Raising an Empire

Children in Early Modern Iberia and Colonial Latin America

Edited by
ONDINA E. GONZÁLEZ
and
BIANCA PREMO

University of New Mexico Press ✦ Albuquerque

Oliveira, Impressor da Universidade, e do Santo Oficio, Anno de 1753). This work had at least five editions between 1664 and 1753.

39. Duarte Nunes de Leão, *Descripção do reino de Portugal* (Lisbon: Jorge Rodriguez, 1610), 304–10.
40. Hugh Cunningham, "The Employment and Unemployment of Children in England c. 1680–1851," *Past and Present* 126 (1990): 115–50.
41. Arquivo Distrital de Évora, *Fundo da Misericórdia*, Hospital do Espírito Santo, books 276 and 277.
42. Joaquim Ferreira Gomes, *Para a história da educação em Portugal* (Porto: Porto Editora, 1995), 79–80.
43. *La mission jésuite du Brésil. Lettres et autres documents (1549–1570)*, ed. Jean-Claude Laborie and Anne Lima (Paris: Chandeigne, 1998), 110, 189–90, 223.
44. Evaldo Cabral de Mello, *O nome e o sangue. Uma parábola familiar no Pernambuco colonial* (Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks, 2000), 23.
45. Henrique Rodrigues, *Emigração e alfabetização. O alto minho e a miragem do Brasil* (Viana do Castelo: Governo Civil, 1995), 59–60. Francisco Contente Domingues and Inácio Guerreiro, "A vida a bordo na Carreira da Índia (século XVI)," *Revista da Universidade de Coimbra* XXXIV (1988): 201.
46. See Note 29 above.
47. Vítor Fernando da Silva Simões Alves, "Os contratos de aprendizagem e a regulamentação do artesanato em Coimbra e sua região de 1560 a 1670," *Munda* 10 (1985): 61–63; António de Oliveira, *A vida económica e social de Coimbra de 1537 a 1640*, vol. 1 (1971): 443–48. Even though the modal age for beginning an apprenticeship was fourteen, the records also reveal that some apprentices were as old as eighteen when they began learning their craft.
48. *Ordenações filipinas*, bk. IV, tít. 31, §8.
49. On the concept of antidora, see Bartolomé Clavero, *La grâce du don. Anthropologie catholique de l'économie moderne* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1996), 79.

CHAPTER TWO

"Not All the Orphans Really Are"

The Diversity of Seville's Juvenile Charity Wards during the Long Eighteenth Century

VALENTINA TIKOFF

LITERAL AND FIGURATIVE "ORPHANS"—CHILDREN SEEMINGLY BEREFT of parents' love and supervision—have a special place in early modern Spanish culture, reflected in the picaresque youngsters of Seville who populate the pages of Cervantes's "Rinconete y Cortadillo" and Murillo's baroque canvases of the city's beggar boys.[1] Such juveniles also were a chronic concern for some of the most prominent social critics and reformers of Hapsburg and Bourbon Spain, who often likened them to "tender plants" that needed to be nurtured and cultivated so they would develop into productive maturity rather than grow wild and unruly.[2] Yet neither artistic images nor prescriptive treatises reveal as much about children and charity in early modern Spain as do the lives of the young people who entered orphanages. And perhaps no city provides a better look at this population for those interested in the histories of Iberia and colonial Latin America than Seville, the Spanish city most closely identified with Spain's transatlantic empire.

2.1. Bartolomé Esteban Murillo, *Three Boys Playing Dice*, c. 1670. Source: Xanthe Brooke and Peter Cherry, *Murillo: Scenes of Childhood* (London: Merrell, 2001), 122.

Early modern Seville had earned considerable renown for its many charitable institutions. By the mid-eighteenth century, these included a variety of specifically juvenile institutions, several of which also became well known far beyond this city on the Guadalquivir River. Through the records of these juvenile institutions, we learn much about how individuals in this society both defined and made provisions for needy children, and also about the identities of the young people and families who had recourse to them. As Kathryn Lynch has pointed out, for too long historians of the family and historians of charity and philanthropy have worked in separate spheres, as if their respective subjects had little to do with one another.[3] This case study of Seville spans that breach in one respect, exploring children's entrance into orphanages as an important, concrete moment when these two historical fields intersect and one that moreover illuminates the broader cultural context.

Like other contributions to this volume, this chapter explores the history of children and childhood, but it does so specifically through records generated by orphanages. Although based on institutional records, this study is not strictly speaking an institutional history; rather than chronicling the origins and development of a city's orphanages, it instead seeks to rethink the identities of the children who resided in them and how they came to be there. Even though individual children's voices are often difficult to detect at this juncture, their backgrounds and experiences—and their diversity—are evident and often differ from what we might infer from orphanage founders' stated intentions and prescriptive policies. Thus, this study demonstrates that even when we do not have direct access to children's voices, we need not rely solely on adults' statements about how children should be treated, nor should we despair of learning anything more about actual children. For additional insight, we can also fruitfully look at children's *identities* and *experiences*, even when gleaned through words penned by others—in this case, by public officials, institutional administrators, and relatives. This approach illuminates not only young people's history but also the important roles that adults in various positions played in shaping their experiences, both during children's own lifetimes and in the historical record.

This study therefore complements other approaches to children's history, such as legal studies, examinations of philosophical and pedagogical thought, and even more traditional institutional histories, all of which improve our understanding of the intellectual and social structures related

to children and childhood but which generally pay less attention to specific children's lives. Though neither a quantitative analysis nor a detailed microhistory of a particular case, the approach employed in this chapter in many ways resembles scholarship that has approached the history of children and youth through police and legal records—other archival sources that likewise capture the reality of individual children's experiences within the social and cultural contexts in which they lived.

This chapter contends that orphanage populations hold important potential for understanding the history of childhood not only because they existed in many communities but also because they reveal connections between children and the social and cultural settings in which they were enmeshed. In Seville, at least, orphanage populations were less marginalized than is often presumed. This chapter especially challenges two perceptions about orphans: first, the common but often erroneous conflation of orphans and foundlings as children without families; and second, the common perception that orphanages served only the "children of marginals."[4] In reality, Seville's orphanages accommodated a diverse population of young people. This diversity was not represented in every institution, however, as children from different family backgrounds entered different rungs within a hierarchy of institutions. The diversity and social segregation of Seville's orphanage population resulted in part from institutional founders' and administrators' divergent objectives and the different populations that they targeted. But children's families also shaped orphanage populations. Although Seville's orphanages had originally been established for destitute and parentless children, it was very common for relatives—including parents—to tap the resources of these institutions, with the result that orphanages accommodated large numbers of children who were only half-orphans (children with one deceased parent), and some who were not orphans at all. Thus, it was both the family *identity* of orphans and also often the active *intervention* of family members that strongly influenced whether and where a particular child was institutionalized.

Since the diversity of orphanage populations resulted from both compliance with and violations of prescriptive institutional policies, it is important to examine both the institutional policies regarding the admission of children and the ways that families worked within and around these guidelines. The discussion below, therefore, begins with a brief overview of the different institutions in Seville and their official admission policies, followed by an examination of the ways that families interacted with

institutions to secure places for children. It concludes with an assessment of how these findings compare to other scholarship on orphanages and the social and cultural history of early modern Spain. Ultimately, this case study of the children and families who used Seville's orphanages not only furthers our understanding of children, families, and charity but also sheds light on issues of gender and social stratification. Finally, it underscores the importance of age as a category of analysis informing all these issues. The scope of this study—encompassing not just one institution but all the orphanages in Seville—is crucial in illuminating the diversity of the city's orphanages and the wards they accommodated. However, examining multiple institutions also complicates attempts at quantification. Many of the institutions discussed here left inconsistent and sporadic records, which are difficult to combine and summarize in reliable statistics. Indeed, extant records at some institutions do not permit reliable quantification over time at all, and the problem is only compounded when one attempts to aggregate statistics from multiple institutions. The extant documentation is rich, though, in noting contemporaries' policies, observations, and actions. Although these cannot be easily summed up mathematically, they do illustrate clear patterns in orphanage operations and thus figure prominently in the analysis provided here. This qualitative evidence also provides rare insight into the lives of the children and adults who lived in, worked at, and interacted with Seville's orphanages.

The chronological focus is the "long eighteenth century," here defined as the years 1681 to 1831. The year 1681 marks the establishment of the first of the four "new" orphanages founded in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries; the end date marks the year of the long-awaited opening of Seville's general poorhouse (*hospicio general*), which thereafter absorbed many of the functions of orphanages and fundamentally changed the ways in which charity was organized and distributed in Seville.[5] This chronological scope also corresponds roughly with the last century and a half of both Spain's "Old Regime" social welfare system—largely dismantled during the *desamortización* (nationalization of church property) in the 1830s—and Spain's role as an imperial power in the continental Americas.[6]

Seville's Orphanages: History and Hierarchy

Although the literature on charity children in preindustrial Europe commonly lumps together foundlings and orphans, contemporaries viewed

these children as very different populations and generally treated them as such. As Brian Pullan has noted, "Although distinctions were sometimes obscured by phrases such as the English 'fatherless children,' the abandoned were in principle different from orphans; for orphans had been separated from known and lawfully married parents by the death of a father or mother or both." Foundlings, by contrast, "lacked the identity and the minimal security afforded by known and honest parents, by stable residence, by a good reputation among neighbours."[7] As a result, foundlings and orphans were often housed in separate institutions. Pullan might have referred to eighteenth-century Seville as a case in point, for in this city there was one foundling home and six different orphanages.

Seville's foundling home took in babies and quickly dispatched them to wet nurses.[8] In contrast, orphanages housed children who were much older than foundlings when they entered institutional care (typically between the ages of six and fourteen) and retained them in-house and under the direct tutelage of institutional officials considerably longer than foundlings were: most orphans were not expected to leave institutional care until their late teens or early twenties. Moreover, whereas the foundling home and its administrators assumed responsibility for nearly all infants deposited to their care (most of whom had been anonymously abandoned), orphanages did not automatically accommodate all the poor or orphaned children of the city. In fact, they did not even accept all those children for whom admission was sought, who themselves made up only a subset of Seville's children in need. The demand for orphanage spaces consistently outstripped the supply, and administrators could choose which children to admit and which to exclude. Since institutional policies consistently stated a preference for orphans, I refer to the institutions as "orphanages," though contemporaries more commonly used a bevy of other terms: *hospicio* (poorhouse), *colegio* (school), *casa* (house).

Foundlings did occasionally enter Seville's orphanages, but they did so in relatively small numbers. Like the foundlings of other preindustrial cities, Seville's foundlings experienced horrific mortality rates, and the vast majority died well before they reached the ages of six to eight, at which time they would have been eligible to enter the city's orphanages. Yet so many babies were abandoned to the care of Seville's foundling home—they represented between 20 and 40 percent of all births in Seville for years between 1800 and 1830—that there was undoubtedly still a sizable population of foundlings who reached the ages at which they might

have entered Seville's orphanages.[9] Unlike its counterparts in some other Spanish cities, though, Seville's foundling home had no standard practice, nor even a prescriptive policy, for channeling its older wards into orphanages.[10] Domestic employment was the likely fate of many of Seville's foundlings who survived the perilous initial years, and even formal adoptions from the city's foundling home likely masked arrangements in which young people served as cheap labor.[11] Generally assumed to be illegitimate and the responsibility of another institution, foundlings never were the population that Seville's orphanages chiefly targeted or accommodated.

Yet orphanages also differed from one another in terms of the children they accommodated. Thus, although orphanage residents in many respects had more in common with each other than with foundlings, they did not constitute a homogenous group. The diversity of orphanage wards stems in part from the variety of institutions in eighteenth-century Seville. Contrary to common assumptions that poor relief was the exclusive preserve of the church, we find in Seville a patchwork of orphanages under royal, municipal, secular, and religious authority. Oldest were the municipal boys' and girls' homes, established in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, respectively.[12] By the late seventeenth century, however, both the municipal School of Christian Doctrine for Boys (Colegio de Niños de la Doctrina, as municipal orphanages throughout the kingdom of Castile were called) and it sister institution, the municipal Orphaned Girls' Home (Casa de Niñas Huérfanas), had become impoverished and housed only a handful of residents.[13] Throughout most of the eighteenth century, they operated on a very small scale, barely surviving for many years before the city council finally closed them in 1828 and 1795, respectively.

Four new institutions established in Seville between 1681 and 1725—two for boys, two for girls—increasingly provided residential charity for juveniles in Seville. The one most closely linked to Seville's role in the transatlantic empire was the Royal School of San Telmo (Real Colegio Seminario de San Telmo), where poor and orphaned boys were taken in and prepared for maritime careers in the Spanish fleets. Orphans and foundlings were common in early modern European maritime fleets, ubiquitous on Venetian, Dutch, British, and Spanish ships alike, and frequently recruited from charitable institutions.[14] Since the sixteenth century, officials in Spain had discussed proposals to create an orphanage expressly dedicated to the navigational training of its wards, and there were several attempts to establish such institutions in the seventeenth century.[15]

These efforts were short-lived, however, until Seville's Seafarers' Guild (Universidad de Mareantes) established the Royal School of San Telmo in Seville in 1681 with the support of King Charles II. In light of this institution's mission, it is no surprise that the guildsmen and crown named it after a favorite patron saint of sailors (in English, Saint Elmo). The Seafarers' Guild administered the orphanage in coordination with royal officials until the 1780s, when naval authorities assumed direct supervision. After several decades of financial distress in the first half of the nineteenth century, this orphanage for training sailors finally closed its doors in 1847.

The other principal male orphanage in Seville was known most often simply as "The Toribios" after founder Toribio de Velasco, a tertiary (lay) member of the Order of Saint Francis. In his will of 1730, Velasco named a variety of secular and religious authorities in Seville as the "protectors" of this institution.[16] Accordingly, the city council, *asistente* (Seville's chief royally appointed municipal officer, the equivalent of the *corregidor* in other Spanish cities), archbishop, and members of the cathedral chapter all continued to have roles in the administration of this institution until it was absorbed into the general poorhouse in the 1830s.[17]

The two newest orphanages for girls in eighteenth-century Seville were both run by religious women, but otherwise they had very different origins and missions. Archbishop Manuel Arias established one at Seville's Espíritu Santo Convent in 1711, mandating that its wards be drawn exclusively from among the city's noble but poor girls.[18] Though he gave them the name "Girls of the Holy Spirit" (Niñas del Espíritu Santo), the institution became better known as the "Noble Girls' School" (Colegio de Niñas Nobles), as I also refer to it, until the archbishop of Seville finally overturned its founding bylaws in 1969 during the Franco years.

The Beaterio of the Most Holy Trinity (Beaterio de la Santísima Trinidad) was the other female orphanage in the city. Isabel Moreno Caballero and two female followers founded it in 1720. As *beatas*, these women were not formally nuns, but they wore garb resembling habits and lived together in communities known as *beaterios*. By the eighteenth century, there already was a rich history of these devout female laywomen in Seville, often linked to charitable work on behalf of orphans and other young girls in danger. Beginning in the Counter-Reformation, these women and the communities in which they lived increasingly fell under the supervision of the secular clergy.[19] While for most of the eighteenth century the Beaterio

of the Most Holy Trinity housed only a handful of girls at a time, it grew dramatically in scale to accommodate over a hundred girls in the 1790s, and it would grow even further in the nineteenth century.

These brief sketches of Seville's eighteenth-century orphanages reveal that these institutions differed from each other not only in terms of administration and funding sources but also in terms of their populations. The variety of institutional structures and purposes helps explain the diversity of Seville's orphanages and the broad array of children whom they served. We see this most directly in orphanage bylaws pertaining to children's eligibility, which reflect founders' and administrators' attempts to target specific populations of young people. Although orphanages consistently mandated that orphans be the preferred candidates for admission, they differed strikingly in other admission criteria. Especially significant were those regarding the family backgrounds of prospective wards. Administrators' different attitudes and policies concerning admission resulted in the segregation of young people into different institutions according to their family backgrounds. Children of legitimate birth from higher-status families went to more selective institutions, where they were prepared for adult roles befitting their respectable family backgrounds, whereas young people of illegitimate birth or unknown or undistinguished families attended less selective institutions where they were prepared for more humble roles.

Both male and female orphanages were socially tiered, but the hierarchies were gendered, and thus somewhat different. Administrators of the female institutions restricted enrollment to more privileged sectors of society: natives of Seville and the daughters of legitimate marriages. Moreover, the female institutions in particular explicitly sought to ensure the respectability of wards by capping the age of admission. For example, Seville's city councilmen adopted bylaws for the municipal girls' orphanage that stated:

> Because the principal business and vocation of the said house is the asylum and internment of lost orphaned girls[,] the administrator is ordered and charged that no one exceeding age fourteen be taken in, since older girls might be dangerous people and improper for the bad examples that they might give to the other girls, and also because, being older than the said age, they have the freedom to run away and to disturb the rest, as has been experienced, and many of them have been dismissed from homes

> where they have been serving for their bad examples and theft, and it is just to avoid this harm.[20]

Echoing such concerns, administrators at the Beaterio de la Santísima Trinidad similarly stipulated that the girls entering their institution must do so "between the ages of seven and ten, since this is a house of education, not correction."[21] Even the nun who served as the girls' teacher at the Noble Girls' School advised the archbishop not to accede to requests to admit girls older than ten, arguing that "the earlier they are removed from the world, the fewer bad traits they bring, which are difficult or perhaps even impossible to shed."[22] And, of course, the Noble Girls' School furthermore required that its wards be from Seville's noble families.

Although none of the male orphanages restricted entry to sons of the nobility, there also was a clear hierarchy for boys that became more pronounced over time. Both the orphanage of San Telmo and the orphanage-cum-reformatory known as the Toribios were originally established to take in the ubiquitous poor and apparently parentless boys who seemed to overrun Seville's streets, as the municipal School of Christian Doctrine had been established to do in the sixteenth century. Administrators of the Toribios always targeted this population, admitting boys with little regard for lineage, sometimes even forcibly rounding up and interning them. In contrast, the administrators of San Telmo became more discriminating in their admission policies, increasingly demanding proof of age, legitimacy, and other requirements. This process had begun already in the late seventeenth century and would continue, despite arguments by some members of the Seafarers' Guild that these tighter admission guidelines were at odds with the goal of serving the neediest boys.[23] Most dramatically, in 1721 administrators began requiring all prospective applicants to submit documentation attesting to their "blood purity" (*limpieza de sangre*), barring the descendants of Jews, Muslims (Moros), mulattoes, gypsies, individuals punished by the Spanish Inquisition, and those who had practiced any of a long list of "unrespectable" (*desestimados*) or "vile" (*viles*) trades, which included butchers, muleteers, and actors, among others.[24] Although they granted some exceptions, San Telmo administrators were generally vigilant about ensuring that these admission criteria regarding age and family backgrounds were met by requiring documentation, including paperwork, concerning an applicant's identity and proof of orphanage, legitimacy, and affirmation of his own and his family's good character.[25]

In contrast, the Toribios continued to serve boys of diverse backgrounds, who were admitted with little regard given to their personal or parental background. We see this clearly in a note written by Toribios administrator José María Rodríguez in 1833 to accompany a requested roster of Toribios residents and their parents. He remarked, "[The names of] some of the parents do not appear here because they [the boys] do not know them, nor does this institution have it on record since they were admitted on orders that only stated the child's name. . . . It will take time to verify the relatives of those who have them, while there are others who know no family at all."[26] Clearly, Rodríguez had not been too meticulous in demanding extensive information about the background of the children he took in nor had his predecessors, mindful of their mission to take in children who appeared to live in the streets, seemingly abandoned by parents and other adult caretakers. Whereas San Telmo became more selective and elitist over the course of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the Toribios expanded to accommodate boys and men who had committed crimes or who were sent there for other punitive reasons.

The disparities in admission criteria at both male and female institutions certainly help explain the diversity of Seville's orphanage population, as well as its distribution across institutions. But the range of children actually resident in Seville's orphanages was even greater than might be inferred from looking solely at prescriptive documents, since children also entered these institutions at the margins—or even in flagrant violation—of prescriptive admission criteria. Relatives, including parents, were often responsible for encouraging administrators to waive admission requirements. It was thus not just institutional founders and administrators who shaped the identities of the clienteles they served but also family members and other adults who did so by advocating and arranging the entry of particular young people into Seville's orphanages.

Families' Roles in Securing Places for Children

Relatives often made the requests for children's admission to orphanages. Aunts, uncles, and grandparents were common advocates for their young family members, entirely in keeping with orphanage policies. The founders and supporting patrons of these institutions consistently mandated that orphans be the preferred or, as was the case for San Telmo, even exclusive candidates for admission. The Spanish term "orphan" (*huérfano, huérfana*)

applied to any child survivor of a deceased parent, though adjectival clauses commonly differentiated different kinds of orphans: those whose mothers had died (*huérfanos de madre*), those whose fathers had died (*huérfanos de padre*), and those who had no surviving parent (*huérfanos de padre y madre*; in English, "full orphans").[27] Generally, children with no surviving parents were to be given highest priority in admission decisions, and among children that had been orphaned by one parent ("half-orphans") those whose fathers had died were generally preferred to those whose mothers had died.

Despite these requirements and the demographic profile of Seville that must have resulted in far more full orphans than the total capacity of Seville's orphanages, children with one or both parents living abounded at these orphanages.[28] This is because parents joined other relatives and adult advocates in seeking children's placement into these institutions. They did so at least at the four principal institutions of Seville in this period. (Parents may also have placed children at the smaller municipal orphanages, though the admissions and matriculation records for these institutions are scant and preclude firm conclusions on this point.[29]) Administrators of the girls' home at the Beaterio de la Santísima Trinidad, for example, noted in the 1790s that "experience shows that many girls enter at the request of their mothers,"[30] a trend that continued into the nineteenth century.[31] A few neighborhoods away at the Noble Girls' School, when Valentina Veles y Mondragón sought to enroll her daughter María de la Concepción, she reminded the archbishop that there had been precedents for admitting noble girls with surviving parents.[32] Parents also sent their sons to orphanages. A Toribios administrator noted in 1792 that the "helpless boys" (*niños desamparados*) served by his institution included those admitted "on the request of their poor fathers, or widowed mothers, who cannot maintain them, educate them, nor provide for them any way of learning an honest trade."[33] Likewise, one observer of the San Telmo maritime orphanage remarked in 1746, "Not all of the [orphans] really are, since through the work or inclinations of the administrators this particular [admission] criterion is waived."[34]

In their efforts to tap the charitable benefits originally intended for orphans, parents frequently argued that their children were de facto orphans due to poverty or other disadvantages. It was especially common for widowed mothers to make such pleas. María González used some familiar rhetorical strategies when she sought a space at San Telmo for her son in 1788. Addressing orphanage officials, she described herself as a "poor widow" with "no help except that of God and you" and mentioned employment requirements (as a wet nurse and domestic servant) that reflected the precariousness of her economic situation and prevented her from raising a child. She also was typical in highlighting specific circumstances that she hoped would merit favorable attention and a special claim on charity dispensed by the institution, in this case the fact that her son's grandfather had been a master shoemaker for the orphanage. (Other applicants cited physical handicaps, a large number of other children, or—at the maritime orphanage of San Telmo—the nautical service of a boy's deceased father or another family member.) María González also resembled other mothers in expressing fears over the fate of a child who she otherwise could not properly supervise and educate, a tack that relatives and guardians would employ even more emphatically when they explicitly expressed interest in the educational opportunities that orphanages offered. Finally, like many other applicants, María González included in her petition to orphanage officials external corroboration of the family's good character and legitimate poverty, signaled by the official designation as a member of the "solemn poor" (*pobre de solemnidad*).[35]

Through such efforts by parents—generally tenacious widows—sometimes half-orphaned children were admitted even when there were full orphans awaiting slots. For example, when administrators at the maritime orphanage of San Telmo decided to enforce more vigorously the policy of preferential admission for complete orphans, widows adjusted their strategies, now circumventing the regular admission process at the orphanage by appealing directly to royal officials who could effectively override official admission guidelines. San Telmo administrators might even have encouraged this approach. When the widow María Seco sought to have her eight-year-old son, Josef Muñoz, admitted to San Telmo in 1783, administrators told her that, since there were full orphans awaiting spaces at San Telmo, Josef could not be admitted without a special dispensation from royal authorities. She took the hint and wrote directly to José de Gálvez, a high-ranking official in the Spanish royal government who interceded on her behalf. The ploy worked, and her son Josef Muñoz was admitted.[36]

Cases such as this demonstrate how widows with children had indeed "learned to use the paternalism of a social order that considered them most needful of protection," as Mary Elizabeth Perry has contended poor

women did in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Seville. But widows' interactions with orphanages in the eighteenth century also show that they balanced the strategies of "obedient submission"—which Perry also has found—with vocal claims for themselves and their children.[37] Far from being silent and ignored or shunning institutional relief, when it came to securing an orphanage slot for their children, these widows could clamor loudly and insist on being heard, often quite effectively. In response to a steady stream of requests by widows, some orphanage administrators even began to argue that by admitting the half-orphaned sons of widows, they could actually best practice charity, since they would thereby help both a child and his widowed mother.[38]

Although widows were most prominent among the parents seeking their children's admission to orphanages, fathers also sought places at orphanages for their children. This was especially common at the elite Noble Girls' School, where we also observe the admission of girls who were not even half-orphans. Keenly aware of the requirement of nobility, fathers (both widowers and not) highlighted their families' reputations in correspondence to the archbishop seeking places for their daughters. Ygnacio Chacón y Rivera, for example, pointed out that his daughter "met all the qualifications of well known and accomplished [*executoriada*] purity and nobility of blood and poverty."[39] Relying on their reputations, others referred simply to their family's "known nobility" (*conocida nobleza*). They also frequently remarked on military leadership positions and other service rendered to the crown as proof of their family's social status and sometimes submitted elaborate proofs of lineage to bolster their claims.[40]

Yet the families of prospective Noble Girls' School wards also argued that they needed the assistance that this institution provided. The poverty claimed by these families was not, however, the same indigence claimed by applicants to other institutions; instead, it was a need measured relative to their social status and obligations. Indeed, one reason that noble families were especially interested in placing daughters at this institution was the promise of a future dowry that would enable wards to take the black veil at one of the city's elite convents. Pedro Ortiz de Escobar y Abet, for example, implicitly conveyed his interest in the dowry benefit when he sought to guarantee a place for his daughter, Felisiana, at the Noble Girls' School. In his petition, he described three-year-old Felisiana as

> showing signs even at such a tender age of following the religious life, this being the only life to which she can aspire since God has given her a father and grandparents who are of noble blood but very poor. Although the [supplicant] earns the salary corresponding to his position [as lieutenant in an infantry regiment], it is barely enough to support himself decently, and not enough to provide any inheritance to his children other than the memory of his great devotion to royal service; and thus to provide the aforementioned Doña Felisiana access to religious life[,] he asks your highness . . . to favor the supplicant and the aforementioned Doña Felisiana de Escobar y Abet [by] granting her the special grace and license to enter as a resident of the Espíritu Santo School in Seville when she reaches the requisite age.[41]

As this letter illustrates, Ortiz de Escobar y Abet sought to ensure his daughter's access to a respectable adult position as a nun through the route facilitated by the Noble Girls' School. He wrote many missives over several years in his efforts to secure a place for his young daughter, a campaign that began well before she even reached the age of seven at which she would become eligible for admission. Ultimately he was successful; Feliciana was admitted to the Noble Girls' School in 1752, when she would have been seven or eight years old.[42]

Day Students, Boarders, and Delinquents

The adult advocates, generally relatives, who sought to enroll children in Seville's orphanages clearly spanned a broad range, from aunts and uncles of full orphans, to indigent mothers of half-orphans, to noblemen in prestigious military and bureaucratic positions who were the fathers of daughters who had not lost either parent. Further adding to the diversity of orphanage populations were day students and paying boarders. By the late eighteenth century, the Beaterio of the Most Holy Trinity was operating a free day school to which neighborhood girls could come and attend classes with orphanage wards. Families also sent boys to the city's male orphanages for education and training. For example, the mother of Antonio Nuñez paid two *reales* per day to the Toribios in 1814 for her son to be there, but only for workdays, "since he comes to learn to be a shoemaker; and on holidays he eats at home."[43] The navigational instructors at

San Telmo also tutored private students who came to the orphanage for instruction. In 1783, San Telmo's chief internal administrator, the marquis of La Plata, complained that there were more than sixty such students. (Three years earlier another inspector had counted thirty-eight.) Institutional rules later capped the allowable number at six.[44] Rarely are the backgrounds or identities of these youths indicated, but we do know that one was the son of a judge in Seville's high court (*audiencia*).[45]

Also common were boarders who resided alongside the charity residents at the city's four principal orphanages. Boarders even resided at the Noble Girls' School, in spite of the explicit ban on such residents in the institution's founding bylaws.[46] Only the municipal orphanages do not appear to have accommodated any boarders, likely in part because families (correctly) perceived them as poor institutions that did not provide many of the services or benefits that the newer institutions did. The parents and guardians who paid to board children at orphanages did so either because they were unable to raise their children themselves or because they wanted to secure the services that orphanages provided, especially education and discipline. As an example of the former we might point to widower and carpenter Juan Manuel Carrera, who initially entrusted his two daughters to the care of neighbors then sought the advice and assistance of a clergyman who encouraged him to seek the girls' admission to Beaterio of the Most Holy Trinity, where he eventually boarded them at the modest rate of two reales per day.[47]

In other cases, it was not the push of poverty and the lack of a parent but rather the pull of educational opportunities that motivated families to pay to board children at orphanages. This was most common at the most selective institutions, which offered the best educational opportunities and prospects for postorphanage life, whether as nuns in the city's well-regarded convents or as junior officers in the Spanish fleet. In particular, San Telmo's advanced navigational curriculum attracted youths from even prominent families. For example, Captain-General of the Fleet Francisco Manxón, who in his position as San Telmo's designated "protector" endorsed several widows' requests for the admission of their sons in San Telmo, sent a young relative of his own to study at San Telmo as a boarder in 1778, alerting the administrative officers at San Telmo:

> My brother Don Joseph recently sent [to me] his thirteen-year-old relative and godchild Josef Turriel, from the College of Villacaredo, with the idea that he should be looked after and that he serve me as a page[.] But having seen how bright this boy is, and [considering] that if he builds on the beginnings of an education that he already has, he might become a good mathematician[,] I have determined to send him to that Royal School [of San Telmo] so that you gentleman can put him in the appropriate class, as one of the rest, without the slightest distinction [from the others], enrolling him as a supernumerary [that is, boarder, above and beyond the 150 charity wards] with my aforementioned brother contributing the amount established for such cases.[48]

Between 1790 and 1809, another category of resident—the noble boarder (*pensionista noble*)—also resided at the orphanage, albeit in separate quarters from the charity wards.[49] As the name suggests, nobility was a requirement for this type of boarder, and the lineages of this elite group of San Telmo residents were scrupulously profiled and documented as a condition of entry.[50] Although the numbers were small compared to the charity wards, the fact that any noble families chose to enroll their sons at this institution further reflects the prominence that San Telmo had achieved by the late eighteenth century.

Perhaps the best-known boarders at Seville's orphanages, however, were the boys sent to the Toribios for "correction."[51] Gabriel Baca, who chronicled the early years of the Toribios's operations in a 1766 publication, reported that by the 1730s, families already were sending their "incorrigible" sons to the Toribios.[52] As late as 1886, a half-century after this institution had closed its doors, Sevillian Francisco Collantes de Terán speculated that "there must be few people over fifty years old who were never threatened in their childhood mischief with being sent to the Toribios."[53] Some were more than threatened. Manuel de Huelva, for example, was sent to the Toribios for a month of "correction" at the request of his widowed mother after he had gotten drunk and shown disrespect to her and a local official.[54] In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, secular and religious authorities also remanded some adults to the Toribios for punishment, though the Toribios always served primarily as a juvenile establishment. Whether a correctional ward had been committed by his own family or other authorities, parents or other relatives usually bore the costs associated with his stay at the Toribios, and they also could and frequently did pay for such "extras" as schooling, clothing, shaving, and even shackles

(*grillos*).[55] Given the tiered nature of Seville's network of orphanages, it is hardly surprising that it was the Toribios, and not the more selective San Telmo or much smaller municipal orphanage for boys, that doubled as a reformatory for boys and young men; none of the girls' institutions served a comparable function. Thus, it would be wrong to conclude that all of Seville's orphanages doubled as punitive institutions or as warehouses for misbehaving or abandoned young people.

Conclusion

The residents of Seville's orphanages clearly were not an undifferentiated mass of youngsters whose parents had uniformly abandoned them to institutional care but rather a diverse group of young people who were accommodated in a fragmented network of juvenile charitable establishments in which niches existed for different groups.[56] In Seville's juvenile charitable network, we see in particular a hierarchy in which rank was closely linked to legitimacy and family status, including the distinction between nobles and commoners. Nicholas Terpstra has found similar types of status distinctions among the populations of orphanages and *conservatori* (homes for girls) of sixteenth-century Italian cities, though he also has noted that the range of wards' backgrounds could vary. Finding that the orphanages and conservatories in Florence "gathered larger numbers of children from a broader social range" than did comparable institutions in Bologna, he has speculated that the difference may be attributable to the fact that Bologna had a general poorhouse that accommodated the most indigent children, thus enabling the city's orphanage administrators to be more selective.[57] In Seville prior to 1831, however, no general poorhouse accommodated poor young people, nor do other institutions appear to have taken them in. Rather, many of the most marginal children in Seville remained outside residential welfare establishments and very likely entered the work force at much younger ages than orphanage residents.[58]

Although most of Seville's orphanages—with the exception of the Noble Girls' School—had been created for needy children, admission policies and procedures, documentation requirements, and tenacious and successful demands from family members of other children effectively kept many "marginals" out of Seville's orphanages. For example, the gypsy population—ubiquitous in contemporaries' comments on Seville's and Spain's poor—are almost entirely absent from Seville's orphanage

populations; or, at least, wards were not identified as such. Children from families deemed less than "respectable" or who were outsiders or newcomers to Seville were at a significant disadvantage, as were those who lacked parents, guardians, relatives, godparents, or other adult advocates who were literate, who could secure the services of someone who was, or who had personal access to institutional administrators to press the case for a particular child's admission.[59] The active intervention of family members was often as important as the family identity of prospective orphanage wards. Legitimacy requirements also probably worked to keep some of these children out of Seville's orphanages—including legitimate children whose families nevertheless lacked the wherewithal to prove their legitimacy. Children from families who had been officially designated as the "solemn poor" did find their way to Seville's orphanages in large numbers, though even they were probably considerably better off than many other children, since they were by definition the "deserving poor" and moreover had access to a notary and some ability to pay (or cajole) him to certify their neediness.[60]

The kind of social selectivity that characterized Seville's orphanage admissions jibes with other research findings on early modern Spain, especially concerning the importance of legitimacy and cross-generational family ties, reputation, and honor.[61] The fact that different standards of poverty and assistance existed and that these, too, depended largely on family identity and social rank also echoes the findings of scholarship on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, suggesting important continuities throughout the Old Regime.[62] Yet some of these same findings also challenge aspects of the "common wisdom" about institutionalization and its links to reputation and social status in the preindustrial Hispanic world, suggesting possible discontinuities between the "long eighteenth century" and earlier eras, or perhaps unique standards for young people. The stigma of receiving relief, especially residential or "indoor" relief, is a familiar theme in scholarship on early modern Spain, including the eighteenth century. Scholars point to the stigma of assistance manifest in provisions of aid for the "shame-faced poor" (*pobres envergonzantes* or *vergonzantes*), who received assistance secretly in their homes so that they might be spared the ignominy of institutionalization.[63] Students of the early modern period also have long described how children deposited in a foundling home were presumed to be illegitimate, a stigma reflected in both popular prejudice and official discrimination that reforms of the very late eighteenth century

finally tried—though perhaps not very effectively—to dismantle.[64] Yet in the experiences of orphanage wards we see something quite different.

In tapping the resources of orphanages, parents and other adult relatives freely admitted—and we can suspect, even exaggerated—their family's dire financial straits to secure places for their children and young kin. Moreover, they did so quite publicly. Unlike foundlings, orphanage residents' parentage was generally known, and in contrast to the secrecy surrounding the "shame-faced poor," the identity of orphanage wards and their families was not kept secret in any way. The fact that relatives from multiple socioeconomic strata, who generally were not themselves in charity institutions, publicly sought the services of orphanages for their children thus also raises a question about the "stigma" (or lack thereof) associated with institutional relief in early modern Spain and particularly with sending a child to an orphanage. We might do well to recall Stuart Woolf's claims that preindustrial philanthropic institutions helped reinforce the social status quo and protect the status of families at multiple social levels, and that it was not just those at society's lowest rungs who used and benefited from them.[65] The fact that orphanages were socially segregated, and that some came to be considered selective and indeed even exclusive institutions, undoubtedly helped preserve their usefulness to families from diverse social ranks.

Seville was not the only city where parents sought to place children in orphanages, even when this violated admission policies. Orphanages elsewhere in Europe and the Americas often housed residents with surviving parents.[66] And in a number of places, even charitable institutions not originally intended expressly for children came to accommodate large numbers of young people sent there by parents.[67] The case of Seville thus reflects not "Spanish exceptionalism" but important commonalities between this Spanish city and other urban societies. Yet historical context remains important, and the findings presented here for Seville do not support all the conclusions that scholars have reached based on investigations elsewhere. In particular, a number of scholars have argued that when parents placed children in orphanages, they did so mainly as an act of economic desperation, a temporary last resort.[68] This explanation likely describes the circumstances of some families who sent children to Seville's orphanages, but it fails to capture the diversity of backgrounds from which children came before they entered these institutions or the varied motives for which they were put there.

Seville's orphanage residents were not necessarily bereft of family, nor can they be aptly described simply as the "children of marginals." Many of them had been entrusted to orphanages as charity wards, day students, or boarders by family members, including parents. Some parents and other relatives were indeed desperate and sought the charity dispensed by orphanages so that their children could be assured basic food, shelter, and supervision. Yet for others, somewhat better off, recourse to orphanages often seems to have been part of a longer-term strategy, an attractive vehicle to provide for a child's proper upbringing and enhance his or her future prospects, whether through education, a dowry, or even appropriate discipline.

The findings reported here also prompt the question of age as a "category of analysis."[69] Life-cycle studies have suggested different roles and functions for individuals at different life stages throughout the early modern period, and this might apply as well to residential relief. The experience of institutionalization, deemed a social anathema for adults from a given family, may have been considered acceptable—and even beneficial—for a younger person. Before the advent of public schools or juvenile reformatories in Seville, orphanages fulfilled these and other functions. Families availed themselves of these services, viewing them as ways to prepare young people for respectable adulthoods outside residential relief establishments. This is an especially important finding given that the young (and the old) have often been disproportionately prevalent among the assisted poor in the Western world, though they are usually marginalized in studies of poverty, charity, and relief in preindustrial Europe.[70] The findings reported here thus challenge us both to devote more attention to the experiences of young charity recipients specifically and also to consider ways in which charity—and perhaps also other topics that we generally think of as more dependent on class or socioeconomic status than age—might have had different implications and meanings for people at different life stages.

We also must remember that not every institution provided the same services or accommodated the same populations. Seville's orphanages were sharply tiered, but together, they served children and families from multiple social strata. This reflected not only founders' and administrators' different purposes and target populations but also the actions of family members who sought the benefits of these institutions for their own children. This case study therefore illustrates the diversity of both this city's network of juvenile relief institutions and the children and families

it served, cautioning against monolithic characterizations of "charity children" and the institutions that accommodated them. It also demonstrates that the images of young people entirely bereft of family ties in early modern Spanish art and literature neither adequately nor necessarily reflect the reality of Seville's orphanage wards, for whom it was not the lack of family but the continuing importance of it—through both reputation and action—that strongly influenced their access to institutional care.

Please note: All translations are mine except where otherwise indicated.

NOTES

1. Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, "Rinconete y Cortadillo," in *Novelas ejemplares* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, n.d.), 139–76; Enrique Valdivieso, *La obra de Murillo en Sevilla* (Seville: Servicio de Publicaciones del Ayuntamiento de Sevilla, 1982). See also Anne J. Cruz, *Discourses of Poverty: Social Reform and the Picaresque Novel in Early Modern Spain* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999); and Mary Elizabeth Perry, *Crime and Society in Early Modern Seville* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1980), 190–211.

2. For overviews of prominent writings on poverty and poor relief in early modern Spain, see María Jiménez Salas, *Historia de la asistencia social en España en la edad moderna* (Madrid: Instituto Balmes de Sociología, Departamento de Historia Social, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1958); Elena Maza Zorilla, *Pobreza y asistencia social en España, siglos XVI al XX. Aproximación histórica.* (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 1987); and Cándido Ruiz Rodrigo and Irene Palacio Lis, *Pauperismo y educación: Siglos XVIII y XIX. Apuntes para una historia de la educación social en España* (Valencia: Martin, 1995).

   The metaphor of children as "tender plants" is taken from Antonio de Heredia Bazan, *Representación al Rey Nuestro Señor. D Philipe V . . . sobre la importancia, y facilidad de establecer cafas, y hospicios donde recoger los pobres mendicantes, niños huerfanos, y ddefamparados, y abolir la mendicidad, lograndofe adelantar las fabricas y comercio* (Zaragoza: Imprenta Real, 1744), fols. 5v–6r, my emphasis; copy in Archivo Municipal de Sevilla (hereafter, AMS), XI, vol. 30, doc. 11. For other botanical metaphors concerning children, see Archivo de la Diputación Provincial de Sevilla (hereafter, ADPS), Hospicio, bundle 3, unnumbered document, copy of poorhouse (*hospicio*) plan drafted by Seville's Economic Society of Friends of the Country, dated Seville, 5 September 1778; copy dated Madrid, 27 August 1781.

3. Katherine A. Lynch, *Individuals, Families, and Communities in Europe, 1200–1800: The Urban Foundations of Western Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003). See also Katherine A. Lynch, "The Family and the History of Public Life," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 24, no. 4 (spring 1994): 665–84. See also Hugh Cunningham, "Histories of Childhood," *American Historical Review* 103, no. 4 (October 1998): 1204.

4. This presumption often surfaces in the literature on children and charity in the preindustrial West. Jeroen J. H. Dekker has written, for example, "Since the late Middle Ages, institutions had been founded for specific groups of

marginals, for example the ill, criminals, orphans, and the insane. Orphanages were the only institutions explicitly intended for children. Children placed in them were above all children of marginals" (Jeroen J. H. Dekker, "Transforming the Nation and the Child: Philanthropy in the Netherlands, Belgium, France and England, c. 1780–c. 1850," in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Reform from the 1690s to 1850*, ed. Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes [Houndmills, England: Macmillan; reprint, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998], 131 [page citations are to the reprint edition]).

5. Alfonso Braojos Garrido, "El hospicio de Sevilla, fundación del reinado fernandino," *Archivo Hispalese*, 2d series, LIX, no. 182 (1976): 1–42. Although Seville gained a poorhouse much later than most other prominent Spanish cities, the 1830s witnessed a widespread change in the practice of charity throughout Spain, in large part as the result of the *desamortización*—nationalization of ecclesiastical property. William J. Callahan, *Church, Politics, and Society in Spain, 1750–1874* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 145–85, especially 179; and Juan Ignacio Carmona García, *El sistema de la hospitalidad pública en la Sevilla del antiguo régimen* (Seville: Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, 1979), 452–56, 474–75.

6. Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, *Sociedad y estado en el siglo XVIII español* (Barcelona: Ariel, 1988), 495; and Cándido Ruiz Rodrigo and Irene Palacio Lis, *Pauperismo y educación: Siglos XVIII y XIX . . . Apuntes para una historia de la educación social en España* (Valencia: Martin, 1995), 105–20. Indeed, the 1830s is often identified as the boundary of Spain's "Old Regime" (*antiguo régimen*), as a cursory survey of titles and time frames of works concerning the end of the Spanish Old Regime will reveal.

7. Brian Pullan, "Orphans and Foundlings in Early Modern Europe" (originally published as *The Stenton Lecture 1988, University of Reading*, 1989; reprinted in *Poverty and Charity: Europe, Italy, Venice, 1400–1700* [Aldershot, England: Variorum (Ashgate), 1994], 5–6 [page citations are to the reprint edition]).

8. The material on Seville's foundling home is taken from León Carlos Alvarez Santaló, *Marginación social y mentalidad en Andalucía occidental: Expósitos en Sevilla (1613–1910)*, with a prologue by A[ntonio] Domínguez Ortiz (Seville: Junta de Andalucía, 1980).

9. Alvarez Santaló, *Marginación social*, [262–63] (table 1), [286] (table 15), [287–98] (table 16), and [297–98] (table 21).

10. On this policy in Madrid, for example, see J. Soubreyoux, "Pauperismo y relaciones sociales en el Madrid del siglo XVIII," *Estudios de Historia Social* 12–13, I–II (January–June 1980): 7–227, 226. But Hélène Tropé reports that in Valencia, as in Seville, only a small percentage of foundlings were ever transferred to the Saint-Vincent Ferrier orphanage in that city. Hélène Tropé, *La formation des enfants orphelins à Valence (XVe–XVIIe siècles): Le cas du Collège impérial Saint-Vincent Ferrier*, with a preface by Augustin Redondo (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1998), 36–37.

11. Alvarez Santaló, *Marginación social*, 105–17.

12. For published sources on Seville's School of Christian Doctrine, see Juan Ignacio Carmona García, *El extenso mundo de la pobreza: La otra cara de la Sevilla imperial* (Seville: Ayuntamiento de Sevilla, 1993), 95–117; Francisco Collantes de Terán, *Los establecimientos de caridad de Sevilla, que se consideran como particulares: Apuntes y memorias para su historia* (Seville: Oficina de El Orden, 1886), 191–96; Juan Luis Morales, *El niño en la cultura española (ante la medicina y otras ciencias; la historia, las letras, las artes y las costumbres)*, vol. 1 (Madrid: n.p., 1960), 435–77. On Seville's municipal orphanage for girls, see Carmona García, *El extenso mundo de la pobreza*, 121–27, 133–51; Morales, *El niño en la cultura española*, 411–16; Mary Elizabeth Perry, *Gender and Disorder in Early Modern Seville* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 49; and Collantes de Terán, *Los establecimientos de caridad*, 238–40.

13. Carmona García, *El extenso mundo de la pobreza*, 95–100; AMS, III, vol. 12, doc. 3; and James Casey, *Early Modern Spain: A Social History* (London: Routledge, 1999), 125.

14. See, for example, Donna T. Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police: London Charity in the Eighteenth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989), 109–15, 127–30; Brian Pullan, *Rich and Poor in Renaissance Venice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), 263; Anne E. C. McCants, *Civic Charity in a Golden Age: Orphan Care in Early Modern Amsterdam* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 64–70.

15. David Goodman, *Spanish Naval Power, 1589–1665: Reconstruction and Defeat* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 183–86; and Jesús Varela Marcos, "El seminario de marinos: Un intento de formación de marinos para las armadas y flotas de Indias," *Revista de historia de América* (Mexico), no. 87 (1979): 9–36. See also Antonio Herrera García, "Estudio histórico sobre el Real Colegio Seminario de San Telmo de Sevilla," *Archivo Hispalense*, 2d series, nos. 89–90 (1958); reprint, Sevilla: Imprenta Provincial, 1958, 8–13 (page citations are to the reprint edition); and Pilar Castillo Manrubia, "Los Colegios de San Telmo," *Revista de historia naval* 4, no. 13 (1986): 79–83.

16. AMS, XI, vol. 63, doc. 16.

17. The principal published work on this institution includes Francisco Aguilar Piñal, "Los Niños Toribios," in *Temas sevillanos: Primera serie*, 2d. rev. and aug.

(Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, 1992), 51–57; Vicente de la Fuente, *Los Toribios de Sevilla . . . Las adoratrices[.] Memorias leidas en la Real Academia de Ciencias Morales y Políticas* (Madrid: Tipografía Gutenberg, 1884); *Enciclopedia vniversal ilvustrada europeo-americana* (1928), s.v. "Toribio. Hist. Los Toribios de Sevilla" and "Tribunal tutelar de menores"; and Juan Luis, *El niño en la cultura española* (Madrid: n.p., 1960), 1:422; Collantes de Terán, *Los establecimientos de caridad de Sevilla*, 151–52.

18. Convento del Espíritu Santo—Seville (hereafter, CES), uncatalogued document labeled "Libro de la fundación del colegio de niñas agregadas a el Convento de Religiosas del Espíritu Santo. . . ."

19. Perry, *Gender and Disorder*, 97–98; on beatas' charitable activities in early modern Seville, see especially 95–117 (especially 102–3), 172. See also Francisco Avellá Cháfer, "Beatas y beaterios en la ciudad y arzobispado de Sevilla," *Archivo Hispalense*, 2d series, 65, no. 198 (1982): 101–2. On beatas in the broader Hispanic world, see, for example, Nancy E. van Deusen, "Defining the Sacred and the Worldly: Beatas and Recogidas in Late Seventeenth-Century Lima," *Colonial Latin American Historical Review* 6, no. 4 (1997): 441–77.

20. AMS, IV, vol. 24, doc. 3.

21. Beaterio de la Santísima Trinidad, Seville (hereafter, BST), uncatalogued document labeled "Provision Real de aprovación de las ordenanzas del Seminario de Niñas Huérfanas de la S[antísi]ma Trinidad de Sevilla," dated Madrid, 16 August 1797, article 5.

22. Archivo del Palacio Arzobispal de Sevilla (hereafter, APA), Espíritu Santo, V, unnumbered bundle [1], unnumbered document, letter from Sor Francisca del Corazón de Jesús, Seville, 22 August 1797 [to archbishop of Seville].

23. Archivo General de Indias, Seville (hereafter, AGI), Indiferente General, bundle 1647, unnumbered document, report from Universidad de Mareantes members acting as representatives (*diputados*) of San Telmo, Seville, 14 August 1699.

24. USAH, Universidad de Mareantes, book 310, fols. 38r–38v. See also Manuel Babío Walls, *El Real Colegio Seminario de San Telmo, 1681–1981: Bosquejo de su fundación: III centenario de la fundación de la Escuela Náutica de San Telmo* (Seville: Escuela Universitaria de Náutica de Sevilla, 1981), 62–71; and María del Carmen Borrego Plá. "Extracción social de los alumnos del Colegio de San Telmo de Sevilla (1721)," in *Primeras Jornadas de Andalucía y América*, 1, proceedings of a conference at La Rábida, Spain (La Rábida: Universidad Hispanoamericana Santa María de la Rábida et al., 1981), 203–4.

25. USAH, Universidad de Mareantes, books 303–8.

26. ADPS, Hospicio, bundle 1, doc. 18. Although the Toribios had been absorbed into the newly created general poorhouse in 1831, it continued to operate separately under the purview of poorhouse officials for some years thereafter.

27. Such distinctions among different kinds of orphans were not unique to early modern Spain but common to societies with high mortality rates and consequently high levels of orphanage. Even orphanages in the United States through the early twentieth century regularly distinguished between "half-orphans" and "full" orphans. See, for example, Timothy A. Hacsi, *Second Home: Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), especially 11 and 63; and Judith Dulberger, ed., *"Mother Donit fore the Best": Correspondence of a Nineteenth-Century Orphan Asylum* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1996), 10.

28. The estimated numbers of five- to nineteen-year-old orphans (individuals who had lost both parents to death) are 1,141 if calculated using a life expectancy at birth of 30, and 1,423 if calculated using a life expectancy at birth of 27.5. Both estimates are based on population counts for a 1787 census and on the age distributions reported in the 1887 census (since the age distribution is not available for earlier censuses). I am grateful to Professor David Reher for providing these estimates, derived from the extensive microsimulation data set for Spain he has compiled using the CAMSIM demographic simulation-modeling program at the University of Cambridge. David Reher, e-mail to author, December 7, 1998. Other estimates are found in David Reher, *Perspectives on the Family in Spain, Past and Present* (Oxford: Clarendon Press [Oxford University Press], 1997), 297–321.

29. Due to the largely undocumented admission process at the municipal orphanage for girls (Casa de Niñas Huérfanas) and its small scale of operations, it is difficult to know with any certainty the extent to which girls with surviving mothers attended this institution. Nonetheless, in the sporadic extant lists of residents, some girls are identified explicitly as orphans (generally complete orphans) and others are not, which suggests that this institution might also have served a combination of orphans and nonorphans. (For an example, see AMS, V, vol. 247, doc. 8.) The documentation for the tiny municipal orphanage for boys (Colegio de Niños de la Doctrina) is even spottier, and for a number of years in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries there were no resident boys at all. AMS, VI, vol. 69, docs. 19 and 22.

30. BST, uncatalogued document labeled "Provision Real de aprovación de las ordenanzas del Seminario de Niñas Huérfanas de la S[antísi]ma Trinidad de Sevilla," dated Madrid, 16 August 1797, article 5.

31. BST, uncatalogued document labeled "Memoriales de niñas solicitando entrar unas pupilas y otras seminarias en el Beaterio de la S[antísi]ma Trinidad de Sevilla, desde el año de 1828 a 1843," letter from Gertrudis Leon, Seville, 22 January 1828 to "señor obispo ausiliar," Seville.

32. APA, V, Espíritu Santo, unnumbered bundle [1], unnumbered document, letter from Valentina Veles y Mondragón, Seville, 2 January 1798 [to archbishop of Seville].

33. Josef Gómez y Medina, *Metodo de vida, que han de observar los exercitantes, distinguidos en la nueva vivienda de la Casa Colegio de Toribios de la ciudad de Sevilla, que da al público Don Josef Gómez y Medina su Administrador* ([Seville]: Imprenta de D. Diego y D. Josef Godina, 1792), 3–4.

34. "El número de huérfanos (no todos los son pues por empeños o por inclinazión se dispensa por los mayordomos esta prezisa zircunstanzia) es al presente de 148," Archivo General de Simancas (hereafter, AGS), Marina, bundle 215, unnumbered document signed by Don Cayetano Gallego Ordoño, dated Seville, 11 January 1746.

35. A translation of this letter reads as follows:

> María Gonz[ále]z, citizen and native of Seville, widow of her husband Sebastian Gonz[ále]z, with great respect notifies your lord that she has a son, eight or nine years old, more or less, and not having any means to maintain him, I have been obliged to serve as a wet nurse, and am sacrificing to provide for him, having no help except that of God, since the nursing period is drawing to a close and I have no recourse other than to beg alms with my son. If I were alone I would go and serve [as a domestic] in a house. And [not] only this, but he is exposed to being lost to me, as a friend of mine is keeping him, so that at night he does not stay in the streets. And now that there is a chance for boys to enter San Telmo I would like you to remember this poor widow, finding myself with greater need than others as I have no help except that of God and you, not considering [my son's] merits on account of having a grandfather who was a master shoemaker at San Telmo for so many years, but only that I am a poor widow, forced to work. [A]ppealing to your great charity, whose justice I am calling upon, I devotedly ask that you receive him under the assistance of the Royal College of S[a]n Telmo; asking in the name of the heart of the Most Holy Maria, and the devoted Saint Anthony . . .

USAH, bundle 682, unnumbered document, letter of María González, Seville, 28 August 1788, [to San Telmo director, Seville]. On the "solemn poor" (*pobres de solemnidad*), see Maza Zorilla, *Pobreza y asistencia social*, 19–23.

36. AGS, Marina, bundle 216, unnumbered document labeled "Que a Josef Muñoz de edad de ocho años, hijo de Josef Muñoz, y Maria Seco, se le reciva en plaza de colegial," San Ildefonso, 5 September 1783.

37. Perry notes that women and children formed a disproportionate share of the "respectable" or "deserving" poor and as such were entitled to charity in their homes, but that they were not well represented among more public recipients of charity, such as licensed beggars and residents of charity institutions (hospitals). Based on these findings, she concludes:

> Seville did not have to confine its poor in hospitals because its charity converted so many paupers, especially women and children, into "envergonzantes," who would not beg—the shamefaced poor who would voluntarily avoid public view. Charity thus because another form of enclosure for the women of this city.
>
> Those paupers who most successfully survived conformed to expectations of respectability required by the donors. Women in particular learned to use the paternalism of the social order that considered them most needful of protection. Realizing that survival required at least the appearance of obedient submission, mothers of the poor quietly raised their children and lived out their lives, while male officials ignored their strength as survivors. (Perry, *Gender and Disorder*, 176.)

38. USAH, Universidad de Mareantes, book 313, fols. 63–64.

39. APA, V, Espíritu Santo, unnumbered bundle [1], unnumbered document, letter of Don Ygancio Chacon, n.p., n.d. [eighteenth century], [to archbishop of Seville].

40. APA, V, Espíritu Santo, unnumbered bundle [1], unnumbered document, letter of María Ana López Leyton and accompanying documentation, [Seville?], 1799 [to archbishop of Seville].

41. APA, V, Espíritu Santo, unnumbered bundle [1], letter of Pedro Ortiz de Escobar y Abet, no place or date given, but ca. October 1747 [to archbishop of Seville].

42. In addition to Pedro Ortiz de Escobar y Abet's letter ca. October 1747, already cited, see APA, V, Espíritu Santo, unnumbered bundle [1], unnumbered documents, letters to the archbishop of Seville from Pedro Ortiz de Escobar y Abet, n.p., 19 August 1749; n.p., n.d., ca. 1750; Seville, 4 April 1752; Seville, 16 May 1752. See also Convento del Espíritu Santo (hereafter, CES),

uncatalogued document labeled "Libro en que se apuntan las entradas y salidas de las niñas coleg[ial]as desde el mes de en[er]o de 1741," entry for Feliciana Escobar y Tortosa.

43. ADPS, Hospicio, bundle 18, unnumbered document, account book for 1814 labeled "Quaderno del Cargo de esta Casa de Niños Toribios, p[ar]a el año de 1814."

44. AGS, Marina, bundle 217, unnumbered document, cover dated San Ildefonso, 18 September 1783; AGS, Marina, bundle 216, unnumbered document, cover dated San Lorenzo, 24 October 1780.

45. AGS, Marina, bundle 216, unnumbered document, dated San Lorenzo, 24 October 1780.

46. CES, uncatalogued document labeled "Libro de la fundación del colegio de ninas agregadas á el Convento de religiosas del Espíritu Santo. . . ."

47. BST, uncatalogued bundle of documents labeled "Memoriales de niñas solicitando entrar unas pupilas y otras seminarias en el Beaterio de la S[antísi]ma Trinidad de Sevilla desde el año el 1828 a 1843," including letter from Juan Manuel Carrera, Seville, 9 February 1828 [to Archbishop of Seville].

48. USAH, Universidad de Mareantes, book 393, letter of Francisco de Manxon, Cádiz, 22 June 1778 to "S[eño]res y diput[a]dos de R[ea]l Colegio Semin[ari]o de S[a]n Telmo," Seville and response from Juan Manuel de Vivero et al., Seville, 30 June 1778, quotation from Manxon's letter.

49. The noble boarders were initially authorized in the 1786 revisions of San Telmo's bylaws, and reaffirmed in the 1788 version: *Ordenanzas para el Real Colegio de San Telmo de Sevilla* (Madrid: Imprenta de Blas Román, 1788), 19–20, article 27. See also USAH, Universidad de Mareantes, book 308; AMS, V, vol. 284, doc. 14.

50. USAH, Universidad de Mareantes, books 303–7. See also José Delgado y Orellana, *Catálogo de pruebas de nobleza del Real Colegio de San Telmo de Sevilla* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas Instituto Salazar y Castro, 1985).

51. Valentina Tikoff, "Before the Reformatory: A Correctional Orphanage in Ancien Regime Seville," in *Becoming Delinquent: European Youth, 1650–1950*, ed. Pamela Cox and Heather Shore (Aldershot, Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 2002), 59–75.

52. Gabriel Baca, *Los Thoribios de Sevilla: Breve noticia de la fundación de su hospicio, su admirable principio, sus gloriosos progresos, y el infeliz estado en que al presente se halla* (Madrid: Imprenta de Francisco Xavier García, 1766), 102–4.

53. Collantes de Terán, *Los establecimientos de caridad*, 159, no. 1.

54. ADPS, Hospicio, bundle 13b, letter from Lorenzo M[ari]a Ferreras, [Seville], 4 August 1827 to Administrator of Toribios, [Seville].

55. ADPS, Hospicio, bundle 18, account books for funds received ("Quadernos de Cargo").

56. Orphanages in diverse historical settings often have segregated young people, thus providing insight regarding social fault lines. After the Reformation, Augsburg had separate orphanages for Catholic and Protestant children. (Thomas Max Safley, *Charity and Economy in the Orphanages of Early Modern Augsburg* [Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1997], 39–44.) In early modern Amsterdam, the children of citizens were treated in a different orphanage than were the children of noncitizens, thus effectively segregating "respectable" children from the "urban underclass" (McCants, *Civic Charity*, 22–30). In the United States, not only were black, white, and Indian children treated in separate institutions but so were the white children of different religious heritages; there were Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish orphanages and even further ethnic subdivisions, such as German Catholic and Irish Catholic orphanages in St. Louis during the 1850s. The kinds of ethnic and religious diversity that defined the way that children were segregated in most of these other contexts did not exist in eighteenth-century Seville. Yet in all of them, as in Seville, it was the actual or presumed identity of the parents that largely determined where children were sent. Timothy A. Hacsi, *Second Home: Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 18–37. For specific examples, see Nurith Zmora, *Orphanages Reconsidered: Child Care Institutions in Progressive Era Baltimore* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1994); Howard Goldstein, *The Home on Gorham Street and the Voices of its Children* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1996); Marilyn Holt, *Indian Orphanages* (Lawrence: University of Kansas, 2001).

57. Nicholas Terpstra, "Making a Living, Making a Life," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 31, no. 4 (winter 2000): 1078–79, quotation from 1078. See also Nicholas Terpstra, "Mothers, Sisters, and Daughters: Girls and Conservatory Guardianship in Late Renaissance Florence," *Renaissance Studies* 17, no. 2 (2003): 201–29; and Nichalas Terpstra, *Abandoned Children of the Italian Renaissance: Orphan Care in Florence and Bologna* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 70–102.

58. Valentina Tikoff, "Assisted Transitions: Children and Adolescents in the Orphanages of Seville at the End of the Old Regime, 1681–1831" (PhD diss., Indiana University, 2000), 161–65.

59. Stuart Woolf has noted the difficulties involved in fulfilling the documentation requirements for charitable assistance in societies with high levels of illiteracy. Stuart Woolf, "Charity and Family Subsistence" (originally published as a European University Institute Working Paper, no. 85/131, Florence, 1985; reprint in *The Poor in Western Europe in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*), 200–201 (page citations are to the reprint edition).

60. Maza Zorilla, *Pobreza y asistencia social*, 19–23.

61. See, for example, Perry, *Gender and Disorder*; Callahan, *Honor, Commerce and Industry in Eighteenth-Century Spain* (Boston: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, 1972); Ann Twinam, *Public Lives, Private Secrets: Gender, Honor, Sexuality and Illegitimacy in Colonial Spanish America* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999); Casey, *Early Modern Spain*; and the essays in Asunción Lavrin, *Sexuality and Marriage in Colonial Latin America* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989).

62. Linda Martz, *Poverty and Welfare in Habsburg Spain: The Example of Toledo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 202, 206–7; Maureen Flynn, *Sacred Charity: Confraternities and Social Welfare in Spain, 1400–1700* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), 79–81.

63. Martz, *Poverty and Welfare*, 206–7. Maza Zorilla, *Pobreza y asistencia social*, 23–26. For Seville in particular, see Carmona García, *El extenso mundo de la pobreza*, 45; and Perry, *Gender and Disorder*, 175.

64. *Novísima recopilación de las leyes de España*, bk. VII, tít. XXXVII, ley IV ("Los expósitos sin padres conocidos se tengan por legítimos para todos los oficios civiles, sin que pueda servir denota la qualidad de tales," 1794) and V ("Reglamento para el establecimiento de las casas de expósitos, crianza y educación de estos," 1796), 688–93. For references to this legislation and other royal initiatives on behalf of foundlings, see Joan Sherwood, *Poverty in Eighteenth-Century Spain: The Women and Children of the Inclusa* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 95–124, 174–210; Alvarez Santaló, *Marginación social*, 191–203; Morales, *El niño en la cultura española*, 1:435–77; Maza Zorilla, *Pobreza y asistencia social*, 163–68; Twinam, *Public Lives, Private Secrets*, 126–83, 298–314; Susan Socolow, "Acceptable Partners: Marriage Choice in Colonial Argentina, 1778–1910," in *Sexuality and Marriage*, ed. Lavrin, 243 (n. 55); and Ondina E. González, "Down and Out in Havana: Foundlings in Eighteenth-Century Cuba," in *Minor Omissions: Children in Latin American History and Society*, ed. Tobias Hecht (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002), 102–13.

65. Stuart Woolf has argued, "There is a . . . continuity well into the nineteenth century (and, some would argue, much later) in the conviction that charity should not be allowed to vault the gulf between ranks of a society of orders (or, subsequently, of a society based on wealth), but on the contrary should function as a reinforcement of the existing social order. The quality and quantity of charity was proportionate to the social level of the recipient, from the material living conditions within the institutions, or the repression of love affairs that ignored the social divide by reclusion of the lower-class woman in a conservatory, to the whole organization of assistance to the shamefaced poor. . . . The stability of the system was ensured by unremitting concern to uphold the moral and economic independence of the basic unit of society—the family. In this context, the institutions of charity played a dual role, not only to substitute for the absence of family (for orphans, the sick and aged, etc.), but to bolster the public reputation of individual families." Stuart Woolf, *The Poor in Western Europe in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* (London: Methuen, 1986), 27.

66. For similar findings at an orphanage in Valencia during the seventeenth century, see Tropé, *Formation des enfants orphelins à Valence*, 112–23. For early modern Italy, see Eugenio Sonnino, "Between the Home and the Hospice: The Plight and Fate of Girl Orphans in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Rome," in *Poor Women and Children in the European Past*, ed. John Henderson and Richard Wall (London: Routledge, 1994), 94–116; and Terpstra, "Making a Living, Making a Life," 1076. For early modern Augsburg, see Safley, *Charity and Economy*, 5; and Thomas Max Safley, *Children of the Laboring Poor: Expectation and Experience Among the Orphans of Early Modern Augsburg* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 132–33. On France, see Maurice Capul, *Abandon et marginalité* (Toulouse: Privat, 1989), 79–83, 89. For London in a slightly later period, see Lydia Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans: Poor Families, Child Welfare, and Contested Citizenship in London* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2006), 67–119. On U.S. institutions in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, see Hacsi, *Second Home*, 106–10; and Holt, *Indian Orphanages*, 76, 248–49.

67. Silvia Arrom, for example, has found that in late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Mexico City, the city's poorhouse served largely as a residential school for children, and Robert Schwartz has found similar patterns at some of the poorhouses erected in early modern France. Silvia M. Arrom, *Containing the Poor: The Mexico City Poor House, 1774–1871* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), passim, especially 126–41, 247–53, 278–88. See also Robert M. Schwartz, *Policing the Poor in Eighteenth-Century France* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 93–131, especially 94–98.

68. Timothy Hacsi, for example, has made this argument in his examination of orphanages in the United States during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Hacsi, *Second Home*, 107–8). See also Schwartz, *Policing the Poor*, 97.

69. I am, of course, borrowing and applying this language from the influential article by Joan Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (December 1986): 1053–75.

70. Robert Jütte, *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 36, 40; and Stuart Woolf, "Introduction: The Poor and Society," in *Poor in Western Europe*, 2–3, 915.

CHAPTER THREE

Growing Up Indian

Migration, Labor, and Life in Lima (1570–1640)

TERESA C. VERGARA

IN 1613 THE NOTARY MIGUEL DE CONTRERAS CONDUCTED A CENSUS of the indigenous population living in Lima.[1] He found that a considerable proportion of Indian residents were children and youths who came from almost all regions of the Peruvian viceroyalty.[2] One of these children was Inés, an eight-year-old orphan girl who lived and worked in Pablo López's home, where her parents had left her when she was "very little." And there was Juanillo, a ten-year-old boy who worked as a domestic servant in the house of Don Juan de Barrios, his Spanish colonial lord (*encomendero*). Don Juan had brought Juanillo from his *encomienda* in Chincha to work in his home in Lima. Yet another youth captured in the census was Antonio Suy Suy, a sixteen-year-old son of an Indian leader, who had lived with Spaniards since he was a very young boy. At the time of the census he was one of the youngest tailors in the city. Luisa, a fourteen-year-old slave girl, had a different life story. In 1610, when she was eleven years old, a mestizo brought her from Chile, her birthplace, and sold her to Bartolomé Nafio Girón, in whose house she now worked.[3]