers and halter-makers.\(^{70}\) The parish was also home to eighteen merchants (of cloth, jewelry, and undergarments), ninety-eight traders (of fish, meat, poultry, fresh and dried fruit, and other foodstuffs), four tavern keepers, seven innkeepers, and seven servants (these were married citizens who resided in their own homes).\(^{71}\) The Moriscos are not specifically named anywhere in this report. However, they can reasonably be counted among the tradesmen (especially the carpenters) and traders. These professions placed the Moriscos in the lower order of local society: they were not wealthy or influential, but their labour was essential to the economy and infrastructure of Valladolid.

The residents of the barrio traditionally worked in trades that made them essential to the infrastructure of the city. Contracts show that local Muslim engineers had designed and built pipes

---


\(^{67}\) See Appendix 2 and AGS, CC, Legajo 2159, folios 6-7. The “Register of the citizens and vicinity and parishes of Valladolid, and those of the places in its jurisdiction, lands and district” was commissioned by Philip II in preparation of the settlement of the Granadan deportees. I’ve dated this report to the spring / early summer of 1571.

\(^{68}\) AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folio 7. “En la perrochia de santiago ay quieniento s e nouenta y siete vezinos los quales tienen los oficios y tratos y exercicios siguiientes …”

\(^{69}\) AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folio 7. “caballeros y escuderos y personas que de sus rentas y haciendas se mantienen y en esto tienen sus exercicios.”

\(^{70}\) AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folio 7. These are listed as: boticarios, sastres, calceteros, carpinteros, entalladores, herreros, esparteros, zapateros, pasteleros, ballesteros, agujeros, silleros, albarderos, cabestreros.

\(^{71}\) AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folio 7. The tavern-keepers were described as “bodegones que solamente se sustentan en guisar y vender de comer a quien va a sus bodegones,” while the innkeepers were “mesoneros que de acoger en sus casas se sustentan.”
to supply the town with water when the intake from the river Pisuerga fell short in the fifteenth century. In the 1490s, they worked with Muslim potters (alfareros, then called alcalleres) to construct pipes to bring water to the Plaza Mayor.\(^{72}\) From the twelfth through sixteenth centuries, many Mudejars and Moriscos worked as master carpenters and came to dominate this office in Valladolid. In 1538, most Moriscos worked in specialized trades: these included 51 carpenters, 20 potters, 8 plasterers (yeseros), 8 weavers of esparto grass (esparteros), as well as farriers, shoemakers, a boilermaker, a cartwright, a shearer, a midwife, and various other professions.\(^{73}\) The Moriscos also made up Valladolid’s official firefighting corps. In 1563, Philip II reconfirmed a 1515 royal contract that named a number of Morisco men as the firefighters of Valladolid because of their knowledge of the construction of the city’s buildings and homes.\(^{74}\) Philip’s decision to re-authorize this appointment was made in the aftermath of the great fire that ravaged Valladolid on September 21, 1561.\(^{75}\) In 1594, there were at least sixteen Morisco carpenters in the Santiago parish, as well as a builder, a plasterer, a potter, a weaver, a baker, a cutler, a shoemaker, a musician, a surgeon, and six blacksmiths, and four merchants. One innkeeper is named: a Morisca widow named Beatriz Ortiz. The 1594 census included both Granadan and local antiguos Moriscos, totaling 1473 individuals in the city at that time. 517 Moriscos were registered in the Santiago parish, most of whom but not all were the residents of the Barrio de Santa María. The occupations of the rest (other than the 36 abovementioned) were unfortunately not recorded.\(^{76}\)

The master builder hired by the city in 1565 to rebuild the arch of the Puerta del Campo was named Francisco Toledano.\(^{77}\) I venture he was the same Francisco Toledano who lived in the

\(^{72}\) Gómez Renau tells this story in more detail, including the setbacks in their progress. She finds these contracts in the collection of the Valladolid Municipal Archive (AMV). See “Alarifes Musulmanes,” 223-238 and Comunidades marginadas en Valladolid: mudéjares y moriscos, s. XV-XVI (Valladolid: Diputación Provincial de Valladolid, 1993), 61-67.

\(^{73}\) Moratinos García and Villanueva Zubizarreta, “Consecuencias”, 130. One fifth of the vecinos are not listed with occupations. This tally is taken from the 1538 censo (lease contracts) found in AHPV, PN 13.

\(^{74}\) AMV, Serie: 1 1 2 1 Disposiciones reales. “Carta de Privilegio y Confirmación de Felipe II” (1563; reconfirmed from 1515). Gómez Renau, “Alarifes Musulmanes en Valladolid” concludes with lists of the names of Morisco men who worked as carpenters and firefighters in this era.

\(^{75}\) See Rosa Sanz Hermida and Jacobo Sanz Hermida, Historia y Literatura del Incendio de Valladolid de 1561 (Valladolid: Ayuntamiento de Valladolid, 1998).

\(^{76}\) AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2109.1 “Lista de moriscos residentes en distintas ciudades y pueblos del distrito de la Inquisicion de Valladolid. Lista hecho por la Inquisicion de Valladolid, 1594.”

\(^{77}\) Fernandez del Hoyo, Desarrollo Urbano, 152: “Poco días después el alarife de la villa, Francisco Toledano, que había reconocido el arco a requerimiento de la ciudad, manifestó que los corredores del arco se habían desplomado a causa del aire “más de un pie y medio,” siendo motivo de peligro paralos …” The sources here are A.M.V., L.A., 13 julio 1565.
Barrio de Santa María, a Morisco carpenter who lived in a house on the calle del alcallería. Toledano was one of the Morisco vecinos commissioned to produce the 1565 register of property that contains the record of his residency. Four years later, he was under investigation by the Valladolid Inquisition. Named a penitent for Islamic heresy, he was reconciled with the Church at the 1570 auto de fe and within the terms of an Edict of Grace. If these references all pertain to the same man, Toledano was representative of an array of Morisco experiences as a citizen, barrio resident, carpenter, and penitent, as well as a legal actor for his community.

While their mass baptism brought them — at least nominally — into the Catholic community, the Moriscos also became vecinos, or citizens, of Valladolid upon conversion. This vecindad meant citizenship in a particularly early modern Castilian way. Historians of this era are careful to point out its weight in contrast to our modern-day use of the word. As Helen Nader explains,

A vecino was a citizen of a specific city, town, or village, in contrast to noncitizens, who were temporary or permanent residents (residentes and moradores). In census terminology, vecino referred to the head of the citizen household, so that a village of fifteen households was said to have fifteen vecinos. Today, Spaniards are citizens of the nation, and vecino has been reduced to the meaning of co-resident or neighbour, without political or legal connotations. Each Castilian, in addition to being a citizen by birthright of a municipality, was a subject (vasallo) of a monarch. Castilians who were citizens of ecclesiastical or seignorial towns were also subjects (vasallos) of the town's lord (señor).

In her study of vecindad, Tamar Herzog argues that the boundaries of early modern Spanish communities were defined by the exercise of rights and not by legal enactments: “Unlike today, early modern categories of belonging were not embedded in legal definitions or in acts of authority.

---

78 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110, exp.2 (1565). Francisco Toledano’s house on calle de alcallería (with the back of the house bordering the calle publica), was between a house that had been owned by Alonso de Buenaño on one side, and was neighbour to Joan Serrano, a carpenter, on the other. A second man named Francisco Toledano, designated “the elder” (el viejo) and likely father of the other, lived on the same street in the barrio. Toledano the elder lived in a house lived on the same street, neighbouring Francisco de Rivera to one side (a royal scribe, and therefore not likely a Morisco) and to the other corrals owned by Joan Lopez de Calatayud (a vecino of the city but not listed among the Moriscos).

79 Along with Gaspar Andado and Sancho de Clavijo, in the name of their “consorts” in the Barrio de Santa María. See AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110, exp.2 (1565).

80 See AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3194, exp. 150.

81 Moriscos are commonly referred to as vecinos in all of my sources. As I mention earlier in this chapter, Rucquoi states that Jews and Muslims in medieval Valladolid were not considered vecinos. See Valladolid en la Edad Media I: Genesis de un poder (1265-1367), 227.

Instead, they were generated by the ability to use rights or to be forced to comply with duties. To look at it in another way, this was citizenship “by performance, that is, people whose citizenship depended on their behavior and reputation and not on formal declarations.” Vecindad was therefore a “measure of the person’s integration in the community.” According to Herzog, requirements and proofs of citizenship included long-term residency, paying taxes, marrying locally (connection to local kinship networks) and performing duties required, such as military service. In exchange, citizens had use of common land and could hold local offices. Among the Morisco citizens and property owners named in census records are Morisca widows who inherited houses, fields, and the titles of vecino/a from their deceased husbands. Morisca women litigated alongside their male counterparts in the lawsuit over their residency in the barrio (1505-1538) and in the situado negotiations (1557-8); some of the 1538 leases were made out in the names of Morisca widows, such as Ana la Serrana, named above in this chapter. Over a dozen women are named in the 1565 survey of Morisco property, including Isabel del Castillo (widow of Lope de Ulloa, a Morisco man condemned by the Spanish Inquisition), Francisca de Rojas (widow of Lope Morejon), and Leonor la Carretona (widow of Alonso Lopez Enamorado), among others. In some cases, wives, mothers, and daughters are named alongside male property owners: Alonso de Montemayor and his mother; Alexo Ramirez and his wife; the daughters of Gaspar Moreno.

The Barrio de Santa Maria remained a contentious space through midcentury. In 1557, the Moriscos began negotiations with the Valladolid Tribunal to protect their property from confiscation by the Spanish Inquisition. Increasing prosecution meant that more Moriscos faced imprisonment and loss of their families’ possessions. Together with the Moriscos of nearby towns, the Barrio de Santa Maria agreed to pay 400,000 maravedies annually to the Valladolid Tribunal in exchange for an end to the confiscation of their property and mercy for Morisco prisoners and

---

83 Tamar Herzog, *Defining Nations: Immigrants and Citizens in Early Modern Spain and Spanish America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 4. This study of citizenship and indigeneity (naturaleza) in the early modern Spanish Atlantic world encompasses Iberia and the Spanish Americas from the late medieval era through the eighteenth century. Herzog finds that "in Spanish America citizenship was converted fully from a legal category into a classification based on social reputation. Instead of maintaining both formal and implicit citizenship, as was the case in the Old World, in the New World implicit citizenship prevailed. New forms of exclusion that were particular to Spanish America also emerged." (44-45)
84 Herzog, 42.
85 Herzog, 62.
86 Herzog, 38-39.
87 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110.2.
This agreement — discussed in further detail in Chapter Two as a central way in which Moriscos mitigated Inquisitorial prosecution — was called the *situado*. It included a number of conditions proposed by the Moriscos, one of which was to remain in their places of residence:

“Also, they ask for license to have their own houses to live in and in the neighbourhood where they are, even though they have been ordered to leave it.” The Inquisition agreed to this request. The 1565 Morisco census created by the Spanish Inquisition for the purposes of administering *situado* payments lists the 141 Morisco *vecinos* who agreed to this arrangement (see Appendix 1) and details Morisco property (*haciendas*) in and around Valladolid.

Pressure to disband the Morisco barrio did not end with the negotiation of the *situado*. The Church continued to call for the Moriscos’ dispersion as a way to force their integration into Old Christian society. This was the argument put forward by Father Andres Martínez of the *Iglesia de Santiago*, the parish church of the Moriscos of Valladolid, who I discuss further in Chapter Two. In 1561, he wrote to the Inquisition to report that his Morisco parishioners did not attend mass or participate in Catholic worship in any way. He complained that they did not know their prayers and did not make any effort to integrate into Old Christian society. Martínez accused the Moriscos of continuing to practice traditional Islamic customs, and he argued that this was made possible by their segregation in the old *morería*. He therefore prescribed their physical relocation within the town so that no two Morisco households could be adjacent:

If they are dispersed throughout the town as I have said, they would communicate with Old Christians, and when the Old Christian and his wife go to mass, so too would the New Christians, from shame or from fear, because they would know [that they were being held accountable]. And the sons would converse with the sons of their neighbours, and daughters would do the same, and [little by little over time] they would make friends and

---

88 Richard Kagan explains that “Castile's money of account in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the *maravedi*. Coins in general usage included the *real*, officially pegged at 34 mrs., the ducat, which was equal to 375 mrs., and the *escudo* which was worth 400 mrs. after a revaluation in 1566.” See Kagan, “A Note on Currency and Spelling,” in Lawsuits and Litigants in Castile, 1500-1700 (University of North Carolina Press, 1981).

89 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folios 270-273, “Lo que pidieron los nuevamente convertidos de Ávila, Arevalo, Valladolid y lo demas, para lo situado” (1557): “item se pidio que diessen licencia que tubiese casa suya propia para que biba en ella y en el barrio donde tubiere aunque le obiese sido mandado que saliese della a esta se respondo que los ynq.res proheberian en ello lo qu mas conbinyese +”

90 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110.2 (1565): “Apeos de las haziendas de Moriscos de Valladolid, Medina del Campo, Arévalo, y Ávila.” Folios 1-85 of 311 are about Valladolid. This census is actually three lists: the first is of 141 Morisco *vecinos* from the Barrio de Santa María who agreed to pay the *situado*; the second is a registry of the property they owned in the city (see my discussion of Moriscos and Old Christians as neighbours in Valladolid, above); and the third is a registry of property, such as fields, orchards, and vineyards that they owned outside of city limits.
would join in marriage. And though those who are already old would benefit little from these remedies, the children would benefit and so would those yet to be born.  

Martínez preemptively dismissed concerns about the cost and effort of such an endeavor, writing, “And don't consider saying that they have their own houses, and houses are expensive in the town and they are poor and would not be able to pay: because these are all economic damages, while living together is damaging their souls.” He insisted that “all temporal interests should be postponed for the salvation of souls.” Martínez was adamant that common methods of promoting Morisco assimilation were not successful because they were “undertaken by force”: calling Moriscos to be accounted for in church, making them learn and comply with their new religion and its associated cultural practices had not yet worked. The Moriscos were still “like their grandparents” (“como sus abuelos”) — as uninitiated as the first wave of converts. Martínez insisted they would remain as such until they were made to conform by proximity to and the example of Old Christians; he believed that meaningful interaction would lead to the creation of new social and familial ties binding Moriscos to their Catholic congregations.

Martínez’s explanation of the causes of Morisco sin and his expression of hope for the salvation of at least the youngest generation of New Christians reveal that, in his opinion, the Moriscos were not inherently unable to be saved. He argued, rather, that their current actions disqualified them from the privileges of Catholicism, namely receiving the Eucharist and achieving salvation. However, if the sinful influences of Moorish traditions — strengthened as a result of the Moriscos’ residential proximity and traditional kinship structures — could be replaced with proper Catholic influences, the Moriscos would be able to join the Church sincerely and save their souls. This opinion echoed the plans of city and church officials to dismantle the Moriscos’ barrio earlier in the century; it would be repeated in rules governing the integration of Granadan deportees, especially underage captives who, after manumission, were ordered to remain in the custody of and service to their former masters rather than return to their parents.

---

91 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136 (“Tribunal de Valladolid – Visitas”), expediente 3, “Sobre la conversion de los moriscos” by Andres Martínez, “cura proprietario” of the Iglesia de Santiago (May 6, 1561): “si los diuiden por el pueblo, como he dicho, comunicaranse con los xpianos viejos, y qua’d o va el xpiano viejo a misa y su muger, yran tambien los xpianos nueuos, de verguença o de temor, por q se ha de tener quenta con ellos. y los hijos co’uersarra con los hijos desus vs.o, y las hijas lo mesmo. y de poco en poco el tpó los harra amigos y se juntarra’ en matrimonios, y ya q’ los q’ agora son viejos les aprovecharra’ poco estos remedios, aprovecharra’ alos hijos, y alos q’ estan por nascer.”

92 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136, exp. 3.

93 See Chapter Four, “Litigating for Liberty.”
Morisco communities was believed to be necessary for their absorption into Catholicism. Residential and social integration were deemed preconditions of religious assimilation.

David Nirenberg begins his most recent book in contemplation of a historical point of view that was at the heart of the 1412 royal order segregating Jews and Muslims from Christians:

'The neighbor of a Jew will never be a good Christian.' The words are those of a medieval holy man, Saint Vincent Ferrer, whose massive campaign of religious segregation and conversion in the early fifteenth century forever altered the confessional landscape of Europe. They express a powerful view of the world, simultaneously sociological and theological: right faith requires distance from wrong faith, which otherwise threatens the believer.\(^{94}\)

Ferrer’s refrain echoed in the plans for the dispersal of the Moriscos, the very descendants of those forced into segregation a century earlier. The fight for the barrio reflects an extension of this outlook: the Morisco neighbour of another Morisco will never be a good Christian. This belief endured beyond the initial controversy over the residential segregation of the neophytes. Early attempts to dismantle the Barrio de Santa María became part of a century-long project to disrupt traditional Morisco community structures through residential dispersion, with the larger aim of Morisco assimilation to Catholicism. In Valladolid, the challenge to the Moriscos’ residential community was put forward in turn by their church landlord, municipal officers, parish priests, and the monarchy. In response, the Moriscos put up a legal defense and protested all efforts to “open” the barrio. The resulting documentation depicts the membership of this neighbourhood and illustrates the cohesion of the Morisco community as its members came together to defend their shared spaces. At the same time, as citizens, property owners, workers and builders, neighbours to Old Christians and long-term residents in the center of town, the men and women of the Barrio de Santa María remained an integral part of Vallisoletano society and the local economy for over a century after their forced baptism. The apparent loss, upon baptism, of their “moorishness” threatened the tenancy of the Moriscos of Valladolid in the Barrio de Santa María in 1502; while they managed to remain in their homes, accusations of excessive and clandestine “moorishness” would continue to endanger their community until their forced departure in the summer 1611.

Chapter 2
Petitioning for Grace

“I have told your predecessors many times before that the New Christians converted from moors who live in the Barrio de Santa María are as moorish as the people of Fez.”

So stated Father Andrés Martínez in the spring of 1561 when he reported to the Inquisition his concerns over the lack of Catholic observance among his Morisco parishioners. This community had been nominally Catholic for nearly sixty years by this time. Yet according to their parish priests, they did not attend mass on Sundays or holidays, did not know the Catholic prayers, and did not respect the Eucharist. Moreover, they continued to live in their own neighbourhood (the aforementioned Barrio de Santa María) apart from the Old Christian majority of the city and generally only married other Moriscos. They were suspected of avoiding pork and wine — signs that they were maintaining Islamic dietary customs — and of practicing other Muslim traditions in secret. Against such accusations and the resulting Inquisitorial prosecution, the Moriscos of Valladolid defended themselves with assertions of loyalty to the king, petitions for mercy, and proposals for budgetary mechanisms designed to protect their property. In 1566, they declared themselves to be “good Christians … who could have left for the Barbary Coast (berberia) but did not want to because they wished to live and die in the service of Our Lord Jesus Christ and your Majesty.”

This chapter examines the Moriscos’ responses to Inquisitorial prosecution and clerical visitation in Valladolid. I consider here the period between their forced Catholic baptism in 1502 until the arrival of the exiled Granadan Moriscos in 1570, focusing especially on a series of encounters between the Moriscos of the Valladolid region and men of the Church in the 1550s and 1560s. I describe how religious authorities employed surveillance, trials, incarceration, confiscation of property, and public religious ceremonies against the Moriscos. I further depict these encounters through visitation records, in which Valladolid priests and Inquisitors recorded their opinions and observations of the Moriscos and made extensive recommendations on the

1 Archivo Histórico Nacional (hereafter AHN), Sección Inquisición, legajo 2136, expediente 3, “Sobre la conversion de los moriscos” (May 1561): “muchas veces antes de agora he dicho a los señores antecesores de v.s. q˜ los xpianos nuevam.e co’uertidos de moros q˜ biven en el varrio de sancta m.a son todos /o casi, tan moros como los de fez.” This and all translations are my own, unless otherwise indicated.

2 AHN, Inquisición, lejago 2108, expediente 16c (1566): “son buenos cristianos porque entodo este tpo sepodrian auer ydo aberberia y nolo an querid.o haçer que desean biuir y morir en seruiçio de nro s.or jesu xpo y de su mag.†”
matter of their religious assimilation. This chapter undercuts 1570 as a watershed moment for the Morisco problem in Old Castile. While the arrival of the exiled Granadans absolutely altered the project of managing Morisco populations, it certainly was not the beginning of official anxieties, policies, or prosecution of Moriscos in Castile, nor was it the starting point of their legal action.  

Morisco responses to the religious prosecution they endured included illicit resistance (such as not going to church or fleeing the Inquisitorial jurisdiction) as well as collective petitioning. In establishing this focus, I do not presume that these were the only Morisco responses to the processes of conversion and Catholic indoctrination. The spectrum of individual belief, questioning, and convictions, and the myriad of possible reactions of the Morisco of Valladolid are not reliably manifest in the available documentation. Moreover, as I discuss in the introductory chapter, my focus of investigation is not the religious identity of the Moriscos but rather the processes through which Moriscos negotiated their official identification, statuses and privileges with Church and State institutions. I therefore concentrate on their legal action in this chapter through an analysis of two related campaigns undertaken by the Moriscos to protect themselves from excessive arrests, imprisonments, and the confiscation of their property. The first was the 1558 negotiation of an annual payment to the Inquisition called the *situado*; the second was a 1566 campaign to have the king extend an Edict of Grace under which the Moriscos could be reconciled with the Church and could acquire possession of the papers that guaranteed this outcome. I identify these encounters as evidence of heightened official concern — which rose in the 1540s and escalated into the 1560s — over the Morisco problem in mid-century Valladolid. Pressure for the Moriscos to embrace Catholicism and to comply with assimilationist policies mounted, and the patience of many officials and church leaders was entirely used up by mid-century.  

---  


5 My observation concurs with L.P. Harvey’s characterization of the decades after the forced baptisms of the Moriscos: “[I]t was in this period, the late 1520s up to the 1550s, that the ‘Morisco question’ went finally sour […] In the 1520s, there still survived a few vestiges of what Spanish historians have termed the *convivencia* of the Middle Ages: that relatively relaxed pattern of toleration that had enabled the three Abrahamic religions to live side by side in the Iberian peninsula for centuries … But as early as the 1560s, violent final solutions were already being envisaged.” See L.P. Harvey, *Muslims in Spain, 1500-1614* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 108-109.
The primary sources I use in this chapter are mainly the records of the Spanish Inquisition, specifically the Valladolid Tribunal, which are held at the National Historical Archive (AHN) in Madrid. Established in 1485 and active after 1500, this Tribunal oversaw a large territory across the provinces of Old Castile, León and Asturias. As the majority of the trial records from the Valladolid Tribunal are no longer extant, I rely especially on official correspondence between the local Inquisitors and the General, or Supreme, Council of the Inquisition in Madrid (commonly called the Suprema). While I use this correspondence to partially reconstruct the landscape of Morisco prosecution, much of the full narrative of these trials is lost, including Morisco testimony. Yet, crucially, I find the petitions and letters generated by the Moriscos within this archival collection. Relying on these sources, I present evidence of an organized, regional Morisco network that responded with legal action to the regular prosecution of its members. This action included hiring professional legal representation, engaging the services of scribes and notaries, writing and submitting petitions and requests, and having community leaders appear before royal and Inquisitional courts. As they understood the inherent power of the records certifying these legal transactions, the Moriscos commonly requested copies of or the original documents that granted privileges and guaranteed settlements. I argue that formal petitioning and negotiating were tactics for surviving in an inquisitorial society.

A related development can be seen in Granada, where by 1565 the Crown was enforcing bans on Arabic language, dress, and music. As described by J.N. Hillgarth, “In 1565 a Provincial Council in Granada abandoned even the terms of evangelization, preaching, and catechesis, in favour of a simple attempt to suppress and differences between Muslim and Christian culture.” See The Mirror of Spain, 1500-1700: The Formation of a Myth (University of Michigan Press, 2000), 206.


7 See the Sección Inquisición at the Archivo Histórico Nacional in Madrid. In my research, I consulted AHN Inquisición, subsección ‘Cartas al Consejo General, Expedientes y Memoriales de la Inquisición de Valladolid’, legajos 3189 a 3206 (años 1552-1614) and AHN Inquisición, subsección ‘Cartas del Consejo a los tribunales de Castilla’, libros 573-587 (años 1523-1613). An excellent guide to Inquisition records collections is Joaquín Pérez Villanueva, Bartolomé Escandell Bonet, et al. (eds), Historia de la Inquisición en España y América (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Inquisitoriales, 1984). This volume explains that besides the abovementioned correspondence subsections, the AHN records for the Inquisición de Valladolid includes “33 legajos: 12 de pleitos civiles, 15 de pleitos criminales, 1 de relaciones de causas, 1 de expedientes de visitas, y 4 de varios.” (64) I consulted the majority of this documentation insofar as it referred to cases dealing with Moriscos.
The first wave of Inquisitorial prosecution directed against Moriscos in the Valladolid jurisdiction occurred in 1523 when a number of arrests were made in Segovia. In 1524, the Moriscos complained to the Suprema that Valladolid Inquisitors were prosecuting them “for light infractions and with only one witness.” Concerned that many Moriscos charged with heresy were not sufficiently educated in Catholicism, the Suprema instructed the tribunals to prosecute only those Moriscos who “had committed acts that were clearly heretical” and to report these cases to it prior to confiscating Morisco property. It ordered the Tribunal of Valladolid in particular to submit four Morisco processes for verification. Faced with such complaints, the Inquisition initially acted cautiously in prosecuting converts who were still ignorant of the ways of the Church. As demonstrated below, Inquisitors would come to distrust claims of ignorance and lack of education by mid-century.

Beginning in the early 1540s and lasting into the following decades, the Valladolid Tribunal uncovered what it believed to be an extensive Morisco network of heresy centered in the nearby towns of Arévalo and Medina del Campo. It began with the May 1540 declaration of Ana Fonseca, a Morisca from Ávila, who denounced Moriscos from various Old Castilian towns. Moriscos from Valladolid were incriminated in this alleged network of heresy, including a man who confessed in January of 1541 to the curate of the Iglesia de Santiago in Valladolid that he believed in the sect of Muhammad. In a surge of arrests, the Suprema ordered the Valladolid Tribunal to increase the capacity of its jail to accommodate the high number of Morisco prisoners. Over the following decades, individuals who denounced Moriscos to the Inquisition sometimes became victims of attacks and murder; Tapia Sánchez writes that a number of such acts of violence occurred among the Moriscos of Valladolid.

---

9 Tapia Sánchez, *La comunidad morisca de Ávila*, 223: “por cosas muy livianas y con solo un testigo”
10 Tapia Sánchez, *La comunidad morisca de Ávila*, 223: “ayan cometido cosas que concluyan derechament heregia … y [que] antes de secuestrar sus bienes se debe informar al Consejo de la General Inquisición.”
11 Tapia Sánchez examines these events in *La comunidad morisca de Ávila*. See chapter VIII, “La complicidad de 1540 en Arévalo y otros partes” (226-230). He observes an increase in Morisco Inquisition cases between 1540 and 1558. (226) He also notes that little is known about this conspiracy outside of the details found in Inquisitorial correspondence, particularly AHN, Inquisición, Libro 574. (227)
Toledo, and Córdoba conferred over these widespread investigations; Castilian Inquisitors were warned to “take great care” with these Morisco cases, and “hoped to God that they would discover something important against the Moriscos.”

Moriscos were perceived as a homogeneous group of potential heretics and dissidents. Throughout the Spanish kingdoms, the Inquisition prosecuted them for practicing Islamic ceremonies (*ceremonias de moros*) or observing the sect of Muhammad (*secta de mahoma*). These charges signaled a long list of actions and assertions, among them: saying that there is no God but Allah and Muhammad is his prophet (this is the creed of Islam, called the *shahadah*); saying that there is no way to enter paradise but to believe in Muhammad, and that Jesus was but a prophet; denying the virgin birth; or stating that Muslims can be saved in their sect, and Jews in their law. The customs of the Moriscos were scrutinized for indications of heresy, such as: refusing to eat pork or drink wine; dressing in clean clothes on Fridays; eating meat on Fridays in contravention of the Catholic Church; and slaughtering animals according to Islamic law. Evidence of Islamic faith also included: giving Muslim names to children and teaching them the five pillars of Islam; celebrating a marriage with Islamic customs, “having sung the songs of the Moors, and made *zambras* and *leylas* with prohibited instruments”; “or if they have washed their dead, shrouding them with new linen, burying them in new ground in hollow graves, placing them sideways with a headstone, placing in the graves green branches, milk, honey, and other delicacies.” Inquisitors were on the lookout for anyone seen observing Ramadan by fasting or giving charity to the poor.

The Inquisition was keen to prosecute prominent Moriscos — men such as Pedro Andado of Valladolid who confessed in October of 1540 — because it hoped these individuals would denounce many of their fellow New Christians. By bringing down the pillars of Morisco communities, it aimed to not only to publicly demonstrate the power and reach of the Council of Inquisition but also to destroy and eradicate all vestiges of Islam. Inquisitors were concerned,

---

13 Tapia Sánchez, *La comunidad morisca de Ávila*, 227: “esperamos en Dios que se ha de descubrir grand cosa contra los moriscos.”

14 As the Qur’an, Mary was a virgin when she gave birth to Jesus. Therefore, it is unclear here whether the inquisitors were mistaken in believing that Muslims denied the virgin birth or if some Moriscos were confused about Islamic beliefs.

15 AHN, Inquisition, libro 1229, folios 172-176. These examples all come from a sixteenth-century document titled “Seta de Mahoma,” written by the General Council of the Inquisition (the Suprema). I believe it was part of an Edict of Faith to be read publicly to instruct people how to identity different forms of heresy so that they could police their neighbours and report infractions to the Inquisition.
therefore, with how to identify experts in Islamic knowledge (alfaquis) who could act as religious leaders to Morisco communities. A sixteenth-century set of instructions for Inquisitors lists reasons to relax or reconcile Morisco alfaquis, and discusses how to determine the humility and sincere repentance of those who taught others about Islam: “... it is difficult to believe that one so firm in heresy could atone for the work of teaching it to others and could convert well ... are these confessions artificial, ways to escape death?”

In the wake of the eruption of Inquisitorial investigations against the Moriscos of Old Castile, Emperor Charles V (Carlos I de España, r.1516-1556) issued a charter on April 15, 1543, permitting the Inquisitor General to proclaim an Edict of Grace (edicto de gracia) to the Moriscos in the jurisdiction of the Tribunal of Valladolid, specifically those in the towns of Arévalo and Medina de Campo. This was a grace period during which New Christians who had committed heresy and apostasy could confess their sins and be reunited with the Church. The king’s stated wish was for the newly converted to persevere in the Catholic faith. The offer of grace was also a device for promoting the assimilation of Moriscos into Catholicism by offering mercy in the face of religious prosecution. In this charter, Charles V encouraged the intermarriage of Moriscos with Old Christians — a rare arrangement and an infrequent recommendation — and promised that dowries in such unions would not be subject to confiscation by the Inquisition. This proposal aimed to disrupt Morisco endogamy, undermining traditional marriage patterns as a way to bring about their assimilation into Catholic society. Like the hunt for Morisco leaders and the plans to dismantle the Moriscos’ neighbourhood (discussed in Chapter One), the king’s recommendation for mixed marriages was part of the larger project to undermine Morisco community structures in order to secure their full assimilation into Catholicism.

16 While there are records of alfaquis in the pre-conversion morería, I have not located any evidence of men fulfilling this role in sixteenth-century Valladolid. For example, see AGS, RGS, legajo 149010.45: “Merced del oficio de repartidor de las aljamas del reino a Abrahem Xarasi, alfaqui del aljama de los moros de Valladolid.” (1490) Digital access via http://pares.mcu.es. For more on alfaquis in the late medieval Spanish kingdoms, see Kathryn A. Miller, Guardians of Islam: Religious Authority and Muslim Communities of Late Medieval Spain (Columbia University Press, 2008).
17 AHN, Inquisition, libro 1229, folio 199 (s.XVI): “... es difícil de creer que quien a estado tan firme en la eregia q’ atoniado trabajo de enseñarla a otros, se convierta bien ... y porque delas confess[iones] deste Reo se echa deuer q’ son artificiosas, y q’ huey de confesar ques alfaqui, q’ solo aconfesado por huir dela muerte...”
18 AGS, PTR, legajo 28, doc 49, 151R: “Cédula de Carlos V sobre merced, gracia y donación a moriscos de Arévalo y Medina del Campo que fuesen reconciliados.”
As evidenced by rising religious tensions in Valladolid during the subsequent decades, the 1543 Edict of Grace was largely unsuccessful. Inquisitorial prosecution continued apace: more Moriscos were imprisoned or risked fleeing the tribunal’s jurisdiction; families left in their wake had their property confiscated by the Inquisition. Additional Edicts of Grace were proclaimed by the Valladolid Tribunal in 1548, 1549, and 1554. The failure of these grace periods to induct Moriscos into the Catholic Church in a meaningful way can be interpreted as the product of the disparate positions of the Moriscos and the religious authorities. Moriscos implicitly understood the Edicts as “a kind of truce to buy the inhibition of the Inquisition” more than a real promise to commit to Christianity, which is what the Crown and Church presumed. Given over to a false sense of security, some may have “neglected to carefully conceal their more-or-less religious practices, giving rise to Inquisitorial intervention.” Meanwhile, beyond spiritual impetus, Valladolid Inquisitors were motivated to prosecute because their tribunal was consistently broke and relied on revenue from confiscated property.

Faced with the assimilationist proposals of the Church and the increasing prosecution of the Inquisition, the Moriscos organized to defend themselves from the imprisonment of their persons and confiscation of their property. To these ends, the Barrio de Santa María allied with the Morisco communities of nearby Old Castilian towns that also fell under the jurisdiction of the Valladolid Tribunal of the Inquisition, including Medina del Campo, Arévalo, Ávila, Palencia, and Segovia. I examine here two related, regional Morisco campaigns. Their 1557 requests for an official Grace involved the negotiation with the Inquisition of a financial agreement called the situado that primarily functioned to protect Moriscos’ property from confiscation. Following this, they petitioned the king to reissue another Edict of Grace against the advice of the Inquisition in 1566. The stakes in these encounters were high. The Church desired spiritual victories over suspected Islamic heretics and relied on the revenue it confiscated from penitents and prisoners.

---

20 Here I agree with and refer to the analysis of Tapia Sánchez. Both quotes are my translations from La comunidad morisca de Ávila, 242.
21 The prosecution described in this chapter was concurrent with the assimilationist project to dismantle the Moriscos’ Barrio de Santa María, as described in Chapter One of this dissertation.
22 That the Valladolid Tribunal faced financial hardships is readily apparent in its correspondence with the Suprema. See AHN, Sección Inquisición, subsección ‘Cartas al Consejo General, Expedientes y Memoriales de la Inquisición de Valladolid’, legajos 3189 a 3206 (años 1552-1614) and AHN Inquisición, subsección ‘Cartas del Consejo a los tribunales de Castilla’, libros 573-587 (años 1523-1613).
For the Moriscos of Old Castile, this was a fight for the survival of their families and financial legacies.

In the autumn of 1557, a total of twenty-six Vallisoletano Moriscos were imprisoned in the jails of the Inquisition or had fled the city to avoid incarceration. Acting on their behalf — and also in the name of five Moriscos from Tordesillas and three from Toro who had fled in fear of the Inquisition — the Moriscos of Valladolid began negotiations with the king and the Inquisition on September 14, 1557. On that day, 114 Morisco vecinos (including a number of Morisca widows) of the Barrio de Santa María requested an Edict of Grace under which the Morisco community could receive the mercy of the Church. They submitted a number of conditions, chief among which was the protection of Morisco property from confiscation by the Inquisition. In return, they proposed an annual payment called the situado to the Valladolid Tribunal. This was a pecuniary obligation that united the Morisco communities under the jurisdiction of the Valladolid Inquisition. From 1558 onward, a number of Morisco communities of the following Old Castilian towns made annual situado payments totaling 400,000 mrs (maravedís) to the tribunal: 88,000 mrs from the Moriscos of Valladolid, 53,000 mrs from Medina del Campo, 216,000 mrs from Ávila and Arévalo, 12,500 mrs from Palencia, and 30,500 mrs from Segovia.

The word situado means an income, wage, or salary. In contemporary cases, a situado was often a royal pension granted to a person or institution in return for services rendered.

---

23 The Morisco situado in Valladolid has received little scholarly attention. The most useful account I have encountered is in Tapia Sánchez, *La comunidad morisca de Ávila*, 241-251. José Martínez Millán has a brief section on “Censos Inquisitoriales impuestos sobre los bienes de los moriscos” in *La hacienda de la Inquisición, 1478-1700* (Editorial CSIC, 1984), 178-184. L.P. Harvey’s short assessment of the situado relies on Tapia Sánchez; see *Muslims in Spain*, 242-246, where Harvey explains that the situado "purchased an understanding whereby the Inquisition desisted from the more vexatious of their programs of action against the Moriscos ...." Documentation on the situado in Valladolid include Inquisition records held at the Archivo Histórico Nacional: pleitos fiscales (legajo 2108, expedientes 12-16); pleitos civiles (legajo 2109, expedientes 1-7; legajo 2110, expedientes 1-8; legajo 2111, expedientes 1, 2, 4, 5; legajo 2112, expediente 4); and is a common topic in the correspondence between the Valladolid Tribunal and the Suprema (I rely especially on Inquisición, libro 1254, folios 270-273). The Archivo General de Simancas also holds records related to the situado, including the sections Consejo y Junta de Hacienda and Estado (in legajos dealing with property issues during the final expulsion of the Moriscos; see AGS, CJH 496.4 and 503.9).

24 AGS CJH 496, 4.13. This report, written by Inquisitors on May 13, 1611, summarizes the history of the situado. Richard Kagan explains, "Castile's money of account in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the maravedi. Coins in general usage included the real, officially pegged at 34 mrs., the ducat, which was equal to 375 mrs., and the escudo which was worth 400 mrs. after a revaluation in 1566." See Kagan, “A Note on Currency and Spelling,” in *Lawsuits and Litigants in Castile, 1500-1700* (University of North Carolina Press, 1981).

25 While the verb “situar” more commonly means to place or locate, it can also mean, “to assign or determine any payment or funds for investment.” (“Sitar,” *Real Academia Española*, “Diccionario de la lengua española.” http://dle.rae.es.) See Justina Rodriguez García and Josefina Castilla Soto, *Diccionario de términos de Historia de*
Valladolid case, the Morisco situado subsidized the salaries of the Inquisitors. It was described as a “tribute” wherein the Moriscos agreed “to invest four hundred thousand maravedíes as an annual and perpetual rent to help in the pay of the officials of the said Holy Office.” The levying of taxes and tributes on the Moriscos was not common to every tribunal, but was the case for the Inquisitions of Valladolid, Zaragoza (Kingdom of Aragon), and Valencia (Kingdom of Valencia). There were many historical precedents for tributes or special taxes paid by minority groups to governing bodies in exchange for protection or accommodation. For example, Christians and Jews paid a poll tax (jizyah) in Islamic territories under the dhimmah system. Muslims and Jews living in the medieval Christian kingdoms of Spain likewise paid specific taxes as religious minorities. In the sixteenth century, a tax called the farda del mar levied on Moriscos in the kingdom of Granada paid for the coastal defense of that kingdom.

The Valladolid situado negotiations were predicated upon a list of twenty-two conditions submitted by the Moriscos to the Inquisition. The lawyer representing the Moriscos of the Inquisitorial jurisdiction of Valladolid, Doctor Vitoria, formally presented these demands on December 9, 1557. With the approval of the Suprema — and with the promise made in the

---

España: Edad Moderna (Barcelona: Ariel, 2005), 119, for broader definitions of “situado” and related terms. Here they explain that “Juros” were the first version of Castilian public debt in the Antiguo Régimen. This was the title given to the annual pension granted by the king, at the expense of the revenues of the Crown, to people or institutions who had obtained the right to receive a certain quantity in cash or in kind as reward for services rendered. As such, “juros” were allocated on specific Crown income. The “situado” was the practice of placing these annual royal pensions on specific Crown income, so that the payment of interest generated depended on the performance of that source of income. This is the sense of the word “situado” in the case of the royal subsidy paid by the Crown’s treasury to sustain the garrison town (“presidio”) in the Spanish colony of La Florida. See Amy Turner Bushnell, Situado and Sabana: Spain’s Support System for the Presidio and Mission Provinces of Florida. American Museum of Natural History, Anthropological Papers, No. 74. The Archaeology of Mission Santa Catalina de Guale Series, 3. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994).

26 This language is used in AHN, Inq, legajo 2109, exp. 1 and AGS CJH 496, 4.13.
27 J. Martínez Millán, La hacienda de la Inquisición, 178. In Appendix III, Martínez Millán tallies the income and expenditures of each tribunal.
28 Kathryn A. Miller, Guardians of Islam, 4.
29 Mercedes García-Arenal and Fernando Rodríguez Mediano, Un Oriente español: los moriscos y el Sacromonte en tiempos de Contrarreforma (Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia, 2010), 67.
30 Doctor Vitoria (sometimes spelled Victoria) was a Valladolid lawyer (letrado, abogado). He acted as the Moriscos’ legal representation in the 1557/58 negotiations and again in 1566 during their campaign for another Edict of Grace (see below). I believe he is the same Doctor Victoria named in a death notice within the Inquisition correspondeance on April 30, 1571, as a “lawyer for the treasury of this Holy Office” (“abogado del fisco deste sancto oficio”). See AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3190, exp. 148. It is not clear under what circumstances the Moriscos’ relationship with Dr. Vitoria was initiated; there is no indication that he was assigned as a special procurator, such as Galaz de Burgos, the “defender of the Moriscos” I discuss in Chapter Three.
The second condition received immediate approval. The first condition, however, was met with some resistance as it would grant pardon to relapsed heretics. The Moriscos insisted that, “as the pardon is general there be no limitation on persons but be applied to everyone, absent and present, free and prisoners though they be relapsed, and to the wives and children and descendants and families of the people to whom this grace is granted because the same was granted in Aragon.”

The Inquisitors agreed to make a one-time allowance for those prisoners who confessed properly.34

The Moriscos pushed further with a bold request that revealed their awareness of related negotiations and settlements. They asked that the Grace granted to the Moriscos in Clement VII’s 1530 papal bull become a hereditary right, passed on to “their successors and by royal privilege to those of this nation and to those who descend from it from today onward forevermore.”35 This manoeuvre would extend the 1530 bull beyond its intended purpose and parameters, and as such was refused by the Inquisition. The Moriscos responded by pointing out that an extension should be permitted in light of a more recent papal bull that accommodated relapsed Morisco prisoners. This requires some deciphering; Tapia Sánchez clarifies that the second papal bull to which they referred was that of Paul IV on June 23, 1556,

which recognized that relapsed Moriscos could be admitted to reconciliation if they ‘appeared to confess their errors before they were taken prisoner by the Holy Office.’ … this bull was not received in Valladolid through the General Council of the Inquisition,
until May 23, 1561, and nevertheless the Castilian converts already knew its terms in December 1557: this is one of the clearest manifestations of the connection that existed between these people and the Moriscos of Aragon, to whom the bull was originally addressed.  

The Morisco petitioners had a long-term objective in their request for this condition. Negotiating to bequeath the mercy they obtained to their descendants was a bid to secure a higher-level status and privileges at a corporate level. The Inquisition’s final decision is not clear in the documents I consulted. Yet it seems unlikely that the inquisitors would have conceded on this point, for doing so would have been akin to giving the Moriscos a carte blanche to do as they wished with the promise of renewable pardon. 

In their pursuit of grace, the petitioners aimed to rescue Morisco prisoners and fugitives as well as to safeguard Morisco property. To facilitate these goals, they wrote a number of logistical specifics into their conditions. Confession was required to receive grace and to be reconciled to the Church, so the Moriscos requested confessors in each town for this purpose and stipulated that prisoners’ cases be processed quickly. The Inquisition agreed, but would not acquiesce in the matter of time limits for those who had fled the jurisdiction. The Moriscos wanted either no deadline or a long-term period during which absentees could return to make confession and receive grace; however, the Inquisition set a one-year deadline for Moriscos to return from outside the kingdom, and only four months for those who had left the district but remained within the kingdom. The Inquisition also refused the Moriscos’ request to limit pecuniary penitence to ten ducats or less; instead, they offered to convert revenue from such fines into charitable assistance for the poor in the district where the trial took place. 

The Inquisition did agree to the terms by which they were required to notify Morisco prisoners of the conditions of the Edict of Grace and their newly guaranteed rights in the presence of lawyers. The Morisco petitioners included this condition that letrados be present to ensure the confessions made by Morisco prisoners be sufficient to guarantee their inclusion in the deal they were brokering. 

These negotiations also reveal the Moriscos’ concern for their honour and reputation in the eyes of Old Christians. They asked that the Inquisitors communicate with them directly rather than

---

36 Tapia Sánchez, La comunidad morisca de Ávila, 245.
37 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, fols. 270v-271r, capitulos 3, 4, 5.
38 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, fols. 270v-271r, capitulo 6.
39 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, fols. 272v-271r, capitulo 18.
posting edicts or speaking from the pulpit when they conducted visitations of the jurisdiction of the tribunal — actions that created “scandal” and “undermined in some way the reputation and good opinion of the newly converted, whose honours are at stake in this matter.”

The Moriscos requested that the Church qualify them to enter public offices and honours to which they were denied entry as converts. They also desired permission to be buried in the churches or monasteries of their choice. Because Inquisitors suspected the Morisco of Islamic burial practices, this request may have been a demonstration of good faith; within this list of conditions, it was also a request to protect their reputations among Old Christians. The Inquisition responded that they were not prohibited from Christian burial, and asked where and when it had been denied to them.

The Moriscos asked, furthermore, to be protected from slander, and called for anyone who falsely testified against a New Christian be prosecuted with all the rigour of the law and to have their property confiscated. The Moriscos’ desire to preserve their honour and public reputation in the eyes of New and Old Christians alike is evidence of their integration into Old Christian society.

Meyerson makes this argument regarding the desires of Valencian conversos to appear honourable to Old Christians in the fifteenth century. He describes two major changes in their performance of honour. First, the “conversos’ social centre of gravity had shifted toward Old Christian society. When conversos competed for social status in Valencia, their rivals and allies were other conversos and Old Christians, not Jews.” Second, honour was gained and retained through public displays of Catholic worship. This performance was an extension of sincere faith for

---


41 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, fols. 271r-271v, capítulo 7. The Inquisitors responded that they would have to issue a special dispensation and asked for direction from the Suprema. The outcome in this case is unknown to me.

42 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, fols. 272r, capítulo 14: “yten se pidio se concediese e diese lic.a e facultad a cada uno p.a que se puede enterrar en la ygla o monasterio q quisiere y por [bien] tubiere.”

43 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, fols. 271v, capítulo 9. The Inquisition agreed to this term.
those conversos who believed in Catholicism, but was a challenge for those who secretly adhered to Judaism and retained private ties to the Jewish community.

With some amendments, the Moriscos’ situado proposal was accepted and made official by a royal permission (merced) granted on February 16, 1558. A number of individuals from each each city and town were commissioned to be “distributors” (repartidores) of the situado. Not all Moriscos in the jurisdiction were automatically included in the settlement; rather, it encompassed those who authorized the Morisco leadership to represent them in this matter. 141 Morisco vecinos of Valladolid were registered as situado payers in 1565; this figure included 30 women, many described as widow heads of household (see Appendix 1). These contributors to the situado owned a substantial amount of property, both houses and lots within the city limits and land in the region surrounding Valladolid, most notably vineyards. These were recorded when the Inquisition ordered and received a full survey of the property owned by the Moriscos obliged to pay this tribute — despite the fact that the second condition of their situado agreement promised there would be no “inventories of their property.” The order came on May 19, 1565, from Doctor Morales, the judge for the Valladolid Tribunal in charge of matters pertaining to property confiscated on grounds of heresy. Under Inquisitorial supervision, the Moriscos themselves were tasked with making the survey. Three men from the Barrio de Santa María were chosen to represent the Valladolid situado payers: Sancho Clavijo (a shoemaker), Francisco Toledano (a carpenter), and Gaspar Andado. Under oath and tight deadlines, they produced a list of the heads of households obliged to the situado and a register of the property they owned, both within and outside city limits.

---

45 AGS CJH 496, 4.13 and AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2109.1 both contain copies of this account made in May, 1611 for the purpose of dealing with the property of the Moriscos expelled from Valladolid.
46 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110, exp. 2, “Pleito civil de los nuevamente convertidos de Valladolid y otros lugares.” This list is titled “Los que estan Obligados a la situacion vezinos desta dha villa de vallid son los siguintes.” In addition to the Moriscos from the town of Valladolid, it includes one vecino of Cuellar, five from Tordesillas, and three from Toro.
47 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110, exp. 2. This case was administered and recorded by Pedro de Castillo, a royal scribe and the "notary of sequestrations" for the Valladolid Inquisition; the work was overseen by the tribunal's receptor, Rodrigo Barbon, who appointed a familiar of the Inquisition named Francisco de Torres to referee the completion of the survey.
48 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110, exp. 2. The relevant document is “Apeos de las haziendas de Moriscos de Valladolid, Medina del Campo, Arévalo, y Ávila” (1565). Valladolid is the first place surveyed in this record, in
It is significant that the Moriscos were willing to pay to be left alone by the Inquisition. To look at it one way, the Moriscos paid the *situado* for the ability to cling to their ancestral traditions with minimal inquisitorial interference. To look at it another way, perhaps the Moriscos expected religious prosecution no matter what they did and the *situado* was a practical move to mitigate punishment. In any case, the *situado* was a collective, regional response to the Inquisitorial prosecution that threatened Morisco lives, freedoms, and the financial survival of their communities. However, in the decades following the establishment of the *situado*, the Moriscos argued that this obligation was a financial hardship they could no longer bear. They claimed that having to pay the Inquisition was leaving them and their families in poverty. The *situado* became a special source of tension once it became apparent that the Granadan Moriscos who were settled across Castile after 1570 would not be obliged to contribute. Therefore, the Moriscos of Valladolid and other nearby towns initiated financial and civil lawsuits (*pleitos fiscales*, *pleitos civiles*) against the Inquisition asking to be freed from this contract. For example, the Moriscos of the Barrio de Santa María submitted this petition in August of 1592:

The citizens of the Barrio de Santa María of this city, of those who are commonly called old Moriscos (*moriscos antiguos*): we say that in the past year of 1558, Your Grace gave mercy to our fathers and grandfathers and ancestors in admitting them to an agreement with the treasury of the holy and general Inquisition so that they would be obligated to pay annually 88,000 mrs. as a *situado* toward the costs of the Holy Office, and for this *situado* you would show mercy to them, as from then onward the property of delinquents in the faith would not be confiscated and would remain free despite their offence. This has been paid until now, and from here onward it will be very difficult to be able to pay because not one third of us remain from the time when the *situado* was established, of these most are widows, orphans, and the most poor and wanting. With the famine and poverty of these times, we can barely sustain ourselves, let alone carry this charge. And so may God be served in that crimes in the faith have ceased through His grace, we ask and supplicate Your Grace to order mercy and charity for us in reducing this sum of 88,000 mrs. to a fair and moderate amount which we, in our poverty and misery, can pay and serve your honour as we have done and will do in all occasions.  

---

49 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3199, exp.91 (August 3, 1592): “Los vezinos del Barrio de sancta María desta vill[a] delos que comunmente llamán moriscos antiguos = Decimos que el año pasado de mill y quinientos y cinquenta y ocho v.m. hizo a nuestros padres abuelos y antecesores delos admitir acierto asiento que tomaron con el fisco dela sancta y general ynquisiçion por el qual se obligaron a pagar en cada Un año .88U mrs. de situado paralos gastos del d[ic]ho sancto officio y por esta situacion seles hiço m[erce]d de que de alli adelante los vienes de los que delinquiesen en la fe. no fuesen confiscados y que quedasen libres sin embargo del delicto lo qual se a pagado asta aora y de aqui a delante sera muy dificultoso el poderse pagar por q[ue] no emos quedado una de tres partes que eran
These disputes posed a threat to the financial prospects and power of the Valladolid Tribunal, as the Moriscos’ tribute constituted a crucial portion of its budget. A flurry of paperwork pertaining to the situado was later created in 1611, as agents of the Crown and the Inquisition attended to the matter of the property of Moriscos expelled from the Spanish kingdoms (announced in 1609 and carried out in Valladolid in July of 1611).\footnote{Between 1609 and 1614, the Moriscos were expelled the Spanish kingdoms. The order of expulsion was read in Valladolid by January 2, 1610. (AGS, Estado, legajo 227, s.n. “Aviso de la publicacion del Vando y registro de los moriscos que alli ay.”) A report sent to the king on July 17, 1611, explains that the Moriscos of the Barrio de Santa María had left Valladolid just days earlier. (AGS, CJH, legajo 496, 4.18)}

The situado negotiations did not suspend the objections of many Valladolid clergy, who believed the Moriscos to be crypto-Islamic heretics. According to their own parish priests, the Moriscos of Valladolid were not meeting the basic requirements of the Catholic Church even many decades after their baptism and after having grace bestowed upon them repeatedly. Two priests of the Iglesia de Santiago, Father Sebastián Calbo and Father Andrés Martínez, reported to the Inquisition the insufficient Catholic knowledge and conduct of the Moriscos of the Barrio de Santa María. Titled “Report on how the Moriscos of Valladolid live, and the signs of their poor conversion” and “On the conversion of the Moriscos”, these statements were submitted as part of an Inquisitorial visitation in the spring of 1561.\footnote{AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136 (“Tribunal de Valladolid – Visitas”), expediente 3: “Relación de como biben los moriscos de valljd y delas señales de su mala conversion” by Sebastián de Calbo, “beneficiado de la villa de villamediana, elemente de cura de senor Santiago” (April 19, 1561); “Sobre la conversion de los moriscos” by Andres Martínez, “cura proprietario” (May 6, 1561). I introduce Martínez’s report in Chapter One.}

In April 1561, the priest Sebastián Calbo asserted that many Morisco “husbands, wives, their children and the servants of their households” did not fulfil the obligations of their baptism or attend to their souls as Christians. He alleged they did not attend mass and they stayed at home on Sundays and holidays. As a confessor in the congregation to which the Moriscos belonged, Calbo attested that they did not know their Catholic prayers or obligations. He expressed his concern at their lack of confession and their inability to recite the Ave María, the Pater Noster, the
To illustrate this, Calbo reported a confrontation he had with one of his Morisco parishioners, a ninety-year-old poor gentleman named Francisco Andado:

I asked him, after Easter, if he came to confess, because he had come late to confession and not at the time ordered by precept, which was at Lent. He answered me, saying ‘Sir, as I have other things going on besides this, I forgot.’ I told him to recite for me the Ave Maria and the Pater Noster, which he did not say as well as I wanted. And so I reprimanded him for not knowing it. And he responded to me [that he had not enough practice]. And I told him to tell me the Credo. And he responded that he did not know the Credo, except for one word, which was ‘credo nondeo’. As I saw the little confusion that he had [ie. how little this seemed to bother him], I protested and [asked] why he did not know it. And he responded “… I think that I do not need to and for this I did not learn it.” I expelled him from the church, saying “Move along, scoundrel! You do not come to confess what you do nor do you repent…” I also told him to learn the Credo and he said he did not want to nor would he do it …

Calbo used this verbal altercation — witnessed by the clergy and chaplains of the church and unnamed bystanders — as proof of the intransigence of the Moriscos of Valladolid. Arguably (and indeed, according to the Santiago priests themselves), elderly Moriscos such as Francisco Andado would be the least likely to adopt Catholic forms of worship. Calbo offered no other individual examples of Morisco transgressions; the inclusion of this belligerent interaction was a calculated move. The priest explained his motivation in reporting this infraction and in charging Andado, his family, and neighbours with being bad Christians, writing, “I do not accuse or complain about these people in order to [bring] death to them … rather, so that their lives might be reformed, in

---

52 These were the central prayers that Catholics were supposed to know by heart: the Ave María is “Hail Mary”, the most popular Marian prayer; the Pater Noster is “Our Father”, the Lord’s Prayer; the Credo is a statement of orthodox belief; and the Salve Regina is “Hail Holy Queen”, a common medieval Marian antiphon.

53 The account names the man, “a morisco who is called Fulano Andado”, while the marginalia clarifies, “This was Francisco Andado and he is dead.” Fulano is akin to “John Doe” or “what’s his name.” The original reads, “y mas desto digo que un Morisco q˜ se llama fulano andado y por otra parte se da a entered por titulo de su voca pobre ydalgo e onbre de hasta nouenta años.”

54 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136, exp. 3 (April, 1561): “… preguntandole despues pascua de resurrection q˜ se vino a confesar. q˜ por q˜ benia tan tarde a confesarse y no al tienpo q˜ mandaba el precepto, que era por la quaresma. me respondio, señor como tenga otras cosas q˜ me ba mas que eso me edescuidado, y entre esto y otras cosas q˜ me acaecio coneste. le dije q˜ me dijese el aue María y pater noster lo qual no me dijo bien como yo quisiera. y ansi le repreheni q˜ por q˜ no lo sabia. y me respondio q˜ no curase tanta platica con el q˜ [basta]ba aqilo y su intencion / dixe q˜ me dijese el credo. respondio. el credo nole se. salbo una palabra sola la qual era credo nondeo. yo como vi la poca confuçion q˜ traia le reñi. y q˜ por q˜ nole sabia. respondio me en uerbum sacerdotis q˜ no [mieto] y como pienso q˜ no tengo necesidas del por eso no le aprendo. lo qual [endijendo] me le expelidela la yglesia diciendo andad tacaño q˜ bos no benis a confesar lo que ace al caso ni traers el arrepentimi[ento] pero antes benis a def[iandar] los sacramentos de la ç santa madre yglesia /al qual juntamente dije q aprendiese el credo y dijo q˜ no quería ni tal aria.”
Compulsory annual confession and church attendance were mandated for all Catholics, yet religious authorities commonly reported the lack of compliance among their congregations. In Spain, these spiritual failings were not restricted to New Christian congregants; Old Christians, too, neglected to learn the required prayers or to confess before their parish priests. The records of the Spanish Inquisition are full of accusations and prosecutions of Old Christians charged with various forms of sinful behavior. In 1564, the Inquisitors of Valladolid complained that the general populace was working on Sundays and holidays (“shoemakers, tailors, and other offices were working even on principal holy days”), and acted to prohibit this apparently common act of spiritual disrespect. In January of 1571, the Valladolid Tribunal had prisoners in jail on charges of secta de Mahoma and Moorish ceremonies (17) and Judaizing (6), but also for Lutheranism (19) and bigamy (3). Furthermore, they had cases before them for twenty-five people accused (but not jailed – yet) of invoking demons, blasphemy (including dirty or scandalous words, as well as speaking in favour of Lutheranism), bigamy, solicitation, negating tenets of the church (e.g. scandalous words against the sacrament, denying the existence of hell, saying that simple fornication is not a sin, and words against consecration), speaking against the Holy Office, and speaking erroneous words from the pulpit. While early modern Catholic Castilian society was inherently religious — life revolved around religious concepts, practices, and traditions, and was largely governed by the Church — early modern Catholic Castilians were not all perfect and observant Christians by the standards of their own Church. Moriscos were not exceptional in not

55 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136, exp. 3 (April, 1561): “yo no acuso ni doy q’ja [queja] para q’ seles sucesa muerte por donde me venga [aun] mal. si no para q’ sean en mendados en la vida en esto y en todo lo de mas. remiso al santo oficio de vras ms. de bajo de cuya regla y fe proferto morir como catolico xpiano”
56 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2138, exp. 12 (March 27, 1564): “Valladolid - Carta del Tribunal sobre trabajar los días de fiesta.” In part, this report reads: “en este pueblo abia tan gran desorden que no abia deferenzia del dia del domingo o fiesta al del trauaxo sino que publicamente los capateros sastres y otros oficiales trauajaban y aun dias de fiesta [muy] principales …”
57 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3190, exp. 123. The lists of these charges are included in a report of pending cases before the Valladolid Tribunal, written on January 19, 1571. Interestingly, one Francisca Perez, a conversa widow from Valencia, was being investigated for saying that good moors would not go to hell. Stuart B. Schwartz discusses the prevalence of this viewpoint in All can be saved: religious tolerance and salvation in the Iberian Atlantic world (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).
58 The sixteenth-century Counter Reformation was an era during which orthodox Catholicism was debated and encoded in response to the Protestant Reformations. The Council of Trent convened in various sessions between 1545-1563 to prescribe and codify requirements for Roman Catholic congregations. For more on Trent, see John W.
conforming to the requirements of the Church. The imperfect practice and knowledge of Catholicism among Old Christians is an important perspective for scholars to maintain while examining the allegations against the New Christian Morisco community for neglecting Catholic worship and traditions.

Father Andrés Martínez sent his report — with its opening claim that the Moriscos of Valladolid were as “moorish as the people of Fez” — to the Valladolid Inquisitor Doctor Riego on May 6, 1561. He bemoaned the Moriscos’ lack of Christian conduct, belief, and knowledge, and emphasized that this was not the first time he had spoken to his superiors regarding such offences. Martínez declared that the Moriscos did not interact with or marry their children to Old Christians. They avoided eating pork and drinking wine. They buried their dead according to their own traditions. Like Calbo, Martínez confirmed that his Morisco parishioners neglected their Christian duties: very few attended church on Sundays or holidays, and only two or three Moriscos followed the parade of the holy Eucharist through the town streets. He declared Morisco knowledge of Catholicism to be negligible, stating, “Very few know the Christian doctrine. I speak of the three prayers, because they know nothing of the rest.” According to the priest, he had come to understand through God that very few Moriscos would be saved, “excepting those who die in a state of innocence.”

Martínez insisted that he taught the doctrine to all of the New Christians, but that they forgot it because they never prayed. In this argument, he shifted the weight of blame from the clergy to the Moriscos themselves, who submitted insufficient religious education as the cause of their ignorance in Catholicism.

Martínez’s concerns extended beyond the simple recital of prayer; in his view, it was imperative to teach the Catholic prayers to the Moriscos because he did not want to give the “most

---


59 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136, exp. 3 (May, 1561), “Sobre la conversión de los moriscos.”

60 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136, exp. 3 (May, 1561): “La doctrina xpiana muy pocos la saben, digo las tres oraciones , que lo demas ninguno ...”; “Yo tengo pa mía a los que dios me da a entender q’ dellos, ninguno o muy pocos de saluan, exceptos los q’ mueren en estado de inocentía.”
holy sacrament” to anyone who did not know basic Christian doctrine. This was Martínez’s chief apprehension: that the Moriscos, as false Christians, should not receive the Eucharist. He wrote, “Giving them the holy sacrament is the largest offense to God … it is giving the holiest of holies to dogs.” Emphasizing the danger Moriscos posed to the sanctity of the Church and to their own salvation, Martínez recommended their removal from the Barrio de Santa María. He proposed, at any cost, their physical dispersal throughout the town in order to fully integrate the Moriscos into Old Christian society and Catholic culture. A as described in Chapter One, this recommendation was part of a larger effort to remove the Moriscos from their segregated living spaces in the former morería.

The concerns of the priests of the Iglesia de Santiago did not go unheard. Responding to widespread reports such as those submitted by the priests Calbo and Martínez, the Suprema ordered all Moriscos to attend mass and sermon with their families on Sundays and holy days. In Valladolid, this directive was issued on March 25, 1564 in the Iglesia de Santiago, in the presence of local Inquisitors and officials. The Suprema issued this order specifically in response to reports that Moriscos were not attending High Mass (misa mayor) or sermon on Sundays and holy days at their local parishes. The Inquisition was troubled that the Moriscos were allegedly working on these days rather than fulfilling their spiritual duties, “against the mandate of the holy mother church.” Moreover, the Suprema feared the New Christians were a corrupting influence on Old Christian society. The fear of the Moriscos’ corrupting influence on the wider congregation was heightened by the fact that Old Christians’ knowledge of Catholic doctrine and practice of Catholic rituals was often far less than thorough, as discussed above. Not only were the Moriscos endangering their own souls and their children’s chances of salvation; their evasion of Catholicism was also a “scandal” and a “bad example for faithful and catholic Christians.”

---

61 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136, exp. 3 (May, 1561): “digo q˜ darles el sanctisimo sacram.o es la mejor ofensa q˜ adios nros. se haze en este pueblo, pues como tengo dicho ellos son como sus abuelos. y es dar el sancto delos santos alos perros.”
62 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136, exp. 3 (May, 1561). I discuss Martínez’s proposal for the dispersal of the Moriscos in Chapter One.
63 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folio 184: “Mandamiento que los nuevamente convertidos de moriscos para que oyan misa y sermones con sus familias en su parrochia dias de domingos y fiestas.” The Suprema sent this order to various tribunals. The copy I consulted, retained in an Inquisition libro, is a form that includes spaces left blank for the name of the parish, church, and tribunal to be filled in by hand. The marginalia on this copy reads, “25 de marzo de 1564 se hizo esta diligencia en santiago de valladolid. y estubieron a esta diligencia los Inquisidores y oficiales.”
64 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folio 184. "de que resulta escandalo y mal exemplo entre los fieles y catholicos xpianos."
This order included various remedies to correct what the Inquisition saw as the lack of knowledge and participation of Moriscos in their Catholic congregations. Morisco families (husbands and wives, children, and any orphans in the care of the family) were to be counted at mass by the priests of their parish church, who would be called upon to “give faith and testimony” to the Moriscos’ compliance. The Inquisition also ordered Morisco children above the age of four to be sent daily from one to two o’clock to their local parish church to receive instruction in the Catholic faith, namely, to learn the doctrine and the prayers of the church. Local parish priests did not escape censure for the poor state of Morisco Catholic observance. The Inquisition reprimanded local curates for negligence of their duty and urged them to take great care with the New Christians in their congregations. Priests were ordered to keep track of Morisco attendance at church, and to assure that each knew how to say the Pater Noster, Ave María, Credo, Salve Regina, and “other things that are necessary for any Christian to know for his salvation.”

It is not known to what extent and in what manner these orders were carried out in Valladolid. The Suprema did threaten local priests with spiritual and pecuniary punishment (excommunication and a fine of fifty ducats paid to the Holy Office) if they failed to follow them. Some parish priests attempted to ensure the church attendance and religious education of the Moriscos of Valladolid, just as Father Martínez had told the Inquisition that he was “in a hurry to teach them.” However, complaints of poor religious observance and accusations of false conversion continued to be levied against the Moriscos of the Barrio de Santa María by Valladolid Inquisitors after 1564 (just as in other regions). It is clear that any program of Catholic indoctrination directed at the Moriscos by religious authorities in Valladolid was not successful on a community-wide level.

Two years later, Moriscos from Valladolid and nearby towns responded again to Inquisitorial prosecution. In 1566, they petitioned for a royal pardon (merced) and for the extension of the papal bull originally issued on June 23, 1556 by Pope Paul IV in favour of the Moriscos.

---

65 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folio 184. “e las otras cosas que son necesarias saber a qualquier cristiano para su salvacion”
66 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folio 184. “we order you in virtue of holy obedience and under pain of [Ex.a] and of fifty ducats for the costs of the holy office that from here forward you will take great care and notice - each and every one of you - of if the said newly converted comply and keep with our [above stated] order.” (“en virtud de s.ta obediencia e so pena de Ex.on y de çInquisición.ta du.os pa los gastos del s.to off.o”)
67 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136, exp. 3. May, 1561: “danse agora gran prisa a dependerlas.”
being admitted to reconciliation with the Church. Significantly, this reconciliation had been extended to relapsed heretics, a category subject to the harshest punishments by the Holy Office.

The Moriscos appealed to the king for mercy because the Inquisition of Valladolid did not support their request. The resulting year-long negotiation began early in 1566 with a petition presented by Luis Andado, a Morisco from Valladolid acting on behalf of his community. The Moriscos also had professional legal representation in the persons of three Valladolid letrados: Doctor Ortiz de Funes, Doctor Corello, and Doctor Vitoria, the lawyer who presented their situado petition in 1557.

The letters sent by Luis Andado and the Moriscos’ lawyers stated that the Moriscos wished to confess their sins and to fully convert to Catholicism. These dispatches emphasized the king’s obligation to show mercy to the Moriscos, who “fondly desire to return to the union of our holy mother church, she who never excludes those who with a true heart come to recognize their faults and sins.”

They singled out and blamed certain Morisco individuals who induced fellow New Christians to sin against the church; these “delinquents” were men such as Agustín Bonete, a carter from Segovia, and others who were then prisoners in the jails of the Valladolid Inquisition. The Moriscos professed that they were good Christians but did not insist that they had always conducted themselves as such. Rather, they stated repeatedly that they “sinned from ignorance and not from malice,” owing to not having been properly instructed in the Catholic faith.

As part of the proposed reissuing of the Edict of Grace, they requested that the king order the Valladolid

68 AHN, Inquisición, lejago 2108, exp. 16c: “Contiene la petición de los nuevos convertidos de Valladolid y el traslado, en latín, de la bula concedida por el Papa en favor de los moriscos para que pueden ser admitidos a reconciliación. 1566.” This is a set of twenty-one documents (thirty-two pages total).
69 A copy of this document is included in AHN, Inquisición, lejago 2108, exp. 16c. The marginalia reads, "Este es un trolitado de un breue de su s.+ Paulo iiiij concedido en facor delos moriscos para que puedan ser admitidos a Reconciliacion aun que sean Relapsos con tanto que parezcan a confesar sus herejes antes que sean presos por el sancto oficio concedido en 23 de junio de 1556 años … Recebido en Valladolid por la via del consejo dela general Inquisición en 23 de mayo de 1561 años." This shows that Morisco relapsed heretics could be admitted to reconciliation under these terms as long as they appeared before the tribunal to confess their sins before they were imprisoned for those sins.
70 The first letter in this collection is dated January 24, 1566; it alludes to earlier correspondence on this topic. Agustín Alvarez, a Morisco citizen of Arévalo, also acted as a Morisco community leader in some of these petitions. There is no known relation between Luis Andado and Francisco Andado, mentioned above; Andado was a prominent Morisco surname in Valladolid.
71 AHN, Inquisición, lejago 2108, exp. 16c. Letter from Doctor Currado, from Madrid on May 2, 1566.
72 AHN, Inquisición, lejago 2108, exp. 16c (sin fecha). “son buenos cristianos porque en todo este tpo se podrian auer ydo a berberia y no lo an querid.o hacer que desean biuir y morir en seruiçio de nro s.or jesu xpo de su mag.+
73 AHN, Inquisición, lejago 2108, exp. 16c. For example, “an pecado de ynorançia y no de maliçia”; “por ynoranza y por no estar bien ynstruídos en las cosas de nuestra santa fee quatolica.”
Inquisitors to appoint confessors for the Moriscos and to grant penance to sinners. They also expressed concern and requested pardon for Moriscos prisoners of the Inquisition and Moriscos who had fled its jurisdiction. Those people had never received the 1556 Edict of Grace and so had never confessed freely, yet many had since been prosecuted.\(^74\) In their petitions, the Moriscos also requested possession of the documents in question. Namely, they asked for copies (treslados) of the 1556 papal bull and the king’s privilege (the merced) that granted them the related Edict of Grace. The judicial power of such documents should not be underestimated. Possession of rights-granting papers was crucial for guaranteeing access to rights and to ensuring legal agency in future conflicts. This request is a testament to the legal acumen of the Morisco leadership and their counsel; similar demands for documents appear in Morisco petitions in many other encounters and negotiations, as evidenced throughout this dissertation.\(^75\)

For months, the Inquisition impeded the Moriscos’ negotiations with methods ranging from tactical delays to outright refusal. Andado’s frustration is evident in his correspondence: “I have traveled six times between Valladolid and Madrid, keeping me away from my home and wasting the little that I have.”\(^76\) The Valladolid Inquisitors finally presented their formal opinions on the matter. Their 1566 report comprises four documents: three opinions (parescers) by the Inquisitors Licenciado Diego González, Señor Guijelmo, and Doctor Riego, as well as a petition from the tribunal’s public prosecutor (fiscal) Licenciado Ramírez. All four argued that the Moriscos did not deserve the Edict of Grace.\(^77\) Their judgments echoed those of the parish priests Calbo and Martinez in 1561.

The Inquisitors did not believe that the Moriscos were motivated by a sincere desire to join the Catholic Church. They had many reasons to be skeptical. They highlighted the fact that the Moriscos of the Valladolid Tribunal had already been offered terms of grace in 1543, 1548, and 1557/8 (the year of the situado agreement), and yet still failed to act as good Christians.\(^78\)

---

\(^74\) AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16c. See letters sent from Doctors Victoria, Ortiz de Funes, and Corello to the Suprema, received in Madrid on March 28, 1566 and from Luis Andado on June 21, 1566.

\(^75\) I build on this argument in the following chapters.

\(^76\) AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16c (April 1566): “hecho desde Vallid aqui para el dho efecto seis caminos y estoy fuera de mi casa y gastando lo poco q tengo”

\(^77\) AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16 e: “Contiene la opinión de los Inquisidores sobre la gracia que piden los moriscos del distrito de Valladolid.1566”

\(^78\) Jaime Contreras notes that Edicts of Grace were offered to the Moriscos of the Valladolid Tribunal in 1543, 1548, 1549, 1554, and 1558. See "Vieille-Castille, Leon, Espagne du Nord," 296-298.
Licenciado González warned, “none of them ask for grace because they want to be reincorporated into the Catholic Church, nor out of a desire to be Christians; rather, they ask because of the danger and difficulty in which they have been in their lives, honour, and property.”

Licenciado Guijelmo concurred, stating that the Moriscos only requested mercy “when they see the rope is around their neck.” Acknowledging the Moriscos’ insistence that they sinned from ignorance and not from malice, Guijelmo still did not see what improvements would come from a fourth Edict of Grace. Licenciado Ramírez pointed out that confession was supposed to be spontaneous and voluntary, but that the Moriscos’ request for grace was the forced action of relapsers, prisoners, and false confessants, while most of the new denunciations submitted were against the absent or deceased. He asked why they had not confessed in 1558, and insisted that the Moriscos were “as Moorish then as they are now.” Indeed, González reported that certain Moriscos who had confessed during earlier periods of grace had later negated their confessions, being evidence that with so many graces and pardons, we do not see that they are taking advantage of demonstrating Christianity, [yet we see] their hardness and [impertinence] in that we cannot make them go to church to mass and sermon on Sundays and holidays, nor do they send their sons to learn the Christian doctrine, nor do they want to be disabused of their evil sect and infidelity. Nor do they know the prayers of the church, nor how to cross themselves, as is understood from the processes of this Holy Office.

The Inquisitors had visited the parish of the Iglesia de Santiago, where they had urged the priests to take great caution with the New Christian parishioners. They observed, “the Moriscos do not want to conform with us” in eating pork, drinking wine, marrying Old Christians, or in their mortuary practices; nor did they order masses or “pious legacies” in their wills, as good Christians did. Ramírez also observed the “obstinacy and hardness that these Moriscos have and have had in their damned sect and the signs they have shown and show of their poor conversion.”

---

79 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16 e: “nenguna destas an pedido por que se entienda a[mi]uer se quieren Reincorporar ala yglia catholica ni tomandola por Voluntad de ser xpianos sino por el peligro E aprieto enque an estado en sus Vidas honrra y haziendas”

80 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16 e: “syno quando se ven la soga a la garganta”

81 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16 e: “ay Euidençia pues contantas gracias y perdon no uemos que aprouechan en hazer demostraçion de xpianidad, antes se ve su dureza y pertinaçia en que no les podemos hazer yr ala yglia A misa y sermon los dias de domingos y fiestas ni enbian a sus hijos ala doctrina xpiana ni procurar ni quieren ser desengañados de su mala secta y infi delidas / ni saben las oraçiones dela yglia ni signarse ni santiguarse como se entiende delos processos deste s.to off.o”

82 Licenciado Gonzalez reported that the Moriscos buried their dead in graves in virgin ground, rather than in churches “as faithful Christians do,” and kept different mortuary customs than Catholics.

83 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16 e: “la obstinaçion e dureza q estos moriscos tienen e an tenjdo en su danada secta y las muestras q andado y dan desu mala conversion”
did he report the lack of Morisco participation in Catholic society and religion, he also detailed what he perceived to be their preservation of Islamic ceremony and beliefs. He accused even imprisoned Moriscos of refusing to eat pork or drink wine, calling these dietary abstentions “notorious ceremonies of the Qur’an and precepts of Muhammad … they hold this to be the greatest sin and offense … and with only this observance and keeping secret intentions to be Moors they comply with the whole sect, even though they do not perform any other ceremonies …”

Ramírez asserted that these practices were passed down from generation to generation, stating that in their own confessions, the Moriscos admitted to having “dogmatized their sons and daughters in their ceremonies and damned sect.”

These observations are consistent with the Islamic concept of taqiyya, or dissimulation to protect Muslims in danger of persecution. In the Catholic Spanish kingdoms, taqiyya was the simultaneous covert practice of Islam and public profession of Catholicism. Maghribian muftis (Islamic scholars) had approved of it as a suitable way for Iberian Moriscos to meet the requirements of Islam while under the imposition of their forced baptism. In this sense, taqiyya was a way for Moriscos to defend themselves from being prosecuted by Inquisition while maintaining Islamic traditions. At the same time, taqiyya made Morisco professions of Catholicism suspect. The Valladolid Inquisitors were suspicious of the Moriscos because they

---

84 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16 e: “lo qual es no torja çerjmonja del al coran y preceptos de mahoma lo qual guardan aun estando presos eneste s.to off.o y por confesions proprjas de muchos q sean Reconziliado enesta Inquisición.on y por testificaciones consta E an declarado abstinence del comer del tozino e beuer vino por ser prohibido en le secta de mahoma y q lotienen porel mayor peccado E ofensa q se le pueda hazer comerlo e beuer el vino y q con sola esta obseruan çia y tener la intençion secreta de moro cu[m]plen contoda la secta aunq no hagan otra ceremonja”

85 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16 e: “es cosa aberiguada porsus propias confesiones q estos morjscos luego q sus hijos e hijas tienen hedad de discretion para ser ensenados en su dañada secta y guardar secreto delo q sus padres les enseñan / les imponen e dogmatizan en sus cerimonjas y danada secta.”


88 This interpretation finds support in Tapia Sánchez, who explains, “Crypto-Muslims had an efficient recourse for defending themselves against the Holy Office: this was taqiyya, being the possibility - contemplated in the Quran - of external compliance with another religion while remaining faithful to Islam on the inside.” La comunidad morisca de Ávila, 231-232. (My translation.)
were aware of the practice of *taqiyya*; they believed that if any Moriscos knew their Catholic prayers — let alone the doctrine of the Church — it was only to be able to better fool priests and Inquisitors into believing they were sincere Christians.\(^8^9\) As such, of the Valladolid Inquisitors in 1566 only Doctor Riego contemplated mercy for the Moriscos. He, too, located the crux of the deliberation in the question of the sincerity of the original conversion of the Moriscos. Yet Riego believed in the worthiness of forgiveness, and wrote, “The fall does not exclude the hope of getting back up ... because even if one does not rise after the first or second fall one can reform in the rest.”\(^9^0\) Ultimately he recommended erring on the side of caution and denying the terms of grace requested by the Moriscos. Like his fellow Inquisitors, Riego believed that Moriscos reunited with the Church after confessing to heresy posed too great of a threat to their New and Old Christian co-parishioners.\(^9^1\)

Ultimately, none of the Inquisitors of Valladolid believed that the Moriscos would reform their ways. Ramirez in particular contested the Moriscos’ defense of ignorance and lack of Christian education. He wrote,

> These Moriscos cannot claim ignorance, nor absence, nor lack of doctrine or someone to instruct them in the faith, because they live in places and parts of this district where there is so much [teaching of the] doctrine and so many ministers of the faith, who every day teach [the faith] and about the sacraments with so much frequency in their parishes. Except that these evil and obstinate [Moriscos] flee from the light of the truth and from being taught. This is seen from experience, for when they are brought to the Holy Office, they do not know the prayers of the Church, [yet] the ceremonies and prayers of their sect, though they are in the Arabic language, they say and pray very well.\(^9^2\)

---

\(^8^9\) Tapia Sánchez writes, “Clearly, the Christian authorities knew of this practice, and it provoked in them a radical mistrust toward Morisco external manifestations of Christianity; as such, in 1566, one of the Inquisitors of Valladolid wrote a report in which he complained that they did not attend church on Sundays, not did they send their children to learn the doctrine, nor did they know their prayers ... and, he added, ‘if any do know the prayers it is only to be able to better fool us.’” *La comunidad morisca de Ávila*, 231-232. (My translation.)

\(^9^0\) AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16 e: “El caer no escluye esperança de lebantar ... porq~ aunq~ en la primera o segunda no se levante podra se emendar enlas de mas.”

\(^9^1\) AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16 e. Riego referred to the “great harm which could occur in their dogmatizing others, both their own kind and strangers alike” (“gran daño que podrian hazer domatizando a otros ansi en los suyos como en los estraño”). Likewise, González wrote about the “great harm and danger that would result from receiving [the Moriscos into the Church] if their conversion was feigned and simulated, for the certain harm that would follow from their dogmatizing their children and other people, both their own and strangers. ” (“el gran daño e peligro que resultara en los resçibir siendo fingidos y simulados convuertidos por el daño cierto que se siguiria en dogmatizar alos hijos e otras personas conjunctas y estrañas”)

\(^9^2\) AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16 e: “no pueden pretender ygnorancia nj absensia nj falta de doctrina nj de quien los ynstruya en la fee pues biuen en lugares y partes deste distrito donde ay tanta doctryna y mnjstros de le fee q cada dia la pediran y ensenan ensus parochias y tanta frecuencia desacram.tos/ sino q estos como malas e obstinados huyen de la luz dela verdad y deser enseñados y ansí se vee por experjençia que quando los traen a este
Ramírez’s proposals for a solution mirrored those of the Santiago priest Andrés Martínez. He reflected upon the potential for the younger Morisco generation to leave behind the “sacrilege and abomination” of their parents’ traditions, to save themselves and “follow the path of truth of our faith” through Catholic education, and thereby eventually live, work, and marry among Old Christians. Like Martínez, Ramírez questioned whether Moriscos should be able to receive the Eucharist while they continued in their “false beliefs.” He had heard reports that the bishop of Segovia denied the Eucharist to the Moriscos, as was done in the kingdoms of Valencia and Murcia “to avoid sacrilege”, and he believed that the Moriscos of Valladolid were “no less Moors” than those in these other regions.93

The observations of the parish priests and opinions of local Inquisitors counted as damning evidence of the Moriscos’ failure to become true Catholics. Yet historians cannot fully explain the religious practices and beliefs of the Vallisoletano Morisco community with these records. These men held heavily charged and preconceived beliefs about the inherent otherness of the Moriscos. Some checks and balances were placed upon the regional tribunals: inquisitorial visitations to Valladolid sometimes resulted in charges being laid against its own officers, ranging from paperwork and procedural errors to mistreatment of prisoners.94 These forms of mistreatment included levying false accusations against Morisco prisoners. For instance, Licenciado Ramírez, fiscal of the Valladolid Tribunal, had been charged in 1561 with accusing Francisco Amador Guzmán, of Ávila, of washing and praying like a Muslim, even though he had no evidence or confession to prove this allegation.95 Their institutional apparatus may have attempted to safeguard

93 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, exp. 16 e: “agora an Resultado de lo qual teniendo noticia el obispo de segouia les prohibio la particpacion del sanctisimo sacrimento serja serujcioo de nuestro senor q no se les admjnistrase pues no le creen y abomjnlan y escarneçen de su santo nombre pues se hace ansi en el Reino de valençia E murçia e otras partes y no por eujtar los sacrjlegios y offensas que cometen contra su diujna magestad y no son estos menos moros que los otros aquiuen se prohíba.”
94 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136, exp. 3, primero cuaderno: “Visita de Procesos” (March 16, 1562. Valladolid). Among other things, this report states, “In the process of Hernando Caldero, morisco, absent, relaxed, it seems that the definitive sentencing is not signed by the ordinario.” Similarly, the ordinario had neglected to fulfill his duties in the processes against Morisco prisoners Leonor del Castillo, Francisco de Piedrahita and his wife María de Ávila.
95 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136, exp. 3, primero cuaderno: “Visita realizada por el doctor Simancas a los Inquisiciónuisidores y oficiales de Valladolid.” The relevant passage states, "Que en la acusaçion que puso a Francisco Amador ... Guzmán, vecino de Ávila, le puso que lavandose y haya orandose dezia y rezaua ciertas oraçiones de moros, no haviendo informacion ninguna ni confession del reo que rezase ni dixese oraçion ninguna quando lavaba."
against the human error of its agents, yet the actions and statements of Inquisitors were loaded with prejudices born in their historical worldview and promoted by the nature of their task. Moreover, they were registering their opinions at a particularly fraught time, as the official tide was turning away from patience and tolerance.

It is important to consider, on the other hand, the stakes and aims of the Iglesia de Santiago priests. These men were under orders to report Morisco heresy to the Inquisition and under pressure from religious and secular authorities to secure the true conversion of their New Christian parishioners. These priests had a duty to ensure the Catholic education and church attendance of the Morisco community; furthermore, they were given this duty under pain of spiritual and financial penalties. They could not have easily admitted failing to do so without believing in the insufficiency of Morisco practice and knowledge of Catholicism. These priests did not record their concern in vague spiritual terms; emphasizing orthopraxy over theological belief, they reported tangible infractions and specific proposals for improvements that reveal significant details about the lack of Catholic religious participation of the Valladolid Moriscos. From the perspective of secular and spiritual authorities in Valladolid, the Moriscos remained a threat to proper Catholic religious and civic order even decades after their conversion to Christianity. The recalcitrance of the Moriscos — like the dangers posed by Judeo-conversos, Lutherans, and religious dissidents — was seen as a sign of perilous times. Valladolid, in particular, was felt to have endured its share of crises in the mid-sixteenth century, including the great fire of 1561, the loss of the royal court, plagues and catastrophic weather. It was in this charged climate that Inquisitor González interpreted the Moriscos’ 1566 petition for an Edict of Grace as insincere and insidious. He wrote,

I don't understand what improvement can been hoped for from these newly converted since after three graces they ask for another … it appears to be a mockery of this office … this does not seem to be piety but cruelty in times as calamitous as these, in which it is warranted to maintain rigor in matters of religion. For our sins we have enemies at the gate,

---

96 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2136, exp. 3, segundo cuaderno (March 11, 1562). Gaspar Andado, a Morisco from Valladolid, was questioned during an Inquisitorial visitation of the Valladolid Tribunal regarding his treatment while in the custody of the Inquisition five years earlier. In his testimony, he maintained that he was not mistreated, and stated that though the Inquisitors initially spoke bitterly to him, they used restraint with him thereafter.

97 See above and AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folio 184.

98 For more on inquisitorial interrogations and the patrolling of practices and actions, see Mary Elizabeth Perry, “Between Muslim and Christian Worlds: Moriscas and Identity in Early Modern Spain,” The Muslim World 95, 2 (2005): 177-198.
and though our Lord teaches us to be pious and forgiving, when the nation of Israel knocked with idolatry and infidelity the first time God sent exemplary punishment …

The high stakes for both the Moriscos and Catholic authorities are illustrated in the public performance of religious prosecution. The Inquisition employed ritual ceremony and symbolism to both legitimize and draw attention to its prosecution of Moriscos. These public ceremonies included not only autos de fe but also the reading of Edicts of Faith (edictos de fe) and the display of penitents’ robes (sanbenitos) in parish churches. These were powerful tools with which to repress heterodoxy and demarcate the boundaries of belonging in Spanish Catholic society. This understanding of the Church’s performance of power creates a noteworthy tension in a study of subaltern resistance. This dissertation highlights the ways in which Moriscos repeatedly challenged and disobeyed both Church and State. The history of Morisco legal action exposes the risk of overstating the reach and power of early modern states, all the while recognizing the very real violence committed against the Moriscos by the state.

An Edict of Faith was an order for the general population to make denunciations to the local Inquisition tribunal. This was a directive to the entire community regarding their duty to report heresies they witnessed or suspected. Such accusations were a notoriously successful method by which the Inquisition gathered information and established control over the population. Attendance at the proclamation of an Edict of Faith was mandatory.

---

99 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2108, expediente 16 e: “No Puedo entender que enmienda [amendment, correction, improvement] se puede esperar destos nueuamente convertidos pues acauo de tres gracias pidan /otra pues a tres suelen dezir Vala Vençida y Mas parece burla del off.o E que rer engañar con palabras que Voluntad de querer salir de sus herrores, y no paresçe esta piadad sino crueldad En los tiempos tan calamitosos en los quales es menester aya mucho Rigor En lo de la Religion pues por nros peccados tenemos los enemigos ala puerta, y aun que nro s.or nos Enseña a ser piadosos E perdonar /quando el pueblo de ysrrael toco En ydolatria y infidelidad por la primera vez hizo dios castígo Exemplar”

100 For more on this, see Evonne Levy and Kenneth Mills, Lexikon of the Hispanic Baroque: Transatlantic Exchange and Transformation (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2014), 2-5, notably their reflection on José Antonio Maravall’s 1975 work La cultura del barroco.

101 In the words of H.C. Lea, “It rendered every individual an agent of the Inquisition, bound under fearful penalties spiritual and temporal, to aid it in maintaining the purity of the faith and, at the same time, it made every man conscious that his lightest word or act might subject him to prosecution by that terrible court whose very name inspired dread.” Lea explains the origins of the Edict of Faith in the late-fifteenth-century Inquisition in History of the Inquisition of Spain, Volume 2, Book 3, Chapter 4: “The Edict of Faith” page 91. For a detailed list of the “diverse heresies” under investigation by the Inquisition, see Lea, History of the Inquisition of Spain, Volume 2, Book 3, Chapter 4: “The Edict of Faith” page 93.

and ceremony, intended to distinguish the righteous from the fallen. Representative of this is an example from mid-century Valladolid, likely at the reading of the 1567 Edict of Faith.\footnote{103} Processions and public readings took place over the course of a week, during which the denunciations were to take place. After a six-day period of confessions and accusations, the Edict of Faith was proclaimed a second time at a high mass. Any person who did not obey was in danger of excommunication.\footnote{104} In the parlance of the Inquisition records of such edicts, offenders would be “anathema” — excommunicated, expelled from the congregation of the Church, and prohibited from the charity of Christians:

> we order, under pain of excommunication, that no one speak with such damned and excommunicated people, nor give them bread nor wine nor meat nor any provision, nor mill flour for their bread, nor give them fire nor shelter, nor show them any works of Christian charity before they are expelled from their villages and homes as damned satanic members …\footnote{105}

This ritual was performed in cathedral churches by clerics and chaplains, along with a choir, and in the presence of Inquisitors seated in the chapel. The priests issued a condemnation of “all apostate heretics from our holy Catholic faith” in a show of ceremony designed to impose fear and compliance in the audience.\footnote{106}

\footnote{103} The following description comes from AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folios 185-187. This is a standard set of instructions for what the church chapter was to say and do during the reading of an Edict of Faith and Anathema (“lo que a de hazer el cabildo quando se lee el edicto de la fe”, “lo que a de hazer el cabildo quando se lee la anathema”). The marginalia on folio 187 indicates that it was done in Valladolid (“como se haze en Valladolid”). The entry is undated but was recorded between documents dated 1564 and 1570 in a libro containing all sixteenth-century material. There is no mention of Granadan Moriscos, which points to a pre-1570 date. My best estimate is therefore that this ceremony was performed at the 1567 reading of the Edict of Faith in Valladolid.

\footnote{104} Lea explains that the priests were ordered to “denounce as publicly excommunicated and anathematized all who had not obeyed the first edict, sprinkling holy water to drive away the demons who kept them in their toils and praying to Christ to bring them back into the bosom of the Church. If they persisted in contumacy, all faithful Christians were ordered within three days to withdraw from all intercourse with them, under pain of similar excommunication.” \textit{History of the Inquisition of Spain}, Volume 2, Book 3, Chapter 4: “The Edict of Faith” page 95.

\footnote{105} AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folio 185. “mandamos sola dicha pena de excomunicacion que ninguno hable con las tales personas descomulgados y malditos y se aparten dellos como de personas miembros del diablo e no les den pan ni vino ni carne ni probision alguna ni les muelen ni masen su pan ni les den fuego no posada ni les muestren voluntad ni obras de xpianos, antes los expelan y alancen de sus pueblos y abitaciones como a malditos miembros de satanas”

\footnote{106} See Lea, \textit{History of the Inquisition of Spain}, Volume 2, Book 3, Chapter 4: “The Edict of Faith” pages 95-96 for his transcription of a typical proclamation during an Edict of Faith. Lea does not use AHN, Inquisición, Libro 1254, folios 185-187 (the central primary source for my account) but the primary material he accessed provides a very similar description of the ritual as that found in the primary material for the Valladolid example – further proof that this was a widespread tool of the Inquisition.
When the [secretary] rises to read the Anathema, there must be present two clerics wearing black capes, the sacristan with the cross covered in mourning, two young boys from the choir holding two lighted candles, and a cauldron of holy water. Once the Anathema has been read, the clerics take the candles in their hands and extinguish them in the water, saying, "Just as these candles die in the water, so too will the souls of those rebels and recalcitrant ones, and they will be buried in the fires of hell." And later, they will begin to sing the psalms … and they will say three or four verses of the Psalm and this must be in tone. And at this time the campanist must be directed to peal the bells.  

The *auto de fe* commonly followed the trials initiated by the Edict of Faith. Rich in spectacle, these “acts of faith” were intended to confirm the Catholic faith and shame those found guilty by the Inquisition. This public ceremony was the formal penance of those found guilty by the Inquisition; sentences also involved a range of spiritual, pecuniary, and bodily punishments. With a mix of the sacred and the macabre, those charged with heresy and apostasy were paraded, condemned, and in some cases handed over to the secular authorities for punishment, including death. Arguably the most (in)famous *auto* ever held in Valladolid was in 1559 when a number of Lutherans were executed.  

The discovery of a Protestant cell among the social elite of Valladolid shocked the authorities. It was a major upheaval in Old Christian Valladolid society that contributed to an atmosphere of heightened tensions over the dangers of heretical threats to Spanish Christendom — and, significantly, coincided with the negotiations over the Morisco problem.

*Autos de fe* were held in tribunal cities, normally on Sundays or feast days, overseen by Inquisitors in the presence of local dignitaries and attended by the general public; they were held as often as the tribunal had a number of trials completed and needed to empty their jail cells.  

---

107 AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folio 187. “Al tiempo que el secret.o subiese a leer la Anathema han de [estar] dos clerigos con capas negras y el sacristan con la cruz cubierta de luto, y dos moços de choro con dos cirios encendidos, e tener allo el caldero del agua venditu. Acabada de leer la Anathema los cligos tomaron los cirios en las manos y los maten en el Agua diziendo ansí como mueren estos cirios en el Agua ansí mueren las animas, de los tales Reueledes y contumaçes y sean sepultados en los ynfurnos. E luego comenzaron a cantar el Psalmo Deus Laudez mez fincueris etc. y santen el Res.o reuelabunt celi iniquitatem Jude y diran tres or quatro versos del Psalmo y esto ha de ser en tono, y a este tiempo ha de estar avijado el campanero para que Repique las campanas.” The Psalms are given as *Deus laudem meum* and *Misere* in Lea, 96.

108 For the wider context of anti-Protestantism in Spain, see Jaime Contreras, “The Impact of Protestantism in Spain 1520-1600” in *Inquisition and Society in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Stephen Haliczer. (London: Croom Helm, 1987) 47-63. The 1559 Lutheran “plot” has been the study of historians and novelists alike; see the 1998 novel *El Hereje (The Heretic)* by the Vallisoletano author Miguel Delibes.

Autos de fe in Valladolid were held in the Plaza de Santa María until 1568, when for reasons of space the Inquisition decided to begin conducting these ceremonies in the Plaza Mayor. Symbolism played an important role in this show of power. Standards carried in the procession featured a mixing of royal and religious emblems. An invoice from 1575 reveals that the after its colours ran in the rain, the “standard of the faith” (estandarte de la fee) of the Tribunal of Valladolid was repainted to feature the arms of the Catholic Monarchs on one side and those of St. Domingo on the other. A large figure of St. Pedro Martir bearing a golden lance was painted on both sides. The arms of St. Domingo were accompanied by the words, painted in gold, “Exsurge domine et judica causam tuam”: “Arise, O lord, and judge your cause.”

Another ritual feature of autos de fe was the wearing of penitential robes called sanbenitos. After the procession and required terms of penitence, these distinctive painted garments were hung publicly and indefinitely in major churches. This display was a reminder of both the stain of heresy on the penitents’ family and the efficacy of the Inquisition. The exhibition of the robes was maintained and curated. Old sanbenitos were repainted to keep them legible, and were sometimes transferred to new locations to be most efficiently exhibited. In Valladolid, penitential habits hung in the Iglesia de San Pablo with the exception of the sanbenitos of Morisco penitents, which were on display in their parish church, the Iglesia de Santiago.

---

110 The decision to hold autos de fe in the Plaza Mayor was made because the Plaza de Santa María was not large enough to comfortably accommodate the number of Inquisitorial officials in attendance at such procedures. See AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3189, exp. 85 (Letter from the Valladolid Tribunal to the Suprema, August 17, 1568): “Los auctos, como V.S. sabe sean acostumbrado a hazer en la plaza de Sancta María, y a causa de ser muy pequeño E baxo el tribunal donde estamos y que con el presidente E oydores audiencia no cabe mas en el, y assi el Presidente E oydores cade vno van de mala gana a el, hemos entendido que desean que se haga en la plaça mayor por estar mas comodo, y estar mas desahabados y ser la plaça de sancta María tam pequeña que no caben de pies el concurso de la seme que de ordinario suele hallarse a ver los auctos. Supplicamos a V.S.ª sea servido se haga en la plaça mayor de aqui adelante.” The Suprema’s permission for the move is noted in the margin: “que este se haga e en la plaça mayor de aqui adelante pareceles que no a vuestra comunidad de hazerse en la de sª Maria.”

111 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3192, exp. 134 and 136. The standard, oil paint on damask, was destroyed in a storm in 1574. The Valladolid Tribunal sent the bill to the Suprema in June, 1575. The painter, Gerónimo Vázquez, was a familiar of the Inquisition in Valladolid. “Exsurge domine et judica causam tuam” (“Arise, O lord, and judge your cause”) is from the 22nd verse of Psalm 73. This line is the first in the papal bull “Exsurge Domine” (Pope Leo X, June 15, 1520).

English text: http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Leo10/110exdom.htm
Both accessed October 22, 2015.

112 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3190, exp. 6. The Valladolid Tribunal reported to the Suprema in February of 1570 that among others, the sanbenitos of the Lutherans condemned (relaxed and reconciled) at the infamous 1559 auto de fe were being repainted. They explain that all penitential habits in Valladolid were at the monastery and church of San
that their sanbenitos be hung in their own parish church alone as a way to protect their reputation throughout the town; this concern for reputation mirrors the above-discussed situado conditions through which the Moriscos’ attempted to protect their honour and public standing.\footnote{AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, fols. 272r, capitulio 13: “y q los q tocan a los convertidos de moros adelanteron thenydos que se pongan en la yglesia de Santiago e lo senalaron” This reading of the “capitulo” fits with other situado conditions aimed to protect the honour and reputation of the Moriscos – the “not airing dirty laundry in public” clauses. The Inquisition replied that they would accommodate this situation suitably.} Still, the exhibition of penitential habits was a physical reminder of the power of the Church over the lives of New Christians and the descendants of those deemed heretics. The Inquisition may have agreed to the Moriscos’ request to move their sanbenitos to their own parish church to ensure they were witness to the power of the Church over their lives.

Edicts of Faith, autos de fe, and the display of sanbenitos were more than symbolic rites. Moriscos prosecuted by the Inquisition faced loss of life, family, liberty, and property. Beyond these dangers, the threats of excommunication and public displays marking Moriscos as heretics shamed and alienated their community. These were impressive devices showcasing the power of the Church. These ceremonies are evidence of the contentious religious identity of the Moriscos as perceived by Catholic religious authorities. They were a physical manifestation of the debates over the religious belonging of the Moriscos. Furthermore, they are evidence of the suspicion and persecution that the Moriscos experienced. These rituals served to mark converts judged to be heretics as other, which ultimately functioned against the Church’s stated goal of assimilation. The public penance of individuals, witnessed by the entire Old Christian population, epitomized the ostracization of Morisco religiosity.

Such were the stakes in mid-century Valladolid. Contrary to the recommendations of the Valladolid Inquisitors in 1566, Philip II issued an Edict of Grace to the Moriscos of the Valladolid Tribunal, specifically naming the “newly converted moors and their descendants, citizens and residents of the cities of Segovia, Ávila, and Palencia, and the towns of Valladolid, Medina del Campo, Arévalo, and Piedrahita” on January 10, 1567. The king’s order to grant this edict of “mercy, grace, and donation, pure and perfect, irrevocable” includes instructions for dealing with Morisco property. In accordance with the situado agreement, the tribunal’s financial officer (receptor) was not permitted to enter, occupy, or confiscate the property of Moriscos suspected or
prosecuted by the Inquisition. The king also granted the Moriscos possession of the original copy of this royal edict, as per their request.\(^{114}\) In issuing this edict against the recommendations of the Inquisition, the king may have counted on the appeasement of the Moriscos as the best bet for their peaceable assimilation. Perhaps he calculated that it was preferable to open the doors to reconciliation as opposed to potentially prosecuting the entire Morisco population of Old Castile; in this case, granting mercy on the basis of conformity to a community subject to increasing prosecution was another strategy aimed at the assimilation of the Moriscos. Philip decided otherwise in the Kingdom of Granada, where in 1567 he re-issued a royal edict banning the Arabic language and Islamic-Granadan cultural traditions. As I discuss in Chapter Three, this antagonistic decision triggered the rebellion of the Granadan Moriscos. In contrast to the Castilian-speaking Morisco communities that constituted a clear minority in some Old Castilian towns and cities, the Arabic-speaking Moriscos of Granada were populous — they formed the majority in some regions — and visibly retained a greater degree of cultural difference from the Old Christians of the region.

In Valladolid, thirty-four Moriscos who had confessed during the terms of the 1567 Edict of Grace were reconciled with the Church at an *auto de fe* in 1570.\(^{115}\) In the offices (sala) of the Inquisition, two Moriscos from Valladolid (a carpenter named Francisco Toledano and María Delbanco, wife of Bernardino Ginete) were reconciled alongside fifteen Moriscos from Arévalo. The rest were reconciled at the Iglesia de Santiago, the Morisco parish church. These included two Moriscos from Palencia (a town north of Valladolid), four from Cuellar (southeast of Valladolid, on the road to Segovia), two from Ávila, and nine Moriscos citizens of Valladolid. The Vallisoletanos were Gaspar López Andado, Juan de Ulloa (a carpenter) and his wife Leonor Carretona, Gaspar de Cuellar (a smith), Alonso de Cuellar, Baltasar de Cuellar (a smith) and his wife Francisca de Ulloa, Ana Carretona (wife of Gaspar Andado, a Morisco prisoner of the Inquisition) and Ana de Ayllón (widow of a boilermaker named Miguel de Ayllón).\(^{116}\) Many of

\(^{114}\) AHN, Inquisición, libro 248, folio 159 (January 10, 1567). In this document, the king acknowledges the details of the Moriscos' petitions to the Inquisition for this Edict of Grace, including their claims of ignorance and poor education in the Catholic faith, and the fear of punishment that drove some members of the Morisco community to flee the tribunal.

\(^{115}\) "Acts of faith" (*autos de fe*) are described in further detail below. The central sources on the 1570 Valladolid *auto de fe* are AHN, Inquisición, libro 248, folio 159 and legajo 3194, exp. 150. These sources are also cited and discussed by Jaime Contreras, "Vielle-Castille, Leon, Espagne du Nord," 296-315.

\(^{116}\) AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3194, exp. 150.
these names also appear in the 1565 list of Moriscos obliged to pay the *situado*. The conditions of their reconciliation differed from normal terms because of their *situado* agreement and the Edict of Grace. Reconciliation was usually a severe verdict, the most serious inquisitorial punishment short of death. It commonly included heavy penalties: confiscation of property, the wearing of the *sanbenito* habit, flogging, and long-term imprisonment or galley labour. The Morisco penitents reconciled in 1570 were given pecuniary penalties of between 1000 and 2000 *maravedís* owed to the Inquisition Tribunal of Valladolid, though some were excused on the grounds of their poverty. They were reconciled “without habit nor confiscation of property, imposing upon them spiritual and moderate pecuniary penalties … this is in conformity with the Edict of Grace of the past year 1567 because during that time they confessed their heretical beliefs in the sect of Muhammad.

Among the penitents at the 1570 *auto de fe* — alongside people charged with Lutheranism, Judaizing, bigamy, blasphemy — were some Moriscos who had been tried outside of the terms of the Edict of Grace. Sentenced to be relaxed, Melchior de Buenavida, a chandler and Morisco citizen of Arévalo, was burned in effigy; the sentence was passed in his absence because he had broken out of the Inquisition jails in 1566, where he had been a prisoner for the “crimes of belief and ceremonies of the sect of Muhammad.” Isabel de Malpartida, a Morisca citizen of Valladolid, was charged with believing in the sect of Muhammad; her Morisco husband, Lope Morejon, had been relaxed. Isabel was sentenced to reconciliation, wearing the penitent’s habit and relegated to perpetual imprisonment. Her property was confiscated on the basis that she was not one of the

---

117 See AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110.2 (1565): Francisco Toledano, Bernardino Ginete (husband of María Delbano), Gaspar Andado, Juan de Ulloa, Leonor la Carretona (in 1565 she was listed as the widow of Alonso López Enamorado), Gaspar de Cuellar, Alonso de Cuellar, and Baltasar de Cuellar.


119 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3194, exp. 150. “Después que se celebro el aucto el año proximo pasado de sesenta e nueue sean admitidos a reconciliacion en forma sin abito ni confiscacion de bienes / yponiendo les penias espirituales y pecunarias moderadas para [proues das] propios lugares / conforme al hedicto de graçia del año proximo pasado de sesenta e siete por que en el ti.no [tiempo?] de el confesaron ser hereges creyentes de la secta de mahoma.”

120 “Relaxed to the secular arm” referred to the death sentence (burning at the stake) carried out by secular authorities after the most serious charges of heresy imposed the Inquisition. For more details, see H.C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition in Spain* Vol.3, Book 7, Chapter 4, p.183-184.
Moriscos who paid the *situado*.\(^{121}\) Two Morisca women were absolved (*absuelta de instancia*):\(^{122}\) Ana de Ulloa, a Morisca citizen of Valladolid and “a prisoner for having testified to heretical belief in the sect of Muhammad” and Beatriz Copete, “reconciled Morisca wife of Juan de Gozon who was imprisoned for a second time for having testified to heretical belief in the sect of Muhammad.” Two Granadan Morisca slaves, Bernardina López and Madalena de Castellanos, also took part in the 1570 *auto de fe*.\(^{123}\) The severity of these outlying cases — Morisco jail-breakers, relapsers, and individuals who did not confess under grace or sign the *situado* agreement — reveals by comparison the extent to which collective Morisco negotiation with the authorities mitigated their religious prosecution.

This examination of Morisco legal action to mitigate Inquisitorial prosecution allows us to trace the rise in official anxiety over the Morisco problem and the resulting increase in prosecution of this group in mid-century Valladolid. Through a series of encounters with Church and State institutions, the Moriscos collectively claimed to be good Christians who “wished to live and die in the service of Our Lord Jesus Christ and your Majesty.”\(^{124}\) While they blamed their religious shortcomings on insufficient education, the Moriscos of Valladolid apparently avoided participating in parish life and continued to reside in the Barrio de Santa María, retaining what they could of their communal autonomy. It is easy to imagine their claims were disingenuous, especially generations after their conversion in 1502. Rather than speculating over their sincerity (itself a slippery and problematic concept) this chapter contributes to a larger analysis of how the Moriscos of Valladolid ran an active legal defense of their communities and property in the face of increasing inquisitorial and royal pressure. Directly following these mid-century encounters was

---

121 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3194, exp. 150. “Reconciliada por creyente dela secta de mahoma: "Isabel de Malpartida, muger de Lope Morejon Morisco relaxado, vecina desta villa [Valladolid] de generacion de moriscas, por creyente de la secta de Mahoma. Reconciliada Abita y carcel perpetua con confiscacion de bienes, no estando obligado ala situacion." Though this entry explains that Malpartida was not obliged to pay the *situado*, I find the name of her deceased husband, Lope Morejon, in the 1565 list of *situado* payers. See AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110.2.

122 “The outcome of a trial could take three main forms. Accused could be acquitted (‘absolved’ or ‘suspended’); or punished by being penanced or reconciled; or burnt (in person or in effigy). Punishments usually combined both spiritual and corporeal penalties.” Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition: a historical revision*, 195.

123 AHN, Inquisición, Legajo 3194, exp. 150. Another document shows that Beatriz Copete was a prisoner in the Inquisition jail in 1569. (See AHN, Inquisición, libro 577, folio 31.) I found the name “Jhoan de Gozon” on the 1565 list of *situado* payers; this could be the same man named as the husband of Beatriz Copete. (See AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2110.2.)

124 AHN, Inquisición, lejago 2108, expediente 16c (1566): “son buenos cristianos porque entodo este tpo sepodrian auey aberberia y nolo an querid.o haçer que desean biuir y morir en seruiçio de nro s.or jesu xpoy de su mag.”
the arrival of the Granadan Moriscos deported from Granada, which would, as I describe in Chapter Three, increase both the suspicions and surveillance of Church and State as well as complicate the identification of the Moriscos as individuals and communities.
Chapter 3
Contested Relocations

Beginning in 1569, an estimated 80,000 Moriscos were deported from the Kingdom of Granada and resettled throughout the Crown of Castile.¹ This deportation was the royal response to their rebellion against the 1567 re-issuing of a royal edict that strongly enforced bans on the Arabic language and Islamic-Granadan dress and customs, bans that were tantamount to an assault on Granadan Morisco culture. The uprising turned into a vicious war fought between royal armies and rebel forces from 1568 to 1570.² The king’s army, led by his half-brother Don Juan de Austria, succeeded in suppressing the rebellion. Both rebels and non-combatant Moriscos (moriscos de paz) were subsequently expelled from the kingdom. There were two central reasons for the deportation. One was to remove Moriscos from proximity to the Mediterranean for fear that they constituted a dangerous "fifth column" of allies to the enemy Ottoman Empire.³ Letters written to the king characterized the epicenter of the rebellion — the Alpujarras mountains — as "populated by a bellicose and courageous people, skilled in the military arts" and called the region "a door

² Well-known, published, contemporary accounts of the war include Luis de Mármol y Carjaval’s Historia del rebelión y castigo de los moriscos del Reino de Granada (16th century), Ginés Pérez de Hita’s Historia de las guerras civiles de Granada (first published as Historia de los bandos de los zegríes y abencerrajes in 1595), and Diego Hurtado de Mendoza’s Guerra de Granada (1610).
³ Andrew C. Hess explored this official anxiety in his article, “The Moriscos: An Ottoman Fifth Column in Sixteenth-Century Spain” The American Historical Review 74, 1 (1968): 1-25. Hess argued that the monarchy’s fears in this regard were unsubstantiated: “there is little evidence available of any international connection between the New Christians in Spain, the Protestant rebels, and the Ottoman Empire.” (6) More recently, Tijana Krstic takes up this question in her assessment of the state of the field of study on the Ottomans and the Moriscos. She cites the limited research to date on the “early contacts between Spanish Muslims and the Ottoman-sponsored Barbary corsairs in the Western Mediterranean following the fall of Granada, as well as the mostly abortive plans on the part of the Ottoman Sultans Süleyman (1520-1566) and Selim II (1566-1574) to provide more decisive military support for the embattled Moriscos as part of the Ottoman bid for military and religious supremacy in the Western Mediterranean.” See Tijana Krstic, “Moriscos in Ottoman Galata, 1609-1620s,” The Expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain: A Mediterranean Diaspora, eds. Mercedes García-Arenal and Gerard Wiegers. Trans. Consuelo López-Morillas and Martin Beagles (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2014), 270. For more on this topic in the context of the late sixteenth century, see Chapter Five, n.11, and Mercedes Garcia-Arenal, “The Moriscos in Morocco: From Granadan Emigration to the Hornacheros of Salé,” The Expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain: A Mediterranean Diaspora, eds. Mercedes Garcia-Arenal and Gerard Wiegers. Trans. Consuelo López-Morillas and Martin Beagles (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2014), 286-328.
always open to our enemies the infidels.\textsuperscript{4} The other aim was to finally assimilate the Moriscos into Catholic society by breaking up dense Morisco populations in the south and settling them in central and northern Spain where, it was thought, they could be amalgamated into Old Christian communities.

The Spanish monarchy attempted to control Granadan Morisco populations through deportation, surveillance, and restricted settlement. By these means, the king hoped to break the traditional community structures that had allowed forms of Islamic religiosity to survive in the post-conversion Morisco world—seen as a necessary step in his project of their total assimilation. Therefore, deported Granadans were prohibited from leaving their assigned locations without license, from traveling without passports, and from carrying or owning weapons. Philip II codified a host of such rules in 1572 and periodically commanded local administrators to report on the Moriscos resettled in their jurisdictions.\textsuperscript{5} Yet the expulsion and its attendant prohibitions exacerbated the “Morisco problem” across Castile and did not bring an end to the Morisco presence in Granada.\textsuperscript{6} Rather, it resulted in a multifaceted dilemma that pivoted on the issue of Morisco mobility, wherein the royal administration faced a surge of fugitives who returned to Granada, widespread illegal resettlement within Castile, a proliferation of requests for licenses and passports, and an onslaught of Morisco claims to hereditary Old Christian titles and freedoms.

I examine these developments in this chapter to illustrate how deported Granadan Moriscos subverted and challenged the post-expulsion prohibitions on their mobility. I begin with a discussion of the deportation and the settlement in the Valladolid region, illustrating the challenges encountered by the authorities and the hardships endured by the Moriscos. My examination of

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{4} Archivo General de Simancas, Cámara de Castilla (hereafter AGS, CC), legajo 2171, s.f. (c.1572), “Memorial de advertimientos sobre la vezindad de las alpujaras, sierras y marinas del reino der granada. Para su S.C. magestad, de Francisco de Ocampo vezino de Ubeda.”: “se pueblen de gente belicosa esforçada y diestra en el arte militar … las alpuzarras es una puerta que esta siempre abierta a nros enemigos los ynfieles por la qual permitiendo lo dios podrian entrar …”
\textsuperscript{5} The 1572 laws are discussed in detail below. Philip II, “Pragmática y declaracion sobre los moriscos del reyno de Granada, y la orden que con ellos se ha de tener” (October 6, 1572, Madrid) in Francisco Izquierdo, La Expulsión de los moriscos del reino de Granada: (pragmáticas, provisiones y órdenes reales) (Azur, 1983), 27-38. Izquierdo provides facsimile of the original version, printed “En Madrid en casa de Alonso Gomez Impressor de su Magestad. 1572.”
census records in Valladolid proves that many deportees relocated illegally in order to reunite with their kin, to find employment, and to reconstitute communities torn apart by the deportation. To these same ends, others acted through legal channels, petitioning for licenses to move and for passports to travel for trade. I describe how these issues became serious obstacles to the Crown’s project of Morisco population management. I then analyze the records of the Royal Chancery court of Valladolid and of the Council of Population to show how some Granadans claimed total exemption from the deportation and related prohibitions on the basis of their alleged Old Christian status. These assertions of hereditary Old Christians titles and freedoms were bolstered by family histories of baptism and loyal service to the king. I situate these claims alongside evolving ideas about purity of blood in sixteenth-century Spanish society.

These contested relocations were a significant part of the Morisco problem — the Crown and Church’s dilemma over the proper mechanisms and forms of Morisco assimilation. The issue of mobility was about more than the actual movement of people. In this case, it was about the rights denied, granted to, or claimed by baptized citizens in the early modern Spanish state, where “political structures were based on the premise that individuals were free to emigrate from one place to another.”

Freedom of migration was held by contemporaries to be a natural right, constantly reaffirmed in different pieces of legislation which instructed that ‘any person who lives and resides in any city, town or village of our kingdoms ... that wishes to live in another ... can do so’, and insisted that prohibiting such movement would be ‘against justice and reason and against their liberty, which is notorious to all.’ Such behaviour would ‘silently introduce servitude in men who are free, inhibiting them from living and residing where they wanted and detaining them against their will where they do not want to live; if this happened it would be unjust and against all Law and reason.’

Yet movement was frequently restricted by laws, prejudices, passports, and local politics, and

---


8 Herzog, “Naming, Identifying and Authorizing Movement,” 192. These examples are taken from the Recopilación de Castilla, law 1, title 9, book 7, the Novísima Recopilación, laws 1-3 and 6, titles 26 (both reproduced in Maria del Carmen Cayetano Martin, ed. Documentos del Archivo de Villa: Reyes Católicos (1475-1479) [Ayuntamiento de Madrid, Area de Cultura, Educación, Juventud y Deportes, Archivo de Villa, 1992], 111-114) and a Pragmática reproduced in the Cédula of 17 October 1544 (R. Konetzke, Colección de documentos para la historia de la formación social de Hispanoamérica. 1493-1810, vol. 1. n.149 [Madrid: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas, 1953].)
therefore became a common cause for litigation.\textsuperscript{9} Granadan Moriscos, too, responded with legal action to secure permissions and freedoms to travel. As I illustrate in this chapter, their litigation generated an important textual record of court documents and identity papers that mediated the access of this marginalized people to many levels of royal, religious, and judicial authority.

In November 1570, Philip II issued instructions for the deportation of Granadan Moriscos to northwest Castile. He began,

First you must know that in order to stabilize and bring order to matters in the Kingdom of Granada we have ordered the expulsion of all of the Moriscos who have been conquered after their rebellion, in order that those who are still in the sierras might be killed more quickly …\textsuperscript{10}

Partial expulsions from the Albaicín quarter of the city of Granada began in 1569 as part of the campaign against Morisco rebels. The war ended formally on October 28, 1570, and the general expulsion commenced on November 1.\textsuperscript{11} Most of the deportations occurred during the winter of 1570-1571. Smaller removals happened in the following years, including the deportation of a group of Moriscos to Valladolid in 1572. Many of those who remained in the south were deported in 1584.\textsuperscript{12} Despite some small, local protests, the monarchy persisted in its attempts to eradicate the Morisco presence from the Kingdom of Granada.\textsuperscript{13} Yet there were some official exceptions to the deportation. Moriscos under the age of fourteen and over the age of seventy were not expelled. Morisco slaves were permitted to remain, though this was a contentious issue between slave

\textsuperscript{9} Herzog illustrates this in the context of the Spanish Americas in “Naming, Identifying and Authorizing Movement.”

\textsuperscript{10} AGS, CC, legajo 2156, folio 84 (November 1570): “Primeramente haueis de saber q˜ para establezer y hordenar las cosas del Rey\textsuperscript{'} de granada hemos mandado q se saquen del todos los moriscos q se han reduzido de los q˜ han andado leuantados pa˜ q˜ con esto se acaden mas en breue los q˜ todavia estan en las sierras …”


\textsuperscript{12} Ladero Quesada estimates that 3,500 Moriscos were deported from the Kingdom of Granada in 1584. (\textit{Granada, historia de un país islámico}, 317.) Carlos Garrido García has shown that the 1584 expulsion of the Moriscos from Granada was not just a "partial" expulsion, as Henri Lapeyre put it, or a "mere consequence of earlier, unfinished decrees (1576, 1578, 1579, 1581)", as Bernard Vincent wrote. Rather, it was "without doubt the definitive end of the presence of the morisco community of the Kingdom of Granada." See Carlos Garrido García, “La expulsión de los moriscos del reino de Granada de 1584. El caso de Guadix y su tierra,” \textit{Miscelánea de estudios árabes y hebraicos} 51(2002), 38. Lapeyre discusses the 1584 expulsion in \textit{Geografía de la España Morisca}, 154-156.

\textsuperscript{13} The loss of the Morisco workforce in 1570-1571 was such that some places, such as Guadix and Alcala la Real, sent petitions to the king in an attempt to keep their Moriscos in 1584; other petitions were written by men of the Church who believed in the sincere Catholicism of individual Moriscos. The Marques of Velez was reported to royal authorities for keeping over thirty Morisco servants working in his household in violation of the 1584 expulsion decree. For all of these examples, see AGS, CC, legajo 2187, folios s.n.
owners and the Crown. Certain Moriscos identified for their essential skills and necessary offices were strategically kept in Granada. Others were rewarded for their service to the Crown with exemption from the deportation, such as García de la Rua, a Granadan Morisco and a secretary and translator to Philip II. Acting as a royal spy, he infiltrated rebel Morisco camps during the rebellion; as recompense, he was issued privileges to bear arms and to remain in Granada with his extended family. In other cases, Moriscos were permitted to remain because of their noble ancestry, connections to Old Christian families, and what was called “the quality of their persons.”

The expulsion was the first part of a complicated project of population management; Crown officials remained engaged in the registration, surveillance, licensing, and prosecution of exiled Moriscos for decades after the first deportations from Granada. Furthermore, Philip and his royal administration had to attend to the altered demographic, environmental, and economic landscapes of the post-war and post-deportation Spanish kingdoms. The population shift impacted most regions of Spain. Parts of the kingdom of Granada were depopulated, with large shifts in landownership and in the social, religious, and cultural landscapes of the region. Christian settlers were sent to repopulate areas in southern Spain left empty by the forced exodus of the Moriscos.

---

14 Morisco slaves were not included in the deportation order from Granada, but Moriscos enslaved during the war and rebellion were taken out of the Kingdom of Granada by their Castilian masters. See Chapter Four for more on enslaved Granadan Moriscos in Valladolid.

15 AGS, CC, legajo 2158, folios 68-70. These are lists of Moriscos who remained in Granada after the expulsion to provide necessary services, or because they were too old, blind, or infirm to survive the deportation. Folio 68 (“Memoria de los moriscos que quedan en Granada y en las otras cuidades deste reyno”) lists municipal officers (seises), dyers (tintoreros), men who constructed and maintained water pipes (cañeros), irrigators (regadores) and other officers (oficiales). For a useful overview of the Moriscos who were allowed to remain in Granada, see Carlos Garrido García, “La expulsión de los moriscos del reino de Granada de 1584. El caso de Guadix y su tierra,” Miscelánea de estudios árabes y hebraicos 51 (2002), 19-38. See also Bernard Vincent, “Los moriscos que permanecieron en el Reino de Granada después de la expulsión de 1570,” in Andalucía en la Edad Moderna: economía y sociedad (Granada: Diputación Provincial de Granada, 1985).

16 AGS, CC, legajo 2172, folio s.n.: “el Presidente a 20 de Junio 1572, sobre el negocio de [garcia] dela ruua”

17 AGS, CC, legajo 2172, folio s.n. (March 1572), “Memorial de los moriscos que han quedado en Granada y otras ciudades del reyno que no sean echados ellas por la calidad de sus personas.”

18 For example, see AGS, CC, Legajo 2157, folio 244 (April 16, 1571). This letter to the king from Francisco Gutiérrez de Cuellar reported that many estates and crops in the Kingdom of Granada were lost to neglect and were therefore devalued.

19 For more on this topic, see David Coleman, Creating Christian Granada: Society & Religious Culture in an Old-World Frontier City, 1492-1600 (Cornell University Press, 2003).

20 For more on this topic, see Manuel Barrios Aguilera and Francisco Andújar Castillo, Hombre y territorio en el Reino de Granada, 1570-1630: estudios sobre repoblación (Almeria: Instituto de Estudios Almerienses, 1995) and...
administrators. Granadan Chancery President Pedro de Deza declared that the land would not be clean or safe until the Moriscos were stopped from returning to Granada. He and other authorities perceived the Granadan Moriscos to be rebels, Muslims, and Ottoman-sympathizers — “so bad and so cruel” that the deportation was a necessary measure for restoring political order and achieving religious purity. The king asserted, “Regardless of the grave and enormous atrocious crimes they have committed in offense to us and our subjects, we have treated them with clemency, piety, and mercy.”

The expulsion marches proceeded under the supervision of captains and constables (alguaciles) who were given instructions by the king. Daily treks of four to five leagues were determined to be mercifully suitable for the women and children deportees. After rising early and marching all day, the exiles would spend the night in any space appropriate to the size of their group, ideally in churches or town council houses. Much of the financial burden of the expulsion was delegated to towns and cities along the path of the deportation. Besides overnight accommodations, provisions (two meals and a midday ration of bread) for poor Moriscos and the guards’ pay were the responsibility of local authorities, not the royal treasury. Because the captains were to decide what roads and stopping places were most appropriate as they made the journey, the exact deportation route itself was not pre-planned.

---


21 AGS, CC, legajo 2172, folio s.n. (June 18, 1572).

22 AGS, CC, legajo 2157, folio 135: On January 28, 1571, Pedro Vermudez (in the service of the Duque de Arcos) sent to the king a list of the offending Moriscos who had been subdued in Monda so that extra caution and restraints could be used in their cases. He claimed, “son tan malos y tan cruels los moriscos que sean reducidos.”


24 AGS, CC, legajo 2156, folio 84. Similar instructions are included in the 1572 commission for the deportation of Moriscos from Granada to Valladolid (AGS, CC, legajo 2171): The captain and his men were ordered to gather the deportees in churches or other appropriate areas to prepare them for the journey. The Moriscos were permitted to bring movable property (bienes muebles) with them, to the extent that it was convenient to be carried during the deportation. These instructions explain how to organize the Moriscos into marching formations and how to guard them at night while they sleep in churches. Guards were to include at least thirty men on foot and eight to ten men on horseback per 500 deportees.

25 Juan de Villuga’s 1546 *Repertorio de todos los caminos de España*, which describes a network of 18,000 km across the Iberian Peninsula, is useful in visualizing which roads were most traveled and may have been taken by the deportees. Villuga’s *Repertorio* is visualized in map form in Gonzalo Menendez Pidal’s *Los caminos en la historia de España* (Madrid, 1951).
Forty to fifty guards (including ten on horseback) were assigned to groups of five hundred Moriscos. Deportees suspected of being dangerous or likely to flee could be tied up. The guards were ordered to supervise and protect the Moriscos, assuring that none fled and also keeping them safe from robbery and harm. The protection of Morisca girls and women merited special attention in these instructions. The king ordered that the “honesty” of Moriscas be guarded, and that no one be permitted to steal their clothing or other possessions. He instructed that Morisco families be kept together, the wives and children not separated from their husbands and fathers.26 There was to be exemplary punishment given to anyone who harassed Morisca women in any way.27 These orders to protect may have had a certain element of basic human compassion to them; they also reflect the contemporary anxiety over the “purity” of women. The orders were certainly made with sensitivity to pacifying the deportees, and aimed to achieve an orderly and disciplined deportation. Such concerns are also visible in royal instructions for the guards to protect the Morisco deportees under their watch from theft and abuse.

Not all of the king’s officers heeded these rules. Captain Francisco de Arteaga made a small fortune delivering Moriscos to Valladolid in 1572.28 Arteaga was a soldier who was rewarded with a commendation and the rank of captain for his service during the rebellion in Granada. He was also given the lucrative deportation commission as recompense for having had his finances depleted during the war. Arteaga made his money during the deportation by buying goods and property at a very low price from Morisco deportees desperate to liquidate their assets quickly. He accepted bribes from towns along the deportation route in exchange for not lodging Moriscos in those places; this billeting was an expense and an experience that the towns and villages wanted to avoid. Arteaga also took bribes of money and jewelry from wealthier Moriscos who in return asked to be left in villages and towns where they had family, rather than being marched all the way to Valladolid.29 It is likely that Arteaga was not the only such officer of the Crown to profit from

26 AGS, CC, legajo 2156, folio 84.
27 AGS, CC, legajo 2171, folios s.n.
28 Archivo de la Real Chancilleria de Valladolid (hereafter ARCV), Registro de Ejecutorias (EJ), Caja 1573, 28 (February 28, 1587) and Caja 1733, 28 (February 13, 1593). The remarkable details about this particular episode of the expulsion are found in the records of a legal dispute at the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid concerning the settlement of Captain Arteaga’s estate after his death. Granadan Moriscos whom Arteaga deported were called upon as witnesses in the trial for the purpose of proving that Arteaga had made his small fortune during the expulsion. These documents are the subject of María Soledad Arribas’ “Deportación de los moriscos de Torres a la ciudad de Valladolid en 1572: fuentes documentales” Sumatan 1 (1991): 35-46.
the expulsion.

Beyond loss of money and property, the expulsion was an experience filled with physical hardship for the Moriscos. One account reveals that Moriscos deported to Valladolid walked for 68 days. Many suffered and died along the way; insufficient provisions, distress, long days of marching, and outbreaks of typhus all caused suffering among the exiles. Lists of the sick and the dead are common in the correspondence between local and royal officials carrying out the deportation. Bernard Vincent refers to the expulsion from the Kingdom of Granada as “one of the most atrocious [deportations] in history.” Details of the difficult journey faced by the deportees are found throughout the records of this expulsion. A report of 700-900 Moriscos delivered to Mérida shows that there was no lodging for the deportees, who were badly maltreated. Extreme disorder is apparent; the expulsion was occurring at a fast pace and at the command of many officers, resulting in some Moriscos being left behind and separated from their families. Regardless of the differences in their lives before and after the expulsion, the Granadan Morisco exiles all endured the “physical and moral suffering of the deportation.”

In protest, many Granadan Moriscos appealed to the Crown to be reunited with their families and asserted their rights to remain in Granada. Philip II — a relentless bureaucrat and great lover of the conciliar system — established the Council of Population (Consejo de Población) in 1570 to oversee matters of justice and property (hacienda) in the wake of the Granadan war. Among other things, this council was tasked with receiving the scores of petitions

---

32 AGS, CC, legajo 2157, f. 53. This document describes Moriscos arriving in vast numbers through Albacete, some falling sick and dying. Vincent’s assessment of similar files concurs with my recounting of these events: “The Moriscos were marched in columns of 1500-2000 persons, divided in cadres of 500 individuals. The columns were marched along routes planned to assure the best refueling. Each group had an escort of 200 soldiers, who were relayed in the larger cities. The columns left early every morning and stopped late at night; the commissioners did an inventory of the Moriscos every day. The Moriscos were given very little food, and only had one real meal in the evenings; bread was distributed at certain stops and was meant to last for days. They marched on average four leagues per day. The stronger Moriscos were handcuffed so that they would not escape. There were some explosive situations, such as when the Moriscos would not eat meat because it was not butchered according to Islamic custom.” (Vincent, “L’expulsion des Morisques du Royaume de Grenade,” 223).
34 For more on Philip bureaucratic tendencies, see Geoffrey Parker, The grand strategy of Philip II (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
written by Granadans who had been ordered to leave their homes or who had already been deported.35 These petitioners negotiated to protect their lives, families, communities, and property; in doing so, they commonly emphasized the hardship they endured and consistently asserted their loyalty to the king. Some, such as Diego López al Hayate, wrote of their military service to the Crown during the Granadan war.36 Some, like the Albofado family in the city of Granada, provided evidence of living and worshiping as Catholics for generations.37 Others begged not to be separated from their children under the age of fourteen, who would not be deported with their parents. In Granada, a Morisca named María Díaz pleaded to the king:

I am poor and a widow. I have two maiden daughters and a thirteen-year-old son. One is called Marta, the other María, and the boy is Pedro. The justices of this city hassle us, apprehending us and taking my children and placing them with other people, as [my daughter] are honest maidens who live confined, I supplicate to Your Majesty to give me licence to remain in this city as we always have been …38

Another striking example is the story of Juan de Ayala, an elderly Morisco citizen of Marbella who wrote to the council in 1571 asking to be exempt from the deportation and to remain in his home of over forty years. His petition aimed to demonstrate his assimilation by detailing a history of early baptism, union with an Old Christian family through marriage, and service to the Crown during the Morisco rebellion. Ayala was a native of Azamor (Morocco) who had moved to Spain and been baptized a Catholic as a child. His provenance means that Ayala’s case was not entirely typical, as his parents’ would have been voluntary converts in their immigration to Granada; still, Ayala’s experience cannot be severed from that of his Morisco neighbours, and indeed his inclusion in the plans for deportation reveals the complexity of who was considered to

35 AGS - CCA - CED, 259, 28-29: "Creación del Consejo de Población" (December 26, 1570, Madrid). A facsimile of this document is published in the AGS exposition catalogue Los Moriscos. Españoles trasterrados, en el Archivo General de Simancas (2010), p.121-122. One of Philip’s many committees, this council included high-ranking ministers of justice, including the president of the audiencia of Granada, and would meet when necessary. This council received and ruled on many hundreds of petitions from the Moriscos, as discussed below. These records are found in the section Cámara de Castilla at the Royal Archive of Simancas. Among others, see “Memoriales de Moriscos y otras personas y corporaciones presentadas a la Junta de Poblacion, 1571-1573” (AGS, CC, legajos 2169 and 2170).
36 AGS, CC, Legajo 2170, folio 54.
37 AGS, CC, Legajo 2170, folio 52.
38 AGS, CC, Legajo 2170, folio 62 (c. 1571-73): “maria diaz natural delreyno degra nada digo q’yo soy pobre y biuda tengo dos hijas donzellas y un hijo de treze años q’s llama la una marta y la otra maria y el muchacho pedro ylas justiçias desta cibdad nos a molestan prendiendo nos y molestandonos tomandome mis hijos y poniendolos conotras personas siendo como son donzellas onestas y recogidas suplican a V. m+d seme mande dar liçencia para poder estarenestaçibdad como siempre emos estado …”
be a Morisco. Ayala himself asserted that he had always lived as a Christian, received communion, confessed his sins and observed the sacraments. His daughter was married to an Old Christian man who had been captured by the Morisco rebels. Furthermore, Ayala claimed to have remained loyal to the king during the Morisco rebellion in 1568, even having served the royal cause by helping to feed the Christian army. He begged the king to show mercy by allowing him to remain with his wife and household in Marbella. Ayala’s petition is one of hundreds written by Granadan Moriscos in formal protest of their deportation. The outcome of his case, and many others, is unknown.

The resettlement of the Granadan Moriscos throughout the Crown of Castile was called a *repartimiento*, meaning distribution or division. An officer named Don Alonso de Sandoval oversaw the removal of 2057 Granadan Moriscos to the Old Castilian towns of Valladolid, Segovia, Arévalo, Olmedo, Medina del Campo and Palencia. Sandoval had parted ways in Toledo from a second group headed for Ávila, Salamanca, and Zamora under the charge of Antonio de la Hoz. Valladolid first received Granadan deportees on December 17, 1570, when Sandoval arrived in Puente de Duero with 501 exiled Granadans. He delivered them to the corregidor of Valladolid, Licenciado Ximénez de Cabredo. 208 Moriscos were to be settled in the city, the rest bound for surrounding villages and hamlets. There are multiple records of this *repartimiento* composed by Sandoval, Cabredo, and Cabredo’s successor Alonso de Messia, all discussed below. However, it is not entirely clear how many deportees were settled in Valladolid after

---

39 AGS, CC, legajo 2169, folio s.n.
40 Sebastián de Covarrubias provided the following definition in his *Teso de la Lengua Castellana, o Española* (Madrid, 1611): “REPARTIR es diuidir alguna cosa en partes. Repartimiento, a tal division. Repartidor, el que la haze.” “Repartimiento” was the term used to refer to the distribution of the properties of conquered Muslims to Christian settlers and nobles during the “re”-conquest of the kingdoms of Spain. According to the Royal Academy of Spanish, “repartimiento” was also used in the early sixteenth century in reference to the colonization, resettlement, and forced labour requirements (*encomienda*) of Native Americas ("repartimiento de indios"). “Repartimiento,” Real Academia Española, “Diccionario de la lengua española.” http://dle.rae.es
41 AGS, CC, Legajo 2156, folio 84. This is confirmed in Vincent, “L’expulsion des Morisques du Royaume de Grenade,” 222 and 240.
42 AGS CC, Legajo 2165, folio 126.
43 The figure is given alternately as 500 or 501 Moriscos. The records are for the 1570 delivery of Granadan deportees to Valladolid are: AGS CC, legajo 2165, folio 126 (early 1571); AGS CC, legajo 2159, folios s.n. (January 1571); AGS CC, legajo 2162, folios 36 and 193 (March 22, 1571); AGS CC, legajo 2163, folio 42 (July 29, 1571).
Sandoval’s arrival in December of 1570. Cabredo made references to having been ordered to prepare for subsequent deliveries but I have not found evidence that those plans were carried out. The next allotment I can confirm took place in 1572, when 391 Moriscos from Torres, Canena, Ximena, Xodar, Bedmar, Garciaez, and Albanchez were resettled in the region. Preparations for this deportation began in March of 1572, when Granadan Chancery President Pedro de Deza granted the commission to expel the Morisco populations of these seven towns and villages near Jaen to Captain Francisco de Arteaga (whose profiteering is discussed above) and Juan Sarabia. The 1572 deportees arrived in Valladolid in multiple groups and at different times between summer and the end of that year.

The Crown had intended that only a few Moriscos from Granada would be assigned to each town and village, with larger quotas for urban centers such as Valladolid. These deportees were to find work and become self-sustaining members of the community; they would become faithful Catholics and loyal Castilians through intermarriage with and under the influence of their Old Christian neighbours, who could exemplify good Catholic lives. The Granadans were therefore prohibited from living in only each other’s company or in local Morisco communities, such as the

---

44 The question has been complicated by errors I have found published in secondary sources. María del Mar Gómez Renau describes three deliveries (“remesas”) of Granadan Moriscos to Valladolid in 1570-1571 but does not include the one I located in 1572. I believe her mistake derives from an incorrect reading of AGS, CC, Legajos 2162, 2163, and 2165, in which she understands later reports about the initial December 1570 delivery as evidence of subsequent deliveries. See Gómez Renau, Comunidades marginadas en Valladolid: mudéjares y moriscos, s. XV-XVI (Valladolid: Diputación Provincial de Valladolid, 1993), 110-115.

45 In AGS, CC, legajo 2159, Cabredo was told to expect more Moriscos (deliveries of 500, 600 and 100) but I do not believe that these took place. Bernard Vincent corroborates my suspicion that these planned repartimientos did not take place in the winter of 1570-1571. He writes that there were plans for a second distribution of Moriscos that would have moved Granadan populations further away from the south, ideally into northwest Spain (northwest Castile, Asturias, Galicia). In this scenario, Ávila, Caceres, Palencia, and Valladolid were to receive unchanged quotas. But Vincent argues that this repartimiento never took place. He provides the evidence that many towns that were meant to receive Moriscos according to the plan laid out never received these populations. See “L’expulsion des Morisques du Royaume de Grenade,” 230-231.

46 AGS, CC, legajo 2171, folios s.n.: “Instrucion para sacarlos moriscos de xodar y otras partes. de Madrid a 14 de marzo 1572.”; “Comission para sacar los moriscos de xodar y otras partes. De Madrid a 14 de marzo 1572.” AGS, CC, legajo 2172 also includes letters from Granada Chancery President Pedro de Deza to the king describing the preparations for the deportation (April-June 1572). The removal did not begin until June; many factors caused delays, including Holy Week celebrations and heavy rain that made roads impassable.

47 I have not located the same level of documentation for this resettlement as I have for the first in 1570. In AGS, CC, legajo 2172, folios s.n. we learn that Juan Sarabia had already gone to Valladolid in June of 1572 with a group of Granadan deportees.

48 Philip II, “Pragmática” (1572), 34.
Barrio de Santa María in Valladolid. The king’s objectives were made clear to his officials in each town:

To our corregidor of the town of Valladolid. You know or ought to know about the state of affairs in the Kingdom of Granada and how for the quietude and pacification of the kingdom we have ordered the expulsion of the Moriscos of the said kingdom. To avoid the inconveniences that have and could occur from their being together, and so that they might be better indoctrinated and be Christians, we are resettling them in cities and towns and places in our kingdoms, separated and divided so that there are no more than one or two in each parish of each town, or according to the disposition and accommodation of each place … that they may earn a living and live self-sustained … 49

Yet the resettlement did not proceed according to plan. Administrators in Valladolid were overwhelmed by the arrival of the Granadans. The deportees were not robust farm hands eager to join their new communities. They were poor, exiled, and marched to within an inch of their lives; many were sick and dying. They were foreigners, suspected of disloyalty and heretical Islamic practices. Furthermore, the Moriscos were not able or willing to remain in many of the places in which they had been resettled. Isolated and unable to support themselves and their families, Granadans began to leave the countryside for the city within the first year. This unsupervised rural-to-urban migration was cause for concern for the authorities; officers were ordered to surveil, report, and punish Moriscos for illegal resettlement and travel.

In December 1570, the king requested jurisdictional reports for the purpose of coordinating the resettlement of the Granadan Moriscos. He wrote:

And to do this repartimiento as befits, we wish to have from you a detailed report of the villages in your lands and the jurisdiction of this town and your township, of the royal estates and free towns as well as the abbeys and noble estates, and of the citizens in each place, and also of the parishes in the town and in the said places, and the parishioners in each parish, and of the accommodation and offices and trades in each. 50

---

49 AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folio 7. Philip II from Madrid on December 11, 1570: “+ El Rey. Nuestro corregidor de la villa de vallid ya sabeis o deueis sauer El estado en que estan las cosas del reino degranada y como para la quietud y pacificacion del hemos mandado sacar todos los moriscos del dicho reino y porque para escusar los yconbienentes que destar juntos a auido y podrian suceder y para que se Puedan mejor dotrinar y ser xpianos a parecido que se repartan y pongan en las ciudades villas y lugares destos nuestros reynos por menudo apartados y diuididos por manera suesiendo posible no aya mas de vno v de dos En cada Perrochia de cada Pueblo o los que Paresciere selon la dispusicion y comodidad que hviere En el … en que Puedan ganar de comer y viuir sustentarse …”

50 AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folio 7. Philip II from Madrid on December 11, 1570: “… y para hacerse El repartimiento como conbienye queremos tener de vos rrelazion particular delos pueblos que ay En la tierra y juri.on dessa V.a y su corregimineto assi rrealengos y eximidos como abbadengos y desenorio y delos vezinos que cada vno tiene y tenbien delas perrochias que ay essa v.a y enlos dichos lugares y los perrochianos quetiene cada Perrochia y la comodidad yoficios y artificios queay enellos …” This word choice invites comparison with the practices and logics of reducción in the Spanish American colonies.
Corregidor Cabredo’s response — his “Register of the citizens and vicinity and parishes of Valladolid, and those of the places in its jurisdiction, lands and district” — details the socio-economic layout of the city and region.\(^{51}\) This is a demographic snapshot of Valladolid, a city home to a population of approximately 30,000 people (smaller than Seville and Toledo, on par with Granada and Córdoba) on the eve of the arrival of the deportees.\(^{52}\) In it, Cabredo painted a modest picture of the jurisdiction in an attempt to dissuade further settlements of Moriscos in the territory. He wrote that this was not a large region, with distances of two and a half leagues between towns and villages, and sufficiently supplied to maintain itself. The citizens of Valladolid earned their living primarily through the main agricultural activities of the region: wine, wheat, and raising livestock. Upper-class citizens owned the lands worked by the farmers and labourers of the lower social orders, and some lived off of the rents from their estates. The town also profited from the business and traffic generated by the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid. Yet recent events — namely the departure of the royal court in 1561 after the great fire that had destroyed the city centre — had immobilized local economic progress. Cabredo described the empty houses, closed businesses, departing merchants, slumping property values, and declining agricultural production that plagued the Valladolid region.\(^{53}\)

The corregidor’s point was that the deportees settled in Valladolid had to labour hard to survive and would not be able to support themselves without skilled occupations. Of those 501 Moriscos delivered by Sandoval in December 1570, Cabredo reported that many were female domestic servants and “not useful” people who survived on charity. He recommended that the king send incoming Granadans to noble estates (lugares de señorío) rather than to Valladolid or to nearby royal estates, free hamlets, or abbeys. He described these noble estates as very good places within five to nine leagues of Valladolid where the Moriscos could earn a living through farming and the tenants there could benefit from their labor.\(^{54}\) Similarly, the neighbouring town of

---

\(^{51}\) AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folios 6-7: “Registro de los vecinos y vecindad y parroquias que ay en Valladolid y en los lugares de su jurisdiccion y tierra y comarca.” In Chapter One, I discuss this report in my description of the Santiago parish and the Barrio de Santa María.


\(^{53}\) AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folio 7.

\(^{54}\) AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folio 7.
Simancas reported that the fifty Granadan deportees settled there were “ragged women but no working men.” Being too small and poor a place to accommodate these Moriscos, Simancas requested the assistance of a local nobleman (hidalgo) and sought help from the king. These reports reveal the unpreparedness of authorities in the region to deal with the influx of the exiled Moriscos; it is possible, too, that this was an excuse intended to avoid accommodating an undesirable population. There was a great disparity between initial assurances of the Crown and the unprepared arrival en masse of dying, sick, and impoverished exiles into unprepared regions.

In January of 1571, Cabredo was dealing with administrative delays and was still under the impression that another delivery of 500 Moriscos was on its way. The winter of 1570 was a bitterly cold one in Valladolid, with heavy snow and rain. These dismal conditions had disastrous results: 90 of the 500 deportees died by March 1571. Of the remaining 410, 208 lived in Valladolid while between 1 and 20 Moriscos each were living in 27 nearby locales. Of those Moriscos living in the city, some had been placed in homes and hospitals “according to their indispositions”; others lived in their own houses, while many worked and lived in the fields on the outskirts of town. 38 young Morisco men and women were working in service in Old Christian homes. The least fortunate begged for alms to survive.

55 AGS, CC, legajo 2157, folio 113 (January 11, 1571). "son mugeres desarrapadas y ningun hombre de trabajo." Diego de Ayala, the author of this report, wrote that Simancas was separate from the jurisdiction of Valladolid and so was not owed anything from that city's corregidor; he also emphasized the importance of Simancas as home of the royal archive.

56 This is a good example of why regional micro-histories are necessary in order to understand the story of the Moriscos. In some other places, the Granadan deportees were welcomed as labourers; see Trevor Dadson, Tolerance and Coexistence in Early Modern Spain: Old Christians and Moriscos in the Campo de Calatrava (Boydell & Brewer, 2014).

57 AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folios 6-7. “… All of this has at this moment begun to be done. And because the weather has been very bitter with snow and rains, I have not accomplished it with the brevity that your majesty ordered and that I desired, but I am hurrying with this task to the extent possible and will not rest until it is done, as is appropriate in the service of your majesty, whose royal person may our Lord guard, with the growth of many more kingdoms and lands, as we your vassals wish and as merits Christianity. From Valladolid, 10 of January 1571.”

58 AGS, CC, legajo 2162, folio 36.

59 AGS, CC, legajo 2162, folio 193: Valladolid (208); Olmos (4); Renedo (5); Puente de Duero (2); Santovenia (2); Castronuevo (5); Geria (8); Valdestilas (10); Villa Nueva (12); Viana (2); Peñaflor (12); Ciguñuela (8); Cabezón (12); Laguna (12); Tudela de Duero (20); Herrera (2); Boecillo (2); Villa de Zaratán (8); Mojados (12); Castro Beza (4); Villabáñez (15); Peñalba (2); Sardón (2); Valbuena (5); Traspinedo (3); Bamba (12); Olivares (20); Villa Nueva de los Infantes (1) = 410. (I've modernized the spelling of these place names; many now have the suffix 'del Duero')

60 AGS, CC, legajo 2162, folio 36.
Reports written by Cabredo’s successor as corregidor, Don Alonso de Messia, corroborate this poor state of affairs. Messia’s records confirm three important demographic trends among the deportees: high mortality rates; the prevalence of poverty; and migration from rural areas to the city. These trends were interrelated, as death and poverty forced the relocation of many Granadan families. According to Messia, 101 of the Granadans were dead by late July 1571 — one fifth of the individuals who had arrived seven months earlier. 23 of the Granadan Moriscos settled in the city of Valladolid had died. Of the 38 Moriscos settled in nearby Simancas, 11 had died. These trends were common throughout the Valladolid region. In Tudela de Duero, 19 of 36 Moriscos had died. Of the surviving 17, 13 remained and 3 moved to Valladolid to work in the summer harvest. The last was a widow named Catalina de Aguilar; she married a Granadan Morisco named Diego Gerónimo and the couple left Tudela de Duero to live in Valladolid. Even after relocating, many Granadans were reduced to begging and menial labour. One family left Olmos, as the place was too poor to support them; they went to Valladolid to find work carrying water and sewing to support their child. A Morisco settled in Peñaflor was crippled, and departed without license to Medina de Rioseco to beg for charity.

Many Granadans relocated in order to find work. Most often, they left rural areas to find work in the city of Valladolid or to participate in the harvest in a nearby village. Spanish officials had intended that the Granadan Moriscos would become agricultural laborers in rural Castile. Under this plan, they would satisfy a local need for labour and would remain isolated from their former Morisco communities. However, many claimed that they could not earn a living in their new settings, while others left to find more desirable work and to be closer to their kin. The deportees were not familiar with Castilian farming methods and many were not inclined to work in the fields to turn a profit for Castilian landowners. Many became self-supporting agricultural workers or traders and peddlers. They supplied urban markets with produce and foodstuffs through their work in horticulture and transportation. These forms of work required a significant amount of travel, and this mobility facilitated contact and communication between the Granadan

---

61 AGS, CC, legajo 2163, folio 42.
62 AGS, CC, legajo 2163, folio 42. According to Messia, there were 231 Granadan Moriscos living in the city of Valladolid in late July 1571. His report states that 254 had been living there before 23 died.
63 AGS, CC, legajo 2163, folio 42 (1571).
64 AGS, CC, legajo 2163, folio 42.
The long-term effect of this migration from rural to urban places was that the majority of Moriscos in Old Castile lived in cities by the end of the sixteenth century. Valladolid was one of eight cities that became home to three-quarters of the Granadans settled in northwestern Castile.

It was, however, illegal for Granadan Moriscos to relocate without a license. The centerpiece of Philip II’s policy for managing the deported populations was the “Pragmatic and declaration on the Moriscos from the Kingdom of Granada, and the order to be kept concerning them.” Issued in Madrid on October 6, 1572, it set out regulations pertaining to the settlement, Christian instruction, surveillance and protection of the Granadan deportees. Among other things, it banned them from traveling without passports, from carrying weapons or speaking Arabic. The pragmatic decreed that no Granadan Moriscos were permitted to leave the place where they were resettled without an official and personal license due to the danger of them returning to their native kingdom.

To that end, the punishment for any Moriscos who left their assigned locations without license and went to within ten leagues of the Kingdom of Granada was death. Granadan Moriscos caught within ten leagues of the kingdoms of Aragon, Valencia, or Navarre would be punished with perpetual galley service. Such men were “received by the galleys of Spain to serve in them as rowers … for, having been deported from the Kingdom of Granada and taken to Castile, they returned to the said Kingdom without license nor order of His Majesty.” These penalties were

---

67 See the following cases brought against Granadan Moriscos who left the places in which they had been registered: ARCV, EJ 1548, 3 (1586): “Ejecutoria del pleito litigado por el fiscal del rey con Alonso Hernández y Alvaro González, moriscos de Granada, presos en la cárcel pública de Zamora, sobre haber abandonado Salamanca, ciudad en la que estaban alistados, sin el permiso del Calcid del reino, pasando a vivir a Zamora”; ARCV, EJ 1628, 1 (1588): “Ejecutoria del pleito litigado por el fiscal del rey con Massi Miguel, Ambrosio de Pero Afán, Francisco de Losa, Luis de Málaga, Diego de Jaén, Diego de Segura y Hernando de Ribera, moriscos de Granada, vecinos de Palencia y Dueñas (Palencia), sobre haber abandonado sin permiso dichas ciudad y villa, en las que están alistados.”
68 Philip II, “Pragmática” (1572), 31.
69 Philip II, “Pragmática” (1572), 32-33.
70 AGS, CC, legajo 2185, folios s.n. (1583): “Relacion de los morisco que sean Receuido alas galeras despaña para seruir enellas al Remótoda. subsidia. Por que siendo sacados del Reyno degranada y lleuados acastilla y otras partes sean buelto al dho Reyno sin licencia ni orden de su magestad.” This particular report lists fourteen men.
lessened to enslavement for minors; children in such cases would be taken from their parents and placed in the service of Old Christians. Moriscos caught traveling without license but not in or near Granada, Valencia, or Aragon would incur a punishment of one hundred lashes and four years of galley service; women and children would become domestic servants in Old Christian homes for four years, the children separated from their parents and given religious instruction. Old and New Christians alike were obliged to denounce fugitives (including their own relatives) to the local justices or face thirty days in prison. In addition to supervising the Granadans and tracking down any who fled, local authorities were to decide what additional punishments to mete out to fugitives. Collaborators faced serious consequences: Morisco accomplices would receive the same punishment as the fugitive, while Old Christian co-conspirators would be banished from the kingdom for two years and charged a fine of ten thousand maravedís (divided and paid in three equal parts to the royal treasury, the justice overseeing the case, and the person who denounced the criminal). 71

These restrictions were precautionary and punitive measures placed upon a population charged collectively with rebellion. In the international context of the era, the king and his advisors believed it was too risky to permit Moriscos to return to Granada or, worse, to depart for Ottoman lands. Direct precedent for these policies can be found at the end of the first Granadan War; in 1501, Muslims were barred from entering the Kingdom of Granada at the time when the Mudejars of that realm were ordered to choose between baptism and expulsion. 72 In the aftermath of the 1502 conversions, it was made illegal for Moriscos in the Crown of Castile to move to Granada, or to sell their property or conduct trade in that kingdom. 73 Likewise, the Moriscos in the Crown of Aragon (baptized 1521-1526) were forbidden to relocate without license. Those rules had been a product of the monarchy’s apprehensions over population loss in the southern kingdoms and fears of Moriscos making pilgrimage to or relocating to Islamic lands. 74 They were part of a tradition of policies restricting the movement of suspect people, such as the 1499 provision

---

71 Philip II, “Pragmática” (1572), 31-33.
72 “Pragmática dada por los Reyes Católicos prohibiendo la entrada de musulmanes en el Reino de Granada y ordenando la expulsión de los musulmanes que permanecen en él (exceptuado los que son esclavos),” in Ana Isabel Carrasco Manchado, De la convivencia a la exclusión: Imágenes legislativas de mudéjares y moriscos. Siglos XIII-XVII (Madrid: Sílex, 2012), 226-227.
73 See “Pragmática dada por los Reyes Católicos sobre que los recién convertidos de Castilla no se trasladen al reino de Granada (1502, septiembre, 17. Toledo.)” in Carrasco Manchado, 237-239.
74 Fernández Chaves and Pérez García, “Mobility under suspicion,” 237-240.
prohibiting Cartagena and other seaports from letting converts from Judaism or Islam depart via their harbours, or the bans on New Christians traveling or relocating to the Americas.  

After 1570, royal policies requiring licenses for Morisco travel and resettlement were influenced specifically by concerns that Moriscos might repopulate Granada and fears of fugitive Granadan bandits terrorizing the Castilian countryside. The king received reports of “many Moriscos who had been taken to Castile” having returned to Granada. Officers wrote to the king from Granada, reporting that “moors” (moros) were still roaming the kingdom — some joining bands of highwaymen known as monfíés, others returning to look for family, friends, and homesteads. One officer reported to the king, in January 1571, that “some moors still go about in the sierras and further along the coast. From those who have been captured we know that many of these were deported to Castile and have returned. It is believed that if they could return, others who are there would do the same.” Royal officers, such as Captain Arteaga and his associate Juan Sarabia, were tasked with tracking down fugitive Moriscos. In 1572, Granada Chancery President Don Pedro de Deza wrote that this business of capturing fugitives was difficult work because some Old Christians were hiding Moriscos to help them to escape the deportation. Many Moriscos did return to Granada, and by 1580 an estimated 10,000 Moriscos lived in that kingdom.

---

75 For the 1499 provision, see AHN, Inquisición, libro 1254, folios 15-16. For an example of the rules against New Christian travel to the Americas, see “Provisión para que ningún hijo ni nieto de quemado sin reconciliación de judío no moro, por la Santa Inquisición, ni ninguno nuevamente convertido de moro ni judío pueda pasar a las Indias (1539, octubre, 3. Madrid.)” in Carrasco Manchado, 265-266. This topic has been treated by Karoline P. Cook in “Navigating Identities: The Case of A Morisco Slave in Seventeenth-Century New Spain,” The Americas 65,1 (2008): 63-79 and Forbidden Passages: Muslims and Moriscos in Colonial Spanish America (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016)

76 AGS, CC, legajo 2157, expediente 160: “Copía de dos capítulos de carta del Duque de Arcos para su M.d […] hebrero 1571.”

77 AGS, CC, legajo 2157, folio 147. Francisco de Gutiérrez de Cuellar to Philip II, from Granada: ““todaVia andan algunos moros por las sierras y mas por la costa y de algunos que sean tomado se Entiende que muchos dellos son delos que de castilla sean buelto y es de creer que si pudieren bolberse otros …”

78 AGS, CC, legajo 2172, folio s.n. (June 18, 1572).

79 AGS, CC, legajo 2172, folio s.n. (June 18, 1572): “sean ocupado en buscarlos y recogerlos que es negocio de harto trabajo y dificultad por la mucha negociacion y solicitud que los xipanos viejos ponen en encubrir y transportar los moriscos que pueden al fin sean recogido” Unfortunately, in Deza’s letter we do not learn anything else about these Old Christians who were sympathetic to the plight of their New Christian Morisco neighbours. Other than potential evidence of tolerance and coexistence between Old and New Christian neighbours, I believe these could have been Old Christian lords who wanted to keep Morisco laborers.

80 AGS, CC, legajos 2182, folios s.n.: “Relacion delos moriscos libres y captiuos y en administracion que ay en el Reino de Granada” accounts for 8701 Moriscos in Granada in 1580. The figure 10,000 comes from Mercedes García-Arenal and Fernando Rodríguez Mediano, Un Oriente español: los moriscos y el Sacromonte en tiempos de
This anxiety over the unsupervised movement of the Granadans is tangible in the reports from Valladolid. In one of his letters to the king, corregidor Cabredo recommended physically marking the newly arrived Granadan Moriscos as a security measure to control their mobility. He proposed that they be branded on the cheek to indicate to which repartimiento they belonged and with signs to show that they were free people. Under this plan, fugitives could be more easily identified, returned to their places of resettlement, and punished accordingly. This shocking proposal to brand free people not individually charged with a crime (though collectively guilty of rebellion) would have been a drastic precautionary measure, a kind of pre-emptive punishment. It most certainly was not carried out, but remains a telling indication of the heightened anxieties over Granadan itinerancy.  

The rules against unlicensed Morisco relocation and travel became common knowledge. These restrictions were publicized in the 1570 royal instructions for the resettlement. Philip’s 1572 pragmatic elaborated upon and entrenched these prohibitions; subsequently, the law was formally reissued on May 8, 1573 and was cited countless times by administrators and justices. In November 1572, corregidor Messia executed the king’s pragmatic with his own specifications for how the laws should be enforced in Valladolid. The town crier read Messia’s version of the king’s orders (“por voz de pregonero publico”) in front of the corregidor’s house on November 9, 1572. In attendance were most of the Granadan Moriscos resettled in Valladolid as well as many of their Old Christian neighbours. People remembered these rules; witnesses in the Valladolid trial of a Morisco man charged with traveling without a passport testified to having asked the defendant...
how it was that he traveled freely to trade at markets despite the regulation against such unlicensed itinerancy. The many reiterations of this rule are direct responses to such problems on the ground, revealing a lack of control over the mobility and settlement of the deportees.

Not all fugitives attempted to return to their homes in Granada. Many migrated in search of employment and family within Old Castile. Already by the summer of 1571, officers from Valladolid were patrolling the region to return to their assigned locations those deportees who left without licenses. These included five Moriscos resettled in Valdestillas, a Morisca woman who had left Agunueula for Valladolid, and three men who had left Villanuebla to find work. On August 20, 1571, the corregidor of Palencia informed the king that two Granadan Morisco men assigned to live there (one an elderly widower, the other with his wife) had left Palencia for Valladolid. Once apprehended and returned to Palencia under guard, they were locked in the public jails, awaiting the king’s orders. Though not always successful, the apparatus of local government was clearly dedicated to surveillance and management of the deportees.

Illicit Granadan Morisco migration in and around Valladolid was sustained on a large-scale. The “Registro y memoria de los moriscos de Valladolid” was compiled by the city scribe, Juan de Fanega, and sent by corregidor Armentero to Philip II in March of 1583. According to this census, 278 Morisco individuals had relocated to Valladolid after their settlement and registration in other places; these people were called “newcomers” (advenedizos). What’s more, 229 individuals registered to live in Valladolid were found to be absent (ausentes) at the time of the census taking, having left to live in other places. All but a few had no known license to relocate.

Poverty was the stated driving force behind many of the moves. For the most part, Granadan “newcomers” to Valladolid described their inability to provide for their families in their assigned

---

84 The trial of Diego Calderón is discussed below. See ARCV, Pleitos Civiles (PL.CIV.), 218.2 and ARCV, EJ 1702.4.
85 AGS ,CC, legajo 2163, folio 42.
86 AGS, CC, legajo 2158, folio 135.
87 AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folios s.n. (March 10, 1583). This census does not list the native Castilian Moriscos of the Barrio de Santa María or the Granadan Moriscos living in the city legally. Rather, it includes five categories of Granadan deportees living in Valladolid: newcomers (advenedizos); prisoners (reclusos); freed slaves; absentees (ausentes); and the dead (muertos). The listed totals are 90 households of newcomers (totaling 278 individuals), 7 prisoners and their families (totaling 22 individuals) 13 freed slaves and their families (totaling 61 individuals), 229 absentees, and 179 deceased. Furthermore, Fanega’s closing remarks reveal that there were 220 heads of households (individual count unknown) living in Valladolid with their families and registered to be there. Therefore, we know that there were 340 Granadan Morisco households residing in Valladolid in 1583. This figure is supported by the census of 1589, which lists 350 Granadan Morisco households in Valladolid; see AGS, CC, legajo 2196, folios s.n.
towns and villages, and explained that they relocated “out of hunger” (por hambre) and in order to earn a living.88 Others had arrived in the city in early days of the resettlement after having been left behind or fallen ill during a forced march.89 Some deportees claimed that they had not been assigned to any particular place. It is possible that they may have been deported but never resettled — the expulsion was in many ways a disorganized affair — or perhaps they decided against disclosing this information for fear of being made to return. In all of these cases, the “newcomers” sought mercy from the authorities and aimed to avoid accusations of fleeing the kingdom.90

There certainly was a great deal of truth in these claims of desperation. However, this census also reveals unauthorized gatherings of families from the same Granadan hometowns — migratory trends that reflect Morisco resistance to the monarchy’s legislated dispersal of Granadan communities. I observed the reconstruction of pre-expulsion kinship and community networks in my examination of the places of origin and places of registration of the 278 newcomers and 229 absentee Granadans in the 1583 Morisco census of Valladolid. The largest example of this were the 35 families deported from the neighbouring Granadan towns of La Peza, Guadix, and Cogollos de Guadix (east of the city of Granada) who reunited illegally in Valladolid after having been dispersed by the expulsion. The majority of the natives of La Peza had been deported to the Burgos region, specifically to the towns of Lences, Melgar, and Villarias, where it seems they were not able to earn a living. Others had been registered to live in Olmedo, Toledo, and Segovia. Before

88 AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folios s.n. There are seventeen examples: 6. Lucas de Molina, “que se fuese con dios porque no se podia sustentar y ansi se vino a esta villa con su casa e muger”; 8. Simon Garcia, “e por no ser lugar para poder ganar de comer se vino a esta villa”; 25. Lorencio Pérez, “dice se vino a esa villa porque en tordesillas no tenian en que ganar de comer”; 31. Gaspar de Simancas, “se vino por la anbre a esta villa donde despues aca a residido”; 43. Lorenzo Herrez, “vino a esta villa abra quarto anos por el anbre que avia quedose en ella con su casa”; 44. Cebrian de Mendoza, “dijo que con el anbre de agora quarto años se vino a esta villa con licencia e con su casa”; 45. Lorencio Caballero, “dijo que por la anbre agora seis anos se vino a esta villa con su casa”; 47. Alonso Herrez, “dijo que [el] no auer en que ganar de comer se vino a esta villa abra un ano”; 48. Sebastian de Talavera, “dice que con la anbre se vino abra quarto anos a esta villa”; 53. Sebastian Ramos, “que se vino a esta villa por no se poder mantener”; 55. Catalina de Mendoza (widow), “dijo que su marido la saco del dho lugar por la hanbre e la trajo a esta villa”; 61. Luis de Quiros, “binose por la anbre”; 69. Luis Herrez, “vino quando la anbre”; 82. Luis de Granada, “nose poder sustentar en arevalo”; 84. Juan de Padilla, “por no se poder mantener”; 85. Miguel Sanchez, “por no se poder sustentar el en su casa”; 87. Juan de Monragon, “por no se poder sustentar.”
89 AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folios s.n. For example, Francisco Herrez de Alarcon, a twenty-five year old coal-vendor and a native of Jerez, Marquesado de Cenete, lived in Valladolid with his wife Isabel de Avila and their two young children. A child during the deportation, he was left behind on the road and arrived in Valladolid as a servant to Don Antonio de Toledo; Francisco stayed to make a life in Valladolid after his employer moved to Madrid.
90 AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folios s.n. There are also three cases of relocating to Valladolid in order to litigate at the Royal Chancery Court for the freedom of enslaved minors: 41. Maria de España; 60. Garcia de Almudey; 88. Isabel Corilla. I discuss the litigation of Granadan slaves in Chapter Four.
they reunited in Valladolid, the natives of Guadix and Cogollos de Guadix had been scattered by the deportation to places such as Ocaña, Medina del Campo, Toledo, Segovia, Valdemoro, and Arévalo. Likewise, thirteen natives of the city of Granada moved their families to Valladolid, though they were registered to live in places like Chinchón and Toledo. Five families native to Albolote (vega de Granada) were deported to Tordesillas but relocated illegally to Valladolid.\textsuperscript{91} Similar reunions occurred in other regions, where, “in regrouping themselves against the orders of Philip II’s pragmatic, the Moriscos regenerated ties of social solidarity sundered by war and slavery.”\textsuperscript{92}

While it is possible that coincidence could have brought together two, three, or more families from the same hometown, the patterns and larger numbers point to purposeful reunions that were intended to recreate community and kinship structures broken by the expulsion. The census discloses many familial ties that connect some of the runaways, spelling out the relationships between husband, wives, and their children. Shared surnames and common circumstances point to likely associations, such as in the cases of cousins and adult siblings registered consecutively with their families. For example, five newcomer families shared the surname Ribera, and all were natives of La Peza.\textsuperscript{93} Beyond clear evidence, this census appeals to conjecture. For example, only two natives of Lorca were registered as having relocated to Valladolid, and no explicit connection between them is recorded. But consider that they were both single men of 25 and 26 years old, both registered in Salamanca, and both had arrived in Valladolid six years earlier — suddenly, it is reasonable to imagine that Juan López and Alonso Herrez may have been friends or even relatives who made the move to Valladolid together.\textsuperscript{94} Ties between nuclear Morisco families were not always made explicit by the census makers, but the illicit resettlement of deported families recorded within these documents points to such relationships.

The kinship of extended families was a significant factor of Morisco identity and group cohesiveness, a legacy of their pre-conversion community structures.\textsuperscript{95} Beyond the ties of family

\textsuperscript{91} AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folios s.n.
\textsuperscript{92} Fernández Chaves and Pérez García, “Mobility under suspicion,” 246.
\textsuperscript{93} AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folios s.n. See entries #20. Isabel de Ribera, #21. García de Ribera, #24. Francisco de Ribera, #40. Miguel de Ribera, and #54. Alonso de Ribera. All five were married adults, four had children.
\textsuperscript{94} AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folios s.n.
\textsuperscript{95} See Mark D. Meyerson, \textit{The Muslims of Valencia in the age of Fernando and Isabel: between coexistence and crusade} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), especially chapter 6, “Conflict and Solidarity in Mudejar Society.”
and extended kin, Moriscos gravitated toward other Moriscos, who congregated in urban centres in this region. Some newcomers married Granadans deportees already living in Valladolid. Two Moriscos from the Alpujarras region — Julian Ballestero, a native of Jubiles, and Hernando Gracian, a native of Ujijar deported to the region of Toledo — each married a daughter of Luis de Salazar, a Granadan Morisco man deported to Valladolid. Juan de Aguilar was a Morisco native of Pinillos deported to Medina del Campo; while there, he married the daughter of Domingo Herrez, a Granadan Morisco deported to Valladolid. The young couple (he was an eighteen-year-old water-carrier) relocated without license to Valladolid, apparently to live near her family. Despite differences of individual circumstances, Granadan deportees shared a language, a common past, and together faced the same suspicions and obstacles. They were categorized as group by the state. Moreover, the Moriscos collectively inherited regionally specific cultural traditions; at the centre of these was a connection (stronger for some, more distant for others) to the *ummah*, the Muslim community of believers. This is a difficult thing to measure in late sixteenth-century Castile; in any case, the illegal congregation of dispersed Moriscos was a way in which they fought for the survival of their families and communities.

Most entries in the 1583 Morisco census make no mention of a license to travel or permission to move. That these were illicit relocations is implied by the purpose of the census itself and in contrast to the few entries in which a license is mentioned. Other than one family of La Peza natives sent to Valladolid with permission from Juan de Soto, only two newcomer families produced papers authorizing their presence in Valladolid. The first was Cebrian de Mendoza, a seventy-year-old native of Granada registered in Chinchón who had relocated to Valladolid four years earlier with his wife, fifty-year-old Isabel de Moya. The other was Gaspar de Zafra, a native of Frajan in the region of Ronda, who produced a license signed by Don Antonio de Luna; he had moved to Valladolid only four months earlier with his wife Helena Herrez, his young daughter,

---

96 Meyerson, *The Muslims of Valencia*, 255: “An essential element buttressing the faith of individual Muslims was the sense of belonging to a larger community of believers, the *ummah*. Whatever the situation of the *ummah’s* individual component politics, even those long since subjugated to Christian powers, membership in the *ummah* served to distinguish them from all non-Muslims.”

97 AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folios s.n. The lack of a license is only explicitly mentioned in cases where such information clarifies the known details: a fugitive servant (36. Gaspar Sánchez), an absent husband (38. Bernaldino Torrijos), and a man in litigation for Old Christian status (81. Lacaro López).
and his niece. There are five cases of licenses issued in the list of absentees. No known attempts were made to remove the “newcomer” Granadan deportees from Valladolid and many of them are named in the 1589 census of Moriscos in the city. It appears that the authorities in Valladolid tolerated the presence of the newcomer fugitives once they were formally registered, in known and fixed places of residence, and proved to be largely self-sustaining. Royal correspondence hints that this was decided to be the easiest course of action.

In fact, this strategy was in keeping with the precedent set in granting licenses to deportees who could not earn a living and had the option of living with relatives in another town. For example, when the only Granadan Morisco man settled in Puente de Duero died, his widow and child were granted a license in 1571 by corregidor Cabredo to move into her sister’s home in Valladolid. Morisco petitioners for licenses largely focused on their poverty and their need to reunite with family:

Andrés Padilla, of the natives of the Kingdom of Granada, registered in the town of Ocaña, says that he is very poor and has his wife and four children to sustain by his own labour. And as these are desolate times, he cannot by the labour of his person provide for himself as well as his wife and children. He has in Valladolid a daughter and a son, each married, and he would do better to live with them, and it would benefit them to have their father with them in the said town of Valladolid. As he currently lives in Ocaña, he asks and humbly supplicates that your majesty may be served to order license given to him to go with his wife and children to live and be registered in Valladolid with the married children he has there, because in this way he might have a better life and provide for his wife and children, and in this he would receive great charity and mercy.

98 AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folios s.n. Among the “absentees”: Domingo de Uleylas, his wife Elvira, and their son Ambrosio procured a license to relocate from Valladolid to Cordoba; the family had fallen ill, and they moved to take refuge with Domingo’s brother. [7, 8, 9] María de Vaena (alias María de Aguilar) had a license to move with her two daughters to Medina del Campo in order to remarry. [47, 48, 49] Likewise, Isabel de Mendoza [59] and Beatriz de Caceres [60] were each granted licenses so that relatives in other towns could support them. Francisca de Martos was a seventy-five-year-old Granadan Morisca who was reduced by poverty to begging for alms in Valladolid; she was licensed to move to Seville so that she could live with her daughters. AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folios s.n. (1589).

99 AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folios s.n. (March 30, 1583).

100 A draft of a letter from Philip II to Armenteros refers to a new order permitting those who had relocated to remain in their chosen locations. See AGS, CC, legajo 2186, folio s.n. (May 1, 1594). This is likely a rescript of the request Padilla presented to the Junta de Hacienda del Reyno de Granada. It reads, “+ señor / Andrés Padilla, delos naturales del Reino de Granada, alistado en la v.a de Ocaña, dize, que El es muy pobre, y tiene su muger, y quatro hijos que sustenar con El trabajo de su persona, y por ser los tiempos tan esteriles, no puede con El trabajo de su persona sustener se, asi y asu muger y hijos, y tiene en Valladolid una hija, y un hijo casados, los quales tienen mejor con que pasar la vida, y le Remediarian como a su padre tiniendoole con sigo en la dha v.a de valladolid. Pide y suplica humillmente a V. Mag+ sea seruido de mandarle dar licençia para que con su muger y hijos pueda yrse y viuir alicantado en Valladolid con sus
Some petitioners also represented themselves as loyal servants of the Crown. Francisco Pérez Rocaici claimed to have served the king before the deportation as a baker (*panadero*) in five royal hospitals in Guadix, having been assigned to that office by Don Juan de Austria and the Bishop of Guadix, Don Melchor de Vozmediano. He was a seventy-five year old Morisco citizen of Valladolid when he requested to move to Jaén in 1592 in order to live among friends who could support him in his old age.\(^{103}\) Jaén (north of the city of Granada) and Ocaña (province of Toledo) are a long way from Valladolid. These and many other petitions reveal that deported Granadans sustained communication with family and friends across considerable distances.

Travel documents and licenses to relocate were the purview of royal officers such as the corregidor of Valladolid, who were required to report their issue to the king. Notices of resettlement also had to be given to local priests, so that they might supervise the church attendance and proper integration of the Granadans in their new parishes.\(^{104}\) Still, the king quickly became concerned that too many licenses were being issued and were resulting in the return of deportees to Granada. As early as 1571, Philip II sent letters to various towns asking whether they had granted licenses to any deported Moriscos permitting them to return to the Kingdom of Granada, having received reports of such activity.\(^{105}\) It is imaginable that some corregidores, reeling from the influx of deportees, hastily responded to their Morisco petitioners with permissions to leave. As a security measure in response to such concerns, the Royal Council took over the approving of licenses after 1576; these duties were then transferred to the Population Council in 1582.\(^{106}\) Yet official anxieties over Granadan Morisco itinerancy persisted. In July 1579, Philip issued a

---

hijos q alli tiene casados como de presente viue en ocaña, purque desta manera podra pasar mejor la vida, y sustener su muger y hijos, y enello Reçiuira gran limosna y merçed/"

\(^{103}\) AGS, CC, legajo 2195, folio s.n. (August 16, 1592).

\(^{104}\) Philip II, “Pragmática” (1572), 31-33.

\(^{105}\) AGS, CC, legajo 2163, folios 1-79: “Otro legajo de cartas de corregidores a S.M. con relación de los Moriscos que hay en sus partidos. Testimonios de entrega y relacion de licencias dadas, año de 1571.” Valladolid corregidor Don Alonso de Messia’s July 1571 report in response to this letter is discussed above (AGS, CC, legajos 2163, folios 42-43).

\(^{106}\) Fernández Chaves and Pérez García, “Mobility under suspicion,” 247.
warning to his officers across the kingdom regarding Granadan Moriscos who had left their assigned locations without license.  

In 1582, the Council of Population identified chronic corruption as a cause of disorder in this matter, reporting to the king that many dishonest notaries and officers accepted bribes to write false identity papers. The stereotype of the corrupt notary was well-established at this time; Kathryn Burns describes contemporary literary representations, common sayings, and a general distrust of notaries in the sixteenth-century Spanish world. 

The unscrupulousness was dangerous on many fronts; beyond making it possible for Moriscos to return to Granada, "they mocked the controls and invalidated the censuses and registers undertaken by the Church and civil authorities." A 1581 royal provision described the illegal transfer of passports and licenses between Granadans, "changing the names and using other forms of deception and stealth" in order to travel unchecked and commit a litany of crimes. 

Valladolid — teeming with lawyers and notaries who gathered around the Royal Chancery Court — was identified as a site of subversion. Corregidor Messia, too, had attributed false papers as a central reason why he and his agents found it difficult to control the mobility of Granadan Moriscos in the Valladolid region. These admonitions reveal fears over unbridled Morisco mobility; beyond this, they expose local disregard for bureaucratic procedures and the monarchy’s lack of control over the guarda de los moriscos, as Messia called the project.

Problems implementing the weapons ban on Granadan Moriscos in Valladolid also signaled the limits of royal control. Fears of itinerant and armed Granadans were closely related. In the 1572 pragmatic, the king prohibited both enslaved and free Granadan Moriscos from owning

---

107 AGS, CRC, 259.1 (July 11, 1579): “Relaciones y testimonios enviados por los corregidores y demás justicias, a petición del Consejo, sobre los moriscos procedentes del reino de Granada, y repartidos en diferentes lugares que había en las localidades.”


109 Fernández Chaves and Pérez García, “Mobility under suspicion,” 247. This example refers to a 1582 report sent from the Junta de Población to Philip II. The authors cite Pascual Boronat and Barrachina, Los moriscos españoles y su expulsión, v. 1 (1901) 592-593.

110 Fernández Chaves and Pérez García, “Mobility under suspicion,” 247-248. This example is from a royal provision in Malaga in 1581. The authors cite Florencio Janer, Condición social de los moriscos de España: causas de su expulsión, y consecuencias que esta produjo en el orden económico y político, 331-313.

111 AGS, CC, legajo 2174, folio s.n. Letter to Philip II, April 22, 1573. A 1589 visitation to the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid praised the legal talent of many of the judges, yet also uncovered corruption among others, including extortion and intimidation; see Richard L. Kagan, Lawsuits and litigants in Castile, 1500-1700. (University of North Carolina Press, 1981), 186-187.
or carrying all “offensive and defensive weapons” with the exception of the round-tipped knives they had been permitted to use in Granada. 112 The array of forbidden weaponry was impressive; various types of lances, arquebuses, pistols, scythes, crossbows, swords, daggers, and sharp knives were contraband. 113 Carrying weapons was a mark of honour and masculinity. Like mobility restrictions, the weapons ban was both precautionary and denigrating; it aimed to disarm and disgrace the conquered Moriscos. Yet the law proved difficult to enforce despite harsh penalties. 114 A particular problem arose in Valladolid, where Old Christian elites were found to be arming their hired Granadan Morisco footmen. Specifically, in 1583 the corregidor of Valladolid accused magistrates of the Royal Chancery Court and other high-ranking gentlemen of the city of employing Granadan Moriscos — young men such as Alonso Herrez and Diego Navarro — as armed footmen. 115 He wrote,

… here we cannot keep the commands regarding the Moriscos because most of the judges and officers employ them, especially as armed footmen. [The Moriscos] are abetted in this way, and also in that they speak Arabic and [some are] from other resettlements. And while I wish to proceed against some of them for wandering and even being suspected of thievery and for carrying weapons, they have escaped … others, who live with lords and gentlemen take their example to do the same. As it benefits them to have this liberty, they work for little or for nothing. This evil generation should be extirpated before it increases. 116

This letter encapsulates a host of interrelated problems that thwarted the monarchy's attempts to control the Granadan Moriscos resettled in Castile: unsupervised mobility and relocation; illegal

112 Philip II, “Pragmática” (1572), 35-36. Ferdinand and Isabel had made it illegal for Granadan Moriscos to carry weapons at the turn of the century; see “Pragmática para que ningún convertido del Reino de Granada tenga ni traiga armas ni pública ni escondidamente,” (Granada, 1501) in Carrasco Manchado, 228-229.

113 AGS, CC, legajo 2168, folios s.n. (November 1572).

114 Philip II, “Pragmática” (1572), 35-36: First time offenders were to be punished with the loss of all of their property, given in three equal parts to the royal treasury, the judge, and the denouncer. Six years of galley service would be added to this punishment upon a second offense, or perpetual galley service on a third strike. In addition to these penalties, the corregidor of Valladolid declared 100 lashes in public and 4 years galley service would be meted out to all offenders. See AGS, CC, legajo 2168, folio s.n. (November 1572).

115 AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folio s.n. (March 10, 1583). In the accompanying census lists, Alonso Herrez is entry #72 of the newcomers and Diego Navarro is entry #14 of the freed slaves. The occupation of each is recorded as footman (“lacayo”).

116 AGS, CC, legajo 2184, folio s.n. (March 10, 1583): “digo q. las pragmaticas sobre los moriscos no se pueden guardar aqui porq. los mas oydores y alcaldes se siruen dellos. y especialmente delacayos con armas q. en esto y en hablar algarauia, y en ser de otros repartimientos. y consentirse son fauorescidos. en tanto q. queriendo yo proceder contra algunos. por andar vagando y aun sospechosos deladrones y por traer armas me los han soltado y de traer por lacayos armados y en tonados a estos. Toman exemplo otros q biben con señores y caballeros para hacer lo mismo, y es grangeria q por Tener libertad siruen por poco ... y antes conviene extirpar q aumentar esta mata generation”
Corregidor Messia had addressed this situation a decade earlier (in November 1572) when he reported that numerous Morisco slaves lived in Valladolid and many carried swords and daggers in the entourage of their masters. He ordered at that time that each Morisco footman could carry only one sword, and then only in the presence of his master, on pain of 100 lashes. After receiving the corregidor's letter in 1583, the king wrote to the Chancery president to rectify this "negligence". It was felt that the liberal granting of travel licenses to Moriscos compounded the danger of their carrying weapons; the king recorded his concern over the murder, theft, and highway robbery allegedly committed by the armed and mobile Granadans. He ordered the criminal judges (alcaldes de crimen) of the Royal Chancery Court to ensure that no special licenses be issued for Granadan Moriscos to carry any weapons, regardless of their high-ranking employers.

This situation in Valladolid reveals the limits of royal power over local affairs. Local interests preceded the king’s agenda when judges and high-ranking officers broke the rules to benefit themselves. Moreover, the patron-client relations between Old Christian employers and Morisco servants reveal a kind of integration between local and immigrant populations. Judges and officers who were meant to be upholding the king’s laws apparently trusted their Granadan servants enough to arm them. Furthermore, in this case and many others the nuances of local history subvert the official narrative of the monarchy’s complete command over the populations of its dominion. The reports from Valladolid were certainly hyperbolic: there was no conspiracy of Granadan Morisco thieves hiring themselves out as footmen to gain access to weapons. Yet these reports do expose a divergence between the perspectives of the Old Christian elite and the monarchy. In the local context, decisions about who to trust and employ were made according to

---

117 AGS, CC, legajo 2168, folio s.n. (November 1572).
118 AGS, CC, legajo 2186, folio s.n. (March 30, 1583): “… y hauiendo sido informado que por el mucho descuydo y negligencia que las dhas justicias hauian tenido en Guardar y hazer que se guardase la dha pragmatica …”
119 AGS, CC, legajo 2186, folio s.n. (March 30, 1583).
120 Fernández Chaves and Pérez García provide context and supporting evidence for the renewed vigilance over Morisco mobility after 1580, in that “parish councilors of Seville denounced the faulty vigilance over the Moriscos, who had concentrated themselves in different neighborhoods far from the center and lived together in communal dwellings. Troubled by this situation, the parish councilors demanded that the city council fully comply with the pragmatic of 1572 …” (“Mobility under suspicion,” 245)
personal opinions and circumstances rather than according to the monarchy’s estimation of the Moriscos. Dadson also makes this argument in regard to the multiplicity of “official” opinions and the local subversion of central authority during the expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain in the early seventeenth century. He calls for historians to resist perpetuating the “official propaganda” of the early modern Spanish Crown and Church as a way to expose the plurality and coexistence of contemporary society. He writes,

> Early modern Spain was not a monolithic state following a single ideology; it was made up of a myriad of little states where the writ of local municipal government often did not run at all … It is well not to lose sight of this fact: the government of early modern Spain did not have the resources or the political structures to impose its will on all its subjects … Local reality proved in the end to be stronger than official rhetoric and the propaganda that it spawned.\(^\text{121}\)

Officially, exemptions to the weapons’ ban were permitted only in special cases of military service to the Crown. As with travel licenses, the impetus to grant this privilege usually came from a Morisco petitioner; here, too, we see deportees negotiating for exceptions to the postwar prohibitions with assertions of necessity and loyal service. In Valladolid, Gonçalo Geniz presented a request to the king for the right to bear arms in 1573. He claimed to have killed Aben Humeya, the leader (capitán e reycillo) of the rebel forces in Granada. Geniz stated that there was a price on his own head because of this assassination and therefore he needed to carry a weapon for his own protection.\(^\text{122}\) Another Morisco man, Vicente Calderón, carried a weapons license in Valladolid. Signed by Don Juan de Austria in Guadix on November 10, 1570, the license read:

> Don Juan de Austria: Because you, Vizente Calderón, citizen of Huxixar [Ugijar] and one of the New Christians of this Kingdom of Granada, have shown the great affection that you have for service to the king my lord during the rebellion of the said Moriscos, rebelling against obedience to his majesty, and [as] you have made certain particular services, it is a just thing that as such a demonstration is made ... We give and grant to you license and faculty that you may carry offensive and defensive weapons, [and] we order that all justices in these kingdoms not impede you.\(^\text{123}\)

---

\(^{121}\) Dadson, *Tolerance and Coexistence*, 122.

\(^{122}\) Archivo Histórico Provincial de Valladolid (hereafter AHPV), Protocolos Notoriales (PN), 452.657

\(^{123}\) AHPV, PN, 584.33: “Don Juan de austria Porquanto vos vizente calderon vezino de huzizar uno delos xpianos nuevos de este reino der granada aueys mostrado la gran aficion que teneyen al servicio del rey mi señor en el levantamiento que los dhos moriscos an echo rebelandose dela obedencia de su mag.d y aueys hecho algunos seruicios particulares yendo cosa justa que [con los] tales se agra alg.a demostraçion nos a pareçcido de dar os como por la [p.tes] os damos y concedemos liçençia y facultad que poays traer armas ofensibas y defensibas ordenando como ordenamos a todas y quales quer justiçias de estos reinos [que] por las treae no os den ynpedimento …”
While the dilemma surrounding fugitives, licenses, and weapons persisted, the Crown and local administrators recognized the need for some Moriscos to travel in order to work, particularly for commercial activity. In 1571, Valladolid corregidor Cabredo suggested making allowances for certain Moriscos to travel to make a living through trade. Philip II stated in his 1572 pragmatic that his intention was not to impede the Moriscos' ability to earn a living, echoing his 1570 instructions to ensure that resettled Granadans could “earn a living and live self-sustained.” The king therefore mandated access to limited-term licenses to travel for various mercantile activities, so long as those Moriscos never returned to Granada. The language in this royal pragmatic makes clear the Moriscos’ legal entitlement to these licenses (“we order that the said licenses be given … to the persons who request them …”), so long as they were free of suspicions of planning to go to Granada.

Valladolid was a major centre of trade in early modern Castile, and a significant number of Granadan Moriscos settled there became carters, muleteers (arrieros), and itinerant merchants. There was a local precedent tying Moriscos to trade: carting had become characteristic of local Castilian Mudéjars in the fifteenth century. Fears of Morisco itinerancy also predated the arrival of the Granadans. Earlier in the sixteenth century, the monarchy, Church, and local justices had been wary of Castilian Morisco merchants facilitating communication between the Morisco communities (former aljamas) in the Valladolid-Ávila region. To the authorities, this unsupervised mobility carried threats of Morisco escape from religious control (eliding parochial oversight and communicating knowledge of Islam) and of abetting the Ottoman enemy. Historians have shown how Mudejar and Morisco merchants did facilitate communication between morerías, morerías.

---

124 AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folio 7.
125 AGS, CC, legajo 2159, folio 7. Philip II from Madrid on December 11, 1570.
126 Philip II, “Pragmática” (1572), 32: "Y porque nuestra intencion no es que los dichos Moriscos sean embaraçados en el trato y comercio y modo de viuir que pueden tener, antes en esto sean ayudados y fauorecidos, mandamos que la dicha licencia se aya de dar, y de por tiempo limitado a las personas que la pidieren, siendo seguras y sin sospecha de que no se ausentarán ni yran, o en caso que desto no ouiesse tanta satisfacion, tomando dellos la seguridad que conuenga. Y encargamos a las justicias que te˜gan en esto muy particular cuenta y cuydado, teniendo principal fin a la guarda y custodia de los dichos Moriscos: y juntamente a que ellos pueda’ viuir tratar y megociar para su sistentamiento, con q’ en quanto toca a yr al reyno de Granada por ahora no se les ha de permitir darles licencia para ello en ningun manera, hasta que otra cosa mandemos."
including in the Valladolid-Ávila region. I have not, however, encountered evidence of Castilian Morisco merchants assisting Granadan traders or any specific interactions between these groups.

Still, Morisco merchants and traders needed to travel to markets throughout the region, such as the famous fairs (ferias) of the neighbouring town of Medina del Campo. Long-distance trade was also required to supply the royal court, located in Madrid from 1561-1601. For example, the king granted licenses to Granadan silk merchants from Pastraña to sell their wares at court. These were official papers issued to each passport holder that included his name and physical description along with his place of residence, the date of issue, and the terms of the license. Work in trade did allow Granadan Moriscos a greater degree of liberty than was desirable in the eyes of the authorities. As L.P. Harvey has noted regarding the numerous Morisco muleteers centered in Hornachos (Extremadura), these men had considerable freedom to travel and often were armed beyond the legal limit, having to carry “knives and sharp instruments necessary to keep [their] pack saddles and other tack in working order.” The cost of this freedom was considerable risk. Some Morisco merchants therefore hoped to make a living in places of great commercial activity without having to travel extensively: a Granadan vecino of Pastraña named Damián Hernández was granted a license to move either to Valladolid or to the royal court in Madrid with his family so that he could conduct his business without the dangers posed by thieves to his wares and his life.

Though Morisco merchants and muleteers supplied necessary services and had a legal entitlement to access limited-term licenses to conduct such business, local and royal officers were

---

129 For more on carting and muleteering, and on how Castilian markets supplied the early modern Spanish court, see David E. Vassberg, The Village and the Outside World, 32-42.
130 See AGS, CC, legajo 2189. On May 18, 1576, Philip II granted a twelve-month license for five Granadan Morisco merchants living in Pastraña (Hernan López, Diego Hernández, Luis Hernández, Lorenco Ruiz, and Gonçalo Hernández) to travel to the royal court four days per month to sell silk and ornamentals. On August 6, 1580, a similar license was issued to Luis Mendoza, another Granadan Morisco silk merchant in Pastraña.
131 AGS, Consejo Real de Castilla (CRC), legajo 514.1. This file of criminal cases brought against Moriscos contains a passport issued on August 22, 1594 to Luis de Çacarias, a Granadan Morisco resettled in Guadalajara. It granted him license to go to Alcala and Guadalupe for commercial activity for a period of thirty days.
133 AGS, CC, legajo 2189, folio s.n. (1570s).
not always amenable to issuing passports because they were adverse to traveling Granadans passing through their jurisdictions. The matter of accommodating the travels of Morisco merchants occurred alongside the “hardening of conditions to obtain a license” discussed above. Justices in Valladolid and Palencia began to refuse to issue passports a decade after the arrival of the Granadan Moriscos. The merchants fought back through the courts. In 1582, a collective of sixteen Granadan Morisco merchants in Valladolid appealed to the king through his Council of Castile. They complained that justices in nearby places impeded their trade at fairs and markets. They wanted the king’s council to send a letter of reproof (carta acordada) supporting their prerogative to conduct their business.

At first glance, this situation seems to be a confusing reversal of the aforementioned, unsanctioned leniency of judges and officers in Valladolid (though I cannot be certain that the elite individuals who hired Morisco footmen were the same men refusing to issue licenses to Morisco merchants). Their scandalous leniency, however, was more a matter of personal convenience, for it was all too easy for them to hire cheap Morisco labour from among the young and newly-arrived deportees who were eager for patronage and connections. The denial of due process to Morisco merchants was born of widespread anxiety over Morisco mobility, especially among the upper echelons. While footmen were likely to be found in a retinue, merchants — even those bearing passports — operated on their own accord and were largely unsupervised. The contemporary fear of Morisco highwaymen (monfiés) compounded the unease with which judges viewed any traveling Moriscos.

In this atmosphere of anxiety over Morisco mobility and in the process of organizing the 1584 deportation of Moriscos from Granada, Philip II instructed his officials to stop licensing

---

134 Fernández Chaves and Pérez García, “Mobility under suspicion,” 247.
135 I thank my friend and colleague Cecilia Tarruell for sending this reference to me: “AHN, Consejos, Legajo 7047: Está sacado de las Consultas de viernes del Consejo de Castilla: "Consulta que hizo el señor licenciado Fuenmayor en ausencia de su Mag. en seys de abril de 1582 años. Nº 20: Gabriel Hernández, mercader, por sí y otras quinze cassas de naturales del reyno de Granada, sus consortes, están aplistados en la ciudad de Valladolid, diçe que por ser mercaderes tiene necesidad para sus mercaderías de yr a las ferias y mercados de la comarca para llevar sus mercaderías y traer otras para el proveimiento de la dicha ciudad, y las justicias de los pueblos comarcanos les hazen muchas vexações sobre ello. Supplica se les dé la carta acordada ynsera en ella los dos capitulos cerca desto hablan, para que las justicias no les molestén sobre ello."
Morisco travel in 1583. In Valladolid in 1583, the city scribe Juan Fanega notarized four letters granting power of attorney to lawyers acting on behalf of Granadan Morisco traders at the Royal Chancery Court (procuadores en la corte y consejo real); all of the Morisco plaintiffs were clearly in pursuit of passports to travel for trade. These “cartas de poder” allowed lawyers to fully represent their clients in court and in all matters related to their lawsuits, and were therefore written at the commencement of a case. In the first document, fourteen Granadan Morisco muleteers issued a collective appeal to the king to reverse the corregidor of Valladolid’s decision not to issue licenses to them. They made the case that they could not earn a living unless they were permitted to travel for trade. Some of the fourteen men in the first case appeared in multiple petitions. Lucas de Molina and Miguel de Molina, along with Agustín de Coca, also gave power of attorney to a lawyer in Madrid to act on their behalf in procuring passports. Lope de Marbella, along with Luis de Marbella and Bernabé de Segura, authorized a different procurator to secure their licenses. Another such protocol was issued for the Granadan Morisco Francisco de Luna in that same April of 1583.

Two class actions — 1595 in Palencia and 1595-6 in Valladolid — demonstrate both the continuing refusal to license Granadan Morisco traders and the collective resistance of those traders to this negation of their royally-confirmed entitlement. Four Granadans registered in Palencia pursued their right to passports after being denied by their corregidor. Eleven Granadan Moriscos pursued a similar suit in Valladolid when they sued the corregidor of Valladolid for not upholding the 1572 pragmatic. The central issue in their case was access to passports and licenses.

---

136 AGS, CC, legajo 2186, folio s.n. (March 30, 1583). Fernández Chaves and Pérez García’s reading concurs with my own; see “Mobility under suspicion,” 247.
137 Kagan, 57.
138 AHPV, PN 255 (3), folio 81 (March 15, 1583). The muleteers were Lucas de Molina, Domingo de Madrid, Juan de Avila, Gaspar Hernández, Hernando Mayordomo, Lope de Marvilla, Miguel de Molina, Diego Hernández, Lorenzo Hernández, Alonso Hernández, Hernando de Molina, Lorenzo Salama, Juan Xeronymo, and Sebastián López. This document is a notarial protocol (written by the scribe Juan Fanega) granting power of attorney to Alonso de Cartagena and Pedro Ruiz de Cartava to act on their behalf in their appeal of Licenciado Armentero’s refusal to issue passports to them, but the corregidor’s reasoning is not included in this record.
139 AHPV, PN 255 (3), folio 86 (April 19, 1583).
140 AHPV, PN 255 (3), folio 92 (April 12, 1583).
141 AHPV, PN 255 (3), folio 87 (April 20, 1583).
142 ARCV, PL.CIV. 3824,2 and ARCV, EJ 1786,57 (June 2, 1595). The men were Diego de Córdoba, Lorenzo Largo, Juan Martínez, and Domingo de Balza. The corregidor of Palencia was Licenciado Alvar Bola.
The Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid decided in favour of the Moriscos in 1596. Yet, it appears that the controversy over passports was not resolved until the early seventeenth century when a group of Granadan Moriscos made a large financial settlement with the king. They agreed to pay 240,000 ducats paid over eight years, terms set in a royal writ in 1602. This charter recognized that the principal income of the Granadans consisted in trade and transport and that the passport system as it stood was limiting and an inconvenience to them. It applied to the Granadans in Valladolid in particular, but not only to the merchants; it declared that the labourers and farmers residing in Valladolid could leave to sleep in their fields without license. This agreement was presented to the Valladolid corregidor, Licenciado Blas Vellón, in 1603 by Gabriel Hernández, the legal representative of the Granadan Moriscos.

The array of legal representatives and notaries named in these cases begs questions about the scribal culture of early modern Castile. Some of these figures appear only intermittently while others emerge repeatedly, even across archival collections. For example, Juan Fanega was a royal and numbered scribe (escribano real y de numero) and the official municipal clerk of the city, and as such was a central figure in the legal community of Valladolid. Fanega’s hand and signature is recognizable in many volumes of notarial protocols held at the Provincial Historical Archive of Valladolid, revealing his impressively long career: he was active from at least 1556-1593. He was the same man commissioned to create and make official copies of the 1583 registry of Granadan Moriscos, and also the same notary hired to write powers of attorney for the Granadan Morisco merchants, both discussed above. Fanega was entrusted to hold in his possession the master lists of Granadan Moriscos living in the city (including the 1583 registry), records which could be consulted in legal cases. Consider the suit against Luis Pérez, who was arrested in 1592

---

143 ARCV, PL.CIV. 615,8 (1595-1596) and ARCV, EJ 1807,59 (April 26, 1596). Their names were Francisco Hernández, Sebastian López, Lorenzo de Alhama, Hernando Díaz, Juan de Luna, Bernabé de Segura, Rodrigo Hernández, Cristobal Alonso, Juan Gomez, Miguel de Madrigal, and Gerónimo Sánchez; López and Alhama had been involved in the 1583 cases.

144 Luis Fernández Martín cites AHPV, PN 1003, 8-IV-1603: "Gabriel Hernández, procurador de los moriscos granadinos, presenta una real cédula al teniente de corregidor que autoriza a los moriscos a salir a trajinar por 4 meses y a dormir en sus huertas sin licencia." (Comediantes, esclavos y moriscos en Valladolid: siglos XVI y XVII [Salamanca: Caja de Ahorros y M.P. de Salamanca, 1988], 166-167, n.21). I was not able to locate the original at the Provincial Historical Archive of Valladolid in 2011, and I do not have any other evidence regarding this settlement.

145 Fanega is called the "escribano mayor del ayuntamiento" in royal records (see AGS CC 2184) and in city council minutes (see AMV, Libros de Actas, 1584).

146 AHPV, PN 255, “Juan Fanega / 1556, 1566, 1583, 1593.”

147 AGS, CC, legajo 2184, “Registro y memoria de los moriscos de Valladolid” (1583) and AHPV, PN 255(3).
on criminal charges for wearing a sword on his belt (una espada čenida), an illegal act as he was identified as a Morisco (acusado de morisco). Pérez was cleared of these charges when he was proven to be not a Morisco, but, in fact, a freed African man. Two documents were instrumental in Pérez’s release: his letter of manumission, which identified his background and his backstory, and the absence of his name in Fanega’s Morisco registry. Like other scribes and administrators, Fanega’s role as keeper of this vital information facilitated the legal action of both the government and the governed.

So far, the cases examined in this chapter demonstrate how Moriscos settled in the Valladolid region engaged in petitioning, negotiation, and litigation for permissions to relocate and travel. Those Granadans sought exception from specific policies restricting their mobility. Others, however, claimed total exemption from the royal prohibitions on the grounds that they had inherited the titles and privileges of Old Christians. In a 1585 royal provision, Philip II stated,

And now we have been informed that … many of the said Moriscos appear before the judges of the said courts, and before the ordinary justices of the cities, towns, and places where they live and other places, asking for it to be declared by sentence that they may carry weapons, and that they are not obliged to keep the said bans, laws, and pragmatics that speak of the Moriscos of the said kingdom. Some of them allege that they are Old Christians, and that their fathers were in possession of this [title]. Others allege and say that their grandfathers and great grandfathers converted to our Holy Catholic faith before the general conversion. Others say that their forefathers came from Tunis and other places in Africa to convert, and that they are not obliged to keep the provisions with the New Christians of the said Kingdom of Granada ...

148 ARCE EJ 1735, 23 (March 4, 1593): “por ser como es africano”; “hera barberisco”; “e para mejor aueriguar la verdad pidio el dho tenj.e de correg.or le mandase dar su mandamy.o conpulsorio para que Gomez juan fanega escriu.o de num.o desta villa en cuio podr estauan los libros delos registros de todos los morisco granadinos que a esta dha villa de valladolid auian venido a habitar por rmo mandado le diesse una fee de como el dho luis perez pte contr.a estaua sentado e listado por morisco granadino en los dhos libros”

149 Philip II, "Provision Real de su Magestad, sobre la orden que se ha de tener en los negocios tocantes a los Moriscos del Reyno de Granada, que pretendieren ser Christianos Viejos" (Madrid, September 3, 1585) in La Expulsión de los moriscos del reino de Granada: (pragmáticas, provisiones y órdenes reales) Ed. Francisco Izquierdo (Azur, 1983), 43: "Y ahora hemos sido informado que sin embargo de lo suso dicho muchos de los dichos Moriscos parecen ante los Alcaldes delas dichas audiencias, y ante las justicias ordinarias de las ciudades villas y lugares donde viuen y de otras partes, pidiendo se declare por sentencia que pueden traer armas, y q no estan obligados a guardar los dichos vandos, leyes y pragmaticas que hablar con los Moriscos del dicho Reyno, alegando algunos dellos que son Christianos Viejos, y que en tal possesion estuuieron sus padres y abuelos, y que otros alegan y dizen: que sus abuelos y visabuelos se co[n]virtieron a nuestra fe Catholica antes dela conuersion general: a otros que sus ascendants vinieron de Tunez y de otras partes de Affrica a co[n]vertirse, y que no estan obligados a guardar lo dispuesto con los Christianos nueueos de el dicho Reyno de Granada ..."
A good example is the case of the Chaves family, Granadan deportees registered in Valladolid and Pastrana, which came before the corregidor of Valladolid in 1590. On March 1, Felipe de Chaves and Alonso de Chaves were accused of traveling without licenses and carrying weapons. They were imprisoned, but presented a letter of exemption (escripto de exenciónes) declaring that they were “Old Christian gentlemen and noblemen and as such and as descendants of such they freely carried offensive and defensive weapons and kept all of the honours, freedoms, and liberties as were kept by and as were accustomed to be kept by the Old Christian gentlemen and nobility of these kingdoms.” Many other Granadan Moriscos asserted similar claims and submitted evidence to defend them, including: records demonstrating the histories of their ancestors’ baptisms; their families’ loyal service to the Crown; past lawsuits defending their titles and privileges; and in some cases, assertions of nobility. In the parlance of the legal records, successful litigants and their descendants were legally entitled “to enjoy the preeminence that the Old Christians of these kingdoms do and have enjoyed.”

These claims were so numerous that they became a problem for the Crown. In an attempt to centralize authority over this matter, Philip II issued a royal provision on September 3, 1585, to the effect that all Granadan Morisco assertions of Old Christian privileges be submitted to the Council of Population. Cases in progress or already decided were to be submitted to the council for review within sixty days, after which they would be declared suspended or revoked.

Nevertheless, Granadans continued to claim Old Christian status in response to the deportation from Granada and subsequent prohibitions, and again when the order of expulsion was announced in 1609 proclaiming the final removal of all Moriscos from the Spanish kingdoms. Santiago Otero Mondéjar estimates these lawsuits to number in the hundreds, or perhaps thousands. He identifies four types of claimants: 1) those whose ancestors converted to Catholicism before the conquest of Granada in 1492; 2) those whose forefathers served the Catholic cause during the

---

150 ARCV, EJ 1672.8 (1590): “eran cristianos viejos caualleros hijos dalgos y como tales y descendientes de tales [auian] traido armas ofensibas y defensibas librem.te y les auian sido guardadas todas las honrras franquezas e libertades que se guardauan y acostunbraan a guardar alos cristianos biejos caualleros hijos dalgo de estos reynos”

151 AGS, CC, legajo 2209, folios s.n. This is the 1581 case of Gonçalo de Mendoza. “aver de goçar delos preheminencias que goçan y angocadolos xipanos biejos destos Reynos”

152 Philip II, "Provision Real de su Magestad, sobre la orden que se ha de tener en los negocios tocantes a los Moriscos del Reyno de Granada, que pretendieren ser Christianos Viejos" (Madrid, September 3, 1585) in La Expulsión de los moriscos del reino de Granada: (pragmáticas, provisiones y órdenes reales) Ed. Francisco Izquierdo (Azur, 1983), 39-46.

153 See Chapter Five.
conquest of Granada; 3) those whose forefathers were baptized as Catholics before the general decree of conversion in 1502; and 4) those who attempted to prove their Old Christian lineage (true or fictitious) once brought up on charges of weapons bearing or traveling without license. As signaled in the 1585 royal provision, there were also descendants of immigrants from Africa who had moved willingly to Spain to convert, and therefore claimed to be “not obliged to keep the provisions with the New Christians of the said Kingdom of Granada.” The Chaves case met the requirements of the second, third, and fourth categories. Felipe de Chaves’ great-grandfather, a Granadan Muslim named Ali Xariz, had been rewarded with the title and freedoms of Old Christian upon his conversion to Catholicism, along with his wife and family, before 1502. The Catholic Monarchs themselves had acted as godparents at his baptism, at which time he took the name Pedro Hernández el Javi/Xaviz. The warden (alcaide) of the fortress of Comares, he served Ferdinand and Isabel during their conquest of Granada, alongside his son, Martin López el Xaviz. His grandsons litigated to defend their family’s privileged status in Jaen in 1579. Just over a decade later, Felipe de Chaves and his family won their case in Valladolid, when the Royal Chancery Court judges ordered that they could keep the “exemptions and liberties that are enjoyed by the Old Christians of these kingdoms.”

It is necessary to consider these cases in terms of purity of blood (limpieza de sangre), the chief distinguishing factor between Old and New Christians. María Elena Martínez explains that while Moriscos in the early sixteenth century could claim to be Old Christians because their grandfathers had been baptized before the general edict of conversion, Muslim heritage became immediate proof of impurity by midcentury: “The category of cristiano viejo, which had appeared before but entered into regular use only in the sixteenth century, came to be defined as someone

---

155 Philip II, “Provision Real de su Magestad (Madrid, September 3, 1585) in Izquierdo, 43. The Moroccan Juan de Ayala, mentioned earlier in this chapter, falls into this category.
156 ARCV, EJ 1672,8 (1590). This was a lawsuit put forward by Alonso Hernández el Xaviz and Lorenzo Fernandez el Xaviz, grandsons of Pedro el Xaviz and uncles of Felipe de Chaves.
157 ARCV, EJ 1672,8 (1590). The lawyer for the Chaves family in 1590 was Garcia de Corral. His opponent was Juan de Hermossa, a public prosecutor for the king (fiscal del rey), represented by Miguel Ximinez de Prado. The definitive sentencing in this case was given on May 29, 1590, at the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid: “mandamos guardar a los dichos ffelipe de chaues y consores seles guarden todas las demas esemçiones e libertades de que gozan los cristianos Viejos destos Reynos ...” This carta de ejecutoria was issued on June 16, 1590.
158 See my discussion of limpieza de sangre in the introductory chapter.
whose ancestry was proven to be pure since ‘time immemorial.’” Yet, we find a plethora of Morisco claims of Old Christian titles and freedoms through the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. While these claimants could not hide or ignore their Muslim lineage, they could litigate to defend the heritable statuses bestowed upon their grandfathers and great-grandfathers decades earlier. These post-1570 lawsuits were not newly initiated applications for Old Christian status; they were defenses of titles and privileges already granted, confirmations of lawful judgments already made. That they required this continual legal defense is a reflection of the changing notions of purity as outlined by Martínez. Moreover, these cases were part of a trend of legal agency that I illustrate throughout this dissertation, wherein Moriscos litigated and petitioned to negotiate social status and secure inheritable privileges — this legal agility was made necessary by the hardening blood-based conceptions of identity.

To this end, Granadan litigants focused on their families’ loyalty, service to the Crown, and — when applicable — highborn or noble status. They presented their family histories within their lawsuits, especially in petitions and interrogatories, or lists of questions to ask the witnesses. In one case, we read how by the time Gonçalo de Mendoza was declared an Old Christian in Valladolid, he had lived through rebellion, war, deportation, arrest, and years of litigation in various cities. His story began near the Granadan city of Almería during the rebellion of 1568-1570. Mendoza and his brother, Gabriel, were the sons of Juan de Mendoza and grandsons of Juan de Portalatina, a Granadan Muslim who had converted to Catholicism before the general edict of conversion was declared in 1502. For his exemplary faith and his loyal service to the Catholic Kings, Portalatina was made warden of Suduz, in the district of Marchena, bishopric of Granada. At this time, he was awarded the title and privileges of an Old Christian. This honorific appointment guaranteed Portalatina and his heirs access to rights otherwise denied to Moriscos in Granada: permission to own and carry weapons and exemption from special taxes such as the farda.160

During the rebellion, Juan de Mendoza and his sons Gonçalo and Gabriel de Mendoza’s were loyal to the Crown at great personal cost. Supported by witness testimony, Gonçalo’s lawsuit

159 Martínez, Genealogical fictions, 53.
160 AGS, CC, legajo 2209, folios s.n.: “Probanza de gonzalo de Mendoza con un treslado signado y auturizado de zedula de don sancho martinez de leyba.” in “Pleytos litigados en el Consejo de Poblacion sobre ser cristianos viejos diferentes sugetos.”
describes how the Mendoza men warned their Old Christian neighbours and clergy about and protected them from the Morisco rebels, even escaping one night to Almeria with a cleric and a sacristan to protect them from violence. The Mendozas were targeted by the leaders of the revolt, who ordered the rebels to seize them and their property for having tried to persuade Moriscos to give up the cause of rebellion. They were made prisoners but were released (by public demand; witness testimony reveals that their arrest was met with local outcry), after which they continued to work against the rebellion in Suduz by stopping highway robberies aimed at Old Christians and by acting as informants for the Crown. The case even claims that Juan de Mendoza and his sons aided in gathering Moriscos in the Almería region for their deportation to Castile. Yet Gonçalo de Mendoza was among those Moriscos deported in 1570, and he had to defend his Old Christian status repeatedly over the following decades. The Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid eventually recognized the Old Christian status of Gonçalo de Mendoza, who was by then a citizen (vecino) of Valladolid, and the claims of his father Juan de Mendoza and brother Gabriel de Mendoza. Gonçalo de Mendoza was granted permission to carry weapons in the city of Valladolid by corregidor Armentero in 1581. Mendoza’s lawyer submitted the confirmation of this privilege to the Council of Population. He also sent a copy of a charter written by Don Sancho Martínez de Leyba, the captain general of the Kingdom of Navarre and the General of the Spanish galleys, who attested to the services the Mendoza men provided to his household and to the king. The Council of Population viewed the case in 1587 and ordered further investigation.

Claims of Old Christian status were also made on the basis of corporate belonging. Certain Morisco communities retained special freedoms and uncommon levels of autonomy throughout the sixteenth century. Diego Calderón was accused in 1590 of carrying a pointed knife, traveling without license to various fairs and markets in neighbouring villages, and claiming to be an Old Christian though he was known to be a Morisco. Charged with civil and criminal offenses, he was thrown in jail. Witnesses testified that Calderón was a known Morisco who had resided in Valladolid for more or less four years; he lived and owned a shop outside of the Puerta del Campo, a main entrance to the city. Calderón was reputed to be a Morisco from Granada because he was

\[161\] AGS, CC, legajo 2209, folios s.n.
\[162\] AGS, CC, legajo 2209, folios s.n. Leyba owned a number of Granadan Morisco slaves in Valladolid: Isabel Navaro, Diego Navaro, Catalina Munoz, Hernando de Comares, Diego de Frias, Rafael de Grimaldo de Salias. See Chapter Four.
known to converse and do business with Granadans in Valladolid; one witness replied that he saw Calderón speaking in Arabic (*algarabia*) with Granadans. Calderón was known to be a Granadan Morisco “by sight and behavior and association” (“de vista y trato y comunicación”). Two witnesses reported having asked Calderón how it was that he went about without a passport. Calderón allegedly replied that he did not require a passport because he was an Old Christian and a citizen of Hornachos. The Moriscos of Hornachos, a sizable village in Extremadura, held collective and hereditary privileges granted to them by the Catholic Monarchs Fernando and Isabel. Calderón maintained the same story during his interrogation, adding that he was also a citizen of Valladolid who had moved to the city because it was a better place to do business. He was able to present evidence to support all of his claims, including proof that he was from the town of Hornachos. Calderón’s lawyers submitted to the court a copy of these privileges, which allowed the citizens of Hornachos and their descendants, including Diego Calderón, to travel freely and carry weapons.

A similar case concerned Andrés Pérez Corto, a Morisco citizen of Valladolid. In 1592, he was denounced and imprisoned by the public prosecutor and the head sheriff of the Royal Chancery Court (*alguacil mayor de corte*) in Valladolid for carrying weapons in the city, which would have been illegal since he was believed to be from Granada. But Pérez Corto proved that he was originally from Daimiel, and produced a privilege written by the Catholic Monarchs to the Morisco citizens of the Campo de Calatrava granting them the privileges enjoyed by Old Christians at the time of their conversion to Catholicism. Like the Moriscos of Hornachos, the Moriscos of the five towns of the Campo de Calatrava in La Mancha (Daimiel, Almagro, Bolano, Villarubia, and Aldea del Rey) possessed charters guaranteeing the freedoms to travel freely and carry weapons. According to the evidence presented in this case, these privileges were generally honoured until the rebellion of the Granadan Moriscos, during and after which Morisco natives of the Campo de Calatrava were routinely denied their hereditary rights. However, Pérez Corto’s lawyer presented extensive evidence on his behalf, including copies of the original royal privileges.

---

164 ARCV, PL. CIV. 218.2. See also ARCV, EJ 1702,4.
165 ARCV, EJ 1734, 48 (1593).
166 Dadson, *Tolerance and Coexistence*, 200-201.
granted to the Moriscos of the Campo de Calatrava. He won his case, and retained his access to those privileges.\footnote{ARCV, EJ 1734, 48 (1593).}

The legal initiatives of Granadan Moriscos bear comparison with the legal resistance of the antiguos Moriscos of Valladolid’s Barrio de Santa María, as described in Chapters One and Two, in that both showcase Moriscos’ remarkable ability to work within the framework of the royal bureaucracy. Remarkable, too, is the Spanish monarchy’s and royal officials’ concern for due process of law. Widespread regard for the law appears at some level of institutional authority in the majority of cases consulted; for example, Morisco merchants denied passports by local justices could still litigate in court in pursuit of their royally-promised licenses. One case of “Old Christian Moriscos” in Valladolid illustrates legal agility in the face of a similar refusal. This case began with a petition to the corregidor of Valladolid in 1573:

"Illustrious sir, Alonso de Soria and Juan de Santafee, citizens of the city of Granada currently residing in the city of Valladolid, say that we need to prove that we are Old Christians, and sons and grandsons of Old Christians. We ask that your grace order that the evidence of witnesses be received, who we will present for the above-mentioned reason, and that you might order for us as a signed testimony of what they say and depose, signed publicly in a manner that gives faith, formalizing it with your authority and judicial decree ...\footnote{AGS, CC, Legajo 2174, s.f.: “Alonso de Soria y Juan de Santa fee vecinos de la ciudad de granada y estante en esta villa de vallid. decimos que nosotros tenemos neszecidad de probar como somos xpianos biexos hijos y nietos de xpianos biexos. suplicamos a vm mande recebir la ynformaçion de testigos que paralo susodho presentaremos y lo que dixeren y depusieren nos lo mande dar por testimonio signado firmais en publica forma en manera que haga fee ynterponiendo en ello su autoridad y decreto Judiçial para lo quales …” Unless otherwise indicated, all translations in this dissertation are my own.}"

Alonso de Soria and Juan de Santafee (Soria’s son-by-adoption and nephew) aimed to secure a formal charter that would legally grant them and their families the status and privileges of Old Christians, and to initiate this process they requested the formal presentation of an interrogatory and a legal record of the resulting witness testimony. The corregidor of Valladolid, Don Alonso de Messia, refused, twice, on the basis of requiring royal permission to formally receive this petition. He later explained, under oath, that “he did not want to make this investigation because it was not in the service of God nor of his majesty.”\footnote{AGS, CC, Legajo 2174, s.f.: “el qual d[ic]ho señor corr[egid]o[r] respondio que no queria se hiziese tal probanza por que no conbenja al serv[j]ci[o] de dios ny de su mag[estad] …”} Seeing that Messia had no intention to accept his petition, the men took the case to Licenciado Gaspar Escudero, a judge (alcalde) at the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid, who agreed to receive their witnesses.
The resulting testimony unanimously identified Soria and Santafee as Old Christians. Alonso de Soria and his brother Miguel de Soria were named as the legitimate sons of Francisco de Camacho and Leonor Hernández, citizens of the city of Granada, married and veiled ("casado y velado") in the Catholic Church. They had been publicly known as "Old Christians, clean of all race of the Moors and the Jews," and not penitents of the Spanish Inquisition. One witness had known Soria since childhood, when their families had been neighbours; he recalled his own father paying the "farda, called the tax of the Moriscos" but said it was publicly known that Francisco de Camacho did not pay that tax. Another witness confirmed the family's reputation in Granada as Old Christians; he had witnessed the wedding of Miguel de Soria and María Hernández in the Catholic church of San Juan de los Reyes. Notwithstanding the testimony of the family’s Old Christian reputation and standing, certain crucial elements in these records point to Soria and Santafee’s Morisco past. All four witnesses were themselves Granadan Moriscos and each had known the family for at least one generation.¹⁷⁰ Their residency on the calle Elvira in the parish of San Andrés meant that the Camacho-Hernández household was part of the Albaicín, known to be the Muslim district of the city of Granada. The family’s close association with a number of Morisco families, their residency in a Morisco neighbourhood in Granada, and their inclusion in the deportation marked them as Morisco. Would the witness testimony be enough to secure a legal declaration of their status as Old Christians?

In any case, through these legal proceedings Soria and Santafee acquired what corregidor Messia had denied them: a formal interrogation of their lineage evidenced by witness testimony, given under oath and in their favour. This document was signed by the presiding judge and attendant scribes, meaning it was invested with judicial authority. Most importantly, Soria and Santafee had possession of an official copy. Knowing that Messia would not likely accept their now-legal evidence in support of their quest for a formal charter granting Old Christian titles and privileges, Soria and Santafee fled from Valladolid to seek justice elsewhere. As Granadan Morisco deportees assigned to reside in that city, this was an illegal move. Messia’s officers caught up with them in Valdestillas, a day's walk (20 km) south of Valladolid, on April 20, 1573. Officer Felipe Fanega arrested the two men along with three other men (Diego de Aguilar, Luis de Salazar, and Francisco Raya) and seven women. All were Granadan Moriscos. Some of the twelve

¹⁷⁰ AGS, CC, Legajo 2174, s.f. The witnesses were Gaspar de Luna, Juan Lazaro, Baltasar Xuarez, and Miguel Hernández.
confessed that the group had been headed to Madrid and beyond. They carried with them their possessions, including clothes, money, and livestock, all of which was confiscated by the authorities. But the most damning discovery among their possessions were their legal documents, which constituted proof that Soria and Santafee intended to pursue the case in another jurisdiction. All twelve fugitives were put in jail. Messia reported the entire affair to the king two days later, on April 22, 1573. The outcome of Alonso de Soria's case after this date is unknown. The extant records are Messia's letters to Philip II, sent in a packet along with testimonies given by Messia, Soria, and various scribes describing what had transpired over the previous four months. Also included was Soria's confiscated información signed by Judge Escudero and the scribe Barquete. Soria likely would have remained in jail until a decision was reached — but this information is missing from the extant record. Ten years later, a 1583 register of Moriscos living in Valladolid listed Alonso de Soria and Juan de Santafee as absentees, meaning they had relocated without permission in the decade after their ordeal.  

Granadan Moriscos resisted and responded to the deportation and subsequent prohibitions in a variety of ways. Some subverted the expulsion and disregarded the bans on their mobility by leaving the places to which they were deported. While many returned to Granada, others relocated within Old Castile to find employment and to reunite with families and pre-expulsion communities. Still others sought licenses to relocate or to travel for trade through petitions and lawsuits. Distinct from those Moriscos who requested exception from some of the rules, some Granadans claimed full exemption from the king’s pragmatic. They declared themselves to have inherited Old Christian titles and privileges, and defended these before the Council of Population

---

171 AGS, CC, legajo 2184, “Registro y memoria de los moriscos de Valladolid” (1583). There is some room for error here. Our Alonso de Soria was described as being “more or less thirty-three years old” in 1573; the Alonso de Soria listed as absent in 1583 was described as aged thirty-three. Still, I believe the man registered in 1583 was the same Alonso de Soria given that he was listed alongside Juan de Santafee (confirmed to be the same Santafee as in 1573 by the inclusion of his parent’s names). The entries read as such: “99. Juan de Santafee hijo de Miguel de Soria de diez e seis años moço pespigado de buen gesto un lunar en la mejilla derecho menos un diente de los dos altos delanteros. 100. María Herrez (Hernández?) madre deste mugger enferma de buen cuerpo. 101. Alonso de Soria natural de Granada de treynta y tre años mediano blanco / ojos pequeños nariz apapaga y ada barua entrerrubia. 102. Elvira Herrez (Hernández?) su mugger del dicho natural de granada de treynta años morena dientes negros falta del derecho caue los dos grandes. 103. María su hija de tres años. 104. Brianda su hija de treçe años de buen gesto / ojeras grandes un lunar caue la nariz a la mejilla hizquierda.” The other 1573 fugitives were not registered in the 1583 census, but “42. Isabel, wife of Diego de Aguilar” and “163. Helena, daughter of Luis de Salazar” are listed among the deceased. As I discuss in Chapter Three, the 1583 register counted newcomers, prisoners, freed slaves, absentees, and the dead, but not the rest of the Granadan deportees settled where they should be, so to speak. Diego de Aguilar, Luis de Salazar, and Francisco Raya may still have been living in Valladolid.
and at the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid. They presented in legal records their family histories of conversion and loyal service to the Crown. Morisco legal agency produced a significant documentary record of the contested relocations that occurred in the wake of their deportation from the Kingdom of Granada. From census lists to passports, petitions, and lawsuits, the terms of Morisco belonging and exclusion were debated and authenticated in the texts generated through Morisco disobedience and litigation.
Chapter 4  
Litigating for Liberty

Juan and Lucas de Almudey were nine and seven years old, respectively, when they were captured in 1568. Moriscos from Jerez, Marquesado de Cenete, the brothers were among countless others captured during the Morisco rebellion and war in the kingdom of Granada (1568–1570) and made slaves to Old Christians throughout the Spanish kingdoms.\(^1\) In 1571, the Almudey brothers were taken to Valladolid as the slaves of Don Juan de Menchaca, the sheriff of the Royal Chancery Court in that city. The next year, Philip II formalized the law against the capture and enslavement of Morisco minors.\(^2\) As discussed below, in 1574 a court case was initiated in Valladolid with the aim of liberating the boys from slavery. Lucas de Almudey won his freedom as a result of this litigation; his older brother Juan did not, and remained enslaved by Don Juan de Menchaca.\(^3\) Across Spain, Granadan Moriscos captured as children sought legal manumission in accordance with the laws of 1572. I argue that the king authorized and facilitated the liberation of enslaved Morisco minors because the overarching royal plan in granting them their freedom was to turn the children of heretical rebels into proper Christian vassals. Philip’s orders required freed slaves to remain in the custody of their former masters, in the capacity of servants, until they reached the age of majority. Morisco children were baptized Catholics but most had not been raised in observant homes; religious and lay authorities suspected all Moriscos of secretly adhering to Islam. Young Moriscos freed from slavery were therefore ordered to be raised and educated as Catholics in the homes of their masters-turned-employers in order to create new, more desirable connections

---

\(^1\) There are no comprehensive figures for the total numbers of Granadan Morisco children and adults enslaved during this conflict. Antonio Domínguez Ortiz states that the number of Moriscos reduced to slavery in the rebellion in Granada (both rebels and those who fell in to the hands of “greedy conquerors”) cannot be counted. See “La esclavitud en Castilla durante la Edad Moderna,” *La esclavitud en Castilla en la edad moderna y otros estudios de marginados* (Granada: Comares, 2003), 6. Fransisco Andújar Castillo estimates the number in the thousands. See “De la ‘Buena Guerra’ al ‘Horro’. La esclavitud morisca en los Vélez (1570-1590),” *Revista Velezana* 18 (1999), 27-38.

\(^2\) This law was published in two 1572 royal pragmatics, the first in July and the second in October. See King Philip II, “Pragmática y declaración sobre los moriscos menores del reino de Granada” (Madrid. July 30, 1572) and “Pragmática y declaración sobre los moriscos del reyno de Granada, y la orden que con ellos se ha de tener” (Madrid. October 6, 1572), both in Francisco Izquierdo, *La Expulsión de los moriscos del reino de Granada: pragmáticas, provisiones y órdenes reales*, (Azur, 1983), 24-38.

\(^3\) Archivo de la Real Chancillería de Valladolid (ARCV), Pleitos Civiles (PL.CIV) 973.6: "Pleito de Juan y Lucas Almudey, menores, vecinos de Jerez del Marquesado (Granada), con Juan de Menchaca, alguacil mayor de la Corte y Chancillería, sobre contravenir la ley del rey de no dar esclavitud a los menores." The verdict was delivered in 1576.
between the next generation of New Christians and the majority Old Christian society. Morisco children were seen as malleable New Christians — once freed from the impediment of slavery and provided with the proper indoctrination. The liberation of these young Morisco captives was to be the first step in their eventual assimilation.

In fact, this law was one part of a larger plan for the assimilation of all Granadan Moriscos into Catholic Castilian society. The October 1572 royal pragmatic was a collection of rules governing the post-rebellion settlement of the thousands of deportees resettled after the war. Granadan Moriscos deported to Castilian towns and villages were to reside among Old Christians, living apart from each other and not in the company of local Moriscos, earning a living in occupations suitable to their prior experience. The pragmatic banned Moriscos from traveling without a license and carrying weapons, and prohibited Arabic language, music, dancing, and baths. Prelates and parish priests were responsible for the Catholic instruction of Morisco men, women, and children — and the salvation of their souls. Every effort was to be taken to see that the Moriscos of Granada lived as Christians in the lands of Castile. Thus, Morisco parents were not permitted to re-gain custody of their manumitted children; rather, the monarchy decreed they would “live christianly” under the control of their former owners. Because slave owners were often loath to agree to the manumission of their slaves, to whom they would owe wages as newly designated servants in their households, the liberation of enslaved Morisco youths commonly became a matter for the courts.

Sixteenth-century Valladolid afforded above-average legal access. It was a royal city, meaning that it was governed by a corregidor who answered directly to the king and fulfilled the role of both administrator and judge. Valladolid was also a place full of lawyers in a litigious era. In fact, lawyers were markedly more numerous in Valladolid than in all of the cities of Castile at this time. The city remained a principal site of royal authority even after the departure of Philip

---

4 See Chapter Three and Philip II, “Pragmática” (October 6, 1572). Unfortunately, I have very little information on what actions were taken to educate Granadan Morisco deportees in Valladolid.
5 Philip II, “Pragmática” (October 6, 1572) 29: “que viuiesen christianamente.”
6 Corregidores (“correctors”) were officers of the Crown in charge of royal cities for two-year terms. See Marvin Lunenfeld, Keepers of the City: The Corregidores of Isabella I of Castile (1474-1504) (Cambridge University Press, 1987).
II’s court for Madrid in 1561 partly because of the presence of the Royal Chancery Court, with its attendant legions of notaries, scribes, and lawyers. Established in 1489 by Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabel of Castile, the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid (Real Chancillería de Valladolid) was one of two appellate courts that were the seats of the highest level of royal justice in early modern Spain – the other being the Royal Chancery Court of Granada, established in 1505. These courts were extensions of royal power, sometimes referred to as the “Tribunal of the Court of the King.”

Chancery judges decided on cases of enslaved Morisco minors when unyielding masters appealed the corregidor’s verdicts. Within this legal apparatus, the monarchy provided legal representation for captive minors in the form of specially-appointed procurators; as discussed below, this arrangement was comparable to similar forms of legal services formally provided for other marginalized populations through which the Crown provided assistance to royal subjects while keeping them under observation. While these offices were paternalistic, Moriscos employed their services strategically to their own legal ends.

Valladolid also had a larger number of slaves than did many other Castilian towns and cities in the sixteenth century. Beginning with the year 1525, Luis Fernández Martín counts 280 slaves in Valladolid notarial protocols from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. 178 of the records include physical descriptions of the slave. Most were described as having black skin, and Fernández Martín speculates that they would therefore likely have been from Guinea, Cape Verde, Angola, or elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa. Slaves’ geographical origins are only recorded in fifteen percent of the documents, and these refer mostly to enslaved Granadan Moriscos. Using this data, Fernández Martín counts forty-seven Granadan Morisco slaves in Valladolid during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The sources I use in this chapter suggest a slightly higher estimate for the enslaved Granadan Morisco population of Valladolid and its environs; an exact number is impossible to ascertain because of the uneven nature of the records. Beyond the forty-seven Granadan Morisco slaves located by Fernández Martín in Valladolid notarial protocols, the

---

8 “Tribunal del Corte del Rey.” See Bennassar, 116, for an overview of the medieval origins of the Royal Chancery Court.
9 Bennassar, 429-430.
10 This figure is based on only one set of documentary records, and I do not read it as a perfectly accurate total for the number of slaves in Valladolid in this era. However, it is an important touchstone because of the exceptional depth of Fernández Martín’s research, and the fact that bills of sale and letters of manumission are both found in these notarial protocols.
11 Fernández Martín, 130-131.
documentary evidence used in this chapter records another thirty-two such individuals in a 1583 registry, and at least fourteen more (excluding those names repeated in the notarial protocols) in Royal Chancery Court records.

I have located records of the litigation of eighteen enslaved Granadan Morisco minors in Valladolid and I discuss these cases throughout this chapter.\(^{12}\) While this city was a hot spot for legal action, it was not entirely unique and many similar cases occurred in other jurisdictions. My central sources are the records of Royal Chancery Court trials, called civil lawsuits (pleitos civiles) and letters of enforcement (cartas de ejecutoría).\(^{13}\) I examine these alongside other key documents pertaining to slaves in Valladolid that include bills of sale, letters of manumission, and census records.\(^{14}\) Missing records also tell a story. In some cases, the 1572 pragmatics may have been implemented without recourse to legal action, particularly if the Morisco slave was very obviously underage and his or her owner yielded to their legal requirement. Moreover, not all trial records survived and those that did are not always fully intact. In mid-sixteenth-century Valladolid, administrators complained about inconsistent and incomplete record keeping, the destruction or sale of court papers, and cases not being deposited because the archives were full. As Richard Kagan explains, “recordkeeping in the courts and tribunals of this epoch was so shoddy that only limited statistical evidence of this flood of litigation survives.”\(^{15}\) Yet it is possible to uncover evidence of lawsuits for which the original court papers no longer exist. Though I did not locate her trial records, I found two discrete references to the case of Lucia de Sevilla, a Granadan Morisca from Ferreira held as a slave in Valladolid. The Provincial Historical Archive of Valladolid holds a document from 1580 naming a legal guardian to represent her in her suit against

\(^{12}\) See Appendix 3: “Enslaved Granadan Morisco minors at the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid”

\(^{13}\) I do not have any records from the original trials overseen by the corregidor of Valladolid. My information about these cases comes from their record within Royal Chancery Court documentation.

\(^{14}\) Luis Fernández Martín’s extensive research at the Provincial Historical Archive of Valladolid focuses in part on slaves and Moriscos and is a useful guide to the notarial protocols that include slaves’ bills of sale, letters of manumission, and powers of attorney. See his Comediantes, esclavos y moriscos en Valladolid: siglos XVI y XVII. (Salamanca: Caja de Ahorros y M.P. de Salamanca, 1988).

\(^{15}\) Richard L. Kagan, Lawsuits and litigants in Castile, 1500-1700. (University of North Carolina Press, 1981), 4. He also explains, “Whatever the exact figure, the influx of cases was so great that officials of the chancillería had to develop administrative shortcuts to keep up with the demand. These practices account for many of the complaints about illegible, hastily written registers, lost and misplaced documents, and the readiness of some officials to issue documents ‘without authorized signatures.’” (6)
her master, Doña Francisca de Vozmediano. At the Royal Archive of Simancas, a 1583 registry of Moriscos in Valladolid lists Lucia de Sevilla as still embroiled in this lawsuit; by then, she had been removed from her master’s home and was in the custody of señor Cristóbal Ortiz by order of the Royal Chancery Court judges.

The enslavement of Granadan Moriscos has received some valuable scholarly attention, especially in local studies. Rafael Sánchez-Blanco drew attention to this subject in 1974 with a focus on captured children in Málaga. Two decades later, Francisco Andújar Castillo published two articles on the manumission of child slaves in Vélez. More recently, Mariano García García wrote a short article on the view from Tordesillas, a town not far from Valladolid, while Aúrelia Martín Casares has studied the consequences of Philip’s 1572 decrees. The wider history of slavery in Spain has received more thorough treatment. Meanwhile, Kagan has given expert treatment to the topic of the legal history of early modern Castile, focusing especially on the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid. This chapter contributes to these conversations by drawing attention to the processes of manumitting enslaved Granadan Moriscos and their prospects for social integration and relationships after liberation. While royal legislation required the separation of freed minors from their parents and demanded they retain bonds of service and patronage with their ex-masters, enslaved Granadans and their kin employed considerable legal agency in pursuit

---

16 AHPV, PN 549.241 (September 1, 1580). On September 1, 1580, a notary public named Andrés Granada was given power of attorney to represent Lucia (who was fifteen years old at that time) at the Royal Chancery Court in Valladolid.
17 Archivo General de Simancas (AGS), Cámara de Castilla (CC), legajo 2184, folios s.n. (March 10, 1583) includes Lucia de Sevilla (entry #24); then eighteen years old, she was described as a small young woman with a nice face.
22 Kagan, Lawsuits and Litigants.
of liberty and the reunion of families sundered by war, captivity, and exile. Framed within this dissertation, I explain this legal action as a way in which some Moriscos negotiated status and defended liberties in the aftermath of the Granadan rebellion and war.\footnote{For a comparative study, see Nancy van Deusen, \textit{Global Indios: The Indigenous Struggle for Justice in Sixteenth-Century Spain} (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015). Using the Archives of the Indies of Seville, van Deusen examines over one hundred lawsuits in which \textit{indios} litigated for freedom from slavery in the Seville region throughout the sixteenth century.} Below, I describe how the Crown justified the wartime capture of Granadan Moriscos but restricted the enslavement of their children. I briefly discuss the context of slavery in sixteenth-century Castile. Then, I consider the mechanisms of manumission for adult Granadan Morisco slaves before turning to examine the litigation concerning enslaved Morisco children, including their legal representation, their lawsuits, and what trial records reveal about their experiences of captivity and manumission. After assessing the aims of official plans for the integration of liberated Morisco minors, I use census and notarial records to illustrate what is known about the post-captivity lives of Granadans in Valladolid.

During the Granadan war, the king’s royal council heard the opinions of legal scholars, judges, and theologians debating the legality and the morality of enslaving Morisco prisoners of war. Legal and military traditions permitted capturing non-Christian enemies during wartime. The king’s religious and state advisors therefore interrogated the status of Moriscos — who were nominal Christians with suspect motives and contested religious identities — as legitimate prisoners of war.\footnote{The sixteenth-century chronicler Luis del Mármol Carvajal described the debates over whether Morisco prisoners of war were legally slaves. See his influential and much-cited \textit{Historia del rebelión y castigo de los moriscos del Reino de Granada}, Capítulo XXXII, “Cómo se declaró que los prisioneros en esta guerra fuesen esclavos con cierta moderación.” Accessed March 9, 2016. 51/bmcdf7986 http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/nd/ark:/59851/bmcdf7986} Philip wrote,

\begin{quote}
Doubts, scruples, and difficulties have arisen in the minds of many as to whether the said rebel Moriscos who had been taken and captured by particular people were and have been made slaves by those who took them and if those and others who have come into their ownership in other ways can be made justly to serve them as slaves or be sold by them.\footnote{Philip II, “Pragmática” (July 30, 1572), 24-25: “... se ha hecho y puesto por algunas personas duda, escrupulo y dificultad, si los dichos moriscos rebelados q” assi fuero” tomados y captiuidos por personas particulares era” y se aua” hecho esclauos delos que los tomaro”, y si ansi ellos como los q” dellos tuuiessen titulos y culpa, o en otra manera, ouissen venido a su poder, se podia justamente seruir dellos como de esclauos y venderlos ...” This and all other translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.} Philip wrote,
\end{quote}

After lengthy consideration, a decision was reached: the Moriscos of Granada could (and some said should) be captured and enslaved. They had rebelled against the monarchy and were no longer
under the legal protection customarily enjoyed by royal subjects.\textsuperscript{26} The Moriscos’ lack of loyalty was compounded by perceptions of their religious affiliations. In the words of the sixteenth-century chronicler Luis del Mármol Carvajal, the Moriscos of Granada “appealed to Muhammad and declared themselves Muslims.”\textsuperscript{27} Secular and ecclesiastical authorities believed that the Moriscos were not sincere Catholics and had not assimilated into Christian society. They were perceived to consider themselves Muslims, and therefore were deemed to be enemies “ganados de buena guerra” — captured in a just war.\textsuperscript{28} This conclusion is a telling example of the political threat the Moriscos constituted.\textsuperscript{29}

This decision was qualified by restrictions on the enslavement of Morisco children. In Madrid on July 30, 1572, King Philip II issued a law that made illegal the enslavement of Morisco minors.\textsuperscript{30} The category of minors was defined in this case as under the age of ten and a half for boys and nine and a half for girls.\textsuperscript{31} According to the king’s law, captured Morisco children could not legally be kept as slaves; rather, they should be placed in the care of Old Christians to be raised and educated as Catholics. Morisco minors captured in the war were never to be returned to their parents. They would serve in the households of good Catholics until they reached the age of majority, which in this case was twenty years old.\textsuperscript{32} This law was reiterated in a royal order issued on October 6, 1572, which stated:

\begin{quote}
This business was discussed with such consideration, and it was resolved that they could and should be slaves, in conformity with a council decision made in the city of Toledo against rebellious Jews that there were in an other time.”
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{26} The king’s advisors also looked to historical precedent. According to Luis de Mármol Carvajal, the verdict was consistent with a decision reached at the Church councils of Toledo (ca. 588-711) regarding Jewish rebels. See \textit{Historia}, Capítulo XXXII: “This business was discussed with such consideration, and it was resolved that they could and should be slaves, in conformity with a council decision made in the city of Toledo against rebellious Jews that there were in an other time.”

\textsuperscript{27} Mármol Carvajal, \textit{Historia}, Capítulo XXXII.

\textsuperscript{28} Late medieval Christian-Mudejar relations were noteworthy precursors to this situation. See Meyerson, “Slavery and the Social Order” 147: “the Mudejars were still perceived as, and sometimes proved to be, politically unreliable and perhaps unworthy of the privilege of freedom. Throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it remained an idée fixe among many Christians, including the monarchs at times, that the Mudejars constituted a pro-Granadan or pro-Maghribian fifth column whose activities and movements needed to be regulated with a heavy hand. The Christians’ continual anxiety about Mudejar insurgency produced and perpetuated behaviours and institutions that had the submission and control of the Mudejars as their goal.”

\textsuperscript{29} Meyerson makes a similar connection between the status of Mudejars and their susceptibility to be enslaved in late medieval Valencia: “There is perhaps no clearer indication of the Mudejars’ status as a politically subjugated and socially inferior people than the ease with which they could pass from a state of freedom to one of servitude.” See “Slavery and the Social Order”, 149 and 164.

\textsuperscript{30} Philip II, “Pragmática” (July 30, 1572), 23-26.

\textsuperscript{31} There is no explanation given for the gendered difference in the age of minority.

\textsuperscript{32} Philip II, “Pragmática” (July 30, 1572), 25-26. This age of majority is given in a royal pragmatic issued later that same year, which outlined the rules of resettlement for the deported Granadans. See “Pragmática y declaración sobre los moriscos del reyno de Granada, y la orden que con ellos se ha de tener” (Madrid. October 6, 1572) in Francisco
We have declared, ordered, and mandated that the children of the rebellious Moriscos of the kingdom of Granada, boys under the age of ten and a half and girls under the age of nine and a half, who were taken as prisoners during the said rebellion, were and are not slaves … because our wish is that they be better instructed and taught, and raised in Christianity (christianamente criados), they may not stay or be in the power of the parents. We order that the justices place them with good ecclesiastical people, or secular people, who will raise and teach them. They will serve these people until they reach the age of twenty years old, after which they will be and remain free as are the rest of the Moriscos who were not taken prisoner.33

The first printed and published versions of this royal order were the July and October 1572 pragmatics. However, there is evidence that the ban on the capture and enslavement of Morisco minors was introduced earlier, during the war. Arévalo de Zuazo, the corregidor of Málaga, issued an order regarding the registration of captured Morisco children on September 3, 1569. It refers to the king’s law against the capture and enslavement of Morisco minors and to the instructions for captured Morisco youth to remain in service until the age of majority (men at twenty years, women at eighteen), but thereafter to enjoy their liberty.34

This contentious order was frequently disobeyed. Many reports show that “innocent children were branded and sold as slaves” before and after the decree was issued.35 The president of the Royal Chancery of Granada, Don Pedro de Deza, wrote to the king in October of 1574, telling him, “here we have reports that in Osuna and in other seigniorial towns there are many young boys, natives of this kingdom, who are branded on the face as slaves without being of the

Izquierdo, La Expulsión de los moriscos del reino de Granada: (pragmáticas, provisiones y órdenes reales), (Azur, 1983), 35. L.P. Harvey explains, "An adult cold be held responsible for his/her own rebellion and punished for it, but the penalty of enslavement could not be inflicted on minors. The fate of the children immediately after capture was not in any obvious way different from that of adults." See Muslims in Spain, 1500 to 1614 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 248.

33 Philip II, “Pragmática” (October 6, 1572), 35: “tenemos declarado, ordenado, y mandado que los hijos delos Moriscos rebelados del dicho reyno, menores los hombres de diez años y medio, y las mugeres de nueve años y medio, que durante la dicha rebellion fueron tomados y presos, no fueron ni son esclauos, segun mas largo en la dicha prouision se contiene. Y porque nuestra voluntad es, que para que los tales sean mas bien instituydos y enseñados, y cristianamente criados, no queden ni esten en poder de sus padres, mandamos que las justicias los pongan con buenas personas ecclesiasticas, o seglares que los crien y enseñen, y se siruan dellos, hasta que tengan edad de veente años, y que despues sean y quedan libres, segun que los demas Moriscos que no fueron presos y toma dos lo son.”


35 Mármol Carvajal, Historia, Capítulo XXXII: “… en esto hubo desde el principio mucha desorden, herrando a los niños inocentes y vendiéndolos por esclavos.” Likewise, Philip’s July 1572 pragmatic states, “And also that others with malice or ignorance have sold minor morisco slaves … sold them and used them as slaves, and some branded them with signs on their faces.” (25)
age to be slaves. They have no one to petition for justice on their behalf, nor to seek satisfaction from the ordinary justices.”

Wartime slaves had been captured by captains and soldiers in the army of Don Juan de Austria, the leader of the royal victory over the rebel Morisco forces. He felt it was cruel to kill women and children on the field of battle, and so instructed his soldiers to take them as prisoners. Battlefield reports sent to Philip II from Granada illustrate the conditions under which many Moriscos were captured. In one, Don Juan’s troops captured and enslaved an estimated four hundred Moriscos who surrendered after a similar number were killed near Seron. Other Morisco children were kidnapped outside of combat zones: a young Morisca girl named Inés de Ladrote was abducted during the war, even though her father, Andrés de Ladrote, was the leader of a troop that fought for the king to suppress the rebels. To protect his family, Andrés had moved his wife and children to Guadix, a supposedly safe place (lugar de paz) outside of the war zone. There, Christian soldiers kidnapped and enslaved Inés. The next time her family saw her, Inés had been branded and was the slave of Dona María de Castilla, a widow in Valladolid.

After winning the war in Granada, the royal response to the rebellion was the deportation of an estimated 80,000 Granadan Moriscos northward into Castile, including to the city of Valladolid. Morisco slaves were not expelled so as to allow Old Christians to keep them in the

36 AGS, legajo 2176, folio s.n.: “aqui se tiene relación que en osuna y otros lugares de señorío ay muchos muchachos delos naturales deste Reyno que estan herrados enel rostro como esclavos, no teniendo eddad para serlo ni quien pida ni buelua por su Justicia ni setiene satisfaçion quelas Justicias ordinarias sela haran”

37 Andújar Castillo argues that more Morisca women than Morisco men were enslaved in the Granadan war because of the high numbers of Morisco men killed and the ease with which Morisca women were captured. He asserts that the Morisco population that remained in Granada after the war — many being slaves exempt from the deportation — was therefore largely made up of women, and that the Morisco slave trade was principally a transaction of Morisca women. See “De la ‘Buena Guera’ al ‘Horro’.” 30. My records for Valladolid include more enslaved men and boys than women and girls (6 girls and 12 boys who litigated; more adult men than women in other sources); however, this is not enough evidence to make a substantial argument about gender and slavery in this region.

38 AGS, Estado, legajo 152, folio 3: “Relacion de las cosas de Granada hasta el xxv de marco 1570.” This is a report dated March 25, 1570, describing military encounters between royal troops and Morisco rebels near Galera, northeast of Guadix. A first assault resulted in the deaths of some captains of the king’s army; when the two sides next met, the royal forces were mostly uninjured, and reported, “none of our enemies escaped, they all died.” The Christian troops passed through Seron and set up to defend Tijola from the Morisco rebels. (Seron is just west of Tijola; both are south of Galera.) When the Moriscos tried to escape under the cover of a rainy night, the Christian soldiers advanced against them. The report estimates that over 400 Moriscos were killed, and that many men and women were captured (among them some Turks). Those who escaped were soon caught again, resulting in the surrender of a reported 100 men and up to 300 women.

39 ARCV, PL.CIV. 475.6. Galaz de Burgos (whose role as the administrator of the Moriscos is discussed below) defended Inés’ case beginning in 1578. She was manumitted in 1585 at the age of about seventeen, after the death of her parents.

40 See Chapter Two for more on the rebellion and expulsion of the Granada Moriscos. The figure of 80,000 deported Granadan Moriscos comes from the analysis of Bernard Vincent: “L’expulsion des Morisques du Royaume de
Kingdom of Granada. Captains and soldiers in the royal army bought and sold Morisco captives during the war and subsequent deportation, and took those captives home as slaves. For example, one profiteering captain in the king’s army named Francisco de Arteaga, commissioned to deport Moriscos from Granada to Valladolid, returned to that city much richer than he left it; among other newly acquired possessions he had with him two young male Morisco slaves. The suppression and dispersal of the Moriscos of Granada — a political and military victory that was also a religious and ideological triumph for the Crown — allowed Christian soldiers to be the victors who took the spoils. The sale and purchase of captives during the deportation were advantageous transactions for many soldiers and captains in the royal army who took Granadan Morisco slaves — including captured children — to many Castilian towns, including Valladolid.

A Valladolid municipal record book from 1594 includes the observation, “in this town there are a lot of slaves.” The evidence is not simply anecdotal. The enslaved population of Valladolid increased with the arrival of Granadan Morisco captives. A second escalation occurred after the Spanish annexation of Portugal in 1580, which brought a large number of African slaves (primarily from Angola and Mozambique) to Spain. Bennassar found that the number of bills of sale for slaves in Valladolid rose after 1570, and likewise noted a rise in entries of slaves’ names in the city’s parish books after 1580. By the late sixteenth century, Spain’s population of nine million included up to 100,000 slaves. The largest concentration was in the south, and Seville was second only to Lisbon for the largest number of slaves on the peninsula — and possibly on the European continent. Slave labour was not the bedrock of the economy, yet neither was

---


43 ARCV, PL.CIV 462,2, testimony of Gregorio Rubio. I discuss Captain Arteaga’s profiteering in Chapter Three.


45 Bennassar, 430, n.46. He cites A.M.V., Libro de Actas, 23 de mayo de 1594: “en esta villa hay muchos esclavos” Bennassar, 430.

46 Domínguez Ortiz, “La esclavitud en Castilla”, 9: “… seguramente, nunca pasaron de 100,000, pero, aún reducidos a estos límites, result la esclavitud un fenómeno de bastante volumen …”

47 Domínguez Ortiz, 9.
slavery uncommon in the early modern Crown of Castile. The king had slaves, mostly Turks and North Africans captured in war and put to hard labour and galley service; meanwhile many private individuals owned black African slaves who served as domestic and field labourers.  

Like other markets, the market for Morisco slaves reflected the pressures of supply and demand. According to one calculation, the average prices in mid-sixteenth-century Valladolid were 66.5 ducats (24,838 mrs) for a male slave and 69 ducats (25,875 mrs) for a female slave. A slave’s value was determined in part by his or her physical and “moral” attributes. Bills of sale usually described the physique, health, and age of a slave, along with something about their good character. Thieves, drunkards, and runaways were not desirable as slaves. In February of 1573, Juan Sevillano, a bonnet maker in Valladolid, sold his slave to Juan de Briones, a councilman of Medina del Campo and a gentilhombre who served in the king’s household. The slave in question was a twenty-three-year-old Granadan Morisco man named Alonso de Santiago, who had been branded on both sides of his face. The bill of sale guaranteed that he was not a thief or a drunk, and was in good health. Alonso de Santiago was sold for 50 ducats. Meanwhile, Vincente de Monforte was sold for 12,000 mrs and Lorenzo Gutierrez was sold for only 170 reales, or 5780 mrs. In Fernández Martín’s study, the highest prices paid for slaves in Valladolid were 200 ducats (the ransom of a male slave) and 150 ducats (sale of a female slave). The lowest prices he found were 13 ducats (sale of a male slave) and 6 ducats (sale of a female slave).

---

49 Núria Rodríguez Bernal, “Marginados de hoy y de ayer en la obra de Antonio Domínguez Ortiz,” Historia Social 47 (2003), 121.
51 Fernández Martín, 131. For currency valuation, see Kagan’s “Note on Currency and Spelling” in Lawsuits and Litigants in Castile: “Castile's money of account in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the maravedí. Coins in general usage included the real, officially pegged at 34 mrs., the ducat, which was equal to 375 mrs., and the escudo which was worth 400 mrs. after a revaluation in 1566.”
52 AHPV PN6714,48.
53 AHPV PN 6943, 330: In 1584, Cristóbal Rodríguez de Eván sold his slave to Sebastian de Castro for 12,000 maravedis; both buyer and seller were citizens of Medina del Campo. The notarized bill of sale shows that the slave was a man named Vincente de Monforte. He was a Granadan Morisco captured “ganado de buena guerra” during the rebellion; he was twenty-five or twenty-six years old at the time of this sale, so he would have been a boy at the time of his capture, perhaps just above the legal age of enslavement. His physical description is included in the document, which records him as having been tall with a lean, white face, branded as a slave on his cheeks and forehead.
54 AHPV, PN 7077, 531: On May 27, 1591, Gaspar Hernández, a shoemaker in Medina del Campo, sold his slave to Captain Sebastien de Palomar, also a citizen of Medina del Campo, for 170 reales. The slave in question was a Morisco man "made subject to slavery in buena guerra"; his name was Lorenzo Gutierrez and he was of medium height with white skin. Previously, Hernández had purchased Gutierrez from another man, Antonio de Mondiabilla, a citizen of Medina del Campo who died in 1591.
55 Comediantes, Esclavo, y Moriscos en Valladolid, 131.
Bills of sale could result in legal disputes, the records of which are another source of information about enslaved Granadan Moriscos. Juan de Valle, a royal army captain and the king’s chamberlain, purchased from two soldiers in his company a Morisco slave named Alonso, described as a captive of “buena Guerra.” Living in Madrid after the war, Juan de Valle sold Alonso to Doctor Juan Paez de Sotomayor. Juan de Valle contested the completion of this sale when Sotomayor died during the transaction; while residing in Valladolid in September of 1572, he submitted his claim over the then thirty-year-old Alonso to the Royal Chancery Court. The case was settled in favour of Captain de Valle on June 25, 1574.\(^{56}\)

Slave owners could issue notarized letters of manumission, called a *carta de horro*, in order to grant legal freedom to their slaves. The term *horro* is derived from *ahorrar*, which meant to excuse someone from labour or to save someone from difficulty, and came to denote liberating a slave.\(^{57}\) These letters were sometimes issued in reward for “many good and loyal years of service”, often in the will of a deceased owner.\(^{58}\) For example, in Valladolid, Dona Francisca de Vozmediano gave her elderly Morisco slave Lorenço de Ferryas to a religious order as an act of charity; the order later granted him his freedom.\(^{59}\) Letters of manumission were more commonly issued in return for a set number of remaining years of service and/or in return for a ransom price (*rescate*).\(^{60}\)

This was the case when Antonio de Galarza, corregidor of Valladolid, issued a letter of manumission to his slave, a forty-year-old Morisca woman named Isabel Manrique. Her freedom was conditional; Isabel was bound to eight more years of slavery, first serving for four years Galarza’s son Martín de Galarza, and then another four years Martín’s sister, Doña Isabel de Solís.

\(^{56}\) ARCV, PL.CIV. 716,3.  
\(^{57}\) Domínguez Ortiz provides *ahorrar* as the etimological root of *horro*. ("La esclavitud," 18). The definition of *ahorrar* (meaning ‘to save’ in modern usage) comes from the “Diccionario de la Lengua Española”, Real Academia Española (Vigésima segunda edición), accessed June 12, 2013, http://lema.rae.es/drae/  
\(^{58}\) Fernández Martín, 145. In rare cases, non-Christian slaves were granted liberty for their conversion to Christianity; Moriscos were already baptized, and therefore did not fit into this category. Fernández Martín (148) notes two cases of Turkish slaves granted freedom for their conversions to Christianity. Interestingly, one of these examples pertains to a slave manumitted in 1597 by Don Juan de Menchaca, the same man who owned Juan and Lucas de Almudey.  
\(^{59}\) AGS, CC 2184. “diole en limosna a los teatinos en san lacaro.” He was seventy years old and had lived in Valladolid eight years when he was registered in this census in 1583. Debra Blumenthal examines similar “pious bequests” in fifteenth-century Valencia; see Enemies and Familiars, 196-198.  
\(^{60}\) This was also common in other regions. See examples in Vélez Blanco in Andújar Castillo, “De la ‘Buena Guera’ al ‘Horro’.” 32.
In January of 1587, Martín de Galarza attempted to persuade his sister to give Isabel her liberty without fulfilling her final four years of slavery, citing Manrique’s old age and her years of loyal service. A ransom price was established in lieu of extended service. Two Granadan Morisco men, Francisco de Luna and Bartolomé de Madrid, paid the ransom of 230 reales for Isabel de Manrique’s freedom.\(^{61}\) In another case, Antonio de Luna, a citizen of Valladolid, caballero in the Order of Santiago and a captain of the king’s cien continos, freed his Granadan Morisco slave Alonso Hernández in 1587. The letter of manumission relates how Hernández had run away from his owner ten years earlier; during his decade of independence, he married and raised a family in Salamanca. De Luna had Hernández put in jail when he located him in 1587, but then agreed to free him — from jail and from slavery — for a ransom price. Alonso de Campos, a Granadan Morisco tailor and citizen of Salamanca, arranged and paid for the ransom. De Luna represented this manumission as an act of charity in the service to God.\(^{62}\)

The financial assistance of free Granadan Moriscos was central to the liberation of Granadan captives of war.\(^{63}\) The relationships between manumitted slaves and those financing the ransoms are not always made apparent in records of manumission, but often it was the family of the enslaved party who paid the ransom price.\(^{64}\) The negotiation and payment of ransoms were mechanisms by which Granadan Morisco families attempted to support each other and attempted to reunite in the aftermath of the war and deportation.\(^{65}\) Considering their dispersal and the official restrictions on their mobility, distance could be a major impediment to negotiating and paying these ransoms.\(^{66}\) The rescate process was an expensive, complicated, and multi-step process; the effort and cost involved in each case are evidence of Granadan Morisco community and solidarity in the face of war and enslavement. I have not located any evidence of local Vallisoletano Moriscos (the antiguos mudejares of the Barrio de Santa María whom I discuss in Chapters One and Two).

\(^{61}\) AHPV PN 754, 52. See also Fernández Martín, 169-170.
\(^{62}\) AHPV PN 754, 1110 (1587)
\(^{63}\) Fernández Martín, 147.
\(^{64}\) This is demonstrated throughout in Andújar Castillo, “De la ‘Buena Guera’ al ‘Horro’.”
\(^{65}\) This argument find support in Andújar Castillo, “De la ‘Buena Guera’ al ‘Horro’” 31: “La compra de la libertad era el único medio de unir lo que la guerra había separado: la familia morisca. En numerosos rescates se aprecia no sólo el ansia de libertad, sino, sobre todo, el denotado esfuerzo por reconstruir las familias divididas por la expulsión de los moriscos y por la esclavitud de los que habían quedado en el antiguo Reino de Granada.”
\(^{66}\) Comparative examples are offered in Andújar Castillo, “De la ‘Buena Guera’ al ‘Horro’.” 32. I discuss the deportation and prohibitions on Granadan travel and relocation in Chapter Three.
assisting or ransoming Granadan Morisco slaves. It is certainly possible that some such actions or affiliations did not survive in the documentary record. It is likely, however, that the Morisco natives of Valladolid felt it would be disadvantageous to be associated with Granadans, and especially with Moriscos enslaved during the rebellion. As I discuss in Chapters One, Two, and Five, the *antiguos* of Valladolid represented themselves collectively in many petitions as loyal and established royal subjects of an ancient and local lineage. It makes sense that they would not have wanted to appear to be in collusion with deported foreign rebels.

Communal ransoming of enslaved individuals was a regular practice in early modern Europe, practiced by some religious orders, confraternities and other lay organizations.\(^\text{67}\) To look at it another way, ransom payments made by Granadan Moriscos may also have been attempts to comply with Islamic laws regarding charity and familial support. There was precedent in late medieval Valencia, where Mudejar individuals and communities liberated Mudejar and foreign Muslim slaves by purchasing them or paying their ransom. This almsgiving was an act of Islamic piety and of solidarity with other Muslims that connected them to the wider Islamic world, “consciously identifying with the *umma*.\(^\text{68}\) Late sixteenth-century Valladolid was not medieval Valencia; it was illegal to be a Muslim in late sixteenth-century Spain, and Moriscos in Castile lacked Islamic religious leadership, which was central to these endeavours.\(^\text{69}\) It is nevertheless conceivable that Granadan Moriscos continued to identify with the Muslim community and to practice these Islamic forms of solidarity.

While some adult slaves achieved freedom through ransom payments and letters of manumission, only Granadan Moriscos captured as children had legal grounds to challenge their enslavement using Philip’s 1572 pragmatics. Courts of law were mandated to investigate the


\[68\] Meyerson, “Slavery and Solidarity”, 327. See also Meyerson, “Slavery and the Social Order”, 170: “As Islamic law enjoined, Mudejar families redeemed their loved ones from their Christian masters.” and n.75: “Llibre de la Çuna e Xara, 92-93, capitols CCCXXVI and CCCXXVII: parents and children are obliged to redeem each other, while the siblings and other relatives of the slave may use their discretion in the matter of the slave’s redemption. It is clear from the documentation that the ransoming of Mudejar slaves often involved the efforts of a wide circle of relatives and friends.”

\[69\] Meyerson writes that religious leadership was “crucial … in inspiring and organizing all this assistance.” See “Slavery and Solidarity,” 320.
legitimacy of claims of illegal enslavement, both to protect the financial interests of slave owners and to extend justice to captured Morisco minors. Lawsuits were initiated and undertaken by special procurators in cases when Old Christian masters refused to liberate their Granadan slaves. Attorneys acting with power of attorney on behalf of their clients were called procurators; their primary task was "to take care of the lawsuits and cases of another by order of the party concerned." These procurators were men expressly appointed to be administrators of deported Morisco populations by order Philip II in October 1572:

It is our wish and order that in each of the principal towns, a suitable town councilman is appointed to be the superintendent, and as patron and defender of the said Moriscos he will take particular care of all matters pertaining to them, and will be given an official copy of the registry, or list, as described above. A councilman may be appointed for this post each year, or for more time, as decided by the justice and government in each place.

In Valladolid, corregidor Don Alonso de Messia named Galaz de Burgos to this position in November 1572. He was put in charge of the registration of the Granadan deportees resettled in the city and its jurisdiction, and ordered to restrict them from leaving their assigned places of residence without express license. Galaz de Burgos is on record as procurator for enslaved Granadan Moriscos in Valladolid in cases as early as 1574 and until at least 1589. The municipal council of Valladolid recognized the urgent need for his procuratorship “to defend and protect them in their lawsuits” and in 1577 asked the king to finance the salary of this “important and necessary” position.

---

70 Kagan, 57, quoting “Muñoz, Práctica de procuradores, p. 1. The Siete Partidas (Partida III, título 5, ley 1) defined a procurador as "the person who receives or follows lawsuits and other legal business by order of the party concerned." (n.125) For more on the duties of attorneys and lawyers, see Kagan, 52-57. Additionally, the title of procurador was applied to other types of offices; for example, officials titled “procurators” were also named to administer overseas regions and populations under Spanish control.

71 Philip II, “Pragmática” (October 6, 1572) 37: “es nuestra voluntad y mandamos que en cada vno delos lugares principales, se no"bre" de"mas" de la justicia vn Regidor de los que parecieren mas a proposito, que sea superintendente, y como patro” y defensor delos dichos Moriscos q” tenga particular cuydado de lo que les tocare, al qual se ha de dar vna copia, o traslado autorizado del dicho registro, o lista, como arriba esta dicho: y tal Regidor se podra nombrar en cada vn año, o por mas tiempo, como pareciere ala justicia y regimiento de los dichos lugares."

72 AGS, CC, legajo 2168, folio s.n. I discuss the rules of resettlement in more detail in Chapter Three.

73 AMV CH 00129 – 10, S.A. (leg 321): "Provisión real de Felipe II al corregidor de Valladolid para que emita información sobre que la villa pide licencia para pagar cierto salario al administrador de los moriscos de Granada repartidos en dicha ciudad." (September 16, 1577). “que aviendose platicado y conferido en el ayuntami[ent]o della quan yportante y necesario era que oviese y se nombrase una persona que particularmente tuiese cuydado y quenta y razon con los moriscos que enesa dha villa viese de los quesello se asuian repartido del reyno de granada y defenderlos y amparar los en sus pleytos asi sobre sus libertades como sobre otras cosas”
Galaz Antolínez de Burgos was an Old Christian citizen of Valladolid, where he was a town councilman (regidor) and a notary (escribano de número).\textsuperscript{75} He was a man of considerable status and wealth; after his death in 1597, his wife, Catalina Alfonso de Saavedra, ordered an inventory of his property, which included vineyards, houses, livestock, furniture, and a large library.\textsuperscript{76} Galaz de Burgos’ interactions with the Morisco population of Valladolid were not limited to his administrative functions. He employed a Granadan Morisco gardener named Miguel de Baeza in his fields.\textsuperscript{77} He also owned a Granadan Morisco slave named Miguel de Molina, whom he freed in 1574 for the ransom price of sixty escudos.\textsuperscript{78} His important functions within the Royal Chancery Court and municipal administration and his substantial property mark Galaz de Burgos as reasonably representative of the educated, affluent, and influential non-noble ranks that personified sixteenth-century Valladolid’s status as an important centre of administration and justice.

Instructions from the king reveal the mechanisms by which Galaz de Burgos would have managed the task of implementing and enforcing the royal orders against the enslavement of Morisco minors in his jurisdiction. First, owners were required to register their Morisco slaves.\textsuperscript{79} The administrator of the Moriscos was to be provided with a register of all the Granadan deportees (free and enslaved) in his jurisdiction. A bureaucrat called a jurado was to be appointed to assist the administrator in registering Moriscos in their new parishes and in conducting regular visitations. The administrator was supposed to conduct a general visitation of the Moriscos of his jurisdiction every month, and the jurado was ordered to visit the Moriscos in each parish every fifteen days.\textsuperscript{80} I have not located records confirming that Galaz de Burgos observed these

\textsuperscript{75} Galaz de Burgos is often introduced as a regidor of Valladolid in documents including his name, and his name also appears in lists of city councilmen in the Libros de Actas (town council record books, held at the Archivo Municipal de Valladolid) in the 1570s-80s.

\textsuperscript{76} AHPV, PN 1036, 650: “Inventario de los bienes del escribano Galaz Antolínez de Burgos” (August 8, 1597). See also Fernández Martín, 167.

\textsuperscript{77} AHPV, PN 521, 53 (1590). See also Fernández Martín, 167, who recorded this man’s name as Jusepe de Baeza.

\textsuperscript{78} AHPV, PN, 549, 93: “Galaz Antolínez de Burgos, escribano del número, da libertad a su esclavo morisco Miguel mediante el pago de 60 escudos” (February 13, 1574). See also Fernández Martín, 167.


\textsuperscript{80} Philip II, “Pragmática” (October 6, 1572), 37-38. These visitations were also supposed to inform local officials, and the king, “how [Granadan Moriscos] live, and how they are occupied and sustained, and how the poor are helped, and the sick cured, and to take special care of the poor and the sick, with an order that the priest intervene in each parish.”
directions with strict regularity. However, he must have fulfilled his supervisory duty in some capacity, because at the very least he located many cases of enslaved Granadan Morisco minors in Valladolid and represented them in their litigation for liberty.  

The cases Galaz de Burgos initiated against slave owners who violated the king’s law were presided over by royal officers, both ordinary and appellate. Lawsuits began at the level of justicia ordinaria, where the judge was either the corregidor or a municipal judge called an alcalde ordinario. Cases began with the presentation of a petition called a demanda requesting the legal manumission of the enslaved party in compliance with the 1572 orders and denouncing the defendant for keeping an underage slave. The trial of Juan and Lucas de Almudey, the enslaved Morisco youths introduced at the beginning of this chapter, began with just such a petition. On July 10, 1574, their older brother García de Almudey presented the following petition to the corregidor of Valladolid, Doctor Pareza de Peralta:

Among the Moriscos who were captured in the war in Granada were my brothers, Juan and Lucas, who lived in the town of Jerez, Marquesado de Çenete. At this time, the said Juan was nine years old, and the said Lucas was seven years old. At present, señor licenciado Menchaca holds and treats them as his slaves. In conformity with the orders of his majesty, because the said Lucas and Juan were younger than ten years old at the time when they were captured in the war in Granada, they can not and should not be slaves, but rather, free men and not subject to servitude … I ask and plead that you declare the said Juan and Lucas to be free men and not subject to any servitude, and as free men that they may live and die in these kingdoms with all liberty. And [I ask] that you condemn the said señor licenciado Menchaca to not be able to hold [them] as slaves, nor detain them nor molest them in any way.

García de Almudey called for Menchaca to declare where and when he came to possess the Almudey boys as slaves, and to swear how old they were at the time of their capture. He also

---

81 See Appendix 3.
82 Helen Nader, *Liberty in absolutist Spain: the Habsburg sale of towns, 1516-1700* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), xvi: “In the Habsburg period, municipal judges of cities, towns, and villages were called alcaldes ordinarios officially and just alcaldes in daily usage.”
83 ARCV, PL.CIV 973,6 (Demanda, July 1574): “Senor Garcia de Almudey, digo; que entre los moriscos que se cautibaron en la guerra de granada se cautibaron a Juan y Lucas q bibian en la villa de xerez en el marquesado de çenete myss hermanos // E al tiempo el dho Juan [tenia] nuebe años y el dho Lucas a siete años los que al presente el senor Liçenq mynchaca los tiene y trata como sus hesclauos y por a conforme a la prematica de su magestad por ser menores los dhos lucas y Juan de diez años al tiempo que los cautibaron en la dha guerra de granada no pueden ni deuen ser esclauos sino onbres libres e no sujetos a serbidumbre //” It is likely that García de Almudey had the assistance of Galaz de Burgos and/or other procurators in preparing this petition, called a demanda. Guardians named Diego Juni and Maximiliano Burgos also appear in other pages of the case records.
requested that Juan and Lucas be placed in the custody of another person until justice was decided in their case. According to their claims of having been nine and seven years old at the time of the capture, the boys would have been more or less fifteen and thirteen years old at the time of their trial. After further deliberation, Juan and Lucas de Almudey appeared in person with Galaz de Burgos to hear corregidor Peralta’s verdict on November 29, 1574. The declared Lucas de Almudey to be free and Juan de Almudey to remain a slave. The evidence of Juan’s minority must have been insufficient to prove that the king’s law applied to his case.

The age at which the plaintiff was captured was the crux of the deliberation in these lawsuits. The defense always argued that the slave was above the age of minority at the time of capture; the prosecution had to prove the minority of their client. A Morisca slave named Úrsula was only five or six years old when she was captured in Granada. As evidence of her young age at the time of capture, her lawyer explained that she was so small that she was carried in the arms of her captors during most of their journey to Madrid, where Úrsula was first sold as a slave. Another case concerns María Serón's sons, captured during the war in Granada when Luis was 6 and Francisco was 4. The boys became the slaves of Gutierre de Vargas (who served as an infantry captain in the Granadan war) and his mother Juana de Sotomayor in Tordesillas, a town near Valladolid. With the legal representation of Galaz de Burgos and a procurator named Gaspar de Valcazar, Maria won her sons' liberty — twice, in fact: first in a decision from the corregidor of

---

84 ARCV, PL.CIV. 973,6, “Vista de los esclavos” (November 29, 1574): “… fallo atento los autos e meritos deste pleyto e probanca del e los [autos] delas personas delos dhos Juan e Lucas de almudey esclavos que deuo de declarar e declaro el dho lucas de almudey no ser esclavo cautibo e le doy por libre e quito para que nolo sea sino libre = e enquanto al dho Juan de almudey declaro ser esclavo cautibo del dh don juan de menchaca. e por esta mi sentencia definitiba. juzgando, ansi o pronun.o e mando sin cartas el doctor pareja.”

85 As in the majority of these lawsuits concerning enslaved Morisco minors, this decision to liberate Lucas was appealed at the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid. The final sentencing in the Almudey case is in ARCV, EJ 1331, 70, “Ejecutoria del pleito litigado por Juan y Lucas de Almudey, residentes en Jerez del Marquesado (Granada), con Juan de Menchaca, alguacil mayor de la Real Chancillería de Valladolid, sobre la liberación de los primeros, apresados y esclavizados durante la Rebelión de las Alpujarras.” (June 3, 1576) Unlike the rest of the collection of cartas de ejecutoria from the Archivo de la Real Chancillería de Valladolid, this document is not accessible online and is not in my possession.

86 The age of minority in this era was relative. As explained above, the age of minority for Morisco captives was under nine and a half for girls and ten and a half for boys. The age of majority for freely leaving the service of Old Christians after manumission was eighteen to twenty. Men and widows had to be older than twenty-five to represent themselves in court.

87 ARCV, PL.CIV. 280,7. See a 1580 petition filed within the case: “… al tiempo del levantamiento dela guerra de granada que fue quando cautivaron ala dha mj parte hera niña de cinco o seys anos y no podia tener mas porque la trayan braços las mas vezes y ansi mismo quando la parte contra la conpro en la villa de madrid … la trayan de mano por ser de tan poca hedad …” The outcome of this lawsuit has been lost, so Úrsula's fate is unknown.
Tordesillas, and again at the Royal Chancery Court in Valladolid after Gutierre and Juana appealed the decision. While the defense argued that the boys were captured “en buena guerra” and cost their owners a lot of money in raising them, María’s procurator proved that the boys were minors when enslaved. This alone won the case in December 1573.  

The roles of María Serón and García de Almudey are noteworthy as they petitioned the courts on behalf of their relatives. With her lawyer, Isabel Guzmán also successfully litigated for the liberation of her children, Gaspar and Catalina, which she secured from the Royal Chancery Court judges in June of 1580. Like the efforts of deported Granadan Moriscos to reunite with their kin and pre-expulsion communities that I examined in Chapter Three, this pursuit of freedom was in part about the reconstitution of Granadan families. Parents, siblings, and friends desired the liberty of minors enslaved in the war and so provided them with financial and legal support. In most cases, their age, gender, resources, or the detention of their masters meant that the enslaved parties could not litigate without the assistance of family members, legal guardians, lawyers, and special procurators.

In fact, with the exception of widows, women and minors were required to have adult male relatives or lawyers act as guardians on their behalf in legal matters. While sixteenth-century Castile was a profoundly litigious society even among the less privileged social orders — the powerful and wealthy, the middling sorts, and the poor estates all might have had their day in court — the courtroom was “a world populated principally by adult males.” A guardian called a curador ad litem was appointed to represent women and litigants under the age of twenty-five, which was the legal age at which a person could represent him or herself in court. In the cases of enslaved Morisco minors, this curatorship was required in addition to the representation of a lawyer and/or the administrator of the Moriscos. In some cases, one lawyer acted in multiple capacities for a client — for example, as guardian and procurator. In others, Galaz de Burgos appeared not only in his role as administrator of the Moriscos but also as legal guardian of the minor when no family member was present to act in that role.

Along with the participation of legal guardians, relatives, and lawyers, almost all of the known cases of enslaved Morisco minors in Valladolid feature Galaz de Burgos as the defender of

---

88 ARCV, EJ 1278, 26.
89 ARCV, EJ 1423, 19.
the Granadan Moriscos. This position was neither new nor anomalous. Seville, too, appointed a “superintendent” of the Moriscos.\textsuperscript{91} In Córdoba, municipal magistrates sometimes acted on behalf of enslaved Morisco minors.\textsuperscript{92} Various contemporary offices mediated between socially marginalized groups and government institutions in the late medieval and early modern Spanish world: these included municipal or state salaried procurators of the poor, the miserable, and the Indians.\textsuperscript{93} For example, royal officials were appointed to protect and monitor indigenous populations in the Spanish Americas.\textsuperscript{94} A procurator of the miserable (procurador dels miserables) provided legal representation and protection to slaves in fifteenth-century Valencia submitting their demands for liberty (demandes de libertat).\textsuperscript{95} Procurators of the poor were employed in most Spanish cities and towns, including Valladolid.\textsuperscript{96} Paupers’ lawsuits were not uncommon.\textsuperscript{97} The records of several cases of Morisco minors litigating for freedom in Valladolid indicate that they received poor relief in the forms of legal representation and financial assistance; these trial records are marked as “litigation of the poor” (“litigan por pobres” or “pleito de pobres”).\textsuperscript{98} The Morisca slave Catalina de Carvajal was granted financial assistance so that she could pursue her case at the Royal Chancery Court in Valladolid, despite being “poor and miserable.” This permission was

\textsuperscript{91} Manual F. Fernández and Rafael M. Pérez García, En los márgenes de la ciudad de Dios: moriscos en Sevilla (Universidad de Zaragoza, 2009).
\textsuperscript{92} L.P. Harvey, Muslims in Spain, 248.
\textsuperscript{93} Spanish colonial administrators appointed procurators of the Indians and of the poor in the Americas. Many of these letters of appointment to offices in the Spanish Americas are held in the collection of the Archivo General de Indias in Seville. For example, see AGI Patronato 231, N.4, R.4: “La Audiencia de México nombra por procurador general de los indios al doctor Bartolomé Melgarejo, a quien le da la instrucción correspondiente para el desempeño de su oficio” (Mexico, 1551).
\textsuperscript{95} Debra Blumenthal, Enemies and familiars, 211-214.
\textsuperscript{96} For example, see AGS CJH 141, “Nomina de Valladolid” (December 20, 1575), which appoints “Letrados de pobres” and “Procuradores de Pobres.”
\textsuperscript{97} Kagan, Lawsuits and litigants, 13: “In theory, the ‘poor’ were entitled to free legal services, and, after the late thirteenth century, the monarchy maintained at each of its higher tribunals an advocate and attorney ‘de pobres’ whose job it was to help poor litigants bring their cases to court. Many cities provided similar services. In practice, however, many of the lawsuits presented by paupers (pleitos de pobres) were given only summary treatment, and in 1590 the official visitor to the chancillería of Valladolid said that poor litigants were obliged to ‘sell their capes’ in order to pay the fees illegally charges by the abogado de pobres (advocate of the poor). Even so, according to most evidence, the poor appeared regularly in the crown’ tribunals … in Valladolid paupers in the late sixteenth century initiated between two and three hundred cases each year.”
\textsuperscript{98} These include the cases of Morisco slaves Inés de Ladrote (ARCV, PL.CIV 475,6), Isabel de Guzman for her children Gaspar and Catalina (ARCV, PL.CIV 170,2), and Juan and Lucas de Almudey (ARCV, PL.CIV 973,6).
arranged through a petition from her procurator and was supported by the testimony of two Morisco witnesses who attested to her serious financial need. Provisions for the legal representation of abject peoples was a way in which the authorities asserted control over such populations, as this mediation facilitated their surveillance and management. This intervention would not have felt out of place to early modern Castilians; in fact, they attributed a level of civic duty to attorneys, whose work was “essential to everyday life.”

When the decisions of the corregidor or ordinary judges were appealed, cases moved to a higher seat of justice: the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid. For example, in 1573 Galaz de Burgos secured from the corregidor of Valladolid the liberty of Hernando de Mendoza, called Hernandillo, a Morisco from Granada who had been captured as a child. His owner, Pedro Castillo, a clergyman in Valladolid, appealed this decision, but the judges upheld the original verdict in an executive order issued on September 24, 1574. The day-to-day progress of these high-stakes cases was slow and bureaucratic, involving reams of paperwork. Royal Chancery Court judges (oidores) would review the petition of the plaintiff, the causes for the appeal from the defense, the witness testimony, and any other pertinent documentation (such as bills of sale, powers of attorney, and requests for poor relief). While some cases were abandoned (olvidados), most of these trials were seen through to conclusion (fenecidos) and received definitive sentencing (sentencia definitiva) within one or two years.

---

99 Her procurator, Gaspar de Valcazar, was listed a decade earlier as a procurator for the poor. See AGS CJH 141, “Nomina de Valladolid” (December 20, 1575). Gaspar de Valcazar was very likely still working in this role, and he appears as procurator in other trial records of enslaved Morisco minors. These include Úrsula (ARCV, PL.CIV 280,7) and Maria Serón for her sons, Francisco and Luis (ARCV, EJ 1278, 26). He may have worked as a regular attorney, as the name Gaspar de Valcazar is listed as defense procurador for Don Juan de Menchaca versus Juan and Lucas de Almudey – but I cannot be certain this is the same man.

100 ARCV, PL.CIV 777.4.

101 Kagan, 60: “a society in which litigation had become so pervasive that the work of the attorney was essential to everyday life. Attorneys, accordingly, were judged as if they were public officials with broad civic responsibilities rather than private practitioners who had invested considerable sums to obtain the exclusive right to represent litigants in court. The crown provided for the poor by offering the free services of a procurador de pobres, but the contradiction posed by the proper role of the attorney in a litigious society was one that Castile, like most societies, was never able adequately to resolve.”

102 ARCV, EJ 1298.58.

103 See Kagan (chapter 5) and Bennassar (pages 338-345) for descriptions of the Chancery officials. The high offices of the Royal Chancery Court included the President, 16 high judges (oidores), 4 ordinary judges (alcaldes), a number of specific judges (Juez Mayor de Vizcaya, Alcaldes de Hijosdalgo) and various prosecutors (fiscales) and notaries (notarios). Many kinds of scribes worked at the court (escribanos de cámara, de crimen, de provincia). Lawyers who worked at the Royal Chancery Court were called abogados, procuradores, and solicidores (a lesser position, requiring only a license from the Royal Chancery Court to practice). A limited, privileged number of
Overseeing a large jurisdiction, this appellate court decided on the cases of enslaved Granadan Morisco minors from across Castile, including places such as Logroño, Ciudad Rodrigo, Zamora, and Toledo. Slave owners from the Valladolid region could become embroiled in lawsuits in other jurisdictions at the level of ordinary courts, or even before the kingdom’s other highest court of appeals, the Royal Chancery Court of Granada. Antonio de Valladolid, a citizen of the nearby town of Medina del Campo, traveled to Granada on business in 1574. He took with him his Granadan Morisco slave (an unnamed muchacho morisquillo) and found himself in trouble with the Chancery Court of Granada when his slave denounced him. Antonio claimed that he did not know about the ban on the enslavement of Morisco minors. The result of this case is unknown, but his excuse would have been difficult to defend. The illegality of the enslavement of Granadan Morisco children was proclaimed publicly in towns across the kingdom along with the rules governing the resettlement of the deportees. Philip’s 1572 pragmatics included orders be read “in the plazas and the marketplaces, and other customary places, so that it might come to the attention of everyone.” Corregidor Messia had these laws read in front of his own house in Valladolid on November 9, 1572.

And yet slave owners were not discouraged from defending themselves when denounced for keeping an underage slave. The July 1572 pragmatic aimed to protect slave owners against potential false claims of freedom made by Moriscos who did not fit under the protection of this law. Lest the law be used as an escape route from legal slavery, judges were instructed to pay careful attention to Morisco claims of illegal capture. While the pragmatic stated that those who maliciously captured, branded, and sold underage slaves must be punished according to the quality of their crimes, it also maintained that people who were ignorant of the illegal capture of the slaves

procurators, scribes, and receptors were titled de número. See Grace E. Coolidge, Guardianship, Gender, and the Nobility in Early Modern Spain (Ashgate, 2011), 17-18 for a brief but useful description of the “complicated juxtaposition of royal and local law” that formed the legal code of early modern Castile – a mix of formal laws (Siete Partidas, Liber iudicum) and codified local tradition (Fueros).

104 ARCV, EJ 1679, 6 (1590).
105 ARCV, EJ 1309, 42 (1575).
106 ARCV, PL.CIV 141,1 (1580).
107 ARCV, PL.CIV 557,3 (1584).
108 AGS CC 2169, folio s.n. (September 22, 1574).
109 Philip II, “Pragmática” (July 30, 1572), 26. “… en las plaças y mercados y otros lugares acostúbrados, para que vea a noticia de todos …”
110 AGS, CC, legajo 2168, folio s.n. (November 1572).
they purchased could get their money back from the original seller. Litigation was costly, and judges often deemed the losing party to be financially responsible for the legal costs incurred by both parties (*condena en costas*). Still, slave owners were financially motivated to pursue the return of their slaves through the court of appeals: at stake was the price of the slave, the value of the labour the slave provided, and the status conferred upon them as slave owners.

This is likely the central reason why slave owners challenged the liberation of their slaves and appealed to the Royal Chancery Court: with an official record of their case, they could seek restitution for the cost of their slave from whom they had first purchased the captive. Some case records include orders for this financial settlement, which was called a *saneamiento*. When the Morisca slave Catalina de Carvajal was liberated by the corregidor of Valladolid in 1585, Dona Isabel de Porras was permitted to request the return of the 100 ducats that her late husband, Diego Ximénez Encisso, had paid for Catalina to Juan Delgado, the secretary of the king’s Council of War. When Porras appealed the liberation of her slave, the Royal Chancery Court judges confirmed that de Porras should receive *saneamiento* from Delgado. Similarly, in October 1577, the judges ordered Melchior de Valencia to repay Juan de Aranda the price he had paid years earlier for the Morisco slave Andrés del Río. Owners of Morisco captives in Valladolid contested the loss of their slaves — through often lengthy and costly trials — in order to pursue financial settlement.

Though the potential indoctrination and integration of liberated Morisco youths were matters of great concern to Spanish authorities, the judges did not examine the religious practices or beliefs of the litigants. Within these lawsuits, the Moriscos whose faith was questioned were the witnesses. A common tactic used by defense lawyers was to discredit the testimony of Morisco witnesses by claiming they were in collusion with the Morisco slave. They asserted that New Christian witnesses could not be trusted to swear faithfully to tell the truth. Regardless, Morisco witnesses did testify under oath in these lawsuits. The act of swearing was called a *juramento*, and it is described in some of the court records. Francisca Mexia, a Granadan Morisca living in Valladolid, was sworn in as a witness in the trial of Gaspar and Catalina, the captured Morisco.

111 Philip II, “Pragmática” (July 30, 1572).
112 ARCV, PL.CIV. 777,4.
113 ARCV, PL.CIV. 281,4.
children of Isabel Guzmán. Francisca was required to make the sign of the cross with her right hand, “for our Lord and his mother Santa María, and the four Apostles … and swearing as a good and Catholic Christian, fearful of God and [her] conscience to say the truth about what [she] might know and what [she is] asked as witness …”

This required oath taking did not dissuade defense lawyers from calling into question the credibility of Morisco witnesses. In 1588, General Diego Flores de Valdes' lawyer appealed the liberation of his slave Pedro de Carmona because the witnesses for Pedro’s case were his Granadan relatives with a presumed personal interest in the case. Moreover, as Moriscos, they were “lowly people who should not be believed.” Similarly, in 1586, Dona Isabel de Porras’ procurator discredited the testimony of Morisco witnesses presented to support the case of her Morisca slave, Catalina de Carvajal. He argued that Porras’ appeal was legitimate in part because the Morisco witnesses “could not be given any credit.” These attempts at defamation relied on and were fed by popular anxieties about Moriscos as insincere Catholics and were compounded by the lack of trust placed in the foreign Granadan New Christians. The eligibility of a Morisca witness in the 1581 trial between the slave Rafael Hernández and his owner Blas López de Mello was called into question because of her religious identity: “She is interested in this case because she is a morisco and has the same interests as the said Rafael. Moreover … she cannot swear faithfully because she is a Morisco. She speaks in favour of the Morisco and would [lie] to gain wrongful liberty to the said Rafael.”

---

114 This may have been the same Francisca (de) Mexia, Granadan Morisca slave in Valladolid, whose letter of manumission was negotiated in June 1580 after her daughter Isabelica was freed as an enslaved minor. I discuss this case below; see AHPV, PN 566, 788.
115 ARCV, PL.CIV. 170,2: “… por nos [n]uestro senor y por santa maria su madre y por los palbras de los santos quatro evangellios … que como buena y catholica cristiana temerosa de dios y de su conçia dira la Vdad delo q supiere y le fuere preguntado en qual presentado por testigo …”
116 ARCV, PL.CIV. 903.1: "lo otro por que los testigos presentadas por la parte contraria son varios y singulares en sus dhos y partes ynteressadas que ynducieron a la parte contraria que siguiente este Pleyto y son moriscos del Reyno de Granada y parientes del dho sclavo y personas vajas a quien no se deue creer"
117 ARCV, PL.CIV. 777.4: “lo otro porque los tes[tigo]s presentados por la parte contraria que algo quisieron decir son moriscos alos qua[les] noseles puede dar se ni credito alguno en semejantes causa s que estas”
118 ARCV, PL.CIV. 989.2. In this case, the non-Morisco witnesses were also discredited for disreputable associations with the Morisco litigant and for alleged personal interests in the case. In November of 1581, Blas López de Mello’s defense lawyer submitted to the court a document to discredit the five witnesses called on behalf of his Morisco slave, Rafael Hernández. The witnesses were accused of a variety of illegal and dishonest acts: a butcher, Gregorio de Espinosa, was called an infamous thief who owed Rafael an alibi; Gregorio’s wife, Isabel Sánchez, was deemed unreliable for covering up the crimes of her husband and Rafael’s poor faith; Cristóbal Rodrigues, a poor harness maker in Medina del Rioseco, was accused of perjury because he had acted as a bondsman for Rafael and was said to have a clear personal interest in the case; finally, Bernardo de Cabreros, a
The violence and hostility of some slave owners also limited the ability of their slaves to pursue litigation. This was the unfortunate case of Rafael Hernández, a Granadan Morisco minor slave serving an Old Christian master in Medina del Rioseco, near Valladolid.\(^{119}\) The court recognized Hernández’s poverty and lack of physical safety repeatedly: he was a slave in a vulnerable position, at the mercy of a master whose cruelty was documented repeatedly in the records of the lawsuit. Hernández accused his owner of keeping him locked up in irons and of subjecting him to torture. The Royal Chancery Court judges finally declared Rafael Hernández to be a free man, no longer subject to servitude; an executive order confirming this final decision was issued on September 6, 1582.\(^{120}\) Such hostility could seriously hinder a litigant’s access to the courts. Dona Isabel de Porras protested her slave Catalina de Carvajal’s legally sanctioned daily attendance at her trial. Porras’ lawyer stated, “this causes great harm to my client, for [having to] raise her like a child who can come and go as she pleases. The day passes and my client does not have her service … [Catalina] has a guardian who can attend her case, and so she has requested [permission to attend the court] out of malice.”\(^{121}\)

The stern application and complicated unfolding of the 1572 laws demand that we ask why it was not desirable or permissible to allow the enslavement of these children. Mármol Carvajal described the king’s decree as the “pious moderation” of a “considerate and just prince.”\(^{122}\) Royal policy in the aftermath of the rebellion was often expressed as the king’s “clemency and piety” toward the Moriscos.\(^{123}\) The ideal of charitable benevolence toward innocent children was a factor in these decisions, and it was part of the king’s responsibility to protect his subjects. And yet the

citizen of Valladolid, was called a man of little faith who would lie to cover Rafael’s cause. The remaining witness who testified in Rafael’s case was a Morisa named María del Pana[do].

\(^{119}\) ARCV, PL.CIV. 989,2.

\(^{120}\) ARCV, EJ 1471,1.

\(^{121}\) ARCV, PL.CIV. 777.4 (April 1585): “Senor Diego Ramirez, en nombre de Dona Ysauel de Porras, biuda, en el pleito que trata con cataline de Caruajal esclaua = digo que Vm dio auto en heste negoçio por el qual mando que la parte contraria pudiese benir a este pleito cada dia quatro horas, dos por la mañana y dos por la tarde, lo qual es en gran dano de mi parte por criar como la cria un hijo en yr y benir y estar sele passaria todo el dia e mi parte no tendra seruiçio della y estando comodalla por libre … pues la parte contraria tiene curador que aga su pleito y le auer pedido lo susodho des de maliçia se lo mande de negar …”

\(^{122}\) Mármol Carvajal, *Historia*, Capitulo XXXII: “… una moderación piadosa, de que quiso usar como príncipe considerad o y justo …”

\(^{123}\) For example, see Philip II, “Pragmática” (October 6, 1572) 37: “Y porque nuestra voluntad es que, lo dichos Moriscos con quien hemos vsado de tanta clemencia y piedad sean bien tratados, y no agrauiados ni injuriados, mandamos q[ue] las justicias lo hagan publicar y pregonar asi, y tengan desto mucho cuidado, y de castigar con exé[m]plo a los que agrauiaren e injuriaren de palabra, o obra, o en otra manera.”
management of enslaved Granadans had broader religious, social, and political implications. In resettling the Granadan Moriscos northward, the monarchy aimed to prevent the growth of what it perceived to be an Islamic fifth-column on Spanish soil during an era of ongoing hostilities with the Ottoman Turks in the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{124} This project demanded the strict surveillance of deportees and the appropriate guardianship of captured Morisco youths. Another official objective was to reinforce the proper spiritual and social order — to regulate the politics of belonging — by placing liberated Morisco minors “with good ecclesiastical people, or secular people, who will raise and teach them.”\textsuperscript{125} Freed from the impediment of slavery, young Moriscos were perceived to be prime candidates for Catholic indoctrination and integration into Christian society.

The notion that children were the key to the assimilation of Morisco communities in the long term was well established at this time.\textsuperscript{126} In the spring of 1561, the Valladolid priest Andrés Martínez lamented the inadequate Christian conduct and belief of his Morisco congregation, the native residents of the Barrio de Santa María. He asked his superiors, "Give remedy, that this might not continue, and that at least the children who are born might not be condemned ... though those who are already old would benefit little from these remedies, the children would benefit and so would those yet to be born."\textsuperscript{127} In proposing that Morisco youth be made to interact with and marry into the Old Christian majority population, and in emphasizing the importance of Morisco children’s attendance at Catholic mass and schooling, Father Martínez, like many before and after him, was asserting the importance of indoctrinating and assimilating the youngest generation of Vallisoletesano New Christians, away from the influence of their crypto-Muslim parents. The same assumptions about the malleability of children — and the inherent social, political, and religious value in that impressionability — were avowed in the 1572 royal instructions for entrusting liberated Granadan Morisco minors to Old Christian households. Comparable processes can be

\textsuperscript{125} Philip II, “Pragmática” (October 6, 1572), 35.
\textsuperscript{126} On Morisco children as targets for Catholic conversion, see Mary Elizabeth Perry, “Between Muslim and Christian Worlds: Moriscas and Identity in Early Modern Spain,” The Muslim World 95,2 (2005): 180. For the case of the Jesuits’ Casa de la Doctrina in the Albaicín, which sought in particular to bring a Catholic education to Granadan Morisco youths, see David Coleman, Creating Christian Granada: Society & Religious Culture in an Old-World Frontier City, 1492-1600 (Cornell University Press, 2003), 156.
\textsuperscript{127} AHN INQ 2136, exp. 3, folio 5, “Sobre la conversión de los Moriscos” (May 6, 1561): “Dar remedios para q’ esto no vaya mas adelante. Y q’ a lo menos pa los q’ son niños y los q’ nasceran no se co’denen … y ya q’ los q’ agora son viejos les aprovechara’ poco estos remedios, aprovechara’ alos hijos, y alos q’ están por nascer.” I discuss Martínez’s wider arguments in Chapters One and Two.
found outside of Iberia; for example, Natalie Rothman represents religious conversion in seventeenth-century Venice as a long-term project of imperial subject-making requiring the social transformation "of difference into sameness."

The separation of Morisco children from their families was a chilling aspect of the Crown’s assimilationist policies, one that was likewise hotly debated decades later during the final expulsion of the Moriscos. There was historical precedent for plans to indoctrinate children taken away from their parents. A similar strategy had been in place in 1502, when Muslims who chose exile over conversion would have had to leave their children behind to be raised as Catholics and, to follow the implicit logic of the policy, assimilated. At one point, the decision was made to take Granadan Morisco children who had not been enslaved away from their parents. These orders were given in Valladolid on November 2, 1572, when corregidor Messia announced, “because customs are nurtured and communicated, I order that all single moriscos and moriscas from the age of ten and older shall serve masters in this town and in its jurisdiction, and that they not be with their fathers nor mothers nor brother nor relatives nor on their own …” This arrangement was not unprecedented; it was common practice for children of this age to work as servants or apprentices and to live in the homes of their masters. Yet there was a particular urgency and a distinct function in the separation of Granadan Morisco children from Morisco households. The threat of imparting Islamic religiosity was bidirectional; Valladolid Inquisitors investigated reports that local Castilian Morisco were taking children deported from Granada into their homes, and suspected “that they have taken them in to better learn Arabic.”

---


129 Meyerson examines the situation of foreign Muslim enslaved children in Valencia: “Not fully inculcated in the ways of Islam, children were more malleable and easier to convert … Many of the children, moreover, had been separated from their families and thus were no longer subject to influences that might have hardened them against the Christian message.” Because of this, in 1496, Fernando the Catholic “ordered that captive Malagan children, whom Valencian Mudejars had purchased, be relinquished to royal officials, ‘so that they not remain in their infidelity and be turned to the Christian faith.’” (Meyerson, “Slavery and Solidarity”, 309.)

130 AGS, CC, legajo 2168, folios s.n’: “Otrosi Porque de la criança e [comunicacio] se toman las costumbres hordenoe e mando que todos los moriscos e moriscas solteros de diez años para arriba sirban amos enesta villa y en los lugares de su tierra e villas de su partido y no esten con sus padres ni madres ny hermanos ny deudos nj de por si e para que ansi se pueda hazer se bengan manifestando so pena de berguença publica la qual contredo rrigor sea executada.”

131 AHN, Legajo 3190, Expediente 161 (June 7th, 1571): "Aquí tenemos relacion que los moriscos desta villa [Valladolid] y de Arevalo y otras partes an recojido en sus casas y servicio niños y niñas delos moriscos que an hechado por aca de Granada, que a esto no sentimos bien dello por q como los tengamos por tan moros a estos como
To this end, Messia ordered a registry listing which Morisco youths were living in which Old Christian homes, their type of service and their salary. He clarified that young Granadans must finish their terms of service regardless of whether they married before the age of majority; with this rule he aimed to close the loophole of Moriscos marrying to escape forced labour with claims of exemption based on the king’s order not to separate Morisco husbands and wives. The corregidor warned that many young Moriscos were, to that end, registering themselves with officials as married when they were, in fact, coupled and cohabitating but not as husband and wife — an arrangement called *amancebamiento*. This constituted a threat not only to the corregidor’s control over local Morisco youths (who could later separate, having avoided being placed in service) but also to the sanctity of marriage. Couples in this situation were ordered, again under threat of public lashes, to register their marriages with the corregidor or the official in charge of the registry of Moriscos of Valladolid, and also to be married properly by a priest. Finally, Messia briefly mentioned protection of Morisco youth in service: anyone treated badly should be removed from that home and placed in service in another — yet no penalty for the abuser is mentioned. Despite the detailed nature of Messia’s orders, I argue that this plan was never implemented and that young Granadan Moriscos who were not slaves remained in the custody of their parents. I have not found a register listing Morisco servants, nor have I come across any references to the actual implementation of this project other than Messia’s 1572 orders. Beyond the cases of enslaved minors, I have not encountered petitions or complaints pertaining to the removal of children from their parents’ homes. The best evidence that this policy never came to fruition comes from census records from 1583 and 1589, which list many Granadan Morisco children above the age of ten living with their Morisco parents.

In contrast, the policy restricting liberated child slaves from returning to their families was enforced. Yet there are examples of families managing to stay together despite the rules governing...
the liberation of enslaved Granadan youths. For example, in 1580 Galaz de Burgos arranged the manumission of a Morisca girl named Isabelica, the slave of a widowed citizen of Valladolid named Doña María Manuel. Keeping the king’s orders, Galaz de Burgos left Isabelica in the care of Doña María; the little girl would serve in her household until the age of twenty, and in return she would earn her keep. There is no mention of a salary or a Christian education for Isabelica; furthermore, there is no reference to a lawsuit in the brief account of her manumission. Isabelica’s mother, Francisca de Mexia, was a slave in the same household, and she requested that her owner name a ransom price for her own freedom when her daughter was liberated. In June of 1580, her ransom was set at 484 reales, paid in two installments on New Year’s Day and Easter of the coming year. Two Granadan Morisco men named Alonso López and Gonzalo de Mendoza agreed to pay her ransom; their relationship to Francisca de Mexia is not explained. Interestingly, this letter of manumission was written for both Francisca de Mexia and Isabelica. Since Isabelica was legally manumitted before this carta de horro was agreed upon, it seems that Mexia, with the financial support of López and Mendoza, was securing the release of both herself and her daughter from all service to Doña María Manuel. This case exemplifies the roles of Granadan kin and community in securing the liberation of enslaved Moriscos. It also reveals that the process of manumitting Morisco minors was not always undertaken in complete adherence with the king’s orders for the custody of these freed youth, nor was each case necessarily brought to trial. According to the terms of this letter of manumission, Mexia and her daughter would have been freed from slavery and all service in the household of Dona María Manuel.

While the surviving documentary record often affords us glimpses into the legal experiences of slaves such as Francisca de Mexia and Isabelica, it can be more challenging to piece together their lives after liberation. A powerful indication of the potential limits to integrating ex-slaves into Castilian society was branding: a permanent, visible mark of enslavement and Morisco lineage. “Fue herrado” — he/she was branded — was a common physical description of Morisco slaves’ bodies in court cases, bills of sale, letters of manumission, and censuses. This refers to

136 It’s completely within the realm of possibility that such documentation has been lost. However, it is common in other records about freed slaves to see brief references to past litigation or letters of manumission — neither of which appears in Isabelica’s case.
137 AHPV, PN 566, 788: “…orro en fauor de las dhas fran.ca e ysauelica su hija e lo he tenido y tengo por bien e por la presente doy libertad a las dhas fran.ca y isabelica su hija mis esclabas y las a orro y ago libros sin sujecion ni cautiberio alguno …” This case is briefly mentioned Fernández Martín, 147.
facial branding: physical scarring indicating enslavement and/or ownership, marked on the cheeks and forehead of the captive with a fire-hot branding iron. For example, the bill of sale for Vincente de Monforte, a Granadan Morisco slave sold in Medina del Campo in 1584, describes him as having been a tall man with a lean, white face, and branded as a slave on his cheeks and forehead. This facial branding was common on Granadan Morisco slaves, including child slaves in Valladolid such as Andrés del Río, Inés de Ladrote, and Pedro de Carmona. Branding was a physical sign of dominance over captives of war and a bodily violation of the enslaved children of the defeated rebels. Like the fetters some slaves were forced to wear, branding was an act of violence against the enslaved.

Fernández Martín describes the most common marks branded on the faces of all slaves in Valladolid according to evidence found in notarial protocols; these were an ‘S’ on one cheek and a lower case ‘i’ on the other. These marks can be interpreted as meaning “Sin iure” or “without rights”. Another likely interpretation: reading the ‘i’ as an image of a nail, or “clavo”, we see “S = ESE + un clavo = ES(E)CLAVO.” Other common branding marks included two marks on the cheek or a sign marked on the chin. There are also cases on record of slaves with the initials or name of their owner branded on their face. Forty-nine of the two hundred and eighty slaves whom Fernández Martín located in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Valladolid notarial protocols were described as having been branded on the face or body. He counts more men than women among the known branded slaves. I located fifteen references to branded Granadan Morisco slaves in Valladolid; the uneven nature of the documentary record (including the inconsistency of descriptions within) makes it difficult to determine what percentage of the overall

\[\text{REFERENCES}\]

138 AHPV, PN 6943, 330.  
139 This widespread practice of branding captives before selling them as slaves was recognized in the July 1572 Pragmática as part of the illegal action of enslaving underage Granadan Moriscos; it ordered that those who maliciously captured, branded, and sold underage slaves must be punished according to the quality of their crime.  
140 ARCV, EJ 1466,47.  
141 ARCV, PL.CIV. 475,6.  
142 ARCV, PL.CIV. 903,1.  
143 Fernández Martín, 134.  
144 Fernández Martín, 135.  
145 Fernández Martín, 134.
Morisco slave population was branded. Among them was Lucas de Almudey, the brother of Juan and García whose trial I discuss above; as a freed man living in Valladolid in 1583 was described as being branded on both cheeks.

As Fernández Martín points out, branding was an indelible mark. Yet within the petitions (demandas) of some of these court cases, there are petitions to remove the signs of slavery from the manumitted person. This could in part refer to the shackles, or irons (hierros), worn by some slaves. However, it is apparent that some of the requests refer to the removal of the marks branded on the faces of these slaves (“señales que tiene en su rostro”). For example, the petition for Rafael Hernández’s case requested the removal of the irons and the signs on his face. There is evidence of this practice in other records. Luis Caran was described in the 1583 registry as “branded with the signs removed” (“herrado quitadas las señales”). One could hypothesize that this meant a second application of the branding iron or scarring with a blade to remove the symbol of slavery and the details of ownership. The elimination of the details of enslavement at the cost of additional physical pain may have been preferable to wearing the name of a past owner.

Fernández Martín notes that it was difficult for black Africans to travel unaccompanied in Spain during this era, as they would be suspected and imprisoned as run-away slaves because of the popular association between black or brown skin and slavery. Freed black slaves had to carry their letter of manumission in order to avoid imprisonment while traveling alone. It is likely that branding carried a similar stigma of slavery; marring — but not erasing — the branded marks of enslavement and carrying one’s letter of manumission would have been methods of proving legal freedom. I have not come across any of the freed slaves’ explanations for the removal of their branded signs. It is possible that there was a level of popular recognition of the manumitted status

146 ARCV, PL.CIV 973,6 (Lucas, and likely Juan, de Almudey); AHPV, PN 6714, 48 (Alonso de Santiago); ARCV, PL.CIV 989,2 (Rafael Hernández); ARCV, EJ 1466, 47 (Andrés del Río); AGS CC 2184 (Agustín de Cocos, Luis Elcarjan, Luis Caran, Pedro de Coca, Francisco Herrez); ARCV, PL.CIV 475,6 (Inés Ladrote); AHPV, PN 6943, 330 (Vincente de Monforte); ARCV, PL.CIV 903,1 (Pedro de Carmona); AHPV, PN 754, 1110 (Alonso Hernández); AHPV, PN 578, 1128 (Luis de Figueroa).

147 AGS CC 2184.

148 Fernández Martín, Comediantes, Esclavo, y Moriscos en Valladolid, 134: “una señal imborrable”

149 AGS CC 2184. There is a distinction between the physical descriptions of these two men and those of other manumitted individuals listed in the 1583 registry of Moriscos in Valladolid. Lucas de Almudey, Agustín de Cocos, Pedro de Coca, and Francisco Herrez were all described as “branded” with no reference to the signs being removed.

150 Fernández Martín, 151 and 153.
of ex-slaves who were twice marked; it is also conceivable that the marring of branded marks functioned as a psychological assurance of the permanence of freedom.

Despite branding marks and other social stigmas related to their captivity, ex-slaves made lives for themselves in Valladolid. Notwithstanding royal policies aimed at weakening ties between Moriscos, they largely made their post-slavery lives among other Granadans. A number of examples are revealed in a register of freed slaves included in a 1583 census of Granadan Moriscos in Valladolid.\textsuperscript{151} This list contains twenty-four family-based entries totaling sixty-one individuals, thirty-two with a recorded history of captivity. Isabel Navaro, from Seron, was underage when she became the slave of Don Sancho de Leyba; after he freed her, Isabel remained in his service, entrusted to him but not his slave (“la tenia en encomienda sin ser esclava”). In 1583, she was twenty years old and married to Diego de Quiros, a Granadan Morisco man who had been deported to Medina del Campo during the expulsion. Diego de Navarro (likely Isabel’s brother) was another ex-slave of Don Sancho de Leyba. In 1583, Diego was twenty-four years old and married to a twenty-two-year-old Morisca named Catalina Muñoz, with whom he had two young children; Catalina had also come to Valladolid as a slave of Don Sancho de Leyba.\textsuperscript{152} These liberated minors remained in the custody and service of their Old Christian master until the age of majority in compliance with the king’s law and the courts’ sentencing. They were three of ten liberated slaves listed in the 1583 census who had been minors at the time of their captivity, a list that included Lucas de Almudey.\textsuperscript{153}

Manumitted Moriscos also worked in occupations consistent with those of free Granadans living in that city.\textsuperscript{154} Diego Navaro was a footman (lacayo); three others were agricultural labourers (labrador); one a muleteer (arriero); one a water-carrier (aguador); and one a

---

\textsuperscript{151} AGS CC 2184, s.n. Philip II ordered officials to make this census for the purpose of knowing how many Granadan Moriscos were living in each town, who had illegally moved to or from the town where they were officially settled without a license, and how many had died. The Valladolid census was submitted by corregidor Armenteros to Philip II on March 20, 1583.

\textsuperscript{152} AGS, CC 2184. Don Sancho de Leyba owned a number of Granadan Morisco slaves in Valladolid: Isabel Navaro, Diego Navaro, Catalina Muñoz, Hernando de Comares, Diego de Frias, Rafael de Grimaldo de Salias. He was the captain general of the Kingdom of Navarre and the General of the Spanish galleys. I believe he was the same man as Don Sancho Martínez de Leiva, the Conde de Baños, a famous soldier and poet who served Philip II in Flanders.

\textsuperscript{153} AGS, CC 2184: Luis Caran, Bartolomé de Torrijos, Francisco Herrez, Clara and Isabel González (likely minors), Isabel Navaro, Diego Navaro, Catalina Martínez, Lucas de Almudey, Lucia de Sevilla.

\textsuperscript{154} I discuss the prevalence of footmen and merchants among Granadan Moriscos living in this region in Chapter Three. Many Granadans became shopkeepers and sellers of foodstuffs in Valladolid.
shopkeeper (*tendero*). Half of those listed in the 1583 census were married; it is striking that none were married to Old Christians or to Moriscos of Castilian origin. No spouses were listed for twelve individuals (though one man had a daughter and others were listed with siblings). Ten ex-slaves married Granadan Moriscos with no recorded history of captivity. Among them was Pedro de Coca, a captive of Hernando Alemán of the king’s cavalry. He was liberated in Madrid in 1574, then moved to Valladolid and married a Morisca named Leonor de Torres; she was a Granadan who had been deported to Melgar. The marriage of the aforementioned Diego de Navaro and Catalina Martínez was the only marriage between ex-slaves recorded here, though the 1583 list also includes an enslaved family: Alonso de Torrijos, his wife Leonor, and their son Bartolomé were among the captives of the regent of Galicia, Licenciado Antolínez. They had been freed and settled in Valladolid five years earlier. Considering his age, Bartolomé was likely liberated as a captured minor. At age seventeen, he lived with his parents, who must have negotiated a ransom for themselves and a release from service for their son — perhaps much in the same way as did Francisca de Mexia for herself and her daughter, Isabelica.

The 1583 census reveals the possibilities for family lives and social integration for liberated slaves living in late sixteenth-century Valladolid, and shows that much of this took place in union with other Granadan Moriscos. Combined with the evidence examined throughout this chapter, it becomes clear that Granadan Moriscos made significant efforts to reunite families and communities separated by captivity and relocation. They worked within the scope of the law in pursuing the manumission of enslaved minors, but against the plans of the Crown and Church for the post-captivity lives of manumitted slaves. This dispute over which social ties to cultivate and which to sever was another way in which Moriscos negotiated the politics of belonging in early modern Castile.

The monarchy facilitated the liberation of enslaved Morisco minors while encouraging their continued domestic service in the same households because there was considerable value in keeping young Granadans as domestic workers in Old Christian households. Both captivity and post-slavery service were intended as forms of social discipline over Granadan Moriscos. The

---

155 AGS, CC 2184.
156 Here I use terms from Natalie Rothman’s study of the “making and unmaking of bondage in early modern societies” in which she writes, "in their quest for freedom, domestic slaves had not only to sever one set of ties, but to cultivate another." See “Contested subjecthood: runaway slaves in early modern Venice,” *Quaderni storici* 139, 2 (2012): 425-427.
Crown aimed to assimilate these children — the progeny of rebellious enemies and suspected heretics — into Catholic Castilian society and therefore stipulated the separation of liberated minors from their families. Both the enslavement of these children and the restrictions on the reunion of Granadan families were palpable manifestations of the lasting violence experienced by the Moriscos of Granada. Yet they are also stories of endurance and of people finding each other despite war, enslavement, great distances and great cost. The litigation of enslaved Granadan Morisco youths is an example of marginalized individuals exercising considerable agency in spaces of judicial and administrative authority. The available record of the lives they lived after gaining their freedom is an indication of the ways in which Granadan Moriscos negotiated and refashioned their lives in the wake of the violence they experienced.
Chapter 5
Resisting Expulsion

“Sir, having passed thirty days of the sixty with which the Moriscos have to leave the kingdom, as stated in the order of expulsion, very few have turned up to tell me that they want to go, while many come with evidence that they are good Christians who want to stay.”

Between 1609 and 1614, 300,000-350,000 Moriscos were expelled from the Spanish kingdoms by order of King Philip III (r. 1598-1621). The Count of Salazar was in charge of the expulsion from Castile. His report to the king in the summer of 1610 includes the above passage and reveals the main ways in which Moriscos disrupted the expulsion: by refusing to leave and by petitioning to stay. These tactics were backed by status claims. Moriscos appealed for exemption from the expulsion and its attendant rules regarding the sale of property on the basis of being Old Moriscos (locally established *antiguos*), Old Christian Moriscos (an honourable status inherited from a forefather who converted before conquest or decree), Good Christian Moriscos (sincere Catholics) or a combination of these. Moriscos also resisted the expulsion through forms of disobedience that threatened the royal treasury and the monarchy’s control over the project of expulsion: unsupervised desertion, returning from exile, the illicit sale of property, and hiding or illegally transporting valuables. Morisco resistance impacted state-level arbitration: a century of debates over the identity and identification of the Moriscos culminated in disputes among the king’s advisors over which Moriscos, if any, should be exempt from expulsion. These debates were predicated on ideas of difference between Moriscos from different regions and lineages, and took into account a variety of proofs and conditions of Morisco religious and social assimilation. Morisco claims of exemption also used these terms of categorical difference; in this chapter I consider the official debates and Morisco petitions as an interconnected set of negotiations.

The decision to expel the Moriscos was highly contested, and the execution of the project was messy and piecemeal. The minutes of the Council of State reveal doubt on the part of the king

1 AGS, Estado, legajo 228(2), s.f. The Count of Salazar to the Council of State (Madrid, August 27, 1610). The Count of Salazar was Don Bernardino de Velasco: “Con auerse passado treynta dias, delos .60. que confirme al Bando tienen los Moriscos para salir del Reyno, acuden muy pocos a dizirme que sequieren yr, y son muchos los que con ynformaçion de ser buenos cristianos quieren quedarse …”

and his advisors, disagreements over how to proceed, and a number of logistical obstacles. There was a particular divergence of opinion on the matter of exemptions. Formal exceptions were written into the charters proclaiming the expulsion, granting permission to Morisca wives of Old Christian men and their children to remain in the Spanish kingdoms. Muslims (moros) who had moved to Spain to convert willingly to Catholicism were likewise exempt, along with their descendants. So too were clerics, monks, and nuns of Morisco lineage and Morisco slaves, including those captured during the Granadan rebellion. Furthermore, at the same time as he ordered the expulsion from Castile, the king commissioned an investigation to determine which Moriscos were known by public reputation to be Catholic and should therefore remain in the Spanish kingdoms. However, there was a lack of accord between the regions of Castile. Some bishops, nobles, and corregidores disputed royal orders and fought to keep the Moriscos in their jurisdictions while prelates and authorities in many other places declared their support for the removal of most, if not all, of the Moriscos. As discussed below, the Bishop of Valladolid approved very few exemptions, and there is little evidence that any exemptions from Valladolid were ultimately upheld.

Recent studies have questioned whether the monarchy succeeded in deporting all of the Moriscos. Leading this charge, Trevor J. Dadson challenges the understanding of the expulsion as a fait accompli by unearthing stories of Moriscos who evaded it in significant ways. He argues that the majority of the Moriscos in Villarrubia de los Ojos, a town in the Campo de Calatrava of La Mancha, returned to live there after the expulsion, and he posits the same was true of other

---


4 “Cédula ordenando la expulsion de todos los moriscos de los Reinos de Castilla la Vieja y Nueva, Extremadura y la Mancha,” (Aranda de Dueros, July 10th, 1610), 364 in Carrasco Manchado, De la convivencia a la exclusión. A similar list appears in a recap of exemptions in the records of the Council of State. See AGS Estado 235, s.f., the Duke of Lerma on October 30, 1610.
places in the region. Mary Halavais points to evidence from 1621 that "there may have been a significant number who remained in Aragon or otherwise evaded expulsion." Bernard Vincent disagrees with this estimation of the success of Morisco resistance and argues that Dadson’s version of events is less representational than Dadson himself asserts. Vincent reminds us that, after a single year of often chaotic operations, about 90% of the Moriscos no longer lived in Spain. Many recent studies have focused on the individuals or groups who managed to escape expulsion, those called vueltos y quedados [returnees and remainders] in the documents. But in spite of the interest of these individual cases, the reality of a massive exile is unquestionable.

While I agree with Vincent, I also hold this revisionist work to be important for many reasons. First, it exposes the limits of royal control. As James Tueller concludes, “The Expulsion was the act of a still-powerful Hispanic monarchy, but we mistakenly depict the Early Modern state as too efficient, powerful or tyrannical if we overlook the individuals and circumstances of local areas where Moriscos did stay and did return.” While the expulsion was completed in many regions, including Valladolid, it was mitigated by Morisco noncompliance and negotiation, and the outcome of the deportation was not assured or inevitable while it was ongoing. There are many regional versions of this story, and enough examples to merit more scholarly attention. Tueller’s recent essay provides a broad overview on the subject and addresses among other things cases of noble Moriscos, of Old Christian noblemen defending their Morisco villagers, and of Moriscos travelling to court to submit petitions for exemption.

Second, I investigate Morisco resistance to the expulsion to bring to light the perspectives and actions of the Moriscos themselves; this is a central purpose of this chapter and of this project as a whole. The Moriscos were not silenced by their prosecution or passive while marginalized. To the contrary, for over a century the Moriscos reacted and responded to assimilationist and prohibitive policies and to religious prosecution with petitioning, litigation, and disobedience.

---

5 Trevor J. Dadson, Los moriscos de Villarrubia de los Ojos (Siglos XV-XVIII : historia de una minoría asimilada, expulsada y reintegrada) (Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 2007) and Tolerance and Coexistence in Early Modern Spain: Old Christians and Moriscos in the Campo de Calatrava (Boydell & Brewer Ltd, 2014).
Much of the legal action was undertaken collectively. The Moriscos did more than respond to specific laws and restrictions; Morisco legal action was about both negotiating individual (and familial) status and protecting community and property. This argument spans my dissertation; in Valladolid, it was true of the Moriscos’ defense of their residential spaces after their conversion to Catholicism and of their petitioning for reprieve from religious prosecution. Some Granadan Moriscos in Valladolid negotiated for recognition of status and privileges: as Old Christians, to alleviate the restrictions they faced in the wake of their deportation, or as illegally captured minors, to reunite Granadan communities separated by deportation and captivity. Morisco resistance to the final expulsion followed a century-long tradition of legal agency and negotiation.

Furthermore, this chapter provides a finale to the narrative developed over the past four chapters about the remarkable ways in which the Moriscos were commonly granted due process by state authorities. The records of the Council of State — the central documentation of the expulsion, preserved in the Sección Consejo de Estado at the Royal Archive of Simancas (AGS) — describe Morisco claims for exemption as real obstacles to the enterprise of expulsion, and yet these claims were always processed. Throughout the sixteenth century, Moriscos in Castile retained a remarkable degree of legal agency while they were the subject of prohibitive state polices, deportations, and religious prosecution. Legal requests, appeals, and petitions were not always successful but it appears they were normally received by royal administrators, including judges and corregidores. This held true into the first years of the final expulsion, when the Moriscos were collectively presumed to be insincere Catholics and a danger to the state, and while Morisco disobedience threatened the authority and treasury of the monarchy. However, in order to finally complete the expulsion of the Moriscos, the king and his Council of State eventually refused most Morisco requests for exemptions based on special categories of lineage, regional identity, or evidence of assimilation to Catholicism — categories of identity upon which negotiations had been predicated for a century. I trace this official turn against exemptions throughout this chapter.

Both the decision to expel the Moriscos and the refusal to grant most exemptions reflect the monarchy’s quest for homogeneity and purity in the Spanish kingdoms. The projects of Reformation — both Protestant and Catholic — in early modern Europe focused on a search for purity, and the expulsion of religious minorities or converts was seen as a “purging” of
Christendom. The Moriscos were expelled because Crown and Church believed they were not and would not become sincere Catholics; their perceived lack of faith was associated with an assumed lack of loyalty to the king and the Spanish state. Both fears of Moriscos as criminals and conspiracy theories concerning supposed alliances between Moriscos and the Ottoman Empire gained currency in the debates over the merits and coverage of the expulsion. In pronouncing this sentence, the monarchy reflected upon the many years of attempts to procure from the New Christian Moriscos a profession from the heart for our holy Catholic faith and to live and die in it, leaving behind the damned sect of Muhammad. Not only have they not left it, but they demonstrate more obstinacy from day to day; not content with this, they have conspired and do conspire against the Royal Crown of these kingdoms, seeking and entering into dealings with The Turk and other Princes and Republics, enemies of our Holy Faith: being in their favour and offering assistance, their person and estates, affirming that they are as Muslim as those in the Barbary. And beyond this they have committed grave and atrocious crimes, robbing and killing as many Christians as they can.

The expulsion took place in a series of regional deportations, beginning with an order announcing the removal of the Moriscos of Valencia on September 22nd, 1609. Similar orders were issued in December 1609 and January 1610 proclaiming the expulsion of the Moriscos of

---


12 AGS, Estado, legajo 219, s.f., “Los puntos pa[ra] el Vando de la Expulsion de los moriscos de Castilla” (1609):”q[ue] auiendo el Rey n[uest]ro s[eno]r considerado q[ue] con todas las diligencias q[ue] se han hecho por tan largo discurso de tiempo pa[ra] procurar q[ue] los christianos nuevos moriscos profesen de coraçon n[uest]ra s[an]ta fee catholica y viviesen y muriesen en ella dexando la maldita secta de Mahoma, no solo no se ha podido acuauar con ellos, pero de dia en dia han ydo mostrando mayor obstinacion, y no contentandose con esto, han maquinado y maquinan contra la corona real destos Reynos procurando y haziendo diligencias con El Turco y otros Principes y republicas enemigos de n[uest]ra s[an]ta fee pa[ra] que venga en su fauor y ayuda, offreçiendoles sus p[er]sonas y haziendas affirmandoles q[ue] son tan moros como los q[ue] estan en Berberia, y demas desto han cometido muchos graues y atroçes delitos robando y matando a todos quantos christianos han podido.”

Granada, Murcia, Andalucía, and the town of Hornachos. The expulsion order for the Kingdom of Aragon was issued on May 29th, 1610. In contrast to these imperatives, the first order to impact the Moriscos of Valladolid was technically a directive for a voluntary exodus. On December 28, 1609, the king gave permission to the Moriscos of Castile, Extremadura, and La Mancha to leave the kingdoms by choice within a thirty-day term; as discussed below, this was an attempt to take control over a Morisco exodus that had already begun in response to the expulsions from other regions, control necessary for the confiscation of Morisco property. Too many Moriscos remained in Castile. Consequently, a second order was issued on July 10, 1610, a charter demanding the expulsion of the Moriscos of those same kingdoms. In his landmark study Geografía de la España morisca, Henri Lapeyre writes that 2424 Morisco individuals, or 531 Morisco households, were ultimately expelled from the province of Valladolid. The vast majority first went to France via Irun/Saint-Jean-de-Luz after registration in Burgos, the Count of Salazar’s administrative centre for the deportation from Old Castile. The question of where and how the Moriscos lived after the expulsion is unfortunately outside of the scope of this study; there is a

---

14 The first order of expulsion for the Moriscos of Granada, Murcia, and Andalucía was issued on December 9th, 1609. See “Cédula Real y pregón ordenando y anunciando la expulsión de los cristianos nuevos moriscos de los reinos de Granada, Murcia y Andalucía” (Madrid, December 9th, 1609), Carrasco Manchado, 350-354. A ban issued on January 10th, 1610 repeated the order to expel the Moriscos of Granada, Murcia, Andalucía, and this time included the town of Hornachos; see “Bando de expulsión de los moriscos de los reynos de Granada y Murcia, y Andalucía, y de la villa de Hornachos, 1609-1610” (Seville, January 10th, 1610), Carrasco Manchado, 356-359. For a brief overview of why Hornachos was a “special case,” see L.P. Harvey, Muslims in Spain, 1500-1614 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 369-371.

15 “Bando ordenando la expulsión de los moriscos del Reyno de Aragón,” (Zaragoza, May 29th, 1610), 359-362 in Carrasco Manchado, De la convivencia a la exclusión.

16 “Cédula Real para que los Moriscos de Castilla, Extremadura y la Mancha que quisiere ir fuera de España, lo puedan hacer dentro de treinta días a partir de la publicación de esta Cédula,” (Madrid, December 28th, 1609), 354-356 in Carrasco Manchado, De la convivencia a la exclusión. As I discuss below, this charter (like all the others noted here) specified from which border crossings they could depart and placed restrictions on the sale and transportation of Morisico property.

17 “Cédula ordenando la expulsión de todos los moriscos de los Reinos de Castilla la Vieja y Nueva, Extremadura y la Mancha,” (Aranda de Dueros, July 10th, 1610), 362-366 in Carrasco Manchado, De la convivencia a la exclusión. A sixty-day deadline was set for this deportation; as seen above, the Count of Salazar warned that few Moriscos had left in the first month after the order of expulsion was published.


19 For the most part, Moriscos departing Castile were processed in Burgos, but the king’s orders changed occasionally during the deportation in response to intelligence he received regarding security threats. For example, the deportation route had been re-routed away from Burgos in January 1610. A supplementary request in a petition from the Granadan Morisco community of Ávila stated that if they were denied licences to stay, they desired to depart the kingdoms via Burgos as permitted in an earlier order, in the interest of safety and cost. See AGS, Estado 227, s.f., January 6, 1610. Olatz Villanueva Zubizarreta pinpoints their passage to France across the border through Irun and Saint-Jean-de-Luz in “Camino de Berbería. El exilio forzoso de los moriscos vallisoletanos en 1610,” Investigaciones históricas: Época moderna y contemporánea 26 (2006): 63.
valuable and recent historiographical movement toward understanding the complexity of the Morisco diaspora.

This chapter offers an overview of the expulsion from Castile, first estimating how many Moriscos left Valladolid and when they departed. I then examine the debates over exemptions, describing Morisco claims and categories of Morisco identification, and how these debates affected changing understandings of these categories. The first was a set of categories centred on regional differences and on lineage, in particular Old Morisco and Old Christian Morisco stock. The second was about proof of religious sincerity — namely, the problem of how to determine which Moriscos were true, practicing Catholics, and what types of evidence could verify their sincerity. I then turn to look at the matter of Morisco property, which was another cause for Morisco petitioning and a source of difficulty and debate for the Crown. Before concluding, I consider briefly those Moriscos who returned from exile. Throughout, I demonstrate how “exceptions, exemptions, returns and negotiations characterized the entire process” of the final removal of the Moriscos from the Spanish kingdoms.

The inaugural deportation of the Moriscos of Valencia reverberated throughout the Spanish kingdoms. Less than one month after Philip III issued the edict on September 22, 1609, the Council of State issued warnings about the poor treatment of Granadan Moriscos in the wake of the Valencia expulsion. Valladolid corregidor Licentiate Paez de Vergara informed the Crown that he had proclaimed grave punishment to anyone found guilty of harassing the Moriscos and would comply with the king’s order to treat the local Granadans well. The municipal council recorded the king’s order to assure the protection of the Moriscos in its book of minutes for Friday, October 16, 1609. To ensure this work was done, it appointed two councilors named Pedro López de Arriere and Juan de Salzedo to be “protectors of the Moriscos.” The exact nature of their tasks is

---

20 Excellent, recent examples of this investigative trend are included in the second section of *The Expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain: A Mediterranean Diaspora*. Eds. Mercedes García-Arenal and Gerard Wiegers. Trans. Consuelo López-Morillas and Martin Beagles (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014), as eight essays on the topic of “The Morisco Diaspora.” For Valladolid, see Villanueva Zubizarreta, “Camino de Berbería,” 71: “No sabemos a ciencia cierta el destino final de los moriscos vallisoletanos porque ningún documento de los que hemos manejado lo especifica. Sabemos que partieron hacia Francia y suponemos que seguirían el camino de otros miles que desde allí se trasladaron a Berbería. Aunque parece que algunos castellanos de los de Castilla la Vieja y Nueva, Extremadura y la Mancha, embarcaron en los puertos atlánticos con destino a Marruecos, la mayoría atravesaron el mediodía francés con destino a Túnez, al igual que andaluces y aragoneses.”


22 AGS Estado 213, s.f. (October 15, 1609).

23 Archivo Municipal de Valladolid (AMV), Libros de Actas, 1609: Ayuntamiento de Valladolid, folios 207b-208a (October 16, 1609): “…desta ciudad para que en ella y su distrito aga nadie moleste ni haga vejaçion a los moriscos
unspecified, but other sources make clear that authorities in the city increased surveillance with the twin purposes of safeguarding the Moriscos and monitoring their actions and movements. For example, that same month President Pedro de Zamora of the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid reported that officers made nightly rounds through the Barrio de Santa María and in the fields surrounding the city, a patrol deemed necessary to “understand the intentions” of the Moriscos.24

Granadan Moriscos objected to the backlash of abuse they suffered and requested protection from the Crown. A petition written by “the Natives of the Kingdom of Granada” — an otherwise unspecified group, perhaps written on behalf of all Moriscos identified as Granadans throughout the Spanish kingdoms — was relayed by the Duke of Lerma to the king’s Council of State on October 23, 1609. As “loyal vassals” they trusted that the king would not permit offense to their “Christianity, loyalty, honour, lives, and estates.” The Granadans complained, “It is not fair, sir, the hate and envy that the common people (gente menor) have for us without reason nor cause.”25 Antagonism persisted over the following months as ensuing expulsion orders were issued. In the city of Ávila, a priest described how local animosity toward the Moriscos for their lack of assimilation had reached a boiling point with the announcement of their expulsion: “for this great contrariness, in less than three months the common [people] of this city are mutinous with them ...”26

Philip’s first charter regarding the departure of the Moriscos of Castile, issued on December 28, 1609, begins by describing another aspect of this widespread disturbance:

… now I am seeing that those of the said nation who live in the kingdoms of Old Castile, New Castile, Extremadura, and La Mancha are disquieted and have been given occasion to think they want to leave to live outside of these said kingdoms, and so they have started to dispose of their estates, selling them for much less than they are worth, and it is not my intent that anyone live in [these kingdoms] against their will. As such, I permit and give license, by virtue of the present order, to all those who want to leave my kingdoms and the...
noble estates of Spain to live outside of them ... without incurring any penalties within thirty days of the publication of this order.\textsuperscript{27}

As made apparent in this charter, the Morisco exodus from Castile had begun unofficially, on a small scale, and as a panicked response to the expulsion decree in Valencia. These undocumented absentees likely wished to avoid having their property confiscated in an impending expulsion. Mercedes García-Arenal has studied clandestine Morisco emigration, which she argues “had flowed uninterruptedly throughout the sixteenth century [and] grew significantly in the years before the Expulsion.” Looking especially at the relocation of Granadan Moriscos to Morocco in the two decades before the expulsion, García-Arenal uncovers the leadership and networks of Moriscos departing from the Spanish kingdoms.\textsuperscript{28} Granting permission for the Moriscos to depart voluntarily was Philip III's attempt to impose royal control over the situation and to move larger numbers out of the territory, and to bring the property of departing Castilian Moriscos into the royal treasury. In addition to the thirty-day rule, this charter set strict regulations regarding the sale of Morisco property (as discussed below) and prohibited them from traveling through Andalusia, Granada, Murcia, Valencia, or Aragon. The order was proclaimed quickly and publicly in Valladolid. On Saturday, January 2, 1610, the top scribe of the city, Diego Núñez Morquecho, confirmed that “today ... the royal decree dispatched by the Council of State was proclaimed by the town crier in the most public places in this city.”\textsuperscript{29}

Despite its “voluntary” nature, this decree did not achieve widespread success. Correspondence between the Council of State and the Count of Salazar reveals that many Moriscos remained in Castile. Consequently, the tone of the royal charter issued on July 10, 1610 was

\textsuperscript{27}“Cédula Real para que los Moriscos de Castilla,” (December 28th, 1609), Carrasco Manchado, 355: “y aora viendo, que los de la dicha nación que habitan en los reynos de Castilla Vieja, Nueva, Estremadura, y la Mancha se han inquietado y dado occasion de pensar que tienen gana de yrse a vivir fuera destos dichos reynos, pues han comenzado a disponer de sus haziendas, vendiéndolas por mucho menos de lo que valen, y no siendo mi intención que ninguno viva en ellos contra su voluntad. Por tanto, permit y doy licencia, en virtud de la presente, a todos los que se quisieren yr destos mis reynos y señorios de España a vivir fuera dellos, adonde bien visto les fuere, para que sin caer ni incurrir en pena alguna, lo puedan fazer dentro de treynta días, que corran desde la publicación della.”

\textsuperscript{28}García-Arenal, “The Moriscos in Morocco,” 301 and 309. García-Arenal argues that evidence of this emigration requires historians to reconsider the generally-accepted estimates of how many Moriscos left Spain (based on Lapeyre, 1959).

\textsuperscript{29}AGS, Estado, legajo 227, s.f.. See “Aviso de la publicacion del Vando y registro de los moriscos que alli ay” and “Testimonio del pregon.” Núñez Morquecho was “escribano del rey nuestro señor y mayor del ayuntamiento dela ciudad de Valladolid y del numero della.” The announcement was overseen by Licenciate Paez de Vergara, the lieutenant and acting corregidor of Valladolid, who wrote, “Fulfilling the order of your Majesty, I have published the decree that the Moriscos who wish to may leave freely. It was announced today, Saturday [the second] of the present month of January ...”
decidedly less patient. Reports reached the king that the Moriscos were apprehensive and had been selling their estates with a view to leaving the kingdom illegally, meaning without supervision and in contravention of the regulations decreed by the monarchy. These sales and departures were not authorized by the Crown, from which the king “inferred their spirit and intent.”

[The Moriscos] have been and are all of the same opinion and volition against the service of God and of me and the good of these kingdoms, without having taken advantage of the many diligences that over many years have been made for their conversion, nor in the example of Old Christians, the natives of these said kingdoms who live in them with such Christianity and loyalty. In effect, the said Moriscos have persevered in their obstinacy and intransigence, and have conspired against my Royal Crown and my said kingdoms of Spain, soliciting assistance from the Turk and other princes, from whom they are promised help, offering them their persons and estates. And though very learned and pious men have shown me the bad life of the said Moriscos … assuring me that I would be without scruple in punishing their lives and estates because of the notoriety and continual nature of their crimes … I have not wanted to proceed in this way but rather with piety. But considering that reason and good and Christian government, I am obliged by my conscience to expel from my kingdoms and republics people who are so scandalous, harmful, and dangerous to the State (Estado) and to its good subjects, and who above all such an offence and disservice to God our lord.³⁰

This second order regarding the removal of the Moriscos from Castile contained harsher language, a real requirement to leave. All “New Christian Moriscos, Granadans, Valencians, and Aragonese” living in Old Castile, New Castile, Extremadura, and La Mancha were ordered to leave the Spanish Kingdoms within sixty days of the publication of the order, taking with them their sons, daughters, and any Morisco servants or kin in their households. They were ordered to never return for any reason, neither to reside in nor to pass through the kingdoms again.

According to 1609 and 1610 registries, there were approximately 372 households of Moriscos in Valladolid when the king ordered the expulsion. As evident in the table below, these numbers are notably lower than those recorded in earlier decades.³¹

---

³⁰ “Cédula ordenando la expulsion de todos los moriscos de los Reinos de Castilla la Vieja y Nueva, Extremadura y la Mancha,” (Aranda de Dueros, July 10th, 1610), 363-364 in Carrasco Manchado, De la convivencia a la exclusión.
³¹ In addition to the numbers displayed below from 1565, 1589, 1595, 1609, and 1610, there is a fascinating register of Granadan Moriscos in Valladolid from March 20, 1583 (AGS, CC, legajo 2184), which I discuss in Chapter Three. It includes five lists: illegal newcomers to Valladolid (deportees registered to live elsewhere); Granadan prisoners; Granadan freed slaves; Granadan absentees (deportees registered to live in Valladolid who left illegally to reside elsewhere); and deceased Granadan deportees. However, it does not name the Granadan Moriscos registered to live in Valladolid and still living there, the “legal” settlers, so to speak, and is therefore seriously incomplete as a census record.
Table 1: Morisco population figures for Valladolid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>GRANADANS</th>
<th>ANTIGUOS</th>
<th>COMBINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1565</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>141 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>350 households/1171 individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>1473 individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>278 households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>94 households/316 individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complicating matters, there are incongruous figures in other sources. The President of the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid wrote that there were approximately 800 households of Moriscos in Valladolid in 1609; this overestimation may have been a product of the official anxieties that surrounded his task of policing this population. Allowing for error, the population drop revealed by these censuses was likely a reflection of Morisco escape in anticipation of the expulsion, the
continuous emigration which partly prompted the king to announce the expulsion from Castile.\textsuperscript{38} It was illegal for Granadan Moriscos to leave without express license, and would have been dangerous and costly for any Morisco to relocate home and family in fear of an expected forced deportation. Yet despite the risks, some Moriscos sold their property (keeping the profits, rather than surrendering it to the royal treasury) and fled the kingdoms. In response to this scenario, Crown and Church officials increased surveillance over Moriscos and their property even before the formal commencement of the expulsion. Valladolid Inquisitors were ordered in December of 1608 to report on which Moriscos had been absent from the region, describing their age, “quality” (\textit{calidad}, likely meaning whether they were \textit{antiguo} or Granadan), and what property they had taken with them or sold.\textsuperscript{39} As discussed below, this fugitive problem continued during the expulsion.

The official, supervised departure of the Moriscos from Valladolid took place between 1610 and 1611, with isolated cases of late departures and settlements concerning property continuing into the following years. First, a large number of Granadan Moriscos in Valladolid responded to the first order of expulsion and left during the winter and spring of 1610. On April 30, 1610, Salazar submitted a report of the number of Moriscos processed in Burgos thus far, including 1199 Moriscos from Valladolid (258 households).\textsuperscript{40} Records from later dates suggest these were mostly Granadans; an account taken on September 29, 1610 reveals that only five Granadan Morisco families remained in the city. That same account — recorded shortly after the expiration of the sixty-day expulsion deadline set on July 10 — shows thirty-five \textit{antiguo} Morisco households still living in Valladolid. This document represents these as just over half of the former population of the Barrio, which it places at having been sixty-five households. Problematically, this number falls short of the 94 citizen heads of household listed by name in the 1609 census, and represents less than half of the well-documented Barrio population in 1565, as seen in the table above.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{38} See above and García-Arenal, “The Moriscos in Morocco,” 301 and 309.
\textsuperscript{39} AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3205, s.f. The Valladolid Inquisitors replied on April 1, 1609 that they were monitoring the situation but as yet had nothing to report.
\textsuperscript{40} Lapeyre, \textit{Geografía de la España Morisca}, 268.
\textsuperscript{41} AGS, Estado, legajo 235, s.f. (September 29, 1610): “La Ciudad de Valladolid - 30 – En esta ciudad no quedaron sino cinco casas de granadinos los cuales an caminado con los de Ávila y otras partes, ay sesenta y cinco casas delos antiguos de las cuales por su boluntad sean ydo las treynta.”
An account taken on November 30, 1610 shows that Juan de Medina Bajan, the captain of the operation for the district of Valladolid, declared he had taken two hundred and fifty people from the region in the most recent removal (la última lleva). Yet a report sent to the Council of State from the city of Valladolid on January 4, 1611 includes the same information as in September 1610, clarifying that three of the five remaining households of Granadans were set to leave and only two to stay in the city with permission from their prelate. The remaining thirty-five households of Moriscos antiguos lived in Valladolid until mid-July 1611. While in the city on behalf of the royal treasury to assess and appraise abandoned Morisco property, Don Juan de Luxan described the Moriscos of the Barrio de Santa María as having departed from the city just days earlier, confirming that “many or most” of the Moriscos of the Barrio left “at the beginning …. voluntarily.”

Those Barrio holdouts, the final Moriscos to remain in Valladolid, defied the orders of expulsion on the grounds of being antiguos. In January of 1610, the corregidor of Valladolid explained, “In this city there are two kinds of Moriscos. One is called ‘of the barrio’ and these are the antiguos; the other are those from the Kingdom of Granada.” The distinction between local and foreign remained the primary, official determinant in categorizing the Moriscos. Across Castile, this meant a distinction between the native Old Moriscos, called antiguos mudéjares (former Muslims living under Christian rule), and the deportees from the Kingdom of Granada. The imperative to impose this division was born of Philip II’s rules for resettling the Granadan deportees throughout the Crown of Castile after 1570, ordering that the Granadans reside intermixed among Old Christians, apart from each other and not among local Morisco populations. The deportees and their descendants were known and identified as Granadans

---

42 AGS, Estado, Legajo 226, s.f., “Rel[aci]on delos nombres y distritos delos capp[itan]les de la hultima leua y de lo q[ue] se [saue] del num[er]o de gente q[ue] tienen.” “Id” (idem) is entered in the column for the Valladolid district; above is the number for Palencia: “ducéntes y çinquenta.”

43 AGS, Estado, legajo 235, s.f. (January 4, 1611): “Valladolid, en esta çiudad no quedaron sino çinco casas de granadinos de los quales salieron las tres y quedaron las dos por ynformaçiones que hizieron ante su perlado y de 65 casas que auia de Moriscos Antiguos an salido de su boluntad las treynta dellas para yr al reyno de françia.” I discuss these exemptions below.

44 AGS, CJH, legajo 496, 4.18 (July 17, 1611): "y asi al principio muchos o los mas del dho barrio boluntariamente se fueron y desamparon las dhas casas."

45 AGS Estado 227, s.n, “Auiso de la publicacion del Vando y r.on de los moriscos que alli ay” (Licenciate Paez de Vergara to Philip III, January 2, 1610): “en esta cjuadad ay dos generos de moriscos unos que llaman del barjo que son de los antiguos y otros delos del reyno de granada.” This missive announced that the edicts of expulsion had been read in the city and accompanied registers listing the local and Granadan Moriscos in Valladolid.

46 I discuss this in Chapter Three. See Philip II, “Pragmatica y declaracion sobre los moriscos del reyno de Granada, y la orden que con ellos se ha de tener” (October 6, 1572, Madrid) in Francisco Izquierdo, La Expulsión de los
though they had become citizens of Castilian towns and cities once settled in those places. In some instances, the distinction was expanded to designate Moriscos as either *antiguos* or *modernos* — “old” or “new.” These categories endured. The disputes in the Council of State over the procedure of the final expulsion — which regions to deport, and when, and in what order? — “reveal the complexity of the Morisco question, which was founded, among other factors, on a most particular geography.” The king and his councillors understood that there were regional Morisco identities: Castilian, Granadan, Valencian, Aragonese, as well as special designations for places like Hornachos. Ultimately, the Valencians were ordered to be expelled first, both because the monarchy believed they had allied with the Ottoman Turks and because it was assumed they would most readily adjust to living in North Africa. That the Moriscos of Castile were first “invited” — rather than ordered — to leave was a product of perceptions of them as less dangerous and volatile, and not constituting a threat due to their smaller and more dispersed populations.

In Castile, the distinction between *antiguos* and Granadans was also evident in Morisco collective action in response to the expulsion. Like other Morisco communities throughout Castile, the residents of Valladolid’s Barrio de Santa María identified themselves as *antiguos*: Old Moriscos, descendants of the local Mudejars converted in 1502, and an established community loyal to the king and as such entitled to remain in their homes. On April 19, 1611 — nine months after the order of expulsion was imposed — the Council of State heard from the Count of Salazar that the *antiguos mudéjares* of Valladolid purported to stay in their homes on account of this ancient lineage (“por muy antiguos”). To corroborate their claim, they presented a writ stating that their ancestry in Valladolid could be traced back more than eight hundred years. This claim stressed indigeneity as the source of their honour and privilege, all of which were offered as justification for their claim to exemption. Their request was denied and their negotiations shifted to focus on property, as discussed later in this chapter.

---


50 AGS, Estado, legajo 235, s.f., Council of State on April 19, 1611. The Moriscos of the Barrio de Santa María had presented a united front in many earlier legal battles (see Chapters One and Two).
Claims of ancient lineage and established citizenship were widespread among Moriscos *antiguos*. In the Kingdom of Murcia, for example, they claimed “that they should not be expelled but rather treated as Old Christians as they have always enjoyed this preeminence.” In this case, the Council of State granted the Moriscos temporary immunity while the matter was under investigation.\(^{51}\) Morisco claims to the title and status of Old Christians began decades earlier when the Moriscos of Granada faced deportation and a host of prohibitions, as discussed in Chapter Three. While Castilian *antiguos* stressed long-standing regional belonging, Granadan Moriscos who asserted Old Christian status proclaimed (and had to prove) a family legacy of political loyalty and resulting hereditary entitlements to the privileges customarily held by Old Christians with no known Jewish or Muslim bloodlines. These honours included the freedoms to travel, relocate, and own and carry weapons without special permissions; under threat of deportation (in 1609-1614 as in 1570 in Granada), claims to Old Christian status were analogous to appeals for exemption from expulsion. For example, the corregidor of Écija expressed doubts about the decision to expel the Moriscos in 1610. In addition to concern for the safety of Morisca women and girls, he expressed trepidation over the removal of the local *antiguos’* long-held privileges:

Some of the moriscos are not those from the kingdom of Granada but rather the descendants of those given mercy and privileges of freedom from the past kings for their service in the conquest of these kingdoms … there are some among them who, they or their fathers, after the war in Granada or before, were Turks or Moors and came voluntarily to turn Christian. Are they to be included in the edicts of expulsion? … \(^{52}\)

In this argument (and others), temporality, inherited honour, and voluntary presence in Catholic Spain were fashioned into a Morisco identity worthy of exemption from the expulsion. As discussed elsewhere in this dissertation, the language of purity of blood (*limpieza de sangre*) was not employed on either side of the argument, as the category of purity had shrunk to the point of

\(^{51}\) AGS, Estado, Legajo 235 (1611), s.f.: “Copia del sesto cap[ítul]o de la ynstruçion que se dio al conde de salaçar: En el Reyno de Murçia ay cantidad de Moriscos de los Antiguos que llaman Mudexares, y estos pretenden que no an de ser espeildos sino tratados como xpianos viejos pues siempre an gozado de la preheminençia de tales …”

\(^{52}\) AGS, Estado, legajo 220, s.f. (c.1610), "Dudas que se ofrecen a Don Luis de alcaraz godinez y guzman correg.dor dela ciudad de Ecija despues de auer Publicado el Vando delos expulssion de los moriscos."; “Algunos moriscos que no son de los del Reyno de granada sino que a sus antecessores los s[eiñores] Reyes pasadas m[erced] y dieron privilegios de franquezas por auer hecho seru[ci]jos en las conquistas destos Reynos los tales se me aduertira si an de yt con los demas que desto entiendo q[ue] ay pocos. Ay algunos que ellos o sus Padres despues de la guerra de granada o antes siendo turcos o moros se vinieron de su voluntad a tornar christianos, si con estos se a de entender el vando.” On the dangers to Moriscas, he wrote, “por lo menos alo[n]de quiera que vaya corren riesgo y peligro sus mugeres y hijas donzellas en hazer ofensas a dios aunq[ue] contra su voluntad por las fuerças que en los caminos y partes adonde llegaren seles pude[n] hazer …”
denying entry to anyone of Morisco descent — no matter how far removed in time a person was from the conversion or judged heresy of his or her forefather.  

There are also instances of Granadan Moriscos asserting a collective identity in response to the expulsion. After the order expelling the Moriscos of Valencia was issued, a group of Granadan Moriscos wrote to the king avowing themselves to be his “loyal vassals,” innocent of acts or thoughts offending the Crown, and insisted that they were a people apart from the Valencian Moriscos though they were “known by the same name.” Describing the anti-Morisco sentiments roused in other regions after the expulsion of the Valencians, and the abuses they suffered in consequence, the Granadans claimed to “live as good Christians in all actions like Old Christians.” They drew a line distinguishing themselves from the Valencians and asked that they not suffer because of the actions of others. Another entreaty was presented by Alonso Marcos, "citizen and native of the city of Ávila, for himself and on behalf of the other natives of the kingdom of Granada." Granadan Moriscos had lived in Castile for forty years by this time. In Old Castile, most of the Granadan Moriscos were Castilian-born, citizens of places like Valladolid and Ávila, and had local ties; they were, at the same time, deemed Granadan, even while the meaning of this category was changing. Marcos and his brethren in Ávila asserted that they were "all good Christians by the mercy of God our Lord and faithful vassals of your majesty." They asked for protection and requested the king “order licenses given to us to remain in these kingdoms of Castile.”

All things considered, it was commonly understood and accepted that Moriscos from other parts of the Spanish kingdoms had different regional identities. Royal policies and Morisco petitions made throughout the sixteenth-century reflected these categories, and there were real social, linguistic, and cultural differences between Moriscos of different regions (the same was

---

54 There was also a precedent of communal legal action among the Granadan Moriscos of Valladolid; see Chapter Three.
55 AGS, Estado, Legajo 218, s.f. “Los Naturales del Reyno de Granada”: “aunque devajo de este nombre y generalidad entedemos”
true of Old Christians for that matter). Several historians have made this point, among them Vincent and Perceval:

Therefore, in 1609, the society was very far from believing the saying that “todos son uno [they are all as one]”, widely repeated in the literature, as José María Perceval has shown. The Moriscos’ contemporaries, from the authorities on down, were perfectly aware of the differences among Aragonese, Valencian, and Granadan (or rather Granadan-Castilian) Moriscos and mudéjares antiguos.57

Yet in order to argue for their complete removal from the Spanish kingdoms, some leaders in government and Church insisted that the Moriscos were all the same — specifically, that they were all Muslims and enemies to God, the king, and the nation of Spain — regardless of their regional provenance. President Pedro de Zamora of the Royal Chancery of Valladolid decried the Moriscos’ lack of Catholic faith and spoke out against exemptions for Castilian Moriscos on the grounds that they were “the antiguos Moriscos de España and neither Granadans nor Valencians.” In a letter to the king — written after the proclamation of the expulsion of the Moriscos of Valencia, but predating the order of “voluntary” exile for Castile by more than two months — Zamora attested to “have been in Valencia, and Aragon, and Granada, and have been for so long a judge and witness to their little Christianity and their infidelity, and with God I have little faith in one or the other.”58

The view of the antiguos Moriscos of Castile was no better among the clergy in the nearby city of Ávila. In a letter sent to the king's Council of State on August 17, 1610, a priest described the antiguos of Ávila as a
damned people of poor quality and more devious than those who have been expelled. As is known from the [Edicts of] Grace conceded to them, those of this city and the rest of the Moriscos of Arévalo, Medina del Campo, Valladolid, Palencia, and Segovia pay and contribute to the Inquisition of Valladolid 400,000 mrs. each year, but are not reformed to our holy faith. It has not been enough, neither the autos de fe ... nor have many years of living among Old Christians been enough to stop them from being separate, as is fire from water … it is in the service of God and your majesty that these pretend Christians and disingenuous Muslims leave and be expelled with all brevity.59

58 AGS, Estado 214, s.f. (President Pedro de Zamora of the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid to King Philip III, October 10, 1609): “… a sup[li]car a [uesta] Mag[esta]d no se entienda el decreto dicho con ellos, pues son de los antiguos Moriscos de España, y no de los granadinos ni valencianos. Pero yo como quien ha estado en Valencia, en Aragon, y en granada, y he sido tanto tiempo Juez y testigo, de su poca christianidad e infidelidad para con dios fío mui poco delos vnos y delos otros …”
59 AGS, Estado 2640, f.284, from “su capellan y presbitero de esta santa iglesia de avila” to the Council of State on August 17, 1610: “por el ynconbinyente q[ue] se sigue y siguiira de que aya de quedar en el Reyno una jente tan
The priest from Ávila referred to earlier Morisco negotiations (Edicts of Grace and the situado payments) as both proof of the failure of Morisco assimilation and an argument against extending further privileges to them. As described below, parish priests in Valladolid likewise condemned the majority of the city’s Moriscos, both antiguos and Granadans, for a number of shortcomings, including refusing to live as and among Old Christians, and failing to worship as Catholics.

Supported by such condemnations, the argument that all Moriscos were the same and none deserved exemption on the basis of regional identity or lineage gained traction as more Moriscos petitioned to remain. The Council of State produced a report outlining “reasons to expel the Moriscos from Spain completely, with no exceptions.” Likely penned in 1611, it discredited the notion that antiguos Moriscos deserved any special treatment or second chances.

The antiguos are no better than the Granadans, since those from Aragon, Catalonia, and Valencia, and those from Hornachos are some of the oldest … Since the Moriscos, old and new, are relics of those infidels who conquered Spain and were itsmasters for so long, what reason is there to conserve the seed of such fierce and cruel enemies? For each house of them that remains in Spain, in fifty years there will be one hundred houses of Muslims who will communicate with those in Barbary and Turkey and France, always seeking to harm Christianity.

This report concludes with a rhetorical coup de grace that turned the Moriscos’ claim of ancient lineage on its head: the expulsion of the Moriscos would end eight hundred years of Muslim presence in the Spanish kingdoms, and not to completely “cleanse” (limpiar) the kingdoms of Moriscos would mean that the greatest feat achieved by any Spanish king would cease to be
perfect.\textsuperscript{63} The final phases of the expulsion illustrate the Council of State’s refusal to accept \textit{antigüedad} or testimonies of sincere Morisco Christianity as sufficient to secure exemption. For example, the king issued a decree expelling the Moriscos of the Ricote Valley of Murcia on October 19, 1613 — despite their established Mudejar status, their claim to Old Christian titles earned for their loyalty during the Granadan rebellion and war, and their widespread local support which included evidence of their Catholicism from their confessors.\textsuperscript{64}

If ancient lineage was not to be accepted as sufficient to secure exemption, what of Catholic sincerity? The conviction that most Moriscos were insincere Catholics was the basis for the decision to expel them from the Spanish kingdoms. In pronouncing this decision, the king repeatedly proclaimed that the Moriscos were not truly converted to Christianity despite repeated Edicts of Grace and attempts to educate them in the ways of the Catholic Church; to the contrary, their “obstinacy grew” and for “their continual crimes” they were held to be “heretics and apostates” deserving of punishment.\textsuperscript{65} And yet, on the same day he proclaimed the expulsion of the Moriscos of Castile — the July 10, 1610 order — Philip III instructed the Bishop of Valladolid, Don Juan Vigil de Quiñones, to conduct a careful investigation in his bishopric and to identify any Moriscos renowned for their Catholicism and therefore deserving of exemption from the expulsion. He wrote,

“Reverend in Christ, Father Bishop of Valladolid, of my council. I have resolved that from my kingdoms will be expelled all the New Christian Granadan, Valencian, and Aragonese Moriscos who live and reside in Old Castile, New Castile, Extremadura and La Mancha. I have charged the superintendency and care of this project to the Count of Salazar of my Council of War and steward (\textit{mayordomo}) of the kingdom. But as it may be there there are some among the Moriscos who might be good Christians I have ordered it be made known that those who have been and are by reputation and continually so will not be expelled …”\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{63} AGS, Estado, legajo 235, s.f.: “la otra es que por no acuar de limpiar de todo pronto este reyno de moriscos por los pocos que quedan, deja de quedar perfeta una hazaña la mayor que ha hecho ningun rey en españa que sera hechar della los moros que amas de ocho ciento años que binieren a ella.”


\textsuperscript{65} AGS, Estado, legajo 217, s.f. (1609): “que por tan largo discurso de años e procurando la conversion de los moriscos dese reyno [Valencia] y del de Castilla, y los editos de graçia que se les conçedieron, y las diligençias que se an hecho para instruyrlos en n[uest]ra sancta fee, y lo poco que todo ello a aprouechado pues sea visto que ninguno be haya convertido antes acreçido su obstinacion … porque la continuaçion de sus delitos les tenia conuençidos de erejes apostatas.”

\textsuperscript{66} AGS, Estado, legajo 224, s.f. King Philip III to the Bishop of Valladolid (Aranda, July 10, 1610): “Reveren]do In christo P[adr]e Obispo de Vall[adol]id del mi cons[e]jo. Yo he resuelto q[ue] se hechen de mis Reynos y señorios
The bishop conducted this search the following month, hearing witness testimony regarding six Granadan Moriscos living in Valladolid who were purported to be sincere Catholics. Witnesses were asked: 1) whether they had any knowledge of the Moriscos who lived in the city; 2) whether any of those Moriscos lived as Catholic Christians, hearing mass regularly, confessing and receiving the Eucharist, and attending sermons and doing good works as Old Christians; 3) whether they knew this to be true without any doubt. Based on the king’s instructions, Bishop Quiñones elaborated on the requirements for being a good Christian Morisco, highlighting conditions related to diet, residency, and communication, as well as stressing the importance of public reputation. This last requirement was an imperative on all counts; public renown and commonly accepted recognition of an individual’s actions and devotion were encapsulated in his or her reputation. The bishop wrote that testimonies should be gathered to determine whether the Moriscos under investigation were Catholic Christians and commonly held to be so in the said town for having been seen to hear mass and sermons, frequenting the holy sacraments, confessing and receiving the Eucharist … and that they have not treated or communicated with Moriscos nor lived in the barrio nor vicinity of them, and that they have been seen eating pork and drinking wine, and that they have not been seen doing things prohibited or contrary to the law of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that without a doubt they have always been seen to have been keeping and to keep the things of our holy Catholic faith …
Similar investigations were conducted throughout the Spanish kingdoms in accordance with the king’s orders. The Bishop of Córdoba accepted proofs similar to those accepted by Bishop Quiñones, and he also investigated the Moriscos’ lineage and political loyalty, proposing to exempt those with Old Christian status. As in the cases associated with antigüedad discussed above, this required evidence that their forefathers had converted to Catholicism before the conquest of Granada, that their family did not participate in the Granadan rebellion, and that they served the royal forces during the Granadan war. Morisco claims of Old Christian status were common from the time of the Granadan war and rebellion, as I discuss in Chapter Three. In Valladolid, the investigation remained focused primarily on evidence drawn from the social, cultural, and religious lives of each subject.

Bishop Quiñones first heard the case of the Granadan Morisco Agustín de Segovia. He was a shoemaker, husband to Isabel Rodríguez and father of five children aged two to sixteen: Alonso, Agustín, Francisco, Isabel, and Antonio. The family lived on the calle Santiago, a main street that bordered the Barrio de Santa María, which meant that Agustín de Segovia and his family lived in the parish of the Iglesia de Santiago. On August 8, 1610, four clergymen from that parish testified as witnesses supporting his case; they were Licenciate Francisco de Barzena, Sebastián Ruiz de Portilla, Licenciate Pedro Carreno, and Francisco Alonso. The priests counted among their parishioners all of the Moriscos antiguos of Valladolid, but declared that “none keep the holy Catholic faith save Agustín de Segovia” and his family. All the priests had witnessed the family’s observance of the Catholic faith in their regular attendance at mass, confession, and receiving of the Eucharist. The entire family received the sacraments and knew the Catholic doctrine, “including the daughter of two-and-a-half-years old who knows the prayers of the church very well.” Agustín de Segovia performed his faith publicly, following the procession of the host through the parish and doing charity work at hospitals on holy days. The family was known to eat pork and drink wine. The priest Barzena reported that for these reasons the residents of the barrio did not like Agustín de Segovia, and in return his family did not interact with the Moriscos. In
addition to the evidence that the family lived as Catholics, the priest Alonso suggested that Isabel Rodríguez might have been an Old Christian.\textsuperscript{70}

None of the other “reputably Catholic” Moriscos investigated by Bishop Quiñones lived in the Santiago parish, and so were not supported by the Santiago priests’ testimony. Rather, Old Christian friends, neighbours, priests, and employers stepped forward to provide evidence of their Catholicism. Six witnesses testified on behalf of the Granadan Morisca Isabel de Soto between August 11 and 13, 1610, contending that the seventy-year-old widow was “a very Catholic Christian and a great servant of God.” She knew the Catholic prayers and doctrine, attended mass and other rites unfailingly, and received the Eucharist three times a week from the Jesuit priest Gaspar Juárez. Father Andrés de la Puente, a friar in the Order of Santo Domingo, testified that he knew no other Morisco who lived as a Catholic in the city and confirmed that she was well educated as a Christian. She would regularly visit the poor and the sick, taking food to destitute women who had no one else to care for them and, when necessary, “helping them to a good death.”\textsuperscript{71}

While Isabel de Soto was known for her virtue, piety, and charity, the remarkable part of her story is her avoidance of the Moriscos, which came to a heart-wrenching climax in a documented confrontation with her son. Witnesses described her emotional reactions toward even the mention of Moriscos. Her Old Christian friend Isabel de Chaves said that de Soto never dealt with Moriscos; hearing of them caused her “great pain, and she would utter ‘Our Father, give them light’.” Father de la Puente had “always heard that she fled from the company of the Moriscos, saying that she could not see or hear them because she did not want to be lost.” The testimony of the final witness revealed the source of de Soto’s discomfort. Doctor Antonio Ponze de Santa Cruz was a presbyter and a university professor, and de Soto was his live-in domestic help. He stated that de Soto “did not deal with and could not hear the name of the Moriscos” and disclosed that she had a Morisco son who did not live as a Christian, despite her best efforts. The unnamed son had recently gone to the Santa Cruz household to speak with his mother; the conversation turned into a loud confrontation in the doorway, the son yelling that he “did not want to live and die

\textsuperscript{70} AGS, Estado legajo 224, s.f. (August 9, 1610): “… Agustín de Segovia y su mugger e que ella dicen tiene prouado ser christiana bieja …”

\textsuperscript{71} AGS, Estado legajo 224, s.f. (August 11-13, 1610). The witnesses in this case were three Old Christian friends of de Soto (María de Soria, Isabel de Chaves, and María de la Cruz), two priests (Padre Fray Andres de la Puente, Padre Andres de Frias), and her employer (Doctor Ponze de Santa Cruz).
among Christians” and de Soto then refusing to admit him into the house. Santa Cruz himself intervened, threatening to report the son to the bishop. The son fled and his whereabouts were unknown. Santa Cruz represented the incident as proof positive of de Soto’s sincere Catholicism, while he considered the rest of the Moriscos to be Muslims (moros). Isabel de Soto’s story illustrates how Bishop Quiñones’ investigation uncovered a small number of cases of demonstrably devout Catholics among the Moriscos of Valladolid. For some of those individuals, there was clearly an emotional and social cost to embracing Christianity: the rejection of and social ostracization by Morisco kin and former friends and neighbours.

On August 25, 1610, Bishop Quiñones heard five witnesses in the case of the Granadan Morisco Martín Alonso, aged fifty and unmarried with no children, a tanner who lived on calle Cantarranas among Old Christian neighbours. One of these, Miguel García, testified that he had been Alonso’s neighbour for over twenty years and never knew him to be a Morisco; the witnesses Antonio de Arraburu, a merchant, and Joachin Pérez, a tanner, likewise had been unaware that Alonso was a Morisco. Alonso was never seen conversing with Moriscos. He ate pork and drank wine and he was popularly recognized for his Catholic devotion. The Jesuit priest Juan Suárez testified that for twenty-eight years Alonso had attended sermons and masses with the Company of Jesus, where he confessed and received the Eucharist and was known to have an excellent understanding of Catholic doctrine and prayers. Pérez reported that it was commonly known that Alonso heard daily morning mass at the church of San Francisco and confessed at the Jesuit house.

An extraordinary indication of Alonso’s reception by and assimilation into Old Christian society was his incorporation into the tanners’ confraternity. His neighbour Joachin Pérez testified that “holding him to be such a good Christian, the confraternity of Sant Eutropio of the tanners admitted him as a member of their brotherhood, which, as he is a Morisco, they would not have done except that his great Christianity is so well known.” This final detail is notable because

---

72 AGS, Estado legajo, 224, s.f. (August 11-13, 1610).
73 This street is described as being far from the Barrio de Santa María (“en catarranas muy distante del barrio de los moriscos”). There is no street with this name in present-day Valladolid, but there is a “Plaza de Cantarranillas” in the city.
74 AGS, Estado, legajo 225, f.49 (August 25, 1610).
75 AGS, Estado 225, f.49 (August 25, 1610): “ansi mismo dixo este declarante que por tenerle por tan buen xpiano la cofradía de sant Eutropio de los pellejeros le han admitido por cofradre de su confradria lo qual por ser morisco no hizieran sino tubieran tan conocida su gran xpianidad.”
confraternities were not legally closed to Moriscos or conversos. Confraternities were local religious brotherhoods, expressions of lay piety often associated with specific occupations and named for patron saints, and they were exceedingly popular in sixteenth-century Valladolid. Yet I have not come across any other mention of Moriscos in the brotherhoods of Valladolid, nor of Morisco confraternities as there were in some other places. It seems that Morisco membership in Valladolid confraternities was rare, and as such Alonso’s acceptance into the tanners’ confraternity was received as evidence of both his integration into Old Christian society as well as the weight of his reputation as a Catholic.

The cases of Miguel de Quesada and Diego García were heard jointly on August 26 and 28, 1610. They were not citizens of Valladolid, but rather servants of the Marquis of Los Vélez. The Granadan nobleman was at that time residing in Valladolid with his retinue, of which three members testified that Quesada and García lived as true Catholics despite their Morisco descent. The Marquis’ chaplain, Licenciate Juan Ramón de la Torre, had known the two young men (both aged twenty) since they were born in Mula, a town on the outskirts of Murcia. He described their exemplary knowledge and observance of the Catholic faith, calling them “fearful of God and their consciences” who without a doubt “kept and lived in the law of Our Lord Jesus Christ,” avoiding Moriscos, eating pork and drinking wine, etc. In addition, the Marquis’ secretary Gines Fernández de Quesada reported that Miguel de Quesada was married to an Old Christian woman from the town of Toro. Like in the case of Agustín de Segovia, detailed above, marriage to an

---

78 This detail hints that Quesada and García may have been born into service, perhaps the sons of servants or liberated Morisco slaves. They were too young to have been captured in the Granadan War, and are clearly called servants (criados), not slaves.
79 AGS, Estado 225, f.49 (August 26, 1610): "... y por esto y por ser personas exemplares de buen vista y costumbres temerosos de dios y de sus conciencias y ... tiene por cierto y sin duda q[ue] los susodhos guardan y viven en la ley de nro s.r jesu cristo ...”
80 AGS, Estado 225, f.49 (August 28, 1610). The third witness was Don Bartolome de Figueroa, aged 28, also in the entourage of the Marquis of Los Vélez. He had known Quesada and García for ten years and his testimony mirrors those of the two witnesses identified above.
Old Christian woman counted as evidence of Catholic assimilation but was not spelled out in the expulsion orders as cause for exemption, as was the marriage of a Morisca woman to an Old Christian man.

The final documented case in Bishop Quiñones’ investigation considered a Morisca widow who had been twice married to Old Christian men. On August 30, 1610, Bishop Quiñones presided over the case of the fifty-year-old Isabel de Molina. She was by all accounts an impeccable Catholic. A Granadan Morisca captured during the war and rebellion of 1568-1570, Molina was seven years old when she became the slave of Sancho de Ortegon, “secretary of the hijosdalgo,” and his wife Doña Isabel de Espinosa. She had remained in their service after her manumission and as governess she raised their children, Lorenzo and Leonor, who was “born into her care”. After the death of her masters, she stayed on to govern the household (“gobierna esta hacienda”) inherited by Lorenzo de Ortegon. The witnesses’ testimony includes many touching statements that reveal Molina’s place at the heart of this Old Christian family, which “treated her as a daughter.” She had raised the children and grandchildren of the family and had been in charge of the Christian education of all the young girls in the household. Her position as a virtual member of the Ortegon family and her extreme Catholic devotion were presented as evidence of her integration into Old Christian society. Having joined the family at such a young age herself, Molina had only ever known life as an Old Christian and had no contact with the Moriscos of the city. Most of her neighbours and acquaintances were unaware of her Morisco descent; Father Gaspar de Magdaleno, a monk in the monastery of San Pablo and Molina’s confessor, had not known she had been a Morisca or a slave. Isabel de Molina had no children of her own but had been married twice, each time to an Old Christian man; she had continued to work for the Ortegon family while a married woman, and had always returned to live in their household in widowhood.

81 AGS, Estado 225, f.50 (August 30, 1610). The witnesses were L Doña Leonor de Ortegon; Leonor’ husband, Don Diego de Calderón; Sancho de Ortegon’s second wife and widow, Doña María Balsamenda; and Doña Elvira de Barros. The dates and details of this case indicate that she was manumitted as an enslaved minor in accordance with Philip II’s laws of 1572; see Chapter Four.

82 AGS, Estado 225, f.50 (August 30, 1610). Her first husband was Gonzalo de Baena, who died not long after their marriage. Her second husband’s surname was Martínez. I do find it strange that neither Doña Leonor nor her husband could recall the first name of Isabel de Molina’s husband. Leonor described him as “Fulano Martínez jubitero cristiano viejo montañez que tambien falleçio.” Fulano means “So-and-so / what’s his name”; a jubitero was a maker of chain-mail doublets; montañez referred to northern Old Christian descent (pointing to the Asturian region north of the border of the eighth-century Muslim conquest of Iberia).
In all, these records from the summer of 1610 offer evidence of six Moriscos in Valladolid — all Granadans, some with families — who met the stated requirements for being a Good Catholic Christian. Witnesses attested to their piety, regular worship, and acts of charity, and confirmed their social ties to Old Christians alone. Conversely, this investigation demonstrates how the majority of the Moriscos of Valladolid did not meet these requirements. This is not definitive proof, of course, that there were no Morisco concessions, accommodations, or even adaptations of Catholicism in Valladolid. The records of Bishop Quiñones’ investigation do not provide a view of the myriad ways in which Moriscos may have responded to and lived with Catholicism every day, off the record. Here, the Moriscos appear collectively in the background of the witness testimony of every case: as people to be avoided, as absent in church, and as socially separate from Old Christians when possible. That the Morisco lineage of the individuals under investigation was hidden, and even kept secret, from their Old Christians friends, neighbours, and adoptive family is in and of itself a testament to a maintained division between Old and New Christians in Valladolid. This division fit increasingly with the construction of an official argument that rejected Morisco assimilation.

A Council of State report written two months later tallied the Moriscos approved as good Christians and nominated for exemption by their prelates. The entry for Valladolid is curious considering the findings of the August investigation. Only one name was forwarded: Lorenzo Núñez, citizen of Valladolid, whose neighbours of twenty years declared “his Christianity was renowned.” The Bishop of Valladolid was tied with that of León for most stringent; each only recommended one individual for exemption from the expulsion, while others named many more.83 This development was likely a result of the larger turn against exemptions visible in the deliberations of the Council of State from this time. The six individuals investigated in Valladolid in August 1610 were clearly the exception to the norm; they lived apart from other Moriscos, among Old Christians, and as Catholics in every way that had counted over the last century. But the imperative of the expulsion — and the rising stakes for the Spanish Crown and Church as Moriscos resisted this final solution — required a tightening of the mechanisms that permitted

83 AGS, Estado, legajo 2640, f.303 (October 23, 1610). For comparison: the Cardinal of Toledo: 153; the Bishop of Cuenca: 12; the Bishop of Plasencia: 23; the Bishop of Palencia: 3; the Bishop of Soria: 117; the Bishop of Cartagena: 6; the Prior of Ucles: 27; the Vicar of Villanueva: 9; of Yeste: 8; of de Veas: 26; of Merida: 141; of Tudia: 9; of Magazela: 30; of Guadalupe: 19. There are other reports containing similar recommendations within this legajo, and it is not clear that any of these were made reality.
exemptions. Long-held proofs of assimilation were interrogated and found wanting; the Council of State poked holes in arguments of Morisco sincerity and assimilation.

The Duke of Lerma — possibly the most infamous champion of the expulsion\(^{84}\) — advised the king not to allow any exemptions whatsoever. Lerma supported his position on November 29, 1610 with two central points. First, he argued that permitting any Moriscos to remain in the Spanish kingdoms would appear to be “tacit permission” for others to return and for people to help them hide. Second, he contended that “to not finish fully cleansing the kingdoms of the Moriscos, the best thing done by the king of the world would cease to be perfect.”\(^{85}\) The purity of the Spanish kingdoms and Philip III’s legacy seem to have become popular exhortations among the king’s advisors. Likewise, the metaphor of exemptions creating an open door permitting Moriscos to remain in and re-enter the Spanish kingdoms was commonplace in their recommendations, as seen in the opinion of the Cardinal of Toledo, also a member of the Council of State:

> since the day when the door was opened for some Moriscos to remain as Old Christians (viejos), Old [Moriscos] (antiguos) and good Christians (buenos Christianos), he was persuaded that the expulsion would not conform to the holy intention of your majesty because getting to remain with evidence of being a good Christian, there would be few bad ones who would not prove they were good. And so what he wants in this evidence is not only that they prove they confess and attend to the sacraments ... this is not what is essential, but rather that they use wine and pork and not speak Arabic (algarabia) and that they withdraw from those of their nation.\(^{86}\)

Here the Cardinal put his finger on the slipperiness of sincerity, the unknowability of inner faith, and the ease with which orthodoxy could be feigned — and suspected. He therefore insisted on both observed orthopraxy and strict avoidance of Morisco sociability (including the eschewal of Morisco company, dietary traditions, and the Arabic language) as necessary proofs of assimilation.

---


\(^{85}\) AGS Estado 235, s.f.: “a 29 de 9bre de 1610. El señor Duque de Lerma. Para que se vea y avise a su M[a]g[esta]d lo que parescie sobre un papel incluso. en que se dan algunas razones por las quales conuiene que todos los Moriscos sean expelidos destos Reynos sin ecepcion ning[u]a. La primera porque si suedan alg[un]os se bolueran los de mas parecien doles q[ue] en una tacita permision y abra acá quien los llame y encubra. La 2a que por no acauar de limpiar de todo punto de moriscos estos Reynos dexa de quedar perfecta la mayor cosa q[ue] ha hecho Rey del mundo.”

\(^{86}\) AGS, Estado 2640, f.304 (October 23, 1610): "Al Cardenal de Toledo que desde el día que vió abrir puerta a que quedasen algunos Moriscos por viejos, antiguos y buenos Christianos se persuadió a que no se auia de hazer la expulsion conforme al Santo Intento de V[uestra] M[agesta]d porque hauiendose de quedar por Informaciones de buenos Christianos pocos haura de los malos que no prueven que son buenos. Que queria que en las Informaciones que destos se hizieron no solo se prouase que confiesan y frequentan los sacramentos pues como queda dicho no es esto lo esencial en ellos sino que usan del Vino y Toçino y no hablan Algaravia y se Retiran delos de su Naçion …"
And yet he concluded that the "holy intention" of the expulsion could only truly be fulfilled with a total removal of the Moriscos, "closing the door" to any exceptions. The Cardinal clarified that he believed the Moriscos to be bad Christians even in the presence of such evidence, and, like Lerma, was in favour of a total expulsion. He reminded the Council that God “cast malediction” on those who were negligent in the expulsion of the Jews and thereby allowed *conversos* to remain in the Spanish kingdoms, which was to him “a thing of much sorrow.”

Others likewise insisted that even observed participation in Catholic culture (such as eating pork and drinking wine) and religious worship (such as receiving the Eucharist) were insufficient proofs of sincere Christianity. These types of evidence were rejected on the basis of two serious arguments. First, that nothing other than intermarriage with Old Christians and requesting the final rites were acceptable in verifying the Catholicism of a Morisco:

> It is also known with certainty that many Moriscos who in their lives frequent the most holy sacrament, [at the time of] their death they do not ask for it nor do they wish to receive it. And so the argument — this guy receives the Eucharist, and therefore is Christian — is invalid. So [while] actually receiving the Eucharist they inviolably maintain the rite of not eating pork and not marrying any Christian women unless it is for love … the true sign is if they have married among Christians, and if at the time of their death they receive the sacraments … And as infidels receive the Eucharist and swear in the name of Christ our Lord in derision, keeping the rite of (avoiding) pork and the rest of the Quran, and it is not known how they die and marry and live among themselves.

Second, the Council cited corruption and listed a number of serious charges: that most legal exemptions were secured through bribery; that Moriscos paid off notaries, curates, their friends, and powerful people; and that even the judges overseeing these cases received “many advantages” from the Moriscos. These objections, raised in 1610 and 1611, provide only a small window into

---

87 AGS, Estado 2640, f.304 (October 23, 1610): “y sin esto Juzga que no prueuan bastamentemente y aun entonces quando lo prouasen creeria que son malos y que conuiene hazer la ezpulsion de todo punto y en este lugar se le acuerda la maldiçion que Dios echo alos que hazen las obras negligentemente y repress.ca que hauiendo faltado despaña tanto numero de Judios como se sabe por no auer salido todos de Rayz. han subçedido tanta manera de inconuenientes y desdichas en estos Reynos que es cosa de mucha lastima.”

88 AGS Estado 235, s.f. "Las razones q ae para que los Moriscos sean totalmente expelidos de España sin excepcion alguna.” (c. 1611): "Tambien se saue con certeza de que muchos Moriscos que en vida han frequentado el s[antissi]mo sacram[en]to en muerte no le han pedido, ni querido reciuir. Y ansi no vale el argumento comulga fulano, luego es cristiano. Pues actualmente comulugando guardan inuiolablemente el rito de no comer tozino, y no se casar con ninguna Christiana si no es por amores … la verdad señal es si se han casado entre Christianos, y si en tiempo de muerte reciuen los sacramentos … pues como infieles comulgar y jurar el nombre de Christo n[uestr]o s[ef]or por escarnio guardando el rito del tozino y los demas del Alcoran y no se saue como mueren y se casan y viuen entre si.”

89 AGS Estado 235, s.f. "Las razones que ay para que los Moriscos sean totalmente expelidos de España sin excepcion alguna.” (c. 1611): “Por donde se vee con euidencia quales podian ser las informaciones que de su
the Council of State’s deliberations over the question of exemptions from the expulsion, debates which were much larger in scope and longer in years.

Another significant consideration of the king and his council was Morisco property. The Spanish Crown intended to profit financially from the expulsion of the Moriscos by confiscating a large part of their assets. The threat of Moriscos evading the royal treasury through illegal property sales and smuggling was therefore a serious concern for the monarchy. Accusations of heresy, political disloyalty, and economic subterfuge went hand in hand, and champions of the expulsion argued that it was a plan “advantageous to the service of God and your majesty that these Moriscos leave because besides being [Moriscos] they serve for nothing more than as spies and correspondents with Barbary and to take money out of Spain in a thousand ways.” Surveillance of Moriscos and their property began in anticipation of the expulsion and continued throughout.

The December 1609 royal charter that permitted the Moriscos to leave Castile also authorized them to sell and transport their property within the thirty-day departure window; the July 1610 order of expulsion had a term of sixty days and repeated many of the same rules governing the sale of Morisco property. The Moriscos were allowed to sell their movable belongings and livestock (*muebles y semovientes*), but not their immovable property (*rayzes*) such as land and houses. They were banned from leaving the kingdoms with any gold, silver, jewelry, letters of exchange, or any money beyond a small amount with which to fund their travels overland or by sea. The rest could be spent on merchandise and produce (*mercadurías y frutos*) purchased only from local Christian Spanish natives (*naturales destos reynos y no de otros*), and these products could then be taken into exile once applicable duties were paid. This rule commanding the deportees to patronize local sellers and producers aimed to retain revenue on Spanish soil.

---

90 For more on this topic, see Francisco Javier Moreno Díaz del Campo, "Geografía de la expulsión morisca: aproximación al análisis de la administración y venta del patrimonio de los moriscos expulsados de la Corona de Castilla," *Chronica nova: Revista de historia moderna de la Universidad de Granada* 31 (2005): 379-426.

91 AGS, Estado 232, s.f. (August 23, 1611): “es cossa conuiniente al seruicio de Dios y de v[uestra] Mag[esta]d se salgan estos moriscos porque demas de ser lo y tener la presunçion contra no siruen sino de espias y de correspondientes en berberia y sacar el dinero de españa por mil modos.”

92 AHN, Inquisición, legajo 3205, s.f. (Valladolid, April 1, 1609).
What remained would be confiscated by the royal treasury. The Count of Salazar had orders to impound valuables from the Moriscos when they were processed in the city of Burgos.

In the July 1610 charter, the king asserted his right to Morisco property and depicted his regulations as lenient and compassionate: “I could justly order to confiscate and take into my treasury all the possessions and properties of the said Moriscos, as the property of traitors of the crime of lesa majestad divina y humana; nevertheless, using clemency toward them, I hold it to be good that they can … sell their moveable goods and livestock.” The king also pledged to protect the Moriscos and their property on their voyages. This was the stated purpose for the surveillance he mandated his officers to undertake throughout and at the borders of his kingdoms, an effort certainly also necessary to assure that no prohibited valuables were leaving his jurisdiction with the departing Moriscos. The July 1610 charter contained a final clause that functioned as both an allowance and a mechanism of confiscation: Moriscos who wished to take money, silver, or jewels into exile could register at the border and forfeit half of the sum to the Crown.

Authorities were on the lookout for third parties hired by Moriscos to transport their valuables out of the Spanish kingdoms and to deliver them their goods in exile. There is clear evidence that the Moriscos of Valladolid hired smugglers. In January 1611, a Portuguese bookseller named Juan de Molina was apprehended in Valladolid for conveying gold and silver to

---

93 “Cédula Real para que los Moriscos de Castilla, Extremadura y la Mancha que quisiéren ir fuera de España, lo puedan hacer dentro de treinta días a partir de la publicación de esta Cédula,” (Madrid, December 28th, 1609), 354-356 in Carrasco Manchado; “Cédula ordenando la expulsion de todos los moriscos de los Reinos de Castilla la Vieja y Nueva, Extremadura y la Mancha.” (Aranda de Dueros, July 10th, 1610), 362-366 in Carrasco Manchado.

94 AGS, Estado, legajo 220, s.f., “Copia del quarto y septimo capitulo de la Instruçion que se dio al Conde de Salazar.”

95 “Cédula ordenando la expulsion de todos los moriscos de los Reinos de Castilla la Vieja y Nueva, Extremadura y la Mancha,” (Aranda de Dueros, July 10th, 1610), Carrasco Manchado, 365: “Y aunque pudiera justamente mandar confiscar y aplicar a mi hazienda todos los bienes muebles y rayzes de los dichos moriscos, como bienes de prodiadores de crimen de lesa majestad divina y humana, todavía, usando de clemencia con ellos, tengo por bien que puedan durante el dicho término de sesenta días, disponer de sus bienes muebles y semovientes …”

96 “Cédula Real para que los Moriscos de Castilla,” (December 28th, 1609), Carrasco Manchado, 355: “Y tengo por bien que puedan durante el dicho tiempo disponer de sus bienes, muebles y semovientes, y no de las rayzes, y llevarlos, no en moneda, oro, plata, ni joyas, ni letras de cambio, sino en mercadurías no prohibidas, compradas de los naturales destos reynos y no de otros, y en frutos dellos. Pero bien permit que puedan llevar el dierno que huvieren maneste para el tránsito que han de hazer. Y para que puedan hazer todo lo susodicho con seguridad, declare que tomo, y recibo a los que asi se quisiere salir destos dichos reynos debaxo de mi proteccion, y amparo real, y los asseguro a ellos y a sus biene para que durante el dicho tiempo puedan andar, y estar seguros, vender, trocar, y enagenar todos los dichos sus bienes muebles y semovientes, y emplear la moneda, oro, plata y joyas en mercadurías, cuya saca es permitida por leyes y premáticas destos reynos, compradas, como queda dicho, de naturales dellos y en fruta de los mismos Reynos, sin que en el dicho tiempo les sea hecho mal ni daño en sus personas, ni bienes contra justicia, so las penas en que caen, e incurren los que quebrantaren el seguro real.”

97 “Cédula ordenando la expulsion de todos los moriscos de los Reinos de Castilla la Vieja y Nueva, Extremadura y la Mancha,” (Aranda de Dueros, July 10th, 1610), Carrasco Manchado, 366.
exiled Moriscos who had hidden their property before being deported. Similar charges were laid against a Valladolid man named Diego López Núñez for having illegally transported Morisco money and jewelry to France on their behalf; he died before his sentencing, leaving his widow, Isabel Gómez, to defend his estate. In a Valladolid jail in March 1612, a citizen of Pastraña named Pedro Gómez Cardoso confessed, under torture, the names of Moriscos who had hired him to smuggle money and jewelry to France. He identified Joan de Hierro Baltasar Ortiz, and “Fulano” (“So-and-so”) Vermejo. Ortiz, along with his wife and his young niece, were antiguos Moriscos and had been residents of the Barrio de Santa María; he was recorded in the 1610 registry, along with three men with the surname Vermejo.

Moriscos in Valladolid were also found guilty of illegal property sales. The king heard reports from many cities and towns of Moriscos illegally selling their estates "with stealth and deception." In February 1610, he ordered both Valladolid corregidor Don Juan Avellaneda and President Pedro de Zamora of the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid to investigate the matter, to nullify any such sales, and to report back to the Council of State. Their enquiries uncovered cases of Morisco fugitives (people who left without supervision instead of being registered and deported under Salazar’s command along the mandated routes) who sold or transferred ownership of their property rather than having it sequestered by the Crown. Zamora acted on information obtained by royal agents regarding the Valladolid Company of Jesuits having attempted to purchase a vineyard on the banks of the Pisuerga river from a Morisco antiguo named Gaspar Guisado. The Chancery President reported that the deal was never completed and the land had remained in Guisado's possession; he took inventory of all of the Morisco's property in case he made further attempts to sell. Another Granadan Morisco, Gaspar de Arraya, had fled eight months earlier, leaving houses in Valladolid and “debts owed to him in Toledo, Madrid, and Pastraña,” pointing to the likelihood of his being a merchant. Zamora also discovered that the Granadan

98 AGS, Estado, legajo 229, s.f. (January 12, 1611).
99 AGS, Consejos y Junta de Hacienda, Legajo 507, 10-11.
100 See AGS, Estado 227 (January 2, 1610) and Appendix 6. Baltasar Ortiz is entry #4; the surname Vermejo is in entries #61 (Francisco), #90 (Hernando), and #91 (Diego).
101 AGS, Estado, legajo 220, s.f. (1610). Philip wrote to Zamora on February 11 and to Avellaneda on February 14. Zamora replied on February 24, Avellaneda on February 20. Other unnumbered folios in this legajo show similar investigations in Soria (correspondence from February 20) and Ávila (correspondence from February 23).
Morisco Zacarias de Mendoza had fled the kingdom without declaring his property to Crown officials; his vineyard was seized on behalf of the royal treasury.\textsuperscript{102}

To forestall further cases, President Zamora ordered an inventory of the estates and property of all the Moriscos living in Valladolid, including both the antiguo and the Granadans. Still in progress when reported on February 24, 1610, the inventory accounted for one hundred houses (declared by fifty Moriscos), thirty-six orchards near the banks of the Pisuerga river, fields of wheat measuring over seventy \textit{yugudas} (approximately 2,240 hectares), and three hundred \textit{aranzadas} of vineyards (approximately 135 hectares).\textsuperscript{103} He reported that in this undertaking they were “discovering the frauds occurring and stopping more from ensuing.”\textsuperscript{104} Yet it seems the investigation may have prompted further transgressions. After declaring his property in this investigation, Juan de Ávila, a Granadan Morisco merchant, fled Valladolid and gave the titles and deeds to his property to the friars of the convent of the Holy Trinity (\textit{Convento de frailes de la Sanctissima Trinidad}). This property consisted of six valuable houses (in good condition and well-located in the commercial district) and approximately eleven hectares of vines. Ávila’s son had died and was buried in the monastery, and in return for this donation the Holy Trinity friars would say fifty masses every year in his memory, along with other remembrances of him. When this came to the attention of the chancery officials, they declared the transaction void and confiscated the property for the Crown.\textsuperscript{105} There is no mention in this record of Ávila’s donation to the convent and his request for the monks to pray for his dead son as expressions of Catholic faith or allegiances.

Beyond a sense of duty to the monarchy and concern for the prosperity of the royal treasury, Zamora, Avellaneda, and their officers working on the ground in Valladolid recognized the potential of an economic and agrarian downturn if the project of managing Morisco property was

\textsuperscript{102} AGS, Estado, legajo 220, s.f. (February 24, 1610). The land in question was a “twelve \textit{aranzadas} of very good vineyard” (“majuelo de doce arançadas de viña muy buena”). An \textit{aranzada} is “an agrarian unit of surface measurement equivalent to 4472m$^2$ in Castile.” (Diccionario de la Lengua Española, “aranzada,” www.dle.rae.es Accessed February 29, 2016.) Zacarias de Mendoza’s vineyard was therefore a little larger than five hectares.

\textsuperscript{103} AGS, Estado, legajo 220, s.f. (February 24, 1610). A \textit{yuguda} is is “an agrarian unit of measurement equivalent to fifty \textit{fanegas} or a little more than thirty-two hectares.” (Diccionario de la Lengua Española, “yuguda,” www.dle.rae.es Accessed February 29, 2016.)

\textsuperscript{104} AGS, Estado, legajo 220, s.f. (February 24, 1610): "se van descubriendo los fraudes que ay y çessan de hacerse otros mayores."

\textsuperscript{105} AGS, Estado, legajo 220, s.f. (February 24, 1610). The details about the Ávila’s property and deceased son are from corregidor Avellaneda’s report; see AGS, Estado, legajo 220, s.f. (February 20, 1610). The measurement of the vineyards is given as twenty-four \textit{alanzadas}. 
neglected. While a number of Moriscos in Valladolid owned vineyards, still many others were agricultural workers who would need to be replaced.\textsuperscript{106} A letter from Valladolid communicated the stakes to the Council of State:

The houses and vineyards that the Moriscos leave need new owners to live there and tend to the vines [or else] they will not produce fruit and it will cause notable damage to the royal patrimony. May your majesty be served in ordering them populated, and in remembering that there are many poor people in Spain who could do this favour … \textsuperscript{107}

A royal agent assessed the abandoned houses of the Barrio de Santa María shortly after the final exodus of the Moriscos \textit{antiguos} of Valladolid. Don Juan de Luxan reported to the king that the houses were in need of major renovations before they could be sold; the repairs would be costly, but necessary in order that some of the houses not collapse.\textsuperscript{108} The Morisco barrio was situated in the centre of Valladolid near the main southern gate of the city; the dilapidation of this neighbourhood would reduce the value of this prime real estate and would constitute a visible sign of infrastructural neglect, as well as an uncharitable waste in the face of the destitution of some Old Christians.

In some other cities, economic considerations prompted requests to exempt local Moriscos from being deported. For example, Moriscos had near monopolies on certain industries in Granada, and officials there wrote to the Council of State outlining their serious concern for key industrial sectors. They described the intricate system of pipes that conducted water to the palaces of the Alhambra and Generalife, the royal \textit{audiencia}, all public places and even some houses — these were maintained by over fifty Morisco \textit{cañeros}, specialized plumbing engineers who alone understood this system of civic irrigation. The \textit{cañeros} would be difficult to replace; not only was each responsible for his own section of ducts and pipes (and, according to this letter, not familiar with the others), but also the Old Christians of the city were “totally ignorant” of this “laborious and humble office.” Granada city officials requested exemptions from the expulsion for Morisco \textit{cañeros}, and so too for Morisco \textit{tintoreros}, or silk dyers: they did excellent work, and it would be difficult to train enough replacements; the loss of half the workforce in this trade would

\textsuperscript{106} 28 were on record in 1594, the occupations of many were not listed here; AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2109, #1. Moriscos were also prominent among the city’s carpenters and shop-keeps / grocers.

\textsuperscript{107} AGS, Estado, legajo 220, s.f. (February 17, 1610). The author was Hernando Vasquez. I do not know who he was, but this quotation continued, “… and I am one of them and the lowest of all in service and merits.”

\textsuperscript{108} AGS, CJH 496, 4.17. (July 30, 1611). I describe the Barrio de Santa María in greater detail in Chapter One.
diminish the value of this important local industry.\textsuperscript{109} Members of the Council of State later used a petition from Old Christian silk dyers — in which they argued that they could provide ample service to the city of Granada without their Morisco colleagues — as justification to push for the expulsion of all Moriscos from the city.\textsuperscript{110}

Reports from Valladolid expressed concern for the maintenance of houses and vineyards left deserted by the Moriscos, but did not go so far as to propose retaining the Morisco population for economic or agricultural continuity. Rather, such objections came from the Moriscos themselves. As described above, the Moriscos of the Barrio de Santa María objected to their removal on the grounds of their status as\textit{ antiguos}. At the same time, they requested permission to sell their property under the condition that they be forced to leave. The\textit{ antiguos} acted collectively, petitioning the king for permission to sell their houses and land, namely orchards, vineyards, and other productive fields; these properties are often referred to as their\textit{ haciendas}, a word that means “estate” and has a medieval provenance denoting land devoted to agriculture.\textsuperscript{111} Their request was couched in terms of both logistics and compassion: the Moriscos described the impossibility of taking all of their possessions into exile, and furthermore asked for mercy on the basis of their poverty.\textsuperscript{112} The Council of State received this plea and agreed on the condition that the Moriscos would finally leave the city.\textsuperscript{113} However, a problem remained: the\textit{ antiguos’} property was bound to the\textit{ situado}. This tribute of 400,000\textit{ maravedís} paid annually after 1558 to the Valladolid Tribunal by the old Moriscos of that district was a major source of Inquisition revenue. After the expulsion was proclaimed, the residents of the Barrio de Santa María collectively lobbied to have their property released from this obligation. They were represented by Gaspar Guisado, Francisco

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{109} AGS, Estado, legajo 227, s.f. (Granada, January 24, 1610).
\item \textsuperscript{110} AGS, Estado 232, s.f. (August 23, 1611).
\item \textsuperscript{111} \textit{Diccionario de la Lengua Española}, “hacienda,” \url{www.dle.rae.es}, Accessed May 27, 2016.
\item \textsuperscript{112} AGS Estado legajo 235, s.f., Council of State on April 19, 1611: "El c[on]de de Salazar escrivio al s[eño]r Antonio de Aroztegui q[ue] los Moriscos Antiguos de V[alladoli]d pretenden quedar por muy antiguos, y q[ue] hauiendo de salir q se les de liz[enci]a para bender sus bienes rayzes por q[ue] ay muchos tan pobres q[ue] sera imposible lleuar lo sino es haziendose esto … y en lo demas le dieron un memorial en que refieren q ha mas de 800 años q residen en V[alladoli]d sus pasados y ellos …”
\item \textsuperscript{113} AGS, Estado legajo 235, (April 19, 1611): “… y hauiendo visto el cons[ejo] le parece, q[ue] si es toca lo de hauer pagado qual quier derecho o lo del hauer buido en Barrio separado salgan en cumplimiento del bando, y q[ue] atrueco de q[ue] salgan y se acabe hobra tan grande se podra hazer poder huber q[ue] se haga con ellos lo mismo q[ue] con los q[ue] se quedaran por buenos xpianos y agora salen pues este exemplo es muy en su fauor y es bien dar luego salida a esta dificultad para q[ue] dentro del plazo debando puedan salir si fuere posible.”
\end{itemize}
de Palacios and other unnamed Old Morisco citizens of Valladolid.\textsuperscript{114} Their petition asserted that the \textit{situado} guaranteed

that they were free owners of their own property, and that even if they committed crimes known to the Inquisition, the holy office could not confiscate. Now, they have been ordered to leave these kingdoms, and they are selling all their property, both movable and fixed, it has been arranged that the buyers will not be asked at any time to pay the \textit{situado}. Even though the Count of Salazar has sent permission for them to sell their said property, and it is guaranteed that the said tax will not be requested at any time, no one dares buy it unless it is on record in a royal charter.\textsuperscript{115}

Philip III conceded their request, stating that property sold by the \textit{antiguos} of Valladolid was free of the \textit{situado} obligation.\textsuperscript{116}

The Morisco \textit{antiguo} Gaspar Guisado who represented the Barrio in this petition — the same man who had been investigated for illegal property sales in February 1610, seen above — was granted license by the king to remain in Valladolid temporarily after the departure of the rest of the Moriscos in order to settle all business related to Morisco property in the city.\textsuperscript{117} This work kept him in the city until at least March of 1612, when he and his associates submitted a report to the Bishop of Valladolid. Guisado worked with his (unnamed) son and another \textit{antiguo} bearing the surname Piedrahita (likely Gaspar de Piedrahita).\textsuperscript{118} One particularly complicated matter that

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{114} Both of these men are listed in the 1610 census of Moriscos \textit{antiguos} in Valladolid. Francisco de Palacios (#53) lived on Calle del Campo with his two daughters. Gaspar Guisado (#8) and his wife had three sons and three daughters. See AGS, Estado, legajo 227, “Memorial de los antiguos vecinos y orijinarios del Barrio de Santa María de esta ciudad de Valladolid y que al presente residen en ella” (January 2, 1610).
  \item \textsuperscript{115} AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2109.2 (June 17, 1611): “El Rey, por quanto por parte de Gaspar guisado fran.co de palacios y otros moriscos antiguos vecinos de la ciudad de Valladolid se me a referido que el año de mill y quinquenta y ocho se hizo asiento con los vecinos de barrio de santa María de la dha ciudad y se les concesio que fuesen dueños libres de sus bienes y que aunque cometiesen algun delito de que conociese contra ellos el s[to] oficio no pudiesen se confiscados que avuiendose les mandado salir destos reinos y que venden todos sus bienes assi muebles como raizes an reparado los comprados en que no se les pida en algun tiempo el derecho de la situacion, y que aunque el conde de salaçar a embiado permision para que se vendan los dhos bienes y asegurado que no se les pedira en ningun tiempo el dho derecho no se [atreuen] a comprar lo sin que conste esto por çedula mia …”
  \item \textsuperscript{116} AHN, Inquisición, legajo 2109.2 (June 17, 1611): “porque es justo que se haga lo que piden declaro y tengo por bien en virtud de la presente o de su copia autentica que puedan vender librem[en]te los d[ic]hos moriscos antiguos de Vall[adol]jd y de otras quales quier partes los bienes raizes que tuuieren sin obligacion de pagar los compradores dellos ningun di[ner]o de los que pagauan y contribuyan los d[ic]hos moriscos antiguos agora ni en ningun tiempo …”
  \item \textsuperscript{117} AGS, Estado, legajo 246, s.f. (November 5, 1611): “Gaspar Guisado que quedo con liz[enci]a de su M[agestad]d a acauar los negocios que qde …”
  \item \textsuperscript{118} AGS, Estado, legajo 246, s.f., The Bishop of Valladolid to the king on March 3, 1612: “Pocos dias ha q[ue] un hijo de Gaspar Guisado y otro de la misma nacion que se diçe Piedrahita me dieron la de V[uestra] m[agesta]d con un memorial dado al Rey n[uest]ro se[fio]r que todo buelue con esta …” The 1610 register of Moriscos antiguos names three people with the surname Piedrahita. One was a widow named Isabel de Piedrahita (entry #75), another was a widower named Antonio de Piedrahita, father of one son and one daughter (entry #64). Gaspar de Piedrahita
demanded their attention was the Morisco property bequeathed to the poor of the Barrio de Santa María. For example, the 1599 will of the late García del Trigo included a clause donating his extensive properties, including houses and vineyards, to benefit the poor Moriscos of the Barrio.\[^{119}\] Guisado and his associates wanted these provisions to remain intact, meaning the profits from the sale of these estates would remain in the hands of exiled Moriscos. Authorities in Valladolid disputed this claim. The Bishop of Valladolid contested this extension of Morisco property rights on the basis of their perceived infidelity. He wrote, “Those of this nation never had dominion over the estates they had, having lost it having been, as they were, hidden and dissimulating Muslims, they could not transfer dominion to anyone else through sale, testament, or in any other way …”\[^{120}\] The outcome is unclear in this record; what is evident is that the bishop’s opinion was a departure from the precedents set by decades of entrenched Morisco property rights and tradition of due process.

One final claim diverted revenue from the royal treasury. In July 1611, Don Juan de Luxan informed the king of a counter-claim to the property of the evicted Moriscos, a challenge to the king’s right to repossess the houses. It came from the Iglesia Mayor of Valladolid — that litigious landlord who had attempted to evict the Moriscos from their homes upon the event of their conversion one hundred years earlier — whose administrators submitted evidence of their entitlement to the houses in the Barrio de Santa María. Luxan forwarded to the king scribal copies, certified and signed by his own hand, of the Iglesia Mayor’s letter of entitlement and an executive order from the Royal Chancery Court that contains the history of the earlier property disputes.\[^{121}\]

Salazar continued to surveil Moriscos in exile. He monitored correspondence between expelled Moriscos and those who remained in Castile, including places such as Ávila, Toro, Segovia, Almagro, Plasencia, and Valladolid. Salazar reported to the Council of State in 1612 that “Luis Hernández … corresponds with Diego López and Diego de Aranda and Juan del Rincon, was the first entry on the list; he was married and had one son and one daughter. See AGS, Estado, legato 227, s.f. (1610).

\[^{119}\] AGS, Estado, legajo 246, s.f., “Memoria de la hacienda que dejaron para los pobres del varrio de santa María garçia del trigo y otras personas de los antiguos del dicho varrio.”

\[^{120}\] AGS, Estado, legajo 246, s.f., The Bishop of Valladolid to the king on March 3, 1612: “los desta nación nunca tubieron dominio dela hacienda que tenian por hauerle perdido siendo como eran Moros encubiertos y disimulados no pudieron traspasar d[ie]chos dominio en nadie por benta t[e]stamento ni de otra manera …”

\[^{121}\] AGS, CJH 496, 4.17 (Letter from Don Juan de Luxan to Philip III, July 30, 1611); AGS, CJH 496, 4.18 (“Sobre la pretension que la Iglesia Mayor de Valladolid tiene a las casas del barrio de Santa María.” July 17, 1611); AGS, CJH 496, 4.19 (“Relacion de la carta executoria de la Iglesia Mayor de Valladolid con los moriscos”)}
citizens of Palencia and Valladolid, and another, Juan Bernardino, a citizen of the said city of Valladolid, who also communicates with those of the said city.”

He also identified a Morisco named Gerónimo Enríquez as a point person for connecting exiled Moriscos in France with those further afield; working out of Marseilles, Enríquez allegedly directed letters to Tunis, Constantinople, and other places. Through such surveillance work, Salazar determined that Moriscos resettled in France were waiting for his commission to expire and would then return to their homes in Castile. He reported that many had returned, and vowed to continue to search out and punish any who returned in accordance with the king’s orders: by “throwing him to the galleys.”

Resistance to the expulsion — Moriscos who fought to stay or secretly returned — was an ongoing obstacle to the expulsion which preoccupied agents of the Crown for a number of years. The records of the Council of State for the years 1609-1613 and beyond reveal that the return of deported Moriscos threatened the completion of the expulsion. Philip III’s instructions to Salazar acknowledged, “it is understood that many remain and some of those who left have returned, attempting to hide themselves …” In September 1612 the Duke of Lerma wrote that expelled Moriscos were “returning daily.” The problem as Salazar described it was widespread, and he requested information that could help him focus on problem spots and persons. For example, he asked if there were any deputies known to be causing disorder; Salazar feared corrupt officials in the pockets of Moriscos impeding his mission of tying up all the loose ends of the expulsion. He also addressed the particular problem of the city of Plasencia, where “the expulsion of the Moriscos antiguos went very poorly.”

Two municipal councilors there “had helped and defended” the

123 AGS, Estado, legajo 247, s.f., “Sumario de lo que contiene un papel del conde de salazar y los auisos q[ue] con el embio.” This summary accompanies two letters written in Salazar’s hand dated January 1612 and January 1613, both from Valladolid.
124 AGS, Estado, legajo 244, folio 58 (July 17, 1612): “en la ciudad de Plasencia se a tomado muy mal la espulsion de los moriscos antiguos …” Plasencia is in Cáceres, far south of Valladolid and west of Madrid.
Moriscos; in addition to significant local resistance to expelling the *antiguos* from Plasencia, there was great disorder in the record-keeping.¹²捌

A royal charter issued on August 21st, 1612 ordered the removal of any Moriscos who had not yet left the Spanish kingdoms; it also dealt with expelled Moriscos who had returned, ordering the men to be pressed into galley service and the women expelled a second time.¹²玖 This punishment predated the charter, as seen in the case of a Morisco man named Lorenzo Bautista who returned from exile in France to rejoin his Old Christian wife and children in Valladolid. Bautista was apprehended and imprisoned in Bilbao, a Basque city in northeastern Castile not far from the French border. He protested the sentence of galley service on numerous grounds. Bautista was at least sixty years old and suffered from a number of ailments. He claimed his old age and infirm condition made it impossible for him to physically perform the grueling labour of rowing in his majesty’s fleet. Beyond entreaties for mercy, Bautista insisted on being identified as a good Christian who had lived his life as and among Old Christians.¹³₀

Bautista’s Old Christian wife, María Rubia, took his case up in Valladolid with a formal petition to have this status recognized. As evidence she brought four Old Christian witnesses before the deputy corregidor of Valladolid on January 21, 1612.¹³¹ Each testified to Bautista’s Old Christian reputation and the good Christian life he led: regularly attending mass, hearing sermons, performing charitable acts, confessing and receiving the Eucharist. Like the requirements of Bishop Quiñones’ investigation in the summer of 1610, this evidence of orthodoxy had to be supported by proof of social and residential assimilation and signs of Catholic orthopraxy. The witnesses all stated that Bautista lived among Old Christians and not in the barrio of the Moriscos. He ate pork and drank wine. Both his first wife, María de Rivera, and María Rubia were Old Christian women of impeccable lineage — Rivera’s parentage was twice described as noble (*hidalgo*). Rivera’s Old Christian identity was characterized by one witness as “montañesa,” likely

¹²捌 AGS, Estado, legajo 244, folio 58 (July 17, 1612). The corregidor of Plasencia, Don Rodrigo Pacheco, had arrested the officer who had been in charge of reporting. Salazar feared that this officer’s imprisonment in a dungeon would cause a jurisdictional dispute over which level of authority was entitled to oversee his case.
¹²玖 “Cédula para que los moriscos que han vuelto a los Reinos sean echados a galeras, y las moriscas, expulsadas, y los que no hubieren salido sean expulsados,” (Madrid, August 21st, 1612), 367-368 in Carrasco Manchado, *De la convivencia a la exclusión*.
¹³₀ AGS, Estado 245, f.20: Letter from the corregidor of Biscay (Vizcaya) to the king (Bilbao, February 4, 1612).
¹³¹ AGS, Estado 245, f.13: “Información testifical probatoria de que Lorenzo Bautista es Cristiano Viejo.” The witnesses were Juan de Ortega, Alonso de Oro, Pedro de Cañaje, and Miguel de Hala. All four men played the pity card, describing Lorenzo’s ailing body and advanced age. Juan de Ortega was his apothecary who had for years provided him with medicines and intimately knowledgeable of Lorenzo’s conditions.
referring to Asturian lineage; people from this northern region commonly represented their pedigree as free from the Muslim contamination that the stock of Christians living south of Covadonga potentially had.\textsuperscript{132} Bautista’s reputation as an Old Christian was also stainless. In fact, all four witnesses stated that he was not known to be a Morisco until the order of expulsion was proclaimed.\textsuperscript{133} Bautista’s case was heard by the Council of State, whose members decided the regular rules of the expulsion applied to his case.\textsuperscript{134}

Philip III declared the expulsion of the Moriscos complete in August of 1614, five years after the deportations began.\textsuperscript{135} Earlier, partial announcements of success had been contradicted by persistent evidence to the contrary. For example, the Count of Salazar had informed Philip III that the expulsion of the Moriscos from Old Castile, New Castile, La Mancha, and Extremadura was complete on July 10, 1611. From those provinces, he wrote, fifty thousand people had been deported. Reflecting on this accomplishment one year later, in a missive dated July 17, 1612, Salazar stated that it remained to attend to the many lawsuits initiated by Moriscos — mostly \textit{antiguos} and some Granadans — regarding their claims of exemption from the expulsion. These people were registered as Moriscos by local authorities but “expressed grievances for different reasons and privileges that they had.” A backlog of their cases remained pending before the limited number of officials authorized to hear them, and with new cases arriving daily from various smaller councils and tribunals it was “impossible to finish them with brevity.” The matter required the attention of the king himself.\textsuperscript{136} There was apparently little question of ignoring the petitions; even

\textsuperscript{132} The Battle of Covadonga (c.722) was the famous, first Christian military victory against the Islamic conquest of Iberia.

\textsuperscript{133} AGS, Estado 245, f.13.

\textsuperscript{134} Tueller points out that this official decision may not have been executed: “The response to Vizeaya, by the Duke of Lerma, was ‘fulfil the expulsion orders’. Although Lerma’s tone implied that Lorenzo was to be sent to the galleys, uncertainly remained. There was enough confusion in the expulsion orders and enforcement of them that Lorenzo could very well have been freed. The orders excluded the old and sick, while with local support the Morisco could have reached an agreement with the corregidor.” See \textit{Good and Faithful Christians}, 219. Tueller cites AGS, Estado 245, folio 20 (4 February 1612).

\textsuperscript{135} Tueller, “The Moriscos Who Stayed Behind or Returned: Post-1609,” 201.

\textsuperscript{136} AGS, Estado, legajo 244, folio 58 (July 17, 1612): “En diez de Julio del año passado, di quenta a V[uestra] Mag[esta]d de aber cumplido la orden, que de V[uestra] Mag[esta]d tube, para la espulsion de los Mori[sc]os en castilla la Vieja, y la nueva, la mancha, y estremadura, de las quales prouinçias salieron çinquenta mill personas, y di quenta tambien a V[uesta] Mag[esta]d como solo quedaua por acauar de despachar muchos pleytos que los Moriscos antiguos y algunos de los del Reyno de Granada tenian, sobre pretender , que auiendo sido listados por moriscos, por las Justiçias ordinaras de donde heran naturales, se les auia hecho agrauio por diferentes razones y previlegios que tenian … y como en los pleytos sean de guarder los terminus de derecho, a las partes, y al fiscal de V[uesta] Mag[esta]d, que por su orden asiste en esta Junta, y como cada dia se remiten a ella de todos los cons[ej]os y tribunals, los pleytos que desta calidad a ellos acuden asido ymoisible acauarse con la breuedad que yo he
when collectively condemned to exile, the Moriscos were commonly given due process and their legal suits could not be simply disregarded.

Just as persistent as the Moriscos was the Council of State, many members of which increasingly advocated an end to the exemptions. They found cause to deny Morisco claims by negating evidence based on regional or corporate identity, lineage, social assimilation, or Catholic devotion — categories of identity which the Moriscos had used to negotiate status over the previous century. The movement toward a single, comprehensive Morisco policy with no exemptions appears to have been a product of bureaucratic frustration with incessant negotiations over status and privilege, and administrative fatigue when deportations planned to happen over the course of months dragged on for years. However, both the king’s decision to expel the Moriscos and the monarchy’s turn against granting special permissions and exceptions are better understood as part of the quest for religious purity within the proto-nation-state. The official measure and meaning of purity ultimately excluded the Moriscos, and after a century of assimilationist policies the Crown decided to solve the Morisco problem with their expulsion. The Valladolid case reveals important ways in which Moriscos challenged this determination and disrupted this process.

137 Tueller describes these delays in “The Moriscos Who Stayed Behind or Returned: Post-1609.”
Epilogue

Across the Spanish kingdoms, the Moriscos were the subject of assimilationist policies and religious prosecution throughout a long sixteenth century. The preceding chapters demonstrate how Moriscos in and around the city of Valladolid responded with legal action and disobedience. The *antiguos* Moriscos litigated to remain in the Barrio de Santa María, protested plans to dismantle their neighbourhood, and mitigated inquisitorial prosecution through petitioning and financial settlements. Many of the Granadan Moriscos relocated to Valladolid after 1570 challenged their deportation by violating or petitioning for exception from the rules of resettlement. Others claimed full exemption based on Old Christian lineage, inherited from Muslim forebears who had become willing and early converts to Catholicism. Enslaved Moriscos challenged and changed their legal identities in court; Granadan Moriscos captured as minors litigated for their liberty under the auspices of royal functionaries, including guardians, lawyers, and specially-appointed procurators such as Galaz de Burgos, the “Defender of the Moriscos” in Valladolid. Their families acted within the rule of law to secure the liberation of the enslaved Morisco youths, but worked against the royal plans for manumitted Moriscos to serve as freed domestic servants in Old Christian homes, where the Crown hoped they would assimilate into Old Christian society. Finally, Moriscos in Valladolid resisted and disrupted the final expulsion. Some refused to leave, some fought to stay, while others attempted to escape as fugitives or to evade the royal treasury through illegal property sales or donations.

Therefore, the emphasis throughout this dissertation is on Morisco resistance: litigating, petitioning, negotiating, noncompliance, and evasion. Other things receive less attention as a consequence of this focus. Morisco responses to Catholicism and to the processes of conversion and assimilation were not limited to resistance. To varying degrees, some Moriscos accommodated Christianity, adopted (and adapted) new cultural traditions, and assimilated into Old Christian society through intermarriage and association. There is evidence of some Moriscos passing as Old Christians, their ancestry revealed by the work of the final expulsion. Among them were Agustín de Segovia, Isabel de Soto, Martín Alonso, Miguel de Quesada, Diego García, and Isabel de Molina, the Moriscos living in Valladolid who, as I discuss in Chapter Five, were defended by their Old Christian friends and neighbours as being “good Catholic Christians.” The focus of this dissertation does not contradict the possibility of a full range of local and individual observances of the Moriscos, whether Catholic, Muslim, both, or neither. Acknowledging a spectrum of
possible identities and allegiances is vital in questioning what it meant to be Morisco and in "rethink[ing] the term 'Morisco' as applying to an ethno-religious minority whose members can be clearly differentiated from" Old Christians.¹

A central point in many Morisco petitions and claims was that the petitioners and claimants were not so different from Old Christians, that they belonged in Spanish society, and should have access to the same privileges, honour, and freedoms to determine their own residency, movement, and associations. They were negotiating the terms of belonging as baptized citizens and as productive, largely cooperative, and loyal subjects of the Spanish state, implying that such economic productivity and political loyalty were sufficient and that there was therefore no need for the authorities to investigate precisely what constituted their New Christian identity. In fact, most of the Morisco claims and petitions do not present evidence of Catholic devotion, such as character references from priests or witness testimony of regular confession and weekly attendance at mass. Rather, parish priests and Inquisitors in Valladolid consistently reported the absence of the Moriscos in church and their lack of participation in Catholic worship.² The antiguo Moriscos’ fight for the Barrio de Santa María and the Granadan Moriscos’ illegal relocations to preserve their communal cohesion can be read as further evidence of their resistance to religious assimilation. The extant archival record indicates that in Valladolid, “good Christian” Moriscos were the exceptions to the rule. Like their Mudejar ancestors, the Moriscos made numerous social and cultural adjustments to survive in a Christian state while using the legal system to defend themselves individually and collectively. Such adjustments on the part of the Moriscos, in other words, did not necessarily entail their abandonment of Islam any more than it had for the Mudejars. The Moriscos, however, had to grapple with religious and political realities different from those dealt with by their Mudejar forebears: they had to live as the subjects of a Catholic monarchy in whose state Islam was a prohibited faith; they had to work to remain in a land—their homeland—whose religious landscape had radically changed.

This dissertation’s focus on Morisco resistance and legal action leads to several significant conclusions. The distinction between the antiguo and Granadan Moriscos of Valladolid — the

² See Chapter Two for reports from the 1560s and Chapter Five for reports from the early seventeenth century.
“two kinds of Moriscos” described by the corregidor of Valladolid in 1610 — endured from the time of the arrival of the Granadan deportees until the final expulsion. Yet their encounters with Church and State institutions reveal that there were more than two kinds of Moriscos. Through legal action, Moriscos sought more advantageous statuses and privileges with the aims of protecting their families, communities, properties, inheritances, and honour. The resulting textual record exposes the mutability of identity categories, as well as the malleable qualities (calidades) and variable practices through which identities were constructed. As William Childers asserts, "Rather than a fixed, essential category, ‘Morisco’ turns out to be a fairly fluid one, for it was at the center of a process that had been under way for decades ..." Morisco status claims were a form of legal self-fashioning. The documentary production of Morisco legal action should be studied as a form of textuality and alongside early modern texts that "express an unprecedented and heightened awareness that identities are malleable and that they could be subject to self-fashioning; that a person's self-presentation might mask his or her inherited identity." In Valladolid, the Moriscos demonstrated a great deal of legal agility and a strong understanding how to present themselves advantageously to Church and State institutions. The textual record of their legal agency reveals how they fashioned particular images of themselves in order to achieve specific goals and to resist prosecution and coercive assimilation.

Moriscos engendered a significant documentary production through their legal negotiations, and historians can use these texts to recover Morisco words and actions in their encounters with royal and religious institutions. Paradoxically, this documentary production also allowed the Church and State to compile records on the Moriscos, facilitating their surveillance and, ultimately, their expulsion. Yet, these encounters also expose the limits of those institutions’ power, first, in terms of the Moriscos’ ability to challenge, evade, and disrupt official plans and policies. Moreover, records pertaining to the management of Morisco populations at a local level also reveal disagreements between jurisdictions and the inability of royal officers to fully implement the king’s orders.

---

3 See Chapter Five, n.45, and AGS Estado 227, s.n, “Aviso de la publicacion del Vando y r.on de los moriscos que alli ay” (Licenciate Paez de Vergara to Philip III, January 2, 1610).
4 Childers, “Disappearing Moriscos, 58.
The Morisco problem as increasingly perceived by contemporary officialdom made manifest early modern controversies over the desired constitution of communities and nations; here I take Benedict Anderson’s definition of nation as “an imagined political community” brought into being intellectually and culturally. Moriscos from different regions and generations asserted their belonging in the emerging nation of Spain in a variety of ways; for example, the lead books of Sacromonte have been interpreted convincingly as a Granadan Morisco attempt to sanctify and make legitimate their presence in the Spanish kingdoms. Like the anonymous Sacromonte forgers, in their legal action the Moriscos of Valladolid were asserting interpretive power over their identification and treatment by Church and State. The question of their success is a loaded one. The Moriscos were undeniably subject to many forms of violence, prosecution, and, ultimately, exile. Yet their negotiations were at times effective. The Barrio de Santa María remained a Morisco enclave until their final expulsion. The king reissued Edicts of Grace; the Inquisition accepted terms and tributes. Morisco petitions for licences, passports, and permissions were frequently successful. Young Granadan Moriscos captured in war were released from slavery. Status claims were routinely granted, though commonly required repeated defence. The majority of the Moriscos were ultimately expelled from the Spanish kingdoms, yet before this outcome was certain, the Moriscos disrupted the process of their eviction. The remarkable history of Morisco legal action in Valladolid provides new insights into individual, communal, confessional, and national identity-making and the politics of belonging in the early modern world.

---
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Caja 1278,26
Caja 1298,58
Caja 1309,42
Caja 1331,70
Caja 1466,47
Caja 1471,1
Caja 1428,19
Caja 1548,3
Caja 1573,28
Caja 1628,1
Caja 1636,24
Caja 1670,6
Caja 1672, 8
Caja 1702, 4
Caja 1733, 28
Caja 1734, 48
Caja 1735, 23
Caja 1786, 57
Caja 1807,59

Pleitos Civiles (PL.CIV.)
Caja 141,1
Caja 170,2
Caja 218.2
Caja 280,7
Caja 281,4
Caja 462,2
Caja 475,6.
Caja 557,3
Caja 615,8
Caja 716,3
Caja 777,4
Caja 903,1
Caja 973,6
Caja 989,2
Caja 3824.2
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Pérez de Hita, Ginés, *Historia de las guerras civiles de Granada* (first published as *Historia de los bandos de los zegries y abencerrajes* in 1595)

Philip II, “Pragmática y declaracion sobre los moriscos del reyno de Granada, y la orden que con ellos se ha de tener” (October 6, 1572, Madrid) in Francisco Izquierdo, *La Expulsión de los moriscos del reino de Granada: (pragmáticas, provisiones y órdenes reales)*. Azur, 1983, 27-38.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Morisco citizens in Valladolid, 1565 (AHN, Inquisición, Legajo 2110.2)

This list names most of the Morisco citizen heads of household in Valladolid’s Barrio de Santa María in 1565. Not included are any Morisco vecinos who did not agree to the situado contract with the Spanish Inquisition. However, based on other census records and on their need to protect their estates, I believe this list includes the majority of the Morisco vecinos.

1. Lope Buri
2. Garçi Nunez
3. Martin Guisado
4. Diego de Malpartida
5. Lope de Portillo
6. Lope de Malpartida
7. Alonso Quadrado
8. Geronimo del Cano
9. Geronimo de Don Juan el Moco
10. Elena la Roja
11. Ynes Alvarez
12. Gaspar de Ayllon
13. Lope de Ayllon
14. Baltasar de Portillo
15. Diego de Ayllon
16. Antonio de Canon
17. Gaspar de Cano
18. Lope de Murçia
19. Pedro de Robledo el Moço
20. Francisco Taladrero
21. Francisco Buri
22. Antonio Florian
23. Sancho Clavijo
24. Lope Morejon
25. Francisco de Cardenas
26. Maria la Pinonera
27. Diego Andado
28. Maria la Serrana
29. Gaspar Sancho
30. Gaspar Seguin
31. Joan de Ulloa el Moço
32. Francisco Castañon
33. Mateo Sancho
34. Antonio Copete
35. Diego Maeso
36. Baltasar Floriana
37. Bernardino Ginete
38. Francisco Sarmiento
39. Melchior Sancho
40. Sancho de Vallid (Valladolid)
41. Ysabel del Castillo
42. Lope Castañon
43. Leonor de Cuellar
44. Alonso de Cuellar
45. Antonio de Viras
46. Miguel el Rico
47. Mari Velez
48. Bernaldino de Segovia
49. Gaspar de Mendoça
50. Melchior Çamorano
51. Baltasar de Robles
52. Manuel Vermejo
53. Gaspar Hurtado
54. Melchior de Robles
55. Bernardino de Robles
56. Gaspar Andado
57. Hernando Andado
58. Jhoan Andado
59. Alexandre Montero
60. Jhoan de Azebado
61. Francisca de Sepulbeda
62. Luis Andado
63. Jhoan de Gozon
64. Baltasar de Medina
65. Anton Capatero El Moço
66. Alonso de Cuellar el Moço
67. Mayor Clavijo
68. Baltasar de Geronimo
69. Luisa de la Serna
70. Gaspar Xinete
71. Gaspar Clavijo
72. Francisco Andado el Moço
73. Gaspar Castañon
74. Maria de Buenaño
75. Maria de Alcalde
76. Maria la Morena
77. Mayor de Avila
78. Maria la Guisada
79. Ana la Castañaona
80. Lope de Montoya
81. Martin de Valladolid
82. Ana de Torquemada
83. Baltasar de Geronimo
84. Gregorio de Murcia
85. Ana la Enamorada
86. Leonor la Carretona
87. Hernando de Corral
88. Jhoan Morexon
89. Ana la Enamorada
90. Jhoan Bazan el Viejo
91. Joan Moreno
92. Ysabel de Tobar
93. Baltasar Andado
94. Diego Salamanques
95. Francisco Salamanques
96. Hernando del Castillo
97. Ana la Mejorada
98. Jhoan Montero
99. Alonso de Ayllon el Viejo
100. Gaspar Montero
101. Catalina la Serrana
102. Luis Castañon
103. Lope de Rojas
104. Melchior Palomades
105. Diego de Alcozer
106. Ana de Benavides
107. Diego Alcalde
108. Antonio Ramirez
109. Melchior Cauallero
110. Ana la Cauallera
111. Ynigo de Bazan
112. Joan Aragones
113. Gaspar de Sanctisteuan
114. Lope Buri el Mozo
115. Ynes Palomades
116. Francisco Andado el Viejo
117. Lope Moreno
118. Alexandre Carreton
119. Andres de Buenaño
120. Francisco de Santodomingo
121. Joan de Ulloa
122. Pedro de Robredo el Viejo
123. Gonzalo de Cuellar
124. Lope de la Plaza
125. Gaspar Conde
126. Francisco Toledano
127. Alonso de Cuellar
128. Garçilopez Andado
129. Lope de Porras
130. Luis de la Serna
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>Grauiel Retaco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>Elena Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>Hernando de Viras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>Micael Xuarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>Ysabel de Viras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>Melchior del Trigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>Ysabel de Cuellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>Antonio Sarmiento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>Graça la Castillera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>Alvaro de Ayllon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>Gaspar de Ulloa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>Alonso Velazquez (vecino de Cuellar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>Gaspar de Cuellar (vecino de Tordesillas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>Baltasar de Cuellar (vecino de Tordesillas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>Alexo Çindobete (vecino de Tordesillas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>Damian de Cuellar (vecino de Toros)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>Domingo de Ulloa (vecino de Toros)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.</td>
<td>Sancho de Ulloa (vecino de Toros)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>Francisco de Ulloa (vecino de Toros)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix 2: Parishes in Valladolid, 1571 (AGS, CC, Legajo 2159, folios 6-7)**

This list is in order of largest to smallest parish, by *vecino* population, with the number of *vecinos* in each in parentheses. The sum of these numbers is 5276, yet this report lists the total number of *vecinos* in Valladolid as 4709.

- San Salvador (608)
- Santiago (597)
- San Miguel (582)
- San Andres (524)
- San Pedro (384)
- Santa María / Iglesia Colegial (340)
- Santa María La Antigua (336)
- San Nicolas (332)
- San Juan (301)
- San Lorenzo (256)
- San Martin (227)
- Santa María Madalena (187)
- San Esteban (163)
- San Elifonso (197)
- San Julian (131)
- San Benito el Viejo (111)
The report also lists the villages and hamlets (aldeas) in the Valladolid jurisdiction, listed here with modernized spelling:

- Tudela de Duero
- Valdestillas
- Puente de Duero
- Viana
- Herrera
- Boecillo
- Laguna
- Cabezón
- Santovenia
- Renedo
- Olmos
- Villa Nueva
- Peñaflor
- Ciguñuela
- Castronuevo
- Geria.

**Appendix 3: Enslaved Granadan Morisco minors at the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid**

These are the lawsuits I located for enslaved Grandan Morisco minors in the city and region of Valladolid. Note that these are cases on appeal, initiated after the slave owners refused to comply with or legally appealed the verdicts of ordinary judges in favour of manumission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s) of lawsuit</th>
<th>Enslaved Morisco minors</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Owner(s) of slave</th>
<th>Outcome of trial</th>
<th>Guardianship / representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>Francisco and Luis, sons of María Seron</td>
<td>ARChV EJ 1278,26</td>
<td>Gutierre de Vargas, an infantry captain in the Granadan war, and his mother Juana de Sotomayor, citizens of Tordesillas</td>
<td>Liberated from slavery and placed in custody.</td>
<td>Galaz de Burgos; Gaspar de Valcazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573 - 1574</td>
<td>Hernandillo</td>
<td>ARChV EJ 1298,58</td>
<td>Pedro Castillo, a clergyman from Valladolid</td>
<td>Liberated from slavery.</td>
<td>Galaz de Burgos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574, 1576, 1584</td>
<td>Juan and Lucas de Almudey, brothers</td>
<td>ARChV PL.CIV 973,6; ARChV EJ 1331.70; AGS CC 2184</td>
<td>Don Juan de Menchaca, sheriff of the Royal Chancery Court of Valladolid</td>
<td>Lucas was liberated from slavery; Juan remained a slave.</td>
<td>Diego Juni, Maximiliano Burgos, and their older brother García de Almudey acted as guardians; Galaz de Burgos assisted in their legal defence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Guardian/Guardians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579-1581</td>
<td>Úrsula</td>
<td>ARChV PL.CIV 280,7</td>
<td>Doña Isabel Nava de Boniseni, a citizen of Valladolid</td>
<td>Granted liberty by ordinary court in Plasencia; outcome of case on appeals at chancery court unknown.</td>
<td>Gaspar Valcazar as guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575-1582</td>
<td>Andrés del Río</td>
<td>ARChV PL.CIV 281,4; ARChV EJ 1466,47</td>
<td>Juan Aranda Gumiel and Antonio Aranda Gumiel, of Sevilla.</td>
<td>Liberated from slavery.</td>
<td>Galaz de Burgos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Inés de Ladrote</td>
<td>ARChV PL.CIV 475.6; ARChV EJ 1507,60</td>
<td>María del Castillo, a citizen of Valladolid</td>
<td>Liberated from slavery.</td>
<td>Galaz de Burgos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579-1583</td>
<td>Isabel Zorrilla</td>
<td>ARChV PL.CIV 134,2; ARChV EJ 1484,24</td>
<td>Francisca de Vozmediano and Isabel Gómez Enríquez, of Valladolid</td>
<td>Liberated from slavery and remained in service to ex-master.</td>
<td>Galaz de Burgos as guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578-1580</td>
<td>Gaspar and Catalina, children of Isabel Guzmán</td>
<td>ARChV PL.CIV 170,2; ARChV EJ 1423,19</td>
<td>Gaspar was owned by Valsera de Camargo, a citizen of the city of Oviedo; Catalina was owned by Hernando de Valdés, a citizen of Valladolid.</td>
<td>Gaspar was liberated from slavery.</td>
<td>Galaz de Burgos, with Francisco Doya acting as procurator in his name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580-1582</td>
<td>Rafael Hernández</td>
<td>ARChV PL.CIV 989,2; ARChV EJ 1471,1</td>
<td>Blas López de Mella of Medina de Rioseco in the Valladolid region.</td>
<td>Liberated from slavery.</td>
<td>Rodrigo Sánchez as guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Miguel García</td>
<td>ARChV EJ 1454,27</td>
<td>Jerónimo López, a merchant in Medina de Rioseco in the Valladolid region.</td>
<td>Liberated from slavery.</td>
<td>Galaz de Burgos and procurator Pedro de Aranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585-1587</td>
<td>Catalina de Carvajal / de Rojas</td>
<td>ARChV PL.CIV 777,4; ARChV EJ 1577,30; ARChV EJ 1571,40</td>
<td>Doña Isabel de Porras, widow of Diego Enciso, who had purchased Catalina from Juan Delgado, secretary of war in the king's Consejo de Hacienda (Treasury).</td>
<td>Liberated from slavery.</td>
<td>Antonio de Hermosa as guardian. Rodrigo Sánchez and Gaspar de Valcazar as procurators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587-1589</td>
<td>Pedro de Carmona, son of Miguel de Carmona of Ugijar, Granada</td>
<td>ARChV PL.CIV 903,1; ARChV EJ 1636,24</td>
<td>General Diego Flórez de Valdés, of Somiedo (Asturias), a resident in Valladolid. He had purchased Pedro from Antonio Gomez Jubitero while living in Seville.</td>
<td>Liberated from slavery.</td>
<td>Galaz de Burgos and Juan de Monroy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the above lawsuits, I located evidence of similar litigation in the following records:

- In 1583, **Lucia de Sevilla** was litigating for her liberty in a court case against her master, Doña Francisca de Vozmediano. She was at that time in the custody of Cristóbal Ortiz by order of the judges. See AHPV, PN 549, f.128 (1578) and AGS, CC, lejago 2184, s.n. (1583).
- **Luis Caran** arrived in Valladolid as the slave of the Marques de Poça. He was libertated from slavery by the courts in Valladolid on the basis that he had been underage at the time of his capture. See AGS, CC, lejago 2184, s.n. (1583).

Several other ex-slaves named in the 1583 census (AGS, CC, lejago 2184, s.n.) seem to have been freed as underage minors, but I found no explicit evidence of lawsuits for their cases:

- Along with his parents, **Bartolomé de Torrijos** had been a slave of Licenciado Antolínez, regent of Galicia. The family was manumitted and was living in Valladolid in 1583, at which time Bartolomé was seventeen years old.
- **Francisco Herrez** was described as a young man (*moço*) in 1583; he had been manumitted ten years earlier in Toledo, where he had been the slave of Baltasar de Toledo.
- **Clara González** had been the captive of Hernando Muñoz, who freed her but kept her in service for a time (“la a dado por libre y le sirve por tiempo”), which suggests that she had been manumitted as an enslaved minor. Her sister **Isabel González** had served Doña Juana de Monjaraz, and was perhaps in the same situation.
- **Isabel Navarro, Diego Navarro, and Catalina Martínez** had been the slaves of Don Sancho de Leyba in Valladolid. Aged 20-24 in 1583, they had worked in service in his care (“en encomienda”); these details suggest they had been manumitted as enslaved minors.

**Appendix 4: The Morisco population in the Inquisitorial District of Valladolid, 1594. (AHN, Inquisición, lejago 2109, #1.)**

The Inquisitorial Tribunal of Valladolid made registers of the Morisco populations (including *antiguos* and Granadans) of the towns and cities in their district in 1594. The monarchy copied and examined these records in May of 1611 in their assessment of the property of the deported Moriscos. Prefacing the registers was this list of the “principal places” where Moriscos were
citizens and residents within the district. It shows that Valladolid had the largest Morisco population in the district, followed closely by Ávila and Salamanca.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VALLADOLID</td>
<td>1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGOS</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVIEDO</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEON</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAMORA</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALENCIA</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTORGA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALAMANCA</td>
<td>1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÁVILA</td>
<td>1362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGOVIA</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORO</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDINA DEL CAMPO</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREVALO</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLMEDO</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORDESILLAS</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADRIGAL</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBA DE TORMES</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL BARCO DE ÁVILA</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONTIVEROS</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIEDRAHITA</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELGAR</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUEÑAS</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FONTIDUEÑA</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 5: Register of the Granadan Moriscos in Valladolid, 1609. (AGS, Estado, legajo 227.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Martin Lopez</td>
<td>Trader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sebastian Lopez</td>
<td>Trader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gabriel Hernández</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Luis Pérez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wife of Luis de Herrera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife of Luis de Herrera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>García de Rojas</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>García de Alcaraz</td>
<td>Trader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tomas de Narbaez</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pedro Mejia</td>
<td>Trader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Andres de Palacios</td>
<td>Fritter maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Miguel de Rojas</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alonso Hernández Solis</td>
<td>Tailor to the Queen's ladies</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Luis Espartelero</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benavente</td>
<td>Father of unnamed son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Unnamed son of Luis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benavente</td>
<td>Son of Luis Espartero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gonzalo Serrano</td>
<td>Vender of <em>aloja</em> drink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Alonso de Alcaraz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tudela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Juan de Mendoza</td>
<td>Spice vendor</td>
<td>Brother-in-law of Luis Hernández</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Luis Hernández</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother-in-law of Juan de Mendoza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lorenzo de Arroyo</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Miguel de Mendoza</td>
<td>Tilemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alonso Castellanos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Diego de Alama</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Juan García</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Juan Garrido</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Gonzalo Hernández</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Gaspar [Ss.ez]</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Francisco de la Nava</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Lorenzo de Mendoza</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Brianda de Avalos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widow of Diego Calderon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Diego el Lozo</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Isabel Hernández</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widow of Melchior de Ecija</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Beatriz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widow of Alonso de Simancas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Andres</td>
<td>Peñaflor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ambrosio de Mendoza</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Francisco Hernández</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Cristobal Alonso</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Francisco de Segura</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Alonso de Segura</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Widow of Sebastian Hernández</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Miguel de Segura</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Juan Vaquero</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Alonso Jimenez</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Lorenzo de Alama</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Maria de San Marcos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Damian Yañez</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Alonso de Mendoza</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Miguel de España</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Martín de San Marcos</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Hernando de Tudela</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Juan de Alarcon</td>
<td>Muleteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Miguel de Escobar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Alonso de Murcia</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Jeronimo de Navas</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Miguel de Burgos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Alonso de Medina</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Andres de Coca</td>
<td>Wall maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Andres Calderon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Agustín de Madrid</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Martín el [sanbosun]</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Hernando de Frias</td>
<td>Mule shearer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Diego de Mata</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Diego Hernández</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Son of Luis de Chaves</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Son of Luis de Chaves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Juan Fernandez</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Juan de Padilla</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Alonso Hernández</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Domingo Abecalde</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Sebastian Pérez</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Pedro Rodriguez</td>
<td>Walmaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Juan Castellano</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Lorenzo Ibañez</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Luis Zapatero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Miguel Carrillo</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Alonso Ximenez</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Baltasar de Alcazar</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Andres Marañon</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Juan Fernandez</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Alonso Castellanos</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Alonso de Alarcon</td>
<td>Vender of oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Bernardino de Segura</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Alonso Velez</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>García de Ronda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Diego Hernández</td>
<td>Vender of oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Andres Hernández</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Lorenzo el Zozo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Alonso el Tuerto</td>
<td>Hatter</td>
<td>&quot;one-eyed&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Sebastian Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Gaspar Diez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Miguel Navarro</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Diego Abendinar</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Hernando Adil</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Luis de Mediano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Lorenzo Hernández</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Simon de Medoza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Martín de España</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Brother of Bartolome de España</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Bartolome de España</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother of Martín de España</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Martín de Zaqui</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Francisco Cachual</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Gonzalo el Sordo</td>
<td>Fruiterer</td>
<td>&quot;the deaf&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Pedro de Antequera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Alonso Gutierrez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Miguel de Jaen</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Alonso de Cabrera</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Juan Marañon</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Widow of Miguel de Murcia</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>Widow of Miguel de Murcia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Gaspar de Rojas</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Andres Ballestero</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Damian de Pliego</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Sebastian de las Navas</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Miguel Geronimo</td>
<td>Muledriver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Ambrosio de Aguilar</td>
<td>Fritter maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Gaspar Gomez</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Miguel Lopez</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Diego de Molina</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Hernando del Castillo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Alonso Hernández</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Alonso de Baena</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Rodrigo Hernández</td>
<td>Maker/vender of sweets</td>
<td>Medina del Campo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Agustín de Segovia</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Lorenzo Hernández</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>Medina del Campo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Lucia, widow of Luis Hernandez</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>Widow of Luis Hernández</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Juan Bautista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Luis Hernández</td>
<td>Carriage driver</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Miguel Baquero</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Alonso de Segura</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Santiago de Murcia</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Francisco de Velasco</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Martín el Zozo</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Diego el Rubio</td>
<td>Footman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Cristobal Ximenez</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Hernando de la Peña</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Andres de Molina</td>
<td>Trader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Juan de Mediano</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Diego Hernández</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Francisco Martínez</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Antonia, widow of Gaspar Pérez</td>
<td>Widow of Gaspar Pérez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Miguel de Molina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Hernando de Navas</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Bartolome de Navas</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Juan de Jerez</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Juan Martínez</td>
<td>Segovia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Luis Mayordomo</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Francisco de Mendoza</td>
<td>Tendero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Luis Hernández</td>
<td>Colour maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Hernando Maraño</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Unnamed son of Hernando Maraño</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Francisco de Mendoza</td>
<td>Vender of oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Alonso Caballero</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Alonso de Torres Alburquerque</td>
<td>Wall maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Diego de Frias</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Alonso Sanchez Tordesillas</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Zacarias Hilador</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Santiago Ximenez</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Francisco el Zozo</td>
<td>Tordesillas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Anton de Tolossa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Juan de Toledo</td>
<td>Plasterer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Sebastian de Rojas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Alonso Lopez</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Juan de Abendinar</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Lorenzo de Abendinar</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Melchior de Toledo</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Widower of Bartolome de Torrijos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Garcia Pérez</td>
<td>Doublet maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Lorenzo Carlos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Widower of Lorenzo Vizcayno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Lorenzo el Xaeni</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Baltasar de Avila</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Juan de la Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Juan de Balderas</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Juan de Avila</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Miguel de la Luz</td>
<td>Friter maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Francisco de la Luz</td>
<td>Fruit vender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Luis Gutierrez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Gaspar de Narvaez</td>
<td>Muleteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Luis Capitan</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Francisco Ramirez</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Francisco Mexia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simancas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Andres de Rojas</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Bartolome Martin</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Alonso de Rivera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Unnamed brother of Juan de Padilla</td>
<td>Cisterniga</td>
<td>Brother of Juan de Padilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Sebastian de Baena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Widow of Sebastian de Segura</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widow of Sebastian de Segura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Lorencio el Cañan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Juan del Zaguador</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Garcia Hernández</td>
<td>Oil seller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Francisco Castellanos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Luis de Tolessa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Lorenzo de Alarcon</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Diego de Rivera, el moço</td>
<td>Oil seller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Lorenzo de Navas</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Pedro Sobrino de Baeza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Iñigo Santos</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Hernando de Mediano</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Miguel de Vergara</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>Villanubla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Andres Santos</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Bautista [tresguilador]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Diego de Curios</td>
<td>Near Guadarama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Juan de Rosales</td>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Diego Mateo</td>
<td>Horse groom to the Queen</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Baltasar Pérez</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Lorenzo Pérez</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Lorenzo Hernández</td>
<td>Water carrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Gonzalo de Toledo</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Miguel Ximenez</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Miguel Rufran</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Alonso de Mendoza</td>
<td>Brickmaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Juan Sanchez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Gaspar de Arroyo</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Son-in-law of Baldivia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Alonso Mexia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of Pedro de Mexia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Diego de Cordoba</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plasencia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Francisco de Murcia</td>
<td>Oil seller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Diego Pérez</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of Lorenzo Pérez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Juan Lopez [caychate]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Diego de Ribera the elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Marcos</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Penalba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Lorenzo de Mendoza</td>
<td>Esparto grass weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Francisco Lopez</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Miguel Castellanos</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Son-in-law of a cattle driver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Francisco Castellanos</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Domingo de Madrigal</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Alonso [Algambori]</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Francisco dela Portugaliza</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Juan de Segura</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Martin de Biedma</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Santiago Castellanos</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Pobre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Gaspar de Antequera</td>
<td>Pastrana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Juan de Cachual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Juan Hernández</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Segovia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Unnamed brother of Juan Hernández</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Segovia</td>
<td>Brother of Juan Hernández</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Francisco de Rojas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Andres de Biedma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Navarro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Diego de Segura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Luis de Salazar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salamanca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Miguel [Zapatero]</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Bartolome de Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Miguel Hernández</td>
<td>Oil seller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Widow of Marcos Gallego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Zacarias de Mendoza</td>
<td>Shopkeeperer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Hernando Diez</td>
<td>Fieldhand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Widow of Lorenzo de Salazar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Bernardino de Alcaraz</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Sebastian Castellanos</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Son of Tomas de Narbaez</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Miguel García</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Diego de Murcia</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Manuel Rubio</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Francisco Mayordomo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother of Alonso Mayordomo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Alonso Mayordomo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother of Francisco Mayordomo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Son of Iñigo Santos</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Juan [Zapatero]</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Juan García</td>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Hernando dela Torre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medina del Campo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Juan de Avila</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Father of unnamed sons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Unnamed son of Juan de Avila</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Son of Juan de Avila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Unnamed son of Juan de Avila</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Son of Juan de Avila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Domingo de Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Diego de Segura</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Felipe del Castillo</td>
<td>Shopkeeperer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Llorente Caballero</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arroyo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Juan Pérez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Head of household</td>
<td>Members of household</td>
<td>Total in household</td>
<td>Location in barrio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gaspar de Piedrahita</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Antonio de Arcos</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>son of his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gaspar de Madrid</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>widower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>orphaned grandchild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>orphaned grandchild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Francisco de Madrid, his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wife of Francisco de Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ana de Rojas, mother in law (of Francisco?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Baltasar Ortiz</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>a girl, his niece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lope de Monesterio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gabriel de Goçon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hernando de Guzman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gaspar Guisado</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Francisco de Viras</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>widower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gaspar de Cuellar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gaspar de Monasterio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>an infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Juan de Ara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5 year old boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Luis de Alcoçer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>his mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Francisco Taladrero</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>an orphaned grandson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Diego de Buenaño</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Diego de Ulloa</td>
<td>1 widower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gaspar de Mendoza</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Francisco de Cuellar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Juan de Alcoçer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Luis de Ulloa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>widower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>María de Duenas, his mother-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Luis Hurtado</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>an infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>an infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Gaspar Clavijo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>an infant daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Baltasar Maestro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Melchior de Viras</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bernardino Ortiz</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>an orphan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>an orphan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Gaspar Moreno</td>
<td>Single; brother of García Moreno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>García Moreno</td>
<td>6 brother of Gaspar Moreno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Gabriel de la Serna</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Melchior de Morales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Francisco Berdugo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Francisco Rebisco</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Gaspar Rico</td>
<td>1 widower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hernando de Alcoçer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Juan Andado</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Gaspar Andado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Luis de Arrayaz</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>an infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Francisco el Bueno</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Gaspar de Ulloa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>his mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>an infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Lope de Torquemada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Francisco de Guzman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hernando Moreno</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Francisco de Açevedo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Diego de Tapia</td>
<td>5 Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>his mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cristobal de Torres, his brother-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Gabriel Donoro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Gabriel Arroyo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Geronimo de Arroyo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Juan de Alicante</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Diego de la Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria de Cuellar, his mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Bernardino Pérez</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Andres Pérez</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Diego de Acevedo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Diego de Valladolid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Alonso de Cuellar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Francisco de Palacios</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Melchior de Robledo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>his mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Francisco Buri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Francisco de Salamanca</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Calle del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Baltasar de Cuellar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Calle de Santiago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Hernando de los Escudos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Calle de Santiago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Luis Navarro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Calle de Santiago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Antonio de Viras</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Calle de Santiago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Francisco Vermejo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Calle de Santiago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Gaspar de M.n, her brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Antonio de Cuellar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>his mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Andres de Cuellar, his brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Francisco de Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Antonio de Piedrahita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Anna de Valladolid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Luis de Cuellar, her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Catalina de Porras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>her daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Isabel de Valladolid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Isabel de Robles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>her daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>her daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>her orphaned niece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>María de Valladolid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Francisca de Morejon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>An orphaned girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Isabel de Clavijo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Francisca de Clavijo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Anjelina de Madrid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Ana de Montoya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Isabel de Piedrahita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>María de Molina = Ysabel Guisada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Isabel de San Juan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>María de Castañon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>María de Morejon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>widow; sister of Angelina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Angelina de Morejon</td>
<td></td>
<td>widow; sister of María</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>son of Angelina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>María de Cuellar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>her daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Isabel de la Rua</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>her orphaned granddaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>her orphaned granddaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>her orphaned granddaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Ana del Rincon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Diego del Rincon, her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Leonor de Ulloa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>her daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>her daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>her daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Luisa de Jinete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>María de la Serna</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>María de Valbuena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Ana Palomera</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Isabel Ortiz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Luisa Catalan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Yfabiana Copete</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Hernando Vermejo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Calle Olleros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Col.1</td>
<td>Col.2</td>
<td>Col.3</td>
<td>Col.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Diego Vermejo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Calle Olleros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Diego de Madrid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Calle Olleros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Luis Andado</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Calle Olleros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>son under 12 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>son under 12 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Juan del Espinar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Calle Olleros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>