
REVIEW ESSAYS

THE CHURCH IN COLONIAL MIDDLE AMERICA : Non Fecit Taliter Omni Nationi

Frederick P. Bowser
Stanford University

AMBIVALENT CONQUESTS: MAYA AND SPANIARD IN YUCATAN, 1517-1570.
By INGA CLENDINNEN. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
Pp. 245. \$34.50.)

FRAY BERNARDINO DE SAHAGUN (1499-1590). By LUIS NICOLAU D'OLWER.
Translated by MAURICIO J. MIXCO. (Salt Lake City: University of Utah
Press, 1987. Pp. 201. \$25.00.)

*THE WORK OF BERNARDINO DE SAHAGUN, PIONEER ETHNOGRAPHER OF
SIXTEENTH-CENTURY AZTEC MEXICO.* Edited by J. JORGE KLOR DE ALVA,
H.B. NICHOLSON, and ELOISE QUIÑONES KEBER. (Austin: Institute for
Mesoamerican Studies, University of Texas, 1988. Pp. 372. \$25.00 paper.)

*DESTIERRO DE SOMBRAS: LUZ EN EL ORIGEN DE LA IMAGEN Y CULTO DE
NUESTRA SEÑORA DE GUADALUPE DEL TEPEYAC.* By EDMUNDO O'GOR-
MAN. (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1986.
Pp. 306.)

CATHOLIC COLONIALISM: A PARISH HISTORY OF GUATEMALA, 1524-1821.
By ADRIAAN C. VAN OSS. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
Pp. 248. \$44.50.)

THE CHURCH AND CLERGY IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY MEXICO. By JOHN
FREDERICK SCHWALLER. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press,
1987. Pp. 263. \$27.50.)

ORIGINS OF CHURCH WEALTH IN MEXICO: ECCLESIASTICAL REVENUES

- AND CHURCH FINANCES, 1523–1600. By JOHN FREDERICK SCHWALLER. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1985. Pp. 241. \$22.50.)
- PEDRO MOYA DE CONTRERAS: CATHOLIC REFORM AND ROYAL POWER IN NEW SPAIN, 1571–1591. By STAFFORD POOLE, C.M. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987. Pp. 309. \$30.00.)
- ENTRE DOS MAJESTADES: EL OBISPO Y LA IGLESIA DEL GRAN MICHOACAN ANTE LAS REFORMAS BORBONICAS, 1758–1722. By OSCAR MAZIN. (Zamora: El Colegio de Michoacán, 1987. Pp. 305.)

“He did not do the like for any other nation,” the pious affirmation that titles this essay, was penned in 1688 by the Mexican Jesuit Francisco de Florencia as part of his panegyric on the Virgin of Guadalupe, *La Estrella del Norte de México*. With only a slight extension of faith in providential design, the phrase might be applied with equal aptness to the remarkable endeavors of the Catholic Church in colonial Middle America. Its effort to create a hierarchical, multi-ethnic spiritual kingdom was of such imposing dimensions that in 1746 another Jesuit, without fear of hyperbolic exaggeration, termed Mexico City “the Rome of the New World.”¹ Scarcely had the words been uttered when the spiritual tide crested and turned, heralding over a century of growing intellectual indifference and political hostility that at its end found the Church reduced to what David Brading has termed pathetic “internal exile.”² Though perhaps unparalleled among historical developments in the range and significance of its import for the region, the rise and decline of the Middle American Church has thus far received only sporadic and patchy attention from historians.³ The books under review here provoke both admiration and wistfulness, since each in its illumination of various aspects of the multifaceted role of the Church serves also to reveal yet other topics that await their historian.

The late J. H. Parry once observed that in many areas of life, the advance of knowledge in Renaissance Europe might be measured by the extent to which the wisdom of the ancient world had been first mastered after retrieval and then respectfully superseded. With regard to our knowledge of the Christianization of Middle America, the same might be said of Robert Ricard’s masterly *Conquête spirituelle du Mexique*.⁴ In the fifty-odd years since its publication, the work has inspired, influenced, and on occasion exasperated students of missionary history with its overtones of Eurocentric Catholicity. Among Ricard’s many accomplishments was to vividly underline that the evangelization of the New World was one of the great driving forces, the irreducible motive, of Spanish colonialism. Hence, avid though both men were for material aggrandizement, Hernán Cortés was instructed by his patron Governor Velásquez that the first aim of his expedition was “to spread the knowledge of the True Faith and the Church of God among those people who dwell in

darkness."⁵ Both the letter and (often) the spirit of that injunction held in the centuries of colonial rule that followed.

Thus the early missionaries and their successors had ample mandate for their endeavors, but conscientious implementation among their Indian charges was for long a source of difficulty to the scrupulous among them, much as it had been to the early Church fathers in the context of pagan Rome.⁶ Could the missionary assume that the Christian God of whom he spoke was already in some way part of the Indian "inner understanding," as certain haunting similarities between Catholic and pagan belief and ritual often seemed to suggest? Or were superficially similar prequest ways of worship and thought to be eradicated as evidence of Satan's work, of which nothing could be salvaged?⁷ Further, among peoples whose modes of expression and experience were so alien to those of the missionary, what was the balance to be in the process of conversion between reason and authority, between persuasion and coercion? And how to know when the True Faith had at last overcome pagan idolatry in the inner understanding? Much as they had given pause to Saints Paul and Augustine, these imponderables daunted some of the most successful and dedicated missionaries.

Rarely has the missionary dilemma been more compellingly demonstrated than in Inga Clendinnen's *Ambivalent Conquests*, an account of Maya responses to Christianity whose central figure is the Franciscan Diego de Landa, the dominant force in Yucatecan spiritual affairs until his death in 1579. In 1561, at the age of thirty-seven, Landa was elected as the first Provincial of the independent missionary province of Guatemala and Yucatán. All unwittingly, in his previous ten years of tireless efforts among the Maya, Landa had set himself up for the embittering disillusionment that his Franciscan counterparts in central Mexico had undergone some two decades before, a trial described so well by Ricard. Mistaking the docility of the Maya villagers for assent, confusing the intellectual curiosity of their chiefs (who were often custodians of ancient ritual) for attempts at more profound Christian initiation, Landa was scarcely a year into his stewardship when he was confronted with unmistakable signs of Maya idolatry that may have extended to human sacrifice in perverse reenactments of the crucifixion.

In what can only be termed furious response, Landa supervised a three-month episcopal inquisition of Maya idolatry, an inquiry that pushed established inquisitorial forms to their limits. More than 4,500 Indians were put to judicial torture, of whom 158 died during or as a direct result of the interrogations. The ordeal did not come to an end until 1563, with the horrified intervention of the first Bishop of Yucatán (himself a Franciscan). But Landa won vindication for his actions in Spain, used his time there to pen his celebrated *Relación de las cosas de Yucatán*, and at the urging of his Franciscan flock in Yucatán, succeeded to the episcopal miter in

1570 to end his days in the land and among the people whose charm his book had extolled.

This is an intricate story, by turns exhilarating and depressing, of cultural interaction among parties whose motives were consciously and unconsciously at variance, and the evidential base is by its very nature both circumstantial and distorted. Given these difficulties, Clendinnen's reconstruction is a model of historical intelligence and anthropological empathy couched in superbly crafted prose. My single reservation is one of nuance. It is impossible to read this book without sympathizing with the Maya dilemma when confronted with the implacable, alien demands of Christianity. By the same token, Landa emerges as a personality more capable of arousing fear and respect than love, and even many of his contemporaries were shocked by the severity of his methods. One's head even nods in momentary agreement when Clendinnen writes that Landa could "construct only a truth cast in the terms of his own system of understanding. He was prepared to accept the Indians as responsible moral beings. . . . But that acceptance meant nothing about a determination to penetrate their own moral order. It provided only the justification for punishing them for offenses against his own."

This assertion is beautifully stated, and perhaps even morally just by the standard of our own times, but its acceptance would deny Landa a role as missionary in his own time. Whether the Maya had deceived him about their "inner understanding" or whether he had wanted to be deceived, and the timing of the discovery of the misunderstanding, is almost beside the point. Landa combined in full measure those attributes of a successful colonial missionary that so puzzle and repel the modern mind: a genuine love of the Indian peoples he served joined with an utter contempt for the spiritual content of their preconquest culture. Hence, the benign tone of Landa's *Relación* can be squared with the ordeals of the 1562 episcopal inquisition that demonstrated to the Maya that Christian teachings were to be regarded as "more than interesting novelties to be scanned for useful notions." For the interested reader, the Yucatecan Catholicism that evolved in the centuries following this realization imposed by Landa has been splendidly sketched in Nancy Farriss's *Maya Society under Colonial Rule*.

The spectacular example of Diego de Landa serves to remind us that even the iron rule of the Order of St. Francis was designed not so much to minimize as to harmonize the impact of various individual missionary personalities and talents in a collective enterprise. At first blush, no two figures of the sixteenth-century missionary movement would seem to be farther apart than the contentious, overweening Landa, so deplored by anthropologists for the pious zeal with which (in his later role as bishop) he destroyed Maya books of sacred ritual, and the scholarly, retiring Bernardino de Sahagún, Landa's celebrated Franciscan contem-

porary who devoted a long life to collecting and studying information about Nahua religion. Yet their spiritual goal was identical; only the means of its attainment (and perhaps the satisfaction with which each looked back on his accomplishments) separated the two Franciscans.

Sahagún was not among the first wave of missionaries to Mexico, the famous Twelve, but arrived instead in 1529, and within perhaps a decade he came to suspect what was later to become a bitter certainty: that the miraculous conversions of the early heroic days of the Mexican mission were a self-congratulatory myth. Then, as a gifted linguist and keen observer, Sahagún began to slowly collect the materials that were to form his great work on the religion and society of Nahua Mexico. His many scholarly endeavors reached their zenith in his magnificent *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España*, the indispensable and incomparable source for understanding the Nahua world before Cortés. Written to make his colleagues aware of, and to persuade the native to reject, the still-popular though forbidden religious beliefs and rites of preconquest times, the *General History* was underpinned by labors suspect even to many within Sahagún's own order, who feared too close an examination of what was after all the work of the Devil among the Nahuas. And the dreadful knowledge that drove Sahagún on in his studies, the existence of pagan continuities in overtly Christian observances, could not be openly proclaimed. The Franciscans were sensitive to charges from outsiders (including the other orders) about the casualness of their prebaptismal instruction and the laxity of their later supervision of their Nahua charges. Further, total loyalty within the Franciscan order was prized, and a challenge by one of their own to the myth of the Twelve's success was unthinkable. Thus Sahagún's doubts about the proselytizing methods of his order, that became almost a condemnation in later years, were told to few. His efforts to endow his fellows with an ethnographic education ended in failure, with his manuscripts scattered and unpublished for centuries.

The record of Sahagún's persistence in the face of these obstacles can be found in Luis Nicolau D'Olwer's not-quite-classic *Fray Bernardino de Sahagún (1499–1590)*, now available in an almost too-faithful English translation of the 1952 Spanish edition, which remains the most comprehensive available biobibliography.⁸ The overriding purpose of Nicolau D'Olwer is to establish the chronology and internal dynamics of Sahagún's manuscript preparation, but along the way he makes many penetrating observations concerning the evolution of Sahagún's thoughts on the proper conversion of the Indian to Catholicism.⁹

By the 1560s, at roughly the midpoint of his career, Sahagún had already acquired a greater knowledge of and respect for Nahua culture than Landa would ever possess for the Mayas, though the difference is one of degree. And if Sahagún learned of Landa's actions as provincial

and bishop in Yucatán (and the record is unclear), he would have despaired at them, since for Fray Bernardino true conversion could only come through persuasion based on a knowledge of the Indian's inner understanding sufficient to supplant it with the True Faith. Indeed, it was precisely Sahagún's insistence on eradicating preconquest belief through study and his growing awareness of the impossibility of the task that forced him into embittered and isolated exasperation against his well-meaning colleagues. The intellectual pride that made him a "pioneer ethnographer," surrounded by a small band of Nahuatl elite informants, would doubtless have caused Sahagún to fail in the practical missionary field, where the less sophisticated Landa did not hesitate to impose his view of a Christian community. Sadly, the weight and subtlety of Sahagún's learning demanded standards for both missionary and convert that had nothing to do with the emerging New Spain. As Nicolau D'Olivera puts it, "The ideal purity of his religion did not permit him to accede to the amalgams of compromises accepted by others who had perhaps arrived in America accustomed to practices and beliefs no less distant from Christian spirituality" (p. 133).

Indeed, Sahagún's Cassandra-like perspicacity may have permitted him to see more clearly than his contemporaries the religious "amalgam" that was beginning to take shape in central Mexico during his last years, a cultural mixture brilliantly described in various stages of its manifestations by Serge Gruzinski in his recent *La Colonisation de l'imaginaire*.¹⁰ Gruzinski's work is as much a philosophical and anthropological interpretation of that elusive process we call acculturation as it is a work of history, a tracing of the tug-of-war within the Indian mentality between pre-Hispanic ways and the promptings of "Occidentalization," as the natives selected, rejected, and modified new patterns of thought and belief. The work merits an extensive treatment beyond the scope of this essay, but an idea of Gruzinski's analytical approach to the Christianization of the Indian may be provided with the example of the practice of confession in the sacrament of penance.

Gruzinski notes that Indian bewilderment with confession began with the Christian emphasis on the free will of the individual as against native notions of group tradition and external forces. Further, Christian (Western) reliance on the written alphabet and the book made for greater orthodoxy and less flexibility than the accustomed pre-Hispanic pictographs and oral traditions. As a result, and unconsciously, the Christian confessor demanded of his Indian charges in their confessions an unprecedented emphasis on introspection, memorization, exactness, and accountability over linear time, to which was linked the idea of a categorization of sins in a system of fixed and eternal values. Gruzinski cautions that Indian reaction to these demands must be studied as a function of cultural background (for example, Nahuatl versus Zapotec) and social

class. Nevertheless, over centuries Indians evaded confession where possible, and when it was unavoidable, their disclosures were garbled and inexact. Most parish priests routinely blamed this state of affairs not on unbridged cultural distance but on limited capacity and understanding, or native "rusticity." More perceptive curates, noting that the native elite sometimes mastered the ritual of confession for the purpose of casuistically minimizing their transgressions, could only express mystification at a people "so coarse and yet so competent." The depths of Sahagún's despair may well be imagined.

It is Sahagún's tireless, self-crippling researches into Nahua culture, very properly labeled as ethnographic today, that interest the contributors to *The Work of Bernardino de Sahagún: Pioneer Ethnographer of Sixteenth-Century Aztec Mexico*, edited by J. Jorge Klor de Alva, H. B. Nicholson, and Eloise Quiñones Keber. In addition to the most useful review of recent Sahagunite studies by H. B. Nicholson, the essays by Klor de Alva, John Keber, Louise Burkhart, and S. I. Cline in the second section of the volume ("The Sahagunite Corpus: Ideology and Revision") will most interest the student of missionary activity. Among the topics treated are Sahagún's use of the techniques of the confessional to elicit much of his information, the extent to which his Christian prejudices were essential intellectual components that both aided and hindered his understanding of the native mind, and the choices of Christian precepts for presentation to the Indians in phrasings that would facilitate their understanding.¹¹ Whatever one's ambivalence about transcultural conversion within the colonial context, it is hard not to come away from these essays, in conjunction with the works of Nicolau D'Olwer and Gruzinski, without a grudging respect for this conscientious missionary.

No topic in the colonial history of the Middle American Church has received such intensive scrutiny as the legend of the apparition of the Virgin of Guadalupe and its consequences. At the pinnacle of the historiography on this phenomenon are Francisco de la Maza's classic *El guadalupanismo mexicano* (Mexico City, 1953) and Jacques Lafaye's provocative, discursive *Quetzalcóatl and Guadalupe*.¹² In addition, William Taylor has recently contributed a brilliantly succinct overview of what we know and still need to know about the sociocultural ramifications of the cult in the colonial period.¹³ The recent contribution made by Edmundo O'Gorman's *Destierro de sombras* to this abundance is its detailed exploration of the motives behind Archbishop Alonso de Montúfar's controversial 1556 sermon in support of the apparition, an advocacy that insured the survival of the cult until the mysterious and still-unstudied groundswell of popular sentiment for the Virgin in the seventeenth century reached colony-wide proportions. In the process of his exploration, O'Gorman demonstrates that Montúfar was an important figure in the early Mexican Church, a prelate whose accomplishments have been for long over-

shadowed by those of his better-known predecessor, Juan de Zumárraga, and whose later incapacity from advanced age has caused historians to dismiss his tenure as a long ecclesiastical interregnum.

In fact, as O’Gorman observes, Montúfar was a proud Dominican with a distinguished career in Spain when named Archbishop of Mexico in 1551 while in his sixties. A churchman of pronounced Marian tendencies and a harbinger of Tridentine emphasis on liturgical rigidity and pomp, Montúfar convoked the first two Provincial Councils of his church in 1555 and 1565. Under his direction, the first fitful attempts were made by the episcopate to assert a measure of spiritual control over the Indian population. Montúfar was bitterly resentful of the sway held over the natives by the missionary orders, particularly the Franciscans, and is said to have exclaimed on one occasion that Pedro de Gante (a famous Franciscan missionary), and not he, was the real Archbishop of Mexico. Be that as it may, O’Gorman argues that Montúfar was forced into near-disimulation by circumstances. For one, physical displacement of the Franciscans, Augustinians, and Dominicans in the native parishes was an impossibility. Despite a drumfire of criticism against the alleged negligence of the orders toward the Indians, not until the *Ordenanza del Patronazgo* was issued in 1574 was the Crown moved to begin the centuries-long process of secularizing the rural parishes. More to the point, during Montúfar’s tenure, the number of secular clergy was unequal to the task despite their jealousy. The archbishop would doubtless have been satisfied had the orders paid greater lip service to episcopal authority, a deference the friars were determined not to give.

Under the burden of his own vexation and desperate to raise the status of the episcopacy in Indian eyes, O’Gorman argues, Montúfar boldly capitalized on the small but growing devotion (primarily among the Spanish of the capital) to the shrine of the Virgin at Tepeyac, built on the site of an Aztec shrine to Tonantzin and under the jurisdiction of the secular clergy. According to O’Gorman’s reconstruction, the archbishop commissioned and installed the now-legendary representation of the Virgin, preached his sermon, and went immediately thereafter to the shrine to exhort a crowd of natives to follow the Spanish devotional example. Two days later, the Franciscans decried these proceedings through a vehement sermon given by their provincial. The sermon deftly sidestepped the question of the Virgin’s apparition but sharply attacked Montúfar’s appeals to the Indians on the grounds that they encouraged the native penchant for idolatry. Doubtless neither participant could have imagined the devotion that the Virgin would inspire in later centuries. Even more incredible would have been future creole arguments that the apparition of Guadalupe, the direct intervention and patronage of the Mother of God in Mexico, provided an autonomous spiritual foundation for the Mexican Church that completely undercut the missionary tradi-

tion. This same tradition was to be powerfully celebrated by the Franciscan Juan de Torquemada in his seventeenth-century *Monarquía indiana*, which cast the friars as the true founders of New Spain.¹⁴

In time, certainly by the end of the sixteenth century, the missionary tradition became largely something to be looked back on with pride and nostalgia. Among the Indian populations of Middle America, their ranks thinned by disease, the parish routine of nominal Catholicism had replaced the exhortations of conversion, and alongside the natives were ranged the Spaniards and the *castas* who also required spiritual guidance. Eloquent, ascetic, itinerant missionaries gave way to parish priests; and at the local level in colonial Middle America, perhaps no figure was more central than that of the *cura*. As William Taylor puts the matter, "As a moral and spiritual father and literate local resident able to speak the native language of his parishioners, the curate was well placed to represent the requirements of the state to rural people and interpret their obligations, as well as to carry their interests to higher authorities."¹⁵ The very routineness of the demands of an ostensibly Catholic population strengthened the longstanding petitions of the episcopacy for royal recognition of its jurisdiction over the natives. Even so, the water-upon-stone gradualness envisioned by the 1574 Ordenanza was too slow for the Bourbons, who drastically hastened the secularization of the Indian parishes administered by the religious orders with the decrees of 1749 and 1753.

Despite the fundamental importance of the parish priest to rural life and the implications for that role implied by secularization, only in the last decade have scholars begun to address these issues.¹⁶ Perhaps the best recent research is embodied in Adriaan van Oss's *Catholic Colonialism*, an absorbing look at the parish-level functioning of the Church in Guatemala. Writing with grace and subtle empathy, van Oss begins with an account of proselytism and eventual doctrinal compromise that evokes the better-known saga of central Mexico, with early Sahagunite fervor for spiritual communion between *doctrinero* and convert slowly giving way to a tacit acceptance of continuities and convergences between pre-Hispanic beliefs and Catholicism. (Indeed, the parallel with events in Yucatán is even more striking, but excesses like those of Landa do not seem to have occurred in Guatemala.) The Guatemalan case differs from that of central Mexico, however, in the sharp regional split that soon developed between the densely populated Indian highlands of the west, dominated until the eighteenth century by the regular orders, and the eastern lowlands, where a sparser native population mingled with Spaniards and became *ladinos* in the cycles of economic exploitation studied by Murdo MacLeod and others. Neglected by the orders, this part of Guatemala became the domain of the secular clergy.

Catholic Colonialism includes a very good chapter on the parish as a fiscal unit, and van Oss demonstrates how the Church, in the face of the

Indians' perpetual exemption from the tithe, nevertheless contrived to control a broader tax base than that of the Crown. A subsequent chapter supplies rich detail on the physical aspects of the parish churches and the role played by the confraternities in their support. Van Oss then recounts the eighteenth-century process of secularization at a depth not yet achieved in most particulars for Mexico, except on the question of the often-harsh attempts of the parish priests to Hispanicize Indian religious life and to eradicate ostensibly Catholic observances that smacked of pagan survivals and idolatry. On this issue, the picture drawn by van Oss of the often dreadful "puritanical niggings" of the Guatemalan clergy may be usefully compared with the information provided by Gruzinski about the efforts of their Mexican counterparts. Van Oss devotes a final chapter to an evenhanded, warts-and-all collective biography of the Guatemalan parish clergy that, along with the conclusion, eloquently corroborates Taylor's remarks on the pivotal role of the curate.

With the works of Clendinnen, Farriss, Gruzinski, and van Oss so recently before us, that of Ricard and the other great staple of the literature, John Leddy Phelan's *Millennial Kingdom*,¹⁷ seem less the indispensable guides than before, although their places of high historiographical honor are assured. Specificity and nuance now bolster and modify the grand generalization, and more importantly, we have begun to acquire an understanding of the spiritual worldview of the Indian, however imperfectly, in many of its continuities and breaks and in some of its rich and often bewildering mix of the cosmic and the everyday. Yet even with Gruzinski's contribution, it is ironic that our knowledge should now be sketchiest for the Nahua heartland. That situation, however, is soon to be remedied.

James Lockhart will include a chapter on religion in his forthcoming general social and cultural history of central Mexican Indians in the postconquest centuries, using primarily sources written by the Nahuas themselves in their own language, and I have been privileged to see a working draft. A review of Lockhart's work before the fact of publication scarcely seems appropriate, but it may be said that Nahua Catholicism is studied closely at the parish level, which roughly followed the lines of Indian sociopolitical organization. At the admittedly elusive level of belief, Lockhart finds a Nahua population that considered itself to be and was considered Catholic, though the fabric of faith was interwoven with preconquest survivals and syncretic practices that performed functions unmet by Christianity. The Nahuas had no interest in imagining a time when their forebears were not Christian, and the saints were overwhelmingly central to their spiritual lives, most strikingly as the ceremonial holders of household land.¹⁸ While conceding the importance of the parish priest, Lockhart stresses the role of confraternities, staffed by a Nahua elite of "church people," in sustaining community devotion. Sig-

nificantly, Lockhart does not detect the “estrangement from the church” by the second half of the sixteenth century that Charles Gibson noted in his classic *Aztecs under Spanish Rule*.¹⁹

For yet another view of the Church at the community level, much is to be expected of William Taylor’s nearly completed, large-scale study of the Spanish and creole priests who served the rural, predominantly Indian parishes of the dioceses of Mexico City and Guadalajara during the critical period from 1740 to 1810. Backed by a massive prosopography, Taylor studies the interaction of Spanish priest and Indian parishioner at a time when rising religious fervor in Mexico brushed against the cool Bourbon attempt to desacralize political power and cut the state loose from divine purpose. It was an era when the Crown not only secularized the parishes at the expense of the orders (as studied by van Oss for Guatemala) but also expected the curate to become merely “a spiritual specialist, his public duties and his role as an agent of the Christian monarch sharply curtailed.”²⁰ Taylor’s intent is to trace the slow, uneven decline of the priest’s role as mediator in the complex balance between popular subordination expressed through the symbols and group activities of a common faith and the state’s search for alternative grounds for cultural and moral superiority. Van Oss was vividly aware of the shift in this mediative role, but apparently his documentation was insufficiently rich to enable him to explore the subject in any depth. Taylor’s results for the area within the orbit of the “New Rome” should illuminate not only the ebbing fortunes of the Mexican Church in the late colonial era but also the dim outlines of ecclesiastical history in nineteenth-century Mexico.

If our knowledge of the interaction between the Church and the faithful is still deficient in many particulars, and biased in favor of the rural Indian-mestizo at the expense of the urban Spaniard-creole,²¹ then still less is known of the internal institutional dynamics of both ecclesiastical branches, particularly that of the episcopacy. Even for most colonial historians, a thumbnail mental sketch of the colonial secular clergy would perhaps conjure up a slowly growing army of ill- (or over-) educated and indolent Johnnies-come-lately, trailing in the missionary wake, grown wealthy through tithes and bequests yet avid for benefices, “dozing in the sunny uplands of pastoral conservatism” before the rude awakening of the Bourbon Enlightenment.²² In short, a coarsened, exaggerated extension of the charmingly insightful but out-of-balance account of Fray García Guerra written by Irving Leonard thirty years ago.²³

Four of the titles under review here (in addition to that of van Oss) take readers some distance toward correcting that impression by revealing a vital episcopate in subtle flux, at least during much of its colonial existence, with many ramifications for the larger society. Of the four, the two works by John Frederick Schwaller are discussed most logically in reverse order of their publication.

Schwaller's *Church and Clergy in Sixteenth-Century Mexico* is in essence an institutional history by prosopography. Relying throughout the work for illustrative example on the biographies of nearly one thousand secular priests compiled from Mexican and Spanish archival sources, he first describes the respective functions of high clergy, parish priests, and chaplains. There follow chapters on career patterns within and outside the Church, the royal and ecclesiastical legal system that dealt with clerical offenses, and the social and ethnic origins of the sixteenth-century secular clergy. Perhaps unavoidably, a panoramic view of the evolution of the sixteenth-century Mexican episcopate does not emerge from what amounts to a collective biography,²⁴ and in places Schwaller would have been well advised to sacrifice hard-won prosopographical detail for clarity. Still, this picture of the twin pillar of the sixteenth-century Mexican Church corrects the previous overconcentration on the missionary orders and serves to remind us that when the tumult of the conquest had passed, a clerical career short of monastic rigor beckoned to many among the aspiring in the colonial world. As in Spain, the secular church quickly became a mirror of society, and a handful of conqueror-priests reined in by Bishop Zumárraga gave way "to a highly organized institution maximizing both private goals of the clerics and public goals of the church." The private goals of these mostly competent and often humane men, without the halos of missionaries, were usually advancement and a good living. In describing this struggle for preferment, Schwaller reminds us of the often overlooked fact that in the sixteenth century, creoles held the edge over peninsulars because the former enjoyed explicit royal favor and easier access to instruction in the often indispensable Indian languages (pp. 215–16). With little of the creole-peninsular antagonism that rent the orders, after 1575 over half of all cathedral chapter members and parish clergy were Mexican-born.

Schwaller's *Origins of Church Wealth in Mexico* is a detailed examination of the financial underpinnings of the hierarchy described in *Church and Clergy*. The first four chapters examine tithes, parish funds, and pious works as sources of ecclesiastical revenue with varying degrees of precision and clarity imposed by the frequently chaotic and sketchy record-keeping extant for the sixteenth century. Schwaller presents the fullest account yet written on the administration, collection, and distribution of tithes, demonstrating that clerical speculation with the fruits of agriculture, particularly grain stocks, made the Church a major factor in the commodity markets of the colony. Schwaller finds (as does van Oss for Guatemala) that tithe revenues went exclusively to support the cathedral chapters and affiliated curates, and he provides detailed illustrations of the personal incomes and expenditures of clerical staff, ranging from canons to laundrywomen. With the tithe going to support the upper clergy, parish priests were forced back on the piety and prosperity of their

parishioners. For curates in the Indian parishes, the problem of adequate subsistence on a modest salary from either the Crown or *encomendero* was a ticklish one because the sacraments were supposed to be administered without charge, and to wheedle food and labor services from the natives as an income supplement was to risk complaint and censure. Schwaller finds, however, that the declared actual income brought by some Indian parishes to their curate far exceeded the attached salary, perhaps warranting the conclusion that a range of sacramental fees were in fact collected from the Indians well before the practice was finally legitimized "at some point in the seventeenth century" (pp. 104–8).

In another important chapter, Schwaller provides a good account of the motives and financial arrangements that went into founding chantries and pious works, carefully describing the origin and function of each of the several types of benefice. Although the cash involved was modest in the beginning, after 1575 these foundations increasingly provided the Church with the liquid capital that, on loan to the laity, became a key support of the credit structure of the colonial economy. Schwaller's documentation is too sketchy to permit an estimate of the amount of investment capital controlled by the episcopate through pious funds during this period, and the wealth of the regular clergy falls outside his purview. Nor does he trace the role of ecclesiastical capital in the credit market (that is, its destination, the borrowers, their use of the funds), although he indicates that members of the urban and rural landholding elites benefited most from this development. Still, Schwaller's work confirms that of other scholars for later periods: far from stagnating, clerical capital and property reentered the colonial economy and played a vital role.

Schwaller has made a fine beginning to the study of Mexican ecclesiastical finance,²⁵ and the subjects of *Origins of Church Wealth in Mexico* cry out for detailed extension into the rest of the colonial period. As the Church was to discover, to be a major source of colonial credit was perhaps to arouse as much resentment and cupidity as gratitude. Historians are broadly aware that these sentiments culminated first in the effort of the financially desperate Bourbon regime to appropriate pious fund capital through the Consolidation Decree of 1804 and then in persistent nineteenth-century efforts, capped by la Reforma, to alienate Church wealth altogether.²⁶ What is lacking for the long interval between the sixteenth century and these traumatic events is an informed sense of the way ecclesiastical lender and private borrower met (or failed to meet) each other's needs in the ebb and flow of Mexican socioeconomic development.²⁷

To appreciate the difficulties encountered by historians in encompassing the complex workings of the Mexican Church for even a brief span of time, it is necessary only to read the works of Schwaller in conjunction with the fine study by Stafford Poole, *Pedro Moya de Contreras: Catholic Reform and Royal Power in New Spain, 1571–1591*. As noted, Schwaller is

concerned with clerical career patterns and finance and mentions the episcopal dignity only in passing. By contrast, Poole studies the broad range of issues confronting the Mexican Church through the eyes of a supremely conscientious prelate who often took a dim view of the abilities and motives of the clergy in nominal service to his office. During his sixteen years in Mexico from 1571 to 1586, briefly as the first Inquisitor General and then as Archbishop (with an eighteen-month interval as interim viceroy before his return to Spain), Moya was the perfect ecclesiastical servant for Philip the Prudent. A confirmed regalist and devout Tridentarian, Moya assumed the leadership of the Mexican Church when it desperately needed direction and consolidation after years of drift during the illnesses of Archbishop Montúfar.

Presiding over the all-important Third Provincial Council of 1585, which established an institutional and doctrinal framework that would endure for centuries, Moya had the opportunity to follow both his convictions and his instructions. He overrode the reluctance of his fellow bishops to formally surrender a largely fictional power over ecclesiastical appointments and gained acceptance of the 1574 Ordenanza del Patronazgo, thereby completing what Poole terms "the transformation of the colonial church into an administrative branch of the Spanish government."

This may overstate the case, but beyond reaffirming that the right of all ecclesiastical appointments was vested in the Crown, the Ordenanza established a system whereby aspiring parish priests underwent competitive examinations under episcopal supervision, after which the name of the successful candidate was presented to the viceroy for confirmation in the King's name. (The new system did not prevent royal appointment of priests in Spain, subject to episcopal scrutiny of credentials on arrival in the colony.) The bishops had little choice but to assent, and Moya favored the Ordenanza because its provisions were meant to apply to all the parishes of New Spain, including those monopolized by the orders since the conquest. This ordinance provided the episcopate with an opportunity, dreamt of since the days of Montúfar, to assume at last the spiritual direction of the Indian population.²⁸

In practice, the progress of secularization was to be agonizingly slow in the years to come. Even Moya conceded that the partial presence of the orders at the parish level was a necessity in his time, and the friars used both direct appeals to the Crown and bureaucratic jealousy between the episcopacy and the viceroy to forestall meaningful transferral into the indefinite future. In depicting this struggle, Poole notes with sympathy the reluctance of the friars to concede that the "personal, charismatic, and often apocalyptic" missionary approach, perhaps appropriate in the 1520s but merely a memory in the 1580s, had to yield ultimately to the "pedestrian bureaucracy of the bishops and the secular clergy." In the event, armed with the Ordenanza, later bishops did what they could

(most notably Juan de Palafox in Puebla in the 1640s), but even in the 1740s some two-fifths of the parishes in the central dioceses of Mexico and Michoacán were still administered by religious.²⁹

Poole views the doctrinal reforms of the Third Provincial Council, following the lead of the Council of Trent, more positively. He notes legislation directed at “the improvement of religious instruction, the extirpation of abuses, the regularization of procedures, the reform of the clergy, the attempted restoration of power and teaching authority to the bishops, and the many attempts to help the Indians.” Poole includes a most interesting summary and analysis of various memorials presented to the Council by concerned churchmen that illustrate the ecclesiastical climate of the times (pp. 130–45). As the incarnation of Trent at the local level, the Mexican council also shared in aspects of the Counter-Reformation that we now find less attractive: the emphasis on externals, a doctrinal and moral rigidity, the attempt to minutely regulate daily life, and the “low esteem of human nature and effort, whether European or Indian.” Poole notes that the Council’s legislation was regularly reprinted and studied for centuries and therefore “must have entered into the religious mentality of Mexican Catholicism.” Only future research, however, will reveal the extent and nature of the Council’s influence on the religious thinking and outlook of the Mexican Church.

Poole sees both the virtues and defects of Moya and the age he symbolized so well. In the introduction, Poole speculates that the very success of institutionalization under Moya paved the way for what is seen as the general decline of the Mexican Church after 1600 into “the worst excesses of seventeenth-century regalism, extravagance, and complacency.” Poole wisely cautions, however, that current research makes generalizations suspect. In any event, Moya pleased his royal master, who noted on his death that “there died today in my kingdom one of the best vassals in my service and one who has done all things well.”

Whatever future conclusions may be reached by historians about the extravagance and complacency of the seventeenth-century Mexican Church, the Bourbons of the eighteenth century were soon persuaded of the necessity for drastic reforms if the institution were to play a useful role in a reinvigorated society. I have noted research on the consequences of these reforms at the parish level, but the broader subject of Mexican ecclesiastical renovation at the prodding of the Bourbon state has received surprisingly little scholarly attention. Nancy Farriss’s work of some twenty years ago remains the standard account of the juridical aspects of the “crisis of ecclesiastical privilege,”³⁰ and David Brading has recalled our attention to the problem in provocative outline.³¹ To date, however, only the recent work of Oscar Mazín has studied church-state relations under the late Bourbons in monographic detail.

Mazín’s *Entre dos majestades* relies on extensive diocesan documen-

tation to study the 1758–1772 tenure of Don Anselmo Sánchez de Tagle as Bishop of Michoacán. On reading Mazín's sensitive account of the career of this dignitary, one is tempted to conclude that the triumphs and disappointments of Don Anselmo epitomize the often painful transition of the Mexican Church from the legacy of benign royal neglect bequeathed by the last Hapsburgs to sharp-eyed tutelage under a Bourbon regalism indifferent to colonial sensibilities and ecclesiastical protocol.

Although Spanish by birth, Sánchez de Tagle enjoyed close family ties to the creole aristocracy and had served as Bishop of Durango before his promotion to the sprawling diocese of Michoacán. In his new post, Don Anselmo hastened the process of secularization in parishes occupied by Augustinians and Franciscans with a minimum of friction. Concerned with the recruitment and proper training of secular clergy to take the positions left by the friars, Sánchez de Tagle caused a new and imposing diocesan seminary to be built. Overall, Mazín demonstrates that Sánchez de Tagle was a competent bishop, not given to doctrinal pronouncements but genuinely concerned with the spiritual, educational, and economic welfare of his flock.

Michoacán, however, shared in the mild depression that was afflicting the neighboring mining districts in the 1760s. Deteriorating economic conditions led to outbreaks of popular unrest that were exacerbated by the unpopular expulsion of the Jesuits. Sánchez de Tagle felt that his good offices had been abused in the efforts of the civil authorities to calm the populace, and he was appalled by the bloody high-handedness with which Visitor-General José de Gálvez judged the culprits. The bishop did not receive Gálvez on his visit to the episcopal capital of Valladolid in 1767, and thereafter relations between Sánchez de Tagle and the viceregal authorities in Mexico City were marked by chilly formality. Indeed, Sánchez de Tagle was soon accused of fraud in handling the royal two-ninths of the tithe revenue, although Mazín admits that Gálvez's complicity in the matter cannot be demonstrated, and the charge was dropped only posthumously. Under the burden of Gálvez's disfavor and pleading not altogether inadmissible ill-health, Don Anselmo chose not to attend the 1771 Fourth Provincial Council presided over by the ultra-regalist Archbishop Francisco Antonio de Lorenzana.

Perhaps it was just as well, since the often stormy conciliar sessions, which witnessed the forcible expulsion of the prelate who had succeeded him as Bishop of Durango, would not have suited someone of Sánchez de Tagle's temperament and outlook. Admittedly, only an observer with a supreme sense of irony and historical perspective could have perceived that the Fourth Council, with its loud laments over Indian idolatry and superstition and its preoccupations with royal infringements on ecclesiastical prerogatives, differed little in substance and tone from the Third Council presided over by Moya de Contreras nearly two cen-

turies earlier. In their collective pastoral wisdom, the bishops were as devoid of suggestions for remedying the Indians' spiritual plight (save for a resolve to instruct the natives in Spanish) as they were of effective power to resist the Crown's constriction of ecclesiastical asylum. The decrees resulting from the Council's deliberations satisfied neither Crown nor papacy and had little effect on ecclesiastical administration in New Spain.

Although these nine books are satisfying both individually and collectively, the reader comes away with a desire for more details concerning the entire range of Church history, particularly for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This is so even though some of the authors, most notably van Oss for Guatemala, provide the broad outlines of the unfolding and conclusion of a sad story.

One takes away from these readings the impression of a Middle American Church that as an institution, over centuries, slowly lost its sense of spiritual purpose. The most obvious explanations for this erosion are the Patronato and the Church's tendency to mirror colonial society rather than to lead it. During the sixteenth century, it may be argued, the Patronato was an entirely appropriate (even essential) arrangement. Under the aegis of the Crown, missionaries had undertaken the Spiritual Conquest and claimed victory. The Church under the episcopate had been staffed by a stream of mostly upright and conscientious men, both Spanish- and American-born, who could balance doctrine with colonial realities. Even if the death of Philip II signaled the end of the best of times, the place and point of the Church in society under the late Hapsburgs seemed secure. Although high positions in the Church might have become mere sinecures for the elite, and the consolations of religion might have increasingly resembled the empty rituals of a dry and immobile faith despite their Tridentine splendor, there remained the extraordinary upsurge of mass devotion after 1650 to sustain an institution that (to paraphrase Octavio Paz) was built to endure, not to change.³² Most compellingly, the Church still had meaningful community function at the parish level.

But the political and intellectual turbulence of the eighteenth century revealed a Church that had served one of Oscar Mazín's "two majesties" so well that it had become incapable of internal rejuvenation. By the time of the Fourth Provincial Council, the Mexican Church at least had deteriorated into a house divided within the changed historical context of emerging nationhood. The ancient split between the orders, who were the heirs of the missionaries, and the secular clergy scarcely mattered by the 1770s. Rather, the division lay between the prosperous, regalistic upper clergy who, with the doctrinal rigidity of Sahagún but lacking his cultural range, were unable to grasp the nature of the popular devotion beneath them, and the too-numerous, potentially rebellious lower clergy, impoverished despite secularization, who had begun to

understand all too well what might move the masses.³³ The few ecclesiastics who sensed the danger to both Crown and Church—Sánchez de Tagle and Agad y Queipo—were ignored by colonial ministers determined to minimize the connection between religion and sovereignty despite the fact that under the Patronato there could be no independent existence for the Church short of an as-yet-unthinkable treason.

Hence, the notion of a “New Rome” proclaimed by the Jesuits in 1764 had become a mirage by the time of consolidation in 1804. The legacy of the Patronato proved more enduring than that of the Spiritual Conquest, and by the late colonial period the Church and its symbols were more susceptible than ever to outside manipulations, not merely those of a reforming yet penurious Crown but the more quixotic designs of men like Hidalgo or Iturbide. The Catholicism of Middle America was not at issue. The mestizo priest José María Morelos might proclaim the greater authenticity of Mexican Catholicism over that of the mother country, and the Indians of the Yucatecan Caste War might take the local saints as their patrons and depict the Spanish as impious hypocrites or unbelievers.³⁴ But with the advent of independence, the Mexican Church as institution could not take control over its destiny. Too far from its constituency in outlook to mobilize their fervor in creating a national Church anywhere in the area, the proximity of the Church to the centers of political power was close enough to taint but too distant for genuine influence. Unable to lead in a society too fragmented to mirror, the nineteenth-century Church became an impediment to change in Catholic Middle America.³⁵

NOTES

1. Jacques Lafaye, *Quetzalcóatl and Guadalupe: The Formation of Mexican National Consciousness, 1531–1813*, translated by Benjamin Keen (Chicago, 1976), 95, 224.
2. David A. Brading, *Prophecy and Myth in Mexican History* (Cambridge, 1984), 31.
3. For an overview, see Joseph M. Barnadas, “The Catholic Church in Colonial Spanish America,” in *The Cambridge History of Latin America*, edited by Leslie Bethell (Cambridge, 1984), 1:511–40, 616–20. For the most recent work on the Mexican Church, see also Asunción Lavrin, “Estructuras, personalidades y mentalidades populares: la nueva historiografía de la iglesia en México,” *Mexican Studies* 4, no. 2 (1988):319–25.
4. Robert Ricard, *Conquête spirituelle du Mexique*, translated by Lesley Bryd Simpson from the 1933 French edition as *The Spiritual Conquest of Mexico* (Berkeley, 1966).
5. *Ibid.*, 16.
6. I rely here on Sabine MacCormack, “‘The Heart Has Its Reasons’: Predicaments of Missionary Christianity in Early Colonial Peru,” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 65, no. 3 (1985):443–45.
7. Ricard asserted that “the missionaries insisted on presenting Christianity, not as a perfecting or a fulfilling of native religions, but as something entirely new, which meant an absolute and complete rupture with the whole past.” See *Spiritual Conquest*, 35. But James Lockhart observes (in a soon-to-be-published study discussed below) that “Spanish ecclesiastics . . . spoke mainly in terms of instruction or indoctrination rather than conversion, and never referred to themselves as missionaries, the term so many modern scholars have anachronistically preferred.”
8. The chronology of Sahagún’s manuscript preparation given in the 1952 edition has been revised in many particulars in Nicolau D’Olwer and Howard F. Cline, “Sahagún and

- His Works," *Guide to Ethnohistorical Sources*, Part Two, edited by Cline and John B. Glass, *Handbook of Middle American Indians* (Austin, 1973), 13:186–207.
9. The reader who wishes to understand Fray Bernardino's career within the cultural ambience that prevailed on both sides of the Atlantic may consult Miguel León-Portilla, *Fray Bernardino de Sahagún* (Madrid, 1987).
 10. See Serge Gruzinski, *Sociétés indigènes et occidentalisation dans le Mexique espagnole, xvi–xviii siècle* (Paris, 1988). Other works of interest by Gruzinski are: *Man-Gods in the Mexican Highlands: Indian Power and Colonial Society, 1520–1800*, translated by Eileen Corrigan (Stanford, 1989); "Normas cristianas y respuestas indígenas: apuntes para el estudio del proceso de occidentalización entre los indios de Nueva España," *Historias* 15 (1986):31–41; and (with Carmen Bernand) *De l'idolatrie: une archéologie des sciences religieuses* (Paris, 1988).
 11. For more on the use of translated moral dialogues as a means of introducing Christian moral precepts, particularly the concept of sin, to Nahua converts, see also Louis M. Burkhart, *The Slippery Earth: Nahua-Christian Moral Dialogue in Sixteenth-Century Mexico* (Tucson, 1989).
 12. See note 1.
 13. William B. Taylor, "The Virgin of Guadalupe in New Spain: An Inquiry into the Social History of Marian Devotion," *American Ethnologist* 14 (1987):9–33.
 14. D. A. Brading, *The Origins of Mexican Nationalism* (Cambridge, 1985), 7–12. For interesting observations on the role of the Virgin of Guadalupe in later Mexican history, see also William B. Taylor, "Between Global Process and Local Knowledge: An Inquiry into Early Latin American Social History, 1500–1900," in *Reliving the Past: The Worlds of Social History*, edited by Olivier Zunz (Chapel Hill, 1985), 155–62.
 15. Taylor, "Between Global Process," 149.
 16. See *ibid.*, 182–83, n. 70, for a listing of recent research.
 17. John Leddy Phelan, *The Millennial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World* (2d rev. ed. of the 1956 original: Berkeley, 1970).
 18. Lockhart notes that the same saints appealed to both the Nahua and Spanish populations and that both were moved by the rash of miracles attributed to certain holy objects in the seventeenth century. Expanding upon O'Gorman's account of the origins of the Guadalupe cult, Lockhart thinks its veneration was doubtless created and sustained by Mexican Spaniards before its explosive growth after 1650.
 19. Charles Gibson, *Aztecs under Spanish Rule* (Stanford, 1964), 111–14. Lockhart explains Gibson's impression by noting that by that date, the great monastery churches of the orders were nearing completion and the Nahua communities were turning their attention to constructing and maintaining their own lesser churches. Lockhart analyzes Gibson's work with affectionate respect in *Charles Gibson and the Ethnohistory of Postconquest Central Mexico*, La Trobe University Institute of Latin American Studies Occasional Paper no. 9 (Melbourne, 1988). But it is clear that Lockhart's work will supplant it in many important particulars.
 20. Taylor, "Between Global Process," 151. Preliminary work by Taylor along these lines is his "Conflict and Balance in District Politics: Tecali and the Sierra Norte de Puebla in the Eighteenth Century," in *Five Centuries of Law and Politics in Central Mexico*, edited by Ronald Spores and Ross Hassig (Nashville, 1984), 87–106. My information on his current project comes from personal communication.
 21. In addition to the monographs of Asunción Lavrin, a recent splendid exception to this rule is Patricia Seed, *To Love, Honor, and Obey in Colonial Mexico: Conflicts over Marriage Choice, 1574–1821* (Stanford, 1988).
 22. The phrase is that of Barnadas, cited in note 3.
 23. See Irving Leonard, *Baroque Times in Old Mexico: Seventeenth-Century Persons, Places, and Practices* (Ann Arbor, 1959), 1–20.
 24. J. Benedict Warren is perhaps a bit severe on this score in an otherwise fair review in *Hispanic American Historical Review* 68, no. 4 (1988):823.
 25. A final chapter discusses the momentary crisis in tithe revenues caused by the effects of the 1576 epidemic. But Schwaller concludes that the Church grew prosperous once more after 1590 with stabilizing conditions and the expansion of the hacienda and commercial agriculture.

26. For some tentative conclusions about *consolidación*, see Margaret Chowning, "The Consolidación de Vales Reales in the Bishopric of Michoacán," forthcoming in the *Hispanic American Historical Review*, and the studies cited therein. The standard work on Church wealth and the Reform is Jan Bazant, *Alienation of Church Wealth in Mexico: Social and Economic Aspects of the Liberal Revolution, 1856-1857* (Cambridge, 1971).
27. For what is known about the Church's activities in the credit markets, see the essays compiled by Arnold J. Bauer in *La iglesia en la economía de América Latina, siglos xvi al xix* (Mexico City, 1986); Francisco Cervantes Bello, "La iglesia y la crisis del crédito colonial en Puebla (1800-1814)," in *Banca y poder en México (1800-1925)*, edited by Leonor Ludlow and Carlos Marichal (Mexico City, 1986), 51-74; and Asunción Lavrin, "El capital eclesiástico y las elites sociales en Nueva España," *Mexican Studies* 1, no. 1 (1985):1-28.
28. For the actual workings of the Ordenanza during this period, see Schwaller, *Church and Clergy*, 81-109.
29. David A. Brading, "Tridentine Catholicism and Enlightened Despotism in Bourbon Mexico," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 15, pt. 1 (1983):7. According to van Oss, after an abortive attempt in 1582 at secularization in Guatemala, the balance there between regulars and seculars in parish control remained almost unaltered until the Bourbon decree of 1753. See *Catholic Colonialism*, 128-35.
30. Nancy Farriss, *Crown and Clergy in Colonial Mexico, 1759-1821: The Crisis of Ecclesiastical Privilege* (London, 1968).
31. See note 29.
32. For the role of the Church in colonial culture under the Hapsburgs, see Octavio Paz, *Sor Juana, or, The Traps of Faith*, translated by Margaret Sayers Peden (Cambridge, 1988), esp. 11-59; and Luis Weckmann, *La herencia medieval de México*, 2 vols. (Mexico City, 1983) 1:199-394.
33. See David A. Brading, "El clero mexicano y el movimiento insurgente de 1810," *Relaciones* 2 (1981):5-26.
34. Farriss, *Maya Society under Colonial Rule* (Princeton, 1984), 314-15.
35. On the political and intellectual marginalization of the Church in Mexico after independence, see Brading, *Origins of Mexican Nationalism*, 66-101; and Jorge Adame Goddard, *El pensamiento político y social de los católicos mexicanos, 1867-1914* (Mexico City, 1981). Van Oss sketches a similar pattern for Guatemala in the conclusion to *Catholic Colonialism*.