

FONDAZIONE
ISTITUTO INTERNAZIONALE DI STORIA ECONOMICA “F. DATINI”
PRATO

ASSISTENZA E SOLIDARIETÀ IN EUROPA
SECC. XIII-XVIII

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AND SOLIDARITY IN
EUROPE FROM THE 13TH TO THE 18TH
CENTURIES

Atti della “Quarantaquattresima Settimana di Studi”
22-26 aprile 2012
a cura di Francesco Ammannati

ESTRATTO

Firenze University Press
2013

Assistenza e solidarietà in Europa Secc. XIII-XVIII = Social assistance and solidarity in Europe from the 13th to the 18th Centuries : atti della “Quarantaquattresima Settimana di Studi”, 22-26 aprile 2012 / a cura di Francesco Ammannati. – Firenze : Firenze University Press, 2013.

(Atti delle Settimane di Studi e altri Convegni ; 44)

<http://digital.casalini.it/9788866553670>

ISBN 978-88-6655-367-0 (online)

ISBN 978-88-6655-366-3 (print)

La Settimana di Studi è stata realizzata con il contributo di:
Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali

La pubblicazione del presente volume è stata realizzata con il contributo di:
Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali

Certificazione scientifica delle Opere

Tutti i volumi pubblicati sono soggetti ad un processo di referaggio esterno di cui sono responsabili il Consiglio editoriale della FUP e i Consigli scientifici delle singole collane. Le opere pubblicate nel catalogo della FUP sono valutate e approvate dal Consiglio editoriale della casa editrice. Per una descrizione più analitica del processo di referaggio si rimanda ai documenti ufficiali pubblicati sul catalogo on-line della casa editrice (www.fupress.com).

Consiglio editoriale Firenze University Press

G. Nigro (Coordinatore), M.T. Bartoli, M. Boddi, R. Casalbuoni, C. Ciappei, R. Del Punta, A. Dolfi, V. Fargion, S. Ferrone, M. Garzaniti, P. Guarnieri, A. Mariani, M. Marini, A. Novelli, M. Verga, A. Zorzi.

La Fondazione Datini si dichiara fin d'ora disponibile ad assolvere i suoi obblighi per l'utilizzo delle immagini contenute nel volume nei confronti di eventuali aventi diritto.

© 2013 Firenze University Press / Fondazione Istituto Internazionale di Storia Economica “F. Datini”

Università degli Studi di Firenze

Firenze University Press

Borgo Albizi, 28

50122 Firenze, Italy

<http://www.fupress.com/>

Printed in Italy

CRITERI DI CERTIFICAZIONE SCIENTIFICA

I testi pubblicati nella collana “Atti delle Settimane di Studi” raccolgono ricerche originali attivate dalla Fondazione Istituto Internazionale di Storia Economica “F. Datini”, sulla base di un progetto varato dai suoi organi scientifici. Gli autori vengono selezionati a seguito di una Call for papers che indica gli obiettivi scientifici del progetto; la selezione è effettuata sulla base di proposte circostanziate contenenti indicazioni sulle questioni storiografiche affrontate, l'area e il periodo storico preso in considerazione e la tipologia delle fonti utilizzate. La Giunta del Comitato scientifico, eventualmente integrata da specialisti volta a volta individuati, analizza le proposte e seleziona quelle ritenute più valide e coerenti con il progetto generale di ricerca. La commissione può anche decidere, ove lo ritenga opportuno, di effettuare inviti diretti a studiosi che si siano distinti per la qualità della loro produzione scientifica sul tema.

I testi risultanti dalle ricerche vengono presentati e discussi in occasione della Settimana di Studi. Nel mese precedente al suo svolgimento, essi vengono messi a disposizione dei partecipanti, per consentire il necessario approfondimento della discussione. Gli atti pubblicano i testi definitivamente redatti dagli autori a seguito della discussione svolta durante il convegno.

A partire da questa Settimana di Studi, tutte le comunicazioni presentate sono state sottoposte, nel testo fornito in modo definitivo, a duplice peer review. Il volume raccoglie solo le comunicazioni che hanno registrato un giudizio positivo.

The works published in the “Proceedings of the Study Week” series represent the collected original research works initiated by the “F. Datini” International Institute of Economic History (Fondazione Istituto Internazionale di Storia Economica “F. Datini”), based on a project launched by its scientific bodies. The authors are chosen following a Call for Papers indicating scientific objectives of the project; selection is performed on the basis of detailed proposals containing indications regarding the researched economic history topics, the area and historical period considered, as well as the sources used. The Scientific Committee, shall if necessary, include specialists identified on a case by case basis, and shall analyse the proposals, choosing those considered the most valid and coherent with the general research project. The Committee may decide, if it deems adequate, to invite individual scholars who have distinguished themselves for the quality of their scientific work on the topic.

The works resulting from research shall be presented and discussed during the Study Week. In the month prior to the Study Week, the works shall be made available to the participants, in order to allow for a more detailed discussion. The final works, edited by the authors after discussion during the Study Week, shall be published in the Proceedings.

Starting from this Study Week, all the “comunicazioni” were submitted to a dual peer review. The book only contains the essays recording a positive judgment.

Commissione di selezione XLIV Settimana di Studi / Selection Commission of the 44th Study Week:

Erik Aerts (Louvain), Wim Blockmans (Leiden), Michele Cassandro (Siena), Murat Çizakça (Kuala Lumpur), Antonio Di Vittorio (Bari), Laurence Fontaine (Parigi), Alberto Grohmann (Perugia), Miguel Ángel Ladero Quesada (Madrid), Paolo Malanima (Catanzaro, Institute of Studies on Mediterranean Societies - CNR Napoli), Adam Manikowski (Warszawa), Paola Massa (Genova), Giampiero Nigro (Firenze), Michael North (Greifswald)

INDICE

Domenica 22 aprile – APERTURA DEI LAVORI

LAURENCE FONTAINE, Assistance et solidarité en Europe,
XIII^e – XVIII^e siècle.....pag. 3

Lunedì 23 aprile – EVOLUZIONE E TIPOLOGIE / EVOLUTION AND TYPES

Relazioni

JÜRGEN SCHLUMBOHM, Usury Poor Relief and Health Care:
British Lying-in Charities and German Public Hospitals Compared.....pag. 17

MARIA ANTÓNIA LOPES, ISABEL DRUMOND BRAGA, The Portuguese Social Care
System in the Modern Age: An Originality Case in Catholic Europe?..... » 31

LEX HEERMA VAN VOSS, Poor Relief Institutions
in North-Western Europe (1550-1800) » 57

MATHIEU ARNOUX, GILLES POSTEL-VINAY, Territoires et institutions de l'assistance
(XII^e-XIX^e siècles): mise en place, crises et reconstructions d'un système social... » 77

MIGUEL ÁNGEL DE BUNES IBARRA, Complicità e solidarietà nel Mediterraneo turco-
barbaresco..... » 105

Comunicazioni

SANDRINE VICTOR, De la confrérie à la confrérie de Métier: mutation des structures
d'encadrement d'assistance et de charité dans le monde pré-industriel à Gérone,
XIII^e-XV^e siècles.....pag. 123

ARIE VAN STEENSEL, Variations in Urban Social Assistance.
Some Examples from Late-Medieval England and the Low Countries » 135

ALIDA CLEMENTE, Per "particular volontaria oblatione". Il Real Hospitio di S. Gennaro
de' poveri e la centralizzazione dell'assistenza nella Napoli di Antico Regime..... » 151

Martedì 24 aprile – FONTI DI FINANZIAMENTO E AUTOFINANZIAMENTO / SOURCES OF
FINANCING AND SELF-FINANCING

Relazioni

GIULIANO PINTO, Formazione e gestione dei patrimoni fondiari degli istituti assistenziali
cittadini (Italia, secoli XIII-XV).....pag. 169

ELISE VAN NEDERVEEN MEERKERK, DANIELLE TEEUWEN, Keeping Up
the Good Works: Voluntary Giving and the Financial Maintenance
of Charitable Institutions in Dutch Towns, c. 1600-1800..... » 179

Comunicazioni

- STEFAN SONDEREGGER, The Financing Strategy of a Major Urban Hospital in the Late Middle Ages (St. Gallen 15th Century)pag. 209
- CHRISTINE JEHANNO, Un grand hôpital en quête de nouvelles ressources: l'hôtel-Dieu de Paris à la fin du Moyen Âge..... » 227
- PAOLA NARDONE, L'Assistenza nel Mezzogiorno: la Casa Santa dell'Annunziata di Sulmona nel XVIII secolo..... » 247

Martedì 24 aprile – GESTIONE, ORGANIZZAZIONE E COSTI DEI SERVIZI OFFERTI AI SOGGETTI DESTINATARI / MANAGEMENT, ORGANISATION AND COSTS OF THE SERVICES OFFERED TO THE RECIPIENT SUBJECTS

Relazioni

- MARINA GAZZINI, La fraternita come luogo di economia. Osservazioni sulla gestione delle attività e dei beni di ospedali e confraternite nell'Italia tardo-medievale.....pag. 261
- AMY SINGER, What is the Price of a Free Lunch? The Costs of Serving and Consuming Meals in Ottoman Public Kitchens (*imaret*) » 277

Comunicazioni

- CRISTINA PÉREZ GALÁN, Los grandes hospitales urbanos en Aragón en el siglo XV: Nuestra Señora de la Esperanza en Huesca y Nuestra Señora de Gracia en Zaragozapag. 291
- FRANCESCO BIANCHI, EDOARDO DEMO, Tra mercanti e mendicanti: amministrare la carità nella terraferma veneta del Rinascimento » 307
- MARIA DE FATIMA MACHADO, L'assistenza ai trovatelli in Portogallo nel Cinquecento..... » 317
- MARIE-LAURE LEGAY, Le financement et la gestion des dépôts de mendicité (France, 1764-1790) » 333
- MARIE-LUCIE ROSSI, La gestion camérale des biens de l'Assistance publique et l'emprise de la valeur à Reggio Emilia (1754-1804) » 347

Mercoledì 25 aprile – IMPATTO SULL'ECONOMIA E SULLA SOCIETÀ / IMPACT ON THE ECONOMY AND SOCIETY

Relazioni

- HENK LOOIJESTEIJN, MARCO H.D. VAN LEEUWEN, Ospizi e corporazioni: assistenza alla classe media nella Repubblica olandesepag. 363
- GIULIANA ALBINI, Ospedali e società urbana: Italia centro-settentrionale, secoli XIII-XVI..... » 384
- ALBERTO MARCOS MARTÍN, Carità e società nella Spagna moderna..... » 399
- MICHAEL TOCH, Social Assistance, Welfare and Their Economic Background: the Jewish Case in Medieval Europe » 419

Comunicazioni

- PAOLA PINELLI, "Demo a' poveri per rimosina per l'amore di Dio": effetti economici e sociali delle distribuzioni di pane e farina a Prato nel XIV secolopag. 427
- ALFREDO MARTÍN GARCÍA, MARÍA JOSÉ PÉREZ ÁLVAREZ, La risposta sociale al fenomeno della povertà nel nord-est della Penisola iberica nel XVIII secolo..... » 439
- KATERINA KONSTANTINIDOU, Carità, ambizioni politiche e assistenza ospedaliera: L'ospedale dei Poveri Infermi nella Corfù Settecentesca..... » 453

Giovedì 26 aprile – L'ASSISTENZA INFORMALE / THE NON FORMAL WELFARE

Relazioni

ANNA BENVENUTI, La municipalizzazione della solidarietà confraternale: esempi dalle città toscane.....	pag.	465
ANGELA GROPPI, L'assistenza agli anziani in età moderna: compiti sociali e doveri familiari.....	»	479

Comunicazioni

ATHANASIA STAVROU, A Mechanism of Securing Private Property in 14 th and 15 th Century Thessalonike.....	pag.	493
MATTHIEU SCHERMAN, Les formes de l'assistance à Trévis au XV ^e siècle.....	»	509
BEATRICE ZUCCA MICHELETTO, Family Solidarity vs. Institutional Relief? Interaction and Complementarity Between Different Survival Strategies in 18 th -Century Turin.....	»	521
ANASTASIA PAPADIA-LALA, Poverty, Charitable Institutions and Politics in the Greek-Venetian East (13 th -17 th centuries)	»	533

Abstracts	pag.	543
-----------------	------	-----

Maria Antónia Lopes, Isabel Drumond Braga

*The Portuguese Social Care System in the Modern Age:
An Originality Case in Catholic Europe?**

Until recently it has been stated, without support of research, that the Church secured the social care system in Portugal in the Modern Age. Three reasons can explain this mistake: because in the Middle Ages the Church's charitable activity was the most visible and structured one, even, in fact, we do not know what was his real accomplishment; because it was so in many Catholic countries in the *Ancien Régime*; finally, because it is common to think that *Misericórdias* or *Santas Casas* or *Santas Casas de Misericórdia* (literally Holy Houses of Mercy) were ecclesiastical institutions. The predisposition of *Misericórdias* to ensure most types of assistance is well established: running almost all the hospitals, ensuring food assistance, medical, legal and spiritual support to prisoners; granting dowries to poor orphans; supporting ashamed poor; subsidizing transportation for poor people, distributing alms, burying the poor for free, praying for their souls; etc. Only foundlings escaped to *Misericórdias*'s monopoly, because they could find protection also in municipal councils.

1. MISERICÓRDIAS

Portuguese *misericórdias* were not the same as homonymous Italian or Spanish institutions, because in these countries this term was used to describe hospitals and/or orphanages and/or confinement homes. Their legal and guardianship nature was also completely different. Even though formally they were confraternities or brotherhoods, the *misericórdias* differed in their legal nature, which was civil, their activities were a spiritual but also a social character and aimed to the outside world. They could only be established by the king or with his permission and its regulations had to be approved by the central power, which protected them. They were always exempt from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which means that neither the parish priests nor the bishops had any power to intervene in their activity. The work of the *misericórdias* was naturally part of the catholic doctrine but they were laymen's organisations, though clergy members could join as Christians, as could anyone else.

* MARIA ANTONIA LOPES author of parts 1-8 and 10; ISABEL DRUMOND BRAGA author of part 9.

1.1 *Reasons for foundation and rapid expansion*

The first *misericórdia*, the Lisbon one, was founded by the widow-queen D. Leonor, in 1498, during the reign of D. Manuel I (1495-1521). Later, the king's actions were decisive, as he incentivised the creation of *misericórdias* across the country and even sent men he trusted to the main cities and towns to incite the local leaders and people of influence to establish them there, motivating them with various privileges and perks.¹ The foundation of *misericórdias* throughout the kingdom was part of an "effort by the Crown to organise assistance."² The origin of the *misericórdias* was further included in the new forms of spirituality and devotion which invited lay people to experience their faith through works, imitating the poverty and humility of Christ and intensifying the resource of the Virgin Mary's intercession. In this respect it was also in the interest of the kings to appear "as main defenders of the faith and chief protectors of the believers and worship best practices, even if that meant encroaching on the territory held by the Church".³ The main reasons for the foundation and rapid expansion of the *misericórdias* in the 16th century were, in short: 1) of a spiritual order, because lay people applied and lived their doctrine; 2) of a state order, as a means of asserting royal power by controlling assistance and making it more effective; 3) and of a social order, since joining a *Misericórdia* was a way of attaining prestige and privileges and, later, as they grew richer, easy access to the capital markets.

According to Isabel Sá, in Portugal the Council of Trent did not innovate in terms of assistance, as it did in other catholic countries, because the reform endorsed by the Crown to achieve secularisation was underway and was not interrupted. The Tridentine decrees actually consolidated the Portuguese reform: "Portuguese monarchs managed to achieve a special legal status for the *misericórdias*. They became confraternities under royal protection, in other words, institutions that, despite their religious nature, were under the jurisdiction of the king. This is a fundamental breakthrough because it enabled *misericórdias* to maintain their eminently religious objectives without being an institution of the Church. From that point on, they would always be institutions of the monarchy, and they would answer to the king, except in matters related to their churches and objects of worship."⁴ It should be noted that this process was totally peaceful, not producing any reaction of resistance or hostility from the bishops. The fact suggests that Church hierarchy had not a real and important role in assistance.

¹ A. DE OLIVEIRA, *A Santa Casa da Misericórdia de Coimbra no contexto das instituições congéneres*, in *Memórias da Misericórdia de Coimbra*, Coimbra 2000 (Misericórdia de Coimbra), pp. 11-41; I. DOS GUIMARÃES SÁ, *As Misericórdias: da fundação à União Dinástica*, in *Portugaliae Monumenta Misericordiarum 1. Fazer a história das misericórdias*, ed. J.P. PAIVA, Lisboa 2002 (UMP), pp. 19-45.

² I. DOS GUIMARÃES SÁ, J.P. PAIVA, *Introdução*, in *Portugaliae Monumenta Misericordiarum*, 3, *A fundação das misericórdias: o reinado de D. Manuel I*, I. DOS GUIMARÃES SÁ, J.P. PAIVA eds., Lisboa 2004 (UMP), p. 8.

³ I. DOS GUIMARÃES SÁ, *Parte I – De 1498 a 1750*, in I. DOS GUIMARÃES SÁ, M.A. LOPES, *História Breve das Misericórdias*, Coimbra 2008 (Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra), p. 23.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

The *misericórdias* were increasingly mentioned in testaments and the incorporation of hospitals grew, which initially had not been deemed part of the *misericórdias*. The annexation of the largest hospital in the kingdom, the *Hospital de Todos os Santos* (All Saints Hospital) in Lisbon, in 1564, was paradigmatic and revealed the prestige and power already attained by the capital's *Misericórdia*. "The *misericórdias* became the point of reference for assistance institutions."⁵ Towards the end of the *Ancien Régime* there would be around 400, spread across the country and its colonial empire.

1.2 Internal organisation

Misericórdias had two types of confreres: the ones of 1st condition, the nobles, ecclesiastics and magistrates, and the ones of 2nd condition, merchants, craftsmen and farmers in rural areas, in other words, the elite of the third estate. The body that controlled each *misericórdia* was the *Mesa* (literally table), which was elected and had a one-year tenure. It comprised an administrator (*provedor*), the top official, a scribe (both confreres of 1st condition) and 11 councillors, five of whom were of 1st and six of 2nd condition. Its members, symbolically numbering thirteen in total, were then known as *mesários* (board members).

Each *misericórdia* drew up its regulations (*compromisso*) inspired by the Lisbon one but adapted to local conditions, which would only take effect after being approved by the king, as has been mentioned. The main alterations to the *compromisso* of the Lisbon *Misericórdia* date from 1516, 1577 and 1618. This last one is vital, as it was adopted or adapted by most of the *santas casas*. In 1806 its adoption, with the necessary local adaptations, was imposed on all *misericórdias*. Only after the second half of the 19th century would there be new regulations.

Initially, as in any other brotherhood, any number of baptised men and women could join the *misericórdias*. After 1577 the new Lisbon *compromisso* imposed *numerus clausus* and forbade the admission of women, Jews, minors, wage earners and illiterates. The elitist process is clear. But in many areas it was impossible to fill the brotherhood quotas if illiterate people were excluded. For this reason, they were a common presence in smaller towns. In relation to New Christians, "though the ban remains (...), here and there they are still admitted, proving the existing permeability, the difficulty segregating them and the length that descendants of Jews who were forced to convert went to in order to conceal their origin, using, among other strategies, their status of brothers of a *misericórdia*."⁶ It was the Marquis of Pombal, minister of king D. José (1750-1777) and key figure of the Portuguese Enlightened Despotism, who through the law of 25 May 1773 prohibited discrimination against New Christians.

It is also a fact that there were some exceptions regarding women, some of whom were elected administrators (*provedoras*), as happened in the 17th century in at

⁵ Â. BARRETO XAVIER, J.P. PAIVA, *Introdução*, in *Portugaliae Monumenta Misericordiarum*, 4, *Crescimento e consolidação: de D. João III a 1580*, Â. Barreto XAVIER, J.P. PAIVA eds., Lisboa 2005 (UMP), p. 11.

⁶ M.M. LOBO DE ARAÚJO, J.P. PAIVA, *Introdução*, in *Portugaliae Monumenta Misericordiarum*, 6, *Estabilidade, grandeza e crise: da Restauração ao final do reinado de D. João V*, M.M. LOBO DE ARAÚJO, J.P. PAIVA eds., Lisboa 2007 (UMP), p. 14.

least two institutions. It is only from the last third of the 19th century that women were legally admitted in some *misericórdias*, but it was a difficult process that lasted more than a hundred years.⁷

1.3 *Economic situation*

The *misericórdias* initially survived on alms (collected by *mamposteiros*, alms collectors, who were granted privileges to attract them and could be hired through income auction procedures) and royal donations of money, goods (annual deliveries of sugar, incense...) and certain wages. During the reign of D. João III (1521-1557) the *misericórdias* began to acquire *padrões de juros* (bonds from the Crown) and through the law of 1593 they received the monopoly of burials, which would provide them with an important source of revenue from renting funeral equipment. It is worth highlighting that none of these forms of income came from real estate. But it is now known that the *misericórdias* acquired their first properties, stemming from the incorporation of confraternities and hospitals, in a process that began as early as the reign of D. Manuel and which intensified in the second half of the 16th century.⁸ The conversion of pre-existing confraternities into *misericórdias* or their incorporation, private donations through wills in favour of the soul (in other words, of tied properties whose income was meant to defray the expense of prayers for the soul) and the incorporation of local or royal hospitals with their earnings, transformed the *misericórdias* into economically powerful institutions. The incorporations were in part facilitated by the bad administration which at the time affected the majority of charity institutions.⁹

Throughout the 17th century the increase in estate wealth is noticeable, but there are also signs of debt in many of them. The *misericórdias* tended to choose investment in interest rate, indifferent to the moral condemnation of usury: capitalisation of goods and granting onerous loans to private entities, in exchange for mortgages. But the nobility, the regular clientele of these capitals (or the Crown, when the money was applied in bonds), was bad at paying and often controlled the *misericórdias*. With the increase in testamentary legacies and the institution of goods assigned to charitable works, the *misericórdias* became very wealthy, but they accumulated too many commitments for masses which became impossible to meet.

In the 18th century all these trends became more marked: great financial difficulties caused by defaulted debts, the inflation at the end of the century, the excessive number of masses, the bad administration and the corruption of those in charge.¹⁰ The social status of the defaulted debtors accompanied the social compo-

⁷ M.A. LOPES, J.P. PAIVA, *Introdução*, in *Portugaliae Monumenta Misericordiarum*, 8, *Tradição e modernidade: o período da monarquia constitucional (1834-1910)*, M.A. LOPES, J.P. PAIVA eds., Lisboa 2010 (UMP), p. 18.

⁸ I. DOS GUIMARÃES SÁ, *As Misericórdias: da fundação à União Dinástica*, cit., pp. 28-29.

⁹ P. DRUMOND BRAGA, *A crise dos estabelecimentos de assistência aos pobres nos finais da Idade Média*, in «Revista Portuguesa de História», 26, 1991, pp. 175-190.

¹⁰ M.A. LOPES, *As Misericórdias: de D. José ao final do século XX*, in *Portugaliae Monumenta Misericordiarum*, 1, cit., pp. 79-81.

sition of each town, but they were always the elites: Aristocracy in Lisbon,¹¹ farmers, priests and confreres in small rural locations. Overall, it was taking its toll on the small but steady income from the burial monopoly too, benefitting other confraternities and, mostly, Third Orders. But there were also plenty of *misericórdias* that benefited from large inheritances from Portuguese who had died in the colony of Brazil.

Though it is common to think of the 18th century, namely the second half, and the first decades of the 19th century as the period of decline for the *misericórdias*, the crisis was not overwhelming. Few *misericórdias* were founded, but the creation of new services in existing ones, the expansion, refurbishment and inauguration of buildings, in particular hospitals, and the trust placed in them by so many benefactors could not have occurred in a time of deep depression. In spite of economic difficulties, the growing weight of assistance to the poor is seen in every *misericórdia* that has been studied, which compels us to mitigate the scenario of total crisis of these brotherhoods at the end of the *Ancien Régime*. In fact, during this period, there was an absolutely fundamental change concerning the action of *misericórdias*: testators, in part compelled by the legislative apparatus of the time, now leaned more towards restricting the constitution of assets tied to the celebration of masses, favouring aid to the sick, incarcerated, elderly, destitute poor, maidens, orphans or foundlings instead, and that was immediately apparent in the new services that were created in the *misericórdias*. Even if heads of these institutions did not keep up with the evolution of ideas, they were obliged to uphold the impositions of the legacies they received. As a result, the assistance provided by the *Santas Casas* was an immediate reflection, without any time lapse, of the will of benefactors of the time. Moreover, some of these confraternities, themselves sensitised by new ways of viewing life and death, inaugurated innovative services by their own initiative and with their own income, without the need for commitments or institutors to bind them.

On the other hand, if the nobility tended to veer away from these brotherhoods – because the ever vigilant Crown controlled the abusive use they made of this estate – this did not imply the withdrawal of other elites who were now emerging and to whom it was not irrelevant, far from it, to join the *misericórdias* and command their fates, if not so much for the economic benefits, for the social recognition they would enjoy. For others, more humble and climbing the social ladder, both individually and as a professional group (as was the case of the pharmacists and traders), it was extremely important to be able to join the class of brothers of 1st condition. Even if this meant enrolling in the 2nd category and, once admitted and using their influence, they could vie for the first one.

¹¹ N.G. MONTEIRO, *O endividamento aristocrático (1750-1832): alguns aspectos*, in “Análise Social”, 116-117, 1992, pp. 263-283.

1.4 *Legal nature and relationships with the ecclesiastical power*

Portuguese *misericórdias* were, as mentioned, lay confraternities under the king's immediate protection and exempt from ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The Church's only authority was obviously to authorise the consecration of a place of worship and the reduction of mandatory masses. They did not even nominate the chaplains, as they were considered employees and, as such, were hired by the *Mesas*. Members of the Church could belong to *misericórdias* and bishops and canons, who were brothers of the 1st condition, were often *provedores*. According to the interplay of local forces, they could even control them if they were part of the leading body, but only as any other influential local person and not more than that.

There is documentary evidence for the second half of the 18th century of frequent confrontations between bishops and *misericórdias*, who were always aware of their autonomy. The prelates never demanded to examine the accounts or activities of the *misericórdias*, which they knew well was not their domain, but they claimed it was their right to inspect places of worship and authorise specific devotions. Nevertheless, when the conflicts made it to the courts, they found in favour of the *santas casas*. That is why it was easier for bishops to control the *misericórdias* from within, by joining them and getting elected to the top position. There were also conflicts between parish priests from small villages and local *misericórdias*, because of the masses, processions and funerals they performed, taking the spotlight and revenue away from the parish priests. Disagreements were also common between the *misericórdias'* managements and the chaplains they employed, the employees who created the most problems. The disputes became so severe that in order to avoid them there was a ban on the admission of members of the Church in these confraternities, as was decided in 1783 in the *misericórdia* of Penafiel.¹²

1.5 *Their activity*

The social work of *misericórdias* over time has been vast and multifaceted. In principle, it upheld the fourteen works of mercy (seven spiritual¹³ and seven corporal¹⁴) established since the 11th/12th centuries. In practice, a part of the spiritual works was neglected and other modalities of physical assistance, absent from the medieval formula, were adopted, such as the concession of dowries to poor girls.

Visiting prisoners was one of the works of mercy of the catholic doctrine. Therefore, assistance to inmates was always a task incurred by the *santas casas*. The people who ran the *misericórdias*, after enquiring about the detainees who were in dire need of help, provided them regular physical (food, clothing, medication...), spiritual and legal assistance. Accompanying those sentenced to death and burying

¹² *Portugaliae Monumenta Misericordiarum*, cit, 7, p. 210.

¹³ Teaching ordinary people, giving sound counsel to whoever asks for it, punishing with charity those who err, comforting the grieving, forgiving those who offend us, bearing hurt with patience and beseeching God for the living and the dead.

¹⁴ Redeeming captives and visiting prisoners, curing the sick, clothing the naked, feeding the hungry and giving drink to the thirsty, giving shelter to pilgrims and burying the dead.

their remains was another task taken on by the *santas casas*. For those who had been convicted to having their bodies exposed and consumed in the place of suffering, the *misericórdias* earned the right to gather their bones every year on All Saints Day, which they did in a ritual ceremony.

Free funerals guaranteed to poor families that required them were also a service that the *misericórdias* always provided. As aforementioned, these confraternities earned the exclusive privilege of “funeral agencies,” which enabled them to channel profits made from sumptuous ceremonies into funding ceremonial funeral for confreres and their families, and the plain but dignified free burials for the poor.

Poor patients received assistance from *misericórdias* in their hospitals and on home visits by “visiting stewards.” Some of these confraternities had doctors among their employees who went to poor patients houses and it was also common to supply the medication free of charge. To do this, from the end of the period in question, the more wealthy *misericórdias* set up their own pharmacies aimed at selling to the public and giving medicine to the poor. In urban spaces the *misericórdias* could also provide a transport service similar to our ambulances: taking patients to the hospital on a kind of litter, the *cadeirinha* (literally, little chair). Providing care for military personnel in the hospitals of the *misericórdias*, by contracts imposed by the Crown, was usual and generally prejudicial for the brotherhoods.

Raising foundlings was legally the domain of the town halls, but several *misericórdias* took on this duty, but not the expense, which was paid with tax revenues. In practice, there was a wealth of solutions and the *santas casas* could contribute to expenses or administrate private (and late) legacies bequeathed to foundlings. The permanent lack of revenue sometimes generated conflicts, or at least bad will, between town halls and *misericórdias*, who struggled with a difficult service, which was aggravated by their considerable administrative complexity. Aside from foundlings, whose aid was never contemplated in the commitments of the *misericórdias*, many of them guaranteed the funding for wet nurses for families whose mother’s could not breastfeed owing to death, illness or having had twins.

Aid for travellers was widespread among *misericórdias*, who established a simple and effective network covering the Portuguese territory. Travellers, still very much associated with pilgrims and therefore somewhat sacred, would make their way to the nearest *misericórdia* and request a *carta de guia* (literally, a guide letter), in other words, a document bearing the institution’s official seal which identified the traveller, their place of origin and destination. Along with the *carta*, which was in reality a certificate of poverty and worthiness of charity, they received monetary aid to support them until they arrived at the next *misericórdia*. Here they presented the *carta de guia* and received the necessary money for the next stage. And so, from *misericórdia* to *misericórdia*, these poor people completed their journeys. When they were sick and unable to walk, the *misericórdias* provided them with or pay for a horse to carry them. Some *misericórdias* also had small shelters which provide, at the very least, a roof, light and warmth for travellers.

Almost every *misericórdia* handed out wedding dowries to poor orphans or to relatives of founders of charitable works, a very important deed throughout the 17th and 18th centuries. But as this form of social correction was not exclusive to *misericórdias* and, moreover, as it is more telling than most of the disciplining objec-

tives of assistance, it will be further discussed later on. The same would be done for hostels and orphanages, expensive institutions which were only possible in more opulent *misericórdias* and frequently under other tutelages.

Handing out alms continued throughout the whole period under study in this paper. Those who struggled with poverty, hunger or cold could not expect any other type of help other than the occasional donation of money. Many *misericórdias* provided lifelong aid to people who had disabilities or were elderly, but in too small a number to cover all circumstances. And, as well as the sick and the elderly, how many healthy people did not earn enough for the minimum means of survival? Either because salaries were too low, a situation that particularly affected women on their own and couples with large families to feed, or because the job market could not cater for everyone. In general, charitable institutions overlooked these situations. The only thing left for these people were institutional or private alms. On the whole, the *misericórdias* gave preference to granting aid that was justified by requests where the petitioner described concrete situations, explaining how they lived, what caused their affliction and what specific help they needed.

An important line of work performed by *misericórdias* was concerned with gathering legacies left in the *Ultramar* (i.e. overseas). *Misericórdias* played a central role this activity, acting, in the words of Inês Amorim, as “attorneys of the deceased.”¹⁵ The process was strictly regulated: in Asia, the local *Misericórdia* acted as recipient, checking the balance and sending it to the Goa *misericórdia* which, in the Portuguese State of India, was head of all the others. When the deceased left no will, it was also the job of the *misericórdias* to locate the heirs and deliver their inheritance to them. From the Goa *misericórdia* information was sent to the Lisbon one which, in turn, wrote to the local counterparts nearest to where the heirs lived in order to contact them. They would make a claim with the local *santa casa* and the steps would resume in the opposite direction. The hardest part was transferring the fortunes, which was done through a trusted person or through bills of exchange drawn on the Lisbon market. Obviously this was a lengthy process and each stakeholder was something of a predator, as the heirs were defrauded.¹⁶ A similar role to that of the Goa one, though without the responsibility over the other *misericórdias*, was played by the *santa casa* of Bahia, in Brazil. This one received precious metals or letters of credit left in wills and sent by the *misericórdias* of Brazil, the Atlantic islands and the coast of Africa. The Bahia *misericórdia* then corresponded with the *misericórdia* of the mother country nearest the place of residence of the heirs, without using the Lisbon *santa casa* as an intermediary.¹⁷

¹⁵ I. AMORIM, *Misericórdia de Aveiro e Misericórdias da Índia no século XVII. Procuradoras dos defuntos*, in *1º Congresso Internacional do Barroco*, Porto 1991 (Universidade do Porto, I), pp. 124-137.

¹⁶ I. DOS GUIMARÃES SÁ, *Quando o rico se faz pobre: Misericórdias, caridade e poder no império português (1500-1800)*, Lisboa 1997 (CNCDP), pp. 204-211.

¹⁷ A.J.R. RUSSELL-WOOD, *Fidalgos e filantropos. A Santa Casa da Misericórdia da Bahia, 1550-1755*, Brasília 1981 (Universidade de Brasília), pp. 276-277.

2. HOSPITALS

It was only from the 16th century that, very gradually, throughout Europe, the hospitals specialised in accepting only patients, because until then they had also taken in travellers, pilgrims, people who were poor (lifelong or temporarily) and foundlings, often without providing any medical care. In the words of Colin Jones – that for such a semantic game had to resort to a Romance language – the hospitalised individual went from *pauvre malade* to *malade pauvre*, in other words, he went from being the poor person who might be ill to the ill person who was poor.¹⁸ In Portugal, this development went hand in hand, though not causally related, with the integration of hospitals in *misericórdias*, a more recent creation.

Starting in the reign of D. Duarte (1433-1438), but gaining momentum under D. João II (1481-1495) and his successors, there arose a tendency (which was not just Portuguese) to merge smaller scattered and less efficient hospitals into bigger units, culminating in 1492 with the creation of the All Saints Hospital in Lisbon, the result of the merger of 43 hospitals. The objectives of this hospital, stated in its by-laws, illustrate the transformation from “charity institution for all kinds of assistance” to “vocational and organised place for the treatment and subsequent cure of patients” on “one condition: that those patients were poor.”¹⁹ After Lisbon, the hospitals of Porto, Évora, Coimbra, Santarém, Setúbal and other smaller ones were established.

Initially the *misericórdias* did not have hospital-related purposes, but as early as the reign of D. Manuel, and especially in the next, some hospitals were incorporated into those confraternities, the most important of which was All Saints Hospital. From this union “the Lisbon *Misericórdia* emerged as the most powerful institution in the field of assistance, increasingly the inspirational and defining model for its counterparts” and the assistance “became more and more an area of the *jurisdictio* of the king.”²⁰ In the 17th century the trend continued, in such a way that from the 18th century the *misericórdias* focused more and more on helping patients. Another decision of the Crown was to hand hospitals over to the friars of the Congregation of Saint John the Evangelist, as occurred in Lisbon, Coimbra, Caldas da Rainha, Santarém or Évora. Some smaller hospitals remained under the supervision of the town halls, by the *provedores das comarcas* (peripheral agents of the central power) and, also, by confraternities.

It should be noted that in Portugal hospitals were not institutions under Episcopal jurisdiction, and so avoided their tutelage (even if only nominal) and, therefore, also the ambiguities and conflicts related to its administration.²¹ Even the

¹⁸ C. JONES, *The Construction of the Hospital Patient in Early Modern France*, in *Institutions of Confinement. Hospitals, Asylums and Prisons in Western Europe and North America, 1500-1950*, N. FINZSCH, R. JÜTTE eds., Cambridge 2003 (Cambridge University Press), p. 57.

¹⁹ M. MENDONÇA, *Albergarias e hospitais no Portugal de quatrocentos*, in “Revista de Ciências Históricas”, 11, 1996, pp. 39-53.

²⁰ Â. BARRETO XAVIER, J.P. PAIVA, *Introdução*, cit., p. 20.

²¹ Cf., e.g., *Les administrateurs d'hôpitaux dans la France de l'ancien régime*, ed. J.-P. GUTTON, Lyon 1999 (Presses Universitaires de Lyon).

hospitals governed by friars were monitored by the *Mesa da Consciência e Ordens*, a higher royal court. With the Marquis of Pombal's policy of regalist Enlightenment, these friars were removed from the hospitals they still ran. As regards the nuns, the problem did not exist because throughout the Modern Age they have never worked in hospitals or played any social action. Portuguese nuns were all contemplative, living in total seclusion.

3. ASSISTING FOUNDLINGS

Since the 16th century, through the general laws of the kingdom (*Ordenações Manuelinas*, 1521), the bringing up of foundlings was the responsibility of the municipal authorities. The money spent on these children came from public taxes. The *Ordenações Filipinas* (1603) kept the same clauses but as the *misericórdias* spread, some of them began to provide help for foundlings in the 17th and 18th centuries, on a voluntary basis. In many municipalities they remained a burden on the town halls, and this was probably the commonest situation throughout the 17th century, if not the 18th century, too, but the distribution is not yet certain. When the *misericórdias* took on the care of foundlings they did not bear the costs, which were still supported by the tax revenues of the municipal bodies. It should be noted that caring for foundlings was the only form of assistance for which the general law of the kingdom made financial provision from public taxation.²² But for them, it did it.

The Marquis of Pombal reformed the assistance given to foundlings in Lisbon (the responsibility of the *Misericórdia*) in 1775.²³ But it was in the reign of D. Maria I (1777-1816) that help for these children was reorganised at national level by an order of 1783, issued by the *Intendência Geral da Polícia* (General Police Administration), then run by Pina Manique. The system prevailing in Portugal was pioneering in Europe because it combined the spread of receptacles with a great institutional and financial uniformity and with a good oversight by a central public body.

From 1783 municipalities that did not have institutions for receiving foundlings were required to open a house equipped with a *roda* (foundling wheel). It was forbidden to make enquiries as to the identity of the person leaving the infant, which was supposed to make it easier to leave it and avoid the greater evil of infanticide, which, allegedly, was rife in the kingdom, leading to population decline. The political-economic reasons for the measure were made explicit in the law. Foundlings were meant to survive "because they embody the wealth of a State in the multitude of inhabitants." The babies were brought up by outside nurses in their homes until the age of seven; the carers were paid by the town halls. In all the towns where the bringing up of foundlings was run by the *misericórdias* the organisation was also

²² There is a huge body of literature on foundlings. See, overall, for Portugal, I. dos Guimarães Sá, *A circulação de crianças na Europa do Sul: o caso dos expostos do Porto no século XVIII*, Lisboa 1995 (Gulbenkian); M.A. LOPES, *Pobreza, assistência e controlo social em Coimbra (1750-1850)*, I, Viseu 2000 (Palimage), pp. 170-332; M.F. REIS, *Os expostos em Santarém. A acção social da Misericórdia (1691-1710)*, Lisboa 2001 (Cosmos); M.A. LOPES, *Proteção social em Portugal na Idade Moderna*, Coimbra 2010 (Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra), pp. 75-82; 155-161; 193-202.

²³ Cf. *Portugaliae Monumenta Misericordiarum*, 7, cit.

based on sending them to outside nurses. The central authority's peripheral agents were obliged to prepare and send to Lisbon annual lists of entries and deaths of foundlings. New levies were channelled to paying for foundlings. In Lisbon, one third of the lottery from its *Misericórdia*, established in 1783, went to the city's foundlings, and four years later they were given a major financial boost consisting of the allocation of 1/3 of the pious bequests not fulfilled from anywhere in the Portuguese Empire.

At the age of seven the children came under the jurisdiction of the judges of orphans and they had to work for their keep. The judges had to appoint a tutor and accommodate them as servants in exchange for food, clothes and a bed. From the age of twelve the boys and girls were paid a wage. When they were 20 they were emancipated and under the law they were legitimate children. This system, established by the Order of 1783, remained in force until the 1860s.

As we have been stressing, Portugal stood out from the other Catholic countries in that the tutelage of the Church was missing from the welfare/assistance institutions and almost always from their activities, too. In terms of the solution established for foundlings, the difference is striking. In Italy and southern France, where the use of foundling wheels was widespread, confraternities, church bodies or committees of lay and clergy were responsible for bringing up foundlings. In Spain it was wholly in the hands of the Church. In addition, in Portugal foundling wheels were in widespread use in the municipalities, especially after 1783. In Italy, in the same period, they were only to be found in the large cities. And the same happened in Spain, where the foundlings were kept in large establishments in the main cities. Some years after Pina Manique's order, Spain began to regulate assistance to foundlings and increased the number of reception houses, as Portugal had done. But the options differed with respect to the authorities responsible for this branch of assistance: whereas in Portugal this role belonged entirely to the civil authorities, in Spain it was left to the Church, and priests organised the reception of foundlings, under the supervision of the bishops.²⁴

As already mentioned, the revenues reserved for foundlings came from locally collected taxes. Because of the countless tax privileges in force, taxation fell mainly on the most needy. It is clear that in times of economic crisis, people's income fell and this meant less money for foundlings precisely when recourse to legal abandonment became more urgent. And so a vicious circle was created. Greater demand always coincided with a poorer institutional ability to respond. The budgetary difficulties, the shortage of nurses (despite the favours long since granted in order to attract them) provoked by low wages that were often late, the non-supervision of the conduct of the nurses and the absence of foundling wheels in many locations with the result that too many foundlings went to neighbouring institutions, explained why "three quarters of all foundlings" died, according to the conclusions of

²⁴ Cf. B. PULLAN, *Poverty and Charity: Europe, Italy, Venice, 1400-1700*, s.l. 1994 (Variorum), chap. III ("Orphans and foundlings in early modern Europe"); P. CARASA SOTO, *Historia de la beneficencia en Castilla y Leon. Poder y pobreza en la sociedad castellana*, Valladolid 1991 (Universidad de Valladolid); I. DOS GUIMARÃES SÁ, *A circulação de crianças na Europa do Sul...*, cit.; M.L. MARCÍLIO, *História social da criança abandonada*, São Paulo 1998 (Hucitec); T.A. FONTE, *No limiar da honra e da pobreza. A infância desvalida e abandonada no Alto Minho (1698-1924)*, Braga 2004 (Universidade do Minho).

Filipe de Araújo e Castro, charged by the government in 1813 to inspect this public service.²⁵

4. ORPHANAGES

After the foundlings, the orphans were the most vulnerable, because they lacked paternal tutelage. In that period, as explained by the ruling of 23 February 1635, only minors who had no father were regarded as orphans. Loss of the mother had no legal recognition. The state took over the role of father through its judges of orphans, established countrywide. Under Portuguese law, all localities with more than 400 households had to have a judge and clerk of orphans. But for this legal structure what mattered was to protect orphans in their capacity as heirs, so an inventory was taken, a tutor appointed, income and/or wages collected, the orphan was placed in education (if his status warranted) or in a job. The poorest, therefore, the ones who had nothing, escaped the notice of the magistrates.²⁶

The *colégios*, orphanages meant for children (not hostels for adolescent girls and youths) were few and far between and were very small. This form of assistance is notable for royal, private, Episcopal and Jesuit initiatives. Colleges for boys were expensive institutions only possible in the richest *misericórdias* but in these, which favoured hostels for girls and women, there were none. With two exceptions: one in Vila Viçosa, with a very humble 16th-century college, last recorded mention of which dates from 1726²⁷; and one in Coimbra, only founded in 1804, though its establishment was instructed in the will of a canon and university professor in 1786.²⁸ Older than that of Coimbra were the orphanages of Lisbon (16th century), Évora and Porto (17th century). The first was founded by the monarch, the second by a canon and the third was founded in 1651 by a priest who entrusted its administration to the local authority. One another was established in Braga, in 1791, by the archbishop and it was the biggest in Portugal: 21 pupils in 1791, 150 in 1799.²⁹

Although this topic requires deeper study, the few studies in existence suggest that the selection criteria for admission in the colleges sought, above all, to protect a group, preventing social degradation by enabling them, in the absence of the *pater familiae*, to maintain a standing and lifestyle. The aim was not the social elevation of the children, let alone to change a model of society that so often glaringly failed.

Truly innovative was the *Casa Pia* (literally, Pious House), set up by a government body, the *Intendência Geral da Polícia*. Officially inaugurated on 3 July 1780, it

²⁵ F. DE ARAUJO E CASTRO, *Projecto sobre a Administração dos Expostos*, in “O Investigador Portuguez em Inglaterra”, 49-50, 1815, pp. 1-12, 141-181.

²⁶ A.I. MARQUES GUEDES, *Os Colégios dos Meninos Órfãos (séculos XVII-XIX): Évora, Porto e Braga*, Lisboa 2006 (Imprensa de Ciências Sociais), pp. 28-35.

²⁷ M.M. LOBO DE ARAUJO, *Dar aos pobres e emprestar a Deus: as Misericórdias de Vila Viçosa e Ponte de Lima (séculos XVI-XVIII)*, Barcelos/Ponte de Lima 2000 (Misericórdias), pp. 272-282.

²⁸ M.A. LOPES, *Pobreza, assistência e controlo social*, I, cit., pp. 333-388.

²⁹ On these colleges, see J.S. RIBEIRO, *Historia dos Estabelecimentos Científicos Litterarios e Artísticos em Portugal*, II-IV, Lisboa 1872-1874 (Academia Real das Sciencias); A.I. MARQUES GUEDES, *Os Colégios dos Meninos Órfãos*, cit.

had already been up and running for some time. This institution is often viewed as being of fundamental importance as a turning point in the conception of state aid for children. This interpretation is not entirely correct. On the one hand the government was always interested in assisting orphans, to the point of creating orphanages. On the other hand, the *Casa Pia*, whose full name was *Casa Pia da Correção* (Pious House of Correction) was a complex of buildings with many functions and it was founded as a way of combating vagrancy and begging. It received people of both sexes and all ages. Vagrant men and women of bad habits were the first users. Afterwards, because children without family or home commonly roamed the streets of Lisbon, these became the most numerous users. *Casa Pia* was basically a workhouse and only gradually became a place where at-risk children were educated, a conversion which was accomplished when it reopened after the Peninsular War. In terms of taking care of children, it was a pioneering institution and unique for the number of children it took in (795 in 1794), easing of religious practices, importance of professional training, emphasis on education (and very good education, to a higher level for the most talented).³⁰ But the impact of *Casa Pia* was lessened by the failure to open more establishments of the same nature.

For poor boys who were not orphans there was very little institutionalised assistance. In light of the immense needs of the people, the very worst cases were chosen and so children who belonged to a family unit were almost always ignored. No matter how poor he was, the father was their support. Very, very occasionally, however, some *misericórdias* did secure some instruction of poor children whose father was alive.

5. GRANTING WEDDING DOWRIES

The reason and social reach of granting dowries by charitable organisations to poor orphans was based, on the one hand, on the generalised practice of giving a dowry, whether or not formalised by legal deed, and, on the other hand, on the difficulties the poor of both sexes had in terms of getting married. Generally speaking a wedding would impoverish men who lived from their work alone. Marriage and having a family was for them a risk with clearly predictable outcomes. They had to be attracted and compensated with a dowry, no matter how small, that would serve as working capital or to buy work tools and implements. Poor women therefore found it hard to get married, which was even more necessary for them as the survival of a single woman, or worse, one with children, was so problematic. Not because they did not get paid work, but because skilled work was barred to them. The “meagre earnings of a woman” as they said at the time, was a social fact and not in any way an exaggeration to arouse pity. The charitable group saw this clearly and tried to remedy the difficulties of fatherless girls by enabling them to get married, the only morally acceptable way of exercising sexuality and procreation. The directors of the welfare/assistance institutions feared that these women, without the

³⁰ In 1793 *Casa Pia* maintained 59 students at the University of Coimbra, 10 in Rome and 7 in London.

support of a father or husband would easily fall into poverty and, being regarded as the weaker sex by nature (if not actually prone to vice), would quickly head into a sinful life, more lucrative than manual labour. They would therefore only receive the dowry if their conduct up to the wedding was absolutely irreproachable.³¹

By favouring a poor girl with a dowry, honoured and orphaned (no father and mother or only without a father, or being a foundling), the chief purpose was to safeguard her morals, not to solve economic hardship or suffering. That is, social discipline. The institution of dowries is thus one that most clearly shows the true objectives of assistance: not to alleviate economic indigence but to prevent moral indigence. But in addition to this basic reason, there were other motives behind granting dowries: the dowries bestowed to “orphans of the king,” those from the *Recolhimento do Castelo* in Lisbon represented a clear colonisation strategy: the orphaned girls, who had lost their fathers in the service of the Crown, went to India or Brazil with dowries which could be posts in the colonial service for whoever they married, thereby promoting the establishment of an elite Portuguese presence in the foreign territories.³² Sometimes the creation of dowries could mean protection for relatives or a local community, when the institutors imposed the choice of kin or persons from a particular village.

Although the endowment of orphaned girls was not one of the 14 works of mercy, the *Santas Casas* committed themselves to this kind of assistance and gave several dowries each year. The money came from bequests which, from the second half of the 17th century, increasingly favoured this mode of assistance. The institution of perpetual endowments required the allocation of considerable capital for the purpose, invested in loan activity that would ensure stable income. It was mostly private individuals (men and women) who created the dowries, but they gave its management and distribution to the *misericórdias*, or else to bishops, chapters, confraternities and third orders.

³¹ On the granting of dowries to impoverished orphan girls by other *misericórdias*, see, among others, A.J.R. RUSSELL-WOOD, *Fidalgos e filantropos*, cit., pp. 133-152; I. DRUMOND BRAGA, *A Misericórdia de Ceuta e a protecção às donzelas 1580-1640*, in *Congresso Internacional de História, Missionação Portuguesa e Encontro de Culturas*, III, Braga 1993, pp. 455-463; M.A. LOPES, *Pobreza, assistência e controlo social*, I, cit., pp. 803-876; M.M. LOBO DE ARAÚJO, *Pobres, honradas e virtuosas: os dotes de D. Francisco e a Misericórdia de Ponte de Lima (1650-1850)*, Ponte de Lima 2000 (Misericórdia de Ponte de Lima); A. MAGALHÃES RIBEIRO, *Práticas de caridade na Misericórdia de Viana da Foz do Lima (séculos XVI-XVIII)*, Braga 2009 (Universidade do Minho), pp. 883-919; M.A. LOPES, *Protecção social em Portugal na Idade Moderna*, cit., pp. 89-95, 175-184; *Tomar estado: dotes e casamentos (séculos XVI-XIX)*, M.M. LOBO DE ARAÚJO, A. ESTEVES eds., Braga 2010 (CITCEM).

³² T.J. COATES, *Degredados e Órfãos: colonização dirigida pela Coroa no império português (1550- 1755)*, Lisboa 1998 (CNCDP).

6. HOSTELS

Hostels were meant for female orphans, widows, female ashamed poor and “wayward.”³³ They were institutions that sheltered laywomen who did not take the veil but live in a community whose daily life resembled that of convent life.

There were two kinds of hostels, those of the honoured and those of the penitents, the latter often devoted to Saint Mary Magdalene. Though dating from earlier times, they emerged in strength all over Catholic Europe after the Council of Trent. They were one of the mechanisms used by the ecclesiastical, civil and family authorities to control the destiny of women in order to combat what they regarded as female social marginalisation, synonymous with moral degradation, that is, sexual freedom. It was one of the normalisation strategies to prevent social deviation, with the internment of girls and young women, or punishing it by gathering those who by choice or involuntarily fell into socially reprehensible circumstances.

The hostels could simply be meant to shelter honoured women, and here it was very important to select the clientele. Sandra Cavallo, alluding to the women interned in hostels in Turin, identifies them with the elites falling into poverty. Their individual conduct is not to be reprimanded, but they were sheltered so that their poverty would not dishonour the family.³⁴ Something similar occurred in Santarém, when the queen D. Maria Francisca de Sabóia authorised the Third Order of St Francis to establish a hostel for women in “high poverty” because there was no shelter in the town “where women of quality and the utmost poverty could stay”³⁵. The same thing happened in Viana do Castelo, with a hostel for impoverished noblewomen.³⁶ The hostel in Ponta Delgada (Azores) was slightly different. It was set up in the 17th century for highly virtuous women in the hope that it might later change and become a convent.³⁷ This often happened in Brazil where the royal charter of 2 September 1603 forbade the founding of convents in the captaincies of Pernambuco and Bahia. The white population got round the ban by opening hostels authorised in the same law but which had rules and ways of life very similar to

³³ For information on hostels in mainland Portugal and its overseas territories, see I. DRUMOND BRAGA, *A Misericórdia de Ceuta e a protecção às donzelas*, cit.; L. Mezan ALGRANTI, *Honradas e devotas: mulheres da colônia. Condição feminina nos conventos e recolhimentos do Sudeste do Brasil, 1750-1822*, Rio de Janeiro 1993 (José Olympio); M.A. LOPES, *Pobreza, Assistência e Controlo Social*, cit., I, pp. 374-388, 485-523; L. MENDES GANDELMAN, *Mulheres para um Império: órfãs e caridade nos recolhimentos femininos da Santa Casa da Misericórdia (Salvador, Rio de Janeiro e Porto - século XVIII)*, Campinas 2005 (Universidade de Campinas); A. MAGALHÃES RIBEIRO, *Práticas de caridade na Misericórdia de Viana*, cit., pp. 847-882.

³⁴ S. CAVALLO, *Charity and Power in Early Modern Italy. Benefactors and their Motives in Turin, 1541-1789*, Cambridge 1995 (Cambridge University Press), p. 254.

³⁵ M.F. REIS, *Os expostos em Santarém*, cit., p. 70.

³⁶ A. MAGALHÃES RIBEIRO, *Práticas de caridade na Misericórdia de Viana*, cit., p. 848.

³⁷ A.T. MATOS, *Vivências, comportamentos e percursos das recolhidas de Santa Bárbara de Ponta Delgada nos séculos XVII a XX*, in *Colóquio Comemorativo dos 450 Anos da cidade de Ponta Delgada*, Ponta Delgada 1999 (Universidade dos Açores), pp. 141-152.

those of the convents.³⁸ In some cases the lifelong internment could be due to family strategies, to keep women from their inheritance.

The hostels for penitents were intended for women with deviant sexual behaviour or at risk of adopting it. They were mostly under episcopal administration, while the *misericórdias* tended to open hostels for orphan girls.

In terms of social status and levels of poverty of the refugees clientele, we must conclude that these women came from all social groups, varying from hostel to hostel. As happened with the orphanages versus foundlings, the numbers of women protected in hostels was small compared with those that were given dowries. We would also maintain that the hostels show that the boundaries between beneficence and repression could be very ambiguous indeed.³⁹

7. CONFRATERNITIES AND THIRD ORDERS

Confraternities or brotherhoods proliferated in Portugal just as they did throughout the Catholic world⁴⁰ and as did, to a lesser extent, the third orders.⁴¹ The confraternities could be lay or religious, with the lay ones being controlled by the bishop only on the spiritual plane. From 1604 the Church obliged the confraternities to formalise their creation and get the approval of the bishops, but under royal provisions of 5 February 1693 and 20 January 1740, the ecclesiastical visitors were banned from interfering in the accounts of the lay confraternities. This was not fully observed. Throughout the second half of the 18th century we find several

³⁸ L. MEZAN ALGRANTI, *Livros de devoção, atos de censura. Ensaio de história do livro e da leitura na América Portuguesa (1750-1821)*, São Paulo 2004 (Hucitec), p. 28.

³⁹ For information on the day-to-day violence imposed on the sheltered women, see M.A. LOPES, *Pobreza, Assistência e Controlo Social*, cit., I, pp. 451-485, 498-522; EADEM, *Repressão de comportamentos femininos numa comunidade de mulheres – uma luta perdida no Recolhimento da Misericórdia de Coimbra (1702-1743)*, in “Revista Portuguesa de História”, 37, 2005, pp. 189-229. Available at <https://estudogeral.sib.uc.pt/>

⁴⁰ For information on the Portuguese confraternities in the Modern Age, see, among others, G. MOTA, *A Irmandade da Senhora do Carmo da Marmeleira - Mortágua (primeira metade do século XVIII)*, in “Revista de História das Ideias”, 9, 1987, n. 2, pp. 267-308; P. PENTEADO, *Confrarias*, in *História Religiosa de Portugal*, 2, *Humanismos e Reformas*, ed. C. MOREIRA AZEVEDO, Lisboa 2000 (Círculo de Leitores), pp. 323-334; M.F. REIS, *Santarém no tempo de D. João V. Administração, sociedade e cultura*, Lisboa 2005 (Colibri); M.M. LOBO DE ARAUJO, *A Confraria de Nossa Senhora do Porto de Ave. Um itinerário sobre a religiosidade popular do Baixo Minho*, Póvoa de Lanhoso 2006 (Confraria de Nossa Senhora do Porto de Ave) and other articles by the same author.

⁴¹ Studies on the Portuguese Third Orders are scarce. See I. AMORIM, E. JESUS, C. RÊGO, *Mulher e religião na época moderna. A Ordem Terceira de S. Francisco, um modelo de sociabilidade religiosa*, in “Portuguese Studies Review”, 13, 2005, nn. 1-2, pp. 369-399; C. RÊGO, E. JESUS, I. AMORIM, *Uma confraria urbana à sombra de um espaço conventual - os Irmãos da Ordem Terceira de S. Francisco do Porto - espiritualidade e sociabilidade (1663-1720; 1699-1730)*, in *Em torno dos espaços religiosos - monásticos e eclesiais*, I. AMORIM, H. OSSWALD, A. POLÓNIA eds., Porto 2005 (IHM-UP), pp. 111-133; J. DE MELLO MORAES, *O hospício da Ordem Terceira franciscana nos sertões da América portuguesa, século XVIII*, in “Noroeste. Revista de História”, 3, 2007, pp. 405-419; J. DE MELLO MORAES, *Viver em penitência: os irmãos terceiros franciscanos e as suas associações*, Braga e São Paulo (1672-1822), Braga 2009 (Universidade do Minho).

incidents of confrontation between Church and Crown for the jurisdiction over these institutions.⁴²

Very old brotherhoods of mediaeval origin live side by side with more recent ones and they often sprang up and vanished with remarkable speed. Most of the modern confraternities were based in their own churches or in parish churches, where several could co-exist, but there were some in monasteries, colleges, hospitals and even in other confraternities, including *misericórdias*. They mostly worshipped the Souls in Purgatory, Our Lady of the Rosary and the Blessed Sacrament.

It was possible, and common, to belong to several confraternities, in which they differed from the *misericórdias*. People of all social levels were generally accepted, clergy and lay, women, men of colour, New Christians and they had no *numerus clausus*, which once again, set them apart from the *misericórdias* and ensured that they would be sought out by everyone excluded from the *Santas Casas*. In the colonies, especially Brazil, the confraternities of white men, slaves and freed slaves multiplied and there was nothing comparable in the Dutch, French or English colonial empires.⁴³ It is clear that joining a confraternity was closely linked to people's fear of the Beyond and their quest for comfort and protection, but there were other, more concrete reasons, that explained their proliferation throughout the country and its empire: less social selectivity than the *misericórdias*, open to women, granting of indulgences, spiritual and material support offered to confreres, help with loans, guarantee of a solemn funeral and prayers for the soul, a sense of belonging, chance to socialise and take part in actions organised by these bodies, and so forth. One factor that favoured the multiplicity of confraternities in a single community was the possibility of belonging to several at the same time. This had several attractions: growth of indulgences and promises of prayers for the soul and huge funeral processions, more possibilities of receiving cash loans, expansion of social life and exercise of influence... which obviously meant enhancing a person's prestige.

As in the *misericórdias*, income came from alms, rents and, more and more, interest from loans granted. The brotherhoods experienced economic problems in the second half of the 18th century, for the same reasons as the *misericórdias*. They overspent on cult festivals, they fell into the hands of bad debtors, they accumulated too many masses in the 18th century and, when they could not fulfil them, requests were sent to Rome for papal letters to reduce them. Many of them merged in order to survive. The number of confraternities declined throughout Catholic Europe in the 18th century. In Portugal, many of them were absorbed by the *misericórdias*, that normally came about through local will, mostly in the 16th and 17th centuries.

Important foci of social life, the confraternities remained very active for the whole of the period under consideration, since they had a much denser network than the *misericórdias*. Though there were exceptions to this, charitable acts of the

⁴² Cf. M.A. LOPES, *A intervenção da Coroa nas instituições de protecção social de 1750 a 1820*, in "Revista de História das Ideias", 29, 2008, pp. 131-176.

⁴³ C.R. BOXER, *The Portuguese Seaborne Empire, 1415-1825*, s.l. 1973 (Penguin Books), p. 296.

confraternities were not directed to the communities to which they belonged. But since the members were numerous we cannot rule out mutual help within them.

Charity was not, also, the chief mission of the third orders. They practised it, but only for the brothers, and the wealthiest opened hostels, schools and important hospitals that were reserved for the members of the order. But their main goal was the spiritual refinement of their members. The third orders were successful, as borne out by the proliferation of these institutions and increase in the number of brothers from the end of the 17th century and during the 18th. They multiplied because there was no *numerus clausus*, the brothers were not split into two categories, women and social groups excluded by the *miseriórdias* could join but, at the same time, there were selection criteria and this made them tools of social recognition. Since they also gave loans their members benefited from preference. Other incentives to join them were eagerness to achieve a more Christian life, the indulgences, the privileges and mutual help in times of sickness and poverty. All these reasons could also apply to many confraternities, but the growing prestige and wealth of the third orders made them more attractive at a time when a lot of confraternities were struggling with financial issues.

8. AND WHAT ABOUT THE CHURCH'S WELFARE ACTION?

When I talk about the role of the Church in welfare/assistance, this means the activity of the Church as an institution, in the sense of hierarchy and ecclesiastical policy, embracing the initiatives and part played by bishops, chapters, religious orders and other influential bodies such as collegiate church or major monasteries. It does not seem justifiable to include in the action of the Church the individual initiatives of clerics who had no responsibilities for running the Church and who, cumulatively, when they founded certain forms of assistance, they did not entrust them to the ecclesiastical structures.

We know that bishops, convents and priests gave out alms (to be an almoner was always an ideal proposed by the Church to whose canon its members would agree), that the priests were the natural informers of the charitable institutions, that some male religious orders dedicated themselves to hospital care and that some bishops founded hostels and colleges (which, as things stand, seem to be their most relevant initiatives). But it should be noted that hostels and colleges did not set out to protect the common poor; they aimed, as with the distribution of dowries to orphan girls, which some bishops also undertook, to achieve spiritual goals. And is it not symptomatic of the key role of the *miseriórdias* that the rich clerics, especially the canons, when they left their fortunes for "social" works they entrusted them to the *miseriórdias*? Why not to the Bishops, Chapters, convents or parishes?

What I wrote at the end of a synthesis on assistance and health care in Portugal in the 18th and 19th centuries remains valid: "The absence of the Catholic Church in this text has probably caused surprise, but, in fact, its role in relief in Portugal was marginal. The Church did not control the most numerous and most important relief institutions, nor did it take any relevant initiatives, although throughout these two centuries the charitable class always considered the Catholic doctrine of charity

to be sublime. The *misericórdias* could include clergymen within their members and acted within the spirit of the Catholic doctrine, which really inspired their action, but they were lay institutions. In 1857 the first [feminine] religious order dedicated to relief was introduced (the Sisters of Charity), but its presence generated such dispute that the nuns had to leave the country five years later. The presence of monastic orders in Portugal, despite being illegal, increased gradually from this decade onwards, but it was only in 1880s that the Sisters of Charity and the Sisters of the Hospital began to act in some provincial hospitals, which also provoked violent disagreement.”⁴⁴

There was however, one important form of assistance provided by a religious order: ransoming captives. But here, too, under the strict control of the Crown.

9. RANSOMING OF CAPTIVES

The problem of captive-taking, Christians of Muslims and vice-versa was one of the outcomes of the almost total lack of understanding between Christianity and Islam. In the Iberian Peninsula, where Moors were present until 1492, the issue became quite specific, from the standpoints of geographic proximity and the knowledge of the attitudes of the Christians by the Moors, and in terms of religious discussion.

Despite trade and some diplomatic contacts, especially from the 18th century,⁴⁵ the commonest circumstance was war, either open or latent, between the two camps who saw in one another their enemy of choice. It was thus easy to be free one moment and a captive the next⁴⁶ for any Christian who lived on the coast, engaged in any seafaring activity, travelled by sea, journeyed to Muslim lands, lived near the kingdom of Granada (until 1492), or even for those who, after 1415, lived in North Africa under Portuguese or Castilian rule or took part in military campaigns. In fact, although these variables were not of equal weight – sea voyages and fishing accounted for over half the captives taken in Europe in the Modern Era⁴⁷ – they were among the possibilities that led to Christians being taken prisoner by the Muslims.

⁴⁴ M.A. LOPES, *Poor Relief, Social Control and Health Care in 18th and 19th Century Portugal*, in *Health Care and Poor Relief in 18th and 19th Southern Europe*, O.P. GRELL, A. CUNNINGHAM, B. ROECK eds., s.l. 2005 (Ashgate Publishing), p. 160.

⁴⁵ I. DRUMOND BRAGA, *Missões Diplomáticas entre Portugal e o Magrebe no século XVIII. Os Relatos de Frei João de Sousa*, Lisboa 2008 (Centro de Estudos Históricos da Universidade Nova de Lisboa); E.-M. VON KEMNITZ, *Portugal e o Magrebe (séculos XVIII-XIX). Pragmatismo, Inovação e Conhecimento nas Relações Diplomáticas*, Lisboa 2010 (Instituto Diplomático).

⁴⁶ I. DRUMOND BRAGA, *Entre a Cristandade e o Islão. Cativos e Renegados nas Franjas de duas Sociedades em Confronto*, Ceuta 1998 (Instituto de Estudios Ceutíes, Ciudad Autónoma de Ceuta), pp. 19-49.

⁴⁷ Cf. E.G. FRIEDMAN, *Spanish Captives in North Africa in the Early Modern Age*, Madison 1983 (University of Wisconsin Press), p. 14; C. LARQUIÉ, *Le Commerce des Hommes en Méditerranée au milieu du XVII^e siècle*, in *Atti del IV Congresso Internazionale di Studi Storici. Rapporti Genova, Mediterraneo, Atlantico nell'Età Moderna*, Génova 1990 (Università di Genova), p. 399; I. DRUMOND BRAGA, *Entre a Cristandade e o Islão*, cit., p. 20.

Prisoners had two choices: to keep their faith or renounce it.⁴⁸ The situation was dire for most captives because of what they had to do,⁴⁹ the bans they suffered (in particular practising their religion), even though in some places they were helped by members of religious orders, and there were other problems, too: use of chains (to prevent escape or make it harder), scanty food, poor care in the event of sickness, kept in dungeons or shelters shared with animals and, sometimes, ill-treatment including physical or verbal violence.⁵⁰

The Church was thus faced with the issue of how to ransom these captives. In the 12th century the military orders undertook some rescues,⁵¹ but the scale and specificity of the problem led to the emergence of congregations with a calling for redemption. Against this background there arose the Order of the Holy Trinity of the Redemption of Captives,⁵² at the end of the twelfth century; and the Order of Our Lady of Mercies,⁵³ in the next one. The Order, approved in 1198 by Innocent III⁵⁴, was founded by the charismatic John of Matha, from Provence, and it was first established in Cerfroid⁵⁵ and later in Marseille.⁵⁶ It was this house that was the ransom centre for southern France. Thanks to the papal and royal support the Trinitarians expanded quickly to various parts of Europe and the Order was regarded as the leading humanitarian organisation to be born under Christianity during the crusade and holy war of the 12th century.⁵⁷

⁴⁸ On those who took this option cf. B. and L. BENASSAR, *Los Cristianos de Alá. La Fascinante Aventura de los Renegados*, tradução de José Luis Gil Aristu, Madrid 1989 (Nerea); A. GONZÁLEZ-RAYMOND, *La Croix et le Croissant. Les Inquisiteurs des Iles face à l' Islam 1550-1700*, Paris 1992 (CNRS); M. GARCÍA-ARENAL, M.A. DE BUNES, *Los Españoles y el Norte de Africa. Siglos XV-XVIII*, Madrid 1992 (Mapfre), pp. 238-255; I. DRUMOND BRAGA, *Entre a Cristandade e o Islão*, cit., pp. 95-141.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 54-60.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 61-68.

⁵¹ J.J. GROSS, *The Trinitarian Order's Apostolate of the Ransom of Christian Captives and Work of Mercy during the First Centuries of its History: a Special Consideration of the Communities Located in the Interior of the European Continent and in Great Britain, in Captivis Libertas. Congresso dell' Apostolato Redentivo-Misericordioso dell' Ordine Trinitario*, I, Rome 1982 (Centro Trinitario di Rocca di Papa), pp. 51-82; A.J. FOREY, *The Military Orders and the Ransoming of Captives from Islam (Twelfth to Early Fourteenth Centuries)*, in "Studia Monastica", 33, 1991, n. 2, pp. 259-279.

⁵² I. VIZCARGUENGA, *Los Orígenes de la Orden Trinitaria*, in *Las dos Ordenes Redentoras en la Iglesia. Actas del I Encuentro Trinitario-Mercedario*, Madrid 1989 (s.n.), pp. 9-35.

⁵³ J. DEVESA, *Los Orígenes de la Orden de Nuestra Señora de la Merced*, in *Las dos Ordenes Redentoras*, cit., pp. 37-52; A. GERHARDS, *Rachat de Captives (ordres voués au)*, in *Dictionnaire Historique des Ordres Religieux*, s.l. 1998 (Fayard), pp. 495-496.

⁵⁴ On this pontificate and on questions of redemption in this period, cf. G. CIPOLLONE, *Cristianità-Islam. Cattività e Liberazione in Nome di Dio. Il Tempo di Innocenzo III dopo 'il 1187'*, Rome 1992 (Pontificia Università Gregoriana), pp. 135, 325-392.

⁵⁵ IDEM, *Studi Intorno a Cerfroid prima Casa dell'Ordine Trinitario (1198-1429)*, Rome 1978.

⁵⁶ IDEM, *La Casa della Santa Trinità di Marseglia (1202-1547). Prima Fondazione sul Mare dell'Ordine Trinitario*, Vatican City 1981.

⁵⁷ A. GERHARDS, *Rachat de Captives (ordres voués au)*, in *Dictionnaire Historique des Ordres Religieux*, cit., pp. 493-495.

The Trinitarians came to Portugal in 1207 and founded their first house in Santarém.⁵⁸ Ransoms started the following year, in Iberia.⁵⁹ The Order later extended to other parts of the territory, including Ceuta and Tangier, from 1568. The Trinitarians were protected by the king, though they embarked on a collision course with the crown in the reign of D. Afonso V (1438-1481). The monarch, almost certainly thinking of the large sums of money that changed hands in ransoms, took that task to the Crown by setting up the Court of Captives in 1461. But in the meantime an amicable agreement was sealed with the Order. There was a redemption administrator, appointed by the Crown, who dealt with the money side of matters, and at the same time the Trinitarians were prevented from soliciting funds for captives. The members of the order were able to deliver the indulgences granted for the ransoms and to receive a certain amount from the Crown for the upkeep of the two convents that existed at the time. This was all revoked in 1561 during the regency of D. Catarina. A new agreement was established. The Order was solely responsible for redemption and the procession and publication of the ransom. Furthermore, the Order was given 80,000 *reais* a year for sustenance, they obtained a licence to ask for alms for works on their houses and had to appoint two members to work with two redemption officials to reach an understanding on ransom issues. The general would further nominate two redeemers to travel to Islam. The Crown was responsible for issuing orders to execute ransoms and for paying for them.⁶⁰

Between 1557 and 1778 (year of the last ransom of the 18th century) the Portuguese Trinitarians secured over 14,000 captives in 47 attempted redemptions and 45 ones accomplished. The number of captives acquired in the ransoms of 1559, in Algeria, of 1578, in Alcácer-Quibir, and of 1625 in Salé, is not known, but it would certainly increase that number.⁶¹ And we have to add to these figures the private ransom deals, the Exchange of Muslims for Christians and even those undertaken by Jesuits and Mercedarians (especially via Castile), despite the theoretical monopoly of the Trinitarians, and not to mention the few successful escapes.⁶² The second half of the 16th century alone saw more than 20 campaigns, securing over 8,500 people – we must not forget the defeat at Alcácer-Quibir and the exceptional rise in the number of captives taken – but the number of ransoms fell substantially in the next centuries.

⁵⁸ For information on the establishing of the Trinitarians, cf. G. CIPOLLONE, *Il Portogallo, Punto Strategico dell' Opera di Riscatti dei Trinitari (XIII-XV)*, in *Congresso Internacional Bartolomeu Dias e a sua Época. Actas*, V, Porto 1989 (Universidade do Porto), pp. 589-603.

⁵⁹ M.Â. BEIRANTE, *O Resgate dos Cativos nos Reinos de Portugal e Algarve (séculos XII-XV)*, in *Actas das III Jornadas de História Medieval do Algarve e Andaluzia*, [Loulé] 1989 (Câmara Municipal de Loulé), pp. 273-282; Edite C.M. ALBERTO, *As Instituições de Resgate de Cativos em Portugal. Sua Estrutura e Funcionamento no século XV*, Lisboa 1994 (Universidade Nova de Lisboa), pp. 66-71.

⁶⁰ I. DRUMOND BRAGA, *Entre a Cristandade e o Islão*, cit., pp. 163-165.

⁶¹ Frei J. DE SÃO JOSÉ, *Historia Chronologica da Esclarecida Ordem da S.S. Trindade Redempção de Cativos, da Provincia de Portugal*, Lisboa 1794 (Simão Tadeu Ferreira), I, pp. 531-535, 583-601; II, pp. 57-67, 162-176, 207, 277-279, 338-343, 428-473, 500-506.

⁶² I. DRUMOND BRAGA, *Entre a Cristandade e o Islão*, cit., pp. 203-231. For information on private ransoms involving subjects from Castile and Aragon, cf. M. GARCÍA-ARENAL, M.A. DE BUNES, *Los Españoles y el Norte de Africa*, cit., pp. 274-275.

The huge, but always inadequate, effort made to raise funds to ransom as many people as possible must be stressed. Donations were made early on, with a view to ransoming captives, and this is related to the development of the works of mercy in the 12th century.⁶³ But the sources of income broadened and measures were taken by the Crown to improve collection of these revenues. Among the first we find solicitations, donations, bequests; the second included the legal provision that the inheritances of intestates without direct heirs would revert to the redemption of prisoners, along with assets found to have no owner and even sums yielded by the imposition of certain punishments.⁶⁴

On the one hand, we have a lack of funds for redemption and the diversion of money for prisoners to other kinds of works, whether or not assistance, on the other hand we must mention the necessary and complex financial arrangements required, plus the subjection to the whims of those holding the captives and the market laws. The redeemers not only did not acquire the captives they wanted at the price they hoped for, they also had to disregard the rules and other royal instructions and ransom the prisoners offered to them by the holders according to Muslim hierarchy. They thus ended up by buying foreigners, the old and the sick, at prices which fluctuated depending on the characteristics of the prisoner (sex, age, status and physical condition), the place, the time and the political and economic circumstances. Ransoms shifted vast amounts of money and entered the realm of high finance,⁶⁵ requiring the purchase of passports for the redeemers, the purchase of gifts to attract the local lords, insurance for the goods and cash transported and even taking out loans if the money was not enough. Ransoms thus seemed to be valuable deals for merchants and sundry intermediaries, both European and Muslim, and even Jews living in North Africa.

10. INTERVENTION BY THE ENLIGHTENED CROWN

In the overall view he outlines for the southern European countries Andrew Cunningham says: “With respect to health care and poor relief this [Napoleon’s invasion] meant in practice removing the Catholic Church from any role in health care and poor relief,” adding that, after their expulsion, there occurred “the restoration of the *status quo ante*.”⁶⁶ Nothing like this happened in Portugal.

The *misericórdias*, hospitals and foundlings were under immediate royal protection, which was often invoked by both the government and the institutions, to defend themselves from the greed of other bodies. Until the mid 18th century, very little was heard of royal tutelage, but this changed in the reign of D. José when the

⁶³ M.J.P. FERRO TAVARES, *Pobreza e Morte em Portugal na Idade Média*, cit., p. 84.

⁶⁴ For information on sources of income for ransoms and the public servants linked to this issue, cf. I. DRUMOND BRAGA, *Entre a Cristandade e o Islão*, cit., pp. 169-199.

⁶⁵ Cf. E. SOLA CASTAÑO, *Los que van y vienen. Marineros, Espías y Rescatadores de Cautivos en la Frontera Mediterránea*, in *Renegados, Viajeros y Tránsfugas. Comportamientos Heterodoxos y de Frontera en el siglo XVI*, Madrid 2000 (Fugaz), pp. 61-69.

⁶⁶ A. CUNNINGHAM, *Some Closing and Opening Remarks*, in *Health Care and Poor Relief*, cit., p. 4.

Crown started to interfere in a big way. This continued for the next two reigns (D. Maria I and D. João VI).

What matters here is to draw attention to something I showed in an earlier work:⁶⁷ the continued interest by the Crown in ensuring the conditions needed for the *misericórdias*, hospitals and foundling homes to function, which it did not show to the confraternities and third orders. I am not saying, of course, that assistance/welfare had been a key concern of the royal power, but I do believe that the matter was not overlooked in the last three reigns of the Portuguese *Ancien Régime*, although the motivations were more political-economic than social in nature.

There is one intervention, in particular, in the functioning of the *misericórdias*, from the 1750s. At first, Pombal did not seem to intend to protect these confraternities. On the contrary, he saw them as a great source of funds to pursue his economic goals. Afterward he acted to make them viable. The *misericórdias* were largely ruined by corruption, irregularities, debt defaults and too many pious obligations. The Crown neither got rid of them nor ignored the problem. The creation of conditions for a sound financial footing, strictly and systematically controlled by the central authority, was the solution found and it came to be a normal practice. On the death of king D. José, in 1777, it was taken for granted and became more pronounced in the following reigns.

The Pombaline measures aimed at the Lisbon *Misericórdia* from the 1760s displayed complete continuity and coherence and amounted to a true reform of social protection in the capital of the Empire. The Marquis of Pombal also intervened directly in the leading hospitals, which had eluded the *misericórdias*. He thoroughly reformed them and where applicable, he removed the male religious orders from them. He supported the *santas casas* which invested in building large hospitals. This minister was further responsible for reforming the assistance provided to foundlings in Lisbon and for setting up the General Police Administration, from which two major novelties emerged: the *Casa Pia* in Lisbon and the national reform of the protection of foundlings, in 1783. Finally, the Pombaline legal revolution of testamentary law and measures against amortisation affected the institutions in general, particularly ecclesiastical ones, but they assured the economic viability of the *misericórdias*, hospitals and foundling homes. The legislator encountered two antagonistic government problems. First, indiscriminate gifts had to be restricted, since they amortised assets and revenues which seriously harmed the economic stimulation of the kingdom and its tax revenues, and, whenever possible, the assets thus amortised had to be recovered for the Crown; second, it was seen that private revenues had to be secured to address social needs for which the *misericórdias*, hospitals and foundling wheels were responsible. Hence, the creation of privileges, always hedged about with provisos, granted to these institutions, showing that the state deemed them irreplaceable.

The action taken by Pombal and the ministers in the reigns of D. Maria and D. João became part of a general policy that is seen throughout enlightened Catholic Europe, with its preoccupation with centralism, regalism, economic development, education and, at least at the level of proclamations, the well-being of the vassals.

⁶⁷ M.A. LOPES, *A intervenção da Coroa nas instituições de protecção social*, cit.

The preambles to the Pombal's laws were doctrinal and justificatory, and did not shrink from summoning examples from abroad. When the law of 9.9.1769 banned friars and nuns from inheriting (arguing that if they were dead to the world they could not reappear to claim legacies), it based itself expressly on the "Amortisation laws lately published in Naples, Milan, Parma, Venice, Bavaria and Lucca."⁶⁸ There was no reference to Spain, since the most significant royal offensive came later,⁶⁹ as was also largely true in Austria.⁷⁰

As social protection in Portugal was not in the hands of the Church – not tutelage, not resources, not implementation (with the provisos already mentioned) – Portuguese Enlightened regalism saw no need to curtail its influence in this field, as happened in Austria, Spain and some Italian states. Despite this, these countries did not leave the Church out when it came to organising assistance/welfare.

Austria had its political Enlightenment under King Joseph II (1780-90). He went ahead with welfare reform by centralising it, but the eventual solution was a compromise between State and Church. Indeed, although the convents were suppressed, thousands of confraternities dissolved and the rest controlled, the system put in place in his hereditary realm was based on cooperation with the priests who targeted assistance in the parishes.⁷¹ "In practice, a bewildering array of private, ecclesiastical and municipal poor relief institutions continued to exist side by side at the local level [...] and it was only after 1850 that a gradual process of centralisation became visible."⁷²

A glance shows that what happened in some Italian states, apart from the papal domains where the pope was also king. In Parma, in spite of being one of the first politically Enlightened states, it was only under Napoleon that the clergy were removed from running the central hospital.⁷³ The same happened in Bologna, where welfare/assistance was controlled by men of the Church through confraternities and parishes.⁷⁴ In Turin, the *Compagnia di San Paolo* (founded in 1563) was vital to assistance⁷⁵ and in the 17th century the Church authorities, in particular the arch-

⁶⁸ Removal of the ability of friars and nuns to inherit was also backed by the mediaeval Portuguese law and by "good Reason".

⁶⁹ For instance, see, *Desamortización y Hacienda Pública*, Madrid 1986 (Ministerio de Agricultura y Ministerio de Economía); P. CARASA SOTO, *Historia de la beneficencia*, cit.; *La desamortización en la Península Ibérica*, ed. G. RUEDA HERNANZ, Madrid 1993 (Marcial Pons); G. DUFOUR, *Lumières et Illustration en Espagne sous les règnes de Charles III et de Charles IV (1759-1808)*, Paris 2006 (Ellipses).

⁷⁰ See, for instance, J. BÉRENGER, *Joseph II serviteur de l'État*, Paris 2007 (Fayard).

⁷¹ M. SCHEUTZ, *Demand and Charitable Supply: Poverty and Poor Relief in Austria in the 18th and 19th Centuries*, in *Health Care and Poor Relief*, cit., pp. 62-64.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁷³ D. GENTILCORE, *Poor Relief, Enlightenment Medicine and the Protomedicato of Parma, 1748-1820*, in *Health Care and Poor Relief*, cit., pp. 187-203

⁷⁴ G. POMATA, *Medicine for the Poor in 18th and 19th Century Bologna*, in *Health Care and Poor Relief*, cit., pp. 229-241.

⁷⁵ Cf. *Per una Storia della Compagnia di San Paolo (1563-1853)*, ed. W.E. CRIVELINN, B. SIGNORELLI, Turin 2004 (Compagnia di San Paolo); *Le figlie della Compagnia. Casa del Soccorso, Opera del Deposito, Educatorio Duchessa Isabella fra Età Moderna e Contemporanea*, ed. A. CANTALUPPI, W.E. CRIVELINN, B. SIGNORELLI, Turin 2011 (Compagnia di San Paolo).

bishop, undertook the management of the charity system.⁷⁶ Regalist royal politics came here early, in the first half of the 18th century, but Victor Amadeus II retained considerable interaction between State, Church and private individuals with respect to assistance, and entrusted its reform to the Jesuits.⁷⁷ In Naples the poor were confined in an institution founded by Charles VII (future Charles III of Spain) in 1751, and there were large hospitals in the kingdom where, as in many other regions, religious orders prevailed. The central authority did not directly promote relief organisations, but it strengthened control of their management.⁷⁸

In Castile and León, a period in the Renaissance when secularisation took hold to some extent, was followed by the 17th century Church Counter-reformation reaction. Here, too, the enlightened despotism of Charles III (1759-1788) did not dispense with the collaboration of the Church. In Spain, efforts focused on dealing with vagrancy with perpetrators being kept in hospices that were set up in nearly dioceses. This reform was operated through the Church (people, resources and organisation). Charles IV (1798-1808) undertook the confiscation of the assets of hospitals, hospices, confraternities and pious works in general, maybe with results of around 15 to 20% in the charitable institutions. But the Spanish monarchy mobilised the bishops for the welfare services (hospices, hospitals, foundling homes). The nineteenth century liberalism in Spain thus had to dismantle the welfare system controlled by the Church.⁷⁹

But none of this happened in Portugal. Simply because it was not necessary. The Portuguese monarchs who ruled from 1750 to 1820 disciplined, rationalised, and set priorities in the functioning of the *misericórdias*, hospitals and foundling homes, but retained the existing institutional framework (whose assets were not confiscated) because, in fact, these establishments were under control. The *misericórdias* (but not the confraternities) were held to be able to ensure assistance. Provided, of course, that they followed the dictates of the central authority, like all good vassals. When the Constitutional Monarchy was established in 1820, since the country lacked the means to create a new welfare/assistance system from scratch, and since what was in place was based on a well-distributed network of *misericórdias* – non-ecclesiastical institutions, well-embedded in local habits, enjoying financial resources and always under the tutelage of the Crown – the new constitutional order regarded them as irreplaceable, the cornerstones of the national charity system. A role that they were to fulfil in the Parliamentary Monarchy (1820-1910), in the 1st Republic (1910-1926) and in the Dictatorship (1926-1974).⁸⁰

⁷⁶ S. CAVALLO, *Charity and Power*, cit., pp. 118-120.

⁷⁷ G. FARRELL-VINAY, *Welfare Provision in Piedmont*, in *Health Care and Poor Relief*, cit., pp. 250-279.

⁷⁸ B. MARIN, *Poverty, Relief and Hospitals in Naples in the 18th and 19th Centuries*, in *Health Care and Poor Relief*, cit., pp. 208-224.

⁷⁹ P. CARASA, *Historia de la beneficencia en Castilla y Leon*, cit., pp. 12-21, 34-74; IDEM, *Welfare Provision in Castile and Madrid*, in *Health Care and Poor Relief*, cit., pp. 96-119.

⁸⁰ Cf. M.A. LOPES, *Parte II – De 1750 a 2000*, in I. DOS GUIMARÃES SÁ, M.A. LOPES, *História Breve das Misericórdias*, cit., pp. 65-131.