



Mural Paintings of Ixmiquilpan. Barbarism and Civilization

MONIKA BRENIŠÍNOVÁ

Center for Ibero-American Studies,
Charles University, Praha, Czech Republic
monika.brenisinova@ff.cuni.cz

ABSTRACT

This paper deals with the 16th century mural paintings that cover the walls of the parish church of San Miguel Arcángel, a former Augustinian mission in Ixmiquilpan. The paintings represent warriors in battle and mixing the Western iconography with the prehispanic one. They are associated with the Chichimeca War (1540-1590), a conflict that threatened the existence of the Viceroyalty of New Spain (1535-1821). The article examines the images of “otherness” and related stereotypes conceiving the paintings as a place, where the identity of local inhabitants was discussed and putting particular emphasis on the pair of categories – barbarism and civilization. In terms of method, it is interdisciplinary and interpretative. It combines the classical historical, art historical concepts and methods with terms and procedures of anthropology and social science.

KEY WORDS: 16th century, Augustinians, Chichimecas, evangelization, identity, Mexicas, monasteries, mural painting, otherness, Otomís, stereotype

Introduction

The Ixmiquilpan murals, covered under several layers of lime, were discovered by accident in the 1960s during the reconstruction of the parish church. The murals come from the 16th century New Spain, yet they are abundant in prehispanic iconography. That is the reason why

they immediately have attracted the attention of scholars all over the world. (KAM NYE 1968:25, 33; PIERCE 1981:1).¹

Ixmiquilpan is a municipality situated in the heart of the Mezquital Valley in Hidalgo State. In the 16th century, the Ixmiquilpan population consisted solely of Otomí people, a settled tribe of agricultures and farmers. Since the 15th century, the Otomíes were subordinated to the Mexicas² (CLENDINNEN 1991; CLENDINNEN 2010; GRUZINSKI 1992; HASSIG 2001; LEÓN-PORTILLA 2013; MORGAN 1984:191-220). They formed part of the Triple Alliance and Ixmiquilpan served as the Nahuatl capital of the Mezquital Valley. It lays on the northern border of Mexican Plateau. It is an arid, desert area, which, in the past, separated the settled Mesoamerican civilizations of Central Mexico from the North zone populated by the Chichimecas, unsettled nomad indigenous tribes and, hence, known as *La Gran Chichimeca*. The frontier between these two zones was flexible, but in the early colonial period, it was set by the Lerma and Pánuco rivers (BERNAND – GRUZINSKI 1998:351-354; JACKSON 2013:28-29; JIMÉNEZ NÚÑEZ 2006:68-70).³

The Christianization of the zone was started after 1530 by the Franciscan order. In the 1540s the Franciscans were followed by the Augustinians, who settled down in the Mezquital Valley (BALLESTEROS GARCÍA 2000:81; BORGES 1992:78-84; DUVERGER 2003:30-33, 37-38; JACKSON 2013:21-29).⁴ In 1546 the discovery of silver ore deposits in Zacatecas changed the history of the region. This turning point caused several significant changes. Among them, in particular, the arrival of an increasing number of Spaniards, yearning for

¹ The paintings were publicly presented for the first time by Jorge Olvera, a Mexican ethnologist, at the Congress of Americanists, an international event, which took place in Mexico City in August 1962.

² In this paper I use the term Mexicas, which is used in the Occidental historiography to name the Mexicas, Nahuatl people who founded Tenochtitlan and became rulers of Aztec empire. Indeed, the Mexicas themselves used the term Azteca (from Nahuatl, *the people from Aztlan*) only for the period of their peregrination. After their sedentarization in the Mexico Valley, they began to use the term Mexicas (from Nahuatl, the ones from México), and/or Tenochcas (from Nahuatl, the ones from Tenochtitlan) referring to México-Tenochtitlan, the Aztec capital. As Nahuatl speaking they belong to the Nahuatl indigenous people.

³ The zone of *La Gran Chichimeca* consisted of contemporary Mexican States of Nayarit, Jalisco, Aguascalientes, Guanajuato, and Zacatecas. In Nahuatl, the language of Mexicas, it was denoted *Chichimecatlalli* (from Nahuatl, country of Chichimecas).

⁴ The Franciscans concentrated their forces in the area around Tula (e.g. Tepeji del Río, Alfajayucan, Atotonilco de Tula, Tlahuelilpan, Tepetitlan, Huichapan, and Tecozautla), while the Augustinians occupied the Mezquital Valley (e.g. Mixquihuala, Actopan, Ixmiquilpan, and Ajacuba). The secular clergy, the priests, also operated in the area.

wealth, and related lifestyle modifications (e.g. free grazing cattle, labor in mines, cultivation of European crops, etc.) related to the construction of *Camino Real*⁵ crammed with *presidios*⁶. Despite all these changes, the Chichimecas, who never had been subordinated to the Mexicas, continued to bother the local Spanish and settled indigenous populations all over the 16th century, refusing not only to subdue to the Spaniards' domination but also the efforts of missionaries to be evangelized. The constant conflicts between Spaniards and Chichimecas culminated in two wars: the Mixton War (1540-1542) and the Chichimeca War (1550-1590)⁷ (BERNAL 2009:283-284; BERNAND – GRUZINSKI 1998:351-359; POWELL 2014; ROMÁN GUTIÉRREZ 1993:360-366).

The core questions of this article are: What the Ixmiquilpan murals represent and which is their contemporary religious and social context? How the categories of barbarism and civilization are displayed? How they were constructed and what stereotyped visions were hidden behind them? What do they tell us about the identity of locals and what can we induce about the contemporary processes of making identity between the authorities and local inhabitants? Briefly, what message is encoded in the paintings and how was it received by spectators?

The paper opens with a brief overview of methodological approaches, concepts and notions with which I am operating in this text. It then continues with an iconographical description and iconological analysis within a contemporary historical framework before presenting my proper interpretation seeking for better understanding of religious and social context and, eventually, summing up the conclusions.

⁵ The *Camino Real de Tierra Adentro* (Royal Road of the Interior Land) was a trade route that connected the capital with the silver mines on the North.

⁶ The *presidios*, i.e. fortified bases, conformed during the Spanish colonial era the basis of defense system of mines, ports, trade roads and frontiers.

⁷ The work *La Guerra Chichimeca (1550-1600)* by Ph. W. Powell, which was for the first time published in 1952, remains up today the main source of information about the Chichimeca War. Powel argues that this war lasted from the 1550s to the 1600s. Nevertheless, there is no consensus among scholars on dating the conflicts with *Chichimeca* Indians. For example, José Francisco Román Gutiérrez dates them back to the 1530s.

Methodological Framework and Terminology

The main objectives of this article are:

- 1) to describe and interpret the paintings based on iconographical description and iconological analyses;
- 2) deconstruct the “images” of barbarism and civilization and using them as a tool of historical analysis, unveil the stereotyped visions of “otherness” hidden behind them;
- 3) reconstruct the religious and social context with the aid of anthropological and sociological concepts and induce appropriate conclusions.

The chosen methodology is interdisciplinary, it mingles the classical historical (e.g. study of written evidence and source criticism) and art historical methods (e.g. iconographical description and iconological analyses) with procedures and concepts of anthropology (symbolic anthropology) and social psychology (theory of identity). It follows that the work is interpretative, based on the deconstruction of images of barbarism and civilization and re-assembling the stereotyped visions of “otherness” contained in them. The interpretation is based on the study of personal research material, contemporary visual and written evidence, scholar literature, and induction.

According to the social psychology and the social identity theory (TAJFEL 1972; TAJFEL – BILLIG – BUNDY – FLAMENT 1971; TURNER 1985),⁸ the perception of “otherness” occupies an important role in the processes of self-identification and social integration. In the course of these processes the individuals identify themselves with behaviour, morals, and habits of important individuals from their social environment (e.g. parents, priests, rulers and/or other forms of authorities). This implies that individuals tend to collaborate and share their identity within a group and at the same time to cultivate and protect their identity (in both cases behaviour aims to achieve a psychic safety).

⁸ The social identity theory was developed by H. Tajfel, a British social psychologist of Polish origin at the beginning of the 1970s. It is a social psychological analysis of the role of self-conception in groups and intergroup relations, which nowadays contains a significant number of concepts and theories. It has generated a quantity of research and nowadays it is one of the most significant general theories on self, group, and their relationship. In the 1980s, one of the Tajfel's students and later colleagues and co-authors J. Ch. Turner (together with their graduate students) elaborated a so-called Self-Categorization Theory, which deals with the role of the categorization process in social identity phenomena and the theory of the group.

Simply said, we can state that the mere existence of social differences makes people evaluate the others, predominantly on behalf of their group (TURNER – TAJFEL 1986:7-24). It implies that the negative definition is the most effective and generally people tend to create their identity by delimitation, i.e. by setting boundaries between “us” and “them”. It means that the “otherness” represents one of the key factors in the process of self-identification and social integration and that people generate within these acts ideas about themselves (auto-stereotypes) and others (hetero- or xeno-stereotypes). These are contained in the so-called images of “otherness” and as such can be observed (BLOOM 1990:23; LIPPMANN 2015:106-202).⁹

These images of “alterity” have many forms. They are present in human behaviour, mentality or gestures and are documented in visual, written and verbal evidence. The problem is that these images are based on experiences and perception, acts that are made up of processes of reduction, selection, and generalization, so the resulting images can not correspond to a complex reality or personal experience, on the contrary – they are based on simple organized forms and, as such they are rather abstract than real. It turns out that the images of alterity represent simplified schemes and clichés and embody what we call prejudices and stereotypes (KOSSSLYN 1980:19-22).

In the past, the “otherness” was perceived in many different ways. For the most of the Occidental history, the people tried to protect and enclose themselves from the “otherness”. As an eloquent example, we can take the image of the Orient that played a significantly important role in the process of making the European identity, as shown by E. W. Said, a Palestinian American professor of literature and one of the founders of postcolonial studies (SAID 1994) and Tz. Todorov, a French philosopher, literary theorist and essayist of Bulgarian origin, in the case of Latin American Studies (TODOROV 1987).¹⁰ By the same way, the minorities and other groups of Occidental society has been othered such as peasants,

⁹ The term stereotype (in modern psychological meaning) was coined by W. Lippmann, a North American journalist, in a variety of his articles and columns, particularly in his book *Public Opinion* (1922). In following decades, the notion of stereotype has been elaborated especially in relation to such phenomena as national identity, state and nationalism. Cf. W. Bloom.

¹⁰ Said's study *Orientalism* (1978) is considered ground-breaking as it launched a wave of discussions about Europe's relationship with non-European cultures and has influenced many other researchers not only in the field of historiography. Said's approach was, for example, particularly important to Tz. Todorov, a French philosopher, literary theorist and essayist of Bulgarian origin, and his work *La conquista de América: el problema del otro* [The Conquest of America: The Question of The Other].

MONIKA BRENIŠÍNOVÁ

Mural Paintings of Ixmiquilpan. Barbarism and Civilization

Jews or women. The identity of individuals and social communities as well is constructed of different layers. In the early Modern Era, these components were, primarily, the consciousness of estate, professional and above all religious awareness; other factors, such as the relation to the birthplace (or landscape in general), family or family clan and to the state could have also an important role.

In this paper, the 16th century monastic architecture together with its artistic decoration are conceived as a form of symbolic communication. A monastery is seen as a liminal place, which stood out of time and space, and as such allowed to make up new identities using the – at the same time contradictory and complementary – dynamic between two modalities of human society – “structure” and “communitas” (TURNER 1969:96-97, 125-130; TURNER 1982:44-51, 58-59). Simultaneously, the missions served as the “theatres of the power”, where the authorities performed social, cultural and religious concepts of the dominant culture. So according to Cl. Geertz, the missions – along with all the set of missionary activities (e.g. sermon, catechism, religious theatre, etc.) – provided a “cultural frame”, from which the dominant culture defined itself and based its superiority and legitimacy (GEERTZ 2003:15-16). In this sense the visual arts presented to the audience the models “of reality” and “for reality”, introducing the viewers to the worldview of the dominant culture along with its mindset and instructing them how to live in it (GEERTZ 2003:90-92).

As regards the terminology being applied in this article, several points need to be clarified. The category of barbarism is universal, it stems from the contradiction between civilized and non-civilized society, and as such it was well known in both traditions, the Western and the Mesoamerican ones. In this paper, both terms are used as tools of historical analysis, i.e. in their contemporary meanings and without any evaluative, causative and/or even racist connotations (ALVA 1992; BEAUFILS – FERRO 2003; GRUZINSKI – FERRO 2014).¹¹ The significance of these categories has changed in space and time. As regards the history of Occident, the term barbarism has a long tradition going back at least to the Antiquity, when barbarians were considered those, who did not share the culture and language with Greeks and later with Romans; till the Christians began to associate this category with faith and

¹¹ In this point, I have to underline that I am conscious and familiar with debates on the postcolonial discourse and/or rights of native Americans. In this light, it is necessary to admit that up to the 20th century, all the native cultures were viewed as barbaric and, hence, the colonization was perceived as necessary as shown by the application of traditional (colonial) terminology stressing the Eurocentric gaze for the description of the history of Americas (e.g. use of terms such as *despoblado* [from Spanish, unoccupied] for the description of American territory unsettled by white men; or *guerra* [from Spanish, war] for designation of an indigenous defence, etc.).

MONIKA BRENIŠÍNOVÁ

Mural Paintings of Ixmiquilpan. Barbarism and Civilization

considered barbarians all the pagans, i.e. those who did not believe in Christ. The notion of civilization arose later, in the course of the 18th century, and as such it does not figure in written materials of the studied period (MORGAN 1984; ELIAS – DUNNING – GOUDSBFOM – MENNELL 2000).¹² Nevertheless, the Spanish used instead of the modern notion civilisation the term *la policia* referring to the organized, political life that can be viewed as synonymous to its more modern equivalent.

As regards the Mexicas, they understood these two categories in a dichotomy of nomadic and sedentary life. While the nomadic life was considered barbaric and associated with gathering and hunting, the sedentary life was perceived as civilized and it was valued in the first place for its socio-political organization (e.g. *altepetl*¹³; see VYŠNÝ 2015:196 and *calpulli*¹⁴; see VYŠNÝ 2012:26-33, 57-58, 101-102), economy (based on agriculture, markets, and long-distance commerce), complex polytheistic religion and other characteristics associated to Mesoamerican civilizations (KIRCHHOFF 1943:92-107; WILLEY – ECKHOLM – MILLON 1964:37-39).¹⁵ The Mexicas used the word *chichimeca*, associated to the various

¹² There is no consensus among scholars on the definition of the term civilization. The concepts of barbarism and civilization became especially important in the 18th and 19th centuries and this from the point of view of universal theories on the development of humanity as evidenced by the entries of encyclopaedias. In 1877 the book *Ancient Society* of American anthropologist L. H. Morgan appeared, where he presented his tripartite scheme of the evolution of humanity leading from the savagery, through barbarism, to the civilization. Although his definitions were vague – he defined the savagery as the period of hunters and gatherers, the barbarism as the era of the domestication of plants and animals and the civilization as the epoch of the state – his ideas influenced the thinking all over the 19th century (e.g. K. G. Marx and F. Engels) and the first half of the 20th century. The book *The Civilizing Process. Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations* by N. Elias, a German sociologist is considered to be the most important work of the 20th century on the theme of civilization.

¹³ An *altepetl* is a *difrasismo*, which literally means "the mountain full of water". It belongs among the most important cultural concepts of Mesoamerica and designates at the same time an ethnic entity as territorial. This geographical location glyph was used not only to designate peoples but also their temples; and among other things, it refers also to the importance of water and the general image of the Mesoamerican world.

¹⁴ A *calpulli*, i.e. "large house", is a main organizational unit of Mexica society. Each *altepetl* was divided into several *calpulli*. These were responsible for diverse social (e.g. education), religious (e.g. organization of religious festivities) and economic tasks (e.g. distribution of land and agriculture).

¹⁵ Mesoamerica is a cultural and geographical concept designating the region extended from Mexico through Guatemala, Belize, El Salvador, western part of Honduras and Nicaragua to Nicoya peninsula in northwestern Costa Rica where an array of advanced civilizations (Aztec and Maya civilizations) with common cultural elements (e.g. a complex calendar system, agriculture based on maize, ballgame, human sacrifice, etc.) was formed. The notion of Mesoamerica comes from a Mexican anthropologist with German origins Paul Kirchhoff, who introduced it in the 1940s. In the

MONIKA BRENIŠINOVÁ

Mural Paintings of Ixmiquilpan. Barbarism and Civilization

nomad ethnic groups of hunter-gatherers (e.g. Huachichiles, Zacatecos, Cascanes, Pame, etc.) living in the north (GÓNZALEZ TORRES 1995:63; SIMÉON 1977:96),¹⁶ in counterpoint to the term *tolteca*,¹⁷ related to the noble and habile craftsmen and artists; while the first term designated barbarism, the second civilization (PIERCE 1981:1; GÓNZALEZ TORRES 1995:180; SAHAGÚN 1981:210; SIMÉON 1977:713).

In this text I am using the terms Spaniards, Natives and missionaries. These are mere abstractions, since in reality the Europeans who came into the Americas were confronted with a rich variety of people of different social statuses, ages, professions, etc. (despite the pressure of Spanish Crown on the homogeneity of Spanish colonization). The same goes for the category of “Indians”, who started to identify themselves as such only after the coming of Spaniards in direct contradiction to them (BERNABEU ALBERT – GIUDICELLI – HAVARD 2013:9-31; GRUZINSKI 2013:94).¹⁸ Since the 20th century and the rise of indigenous populations’ rights, the term Native American (or Natives) is preferred to name the indigenous peoples of the Americas, in view of the fact that it recognizes their primacy. In this text, I am referring to the narrower groups of Natives, whose names are based on shared language and history, such as the Mexicas, Otomíes and Chichimecas (DUVERGER 1993:9; LIMÓN OLVERA 2012:292-293, 390).

1960s this concept was revised by G. R. Willey, G. F. Eckholm and R. F. Millon in relation to the publication of Handbook of Middle American Indian.

¹⁶ The definition of the notion Chichimecas significantly varies. Generally, it has been translated as “inhabitants of Chichiman, land of milk”, “the one who sucks or breast”) or as “lineage of dogs“. For inhabitants of Mexican Valley, it had both, positive (noble savage) and negative (barbarian) connotation, since it was used to name the settled Mesoamerican civilizations (e.g. Tolteca-Chichimeca, Nonoalca-Chichimeca), as well as the northern nomadic ethnic groups (e.g. Nahu-Chichimecas, Oton-Chichimecas, Cuexteca-Chichimecas). Allegedly, the Chichimecas were also ancestors of the Mexicas. Eventually, the Chichimeca tribes are sometimes excluded from Mesoamerican cultural area (see the note 10), because of their nomadic way of life.

¹⁷ The term Toltecas had for the Mexicas various meanings. It was used to denominate the inhabitants of Tula, the various ethnic groups that came into the Central Mexico in the 10th century and dominated different regions of Mesoamerica with their dominion known as Toltec Empire (900-1200) and, eventually, artists and artisans, masters or skilled craftsmen.

¹⁸ S. Barnabéu Albert, Ch. Giudicelli and G. Harvard use the notion *indianización* (from Spanish, *indigenización*) to name the process of transformation of various indigenous ethnicities to one homogenous group. However, other authors, e.g. French historian S. Gruzinski use the same term to express the processes of appropriation and assimilation of western culture by the indigenous ones, mainly of Christianity.

Primary Sources. Written and Visual Evidence

The main source of this paper represents an audio-visual material collected during field research that I carried out in 2013 at the territory of Central Mexico.¹⁹ For the comparison and contextualization, I worked with two different groups of primary sources dating from the 16th century: first, a collection of written evidence (e.g. chronicles, letters, and annals, etc.); second, an assembly of visual evidence (e.g. maps and colonial codices, etc.), which are listed below. While the first group was elaborated by white European men (solely by regular and secular clergymen, royal and vice-royal officials, Spanish conquerors and colonizers), the second one was made by native painter-scribes known as *tlacuilos* (SIMÉON 1977:583; TOWNSEND 2017:xviii), who became – after the European intrusion – part of colonial administration. It turns out that the written evidence, which was meant to serve to royal, vice-royal, ecclesiastical or individual purposes, speaks more about the western imagery than about the native one. The visual evidence, which should serve solely to the intentions of the former native aristocracy, testifies about native imagery, although it speaks rather about the elite worldview than that of regular people (e.g. indigenous farmers, workers, and artisans). Moreover, in both cases, we have to take into consideration a significant time gap together with a high number of mediators (e.g. scribes, archivists, historians, translators, editors or anybody who stands between the reader and the resource itself) that may have contributed to the distortion of described events, persons and phenomena.

Ixmiquilpan Murals. Iconographical Program and Iconological Analysis

The set of studied murals covers the wall of the former monasterial church of San Miguel Arcángel, which, nowadays, serves as a parish. A former Augustinian monastery was founded between the years 1546-1550 and built between 1550-1560. The majority of specialists on the theme agree that the paintings were commissioned in the 1570s in direct relation to the Chichimeca War and the General Chapter of the Augustinian order, which was held there in 1572. Although there is no consensus on the personality of the patron of the paintings, the friar Andrés de Mata is most frequently mentioned as a *maecenas* of the iconographic program since he was the founder of the monastery and was in the office of its

¹⁹ In 2013 I had the opportunity due to support of the Mexican Government Scholarship for International Students to carry on a vast field research during which I visited and documented 116 monasteries situated in the area of Central Mexico (Ciudad de México, Estado de México State, Morelos State, Puebla State, Tlaxcala State and Hidalgo State), the Ixmiquilpan monastery was one of them.

prior till 1572. In any case, we can state that the paintings were elaborated by the indigenous painters and commissioned by the Augustinian order (ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1976:9-10; ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1982:9; KUBLER 2012:109, 620; McANDREW 1965: 127, 482; PIERCE 1981:1).²⁰

The paintings are polychromous, executed in tones of brown, yellow, green and blue and contoured by a black line. They are composed of two large decorative friezes that are situated at eye level and cover the nave almost all along its length. The background of the friezes is conformed – in accordance with the Renaissance mode – by the acanthus leaves. While in Occident this type of paintings is traditionally known as grotesque, in colonial Mexico it has been labelled as *pintura a lo romano* (KUBLER 2012:444; TOUSSAINT 1965:220-226; VOCABULARIO 1975:385).²¹ They gained other names, such as *frisos* or *grutescos monumentales* (in English, monumental friezes or grotesques) (ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1976:9-10; ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1982:1, 9-10), pointing out their significant dimensions. In addition, there are four other paintings that are iconographically related to the iconographic program of the friezes: two monumental paintings located in the tympana under the choir and two scenes hidden in the church vaults, one in the presbytery, and another in the choir. Unfortunately, the iconographic program is not complete giving the lack of apse painting, which remains a pivotal problem that complicates, if not precludes, the attempts at an overall interpretation of the paintings. I am trying to overcome this lack by comparing the studied set of painting with other Augustinian iconographic programs from the area (e.g. Actopan and Santa María Xoxoteco).

Concerning the elaboration of the paintings, they combine Western and Mesoamerican elements and techniques. Since the prehispanic iconography predominates, they represent one of the most striking examples of the Indochristian art. (MORENO VILLA 1986; REYES-VALERIO 2000).²² To the Western tradition, we count the elaboration of the friezes with the

²⁰ G. Kubler places the execution of the paintings in the 1570s, when the construction of the convent was likely to be accomplished and when the paintings of nearby Augustinian monasteries in Actopan or Oaxtepec were achieved too. The majority of authors agree with E. I. Estrada de Gerlero. She proposed that the friezes could be painted on the occasion of the general assembly of the Augustinian order which was held here in 1572. The main topics of the assembly were the wars against Chichimecas and Huastecas, which were both proclaimed fair.

²¹ The definition of the *pintura a lo romano* can be read in *Ordenanzas de los pintores y doradores* (1557) (in Spanish, Decrees concerning painters and gilders), which were published in *Arte Colonial in México* by M. Toussaint.

²² The monastic artistic decoration in the form of murals and sculptural reliefs was generally created by indigenous artists and craftsmen in collaboration with European missionaries. They were

help of cartoons with the acanth motive along with Occidental artistic techniques such as foreshortening or shading. On the other hand, the incorporation of indigenous symbolism and iconography, the predominant representation of all the figures from a profile, together with the lack of perspective and the construction of space with help of superposition of individual elements and use of complementary colours, such as blue and orange, belong to the Mesoamerican artistic conventions. There are also a series of indigenous innovations, such as the zoomorphic beings wearing sandals.

Respecting the iconographic program of the decorative friezes, we distinguish the southern and northern bands. On the northern band, we observe knights wearing characteristic prehispanic military insignia. The knights are wearing military costumes typical of prehispanic Central Mexico (BERDAN – ANAWALT 1997:184-185; HEATH 2002:nepag.; HASSIG 1992:270-283). The basic elements of these dresses were *ichcahuipilli*, a suit of padded cotton armour, and *chimalli*,²³ a circular shield. This basic uniform could be complemented by elaborate feather insignia: *tlahuiztli*,²⁴ a feathered bodysuit, *copilli*,²⁵ a simple crown or feathered headdress, plus *pantli*,²⁶ a battle standard. Besides, they have

educated in European techniques and forms and for this reason this art is a combination of Western and Mesoamerican artistic forms and techniques. That is why it was labelled mestizo, *tequitqui* or lately Indochristian. The term *tequitqui* was coined in the 1940s by Mexican essayist J. M. Villa in order to name the colonial artistic production that mingled Spanish and Indian elements. The notion means “tributary” and was born from the comparison with the Spanish Mudéjar art. Since the term emphasizes the European tradition and, moreover, implies a subordinated position of indigenous artists and craftsmen, it has been since 1970s rejected. However, the discussion on an appropriate nomenclature of colonial Latin American art has not been finished yet.

²³ The shields varied in ornamentations. We can distinguish, for example, Twisted Gourd shield (*xicalcolihqui*), Huastec Nose Ornament shield (*cuexyo*) or the Silver Stone shield (*teucuiltlateteyo*). It seems likely that they had no connection to the military rank or costume. Cf. Matrícula de Tributos (e.g. fol. 3r, 4r) or Lienzo de Tlaxcala (e.g. cell 46).

²⁴ The Mexicas had a rich variety of warriors' costumes, among them, for example, Huastec (*cuextecal*), Butterfly (*papalotl*), Jaguar (*ocelotl*), Coyote (*coyotl*) or Claw (*xopilli*) dresses. Some of them had different colour variants, e.g. Huastec of Jaguar uniforms. Cf. Matrícula de Tributos (e.g. fol. 3r and 3v, 12r), Codex Mendoza (e.g. fol. 23v, 23r, 26r, 31r, 34 r, 41r, 46r), Florentine Codex, XIII (e.g. fol. 34r).

²⁵ A *copilli* is a pointed coin-shaped hat that makes part of Huastec costume.

²⁶ The Mexicas used during battles several types of back banners (e.g. *quaxolotl*, an umbrella like banner; *tlecocomoctli*, in form of a headdress in fire, or the *papalotl*, in form of a butterfly), which were worn on warriors' back. According to Pohl or Hassig their use was solely functional, (although their symbolism was rooted in the Mexica mythology), since they served as signal flags to coordinate the movement of different Aztec units. In Ixmiquilpan, the whole frieze is divided into repeated scenes, which are divided by standing men holding *pantli*. Cf. Codex Mendoza (e.g. fol. 67) or Lienzo de Tlaxcala (e.g. cell 29, 40).

huaraches,²⁷ traditional sandals on their feet and are dotted with *macahuatl*, an obsidian-bladed sword made up from wood, and *tepoztopilli*, an obsidian-bladed spear. And some of them are equipped with trophy heads²⁸ (holding in hands or hanging at the waist). The knights are fighting with lightly clad warriors. These wear only loincloths and/or *tilmas*, robes tied on the shoulder. They are armed with *tlahuitolli*, arcs, and *yaomitl*, arrows, and some of them are grasping *chimallis*, or stones. The knights are accompanied by men's heads represented from profile and spreading from the acanthus foliage, and two zoomorphic beings. These beings wear *huaraches* and they are dotted by bows and arrows and trophy heads.

The first one possesses a horse body and human arms and face, its head is decorated by a headband of feathers, it grabs a *chimalli* along with a bow in its right hand, while in his left hand it has three arrows, a white trophy head tends from his waist (BARBA AHUATZIN – BANCO PADILLA 2009:24-27, 106-110; DOMÍNGUEZ TORRES 2013:187-188).²⁹ The other one holds in his dextral hand an arch, its left foot is human, its tail ends in a small reptile and the sharp fangs shine in its jaws. In his sinister hand, he carries a half-naked warrior, who is holding a *macahuatl* in his left hand, while in his right one we observe a stone. A beaded bracelet and earplugs represent his only ornament. The defeated and captives are from the ranks of poorly clothed fighters and phytomorphic creatures. Furthermore, the northern frieze is completed with two significantly deteriorated medallions. Both scenes are symmetric and organized along the central axis. The first medallion depicts a pair of fighters, on the left side

²⁷ According to Codex Mendoza the warriors had the right to wear the sandals from the number of two captives and higher. It follows that only high-status men such as warriors and the emperor's emissaries used to wear shoes.

²⁸ According to the Codex Mendoza the use of feathered military costumes was regulated by the number of captured prisoners: a cotton armour to one captive, a Huastec costume corresponded to two captives, a Butterfly costume to three captives, a Jaguar costume to four captives (these had four variants, yellow, red, blue and green) and a Claw costume for five or six prisoners. Nevertheless, there is an abundant variety of other costumes and styles depicted in visual resources whose rank is not clear. In general, we can state that common warriors (*macehualtin*) used to wear only loincloths (or animal skins when they advanced in the warrior hierarchy) along with plain shields and cotton armours with feather suits were intended for the noble (*pipiltin*) and priest warriors Cf. Codex Mendoza (fol. 64r). According to B. Sahagún the symbol of warrior's rank was his *manta*, a cape rather than the feather suit.

²⁹ As M. Domínguez Torres pointed out, the trophy heads were not worn during the battle. She asserts that since they were not a part of military insignia as they are painted in Ixmiquilpan, they represent rather a stereotyped vision of Mexica warfare. This is true, but in Maya art, we can find several examples of trophy heads represented dangling from the belt and/or laying on the ground. Generally, they are depicted in relation to the presentation of the tribute to the ruler or with Water Lilly Jaguar. The Jaguar has also a strong funeral symbolism and it is linked to the cult of the dead.

MONIKA BRENIŠINOVÁ

Mural Paintings of Ixmiquilpan. Barbarism and Civilization

we observe a coyote warrior clutching in his left hand a *macahuitl*, who, by the gesture of his right hand, subjects a slightly clad warrior represented on the right side. The captive is kneeling and seems to hold a stone in his right arm. The second medallion displays a figure of an Aztec warrior armed with *macahuitl*, wearing a *copilli* and a quiver. The warrior seems to bear an object with four darts (Figure 1).



Figure 1: A Medallion with Mexica Warrior and Chichimeca Captive. A fresco secco wall painting, c. 1570, church, San Miguel Arcángel ex-monastery, Ixmiquilpan, Hidalgo State. Photo: M. Brenišinová.

The southern frieze displays semi-naked phytomorphic creatures with women's heads and round bellies, whose delicate parts are covered by the acanthus leaves. These are armed by nothing more than round shields and are struggling against Mexica knights (Figure 2). Word scrolls come out from the mouths of all the figures suggesting that there are talking and/or singing.

MONIKA BRENIŠÍNOVÁ

Mural Paintings of Ixmiquilpan. Barbarism and Civilization



Figure 2: *View of the Southern Wall.* A fresco secco wall painting, c. 1570, church, San Miguel Arcángel ex-monastery, Ixmiquilpan, Hidalgo State. Photo: M. Brenišínová.

The same goes for the pair of monumental paintings that fulfil the tympana. Both scenes are situated under the choir and they are framed by decorative belts at their bottom. While the northern one is preserved in relatively good conditions, the southern is unfortunately considerably damaged. The northern mural is situated by the entrance to the baptistery, which interferes with the overall layout of the painting and causes the fact that the main part of the scene is situated on the right side. Here, we observe a pair of giant beasts, a jaguar on the right hand and an eagle on the left, with a coat of arms at their feet. The jaguar and eagle are represented in the first plan, speech scrolls emanate from their mouth and beak and the eagle wears a headdress of quetzal feathers. The coat of arms combines Western and Mesoamerican

MONIKA BRENIŠÍNOVÁ

Mural Paintings of Ixmiquilpan. Barbarism and Civilization

forms. It displays a traditional European coat of arms with a barely discernible armlet and a column in the middle of a simplified mountain with a water spring at the bottom. In the left half of the scene, we observe another image of a jaguar represented on a smaller scale. In his right paw, he holds a bow and in his left paw he clutches an arrow, his head is decorated by a quetzal headdress and speech scrolls are coming out of his mouth. The second plan is being conformed by a typical local landscape – an arid desert covered by nothing more than rocks, cacti and mesquite plants (Figure 3).



Figure 3: View of the Northern Tympanum Wall Painting. A fresco secco wall painting, c. 1570, church, San Miguel Arcángel ex-monastery, Ixmiquilpan, Hidalgo State. Photo: M. Brenišínová.

Unfortunately, the mural painting of the opposite, southern side is vastly deteriorated. The whole scene is divided into two halves along a central axis. In the middle and at the top of the scene, a spectator can recognize a monumental image of an eagle. The eagle is represented with a pair of wide-outstretched wings with a quetzal headdress on the top of his head. He is sitting on a pair of plants – a nopal and possibly a verdolaga (*Portulaca orelacea*) and a speech scrolls come out from his beak. He is surrounded by a pair of jaguars, whose contours are blurred, so they are barely discernible. Both reptiles are wearing quetzal headbands and a jaguar on the right side holds a *macahuítl*. The background of the mural consists of the same landscape as in the aforementioned case (Figure 4).



Figure 4: *View of the Southern Tympanum Wall Painting.* A fresco secco wall painting, c. 1570, church, San Miguel Arcángel ex-monastery, Ixmiquilpan, Hidalgo State. Photo: M. Brenišínová.

The final pair of paintings that are related to the iconographic program of the friezes is to be found in the vaults of the nave. The first one is located in the presbytery, the second in the choir. Both scenes display an eagle similar to the picture described above. The eagle wears a quetzal headdress, bears a long battle banner and his chest is decorated with a circular pectoral. In front of the eagle's beak the speech scrolls are floating. This mural suggests that the original iconographic program had to be much larger, but unfortunately other paintings have not been preserved.

As far as the content of the paintings is concerned, there is no consensus among scholars. The truth is rather opposite and the range of opinions on the significance of the Ixmiquilpan murals is particularly vast and disperse. It follows that in this part of the paper, I will discuss some of these opinions trying to bring the light into this diverse tangle of different stands and, eventually, I will present my own opinions and interpretations (the truth is that since the Ixmiquilpan iconographic program is incomplete and without any direct written evidence,

any explanation would be a mere interpretation, which still can bring the reader to a more likely image of historical reality).

Concerning the iconological analysis of the northern frieze, the identity of two differently clothed groups of warriors remains problematic. Generally, the uniformed fighters are related to the Mexicas warriors since they were a uniforms and regalia typical of Mexica army and are carrying characteristic wooden weapons with obsidian blades *macahuitl* and *tepoztopilli*; and identified as the local inhabitants Otomíes (CARRILLO Y GARIEL 1961:27; ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1976:11; KAMM NYE 198:27-30; VERGARA HERNÁNDEZ 2013:157-158, 159; WRIGHT CARR 1998:91-92).³⁰ Nevertheless, given the fact that Ixmiquilpan served – before the coming of Spaniards – as an outpost of Aztec influence in the north and its inhabitants protected the northern frontier of Aztec Empire against the dreaded Chichimecas, there is no reason to question the relation of these warriors with former Aztec dominion and its armed forces. Besides, this is confirmed by the presence of two *altepetl*, the pre-Columbian site glyphs, as well as by the contemporary written evidence, since archival documents demonstrate that the locals continued to perform the same service even after the conquest, only now for the Spanish Empire (DOMÍNGUEZ TORRES 2013:183, 194; PIERCE 1981:7-9).³¹

On the other hand, from the study of the same documents, it turns out that the 16th century indigenous warriors used to wear timeworn European clothes, swords and rode horses (as well as Chichimecas at that time). It implies that the Ixmiquilpan paintings do not represent the historic reality of 16th century New Spain, they are allegoric and their aim was rather symbolic. They were aimed to communicate some message. On the other hand, D. L. Pierce who studied a set of colonial codices (e.g. Codex Mendoza or Annals of Tlatelolco), demonstrated that the traditional prehispanic military uniforms continued to be used throughout the 16th century on the occasion of public ceremonies (ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1976:16-17; PIERCE 1981:2-7). Even in colonial art, we can find various

³⁰ H. Kamm Nye believed that the Ixmiquilpan paintings embodied the mythology of both Mexicas and Otomíes within a general Christian layout.

³¹ In Tlatelolco Codex we see several indigenous warriors in traditional prehispanic uniforms with European swords going to Mixton War in 1542 (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Codex_of_Tlatelolco#/media/File:Codex_of_tlatelolco.JPG).

examples showing that the Natives used to wear pre-Columbian warriors' dresses during the religious and/or secular festivals up to the 18th century.³²

As for the identity of the scantily dressed autochthonous warriors, the majority of scholars agree that the men in loincloths represent Chichimecas, who had never been subjected to the Mexicas, and after the coming of white men, they rebelled against the efforts of Spaniards to be evangelized, conquered and acculturated (JACKSON 2013:146; PIERCE 1981:7; VERGARA HERNÁNDEZ 2013:157-158; WRIGHT CARR 1998:74-75). They also continued to bother the Spanish as well as the sedentary indigenous population – mainly Otomí – all over the 16th century. The written and visual evidence approves this theory. D. L. Pierce studied a corpus of pre-Columbian documents that narrate the story of immigrations (e.g. the Xólotl, Quinatzin, Tlotzin, Tlaxcala codices, etc.)³³ towards the Valley of Mexico and these show without any doubts the evolution of weapons in relation to the transition from the nomadic to the sedentary life, i.e. from the bows and arrows to the *macahuítl*, the *atlatl*, a spear thrower (which was rarely depicted), and the *tepoztopilli*. It follows that the sedentary indigenous populations of Central Mexico were aware of the difference between both sets of weapons and used the depiction of the bow and arrows (along with the shortage of clothing) as a symbol of the word *chichimeca*, first, to designate the Chichimecas themselves, second, to indicate the northern border and third, to express the idea of nomadic way of life. However, even the iconography of the Chichimecas was symbolic and did not correspond to the historic reality. The Chichimecas were a compound of a variety of indigenous ethnics and tribes with different religious, social and political practices, and hence also military ones. In addition, unlike the Mexicas, the Chichimeca warriors used to wear typical red body paints that is not present in Ixmiquilpan.

Moreover, the Chichimecas represented the biggest threat for 16th century New Spain, threatening not only its expansion, but also the functioning of Viceroyalty itself including the

³² Cf. Anonymous painter. *El palo volador*. Viceroyalty of New Spain, c. 1651-1700. Oil painting, 107 x 505 cm. Museum of the Americas, inventory number: 0653 (<http://ceres.mcu.es/>).

³³ D. L. Pierce studied prehispanic codices and maps coming from various schools, such as the Texcoco School documents (e.g. Map of Quinatzin, Map of Tlotzin, Boban Aztec Calendar Wheel, Codex Xolotl) or the Mexico-Tenochtitlan School texts (e.g. Codex Telleriano-Remensis or Tolteca-Chichimeca History) that tell the story of arrival of the Mexicas to the Valley of Mexico plus the documents that originated outside of Mexico Valley (e.g. Lienzode Tlaxcala, Annals of Cuauhtinchan) and compared them to the colonial set of visual and written evidence (e.g. Codex Mendoza, Florentine Codex, XIII). She underpinned the fact that also the documents coming from the outside of the Valley of Mexico (e.g. Annals of Cuauhtinchan, Lienzo de Tlaxcala) use the symbol of the bow and arrows in the same way.

mission of the Christianization of Natives (in particular, if we contemplate the high costs of unceasing clashes with Chichimecas). In fact, the study of written evidence shows that the missionaries not only approved but eventually supported the war campaign against the Chichimecas, who in the second half of the 16th century attacked several missions and killed their inhabitants (ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1976:17; GRIJALVA 1985:173, 204).³⁴ According to Ph. W. Powell the missionaries were not capable to face the attacks of the Chichimecas:

*“Thus, the missionaries, [...] were virtually useless in the enterprise of pacifying the Chichimecas during much of this forty-year war” (POWELL 2014:10).*³⁵

As for the significance of the battle itself, the scholars' opinions can be divided into two different groups.³⁶ The first group considers the paintings rather an expression of Occidental tradition, while the second emphasizes on the Mesoamerican tradition. The majority of these authors accepted the A. Carrillo y Gariels' conviction that the paintings represent at the symbolical level the European timeworn theme of psychomachy (EARLS 1987:237),³⁷ i.e. the Battle between the Good and Evil (CARILLO Y GARIEL 1961:24; ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1982:9; VERGARA HERNÁNDEZ 2013:157-158; WRIGHT CARR 1998:90).³⁸ Moreover, some of them are convinced that besides the moralizing motive the friezes depict the Chichimeca War presented within the Christian idea of the just war theory (*bellum iustum*) (ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1976:18; DOMÍNGUEZ TORRES 2013:185-

³⁴ The Chichimecas attacked, for example, the Augustinian convent in Xilitla in 1587 and a year later in Chichicaxtla. Indeed, Ixmiquilpan itself was attacked in 1570. Many religious men supported the war against the Chichimecas, as evidenced by their anti-Chichimeca opinions, among them, e.g. Juan de Zumárraga, Gerónimo de Mendieta, Vasco de Quiroga, Alonso de la Veracruz, Pedro Moya de Contreras, Pedro de Ayala or Juan Focher. The *Chichimecas* were the theme of several synods, congresses, and ecclesiastical councils.

³⁵ „Así, los misioneros, [...], fueron virtualmente inútiles en la empresa de pacificar a los chichimecas durante la gran parte de esta guerra de cuarenta años” (trans. by the author).

³⁶ The authors themselves frequently underline the complexity of symbolism and multi-meaning of the Ixmiquilpan paintings. Some of them changed their minds over the time or presented simultaneously multiple hypotheses. Thus, the classification of their opinions has been very complicated.

³⁷ In Christian iconography, the psychomachy (Battle of Virtues and Vices or Battle of Good and Evil) is an allegorical representation of the conflict between the soul and flesh or good and evil that is based on 5th century poem *Psychomachia* written in Latin by the Spanish poet Prudentius. The poem, as well as its representation, became quite popular during the High Middle Ages and Renaissance and it is linked to the doctrine of seven deadly sins.

³⁸ D. Wright Carr disagrees with this stance arguing that there is no model in the Old World that would represent a psychomachy through the depiction of battle.

186; JACKSON 2013:151-152, 164; PIERCE 1981:7; VERGARA HERNÁNDEZ 2013:159-160, 169) or the then-popular *Dance of Mexicas and Chichimecas* (HARRIS 2000),³⁹ an adaptation of the *Dance of Christians and Moors*, a popular tradition that had come to Mexico from the Iberian peninsula (DEBROISE 1994: 155-172; WAKE 2010:254).⁴⁰ The adherents of Mesoamerican tradition conceive the paintings as expression of Nahuatl concept of war (HASSIG 2001:2-3, 24-27, 34-35, 106-107; JOHANSSON 1993:118-125)⁴¹ whether it was *atl tlachinolli*, a conquest war, *xochiyaotl*, a flower war (DUVERGER 2003:163) or *yaoyotl*, a sacred war that was linked to *tonatiuhilhuicatl*⁴² (JACKSON 2013:151-152, 161; WRIGHT CARR 1998:74-78, 86-90),⁴³ a Nahuatl idea of heaven having them or for a demonstration of indigenous resistance (GRUZINSKI 2001:195).⁴⁴

³⁹ The religious theatre (e.g. The Conquest of Jerusalem, The Conquest of Rhodes, etc.) was one of the missionary methods applied by the missionary orders during the process of Evangelization of Natives (for the specialized literature on see the works by B. Aracil Varón, A. Partida or O. Rivera). It became very popular among Indians and part of all sorts of festivals and ceremonies including religious and secular processions. The drama could also have a form of a dance (e.g. the original Spanish Dance of Moors and Christians that evolved in New Spain into the Dance of Mexicas and Chichimecas) or mock battles.

⁴⁰ E. Wake argued that the Ixmiquilpan paintings represent a theatrical staging of an *otoncuicatl*, an Otomí warrior song and she related some Ixmiquilpan iconographical elements with song contained in *Cantares Mexicanos*, a manuscript collection of Nahuatl songs or poems recorded in the 16th century.

⁴¹ The Mexicas distinguished several types of wars: (atl) tlachinolli, a conquest or punishing war, xochiyayotl, a ritualized flower war and yayotl, a sacred war.

⁴² The *tonatiuhilhuicatl* was the Mexica third celestial stratum. It was associated with the West and was intended for warriors and women who died during childbirth.

⁴³ D. Wright Carr identified a set of prehispanic symbols and iconography related to the *yayotl* and proved that this prehispanic iconography was used until the 17th century.

⁴⁴ S. Gruzinski interpreted the paintings as a Christianized version of *Metamorphoses* by Ovid, a sophisticated iconographic program designed by indigenous and missionary elites, which, however, incorporated also hidden of prehispanic mythology.

MONIKA BRENIŠINOVÁ

Mural Paintings of Ixmiquilpan. Barbarism and Civilization



Figure 5: View of the Northern Decorative Frieze with Mexica Warriors Struggling with the Chichimecas. A fresco secco wall painting, c. 1570, church, San Miguel Arcángel ex-monastery, Ixmiquilpan, Hidalgo State. Photo: M. Brenišinová.

Unfortunately, the warriors are not represented in the number of seven and it is difficult to determine which knights were meant to be Virtues and which ones Vices, although it is still possible that the paintings were interpreted by the missionaries as representing a battle between Good and Evil. Some allusions would fit such a didactic reading and we cannot omit that the artistic decoration was used as a didactic tool. Giving the fact that the patron of the ex-monastery was Saint Michael, I would suggest that the warriors represent *milites Christi*, an image that the spectators could refer not only to the Bible (e.g. Book of Ephesians) but also to the warriors going to the Holy Land on a Crusade and/or the Reconquest and what is

more important to themselves and their struggle, contra Chichimecas. Knights struggling in the company of monumental eagles could be related to the crusading activities (e.g. Constantine the Great, Heraclius, Charlemagne) and the conquest of Mexico was till the beginning accompanied by symbolic erections of crosses. Hernán Cortés fought in the sign of Holy Cross and the reverence for the True Cross and the Virgin Mary were some of the first things the missionaries taught Indians (Figure 5). Moreover, giving the fact that in Ixmiquilpan they celebrate the Festival of the Holy Cross up today (PEÑALOSA 1969:198-203)⁴⁵ that has been celebrated by processions and *Dances of Mexicas and Chichimecas*, I think that is likely that the friezes refer to the Legend of the Holy Cross (e.g. apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus),⁴⁶ in which we meet Archangel Michael, the patron of the monastery. Saint Michael was chosen intentionally to replace the local cult rendered to Huitzilopochtli, the main Mexica god since their colour was blue, they had similar weapons (while Archangel had a fire sword, Aztec tribal god had a *xiuhcoatl*, a fire snake) and they were both associated to the water and rain. In this sense, the northern frieze embodies also the *Otomí* worldview, since the *Otomíes* related the North to the blue colour and summer, during which they celebrated the festival of *Xocotl Huetzi*, the Great feast of the death and the gods Yozipa (Xiuhtecutli) and Otontecuhtli. Therefore, the Legend of the Holy Cross (EARLS 1987:39, 89-90) would shield all the aforementioned motives, since it makes it possible to incorporate both the prehispanic concepts of the sacred war and heaven together with Otomí worldview with the psychomachy, (since in the literature of that time the crusades were frequently seen as an allegory of the battle between Good and Evil). Eventually, the crusading ideology provided also an explanation of contemporary events in form of Chichimeca War from the Christian viewpoint, as well as an example to lead since the martyrdom could serve as an inspiration to the young worshippers and encouragement for their recruiting.

As for the content of the southern frieze, the major commotion has been raised by the question of the identity of enigmatic phytomorphic creatures. Based on the specialized literature, I have distinguished three different standpoints among scholars. The first group of authors

⁴⁵ The festival of the Holy Cross of El Maye, the Holy Cross mountain, is up to this day one of the most important festivities of Ixmiquilpan. It is celebrated on May 3rd. On this day the cross kept at the chapel on Deshitzo Mountain is descended and brought up to the chapel in a procession that starts at the Maye Church and goes up the mountain to leave the cross.

⁴⁶ This legend is based on the *Golden Legend* by Jacopo da Voragine and narrates the history of the wood, from which became the cross on which Jesus Christ was crucified and its later triumph. The most famous depiction of the Legend of the Holy Cross are the polychromous frescos by Pierro della Francesca at the Church of San Francesco, Arezzo (c. 1452-1466). Moreover, the Fray Andrés de Mata lived in Italy, where he allegedly worked as a painter.

suggests that they represent *cihuateteo* (in Nahuatl divine women), a pre-Columbian spirits of women who died in childbirth⁴⁷ (ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1976:11; ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1982:9; WRIGHT CARR 1998:88). In pre-Columbian tradition childbirth was seen as an equivalent of war and, hence, the *cihuateteo* were conceived as the opponents of the spirits of deceased Aztec warriors. While the women stayed in a dark place in the west called *Cihuatlampa* (in Nahuatl the place of women), the men dwelled in *ilhuicatl-Tonatiuh*, the third celestial layer in Mexica mythology where the Sun dwells, and they together accompanied the sun on its quotidian way to the west. As for the iconography of *cihuateteo*, their traditional attributes were elements emphasizing the unaccomplished women's fertility, e.g. bare breasts or thin waist, and the link to the earth and darkness, e.g. loose hair and skirts with snakes. According to my opinion, various facts speak against this theory. First, the *cihuateteo* are linked to the west, whereas in Ixmiquilpan they are displayed on the southern wall. Second, in Ixmiquilpan paintings the attributes of female fertility, e.g. round belly, are emphasized, while the prehispanic iconography stresses the unrealized motherhood. Third, the fact that they are struggling with Indian knights instead of collaborating with them fits into this logic neither. The second theory has the phytomorphic creatures for pregnant women, the goddesses of the Moon, the religious cult spread among the Otomíes (KAM NYE 1968:22-23). I cannot agree with this theory either. Firstly because of the mistaken reference to the pregnancy, secondly because of the obvious references to the Mexica and Otomí mythology that will be discussed below. The third thesis affirms that the presence of pre-Columbian attributes, such as feather headbands, should serve to the satanization of prehispanic deities (VERGARA HERNÁNDEZ 2013:159; DOMÍNGUEZ TORRES 2013: 59, 168).⁴⁸ However, this interpretation is disproven by the presence of the same attributes on the side of the Indian knights, who have a positive connotation here.

Concerning my opinion, the iconography – displaying these women with long loose hair and round bellies – corresponds more to the Western medieval and Renaissance models than to the Mesoamerican ones and makes possible to relate these images to the ideas of wild, savage

⁴⁷ The significance of *cihuateteo* was ambiguous, on one hand, they were related to fertility and childbirth, on the other to war and sacrifice. H. Kamm Nye related these phytomorphic beings with the legends associated with the Aztec New Fire Ceremony, which was celebrated every 52 years and during which the pregnant women were put under guard, so they could not attack and harm their husbands.

⁴⁸ M. Domínguez Torres identified some of these creatures as pre-Columbian deities such as Xipe Totec, because of his pink feather headdress called *ehuatl*, one of the attributes of this god of vegetation.

life and, hence also to paganism.⁴⁹ Furthermore, the comparison with the nearby Actopan and Santa María Xoxoteco paintings allows us to connect them to the doctrine of the sins and vices and, hence also to the psychomachy.⁵⁰ Some authors relate them as well to the Chichimecas since the Chichimeca women used to participate in the battles on a common base (POWELL 2014:61). Similarly, the southern frieze corresponds to the Otomí worldview since the predominant colour of the southern frieze is green, and the Otomíes associated the South to the winter and green colour. During the hibernal season, they used to honour the god of the vegetation Xipe Totec⁵¹ along with Huitzilopochtli and they made ritual battles between eagles and jaguars to help the Sun regain its forces.

The question of the interpretation of the depiction of zoomorphic beings belongs also to the complicated ones. A. Carrillo y Gariel identified them as centaurs and dragons (or griffins) and many other authors have continued his opinion (CARRILLO Y GARIEL 1961:18, 40; DOMÍNGUEZ TORRES 2013:186; ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1976:10-11; ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1982:9; GRUZINSKI 2013:47). It is not even clear to which side they belong. Some authors have them for conquerors since some of them possess beards (KAM NYE 1968:29) others associate them with the Chichimecas warriors given the fact that they are equipped with the bows and arrows (PIERCE 1981:7; VERGARA HERNÁNDEZ 2013:165-166),⁵² others with Mexica warriors (DOMÍNGUEZ TORRES 2013:186) and certain scholars suppose that they embody the Evil (CARRILLO Y GARIEL 1961:18; ESTRADA DE GERLERO 1976:11; VERGARA HERNÁNDEZ 2013:167-168). Given the fact that they are dotted with trophy heads and wear sandals, a symbol of high social status, I would incline to the third opinion. Moreover, the Mexicas never stopped using bow and arrows,

⁴⁹ The picturing of wild people has a long tradition in the Western history of art. As an example, we can take the Book of Hours of Henri d'Angoulême, where we can observe a representation of the *Death of the Centaur* (fol. 41v), where the centaur along with the wild women represent a personification of Vices. The wild people were generally displayed as naked or covered by hair and frequently served as a metaphor of wildlife and paganism. Examples can be seen on engravings of such masters as Albrecht Dürer or Martin Schongauer that were used as templates in both the Old and New World.

⁵⁰ See note 37.

⁵¹ M. Domínguez Torres and I. E. Estrada de Gerlero identified one of the warriors of the southern frieze as Xipe Totec, because of the presence of pink heron feathers, an attribute of this prehispanic deity. See note 41.

⁵² A. Vergara Hernández states in his chapter that the Chichimecas already used to ride horses at that time. He states that as the centaur is rescuing a Chichimeca warrior, it is possible that the representation of the centaurs is related to the Chichimecas and the fact that they started riding horses since 1570.

even though they used their depiction as a symbol of barbarity. From the western point of view, the centaurs (as well as other zoomorphic beings) can be related to the animality and barbarism. (DOMÍNGUEZ TORRES 2013:186-187; VERGARA HERNÁNDEZ 2013:168). It follows that although the contemporary written evidence confirms the Spanish habit to associate the Chichimecas with animals and bestial life was common in 16th century New Spain (MENDIETA 1993:732; OROZCO Y JIMÉNEZ 1922-1927:183-187),⁵³ the zoomorphic figures in Ixmiquilpan are more likely related to the Mexicas since they wear trophy heads, huaraches and headdresses (VERGARA HERNÁNDEZ 2013:168-169).

The two medallions, often neglected by scholars, bring the light into the whole issue since they both represent the poorly dressed warriors in a subordinate position to the uniformed ones pointing out the difference between their weapons (*macahuiltl*/stone) and clothing (loincloths/military armour and suits). Especially the representation of taking captives has a long tradition in both traditions⁵⁴ and as such permitted to conceive and represent Chihimecas within the language which would be understandable to both cultures, i.e. as barbarians living at a lower level of life that can be, therefore, subjugated and enslaved.

Referring to the paintings in the choir, they both contain a depiction of an *altepetl*, toponym being more illustrative the one of the southern walls. This was identified as a toponym of Tenochtitlan-Ixmiquilpan, since it displays a pair of plants associated with this two city-towns – a nopal in the case of Mexico-Tenochtitlan and a verdolaga plant (*Portulaca orelacea*) in that of Ixmiquilpan⁵⁵ (SERRANO AVILÉS 2006:55). It is clear evidence of *translatio imperii*, which shows Ixmiquilpan as the capital of Spanish dominion in the middle of still non-conquered northern territory putting emphasis on both the famous prehispanic history and the continuity of power.

This stance is supported by the omnipresence of eagles and jaguars, whose meanings in both traditions are multi-layered and abundant. From this point of view, the images of eagles and eagle knights embody the symbolism of sun-light-day-life, while the pictures of jaguars and jaguar knights represent a symbolic line of moon-darkness-night-death, which is typical of

⁵³ Among 16th century chronicles, Bernardino de Sahagún, Diego Muñoz Camargo, Gerónimo de Mendieta, Juan de Torquemada y Diego Durán comment on Chichimecas.

⁵⁴ A typical gesture of taking captive can be observed in pre-Columbian art since the Olmec civilization and remained the same until the coming of Europeans. In the western tradition, a similar gesture was used solely to express the patronage over a vassal.

⁵⁵ Ixmiquilpan means in Nahuatl "lugar de cultivos como navajas" and in Otomí language, *nts'utk'*, i.e. verdolaga plant.

Mexica worldview and cosmogony, but at the same time it also perfectly suits the Christian *imago mundi* based on the contradiction of heaven-faith-virtue-life on one side and hell-paganism-sin and vice-death on the other. (BARBA AHUATZIN – BLANCO PADILLA 2009:31-33, 163, 166, 167 171-176, 147-154).

In the Christian tradition, the eagle is an attribute of Saint John the Evangelist and the lion of San Mark, but they can both symbolize Jesus Christ – the lion his resurrection and the eagle his ascension (MONREAL Y TEJADA 2000:436-437, 513). In the pre-Columbian tradition the jaguars and eagles – as they are represented on the northern wall under the choir – were seen as the protectors of *altepetl*, an Aztec conception of city-state, as we can read in *Historia general de las cosas de la Nueva España (1570-1580)* by Bernardino de Sahagún:

“Tiger dais, eagle dais, that is, the forts live there, the robust no one can beat them there [...] there is the tiger wall, the eagle wall, so that the city is protected, that is, the water, the mountain” (SAHAGÚN 1981:244).⁵⁶

The Ixmiquilpan paintings have been considered unique within the context of the 16th century New Spain mural painting from two main reasons. First, because of an abundant presence of prehispanic iconography; second; because of its secular, military theme. However, the representation of military motives within religious temples was common in both traditions.⁵⁷ And, indeed, as M. Domínguez Torres pointed out a grotesque represented a particularly convenient place not only for military scenes but also for the representation of the Battle of Virtues and Vices or to bring honour to the patrons of the building (DOMÍNGUEZ TORRES 2013:178-181). For example, in nearby Actopan we can observe a wall painting representing two *caciques* Juan Inica de Actopan along with don Pedro de Izcuicuitlapilco in the company of fray Martín de Asebeido in the sign of mutual cooperation between the missionaries and indigenous aristocracy.

⁵⁶ *“Estrado de tigre, estrado de águila, quiere decir, allí viven los fuertes, los robustos nadie puede vencerlos [...] allí está en pie la muralla del tigre, la muralla del águila, con que es resguardada la ciudad, es decir, el agua, el cerro,”* (tran. by the author).

⁵⁷ In Christian context the military scenes within a religious structure are often represented to commemorate some important local battle, e.g. the Siege of Constantinople from 1453 painted in the exterior walls of monastic churches in Voronet and Moldovita in Romania or mural paintings decorating the apse of a small Spanish country church of Nuestra Señora de la Asunción depicting the battle of Nájera from 1367. The most famous example is the Hall of Battles depicting Spanish military victories (including that over Moors) in the El Escorial Monastery.

Despite the obvious presence of the prehispanic iconography which has attracted a significant attention, I am firmly convinced that the main aim of the paintings is to channel basic Christian categories concerning solely the History of Salvation (the cult of the Holy Cross), moral categories (the doctrine of Seven deadly sins, Virtues and Vices) and Western worldview (social hierarchy, worldview, mutual rights, and obligations). My opinion is based on the contemporary relations between artists and patrons and the conception of authorship that made impossible some content intrusions that the missionaries would not notice. And also on the comparison with other Augustinians iconographic programs (e.g. Metztlán, Actopan, Santa María Xoxoteco) (BRENIŠÍNOVÁ 2017:143-152), which illustrate that the Augustinians developed in the region of Mezquital Valley a specific iconography based on a conscious work with pre-Columbian symbolism and elements⁵⁸ in order to shape the indigenous religiosity and make the Christian doctrine more comprehensible and easier to understand and accept.

In my doctoral thesis, I demonstrated that the 16th century monasteries continued to serve – even after the conquest – as Mesoamerican calendar and made possible the orientation in the agricultural year. From the study of liturgical calendars, it also turned out that the missionaries intentionally changed the dates of the Christian calendar in order to adapt it to the pre-Columbian ones (BRENIŠÍNOVÁ 2017:95-96). The fact that Ixmiquilpan paintings embody the Otomí worldview perfectly suits this logic. So from my point of view, from the point of Natives, the northern frieze represents at the symbolic level the ensuing. In the presbytery, we see the eagle and the lion protecting a mountain. The mountains were seen in the prehispanic era as reservoirs of water and corn (in Spanish, *cerro de los mantenimientos*). (FLORESCANO 1999:80-83).⁵⁹ In pre-Columbian times, the religion was strictly related to the state, the people believed (unlike Christians) that they can influence the actions of Gods and that is the reason why they used to bring the offering and sacrifices. The sacrifices were

⁵⁸ The use of autochthonous elements has had a long tradition in the history of Christian Church that dates back at least to the times of Pope Gregory I. (c. 540-604). In accordance with this tradition, the missionary orders, who had had to face a wide range of problems at the beginning of the evangelization process in the New World (e.g. ethnic and linguistic diversity, dispersion of indigenous population, idolatry, etc.) founded in 1541 the *Unión Santa* (Saint Union) and in cooperation with the first viceroy Antonio de Mendoza (c. 1495-1552) elaborated a complex set of missionary methods based on learning indigenous languages and the use of chosen prehispanic elements in order to facilitate to the Natives the acceptance of the new Christian faith.

⁵⁹ According to the Mexica beliefs, the temple pyramids represented an incarnation of the *tonacatepetl*, (in English, maintenance hill). It is the symbol of the origins and creation of the three levels of the cosmos and entry to the underworld where maintenance and water are found.

seen as a contract between humans and deities due to which the Sun continued moving, the earth obtained rain and people maize. After the conquest, The Festival of the Holy Cross began to be celebrated on the May 3, but frequently the celebrations began already on April 25, on the day of Saint Mark. It is a time of expectations of first rains, when the Sun is coming to the zenith and people are celebrating water, trying to support fertility and rain by rituals and sacrifices, preparing the corn to be planted. The Festival of the Holy Cross relates to the original Mesoamerican myths about the origin of rain and to the symbolism of the mountain as a source of water and corn (and also caves as dwellings of beasts and gods). Afterwards, a few days later, usually on May 5, ritual battles between eagles and jaguars were held in order to help Sun regain its forces. On September 28, the day of Saint Michael, the dead are coming and their one-month stay among the living begins, the people give them food and drink since they believe that the dead have the power to bring the rain and fertility (because they once already served as offerings to the earth), so the living and the dead (overseeing the rain and growing corn) work together to maintain a balance of natural forces and harmony to keep the world going.

Thus the Ixmiquilpan paintings illustrate the connection between corn, mountains, and rain, which has been crucial for Mesoamerican inhabitants for thousands of years. Before the arrival of the Spaniards, the religion was a matter of the state; after their coming, this role (of word order and running guarantor) was transferred to the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church adopted it and adapted the Christian religious holidays to suit the Mesoamerican agricultural year. So the paintings in Ixmiquilpan represent a social contract (HARRIS 2000:119-121, 128-131),⁶⁰ a treaty between the Otomíes and the missionaries stating that each part would fulfil its duties, the Otomíes would fight in the sign of the True Cross for the Catholic Church against the gentiles and venerate new God and the Catholic Church would keep the Sun alive.

Picturing the “Others”. Barbarism and Civilization

In this part of the text, I will address the images of “otherness” contained in the Ixmiquilpan paintings. I will deconstruct them using the categories of barbarism and civilization as the main tool of historical analysis in an attempt to unveil the religious, social and political

⁶⁰ Indeed M. Harris mentions in his work that the Indians used to play mock battles between uncivilized Chichimecas and civilized Mexicas to assure the missionaries of their alliance, although it does not rule out that it could also be an expression of Indian resistance to the Spaniards.

concepts hidden behind them. Furthermore, I will discuss, how these stereotyped visions were constructed and how they were used in the process of making the identity of local inhabitants. In brief, what was their main message?

The elements associated with barbarism were: sporadic clothing, bare feet, bow and arrows, stones, darts, the gesture of capture and dead (closed eyes) along with phytomorphic creatures (the women). The elements related to civilization were Aztec military uniforms and insignia (*tlahuiztli*, *copilli*, *huaraches*, and feather headdresses), the *altepeltl* of Ixmiquilpan-Tenochtitlan, *macahuil* weapons, trophy heads, back-banners, jaguars and eagles and zoomorphic creatures (centaurs and griffins). The elements in common were: speaking scrolls, *chimalli* and loincloths.

Let us see which basic facts and general statements we can induce from the aforementioned elements and their distribution. The paintings depict a conflict between two different military groups. These are represented with different attributes and, hence, in different social statuses. Since the representation of the indigenous warriors combines Western and Mesoamerican iconography and does not correspond to the historical reality, the visual language of the murals is ideal, symbolic and syncretic.⁶¹ The “images” of warriors were stereotyped and stemmed from both traditions. Given that the paintings were commissioned by the Augustinian order, the overall layout was the Western one as the technique of execution of the paintings (e.g. the use of cartoons, shading, acanthus foliage, etc.) or the presence of *centaurs* and *griffins* reveal. The obvious presence of prehispanic symbolism and iconography should serve to transfer the Christian ideas and categories (and make them circulate) in the visual language that would be understandable to the Spaniards, as well as to the Otomí indigenous people, who very likely played on selected occasions the roles of the Mexicas and Chichimecas. (We cannot forget that the apse paintings that would illuminate the entire program have not been preserved.)

So, how the hetero-stereotype looked like? The “others”, the Chichimecas were associated with the lack of clothes and lower level of weaponry. It turns out, that their society was

⁶¹ The missionaries, who came to the Americas, not only observed their new reality, they also, naturally, compared their experiences to their stereotyped visions searching for appropriate expressions of their new reality. So their ideas about the Mexicas and/or Chichimecas arose from the place between their personal experiences, knowledge, readings, discussions with others on the one hand and abstraction and generalization on the other. So the “images” of warriors are the result of comparison and deduction, searching for similar and naming the other. It is based on personal experience but constructed with the help of already known ideas and notions.

MONIKA BRENIŠÍNOVÁ

Mural Paintings of Ixmiquilpan. Barbarism and Civilization

presented as lower and simply organised. Given the fact that the correlation between the clothing and weaponry and social and political hierarchy is universal and the clothes and weapons often serve as a symbol of social status in hierarchised societies, we can state that this stereotyped vision of Chichimecas should serve to dehumanize them, i.e. to express the idea of their subhumanity and lower level of their nomadic way of life.

The idea of superior and inferior people implies the inherent right of a superior group to subordinate and govern the subordinate one and it is well known to both cultures. In the Western tradition, we can trace it at least back to Aristotle, while in Mesoamerica it has also very long roots as the practice of systematic destruction and/or rewriting of enemies' codices based on historical consciousness and importance of genealogies testifies. It follows that the "law of cultural dominance" (M. D. Sahlins) or "colonial imperialism" (M. Weber) was well known to both hegemonies whether it was Aztec Empire or the Viceroyalty of New Spain.

The northern frontier was tangible, it influenced the humans' lives as well as the history of states before and after the arrival of Spaniards. The boundary between the zone of *La Gran Chichimeca* and Central Mexico crossed not only the country but also the mentality stressing the differences between the ways of life, social and political organization or religion. The representation of Chichimecas had a long tradition both in prehispanic and in colonial Mexico and as such, it became an appropriate tool of shaping identity between "us" and "them".⁶²

In both cultures the "image" of *Chichimecas* revolved around the category of barbarity. They were both universalists and expansionists presupposing the dissemination of the culture of civilized society to non-civilized cultures, and, at the same time, they justified the expansion of their civilizations by referring to the barbarity of societies they wanted to subordinate. Spanish chroniclers and other authors frequently appreciated the Mexica society and characterized it as civilized. They admired solely the social and political organization of their society, as well as Tenochtitlan, as can be read in *Historia general...* by Bernardino de Sahagún:

⁶² For the description and representation of the Chichimecas see note 33.

MONIKA BRENIŠÍNOVÁ

Mural Paintings of Ixmiquilpan. Barbarism and Civilization

“And they did not lack the police: they lived in a village, they had their republic,” (SAHAGÚN 1981:602).⁶³

It follows that the “image” of Chichimecas – constructed on the basis of individual and social experiences – did not correspond to the historical reality, although it became constant in the 16th century written and visual evidence since it served as an appropriate tool that helped shape the colonial identity.

On the contrary, the Ixmiquilpan community (auto-stereotype) is represented as a male community consisting of warriors of different military ranks as shown by a variety of their uniforms along with insignia and superior armour and weapons. It turns out that it is represented as organised, socially differentiated and hierarchised society. The association with eagles and jaguars together with toponyms points out the historical continuity and shows the Ixmiquilpan community as having access to power and religion.

The fact that these two different groups of warriors are represented as struggling shows the war as a tool of spreading not only the power but also the social and religious ideas, concepts and practices. The dialectic between barbarism and civilization served as an intentional tool of elitism, whose aim was to contribute to shaping a new identity, which would be based on the Christian faith, western worldview, and values, and, which would lean simultaneously on the Mesoamerican tradition, iconography and the glorious history of Ixmiquilpan-Tenochtitlan (*translatio imperii*). This dialectic was reinforced by the dichotomy between two modalities of society, the “communitas”, in this case, represented by the Chichimecas because of the emphasis put onto the equality, and the “structure” embodied by the Mexicas shown as a hierarchised society with access to the power and religion. Such an image should strengthen the identity of sedentary Otomíes, since they represented them as morally and culturally superior.

After the military conquest, the missions along with their artistic decoration (especially in the form of wall paintings) became the crucial spaces where the new political, social and

⁶³ “*Y no carecían de policía: vivían en poblado, tenían su república*” (translated by the author). The same stands towards Mexica society based on the positive evaluation of its social and political organization can be observed in many other Spanish colonial evidence, e.g. in the second letter by Hernán Cortés to Charles V, King of Castile and Aragon and the Holy Roman Emperor. Nevertheless, the Spaniards appreciated the social and political order of the Mexicas but they disapproved of their polytheistic religion related with human sacrifices and ritual cannibalism or the polygamy of Mexica aristocracy.

religious concepts were promoted. They turn out to be a tool of social control pointing out the superiority of the Spanish Empire and Christian faith. In the worlds of Cl. Geertz, they showed the spectators how the world is organised and how to live in it. So the paintings were meant to reassert the values of new colonial order, whether social or religious and, at the same time, to maintain the privileged position of the Spanish and their indigenous allies by promoting shared history and values (and, hence reduce the potentially dangerous diversity) and also an emotional relation to the town (and to the state) and its authorities by evoking the Christian Virtues, Crusades and Sacred war as a measure of good governance and legitimacy.

Conclusion

To sum up, the Ixmiquilpan church and its walls became the place where the missionaries intentionally shaped the identity of local indigenous inhabitants by conceptualized and stereotyped images of Mexica and Chichimeca warriors by pointing out the differences between “us” and “them”, as well as the civilization level, social organisation and position of these two groups within the new colonial order. The difference between barbarism and civilization should imply the conflict between Christianity and paganism and Good and Evil. And an idealised image of war – based on the sacred past of both involucrated cultures – should anchor the identity of Otomíes and, at the same time, imply the necessity to subdue the nomadic indigenous tribes (and bring them into the Catholic Church). Simultaneously, the paintings provided an explanation of contemporaneous events (Chichimeca War) and how to handle them. And, what is probably the most important thing they made possible the reinterpretation of the past accepting and reintegrating the Mesoamerican history (e.g. references to the Mexica Empire and Tenochtitlan, the Coatepec or Five Sun myths, etc.) into the universalist story of the West, which is the History of Salvation. In this light, every event or newly discovered territory is seen as another possibility to save the world and finally accomplish its history; and, every war is a crusade, whether the Christians fight against the Moors or the Spaniards (along with their indigenous allies) against the Chichimecas.

Acknowledgments

This article was written with the support of the European Regional Development Fund-Project “Creativity and Adaptability as Conditions of the Success in an Interrelated World”, No. CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16_019/0000734. This work was financially supported by the research program of Charles University PROGRES Q09 – History, the key to understanding the globalized world.

Bibliography

Primary sources

BERDAN, Frances – ANAWALT, Patricia Rieff (eds.) (1997): *The Essential Codex Mendoza*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

GRIJALVA, Antonio de (1985): *Crónica de la Orden de N.P.S. Agustín en las provincias de la Nueva España*. Ciudad de México: Editorial Porrúa.

Lienzo de Tlaxcala (<http://www.latinamericanstudies.org/tlaxcala-lienzo.htm>).

Matrícula de Tributos

(https://mexicana.cultura.gob.mx/en/repositorio/detalle?id=_suri:MEDIATECACODICE:TransObject:5bc4ebf77a8a0222efe681ea).

MENDIETA, Gerónimo de (1993): *Historia eclesiástica indiana*. Ciudad de México: Porrúa.

OROZCO Y JIMÉNEZ, Francisco (ed.) (1922-1927): *Colección de documentos históricos, inéditos o muy raros, referentes al arzobispado de Guadalajara I*. Guadalajara.

SAHAGÚN, Bernardino de (1981): *Historia general de las cosas de la Nueva España (1570-1580) II*. México: Editorial Porrúa.

TLATELOLCO CODEX

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Codex_of_Tlatelolco#/media/File:Codex_of_tlatelolco.JPG).

Anonymous painter: *El palo volador*. Viceroyalty of New Spain, c. 1651-1700. Oil painting, 107 x 505 cm. Museum of the Americas, inventory number: 06530 (<http://ceres.mcu.es/>).

Secondary Literature

ALVA, J. Jorge Klor de (1992): Colonialism and Postcolonialism as (Latin) American Mirages. In *Colonial Latin American Review* 1-2, pp. 3-23.

BALLESTEROS GARCÍA, Víctor (2000): *Los conventos del estado de Hidalgo: expresiones religiosas del arte y la cultura del siglo XVI. The Monasteries of the State of Hidalgo: Religious Expressions of the Art and the Culture of the Sixteenth Century*. Pachuca: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo.

BARBA AHUATZIN, Beatriz – BANCO PADILLA, Alicia (coord.) (2009): *Iconografía mexicana IX y X: flora y fauna*. Ciudad de México: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e

Historia.

BEAUFILS, Thomas (dir.) – FERRO, Marc. et al. (2003): *Le livre noir du colonialisme: XVIe-XXIe siècle, de l'extermination à la repentance*. Paris: Laffont.

BERNABEU ALBERT, Salvador – GIUDICELLI, Christophe – HAVARD, Gilles (2013): *La indianización. Cautivos, renegados, "hombres libres" y misioneros en los confines americanos*. S. XVI-XIX. Arnajuez: Doce Calles.

BERNAL, Ignacio et al. (2009): *Historia general de México*. Ciudad de México: El Colegio de México.

BERNAND, Carmen – GRUZINSKI, Serge (1998): *Historia del nuevo mundo. Los mestizajes, 1550-1640*. Ciudad de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

BLOOM, William (1990): *Personal Identity, National Identity and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BORGES, Pedro (1992): *Religiosos en Hispanoamérica*. Madrid: Editorial MAPFRE.

BRENÍŠNOVÁ, Monika (2017): *Del convento al hombre. El significado de la arquitectura conventual y su arte en la Nueva España del siglo XVI* (Ph.D. thesis). Prague: Universidad Carolina.

CARRILLO Y GARIEL, Abelardo (1961): *Ixmiquilpan*. Ciudad de México: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.

CLENDINNEN, Inga (1991): *Aztecs: an Interpretation*. Cambridge (Mass.): Cambridge University Press.

CLENDINNEN, Inga (2010): *The Cost of Courage in Aztec Society: Essays on Mesoamerican Society and Culture*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

DEBROISE, Olivier (1994): Imaginario fronterizo/identidad en tránsito. El caso de los murales de San Miguel Ixmiquilpan. In *Arte, historia e identidad en América. Visiones comparativas. XVII Coloquio internacional de Historia del Arte 1*, pp. 155-172.

DUVERGER, Christian (2003): *Agua y fuego: arte sacro indígena de México en el siglo XVI*. Ciudad de México: Landucci.

DUVERGER, Christian (1993): *La flor letal. Economía del sacrificio Mexica*. Ciudad de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

DOMÍNGUEZ TORRES, Mónica (2013): *Military Ethos and Visual Culture in Post-Conquest Mexico*. Farnham: Ashgate.

EARLS, Irene (1987): *Renaissance Art: A Topical Dictionnary*. New York: Greenwood Press.

ELIAS, Norbert – DUNNING, Eric – GOUDSBFOM, Johan – MENNELL, Stephen (eds.) (2000): *The Civilizing Process. Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Malden/Oxford/Carlton: Blackwell publishing.

ESTRADA DE GERLERO, Elena Isabel (1976): El friso monumental de Ixmiquilpan. In *Actes du XLII e Congrès International des Americanistes X*, pp. 9-19.

ESTRADA DE GERLERO, Elena Isabel (1982): La pintura mural durante el virreinato. In *Historia del arte mexicano* 6, pp. 1-17.

FLORESCANO, Enrique (1999). *Memoria indígena*. Ciudad de México: Taurus.

GEERTZ, Clifford (2003): *La interpretación de las culturas*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

GÓNZALEZ TORRES, Yólotl (1995): *Diccionario de mitología y religión de Mesoamérica*. Ciudad de México: Ed. Larousse.

GRUZINSKI, Serge (2013): *La colonización de lo imaginario. Sociedades indígenas y occidentalización en el México español*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

GRUZINSKI, Serge (2001): *O pensamento mestiço*. São Paulo: Editora Schwarz LTDA.

GRUZINSKI, Serge (1992): *The Aztecs. Rise and Fall of an Empire*. New York: Harry N. Abrams Publishers.

GRUZINSKI, Serge – FERRO, Marc (2014): *The Eagle and the Dragon: Globalization and European Dreams of Conquest in China and America in the Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge: Polity.

HARRIS, Max (2000): *Aztec, Moors and Spaniards. Festivals of Reconquest in Mexico and Spain*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

HASSIG, Ross (2001): *Time, History and Beliefs in Aztec and Colonial Mexico*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

HASSIG, Ross (1992): *War and Society in Ancient Mesoamerica*.

HEATH, Ian (2002): *Armies Of The 16th Century 2: The Armies of the Aztec and Inca Empires, Other Native Peoples of the Americas and the Conquistadores 1450-1608*. Great Britain: Foundry Books.

JACKSON, Robert H. (ed.) (2013): *Conflict and Conversion in Sixteenth Century Central Mexico: the Augustinian War on and beyond the Chichimeca Frontier*. Leiden (Netherlands)/Boston, Mass.: Brill.

JACKSON, Robert H. (ed.) (2014): *Evangelization and Cultural Conflict in Colonial Mexico*. Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

JIMÉNEZ NÚÑEZ, Alfredo (2006): *El Gran Norte de México. Una frontera imperial en la Nueva España (1540-1820)*. Madrid: Tébar.

JOHANSSON, Patrick (1993): *La palabra de los Aztecas*. Ciudad de México: Trillo.

KAMM NYE, Harriet (1968): The Talking Murals of Ixmiquilpan. In *Mexico Quarterly Review* 3, pp. 24-34.

KIRCHHOFF, Paul (1943): Mesoamérica: sus límites geográficos, composición étnica y caracteres culturales. In *Acta Americana* 1, pp. 92-107.

KOSSSLYN, Stephen Michael (1980): *Image and Mind*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

KOSSSLYN, Stephen Michael (1996): *Image and Brain. The Resolution of the Imagery Debate*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

KUBER, George (2012). *Arquitectura mexicana del siglo XVI*. Ciudad de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

LEÓN-PORTILLA, Miguel (ed.) (2013): *Visión de los vencidos: relaciones indígenas de la conquista*. Ciudad de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

LIMÓN OLVERA, Silvia (2012): *El fuego sagrado. Simbolismo y ritualidad entre los nahuas*. Ciudad de México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

LIPPMANN, Walter (2015): *Public Opinion* [ebook]. USA: First Star Publishing.

MCANDREW, John (1965). *The Open-Air Churches of Sixteenth Century Mexico: Atrios, Posas, Open chapels, and Other Studies*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

MONREAL Y TEJADA, Luis (2000): *Iconografía del cristianismo*. Barcelona: Acantilado.

MORGAN, Lewis (1984): *Ancient Society*. Chicago: Charles H. Keer & Company Co.

PEÑALOSA, Joaquín Antonio (1969): *La práctica religiosa en México. Siglo XVI*. Ciudad de México: Editorial JUS.

PIERCE, Donna L. (1981): Identification of the Warriors in the Frescoes of Ixmiquilpan. In *Research Center for the Arts Review* 4, pp. 1-8.

POHL, John (2001): *Aztec Warrior AD 1325-1521*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing.

POWELL, Philip Wayne (2014): *La Guerra chichimeca (1550-1600)*. Ciudad de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

ROMÁN GUTIÉRREZ, José Francisco (1993): *Sociedad y evangelización en Nueva Galicia durante el siglo XVI*. Zapopán: Colegio de Jalisco.

SÁNCHEZ VÁZQUEZ, Sergio (2008): Religiosidad y cosmovisión. La fiesta de la Santa Cruz en Ixmiquilpan. In *Cinteotl* 3 (https://www.uaeh.edu.mx/campus/icshu/revista/revista_num3_08/portada_cinteotl3.htm).

SAID, Edward W. (1994): *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

SERRANO AVILÉS, Tomás (2006): *Y se fue... Los municipios hidalguenses de muy alta migración internacional*. Pachuca: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo.

SIMÉON, Rémi (1977): *Diccionario de la lengua náhuatl o mexicana*. Ciudad de México: Siglo XXI Editores.

TAJFEL, Henri (1972): Social Categorization. English Manuscript of "La catégorisation sociale". In *Introduction à la Psychologie Sociale* 1, pp. 272-302.

TAJFEL, Henri – BILLIG, M. – BUNDY, R. P. – FLAMENT, Claude (1971): Social Categorization and Intergroup Behaviour. In *European Journal of Social Psychology* 1, pp. 147-177.

TODOROV, Tzvetan (1987): *La conquista de América: el problema del otro*. Ciudad De México: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.

TOUSSAINT, Manuel (1965): *Arte colonial en México*. Ciudad de México: Impr. Univ.

TOWNSEND, Camilla (2017): *Annals of Native America. How the Nahuas of Colonial Mexico Kept their History Alive*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

TURNER, John Charles – TAJFEL, Henri (1986): The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behaviour. In Stephen Worchel, William. G. Austin (eds.): *The Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers, pp. 7-24.

TURNER, John Charles (1985): Social Categorization and the Self-Concept: A Social Cognitive Theory of Group Behaviour. In Edward J. Lawler (ed.): *Advances in Group Processes: Theory and Research* 2. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 7-122.

TURNER, Victor (1982): *From Ritual to Theater: the Human Seriousness of Play*. New York: PAJ Publications.

TURNER, Victor (1969): *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Chicago: Aldine Publications. Co.

VERGARA HERNÁNDEZ, Arturo (2013): Nómadas contra sedentarios: manifestaciones artísticas sobre la guerra chichimeca, siglo XVI. In Arturo Vergara

MONIKA BRENIŠÍNOVÁ

Mural Paintings of Ixmiquilpan. Barbarism and Civilization

Hernández (ed.): *Arte y sociedad en la Nueva España*. Pachuca de Soto: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo, pp. 145-171.

Vocabulario arquitectónico ilustrado (1975). Ciudad de México: Secretaría del Patrimonio Nacional.

VYŠNÝ, Peter (2012): *Štát a právo Aztékov* [State and Law of Aztecs]. Trnava: Typi Universitatis Trnaviensis.

VYŠNÝ, Peter (2015): *Hitoricko-právne súvislosti dobytia Nového sveta Španielmi* [Historical and Legal Context of Conquest of New Spain by Spaniards]. Trnava: Typi Universitatis Trnaviensis.

WAKE, Eleanore (2010): *Framing The Sacred. The Indian Churches of Early Colonial Mexico*. Norman (Okla.): University of Oklahoma Press.

WILLEY, Gordon R. – ECKHOLM, Gordon F. – MILLON, Rene F. (1964): The Patterns of Farming Life and Civilization. In Robert C. West (ed.): *Handbook of American Indians* I. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 37-39.

WRIGHT CARR, David (1998): Sangre para el sol: las pinturas murales del siglo XVI en la parroquia de Ixmiquilpan, Hidalgo. In *Memorias de la Academia Mexicana de la historia correspondiente de la Real Madrid XLI*, pp. 73-103.

Monika Brenišínová (1983) is a graduate of the Center for Ibero-American Studies at Charles University in Prague. Since 2017 she has been teaching and researching at Charles University. Her research is focused on art history of Latin America, the issues of evangelization of indigenous cultures and the history of science. She specializes on the history of Early Modern Times and interdisciplinary approaches. She has attended numerous conferences both home and abroad and published extensively in scientific and popular journals. She is a co-author of the monograph *History of Art of Latin America*.

