

Meeting Our Lady of Guadalupe in Eighteenth-Century Mexico

William B. Taylor
University of California, Berkeley

The main story of *guadalupanismo* in Mexico during the eighteenth century is well known. It is a story of vigorous promotion and widespread devotion in which the 1730s, 1740s, and 1750s were the watershed. Early in the terrifying epidemic of 1737 *peninsular* Archbishop-Viceroy Juan Antonio de Vizarrón y Eguiarreta proclaimed Our Lady of Guadalupe patroness of Mexico City and New Spain and renewed the campaign for papal recognition of the apparition story.¹ His initiatives were well received at home and abroad, culminating in a papal bull of 1754 in which Pope Benedict XIV officially announced the miracle and recognized Mary of Guadalupe as patroness of New Spain, borrowing the words of Psalm 147, *Non fecit taliter omni nationi* (He -God- has favored no other people in this way).² A closer consideration of how the devo

¹ Many other saints and advocations were invoked as well. See Cayetano Cabrera y Quintero, *Escudo de armas de México* ..., Mexico: Viuda de J. B. de Hoyal, 1746.

² In a sermon delivered in the Mexico City cathedral on August 18, 1808, Archbishop Lizana y Beaumont claimed Benedict XIV was so enamored of Our Lady of Guadalupe and so convinced of the authenticity of the apparitions that when he heard the representative to Rome from New Spain, Juan Francisco López, S.J., was wearing shoes he had worn to visit the shrine at Tepeyac, he asked for them and remarked that if he were in America he would go to the shrine on his knees, in bare feet, *Sermón que en las solemnes rogativas que se hicieron en la santa Iglesia metropolitana de México implorando el auxilio divino en las actuales ocurrencias de la monarquía española predicó* ..., México: María Fernández de Jaúregui, 1808.

tion grew in the eighteenth century, especially how it grew without Tepeyac becoming a magnet for pilgrims from distant places, is the aim of this essay.

I. Promotion and Growth

By just about any measure a historian can summon, the devotion seems to have grown as never before after 1754. Great celebrations of thanksgiving were ordered and undertaken in the cities of the viceroyalty after the bull was published in America in 1756. (This was the beginning of annual december 12 celebrations in much of the territory of modern Mexico.) Soon every diocesan capital had a shrine to Our Lady of Guadalupe, and many other towns received licenses to construct their own church or resplendent altar to Guadalupe.³ Copies of the image dating from 1740 to 1810 survive in far greater numbers in churches, archives, and private collections than from the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and more are recorded than in church inventories and wills of all classes of people. Thousands of houses, probably tens of thousands, boasted a painting or cheap print of the image over a home altar. Young scholars at the university in Mexico City dedicated their academic theses to Our Lady of Guadalupe in unprecedented numbers after 1754. More places were named or renamed for her; Guadalupe became a widely popular baptismal name for the first time;⁴ and there are more reports of marvelous events, including

³ For example, the reports from 1760-1761 by parish priests in the Diocese of Michoacán in response to a circular requesting information about their parishes and properties mention a dozen or so recently-acquired images of or altars to Our Lady of Guadalupe, Oscar Mazín Gómez, ed., *El gran Michoacán: Cuatro informes del obispado de Michoacán, 1759-1769*, Zamora: El Colegio de Michoacán, 1986, pp. 37-180, 247-431.

⁴ The *Catálogo de Ilustraciones* for the Archivo General de la Nación, lists 236 theses dedicated to Guadalupe between 1651 and 1808. Of these, 203 date from 1701-1808, clustering especially in 1756-1765 (42) and the 1780s (36). The index to

healings, rescues, and sightings of the image in nature from the 1750s forward.⁵

The most telling signs of familiarity and spreading devotion at the time are the quotidian ones that begin to dot the written record: Indians invoking Our Lady of Guadalupe in their petitions to colonial officials; prisoners making their petitions for pardon in her name; mission Indians in Sonora said to observe her feast day on december 12; and disputes among family members over a coveted home altar image in central mexican villages.⁶ For a parade of pupils from the primary school run by the Franciscan missionary college in Pachuca,

the 3,691 volumes of the Archivo General de la Nación (AGN), *Ramo de Tierras* (Tierras), records few places named Guadalupe before 1691. Nearly all of the Guadalupe place names date from the eighteenth century, especially after the 1730s, with the Tenango del Valle district of the modern state of México unusually prominent. There was also a pocket of new places called Guadalupe in San Luis Potosí. The fifty-one haciendas called Guadalupe before 1750 were mainly located in the center (the Valley of Mexico and districts of the modern states of Mexico and Hidalgo) and two areas to the north where *guadalupanismo* became important in the seventeenth century: Querétaro and San Luis Potosí. The sixty-nine new references to haciendas called Guadalupe after 1750 continued the regional concentration in the center, but with a range that now reached into Puebla, the west (Michoacán and Jalisco), and north (the Bajío, Durango, and Nueva Vizcaya).

⁵ Sutro Library (San Francisco), manuscript *efemérides* of Felipe Zúñiga y Ontiveros (1763-1773), entry for 1764 includes a description of Guadalupe's "prodigious" protection of the city against rising flood waters that year; Sutro Library BT 660.G8, 1864 copy of documents dated 1755-1759, said to be in the cathedral archive of Puebla: investigation into a reputed more of healing for Madre Nicolasa María Jascinta de San José; José Joaquín Granados y Gálvez's *Tardes americanas: gobierno géntil y católico ...*, Mexico: Zúñiga y Ontiveros, 1778, pp. 537-538 mentions that a hailstorm in the Valley of Mexico in 1678 deposited a hailstone with a perfectly formed image of Our Lady of Guadalupe.

⁶ For example, AGN Clero Regular y Secular (CRS) 68 exp. 3 f. 296, "que por amor de Dios y Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe suplican al presente Sr. Juez el arancel", petition of the town of San Agustín, 1772; *Gazetas de México, compendio de noticias de Nueva España*, Mexico: Zúñiga y Ontiveros, 1784-1809, october 4, 1794 issue, Indians of the mission San Pedro de Aconchi reportedly observed the day of Our Lady of Guadalupe; AGN, Tierras 2474, exp. 5, Capultitlán (Toluca, juris.),

Hidalgo on august 12, 1797, nearly all the little boys reportedly were dressed up as Guadalupe's indian protege, Juan Diego. And at his trial for robbery in 1804 a *mestizo* muleteer from Tequila, Jalisco in western Mexico complained that he had been arrested without cause because he was a humble man without influential friends: "que a él lo castigarían porque no tenía mujer bonita ni hijos, y que solo que fuera la Guadalupe".⁷

The mounting written record in which the Virgin of Guadalupe is mentioned suggests both popular enthusiasm and a denser, more prescribed and institutionalized web of regulations and observances. The december 12 celebrations, popular in various cities and towns after the first oaths of allegiance (*jurats*) ordered by Archbishop-Viceroy Vizarrón in 1737 acquired new layers of commemorative meaning as the century unfolded. The oaths were repeated in 1747 to mark the tenth anniversary and remember with gratitude both the providential apparition in 1531 and Mary's efficacious intervention in the epidemic in 1737.⁸ Still grander acts of thanksgiving took place in 1756-57 to celebrate the papal bull recognizing the authenticity of the apparitions. The symphony of december fiestas after 1757 commemorated both the apparition and the papal proclamation.⁹ In other institutional developments, lay

1730, and AGN Tierras 2544 exp. 14, Tianguistengo (Meztitlán juris., Hidalgo), 1795, cases of villagers litigating over family images of Guadalupe. The appeals to the criminal court of the Acordada by five plebeian prisoners in 1799 are in AGN Acordada 15. The petitioners were from Mexico City and the Bajío. For an earlier appeal to Our Lady of Guadalupe, there is the 11709 new year's petition of Manuel del Barrio y Sedano for her help in his efforts to shed "las vestiduras viejas de tibieza, flojedad, y frialdad y vista las nuevas de fervor, amor, y caridad", AGN Inquisición 74,1 fols. 306r-307v.

⁷ *Gazetas de México*, september 2, 1797 issue, "casi todos los niños se vistieron galanamente en traje del dichoso Neófito Juan Diego"; the muleteer's lament is in Archivo Judicial de la Audiencia de la Nueva Galicia (Biblioteca Pública del Estado, Guadalajara, Jalisco) bundle formerly labeled "1806 (120), exp. 1."

⁸ Antonio Pompa y Pompa, in *La Voz Guadalupeña*, february 12, 1947, pp. 6-7.

⁹ More major anniversaries were still to come, including the 250th anniversary of

confraternities dedicated to Our Lady of Guadalupe grew in number from the 1740s. In the 1760s and 1770s wealthy occupational groups, including leading *hacendados* of central Mexico and the Real Colegio de Abogados of Mexico City, began sponsoring annual novenas at the shrine and publishing the keynote sermon they commissioned for it.¹⁰ In the eighteenth century licenses were required to collect alms for a shrine, and by the 1780s they were usually restricted to short periods and small areas, if not denied altogether. Our Lady of Guadalupe was the exception to these tighter restrictions on alms collectors. Licenses to collect for Guadalupe were granted routinely and often without limits, especially after 1756.¹¹ Even during the late eighteenth-century reforms in the name of oversight and efficiency, itinerant and local collectors for the annual Indian fiesta at Tepeyac were waved through with two-year licenses on the grounds that it was a “time immemorial” custom.

Other formal acts meant to encourage the devotion and underwrite the cult at Tepeyac include a 1757 royal decree requiring all future wills to include a provision for the shrine;¹² circulars by

the apparition in december 1780, which led to another burst of publications, student theses, and baptisms.

¹⁰ Luis Beltrán de Beltrán, *El poder sobre las aguas Sermón que en el día 23 de junio y último del novenario que . . . hicieron los caballeros hacendados . . .*, Mexico: Imprenta de la Bibliotheca Mexicana, 1765; AGN Escribanos 20 exp. 6, 1780 notes that the Real Colegio de Escribanos had sponsored an annual fiesta in honor of Our Lady of Guadalupe since 1772.

¹¹ AGN General de Parte, 41, exp. 133.

¹² Real Cédula of July 29, 1757, issued by the Marqués de las Amarillas. (See Council of the Indies recommendation on september 7, 1756 “que se sirva mandar que en los testamentos que se otorgaren en la Nueva España se exprese por manda forzosa el santuario y simulacro de aquella santa imagen”, AGI México legajo 2531.) Evidently the proceeds from this decree were disappointing. In a letter of september 5, 1786 the *colegiata* priests complained that in many places no one took responsibility for the collections and that the shrine was short of revenue as a result. Tulane University, Latin American Library, Viceregal and Ecclesiastical Mexican Collection 50 exp. 11.

the bishops encouraging devotions on the 12th of every month;¹³ and an array of promotional publications including novena booklets, sermons, leaflets and single sheets of special prayers and poems; testimonial texts, including Miguel Cabrera's *Maravilla Americana y conjunto de raras maravillas* (1756); and the first booklet designed expressly for religious tourists to Tepeyac, published in 1794.¹⁴ Our Lady of Guadalupe's intercession was sought in all kinds of calamities during the eighteenth century; no longer just for floods, illness, and accidents, but especially for support and protection in time of war.¹⁵

From the 1730s the search was on for guadalupan relics and fresh evidence to authenticate the miracle. Italian savant Lorenzo Boturini was caught up in this groundswell of *guadalupanismo* when

¹³ The first "día doce" booklet apparently was published in 1763 or shortly before: *Día doce de cada mes, para celebrar el singular misterio de la concepción en gracia de María Santísima Nuestra Señora, y el estupendo milagro de su aparición prodigiosa en su soberana y divina imagen de Guadalupe ...*, Mexico: Imprenta de la Bibliotheca Americana, 1763 (said to be "reimpresa"). Other versions were published by the Zúñiga y Ontiveros publishing house in 1782 and 1797.

¹⁴ José Francisco Valdés, *Salutación a María Santísima de Guadalupe. Práctica devota para venerarla en su santuario, quando se le hace la visita*, Mexico: Zúñiga y Ontiveros, 1794; reprinted in 1808 and 1819.

¹⁵ For example, during the War of Spanish Succession, Manuel de Argüello, *Acción de gracias ... en virtud de ... las victorias que consiguió ... los días 8 y 11 de diciembre del año de 1710 ...*, Mexico: Vda. de Ribera, 1711; during the War of Austrian Succession, José de Arlegui, *Sagrado paladion del americano orbe. Sermón ... que hizo a María Sma. de Guadalupe la muy noble e ilustre ciudad de San Luis Potosí por el feliz suceso de las católicas armas ...*, Mexico: Vda. de Hogal, 1743; during the Seven Years' War, *acta de cabildo* of the Mexico City *ayuntamiento*, September 13, 1762 records a viceregal decree calling for a novena in honor of Our Lady of Guadalupe for "divino auxilio por la amenaza de la Nación inglesa a estos dominios", and in an entry of february 20, 1765, Zúñiga y Ontiveros recorded in his *efemérides* (Sutro Library) that a mass had been offered to Our Lady of Guadalupe as patroness of the troops (*patrona de la tropa*); and during the wars with France and Britain during the 1790s, AGN Colegios 426 exp. 16 noted on january 13, 1796 that the special novena was being celebrated at Tepeyac to appeal for victory.

he arrived in Mexico City in 1736, just as the great epidemic was about to strike. Over the next seven years he acquired an extraordinary collection of manuscripts relating to pre-columbian Mesoamerica and the apparitions and the shrine at Tepeyac, before his arrest and deportation to Spain in 1744.¹⁶ Mariano Fernández de Echeverría y Veytia, a young creole attorney who represented his father's legal affairs in Europe from 1738-1750 took Boturini into his home in Madrid for nearly two years (1744-46) and became fascinated by his Mexican studies. For the rest of his life, Echeverría y Veytia devoted his spare time to his own studies of pre-columbian civilizations, the history of his hometown, Puebla, and a manuscript he called *Baluartes de México*, a providential history of the Virgin Mary in New Spain that focused on Our Lady of Guadalupe and Mexico City.¹⁷ He recounted in *Baluartes* a trip in 1746 to Valladolid, Spain, hometown of Juan de Zumárraga, the bishop to whom Juan Diego reportedly revealed the miracles, but who left no trace of the encounters or his devotion. Entering the cathedral church there Echeverría y Veytia glimpsed a large painting of Mexico's Virgin of Guadalupe next to the altar railing of the main chapel. His heart skipped a beat. Here, he thought, was the long sought evidence of Zumárraga's personal connection to the apparition story. He hurried forward only to be disappointed. The painting could not have been the gift of Zumárraga himself or a contemporary for it was dated 1667, at the time of the first wave of petitions to Rome for recognition of the apparitions.¹⁸ In the same spirit of eager anticipation, a reconstruction project at the shrine in 1751 included an unsuccessful search for the bones of

¹⁶ An inventory of Boturini's guadalupan manuscripts appears in Ernesto de la Torre Villar and Ramiro Navarro de Anda, *Testimonios históricos guadalupanos*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1982, pp. 405-412.

¹⁷ None of these works was published during his lifetime. He died in 1780.

¹⁸ *Baluartes de México. Descripción histórica de las cuatro milagrosas imágenes de Nuestra Señora que se veneran en la ... ciudad de México ...*, México: Impr. de A. Valdés, 1820, pp. 37-38.

Juan Diego.¹⁹ Later in the century more sites associated with the apparitions were developed for devotees. The extraordinary little Capilla del Pocito was constructed in the sanctuary grounds between 1777 and 1791, and in 1789 a license was issued for the construction of a chapel in the village of Tolpetlac at a place said to have been the home of Juan Diego's uncle Juan Bernardino, where Mary of Guadalupe had appeared and cured him.²⁰

But there are twists in this story of promotion and continuous development of *guadalupanismo* from the 1730s. Take the role usually assigned to archbishop-vicey Vizarrón as the architect of the watershed events from 1737-1754. He certainly proved himself an enthusiastic *guadalupanista* before the epidemic of 1737 and was a determined and skillful promoter until death overtook him in 1747.²¹ From the time he arrived as archbishop-elect in late 1731 he organized and attended ceremonies at the shrine, including, the bicentennial of the apparition and the groundbreaking for a capuchin convent on site in november and december 1731, donated an exquisite italian vestment embroidered with gold thread in 1735, and pushed for formal recognition of the settlement at Tepeyac as a *pueblo* and a *villa*.²² Then during the epidemic he declared Our

¹⁹ Echeverría y Veytia, *Baluartes*, p. 27.

²⁰ AGN Bienes Nacionales 575 exp. 11, license granted to the parish priest and people of Tolpetlac. The chapel was still unfinished in 1803 when an appeal for donations was published in the *Gazetas de México*, december 16, 1803 issue.

²¹ He was archbishop from 1731 to 1747, and vicey from 1734 to 1740. Other *peninsular* officials were among the ardent *guadalupanistas* of the late eighteenth century. For example, Archbishop Francisco Antonio de Lorenzana (1766-1772), as well as most viceyos (perhaps especially Frey Antonio María de Bucareli, who served from 1771 to 1779 and was buried at the shrine). One exception among viceyos seems to have been the second Conde de Revilla Gigedo (1789-1794), who ordered the removal of the image of Our Lady of Guadalupe from several locations on the grounds of the royal palace in Mexico City, and did not attend the december 12 festivities at the shrine in 1791, José Gómez, *Diario curioso ... 1789-1794*, México: UNAM, 1986, pp. 12, 14, 44.

²² *Gazeta de México*, november 19, 1731, december 12, 1731, august 1735. The Capuchin convent was completed 1737. As Vizarrón requested, the crown approved in

Lady of Guadalupe patroness of the city and the viceroyalty, and afterwards reignited the campaign for papal recognition and pursued the elevation of the shrine as a collegiate church. But it was the city government rather than the archbishop-viceoy that first pushed for recognition of Our Lady of Guadalupe as official patroness during the early weeks of the epidemic in January 1737, and Vizarrón firmly resisted the city councilors' plea for the image to be brought from the shrine to the cathedral, as had been done during the great flood of 1629-33.²³

Above all, the record of *guadalupanismo* in Mexico before Vizarrón arrived suggests that his efforts to promote the devotion depended on initiatives and momentum that had been building for more than thirty years. New shrines to Guadalupe were already established or under construction in provincial cities of Valladolid, Zacatecas, Antequera, and Pachuca during that time, and more of the guadalupan sermons being published in the early eighteenth century were originally delivered in provincial churches. The planning for a college of ecclesiastical dignitaries (*colegiata*) at Tepeyac—one of Vizarrón's pet projects—dates back to the completion of the great temple there in 1709, and petitions for licenses to found the college met with success from the crown and papacy in 1717 and 1725, long before he arrived. The college was not inaugurated until 1750, after Vizarrón's death, because the site lacked the required settlement and infrastructure to qualify as a *villa*. The bicentennial celebrations and founding of a capuchin convent at the shrine also were planned before Vizarrón's arrival and point to a new interest in commemorative events that added to the popularity of the image

principle the elevation of the settlement at Tepeyac as a *villa*, AGN Reales Cédulas Originales (RCO) 42 exp. 134. The cédulas completing the process of making the settlement a *villa* were issued on august 21, 1748 and july 22, 1749, AGN RCO 68 exp. 32 and 69 exp. 16.

²³ Archivo Histórico del Ayuntamiento de la Ciudad de México (AHACM) núm. de inventario 62^a, the *acta de cabildo* for january 27, 1737 records the viceoy's reply to the *ayuntamiento's* request for the image to be brought to the city.

and the apparition story before 1737. As a run-up to the bicentennial of the apparition in 1731 (There had been no centennial celebration in 1631.), the great church at Tepeyac was lavishly re-dedicated in May 1722 and the cathedral dignitaries undertook a second inquiry into the authenticity of the apparition story as part of a new petition to Rome.²⁴ A string of commemorations before the great epidemic and declaration of the Virgin of Guadalupe as patroness followed. On december 12, 1728 the 197th anniversary of the apparition was celebrated in MC; in 1729 the centennial of the flood that marked Guadalupe's first great public miracle was observed, along with the 198th anniversary of the apparition. Then the bicentennial celebrations in 1731, and the 50th anniversary of the confraternity to Guadalupe at Tepeyac in 1735.²⁵

While a flowering of guadalupan devotion and sponsorship from 1737 to the end of the eighteenth century is abundantly documented, the story becomes more complicated and fluid when particular situations —places, people, and times— are considered. For example, the history of confraternities dedicated to Guadalupe does not follow a smooth trajectory of greater activity everywhere. For the Archdiocese of Mexico the pastoral visit of 1683-85 found five confraternities dedicated to Guadalupe in the ninety or so parishes visited outside the Valley of Mexico, four of them in or near the Valley of Toluca; the visit in 1717 found eleven guadalupan

²⁴ The investigation was carried out in 1723, *Informaciones sobre la milagrosa aparición de la Santísima Virgen de Guadalupe recibidas en 1666 y 1723*, Fortino Hipólito Vera, ed., 2nd ed., México: Imprenta Gallarda, 1948, pp. 189-247.

²⁵ 1722-23: *Boletín del Instituto Bibliográfico Mexicano (BIBM)*, núm. 5 (1905), p. 995, *Gazeta de México*, May 1722, *Informaciones ... en 1666 y 1723*, pp. 189-247; 1728: *BIBM*, núm. 4 (1903), p. 82, *Gazeta de México*, december 1728; 1729, *BIBM*, núm. 4 (1903), pp. 134-135, *Gazeta de México*, september 1729, pp. 152-153. *Gazeta de México*, December 1729; *BIBM*, núm. 4 (1903), pp. 291-292, *Gazeta de México*, december 1731; 1735: *BIBM*, núm. 4 (1903), p. 583, *Gazeta de México*, december 1735. Mention of these commemorations is also found in the *actas de cabildo* of Mexico City's *ayuntamiento*, AHACM.

confraternities, but only two of them near Toluca and most of the new ones concentrated in parishes of the modern states of Morelos and Querétaro situated close to the Valley of Mexico; and the pastoral visits of 1752-58 found fifteen, with a yet different regional distribution. By then, only one was still active around Toluca, but nine new ones appeared in the modern state of Hidalgo.²⁶ So, these formal institutions of lay devotion rose and fell in popularity and, in a few cases, rural communities actively resisted the promotion of *guadalupanismo* in their parishes.²⁷ No place, except perhaps Mexico City or the city of San Luis Potosí and its hinterland, fits the pattern of steady growth to a tee, not even the community that grew up around the shrine at Tepeyac in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.²⁸ Developments there during the eighteenth century appear to be more the result of promotion by authorities in Mexico City and opportunities for employment in construction than from waves of ardent devotees moving to the holy site as if it were a New World Varanasi.²⁹

²⁶ Archivo Histórico del Arzobispado de México (AHAM), pastoral visit books of Archbishops Aguiar y Seixas, Lanciego, and Rubio y Salinas.

²⁷ E.g. Tejupilco 1760, AGN Clero Regular y Secular (CRS) 204 exp.9; Tepetlaostoc 1758, AGN CRS 156 exp. 5; Acatlán, j. Tulancingo 1817, AGN CRS 136 exp. 8.

²⁸ The set of reports on parishes and shrines in the Archdiocese of Mexico in 1743 rarely mention Our Lady of Guadalupe, Francisco de Solano, ed., *Relaciones geográficas del Arzobispado de México. 1743*, 2 vols., Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1988. An example of the particular appeal of Our Lady of Guadalupe in the vicinity of San Luis Potosí is the request by the parish priest of San Francisco del Valle and his parishioners for permission to build a shrine to Guadalupe in 1802. In his petition, the priest recalled the shrine in the city of San Luis (“Hago memoria de el santuario de la ciudad de San Luis Potosí”) and said it was difficult for his parishioners to go there or to other shrines, AGN, Civil 1806 exp. 2.

²⁹ Support for the *colegiata* was never in doubt—endowments began to accumulate from influential devotees in Mexico City as early as 1708; a proposal was made to the Council of the Indies in 1717 and approved in principle (Archivo General de Indias, Audiencia de México, legajo 2531); a papal decree authorized its establishment in 1725 (Delfina López Sarrelangue, *Una villa mexicana en el siglo XVIII*, México:

How much of this growth in guadalupan devotion was promotion by elite devotees and how much was popular fervor? What was guided by authorities and what was spontaneous and inner-directed? The answers no doubt vary by place and time, and disentangling promotion and devotion is next to impossible unless there is evidence of coercion or direct resistance. Especially by the eighteenth century, it was rarely a simple matter of promotion followed by devotion, but whether leading or following, the official promotion seems to

Imprenta Universitaria, 1957, p. 32); and the next year a judge on the Audiencia de México was named Protector Especial de la Colegiata in order to move the project along (*Gazeta de México*, July 1728). To complete the process of establishing a *colegiata*, however, it had to be located in a substantial, formal community designated as a *villa*. At Archbishop-Viceroy Vizarrón's request, the crown authorized the erection of a *villa* there in 1733, but certain physical requirements had not yet been met (AGN RCO 52 exp. 134, december 28, 1733). The audiencia followed up in 1735, authorizing first the formation of a lesser town, a *pueblo de indios*, although the settlement at Tepeyac did not develop the structure of a recognized *pueblo* until 1741 (López Sarrelangue, *Una villa*, p. 33, 34). Population and organization were part of the problem. In 1721 there were 918 souls dispersed among five Indian *barrios* in the vicinity of the shrine, without a nucleated center (AGN Bienes Nacionales [BN] 912 exp. 16). Lack of a regular water supply was part of the problem. A water grant had been made in 1679 and attempts to build an aqueduct to the site for domestic use were started in 1714 and 1727, but not completed until 1751 (López Sarrelangue, *Una villa*, pp. 84-90). On august 21, 1748 the standing of the settlement at the shrine as a *villa* was affirmed by royal cédula and in 1749 the townsite was reformed according to an approved plan, AGN RCO 68 exp. 32 and AGN RCO 69 exp. 16, July 22, 1749. Soon thereafter, in 1750, the *colegiata* was finally established.

By 1797 the parish of the *villa* of Guadalupe had grown to 2,168 souls, with the town center accounting for half of the total (1,089), AHAM caja 1717-1797. Surprisingly, the proportion of residents named Guadalupe had declined substantially since 1721, even in most of the outlying Indian *barrios* of the jurisdiction. Six per cent of Santa Ysabel Tola's people were named Guadalupe in 1721, 3.8% in 1797; 10.7% of San Juan Sigualtepec's people were named Guadalupe in 1721, 2.5% in 1797; in Santiago Zacualco, 4.5% in 1721 and .65% in 1797; and in San Pedro Zacatengo, 2.6% in 1721 and 5.4% in 1797. In the *villa* itself only 1.1% of the residents carried the name Guadalupe, and over half of them were living on the Ca-

have been well received for the most part across classes and regions. Well received, but often taken in directions not intended or always welcomed by official promoters. Images of Guadalupe and materials associated with them circulated well beyond the reach of the carriers who represented them officially, into the hands, homes, and chapels of individuals, families, and landed estates, and into churches that were visited by a priest perhaps once a year.³⁰ Local enthusiasm spilled beyond the official even in Mexico City where neighborhoods and occupational groups like the street vendors of the Zócalo and the honey merchants of the Calle de la Azequia celebrated their own guadalupan fiestas and rosary processions on the twelfth of every month and organized themselves into semi-formal brotherhoods without official license or close supervision.³¹ Unlicensed, reportedly unruly guadalupan processions were particularly worrisome to officials in the capital and elsewhere, as lengthy cases against the Barrio del Hornillo in Mexico City in 1772-73 and in Toluca in 1751 show.³² A campesino's appeal for the

-lle de la Caja de Agua. In all, 2% of the residents of the parish of the Villa de Guadalupe in 1792 were named Guadalupe, compared to 4.2% in Arandas, Jalisco, another parish dedicated to Our Lady of Guadalupe. Small numbers of Indians from other parts of the Valley of México moved to the vicinity of Tepeyac in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; e.g. from Zumpango de la Laguna in 1587, AGN Tierras 2948 exp. 60. Whether the early settlers were attracted by the aura of divine presence more than by economic opportunity or dislocation the record does not say.

³⁰ Most were produced in Mexico City.

³¹ AGN CRS 27 exp. 2, 1797 "tratantes de la plaza"; AGN CRS 27 exp. 6, 1798 "comerciantes meleros de la calle de la azequia"; AGN CRS 151 exp. 7, Barrio San Hipólito was in trouble over its unlicensed *bermandad* and irregularly licensed Rosary processions.

³² AHAM caja 1751, Toluca; AGN BN 976 exp. 5 Barrio del Hornillo, parish of Santa Cruz y Soledad. In 1776 Ignacio Vilchiz, a barber-surgeon who lived in the portal de Santo Domingo in Mexico City reported to the Inquisition a procession with pigskins filled with *pulque* and covered with flowers accompanied by many horsemen who carried as a sort of banner an image of Our Lady of Guadalupe, AGN, Inquisición 1099, exp. 11.

Virgin of Guadalupe's intercession in his humble petition to a colonial judge for mercy and justice might, in other circumstances, become his battle cry, as a startled royalist commander at Tlalpujahua, Michoacán reported in 1811: "... comenzó una algazara de voces gritando 'ahora es tiempo, Viva Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe y mueran todos,' y al instante descargaron sobre nosotros una lluvia inmensa de piedras".³³

The main point to be made about promotion and devotion during the eighteenth century is that there was plenty of each. Promotion and devotion rarely moved along entirely separate tracks or followed one causal line. Simultaneously there was more institutionalization of the devotion *and* more unauthorized contagion and enthusiasm. A paradox contained in this history of guadalupan devotion and promotion that further complicates the main story of dramatic growth is that while the devotion was spreading throughout the viceroyalty there was no corresponding movement of devout visitors to Tepeyac from distant places.

II. Popularity without pilgrimage

Thinking about the medieval and early modern european tradition of pilgrimage, I expected to find pilgrims and a pilgrimage literature

³³ *Gazeta del Gobierno de México*, tomo 2, num. 23, 1811, pp. 151-152. While the promotion/devotion conundrum makes too neat a separation and resists a general answer, it is worth broaching and approaching with particulars as a way to guard against timeless or poorly supported propositions like: *guadalupanismo* has always been first and foremost an indian devotion; or its opposite, that *guadalupanismo* was born creole in the mid-seventeenth century. Without much evidence or attention to time, *guadalupanismo* is still assumed to have been a wildly popular indian devotion from the early years of spanish colonization. Octavio Paz is only the most famous writer to suppose that *guadalupanismo* was born indian and that indians turned to this image of the Virgin Mary for consolation in their "spiritual orphanhood" in the aftermath of conquest. Recent scholarship, based largely on apologetic texts that were written by priests and published during the colonial period, has taken the opposite tack, positing that early indian devotion is a myth, that *guadalupanismo* was born and raised urban and creole spaniard. But clearly there were indian devotees of

for guadalupan devotion in the colonial Mexico. Guidebooks, books of miracles, and scores of personal accounts of pilgrimage circulated in Europe during the Middle Ages; and there are other records in the form of certificates of pilgrimage and papal indulgences for those who completed the journeys to Rome, Jerusalem, and Compostela. Few christians undertook those great journeys, or perhaps even went to a less remote regional shrine, but the idea of the long-distance journey of hardship, penance, spiritual cleansing, and reward was familiar to all and desired by many. Sacred journeys have an important place in pre-columbian Mexican lore, too, so I was surprised to find no guide books or accounts of long-distance pilgrimage to Tepeyac, no network of shrines and sacred routes leading there during the colonial period, especially during the eighteenth century when *guadalupanismo* was so obviously expanding.

Our Lady of Guadalupe from the Valley of Mexico and surrounding highland communities who visited the shrine at Tepeyac by the early seventeenth century. The celebration at that time of separate fiesta seasons at the shrine for indians and spaniards is hard to account for otherwise. (See William B. Taylor, "Mexico's Virgin of Guadalupe in the Seventeenth Century: Hagiography and Beyond", in Allan Greer and Jodi Bilinkoff, eds., *Colonial Saints: Discovering the Holy in the Americas*, New York: Routledge, 2003, pp. 277-298.) And there is widely scattered evidence of indian interest in Our Lady of Guadalupe during the eighteenth century, especially in central Mexico. However, the growing prominence of indians in the record of *guadalupanismo* during the eighteenth century may well owe as much to promotion by leading creole and *peninsular* churchmen as to locally-generated Indian devotion. The baptism and census records for parishes in central and western Mexico that I have reviewed for the eighteenth century typically show about twice as many non-indians as indians named Guadalupe. In a 1987 article, "The Virgin of Guadalupe in New Spain: An Inquiry into the Social History of Marian Devotion", *American Ethnologist* 14: 1 (february 1987): 9-33, I examined baptism records for six Jalisco parishes (the Guadalajara *sagrario*, Tlajomulco, Zacoalco, Arandas, Acatlán, and Tonalá), one for the Valley of Oaxaca (Mitla), and one for the Estado de México (Tenango del Valle). Recently I have added *matriculas* (lists of residents) for the districts of El Cardonal and Zimapán in the state of Hidalgo, AGN BN 388, exp. 19, AGN BN403, exp. 17 and AGN BN 818, exp. 8. With the exception of Arandas, the general pattern of more non-indian than indian Guadalupes holds for these places. It is from evangelizing priests, more than from indian devotees

The literature on Mexican *guadalupanismo* imagines otherwise. To Victor and Edith Turner, for example, the Virgin of Guadalupe was Mexico's "dominant symbol" presiding over what they called "the total symbolic system" —situated at the apex of pilgrimage routes, above an orderly hierarchy of shrines and images. The Turners were persuaded that what they took to be a European tradition of Christian pilgrimage had moved to America. They wrote, "The medieval mode of Catholic pilgrimage was given a new lease on life in the overseas empires of Spain, Portugal and France... Foremost among the shrines of the major pilgrimage systems are those dedicated to the Mother of God... All are subordinate in fame and catchment scope to the cultus of the Virgin of Guadalupe ... The system ensures the constant crisscrossing of pilgrimage

themselves, that we have the main testimonials to an Indian essence of the cult in the late colonial period. The affectionate term "la morenita"—the dark little Lady—by which Guadalupe is universally known today does not appear in the records I have examined before the 1740s, and was used to Spain as well as the New World to refer to dark images of Mary. While many eighteenth-century sermons, especially after the 1730s, referred to Our Lady of Guadalupe as favoring Indians especially, and Indian devotion was being promoted in other ways, the sermons rarely state that the image has an Indian appearance. A clear example is in mercedarian Cristóbal de Aldana's *Crónica de la Merced de México*, but it is quite late, probably from the 1770s: "Uno de los principales empeños de N.V.P. fue encender en los corazones de aquellos Neófitos el amor y devoción a María Sma ... No la mientan sino con el tierno renombre de N. muy amada Madre: Totlatzo Nantze, y la Soberana Reyna ha dado las más auténticas pruebas de lo que se agrada del amor y ternura destas pobres gentes, hasta aparece en su propio trage su mismo modo de tocado, y remedando su mismo color como se admira en la portentosa Imagen de Guadalupe", México: Biblioteca Nacional, 1953, p. 27. Even though promoted in this way, Our Lady of Guadalupe was increasingly regarded as a sign of the sacred for everyone. This was as true of sermons as of popular devotion. See, for example the December 12, 1744 sermon delivered in Guanajuato by Joaquín Osuna which develops the theme that Our Lady of Guadalupe is "from both Spains", *El Iris Celeste de las católicas Españas, la aparición y patrocinio de N.S. de Guadalupe en las Indias occidentales*, Mexico: F.X. Sánchez, 1745.

ways, as in medieval Europe".³⁴ But Our Lady of Guadalupe and Tepeyac did not predominate in this way. Hundreds of shrines attracted devotees from beyond the immediate vicinity. While the image of the Virgin of Guadalupe became the most widely known object of faith in New Spain by the late eighteenth century, there is little to suggest that the legendary site of the Virgin Mary's apparitions to Juan Diego was much more popular as a destination for sacred travel beyond its vicinity than were half a dozen shrines to other miraculous images, not to mention the hundreds of other shrines that were regarded as essential to the wellbeing of people living closer by. Little in the way of an interlocking system of pilgrimage routes developed (even with the advent of railroads in the late nineteenth century, when great streams of visitors began to travel there), and there were about as many shrines to miraculous images in Mexico 1850 or 2000 as in 1700. This is not a history in which other shrines fell away in the face of irresistible attraction and relentless promotion of Our Lady of Guadalupe.³⁵

How could people be so attracted to the image of Guadalupe without being equally interested in Tepeyac, where the image had appeared on the cloak of a humble indian and was still displayed? I am emphasizing attachment to place, but there are other considerations, too. Few people could afford to go unless they regarded it as the final journey, and the broken terrain, great distances, and dangers of the road also discouraged long-distance travels. Another consideration is the lack of official encouragement, if not active discouragement, for european-style great pilgrimages on the

³⁴ *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture: Anthropological Perspectives*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1978, p. 172. The eighteenth-century urban shrines in diocesan capitals expressed the intention of building a network.

³⁵ The subject of faith in territorial terms is a daunting challenge for historical study. Tracking shrine visitors, migrants, and long-distance travelers including muleteers, traders, hermits attached to shrines, missionaries, parish priests, alms collectors, and bishops on pastoral visits is one approach, but it is easier said than done. Locating images of Our Lady of Guadalupe is another.

grounds that pilgrims would contribute to vagrancy, social disorder, and economic dislocations. Long penitential sojourns to a shrine were part of the mental world of Hispanized subjects in New Spain, but indulgences for actual pilgrimages were not issued by colonial bishops, and when a creole spanish woman from Monterrey in northern Mexico promised to go to Tepeyac if she recovered from a grave illness in 1758, the bishop of Guadalajara was quick to excuse her from the vow.³⁶ *When christianity broke in on America* is part of an explanation. The new politics of religion in Europe during the sixteenth century also worked against holy wanderers and travel to remote destinations.³⁷ Border crossings became riskier, and in protestant regions religious pilgrimages were virtually eliminated. In catholic areas they were regulated more closely, if not discouraged, and sacred travel often was channeled toward shorter journeys to regional shrines that reinforced the importance of dioceses and state territories.³⁸ Nevertheless, there remained more

³⁶ Bancroft Library, 87/190m Mexican Miscellany, carton 2, “Sumaria ynformación en orden a la marabilla de Nuestra Señora del Nogal”, 1758. The earliest long-distance pilgrimage to Tepeyac I have seen documented was made by a small group of Ópata people in early 1840, C. Dora Tabanico, “De Tuape a la Basílica de Guadalupe”, in *Memorias: IV Simposio de la Sociedad Sonorense de Historia*, Hermosillo: Instituto Sonorense de Cultura, 1991, pp. 133-138. It would be surprising if some of the visitors to Mexico City for litigation and appeals to the viceroy or audiencia during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries did not make the short side trip to Tepeyac, but I have not yet found mention of this in colonial records. Even when Manuel Altamirano seemed to observe a change toward long distance pilgrimage to Tepeyac in the late nineteenth century, he noted that the visitors were mainly people from Mexico City: “[Es] una de las mayores fiestas del Catolicismo mexicano, la primera seguramente por su popularidad, por su universalidad. . . . Es la ciudad de México entera que se traslada al pie del santuario, desde la mañana hasta la tarde”, *Paisajes y leyendas. Tradiciones y costumbres de México*, México: Porrúa (Sepan Cuantos, 375), 1979, p. 55.

³⁷ Ronald C. Finucane, *Miracles and Pilgrims: Popular Beliefs in Medieval England*, Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1977, p. 217.

³⁸ Philip M. Soergel, *Wondrous in his Saints: Counter-Reformation Propaganda in Bavaria*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

long-distance travel to sacred places in Europe than in the viceroyalty.

Another piece of the puzzle of limited pilgrimage may be found in the notion of beauty and the significance of copies of religious images in early modern catholic culture, before the age of mechanical reproduction. Most of the painted copies that found their way into parish churches and regional shrines were the same size as the image at Tepeyac and executed with the greatest care to replicate it as faithfully as humanly possible. If we take the viewpoint of the consumers and makers of these many images, something more complex was going on than slavish imitation emptied of spiritual content. The standard of beauty for religious images had to do with reception, more than originality -if a representation of Christ or Mary or another saint evoked feelings of intense love and contrition from devotees and thereby was pleasing to God and invited his presence and favor, it could be considered beautiful.³⁹ The effects -including miracles- were the proof. Accurate, painstaking representation of the form and spirit of the subject was understood to be especially pleasing to God. The richer the materials and the more polished and exquisite the execution, the more beautiful, perfect, and holy the result. And the more a copy resembled the matrix image. the more it, too, invited Mary's presence and inspired a sense of awe. If a particular image was thought to be of great beauty, thanks especially to its association with miracles, what could be better than a nearly perfect copy, especially if the two had touched? This was a conception of beauty that could

³⁹ All were copies -“portraits”, as Florencia put it. There was only one original. That was Mary, herself. As the lettering on one eighteenth-century painting of the image put it, this was “viva copia de la copia viva de María Santísima” (on the first illustration in Jaime Cuadriello and others, *Zodiaco mariano: 250 años de la declaración pontificia de María de Guadalupe como patrono de México*, México: Museo de la Basílica de Guadalupe, 2004).

value replication as the real thing.⁴⁰ With a fine copy of the image in a church within reach, or even a cheap print on a home altar, there was less reason, rather than more, to go to Tepeyac on pilgrimage. Guadalupe was already with you, if approached in the right way.

If few devotees of Guadalupe were going to Tepeyac from great distances, were they going somewhere else? Yes, they were going to local and regional sites, usually on foot, or they were finding Guadalupe at home.⁴¹ Even as concentration of the sacred in one place was being promoted by viceregal and archiepiscopal officials and spread out from there after 1737, decentralization was at work. Mexico City and its officials always had difficulty convincing the viceroyalty's thousands of outlying settlements that *they* were not the navel of the universe. Local copies of the Virgin of Guadalupe were said to come alive—sweating, crying, bleeding, changing expression—all signs of divine presence that beckoned to devotees.⁴²

⁴⁰ Art historian Clara Bargellini finds originality in this seemingly endless fascination with the image in eighteenth-century Mexico. In doing so she criticizes earlier generations of art historians for not regarding the Guadalupe paintings as art, and for ignoring the originality of Baroque production, "Originality and Invention in the Painting of New Spain", in Donna Pierce, ed., *Painting a New World: Mexican Art and Life, 1521-1821*, Denver: Denver Art Museum, 2004, pp. 79-91.

⁴¹ The sensory experience of surroundings conferred by pedestrian travel seems to be a key to past place-centered European experiences of location, and walking was the common means of conveyance in Mexico until the twentieth century. Walking was virtually the only means of travel over land before the arrival of European draft animals, and it was fundamental to much colonial-era movement and place making. I think of colonial land grant ceremonies in which the judge and interested parties walked the boundaries of the property, pulling up grass and tossing stones in the air as they went, and the circumambulations and other religious processions that both marked the liturgical year and traced physical boundaries.

⁴² Other Guadalupean images elsewhere were associated with miracles before the eighteenth century, including a famous image in Antequera that remained untouched by a fire in 1665, Francisco de Florencia, *La estrella del norte de México* (1695), Guadalajara: 1895, pp. 146-149; a Guadalupeana in the mission church of San Francisco de Conchos, Chihuahua that sweated for three days in 1695, Lauro López

For example, at Temamatla, near Chalco in the Valley of Mexico, local people announced in 1737 that their copy of Our Lady of Guadalupe sweated and spoke to them—Mary was fully present right there, in their image.⁴³ And a millenarian movement at Tututepec in the Sierra of Mezquitlán (Hidalgo) in 1769 made even stronger claims for the Virgin’s presence. The old man said to be the New Savior was paired with a young woman who was reputed to be the incarnation of Our Lady of Guadalupe. She had come to Tututepec in the flesh, said one witness, because “Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, la que apareció en México, cayó de su grandeza allá”.⁴⁴ In less provocative ways, most devotees living beyond the Valley of Mexico were satisfied with the likeness of Guadalupe that was close at hand, set among the other revered images in their local church or on a home altar, or in a regional capital. Few seem to have felt themselves powerfully “drawn to the image” at Tepeyac from great distances, as so many devotees do today.

Beltrán, *La Guadalupeana que sudó tres días*, Chihuahua: Editorial Camino, 1989; and an image or incident in Apam, Hidalgo before 1722 mentioned by Br. José de Lizardi y Valle in his prologue to the 1722-1723 inquiry, *Informaciones sobre la milagrosa aparición ...*, p. 203. Omitting the details, Lizardi also mentions that there were many other miracles associated with Our Lady of Guadalupe. Our Lady of Guadalupe became a prominent patron in ex-voto paintings during the eighteenth century. Several are published in Horacio Senties, *La Villa de Guadalupe: Historia, estampas y leyendas*, México: Departamento del Distrito Federal, 1991, p.104, and *Dones y promesas: 500 años de arte ofrenda (exvotos mexicanos)*, México: Fundación Cultural Televisa, 1996, pp. 55, 57.

⁴³ Juan Francisco Sahagún Arévalo Ladrón de Guevara, ed., *Gacetas de México, 1728-1742*, in Nicolás León, ed., *Bibliografía mexicana del siglo XVIII*, México: Imp. de Díaz de León, 1902-1908, Boletín del Instituto Bibliográfico, núm. 5, p. 722 (gaceta for september 1737).

⁴⁴ AGN Criminal 308 exp. 1, fols. 32-34, testimony of Diego Agustín. In his summary of events, the *alcalde mayor* mentioned that followers brought to the Savior’s “mosque” (*mezquita*) images of Our Lady of Guadalupe and San Mateo from their home churches, fol. 12v.

Conclusion

The flowering of *guadalupanismo* in the eighteenth century, then, leads back to many sacred places other than Mexico City and Tepeyac more than it undercut their importance. Long-distance pilgrimages themselves were rare, in part because distant places were not imagined as more central than one's own, except for a particular purpose. While some shrines were better known and more visited than others, devotees did not act as if there were a hierarchy of shrines or a single dominant symbol in the 'Turners' terms. For example, the indians of Huejutla on the edge of the Valley of Mexico preferred to go with their musicians to the district headtown of Texcoco to honor Our Lady of Guadalupe on december 12 in the 1770s rather than either making the day-long trek to Tepeyac or staying home and worshipping at the altar to Guadalupe in their village church.⁴⁵

This lure of the local in Mexican *guadalupanismo* has not disappeared with the rise of Tepeyac as a great pilgrimage destination since the advent of rapid transit. In conversation with a huichol man from the mountains of southwestern Zacatecas who had visited Tepeyac, historian Thomas Calvo recently brushed up against one of those transforming acts of possession in which distance and time collapse, and circulation of people and objects comes to rest in place, as it did for Tututepec's Guadalupe-in-the-flesh in 1769. Calvo writes:

⁴⁵ This practice is known because their parish priest pursued a two-pronged formal complaint: that they did not celebrate the holiday at home and that the district governor of Texcoco charged them half a *real* to attend the festivities there. In response, the audiencia ordered the district governor not to collect fees for attendance, but did not address the question of where the indians should celebrate the holiday, AGN, General de Parte 59, exp. 251 (1777). Pilgrimages to the regional shrine at San Luis Potosí are mentioned in the 1792 sermon preached there by Antonio López Murto, *El incomparable patronato mariano ...*, Mexico: Zúñiga y Ontiveros, 1793, p. 19.

En una de mis visitas a los huicholes, un hombre, que había visitado la ciudad de México y el santuario de Guadalupe me enseñaba un templo *tuki*, donde había un altar con ofrendas votivas y otros símbolos, entre otros dos cuadros de la Virgen de Guadalupe. Yo pregunté intencionadamente a mi informante huichol si esa “Virgen” no era “Mexicana”, ya que era igual a la vista por él en México. Él contestaba invariablemente a mis insistentes preguntas con una frase lacónica: ‘*No, la Virgen de guadalupe no es mexciana, es huichol*’. Yo intentaba hacerle ver que era un “símbolo tomado de México”, aunque ellos la identifiquen también con la diosa *Tanana*. Finalmente contestó: ‘*Ya le he dicho que la Virgen de Guadalupe es nuestra, es huichol; los vecinos [mexicanos] nos la robaron hace tiempo ...*’.⁴⁶

As the fame of Our Lady of Guadalupe reached into remote corners of the future Mexico, the image was on the way to becoming a dominant symbol. But it was a peculiar kind of dominant symbol, one that tended to reinforce the importance of many localities and many images more than ordering a vast spiritual geography. Territories of recognition and devotion were much larger than territories of sacred travel; and, as important as alms collectors, missionaries, pastoral visitors, and other official carriers may have been to the territorial reach of particular images and shrines, much of the dissemination occurred in secondary ways, from provincial places and unofficial sources rather than from the main shrine. The painstakingly executed eighteenth-century copies of Our Lady of Guadalupe were likely to take on lives of their own rather than propel the viewer to Tepeyac. To many guadalupean devotees, Mary was as present in an admired copy or a found object that resembled the Virgin of Guadalupe⁴⁷ as she was in the matrix image.

This conception of immanence is more than a historical curiosity. It continues to be expressed now and far from home. In addition to

⁴⁶ “Prólogo” in Félix Báez Jorge, *La parentela de María*, Xalapa: Universidad Veracruzana, 1994, p. 18.

⁴⁷ For example, La Virgen de la Piedrita of Canalejas, Estado de México, found in 1868. See Jesús García Gutiérrez, *La Virgen de la Piedrita*, 2nd ed., n.p.: 1993.

the paintings and mechanical reproductions of the image that they own or visit, people find Mary-as-Guadalupe in the shadows cast on the bark of a tree in Watsonville, California; in a pool of spilled ice cream on a sidewalk in Houston, Texas; in a water stain on a bedroom wall in Holly, Colorado; on the glass sheathing of an office building in Clearwater, Florida; and on the back of a highway sign in Yakima, Washington. People go to these places “to be with her,” they say. Even in our time, then, when Tepeyac has become the most visited of catholic shrines, in one of the world’s largest cities, it is not just a center and periphery story. It was even less so in the colonial period, when pious wayfarers sought less for individual salvation in faraway places than for divine presence and favor in the landscape of home.