

1995

## "Criollo" Patriotism in Guadalupe's "First Evangelist," Miguel Sanches (1594-1674)

Martinus Cawley

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian\\_studies](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies)



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Cawley, Martinus (1995) "'Criollo' Patriotism in Guadalupe's 'First Evangelist,' Miguel Sanches (1594-1674)," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 46, Article 8.

Available at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian\\_studies/vol46/iss1/8](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol46/iss1/8)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Marian Library Publications at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marian Studies by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu), [ecommons@udayton.edu](mailto:ecommons@udayton.edu).

**CRIOLLO PATRIOTISM  
IN GUADALUPE'S "FIRST EVANGELIST"  
MIGUEL SÁNCHEZ (1594–1674)**

*Martinus Cawley, O.C.S.O.\**

Introduction

What the fourth of July, 1776, means to the United States, the sixteenth of September, 1810, means to modern Mexico. The former date was marked by a Declaration of Independence, whose sonorous phrases on liberty and tyranny were seasoned with religious allusions as bold as the colonists' pluralism would allow. Mexico's *Grito de Dolores* was less urbane and remains unwritten, but the shabby banner then borrowed from the nearest parish sacristy evoked a unanimity shared by everyone in the land. There was nothing the Mexicans so agreed on as their love for what that banner represented: Our Lady of Guadalupe in her shrine at Tepeyac, Patroness of all New Spain since 1754.

William Taylor pointed out the importance of 1754—the year of the papal declaration of Guadalupan patronage for all territories administered from Mexico City. Prior to that, Guadalupe had been dear mainly to literate folk in the larger towns, who could travel or at least keep up with news about New Spain and who could afford copies of the Guadalupan image for their homes and fashionable churches. But in remote rural parishes, among the untraveled, unlettered peasants, Guadalupe was hardly known until her feast became a public

\*Father Martinus Cawley, O.C.S.O., a Trappist from Guadalupe Abbey, is a dedicated student of the history and influence of Guadalupe. This is the first of what will be a collection on Miguel Sánchez, his *criollo* patriotism, and his role in promoting the shrine of Guadalupe. Fr. Cawley's address is Trappist Abbey, P.O. 97, Lafayette, OR 97127.

holiday, with processions and dances and sermons everywhere to tell her story. Taylor's research shows that this public awareness began only in 1754.<sup>1</sup>

This does not falsify the tradition about Guadalupe's role in the early conversion of the Indians,<sup>2</sup> any more than scientific studies of the Great Flood (1629-34) exclude the belief that the city owed its recovery to this same protectress. As with many biblical narratives, we are simply invited to understand both traditions from a more comprehensive viewpoint.

In 1810, the boundaries of New Spain embraced many distinct ethnic groups, each of which had its own attitude toward national unity and toward Old Spain. The social elite, born and educated back on the Iberian Peninsula and popularly dubbed *gachupines*, were very loyal to the king but regarded New Spain with indifference, concerned only that the fulfillment of their colonial charges would lead eventually to comfortable positions back in Spain. Among the Indians, with no ancestral ties to Old Spain, loyalty was first to family, language group and local region. Of the many other ethnic groups, the one important for this study is termed the *criollos*—persons of entirely European ancestry, born and shaped in America, for whom New Spain, with its existing boundaries, was a beloved fatherland, whereas Old Spain, with its taxes and its favoritism to the *gachupines*, was a tyrant (as Britain had been to the Anglo-Saxon colonists to the north). It was among the *criollos* that the Mexican national consciousness was born, and it was mainly through their efforts that the Lady of Guadalupe was declared national patroness in 1754. However, more than a century of further effort was required before that patronage was unanimously accepted.

The key role of the *criollos* in promoting Guadalupe was classically expressed in 1945 by Francisco de la Maza (1913-72). He had found two "mirrors which the Colonials had built for themselves for gazing into and discovering who

<sup>1</sup>W. B. Taylor, "The Virgin of Guadalupe in New Spain . . .," *American Ethnologist* 14 (1987): 9-33.

<sup>2</sup>Donald Demarest and Coley Taylor, eds., *The Dark Virgin, the Book of Our Lady of Guadalupe: A Documentary Anthology* (Academy Guild Press, 1962, c1956), 9.

they were."<sup>3</sup> The first mirror was colonial architecture, but the second was religion—and here was the “story of Guadalupe.”<sup>4</sup> The *criollo* author to whom Maza gives greatest credit for “creating” that story is Miguel Sánchez (1594–1674), especially in his major work, the *Imagen* (1648).

Maza's ideas on Guadalupe are resumed and expanded in a work of the French scholar, Jacques Lafaye (*Quetzalcoatl and Guadalupe*, English translation, 1976). Lafaye speaks of a gradual “Mexicanization” of the Guadalupan Cult, “establishing a distance” between it and an older Guadalupe back in Spain. Like Maza, he traces this distancing to the *criollos*, especially to Sánchez.<sup>5</sup>

My approach differs in two ways from that of Maza and Lafaye. Their primary interest was the emergence of the Mexican national consciousness, and they looked to Sánchez as one of its many pioneers; however, my primary interest is Sánchez himself, and this article on his patriotism is the first of several that will form a kind of biography. Secondly, in studying Sánchez' patriotism, Maza and Lafaye consider almost exclusively his main work, the *Imagen*, whereas I examine at some length all his extant works to which I have had access (see Bibliography).

Although a brief biography might be helpful at this point, the data external to his writings are so sparse and ambiguous that it is impossible to say anything very noteworthy about his career. The overview of his major works will provide some insight into his personality. Sánchez was born in Mexico City about 1594, a child of a *criollo* family (which he hardly ever mentions). He was educated locally, and apparently studied for the priesthood at the Royal University of Mexico during the years preceding the dedication of the new shrine at Guadalupe in 1622. It was in those years also that he began the “fifty

<sup>3</sup>E de la Maza, *El Guadalupanismo Mexicano*. (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1986). The “key” chapter was published in 1949; the first complete edition in 1953.

<sup>4</sup>Maza, *El Guadalupanismo Mexicano*, 10.

<sup>5</sup>Jacques Lafaye, *Quetzalcoatl and Guadalupe: The Formation of Mexican National Consciousness* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 233–4.

years" of research on the devotion of which he later speaks. By 1640, his reputation for preaching was at its height, especially among *criollos*, and it was in that year that his first extant work, a sermon, appeared in print. His reputation was not solely as a preacher; he was universally admired for his holiness of life—ever refusing offers of prestigious positions, living in great poverty and immersed in study (especially of St Augustine).<sup>6</sup> (In a later article, I plan to explore the sources and means by which Sánchez gradually synthesized the Guadalupan traditions and wrote on the dignity which the shrine lent to the Mexican Church.) His main Guadalupan work, the *Imagen*, came out in 1648, but he did not find a financial backer for his more personal *Novenas* until 1665, at which time he was chaplain at Guadalupe's twin shrine, Los Remedios. The following year he collaborated with two members of his team, Francisco de Siles and Luis Becerra Tanco, in the famous Consultation which led—eighty-eight years later—to the declaration of Our Lady of Guadalupe as patroness of New Spain. Sánchez was never chaplain at Guadalupe, for he did not know the Nahuatl language of the Indians there; but he lived there in his retirement as a hermit, and he was buried there in 1674.

Sánchez' works are not presented here chronologically, but in a sequence which highlights his patriotism. First, I examine two explicitly Guadalupan works in which the peculiar format and audience evoke little expression of the *criollo* spirit; these are the juridical Consultation (1666), meant for the authorities in Rome, and the *Novenas* (1665), meant for private use by pilgrims of diverse background at either Guadalupe or Los Remedios. Next I comment on *David Seráfico* (1653), a work which, though not at all Guadalupan, is concerned with Our Lady and her Immaculate Conception and alludes with great pride to Sánchez' *alma mater*, the Royal University of Mexico. Then comes a very patriotic piece, not on Our Lady but on Mexico's protomartyr, Felipe de Jesús (d.1640). Last, I consider Sánchez' most patriotic statement on Guadalupe, the *Imagen* (1648).

<sup>6</sup>Antonio Robles, *Diario de sucesos notables, 1615-1703*, ed. by Antonio Castro Leal (Mexico: Editorial Porrúa, 1946), 22 Mar. 1674.

The Marian shrine of Guadalupe is located at Tepeyac Hill, just north of Mexico City, where roads branched out to all parts of New Spain. The site had long been sacred to the Aztec mother goddess. Its dedication to Our Lady occurred shortly after the Conquest when it was named for Guadalupe, a Spanish shrine dear to the *Conquistadores*. Its central cult object has ever been an image of the Virgin with insignia reminiscent of the "woman clothed with the sun" (Apoc. 12). Its reputation for miracles is well documented from the 1550s, and, as early as the 1580s, Spaniards spoke of its image as miraculous (*aparecida*)—just as they did of so many images in Spain.<sup>7</sup> Among the Indians, especially in the pueblo of Cuaútitlan, an early tradition connects the shrine's origin with two townsmen, Juan Diego and his uncle, Juan Bernardino.<sup>8</sup> This present article does not deal with the historicity of the events, but is limited to the role of Sánchez and to his patriotism. In my opinion, Sánchez' chief helper in gathering and synthesizing these traditions was the linguist and astronomer, Luis Becerra Tanco, who dated the apparition to 1531 and identified the bishop as Juan de Zumarraga.

In the synthesis of these traditions, which Sánchez and his friends brought together, Juan Diego is a recent convert to whom Our Lady appears at Tepeyac with a request to have the bishop build her a shrine. The bishop hesitates and the delay is complicated by an illness of the uncle. But then, though it is wintry December, Our Lady makes the barren hill bloom with Castilian flowers and directs Juan Diego to fill his *tilma* (cloak) with them, as a sign to convince the bishop to accede to her request. As Juan Diego presents the flowers, the greatest miracle of all occurs: Our Lady's image is imprinted on the *tilma*, which becomes the centerpiece of the new shrine.

The Spanish tradition was handed down mainly within family circles, with mention of healings enjoyed by relatives or friends; but it was also shared publicly in ex-votos, printed poems and woodcuts, sometimes with an allusion to the miracle

<sup>7</sup>J. Suárez de Peralta, *Tratado del descubrimiento de las Indias*, in J. García Gutierrez, *Primer Siglo Guadalupeño* (Mexico: San Ignacio de Loyola, 1945), cap. 41.

<sup>8</sup>García Gutierrez, *Primer Siglo*, 34–49.

of the roses. The Indian tradition was expressed mainly in sacred dramas, enacted annually at Tepeyac. Some of these included superb dialogues, which, happily, were preserved in an Aztec publication by the chaplain Luis Lasso de la Vega (1649) and in the Spanish document that Becerra Tanco submitted to the Consultation of 1666. In his *Imagen*, Sánchez himself, usually so wordy, somehow reduces these rich dialogues to the barest essentials. His associate, Francisco de Siles, in an account sent to Rome in 1663, not only telescopes the dialogues but also entirely omits the reference to the uncle which prompted one of them.

Secular historians, such as Maza and Lafaye, reject the historicity of such a miraculous origin for Guadalupe, just as they would the Gospel accounts of the virgin birth of Christ. But a surprising variety of scholarly devotees find this narrative a splendid way to express the mystery of Our Lady's presence and influence at Tepeyac. They find confirmation of the miraculous origin of the image in aspects of its remarkable coloring and preservation.<sup>9</sup> The question of historical origins is pre-scinded here, only to enter into the mind of Sánchez and to explore his patriotism.

### **Sánchez' Testimony at the Consultation of 1666**

When Sánchez published his *Imagen* in 1648, his friends not only applauded his account of the Spanish tradition known from their childhood, but they also expressed shame that no one had done it previously. An important step was moving the Shrine's liturgical feast (September 8) to the anniversary of the main miracle, December 12. Transferring a feast required that the local bishop request permission from Rome, but, in the mid-seventeenth century, Mexico City rarely had its own bishop in residence.

In 1663, however, under the lead of Siles, Rome was petitioned. A reply arrived in 1665, during yet another interregnum, asking for witnesses to substantiate the narrative Siles

<sup>9</sup>P. S. Callahan, *The Tilma under Infra-red Radiation* (Washington, DC: CARA, 1981), 18.

had sent. Siles promptly gained the consent of all concerned and himself set up an official consultation, a copy of whose minutes is extant and has been frequently published.<sup>10</sup> The first eight witnesses were interrogated at Cuaútitlan; these were prominent or elderly Indians, including two women. The remaining twelve, interrogated in the city, were mainly *criollos*, with Sánchez first among them and two laymen at the end.

In a future article I hope to treat each witness in detail but here, for the sake of simplicity, I omit the personal names and refer to each by profession and sequential number. I indicate the witnesses themselves by "w1, w2, . . . w20," and the item on the Questionnaire by "#1, #2, . . . #9." References to preliminary material at the head of the document are by date.<sup>11</sup>

The Questionnaire was not intended to allow "open" responses; the witnesses were asked to verify whether each item was true and to give some source for their conviction. But Siles did allow considerable leeway in the replies. Some witnesses used the opportunity to provide a rich range of further data, while others simply affirmed the statement, either as formulated by Siles or by the previous witness. Here our interest is with the impromptu replies, those supplying additional information. Our questions are, first, to what extent does patriotism enter into their discussion of Guadalupe, and, second, what impact has Guadalupe on the concept each witness has of his or her cultural identity?

<sup>10</sup>E. de la Torre Villar and R. Navarro de Anda, *Testimonios históricos Guadalupeños* (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1982), 1338.

<sup>11</sup>Maza treats the Consultation briefly, using the extracts in Florencia rather than the full text as published by Vera, and foregoing any detailed analysis (Maza, *Guadalupanismo*, 97-105). He mistakes Siles' narrative of 1663, summarized in the Questionnaire, for a simple copy of Sánchez' *Imagen* (ibid., 97), not noticing its unique presentation of the Spanish tradition and virtually complete omission of the Indian. Lafaye follows him in this (Lafaye, *Quetzalcoatl*, 253). Maza also says the Indian witnesses simply repeat the Questionnaire (ibid., 99-100), whereas all but one openly deny knowing the name cited for the Bishop, and all but two launch into Juan Bernardino material, totally absent from the Questionnaire. Many scholars share Maza's low esteem of the Consultation, since its unwieldy structure makes it hard to study without a computer. To my mind it is a priceless illustration of the twin traditions.



Because the last five witnesses gave almost identical testimony, we omit them in this article. Two of them (w16, w17) were interviewed on the Friday before Ash Wednesday and three the following Thursday (w18, w19, w20). Their unanimity suggests they were hastily interviewed in one another's presence. They do not simply agree to what has been said before—they do give some clarification, though they add nothing significant in relation to patriotism. With these five we can group "w11," a virtuous and pastoral-minded Franciscan provincial, who had given testimony alone some days previously. (Furthermore, since I am studying *criollo* patriotism, I will say little about the Indian witnesses).

Let me begin with "w13" and "w14," another pair seemingly testifying together. Both are religious and have served as provincial superiors. Both happen to be mentioned in the famous *Diary* of Gregorio de Guijo as serving on a committee set up by the current Viceroy, with whom they were well acquainted.<sup>12</sup> One respondent (w13) is very much a *criollo*, and his companion, though born and educated elsewhere, has been in New Spain for thirty-two long years. Although their testimony is largely identical with that of "w11" and "w12," their wording is often their own, and we are struck by the breadth of their perspective. As provincials and as friends of the viceroy, they have traveled much and can readily generalize on Guadalupanism in "all the houses" and "all the churches" throughout the realm. They think beyond the city, embracing New Spain as a whole—as would the Guadalupan Patronage of 1754.

The same is true of a Jesuit (w15) who had been at the core of a recent major dispute against his Order.<sup>13</sup> Yet his broad perspective is complemented with a local note: he is the first of the witnesses to mention Guadalupe's role in the Great Flood of 1629-34.

Even more deeply rooted in local lore is an Augustinian (w12), who seems never to have risen above the rank of provincial councillor. His testimony stresses his family's long

<sup>12</sup>G. M. de Guijo, *Diario, 1648-1664* (Mexico: Editorial Porrúa, 1946-1952), vol. 1: July 1661, etc.; Index: Juan de Herrera, Pedro de San Simón.

<sup>13</sup>Guijo, *Diario*, Index: Diego de Monroy.

involvement with the city. He recounts many anecdotes about the shrine and incidents which occurred during the transfer of the image from the old church to the new. He speaks of the height of the flood waters in 1629-34, of ceremonies using pontifical regalia, of artists who refused to copy the image without first receiving the sacraments. He does not answer when asked to deny the image has been retouched, perhaps aware of the tamperings (as suggested by some scholars).<sup>14</sup>

This *criollo* Augustinian, so steeped in local lore, reminds us of the Indian witnesses at Cuaútitlan, whose talk is all of local landmarks, local officials, local pilgrimages. One of them, aged eighty-five, has never even traveled the twelve miles to Guadalupe (w4—#3, #6). Their perspective hardly extends to the whole "realm of New Spain" (*reino de Nueva España*), and they scarcely think of themselves as "the Indians of New Spain." They do not even see themselves as part of a language group but simply as part of a *pueblo* and *barrio*. The bond relating them to Guadalupe through Juan Diego is not based on a common race or language or even kinship; rather it is because they are part of the same village and have shared in the same projects of building and maintenance and celebration at Tepeyac.

Among the *criollo* witnesses besides Sánchez (w9), there remains just one eighty-five-year-old Dominican (w10), almost as devoted to the Shrine as Sánchez. This old man's interest in Guadalupe dates back over sixty years (w10—#4) and has continued even while serving in churches outside the capital. He found Guadalupanism wherever he turned (w10—#7). In his enthusiasm, he conducted little experiments to test his thesis that the image looked more beautiful each time he viewed it (w10—#6). He cites various details not mentioned in the Questionnaire (w10 *passim*). It appears that he is familiar with Sánchez' *Imagen* and may have had contact with some of its sources (v.g., w10—#3). He is the only witness to give Guadalupe the epithet *La Criolla*, obviously to distinguish the Mexican shrine from the Spanish (w10—#3). Again, he is the only one to tell us that God granted the event of Guadalupe to "this New World of the Indies" for "the universal consolation

<sup>14</sup>Callahan, *Tilma*, 18-19.

of the Catholics thereof and for the total and stable conversion of the Natives thereof" (w10—#4)—opinions surely shared by Sánchez, Siles and their whole circle.

Sánchez' own testimony (w9) is as enthusiastic as ever, but the juridical setting and format inhibit his use of the Baroque and biblical language and imagery in which he is most comfortable. He quietly asserts that no other shrine in the realm has ever been as much frequented as Guadalupe (w9—#8), and that the divine purpose in providing it was "for the widespread consolation of this realm and of all who frequent it" (w9—#5). He alludes repeatedly to his more than fifty years of research into its history (w9—#1, Gen—#2). Other *criollo* witnesses mention their family as the source of their knowledge of Guadalupe; the sources Sánchez cites are simply "persons of quality, nobility and letters in times past . . . , elderly, aged persons" (w9—#2). His *criollo* patriotism is distinct from family loyalty.

The Consultation of 1666 adds little to our acquaintance with Sánchez' patriotism. Its merit lies rather, as Maza failed to perceive, in its vivid illustration of the *criollo* tradition, as it existed before the *Imagen* was published. This tradition is represented most vividly by the old Dominican and the middle-ranking Augustinian (w10 and w12), both enthusiastic *criollos*.

### Patriotism in the *Novenas* of 1665

We pass now to the most personal of Sánchez' extant writings, his *Novenas*. If the Consultation left little room for patriotism because of its format, the *Novenas* did the same because they were intended for pilgrims of both Guadalupe and Los Remedios, regardless of race or place of birth. Though published only in 1665, a draft was almost ready to print as early as 1647 (*Imagen*: Commendations/Lasso).

The *Novenas* are a set of meditations for private use over the course of nine consecutive days, at either of the two shrines. Each day has three meditations: morning, afternoon and night. The daytime pieces (morning and afternoon) are devoid of any reference to the history of either shrine and follow a pattern of their own (Prep, IV). On each of the nine days, one of the

nine Choirs of Angels is considered, to show how the faithful can become "companions and disciples" of that choir. Appropriate Biblical stories are taken up within the daytime meditations, largely from the Old Testament; these flow over into the nighttime meditations and mingle with the stories of the shrines themselves.

Earthly patriotism is hardly expected in a work so centered on heavenly spirits. Unlike saints who once had bodies, angels have no tangibility to confine them to any principal shrine. Their only bond with any territory is as guardians. So, too, Our Lady—assumed into heaven and leaving no bodily remnants—can serve as protectress for any place. In the New World, which does not yet have local saints and relics of its own, she fits in with special appropriateness.

Patriotic themes are rare in the *Novenas* (one of the reasons that Maza largely ignores this work).<sup>15</sup> The closest Sánchez here comes to patriotism is when he calls Mexico City *nobilísima* and the "imperial city of this New World," and when he describes either shrine as "a Paradise" (*Nov*: Dedic.). A preliminary letter from Siles goes further, declaring Mexico *felicísima* among all the cities of Christendom (*Nov*: Siles). These rare praises are offset in the concluding meditations with words on the city as a "Babylon of captivity, traffic, bustle and confusion" (Append. III); it is even a *Sodom, nefanda y peligrosa* (a Sodom, unmentionable and dangerous [Append. IV]).

Nevertheless, the *Novenas* show some patriotism in the positive sense they give to certain terms characteristic of the New World. The term "New World" itself is usually purely geographic, its most emotion-laden use coming as a quasi-apostrophe honoring the little statue of Los Remedios, imported to America by the *Conquistadores*: "Who better than Mary could teach the love of God? Let the New World answer, that New World whither She came, furrowing seas and capturing armies to win souls . . . !" (Day 9, night).

The terms México, *mexicano* are used rarely and without much patriotic emotion, but Sánchez does juxtapose "our Mexican Guadalupe" and its "pathway and hillcountry" with

<sup>15</sup>Maza, *Guadalupanismo*, 55-56.

the "hillcountry of Judea" (Lk. 1:39—Day 8, night). Sánchez never uses here the strongly patriotic term, *criollo*, but Siles, in a preliminary letter to the saintly archbishop, Cuevas Davalos, uses a polite equivalent, calling the prelate the first "son of the city" to hold so high a rank, previously deemed "inaccessible" to the locally born.

The term *conquistador* is held in honor, especially when applied to Cortés. Sánchez sets Cortés alongside the biblical Barak (Jgs. 4 & 5) and laments that "the times" so "envy" Cortés as "scarcely to recall his memory" (Day 5, night). The indigenous character of Juan Diego and of his counterpart at Los Remedios is frequently mentioned, but even the strongest mention (Day 3, night) is only feebly patriotic, and does not refer to *criollo* patriotism. The two seers' ethnic origin is simply an item, listed among the traits they have in common. Sánchez never addresses his readers with any polite patriotic vocative, such as *Méxicanos* or *Americanos*—not even as *Hermanos* or *Cristianos*, but simply (some fifteen times) as *fieles*: a general term for all "faithful" believers of any origin, rank, age or sex.

Later generations considered Guadalupe a shrine for *criollos* and Indians, leaving Los Remedios largely to the Peninsular-born. Sánchez never mentions such differing clienteles, but he does note another traditional contrast: Guadalupe, associated with the "sun," is the place to pray in time of flood; Los Remedios, linked with the *noche triste* and the "moon," is the place for times of drought (Day 7, night). But again, there is no trace of patriotism.

The nine days of the *Novenas* are dedicated to the nine choirs of angels: each day there is a new choir of *compañeros y maestros* (companions and teachers). These two terms are ubiquitous in the *Novenas*. We may be surprised that a Marian devotion was so closely associated with the angels, but at that time "Queen of the Angels" was a common Marian title at both Los Remedios and Guadalupe.<sup>16</sup> If the "companionship" Sánchez longed for was that of the invisible angels, what pa-

<sup>16</sup>See, e.g., Guijo, *Diario*, 17-20 June 1653 and 14 June-3 July 1661; Consultation of 1666: w9—gen; w10—#3; w12—#2.

triotic interest had he in the company of his fellow *criollos*? I suggest he exalted patriotism because of his love and compassion for his countrymen who, because their self-esteem had been wounded, needed to see their love of homeland sanctioned and "baptized."<sup>17</sup>

The *Novenas* are a spiritual work, in which spiritual kinship with an angel can be mentioned, but allusions to human family and ancestry would be out of place, as would references to earthly patriotism. But, in another work, dealing with his relation to his *alma mater*, the Royal University of Mexico, we gain a glimpse of his patriotism from another angle.

### *David Seráfico* (1653)

The *David Seráfico* is not at all a Guadalupan work and is only indirectly Marian. Its genre, strange to a modern reader, was popular at the time; such pieces served as a type of souvenir for Mexico's many week-long pageants in honor of religious or secular events. On this occasion the event was the Royal University's renewal of an oath to defend the Immaculate Conception.<sup>18</sup> The oath was requested by an official representative (*visitator*) from Spain, Pedro de Galvez. He thought Mexico's university should renew such oaths annually, as was done in the homeland; but soon after his departure, the annual repetitions ceased (doubtless, in view of the expense).<sup>19</sup>

Sánchez makes no reference to Galvez' request; instead, he highlights an oath taken earlier by the University (back in 1619), presumably while he was a student there (4v). He alludes repeatedly to two recent attacks on the Immaculate Conception and sees the pageant as an act of "defense" against them (4r, 18v). He never indicates the authors, titles or

<sup>17</sup>There is also Sánchez' love for his personal patron, Michael the Archangel. In other works, he mentions Michael almost as readily as his great teacher, Augustine, but in the *Novenas*, most allusions to Michael are in the introductions or the appendices (Siles; Dedic.; Prep. III, bis; Day 2, afternoon; Final IV).

<sup>18</sup> This event is more soberly described in Guijo, *Diario*, 18-19 Jan. 1653.

<sup>19</sup> Guijo, *Diario*, 17-18 Jan. 1654; 20 Jan. 1655.

arguments of the attacks, and he marshals no evidence against them. He simply presents his *alma mater*, drawn up in battle array, and extols her in biblical language.

Although he ignores Galvez' allusion to the example of the universities in Spain, Sánchez does refer to a recent book, the *Armamentarium virginis*, which lists universities that have taken the oath. To his dismay, this book fails to mention the Mexican establishment which, Sánchez insists, was chronologically one of the first to pledge (4v), and perhaps the first to renew the oath with solemnity (18v; 26r), and to promise a voluntary annual renewal (27v).

A major feature of the pageant was the solemn welcoming of a copy of the *Armamentarium* (20v). Despite its silence on his *alma mater*, Sánchez compares it with the heavenly book of the Apocalypse, which the Lamb alone is worthy to open (Apoc. 5:1-5). Its authors are all Franciscan, and so it is appropriate that St. Francis and his friars carry it in procession. St. Francis, of course, is represented in the processional statue of him carried by his friars (11v). Within the pageant, Sánchez honors each processional contingent by linking it to some biblical person or group. He pays tribute at length to the Franciscans, longtime advocates of the Immaculate Conception, whose principal teacher on this topic, Duns Scotus, appears in another processional statue. The whole Franciscan brotherhood, including tertiaries, reminds Sánchez of David dancing before the Ark. St. Francis, thus corporately personified, is a new David and, indeed, a "Seraphic David," in allusion to the traditional Seraph who imprinted the stigmata of Christ on his limbs on Mt. Alvernia (7r-14v; cf. II Sam. 6).

At the house of the Jesuits, the procession is joined by other university personnel. Sánchez sees this as a meeting of "seraphic" and "cherubic" choirs (12v). There is nothing patriotic about such choirs, but, at the cathedral, where the secular clergy join the procession, Sánchez' logic shifts. The cathedral clergy, including himself, form a choir not of angels but of elders, from that most patriotic town, Bethulia. They come out to meet the *David Seráphico* and also their own triumphant Judith, personified in a processional statue of the Immaculate Conception (13r; cf. Jdt. 13:14-16).

Even this patriotism is feeble and not specific to the *criollos*. It pales beside Sánchez' love for his favorite saints. St. Michael appears only in the preliminary letter of his friend, Juan de Poblete, but references to St. Augustine occur in at least fourteen passages. Although Augustine is not represented in the procession by any group or statue, it is he who offers Sánchez the four key Davidic texts around which the whole work is organized (1r, 2v, 7, 14v).

Sánchez, who at this time was not yet an Oratorian, says nothing of St. Philip Neri. But he was very much part of the Confraternity of St. Peter, and he happily reports that, before today's procession, the members had renewed their own oath. January 18 was the feast of St. Peter's Chair at Rome, and Sánchez takes the liberty to compare Peter's chair with the doctrinal "chairs" of the university (14r).

Sánchez regrets that the renewal of the oath no longer takes place in the favorite chapel of his days as a student, St. Catherine's (25r).<sup>20</sup> He accepts the main hall as the place for this renewal because the image of the Immaculate Conception was kept there and the inscription under it was composed by a *criollo* poet. Sánchez may have remembered the competition in which that poetic inscription was chosen, and he may have admired the winner, not only as poet but also scholar. Yet nowhere does his patriotism lead him to mention his *alma mater's* outstanding teachers. He refers to the university's five departments as the five stones David had ready for use against any Goliath that would deny the Immaculate Conception (6rv). Sánchez says little of the Mass preceding the renewal of the oath, but he notes its harmonious interchange, so like that of angelic choirs (18v) and of the liturgy of the Apocalypse (31r).

The *David Seráfico* certainly reflects Sánchez' love for his *alma mater* and his native archdiocese and city. He resents the failure to extol their doctrinal orthodoxy. But, apart from the *criollo* poet of the inscription below the image of the Immaculate Conception, he mentions no officers of the university or of the cathedral. He manifests an eager patriotism, indeed, but

<sup>20</sup> This patroness of philosophers is mentioned also at the end of the *Imagen*, in a colophon naming her his personal *magistra*.



on a level far beneath his all-consuming love for the angels and saints (whom he shares even with Spain).

### The Sermon for San Felipe de Jesús (1640)

This sermon, Sánchez' earliest extant work, treats the *criollo* protomartyr, Felipe de Jesús, and is also the one most consciously addressed to a *criollo* audience. It is a sermon preached for a widow taking the veil on the feast of Felipe de Jesús (a young Franciscan shipwrecked in Japan and martyred in 1597); in 1640, this feast (February 5) occurred on Sexagesima Sunday. Thus the sermon weaves together biblical texts appropriate to all three themes: the widow's espousal to Christ, the martyr's crucifixion in Japan, and the Sunday Gospel's parable of the Sower. The sermon also includes a passage which Maza sees as an allusion to Guadalupe, and its "Dedication" tells of Sánchez' plans for the *Imagen*.

We do not know why Sánchez was invited to preach for this veiling ceremony. The widow may have been associated with him, but she may also have been related to the wealthy dean of the cathedral to whom the work is dedicated. Modern readers will be shocked at the scant attention given the widow and the utter silence about her deceased husband and any children they may have had. In sharp contrast with this, the wealthy dean is honored with four pages full of heraldry, poetry and Baroque prose. The title page names him in large print, while the widow and the convent are named in tiny letters at the foot of the page.

Convention perhaps forbade personal allusions to the widow or to her proverbial loneliness, but one would at least have expected more to be said on St. Francis, whose Rule she was embracing (6r), and on the Immaculate Conception, for which the cloister was named. One convention of which Sánchez was always aware was the avoidance of flattery (*lisonja*). Clerical conversation avoided flattery by playing a range of acceptable games. It was not considered flattery to pun on someone's name or to allude to a biblical reference for his profession. Disciplined poetry was also acceptable, especially in Latin. Sánchez offers his benefactor all such honors,

but does not even name the poor widow. He does offer her a list of womanly virtues to practice, a list striking enough in itself but enumerated too rapidly for the ear to absorb (15v). As he weaves allegories around the biblical widow Ruth (4r-5r, 9v, 15v) and presents Eve as the quasi-widow of the sleeping, quasi-dead Adam, Sánchez appears to appeal to the widow's heart (16r). He certainly moves her when he offers her a personal bond with Felipe de Jesús. Just as Ruth's kinsman had to renounce his rights and surrender his sandal for Boaz to espouse her, so the *criollo* Felipe, already unshod as a Discalced Franciscan, now offers this widow to Christ as Bride (5r).

Compassion for her bereavement was probably the last thing the widow had in mind in choosing this feastday and this preacher. The keynote she desired was probably the very one he struck. She would applaud his dedicating Felipe's praises to the high-ranking dean, especially when she saw the opening word of that dedication: "Mexico . . . would blame me if I dedicated this" to anyone else (3r). She would likewise thrill to hear the references to patriotism, as the preacher cited St Jerome and others on the dignity of love of the homeland. Above all she would applaud his bold desire not to be a *criollo* so that his praises of Felipe might ring the more true (4r). Her ears were attuned not for kind words about herself, but for links between the saint and the fatherland she loved, such as the following: "I am addressing you, oh most fortunate child of Mexico; you, the richest discovery among all her *criollos*; you, the most blessed son of our whole fatherland!" (13r). She would be equally delighted when, amid a complicated allegory about Jesus calling Zachaeus down from his tree, Sánchez addresses Felipe as "Oh, my Indian Jesús! Oh, my valiant Felipe!" (11v).

Sánchez' *criollo* patriotism implies no disdain of Old Spain. He lets the name Felipe echo that of Philip, the King of "All the Spains" (Philip IV, 1621-65: 9r). The new nun could only feel honored, when Sánchez grouped her with all the widowed queens of Old Spain, on whom the early Councils of Syracuse enjoined a cloistered consecration similar to her own (16r).

Sánchez is aware that Felipe has been attacked by the devil's advocates among the non-*criollos*, and so he rehearses and

refutes their allegations of cowardice, citing an official chronicle and drawing his defense from Scripture (13r-15r). The objectors are new Nathaniels, doubting that "any good can come from Nazareth;" but a new *criollo* Philip answers, as of old: "Come and see!" (Jn. 1:46; 13v).

Sánchez also compares the *criollos* to the persecuted children of the Woman of the Apocalypse (Apoc. 12:17; 13v). The language is dense and the pronouns shift, but the sense seems close to the following: "Mexico, my Fatherland, are you that Woman whom John saw as a portent in the far reaches of the sky? That woman with her luminaries around her? And pregnant with a son inside her? Yes, to a large extent you seem to be: she has your eagle wings; there is a dragon after her, who takes advantage of your waters. And when she—or you—linger still in heaven with the one son, is not the dragon intent to drag you down from there? And what happens to your other sons, those down on the earth?"

Sánchez answers this question by saying that each of the Woman's children suffers the same blow as did the composite statue in Daniel 2:31-35. A stone is thrown, which does not harm the metal parts of the statue, but only the "earthenware feet" (*los pies de tierra*, lit. "feet of earth/land"). "The whole plot is against the poor earth/land. . . . All the statue's misfortune lies in its feet of earth/land. In a stone, it is always presumed to be a major defect that it be from this land" (14r). The syntax becomes even more complex, and the imagery more baroque; Sánchez seems to be alluding to the endless flow of silver and tribute money from New to Old Spain (one of his rare allusions to the *criollos'* socio-economic situation!).

In pointing to the Woman of Apocalypse 12, does Sánchez mean to suggest the image of Guadalupe? With Maza,<sup>21</sup> I believe he does, just as when, at the end of the "Dedication," he apologizes for so slight a gift and offers his benefactor the hope of another one soon to come, "fuller and more worthy," about "the Second Eve in our Shrine of Guadalupe." If he did have Guadalupe in mind in this allusion to the Apocalyptic Woman, the good widow surely understood.

<sup>21</sup> Maza, *Guadalupanismo*, 50.

### The Guadalupan *Imagen* (1648)

The *Imagen* is both the longest of Sánchez' works and the most difficult to cite. Its chapters are not numbered and its headings are wordy. Subsections are marked off, sometimes with subtitles, sometimes with only a gap in the print. We can cite the pagination of the primitive edition, but only its ninety-six central leaves are numbered and not even these divisions are noted in the modern editions.<sup>22</sup> My own references will be to chapter headings, encapsulated in a key word, along with mention of a subtitle where applicable, separated by a slash. I have also created a few subtitles where—although there is not even a space in the type—there is a very real change in genre (e.g., the all-important "Epilogue" at the end of the chapter on the *Milagros*, to which I refer with the signal *Milagros/Epilogue*).

The plan of the *Imagen* is based on the language of painters. Like any image, that of Guadalupe reproduces an *original*, which Sánchez identifies as the tableau of the heavenly Woman in Apocalypse 12, and not only the tableau as seen "in heaven," but also the ensuing drama as continued "on earth." So he captions his first title with a long phrase, beginning with *Original* . . . Any image likewise has its *dibujo* (outline or sketch), bearing the pattern but lacking the color and shading of the original and of the final painting. Guadalupe's *dibujo* is not a tableau; it is the drama of the conquest and evangelization of Mexico, which Sánchez narrates, using phrases from Apocalypse 12. So he captions this chapter *Misterioso dibujo*. An image also has its *descubrimiento* (discovery), and Guadalupe's is at once a drama and a concrete tableau. The drama is Sánchez' story of the apparitions, while the miracle of the tilma provides the tableau. Sánchez, of course, adds characteristic biblical parallels at every turn. An image also has its *pincel* . . . *que* . . . *retoca* (brush for touching up) the detail. For Guadalupe, this is Sánchez' visual scrutiny of the image of Tepeyac and his comments upon it, phrased once more in

<sup>22</sup> Maza meets this problem by giving no references at all, while Lafaye cites page numbers without telling what edition he uses (Lafaye, *Quetzalcoatl*, 326-7, nn. 23-54).

terms of Apocalypse 12. An image must be hung in its place, and Guadalupe has its *colocación* (placement). This is followed by a *descripción* of its primitive chapel and of the building which replaced it (already in Sánchez' time). There follow a few sample *milagros* (miracles), traditionally attributed to Guadalupe. At the end are some general comments and the epilogue (for which I created subtitles).

This entire composition is sandwiched between some letters, four at the beginning and three at the end. Of the opening four, two are official approbations from the state and the Church, one is Sánchez' "Dedication," and the last is his prefatory *Fundamento*, addressed to the reader. The three at the end are chosen from among several letters of commendation, addressed to Sánchez by admiring friends.<sup>23</sup>

The modern commentators stress Sánchez' motivation for writing: "They all moved me: my fatherland, fellows, companions, city folk, citizens of this New World. Unschooled though I was for such an undertaking, they all thought it better that I boldly expose myself than allow it to seem that everyone had fallen into shameful oblivion of such an Image, of a relic so rooted in this land as to be its own primitive *criolla*" (*Milagros/Epilogue*).<sup>24</sup> Sánchez connects the eagle of Mexico City's coat-of-arms with the eagle of Apocalypse 12 (*Dibujo/aquillae*).<sup>25</sup> (Edwin E. Sylvest, Jr., stresses the Guadalupan adaptation of the Mexican coat-of-arms used in a logo at the head of the 1648 edition.)<sup>26</sup>

Maza points out that Sánchez compares the angels preparing the clay for God to form Adam with the *conquistadores* preparing Mexico for Guadalupe: "... the good thing about the conquest of this land was that, in it, the Virgin Mary was to

<sup>23</sup> Maza cites some 30 texts from the *Imagen*, and Lafaye some 16. Both stress one text, about Adam as "image of God." This ends up boldly asserting that God's aim in bringing about the Conquest was largely so that the Guadalupan Image might appear in Mexico (*Dibujo/intro*: Maza, *Guadalupanismo*, 56-57; Lafaye, *Quetzalcoatl*, 249, 251).

<sup>24</sup> Maza, *Guadalupanismo*, 53; Lafaye, *Quetzalcoatl*, 251.

<sup>25</sup> Maza, *Guadalupanismo*, 70-71.

<sup>26</sup> E. E. Sylvest, Jr., *Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe* (Dallas, TX: Bridwell Library, 1992), 17.

make her appearance in her holy Image of Guadalupe. It was this which enabled the men to sing so wholeheartedly of victory" (*Dibujo/Michael*).<sup>27</sup>

Maza, who regarded Sánchez as a pioneer in the development of the Mexican national consciousness, is sensitive to the passages alluding to socio-economic prejudice against the *criollos*. For instance, Sánchez laments that Mexico's gold and silver and its best products are always sent abroad to enrich others, while the very persons thus impoverished are also slandered (*Dibujo/flumine*).<sup>28</sup> Sánchez ministered to such griefs in terms of Guadalupe:

... all the labors, all the pains, everything distasteful that comes to Mexico, is forgotten and healed, made up for and relieved, once there appears in this land ... that likeness of God, that image of God, which is Mary in her holy Image at our Mexican Guadalupe. ... Those born in the land conquered by her ... can be happily reassured to see themselves accompanied by the Image of Mary, appearing so as to defend them from the Dragon ... (*Dibujo/semine*).

With St. Bernard, he also consoles the *criollos* with the words of the bridegroom in the Canticle of Canticle about flowers appearing in "our" land. Christ not only becomes man; he also adopts a land, boasting that flowers (not the sun, moon, or the stars) have appeared in "our" land. The flowers of Guadalupe enable the Mexicans to claim brotherhood (a family relationship) with Mary, since, in those flowers and in her image, she is born anew, born now in the same city as they. Their land, her land, is itself a most loving mother to her and to them, her brothers (and sisters) (*Píncel /solitudinem*).

At the end of his work, Sánchez, escorted by Augustine, approaches the seer of the Apocalypse to offer him the Guadalupean image. Their words echo those of Christ on the cross (Jn. 19:27): "Behold your mother; behold her Guadalupean image; behold her, fragrant in her miracle; behold the consolation

<sup>27</sup> Maza, *Guadalupanismo*, 57.

<sup>28</sup> Maza, *Guadalupanismo*, 51-53.

of this local Christendom; behold the protectress of the poor; behold the medicine of the sick; behold the relief of the afflicted; behold the advocate of the troubled; behold the honor of Mexico City; behold the glory of all believing inhabitants of this New World" (*Milagros /Epilogue*).

Maza and Lafaye read the *Imagen* as a prelude to the "nationalistic, patriotic and even subversive" literature that inspired the events of 1810, and as the very beginning of a "revolution," even a "Copernican revolution."<sup>29</sup> Both ask how much Sánchez' readers perceived of this "subversive" tendency in his work. In the letters attached to it, both find sympathetic awareness to support their views.<sup>30</sup> However, two factors suggest they overstate this "subversive" character.

First, while Sánchez' readers surely enjoyed the endless allegories in which he couched his *criollo* speculations, it is doubtful that any of them remembered the details afterwards. Indeed, two contemporaries were eager to rid the Guadalupe story of such literary developments. In 1660, the Jesuit Mateo de la Cruz re-published the *Imagen*, shorn of all Baroque elements. In 1666, Luis Becerra Tanco, the Nahuatl scholar who, in my opinion, supplied many of Sánchez' sources, explicitly dismissed use of such adornments in his own account of Guadalupe.<sup>31</sup>

Then, in the letters Maza and Lafaye do not cite, I find little *criollo* concern. The first merely evokes thanks from "all New Spain" for a book long overdue (*Aprobación/Rozas*). The second, written by the Nahuatl-speaking chaplain, merely calls Sánchez "the most fortunate *criollo* of our whole nation," for whose pen Mary has reserved this task (Commendations /Lasso).

Last of all, it seems to me that Maza and Lafaye exaggerate the difference between the Guadalupan faith of Sánchez' contemporaries and that of such men of the previous century as Bernal

<sup>29</sup> Maza, *Guadalupanismo*, 72; Lafaye, *Quetzalcoatl*, 250, 249, 251.

<sup>30</sup> *Aprobación*; Poblete and Commendations; Barcenas in Maza, *Guadalupanismo*, 56, 73; Commendations: Siles, in Lafaye, *Quetzalcoatl*, 251-253.

<sup>31</sup> L. Becerra Tanco, *Origen milagroso del santuario* (Mexico, 1666) *Prólogo*.

Díaz del Castillo<sup>32</sup> and Archbishop Montúfar.<sup>33</sup> These latter focus, not on the miraculous origin of the image, but on the miracles of healing and the emergence of a miracle shrine at a frontier city, both of which show the city as coming of age and being the spiritual equal of cities in Spain. Although Sánchez says little about contemporary miracles at Guadalupe, that does not mean his fellow *criollos* were not interested in them. Belief in Guadalupe as a place of healing ennobles the believer, whether or not the origin of the image is considered. Indeed, too great a stress on the miraculous origin can lead to forgetting Our Lady's concern for little people's needs.

More of Sánchez' praises of Mexico could be listed, but these would do little to clarify his *criollo* patriotism. A surer guide lies in studying his vocabulary as he speaks of his *patria* and his compatriots, especially if we juxtapose his patriotism with the other great loves of his life. Most of his statements about Mexico are playful allegories, soon forgotten by his hearers, but the habitual vocabulary of so popular a preacher could establish patterns of expression with lasting significance. An example is the use of the word *criollo*. Sánchez is strangely reluctant to use it as a simple masculine term to name his compatriots, yet he will use it of Our Lady. Of nine uses in the *Imagen*, a surprising seven are in the feminine: for Our Lady, for her garb, for the biblical Noemi, *criolla* of Bethlehem (*Milagros/Remedios*). Of the two masculine uses, one is a half-joking compliment in a letter (Commendations /Lasso) and the other is forced on Sánchez by his need for a synonym after using his habitual phrase: "those born in my Fatherland, the *criollos* of this New World" (*Pincel/coelo*). His habitual phrases are "those born in this land" (3 times), or "born in it" (3 times), or "born in this New World" (twice), or "born in this city" (once). This term, *los nacidos*, and the abstract, *la nación* (8 times), became dear to future nationalists!

<sup>32</sup> B. Díaz del Castillo, *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la nueva España*, cc. 150 and 210.

<sup>33</sup> A. Montúfar, Information. . . 1556, passim. For the text and the complicated history of the editions, see E. Torre Villar and R. Navarro de Anda, *Testimonio Históricos Guadalupeños* (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1982).



Other alternatives to *criollo* are "sons of this land" (4 times), "sons of the *Conquistadores*" (once) and, more remarkably, "sons of the Virgin of Guadalupe" (4 times). Of course, the correlative for the "sons" is the "Fatherland," a term used sixteen times in the *Imagen* proper, and seven more times in the letters of Siles and Barcenas. Usually, it is "the" *patria* (11 times) or "my" *patria* (8 times); but three times it is "Our Lady's" *patria* (*Colocación*, *Milagros/flood*; *Commendations/Siles*).

Sánchez almost never calls his *patria* by its official name, *Nueva España*. His one use of this term is purely geographical—from Tepeyac, highways lead off to all parts of "New Spain" (*Descripción*). Another use of the term is found in the text of the attached letter which expresses the concern for the *criollos* (*Aprobación/Rozas*). Sánchez' circle seems to be moving away from this name, as it stresses the link of their *patria* with Old Spain. Instead, they use *Nuevo Mundo* (20 times). One of Sánchez' friends also uses the synonym, *Nuevo Orbe* (*Aprobación/Poblete*).

Even dearer to Sánchez' *criollo* heart is the term *México*, which strictly names just the city but taken more loosely embraces the whole region where the *mexicana* language is spoken. Half of Sánchez' forty-eight or more uses of *México* are wide open and can mean not just the city and region but the whole "realm," that realm whose official name, *Nueva España*, he dislikes. Also, when speaking of his *patria*, he can mean at once the city and the whole *Nuevo Mundo* administered from it. One would expect him to enjoy naming his compatriots *mexicanos*, but he avoids this epithet with the same strange consistency as he does *criollos*, except when naming *mexicana*-speaking Indians (*Dibujo/signum*). However, he readily uses the feminine, *mexicana*, just as he does the feminine, *criolla*; indeed, he even uses the masculine, *mexicano*, if its noun is impersonal, as in a favorite expression of his, *nuestro mexicano Guadalupe*.

Sánchez uses *nuestro mexicano Guadalupe* seven times in the *Imagen* and once in the *Novenas* (Day 8, night). His friend Barcenas also uses it once. It is a phrase which quietly evokes the Spanish Guadalupe and sets it aside for the local one. Sánchez' one explicit mention of the older Guadalupe is

tucked into the obscure middle of a list of shrines (*Fundamento*). I suggest the phrase *nuestro mexicano Guadalupe* has community-building force, like that of the terms used within religious orders and confraternities, which name their patron saint as "our Father Saint N." Not yet an Oratorian in 1648, Sánchez is already a fervent member of the Confraternity of St Peter, readily naming the Prince of the Apostles *nuestro Padre San Pedro* (*Pincel/coelo*: 3 times). He uses equivalent expressions when naming members of the Augustinian and Franciscan Orders (*Pincel/stellarum*; *Descubrimiento/Primera*). As for the Jesuits, who probably taught him as a boy, he fondly calls their Society *nuestra madre* (*Dibujo/aquilae*).

If Sánchez was so reserved about the old Guadalupe, what was his attitude to Old Spain in general? Of his four references, three appear to refer to the power of the Spanish king. He twice uses "All the Spains," as a synonym for the Spanish Empire. He uses *españoles* only twice, both times referring to the *conquistadores* in conflict with the *mexicanos*. Although the crown and the *conquistadores* receive his enthusiastic support, he never names specific individuals in Spain, or Spaniards living in Mexico, whom less gracious *criollos* called *gachupines*. He may mean to include these in the generic word *moradores* ("inhabitants," used four times), but they do not fit his term "sons of the land."

Sánchez' loyalty to the king is shown in two short texts (*Dibujo/sole* and *Pincel/sole*). In the first, after a reference to Venantius Fortunatus, a Christian poet of Roman Spain, he mentions the reigning monarch, Philip IV, and exclaims: "Oops! There goes the name, leaping from heart to mouth! So I take these verses and with all my heart I dedicate them to him under the title of 'Sun.' I do it in the name of my fatherland and of all its lowly folk, of whom I am the lowliest." In the second text, after citing Aristotle on gold in the mines of a land called "Philippi," which he identifies as "a land of Spain's Catholic monarchy, a land of those Philips of glorious memory, a land of Philip the Great. May the Heavens prosper him for ages on end, for it is he who governs her this day and gives her joy, he whom it is her pleasure to love and to obey with all veneration. . . ." This esteem for Philip IV, whose performance as a

ruler was most incompetent, is evidence of his goodwill toward the monarchy.

Besides the Spanish monarchs, Sánchez steadfastly honors the great hero of the *criollos*, Fernando Cortés, captain of the *conquistadores*. He identifies Cortés as Michael, leader of the angels (*Dibujo/Michael*). In the *Novenas*, Sánchez compared Cortés with Debora's Barak and blamed later generations for not honoring him enough (Day 5, night). The conquest itself is mentioned thirteen times in the *Imagen*, and the honors paid the *conquistadores* (5 times) are crowned by naming Our Lady their "assistant *conquistadora*" (3 times: *Descubrimiento/primeria*; *Pincel/mulier*; *Milagros/Remedios*).

The merit of the Conquest lies in its "glorious purpose" (*Dibujo/intro.*), namely, the "conversion of this New World" (11 times). The conversion brings the Indians from their *gentilidad* (gentile paganism: 11 times), into the fold of *cristiandad*. This term thrice is preceded by the article *la cristiandad* (all Christendom). Thrice it has a demonstrative adjective—"this New Christendom" (*aquesta, esta, aquella cristiandad*). There are also the noun *cristianos* (twice) and the adjective *cristiana* (3 times). The synonym *católica* is reserved for the Spanish monarchy (twice), or the Faith (once). The other synonym, *evangélica*, is used twice of "the Gospel Light" and once of the "Gospel Law" and the Franciscan *familia* as the "Gospel teacher" of the Indians.

*Iglesia* (the Church) has various meanings. It is the Mystical Body of Christ (3 times); the institutional Church as founded, expanded and governed (3 times); the local Church, or diocese (3 times); and, finally, a building for a local worshipping community (3 times). No separation of Church and state ever enters Sánchez' head. He never bothers to balance his praises of the king with mention of the pope. Reference to the papacy is made only in the list of officers who use costly garb (*Descripción*). Equally surprisingly, and despite his esteem for "descendants of the *conquistadores*," he never says a word about his own lineage, unless *los míos* refers to his own kin (*Milagros/Epilogue*).

What of the Indians? Sánchez seems to allow a Christian Indian the same heavenly honors he attributes to *criollos*, "born

in this land." The Indian may be a neophyte (*recién convertido*: 3 times), or economically poor (*pobre*: once) and socially "lowly" (*humilde*: 3 times). Even at Guadalupe, he may be relegated to the least sumptuous accommodations, "segregated according to social standing" (*según la calidad de las personas que llegan [Descripción]*). At the patronal festivities, during the octave of Our Lady's Nativity, the day assigned to him is the last of all (*Milagros/Shrines compared*). Sánchez would doubtless explain such segregation in terms of the language barrier; for he knows that, on the spiritual level, Our Lady's honor goes especially to these *naturales*, as it did to Juan Diego (*Descripción; Milagros/procession/Remedios*).

Later, less spiritual *Criollos* would not be so favorably disposed to the Indians. The only persons to receive Sánchez scorn were heretics. The *Imagen* came out within a few months of the greatest *auto da fé* ever held in Mexico,<sup>34</sup> and Sánchez was perhaps thinking of this procedure when he expressed shame that his fatherland had any heretics. He gladly added, in words borrowed from Augustine, that none of these had their "roots of origin in this land," but had come from far away (*Dibujo/aquilae*).

### Conclusion

Sánchez' *criollo* patriotism was unlike that of modern nations, with their collective angers, their self-glorifying epics, and their touristic boasts. He does not sanction the *criollos*' hatred for the *gachupines*. He failed in his feeble effort to reinstate Cortés within the national epic. He did offer the *criollos* a baptized language in which to speak publicly of their hardships.

For him, patriotism was one love among many. Although he never mentions his family, he does show enthusiasm for his *alma mater*, the Royal University of Mexico, for his

<sup>34</sup>F. Sosa, *El Episcopado Mexicano* (3rd. ed., 2 vols.; Mexico: Editorial Jus, 1962), 1:233-239.

archdiocese and his city. Though inclined to solitude, he has warm friendships, especially among his fellow *criollos*. He also has polite bonds with those who appreciate his sermons and offer him hospitality. He cites modern theologians but names no local mentor or spiritual father. His disapproval is reserved only for heretics.

But his earthly loves pale before his heavenly friendships. His personal patron, St. Michael, and his favorite author, St. Augustine, are extolled at every turn, and he also has a predilection for other Fathers of the Church. He is less outspoken in his devotion for St. Catherine, who was his patron as a student, or for St. Peter, patron of his elite confraternity. The angels, not limited to any outward heritage, are the "companions and teachers" of his inner life of prayer. Our Lady is for him both a "public" figure (especially at Guadalupe) and a personal confidant, whom he lets us glimpse in the final pages of both the *Imagen* and the *Novenas*.

Sánchez is keenly aware of the socio-economic malaise felt by his fellow *criollos*; he baptizes it into a suffering that is conatural to the dignity given them by the Guadalupan event. He cannot conceive of a separation of Church and state, and certainly not a rebellion against a king whom he accepts without reservation.

The praises he showers on the *criollos'* fatherland are couched in complex allegories, none of them with any future. He could never have provided a motto such as "*Non fecit taliter omni nationi*" ("He has not done the like to any another nation"—a line from Psalm 147, the last psalm of Our Lady's Vespers). Sánchez' impact on *criollo* patriotism was not so much *what* he said, but rather *how* he said it. His style, steeped in the Scriptures and the Fathers, breathed a powerful unanimity; it reflected a transcendent unanimity.

His vocabulary discreetly phased out certain demographic terms and popularized others. He replaced the colonial term *Nueva España* with the more cosmopolitan *Nuevo Mundo*. He made the word *México* mean no longer just the city and its vicinity but the whole realm dependent on it, all of which he recognized as his *patria*, his *tierra*. This *México* was so linked to *nuestro mexicano Guadalupe*, that when the country

slipped away from the Spanish Crown, it remained united in the tender arms of Guadalupe. As for contemporary Spain and the Old Guadalupe and the unpopular *gachupines*, Sánchez scarcely mentions them. The Indians, however, fit within his other favorite phrase, *los nacidos en esta tierra* (those born in this land), and he shares with them the Guadalupan honors of the *criollos*.

Sánchez welded the two Guadalupan traditions, Spanish and Indian, into one, but his welding was incomplete. He neglected the magnificent dialogues and lacked an eye for the little daily miracles that those dialogues promise. He did, though, mention the Juan Bernardino of the Indian tradition (whom even Siles had failed to mention). But after Sánchez, no *criollo* would ever again speak of Guadalupe without giving Juan Diego a name and a beloved face. A complete welding of the traditions would take generations; only the declaration of Patronage of 1754 would achieve it. But with that patronage in place, Mexican national consciousness was ready to bloom—under the banner of Guadalupe.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Becerra Tanco, L. *Origen Milagrosa del Santuario*. . . Mexico, 1666. Few copies of this first edition remain. His revised edition, published posthumously, and entitled *Felicidad de México* . . . , Mexico, 1675, has gone through many reprints. Partial translation in Demarest, pp. 99-112.
- Callahan, P. S. *The Tilma under Infra-red Radiation*. CARA, Washington, D.C., 1981.
- Cawley, M. *Anthology of Early Guadalupan Literature*. Guadalupe Abbey, 1984.
- Demarest, D. and C. Taylor. *The Dark Virgin*. A documentary anthology first published in 1956; reprinted by Academy Guild Press, 1959 and 1962.
- Díaz del Castillo, B. *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España*. Relevant texts in Torre Villar (below), pp. 145-7. Many English anthologies.
- Grajales G. and E. J. Burrus. *Guadalupan Bibliography (1531-1984)*. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 1986.
- Guijo, G. M. de. *Diario, 1648-1664*. Editorial Porrúa, Mexico, Vol. I, 1946; Vol. II, 1952. Other editions exist.
- Lafaye, J. *Quetzalcoatl and Guadalupe*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1976. French original, 1974; Spanish edition, 1977.

- Lasso de la Vega, L. *Huey tlamabutsoltica*. . . . Mexico, 1649. Many reprints and translations, beginning in 1926. English translation by M. Cawley, *Guadalupe from the Aztec*, Guadalupe Abbey, 1983. Several editions.
- Maza, F. de la. *El Guadalupanismo Mexicano*. Fondo de Cultura Económica, Mexico, 1986. Key chapter published in 1949. First complete edition, 1953.
- Montúfar, A. de, Archbishop. *Información* . . . , 1556. For the text and the complicated history of the editions, see Torre Villar (below), pp. 36-141. English synopsis in Cawley (1984), pp. 21-41.
- Robles, Antonio. *Diario de sucesos notables, 1615-1703* (ed. Antonio Castro Leal). Mexico. Editorial Porrúa, 1946.
- Sánchez, M. *Sermon de S. Felipe de Jesús*. Mexico, 1640. A copy exists in the Mexican National Library. Reference by leaves, recto and verso.
- . *Imagen de la Virgen*. . . . Mexico, 1648. A copy exists at the Basilica of Guadalupe. Reprints include Torre Villar, pp. 152-267. Partial translation in Demarest, pp. 59-96.
- . *El David Seráfico*. . . . Mexico, 1653. A copy exists in the Mexican National Library. References by leaves, recto and verso.
- . *Novenas de la Virgen*. . . . Mexico, 1665. A copy exists at the Basilica of Guadalupe, along with a later edition, which I have photocopied, but whose date I have lost. It is perhaps the Madrid edition of 1785.
- Sosa, F. *El Episcopado Mexicano*. Editorial Jus, Mexico, 3rd ed. (2 vols), 1962. First ed., 1877. Individual biographies of each successive Archbishop.
- Suarez de Peralta, J. *Tratado del descubrimiento de las Indias*. Relevant text and notes in J. García Gutiérrez, *Primer Siglo Guadalupano*, San Ignacio de Loyola, Mexico, 1945, pp. 83-84.
- Sylvest, E. E., Jr. *Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe*. . . . Catalog for a Guadalupean exhibit at Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX, 1992.
- Taylor, W. B. "The Virgin of Guadalupe in New Spain . . .," *American Ethnologist* 14 (1987): 9-33.
- Torre Villar, E. de la and R. Navarro de Anda. *Testimonios Historicos Guadalupanos*. Fondo de Cultura Económica, Mexico, 1982. Good anthology.
- Vera, F. H. *Informaciones* . . . , 1666 y 1723. Imprenta Católica, Amealameca, 1889.