

FRIENDS, FOLLOWERS, COUNTRYMEN:  
VICEREGAL PATRONAGE IN MID-EIGHTEENTH  
CENTURY NEW SPAIN

Christoph ROSENMÜLLER  
Middle Tennessee State University  
crosenmuller@yahoo.com

*Introduction*

Palace intrigues and favoritism: these themes are not usually associated with the study of the colonial state in Hispanic America. Although the power of cliental systems concern policy makers in the world—one only needs to think about the current situation of state building in Latin America—<sup>1</sup> historians of colonial Hispanic America have mostly neglected this subject. This article traces therefore the interaction of local social networks in New Spain with the most powerful officeholder of the colonial state: the viceroy. This article aims at reconstituting the webs of patronage among popular and elite actors, the particular economic and political interests of these networks, and their links to the viceregal court.

Older historical scholarship on Latin America tended to base its conclusions on the stream of royal directives issuing from the peninsula.<sup>2</sup> However, scholars writing since the 1960s have shown that local actors in America successfully thwarted the implementation of these directives by co-opting royal officials. A gap separated the metropolitan legal intent from colonial reality.<sup>3</sup> As a

<sup>1</sup> For an analysis of current cliental politics in Latin America, see, e. g., Roderic A. Camp, *Mexico's Mandarins: Crafting a Power Elite for the Twenty-First Century*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2002. I wish to thank Margaret L. King, professor of early modern European history at Brooklyn College, for her knowledgeable critique of an earlier draft of this article.

<sup>2</sup> See, e. g., José María Ots Capdequí, *El estado español en las Indias*, México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1946.

<sup>3</sup> John Leddy Phelan, *The Kingdom of Quito in the Seventeenth Century. Bureaucratic Politics in the Spanish Empire*, Madison, The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

result, the local actors within the colonial state move into the focus. Prosopographical inquiries on the eighteenth century postulate, *e. g.*, that the crown increasingly closed this gap by appointing officials of peninsular background to the American high courts (*audiencia*).<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, recent publications have again somewhat modified the controversy about this “revolution in government” from 1765 to 1786.<sup>5</sup> While also focusing on the profile of administrators, Michel Bertrand systematically studied the social networks among bureaucrats and colonial society. He argues that although the crown insisted on tethering the colonies already in the Habsburg period, the superseding impact of clientage foiled most of these attempts.<sup>6</sup>

In his book on the political elites at the early modern Roman curia, historian Wolfgang Reinhard distinguishes four types of personal relationships or characteristics facilitating the formation of a social network in the ancien régime: kinship, common regional background, friendship, and patronage.<sup>7</sup> Kinship, even remote, could be activated for entry into a stable and reliable social relation; the same is true for *Landsmannschaft*, *i. e.*, the common regional background, or *campanilismo*, as the Italians call a shared origin around the same bell tower. Friendship or *amistad* in the early modern period, defined as an acquired relation entailing the reciprocal exchange of goods or favors, contrasts very much with our current, more romantic notions of a sentimental bond. Patronage,

<sup>4</sup> Mark A. Burkholder and Dewitt Samuel Chandler, *From Impotence to Authority: the Spanish Crown and the American Audiencias, 1687-1808*, Columbia, University of Missouri Press, 1977.

<sup>5</sup> On this thesis, see David Brading, *Miners and Merchants in Bourbon Mexico, 1763-1810*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1971.

<sup>6</sup> Michel Bertrand, *Grandeur et misère de l'office. Les officiers de finances de Nouvelle-Espagne XVIIe-XVIIIe siècles*, Paris, Publications de la Sorbonne, 1999. See also Tamar Herzog, *La administración como un fenómeno social: La justicia penal de la ciudad de Quito (1650-1750)*, Madrid, Centro de Estudios Constitucionales, 1995; Francois-Xavier Guerra, “Pour une nouvelle histoire politique: Acteurs sociaux et acteurs politiques”, *Structures et cultures des sociétés Ibéro-Américaines. Au-delà du modèle économique: Colloque international en hommage au professeur François Chevalier, 29-30 avril 1988*, Paris, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1990, p. 245-260. For a methodologically inspiring and somewhat ignored study, Stephanie Blank, “Patrons, Clients, and Kin in Seventeenth-Century Caracas: A Methodological Essay in Colonial Spanish American Social History,” *HAHR* 54:2 (1974), p. 260-283. An overview of sociological and anthropological literature on clientage offers Steffen Schmidt, *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1977.

<sup>7</sup> Wolfgang Reinhard, *Freunde und Kreaturen. “Verflechtung” als Konzept zur Erforschung historischer Führungsgruppen. Römische Oligarchie um 1600*, Munich, Ernst Vögel, 1979.

finally, is considered a "...dyadic asymmetric interpersonal contact of formal or informal character..." where the patron offers his/her client lasting relative protection in exchange for the client's services.<sup>8</sup> The boundary between friendship of this definition and patronage is somewhat fragile; either could evolve into the other if circumstances changed.<sup>9</sup>

Suffice here to add as a nuance an important dimension in the European and hence in a hybrid version in America that blends aspects of the categories friendship or patronage with kinship: godparenthood and coparenthood, or as it is known in Hispanic America, *padrinazgo* and *compadrazgo*.<sup>10</sup> These terms have separate meanings: By sponsoring someone else's child at a baptism, godparents or *padrinos* usually establish a lasting, affective, and initially vertical bond to the baptizee. By sharing familial obligations, godparents also create an emotive and possibly spiritual bond to the natural parents called *compadrazgo* or coparenthood. Taken together, historians label this complex "spiritual kinship" or *compadrinazo*. Godparenthood survives in Europe and North America, whereas the relevance of coparenthood has succumbed to social change. In Latin America, however, *compadrazgo* flourishes, frequently superseding *padrinazgo* in importance. Over the course of time, sacral, social, or political overtones have accompanied spiritual kinship. Spiritual kinship may resemble either friendship or patronage and reinforces this link by introducing spiritual elements of kinship.<sup>11</sup>

Reinhard's proposition tailored to the Roman curia serves as a pattern for understanding viceregal networks and their impact on politics in early modern New Spain, as well. Based on this pattern, I will analyze the various social ties the viceroy established in the realm and his utilization of them for his political or personal goals. These social networks were not only limited to the elite; rather they permeated the entire viceroyalty since many of

<sup>8</sup> Reinhard, p. 39.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35-39.

<sup>10</sup> I refer here to the excellent study on "spiritual kinship" by Joseph H. Lynch who thoroughly synthesizes the literature on Europe and Latin America, *Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1986. Lynch points to the changing medieval and early modern usages of the coparenthood complex (Latin terms *compadres/comatres* and *patrini/matrinae*).

<sup>11</sup> Joseph Lynch, p. 1-9.

the viceroy's retainers and new clients did not belong to the upper echelons of society—even under a wide definition of the term “elite.” For example, many of the district officials (*alcaldes mayores*) appointed by the viceroy formed part of the provincial elite by virtue of their office but could certainly not claim considerable social prestige in the capital city. Additionally, *e. g.*, Indian nobles (*principales*) could enter into the viceregal network—as demonstrated by the favorable testimony of the former governor of the *parcialidad* (the Indian neighborhood) San Juan Tenochtitlan—indicating that the web of patronage also transgressed the fluid boundaries of race.<sup>12</sup>

The ability of network analysis to address social ties among variegated groups poses a problem, too. Unlike the members of a corporation, the viceregal web of clientage remained in constant motion; hence, demarcating this network is virtually impossible. This fact encumbers generalizing conclusions on the viceregal clients, which the typical prosopography of a set of persons normally delivers. The scarcity of colonial sources reflecting the frequently clandestine connections adds to the problem. This may on occasion exclude actors and inaccurately reflect the social distance between patron and client. Regardless of the methodological problems, including the workings of clientelism will provide us with a far better understanding of political processes than any reading of documents at face value can proffer.

Owing to the demise of political history, few historians have devoted any attention in recent years to the apex of government in New Spain, the viceroyalty. Much remains to be researched as regards to viceregal networks and courtly culture, especially about the period before 1765. This topic has only been approached in a preliminary fashion by synthesizing the scant information.<sup>13</sup> Most

<sup>12</sup> Testimony of Don Andrés Hernández de Miranda, “... Casique y Principal de la Parsialidad de San Juan Extramuros Gobernador que a sido de ella ...,” Mexico City, 22 March 1757, Archivo General de las Indias, Seville, Spain (hereinafter abbreviated as AGI), *Escribanía*, legajo 246 B, f. 822v.

<sup>13</sup> Horst Pietschmann, “La corte virreinal de México en el siglo XVII en sus dimensiones jurídico-institucionales, sociales y culturales: Aproximación al estado de la investigación,” in *La creatividad femenina en el mundo barroco hispánico. María de Zayas-Isabel Rebeca Correa-Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*, edited by Monika Bosse, Barbara Potthast, André Stoll, v. 2, Kassel, Germany, Reichenberger, 1999, p. 481-497; Pilar Latasa Vasallo, “La Casa del Obispo-Virrey Palafox: Familia y Patronazgo. Un análisis comparativo con la corte virreinal hispanoamericano,” *Palafox*.

historians have addressed the tenure of viceroys in the somewhat more conservative fashion of a minute narrative. The Spanish scholar Antonio del Valle Menéndez in collaboration with Pilar Latasa Vasallo recently wrote a detailed and weighty biography on Juan Francisco de Güemes y Horcasitas, first count of Revillagigedo, viceroy of New Spain from 1746 to 1755. Del Valle Menéndez praised the protagonist as a righteous reformer and soldier.<sup>14</sup> While thorough in locating and condensing documentation, Del Valle Menéndez does not discuss the functioning of clientelism in-depth. An analysis of the formation of viceregal social networks and policies during Güemes's term will modify Del Valle's thesis and may test the arguments revolving around the origins of royal reform policies.

### *The Viceroy and his Patron*

In 1743, King Philip V appointed the marquis of la Ensenada as secretary of the *hacienda* (the royal exchequer), the Indies, the navy and a series of other responsibilities, essentially designating him prime minister of the regime. Ensenada tailored a program aimed at strengthening the monarchy although his opposition at court stymied many of his projects. He rebuilt the navy and gained the right from the Vatican to propose most of the higher clergy in Spain. The marquis failed with his ambitious plan to replace the provincial taxes with a single tax on income payable by all members of society (the *única contribución*). Yet, de-privatizing the provincial taxes and reintroducing the intendancy system in Spain raised proceeds for the royal coffers and intensified royal power in the provinces.<sup>15</sup>

*Iglesia, cultura y Estado en el siglo XVII. Congreso Internacional IV centenario del nacimiento de Don Juan de Palafox y Mendoza, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, 13-15 Abril 2001, Pamplona, Spain, Universidad de Navarra, 2001, p. 201-228.*

<sup>14</sup> Antonio del Valle Menéndez in collaboration with Pilar Latasa Vasallo, *Juan Francisco de Güemes y Horcasitas. Primer Conde de Revillagigedo. Virrey de México. La historia de un soldado (1681-1766)*, Santander, Spain, Librería Estudios, 1998, p. 428-429. For further information on the viceroy see also J. Ignacio Rubio Mañé, "Llegada a México del virrey D. Juan Francisco de Güemes y Horcasitas, 1746," *Boletín del Archivo General de la Nación* 19:1 (1948), p. 1-14.

<sup>15</sup> John Lynch, *Bourbon Spain, 1700-1808*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1989, p. 159-160, 164-170, 187-188.

As regards to Spain's colonies, Ensenada pursued changes not as radical as the reforms instigated by the inspection (*visita*) of José de Gálvez (1765-1771), but clearly of a different mold than the Bourbon regime of the early decades of the century. The marquis continued the policy of appointing capable officials —viceroys and governors— with a military background and, like him, born into the lower nobility, the *hidalguía*. The viceroy Juan Francisco de Güemes y Horcasitas was a protagonist of Ensenada's policies. Born 1681 in Cantabria in northern Spain into a hidalgo family, Güemes joined the Bourbon military. Rising rapidly through the ranks, Güemes was promoted to governor of Cuba in 1733. Appointed viceroy of New Spain on 23 November 1745, he left Cuba and received the *bastón* —the staff symbolizing the rule over the colony— on 7 July in Otumba on the fringes of the valley of Mexico.<sup>16</sup> Only in 1749, he joined the titled nobility as count of Revillagigedo —well into his tenure as viceroy.<sup>17</sup> After his return from America, he crowned his career with a seat in the Council of War in Madrid.<sup>18</sup> With this career, Güemes belonged to a different cut of viceroys than those of the late Habsburg or early Bourbon period. These rulers had usually chosen their viceroys from among the younger sons or occasionally the titulars of Spain's high nobility.<sup>19</sup>

Ensenada clearly considered Güemes a reliable and efficacious client willing to execute his reform program. Ensenada wrote to the viceroy that "...as far as the audiencia, tribunals, etcetera, are concerned, it is necessary that Your Grace puts his hand on it, pulling at what may seem to be the issue in secrecy, for that is what I am here for, I have a very long and very powerful sword for everything that is just, and the obligation to extinguish abuses and disorder."<sup>20</sup> Soon after, the viceroy implemented a series of meas-

<sup>16</sup> Güemes to Ensenada, Mexico, 10 July 1746, AGI, *Mexico* 1506, No. 7. Otumba is located within the northeastern confines of the present state of Mexico (*Estado de México*).

<sup>17</sup> To avoid confusion, I am referring to the protagonist with his surname Güemes. The crown issued the *título de Castilla*, the title of Castile, on 12 August 1749, well into the tenure of Güemes as viceroy, AGI, *Mexico* 1506.

<sup>18</sup> Del Valle, p. 796.

<sup>19</sup> J. Ignacio Rubio Mañé, *Introducción al estudio de los virreyes de la Nueva España, 1535-1746*, v. 1, México, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1959, p. 242, 251-264, 267-270. For the distinction among *hidalgos*, *caballeros*, *títulos*, and *grandeza*, see Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, *La sociedad española en el siglo XVII. I*, Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1963, p. 189-193.

<sup>20</sup> The original reads "... en lo que mira a Audiencia, Tribunales etcetera, también es

ures to heighten royal control in overseas. In 1749 Ensenada sent a *real cédula* to the viceroy ordering him and the archbishop to begin secularizing regular parishes in the archdiocese of Mexico.<sup>21</sup> Against the vehement resistance of the mendicant orders as well as their allies in the town halls and the audiencia, the viceroy and the archbishop systematically replaced the regulars with secular clergy usually upon the death of an incumbent friar. Especially the period from 1751 to 1756 saw a cluster of secularizations when the regulars lost twenty-six parishes in the archdiocese.<sup>22</sup>

In 1752 the viceroy drafted a report to the crown about misadministration of the *alcaldías mayores* in the realm. The viceroy's account helped terminating the sale of *alcaldías mayores* in the entire empire in the 1750s. The crown also replaced the *alcaldes mayores* in Puebla and Sinaloa with governors. These new officials could draw on a similar career military background as the viceroy and received an elevated salary to warrant higher independence from local pressure and a more obsequious execution of royal policies.<sup>23</sup>

The end of the contract farming out the *alcabala* (the excise tax) of Mexico City to the *consulado*<sup>24</sup> drew near in 1752. Ensenada directed Güemes not to extend the compact but to collect the excise henceforth directly under royal administration. The *consulado* and the town hall of Mexico resisted any changes and sent spirited petitions to the court in Madrid.<sup>25</sup> Güemes himself originally advised against the changes.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, he followed Ensenada's orders and established the royal administration on January 1, 1754. Although personnel and infrastructure of the taxation process did

menester, que V.M. meta la mano, tirando en lo que le pareciere la piedra y escondiendo la mano, pues p.a esto estoy Yo aquí, que tengo una espada muy larga, y muy libre p.a todo lo que sea justo, y obligación de extinguir abusos, y desordenes," draft of Ensenada's letter to Güemes, Aranjuez, 24 May 1748, AGI, Mexico 1506, No. 41. 1.

<sup>21</sup> Real cédula to Güemes, Buen Retiro, 4 October 1749, Archivo General de la Nación (México), ramo *Reales Cédulas Originales* 69, exp. 104 (hereinafter AGN).

<sup>22</sup> William Taylor, *Magistrates of the Sacred. Priests and Parishioners in Eighteenth-Century Mexico*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1996, p. 83-85.

<sup>23</sup> Güemes to Arriaga, duplicate, Mexico, 10 March 1755, AGI, Mexico 1352.

<sup>24</sup> The corporation of the wholesale merchants based in Mexico City as well as in Cádiz, Spain, and in other capitals of the empire.

<sup>25</sup> Güemes to king, Mexico City, 22 October 1753, AGI Mexico 2093; town hall (*ayuntamiento*) of Mexico City to king, Mexico City, 22 December 1753, *ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> Reglamento de Alcabalas por el Conde de Revillagigedo..., Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, (hereinafter BNM) MS 10358, 584, f. 24.

not alter markedly, the crown raised the annual yield by a spectacular 339 075 to a total of 712 408 pesos after deduction of all operating costs. Under the previous arrangement, the *consulado* had merely deposited a yearly flat fee of 373 333 pesos in the royal treasury.<sup>27</sup> Very clearly, the marquis of la Ensenada needed a trustworthy client to take on the influential *consulado* of Mexico. While the debate about the efficacy of many of the Bourbon reforms continues, specific measures did yield higher control and revenue for the king —usually at the expense of the local oligarchy.<sup>28</sup>

The bonds between Ensenada and Güemes had been forged long before; both belonged to the clientage of Ensenada's predecessor as secretary of the Indies, José Patiño (1726-1736). Ensenada also shared with his client Güemes a common regional origin in the *montaños* region, *i. e.*, the mountainous area north of Burgos in Spain including Cantabria.<sup>29</sup> Güemes's letters through the *vía reservada*, *i. e.*, delivered directly to Ensenada while bypassing the Council of the Indies, reflect the personal relationship between the two officials. The viceroy penned "My lord and friend" and "My wife renews to Your Grace the assurance of her loyalty and estimation, and I profess invariable obedience and friendship with which I am Your Grace's until my death."<sup>30</sup> Ensenada responded in a similar style: "To Madame my allegiance...I remain Your Grace's with immutable friendship."<sup>31</sup> These phrases surpass pure embellishment. Güemes clearly did not use similar language with Ensenada's successor as secretary of the Indies, Julián de Arriaga. The viceroy demonstrates his lasting relation to his

<sup>27</sup> Reglamento de Alcabalas ..., *ibid.*, f. 23-47v. This report, however, drafted by Güemes's son, the second count of Revillagigedo, viceroy of New Spain from 1789 to 1794, likely portrays the new administration of the alcabala in a favorable light.

<sup>28</sup> Compare with the findings of Bertrand on the real hacienda, "... les réformes imposées après la visite générale de José de Gálvez apparaissent clairement comme l'aboutissement d'un lent et long processus bien plus que comme une quelconque rupture," Bertrand, *Grandeur*, p. 406.

<sup>29</sup> Ensenada descended from a hidalgo background in the La Rioja region in northern Spain; Concepción de Castro, "Las secretarías de los consejos, las de estado y del despacho y sus oficiales durante la primera mitad del siglo XVIII," *Hispania* 59:1 (1999), p. 193-215, here 201.

<sup>30</sup> The original reads "Mi Señor y Amigo ...", and "Mi Muger renueva â V.M. los recursos de su reconocimiento y estimazion; y yo la ynvariable fineza y amistad con que soy de V. M. todo asta morir..." , Carta reservada to Ensenada, Mexico, 21 February 1747, AGI, *Mexico* 1506, N. 25.

<sup>31</sup> "A Madama mis rendimientos... Quedo de V.M. con immutable amistad". Copy of Ensenada to Güemes, Buen Retiro, 14 August 1748, AGI, *Mexico* 1506, N. 41. 2.

patron by employing the word *señor*. The term friendship (*amistad*) reflects the blurred division between friendship and patronage, permitting the patron to denote his client euphemistically as a friend. One should not take this word as an indication of an equal bond; this exchange of courtesies belonged to the repertoire of the ancien regime.<sup>32</sup>

### *Kinship*

In New Spain, the viceroy had several means at his disposal to secure and reward the loyalty of his retainers and his newly established clients. The official could promote clients from one *alcaldía mayor* to the next and appoint them as interim officials in the royal exchequer. The incumbent placed his dependents in a range of offices such as scribe of government (*escribano mayor de gobernación y guerra*) and interim *relator* of the *sala de crimen*,<sup>33</sup> or the overseer of the hospital of the Indians (*administrador mayordomo* of the *hospital de los indios*). Since a recommendation of a viceroy well connected with the dominant clique in Madrid could considerably help a colonial career, clergy or officials vied for the patronage of the officeholder.

Upon arrival in New Spain, Güemes mobilized his wife's transatlantic familial ties. While stationed as a colonel in Granada, Güemes had married Antonia Pacheco de Padilla Guardiola, offspring of a prominent local family.<sup>34</sup> Through her great-grandfather she was related to the marquis of Santa Fe de Guardiola, a Sevillian nobleman promoted to the post of *oidor* (judge) in the audiencia of New Spain.<sup>35</sup> Two of the marquis' great-grandsons, Miguel Ignacio and Manuel Ignacio Gorospe Irala Padilla sat as a canon and a half portion, respectively, in the Puebla cathedral

<sup>32</sup> On the early modern practice, see Reinhard, p. 308.

<sup>33</sup> This official prepared the prosecution's arguments in the criminal cases heard in the audiencia.

<sup>34</sup> Her full name is Antonia Ceferina Paula Pacheco de Padilla Aguayo Guardiola y Guzmán Aguado Aguirre Girón y Narváez; her father gained entry to the military order of Calatrava; Del Valle, p. 63.

<sup>35</sup> Doris M. Ladd, *The Mexican Nobility at Independence 1780-1826*, Austin, Texas, Institute of Latin American Studies of the University of Texas at Austin, 1976, p. 198.

chapter.<sup>36</sup> Their brothers had obtained respectable posts, too; one exercised the vicarage general of Yucatan; another had obtained a licentiate and served as an attorney at the audiencia of New Spain while the youngest acquired a parish in Puebla.<sup>37</sup>

In the years of his tenure, Güemes systematically exercised patronage over this family. In 1753 the chapter of Puebla chose a new doctoral canon, a well-remunerated position for a graduate in canon law in charge of all the chapter's litigation. In accordance with the laws governing royal patronage (*real patronato*) over the church in the Indies, the chapter named three clerics for a proposal list (*terna*). The viceroy as the vice-patron usually acquiesced and appointed the cleric placed on the first position of the list in order to avoid any conflict with the church. Although the *asistente real*, a cleric nominated by the viceroy to monitor the discussion and vote on the terna, did not report any procedural inconsistencies, the viceroy soon after complained to the Council of the Indies about the selection of unqualified candidates in Puebla. Güemes indicated that the chapter had not included Manuel Ignacio de Gorospe in the proposal list. In Güemes's eyes, this candidate had demonstrated superior qualifications to any other applicant and deserved the position. Güemes apparently tried to use his influence in Madrid to promote his client and strengthen his foothold in the chapter. The viceroy admitted he had collaborated with the cleric at various times successfully and Gorospe also found the support of the bishop and the town hall of Puebla.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>36</sup> The marquis of Santa Fe de Guardiola's granddaughter Ana María Teresa Padilla Estrada married José Martín Gorospe Irala, a descendant of Basque immigrants residing in Puebla. I am very indebted to Javier Sanchiz from the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, for giving me access to his forthcoming monumental social history and genealogy that explains most of the Gorospe family relationships in this paragraph; see José I. Conde and Javier Sanchiz, *Títulos y Dignidades nobiliarias en Nueva España*, México, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

<sup>37</sup> A relación de méritos, s. d., copy from 8 February 1753, is available for Dr. Manuel Ignacio Gorospe Padilla, AGI, *Indiferente*, 238, No. 4. On Miguel and Joaquín, the youngest of the brothers, see "El Gobernador [of Puebla, Pedro de Montesinos Lara] informa reservadam.te de los eclesiásticos de aqu.a Yglesia y ovispado, Puebla, 25 March 1755, AGI, *Mexico* 2549. For the third son, Don Rafael María Gorospe Padilla, testimony of witness Pedro Melo y Portugal, alférez de navío, Cadiz, 30 August 1765, AGI, *Contratación* 5508, N.1, R. 50, f. 1-4v; relación de méritos, Madrid, 27 September 1759, AGI, *Indiferente* 158, N. 27. On Diego Gorospe, see José Manuel de Castro Santa-Anna, *Diario de Sucesos Notables, Documentos para la historia de Méjico*, México, Imprenta de Juan R. Navarro, 1854, v. 5, p. 71.

<sup>38</sup> Güemes to king, Mexico, 20 March 1753, AGI, *Mexico* 1351.

The *fiscal* —the crown attorney for civil affairs— for New Spain of the Council of the Indies in his answer from 22 August 1753 could find no fault with the election in Puebla and rejected Güemes's critique, calling the viceroy's behavior "strange."<sup>39</sup> Shortly after, in October of the same year, a similar case occurred. During the election of a canon for the chapter of Valladolid (in Michoacán, nowadays called Morelia), the viceroy threw his weight again behind one of his clients, demanding his appointment. This time the *fiscal* censored the viceroy for "lack of integrity"<sup>40</sup>

The ties of patronage to the Gorospe Irala Padilla family in Puebla served the viceroy in another sensitive matter. In 1750 Güemes reported the rapid growth of the mining camp Bolaños, located in the territory of the *audiencia* of Guadalajara and lamented its insufficient administration. In an unusual move, the monarch with a *real cédula* (a royal communication) from 16 March 1751 relieved the *audiencia* of Guadalajara of all jurisdiction and granted Güemes extraordinary powers to establish a *real de minas*, i. e., a royally governed mining camp.<sup>41</sup> Soon after, the viceroy sent out an official to examine the site and ordered the foundation of a new treasury.<sup>42</sup> The viceroy requested more control over the region to curb the tax evasion of the local miners and their collusion with the *audiencia* of Guadalajara.<sup>43</sup> With the backing of Ensenada, Güemes used his powers as superintendent of the royal exchequer to institute a *corregimiento*, akin to an *alcaldía mayor*, in Bolaños. Güemes thus challenged the vested interests of miners and *audiencia* ministers.

Knowing he would cause considerable ire fighting this axis, the viceroy chose on 2 December 1754 a person from a circle he knew he could trust well: Diego Gorospe, brother of the Pueblan

<sup>39</sup> "...extraño..." *respuesta* of the *fiscal* of the Council of the Indies, Madrid, 22 August 1753, AGI, Mexico 516.

<sup>40</sup> *Dictamen* of the *fiscal* of the Council of the Indies, Madrid, 19 May 1754, AGI, Mexico 516.

<sup>41</sup> Del Valle, p. 480-481.

<sup>42</sup> Güemes to Ensenada, Mexico, 25 February 1753, [AGI] Mexico 1350, No. 16.

<sup>43</sup> "Instrucción que lo que vos, D. Diego Gorospe y Padilla, debeis observar y ejecutar ..." Güemes to Diego Gorospe, Mexico City, 28 November 1754, in *Instrucciones y memorias de los virreyes novohispanos*, edited by Ernesto de la Torre Villar, México, Editorial Porrúa, 1991, v. 2, p. 853-861.

clerics.<sup>44</sup> While installing a tighter supervision over tax compliance, Gorospe met stiff resistance from the miners not used to royal interference. A stream of complaints about the *corregidor* reached the Council of the Indies. When Ensenada fell from power in 1754 and Güemes departed from New Spain in 1755, the miners closed in on victory. Although tax revenues for the crown at the treasury had risen,<sup>45</sup> the new viceroy marquis of Amarillas sent a commissary to Bolaños and relieved Güemes's client of the post in 1757.<sup>46</sup> The Council of the Indies also suspended the viceroy's jurisdiction over the *corregimiento* and returned it to the authority of the *audiencia* of Guadalajara.<sup>47</sup> Julián de Arriaga, Ensenada's successor as secretary of the Indies, helped dismantling Güemes's onslaught on the local oligarchy in Bolaños. A client of Ensenada, Arriaga survived his patron's fall from power in 1754 but had to answer to the rising, more conservative circle around the duke of Huéscar.<sup>48</sup>

These two examples demonstrate the use of transatlantic kinship for the viceregal network. All the involved Mexican personages, firmly embedded in the colony, used Güemes arrival to profit from his patronage. For the incoming viceroy, the ties to the Puebla family helped to secure influence in the ecclesiastical cabildo<sup>49</sup> and apparently extended viceregal ties to the bishop and the town hall.<sup>50</sup> The importance of the close ties of *audiencia* ministers with the Puebla corporations and oligarchy at the beginning of the eighteenth century has already been shown.<sup>51</sup> Access to power circles in New Spain's second city, a thriving manufacturer of textiles and

<sup>44</sup> Castro Santa-Anna, v. 5, p. 71.

<sup>45</sup> The annual tax collection in the camp rose by 1 230 002 pesos; informe of Joaquín Antonio Cortillas, contador de cuentas and Santiago Abad, contador de resultas, Mexico City, 12 September 1757, AGI, *Escribanía* 246 A, f. 5-12.

<sup>46</sup> Julián de Arriaga to marquis of Amarillas, Madrid, 11 June 1757, AGN, *Reales Cédulas Originales* 77, exp. 68, f. 163-163v.

<sup>47</sup> In 1760, the miners of Bolaños and Diego Gorospe still litigated in the *audiencia* about the *corregidor*'s alleged misdemeanors; viceroy Francisco Cajigal de la Vega to Toribio Gómez de Tagle, receptor of the Mexican *audiencia*, Mexico, 3 July 1760, AGN, *General de Parte* 42, exp. 327, f. 310-310v.

<sup>48</sup> Lynch, *Bourbon Spain*, p. 190-191.

<sup>49</sup> The viceroy disagreed several times with the chapter on issues of personnel; see his complaint about the election of the *canónigo magistral*, *i. e.*, the canon in charge of sermons at the cathedral; Güemes to king, Mexico City, 20 December 1747, AGI, *Mexico* 512.

<sup>50</sup> Canon Gorospe held the position of a *provisor*, *i. e.*, the legal advisor to the bishop of Puebla, Güemes to king, 20 March 1753, AGI, *Mexico* 1351.

<sup>51</sup> Bertrand, *Grandeur*, p. 338-342, especially footnote 52.

ceramics, was even more relevant given the hostile stance of the *alcalde mayor* of the city.<sup>52</sup> Additionally, the case of Bolaños demonstrates that the viceroy used reliable confidantes to attack entrenched interest groups in the provinces and to extend his jurisdiction.

### *Campanilismo*

Historian Antonio del Valle Menéndez observes that Güemes nominated many district officials with surnames originating in the *montañés* region: Colina, Ríos, Tagle, Del Valle, etcetera. The historian argues that these *alcaldes mayores* could not have been *criados*—defined as a retainer belonging to the official's entourage before arrival in New Spain—of Güemes because the viceroy claimed in his *juicio de residencia* never to have appointed as many *criados* as the law permitted.<sup>53</sup> This statement needs some qualification. We do not know the exact number of *criados* Güemes brought from Spain. Although many of the viceregal appointees cannot be considered true *criados*, Güemes deliberately chose locals of *montañés* provenance to reinforce the ties of patronage with the prospective officeholder. Hence, in many cases their status approached that of a *criado* and some might even have attained a similar relation of trust with their patron. Following a common pattern of Spain's ancien regime, Güemes utilized *campanilismo* to establish a wider web of clients.

For example, Güemes appointed four clients with the *montañés* surname Colina to various posts, mostly *alcaldías mayores* in the viceroyalty.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>52</sup> Louisa Schell Hoberman, *Mexico's Merchant Elite, 1590-1660. Silver, State, and Society*, Durham and London, Duke University Press, 1991, p. 270-274. Incriminating statements about Revillagigedo's secretary demonstrate the hostility of the marquis of Viso-Alegre, former *alcalde mayor* of Puebla de los Angeles; Viso-Alegre to king, Puebla, 3 October 1758, AGI, Mexico 1853.

<sup>53</sup> Del Valle, p. 450. The laws of the Indies mandated the *juicio de residencia*, the customary judiciary review of all colonial officials at the end of their term.

<sup>54</sup> The data is derived from the *media anata* tax records. A real cédula from 1631 mandated any incoming official needed to deposit in advance half an annual salary with the royal exchequer and a third of all future fees one could legally levy by virtue of office. The *ramos* (sections) *Media Anata* and *Archivo Histórico de la Hacienda*, both in the AGN, here abbreviated MA and AHH, contain long series of receipts for these deposits. The dates in parentheses in the column *alcaldía mayor* indicate the actual tenure of this office when the document reveals them; most *media anata* papers, however, only record the date of the payment of this tax.

## GÜEMES' APPOINTMENTS OF OFFICIALS WITH THE SURNAME COLINA

Date of payment of the <i>Media Annata</i>	Name of Appointee	<i>Alcaldía mayor</i>	Source
11-March-51	Colina, Antonio	Real de Tlalpujagua	MA 20, 180-81v
29-November-47	Colina, Baltasar	Tenango del Valle	MA 50
06-March-51	Colina, Francisco J.	Real de Guanajuato (tenure 4.13.1751 -10.22.1752)	MA 20, 170-173 AHH 1058, exp. 1
22-January-53	Colina, Francisco J.	Malinalco (10.15.1753-10.16.1754)	MA 20, 251-252v AHH 1058, exp. 1
25-May-56	Colina, Francisco J.	Iztlahuaca	AHH 1058, exp. 1
10-April-58	Colina, Francisco J.	Huichiapan y Xilotepec	AHH 1058, exp. 1
01-January-48	Colina, Juan José	Metepec (1.1.1748-12.9.1750)	AHH 1058, exp. 1
30-December-48	Colina, Juan José	Iztlahuaca	MA 42
02-September-51	Colina, Juan José	Celaya y Salvatierra	MA 20, F 213-215
24-June-54	Colina, Juan José	Interim treasurer of penas de cámara	Castro Santa-Ana, <i>Diario</i> , 5:8.

The first two appointees on the list, Antonio and Baltasar, received modest districts, respectively: An anonymous author, concerned with the prospects for the purchase of these offices, estimated the mining town (*real de minas*) Tlalpujahua and its vicinity as a two on a scale of three.<sup>55</sup> Tenango del Valle was considered third class although tribute proceeds were higher than in Tlalpujahua. The viceroy also appointed Juan José Colina three times as interim district official in profitable districts: Metepec, Iztlahuaca, and Celaya with Salvatierra. Metepec and Iztlahuaca, both located in the valley of Toluca stretching towards the north-west, were home to a sizable Indian population, and yielded considerable annual tribute proceeds —indicating lush profits for the district official.<sup>56</sup> The district Celaya with Salvatierra in the diocese of Michoacán just west of Querétaro rendered even superior spoils than these districts.<sup>57</sup> On 24 June 1754, Güemes named Juan José

<sup>55</sup> Anonymous author, *Indice extractado de todos los Gobiernos, Correximientos, y Alcaldías mayores dela Nueva España* ... s.n., 1784, Biblioteca Nacional de México, *Fondo Reservado*, *Manuscritos* 455 [1392]. The author recorded tribute proceeds for Tenango at 13 649 pesos annually.

<sup>56</sup> The *índice extractado* assigns almost 15 000 pesos annual tribute payment to Metepecque and 17 722 pesos to Iztlahuaca and qualifies them both as *segunda clase* (second category).

<sup>57</sup> The *índice extractado* registers this district as first class with an annual tribute of 53 147 pesos.

Colina interim treasurer of *penas de cámara*, i. e., the fees and penalties the *audiencia* imposed in litigation.<sup>58</sup> The viceroy “walked” his client through different offices to end up in the most desirable of the financial administration. Francisco Javier Colina—who could very well have been Juan José’s relative—similarly moved from one *alcaldía mayor* to the next. After the death of the crown appointee of Metepec on 11 August 1755, Güemes for the first time detached Iztlahuaca from the district and appointed Francisco Javier as an interim. However, with the departure of the viceroy, the position of the appointee became tenuous. The brother of the deceased *alcalde mayor* of both officialdoms sued and the crown overturned the decision, granting the plaintiff the right to finish his brother’s term.<sup>59</sup>

### *The Entourage*

Choosing the entourage traveling with the viceroy to the colony posed a problem for the incoming viceroy. Beyond kinship and *campanilismo* that reinforced the ties of patronage, expected utility at the court determined the selection of retainers. For example, Güemes’s son, the second count of Revillagigedo, listed in his embarkation papers a legal assessor, a *mayordomo* (steward), two secretaries and their respective aides, four pages, three chamber servants, a dessert chef, a chef de cuisine along with their aides, lackeys, doormen, and a coachman. These followers exercised important functions at the court.

As to his father, it remains unclear exactly how many criados traveled with him to New Spain because the papers documenting his passage from Cuba to Veracruz do not exist anymore. In his earlier voyage from Spain to Cuba, officially only a small entourage including his wife, his nephew, and three other *créatures* accompanied Güemes.<sup>60</sup> Most incoming viceroys of the early eighteenth

<sup>58</sup> Castro Santa-Ana, v. 5, p. 8.

<sup>59</sup> The marquis of Amarillas to Julián de Arriaga, AGI, *Mexico* 516, 13 March 1756. Peter Gerhard points out that in 1762 the crown separated the two districts for good; Peter Gerhard, *A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain*, Cambridge Latin American Studies, v. 14, edited by David Joslin *et al.* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1972), p. 176.

<sup>60</sup> Joseph Patiño to Francisco de Varas y Valdés, Madrid, 10 December 1733, and licencia to embark, s.n., AGI, *Contratación* 5481, N. 2, R. 23, f. 9-11r.

century, scions of Castile's great lineages, brought with them an entourage of thirty to forty clients and their families from Spain.<sup>61</sup> A total of twenty-four retainers and their respective families crossed the Atlantic with the second count of Revillagigedo, Güemes's son.<sup>62</sup>

Once appointed, several relatives and dependents of the viceroy Juan Francisco de Güemes y Horcasitas flocked first to Cuba and then to New Spain. For example, shortly after his arrival on 9 August 1746 in Veracruz, he appointed Nicolás Villegas y Horcasitas, clearly related to his mother and possibly his cousin, as corregidor of the city Antequera de Oaxaca.<sup>63</sup> A major city located in the south with a strong Indian population, the city yielded a handsome tribute to the crown and promised one of the most rewarding incomes to any district official.<sup>64</sup> Under regular circumstances, the crown reserved the privilege to nominate the official in this and most other truly profitable districts. Nonetheless, the viceroy contrived to install his relative as an interim in this position. Although no official record documents the journey, yet it is plausible Nicolás Villegas must have traveled to America once opportunity in the form of his patron called. Shortly after his arrival in Oaxaca, however, the corregidor was murdered. The sources do not reveal anything about the motives of the murder. The local judges of the first instance —the *alcaldes ordinarios*— prepared the case. They imprisoned a suspect vehemently denying all charges when the viceroy relieved them of their jurisdiction. Güemes ordered the suspect's transfer to the prison within the palace of Mexico City. The *sala de crimen*<sup>65</sup> deliberated the case in October

<sup>61</sup> About one hundred criados and their dependents accompanied the duke of Alburquerque to New Spain in 1702; real cédula to Captain General Ducas, Madrid, 8 May 1702, AGI, *Mexico* 610; memoria de los criados y allegados ..., Mexico City, 24 November 1710, AGI, *Mexico* 658, f. 33-34v. Güemes' son, the second count of Revillagigedo, arrived in Veracruz with 24 criados to which we have to add their corresponding families, AGI, *Contratación* 5533, N. 3, R. 8, f. 2-2v.

<sup>62</sup> Juan Vicente de Güemes Pacheco Padilla y Horcasitas, second count of Revillagigedo to the president of the Casa de Contratación, Cádiz, 27 May 1789, AGI, *Contratación* 5533, N. 3, R. 8, f. 2-2v.

<sup>63</sup> In 1950 the authorities changed the city's name to Oaxaca de Juárez; for Nicolas Villegas y Horcasitas, see the interim appointment "...para un año más o menos..." (for one year more or less), Mexico City, 3 September 1746, AGN, *Media Anata* 205, f. 374; and Villegas' nomination as judge of his predecessor's juicio de residencia; AGN, *Judicial* 23, exp. 24, f. 54v-56v.

<sup>64</sup> The *indice extractado* notes the corregimiento rendered 16 945 pesos annually in Indian tribute and classified it as first class.

<sup>65</sup> The *sala de crimen*, a section of the *audiencia*, adjudicated appellate criminal trials.

1747 but could not find any incriminating evidence. Yet the viceroy —although not entitled to interfere with the proceedings of criminal justice— kept the defendant in jail until at least 20 July 1748.<sup>66</sup> Here the documents end and the fate of the culprit cannot be traced further. However, the sources illustrate the initially successful patronage of the viceroy over his dependant and the energetic measures taken to redress a crime.

The appointment of Villegas in Oaxaca did not only serve to reward a viceregal familial client but also to bolster the grip on the colony. Since communication within the realm moved slowly and the viceroy had at his disposal limited means of effectively coercing district officials, placing dependents in administrative posts inside and outside of Mexico City propped up his influence. Another case in point is Güemes's *caballerizo* (Master of the Horse) Tomás Vélez Cachupín who as a close *criado* and perhaps kinsman had accompanied Güemes to Cuba. Around 1749, the viceroy appointed him interim governor and captain-general of New Mexico for which he obtained a royal confirmation.<sup>67</sup> In Santa Fe, fighting Comanches and Apaches as well as warding off French traders from New Orleans kept him occupied, as several letters testify.<sup>68</sup> At the conclusion of his patron's term, Vélez Cachupín returned with his patron to Spain.<sup>69</sup> The rigors of the office in a remote area did not deter him. In 1761 the *caballerizo* acquired a new royal title for the governorship.<sup>70</sup> The *caballerizo* stayed his time in New Mexico until 1768 when he returned to Castile.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>66</sup> AGN, *Criminal* 560, exp. 4, f. 119-134.

<sup>67</sup> Born in Castro Urdiales, Cantabria, Tomás Vélez Cachupín belonged to the family of Güemes' cousin and brother-in-law, also born in that town, Del Valle, p. 25; for Vélez's career in America, AGI, *Contratación* 5481, N. 2, R. 23, 11r. Testimony of marquis of Aranda, fiscal of the audiencia of Mexico, secret inquest (*pesquisa secreta*) of the juicio de residencia of Revillagigedo, Mexico, s. d. 1757; AGI, *Escribanía*, 246 B, 304v; also real cédula to Güemes, Madrid, 16 December 1753, AGN, *Reales Cédulas Originales* 73, exp. 121.

<sup>68</sup> See, e. g., "Representaz.on del Govern.or D. Thomas Velez Cachupin sobre restablecim.to dela Paz con los Comanches," Vélez to viceroy marquis of las Cruillas, Santa Fe de Nuevo México, 27 June 1762, AGN, *Provincias Internas* 161, exp. 2, f. 8-18.

<sup>69</sup> Arriaga to Amarillas, Madrid, 26 August 1755, AGN, *Reales Cédulas Originales* 234, f. 119-119v.

<sup>70</sup> Real cédula, secretary for New Spain of the Council of the Indies, José Ignacio de Goyeneche to Tomás Vélez Cachupín, Buen Retiro, 5 March 1761, AGN, *Reales Cédulas Originales* 81, exp. 7.

<sup>71</sup> "En 11 de Abril de 1768 consedio S. E. liz.a a Don Thomas Velez Cachupin, Governador que fue del nuevo Mexico p.a q.e pueda regresarse a los Reinos de Castilla," Licencias para España. Gobierno del Ex.mo S.or Marquez de Croix, AGN, *General de Parte* 20, exp. 163, f. 137v.

These two examples show that even the viceroy's *criados* did in fact travel to and reside in the peripheral districts and *gobiernos* of the realm. The appointees did not always simply appoint a lieutenant to collect duties holding the districts as sinecures. Instead, Güemes's *criados* settled temporarily in remote areas. Although wealthy, the city Antequera de Oaxaca lies over 480 kilometers away from the capital—quite a stretch from Nicolás Villegas y Horcasitas's patron. More than 1 900 kilometers toilsome travel on the *camino real* separated Santa Fe from Mexico City.

The viceroy had certainly an interest in placing his clients in the periphery and his dependents, especially those of modest social origins, could hardly resist appointment to a distant post. In contrast, many of Güemes's predecessors of the seventeenth and the early eighteenth century belonged to the *grandeza*. Some of their *criados* boasted knighthoods of the military orders and could even utilize their own social ties to the court in Madrid.<sup>72</sup> Research needs to clarify if these clients could be convinced to exercise their offices in—from their viewpoint—unattractive outposts of the empire.

### *Friends and spiritual kinship*

The viceroy also sought to include members of the upper social echelon into his network.<sup>73</sup> Apart from a few members of the *audiencia*,<sup>74</sup> Revillagigedo forged an alliance with two great merchants: the count of San Bartolomé de Jala and captain Jacinto Martínez Aguirre. The count rose to prominence in New Spain by

<sup>72</sup> Christoph Rosenmüller, "Clients, Conflicts, and the Court. The Viceroyalty of the X Duke of Alburquerque in New Spain, 1702-1710" (Ph. D. diss., Tulane University, 2003), p. 196-197.

<sup>73</sup> Although research has elucidated the second half of the eighteenth century, historians know little about elite groups in the preceding era; for a recent overview see Bernd Schröter, Christian Büschges (eds.), *Beneméritos, aristócratas y empresarios. Identidades y estructuras sociales de las capas altas urbanas en América hispánica*, Frankfurt am Main, Vervuert, 1999.

<sup>74</sup> With the help of the marquis of Santa Fe de Guardiola, Güemes established an important link with the oidor Domingo Valcárcel, appointing him auditor de guerra and later attorney of the *juicio de residencia*, Del Valle, 348, p. 430-436. In 1740, Guardiola, then corregidor of Mexico City, and Valcárcel had joined the network crucial in determining the local politics of the real hacienda. From 1729 to 1733 this network, including oidor Pedro Malo de Villavicencio, the regent of the tribunal of accounts, and other officers of the royal exchequer, had successfully foiled an attack by the visitador Contreras to hold the regent and several officials accountable for fraudulence. After two interventions of the viceroy—co-opted into the web—the crown

importing Venezuelan cacao while virtually driving out the competition.<sup>75</sup> He invested his profits in a chain of haciendas producing *pulque*, the popular indigenous potion of fermented agave, and rented several crown monopolies, among them the *pulque* sale. Through clever marriages, he accelerated his rise from modest social origins. His wives successively brought handsome dowries of 8 000 and 12 000 pesos, respectively, into their marriages and upon their deaths bequeathed to him a fortune of almost 180 000 pesos total.<sup>76</sup> San Bartolomé's friend, the wealthy merchant captain Jacinto Martínez Aguirre, consul of the merchants' corporation, and *alcalde ordinario* (a town councilor who sat as judge in cases of first instance), renter of the excise tax in Puebla and the playing cards monopoly, played an equally prominent role in society.<sup>77</sup>

Given the wealth and influence of these two merchants—one of whom already boasted a title of nobility at a time when the viceroy could only claim *hidalguía*—their relation to the viceroy cannot be described as asymmetric. Instead, it approximated friendship among equals with comparable resources probably flowing in both directions. Evidence for promotions of family members of Güemes's friends exists but interventions in contravention of the law are hard to prove.

In July 1754 Güemes used his powers by promoting the count of San Bartolomé de Jala's son to the captaincy of the consulado's grenadier battalion—much to the chagrin of several lieutenants and color sergeants in the unit with more seniority than San Bartolomé de Jala's offspring.<sup>78</sup> In 1754, the viceroy also promoted

recalled the visitador in July 1733. After Malo de Villavicencio's death, his son assumed his father's post on the bench in 1747; Michel Bertrand, "Clientélisme et pouvoir en Nouvelle-Espagne," in Raquel Thiercelin, ed., *Cultures et sociétés, Andes et Mésio-Amérique, Mélanges en l'honneur de P. Duviols*, v. 1, Aix-en-Provence, Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1992, p. 140-149; Mark A. Burkholder and D. S. Chandler, *Biographical Dictionary of Audiencia Ministers in the Americas, 1687-1821*, Westport, CN, Greenwood Press, 1982, p. 195-197; it can be assumed that modifications in the real hacienda without the web's agreement remained difficult, therefore Güemes's inclination to collaborate.

<sup>75</sup> John Mark Tutino, "Creole Mexico: Spanish Elites, Haciendas, and Indian Towns, 1750-1810" (Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1976), p. 66.

<sup>76</sup> Tutino, p. 64.

<sup>77</sup> Deposit of the consulado, Mexico City, 18 February 1743, AGN, *Judicial* 21, exp. 67, f. 116v-118; Real cédula to audiencia, San Ildefonso, 15 August 1742, AGN, *Reales Cédulas Originales* 62, exp. 57, f. 170-179v; Castro Santa-Anna, v. 5, p. 15.

<sup>78</sup> Castro Santa-Anna, v. 4, p. 33.

Martínez Aguirre's son-in-law to the post of governor and captain-general of New Mexico —after his own *caballerizo* had left the command.<sup>79</sup>

Güemes may also have supported captain Martínez Aguirre in the litigation about obligations of a monopoly renter. Martínez Aguirre's terms of the monopoly contract to sell playing cards in the colony (the *asiento de naipes*) was seriously put in doubt in 1745 when the crown issued a *real cédula* prohibiting all gambling within New Spain. Although gambling had been illegal before under the laws of the Indies, the contractor argued that the authorities had tolerated the custom. With the enforcement of the new order, his income from the monopoly dropped significantly. Martínez Aguirre requested the viceroy to release him from the contract and restore the considerable sums he had advanced to the crown for the remainder of the compact. Güemes y Horcasitas sent the case for an assessment to three trusted attorneys accredited with the *audiencia*. These handpicked jurists duly recommended granting the contractor's request.<sup>80</sup> When the *fiscal* at the *audiencia*, the crown's representative for civil affairs, jettisoned the legal opinion, the *audiencia* rebutted him, upholding Martínez Aguirre's demands. Martínez Aguirre could also summon witnesses in order to bolster his claim, useful for a potential review at the Council of the Indies. Among others the already familiar relative of the viceroy, the marquis of Santa Fe de Guardiola backed Martínez Aguirre along with a viceregal *criado*, the governor of the palace guard. The appearance of this viceregal *créature* was unthinkable without Güemes's approval.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>79</sup> AGN, *Matrimonios* 120, exp. 68, f. 336-340 records the marriage in the sagrario between Francisco Antonio Marín del Valle and Maria Ignacia Martínez y Ugarte, daughter of the merchant. For the appointment to the governorship in New Mexico, Martínez Aguirre acted as Marín's *padre* (father) [sic] and *fiador*, i. e., a guarantor in case the appointed official defaulted on his duties, Mexico, 28 March 1754, AGN, AHH 1653, f. 286.

<sup>80</sup> The viceroy appointed, among others, his *asesor letrado* (legal advisor) Baltasar Rodríguez Medrano for this task. On this relationship, see Castro Santa-Anna, v. 5, p. 162. Viceroys often employed their clients for similar legal expertise to obtain the desired results, Rosenmüller, p. 131-132.

<sup>81</sup> Real cédula, Madrid, 31 July 1745, Güemes to king, Mexico City, 30 July 1748, and the expedientes labeled "Sup. Gob. 1748 Testimonios del Q.a Informaz.n dada por el Cap.n D. Jaz.to Martinez y Aguirre de mandatto de el Ex.mo Señor Virrey de este Reyno ante el Corregidor de esta Ciudad ..." and "Testimonios de la Prueba dada por el Cap.n Jasinto Martinez de Aguirre en el pleito que tiene sobre la rescision del rematte del Asiento de Naipes..." , "all in AGI, Mexico

The viceroy and his two friends fortified their relationship by forging familial bonds through marriage and *compadrazgo*, the spiritual co-parenthood of the Hispanic world. Following up on his successful marriage policies, the count of San Bartolomé de Jala engineered a lasting link to Revillagigedo by espousing his daughter from the second marriage to the viceroy's secretary.<sup>82</sup> When the secretary and his wife had their newborn child ostentatiously baptized in the *sagrario* of the cathedral on 21 December 1752, the viceroy's oldest son godfathered the child and hence became the *compadre* of the child's parents.<sup>83</sup> For the secretary, a *criado* of rather humble origin, the marriage to Bartolomé de Jala's daughter resulted in an unexpected blessing: Upon the secretary's death, his wife allegedly owned property amounting to half a million pesos.<sup>84</sup>

The viceroy's oldest son also served as godfather (*padrino*) when on 20 July 1754 captain Martínez Aguirre entered the military order of Calatrava.<sup>85</sup> The young son—eighteen years old—remarkably exercised this rôle in relation to the older merchant.<sup>86</sup> Yet, since the laws of the Indies prohibited the viceroy and audiencia ministers to godfather any locals, Revillagigedo reinforced the link to Martínez Aguirre through his son.<sup>87</sup>

1343. Güemes brought his criado Nicolas Junco from Cuba to Mexico and promoted him to the post of governor of the palace infantry. Later, Junco advanced to the captaincy of the Veracruz dragoons; Güemes to Ensenada, 15 January 1752, AGI, *Mexico* 1349. Several witnesses attest his status of a viceregal criado; see, e. g., testimony of fiscal marquis of Aranda in the secret pesquisa of the juicio de residencia of Güemes, Mexico, 1757, AGI, *Escribanía*, 246 B, f. 304.

<sup>82</sup> More precisely, Josefa Bernadina Rodríguez Sáenz de Pedrozo Soria y Villaroel, daughter of Manuel Rodríguez Sáenz Pedrozo, first count of San Bartolomé de Jala and Josefa Soria Villaroel y Berduzco married Antonio Gómez Barcena, secretary and criado of the viceroy. Although the surname Sáenz also appears frequently in the *montañés* region, San Bartolomé de Jala's ethnic origin is Basque, see Ladd, *Mexican Nobility*, p. 199.

<sup>83</sup> Castro Santa-Ana, v. 4, p. 58-59. Güemes's son, Juan Vicente Güemes Horcasitas y Padilla, second count of Revillagigedo, may have activated the established links upon his return to New Spain as viceroy in 1789.

<sup>84</sup> This sum is based on the hostile account of the marquis of Viso-Alegre to king, Mexico, 3 October 1758, AGI, *Mexico* 1853.

<sup>85</sup> Castro Santa-Ana, v. 5, p. 15.

<sup>86</sup> Juan Vicente Güemes y Padilla was born on 20 April 1736 in Havana, Cuba; Del Valle, p. 328; Martínez's birthdate is unknown. In 1738, he deposited over 13 000 pesos for the foundation of three principales de capellanía, i. e., stipends for priests, so Martínez must have been older than don Juan Vicente; AGN, *Bienes Nacionales* 53, exp. 14.

<sup>87</sup> *Recopilación de leyes de los reynos de las Indias mandada imprimir y publicar por la Magestad Católica del Rey Don Carlos II. Nuestro Señor ...*, (1741) Madrid, Consejo de la Hispanidad, 1953 (hereinafter cited as RLRI) libro II, título XVI, ley XXXVIII.

Given the illegal nature, a flow of resources from viceregal friends to the incumbent official is harder to trace. Revillagigedo and his family on occasion visited Martínez Aguirre's hacienda in San Angel, a popular colonial retreat for Mexico City's affluent circles.<sup>88</sup> At the end of his tenure in October 1755, Revillagigedo and his entourage departed from the capital towards Veracruz and rested in Otumba at Martínez Aguirre's recently acquired hacienda San Bartolomé "de los Tepetates, alias de los Virreyes."<sup>89</sup> Here, the viceroy waited to receive his successor and exchange the *bastón*. Hosting the viceroy and his entourage entailed considerable expense for the proprietor but also rewarded him with social prestige and direct access to the incumbent.<sup>90</sup>

### *Patronage and Corruption*

Revillagigedo's many patronal relationships raise questions about his integrity, and several contemporary sources lambaste his conduct: José Manuel de Castro Santa-Ana, author of a diary as minute as it is incendiary, charged that no other viceroy had ever amassed so much wealth to the detriment of the Creoles.<sup>91</sup> Another local witness, the marquis of Viso-Alegre, former alcalde mayor of Puebla, pointed in 1758, after Revillagigedo's departure, to the suspicious and unmerited wealth of the ex-viceroy's secretary.<sup>92</sup> Finally, the French traveler Villiet d'Arignon reported from Cuba,

<sup>88</sup> Castro Santa-Ana, v. 4, p. 9.

<sup>89</sup> Castro Santa-Ana, v. 5, p. 173. For the acquisition from Angela Francisca Roldán, see the contract, Mexico City, 15 January 1749, AGN, *Tierras* 3353, exp. 43. The name of the hacienda is also indicative.

<sup>90</sup> In the falling out between Martínez Aguirre and the count of San Bartolomé de Jala over the auction of the pulque monopoly in 1753, the viceroy stood back and had the audiencia decide. While the count of San Bartolomé de Jala offered a higher sum for the annual lease than Martínez Aguirre, the count rejected crown review over his operations. Güemes discussed the issue in the *real acuerdo*. In this joint meeting of viceroy and audiencia, the oidores recommended throwing out San Bartolomé's bid and rewarding Martínez Aguirre with the contract, Castro Santa-Ana, v. 4, p. 35.

<sup>91</sup> "Esta misma mañana salieron las cargas y equipaje del Ex[elentísi]mo. S[eño]r. virey conde de Revillagigedo; pasaba de 200 mulas cargadas con sus mantas y reposteros, y se tiene por cierto que ninguno de los vireyes que han gobernado este reino ha logrado los intereses que este." Castro Santa-Ana, v. 5, p. 170.

<sup>92</sup> Marquis of Viso-Alegre to king, Puebla, 3 October 1758, AGI, *México* 1853.

where Güemes had served as captain-general, that a saying circulated satirizing Güemes's self-enrichment: "No es conde ni marqués, Juan es."<sup>93</sup>

This is not the place to discuss in depth the problematic of corruption under the ancien regime.<sup>94</sup> Patronage and its effects constituted a pillar of the old order and what we consider currently as illicit nepotism, speculation, or bribery, was common practice in the early modern European countries and hence in the Spanish empire, from the court in Madrid down to humble *alcaldes mayores* in New Spain's districts. However, the view on these practices changed slowly. In the late middle ages, courtiers talked openly about securing promotions for their clients and felt morally obligated to pursue their advancement.<sup>95</sup> Although the practice of clientelism continued, eighteenth-century inhabitants of the Spanish realms delicately shunned parlance about these exploits. The crown increasingly could impose some limitations on the extent of patronage curbing the most egregious contraventions. Nonetheless, the center had not yet been able to suppress many facets of what is now known as corruption; we witness here the tension between the maxims to uphold the word of the law and the actual practices.

Certainly, some of Revillagigedo's critics had to settle one issue or another with the outgoing incumbent and their charges did not necessarily reflect a principled stance against excessive patronage. Joaquín Castro Santa-Anna, attorney at the *audiencia* and son of an accountant of the *alcabala* administration, possibly resented the changes in the tax collection.<sup>96</sup> Castro Santa-Anna had received two *alcaldías mayores* from Güemes's predecessor in New Spain and may have found his prospects of promotion blocked.<sup>97</sup>

<sup>93</sup> "Neither count nor marquis, he is Juan," cited in Del Valle, 331.

<sup>94</sup> For a good discussion, see Horst Pietschmann, "Burocracia y corrupción en Hispanoamérica colonial. Una aproximación tentativa," *Nova Americana* 5 (1983), p. 11-37.

<sup>95</sup> Reinhard, *Freunde und Kreaturen*, 35.

<sup>96</sup> Witness Juan Antonio Casas Novas, mayordomo of the cathedral, Mexico, 12 July 1748, AGI, *Indiferente* 152, N 2.

<sup>97</sup> The count of Fuenclara appointed José Manuel de Castro Santa-Anna to the *alcaldía mayor* of the *real y minas* (mining camp) de Zimapán in 1744 and then to the *alcaldía mayor* of Chalco and Tlalmanalco including the *agregado* (annex) of Tlayacapa. Castro delivered his oath in the *real acuerdo* on 21 August 1746. The official then acquired the *alcaldía mayor* of Tacuba from the king in 1748, possibly with the help of his patron. AGI, *Escribanía* 245 A and 246 A, 1 cuaderno, f. 153v; AGI, *Indiferente* 171 and Archivo General de Simancas, Hacienda 182-365. Castro moderated his acrimony towards the end of Güemes's term. Copies of the diary's edi-

Tied through the Marshall of Castile's wife to established Creole families, he painted an image of viceregal graft that is familiar from other Creoles.<sup>98</sup>

Lurking behind the charge of the second accuser, the marquis of Viso-Alegre, could have been Revillagigedo's 1752 memorandum to the crown about misadministration of the *alcaldías mayores*. Here the viceroy singled out for attack the officialdom of Puebla held at that time by the marquis.<sup>99</sup>

However, apart from these possible opponents of Revillagigedo, Tomás de Maldonado Sánchez Romero, fiscal for New Spain at the Council of the Indies, also censored the viceroy for illicitly supporting his candidates in the canon elections of Puebla and Valladolid. Maldonado, qualifying Güemes conduct as displaying "lack of integrity,"<sup>100</sup> cannot easily be discarded as a political enemy of the viceroy. Appointed in 1752, Maldonado must have had the approval of the secretary of the Indies, the marquis of la Ensenada, patron of the viceroy.<sup>101</sup> With the fiscal's dictamen, the chapter elections stood and Güemes could not obtain the canonries for his candidates. Although the fiscal of the Council and the viceroy shared a common patron, the Council of the Indies was able to ward off this excessive form of patronage.

Hailing Revillagigedo as a righteous administrator in our current sense, as his biographer Del Valle did, is therefore perhaps a bit misleading.<sup>102</sup> Governance and its practitioners in the eighteenth century did digress substantially from our current ethical standards. Revillagigedo was no exception in this regard.

tion from 1854 are rare; the *Fondo Reservado* of Biblioteca nacional de Mexico National and the library of the Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos in Seville, Spain, hold copies.

<sup>98</sup> Witness Juan Antonio Casas Novas, mayordomo of the cathedral, Mexico, 12 July 1748, AGI, *Indiferente* 152, N 2.

<sup>99</sup> Güemes to Arriaga, duplicate, Mexico, 10 March 1755, AGI, *Mexico* 1352. With a title established on 29 May 1711, older than the viceroy's, and boasting the countship of Pineda, Viso-Alegre very likely considered himself at least Güemes's peer. For the creation of the title of marquis of Viso-Alegre, see Sanchiz and Conde, *Títulos*.

<sup>100</sup> *Dictamen* of the fiscal of the Council of the Indies, Madrid, 19 May 1754, AGI, *Mexico* 516.

<sup>101</sup> On Maldonado, see Mark A. Burkholder, *Biographical Dictionary of Councilors of the Indies, 1717-1808*, New York, Greenwood, 1986, p. 75.

<sup>102</sup> Del Valle, p. 428-429.

### Conclusion

The viceroy utilized various facets of patronage to reward his clients and to tighten his hold on the realm. The case of the introduction of a *corregidor* in the mining camp of Bolaños illustrates this. Güemes appointed his client and distant relative to this office in New Galicia. This client strengthened viceregal supervision and raised proceeds for the crown while confronting the local miners and the *audiencia* of Guadalajara. Even many of Güemes's *criados* did not only hold their offices as mere sinecures. They also resided in remote offices, such as his *caballerizo* in the *gobierno* of New Mexico. Yet unlike most other viceroys, Güemes did not bring with him an extended entourage from Spain. Some clients flocked to New Spain after the viceroy's appointment but Güemes built most of his clientage by activating transatlantic kinship and by choosing officials in New Spain from a common regional background.

Güemes also constructed friendships with powerful merchants associated with the Mexican *consulado*. The viceroy promoted the offspring of these merchants and, although hard to prove, appears to have received favors in return. These links could explain his initial disinclination towards the proposed change in the *alcabala* collection. Nonetheless, the viceroy did not stall placing the *alcabala* under royal administration. While some of his opponents chided Güemes's lack of integrity, the viceroy did not digress from the standards of conduct generally accepted in mid-century. His willingness to execute reforms marks his tenure as different from his predecessors at the beginning of the century. Viceroys such as the tenth duke of Albuquerque (1702-1710) connived with the local commercial oligarchy and the clergy of Puebla to thwart the reform of the *alcabalas* administration in that city. Albuquerque also collaborated with the mendicant orders and *alcaldes mayores* to derail the secularization of regular parishes.<sup>103</sup> Güemes effectively implemented changes and used patronage to see through reforms against significant opposition in New Spain. In other words, rais-

<sup>103</sup> Bertrand, *Grandeur*, p. 337-339; Rosenmüller, p. 126-137.

ing control for the metropolis during Güemes's term without clientage was unthinkable. The analysis of Güemes's tenure also demonstrates again that significant reforms occurred in New Spain more than a decade before the *visitador* José de Gálvez set foot on America. Precursors of the late eighteenth-century conflicts between the monarchy and locals that led ultimately to independence can therefore be traced back to the mid-eighteenth century.

Artículo recibido el 15 de octubre de 2005  
y aprobado el 17 de noviembre de 2005