



## A Seventeenth-Century Confraternity in Santa Ana, San Salvador. What It Can Tell Us about That Era

Murdo J. MacLeod

Volume 31, Number 1, Spring 2020

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1100130ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/confrat.v31i1.36862>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

1180-0682 (print)

2293-7579 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

MacLeod, M. (2020). A Seventeenth-Century Confraternity in Santa Ana, San Salvador. What It Can Tell Us about That Era. *Confraternitas*, 31(1), 3-15. <https://doi.org/10.33137/confrat.v31i1.36862>

Article abstract

The colonial settlement of Santa Ana has been somewhat neglected by authorities and historians. This article looks at the founding there in 1672–73 of a confraternity dedicated to Saint Rose of Lima and how this illustrates several aspects of life at that time. When the bishop of Guatemala imposed full Tridentine authority on Santa Ana, many confraternities tried to avoid it. Quiet struggles over the roles of the local priest, supervision of the elections of office holders, the location of the new altar, ethnic and gender memberships, and the changing nature of the multiethnic settlement, all led to readjustments. These contentions continued throughout the colonial period and after.

# A Seventeenth-Century Confraternity in Santa Ana, San Salvador. What It Can Tell Us about That Era

Murdo J. MacLeod

---

*Summary:* The colonial settlement of Santa Ana has been somewhat neglected by authorities and historians. This article looks at the founding there in 1672–73 of a confraternity dedicated to Saint Rose of Lima and how this illustrates several aspects of life at that time. When the bishop of Guatemala imposed full Tridentine authority on Santa Ana, many confraternities tried to avoid it. Quiet struggles over the roles of the local priest, supervision of the elections of office holders, the location of the new altar, ethnic and gender memberships, and the changing nature of the multiethnic settlement, all led to readjustments. These contentions continued throughout the colonial period and after.

## Foreword

During my reading of sources on *cofradías* or *hermandades* (confraternities or brotherhoods) in colonial Spanish Central America, I came upon a printed archival document about a Salvadoran *cofradía* that opened several windows to ecclesiastical, ethnic, and economic features of these times in colonial Central America and, to some extent, elsewhere. This essay explores these connections.

## Introduction

The colonial jurisdiction of San Salvador and Sonsonate was the most densely inhabited and most productive area of Spanish colonial Central America. Until recently, however, its history was relatively ignored by national and foreign authors.<sup>1</sup> Even more neglected at the time was the settlement of Santa Ana, for most of the colonial period and today the third largest community after the cities of San Salvador and San Miguel in the entire jurisdiction. Even smaller San Vicente and the town of Sonsonate achieved the title of *villa* or lesser city during the colonial period, whereas

---

<sup>1</sup> I have discussed this historiographical neglect and possible reasons for it in MacLeod, “Paradojas e incógnitas.” Colonial Central America, then comprising the present-day Mexican state of Chiapas and the five states of Central America—Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica—was usually known as the Audiencia de Guatemala in the Spanish colonial period.

Santa Ana remained a *pueblo* (roughly a village) until after independence.<sup>2</sup> Founded by bands of Spanish invaders and their native auxiliaries in the 1530s, the new settlement of a few Spanish males was surrounded by a dense Pipil-speaking native population. In 1569 the bishop of Guatemala and Verapaz Bernardino Villalpando gave it a name—Santa Ana Grande—after the reputed mother of the Virgin Mary.<sup>3</sup>

Santa Ana sits in a long mountain valley at about 2,000 feet in the west of the colonial jurisdiction (today's El Salvador) near the Guatemalan border. Not tropical or humid enough, Santa Ana missed most of the sixteenth-century cacao export boom in the neighbouring Sonsonate or Izalcos province. As we shall see, however, it was well placed by climate and geography to participate in the indigo (*añil*) industry, much more widespread in area, that started slowly in the second half of the seventeenth century.<sup>4</sup>

### The *Cofradía*

In 1672 four Spanish *vecinos* or citizens of Santa Ana appeared before the bishop of Guatemala and Verapaz, the Reverend Doctor Juan de Santo Mathía Sáenz de Mañozca y Murillo. They began, after the customary respectful preliminaries, by reminding the bishop that they had come before him the previous year, 1671, to seek permission to found and build an *hermita* (a hermitage and often simply a rural chapel) and a confraternity devoted to the “Glorious Santa Rosa de Santa María of Lima” (Peru).<sup>5</sup>

Saint Rose, the first canonized saint born in the Americas, was the daughter of a Spanish father and a mother of mixed ethnic heritage. She was known for extreme asceticism, piety, chastity, and charity, and died quite young (1586–1617). She was beatified in 1668 and canonized by

<sup>2</sup> In a pioneering book Rodolfo Barón Castro explains this failure by Spanish authorities to assign any importance to the pueblo; see his *La población de El Salvador*, 348–356. Santa Ana was tentatively named a villa in 1812 but was not named a city by independent Central America until 1824.

<sup>3</sup> Lardé y Larín, *El Salvador*, 417–425.

<sup>4</sup> William Fowler has written extensively on the sixteenth-century cacao industry in Sonsonate. He succinctly summarizes El Salvador's booms and busts in “Cacao, Indigo, and Coffee.” The most thorough book on the eighteenth-century indigo export industry is Fernández Molina, *Pintando el mundo de azul*, which is his revised and expanded doctoral dissertation “Coloring the World in Blue: The Indigo Boom and the Central American Market, 1750–1810,” (University of Texas, 1992).

<sup>5</sup> The main source for this essay is “Se funda la cofradía de Santa Rosa en la iglesia parroquial del pueblo de Santa Ana de la alcaldía mayor de San Salvador. Año de 1673,” The call number of the original document preserved in the cathedral archive (hereafter cited as CGP) is T3, caja 102, exp. 13.

Pope Clement X on 12 April 1671. A Spanish royal decree announcing her beatification and canonization, and naming Saint Rose as a patron of the “Indies,” was dated 24 May 1672. It probably reached Central America in late 1672.<sup>6</sup>

The date that first attracts attention is that of the first petition by the four vecinos, 1671, the very year of the canonization in distant Rome. Obviously, in a time of slow and hazardous maritime communication this is extraordinary. Several explanations suggest themselves. One is that the news of the beatification had reached the bishop and the Santa Ana vecinos, who had then assumed that sainthood would surely follow. The more likely explanation relates to ubiquitous local beliefs in saints, canonized or not. A couple of examples may suffice. In January 1626 in the village of Apastepeque in San Salvador, during the funeral mass for a mulatto named Pascual Marroquín, a local priest declared that Marroquín was a saint, had performed miracles, and had rescued souls from purgatory. Some of the congregation were scandalized, but further inquiries revealed that such credence in Marroquín’s sanctity was locally widespread. The Mexico City Inquisition did not agree.

Most pre-conquest Mesoamerican religions held a belief in each individual being awarded at birth an animal counterpart to which his or her life force was linked. This spirit could have strong or weak aspects but could be perceived as protective, and may have become identified by converted Indians as an equivalent to the Christian guardian angel. Francisco Ximénez, a colonial Dominican chronicler, was convinced that Indian preferences for holy paintings and statues showing saints with animals were a surreptitious attempt to depict *naguales* or guardian animals, rather than Christian saints.<sup>7</sup> An exasperated *Inquisición* in Mexico City decided to try to halt these local devotions. “All paintings, relics, seals, and textiles of non-canonized but adored people are to be taken down in convents, churches, book shops, and public places. They must be stored in one place, a chest with three keys, and real saints’ paintings and relics installed.”<sup>8</sup>

The somewhat mysterious date of the first petition aside, one is struck by the considerable enthusiasm for Santa Rosa in the settlement of Santa Ana. Her American origin and her mixed ethnic heritage were surely part of the explanation, especially to the founders of the *cofradía*. From the beginning its composition was ethnically complex, a situation

<sup>6</sup> Graziano, *The Mystical Marriage of Saint Rose of Lima*, contains her biography and places Saint Rose in the culture of her place and times. The royal decree of 24 May 1672 is in Archivo Nacional de Centroamérica (hereafter cited as ANCA), A1–24, leg. 4582, fols. 101r–104r.

<sup>7</sup> Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico City (hereafter cited as AGN), *Inquisición*, vol. 339 (Jan. 1627) fols. 49r–72r. Ximénez, *Historia de la Provincia de San Vicente de Chiapa*, 3:261, 263.

<sup>8</sup> Auto of the Holy Office, Mexico City AGN, *Inquisición*, vol. 601, fols. 571r–572r, at date 2 Apr. 1664. Here and henceforth, all translations are my own, unless otherwise indicated.

that appeared to present no problem for the Spanish leaders of Santa Ana. We are then in the presence of an early manifestation of local multiethnic patriotism.

For the moment, the petitioners, after receiving encouragement from the bishop or his entourage, were sent home for more specifics and consultation with and commentary by the *cura* (curate) of the parish church of Santa Ana, Bachiller Alonso Ezquizábel, the beneficed priest of the “pueblo of Santa Ana and its subsidiary villages.” Ezquizábel persuaded the leaders of the putative *cofradía* that, given the frequent high winds and storms, the construction of a flimsy rural hermitage was a bad idea. Better, he explained, to dedicate a new or refurbished chapel—it is not clear which—in the sturdy stone and tile-roof built parish church, a chapel dedicated to “the glorious virgin Saint Rose of Saint Mary of Peru,” where the image of the saint would be placed on the new altar that the *cofradía* would adorn. The priest summoned all of the leading citizens to hear these suggestions, adding that his support of the project was required by the bishop. The *cura* was, in fact, not only persuading but insisting that if the future *cofrades* (*cofradía* members) wanted his cooperation then the new chapel had to be in the parish church and not in a rural hermita.<sup>9</sup>

This change of site and the priest’s insistence on it bring attention to several matters that affected confraternities in colonial Central America. The Council of Trent had decreed that *cofradías* and their rules of governance must be approved by the appropriate diocesan bishop and overseen by a parish priest who, among other matters, would control observances and supervise the annual elections of office holders. The Tridentine decrees had then been reinforced by papal bulls.<sup>10</sup>

In seventeenth and eighteenth-century Central America these decrees were often, probably in a majority of cases, ignored. In mountainous terrains with a rainy season and difficult rudimentary trails, priests’ visits to many villages, especially outlying ones, were hazardous and often infrequent. As a result, either through ignorance of ecclesiastical decrees or through deliberate attempts to maintain or hide some autonomy, or perhaps both, many *cofradías* simply went their own way in such matters.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> “Se funda,” 111.

<sup>10</sup> Royal *cédulas* dated 20 March 1687, and 31 January 1760 invoking Tridentine decrees on *cofradías* are described in Pardo, *Efemérides*, 53, 187. See also AGN, *Cofradías*, I, 7,8 (no dates, ca. 1720s). For a survey, mostly on Spanish South America, including information on relevant papal bulls, see Villegas, *Aplicación del Concilio de Trento*.

<sup>11</sup> For an auto or decree from the Audiencia, (the high court of Guatemala), see the following: “Auto of the audiencia, declaring that confraternities be suppressed that do not have authorization from the ordinary, given that there are many like this in Indian pueblos,” 20 Mar. 1637, in Pardo, *Efemérides*, 53. A royal decree (*real cédula*) declared “that the royal audiencia must proceed to the suppression of those *cofradías* erected without a license from the ordinary;”

The Santa Rosa confraternity in Santa Ana did not. Future office holders and others spent time and money to obtain the prescribed approval from their parish curate and the bishop of Guatemala. One can only partially deduce why. Santa Ana was a large settlement on a relatively easy road linking two main cities, Santiago (now Antigua), the capital city of the whole region, and San Salvador, the provincial capital. Moreover, the bishop, Sáenz de Mañosca, was a stickler over ecclesiastical privileges and seems to have had more than usual interest in *cofradías*, as apparently did the assertive parish priest Alonso Ezquízabel who was also quite insistent about his fees and was in permanent residence there.<sup>12</sup>

Father Ezquízabel and the leading *vecinos* then proceeded, somewhat presumptively, to set up the new side chapel in the parish church and to write the rules or ordinances for the confraternity. Only then did the petitioners return to Santiago and the bishop's court to present these *faits accomplis*, along with the ordinances, and to ask Bishop Sáenz de Mañosca for his approval. The bishop accepted the petition in most respects, even if it was, as he brusquely pointed out, a "*retro scripto* petition." Much was in good order, but the *cofradía* had to continue "with the attendance, participation, and approval of Br. Alonso de Equizabel [sic], the parish priest of Santa Ana." The *cofradía* was also to be located definitively in the parish church.<sup>13</sup>

The bishop's insistence brings to the fore two other preoccupations of ecclesiastical and civil authorities regarding confraternities. From the surge of enthusiasm in the 1570s for the founding of new ones, especially among Native Americans, authorities had shown some ambivalence. As an aspect of the need to spread the faith among neophytes in the New World, and as an aid to the organization and building of new churches and monastic structures in a time of rapid population decline, church and state were supportive. But was this enthusiasm completely innocent, especially given pagan survivals and the many incidents of attempts to win various degrees

---

31 Jan. 1740, in Pardo, *Efemérides*, 77. For Spanish *cofradías* that avoided Tridentine supervision, see Bazarte Martínez, *Las cofradías de españoles en la Ciudad de México*. In Mexico City, Spanish *cofradías* were more closely supervised but found other ways of asserting some autonomy, Bazarte Martínez, *Las cofradías de españoles en la Ciudad de México*, 33–34.

<sup>12</sup> Like the new Santa Rosa confraternity, there were several groups of "legal" confraternities that confirm our deduction. For example, each of eight pueblos on the Salvadoran Pacific coastal plain had only one *cofradía* and had received Tridentine episcopal licences and supervision. Because they were close to the provincial capital of San Salvador, communication was comparatively easy there. See Vásquez, *Crónica de la Provincia del Santísimo Nombre de Jesús*, 4:60–61 (report dated 1689). For Bishop Sáenz de Mañosca's founding of an Archicofradía in the Guatemala City cathedral (1669), see Pardo, *Efemérides*, 79. In 1670, Sáenz de Mañosca became interim president of the whole of Central America; Pardo, *Efemérides*, 81).

<sup>13</sup> "Se funda," 111.

of autonomy? Also, and here the institutions of the state shared ecclesiastical misgivings, what about rowdy and drunken feasts and expensive processions, pilgrimages, candles, and vestments? Such exorbitant expenditures threatened the collection of tribute and other taxes, and could lead to unorthodox, poorly supervised rites and beliefs.<sup>14</sup>

One solution was to try to decrease the number of confraternities, especially among Indians. Numbers were reduced, both by royal and superior Central American authority, as well as by local officials and tax collectors. Official directives on this topic illustrate some of these points. On 20 March 1637, the Audiencia of Guatemala dispatched the following *auto* (order): “In view of the growing number of confraternities in Indian pueblos, and the excesses committed during the dances and banquets celebrated on the day of their titular patron saint, it is ordered that in all the districts of the audiencia the auto and ordinances on confraternities promulgated by high court judge, Luis de los Infantes y Mendoza, during his visit to the jurisdiction of Chiapas be imposed, including the suppression of those confraternities that have not been authorized by bishops.”<sup>15</sup> As an interesting aside here, we might note that a Spanish *encomendero* (holder of a grant of Indian labour and tribute tax) for the pueblo of Ataco, upon seeing the *auto*, added that all unlicensed confraternities in “his” village should also be suppressed, thus presumably freeing up more tax money and labour for him.<sup>16</sup> In the case of the confraternity of Santa Rosa, Bishop Sáenz de Mañosa was quite open about such matters. Ordinances for the new *cofradía* had to be few and specific. Extra expenses were to be limited because “wastefulness results in failure to continue and [leads to] *cofradía* closures and loss of funds and numbers.”<sup>17</sup> Once the ordinances had been

<sup>14</sup> Gibson, *The Aztecs under Spanish Rule*, 127–133, discusses the growth of *cofradías* in the 1570s. In response to repeated reports of rowdy and expensive confraternity behaviour, the crown replied with several *cédulas*, e.g. 1602 and 1672; Larreynaga, *Prontuario de todas las reales cédulas*, 56–57. Especially deplored were dances that seemed to refer back to pre-conquest days, including apparent acting out of wars and human sacrifice; see Chinchilla Aguilar, *La danza del sacrificio*.

<sup>15</sup> ANCA, A1.2, exp. 16150, leg. 2245, fol. 169v, at date 20 Mar. 1637. Note that these attacks on exuberant celebrations were not limited to Indian villages; the following Inquisition document denounces “common ordinary people” of Santiago, the capital, for “indecent dances” with huge crowds, some taking place on church grounds and cemeteries (1704), AGN, Inquisición, vol. 728, exp. 9, fols. 258r–262v. “Common ordinary people” was often a clergy shorthand for all ethnic categories which were not Indian or Spanish. There are at least two other Inquisition documents condemning “indecent” dances by non-Indians in Santiago.

<sup>16</sup> The *encomendero*’s attack on “his” *cofradías* is also found in ANCA, A1.2, exp. 16150, leg. 2245, fol. 169v.

<sup>17</sup> “Se funda,” 112.

revised he ordered that they be resubmitted to him. All these requirements were fairly standard for the time.

Linked to these preoccupations of church and state, and to ambivalence about *cofradía* numbers, was a suspicion of hermits and isolated rural shrines and chapels. These official worries had been a feature of sixteenth-century Spain and continued in Central America. Unsupervised lay activities and the absence of orthodox clergy could only cause trouble and ran against the oft-mentioned Spanish belief in urban “*vida política y cristiana*.”<sup>18</sup>

At this point, curate Ezquizábel summoned the entire village to a mass and read out the bishop’s orders and revised regulations. A few weeks later several *vecinos* assembled to rewrite the ordinances. The first problem they encountered was the official saint’s day set aside by the papacy for the celebration of Santa Rosa, 30 August, a date when “all the *vecinos* or most of them are away from the pueblo and their houses at the dye harvest and so also from the saint’s fiesta with the attendance and solemnity required or, just as importantly, from the election of the office holders, and so it cannot take place.”<sup>19</sup> So the feast day and election had to be changed to the second Sunday after the “*pascua de flores*” (probably the Christmas season), with the appropriate procession, mass, and sermon, with all the brothers and sisters present with lighted candles in their hands, paid for by the *cofradía* and the 13 *tostones* (3.25 pesos) to be paid to the cura according to the standard list of fees (the *arancel*). On the new feast day, a *cofrade* would go out with a bell to summon all the *cofrades* to the election that would take place in the parish church according to age, starting with the outgoing office holders (“por los alcaldes mayordomos y demás oficiales de allá”). The elections were to be unanimous and confirmed by the priest.<sup>20</sup> All was written down in the new election book signed by the cura and his notary.

Next appeared a clause stating that all previous office holders could be re-elected if their behaviour had been good, to the benefit, it was stated,

---

<sup>18</sup> Although concentrating on local unofficial and official saints and shrines, William A. Christian, Jr., also studies attitudes to what he calls “brotherhoods,” and to a lesser extent ambivalences to hermits and hermitages: *Local Religion in Sixteenth-Century Spain*, 109, 111–112, 169–170. Unlicensed hermitages in Central America were demolished frequently. Two typical examples are from Jalapa, ANCA, A1.11, exp.4727, fol. 19r at date 17 Sept. 1692; and Chiapa de Indios, Chiapas, ANCA, A1.23, leg. 15252, fol. 249r at date 29 Sept. 1713. In AGN, Inquisición, vol. 339, fols. 49r–62r, a hermit near Mixco, Guatemala, wore holy vestments in spite of repeated warnings. (He was probably wearing a chasuble, the outer garment worn by ecclesiastics when presiding at mass.) In 1712 the crown refused permission to build a hermitage dedicated to the Virgin of Guadalupe, but two years later allowed the construction of a new chapel in her name in the cathedral; Pardo, *Efemérides*, 139.

<sup>19</sup> “Se funda,” 112.

<sup>20</sup> “Se funda,” 113.



of the confraternity—continuity being thus ensured. The *cofradía* was open to all people, “Spaniards, mestizos, mulattos, blacks, Indians,” and men and women, as long they paid the fees decided by the bishop.<sup>21</sup>

Several matters are worthy of comment. The heavy hand of the village cura is apparent. He had appointed the first set of office holders and was assuring their re-election. And in each *ordenanza* his fee, according to the official schedule, was to be paid up front. The clause on membership no doubt reflects the ethnic composition of the town. It was no longer a small Spanish settlement surrounded by Indian villages, but rather a multiethnic society, albeit still with a large Indian minority.<sup>22</sup> This demographic reality appeared not to perturb the Spanish petitioners in the least. The bishop’s last instruction, for the moment, was that the revised ordinances had to be resubmitted to him for final approval. The cura and the office holders, before the assembled townspeople, began to revise them.

The feast day was not to be celebrated on 30 August because that would coincide with the indigo harvest, “las temporadas de la tinta” (seasons of the dye), when workers would be absent, so it was to take place on the second Sunday after Christmas (“la Dominica in Albis”).<sup>23</sup> The material on re-election and ethnic membership was all repeated. There was to be a sung mass every two months (i.e. six per year), and for each one the cura should be paid four tostones. There was also to be a yearly mass for the souls in purgatory of deceased former members, for which the cura was to receive six tostones.

The *mayordomo* (a type of business manager) was to keep accounts and submit them to the cura. If a troublemaker were to ignore these warnings, the cura should expel him from the *cofradía* and expunge his name from the membership book. *Tenantzes* or official nurses were to search for sick members each week and report their findings to the office holders (but see below) who would pay for necessary expenses. There was to be a confraternity chest with two keys, one for the cura and another for the senior mayordomo, where money would be deposited or withdrawn upon the decision of all the office holders.

Ezquizábel’s main coadjutor, Lorenzo Gonzales de Maeda, read out the revised ordinances to the assembled vecinos who agreed to them without any additions or deletions. Some of the nine signatories were from the

---

<sup>21</sup> “Se funda,” 113.

<sup>22</sup> For a discussion of census materials, including ethnic categories, see below.

<sup>23</sup> The indigo harvest was seasonal and allowed for a continuation of village agriculture and other activities and, while it had its own hazards and exploitations, they were far less than those of the extortionate, year-round cacao industry, especially when it was in decline. For typical Spanish mutual recriminations over this, see CGP, T1, caja 72, fol. 22r at date 13 Sept. 1585.

first petitioners to the bishop and one, Gabriel de Ezquizábel, was obviously a relative, a brother perhaps, of the priest.

On 15 May 1673, about a year after the first undated petition, Bishop Sáenz de Mañosca issued the final decree. He founded the “Cofradía de Sancta Rosa de Sancta María Virgen, de el Perú, en la Sancta Yglesia Parroquial de el Pueblo de Señora Sancta Anna de la Provincia de San Salvador” and approved the eleven ordenanzas, with the “following additions, declarations, and restrictions.” (1) The bishop mandated a complete detailed inventory of everything owned by the *cofradía*, indicating the state and value of each item. These goods were then to be handed over to the mayordomos, who were then to give them to their successors, with additions and subtractions noted. All of this was to be supervised by the curate. (2) The *cofradía* had to keep three books locked up in the chest with two keys, one containing a list of all *cofrades* and on the cover a copy of the founding and ordinances of the *cofradía*; and two, a book of accounts including all income and expenses. And finally, a third book of office holders’ elections, and a fee of four *reales* (half a peso) to be paid as an entrance fee by all Spaniards, both men and women. Mestizos, mulattos, and blacks were to pay two *reales* and Indians one real.<sup>24</sup> Once again we see that the confraternity, for the moment, appears to be open to all in a multiethnic town. It is also apparent, however, that ecclesiastical government, especially the bishop, wished to maintain, and even fortify, ethnic categories, and emphatically assigned economic value and even financial rank to the three main categories: Spaniards, others including Blacks, and Indians. Note that there was no hint of class or wealth distinctions. A wealthy Indian still paid only one real and an impoverished Spaniard four. These and similar categories were common in ethnically diverse *cofradías* under episcopal supervision.

And then comes a surprise. The bishop, following the ruling decreed by his predecessor, Bishop Payo Enríquez de Rivera y Manrique (bishop of Guatemala, 1657–1667), prohibited the office of *tenantzes*, or nurses, the only female office holders of the *cofradía*. Instead of women *tenantzes*, the male office holders (*alcaldes* and *mayordomos*) had to search weekly for the ailing and attend to their care.<sup>25</sup> Bishop Payo de Rivera, later archbishop of

<sup>24</sup> Bishop Sáenz de Mañosca’s final decree is herein partly translated and also somewhat summarized from the last three pages of the printed founding document “Se funda.” 113–115. The chest with its two keys and three books was a standard feature in confraternity statutes, not always respected. Strict ethnic categories within multiethnic memberships were also common but were to become more complex during the eighteenth century. *Tenantzes*, female health workers, were also quite frequent in many confraternities, and a few of them among Black and Spanish ones had other women officers, although they were very rare in the highest ranks.

<sup>25</sup> “Se funda,” 115.

Mexico and then viceroy of New Spain before he retired back to Spain, was not a notable misogynist, and indeed had been a supporter of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, the great Mexican poet nun. His successor in Guatemala, Bishop Sáenz de Mañosca, of American birth, may have been in awe of the bishop, by then Archbishop of Mexico, Payo de Rivera, or hoped for preferment. In any event he died in Guatemala less than two years after signing our *cofradía* documents. Here we see a somewhat familiar world of rank and prestige, and yet another attempt to impose categories, in this case based on gender, upon the *cofrades*.

Finally, the bishop warns the officers of the *cofradía* not to add on further ordinances; if, out of great necessity, any were to be added, they were to be submitted to him for judgment. The *cofradía* “is to be understood as subject, in everything, to the ordinary of this bishopric and to no other fate or way.” The bishop conceded to the *cofradía* all the indulgences from Pope Clement X, sent to the bishopric in Guatemala. A copy of these indulgences was to be placed beside the altar of Santa Rosa in the parish church.<sup>26</sup> Thus, the full requirements of the Tridentine decrees were imposed, and in many respects the founding document opens several windows onto an analysis of that era’s life and understandings.

### Coda (Epilogue)

Devotion to Santa Rosa of Lima grew in a variety of ways over the next century and more after her canonization. Just six years after the establishment of the new *cofradía* in Santa Ana, another one of mixed ethnicities was founded in her name in the nearby pueblo of Izalcos in 1678.<sup>27</sup>

Five years later in 1683, the provincial of the Franciscan monastery in the capital city of Santiago asked the city council to petition the papacy for a relic of Santa Rosa for their chapel. An oil painting of the saint had been installed in a Santiago church the year before, followed in 1689 by one in another church.<sup>28</sup>

Some years before 1740, a Beaterio de Santa Rosa de Lima became a recognized establishment in the capital as a retreat for pious single women who had not taken conventual vows. About the same time various haciendas, two at least in San Salvador, took the name of Santa Rosa.<sup>29</sup>

We have no further mention of the confraternity of Santa Rosa in the pueblo of Santa Ana, nor of any other confraternities there. What is apparent is that the pueblo grew rapidly, according to one scholar by a factor of

<sup>26</sup> “Se funda,” 115–116.

<sup>27</sup> CGP, T2–109, no. 68 (1678).

<sup>28</sup> Pardo, *Efemérides*, 97, 105, 108.

<sup>29</sup> ANCA, A1.17, exp. 5002, leg. 210 (1740). Cortés y Larraz, *Descripción*, 1:169 and 258.

twelve or fourteen between 1548 and 1828. All observers described it as a very fertile, underdeveloped agricultural valley.

Santa Ana was to some extent a demographic anomaly in the region. Unlike San Salvador and San Miguel, the two cities, and San Vicente (de Austria), the villa, which had sizeable populations of Spaniards both in 1740 and 1772, the number of Spaniards in Santa Ana declined over the years and shrank from about 11.5% to just under 2% during these years.<sup>30</sup>

In these same decades, the Indian population, to the extent our figures are even roughly reliable, remained a healthy minority, comprising between 27% and 32% of the total. It is worth noting, however, from what we can deduce about family size, that the Indian population, leaving aside its two subsidiary villages which were heavily indigenous, was just about replacing itself with a family size of approximately 4 or 5. At the same time, the population of mixed ancestry experienced a much faster growth, with a family size of almost 7.<sup>31</sup>

So it was, then, that the pueblo of Santa Ana expanded rapidly in the middle and late eighteenth century, largely because of a reproductive mulatto and ladino (acculturated Indians) populations. Unlike San Salvador, San Miguel, and San Vicente, however, it retained a large, if minority, Indian population and a tiny Spanish one. Meanwhile the Salvadoran countryside, unlike today, was overwhelmingly composed of Indians who were bilingual.<sup>32</sup> Noteworthy is the failure of various bishops to perpetuate rigid ethnic categories. The demographic structure of Santa Ana moved slowly but steadily toward a multiethnic community as the local leaders of the *cofradía* of Santa Rosa had envisioned. Differences between confraternities and high clergy were age old.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

#### CITED WORKS

##### *Manuscript Sources*

Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico City (AGN)  
Inquisición, vol. 339, fols. 49–71, Jan. 1621

<sup>30</sup> Barón Castro, *La población*, 350; Lardé y Larín, *El Salvador*, 417–421.

<sup>31</sup> Cortés y Larraz, *Descripción*, 226–228.

<sup>32</sup> Manuel de Gálvez Corral, “Relación geográfica de las provincias de San Salvador, San Miguel y Villa de San Vicente de Austria, 1740,” in *Relaciones geográficas e históricas del siglo XVIII del Reino de Guatemala*, 2 vols., Jorge Luján Muñoz, ed. (Guatemala City: Universidad del Valle de Guatemala, 2000), I, 191–210; Cortés y Larraz, *Descripción*, 227.

Inquisición, vol. 601, fols. 571–572, 2 Apr. 1666.  
Inquisición, vol. 728, exp. 9, fols. 258–262v, 1704.  
Cofradías, I, 7,8.

Archivo Nacional de Centroamérica, Guatemala City (ANCA)

A1.2, exp. 16150, leg. 2245, fol. 169v, 20 Mar. 1637.  
A1.11, exp. 4727, fol. 19, 17 Sept. 1692.  
A1.17, exp. 5002, leg. 210, 1740.  
A1.23, leg. 15252, fol. 249, 29 Sept. 1713.  
A1.24, leg. 4582, fols. 101–104, 24 May 1672.

Archivo Histórico Arquidiocesano “Francisco de Paula García Peláez,”  
Guatemala City (CGP)

T1, caja 72, fol. 22, 13 Sept. 1585.  
T2–109, no. 68, 1678.  
T3, caja 102, exp. 13, 1673.

#### *Printed Sources*

- Barón Castro, Rodolfo. *La población de El Salvador*. 4th ed. Biblioteca de Historia Salvadoreña, 63. San Salvador: Dirección de Publicaciones e Impresos, 2002.
- Bazarte Martínez, Alicia. *Las cofradías de españoles en la Ciudad de México, 1526–1809*. Biblioteca de ciencias sociales y humanidades. Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, 1989.
- Chinchilla Aguilar, Ernesto. *La danza del sacrificio y otros estudios*. Guatemala City: Centro Editorial “José de Pineda Ibarra,” 1963.
- Christian, Jr., William A. *Local Religion in Sixteenth-Century Spain*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- Cortés y Larraz, Pedro. *Descripción geográfico-moral de la Diócesis de Guatemala*. 2 vols. Biblioteca “Goathemala,” 20. Guatemala City: Sociedad de Geografía e Historia, 1958.
- Fernández Molina, José Antonio. *Pintando el mundo de azul: El auge añilero en el mercado centroamericano, 1750–1810*. San Salvador: Biblioteca de Historia Salvadoreña, 2003.
- Fowler, William. “Cacao, Indigo and Coffee: Cash Crops in the History of El Salvador.” *Research in Economic Anthropology* 8.2 (1987): 151–160.
- Gálvez Corral, Manuel de. “Relación geográfica de las provincias de San Salvador, San Miguel y Villa de San Vicente de Austria, 1740.” In Jorge Luján Muñoz, (ed.), *Relaciones geográficas e históricas del siglo XVIII del Reino de Guatemala*. Guatemala City: Universidad del Valle de Guatemala, 2006, 194–210.

- Gibson Charles. *The Aztecs under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico, 1519–1810*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- Graziano, Frank. *The Mystical Marriage of Saint Rose of Lima*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lardé y Larín, Jorge. *El Salvador: Historia de sus pueblos, villas y ciudades*. San Salvador: Ministerio de Cultura, Departamento Editorial, 1957.
- Larreynaga, Miguel. *Prontuario de todas las reales cédulas, cartas acordadas y órdenes comunicados a la Audiencia del Antiguo Reino de Guatemala desde el año de 1600 hasta 1818*. Guatemala City: Imprenta la Luna, 1857.
- MacLeod, Murdo J. “Paradojas e incógnitas en la historia colonial de San Salvador y Sonsonate.” In Ana Margarita Gálvez and Sajid Alfred Herrera, (eds.), *Mestizaje, poder y sociedad: Ensayos de historia colonial de las provincias de San Salvador y Sonsonate*. San Salvador: FLACSO, Programa El Salvador, 2003, pp. 215–227.
- Pardo, José Joaquín. *Efemérides para escribir la historia de la muy noble y muy leal Ciudad de Santiago de los Caballeros del Reino de Guatemala*. Guatemala City: Tipografía Nacional, 1944.
- “Se funda la cofradía de Santa Rosa en la iglesia parroquial del pueblo de Santa Ana de la alcaldía mayor de San Salvador, Año de 1673.” Transcription by Ramiro Ordóñez Jonama. *Boletín del Archivo Histórico Arquidiocesano “Francisco de Paula García Peláez”* 11.3 (1991): 111–116.
- Vásquez, Francisco. *Crónica de la provincia del Santísimo Nombre de Jesús de Guatemala de la Orden de N. Seráfico Padre San Francisco en el Reino de Nueva España*. 2d ed. 4 vols. Biblioteca “Goathemala,” 14–17. Guatemala City: Sociedad de Geografía e Historia, 1944.
- Villegas, Juan. *Aplicación del Concilio de Trento en Hispanoamérica, 1564–1600: Provincia Eclesiástica del Perú*. Cuadernos del ITU, 3. Montevideo: Instituto Teológico del Uruguay, 1975.
- Ximénez, Francisco. *Historia de la Provincia de San Vicente de Chiapa y Guatemala de la Orden de Predicadores*. 3 vols. Biblioteca “Goathemala,” 3. Guatemala City: Sociedad de Geografía e Historia, 1929–32.