

UC Berkeley

New Faculty Lecture Series (formerly Morrison Library Inaugural Address)

Title

Our Lady of Guadalupe and Friends: The Virgin Mary in Colonial Mexico City

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9nn001h8>

Author

Taylor, William B.

Publication Date

1999


M o r r i s o n
L i b r a r y
I n a u g u r a l
A d d r e s s
S e r i e s

William B. Taylor

Our Lady of Guadalupe and Friends:
The Virgin Mary in Colonial Mexico City



University of California, Berkeley
1999



Morrison Library Inaugural Address Series
No. 15

Editorial Board

Carlos R. Delgado, *series editor*

Walter Brem, *issue editor*

Morrison Library: Alex Warren

Text format and design: Mary Scott

© 1999 UC Regents

ISSN: 1079-2732

Published by:

The Doe Library
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-6000

*We wish to thank the Department of History
and the Center for Latin American Studies for
supporting the publication of this lecture.*

PREFACE

The goal of this series is to foster scholarship on campus by providing new faculty members with the opportunity to share their research interest with their colleagues and students. We see the role of an academic library not only as a place where bibliographic materials are acquired, stored, and made accessible to the intellectual community, but also as an institution that is an active participant in the generation of knowledge.

New faculty members represent areas of scholarship the University wishes to develop or further strengthen. They are also among the best minds in their respective fields of specialization. The Morrison Library will provide an environment where the latest research trends and research questions in these areas can be presented and discussed.

Editorial Board

OUR LADY OF GUADALUPE AND FRIENDS:

THE VIRGIN MARY IN COLONIAL MEXICO CITY

“If the image of Guadalupe is the most visited by the people of Mexico [City], Mexico [City] is the most visited by Our Lady of Los Remedios. . . . When Our Lady of Los Remedios visits, Our Lady of Guadalupe visits as well, different in its image, but the same Original.”—Francisco de Florencia, 1685.

Virgil Elizondo recently described his first, unforgettable visit to the shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe in the Valley of Mexico:

When I was six or seven, my father took me on my first pilgrimage to her shrine at Tepeyac. . . . The trip from San Antonio [Texas] took three long days of difficult driving through seemingly endless deserts and then over beautiful mountains whose peaks touched the heavens. . . . I had grown up hearing all kinds of marvelous stories and testimonies about Our Lady of Guadalupe. I felt I already knew her well and couldn't wait to meet her personally We finally arrived at the basilica in rhythmic procession with the thousands of others who moved, it seemed, as one collective body We were in the rhythmic movement of the universe—indeed, at this moment we were in contact with the very source of life and movement. . . . In that sacred space, I was part of the communion of earth and heaven, of present family, ancestors, and generations to come. . . .

Some may have doubts about the exact origins of this tradition, but no one can deny her presence on the tilma and even more than that, her living presence in the growing number of her followers across the Americas. . . . The story of Our Lady of Guadalupe is constitutive of the saving truth of the *sensus fidelium*—of the faith memory of the people.¹

Father Elizondo knows an intimate, living faith in Mary through the image of Guadalupe that has long reached to the far corners of Mexico and beyond. As Jeannette Rodríguez writes, “To be of Mexican descent is to recognize the image of Our Lady of Guadalupe.”²

Devotion to Our Lady of Guadalupe **is** deep and widespread, a touchstone to the history of religion in Mexico. And Mexico **is** a special case of a religious image becoming the main symbol for an

emerging nation, but devotion to this image of Mary has not always spread so far and wide. It has a history—long and often obscure—that I began to sense thirty years ago while studying land tenure and society in colonial Oaxaca. Since Oaxaca was one of the most Indian and rural states in Mexico, and scholars and followers of the Virgin of Guadalupe called this image “the Indian Madonna” and “the central symbol of religious life in the countryside,”³ I expected to find evidence of the devotion in many colonial villages, and to see the name Guadalupe often in eighteenth-century baptism registers. But the colonial record for Oaxaca was strangely quiet about Our Lady of Guadalupe. The statue and shrine of Nuestra Señora de la Soledad in the city of Oaxaca was more often on people’s minds there if we can judge by their written records and other artifacts.

The image of Our Lady of Guadalupe has not always been, and in some sense still is not, the dominant symbol and wellspring of devotion throughout Mexico; and the location of its principal shrine in the Valley of Mexico may be as much a key to its special importance before the twentieth century as is its association with the oldest Marian apparition officially recognized by the Catholic Church or its special attraction to country people. Scores of shrines to different advocations and prodigious images of Mary have captured the hearts of thousands, sometimes millions of followers in Mexico. They still do.

The Capital of Miraculous Images

Compared to Spain, there was an unusually strong urban aspect to miracle shrines in New Spain. Mexico City, where the state was represented in every sense, became the capital of miraculous images, especially of the Virgin Mary. Miraculous images were an important part of the city’s reputation as the Viceroyalty of New Spain’s sacred center. As a proud *capitalino* author put it in the late eighteenth century, “one of the things that most makes this capital great is the celebrated shrines with which God has singularly blessed it.”⁴ Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century commentators routinely

spoke of a “baluarte”—a bastion—of shrines and prodigious images of Mary defending the city at its cardinal points, serving as sentinels of divine protection and Christian purity. And there were not just four or five images to revere in this way. In the 1620s, one chronicler identified twelve important shrines for miraculous images associated with Mexico City. For the eighteenth century, I know of 66 images in and near the city with their own shrines and chapels that were widely acclaimed as places of many miracles. Forty-eight of these renowned images depicted the Virgin Mary, and fourteen of the remaining eighteen were figures of Christ.

The viceregal capital had become a veritable city of images and shrines. There was the shrine of Nuestra Señora de los Angeles in the Indian precinct of Tlatelolco, an image painted over a rough and perishable adobe wall, on which Mary's face and hands somehow escaped damage despite years of exposure to the elements. In the late eighteenth century it attracted crowds of commuter pilgrims from throughout the city. There was also Nuestra Señora de las Lágrimas, a statue of Our Lady of Sorrows sacred especially to the silversmiths of the city who discovered it in a dark alleyway on today's Avenida Madero following Easter festivities one year in the mid-seventeenth century. As its fame spread, the statue was eventually moved to the cathedral's chapel of the Immaculate Conception.⁵ Then there was the statue of Mary in the Jesuit church of Loreto, a few blocks east of the *zócalo*, the city's great plaza. Jesuits were dedicated promoters of Marian devotion in New Spain in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and the Virgin of Loreto—associated with the family home of the Virgin, miraculously transported to Italy—was one of their favorite advocations. When this church was closed after the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spanish territories in 1767, devotees from several parts of the city coveted the statue and the promise of divine favors associated with it. They remembered the many miracle paintings, crutches, “and other tokens [of Mary's favor]”⁶ that adorned the walls of the Chapel of Loreto. Now they vied for possession. In 1773, leaders from the principal Indian districts of Santiago and San Juan objected to the statue's removal to the convent church of

La Encarnación rather than to the Colegio de Indias de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe. The viceroy decreed that the statue could remain with the nuns of La Encarnación, but the Indians of the city must have access to the church for their celebrations in honor of Mary and be allowed to kiss the altar and place votive candles before the image in their customary way.⁷

Compatible Histories

The list goes on, but Mexico City as spiritual capital in the colonial period must begin with two of these many shrines and images: Our Lady of Guadalupe and Our Lady of Los Remedios. The shrine of Guadalupe was located to the north of the city center about three miles, at the base of the hill of Tepeyac. Remedios was eleven miles to the northwest, perched on the hill of Totoltepec near the Indian pueblo of Naucalpan. By the late sixteenth century, these two shrines were regarded as the most important sites of Marian devotion in the Valley of Mexico—always among the four sentinels guarding Mexico City at its cardinal points, defining the city's territory in two directions. Francisco de Florencia, the tireless Jesuit devotee of Mary, who is best-known as a follower of Guadalupe, wrote of these two shrines in the 1680s as almost equally important and attached mainly to the city. He made the following comment in his devotional history of Our Lady of Guadalupe:⁸

They have been showered equally with the generous piety of devotees in Mexico City. One may well wonder to which [image] this Mexican devotion has bestowed more gifts. The answer is the Virgin of Guadalupe because the road to her shrine is more heavily travelled and the shrine is closer to the city.

Our Lady of Guadalupe and Our Lady of Los Remedios were mentioned in the same breath and revered by many of the same colonial benefactors, public figures, and authors during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁹ They were invoked for some of the same purposes—such as recovery from illness, protection

from physical harm on land and sea, and success in war—which led to personal preferences for one image over the other, but they were also viewed by people of Mexico City in complementary ways. This was especially true for water, a preoccupation of *capitalinos*. Our Lady of Los Remedios was the special advocate in times of drought, often brought to the cathedral in the late colonial period for a novena of devotions in May or June if the spring rains had not begun. Our Lady of Guadalupe, on the other hand, was invoked in times of flood (most famously, and perhaps first, in the deluges of 1629-34 when the image made its only recorded trip beyond the sanctuary grounds, for a long stay in the cathedral until the waters receded.)

But nineteenth- and twentieth-century commentators usually have treated the two images as rivals, as if Our Lady of Los Remedios was the Mary of elite Spaniards of the capital and Our Lady of Guadalupe was the Mary of Indians, mestizos, country people, and the poor—the mother of a future Mexico. The colonial manuscript record tells a more ambiguous and less idolatrous story than this vision of Marian adversaries.¹⁰ In the sixteenth and early seventeenth-century documentation, Mexico City stands out as the main place of devotion to Guadalupe as well as to Los Remedios. As early as 1556, a Franciscan, Francisco de Bustamante, criticized “the people of this city,” including Archbishop Montúfar, for their devotion to an image of Our Lady of Guadalupe at Tepeyac as a bad example for Indians.¹¹ Montúfar’s seventeenth- and eighteenth-century successors followed his lead, as did viceroys, sponsoring ever more elaborate events and facilities at Tepeyac and treating the shrine as the sacred gateway to the capital.

The formative period for many miracle shrines and images throughout New Spain, between the 1570s and 1620s, is poorly documented in the manuscript record and little studied in the scholarly literature, even for Mexico City (where we would expect the documentation to be fullest). This near silence is as true for the history of devotion to Our Lady of Guadalupe as it is for other miraculous images. There just is not much certain documentation for devotion to Our Lady of Guadalupe in the sixteenth and very

early seventeenth centuries. There is, however, some intriguing indirect evidence that the popularity of this shrine was growing and that stories of Marian apparitions at Tepeyac in 1531 were developing then. Here are some of the mounting signs:

1. The earliest dated versions of the apparition stories for Guadalupe were written down and published only in the late 1640s, but those texts display the fullness of an oral tradition retold and refined many times.

2. A larger and more permanent shrine was completed at Tepeyac in 1622, sponsored by Archbishop Juan Pérez de la Serna.

3. Substantial gifts to the shrine were accumulating from the wills of Mexico City's elite.

4. The *medidas* business comes into view at about this time, too. (*Medidas* were colored ribbons cut to the exact height of the image, often with a little impression of the image or the shrine stamped in silver or gold, and sometimes said to have touched the sacred image. They were part relics, part souvenirs of a visit to the shrine.)

Still, the Guadalupan tradition in those formative years remains elusive, and, even in the second quarter of the seventeenth century, administrators of the shrine spoke of it as “very poor” and “in great need.”¹²

Stories of the origins and miracles of Our Lady of Los Remedios turn out to be better documented for this crucial early period, and they suggest a pattern that may hold true for other shrines and images of New Spain, including Our Lady of Guadalupe. The first cluster of written sources for the shrine of Los Remedios dates from the 1570s when the Mexico City government assumed responsibility for building a new and more fitting shrine and began to administer its properties, present candidates for the chaplaincy, and promote a special relationship between this image and the city. In 1579 a new confraternity of city fathers and other notables was established to guide the devotion. The founding records of this *archicofradia* provide the earliest written version of an origin

story. It is a terse, matter-of-fact, Spanish-centered story of “the great favor and miracle”¹³ bestowed upon the conquistadores in 1520 when they fled Tenochtitlan in panic during the Noche Triste: after The Blessed Mary appeared to them at the hill of Totoltepec the course of the conquest began to turn in their favor. According to this account, Cortés and the other Spaniards who survived the Noche Triste remembered the place and built a shrine to commemorate the event and honor Mary in the little statue that had been with them there. But the shrine fell to ruins and only now in the 1570s had a new church been built.¹⁴

In 1621 the city fathers sponsored the earliest printed devotional history of a miracle shrine in New Spain, a remarkable book about Los Remedios by the Mercedarian, Luis de Cisneros.¹⁵ Cisneros begins with a modest disclaimer that “the beginnings and origin [of this devotion] are not known with any certainty; the word has spread because of its tremendous miracles.”¹⁶ Setting modesty aside, he goes on to a lengthy account of providential beginnings, as well as notable miracles and the image’s occasional trips to Mexico City. His story of origins is considerably more elaborate than the 1579 *archicofradía* version and it shifts the Noche Triste events from centerpiece to setting (without neglecting the connection to the Spanish Conquest or the city).

In Cisneros’s telling, the Spaniard who brought the image during the Noche Triste retreat was killed, and the statue was lost where he had left it, in the shelter of a large maguey plant on the hilltop. Twenty years later, an Otomí Indian noble, don Juan Ceteutli,¹⁷ discovered the statue when he was drawn to the site by celestial lights and music. The image was still in fine condition and don Juan carried it home with great care and devotion. The next morning it was gone, but don Juan found it again at the original site. This sequence of removal and return was repeated until he realized that the Virgin wanted her image to remain on the hilltop. The rest of this origin story recounts don Juan’s pious efforts to convince others, including skeptical Franciscan friars at Tacuba, of his brush with the Virgin and her signs and message, and to enlist their support in building a shrine for the image.

Cisneros's story in 1621 has become the standard version that is told today, just as Miguel Sánchez's and Luis Lasso de la Vega's accounts of the apparitions of Mary to Juan Diego and the miraculous impression of her image on his coarse cloak, published in Mexico City in the late 1640s, are the written basis for the Virgin of Guadalupe tradition as we have come to know it.¹⁸

Sánchez's Guadalupe shares with Cisneros's Los Remedios a pious Indian protagonist from the countryside who receives the gift of Mary's company and grace, and the duty of sharing the news with skeptical church authorities and carrying out her instructions. That Cisneros's devotional history of Los Remedios was published almost three decades before Sánchez's little book does not mean that widespread devotion to Our Lady of Los Remedios preceded Our Lady of Guadalupe's popularity or that Sánchez's book was simply modelled after Cisneros's. It does suggest that los Remedios already occupied an important place in Marian devotion for the city and vicinity by 1621. But Cisneros was quick to note that apparition events at Tepeyac occurred first,¹⁹ as if the shrine to Guadalupe enjoyed a measure of primacy through seniority. It may well be that Cisneros's account, which departs so dramatically from the 1579 version, is an artful elaboration of an oral tradition for Los Remedios that was shaped around as yet unwritten apparition stories for Guadalupe that may or may not have been the same as Sánchez published later.

Sánchez himself drew out both a parallel and a connection to Our Lady of Los Remedios that seems to depend on Cisneros's story. He observed that for both images, Mary revealed herself to devout Indian neophytes named Juan, thereby expressing her pleasure and support for the evangelizing enterprise in central Mexico. Inspired by the Old Testament's Book of Ruth, Sánchez went on to equate Ruth's faultless devotion to her mother-in-law, Naomi, with the images of Los Remedios and Guadalupe. Like Ruth following Naomi back to her homeland with the words, "Whither thou goest I will go. . . . Thy people shall be my people, thy God my God," Los Remedios follows Guadalupe to Mexico.

“In Ruth and Naomi I venerate the two miraculous images of the Virgin Mary,” Sánchez wrote. “Los Remedios is Ruth, come from Spain, accompanying the conquistadores with love for the land, prepared to protect it, favoring the Spaniards in their Conquest. Guadalupe is Naomi, a criolla [native born] who appeared in Mexico.”²⁰

What intrigues me most about these two early seventeenth-century accounts of the Virgin of Los Remedios and the Virgin of Guadalupe by Cisneros and Sánchez is the American twist the authors give them. Here are stories told by creole Spanish priests about devout Indians who become instruments of Mary’s grace. If the 1570s to about 1620 frames a formative period in the development of miracle shrines and their origin stories, the publication of these two books in 1621 and 1648 frames another kind of period, one of despair and often anxious activity in response to Spain’s declining fortunes in Europe, and a sense of failure in the “spiritual conquest” of America and the “invisible war” against the devil. It was also a time when pessimistic official views of Indians as lapsed Christians or hopelessly ignorant, childish pagans prevailed. Whether or not they were part inventors of their origin stories or faithful recorders of a well-developed oral tradition, Cisneros’s and Sánchez’s appeal to a providential spirituality in America is a different response to the sense of combat and loss in matters of faith at the time. It opened a more sociable and optimistic route to spiritual renewal and “the will to create another Spain” in America²¹ than animated Baroque Catholicism generally.

Our Lady of Guadalupe and Our Lady of Los Remedios: Some Differences

I have emphasized the similarities and complementarities of the Guadalupe and Los Remedios traditions because these neglected affinities are fundamental to the wider history of shrines and images in New Spain. But there are also differences between them that were apparent in the eighteenth century and increasingly salient from the time of national independence in 1821. The famous

difference—that Our Lady of Los Remedios was more closely associated with Spaniards and the Spanish Conquest—is less clear than it may seem since the largest group of followers of Los Remedios consisted of rural Indians, if we can judge by attendance and spending at the separate annual fiestas for Indians and Spaniards at the shrine. Also, colonial commentators associated the “Spiritual Conquest” of Mexico with Our Lady of Guadalupe, not just Remedios;²² and the leading sponsors of the shrine at Tepeyac were elite Spanish and Spanish creole families from Mexico City.

A second, less qualified difference is that by the mid-seventeenth century Our Lady of Guadalupe’s fame was closely identified with the image’s supernatural origin—the belief that it was not made by human hands—while the fame of Los Remedios came mainly from dispensing personal or collective favors.

Third, the reputation of the image of Our Lady of Guadalupe was also based on its refined beauty and well-preserved state despite being impressed upon a coarse fabric and suffering many years of handling and exposure to salty vapors. To protect such a uniquely divine image, it was kept in its shrine, except during the 1629-34 floods (which may have been before the idea of the image’s supernatural origin had crystallized).²³ Followers came to the shrine, the original image did not go to them (which helps to account for the popularity of full-size, painstakingly rendered painted copies of the Guadalupan image in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The more exact the copy, the more it was thought to invite Mary’s presence, as the image at Tepeyac was believed to do. In fact, several particularly close copies became sites of popular pilgrimage shrines in their own right.) Our Lady of Los Remedios, by contrast, was handled and moved much more often in the late colonial period. It became something of a pilgrim image, taken in procession to Mexico City for short and long periods, retouched from time to time, and frequently re clothed from an ever-growing, jewelled wardrobe.



Figure 1

Frontispiece for *Opúsculo guadalupano . . .*, México: 1790, by Joseph Antonio Bartolache. The author assures his readers that this engraved image of Our Lady of Guadalupe is “the most like its original.” Painted, printed, and sculpted reproductions of the image of Guadalupe abounded in central and northern Mexico during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Historians and anthropologists have been more interested in unique and offbeat examples than the many images of Guadalupe that strove to replicate the image at Tepeyac. Emphasizing the unusual in these copies loses sight of what was most valued by colonial consumers of this art: the more exact the reproduction, the more it was thought to invite the presence and intercession of the “real” original—Mary, herself. (Courtesy of the Bancroft Library.)

And a fourth difference—the most important one, I think. The growing popularity of the two shrines followed different trajectories in the eighteenth century. Devotion to Our Lady of Los Remedios waxed and waned and waxed again during the colonial period, with growing popularity and patronage during much of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, decline in the mid-eighteenth century, and an impressive renewal of interest in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries that increasingly centered on the city and its inhabitants. After the Independence struggle from 1810 to 1821 there was another notable decline in popularity,²⁴ which became pronounced after the Reform Period of the 1850s and 1860s, when the shrine was detached from the city. By then, most of the faithful followers were country people living near the shrine or pilgrims from the State of Mexico and the adjoining states of Querétaro and Hidalgo. By contrast, Our Lady of Guadalupe's appeal grew without obvious interruption after the 1620s. The growth was rather modest in the seventeenth century, then rapid and apparently steady from the 1730s to the 1770s, then rapid and steady again during much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as nation-building and migration carried followers across old frontiers of residence and affiliation.

The great watershed in the late colonial history of Our Lady of Guadalupe's popularity in and beyond Mexico City was the devastating epidemic of 1737-38. As one year of suffering stretched into two, virtually every reputedly miraculous image in this city of images was taken into the streets for penitential processions, sometimes one at a time, sometimes in groups. Images that were famous mainly in one neighborhood appeared on a larger stage, often installed in the cathedral for a special novena of devotions. So, a number of images and shrines came into their own, at least for a time during the 1740s, in the aftermath of this epidemic. But the greatest surge of devotion from the time of this epidemic centered on Our Lady of Guadalupe. The new level of devotion resulted partly from a spontaneous outpouring of faith in which prayerful appeals to this image of the Immaculate Conception came to be regarded as the most efficacious in lifting the epidemic, but also



Figure 2

The statuette of Our Lady of los Remedios was called to Mexico City in the colonial period during times of need for a novena of special devotions. Clothed in exquisite costumes and jewels, Mary and the Christ child were carried in procession from the shrine near Naucalpan to the parish church of Veracruz (across from the Alameda in downtown Mexico City), and from there to the cathedral in a gala procession the next day.

Novena booklets were printed for these visits in order to assist the faithful in the prescribed devotions and generate revenue. Sometimes, as here in the booklet for the 1685 visit, the image of los Remedios was depicted in a simple woodcut or engraving. This one shows the Virgin and Christ child in their finery, surrounded by objects signifying the preciousness of the statue: fancy silver lamps and candleholders house the flame of spiritual illumination (suggested also by the halo of light enveloping Mary's head), and silver tokens of an arm, a heart, a leg, and a head ("milagritos") commemorate and give thanks to the Virgin for recovery from serious illness. (Courtesy of the John Carter Brown Library, Providence, Rhode Island.)

because the archbishop-vice-roy at the time, already an ardent devotee of the image at Tepeyac, pressed for formal dedications first of the city and then of the viceroyalty to Our Lady of Guadalupe, and because priests trained in Mexico City enthusiastically carried the devotion into their parishes thereafter.²⁵

By the 1740s the image of Guadalupe was associated more with New Spain as a whole²⁶ and Mexico City as capital of New Spain, while Los Remedios increasingly became the sign of Mary's special protection of the city and its inhabitants. Our Lady of Los Remedios's appeal intensified in the late eighteenth century, but it was mainly an appeal to ardent followers in Mexico City rather than reaching into new and distant places.²⁷

During and after the Independence wars of the 1810s the histories of these two shrines diverged more decisively, culminating in Guadalupe's effective ascendance as symbol of the city and the nation in the 1820s, and a more localized devotion to Los Remedios.²⁸ There was a political edge to veneration of the images of Our Lady of Guadalupe and Our Lady of Los Remedios during the Independence War, but it was not as simple as Los Remedios for the royalists and Guadalupe for the insurgents. Devout royalists appealed to many images of Christ, Mary, and the saints for protection, including Our Lady of Guadalupe and Our Lady of Los Remedios. That the royalists maintained control of Mexico City throughout the war reinforced the idea that Los Remedios, Guadalupe, and the other Marian "sentinels" of the city were their special advocates. Our Lady of Los Remedios was dubbed La Generala by some ardent royalists, but it was not the only image royalists looked to for protection and guidance, whether they resided in the city or other royalist strongholds like the city of Querétaro. Not surprisingly, the insurgents, who were not *capitalinos* and did not control Mexico City, did not warm to the capital's many miraculous images with the exception of Guadalupe, which had successfully been promoted as patroness of the entire viceroyalty since 1737. In addition to Guadalupe, insurgents would have looked for help and consolation to the miraculous images from their home regions, such as the Virgin of San Juan de los



Figure 3

Title page of a booklet dedicated to Our Lady of Guadalupe during the celebrations of December 12, 1748 that commemorated the apparition of Mary to Juan Diego in 1531. Following the epidemic of 1737-38 and the official promotion of Guadalupe as patroness of the city of Mexico and the entire Viceroyalty of New Spain, many different prints of the image of Guadalupe were published, often as embellishments for one of the scores of sermons delivered and printed in Mexico City during the 1740s and 1750s. This simple wood-cut print is especially familiar because the publisher, la Imprenta del Nuevo Rezado, de Doña Maria de Ribera, made these devotional works a specialty and included the same wood-cut over and over again. (Courtesy of the Bancroft Library.)

Lagos in the Altos de Jalisco and the Bajío, the Virgin of Ocotlán in Tlaxcala and Puebla, the Christ of Chalma in the State of Mexico, or the Christ of Otatitlán in Veracruz.

Veneration of images in the colonial period was more fluid and conventional than modern commentators suppose when they speak of rival images of Mary, as if the images embodied different divine beings. The ambiguities in this history of Our Lady of Guadalupe and Our Lady of Los Remedios suggest an understanding that ardent devotion to an image and shrine might attract Mary's presence and grace. The image became a nexus of intensified communication, and the quality of the reception by devotees was indispensable to its efficacy. As one follower of Our Lady of Guadalupe put it in 1809, "through it [this image] we venerate the Queen of Heaven."²⁹



During the long colonial period, Our Lady of Guadalupe and Our Lady of Los Remedios were treated mainly as compatible images in Mexico City, both with great appeal there, expressing Mary's special protection of the capital and its vicinity. The histories of their shrines and followings need to be studied together, along with the many other miracle shrines in the Valley of Mexico and beyond, not as separate, unrelated, or resolutely antagonistic histories.

The great difference between the history of saints, shrines, and miracles in Spain and New Spain is not mainly about a clash of American and Spanish images on Mexican soil, or one kind of apparition over another, or messages of judgment and destruction over there and messages of motherly love and indulgence here. The great difference is that the extraordinary devotion to the Virgin Mary in Mexico did not decline during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries or shrink back into local devotions, as it ap-

parently did in Spain and most of Europe. On the contrary, it was still on the rise almost everywhere I looked in Mexico. Mexico City as the capital of miraculous images of Mary is a reflection of this compelling continuity, not an aberration; so is the intense, if more localized devotion to Our Lady of Los Remedios, Our Lady of Los Angeles, or Our Lady of Loreto; and so is the close and growing association between Our Lady of Guadalupe and the people of Mexico since the 1820s. “¡Se quedó!” replied a Mexican *campesina* to Virgil Elizondo’s question about what made Our Lady of Guadalupe so special.³⁰ She came to stay. In many guises.

FOOTNOTES

1. *Guadalupe: Mother of the New Creation*, Maryknoll, NY: 1997, pp. ix-xii.

2. *Our Lady of Guadalupe: Faith and Empowerment Among Mexican-American Women*, Austin: 1993, p. xxv.

3. E.g., Nathan Whetten, *Rural Mexico*, Chicago: 1948, p. 458-460.

4. Ignacio Carrillo y Pérez, *Pensil americano florido en el rigor del invierno, la imagen de María Santísima de Guadalupe ...*, México: 1797, p. ii (“siendo una de las cosas que más agrandecen a esta Capital los célebres Santuarios con que Dios la ha singularizado”). Another late colonial text that celebrates the city’s miracles shrines as an incomparable providential sign is Br. Juan de Viera, *Compendiosa narración de la ciudad de México* (1777), México: 1952.

5. “Origen y breve noticia de la milagrosa Imagen de Nra. Sra. de las Lágrimas, que se venera en la Metropolitana Iglesia, de este Arzobispado,” in Nicolás León, “Bibliografía mexicana del siglo XVIII,” *Boletín del Instituto Bibliográfico Mexicano*, núm. 7 (1906), pp. 75-76.

6. “otros signos.”

7. Archivo General de la Nación (México), Ramo de Real Junta, vol. 1. And now there is Nuestra Señora del Metro, a stain on a section of marble aggregate flooring from the Hidalgo subway station, just off the Alameda, that resembles the flowing form of a Baroque image of the Immaculate Conception and attracts a stream of devotees to its little above-ground display case more than a year after its discovery.

8. *La estrella de el Norte de México ...*, [1688], Guadalajara: 1895, pp. 188-189. Florencia discusses the relationship between these two images of Mary in other passages, as well (e.g., “son como dos brazos y como dos manos de esta Divina Señora, con que ampara a México,” p. 116).

9. Even enthusiastic devotees of Guadalupe such as Archbishop-Viceroy Juan de Ortega Montañes in the 1690s and Archbishop-Viceroy Vizarrón in the 1730s paid their respects to Los Remedios.

10. Solange Alberro begins to address this more ambiguous history in "Remedios y Guadalupe: De la unión a la discordia," Clara García Ayluardo and Manuel Ramos Medina (eds.), *Manifestaciones religiosas en el mundo colonial americano*, México: 1994, II, 151-164.

11. "Información por el sermón de 1556," in Ernesto de la Torre Villar and Ramiro Navarro de Anda, eds., *Testimonios históricos guadalupanos*, México: 1982, pp. 36-141.

12. Archivo General de la Nación (México), Acervo 49, caja 140, July 11, 1633 and December 25, 1649.

13. *La merced grande y milagro*.

14. Archivo Histórico de la Ciudad de México, Número de inventario 3895, exp. 1.

15. *Historia de El Principio, y origen[,] progresos[,] venidas a México y milagros de la Santa Imagen de nuestra Señora de los Remedios, extramuros de México*. It preceded by twenty-seven years the first published account of the image of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe at Tepeyac, Miguel Sánchez's *Imagen de la Virgen María Madre de Dios de Gvadalupe. Milagrosamente aparecida en México ...*, México: 1648.

16. "...no saberse su principio y origen con certidumbre ha dado a conocer a fuerza de grandísimos milagros."

17. Or Quauhtli (eagle).

18. Linda Curcio-Nagy picks up the Los Remedios story after the tradition set down by Cisneros was in place and draws upon the rich documentation for this shrine from the Archivo Histórico de la Ciudad de México in her "Native Icon to City Protectress to Royal Patroness: Ritual, Political Symbolism and the Virgin of

Remedies," *The Americas* 52:3 (January 1996), 367-391. Lasso de la Vega, *Huey tlamahuiçoltica omonexiti in ilhuicac tlatocacihuapilli Santa Maria totlaçonantizin Guadalupe in nican huey altepenahuac Mexico itocayocan Tepeyacac*, México: 1649. Sánchez's book is cited in note 9.

19. Unfortunately, Cisneros does not elaborate on the Guadalupean apparitions. He seems to assume that readers will know what he means, which suggests a Mexico City audience.

20. Sánchez, *Imagen de la Virgen*, fol. 83v.

21. Octavio Paz, "Foreword" to Jacques Lafaye, *Quetzalcoatl and Guadalupe: The Formation of Mexican National Consciousness, 1531-1813*, Chicago: 1976, p. xiii.

22. For a reference to the Virgin of Guadalupe as "conquistadora de este reyno," responsible for the rapid conversion, see Archivo Histórico de la Mitra (Mexico City), caja for 1797, expediente on San Felipe de Jesús ("Tantos y tan rápidos progresos se deven a la Conquistadora de este Reyno, Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe"). Florencia, *Estrella*, p. 89 tells of an Indian hermit at the shrine who had witnessed a battle between Spaniards and Mexicas at Tepeyac in 1521 in which he and others saw "this Lady, in the same clothing" throw dust in the Mexica warriors' eyes so they would not prevail.

23. And except to move the image to new quarters in the santuario precinct.

24. The image of Los Remedios was removed from its shrine to the cathedral for most of the Independence period. Its declining popularity beyond the city would seem to date from this time.

25. The centennial commemoration of relief from the great flood of 1629-34 and the bicentennial of the traditional date of the apparitions probably contributed to the special attraction of Our Lady of Guadalupe as intercessor in this new time of crisis.

26. In a sense, the groundwork was laid in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries with important satellite shrines to Guadalupe developing in San Luis Potosí, Querétaro, and Zacatecas. But this extended devotion was patchy and regional—arguably a substitute for affiliation with Tepeyac and pilgrimages to the mother shrine—while the spread of devotion to Guadalupe reached unprecedented proportions after 1737 that have never been reversed.

27. Other Mexican shrines to the advocacy of Los Remedios were established in the colonial period at Cholula (Puebla), Tepepan (Distrito Federal), Zitácuaro (Michoacán), San Juan Ixtepec (Puebla), Cozumel (Yucatán), Comonfort (Guanajuato), San Luis Potosí, Durango, Acatepec (Guerrero), and Zacatecas. Few, if any, of the images of Mary at these shrines were copied from the Virgin of Los Remedios discussed here, and none was a satellite to the shrine at Totoltepec, but there is evidence of devotion to this renowned image of Los Remedios beyond the Valley of Mexico in the gifts of land and other property to the Totoltepec shrine from residents of Morelia, Puebla, and, especially, the Valley of Toluca. Of the 326 sponsors for the publication of Ignacio Carrillo Pérez's devotional history of Our Lady of Los Remedios of Totoltepec in 1808 (*Lo máximo en lo mínimo: La portentosa imagen de Nuestra Señora de los Remedios, conquistadora y patrona de la imperial ciudad de México*), at least 93 (28.5%) lived outside the Valley of Mexico. Nearly all were from central Mexico (including the Bajío).

28. During the War of Independence the Remedios image was removed to Mexico City and much-needed repairs to the shrine were deferred.

29. Juan Francisco Domínguez, *Singular privilegio de la sagrada imagen en Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe. Madre de Dios*, México: 1809, p. 4. In the same vein, see Florencia, *Estrella*, p. 35.

30. "Foreword" to Rodríguez, *Our Lady of Guadalupe*, p. xiii. Elizondo referred to his informant as "a simple Indian woman."

Morrison Library Inaugural Address Series

No. 1: Antonio Cornejo-Polar, *The Multiple Voices of Latin American Literature*, 1994

No. 2: Laura Pérez, *Reconfiguring Nation and Identity: U.S. Latina and Latin American Women's Oppositional Writing*, 1995

No. 3: Loïc J.D. Wacquant, *The Passion of the Pugilist: Desire and Domination in the Making of Prizefighters*, 1995, Will not be published.

No. 4: Kathleen McCarthy, *He Stoops to Conquer: The Lover as Slave in Roman Elegy*, 1996

No. 5: Darcy Grimaldo Grigsby, *Mamelukes in Paris: Fashionable Trophies of Failed Napoleonic Conquest*, 1996

No. 6: Cathryn Carson, *Building Physics after World War II: Lawrence and Heisenberg*, 1997

No. 7: Kerwin Klein, *Apocalypse Noir, Carey McWilliams and Posthistorical California*, 1997

No. 8: Ralph J. Hexter, *The Faith of Achætes: Finding Aeneas' Other*, 1997

No. 9: Albert Russell Ascoli, *'Faith' as Cover Up: An Ethical Fable from Early Modern Italy*, 1997

No. 10: Kate van Orden, *Street Songs and Cheap Print During the French Wars of Religion*, 1998

No. 11: David Henkin, *Sheets and Streets: The Daily Paper in Nineteenth-Century Urban America*, 1998

No. 12: Nicholas Paige, *Writing Interiority: Some Speculations on Gender and Autobiographical Authority in Seventeenth-Century French Mysticism*, 1998

No. 13: David Hult, *Manuscript Transmission, Reception and Canon Formation: The Case of Chrétien de Troyes*, 1998

No. 14: José Rabasa, *Franciscans and Dominicans Under the Gaze of a Tlacuilo: Plural-World Dwelling in an Indian Pictorial Codex*, 1998