

The Virgin of Guadalupe in New Spain: An Inquiry into the Social History of Marian Devotion



William B. Taylor

American Ethnologist, Vol. 14, No. 1, Frontiers of Christian Evangelism (Feb., 1987), 9-33.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0094-0496%28198702%2914%3A1%3C9%3ATVOGIN%3E2.0.CO%3B2-H>

American Ethnologist is currently published by American Anthropological Association.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/anthro.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Virgin of Guadalupe in New Spain: an inquiry into the social history of Marian devotion

WILLIAM B. TAYLOR—University of Virginia

The Virgin Mary occupies an unrivalled place in the history of Christian saints in Latin America. She is represented in many distinct forms including Our Lady of Mercy, Our Lady of the Rosary, Our Lady of the Remedies, the crowned Madonna, Madonna and child, and especially in the joyful and sorrowful events that connected her life to Christ, including Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception, Our Lady of the Annunciation, Our Lady of the Purification, Our Lady of the Sorrows, and Our Lady of the Assumption. Of these representations of the Virgin, Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception (Mary Immaculate) was the most widely venerated in the portion of Spain's New Spain that would become Mexico and the American Southwest. Depicting her as a young woman with the moon beneath her feet—like the pregnant woman of Revelation 12:1—these colonial images of Mary Immaculate connect Mary's own immaculate conception to the stainless conception of Christ in her womb in a sweeping allusion to her perpetual virginity.

Hundreds of distinctive individual images of Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception became identified with the destiny of particular places and people, and were believed to contain the power to protect and favor them. Some of these painted and sculpted images of the Virgin Mary gained a wide following, and their sanctuaries became important centers of pilgrimage and popular devotion. But one, the Virgin of Guadalupe, has risen far above the others in the estimation of Mexicans as a protean image of motherhood, nourishment, health, salvation, and national destiny.

In a timeless way Guadalupe's prophetic meaning for a future Mexico has been extended back to the Spanish Conquest. "Mexico was born at Tepeyac," say many books on Mexican history. The story of the apparition in 1531, just ten years after the Aztec capital at Tenochtitlan fell to Cortés, is rich in providential possibilities—a dark-complexioned Virgin Mary appears to a lowly Indian at Tepeyac, the sacred place of a pre-Columbian mother goddess, leaving her beautiful image on the Indian's cloak. Then, in a spontaneous surge of Indian devotion, natives flock to the site of the miracle, embracing her image in their spiritual orphanhood as if she were a new mother restoring order in the supernatural world as well as in the here and now. She combines the Indian past with the Spanish present to make something new, a proto-Mexican

Veneration of the Virgin of Guadalupe in New Spain (1519–1821) is reconsidered from three angles: in relation to the more widespread devotion to images of Mary Immaculate in villages, in relation to the colonial capital of Mexico City, and as a model of mediation within the colonial society for Indian subjects as well as of protest against Spanish rule. From new documentation, the article posits more widespread early veneration of the American and Spanish Guadalupe among non-Indians and through Mexico City and Catholic priests than among Indians in syncretic cults. It also questions whether the Virgin of Guadalupe was unequivocally the "dominant" religious symbol in the future Mexico before national independence. [Virgin of Guadalupe, symbolism, popular religion, colonial Mexico, Christian names]

Indian madonna who will gradually be accepted as well by American Spaniards and *mestizos* as their own, thus forming the spiritual basis of a national independence movement in the early 19th century.¹

The many writings on the colonial cult of Guadalupe have been absorbed in authenticating or refuting the apparition legend or studying her image as the central theme of the history of Mexican national consciousness. Firm evidence of the tradition in the 16th century is scarce, and there is debate over whether the image of the Virgin of Guadalupe venerated at Tepeyac at that time was a replica of the Spanish image—a sculpted Madonna and child—or the famous American painting of the Virgin.² Most of the writers separate into two groups, apparitionists and anti-apparitionists. Little has been done to establish when, where, and how the cult grew, or to see the changes and lasting representations of the Virgin Mary in relationship to other developments in colonial history, including the history of the Catholic Church in Spanish America.

An exception has been the writings of anthropologists, which maintain a constructive tension between reconstructing the past in a way that people then would have recognized it and the hidden patterns in that reconstructed past. However, in their approach to the Virgin Mary in Mexican history, most anthropologists (as well as historians) have focused on “the dark Virgin,” the American Guadalupe, and treated her as the image of a syncretic goddess with a huge Indian following since the 16th century, or as the “spiritual aspect of protest against the colonial regime.”³ This perspective obscures the fact that the Virgin Mary was introduced by Spanish masters as their own patroness, in hundreds of different images, and that she stood ambiguously for several meanings that were subject to change and that may or may not have moved people to action.

The present article attempts to follow these more complex and ambiguous meanings. Three “conquests” in early Mexican history provide a loose chronology: first, the Spanish military conquest after 1519; second, the “spiritual conquest,” by which I mean not so much the conversion of native people to Christianity as the place of religion in the formation and maintenance of colonial rule; and third, the element of “reconquest” in the movements for Independence early in the 19th century. The body of the essay is divided into three parts: how the cult of Mary began and how it may have grown, especially through images of Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception, including the American Guadalupe; given names as evidence of Marian devotion in the 18th century; and political symbolism attached to Mary in colonial Mexico and the Independence war.

Spaniards and the Virgin Mary, Mexico City and the American Guadalupe

In the first conquest the Virgin Mary was La Conquistadora, the supernatural protectress of the Spaniards, a symbol of Spanish power. For example, Cortés’ campaign banner carried a picture of Mary, and the province of Tabasco was given the name Holy Mary of Victory during the military conquest. Although she did not engage in combat according to Spanish accounts—except at one point to throw dust in the Indians’ eyes—Bernal Díaz tells us that the Spaniards commended themselves (not just their souls) to “Christ and his Blessed Mother” (Díaz del Castillo 1982:6). Robert Padden has suggested that the Indians as well as Spaniards in those earliest years understood the Virgin Mary as the embodiment of Spanish sovereignty in a cosmic confrontation of supernatural forces, with the Spaniards intent upon dethroning the old gods and replacing them with Mary in the native temples and sacred places.⁴ Certainly religion and sovereignty were inseparable to those early Spaniards, and Cortés did bring a generous supply of pictures and statues of the Virgin, which he presented to the Indians as representations of divine mission and Spanish rule, placing them on the altars of Indian idols wherever he could.

After the military conquest, what appear to be indigenous folk beliefs about the Virgin Mary and peculiarly strong reverence for Mary among colonial Indians look upon closer inspection

much like the popular beliefs of contemporary Spaniards. It is true that in the formal religion of the Catholic Church the Virgin Mary carried a variety of symbolic connotations: as queen, virgin, bride, the new Eve, innocence, mother, and intercessor; whereas in rural Latin America she was revered mainly as protective intercessor and fertile mother. It would be a mistake, however, to present the religion of Spanish rulers only as formal and doctrinaire. What Indians understood about the Virgin directly from the first Spaniards was also communicated in matter-of-fact ways. Indian devotion to Mary in the colonial period bore some striking resemblances to folk beliefs about her in 16th-century Spain. To Spaniards of that time she was not mainly a remote or regal figure. As William Christian shows in *Apparitions in Late Medieval and Renaissance Spain*, a truly extraordinary reverence for Mary blossomed in Castile at about the time of the military conquest of Mexico. The numerous reports of apparitions in Spain were, as Christian says, “eminently social visions, validated by widespread public devotion” (Christian 1981:4, 13–14, 213–215). During that time she eclipsed all other saints and heroes of the Church. Roughly two-thirds of all reported miracles were attributed to Mary in her various forms.

In Spanish popular belief, God and Christ were more feared than loved. God was a remote and brooding eminence, while Christ was represented either as a child or sacrificed on the cross—which Christian says were references to plague and judgment. Mary, on the other hand, was the beloved intercessor who worked to deflect or soften the harsh judgments of a stern God. She was not a grim messenger but a sympathetic advocate for her believers. At one point in Bernal Díaz’s narrative of the conquest Cortés tells the Indians of Cempoala that they, too, should look upon Mary as their intercessor:

as they now have no more idols in their high temples he would leave them a great lady who was the Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom we believe in and venerate, and . . . they should treat her as their lady and intercessor [Díaz del Castillo 1982:99].

The Virgin Mary in Spain was also closely associated with the land and fertility. This was another connection conveyed to Indians in an ingenuous way, as when Cortés encouraged Indians at Tenochtitlan to pray to the Virgin Mary for rain (Padden 1967:99). The point here is not that the meaning of the Virgin Mary to Indians in colonial Mexico was simply borrowed from Spanish folk beliefs—beliefs change in the borrowing and acquire distinctive qualities. The point is that Spanish conceptions of the Virgin were not only abstract and formal while Indian conceptions were informal and syncretic; there were not neatly separable great and little traditions in this respect.

For Mexico, the local cults of Mary Immaculate (of which Guadalupe was one of many representations) were especially strong in the territories assigned to the Franciscans and Augustinians in the 16th and 17th centuries. The Franciscans, in particular, used Mary Immaculate in their evangelization of Indians as a symbol of charity and redemption; “the good little grandmother,” as they called her. Hundreds of local cults of Mary Immaculate grew up in the hospital chapels founded by the Franciscans in Indian villages and dedicated to her image. These local cults, dedicated to many representations of Mary Immaculate and associated with the protection and destiny of particular villages, developed in the 17th and 18th centuries, at a time when Indian *pueblos* stabilized and developed distinctive forms and institutions that reinforced local community attachments. At the same time, several images of Mary gained a wider following: the Virgin of Los Remedios, the Virgin of Candelaria at San Juan de los Lagos, the Virgin of Zapopan, and especially the Virgin of Guadalupe.

The consciously providential version of Guadalupe’s apparition apparently was more popular among creole clergymen of the mid-17th century than among Indian villagers,⁵ although these mid-colony priests clearly attempted to use her as a pious sign to bring Indians into the Church. In the 16th- and 17th-century references to where Guadalupe was venerated and by whom, the viceregal capital of Mexico City stands out. As early as 1556 the Franciscan Francisco de Bustamante criticized the devotion of “the people of this city” to the image of Guadalupe at Tepeyac as a bad example for the Indians (for my purpose it makes little difference

whether the image to which Bustamante referred was modeled after the Spanish Guadalupe, the sculpted figure for which the shrine presumably was named, as Lafaye thinks, or the famous picture of the Virgin which we know as the Mexican Guadalupe).⁶ By 1557, Archbishop Montúfar, whose see was in Mexico City, was a patron of the cult. His successors in the late 17th and 18th centuries sponsored ever more elaborate churches at Tepeyac. He was soon joined by viceroys who habitually visited the shrine, sometimes as often as once a week. In the late 17th century, even before construction was beginning on the great church that still stands at Tepeyac, the viceroys solidified the connection between capital and shrine by building a grand highway from the main square in Mexico City with its viceregal offices, to the sanctuary of Guadalupe about 3 miles away.

In the late 16th century both Viceroy Martín Enríquez (1568–80) and Miles Phillips (an English sailor stranded in Mexico from 1568 to 1582) underscored the appeal of the cult to Spaniards travelling to and from the city. Phillips observed that any Spaniard passing the shrine “will alight and come into the church and kneel before the image and pray to our Lady to defend them from all evil.”⁷ Even earlier, in the 1550s, Archbishop Montúfar had observed its attraction to Spanish women from the city “who walk there barefoot with their pilgrim’s staffs to visit and praise our Lady” (López Sarrelangue 1957:132). Located on the principal road into Mexico City, which led to the port of Veracruz and on to Europe, the Shrine of Guadalupe came to define the edge of the city and its “effective space.” By the 1560s dignitaries from Spain were met there by the viceroys and archbishops, and colonial records generally describe the location of the shrine as *extramuros* (outside or adjoining), *contramuros de esta capital* (at the border of this capital) or at the city’s *salida principal* (principal exit) “through which the necessities of that city enter.”⁸ Most of Guadalupe’s early recorded miracles also are connected to Mexico City (see Figure 1). She was reported to have stemmed both the great flood of 1629 and the *matlazáhuatl* epidemic of 1737–39, during which the archbishop formally proclaimed her patroness and protectress of the city “and its territory.”⁹ Writing from Guadalajara in 1742, Licenciado Matías de la Mota Padilla still associated Guadalupe with Mexico City. He judged that “the whole world may envy Mexico City its good fortune in having the appearance of a sign as great as Holy Mary, who protects it.”¹⁰ José Joaquín Fernández de Lizardi, the famous Mexican pundit, writing in 1811, recounted that when a large meteor shower was sighted in 1789, most people of Mexico City believed it was fire from Heaven. In panicky disarray they fled to the shrine of Guadalupe, shouting “To the sanctuary, to Our Lady of Guadalupe.”¹¹ When blanket statements about widespread devotion appear in the record, the chroniclers’ specific examples are for Mexico City and *ciudadanos mexicanos* (people of Mexico City), or for San Luis Potosí, Valladolid, Puebla, Guadalajara, Zacatecas, and other large towns. The record of self-conscious appeals to her as their patroness by these other cities surfaces from the 1730s as well.

Several formal changes in the years from 1733 to 1756 encouraged a widening circle of devotion to the Virgin of Guadalupe by bringing the community that surrounded her shrine out of the shadows of the capital. In 1733 the viceroy changed the community’s title from *pueblo* to *villa* (the rank just below *ciudad*—city) and separated the Indians who resided there from the immediate jurisdiction of Santiago Tlatelolco, one of the principal Indian districts of Mexico City. In 1746 the bishops and cathedral chapters of New Spain united to proclaim the Virgin of Guadalupe the patroness of the viceroyalty. In 1749 the establishment of the Villa de Guadalupe was completed and the shrine became an endowed *colegiata* or college of canons (as papal bulls had authorized in 1725, 1729, and 1746). In 1751 the officers of the *Colegiata* took possession of their posts, and on 12 December a formal coronation ceremony for the Virgin of Guadalupe at Tepeyac celebrated her as the “Universal Patroness of this Kingdom of New Spain.” Finally, the *fiestas* in Mexico City and other principal towns in 1756 to commemorate the Pope’s formal confirmation in 1754 of Our Lady de Guadalupe as patroness of the “entire kingdom” completed the official elevation of her image and her town.¹²



Figure 1. The Virgin of Guadalupe comes to the aid of the faithful in Mexico City during the epidemic of 1737. Engraving executed in 1743 and published in Cayetano Cabrera y Quintero, *Escudo de armas de México . . .*, Mexico, 1746 (Courtesy of the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University).

The celebrations of 1756 appear to have been pivotal events in the promotion of the cult of Guadalupe by church leaders in New Spain. Certainly peninsular prelates and native-born curates were promoting devotion to the Mexican Guadalupe with a new intensity in the late 1750s and 1760s. The *Promptuario manual mexicano*, a book of sermons and lectures for the use of curates in their teaching duties written by Ignacio de Paredes, S.J., and published in 1759, includes a sermon on Our Lady of Guadalupe and a short history of the apparition suitable for presentation to Indian neophytes “so that this [history] may be known to all the Indians, who are especially favored by the same lady”—as if the story of the apparition was not yet well known among Indians.¹³ Archbishop Lorenzana actively sponsored veneration of the Mexican Guadalupe in the late 1760s, especially in his “Oración a Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe: Non Fecit Taliter Omni Nationi” in which he recounted the apparition tale, described the painting and urged that the message of this “divine favor . . . to Americans” be taken to Indians: “May all the Indians come, may all the Indian women come to pay their respects to this Lady, may the children come from afar, and may the Indian women believe.”¹⁴ Lorenzana’s successor, Alonso Núñez de Haro y Peralta, issued a circular on 12 August 1776, declaring his obligation to promote the cult (*solicitar el mayor culto*) of the Virgin Mary and her “marvelous apparition in the image of Guadalupe” as the patroness of “this entire kingdom.” And Archbishop Lizana y Beaumont lent his support in a pastoral letter of 25 March 1803:

shortly after the conquest of this Imperial and Most Noble City, you were sent from Heaven the Sovereign Queen of the Angels as a sign of how much she loves you, and as a certain omen of the treasures the God of mercy would provide from the hands of your sweet Mother.¹⁵

Also from the late 1750s and 1760s on, concerted efforts by curates in rural Indian parishes of central Mexico to establish or increase popular veneration of the image of the Mexican Guadalupe appear in the judicial record. One example comes from a 1760 record for Tejupilco in the district of Temascaltepec (Estado de México). The Indians of Tejupilco complained that the curate was forcing them to offer an annual celebration for the apparition of the Virgin of Guadalupe. The curate responded that the Indians had celebrated the apparition in 1758 and he was working to institutionalize it in an annual celebration (Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico [AGN] Clero Regular y Secular 204, exs. 9–10). Other examples include Manuel Casell, *párroco* (parish priest) of Atotonilco el Chico (Hidalgo) who actively promoted the cult after he arrived in 1758, when the residents had decided to declare the Virgin of Guadalupe their patroness; Nicolás Ximénez, *párroco* of Epasoyucan (Hidalgo), who founded a *cofradía* (sodality) to the Virgin of Guadalupe sometime between 1751 and 1760 and had an altar to her constructed in the parish church (John Carter Brown Library [JCB] B760 A973i).

The clustering of cases like these in the later 1750s appears to be linked to a marked attachment to the Virgin of Guadalupe by curates trained in Mexico City at that time: the curates mentioned above and in note 22 were trained there; the published panegyric sermons to the Virgin of Guadalupe that are available in the Biblioteca Nacional are more numerous from 1757 on; and the professional resúmenes for aspirants to parishes in the early 1760s begin to list sermons the priests gave at Tepeyac and their participation in competitions for posts in the *Colegiata* in the 1750s.¹⁶ The deep reverence of one Indian curate from Mexico City in the late 1750s is recounted in the *relación de méritos y servicios* of Juan Faustino Xuárez de Escovedo, the son of Indian nobles of the Barrio de la Candelaria. Shortly after his appointment as *cura coadjutor* of San Juan Cozcatlán in the Huasteca, he was called out of town to hear a confession:

while crossing the Axtla River the waters suddenly rose and swept him downstream; inside he cried out to the Most Holy Virgin of Guadalupe, and the Indians pulled him out, almost dead [JCB B760 A973i].

This concentration of clerical activity in favor of the cult of the Virgin of Guadalupe in the 1750s also is illustrated by new lay brotherhoods and side altars dedicated to the image, which were sponsored by the curates, and the complaint by Indians of the Zacualpan jurisdiction (Estado de México) in 1757 that their secular priests were introducing feast days in honor of Guadalupe

as a way to increase their incomes (AGN Clero Regular y Secular 156, exps. 2–3). Complaints about added fees of this kind appear occasionally in later ecclesiastical court cases, as when the Audiencia of New Spain ordered the curate of Acatlán (Hidalgo) in 1817 not to collect from local Indians for religious celebrations in honor of Our Lady of Guadalupe and San Miguel.¹⁷

Before the 1650s copies of Guadalupe's picture found their way into other parts of Mexico: first, apparently, to the city of San Luis Potosí early in the century; also to Querétaro, Antequera, Zacatecas, and Saltillo.¹⁸ By the early 18th century Tepeyac would become the major pilgrimage site in New Spain, although it was not without rivals. By the 1770s there were reports of apparitions of the Virgin of Guadalupe in western Mexico, and chapels were dedicated to her in district seats as far north as New Mexico and Texas. Clearly, by then there was a substantial network of devotees to the American Guadalupe.

Four patterns seem likely from what is known about the expansion of this cult. First, its greatest pull centered in Mexico City, the Valley of Mexico, and places within a few days' travel of the sanctuary. Second, it grew especially through an urban network. For example, Andrés Cavo's account of what he called "unprecedented celebrations" in honor of the Virgin of Guadalupe in 1756 says that they took place in Mexico City and "all the cities of New Spain." Third, when the cult spread outside the Valley of Mexico, it grew first and most broadly to the north (the least Indian part of the viceroyalty). By the end of the colonial period, a resident of rural San Luis Potosí could report that

if you travel through the *ranchos* of this entire kingdom you will find that two things rarely are lacking: an image of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe and a poor school master who teaches reading and Christian doctrine [Cavo 1836:II, 170–171; AGN Intendencias 51, exp. 5, f. 54].¹⁹

And fourth, to the extent that there was a syncretic Indian cult of Guadalupe before the 18th century, it may have been centered in the Mexico City wards of San Juan and Tlatelolco, among Indians who lived or settled near the sanctuary, and in the district of Cuauhtitlán, where testimonials to the apparition were taken from local Indians in 1666 as part of an official Church authentication.²⁰ Bernardino de Sahagún, the famous Franciscan missionary and student of Náhuatl and pre-Conquest life, writing in the second half of the 16th century, provided an earlier indication of Indian pilgrimages to Tepeyac. He reported that Indians came to worship at Tepeyac "from distant places, as distant as in former times."²¹ However, Sahagún says little more about who the pilgrims were, where they came from, or what they believed. Perhaps the Indian cult of Guadalupe in the early colonial period corresponded roughly to the territory of pilgrimage and worship of the pre-Hispanic goddess Tonantzin at Tepeyac (whatever that territory may have been), but too little is known at present about the cult of Tonantzin to elaborate on this relationship. In any case, the few clear examples we have suggest that the Day of the Virgin of Guadalupe was not much celebrated in outlying Indian villages before the 1750s, and that it was less a spontaneous devotion than one that was fostered by parish priests, few of whom were Indians and nearly all of whom were educated in cathedral cities.²² Urban, often peninsular, church leaders and the parish priests and missionaries trained in their *colegios* and seminaries seem to have been aggressively promoting the cult of Guadalupe in the 18th century more than hurrying to catch up with popular Indian devotion.

To say that the Virgin of Guadalupe was only a metropolitan or urban symbol goes too far, but it does seem likely that, in addition to Indian devotees scattered in and near the Valley of Mexico, the cult grew first and deepest in the viceregal and archiepiscopal capital of Mexico City; and that Guadalupe was adopted as the patroness of Mexico City before she commanded much attention elsewhere. Perhaps this is a case of the great preindustrial city as style center, as Paul Wheatley (1971:Ch.5) calls it;²³ the place from which values are disseminated and specialized expertise provided. In any case, we have missed the close connection between the cult of Guadalupe and the history of the city by seeing the devotion as Indian-based and treating it in protonational terms.

Marías and Guadalupes

Establishing who believed and how people expressed their devotion is not easily done. Occasionally, suggestive evidence of devotion appears in judicial records—in appeals to colonial judges in the name of the Virgin of Guadalupe and in dated references to pilgrimages to the shrine and village celebrations of the apparition (see note 35)—but these are scarce fragments. It would be especially helpful to have serial evidence of a homogeneous kind that spans several centuries. Serial evidence of pilgrimages would be best. At some European shrines, “books of miracles” and “books of benefactors” were kept, recording the miracles attributed to a sacred image and registering the groups of pilgrims that went there bearing gifts. If such registers exist at the *Basílica de Guadalupe* for the colonial period, they have not yet been utilized by scholars.

Although we may never know much about who made pilgrimages to the shrine at Tepeyac, something of a spiritual geography can be recovered from baptismal and property records that indicate where and when parents named their children for her and where there were estates and settlements called Guadalupe. Names do not tell us enough about religious beliefs but the patterns of naming by place and time give a first approximation of long-term shifts in devotion that can be compared to other, more scattered evidence. An inspection of baptismal records from several parishes in Jalisco, Oaxaca, and the Estado de México suggests that the name Guadalupe gained popularity in provincial cities, district head towns, and creole ranching areas in the second half of the 18th century, but was not as common in Indian districts and rural villages outside the vicinity of Mexico City until after the Independence wars.

The sample consists of 18,771 baptisms from the late 18th and early 19th centuries distributed among eight parishes. Of the eight parishes, six are in Jalisco (the *sagrario metropolitano* in Guadalajara, Tlajomulco, Tonalá, Zacoalco, Arandas, and Acatlán de Juárez), one in the Estado de México (Tenango del Valle), and one in the Valley of Oaxaca (Mitla). The Jalisco parishes offer a range of communities and ethnic composition: Guadalajara *sagrario* (an urban parish), *Arandas* (a largely non-Indian parish of ranches and small hamlets), *Acatlán* (a parish near Guadalajara in transition from Indian to *mestizo* and mulatto where many of the residents were landless laborers), *Zacoalco* (a large parish with roughly equal numbers of Indians and non-Indians), and *Tonalá* and *Tlajomulco* (two parishes near Guadalajara with a majority of Indians). The two parishes from central and southern Mexico—Tenango del Valle and Mitla—had large Indian populations at the time and provide a comparison to the patterns of Indian names in Jalisco. Of the 18,771 individuals, 10,658 were classified as Indians, 8113 as Spaniards, *mestizos*, and mulattos. For each parish and time period, the total number of baptisms, the number of infants who bore the name María or other direct references to the Virgin, and the Guadalupes have been tabulated by sex and racial designation. For the Guadalupes, the month and day of baptism were also recorded.

Irrespective of race, women named María and Guadalupe outnumbered men—by about ten to one for Marías (9.4:1 for non-Indians and 9.8:1 for Indians) but by only 2.4:1 for Guadalupes (2.45:1 for non-Indians and 2.25:1 for Indians). More non-Indian women than Indian women were Marías, by 87.5 percent to 73.9 percent, but the percentages are high in both cases, suggesting a powerful cult of Mary generally. And the importance of the name Mary was growing during the years represented in the sample, roughly 1750 to 1840. There was an increase in the percentage of women named María, whether Indian or not, for nearly every parish, decade by decade from the 1740s to 1820. Somewhat more non-Indian men than Indian men carried the name María (usually as José María) or Mariano (9.3 percent to 7.6 percent) but the absolute difference between them is not as great as for the women, and the pattern for men does not show the increase that is so clear for the women. If anything, men were less likely to be given the name María as time went on.

Guadalupe appears much less often than María in these baptismal records but, again, non-Indians were more likely than Indians to be named Guadalupe, by 3.3:1 (3.2:1 for men and

3.4:1 for women). Of the Indians, .62 percent of the men and 1.4 percent of the women were Guadalupes, for a total of .99 percent of Indian baptisms. The figures for non-Indians are 1.97 percent of the men, 4.78 percent of the women, and a total of 3.35 percent of all non-Indian baptisms (see Table 1). The given name Guadalupe seems to have gained initial popularity in the second half of the 18th century. For the parish in Guadalajara there was nearly a threefold increase in the frequency of Guadalupes between 1745 and 1781 (.84 percent in 1745 to 2.2 percent in 1781). In the rural parishes of Jalisco often there were no Guadalupes at all in a year, or at most one or two before the 1750s.

Coupled with the greater frequency of non-Indian Guadalupes, the distribution of Guadalupes over the course of the year for all parishes except Arandas also suggests a pattern of veneration of the image of Guadalupe among non-Indians that was more widespread than among Indians at the time. As Guadalupe became a more common name in the late-18th century, Indian Guadalupes generally were born and baptized in December—Guadalupe’s month—and most of these were born near her day, 12 December, or were baptized within a week thereafter. This suggests that the pattern of Guadalupe namings for Indians followed the usual pattern of naming in Spanish America in the 18th century—an infant received the name of the saint or saints on whose day or in whose month he was born or baptized. Naming, then, had more to do with date of birth or baptism than with personal preference of the parents or godparents, or of the priest who baptized the infant and enrolled him in the register.²⁴ The monthly distribution for the non-Indians was different enough from the Indians to suggest that Guadalupe was becoming for them a popular choice irrespective of the season: 70 percent of non-Indian Guadalupe baptisms occurred from January to November (compared to 32.9 percent of Indian Guadalupes). Only 18.3 percent of non-Indian Guadalupes were born or baptized within a week of 12 December compared to 45.6 percent of the Indian Guadalupes. Overall, 42.7 percent of all Guadalupes were born in December and 27.2 percent of these namings were made close to 12 December. Arandas is the one exception to this seasonal pattern and the contrast between Indian and non-Indian Guadalupes. For all Arandas groups, Guadalupes were quite evenly distributed over the 12 months, with only 11.8 percent of Indian Guadalupes and 12.6 percent of non-Indian Guadalupes baptized in December.

While the name Guadalupe became more popular in the late 18th century, the pattern of increase is less clear and consistent than the naming of Marías. A plateau of popularity seems to have been reached in the 1780s, holding good through at least the 1830s (see Table 2).

For Tenango del Valle and Tlajomulco—two parishes where there were Indian *pueblos* with a substantial non-Indian population, near large estates—there was an increase of Guadalupe namings during the War of Independence in the 1810s (from 1.06 percent during 1786–1804 at Tenango del Valle to 3.06 percent there from 1809–17, and from .19 percent during 1800–06 at Tlajomulco to .92 percent in 1810–11). Other differences of naming among the eight parishes underscore the popularity of the name Guadalupe among non-Indians, and Mitla and Arandas as the extreme examples of the differences between Indians and non-Indians. In Table

Table 1. Total Guadalupe baptisms.

Parish	Indian		Non-Indian	
Tlajomulco	10/2088	(.48%)	24/707	(3.39%)
Zacoalco	14/1662	(.85%)	31/1077	(2.88%)
Acatlán	10/1041	(.96%)	35/1053	(3.32%)
Tonalá	2/489	(.41%)	6/124	(4.84%)
Tenango del Valle	42/3053	(1.38%)	46/1593	(2.89%)
Mitla	3/1476	(.20%)		
Arandas	19/337	(5.64%)	93/2220	(4.19%)
Guadalajara, Sagrario	5/512	(.98%)	37/1339	(2.76%)
	105/10658	(.99%)	272/8113	(3.35%)

Table 2. Guadalupe baptisms over time.

Years	Male		Female		Total	
Indian						
1786–1810	18/2610	(.69%)	30/2469	(1.22%)	48/5079	(.95%)
1810–1821	3/1247	(.24%)	23/1206	(1.19%)	26/2453	(1.06%)
1822–1840	8/1140	(.70%)	10/960	(1.04%)	18/2100	(.86%)
Non-Indian						
1786–1810	39/1738	(2.24%)	94/1809	(4.97%)	133/3547	(3.75%)
1810–1821	17/744	(2.28%)	35/710	(4.93%)	52/1454	(3.58%)
1822–1840	8/609	(1.32%)	27/632	(4.27%)	35/1239	(2.82%)

Table 3. Frequency of Guadalupes, ranked by parish.

Parish	Percentage of Total Baptisms	Percentage of Non-Indian Baptisms	Percentage of Indian Baptisms
Arandas	4.38	4.19	5.64
Guadalajara	2.27	2.76	.98
Acatlán	2.15	3.32	.96
Tenango del Valle	1.89	2.89	1.38
Zacoalco	1.64	2.88	.85
Tonalá	1.31	4.84	.41
Tlajomulco	1.22	3.39	.48
Mitla	.20	—	.20

3, the least Indian parishes of Arandas, the Guadalajara *sagrario*, and Acatlán had the highest percentages of Guadalupes—6 to 10 times more as a percentage of all baptisms than did Mitla, and 2 to 4 times more than the central Jalisco parishes with large Indian populations (Tonalá, Tlajomulco, and Zacoalco). For Indians in these parishes, the name Guadalupe appeared least often in the most Indian parishes of Mitla, Tonalá, and Tlajomulco. For non-Indians, it seemed to make little difference whether they lived in a city, on *ranchos*, or among Indians. Non-Indians were somewhat more likely to be named Guadalupe if they lived in parishes with a majority of Indians. As Table 3 indicates, Guadalupes were less frequent among non-Indians in Guadalajara than they were in the Tonalá and Tlajomulco parishes.

Mitla stands apart from the other parishes in this sample for its Indian *pueblos* with much land and few Spaniards. Its place in the pattern of Guadalupe namings is equally distinctive. Even as late as 1808–43, very few Guadalupes appear among the names in the baptismal registers of Mitla—only 3 of 1476 baptisms examined, or .20 percent—by far the lowest frequency in the sample. And all 3 of the Mitla Guadalupes were born or baptized on 12 December. By contrast, Arandas had 22 times Mitla’s frequency of Guadalupes (112/2,557 or 4.4 percent) and 2 to 6 times more than in other parishes. Arandas also experienced a larger increase in Guadalupes between the 1770s and 1820 than did the others: from 2.4 percent from 1771–76 to 4.6 percent from 1790–1819. One obvious reason for the popularity of Guadalupe as a personal name in Arandas is that Guadalupe was the patroness of the parish. But other parishes dedicated to Guadalupe may not have had such a clear pattern of naming so early. Another consideration is that this was essentially a non-Indian parish that included recent migrants and many local *rancheros*, traders, and laborers who had travelled beyond the confines of their parish and might be considered more proto-Mexican than the people of other rural parishes in this sample. Children in non-Indian parishes (and in Arandas in particular) in the 18th century usually were christened with two to three names, increasing the likelihood that one of their names would be María or Guadalupe.

Much remains to be done with the study of naming and the appearance of Guadalupes in the baptism records. More parishes need to be examined and the time period should be ex-

tended at least to 1900. For now, it appears that naming followed the saints associated with the date of birth or baptism, but there were no absolute rules and no simple differences based on place, race, or gender. Still, two large patterns are quite well established in this sample. One is the special attachment to Mary and the new frequency with which children were named Guadalupe in the late 18th century, which suggest that the popularity of Guadalupe followed and depended upon a deeply rooted devotion to Mary. The name Guadalupe was far from ubiquitous in the late colonial period but, given the custom of naming for the saints associated with the date of birth or baptism and the frequency of Guadalupes from the 1750s to the last decade of the 18th century, the 3.35 percent of non-Indians named Guadalupe is substantial. By contrast, less than 1 percent of Indians baptized in this sample were Guadalupes. Second, the increasing use of the name Guadalupe and its almost random distribution during the year was associated with non-Indians more than with Indians. From this sample, the more Indian the parish the less Guadalupe appears as a chosen personal name in the late colonial period.

When the name Guadalupe first gained popularity in most of these parishes in the mid-18th century it probably followed the common pattern of naming for saints, with clusters of Guadalupes appearing in December in association with the day of the Virgin of Guadalupe, and fewer Guadalupes baptized in other months. Higher frequency of the name Guadalupe and more Guadalupes baptized from January to November suggests a stronger, self-generating attachment to this Mexican image of the Virgin Mary. Before 1840, the naming of non-Indians followed such a pattern more closely than did the naming of Indians.²⁵

symbol and ideology

The messages of the symbol of Mary Immaculate, whether we consider Guadalupe separately or, preferably, as the most widely venerated of many different images in New Spain, bear on the question of the second conquest—how Spaniards ruled in America and how their rule ended. In colonial Mexico, especially outside large cities, she was venerated time and again as mother and intercessor. For farming villagers, an important layer of meaning came from her position as a unique mother of miraculous, spontaneous fertility. Motherhood in this marvelous form was naturally connected by village farmers to fertility of the land they tilled. Mircea Eliade speaks in universal terms of the earth being “endowed with manifold religious significance,” with significance especially as “Mother Earth,” source of life, and, by extension, of women as “centres of sacred power” (Eliade 1963:240, 259, 262, 332). The case of Mexico before and after the initial encounters of native Americans and Spaniards is no exception. Ancient beliefs in the efficacy of propitiatory agrarian rites did not lose their strength and the Virgin Mary was a main point of contact. Mary, especially Guadalupe, came to be associated in central Mexico with *pulque*, the milky fermented juice of the *maguey* plant, the “milk of the gods” reported in pre-Hispanic traditions. In some colonial Indian villages there were fields of *maguey* named for the Virgin Mary, and in the late 18th century the Virgin of Guadalupe was sometimes called the Mother of Maguey. As a symbol of health and hospitals, the Virgin Mary of the Immaculate Conception also had great appeal as a guardian against epidemics and other illnesses.

But it is especially as intercessor that Mary Immaculate contains one of the master principles of religious life and political relationships within the colonial system. The mediation of her womb between the spiritual and the physical, as the means of the Incarnation, was only one aspect of her mediation between heaven and earth. Mary retained her special hold on popular piety partly because God had not been softened in Spanish America just as the great gulfs in the social and political hierarchy had not been spanned. There was need of her intercession with her son and his father, not only to create a bridge into heaven for the believer, but to bring healing and consolation to the living. Although her place in the journey to personal salvation was very important, for rural people in the future Mexico she was perhaps less a broker in the journey after death than a protectress in this life. Part of her appeal was that she did not seem

to play favorites. She was mother and mediator for all, while the saints appeared more as special advocates for particular people and special purposes.

The images of Mary Immaculate assume the posture of prayer. Prayer was the instrument both of Mary's intercession with God and of the believer's appeal to her. The art historian Elizabeth Wilder Weismann noticed that this appeal was associated with distinctive images of the Virgin Mary that were believed to contain her power. Unlike the pinup versions of Mary that were popular in the academic art of Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries, the favorite representations from rural Mexico were friendly, approachable little women (Weismann 1950:173). As Marina Warner says about Mary as intercessor, "she is approached as a human mother who brims with a mother's love."²⁶ Perhaps this reflects both the conceptual thinking of Indian villagers and the teachings of the Franciscans who often represented the Virgin as a modest housewife, easily approached.

This central meaning of the Virgin Mary in Indian Mexico as mother and intercessor carries two paradoxical messages for colonial political life. Most scholars who have considered the Virgin's political significance see revolutionary and messianic messages, the Virgin as a symbol of counterculture inviting her believers to escape the restraints of established order in the hope of communion (Greenberg 1981:46–47; Taussig 1980:210 and *passim*). She was the only mortal to have escaped the stain of the sins of Adam and Eve. Her purity carried the promise of redemption; her child was the source of a new beginning. Colonial Indians could have understood this new beginning as liberation in the widest sense—spiritual salvation, escape from taxes and oppressive labor service, and protest against alien power. As a symbol of liberation and the embodiment of Indian interests, Mary was proof that her faithful were a chosen people. In effect, veneration of the Virgin was a critique of the existing social order, a rejection of Spanish values and a guide to action—as if she represented a "confrontation of Spanish and Indian worlds." Because the political history of the Virgin Mary has been considered largely in association with uprisings, especially with the Independence war and the Revolution of 1910, we have had the impression that this message of protest was the only one, that Guadalupe was *communitas* for Indians from the 1530s on, the opposite of structure and of everything hierarchical, paternalistic, and Hispanic.²⁷

But there is another clear political message embedded in faith in the Virgin Mary that on the surface contradicts the symbolism of liberation: as mediator, the Virgin was a model of acceptance and legitimation of colonial authority. The success of Spanish rule in Mexico for nearly three centuries without a standing army depended on a system of administration and justice that worked through intermediaries and specialists, defusing or postponing independent action by offended subjects. It succeeded largely because the elaborate hierarchy of colonial judges was, in the end, believed to be just or at least was widely accepted as a way to resolve disputes. Village Indians in colonial Mexico were inclined to take their grievances over land and taxes to the courts, to work through legal intermediaries, and to appeal to a higher authority within the colonial structure if the verdict went against them. The images of the Virgin were intermediaries, too, who would intercede with higher authorities on behalf of the believer. Believing in her was like having a friend in high places. She gave country people a stake in the colonial system. Ritually, the Virgin was approached as the colonial governors were—humbly, hat in hand. One had to trust in the Virgin and give her time, just as one had to accept that justice worked slowly in the colonial courts. Here was a statement about self-control and hierarchical social relationships that joined religion and a politics of deference. The Virgin Mary personified the church (colonial records often refer to the church as "the pious mother"); and, like the church, she was the intercessor between Christians and God. But she had also become the mediator between the King of Spain and "the Americans," as Itá y Parra put it in *El círculo de amor* (1747) (Lafaye 1976:288). In this way she sanctified the authority of the colonial system, affirmed the unity of that society, and carried a message not to take matters into your own hands, not to right your own wrongs. Turn them over to Mother Mary.

This political message of accommodation worked especially well so long as curates had the king's support in exercising moral and political, as well as spiritual, leadership in their parishes. Where the Virgin Mary had not been appropriated by the local community or used against the authority of the priest, she was part of the priest's domain, and many times curates displayed her image as a way to stop local uprisings against Spanish tax collectors and governors. Where curates lost much of their moral authority in the late 18th century during the Bourbon reforms, or where they chose to identify more closely with their parishioners than with the cathedral chapter or the king, or where curates were absent, the Virgin's messages of reconciliation and stability was jeopardized (Taylor 1984:87–106).

The Virgin's messages of accommodation and liberation were not perceived as contradictory or as simple alternatives. The importance of each message waxed and waned, but neither meaning disappeared. Mary's message of liberation dominated the third conquest, during the struggle over independence in the years after 1810. As in the Spanish Conquest, she had become a patroness of partisans in an armed struggle. But the tables were turned; she now surfaced as the patroness of Mexicans against Spaniards (Mexicans meaning here people who consciously thought of themselves as Mexicans). The Virgin of Guadalupe in particular was sometimes taken up as a spiritual ally of common people in revolt after the war broke out, partly because of a change that had been in the making for many years. Gradually the Virgin Mary had come to be a general protectress, not only a specialist in dialogue with a distant God. She was approached for aid against hated new taxes, and in other ways that had political meaning for an ideology of community autonomy and protection of the poor. For example, Toribio Ruiz, *afromestizo* scribe (*escribano*) of the Indians of Zacoalco (Jalisco) in 1783 proclaimed that "Most Holy Mary is praying for us" in a protracted land dispute. When a Spanish resident joked that since the *audiencia* (the high court in Guadalajara) had issued a definitive judgment in the case, the Mother of God must no longer be pleading his case, Ruiz replied ominously, "Consider the temporal and eternal judgments."²⁸ And in the complaint by the Indians of Chacaltianguis (Cozamaloapa district of Veracruz) against their curate in 1768 for collecting excessive fees, they appealed to the Viceroy's "royal piety" and to the "protection of the Virgin Mary to free us from these many oppressions."²⁹

The Virgin Mary also found her way into popular conceptions of the Trinity. The curate of Otumba on the northeast edge of the Valley of Mexico in 1795 doubted the story of the apparition of the Virgin of Guadalupe but kept a print which depicted the Trinity with three figures: God the Father on the right, Christ on the left, and the Virgin Mary in the center with the Holy Spirit springing from her body (AGN Inquisición 1360, exps. 1–2) (see Figure 2). Twenty years before, the *Alcalde Mayor* of Colima reported having seen a painting and drawings on rocks at a spot near the foot of the Volcán de Colima where local mulattoes were believed to worship the Devil (AGN Inquisición 1145, exp. 8, fols. 98–105). The painted image, according to the *alcalde mayor's* drawing of it, placed a crowned Virgin Mary of the Immaculate Conception—the largest of the figures—in a vertical line between a small figure of Christ and God in Heaven, with a dove representing the Holy Spirit at the top. These misconceptions of the Virgin Mary as part of the Trinity or as the source of the Holy Spirit were not new but they may have been more common in the late 18th century. Ignacio José Hugo de Omerick, the parish priest of Tepecoacuilco (Guerrero), in his lengthy advice of 1769 to curates in Indian parishes on current doctrine and techniques for teaching Christianity to their flock emphatically rejected a conception of the Trinity in which the Holy Spirit emanated from the Virgin Mary, as if such a conception were common in Mexico.³⁰

In forgotten times and places in central Mexico during the decades before 1810 the Virgin of Guadalupe became attached to an idea of millennial reconquest. In a regional Indian uprising in the jurisdiction of Tulancingo during 1769 the leaders called for death to Spanish officials and the creation of an Indian priesthood. They dreamed of the day when bishops and *alcaldes mayores* would kneel and kiss the rings of Indian priests. The leader of their theocratic utopia called himself the New Savior, and his consort was known as the Virgin of Guadalupe.³¹ And,



Figure 2. A print from the late 18th century representing the Virgin Mary in the Trinity, with the Holy Spirit springing from her body. From AGN Inquisición 1360, exps. 1–2 (Courtesy of the Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico).

during the chaotic first months of the Independence struggle the Virgin of Guadalupe was used not only by Miguel Hidalgo, the parish priest who adopted this image as the symbol of his movement shortly after he began his march on Mexico City in September 1810, but also by other curates who invoked her protection against the *gachupines* (peninsular Spaniards)³² and by small bands of rebels to justify their acts of destruction. In December 1810, Father Hidalgo ordered the Indians of Juchipila (directly north of Guadalajara in the state of Zacatecas) not to sack the estates of the local Spanish tax administrator. The Indians refused to obey, even after a direct order from their parish priest. They did it, they said, with the permission of the Virgin of Guadalupe.³³ What had been forbidden only months before could now be accomplished under the higher authority of the Virgin.

Nevertheless, other connections between the Virgin of Guadalupe and Indian rebellion in the late colonial period are more ambiguous. In 1800, Indians in Tlaxcala and Nayarit were rumored to have plotted with a Spanish creole aristocrat in Mexico City to start a rebellion against the crown on 12 December, the day of the Virgin of Guadalupe. The evidence of this aborted rebellion is sketchy but the men and women from Nayarit who were called to testify in early 1801 said that it was to begin by setting fire to the church at Tepeyac—they made no

mention of rescuing the sacred painting—and at the same time setting off explosions at the viceregal palace in Mexico City.³⁴

Victor Turner's bold and penetrating essay, "Hidalgo: History as Social Drama," encapsulates the view that the Hidalgo movement was essentially an Indian revolt, and that Guadalupe was the natural connecting symbol of national protest (Turner 1974:98–155). In Turner's words, Guadalupe was, by 1810, "the supreme mobilizing symbol of nationalism," and "national community," a "populist symbol that activated the masses." Eric R. Wolf said much the same thing about the Virgin of Guadalupe as a syncretic image with a special mass appeal to Indians and *mestizos* in Mexico, carrying a message of power to the people, when he spoke of the War of Independence as "the final realization of the apocalyptic promise of Guadalupe," the return of Tonantzin which had "guaranteed a rightful place to the Indians in the new social system of New Spain" (Wolf 1958:37–38). There are several problems with this view of the Hidalgo revolt. Two of them are that a minority of its followers and apparently none of its leaders were "Indians" in any conventional sense; and the Virgin of Guadalupe did not appear everywhere as the banner of Hidalgo's movement. The Hidalgo movement was concentrated in the Bajío region north of Mexico City—the most prosperous and populous area, and one of the least Indian at that time. Many residents of the Bajío had migrated from areas closer to Mexico City or had, I suspect, visited the shrine of Guadalupe.

And there are the further problems that the cult of Guadalupe was not mainly Indian or attached only to the cause of independence.³⁵ Even at the end of the colonial period the prophetic appeal to an Indian past in the Guadalupe cult was promoted mainly by creole intellectuals like Fray Joseph Joaquín Sardo, an Augustinian writing in 1810 (Sardo 1819:61–66). Sardo celebrated the Christ of Chalma and the Virgin of Guadalupe as connected signs that Mexico was a chosen realm, both images appearing to humble Indians at places sacred to pagan mother and father deities, with the Christ at Chalma making his timely appearance several years after his mother, Guadalupe (1531 and 1539). In September or October of 1811, Fernández de Lizardi composed a poem, "La muralla de México en la protección de María Santísima Nuestra Señora," in which he celebrated the failure of Hidalgo's insurgents to occupy Mexico City the year before. He attributed the city's safety to the Virgin Mary—"She is the fortress, the surest wall, defense, and castle"—pointing to the ring of shrines dedicated to images of Mary that surrounded the city, calling them the capital's "valiant squadron." But he singled out two images as the bastions of "this happy and fortunate" city: those of Guadalupe and Los Remedios (Fernández de Lizardi 1963:99). Clearly some Indians who were devoted to the image of Guadalupe actively *opposed* the Hidalgo forces. For example, when the Indians of Zacapoaxtla (Puebla) requested permission in 1813 to build a temple to the Virgin of Guadalupe, they explained that it was to honor Guadalupe for her protection in 1810–11. When they heard that Father Hidalgo was using the name of the Virgin of Guadalupe, the Zacapoaxtla Indians declared her their patroness against the insurgents and attributed to her their repeated victories over Hidalgo's forces.³⁶

By concentrating on the Virgin of Guadalupe, as well as by assuming mass Indian support, some of the complex and contingent meaning of religious symbols at the time of the Independence struggle is lost. For instance, Hidalgo's popular movement probably was connected both to the Virgin of San Juan de los Lagos and widespread devotion to Mary Immaculate in general. Hidalgo planned his uprising to coincide with the fair of this widely venerated image at San Juan de los Lagos on 8 December, which is also the date of the universal feast of the Virgin of the Immaculate Conception. Many of the areas of central and western Mexico where Indians did join the Hidalgo forces by the hundreds or thousands had been evangelized by the Franciscans and maintained strong local attachments to an image of Mary Immaculate. Guadalupe, as an image of Mary Immaculate with a large following among creole priests, townspeople, and some country people in areas north of Mexico City could have served as the bridge between these proto-Mexicans and villagers who were devoted to their local images more than to the Virgin of Guadalupe. If this was so, Guadalupe as a symbol of nationhood for Indians

and common people may have been more a product of the war than the universal, dominant symbol ready to “activate the masses.”

The attachment of this image to Indian justice and nationalism seems to have grown during and after the war in three ways that bear some relationship to the examples of public men. First, in the course of the fighting there were dislocations and migrations of villagers in central and north-central Mexico who came into direct contact with the cult of the Virgin of Guadalupe, perhaps for the first time. This would have been especially true during the height of the Morelos movement from 1811 to 1814, since José María Morelos, even more than Miguel Hidalgo, invoked the name of the Virgin of Guadalupe as the rallying cry of the revolution. His flag was blue and white, the colors of the Virgin’s dress; “Virgin of Guadalupe” was used as a countersign by his troops; and he publicly attributed his victories to her (Meier 1974:479–480). Second, there was the association between the Virgin of Guadalupe and Miguel Hidalgo, the martyr to independence, regarded as the “Father of Mexico,” which became automatic after 1828 when the name of the community at Tepeyac was changed from the Villa de Guadalupe to Guadalupe Hidalgo, with the rank of city (López Sarrelangue 1957:258). Third, there was the reputation of a great military hero from Durango and Mexico City who changed his name during the Independence war from Manuel Félix Fernández to Guadalupe Victoria and went on to become Mexico’s first constitutional president in 1824. He also presided over the ceremony at the sanctuary in 1828 in which the name of the community was changed.

Even if the modern universal appeal of the cult of the Virgin of Guadalupe was as much a result as a source of mobilization in the Independence wars, Guadalupe was the natural symbol of nationalism when it became a popular sentiment in the 19th century (perhaps especially during the French intervention in the 1860s). Unlike the small host of images of the Virgin with local or regional appeal, the cult of Guadalupe provided a loose and incomplete but still important network of connections among formally separated groups and places—precisely among those groups and places that seem to have taken part in the independence struggle during the early years: some urban creoles, especially in the Bajío; and deracinated *mestizos* and Indians in the Bajío and some parts of central and western Mexico. Guadalupe had a special appeal in places where people thought of themselves as Mexicans, or as members of a social category without privileges, or as members of a group whose privileges had been lost—notably creoles, the lower clergy, and landless farmworkers, including Indians who thought of themselves as Indians. But Guadalupe also represented the nation by the location of her sanctuary in the Valley of Mexico and her longstanding association with the unrivalled political and cultural capital, Mexico City—the place of intercession.

The idea that one symbol can stand both for submission to authority and liberation will not surprise most students of the history of religions. Nearly 20 years ago Victor Turner gave clear meaning to what he called the “multivocality” of symbols—their various, contradictory meanings (Turner 1967:50–51). Female sacred images in particular have had many different meanings—simultaneously nurturing, protecting, terrifying, and destroying (Preston 1982:329). Recognizing the existence of these split meanings in the past is, however, only the first step toward relating the Virgin of Guadalupe, popular piety, and the operation of the state in Mexican history.

conclusion

This paper has described a possible history of devotion to the image of the American Guadalupe in colonial Mexico that moves away from her as the Virgin of the conquered Indians. The Indian cult of Guadalupe before the second half of the 18th century probably was concentrated in and near the Valley of Mexico, with pockets of devotees in more distant places that were connected to old pilgrimage routes to Tepeyac or to the popular devotion to this image that was being promoted by the clergy, especially in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. The

more dynamic, popular devotion to Guadalupe seems to have emanated from Mexico City in official and unofficial ways, from other cities of the viceroyalty (especially San Luis Potosí, Zacatecas, Querétaro, Guadalajara, and smaller towns populated mainly by non-Indians), from the priesthood, and from the non-Indian population of the countryside in central and northern Mexico.

More archival research needs to be done on how and where the cult of Guadalupe came into existence, who believed, what changed, and when; but equally important for the history of this most Mexican image of the Virgin is the scope of study. We are not likely to learn much about the unfolding of the cult by sighting it only from atop Clifford Geertz's hermeneutical "anthills" (Geertz 1983:170); or by looking for origins and symbolic representations of Guadalupe only in peasant communities, Indian protests against colonial rule, and ideas of liberation; or by "upstreaming" back in time from current devotion and speaking of her as a "dominant symbol" with a "highly constant and consistent meaning" without close attention to different times and places.³⁷ A more appropriate scope of study in this case is the community of devotion to the Virgin Mary in all her forms, but especially in the form of Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception, in Spain as well as Mexico, and among subjects and rulers alike. While highlighting a longstanding association between the Virgin of Guadalupe and Mexico City, this essay suggests that the cult of Mary changed substantially during the course of the colonial centuries. Specifically, the relationship between the cult of Mary Immaculate and Indians in the colonial polity of New Spain seems to fall into three phases that were shaped by situations of conflict and disruption. In the generations after the first conquest, ideas of redemption and justice through mediation, prayer, and deference occupied an important place in the formation of a way of thinking and living that made Christianity and colonial rule generally acceptable to many established Indian communities. In the 17th and early 18th centuries, the rise of the Virgin Mary of the Immaculate Conception as a corporate protectress and intercessor for Indian *pueblos* may have been connected in time and place with a gradual reconstitution of Indian peasants in more ideologically "closed, corporate communities" (which were, in fact, neither closed nor simply corporate).³⁸ In the late 18th century and during the Independence war, a time of increasing interest in the image of Guadalupe, the Virgin's protection more often implied a challenge to the political and social order directed from capital cities, and armed action against privileged people.

This last shift in popular beliefs may well be related to Bourbon political reforms that altered the church's position in public life and were cutting the crown loose from legitimating religious symbols, as well as to material changes of the time (expansion of commercial agriculture and mining, chronic shortages of cash and credit, population growth, migration, and pressure on village lands and waters), to the weakening of corporate community and district ties in some regions, and to a growing sense of membership in larger groups such as "Indians" and "Americans." Where the first impulse of 16th-century Spanish officials and settlers in Mexico had been to promote a network of dispersed cities and towns among the mines and Indians, balanced and restrained by a theory of centralized royal authority, the Bourbons and regalist prelates of the 18th century pressed ahead with the rule of law, standardization, and a less equivocal centralization of power located especially in the administrative and commercial capitals of Mexico City and Guadalajara. The old pulsating, mediated relationships between pluralism and centralization, custom and law, and religion and the state that had favored the multiple meanings of Mary Immaculate for Indian villagers, were giving way to royal monologues and fixed rules.

notes

Acknowledgments. Part of this essay was presented as the Arthur Aiton Lecture at the University of Michigan on 15 March 1984. I am grateful to Rebecca Scott for her encouragement and hospitality on that occasion. In this work I am also indebted to David Carrasco of the Department of Religious Studies, Uni-

versity of Colorado, for his generous support of my interest in the history of religions in Mexico and for our conversations about issues of center and periphery, to Nancy D. Mann and Herbert Braun for good editorial advice, and to Steve J. Stern, Salvador Victoria Hernández, David Frye, and Ruth Behar for valuable archival references.

¹A message of national destiny rooted in the Indian past has long been the common sense about the cult of the Virgin of Guadalupe before Independence, whether the authors are foreign novelists and world travellers like Graham Greene ("This Virgin claimed a church where she might love her Indians and guard them from the Spanish conqueror. The legend gave the Indian self-respect; it gave him a hold over his conqueror; it was a liberating, not an enslaving legend" [1950:103]); Mexican literary figures like Rodolfo Usigli (1967) or Octavio Paz ("Tonantzin/Guadalupe was the imagination's answer to the situation of orphanhood in which the Conquest left the Indians . . . the Indians took refuge in the skirts of Tonantzin/Guadalupe" [1979:49]); Mexican scholars writing school textbooks (The image of the Virgin of Guadalupe in the 16th century "immediately became the Virgin of the Indians and before long the Virgin of those born in Mexico, the Mexicans" [Jiménez Moreno, Miranda, and Fernández 1963:285]); or foreign scholars ("The Indian population accepted her as the miraculous incarnation of the Aztec earth and fertility goddess Tonantzi," "Guadalupe's image began to appear everywhere" [Campbell 1982:7, 9]).

The latest publication in English on the history of the cult of the Virgin of Guadalupe is by Donald Kurtz (1982). It is mainly concerned with the idea that Bishop Zumárraga promoted the legend of the apparition in the 1530s in order to humanize Indians in the eyes of Spaniards. And it starts from premises of Indian unity, widespread Indian belief in the Virgin of Guadalupe in the early colonial period, and the legendary events of the apparition in 1531 as historically true.

Another recent work, Rodríguez (1980), is not much concerned with who believed or when, and assumes a more or less simultaneous veneration by creoles, *mestizos*, and Indians. Rodríguez does, however, review some of the classic writings on the cult and critiques them from an anti-apparitionist perspective. He urges a reinterpretation of the Guadalupe symbol as a source of self-esteem, national unity and quest for Mexico's destiny, to replace what he regards as the apparitionist hoax, which he views as an opiate of the oppressed in Mexico.

²A pivotal, still unresolved matter in the debate is the dating of the "Nican Mopohua," an account of the apparition written in Náhuatl and attributed to Antonio Valeriano, an early student of the Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco. The original manuscript apparently has not been mentioned in print or seen since the late 17th century, but Ernest J. Burrus (1983:324–327) recently judged the earliest, undated copy in the New York Public Library to be written in mid-16th-century script. Modern scholarship that questions the antiquity of the tradition of the apparition includes De la Maza (1953), Lafaye (1976), and Rodríguez (1980). De la Torre Villar and Navarro de Anda (1982) contains the principal historical texts for the Guadalupean tradition.

³Lafaye (1976:299). Lafaye has made a valuable contribution to an understanding of the cult of the Virgin of Guadalupe as "the central theme of the history of creole consciousness," but as in other writings that refer to the history of the cult, his book treats it from the standpoint of protest and assumes, rather than demonstrates, a widespread early devotion by the "Indians," rooted in oppression and a cosmogony that bred eschatological hopes (pp. 22, 29, 242–243, 277, and 288).

⁴Padden (1967:Chs. 8–9). Spanish officials promoted the cult of Mary from the early colonial period. According to the First Provincial Council of bishops in 1555, four of the twelve high holy days to be observed by Indians were dedicated to the Virgin (*Concilios provinciales* 1981:68–69). The *Recopilación de leyes de los reynos de las Indias* (1973:libro 1, título 1, ley 24) summarizes a royal *cédula* of 1645 declaring the Virgin Mary to be "Patroness and Protectress, as in our kingdoms [of Spain]."

⁵The intellectual history of the apparition is discussed in De la Maza (1953) and Lafaye (1976).

⁶Bergoend (1969:90–91). I can add little to the debate over what image or images were venerated at Tepeyac in the 16th century. A petition in 1665 of Br. Alfonso de Hita, the former vicar of the sanctuary, does speak of the sanctuary being founded "over 140 years earlier"; that is, during the 1520s and before the traditional date of the apparitions in 1531. This would seem to indicate that the Spanish Guadalupe was honored there initially (AGN Acervo 49, caja 140). Miles Phillips, in his 1582 account of the years he spent in New Spain, said that the image venerated as Our Lady of Guadalupe at Tepeyac was "of silver and gilt, being as high and as large as a tall woman" (Hakluyt 1907:VI, 314). This would seem to refer to a sculpted figure rather than the painting. Viceroy Martín Enríquez, in a letter to the king of 12 September 1575 said that the shrine supposedly was named Guadalupe because the image of the Virgin there was said to look like the Spanish Virgin of Guadalupe (Cartas de Indias 1877:39–40).

⁷Hakluyt (1907:VI, 314–315). In his 1575 letter to the king (*Cartas de Indias* 1877:39–40) Viceroy Enríquez spoke of a shrine to Our Lady of Guadalupe that had become popular among *la gente* ("the people") 20 years before when a *ganadero* (a cattleman) spread the word that he had regained his health by going there.

⁸López Sarrelangue (1957:305); Hanke (1977:IV, 192 for 1644, and I, 315 for 1592). A close association between the Shrine of Guadalupe at Tepeyac and the cathedral remained strong in the 17th century. Vicars of the sanctuary were sometimes cathedral dignitaries (in 1644, for example, the vicar was the *maestrescuela* of the cathedral, AGN Acervo 49, caja 174) and archbishops continued to speak of themselves as patrons of the cult (AGN Acervo 49, caja 140, 11 May 1657). The Villa de Guadalupe continued to be the place where dignitaries from Europe were met until the end of the colonial period, as in the viceregal decree of 4 June 1779 that the new viceroy, Martín de Mayorga, be received there (AGN Bandos 11 exp. 13).

⁹Cabrera y Quintero (1746:23). In 1737 the Inquisition ordered three nights of festival lights on the façade of the Santo Oficio building and the house of the *inquisidores* in Mexico City in honor of the Virgen de Guadalupe having been declared patroness of the city (AGN Inquisición 862, fols. 260–263).

A bitter dispute in 1679 between the Indian *cofradía* (sodality) to Guadalupe at Tepeyac and Spanish devotees of the Virgin of Guadalupe in Mexico City over collection of alms indicates both a rivalry and the appeal of Guadalupe in the capital. The Indian *cofradía* had long been allowed to collect alms, but licenses had also been granted to the Spaniards to collect “outside and within this city.” The *provisor* of the ecclesiastical court in that year clarified the situation to the advantage of the Spaniards of the capital, allowing the Indian *cofrades* to solicit in the city only from Indian homes (AGN Acervo 49, caja 174).

This brief account of the development of the cult is not meant to suggest an unbroken line of growth from the 1520s on. Various administrators and rent collectors for the sanctuary in the second quarter of the 17th century spoke of it as “very poor” and “in great need” (AGN Acervo 49, caja 140, 11 July 1633 and 25 December 1649). Still, the image of the Virgin of Guadalupe was already becoming good business by then. Joseph Ferrer claimed to have invented and sold “medidas de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe” at the sanctuary and in Mexico City since the 1620s, paying the vicar 100 pesos per year and 50 pesos worth of *medidas* for the privilege, and commissioning a large painting of the apparition that was displayed in the sanctuary (AGN Acervo 49, caja 149, folder 3). The “medidas” apparently were ribbons cut to the height of the painting of the Virgin and stamped in gold or silver with her image and name.

¹⁰Quoted in Lafaye (1976:284). The following of the cult in Mexico City in the 18th century is documented in many ways, including the many sculpted images of the Virgin of Guadalupe that still grace the walls of 18th-century buildings in the heart of the city; the broad public appeals to her in times of need, such as the *oraciones* printed in Mexico City at the time of the earthquakes of 1776 (AGN Inquisición 1103 exp. 17, fols. 187–190); the active interest of the secular clergy; the celebrations organized in the city’s monasteries and convents (for example, the 1723 festivities in the Convento de San José de carmelitas descalzas mentioned in AGN Templos y Conventos 157 exp. 20, fols. 128–32); Archbishop Lorenzana’s promotion of the cult as providentially centered in Mexico City in the late 1760s (she appeared “para que los cortesanos y vecinos de México vengan a suplicar en sus necesidades; aquí para defender la Capital de entrada, o invasión de enemigos; aquí donde tributar las primicias de su veneración los Exmos Virreyes, e Illmos Prelados . . .”), Lorenzana (1770:211); Archbishop Núñez de Haro’s 1776 order for an annual *repique a vuelo* of the cathedral bells and those of all other churches in the city on 11 and 12 December in honor of the apparition of the city’s patroness and the “patroness of this entire kingdom” (AGN Bandos 9 fol. 262); and the “indecent” processions in the city in which her image was carried in front as a standard (AGN Inquisición 1099 exp. 11, 1776).

¹¹Fernández de Lizardi (1963:157). Fernández de Lizardi went on to say that “everyone knows about this; many of those who ran to Tepeyac are still living.”

¹²AGN Reales Cédulas Originales 52, exp. 134, 28 December 1733; 68, exp. 32, 21 August 1748; 69, exp. 16, 22 July 1749; 71, exp. 42, 14 December 1751; Ventura Beleña (1981:tomo primero, second enumeration, pp. 126–128); Cuevas (1921–24:IV, 41); Pompa y Pompa (1941:13, 14, 20; 1967:ch. VI). The crown added its support to the elevation of the Virgin of Guadalupe to patroness of New Spain in a 7 December 1756 *real servicio* that declared her image and sanctuary to be “a pious and indispensable legacy” (“legado pío y manda forzosa”) “in the district of the Audiencia de México and those of Guadalupe and Guatemala” (AGN Reales Cédulas Originales 77 exp. 17).

On 7 September 1756, the new *Colegiata* obtained from the Council of the Indies an order that legal testaments in New Spain be required to provide for “the sanctuary and representation of that holy image” (AGI Mexico, legajo 2531).

Further institutional evidence of the cult consolidating and growing in the late 18th century includes the consecration by the early 1790s of the twelfth day of each month to Our Lady of Guadalupe in honor of her apparition (BN 1573 LAF [1792]).

¹³Ignacio de Paredes (1759). In 1759, the crown authorized the establishment of a school for Indian girls in Mexico City dedicated to Our Lady of Guadalupe, the Colegio Real de Indias Educandas de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe (Olaechea 1970:360–362 and AGI Mexico 2546). Judging by a 1791 reference, the few students in the school were from the Mexico City Indian neighborhoods of San Juan and Santiago (AGI Mexico 2546, “Sobre un testimonio del expediente instruido a instancia del Marqués de Castaniza . . .,” 7 February 1811).

¹⁴Lorenzana (1770:195–216). Following Lorenzana’s lead, Ignacio José Hugo de Omerick, curate of Tepecoacuilco (Guerrero) in 1769, recommended to his fellow curates that they use the Virgin Mary, especially the Virgin of Guadalupe, to promote religious teaching among Indians because they “live proud and happy . . . when they are told that that most fortunate Indian Juan Diego was worthy of Our Lady’s apparitions” (Bancroft M-M 113, p. 113). Omerick went on to become a canon in the Colegiata of Our Lady of Guadalupe at Tepeyac.

¹⁵AGN Bandos 9 exp. 36; *carta pastoral*, 25 March 1803, p. 12. Archbishop Lizana reiterated the connection between the sanctuary of Guadalupe and Mexico City in his order to the college of canons at the Villa de Guadalupe on 22 December 1807 to celebrate the news of victory against the English at Buenos Aires by giving the same service as the one to be given in the cathedral the following day.

¹⁶ICB bound volume of *relaciones de méritos y servicios* B 760 A973i. References to the published and unpublished writings of parish priests about Our Lady of Guadalupe also sometimes appear in *relaciones de méritos y servicios*, as in that of Luis de Mendizábal y Zubialdea, an ordained priest of the Bishopric of

Puebla in 1819. Among his achievements he listed a poetic work called “*Idilio guadalupano*” (AGI Mexico 2550).

¹⁷AGN Clero Regular y Secular 136, exp. 8 for Zacualpan. The curate of Meztlán de la Sierra (Hidalgo) in 1780 was charged by his Indian parishioners with keeping for himself half of the wax left over from the annual celebration of the Virgin of Guadalupe (AGN Clero Regular y Secular 74, exp. 1 fol. 4r). The young vicar of Tezontepec in 1763, Joseph Joaquín Loreto Yturria Mora Yparraguirre, reported that he had been associated briefly with the School of Most Holy Mary of Guadalupe of the Hospital Real in Mexico City and had arranged for Guadalupe to be named patroness (JCB B760 A973i). The curate of Atitalaquia said he was responsible for an altar to the Virgin of Guadalupe in his parish church (date unknown). He served this parish from 1736 to 1758, JCB B760 A973i).

¹⁸Cuevas (1921–24:IV, 129) says that chapel of Our Lady of Guadalupe outside the city of San Luis Potosí was informally established by a “pious gentleman,” Francisco Castro y Mampaso, among others.

A principal document for the idea of a widespread devotion to the image of the American Guadalupe by the mid-17th century is a letter to the Pope written by Fray Tomás de Monterroso, Bishop of Oaxaca, dated 10 May 1667 and published in translation by Cuevas (1921–24:IV, 35). Written in support of the petition by the cathedral chapter of the archbishopric for papal recognition of the apparition, Monterroso’s statement was a short but enthusiastic general endorsement. It claimed that “all of New Spain” believed in the apparition to “a poor Indian,” that “I saw the multitudes of people from Mexico City and other *pueblos* of New Spain who come to visit the sanctuary,” and that “there is an image of Our Lady of Guadalupe in almost all the *pueblos* of New Spain.” Monterroso specified only Mexico City and he did not say he had seen for himself copies of the image in the *pueblos*. Perhaps he was inferring a general circulation of the image from copies he would have seen in provincial towns and cities such as Antequera.

¹⁹The quote for San Luis Potosí comes from an 1805 *informe* from Luis María de Luna López Portillo, Hacienda de la Parada de Luna, Armadillo, S.L.P. to the intendant. Reference supplied by David Frye and Ruth Behar.

²⁰Vera (1889). A Dominican testified in this investigation to an Indian having recovered from a mortal arrow wound after appealing to the Virgin of Guadalupe at her shrine. But it was not until 1789 that the curate and Indians of Tolpetlac in the Valley of Mexico were granted permission to erect a chapel on the spot where Our Lady of Guadalupe was said to have appeared to Juan Bernardino, uncle of Juan Diego (AGN Bienes Nacionales 575, exp. 11).

Other indications of popular and Indian devotion to the image and shrine of the American Guadalupe in the 17th century include a petition of the administrator of the sanctuary in 1649 that speaks of the Virgin of Guadalupe as “an image of such devotion and so worthy of note because of the apparition” (AGN Acervo 49, caja 140, folder 23); the archbishop’s mention in a record of 11 May 1657 of natives and other people going there for the sacraments (AGN Acervo 49, caja 140); and an archiepiscopal order dated 16 January 1677 that the glass case covering the image should no longer be opened for devotees to kiss the image or touch it with their hands or with religious images and rosaries (AGN Acervo 49, caja 140, folder 8).

²¹Sahagún (1938:tomo 3, 299). Sahagún added only that before the Conquest some Indians went over 20 leagues (perhaps 50 miles) to Tepeyac, and that they went at the time of his writing from such distant places even though there were other churches to the Virgin closer by. He said they called her Tonantzin as well as Our Lady of Guadalupe and he suspected this was an idolatrous misconception.

²²These fiestas in 1756 that I can document now are for Mexico City and other principal towns (AGN Inquisición 986 exp 10, fols. 167–72; BN MS 15/277), but additional evidence may well show that this papal confirmation of Guadalupe’s patronage was the occasion when parish priests tried to promote the first general celebration in the countryside. That the curate of Tepetlaostoc (Estado de México) was trying to promote an annual celebration to the Virgin of Guadalupe in the *pueblos* of his parish in the late 1750s is documented in AGN Clero Regular y Secular 156, exp. 5, fol. 146v. See also the citations in note 17. In the last years of the colonial period José Mariano Cuebas, curate of Lerma (Estado de México), finished a chapel to the Virgin of Guadalupe largely at his own expense and led his parishioners in carting rocks for the construction (AGN Historia 578A, report of Subdelegado Joseph Matheo Martínez de Castro, 26 September 1793); and the curate of Tepihuacán in 1811 complained of his Indians’ paganism and insolence despite his many gifts to them, including a sanctuary to María Santísima de Guadalupe (García and Pereyra 1905–11:vol. 5, doc. xxv, pp. 186–187).

The public devotion to the Virgin Mary, especially to the image of the Virgin of Guadalupe, of parish priests in the Archbishopric of Mexico at the end of the colonial period is richly documented in judicial records and treatises. Br. Luis Venegas, the vicar of Tetelpa in the parish of Tlaquiltenango (Morelos) gave a provocative sermon in praise of the Virgin to his parishioners in 1804 in which he proposed that she be made the “captain” of armies and public celebrations such as dances, bullfights, and plays (AGN Bienes Nacionales 172, exp. 51). In 1809, the curate of Tultitlán (Valley of Mexico) was reported to celebrate a mass every Saturday for Our Lady of Guadalupe (AGN Bienes Nacionales 663 exp. 5).

²³Paul Wheatley, “City as Symbol,” Inaugural Lecture, delivered at the University College, London, 20 November 1967. Diffusion from Mexico City also is suggested by evidence in notes 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 25. Just as the altars and ornaments of village churches usually were produced on order in Mexico City workshops, perhaps many of the early copies of the Guadalupe painting were also made there.

²⁴It is not clear from the baptismal registers who chose the names. Undoubtedly the parish priest influenced many of the namings since he performed the ceremony of baptism and may have been the only participant who kept close track of the saints’ days. The standard entry in the registers contains the phrase

"a quien le puse por nombre" (to whom I put the name), which may or may not indicate that the priest chose the name. The early guides for parish priests and manuals for the administration of sacraments suggest that the priest should not allow certain names but that within those limits parents and godparents could choose the names (*Manual breve* 1638:fol. 2, "No consienta el Sacerdote que le pongan algún nombre del testamento viejo, ni de gentiles, o judíos, ni alguno ridículo, sino de los que se acostumbran poner en la Sancta Iglesia, o de algún Santo, o Santa del nuevo testamento," and de la Peña Montenegro 1771:libro 3, tratado 1, párrafo 18, "Repáren mucho los Doctrineros en que a los Indios que bautizan, no se les pongan los nombres que usaban ponerlos los padres en la Gentilidad"). The Archbishop of Guadalajara's instructions to the curate of Jocotepec in 1874 echoed these traditional parameters that colonial priests would have set for names. He urged the curate not to allow unusual names even if they came from Roman martyrs, nor names of saints from the Old Testament. Names should, he said, be drawn from the New Testament, preferring those of saints who were well known to Christians for their virtues (CAAG, record of the archbishop's visita).

In a parish where the curate presumably selected or attempted to select most of the names, the arrival of a new curate could well account for changes in the pattern of naming. Two pieces of evidence work against the idea that it was simply the priest who chose the names: (1) changes in naming did not usually coincide with changes in curates; and (2) the pattern of naming varied from place to place within single parishes even where one priest baptized all the infants of the parish. For example, in the parish of Tlajomulco, the frequency of Mariás and Guadalupe was substantially different in the town of Tlajomulco and the rest of the parish, with many more Indian Mariás in the town than in the outlying villages and estates, and more non-Indian Guadalupe in the outliers than in the town.

²⁵The attachment of non-Indians and Indians to the cult of the Virgin of Guadalupe may also be studied in the naming of places and the establishment of shrines to her. Scores of *haciendas*, *ranchos*, sugar mills, and mines—especially in central and northern Mexico—were named Guadalupe by the early-18th century, following in the wake of the first well-documented period of growth of the cult in the mid-17th century. Non-Indian brotherhoods dedicated to the cult of the Virgin of Guadalupe sometimes appear in ecclesiastical court records; for example, the petition of Don Felipe Francisco Tenorio, merchant of the Villa de Tlapa (Guerrero) and guardian of the Hermandad de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, for permission to collect alms for a mass on the 12th of each month (AGN Clero Regular y Secular 151, exp. 14).

Indian and non-Indian *pueblos*, *barrios*, and *cofradías* sometimes were named for Guadalupe but they appear much less often than the Spanish *haciendas* and *ranchos*, and mainly in the late colonial period. For example, the *cofradía* of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe in Tamazunchale—the one *cofradía* named for Guadalupe in a survey for the district of San Luis Potosí in 1798—was founded in 1749 (AGN Clero Regular y Secular 72 exp. 20, fol. 451). The *cofradía* of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe in the Villa de Orizaba was founded in 1781 (AGN Reales Cédulas Originales 120, exp. 134).

Expansion of the cult in the 17th century is also suggested by the efforts of the sanctuary administrators to extend the collection of offerings. In 1633 the rent collector, Juan Ruiz González, sought a license from the ecclesiastical court of the archbishopric to allow Dr. Antonio de Esquivel Castañeda, "who is going to Querétaro and other places," to collect alms for the Virgin of Guadalupe (AGN Acervo 49, caja 140, folder 24). In 1649, the *mayordomo* of the sanctuary urged a grander program of collection:

"It is necessary to ask for [offerings] throughout the archbishopric," he said, having already made a temporary agreement with Diego de Venavides to do so [AGN Acervo 49, caja 140, folder 18].

Another approach to the expansion of the cult of Guadalupe would be to study the 17th- and 18th-century missionaries who devoted themselves to founding *hospicios* (houses of charity) in her name. Perhaps the most energetic missionary devotee of the Virgin of Guadalupe was the Spanish Franciscan Antonio Margil de Jesús, who died in 1726 after four decades of service from Nicaragua to Texas. He is best known as the founder of the Colegio de la Santísima Cruz of Querétaro in 1683 and the Apostólico Colegio de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe of Zacatecas in 1706 (Guerra 1726; Ríos 1941). The friars of the Zacatecas colegio made short visits to established parishes of western and north-central New Spain as well as preparing for long-term missionary service, mainly in the north. The curate of Nochistlán (Jalisco), Juan Nepomuceno Báez, reported in 1788 that he had twice called in the Zacatecan friars of Guadalupe to help stamp out drinking and other vices (AJANG bundle of criminal records labeled 1700–93 leg. 84 [16]).

²⁶The deep belief by colonial priests in the Virgin Mary as spiritual advocate and intercessor is illustrated by the 1692 will of Br. Francisco de Fuentes, curate of Yahualica (Hidalgo), in which he invoked "por mi abogada a la purísima Virgen María Señora Nuestra concebida sin la culpa original desde el primer yns-tante de su ser, para que interceda con su santísimo hijo . . ." (AGN Templos y Conventos 95, exp. 3).

²⁷The concept of *communitas* is succinctly stated in Turner and Turner (1978:250–251) and used in chapter 2 in connection with the colonial Guadalupe (especially p. 92).

²⁸AGN Inquisición 1213 exp. 6, "Vea Ud. la temporal y Eterna." For Zacoalco, this protection of Mary in earthly affairs may well have been associated with the image of Guadalupe in the late colonial period. In his visita of 1776, Bishop Antonio de Alcalde denied a petition of Indians from Zacoalco for mass to be celebrated in a chapel dedicated to Guadalupe for fear of drunkenness and disorderly conduct, and ordered that her image be moved to the parish church (AGI Guadalajara legajo 341).

²⁹AGN Reales Cédulas Originales 93, exp. 103, "protección de la Virgen María para libertarse de tantas opresiones."

³⁰Bancroft M-M 113, "Conversaciones familiares de un cura a sus Feligreses Yndios, . . ." ch. 6, 115ff. Writing near the end of the 17th century, Alonso de la Peña Montenegro (Bishop of Quito, Ecuador) re-

garded the misconception of the Trinity as three people to be common among Indians (1771:lib. 2, trat. 8, sess. 4).

³¹AGN Criminal 308. Much of the evidence for Guadalupe as an emblem of revolt and liberation in the last years of Spanish rule comes, again, from Mexico City and non-Indians: the Revolt of the Machetes in Mexico City in 1799, and the disturbances between creoles and *peninsulares* in Valladolid around 12 December 1809 (García 1910:I, 335).

³²For example, the curate of Temascaltepec in 1811, Br. José Antonio Zúñiga, was reported to have proclaimed “Viva Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe y mueran los Gachupines y sus seques amigos” (AGN Inquisición 462, exp. 34).

³³AJANG Civil, bundle labelled 1809–19 leg. 5 (49), 19 December 1810, Decreto sobre impedir a los naturales de Juchipila y Aposol que bejen la casa y haciendas de D. Julián Muñana.

In central Mexico, cries of “Viva Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe” were heard during the overrunning of Atlacomulco and San Juan de los Jarros, and the killing of peninsular Spaniards there on 1–3 November 1810 (AGN Criminal 229, fols. 263–303).

³⁴AGN Historia 428, exp. 3, “el día de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe habían de alumbrar en su santuario cirios compuestos de mixtos para que a cierta señal ardiese el templo y en la confusión volar el palacio del Exmo Señor Virrey que debía estar ya minado.” Reference supplied by Salvador Victoria Hernández. Another earlier rumor of a plan to destroy the sanctuary and also the image of the Virgin of Guadalupe was reported in a 1771 investigation by the Inquisition of Joseph Guerrero, a 26-year-old creole living in Mexico City. He claimed that various local notables were plotting to burn the sanctuary and turn the kingdom over to the English. The plan was to destroy the image in the belief that if it ever deteriorated by itself, the world would be destroyed. The Inquisition judged Guerrero’s disclosure to be the rantings of an inveterate liar and sacrilegious criminal (AGN Inquisición 1097 exp. 18).

³⁵Clearly Indians, especially in central Mexico, were being drawn to the Virgin of Guadalupe in the late colonial period but the evidence at present is fragmentary or very general, as in Benito María de Moxó’s letters of 1805 which speak of large numbers of Indian pilgrims visiting Tepeyac and returning to their villages to make sacrilegious offerings to their idols of the flowers and incense they brought back (1839:205–206), and the statement of Archbishop Rubio y Salinas in 1753 quoted by Lafaye (1976:277).

In 1779, the Council of the Indies provided for six posts in the *Colegiata* to be filled by experts in Indian languages: four in Náhuatl, one in Mazahua, and one in Otomí. This may indicate that Indian pilgrims to the shrine, and other devotees, came from places where these languages were spoken. It could also indicate where the *Colegiata* planned to promote the cult (AGI Mexico 2531, 10 June 1779).

My four examples of Indians in central Mexico invoking the Virgin of Guadalupe in their petitions to authorities in Mexico City all date from the last decades of the colonial period. One is an individual petition and three are in the name of communities: AGN Criminal 48, exp. 12, fol. 331r, petition of Manuel José, *indio esclavo* of Rodrigo del Valle, Trapiche de San Diego (near Yautepec, Morelos), 1775, “y así pido y suplico a la grandessa de vuesa exxelencia que por N^a Señora de Guadalupe mande el que se me dé papel para buscar amo”; AGN Clero Regular y Secular 68, exp. 3, fol. 296, request by Indians of San Agustín (jurisdiction of Ixtlahuaca, Edo. de México), 9 April 1772, “que por amor de Dios y N^a S^a de Guadalupe suplican al presente Sⁱ juez el arancel”; AGN Criminal 222, exp. 51r, petition by Nicolás Juárez and “todos de mi pueblo . . . San José Cocotichan” and operarios de la Hacienda de Atoyac (jurisdiction of Chalco, Edo. de México), 12 December 1785, “Pido y suplico q^e p^r la corona del Rey N^o Sⁱ y p^r N^a S^a de Guadalupe nos aga Vxa Justicia”; and AGN Bienes Nacionales 172, exp. 45, an 1805 petition by the gobernador of San Juan Bautista Tescatepec (Tlaxcala), “Suplicamos por María Santísima de Guadalupe.”

A collection of 1799 petitions for clemency by individuals detained by the *Acordada* (AGN Acordada 15) yields five appeals in the name of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe. These appeals seem to be more closely associated with urban residence than anything else. Of the three Indian petitioners (fols. 94, 163, 285), two resided in Mexico City and one in the city of Guanajuato. Of the two non-Indians, one was from the city of Querétaro and the other was not identified by place. Most of the petitions make no reference to the Virgin Mary or the image of the Virgin of Guadalupe. The citations above to AGN Criminal and *Acordada* documents were supplied by Steve J. Stern.

Other examples of Indian veneration of the Virgin of Guadalupe are the home of an Indian of San Gregorio (jurisdiction of Xochimilco, in the Valley of Mexico) in 1736 containing an oratory with a large picture of the Virgin of Guadalupe (AGN Criminal 49, exp. 30, fol. 546r); a 1762 report that when elections at Calimaya in the Metepec district were held, some voters were away at the *fiesta* of Nuestra Señora de los Angeles at Texaquique and others had gone to the Santuario de la Virgen de Guadalupe (Colín 1968:no. 562); a 1780 report for Molango (Hidalgo) that Indians there celebrated Guadalupe’s apparition with an annual village *fiesta* (AGN Clero Regular y Secular 74, exp. 1, fol. 4r); the *república* of Sultepec in 1798 following the custom of naming *mayordomos* for various saints on the Day of the Virgin of Guadalupe (AGN Clero Regular y Secular 206, exp. 3); an Indian couple attending a rosary to Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe in Tulancingo in 1801 (AGN Criminal 108, exp. 14); and some Indians of Teocalzingo (Zacualpan jurisdiction) celebrating the anniversary of the Virgin’s birth in September 1805 by placing candles and flowers before an image of the Mexican Guadalupe (AGN Criminal 3, exp. 10).

No doubt many more examples will be found in the late colonial records, especially in the inventories of church ornaments, books of pastoral visits, and the *directorios* (detailed listings of the parish fees collected annually).

³⁶AGN Templos y Conventos 24. Although permission was not granted in 1813, by 1818 a grand church to Guadalupe was under construction in Zacapoaxtla, guided by the curate Miguel Pérez Trabanca. Con-

struction of the church during the 19th century is chronicled in Rebollar Chávez (1946:20–22).

Some curates appealed to the Virgin of Guadalupe for aid against the early insurgency. For example, the curate of Actopan, Dr. Jacinto Sánchez de Aparicio, reported on 21 August 1811 that he and the priests of his district were celebrating a *novenario* of solemn masses for her intercession with God and the Christ of the Armies (García and Pereyra 1905–11: vol. 5, doc. xlix, p. 246ff).

³⁷As the Turners did (1978:245). “Upstreaming” is the ethnohistorical technique of using “ethnographic data on a modern culture to reinterpret older accounts of its ancestral culture” (Wylie 1973:707–720). I am suggesting here that upstreaming is not likely to advance an understanding of devotion to the Virgin of Guadalupe in the colonial period until more “older accounts” are brought to light that reveal who believed what, where, and when. The early history is likely to shed as much light on modern devotion as vice versa, and that may not be very much.

³⁸Even as it is refined and revised, Eric Wolf’s treatment of “closed, corporate” villages remains central to current research in Spanish American social history (Wolf 1955, 1957, 1986).

references cited

Archives and manuscript collections

Archivo General de Indias, Seville (AGI)
Audiencia de Guadalajara
Audiencia de México
Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico (AGN)
Acervo 49 (*provisorato* records)
Acordada
Bandos
Bienes Nacionales
Clero Regular y Secular
Criminal
Historia
Inquisición
Intendencias
Reales Cédulas Originales
Templos y Conventos
Archivo Judicial de la Audiencia de la Nueva Galicia, Guadalajara (AJANG)
Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley
Mexican Manuscripts (Bancroft M-M)
Biblioteca Nacional, Mexico
Lafragua Collection (BN LAF)
Manuscripts (BN MS)
Cathedral Archive of the Archbishopric of Guadalajara (CAAG)
John Carter Brown Library, Providence, Rhode Island (JCB)

Books and articles

Bergoend, Bernardo
1969 La nacionalidad mexicana y la Virgen de Guadalupe. 2nd edition. Mexico: Editorial Jus.
Burrus, Ernest J.
1983 La continuidad y congruencia de los documentos de la historia guadalupana. In Congreso mar-
iológico. Mexico: Basílica de Santa María de Guadalupe.
Cabrera y Quintero, Cayetano
1746 Escudo de armas de México. . . . Mexico.
Campbell, Ena
1982 The Virgin of Guadalupe and the Female Self Image: A Mexican Case History. In *Mother Wor-
ship: Theme and Variation*. pp. 5–24. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Cartas de Indias
1877 Madrid: Ministerio de Fomento.
Cavo, Andrés
1836 Historia de los tres siglos de México durante el gobierno español. Jalapa: Tipografía veracruzana
de A. Ruiz.
Christian, William
1981 Apparitions in Late Medieval and Renaissance Spain. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Colín, Mario
1968 Índice de documentos relativos a los pueblos del Estado de México: Ramo de Indios. Mexico:
Biblioteca enciclopédica del Estado de México.
Concilios provinciales primero y segundo . . . en los años de 1555 y 1556 . . .
1981[1769] Mexico: Agua Impresores.

- Cuevas, Mariano
1921–24 *Historia de la iglesia en México*. 4 vols. Tlalpam, D.F.: Impr. del Asilo Patricio Sanz.
- De la Maza, Francisco
1953 *El guadalupanismo mexicano*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- De la Peña Montenegro, Alonso
1771[1668] *Itinerario para parrochos*. . . . Madrid.
- De la Torre Villar, Ernesto, and Ramiro Navarro de Anda, eds.
1982 *Testimonios históricos guadalupanos*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Díaz del Castillo, Bernal
1982 *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España*. Carmelo Sáenz de Santa María, ed. Madrid: Instituto Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo.
- Eliade, Mircea
1963 *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. Cleveland: World Publishing Co.
- Fernández de Lizardi, José Joaquín
1963 *Obras*: I. Poesías y fábulas. Jacobo Chencinsky and Luis Mario Schneider, eds. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- García, Genaro, ed.
1910 *Documentos históricos mexicanos*. 7 vols. Mexico: Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Historia y Etnología.
- García, Genaro, and Carlos Pereyra, eds.
1905–11 *Documentos inéditos o muy raros para la historia de México*. 36 vols. Mexico: Vda. de C. Bouret.
- Geertz, Clifford
1983 *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Greenberg, James B.
1981 *Santiago's Sword: Chatino Peasant Religion and Economics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Greene, Graham
1950[1939] *The Lawless Roads*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.
- Guerra, Joseph
1726 *Fecunda nube del cielo Guadalupano*. . . . Mexico.
- Hakluyt, Richard, ed.
1907[1599–1600] *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation*. 8 vols. New York: Dutton.
- Hanke, Lewis, ed.
1976–78 *Los virreyes españoles en América durante el gobierno de la Casa de Austria*: Mexico. 5 vols. Madrid: Atlas.
- Jiménez Moreno, Wigberto, José Miranda, and María Teresa Fernández
1963 *Historia de México*. Mexico: Editorial ECLALSA, Editorial Porrúa.
- Kurtz, Donald
1982 *The Virgin of Guadalupe and the Politics of Becoming Human*. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 38:194–210.
- Lafaye, Jacques
1976 *Quetzalcoatl and Guadalupe: The Formation of National Consciousness, 1531–1813*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- López Sarrelangue, Delfina
1957 *Una villa mexicana en el siglo XVIII*. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Lorenzana y Buitrón, Francisco Antonio
1770 *Cartas pastorales y edictos del III^{mo} Señor D. Francisco Antonio Lorenzana Buitrón, Arzobispo de México*. Mexico.
- Manual breve y forma de administrar*. . . .
1638 Mexico.
- Meier, Matt S.
1974 *María insurgente*. *Historia Mexicana* 23:466–482.
- Moxó, Benito María de
1839 *Cartas mejicanas escritas en 1805*. Genoa: Tip. de L. Pellas.
- Olaechea, Juan B.
1970 *Doncellas indias en religión*. *Missionalia Hispánica* 27:341–378.
- Padden, Robert
1967 *The Hummingbird and the Hawk: Conquest and Sovereignty in the Valley of Mexico, 1503–41*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Paredes, Ignacio de
1759 *Promptuario manual mexicano*. . . . Mexico.
- Paz, Octavio
1979 *Nueva España: Orfandad y legitimidad*. In *El ogro filantrópico: Historia y política, 1971–78*. Mexico: Joaquín Mortiz.
- Pompa y Pompa, Antonio
1941 *Cómo fue celebrada la confirmación del patronato guadalupano en 1756*. *La Voz Guadalupeña* 8(2):13, 14, 20.

- 1967 El gran acontecimiento guadalupano. Mexico: Editorial Jus.
- Preston, James J., ed.
1982 Mother Worship: Theme and Variations. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rebollar Chávez, José
1946 El templo guadalupano en Zacapoaxtla, Puebla. *La Voz Guadalupeana* 13(7):20–22.
- Recopilación de leyes de los reynos de las Indias
1973[1681] Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica.
- Rodríguez, Mauro
1980 Guadalupe: Historia o símbolo? Mexico: Edicol.
- Sahagún, Bernardino de
1938 Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España. 5 vols. Mexico: Robredo.
- Sardo, Fr. Joaquín
1819 Relación histórica y moral de la portentosa imagen de Nuestro Señor Jesuchristo Crucificado aparecida en una de las cuevas de San Miguel de Chalma. Mexico.
- Taussig, Michael T.
1980 The Devil and Commodity Fetishism in South America. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Taylor, William B.
1984 Conflict and Balance in District Politics: Tecali and the Sierra Norte de Puebla in the Eighteenth Century. In *Five Centuries of Law and Politics in Central Mexico*. Ronald Spores and Ross Hassig, eds. pp. 87–106. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Publications in Anthropology No. 30.
- Turner, Victor
1967 The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
1974 Dramas, Fields and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Turner, Victor, and Edith Turner
1978 Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Usigli, Rodolfo
1967 Corona de luz: pieza antihistórica en tres actos. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Ventura Beleña, Eusebio
1981[1787] Recopilación sumaria. . . . Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Vera, Fortino, ed.
1889 Informaciones sobre la milagrosa aparición de la Santísima Virgen de Guadalupe recibidas en 1666 y 1723. Amecameca: Imp. del Colegio Católico.
- Warner, Marina
1976 Alone of All Her Sex: The Myth and the Cult of the Virgin Mary. New York: Vintage Books.
- Weismann, Elizabeth W.
1950 Mexico in Sculpture, 1521–1821. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wheatley, Paul
1971 The Pivot of the Four Quarters: A Preliminary Inquiry into the Origins & Character of the Ancient Chinese City. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Wolf, Eric R.
1955 Types of Latin American Peasantry: A Preliminary Discussion. *American Anthropologist* 57:452–471.
1957 Closed, Corporate Communities in Mesoamerica and Central Java. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 13:1–18.
1958 The Virgin of Guadalupe: A Mexican National Symbol. *Journal of American Folklore* 71:34–39.
1986 The Vicissitudes of the Closed, Corporate Peasant Community. *American Ethnologist* 13:325–329.
- Wylie, Kenneth C.
1973 The Uses and Misuses of Ethnohistory. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 3:707–720.

submitted 1 May 1986

accepted 23 September 1986