

## **Dowry and Marriage in the City of Guanajuato, Mexico during the Colonial Period\***

**Jose Luis Caño**  
**University of Seville, Spain**

While certain aspects of the city of Guanajuato's colonial past are now better understood due to recent studies both in Spain and Mexico, others remain obscure and the subject of cursory investigation. One such topic is the prominent role of women in Hispanoamerica, although it has been recognized by recent historiography.<sup>1</sup> With regard to Guanajuato, in particular, there are a few relevant essays that have contributed to the investigation of the upper-class woman's role in society, for example those by Guevara Sanginés y Caño Ortigosa.<sup>2</sup>

Using these articles and an ample collection of written deeds produced by or for the women of Guanajuato during the Colonial Period as a point of departure, this study further examines the position of upper-class women in the socio-economic context of Guanajuato. The quantity of documentation generated by women during the Colonial times makes such an investigation possible since 30% of the property deeds in Guanajuato between 1700 and 1712, were drafted by women.<sup>3</sup> This demonstrates that the elite women of Guanajuato, as with their counterparts in other areas of Spanish America, represented an essential and active part of society.

Therefore, the importance of discerning the social and economic mechanisms that enabled women to gain this influence is evident. It can be said that the institutions of dowry and marriage figured prominently in women's public lives, as these were some of the means by which social

---

\* We would like to thank Andrew Kincaid, of the University of Pennsylvania, for the help he has given us with the translation, as well as Dr. Anthony Grubbs, of Michigan State University, for his revision and commentary.

<sup>1</sup> Virginia M. Bouvier, "Alcances y límites de la historiografía: la mujer y la conquista de América", en Juan Andreo García y Sara Beatriz Guardia (comp.), *Historia de las mujeres en América Latina*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 2002, pp. 111-133.

<sup>2</sup> María Guevara Sanginés, "Testamentos de mujeres en Guanajuato. Primera mitad del siglo XVIII" en *Folios*, núm. 9 (Guanajuato, octubre, 1999), pp. 73-90.- José Luis Caño Ortigosa, "La integración económica y social de la mujer en la élite de Guanajuato (1700-1750)", en Juan José Sánchez Baena y Lucía Provencio Garrigós (eds.), *El Mediterráneo y América*. Murcia: Servicio de Publicaciones y Estadística de la Región de Murcia, 2006, pp. 417-430. "Mineras en el Guanajuato colonial", en *Temas americanistas*, número 18 (Sevilla, 2005), pp. 2-16.

<sup>3</sup> Caño Ortigosa, "La integración económica y social".

status and prestige were established and maintained. This investigation focuses on these two key aspects of female life and how they had consequences for the historical, political, economic, and social life of the city. The study begins with the self-documented deeds of 1606 and ends when the Spanish lost administrative and military control of the area in 1821.

The identification and study of all handwritten dowries in seventeenth- through nineteenth century Guanajuato, as with registries in general, while indispensable for the identification of marriages and their households, appeared to be a prohibitively burdensome task for an essay of this type, given that there were several active notaries in the city from the middle of the eighteenth century. This explains why we have refined our focus and decided to address only those dowries included in the more than 23,600 documents between 1606 and 1821 which have been preserved by the notary of the town council, the most prolific in the region.

These registries are the primary sources employed in this paper, and they lead us to a focus on the upper echelons of society, which served as a model for and directed the customs of the lower social strata. Similarly, authors such as Lohmann Villena, Vila Vilar, Gonzalbo Aizpuru, Jochims Reichel, Peñafiel Ramón, Mijares Ramírez and Caño Ortigosa have already demonstrated the distinct role that women played in the course of history throughout colonial America.<sup>4</sup> It was women who, by means of marriage, facilitated the conservation of family structures, by planning their daughters' weddings according to particular economic interests or in attempts to obtain social prestige. At the same time, women were charged with preserving and transmitting their possessions through the female familial line by means of the dowry.

1. The Dowry and the *Arras*

- 2.

According to Castilian law, a legal marriage was constituted by the contribution of, on one side, the dowry and, on the other, the *arras* and other possessions that the husband brought

---

<sup>4</sup> Guillermo Lohmann Villena y Enriqueta Vila Vilar, "Juana de Rojas: una mujer emigrante, empresaria y matriarca del siglo XVII", y Pilar Gonzalbo Aizpuru, "Las mujeres novohispanas y las contradicciones de una sociedad patriarcal", en Pilar Gonzalbo Aizpuru y Berta Ares Queija, *Las mujeres en la construcción de las sociedades iberoamericanas*. Sevilla-México: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas y El Colegio de México, 2004, pp. 88 y 134.- Heloisa Jochims Reichel, "La mujer rioplatense en la visión de los viajeros: un sujeto de la historia", en Andreo García y Beatriz Guardia, ob. cit., pp. 181-193.- Antonio Peñafiel Ramón, *Mujer, mentalidad e identidad en la España moderna (siglo XVIII)*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 2001, p. 14.- Ivonne Mijares Ramírez, "Mujeres en la Nueva España: entre la autonomía y la dependencia. México en el siglo XVI", en *Actas del IX Congreso Internacional de Historia de América*. 2 vols. Mérida: Junta de Extremadura, 2002, vol. II, pp. 135-143.- Caño Ortigosa, "La integración económica y social" y "Mineras en el Guanajuato".

with him. The dowry and the *arras* served as a form of financial security for the bride, especially in the event of her husband's death, although the latter gradually lost importance over the course of the centuries, ceding ground to the former.<sup>5</sup> The wealth that formed the dowry and the *arras* was administered through communal possessions, the first being formed by the mass of property provided by the women at the moment of marriage in order to assist with the maintenance of marital obligations, while the *arras* was the property given by the groom to his wife before marriage.

Authors such as Juan Luis Vives and Brother Luis de León recognized that the woman was essential for maintaining a successful household, but not for working, shopping, or running estates; activities which were better left to men. A woman, it was thought, "should be content with the estate that she inherited from her parents and with reaping the fruits of it, nor is it owed, nor linked with the danger and restlessness of other granaries and deals".<sup>6</sup> Although not legally restricted from participating in lucrative dealings, it was generally agreed upon that women should not become involved in such matters.<sup>7</sup> The dowry, supplied by the bride's family was given to the groom, who, upon receipt, presented a document that not only confirmed the exchange, but also made him executor of the estate for the duration of the marriage. Nevertheless, the property associated with the dowry was distinct from the husband's personal estate and, in fact, he was responsible for maintaining such a separation so that, in the case of his death or the dissolution of the marriage, the dowry would be available to ensure the financial security of the bride. In the event of a wife's passing, her husband would maintain the dowry in trust so that her children might inherit it upon reaching the age of majority. Thus, a husband could administer the dowry and profit from it, but could not diminish or transfer the specified properties, lest the wife, in accordance with statute, repossess the said property, having established that her husband was handling it in a manner that did not conform to her best interests.<sup>8</sup> In this way, in 1726, the

---

<sup>5</sup> María Francisca Gámez Montalvo, *Régimen jurídico de la mujer en la familia castellana medieval*. Granada: Comares, 1998, pp. 113-151.

<sup>6</sup> Juan Luis Vives, *Instrucción de la mujer cristiana*. Amberes: 1524, en Pilar Gonzalbo, *La educación de la mujer en la Nueva España*. México: Consejo Nacional de Fomento Educativo, 1985, p. 32.

<sup>7</sup> Juan Luis Vives, ob. cit., y Fray Luis de León, *La perfecta casada*. 1583, en Gonzalbo, art. cit., pp. 32-35 y 39-42.

<sup>8</sup> Oihane Oliveri Korta, *Mujer y herencia en el estamento hidalgo guipuzcoano durante el Antiguo Régimen (siglos XVI-XVIII)*. San Sebastián: Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa, 2001, p. 86.- Isabel Pérez Molina, *Las mujeres en el antiguo régimen. Imagen y realidad (ss. XVI-XVIII)*. Barcelona: Icaria, 1994, pp. 44-45.- Carmen Cremades Griñán y Pilar Sánchez Parra, "Los bienes de las mujeres aportados al matrimonio. Estudio de la evolución de la dote en la Edad Moderna", en María del Carmen García Nieto-París (ed.), *Ordenamiento jurídico y realidad social de las*

assayer and balancer of Guanajuato, Sebastián Romero Camacho, allowed his wife, Isabel María Salinas Figueroa, to draw up her last will and testament and make it clear that upon her death, she wished to relinquish her claim to her dowry.<sup>9</sup>

However, there are doubts concerning whether the debts of a husband could be settled with his wife's dowry, though in the case of Guanajuato, several references indicate that this practice was prohibited, as it was occasionally employed as a legal defense by debtors for renegeing on their obligations. Such was the case of Gonzalo Leagui, accountant for the *Caja Real*, who, in the early years of the eighteenth century, became embroiled in a protracted legal battle against the miners of the town, during the course of which they seized his property as recompense. On several occasions, his wife, Sebastiana Vázquez de Lara, presented her case to a judge in order to defend her impounded property, especially the shops which had contributed to her dowry. To corroborate her claims, in order to avoid payment, he made certain to arrive in Guanajuato apparently impoverished with half of her salary frozen and carrying hardly any personal effects. Also, in 1704, María Manuela Canalejo Espínola had to enter into a legal battle to convince the local judges to release the property specified in her dowry certificate from the seizure that had been directed at her husband.<sup>10</sup>

In the period from 1606 to 1821, we have identified 62 handwritten notary documents in Guanajuato that appear as itemized dowries, valued at a total of 434,939 pesos.<sup>11</sup> The average value in the area, therefore, was 7,015 pesos. Of course, the value of dowries varied widely from family to family; as evidenced by the enormous disparity between the 58,123 pesos offered by María Josefa de Alegría y Bustos in 1770 and the scant 173 pesos that José Solano y Sardaneta received in 1730 upon marrying Ana María de Sopeña, daughter of Juan Sopeña Laherran.<sup>12</sup>

Between these quantities, we find the 50,000 pesos offered by Pedro Otero Sánchez Dovalina to wed María Josefa Septien Montero Pérez in 1805. Notable also is the 24,274 pesos

---

*mujeres, siglos XVI a XX: Actas de las IV Jornadas de Investigación Interdisciplinaria.* Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1984, p. 145.

<sup>9</sup> Poder para testar que otorga Sebastián Romero Camacho en Guanajuato el 7 de julio de 1726. Archivo Histórico de la Universidad de Guanajuato (AHUG), Protocolo de Cabildo Libro (PCL), 1726, f. 189.

<sup>10</sup> Autos del común y minas contra los oficiales reales, Guanajuato 1700-1701. Visita a la Caja Real de Guanajuato, 1704-1715. Archivo General de Indias (AGI), México 1.044 y 1.045.- Véase también el poder otorgado por Sebastiana Vázquez de Lara en Guanajuato el 9 de mayo de 1701 para reclamar ante el oidor la devolución de un tendejón de su propiedad en la mina de Rayas. AHUG, PCL, 1701, f. 99.- Poder otorgado por María Manuela Canalejo Espínola en Guanajuato el 2 de octubre de 1704. AHUG, PCL, 1704, f. 265v.

<sup>11</sup> Appendix.

<sup>12</sup> Carta de dote de José Solano Sardaneta, Guanajuato 15 de septiembre de 1730 y carta de dote de María Josefa de Alegría y Bustos, Guanajuato 6 de noviembre de 1770. AHUG, PCL, 1729-30, f. 749v y AHUG, PCL, 1770, f. 465.

dowry with which Cristóbal Domínguez Belmonte negotiated the marriage of his daughter Ana Francisca to Juan Ortiz de la Lagunilla, or the 20,250 pesos offered to José Antonio Mendizábal and the 20,000 pesos received by Francisco Alipasolo, or the riches given by Captain Manuel Aranda Saavedra and Josefa Teresa de Busto y Moya to arrange the marriage of both María Antonia and Ana de Aranda Saavedra, respectively. It is fitting, moreover, to review the 12,000 pesos that Gonzalo de Aranda received from his in-laws, Francisco Matías de Busto and Luisa Marmolejo Esquivel, upon marrying Francisca Busto Esquivel, as with Pedro Flores Collar del General Damián Villavicencio y Ana de Moya y Monroy, on marrying Micaela de Villavicencio.<sup>13</sup> It is also significant that all the male recipients of these dowries during the Colonial period were *peninsulares*—Spaniards born in Spain, who enjoyed a set of rights and privileges distinct from those born in the Americas—that were already, or would become, heads of city councils or were the siblings of councilmen. Likewise, those interested in paying these sums to forge ties with important families were some of the most notable representatives of the Creole elite in Guanajuato, especially the mothers of brides who sought to secure governmental positions for their children.

Essentially, the property offered by the bride played an integral role with regard to the marriage, as much for its economic importance as for its significance in expressing the social position of those involved and, perhaps most importantly, in attempting to secure a similar status for their daughters. In this sense, the evolution of the sum contributed as dowry was especially relevant, since its increase in price could lead families to impoverish themselves in order to maintain their daughters in an elevated social stratum. It seems, though, that in Guanajuato the Crown's intention in the Pragmatic Sanction proclaimed by Felipe IV in 1623, which was later ratified by Felipe V in 1723, aimed at preventing some of the more exorbitant dowries, though without success.

From this, it can be deduced that the dowry figured prominently in Guanajuato as a mechanism for the transmission of family wealth and a guarantee of social prestige for the members of the locality's elite families. However, this was not a novel practice, as it resembled

---

<sup>13</sup> Cartas de dote fechadas en Guanajuato el 23 de agosto de 1702, 26 de febrero de 1718, 5 de diciembre de 1725 y 18 de marzo de 1729. AHUG, PCL, 1702, f. 150; AHUG, PCL, 1718, f. 40v.; AHUG, PCL, 1725, f. 618v y AHUG, PCL, 1729-30, f. 117.

the customs adopted by the Guipuzcoa estate gentleman in this era,<sup>14</sup> in which the role of the woman as an heir and transmitter of the family fortune was very relevant, according to the conventional matrimonial policy. In this scheme, governing the transfer of goods, the dowry should not only be considered a means of dividing the inheritance, but also of stratification between the siblings who entailed these matrimonial strategies. These ideas directly dealt with the compensation of personal wealth and the alliances that secured social prestige, in effect, that “symbolic” wealth was just as necessary as its “real” counterpart.<sup>15</sup>

In Guipúzcoa an heir received and managed the household and the other siblings maintained their hierarchically-determined positions, which depended on the distribution of dowries and other outlays. The situation was similar in Guanajuato. In such case, a first-born son could be the beneficiary of a hereditary title or of a public office held by his father, while his siblings were entitled to sums of money, possessions, or chaplaincies. Also, daughters might occasionally receive public offices as a dowry with the intention of having the son-in-law execute the duties involved with such positions.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, as a means of negotiating a beneficial marriage,<sup>17</sup> a daughter could be named beneficiary over her brother, receiving a larger portion of dowry than that which she was originally guaranteed.

Such Guanajuato families as those of the Royal Second Lieutenant Damián Villavicencio and his wife Ana Moya Monroy or of the assayer Manuel Gonzalez Cedillo and his wife Ana María Romero Camacho practiced this unequal distribution or stratification of resources. The first couple decided to bestow the office of second lieutenant of the town upon their son, José Atanasio, providing their daughter Micaela with 12,000 pesos upon her betrothal to the town councilor, Pedro Flores Collar, while they gave their other daughter, Catalina, a sum ten times smaller when she arranged to wed Diego Cayetano de Alcocer y Bocanegra. In the case of the

---

<sup>14</sup> Los vascos, como hidalgos considerados en la época colonial, son parte importante de las elites en México, y sus costumbres vascas también son usadas allí cuando se trasladan

<sup>15</sup> Oliveri Korta, ob. cit., pp. 21 y 27.

<sup>16</sup> AHUG, PCL, 1719-20 hasta 1730.- Escritura de pago de un tercio del valor del oficio de alguacil mayor que otorga Juan Pardo Verastegui a favor de Ana Pardo Verastegui, 1 de junio de 1731. AHUG, PCL, 1731, f. 134.- Manuel González Cedillo obtuvo el cargo de ensayador de la Caja Real que poseyó su suegro Sebastián Romero Camacho. Poder de Manuel González Cedillo para solicitar el cargo de ensayador que renunció a su favor Sebastián Atanasio Romero Camacho, 21 de marzo de 1733, AHUG, PCL, 1733.- Aurora Jáuregui de Cervantes, *Los marqueses de Rayas*. Guanajuato: La Rana, 1987, pp. 59-85.- Fundación de capellanías de 2.000 pesos de capital que otorgaron en Guanajuato María Herrera y Liñán, mujer de Pedro Flores Porras y Buitrón y Juana de Cáceres Caballero, esposa de Francisco Alcocer, a favor de sus hijos el Br. Pedro Flores Liñán y el Br. Francisco Alcocer, el 26 de agosto de 1700 y el 15 de octubre de 1707. AHUG, PCL, 1700, f. 174 y AHUG, PCL, 1707, f. 195v.

<sup>17</sup> Oliveri Korta, ob. cit., p. 70.

second family, González Cedillo had already received the office of assayer from his father-in-law, Sebastián Romero Camacho, to provide for the financial stability to his daughter, Ana María. Similarly, these families gave different amounts as dowry for their daughters, as they first offered 9,020 pesos for Manuela Modesta, then 7,232 for Cesárea, and finally, 9,973 pesos for Josefa, when she married Francisco Javier Uribarren.<sup>18</sup>

Thus, the role of women was just as much to link separate oligarchic families as to guarantee the comfort of prestigious new members, as was often the case with recently arrived *peninsulares* who promised to prosper quickly, owing to their allegedly superior skill and intelligence or by, perhaps, the letters of appointment that they had brought with them. However, it is also true that, on occasion, the dowries that women contributed were crucial for those that received them, as no small portion of these *peninsulares* arrived completely destitute. Certainly, then, the dowry was an important means for women to transmit fortunes, although, in accordance with the law, their husbands managed the accounts.<sup>19</sup>

This said, however, a woman was entitled to deny her husband the privilege of administering her dowry so long as she could demonstrate that he was not making good use of the privilege or that he was mismanaging her finances. In 1733, for example, María Cayetana Pérez de Hermida revoked the power of attorney from her husband, Joaquín Sánchez de Tagle, after her estate noticeably diminished in worth under his stewardship. Similarly, in 1733, María Ana Josefa Sopeña Fernández filed an injunction to prevent her spouse, Alonso Cid Fernández from administering her dowry.<sup>20</sup>

The practice of the *arras* was quite different from the dowry, because they were considered the exclusive property of the wife, over which the husband had no authority. She had at her disposal the entirety of the *arras* without his consent, unless she bore his children, in which case she was only entitled to a quarter.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Escritura de poder fechada en Guanajuato el 5 de febrero de 1707. AHUG, PCL, 1707, f. 42v.- Escrituras de dote fechadas en Guanajuato el 23 de agosto de 1702, el 29 de enero de 1704, el 6 de diciembre de 1741 y el 17 de septiembre de 1742. AHUG, PCL, 1702, f. 150; AHUG, PCL, 1704, f. 37; AHUG, PCL, 1741, fs. 174 y 224 y AHUG, PCL, 1742, f. 142v.

<sup>19</sup> Gonzalbo Aizpuru, "Las mujeres novohispanas y las contradicciones", p. 137.

<sup>20</sup> Anulación de poder que otorga María Cayetana Pérez de Hermida, Guanajuato 17 de enero de 1733. AHUG, PCL, 1733, f. 288v.- Poder que otorga María Ana Josefa Sopeña Fernández en Guanajuato el 16 de julio de 1733. AHUG, PCL, 1733, f. 190.

<sup>21</sup> Carta de arras de 1.000 pesos que otorga Juan de Herrera Quintana a favor de Micaela Salgado por su honra, virginidad y limpieza, Guanajuato 23 de abril de 1701; Arras de 6.000 pesos que otorga Francisco Matías de Busto a favor de María Reinoso y Alonso, Guanajuato 5 de octubre de 1728; Recibo de dote y donación de 1.000 pesos en

## 2. – Marriage

During the Colonial age, married life was considered the ideal state for women since almost all of the laws concerning them dealt with marriage. The only other options available at the time were to join a convent or remain permanently subject to the head of the household. Any other circumstance meant marginalization.<sup>22</sup>

In Guanajuato, the most straightforward plan for wealthy families was to arrange for their daughters to marry one of the numerous *peninsulares* of the city. These men either were drawn to the city by the possibility of personal wealth offered by the mineral wealth of the region, or had arrived to fill one of the various political or treasury offices acquired in Spain. The *peninsulares* were preferred to Creoles, as they guaranteed the maintenance of the family's prestige while they secured access to the fortunes of local mining families, landowners, or merchants.<sup>23</sup>

The opportunities for an upper-class woman in Mexico were few, consisting of matrimony or taking holy vows. Indeed, marriage was the best option for a woman of Guanajuato, especially since the town lacked a convent that would have given the local women access to a religious life, without the total estrangement from their families and an elevation in costs. This distinct lack became evident in 1752 when, in the nearby town of San Miguel el Grande, the daughter of Manuel de la Canal, the town's most prominent resident, and the Guanajuato woman María de Hervás y Flores decided to found a convent for Spanish women with a substantial portion of her inheritance, which totaled over 70,000 pesos. The project soon had the support of the town's most important residents, who offered to contribute such sums as would ensure the satisfactory completion of the convent and, in some cases, implied the purchase of a place in the said convent for one of their daughters or descendents. All of the benefactors, including the Bishops from Michoacán and the Audiencia de México, secured social, religious, and economic benefits, which the aforementioned foundation would have for San Miguel el Grande, since the daughters of the powerful families of the whole region were obligated to

---

arras que otorga Manuel José de Santillán por casarse con Estefanía Dominga Busto y Brito, Guanajuato 30 de abril de 1736; Promesa de 500 pesos de arras que otorga Pedro García de Lara a favor de Clara Pérez Rueda, Guanajuato 30 de diciembre de 1737. AHUG, PCL, 1701, f. 81; AHUG, PCL, 1728, f. 385v; AHUG, PCL, 1736, f. 341 y AHUG, PCL, 1737, f. 322.- Oliveri Korta, ob. cit, p. 89.

<sup>22</sup> Pérez Molina, ob. cit., pp. 27-31.

<sup>23</sup> Caño Ortigosa, art. cit.

contribute a sum of at least 4,000 pesos to join, at which time they would have a place in which to take refuge if they did not marry or if they chose to embark on the religious path.<sup>24</sup>

Therefore, the erstwhile absence of a convent of this type for the young women of Guanajuato, made marriage to an advantageous husband generally preferred. Marriage was, according to Bennassar and Pérez Molina, the act that functioned as the nucleus of the family, as it established the conditions for legal procreation and permitted the conservation and transmission of estates, all of which were necessary for the maintenance of the social and economic structure. This explains why there existed a contract that reviewed the contribution of each member, always keeping in mind that the woman enjoyed a legal responsibility, as did her husband.<sup>25</sup> This takes on a larger significance if one keeps in mind that the conjugal link constituted the mechanism by which elite women contributed to the transformation of their families, given that, by means of weddings, they could increase or decrease the prestige and wealth of their families or obtain better positions within society.<sup>26</sup>

Although it is true that, as Schroter has shown, tradition and values should be considered as active and complete factors that determined many of women's marital behaviors in this era;<sup>27</sup> with marital contracts, women did obtain and codify advantageous alliances and estate agreements. For example, the norm in Cataluña was to maintain separate possessions, although, some opted for different types of contracts. With the separation of property, each partner maintained distinct estates, comprised both of prior possessions and those acquired during the marriage. In reality, the only property that a woman usually had before marriage was her dowry, which served to mitigate their financial vulnerability, especially in the case of being widowed. The Church and State encouraged these conjugal unions, as they were understood as alliances between families that could serve to coordinate peace between feuding clans or arrange economic interests. This explains why, in the laws of Castile, seen in the *Novissima Recopilación*, and pertinent in a large portion of the *Ordenamiento de Alcalá* and of the *Leyes de Toro*, secret

---

<sup>24</sup> Expediente de fundación de un convento de religiosas españolas en San Miguel el Grande, 1753. AGI, México, 1061.

<sup>25</sup> Bartolomé Bennassar, *Los españoles. Actitudes y mentalidad*. Barcelona: Argos, 1978, pp. 109 y 168.- Pérez Molina, ob. cit, pp. 27-31.- Peñafiel Ramón, ob. cit, p. 22.

<sup>26</sup> Lohmann Villena y Vila Vilar, art. cit., p. 90.

<sup>27</sup> Bernd Schröter, "Acerca de la posición de la mujer en el contexto del matrimonio en una región fronteriza de la América hispánica a fines del período colonial. Resultados y desiderata", en *Cuadernos de Historia Latinoamericana. Mujer y familia en América Latina. Siglos XVIII-XX*, núm 4, (Málaga, 1996), p. 73.

marriages, that is, without the consent of a male family member, were condemned, and punishable by banishment for the groom and disinheritance for the bride.<sup>28</sup>

Shared possessions, however, were handled differently; that is, they were always administered by the husband, leaving women no legal recourse to execute the shared estate, as they were recognized as minors under the law. Therefore, this well-established differentiation between possessions given by marriage and shared property was essential.<sup>29</sup> Guanajuato residents such as María Gertrudis Busto y Alcocer and José de Liceaga understood this, to the extent that when their marriage agreement was drawn up before the notary, the document specified that she was entitled to the estate of San Pedro y San Pablo and twelve bars from the Vivanco mine.<sup>30</sup>

A husband, furthermore, could also confer on his wife certain generalized powers so that she might act in his name, or he could ratify that which was done by his wife without his prior permission, or finally, if he was absent, and the cause was deemed necessary, a judge could give permission for any action in his stead. This permitted women a certain freedom of movement in spite of their subordinate hierarchical positions, encouraging women to develop their own legal and public instruments and documents. The laws of *Toro* extended to some degree the rights of women, allowing them to withhold their personal effects when paying their husbands' debts if they so chose, though their shared property remained unprotected. In this way, they were not liable for the actions of their husband, though their legal minority was accentuated, in spite of the fact that they had been the beneficiary of their shared possessions or the rents of their administered property. In reality, a woman could protect her possessions from her husband's actions, though this did not entirely protect her from the debts incurred by the husband.<sup>31</sup> This is evidenced by the fact that Ana de Moya y Monroy transferred or gave the proceeds of her estate and her houses to one of the creditors of her late husband, the general Damián de Villavicencio, who, in 1710, owed more than 20,000 pesos. Similarly, MaríaAna de Sopeña had to mortgage her

---

<sup>28</sup> Teodoro Hampe Martínez, "Imagen y participación de las mujeres en la cultura del Perú virreinal: una aproximación bibliográfica", en Andreo García y Beatriz Guardia, ob. cit., p. 139.- Delfina González del Riego, "El divorcio en la sociedad colonial limeña", en Margarita Zegarra Flórez (ed.), *Mujeres y género en la historia del Perú*. Lima: Centro de documentación sobre la Mujer, 1999, pp. 133 y 134.- Pérez Molina, ob. cit, pp. 32 y 37-38.

<sup>29</sup> Ellen G. Friedman, "El estatus jurídico de la mujer castellana durante el Antiguo Régimen", en García Nieto-París, ob. cit., p. 48.

<sup>30</sup> Escritura otorgada por José Liceaga en Guanajuato el 7 de noviembre de 1729. AHUG, PCL, 1729-30, f. 451.

<sup>31</sup> Oliveri Korta, ob. cit., pp. 92-94.

house in 1734 to finance payment of the debts that her husband, Alonso Cid Fernández, had left upon his death.<sup>32</sup>

However, as has already been explained, in Guanajuato, as in other parts of New Spain, one of the most important personal assets that a husband could contribute to a marriage was his lineage. In accordance with the model established by Brading towards the end of the eighteenth century, important local families aspired to maintain their prestige and blood purity by the union of their daughters to recently arrived, though often indigent, *peninsulares*, owing to their racial origin and their supposedly superior capacity for work.<sup>33</sup> There are numerous examples that could be cited here to confirm this practice, evincing that social networks satisfied by kinship ties served to integrate recent arrivals.

This is clearly illustrated by the case of the treasurer of the *Caja Real* of Guanajuato, Gregorio Pérez de Castro, in his lawsuit against the royal miners between 1721 and 1737. They served Pérez de Castro with numerous charges on behalf of the Guanajuato mining industry that sought to defend its business and increase its benefits through the elimination of, what was to them, one troublesome tax official. This, in turn, made evident the plot that members of the family network had devised against him, articulated by a series of related women whose matriarch was Josefa Teresa de Bustos y Moya. This family network constituted a power elite unto itself that integrated a large portion of the more economically and politically powerful miners, traders, and councilmen of the town, such as Ignacio Uribarren, Andrés Aguiar, Bernardo López Peñuelas, Francisco Iguño, Francisco Yguerategui, Pedro Flores Collar, Francisco Pérez Hermida and José Antonio Bartolache, all of whom were married to nieces, daughters, or cousins of Josefa Teresa. Others were connected to the network by varying degrees of kinship, many of whom were *peninsulares*, such as Pedro Aguirre Acharán, Domingo Villanueva, Francisco José Morales, Juan Hervás, Juan Garcia Enterría, José de Noriega, Celedón Enriquez, José y Domingo Pardo Verastegui, Benito Lorenzo de Eleado, José Mejía, Juan Pedro de la Campa, José Cuartero, Santiago Pérez del Hoyo and José Rada Capetillo. In turn, all of the included *peninsulares* of this complicated network also maintained commercial deals with important businessmen such as

---

<sup>32</sup> Escritura de cesión de rentas rogada por Ana de Moya Monroy, 2 de mayo de 1710. AHUG, PCL, 1710, f. 91v.-  
Escritura de obligación, Guanajuato 10 de marzo de 1734. AHUG, PCL, 1734, f. 54.

<sup>33</sup> D. A. Brading, *Mineros y comerciantes en el México borbónico: (1763-1810)*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1975, pp. 403-433.

Mateo Mendieta, Juan de Buergo, Hipólito Núñez, Cayetano Rocha, Pedro Otero, or Mateo Cardenal.<sup>34</sup>

Thanks to the women of the Bustos Moya family, it was evident that a dense web of authority had been established. In fact, this clan was not limited only to those reported by Pérez Castro, since it had begun to incorporate through marriage, during the Colonial period, various prominent miners, traders, and councilmen, such as Lorenzo Olazábal, Antonio Sánchez Salgado, Pedro de la Rea, Damián Villaviencio, Pedro Aduirre Acharán, José de Liceaga, Juan Quintana, José Ramírez de Béjar, Bernardo Fernández Riaño, Bernardino Antonio de Navas Espínola y Andrade, José de Gorostiza, Francisco Antonio Mendizábal, Domingo de Alegría, and Domingo Llorente, amongst many others, to cite only those that came to occupy positions within the local government. Some of their wives, by whom this clan was woven together, were María y Ana Moya Monroy, Ana Gertrudís y Juana Bustos Moya, María Ramírez de Béjar, Antonia, Andrea, Andrea Teresa y María Gertrudís Bustos Moya y Alcocer, María Rafaela Aranda Saavedra, María Ignacia Fernández Marmolejo y Esquivel, and Ana María Gregoria López Peñuelas y Bustos. Clearly, the male Creole members of the aforementioned family were included in this community of interests, as the sons, brothers, cousins, and other family members born in the Viceroyalty usually married sought-after *debutantes* or dedicated themselves to the Church, securing significant positions within the ecclesiastical hierarchy, such as in the cases of Francisco and Nicolas Bustos Jerez, Francisco Matias and Pedor de Bustos Moya, Ramón Luis and Juan Ignacio Aranda Saavedra, Juan José, Damián and Michael Bustos Rodríguez, and Juan Alejo Bustos Reinoso.<sup>35</sup>

The heads of these families did not always approve of the *peninsular* with whom their daughter sought marriage and as such, there is a body of cases wherein Castilian law governing familiar consent had to be applied. The curious thing is that such situations came to be so common that the Council and the Court decided to amend these laws, permitting marriage without a family blessing. Such was the case of Guadalupe Barrera Torrescano, particularly important as an example, as it features a woman as a protagonist. As Countess de La Valenciana

---

<sup>34</sup> Expediente de Pedro de Aguirre Acharán, vecino de la villa de Santa Fe, Real y Minas de Guanajuato, y los mineros de dicha minería contra Gregorio Pérez de Castro, oficial real, sobre excesos cometidos en el ejercicio de su empleo. AGI, México, 201C.- Caño Ortigosa, art. cit.

<sup>35</sup> La identificación de todos estos matrimonios es posible a partir de numerosas escrituras notariales integradas en los libros anuales de protocolos del cabildo de Guanajuato desde 1686 a 1780. AHUG, PCL, Serie de 1686 hasta 1780. Véase también las fuentes reseñadas en el Apéndice.

and matriarch of one the richest families in New Spain, whose holdings included mines and estates (they contributed more than 120,000 pesos annually to the king) she had followed rigidly and faithfully the course set out by her husband. Her father, Antonio Obregón Alcocer, count of La Valenciana, before dying in 1786 and leaving an inheritance of four million pesos, had already opposed the marriage that his daughter had desired. His wife, now widowed, had several sons, but the oldest of them was not yet of legal age, leaving her executor of the estate and giving her the right to make a decision concerning her daughter's marriage. Thus, from this privileged position she could initiate a dispute, which failed, to impede the wedding of her daughter Gertrudis with the aforementioned *peninsular*, who would later become count of Pérez Gálvez and one of the richest men in New Spain in the early nineteenth century. This case serves to demonstrate how a matriarch could fight to direct the marital life of her children. Crucially, her rejection of a *peninsular* also calls into question the desire of Guanajuato elites to form unions with any *peninsular* - just because of his Iberian birthplace. The countess did marry her other daughter to another *peninsular*, Diego de Rul, who, in 1804, obtained the title of Count of the House of Rul, thus proving to be a better prospect for the family's wealth and status.<sup>36</sup>

Contrasting with what Schroter suggests had occurred in other places throughout the empire, in Guanajuato there was not a strong tendency to form clans separate from and at the exclusion of immigrants. Furthermore, Schroter claims that from the end of the sixteenth until the eighteenth century, the tendency in New Spain and Peru was for the old oligarchy to establish prestige barriers against new arrivals. This is certainly a somewhat crude generalization, given that in the *gobernación* of the Yucatán, the *peninsulares* managed to integrate themselves into the most eminent families of Mérida and Valladolid, in spite of their marked endogamy, although they prevailed most of all in San Francisco de Campeche because of its maritime and commercial character. In reality, in Guanajuato there were very similar circumstances to those in the *Banda Oriental* (present-day Uruguay) and in *Río de la Plata* (present-day Argentina), where the consistent arrival of Spaniards, many of them traders, favored their marriage with Creole women, above all because these women preferred to be related to *peninsulares*.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Ángela Carballeda, "Género y matrimonio en Nueva España: las mujeres de la élite ante la aplicación de la pragmática de 1776", en Gonzalbo Aizpuru y Berta Ares Queija, ob. cit., pp. 236 y 237.- Caño Ortigosa, art. cit.

<sup>37</sup> Schröter, art. cit., pp. 77-85.- Victoria González Muñoz, *Cabildo y grupos de poder en Yucatán (siglo XVII)*. Sevilla: Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, 1994, pp. 252-257 y 267-270.- Ana Isabel Martínez Ortega, *Estructura y configuración socioeconómica de los cabildos de Yucatán en el siglo XVIII*. Sevilla: Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, 1993, pp. 176-188 y 200-207.- Caño Ortigosa, art. cit.

Additionally, it must be noted that not only young women married, but also a considerable number of widows seeking second marriages, which was logical, considering the surplus of men, the necessity of male guardianship, the social pressure on women with regard to marriage, their awareness of danger, and, above all, prestige. In fact, more than half of the widows would remarry within one year of their husbands' deaths, in spite of the fact that Catholic custom prescribes a year of mourning and withdrawal from public life that, in principle, should have been observed in these circumstances.<sup>38</sup>

It must be said that women governed no small number of households in Guanajuato. Thus, there were many women in the local oligarchy who had to face several years without the company of their husbands, taking charge of their children, business, property, etc. It is not strange, then, that they generated extensive and varied paperwork, as documents of power, loans given and received, letters of appointment to administer property, executorships, foundations of chaplaincies, etc., making almost continual records of the condition of the widows. All of this corroborates a few facts, such as those that occurred in 1700, for example. This year, Agustina de Ribera, widow of Jerónimo Mejía de Cuevas, bestowed a power on a resident of Celaya to cover the debts of a sergeant in the city. Also, María de Medina, widow of Bartolomé Martínez Lobato, received an obligation of payment from Pedro Bulnes Bustamente. A few days later, Luisa de Fonesca, widow of the miner Antonio de Olalde, gave authority to Francisco de Posada to administer her bullion from the Santa Ursula mine and her estate. This same widow, a few months later, would make the decision to make interest from her bullion, lending four parts to captain Felipe Salinas. Finally, also in 1700, María Núñez de Villavicencio, widow of Esteban de Acosta founded a chaplaincy for her son.<sup>39</sup>

In view of what has been here presented, it seems evident that in Guanajuato many of the members of the political, economic, and social elite connected and exerted influence by way of a network whose integral links were composed of relationships between women. Certainly, women of the Guanajuato oligarchy, as with other Colonial Hispano-American regions, were an essential

---

<sup>38</sup> Schröter, art. cit., pp. 77-85.- Victoria González Muñoz, *Cabildo y grupos de poder en Yucatán (siglo XVII)*. Sevilla: Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, 1994, pp. 252-257 y 267-270.- Ana Isabel Martínez Ortega, *Estructura y configuración socioeconómica de los cabildos de Yucatán en el siglo XVIII*. Sevilla: Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, 1993, pp. 176-188 y 200-207.- Caño Ortigosa, art. cit.

<sup>39</sup> Escritura de poder, 1 de marzo de 1700. Escritura de obligación de pago, 26 de marzo de 1700. Escritura de poder, 12 de abril de 1700. Escritura de arrendamiento, 24 de noviembre de 1700. Escritura de fundación de capellanía, 13 de agosto de 1700. AHUG, PCL, 1700, fs. 30v, 39v, 53v, 274 y 160v.

and active part of the society. Without women, a large portion of the social configuration of the elite, their patterns of behavior concerning access to the local government, the mechanisms for upkeep, and control of estates, including the transmission and accumulation of property and wealth, cannot be understood. Indeed, through inheritance and dowry, these women transmitted a considerable portion of the capital and governmental offices that sustained the economic and social base that supported the social leadership. In turn, this power group continually grew and renovated itself thanks to the integration of new men, largely *peninsulares*, which was possible because of the marriage practices involving the women of these particular families.

## **Bibliography**

- Juan Andreo García and Sara Beatriz Guardia, *Historia de las mujeres en América Latina*, (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 2002).
- Bartolomé Bennassar, *Los españoles. Actitudes y mentalidad*, (Barcelona: Argos, 1978).
- D. A. Brading, *Mineros y comerciantes en el México borbónico: (1763-1810)*, (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1975).
- José Luis Caño Ortigosa, "Mineras en el Guanajuato colonial", *Temas americanistas*, 18 (2005): 2-16.
- María Francisca Gámez Montalvo, *Régimen jurídico de la mujer en la familia castellana medieval*, (Granada: Comares, 1998).
- María del Carmen García Nieto-París, *Ordenamiento jurídico y realidad social de las mujeres, siglos XVI a XX: Actas de las IV Jornadas de Investigación Interdisciplinaria*, (Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1984).
- Pilar Gonzalbo, *La educación de la mujer en la Nueva España*, (Mexico: Consejo Nacional de Fomento Educativo, 1985).
- Pilar Gonzalbo Aizpuru and Berta Ares Queija, *Las mujeres en la construcción de las sociedades iberoamericanas*, (Seville: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2004).
- Victoria González Muñoz, *Cabildo y grupos de poder en Yucatán (siglo XVII)*, (Seville: Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, 1994).
- María Guevara Sanginés, "Testamentos de mujeres en Guanajuato. Primera mitad del siglo XVIII". *Folios*, 9 (October, 1999): 73-90.
- Aurora Jáuregui de Cervantes, *Los marqueses de Rayas*, (Guanajuato: La Rana, 1987)
- Ana Isabel Martínez Ortega, *Estructura y configuración socioeconómica de los cabildos de Yucatán en el siglo XVIII*, (Seville: Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, 1993).
- Ivonne Mijares Ramírez, "Mujeres en la Nueva España: entre la autonomía y la dependencia. Mexico en el siglo XVI", *Actas del IX Congreso Internacional de Historia de América* (2 vols., Merida: Junta de Extremadura, 2002), Vol. II.
- Oihane Oliveri Korta, *Mujer y herencia en el estamento hidalgo guipuzcoano durante el Antiguo Régimen (siglos XVI-XVIII)*, (San Sebastian: Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa, 2001).

Appendix

Nº	DOTANTES	BENEFICIARIOS	DOTE (PESOS)	FECHA	DOCUMENTO
1	Elvira de Torres	Juan López Juana Hinojosa	1.960	December 1, 1605	AHUG, PCL, 1606, f. 14
2	?	Juan de la Fuente Catalina de Cabra	1.500	April, 1606	AHUG, PCL, 1606, f. 42
3	?	Andrés de Burgos Luisa de Tovar	1.500	October 20, 1606	AHUG, PCL, 1606, f. 139
4	Luisa Gómez	Gabriel Burgueño María Gómez	300	January 8, 1607	AHUG, PCL, 1607, f. 12
5	Martín de Salcedo María de la O	Francisco de Santa Fe Juana Lezcano	2.246	May 20, 1608	AHUG, PCL, 1608, f. 39
6	?	Juan Morán Juana Ledezma	1.000	September 10, 1629	AHUG, PCL, 1629, f. 48
7	Hernando Ramos	Antonio de Aguiar y Quiroga Beatriz de Bustos	6.000	September 19, 1633	AHUG, PCL, 1633, f. 46
8	Francisco Rodríguez Mariscal María de Argüello Jaso	José Pérez Criado Isabel de Argüello Mariscal	2.000	February 10, 1701	AHUG, PCL, 1701, 41
9	Juan Sopeña y Laherran	Francisco Trabesedo Antonia María Sopeña	5.126	May 30, 1701	AHUG, PCL, 1701, f. 110
10	Nicolás de Torres	Santiago Villanueva y Urivay María de Torres y Correa	4.531	November 2, 1701	AHUG, PCL, 1701, f. 230v
11	Jerónimo Montáñez	Eugenio de Almelda Corona Ángela Montáñez	696	December 20, 1701	AHUG, PCL, 1701, f. 248
12	Miguel J. Montáñez Berastegui Damiana de Berastegui	Lucas García Tineo María Montáñez y Berastegui	9.465	December 20, 1701	AHUG, PCL, 1701, f. 249v
13	Damián de Villavicencio Ana de Moya y Monroy	Pedro Flores Collar Micaela de Villavicencio	12.000	August 23, 1702	AHUG, PCL, 1702, f. 150
14	Damián de Villavicencio Ana de Moya y Monroy	Diego C. Alcocer Bocanegra Catalina Villavicencio Moya	1.200	January 29, 1704	AHUG, PCL, 1704, f. 37
15	Sebastián Romero Camacho Isabel María Salinas Figueroa	Sebastián Anieva Sánchez M <sup>a</sup> Isabel Romero Camacho	5.295	July 14, 1704	AHUG, PCL, 1704, f. 203v
16	Sebastián Romero Camacho Isabel María Salinas Figueroa	Juan Atanasio Villanueva	2.608	September 3, 1710	AHUG, PCL, 1710, f. 144v
17	Juan Acevedo y León	Francisco Pérez Hermida Ana de Acevedo y León	8.798	November 11, 1710	AHUG, PCL, 1710, f. 210
18	Manuel Aranda Saavedra Josefa Bustos Moya	Francisco Alipasolo Ana Aranda y Saavedra	20.000	February 26, 1718	AHUG, PCL, 1718, f. 40v

Nº	DOTANTES	BENEFICIARIOS	NOTE (PESOS)	FECHA	DOCUMENTO
19	Jacinto Sánchez de Tagle	Francisco Pérez Hermida Josefa Sánchez de Tagle	300	February 3, 1719	AHUG, PCL, 1719-20, f. 30
20	Francisco Ramírez de Béjar	Pedro Aguirre Acharán María Ramírez de Béjar	9.000	February 8, 1719	AHUG, PCL, 1719-20, f. 46v
21	Juan Sopeña y Laherrán	Juana de Dios Carrasco	900	October 6, 1723	AHUG, PCL, 1723, f. 245
22	German de Valverde Josefa Villaseñor Villarreal	Basilio de Paz Antonia Valverde Villaseñor	800	October 15, 1723	AHUG, PCL, 1723, f. 253
23	Juan Sopeña y Laherrán	Gregorio Berroterán y Arzu Mª Josefa de Nieves y Sopeña	6.000	November 25, 1723	AHUG, PCL, 1723, f. 285v
24	Juan Bautista de Bustos Rosa María Gamiño	Juan López Isabel Margarita de Bustos	1.414	September 23, 1724	AHUG, PCL, 1724, f. 240v
25	Gertrudis Zavala Santurce	Alonso López de Leys Antonia Martínez de Castro	2.513	September 7, 1725	AHUG, PCL, 1725, f. 386
26	Cristóbal Gutiérrez Navarro	Domingo Fonseca Montenegro Catalina de San Juan Gutiérrez	971	September 7, 1725	AHUG, PCL, 1725, f. 388
27	Gertrudis de Valleblancarte	Cristóbal Domínguez Belmonte Juana Petronila de Arostegui	2.355	September 19, 1725	AHUG, PCL, 1725, f. 407
28	Antonio Marañón de Otanez	Esteban Careaga Isabel José Marañón	3.303	November 11, 1725	AHUG, PCL, 1725, f. 417
29	Francisco Matías de Bustos Luisa Marmolejo Esquivel	Gonzalo de Aranda Francisca de Bustos Esquivel	12.000	December 5, 1725	AHUG, PCL, 1725, f. 618v
30	Francisco Rodríguez Llanos Felipa Rocha	José López Peñuelas Mª Manuela Velásquez Rocha	3.000	February 23, 1726	AHUG, PCL, 1726, f. 68v
31	Francisco Sáenz de Goya	José Ramírez Béjar Josefa Espinosa de los Monteros	1.320	June 21, 1726	AHUG, PCL, 1726, f. 176
32	Francisco Yguerategui	José Liceaga María Gertrudis Bustos Moya	840	June 25, 1726	AHUG, PCL, 1726, f. 179v
33	Pedro Pérez del Hoyo	Felipe García del Hoyo Manuela Pérez del Hoyo	6.000	June 2, 1727	AHUG, PCL, 1727, f. 106v
34	Pedro Pérez del Hoyo	Andrés García del Hoyo María Antonia Pérez del Hoyo	6.000	June 4, 1727	AHUG, PCL, 1727, f. 107
35	Isabel María Salinas Figueroa	Juan Francisco Rodríguez Ana Josefa Sánchez Anieva	2.868	Septemeber 14, 1727	AHUG, PCL, 1727, f. 203v
36	Juan Sopeña Laherran Mª Francisca Arce y Oregón	José Joaquín Estrada Altamirano Isabel Joaquina Sopeña Laherran	6.000	January 10, 1728	AHUG, PCL, 1728, f. 22v
37	Francisco Javier de Bustos	José Pallares Ana María de Bustos	5.000	April 5, 1728	AHUG, PCL, 1728, f. 144v
38	Juana Gutiérrez	Gonzalo Fernández Peralta	500	September 12, 1728	AHUG, PCL, 1728, f. 351

Nº	DOTANTES	BENEFICIARIOS	NOTE (PESOS)	FECHA	DOCUMENTO
		Catarina de cepeda Gutiérrez			
39	María Reynoso	Francisco Matías de Bustos	6.000	October 5, 1728	AHUG, PCL, 1728, f. 385v
40	Manuel Aranda Saavedra Josefa Teresa Bustos Moya	José Antonio Mendizábal M <sup>a</sup> Antonia Aranda Saavedra	20.250	March 18, 1729	AHUG, PCL, 1729-30, f. 117
41	Benito Lorenzo Eleado Francisca Moya	Juan Salgado María Efigenia Eleado	1.988	November 12, 1729	AHUG, PCL, 1729-30, f. 456v
42	Juan Sopeña Laherrán	José Solano y Sardaneta Ana María de Sopeña	173	September 15, 1730	AHUG, PCL, 1729-30, f. 749v
43	Juan Sopeña Laherrán	Ana María Sopeña Antonio Sardaneta Lozano	2.227	January 28, 1733	AHUG, PCL, 1733, f. 10v
44	Antonio Pacheco María Uscarres	Sebastián Estrada María Pacheco	3.550	August 1, 1733	AHUG, PCL, 1733, f. 195
45	Juan Sopeña Laherrán María Fernández Arce	José Antonio González María Fermina González	2.227	January 28, 1733	AHUG, PCL, 1733, f. 311
46	Alonso Nava y Mota Francisca Sosa	Esteban Bringas Gregoria Nava y Mota	9.000	March 12, 1736	AHUG, PCL, 1736, f. 328
47	José de Bustos Micaela Jerónima de Brito	Manuel José de Santillán Estefanía Dominga Bustos Brito	1.500	April 30, 1736	AHUG, PCL, 1736, f. 341
48	Manuel González Cedillo Ana María Romero Camacho	Ignacio Martínez Lejarzar Manuela M. González Cedillo	9.020	December 6, 1741	AHUG, PCL, 1741, f. 174
49	Simón Francisco de Arroyo	José Vélez de las Cuevas Petronila de Arroyo	3.374	November 6, 1741	AHUG, PCL, 1741, f. 221
50	Manuel González Cedillo Ana María Romero Camacho	José García Malabear Antonia C. González Cedillo	7.232	December 6, 1741	AHUG, PCL, 1741, f. 224
51	Manuel González Cedillo Ana María Romero Camacho	Francisco Javier Uribarren Josefa González Cedillo	9.973	September 17, 1742	AHUG, PCL, 1742, f. 142v
52	Manuel González Cedillo Ana María Romero Camacho	Rodrigo Álvarez Sobrino María T. González Cedillo	10.416	January 7, 1747	AHUG, PCL, 1747, f. 3v
53	Cristóbal Domínguez Belmonte	Juan Ortiz de la Lagunilla Ana F <sup>a</sup> Domínguez Belmonte	24.275	August 23, 1748	AHUG, PCL, 1748, f. 217
54	Felipe Herrera Calderón María G. Romero Camacho	Francisco Bruno Sierra Castillo María Herrera Calderón Romero	1.200	January 20, 1769	AHUG, PCL, 1769, f. 23
55	García Ramírez Rendón María Ana Zambrano	Francisco Bruno de Ureña	1.250	April 24, 1769	AHUG, PCL, 1769, f. 156v
56	?	María Josefa de Alegría Bustos	58.123	November 6, 1770	AHUG, PCL, 1770, f. 465
57	María Josefa M. Bustos Reinoso Francisco de Ochoa Elizalde	M <sup>a</sup> Josefa Ochoa Elizalde Bustos Juan José Compains	6.039	November 29, 1781	AHUG, PCL, 1781, f. 387v
58	María Josefa M. Bustos Reinoso	Gertrudis Ochoa Elizalde Bustos	6.039	November 29, 1781	AHUG, PCL, 1781, f. 394

<b>Nº</b>	<b>DOTANTES</b>	<b>BENEFICIARIOS</b>	<b>DOTE (PESOS)</b>	<b>FECHA</b>	<b>DOCUMENTO</b>
	Francisco de Ochoa Elizalde	Antonio José Mendizábal			
<b>59</b>	María Josefa M. Bustos Reinoso	Juan Luis López M <sup>a</sup> Jesús Ochoa Elizalde Bustos	<b>6.039</b>	January 22, 1783	AHUG, PCL, 1783, f. 43v
<b>60</b>	Pedro E. Otero Sánchez Dovalina	M <sup>a</sup> Josefa Septien Montero Pérez	<b>50.000</b>	May 14, 1805	AHUG, PCL, 1805, f. 191v
<b>61</b>	Juan Antonio de Riaño	José Miguel Septien Iriarte Rosa de Riaño y Saint Marent	<b>6.000</b>	June 10, 1809	AHUG, PCL, 1809, f. 180v
<b>62</b>	José Ignacio Rocha	Benigno Bustamante M <sup>a</sup> Ángela Rocha del Río	<b>5.000</b>	April 5, 1819	AHUG, PCL, 1819, f. 80v
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>434.939</b>		
<b>MEDIA</b>			<b>7.015</b>		