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Through his microhistorical examination of the Portuguese Maria de Macedo’s inquisition process (1665-67), which resulted in her conviction for falsifying holy visions, Bryan Givens creatively elucidates the ways in which a single trial record, in combination with other sources, can illuminate “cultural interactions” (6) between elite and non-elite levels of society. According to Givens, Maria de Macedo, as the daughter of a skilled artisan who made guitars for the royal court and the wife of a functionary in the treasury, was placed firmly within the “middling sort” of Lisbon society (3). It was because of this social position that Maria was able to draw upon disparate cultural elements originating in multiple social milieus of early modern Portugal to synthesize the contents of her singular visions.

Maria dictated an account of her visions to her husband Feliciano, who recorded them in a manuscript pamphlet a full fifteen years before Maria’s trial process began; although later incorporated into the trial dossier, the pamphlet stands as a testimony unmediated by inquisitors’ questioning. Givens utilizes a multitude of contemporary sources to argue persuasively that Maria emphasized two dominant sets of cultural beliefs in her visions, both grounded in Christian society’s interactions with Islam in Portugal’s past. The first involved legends of enchanted Muslims revealing hidden treasure left behind in the wake of Islam’s retreat from the Iberian peninsula. Maria’s visions began during her childhood and continued until her trial process began; and the contents of the visions changed over time, becoming progressively more Christian. Two figures who appeared dressed as “Turks” in her visions eventually began dressing as Christians, for example, and what, initially, was a palace and a treasure mine became the Christian community Maria called the Hidden Isle.

The second involved Sebastianism. Portugal’s King Sebastian had been killed at the Battle of the Three Kings in Morocco in 1578. Maria, like many of her seventeenth-century compatriots, thought Sebastian (whose body was never recovered) would return to re-establish Portuguese independence from the Spanish and once again crusade in the Mediterranean against Islam. By the 1650s Maria’s visions had come to focus upon meeting the pious Sebastian at the Hidden Isle. His promises to Maria that he would return to create a new world
order were indicative of a millenarianism popular amongst lower social levels in Lisbon. But Givens asserts that Maria’s Sebastianism also derived from the works of exiled nobleman Dom João de Castro. Although it is unlikely that Maria ever read de Castro’s two rather elite publications, Givens argues through a comparative analysis of Maria’s pamphlet and de Castro’s works that she had incorporated de Castro’s material, which she most likely encountered through oral conversation, into the narrative of her visions.

Another interaction between elite and non-elite cultural constructs occurred when Maria was brought before Lisbon’s inquisition tribunal. Givens analyzes the process of elimination by which the tribunal came to judge Maria’s case. The inquisitors, and the Conselho Geral, were concerned with the heterodoxy of some of the statements in Maria’s pamphlet, including her assertion that St. John the Evangelist was still alive and would return with Sebastian from the Hidden Isle to assist in creating a new age (and not Sebastianism in and of itself). One of the three inquisitors, Fernão Correa de la Cerda, particularly was concerned with the visions’ possible demonic origin. As Givens explains, de la Cerda applied stereotypical tropes of women misled by visions to Maria’s case through his questioning of her until he found the one he felt fit best – Maria had invented her visions. De la Cerda found those elite tropes in his legal and theological books. Maria’s conceptualization of herself as a good Old Christian woman of demonstrable piety, derived from more popular conceptions of appropriate religious practice, in the end gave way under the pressure of torture to the elite conceptual trope of fictive visions – at least officially. After her confession, at the urging of the Conselho Geral, Maria was supposed to make a full public abjuration before being exiled to Angola. She avoided the public abjuration through the ill Feliciano de Macedo’s successful petition; and the tribunal waived Maria’s exile as an act of mercy in the wake of Feliciano’s death.

Givens thus leaves Maria still living in Lisbon, fulfilling the terms of her sentence through penance and spiritual exercises; the historical records that could have given evidence of Maria’s life after her trial process have not survived. Givens not only has utilized Maria’s life until that point to illuminate how Maria conceptualized herself and her visions through the unique evidence of her pamphlet, but also has marshaled a wide array of sources to demonstrate the importance of millenarian ideas to the more popular levels of mid-seventeenth century Portuguese society. Methodologically, the book is a well-researched and tightly-argued example of microhistory at its best.
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