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Abstract

In 1591, Philip II faced a revolt from his Aragonese subjects. A good number of nobles, priests and citizens were involved in the rebellion, but artisans, farmers and other members of the people also played a role in it. The article focuses on this important conflict, emphasising the relevance of popular intervention and how it was mobilised by the pamphlets which the leaders of the movement commissioned and spread by diverse means in order to gain the support of the less privileged ranks of Aragonese society. In this sense, the Aragonese Rebellion of 1591 offers a good example of popular mobilisation and of the limits of popular agency within a political conflict during the Early Modern Age.
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1. Introduction: Subversive Writings and Popular Sedition During the Early Modern Age

The verses cited above were published by Canon Vicencio Blasco de Lanuza, who attributed them to 'un Poeta de mi patria' and explained that they formed part of a longer composition arguing 'que ciertamente es el vulgo perniciosissimo si se descompone'.

1 This article is part of the I+D+i Project PID2021-126470NB-I00, funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by FEDER A way of doing Europe, and of the Reference Research Group of the Government of Aragon BLANCAS (Historia Moderna) H01_23R, funded by the Department of Science, University and Knowledge Society of the Government of Aragon. I am grateful to Dr Alistair Malcolm, of the University of Limerick, for his kind and meticulous revision.

2 (a poet from my homeland). Unless otherwise stated, all translations are mine.

(That certainly common people are most pernicious when in disarray)
Upon analysing the content of these verses, it is noteworthy that the author includes libels and pamphlets among the manifestations of violence that may generate serious disturbances. This notion aligns with the assessment by Francis Bacon, who argued that ‘Libels, and licentious Discourses against the State, when they are frequent and open; And in like sort, false Newes, often running up and downe, to the disadvantage of the State, and hastily embraced, are amongst the Signes of Troubles’. Bacon then refers to Virgil’s view that Fame was the sister of the Giants, which made rumours (Fames) ‘Reliques of Seditious past’ and, simultaneously, ‘the preludes of Seditious to come’. This is why he claims that the Latin author was correct in concluding that ‘Seditious Tumults, and Seditious Fames, differ no more, but as Brother and Sister, Masculine and Feminine’ (1625, 76-77). And, in a similar way, it is interesting to note that years later, in a 1664 trial of a bookseller accused of disseminating seditious pamphlets, the King’s sergeant Sir William Morton argued that ‘Dispersing seditious Books is very near a kin to raising of Tumults, they are as like as Brother and Sister: Raising of Tumults is the more Masculine, and Printing and Dispersing Seditious books, is the Feminine part of every Rebellion’ (Dzelzainis 2006, 139).

A little earlier, chroniclers recounting the conflicts in the kingdom of Aragon in the late sixteenth century highlighted the subversive influence of pasquinades circulated during various crises. This was particularly evident during the clerical riot in Teruel in 1571 and the Aragonese Rebellion which took place two decades later. Blasco de Lanuza and the Argensola brothers – contemporaries of his and, just like him, privileged witnesses to both events – shared a similar perspective on the issue. According to Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola, the unrestrained action of a royal official in Teruel in 1571 ‘tentó harto la paciencia a toda la provincia y, si no causó alborotos violentos, nacieron de su despecho pasquines y quejas’ (1996, 118). A similar view was expressed by Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola throughout his Informacion on the revolt against Philip II. In a first allusion, he stresses how widespread the diffusion of subversive writings had been during this episode and noted that ‘como estaba quitado el freno del temor, publicábanse sin autor muchos versos, que llaman pasquines … que encendian los ánimos’ (1991, 94). A few pages later, he affirms that, when the order to raise men to resist the King’s army was received in Teruel, ‘Amanecieron en ciertos lugares públicos papeles culpando á los que estorvaban esta resolucion, y sollevando al pueblo’ (121). Finally, he explains that one of the accused was ‘hombre de buen entendimiento y amigo de novedades, que no le hizo esto poco daño, porque le aplicó el fisco muchos de los pasquines que en aquellas sediciones alborotaron el pueblo’ (185-186).

The documentation generated by the courts’ efforts to identify, prosecute and convict those who produced and disseminated subversive writings during the rebellion of 1591 has allowed

---

3 As will be seen in the following pages, the writings of Lupercio and Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola are particularly interesting. In addition to their status as eyewitnesses, they were renowned poets and active members of Spanish Court circles in the first decades of the seventeenth century. In fact, both served as secretaries to the Count of Lemos during his mandate as viceroy of Naples and were chroniclers of the kingdom of Aragon and chroniclers of the King in the Crown of Aragon. For an insight into the relevance of their ties to the Court, see Gascón Pérez 2012.

4 (strained the patience of the whole province and, although it did not cause violent unrest, it gave rise to pasquinades and complaints). A detailed analysis of this riot can be found in Miguel García 1996.

5 (since the bridle of fear had been removed, many verses without author were published, which they call pasquines … that inflamed the spirits).

6 (papers appeared in certain public places blaming those who hindered this resolution and arousing the people).

7 (a man of good understanding and fond of novelties, which did him no little harm, because the prosecutors attributed to him many of the pasquinades that stirred up the people during those seditions). Although Argensola does not mention his name, he is referring to Cosme Pariente, who was sentenced to the galleys, as observed by Pidal (1862-1863, vol. III, 137).
historians to gain insight into the content of a significant number of subversive compositions. Moreover, study of these legal records provides access to the testimonies collected by royal officials, which explain the production methods and means of circulation of these literary pieces. These testimonies also reveal the authorities’ opinion about both the texts and their authors as elements conducive to public disturbances. The conclusions of the secular tribunals coincide in substance with that expressed in the accusations made against various clerics in 1571 and 1591 by two ecclesiastical courts for reading and publicly distributing ‘romances y pasquines muy perjudiciales y escandalosos’ (Royo García 1992, 254). In view of all this evidence, it seems plausible to conclude that in the early modern age there was a clear perception that the emergence of subversive literature during the build-up to a conflict contributed to its aggravation, since verbal violence, combined with acts of physical or symbolic violence, not only increased the effects caused by the latter, but also denoted the intention to involve the popular strata of society in the episode, which typically led to its further radicalisation (Burke 1978, 260-261; Zagorin 1982, 18-19).

2. A General Overview of the Aragonese Rebellion of 1591

The conflict which opposed King Philip II of Spain to his Aragonese subjects in the late sixteenth century provides a fine example of the impact of mobilisation campaigns founded on the dissemination of subversive writings. Therefore, the general features of this rebellion will be summarised here, starting by pointing out that this topic is not a new one for historiography: as I have indicated previously (Gascón Pérez 1995, 1999a, 2000), many erudite pages have been written by scholars, who often were captivated by the towering figure of Philip II and determined to emphasise the leading part played by the King’s former secretary, Antonio Pérez, in the gestation and the outcome of the crisis. The accounts of the seventeenth-century chroniclers were influenced by the proximity of the events. Aragonese writers, for their part, wanted to defend the good name of their kingdom and sustain the continuity of its political regime, founded, as it was, on respect for the law over the King’s will. In an effort to reconcile the two viewpoints, they blamed Pérez, a few rioters and the ‘vulgo ciego’ (ignorant [blind] common people), while exonerating the good citizens of Aragonese society. Such an argument allowed them to affirm the loyalty of their kingdom, minimise the extent of the uprising and vindicate their political system. At the same time, they were still able to justify the repression ordered by Philip II, to depict him as a fatherly ruler, not a tyrant, and to present all the legal restrictions which were passed in the session of the ‘Cortes de Aragón’ called in the town of Tarazona in 1592 as natural improvements to their laws.

The triad composed by Pérez, a small number of rioters and the ignorant masses is at the heart of the classic research into the conflict, which I have called the ‘aristocratic view of 1591’ (Gascón Pérez 2000). This was the thesis proposed by the Marquis of Pidal in his three-volume Historia de las alteraciones de Aragon en el reinado de Felipe II (1862-1863), and it was reinforced by the monograph Antonio Pérez, written by Gregorio Marañón (1947). According to both authors, the Aragonese political resistance against Philip II was led by a meagre cluster of mem-

---

8 As Antonio Castillo Gómez has pointed out, the intervention of the authorities to prosecute the authors of libels and pamphlets has meant that this type of writing has left a larger documentary footprint than other forms of what he calls ‘exposed literature’, which makes it more likely to be the subject of investigation by historians (2009, 594).

9 The documents related to this matter are kept in the Archivo General de Simancas, Estado, l. 35 and l. 36, and were essential for my book La rebelión de las palabras (Gascón Pérez 2003).

10 (very harmful and scandalous romances and pasquínades).
bers of the lesser nobility – knights and infanzones – closely associated with Antonio Pérez, and the conflict was limited to the city of Saragossa, the capital of the realm. Therefore, Marañón proposed rejecting the adjective 'Aragonese', instead referring exclusively to the revolt that took place in the city of Saragossa, an opinion that Jarque Martínez and Salas Auséns (1991) have recently endorsed. Despite differing in this respect from the general interpretation of the conflict elaborated by Pidal, the fact is that this account has been widely accepted to the present day, as shown, for example, by the praise that Hispanist Albert Lovett and Catalan historian Jordi Nadal (2001, 134) dedicated to Pidal, the former asserting that ‘But however good the modern authorities, they will never supersede the marqués de Pidal’ (Lovett 1986, 326). On the other hand, the most common word used to identify a historical episode that until 1862 had never received a specific denomination is still alteraciones (troubles). The success of the expression is illustrated by the fact that it was used in the Spanish translation of Geoffrey Parker's latest biography of Philip II, even though an earlier version of the book had used the term rebellion.11

However, the actual manuscript evidence that was deployed by Pidal and Marañón, as well as the latest research by Colás Latorre (1991 and 1996), Gil Pujol (1991a, 1995 and 1997), Gracia Rivas (1992), Sánchez López (1992 and 1996-1997) and Gascón Pérez (1994, 2000, 2003 and 2010) suggest several weaknesses in the ‘aristocratic view’. First, whereas Saragossa was the main scene of the events that took place – the town being the seat of all the judicial and political institutions that were involved in the conflict – Pidal himself observed that an early sign of opposition took place in the town of Calatayud, near the Castilian frontier, where the friars of the monastery of San Pedro Mártir sheltered Antonio Pérez and prevented royal officers from arresting him. In addition, several Aragonese municipalities supplied weapons and troops to the forces commanded by the ‘Justicia Mayor’ (the Chief Justice of Aragon) in his resistance to the King's army. Moreover, this call to arms provoked riots in Teruel and Albarracín which were later investigated by a royal commissioner, whose activity concluded with the execution of approximately ten people. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the subsequent repression of the insurrection included several general measures to restore order: military occupation of the kingdom; convening of the ‘Cortes de Aragón’, where new laws were enacted; a general pardon – albeit with multiple exceptions – decreed by the king; and the signing of an Act of ‘unión y concordia’ in 1593, which declared a state of emergency throughout the realm so that all the fugitives might be pursued and punished without any regard for legal guarantees.

As for the term alteraciones coined by Pidal to describe the conflict, it must be said that this and other words were indiscriminately employed by contemporary writers. Only the word ‘rebelión’ seems to have been avoided by the Aragonese chroniclers – though not by the Castilian ones – who used it solely to deny the accusation of rebelling against their King. The reality is that such a generic term as alteraciones cannot adequately describe a conflict in which the monarch’s legitimacy to exercise absolute power12 was called into question; the choice of this word devalues the importance of the events. Thus, despite the claims of Aragonese chroniclers, we may speak of a rebellion, because Philip II condemned the rioters ‘por rebeldes, traydores e infieles a Nos y a nuestra Corona Real’,13 and they were sentenced for the crime of lèse-majesté. The word ‘rebellion’ accurately describes what occurred in Aragon in 1591, despite the actors’

11 See Parker (2012, 888) and Parker (2015, 438). The term used in the original English version of the latter work is ‘revolt’ (Parker 2014, 333).

12 In this article I have preferred to speak of the defence of absolute power rather than absolutism. In respect to this concept, the work of Gil Pujol (2020) offers an interesting review of its historiographical uses, debates and new approaches.

13 (as rebels, traitors and [people] disloyal to Us and our Royal Crown). Quoted in Gascón Pérez (2010, 389).
personal feelings. Additionally, the term avoids the dangerous ideological weight implied by the term 'revolution', frequently used by theorists of social conflict (Zagorin 1982, 16-17).

Finally, the ‘aristocratic view’ does not answer all the questions relating to the social, geographical and ideological analysis of the conflict. Evidence from the archives highlights the social complexity of an event that involved not only nobles, knights and infanzones, but also priests, citizens, craftsmen and ‘labradores’ (farmers). This was an uprising that drew in all social elements, whilst the King nonetheless still enjoyed the support of much of Aragonese society. Not only that, but the ‘aristocratic view’ does not explain the geographical extent of the rebellion. Finally, Pidal and Marañón knew next to nothing about the political thought of the major figures, or about how they were influenced by kinship ties and patronage networks. It is with the aim of presenting a new and more comprehensive approach to the uprising that I suggest that there was an ‘Aragonese Rebellion of 1591’, in which five phases can be distinguished. They were marked by the entrance and exit of the leading protagonists, by the evolution of their objectives and by the different means that they employed to achieve them.

First, the ‘Legal Phase’ extends from Antonio Pérez’s arrival in Aragon in April 1590 until the uprising of 24 May 1591 and is characterised by the participation of members of all the estates, who upheld Pérez’s right to engage in legal proceedings against the King before the Court of the ‘Justicia Mayor’ and the Aragonese ‘Real Audiencia’ (Royal Supreme Court). Pérez, who had fled his Castilian prison, reached Aragon to seek the protection of some noblemen with whom he had become friends during his career as principal secretary to the King, but he was also hoping to benefit from a legal system whose judicial guarantees were more amenable than those of Castile, as well as the public sympathy of a society which had experienced political conflicts with the Habsburg monarchs for decades, and a kingdom which shared a border with France. As a result, he was able to present his case as the case of the kingdom of Aragon, and attract the attention — and support — of most of the high nobility, of a good number of knights and infanzones; priests, citizens, lawyers, notaries, physicians, merchants, printers, cantors, craftsmen and farmers. When Philip II realised he would never have his former secretary condemned by the Aragonese courts of justice, he resorted to the Inquisition, the sole institution whose power could prevail over the guarantees granted by the Aragonese laws. Pérez

14 The Spanish term ‘labrador’ may refer both to a farmer (who owns the land he works) and a peasant (a labourer who works the land of others). Those who took part in the events of 1591 were mainly prosperous townsmen who owned small- to medium-sized country estates. Here the English word ‘farmer’ is preferred since it describes more accurately their socioeconomic position.

15 For example, the Duke of Villahermosa, the Counts of Aranda, Morata and Belchite and the Baron of La Laguna.

16 Don Martín de Bolea, Don Pedro de Bolea, Don Martín de Lanuza, Don Juan de Aragón, Don Diego de Heredia, Don Juan de Luna, Don Miguel de Gurrea and Francisco de Ayerbe, among others.

17 Such as Don Vicencio Agustín, Prior of La Seo, Bartolomé Llorente, Prior of El Pilar, Luis Sánchez de Cutanda, Dean of Teruel, Gregorio de Andía, Vicar of Saint-Paul, the Franciscan friar Diego Murillo, and others.

18 Don Juan Agustín, Juan de Laserna, Don Galacían Cerdán and Esteban de Aranda, among others.

19 For example, Gaspar de Espinosa, Gerardo de Clavería, Juan de Bardaxí and Andrés Serveto de Aniñón.

20 Like Juan de Mendive, Bartolomé Malo and the brothers Miguel and Mateo de Villanueva.

21 Such as Juan de Murillo and Bartolomé Foncalda.

22 These included Jaime de Urgel, Francisco Pérez de Calatayud, Miguel López de Tolosa and Juan de Sádaba.

23 Juan de Alteraque and Luis Ganareo.

24 Jerónimo Muniesa and Martín Ruiz.

25 For example, the wool manufacturer Pedro de Fuertes and members of other guilds, such as the hosiers Martín de la Era and Pedro de Quintana, the sack manufacturer Juan Royo and the dyer Martín Sarrial.

26 Juan del Barco, Jaime Lacambra and Jaime Cristóbal, among others.
was therefore accused of heresy. The Court of the ‘Justicia Mayor’ complied with this decision, and Pérez was handed over to the Holy Office. But a riot against the Inquisition broke out and the rioters returned the prisoner to the jurisdiction of the ‘Justicia Mayor’.

In the ‘Coercive Phase’, between the riots which took place on 24 May and 24 September 1591, tensions increased. Pérez and his protectors, on the one hand, and the King and his officers, on the other, called on the judges to respect the law, but put pressure on the lawyers by various means. Meanwhile, some of the nobles – whether titled or not – feared the social unrest and the foreseeable reaction of Philip II and decided to abandon their initial attitude and to transfer Pérez to the Holy Office in order to appease the monarch. A new attempt to transfer the prisoner, on 24 September, ended in a second riot, which was much more violent than the first one and resulted in the death of about fifteen people. Pérez was released. Throughout this period, more members of the lower orders of Aragonese society became involved in the rebellion. Under such circumstances, the insurrection became more and more radical. In addition, it should be noted that the second riot was directed not only against the Inquisition, but also against those – even the Aragonese – who had supported the attempt to transfer Pérez to the Holy Office’s prison.

During the ‘Radical Phase’, from 24 September to 31 October 1591, Pérez remained in Saragossa, out of Philip II’s reach, while the King decided to send an army to occupy Aragon and restore order in the realm. This decision provoked different reactions among the Aragonese. Some of them contacted the commander of the King’s army, the ‘capitán general’ Don Alonso de Vargas, to ask for his help and place themselves at his disposal, or to consult him about the nature of his mission. Others wrote to the royal Court, to ask for some more lenient recourse than armed intervention. A third group, composed mainly of nobles and royal officers, tried to leave Saragossa or, at least, take their families to safety. This caused an exodus which was only interrupted when the craftsmen’s guilds took control of the city’s gates, an unmistakable sign of the authorities’ loss of power. Meanwhile, a few daring men plotted to kill some of the leaders of the uprising. Finally, a group of noblemen, knights, infanzones, citizens and Prior Don Vicencio Agustín formally asked the ‘Diputación’ (the standing committee of the estates) to find out whether Vargas’ objective on entering the kingdom would be to usurp the right to administer justice. In that case they would call the people to resist his troops. The ‘Diputación’ corroborated their suspicions and, after consulting a board of thirteen lawyers, on 31 October 1591 pronounced a statement of resistance, which was confirmed the following day by the Court of the ‘Justicia Mayor’. The involvement of the ‘Diputación’ and the ‘Justicia’ gave institutional support to an uprising led by members of the lower nobility, craftsmen, citizens and farmers. The Duke of Villahermosa and the Count of Aranda, the main representatives of the higher nobility, had an ambiguous stance that failed to hide the fact that they were closer to the position of the Aragonese rebels than to the defence of the King’s absolute power.

The fourth phase is the shortest and least known part of the conflict. The ‘Military Phase’ lasted for only the first twelve days of November 1591, when the ‘Diputación’ and the ‘Justicia’ tried to recruit an army to resist the royal troops. They enlisted men from the parishes of Saragossa and demanded that other municipalities and nobles send soldiers to the capital city of the kingdom. The response to this demand was patchy (Gil Pujol 1991a) and led to turmoil in some places, which was particularly serious in Teruel (Almagro Basch 1984). In short, it is difficult to determine the size of the force gathered in this way, though sources confirm that the Aragonese army was not a large one. Moreover, it consisted primarily of non-professional soldiers, although there were some who had previously seen service in the King’s armies. Artillery was provided by several municipalities and noblemen, and supplies were transported to Saragossa, while Aragonese officers confiscated the goods that had been acquired by the King’s
‘capitán general’ Vargas. Army officers, captains and subalterns were chosen, and even a Council of War was created, composed of the Duke of Villaormosa, the Count of Aranda, Don Miguel de Gurrea and Don Pedro de Hijar. Lord Chief Justice Don Juan de Lanuza and Deputy Don Juan de Luna, who led the troops, took part in it as well. Although the rebel army was deployed in the field, it never engaged in a battle. When Lanuza and Luna realised that the royal army was approaching Saragossa, they fled, and the news of their escape provoked a stampede. Vargas encountered no opposition when he entered Saragossa on 12 November 1591.

Aragon remained under military occupation until September 1593, and Saragossa hosted a military garrison until 1626. Philip II decreed a ruthless repression, which started with the execution of Don Juan de Lanuza on 20 December 1591, followed by the death of fifteen more people in January 1592, by order of Governor Don Ramón Cerdán. Meanwhile, Antonio Pérez and some of his Aragonese supporters reached France to seek the protection of Catherine of Bourbon, sister of Henry IV of France. With her collaboration, they prepared a military expedition across the Pyrenees which might be considered the fifth and last phase of the conflict, or even its epilogue. The ‘Jornada de los Bearnenses’ (Bearnese Expedition) took place in February 1592. Its aim was to take advantage of the discontent caused by the repression instigated by the King, especially the death of the Lord Chief Justice, the most significant magistrate of the kingdom, and to incite the Aragonese to revolt against occupation. The attempt failed. Some of the organisers of the ‘Jornada’ were captured, and others fled to France. The repression continued for years – several executions in Saragossa and Teruel in 1592, some autos de fe by the Holy Office between 1592 and 1597, numerous confiscations and other major or minor punishments that lasted until the beginning of the seventeenth century. Not only that, but Philip II introduced significant changes into the Aragonese political regime, mostly limiting the powers and functions of those institutions involved in the conflict, namely the ‘Diputación’ and the ‘Justicia’. The call for a session of the ‘Cortes de Aragón’ in May 1592 permitted the continuity of the constitutional regime, while allowing the King to hold a strong sway over it (Gil Pujol 1991b, 111-115).

The effects of the repression were visible until 1599, when Philip III, recently married in Valencia and on his way to Madrid, passed through Teruel and Saragossa and ordered the removal of the remains of those executed, still displayed in various public places in both cities. Many years later, the Castilian chronicler Luis Cabrera de Córdoba (1877, 612) recorded how Antonio Pérez had died in France in 1611 and that, four years after his death, his descendants had obtained a pardon for him from the Holy Office. In line with this decision, Cabrera de Córdoba wrote, the Saragossa rioters should by rights have been declared innocent of sheltering him when he had sought the protection of the Aragonese laws against the Inquisition. They were not pardoned, of course, but historians might well reflect on how the insurgents had just as much reason to consider themselves guilty of no more than the defence of their laws, as the King had to consider them as rebels. In any case, as stated above, the term ‘Aragonese Rebellion’ seems to describe accurately the event in which they played a leading part, in keeping with the complex nature of the uprising here described.

3. The People and the Limits of Their Political Commitment

When examining popular participation in the Aragonese Rebellion, it is important to remember that several contemporary authors specifically attributed acts of resistance against authority to individuals of lower social status. This was often done with the intention of absolving the Aragonese ruling groups and the institutions of the realm of their responsibility for the conflict
(Gascón Pérez 1994). For instance, Don Francisco de Gurrea y Aragón claimed that ‘esta guerra y conquista que á su naturaleza y patria hacían y ofensa á su Rey, no la hacían sino con unos gitones y una gente perdida del pueblo, que sólo la encendían y comandaban Gil de Mesa y Don Diego de Heredia y Don Martín de Lanuza’ (1888, 120).27 We find a similar idea in Gonzalo de Céspedes y Meneses when he writes that ‘Capateros de viejo, Cortadores de carne, Xiferos y Acacanes, y otras tales personas; fueron sus confidentes: mas no la gente noble, no los cuerdos, y lurisconsultos prudentes; ni como escrivio alguno, hasta los Religiosos’ (1622, 124).28 Something similar can be said of Lupercio de Argensola’s treatment of the popular participation in the riots that broke out in Saragossa in May and September 1591. Referring specifically to the shouts of ‘viva la libertad’29 which, all authors agree, abounded on both occasions, Argensola attributes them to the ‘turba insolente’ (1991, 105)30 and the ‘vulgo alborotado y ciego’ (90),31 and especially to ‘muchos gascones enjertos en el reino, dando la lengua testimonio de su patria, que no sabian pronunciar las voces que daban á vueltas de la mas gente, ni decir viva la libertad, que era voz que el vulgo este dia y otros repetia muchas veces’ (ibid.).32

In short, the examples given here show that these authors insisted on presenting a few rioters and marginal social groups as responsible for the disorders. It was an idea which allowed them to relativise the extent of what had happened and which, as mentioned above, was later adopted by the proponents of the ‘aristocratic view’ of the conflict. Thus, Cabrera de Córdoba went so far as to assert that ‘el reino siempre estuvo sosegado. La ciudad jamas concurrió en violencia alguna. Concurrieron aquellos pocos inquietos con alguna parte del vulgo, y en todo ello fue harto mayor el ruido que las nueces’ (1877, 585, note 1).33 For his part, Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola concluded that, given the small number of people involved, ‘No por la culpa de tan pequeño numero de delinquentes se ha de poner nota de infamia a todo un Reyno’ (1991, 131).34

However, while it is undeniable that the chroniclers invoked the popular component of the Aragonese conflict in order to exonerate the upper strata of the kingdom, it is no less true that those involved in the uprising included not only nobles, knights, infanzones and priests, but also, as mentioned in the previous section, a wide range of people from a variety of backgrounds. Here we might define the elusive category of ‘people’ as consisting of citizens, jurists, merchants and other professionals, as well as craftsmen and farmers. In fact, many of them were prosecuted and sentenced both for their participation in acts of violence and for expressing their refusal to obey the orders of the King or his officials. Various documents allude to their attitudes as well. Some of the chroniclers mentioned above also highlight the political awareness

---

27 (this war and conquest which they made against their nature and homeland, and offence [which they committed] against their King, was aided and abetted by no more than a few foreign vagabonds and lost souls from amongst the common people of the town, who were encouraged and commanded by Gil de Mesa and Don Diego de Heredia and Don Martín de Lanuza alone).
28 (cobbblers, meat cutters, slaughterers and water carriers, and other such persons were their confidants: but not the noble people, not the level-headed, and not the prudent jurisconsults; nor even, as one wrote, the religious).
29 (long live liberty).
30 (insolent mob).
31 (untruly and blind common people).
32 (many Gascons settled in the kingdom, whose tongue bore testimony of their origins, because they knew not how to pronounce the slogans that they uttered in response to the rest of the people, not to say ‘long live liberty’, which was the slogan that the common people repeated many times over on that day and on other days). About verbal and gestural violence during the Aragonese Rebellion, see the work by Bravo 2019.
33 (the kingdom was always quiet. The city was never involved in any violence. Those restless few were involved with some of the common people, and in all this there was far too much ado about nothing).
34 (Not for the fault of such a small number of criminals should a whole kingdom be tainted with infamy).
of certain groups from the lower estates – especially farmers and artisans –, whom they praise for their commitment to the defence of the ‘fueros’.35

Thus, Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola, in his allusions to the ‘vulgo ciego’ (ignorant common people), affirms that ‘el mayor cuerpo de él era de labradores y pelaires, que hay gran número desta gente en esta ciudad y no son como en otras de España rústicos, sino muy pláticos, valientes y atrevidos, y sobre todo muy celosos de las leyes’ (1991, 90).36 More generally, Father Murillo noted that, during the conflict, ‘el hypo del pueblo era no permitir que se les quebrantassen los fueros’ (1616, Part 2, 85).37 Furthermore, through various testimonies we know that, during the rebellion, a good number of farmers, artisans and other people of popular status attended meetings, together with nobles, knights, ecclesiastics and members of the local citizenry, at which they discussed the events of the moment and insisted on the need to defend the privileges and liberties of the kingdom (Gascón Pérez 2010, 540-545). Argensola recorded one of these meetings, in which ‘algunos labradores a quien el virrey habló le osaron responder descomedidamente, y tal dellos hubo que dicen que le dijo que daría sarmientos para quemar a quien hiciese contra los fueros y libertades’ (1991, 99).38 In relation to this episode, statements by the viceroy Don Jaime Ximeno have been preserved, in which he declares that ‘Viose tambien mucho bullicio y desatino en los labradores y gente popular’ (Gascón Pérez 2010, 168), and that he regrets the complicity between the farmers and the promoters of the uprising, because, as he puts it, ‘aunque algunos dan en la cuenta, vese en muchos labradores estan muy persuadidos y que hablan el mismo lenguaje’ (167).39 For his part, the Count of Aranda noted a similar attitude in some of the farmers he knew, who ‘blasonaban mucho de çelar la observancia de los fueros’ (475).40 This political commitment was also acknowledged in a pamphlet describing the riot on 24 May 1591, which claims that ‘más que la tierra, cultivan / la libertad de su patria’ (Gascón Pérez 2003, 33, ll. 35-36)41 and praises their role in the episode:

Cántese de labradores
lo que de nobles se canta:
que sus ocasiones obran,
obran mucho y mucho callan.
Intitúlense defensas
de los muros de su patria;
de sus émulos, verdugos;
y de su ciudad, murallas.
Dese a quien se debe el premio
de gloria tiranizada
a caballeros impuesta:

35 The term ‘fueros’ refers to the historical laws of the kingdom of Aragon. At the time, ‘fueros’, ‘privilegios’ and ‘leyes’ were often used indistinctly.
36 (the largest part of them were farmers and wool manufacturers, since there are a large number of these people in this city, and they are not the rustic yokels that are found in other cities in Spain, but very practical, brave and daring, and above all very zealous of the laws).
37 (the people’s mantra was not to allow their ‘fueros’ to be violated).
38 (some of the farmers to whom the viceroy spoke dared to answer him discourteously, and it is said that one among them told him that he would provide firewood [vine shoots] to burn whoever did anything against the ‘fueros’ and liberties).
39 (there was also a lot of unrest and foolishness among farmers and the populace) and (although some of them understand it, it is clear that many farmers are very persuaded and speak the same language).
40 (took great pride in their zeal for the observance of the ‘fueros’).
41 (more than the land, they cultivate / the freedom of their homeland).
dese a su dueño por paga.
Atribúyanse las loas
y las sátiras que andan
a solos los labradores,
pues son hijas las hazañas.  
(34-35, ll. 61-76)

Obviously, the praise of farmers and artisans is part of a more complex discourse, aimed at mobilising these and other popular groups. In this sense, it is possible to speak of a set of political notions common to the rebels in 1591, whose analysis might be based on various sources, including the pamphlets that circulated at different times of the conflict (Gascón Pérez 2018). However, this does not of course entail the existence of an ideology that was unanimously shared by all the inhabitants of the kingdom of Aragon. In fact, as Christian Jouhaud pointed out in the case of the French mazarinades, it is not even possible to be sure if the authors of the political satires really professed all the ideas expressed in their writings (1985, 16). After all, the primary purpose of these works was a rhetorical one, which was simply to move their audience to action. Or, in the words of the Count of Aranda, ‘levantar el pueblo e los motines que sucedieron’ (Gascón Pérez 2003, xciv). In this respect, it should not be forgotten that the instrumental nature of this ‘revolutionary publicity’ is shaped by the direct intervention of Antonio Pérez, who used it to secure the support of a significant sector of the Aragonese population in his eventually successful attempt to evade Philip II’s justice. His own contemporaries were aware of this strategy, as seen in Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola, who referred to it in the following terms:

como estaba quitado el freno del temor, publicábanse sin autor muchos versos, que llaman pasquines, … señaladamente un diálogo, que, aunque en verso suelto, imitaba mucho el estilo de Luciano: dícese que le compuso el mismo Antonio Pérez; en que introducía las almas del marques de Almenara y de don Juan de Gurrea, gobernador de Aragon, hablando en el infierno, y á vueltas incitando á los aragoneses á la defensa de sus leyes ó fueros. (1991, 94)

Argensola also claims that, to a large extent, the success of the literary campaign was based on its ability to arouse sympathy for Pérez’s fate, especially among the common people (51). And, in turn, Gonzalo de Céspedes y Meneses emphasised that the former secretary knew how to play up ‘diestramente, la observancia inuiolable, de sus leyes y fueros. Para con tal pretesto, confundir sus delictos, diuertir el castigo, y hazer (mediante su vigor, y las diligencias de los sediciosos amigos) común y publico, el daño particular y propio’ (1622, 117).

Researchers
are in unanimous agreement on this matter, starting with Pidal, who, in spite of everything, made little use of the pamphlets in his study (1862-1863, vol. II, 41-42), and the same may be said of Marañón (1948, vol. II, 554-555). For his part, Teófanes Egido analysed in detail the content of several poems and pointed out that Pérez ‘had the skill – and the good fortune – to combine his personal cause with a much broader one: the problem of the Aragonese ‘Fueros’ and Liberties, the Inquisition’s jurisdiction and the fact that the Kingdom was ruled by foreign (i.e. Castilian) viceroys, besides secular social tensions’ (1973, 18-19). In any case, as the same author explains, ‘The monarchical institution … remains almost entirely unscathed, as the invectives are directed at figures who played a role in the trial against Antonio Pérez; more specifically, they are aimed at his personal enemies’. Recently, Paloma Bravo has insisted on the importance of Pérez as a promoter of the pasquinades, highlighting the intellectual and political vitality of the city of Saragossa, ‘capable of producing in a few months a large number of libels that are often surprising for their quality’ (1998, 42).

4. The Political Content of the Aragonese Pasquinades

As I have had occasion to ascertain previously (Gascón Pérez 2003, 2018 and 2020), the study of the content of these writings clearly shows that the references to Pérez’s unjust persecution coexisted with abundant calls for the defence of the Aragonese ‘fueros’, which were praised as ‘los fueros, leyes pías / tan dignas de conservarse’ (Gascón Pérez 2003, 122, ll. 107-108), or as ‘los santos fueros’ (142, l. 2) and ‘las santas libertades’ (41, l. 3). In fact, these invocations became, over time, the most recurrent leitmotif in the pasquinades, which proclaim that ‘¡Vivan, vivan nuestros fueros / y mueran nuestros contrarios!’ (42, ll. 51-52) and often also include references to the ‘patria’ (homeland) or the ‘nación aragonesa’ (Aragonese nation) and the need to defend it, above all, from the trickery of traitors, as exemplified below:

Cuando las leyes tuercen y aquellos a quien nuestra patria tiene por padres suelen ser malos padrastros y prevaricadores dellas, es tiempo de resoluciones temerarias, no dando lugar a que la malicia, con fines interesados, sea el precio de nuestras sagradas leyes. (133)

For the most part, these formulas were accompanied by reiterated expressions of loyalty to Philip II, who only exceptionally was the object of direct attacks, although it is worth noting that these included several accusations of tyranny and an unfavourable comparison with Herod, since, as we find in one of the poems, the King of Judea saw his crown threatened by the omen that the King of the Jews had been born who was to dethrone him. But as for the Spanish King, ‘A este nadie le quita / su cetro ni su corona, / y este a nadie perdona / si no es al que al mal le incita’ (144, ll. 21-24). By contrast, various royal ministers and Aragonese authorities, as well as members of the Holy Office, became the target of numerous attacks; they were accused of seeking to undermine

47 (the ‘fueros’, pious laws / so worthy of preservation).
48 (holy ‘fueros’).
49 (holy liberties).
50 (Long live, long live our ‘fueros’ / and death to our adversaries!).
51 (When the laws are twisted and those whom our homeland considers to be its fathers are often bad stepfathers and prevaricators of the law, it is time for fearless resolutions, not allowing malice, for self-interested ends, to be the price of our sacred laws).
52 (From this one nobody takes away / his sceptre or his crown / and this one forgives nobody / except the one who incites him to evil).
the ‘fueros’, often due to their hostility towards Pérez in the legal cases against him. This explains why numerous pasquinades surfaced during the ‘Coercive Phase’ of the conflict. The instigators of the riot on 24 May had an interest in recording their success, ridiculing their opponents and justifying their actions, which gave rise to abundant satirical texts, the best of which was the ‘Pasquín del Infierno’ (Pasquinade of Hell) mentioned above. These writings also attempted to influence the verdict of the Court of the ‘Judicantes’, an institution which consisted of seventeen legal laymen, who were advised by two jurists. On 10 July it was to rule on the complaints against two lieutenants of the ‘Justicia Mayor’ filed by Antonio Pérez and Don Martín de Lanuza, for having unjustly refused their appeals based on the ‘fueros’. As a consequence, various poems depicted the two lieutenants as prevaricators, and denounced their attempts to bribe several members of the court. Amidst tremendous tension, both defendants were sentenced to debarment from public office for life and three years’ banishment from Aragon. The sentence was later revoked by Philip II during the repression that followed the conflict (Gascón Pérez 2003, lxxv-lxxvi).

Later, during the ‘Military Phase’, a popular riot was provoked by the posting of pamphlets in the city of Teruel. They had appeared in response to the local authorities’ reluctance to send troops to Saragossa at the request of the ‘Justicia Mayor’ to resist the army of Philip II. Consequently, as Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola puts it, ‘Amanecieron en ciertos lugares públicos papeles culpando á los que estorvaban esta resolucion, y solevando al pueblo; y aunque mucha gente vulgar, que estaba en la plaza, los leia, ninguno los quitaba, hasta que llegaron unos alguaciles’ (1991, 121). When the bailiffs tore up the pasquinades, ‘dicen que uno de los del pueblo dijo, que antes debieran estar escritos con letras de oro’ (ibid.), and it was this remark that incited the population to revolt. The killing of several citizens, accused of being traitors to the ‘fueros’, compelled Philip II to dispatch a commissioner to Teruel to judge what had happened, which led to several death sentences and condemnation of others to the galleys. Finally, it is worth mentioning the late appearance of a pasquinade when the repression of the uprising was already under way. Specifically, on 22 July 1592, three copies of a text containing intensely derogatory comments against the King, including the aforementioned comparison with Herod, were circulated (Gascón Pérez 2003, 143-153). When the Holy Office saw them a few days later, the inquisitors lamented that ‘será malo de averiguar el author, por ser muchos los de aquella opinion, y aumenta esta sospecha el ver que los mas edictos que avemos fixado en las yglesias contra los absentes los an rasgado al paresçer de propio’ (quoted in Gascón Pérez 2003, lxxiii-lxxiv).

As they foresaw, their diligences did not bear fruit. However, it does not seem that those verses had any better luck, since, as Pilar Sánchez López notes, ‘The pasquinade had little or no popular resonance given the few copies that were found and the speed with which they were withdrawn. It had a greater effect on the minds of the inquisitors, who were surprised that at this point, when the kingdom had ‘the knife at its throat and punishment in its hand’, any sign of opposition should have been made public’ (1996-1997, 331).

---

53 Undoubtedly it is the composition which has attracted most interest among researchers. That is the reason why it has been published on many occasions. It may be found, for instance, in Gascón Pérez 2003, 60-75.
54 (Papers appeared in certain public places blaming those who hindered this resolution and arousing the people; and although many vulgar people, who were in the square, were reading them, none of them took them down, until some bailiffs arrived).
55 (they say that one of the commoners said that they should rather have been written in letters of gold).
56 (the author will be hard to find, as there are many of that opinion, and this suspicion is heightened by the fact that most of the edicts that we have posted up in the churches against absentees have been torn down on purpose, apparently).
5. Political Pamphlets as a Weapon for Popular Mobilization

At this point, it should be recalled that philologists, linguists, anthropologists and historians have stressed the peculiar nature of this type of literary composition, which, as a genre, falls between elite and popular culture, as well as between written and oral communication. With regard to the first pair of concepts, it is worth explaining that in recent decades it has become quite common to qualify the tendency to refer to popular literature by using expressions such as ‘semi-popular’ (García de Enterría 1973, 42) or ‘popularised’ (Caro Baroja 1990, 521). After all, as Teófanes Egido reminds us, the authors of pasquinades whose identity has been established ‘belong to sectors far removed from the lower classes, on account of their interests and mindset’ (1973, 11). This, in the words of Egido, means that ‘the people, the common people, are the target – not the agent – of all this immense production, which does not appear to be the expression of popular public opinion, but that of a minority who are interested in influencing the masses’ (1971, 47). But this does not invalidate the fact that, despite the educated background of the authors of pasquinades and of political satires in general, they were still able to combine resources from elite and popular culture in order to appeal to as wide a readership as possible (Jouhaud 1985, 63). Thus, when assessing their literary quality or their reliability as a source, it is necessary to consider that ‘both expressive beauty and historical truth are subordinate values: the purpose is political effectiveness. And a dirty and deficient, albeit opportune, pasquinade or a bad ‘espinela’ [a ten-line stanza], apt to be memorised, laughed at, and repeated can be more effective – i.e. multiplied – than perfectly elaborated serious compositions’ (Egido 1990, 341).

Similarly, several authors have noted the coexistence of oral and written communication, and the combination of resources from both worlds to reach a larger audience. Thus, both Lois Schwoerer (1977, 868) and Christian Jouhaud (1985, 26) have stressed the importance of iconographic material and, above all, of oral dissemination as tools for extending the compass of written texts to the semi-literate and illiterate elements of society, while Castillo Gómez (2016, 144) has recalled that, thanks to the interaction between the different forms of communication existing in the Early Modern Age – oral, written and visual –, some pamphlets have been considered as true mass media. More specifically, Asa Briggs and Peter Burke, analysing the pamphlet campaign generated by the spread of the Reformation in the early decades of the sixteenth century, have drawn attention to the persistence of oral communication in a world in which the printed text was coming to occupy an ever-increasing space. In their view, the growing significance of the printing press was qualified by the high cost of printed texts and widespread illiteracy among the population, so that ‘only a minority of the German-speaking population could afford to buy pamphlets and only a minority were able to read. The texts were probably read in public more often than in private and their message was heard by more people than were able to read it’ (2005, 67).

In this respect, it is worth remembering that all the writings mentioned in the present article were circulated in manuscript form, which is why a witness identified them as escritos de mano (handwritten papers) and the Duke of Villahermosa claimed to have had knowledge of them ‘de la manera que bulgarmente los biam las demas personas, yendo de mano en mano’. On the other hand, we know that the dissemination was not limited to the capital of the kingdom. Proof of this is the appearance of unos carteles (a few placards) in Saragossa in mid-July 1590, at the height of the ‘Legal Phase’ of the conflict. The documentation does not provide news of the content of these carteles, but it does provide news of the alarm they gave to the local authorities,

\footnote{57 (in the way they were commonly seen by other people, when circulated from hand to hand). Unless otherwise stated, all testimonies mentioned in this section are taken from Gascón Pérez 2003, lxxxvi-xci.}
who considered them to be ‘en muy grande desacato de S.M. y offensa desta ciudad y occasion de poder seguir por ello muy grandes alteraciones y motin en esta ciudad y reyno’. Such alarm may have had some basis, as the same source explains that Saragossa was not the only place where these writings appeared: ‘muchos dellos se habian embiado por el reyno y fuera del a diversas partes’.

Finally, we have some interesting data on the mechanisms of diffusion of the pasquinades during the conflict, which suggest that their content was not only available to a literate public, but that it was also accessible to uneducated people. The business of dissemination was supported by the production of handwritten copies of the texts, a task initially promoted by Antonio Pérez and in which various scribes and students collaborated. These copies were also displayed in public places, which made it easier for them to be read aloud in front of small or large groups, or, in the words of another witness, ‘otras vezes los dexavan caer en las plaças y en otras partes, para que los tomasen y viessen’. When the writings were invectives against specific individuals, they were affixed to the doors of their houses or hurled through their windows, sometimes accompanied by arquebus shots. However, the individual nature of this type of attack did not prevent these pamphlets from also having a certain diffusion. From a statement by Bartolomé de Argensola we learn that ‘el dicho conde de Morata leyo al duque [de Villahermosa] unos pasquines o cartas maliciosas que le habían arrojado y fixado en las esquinas de su casa’. Lastly, it is worth mentioning the intervention of some ecclesiastics in the copying and dissemination of several pieces, the most intriguing case being the one described by Argensola in the following paragraph:

In summary, the nature of the pasquinades and the methods of their circulation enabled their messages to reach individuals from diverse social backgrounds. This draws attention once again to the crossover between the educated and the popular, on the one hand, and between the written and the oral, on the other. These links encompass not only formal but also ideological aspects, as noted by Lía Schwartz Lerner when she underlines that political satires offer pertinent texts for rethinking the phenomenon of ‘ideological negotiations’, in Jacques Revel’s terms, which are the product of the systematic interweaving of popular forms and educated models, as characteristic of the genre as of other narrative and dramatic texts in those centuries, which have been suggestively analysed by García de Enterría, Maxime Chevalier, Augustín Redondo and Monique Joly, among other scholars. Some satirical variants reveal the strategies of solidarity deployed by certain social groups to obtain the support of the common people, others point to cultural practices of domination that cut across all social groups, and force us to redefine the poetic object, the product of concurrent ideological discourses. (1995, 153)
The key question in this matter is how far the ‘ideological negotiation’ described by Revel and mentioned by Schwartz Lerner could have gone. Or, applying the words of José Antonio Maravall to the case of the pasquinades, ‘whether you give the public what they want or whether you manage to make them want what you are offering them’ (1975, 195). In this respect, we must pose the question of whether the current evidence is sufficient to establish the presence of a political consciousness amongst the Aragonese, including the frequently mentioned farmers and craftsmen. Should we accept the existence of this political consciousness, it is no less difficult to discern whether it developed autonomously or whether it was activated by external influences. Maravall, in response to the question he himself had raised, concluded that ‘There is no doubt that the public is conditioned by the offer before them and that everything boils down to presenting it to them in such a way that it arouses feelings to which they seem to respond’ (ibid.). However, without rejecting this assertion in its entirety, it is worth contrasting it with the opinion of Christopher Hill, according to whom ‘almost by definition, a great revolution cannot take place without ideas. Most men have to believe quite strongly in some ideal before they will kill or be killed’ (1965, 1), a reflection which he develops by asserting further on that ‘men, that is to say, do not break lightly with the past: if they are to challenge conventionally accepted standards they must have an alternative body of ideas to support them’ (5).

This approach is consistent with the data presented in this essay about the dissemination of pasquinades in 1591, which suggests that ‘those who launched invectives against the King and his ministers along with proclamations in defence of the kingdom’s ‘fueros’ and liberties hoped that part of the population would be receptive to them’ (Gascón Pérez 2003, xcv). Unfortunately, the currently available sources do not allow for case studies to determine the true impact of Aragonese pasquinades on their potential audience. However there is no doubt that a connection can be made ‘between the shaping of a certain public opinion and the circulation and fixation of pasquinades, verses or libels, at least in some particularly significant periods’, as pointed out by Castillo Gómez (2009, 595), and previous research enables us to consider how a ‘body of ideas’ – to continue using the term proposed by Hill – may have germinated among the common people involved in the conflict.

It should be stressed that Aragonese constitutionalist thinking, as an alternative doctrine to the absolute power of the kings, developed on the basis of a well-established corpus of ‘fueros’ and the elaboration of a constitutionalist ideology, and was also founded on the memory of the jurisdictional conflicts between the monarchy and the institutions of the kingdom in the late fifteenth century and throughout the sixteenth century (Gascón Pérez 1999b). However, it seems safe to say that, in the case of most of Aragonese society, the awareness of belonging to a political community may have been based not so much on a thorough knowledge of the doctrine of the ‘fueros’ or the history of the kingdom – something that was only within the reach of a select minority of the population, as Carmelo Lisón Tolosana (1984, 134) has already pointed out – as on the certain possibility of being protected by the Aragonese ‘fueros’, as evidenced in a series of everyday events. Finally, in addition to the experience and memory of repeated jurisdictional disputes and daily experience of the ‘fueros’, we must also note the impact of messages disseminated through different channels by the governing institutions or other sources of authority, characterised by their intellectual complexity, to reinforce the socio-political bonds among the population (Serrano Martín 2011).
6. Conclusion: The Pasquinades in the Aragonese Rebellion

Such messages found a very effective channel in public ceremonies, but reached their greatest intensity during the abundant jurisdictional crises experienced since the end of the fifteenth century, which forced the ‘Diputación’ and the ‘Justicia’ to justify legal resistance to various commands from the monarchs or their officials. Their assertions were occasionally projected beyond the educated elites by means of writings aimed at mobilising popular groups in society. One of the most relevant episodes took place in the city of Teruel in 1571, during the aforementioned clerical riot. However, the main crisis was undoubtedly the Aragonese Rebellion of 1591, during which the intense campaign of popular mobilisation described above was articulated. Concerning this campaign, Egido has written that, ‘few cycles of this type of production are as complete and as attractive to observation as this one’, adding that an accurate interpretation of the texts that comprise it requires an understanding ‘of the historical and literary context in which they were born, copied, distributed, read aloud, recounted and requisitioned’, and emphasised that the moment of their creation was ‘one of those occasions when the written or spoken agitation, the word, was able to connect with “popular” movements in which the most varied social sectors participated’ (2003, x). The success of this campaign lies precisely in the fact that it sparked a major popular mobilisation which intensified a conflict whose origins lay in the defence of Antonio Pérez, but which ended up becoming an episode of resistance against Philip II. Undoubtedly, both the circulation of pamphlets and the internal dynamics of the Aragonese Rebellion gave to these events a scale comparable to other contemporary political crises. It is no coincidence that during the seventeenth century the ‘pamphlet war’ was part of every major political crisis (Schwoerer 1977, 848). Yet, it was also common for calls to the popular classes for mobilisation to change the course of events, often with unexpected consequences for the ruling groups. Thus, in the opinion of Briggs and Burke,

These events followed a recurrent pattern which may be described as a “sorcerer’s apprentice” model of political change in early modern Europe. Again and again, disputes within elites led to their appealing for support to a wider group, often described as “the people”. In order to reach this wider group, the elites could not rely on face-to-face communication and so they turned to public debates and to pamphlets. The appeal to the people was often successful. Indeed, it was sometimes more successful than those initiating it expected or even wanted. On a number of occasions, frightened by what they had started, the elite tried to damp down debate, only to discover that they were too late and that the forest fire was out of control. (2005, 62)

In this sense, Kenneth Scholberg was only partly right when he concluded that ‘neither the bitter satires of the Portuguese nor the vehement pasquinades of the Aragonese changed the course of history’ (1979, 143). Focusing here on the Aragonese case, and recalling the terms used by Virgil and his seventeenth-century interpreters, the Aragonese Rebellion deserves to be remembered for both its tumultuous – masculine – and its literary – feminine – features. Although pasquinades did not prevent Philip II from eventually prevailing, they helped build a complex resistance movement that involved significant sectors of every stratum of Aragonese society.
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