

Marianismo: *The Other Face of Machismo in Latin America*

EVELYN P. STEVENS

The passive female image is also the concern of political scientist Evelyn Stevens. Although she has lived half of her life in Latin America, Stevens focuses on Mexico and on a theme in which she became interested "when I became aware that Latin American women were more comfortable in their roles than their Anglo-American counterparts." Marianismo, or the cult of feminine spiritual superiority, she argues, is as prevalent as and symbiotic with machismo but less understood, and, far from being victims, Latin American women are conscious beneficiaries of that myth.

ONE of the functional imperatives of human society is a division of labor according to a set of criteria generally accepted by most members of the group. That these criteria correspond to no "natural law" is obvious from the wide variations in the ways in which different cultures parcel out the jobs to be done. The only requirement appears to be that the criteria be regarded as right or good or inevitable by most of the people who act according to their dictates. It does not seem to matter whether a particular system is based on tradition, magic, or "logic" as long as the accompanying rationalization helps to keep confusion and tension at a minimum level.

Some of the most obvious and widely used criteria for deciding who shall do what are age, sex, and class. But these categories may be manipulated in different ways by societies in different parts of the world. "Children should be seen and not heard" is a semisacred principle which prevails over a large area of the earth, only to be contradicted by diaper dictatorships in other areas. In some cultures, only the man may carve the meat at mealtime, while in others this task is regarded as "women's work."

In every society we find a pattern of expectations based on real or imagined attributes of the individuals or groups who perform certain tasks. With time, these attributes attain a validity which makes it possible to use them as criteria for value judgments quite unrelated to functional necessity. Uncritical acceptance of such stereotypes can contribute to social or political consequences of great magnitude. In Latin America, the twin phenomena of *machismo* and *marianismo* offer us an illustration of this observation. *Machismo*, a term familiar to area specialists, has passed into the vocabulary of the general public, where it has suffered the same kind of semantic deformation as Weber's *charisma*.¹

In the interest of clarity in the following discussion, the term *machismo* will be used to designate a way of orientation which can be most succinctly described as the cult of virility. The chief characteristics of this cult are exaggerated aggressiveness and intransigence in male-to-male interpersonal relationships and arrogance and sexual aggression in male-to-female relationships.²

It has only been in the quite recent past that any attention has been focused on the other face of the problem. Women generally have maintained a discreet reserve with respect to the subject of *marianismo*, possibly because a very large segment of that group fears that publicity would endanger their prerogatives. A short time ago, however, a handful of male writers began to focus on this heretofore neglected pattern of attitudes and behavior. In this way, the term *hembrismo* ("female-ism") has been introduced by one observer, while *feminismo* has been used by another.³

I am indebted to Dr. Rogelio Diaz-Guerrero, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, and to Professor Sutti Ortiz, Case Western Reserve University, for discussion and criticism of some of the premises of this essay.

Marianismo is just as prevalent as *machismo* but it is less understood by Latin Americans themselves and almost unknown to foreigners. It is the cult of feminine spiritual superiority, which teaches that women are semi-divine, morally superior to and spiritually stronger than men. It is this pattern of attitudes and behavior that will be the principal focus of attention in the present paper, but it will often be necessary to refer to the dynamic interplay between the two phenomena.

Old World Antecedents

Both *marianismo* and *machismo* are New World phenomena with ancient roots in Old World cultures. Many of the contributing elements can be found even today in Italy and Spain, but the fully developed syndrome occurs only in Latin America.⁴

Concepts of honor and shame associated with notions of manliness can be found in many of the cultures of southern Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa, but a Spanish historian argues that the exaggerated characteristics which we have come to associate with *machismo* are a degeneration of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century upper-class attitudes toward the concepts. "In the plebeian sector of society," says this author, "the equivalent of the gentleman of easily affected honour is the professional bravo, the bullying braggart, the dandified tough."⁵ Although the behavior pattern gradually became less important in Spanish culture, it seems to have made its way to America via the soldiers and adventurers who participated in the conquest. The time fit is persuasive. It may even be surmised that the conquest drained Spain of these individuals and provided them with a more propitious atmosphere in America, in which they flourished and assumed the importance which they have today. Samuel Ramos argues that in Mexico typical *macho* behavior is a low-class phenomenon, but he is drowned out by a chorus of other observers who can see ramifications in every social class and in every country of Latin America.⁶

Although all mestizo social classes are permeated with *machismo* and *marianismo* characteristics, the same statement does not hold true with respect to other ethnic groupings. Indigenous communities, while patriarchal in structure and value orientations, do not seem to share the *machismo-marianismo* attitudes as long as they retain their cultural "purity."

Marianismo is not a religious practice, although the word *marianism* is sometimes used to describe a movement within the Roman Catholic church which has as its object the special veneration of the figure of the Virgin Mary. That cult, as it is practiced throughout the world, is rooted in very ancient religious observances that have evolved within the church itself, at times with the enthusiastic endorsement of ecclesiastical authorities and at other times with at least the tolerance of those authorities.

Marianism, or *Mariology*, as most theologians prefer to call the religious movement, has provided a central figure and a convenient set of assumptions around which the practitioners of *marianismo* have erected a secular edifice

of beliefs and practices related to the position of women in society. It is that edifice, rather than the religious phenomenon, which is the object of this study.

The roots of *marianismo* are both deep and widespread, springing apparently from primitive awe at woman's ability to produce a live human creature from inside her own body. This is the aspect of femininity which attracted the attention of the early artists who fashioned the Gravettian "venuses" of the upper Paleolithic era. In those small crude sculptures, the figures have enormous breasts and protruding bellies, as though they were pregnant. To the early men and women who posed the ontological question in its simplest terms—"Where did I come from?"—the answer must also have seemed simple, and on the basis of circumstantial evidence, woman was celebrated as being the sole source of life.

Archeological research points to southern Russia, to the region around the Caspian Sea, as the source of inspiration for the cult of the mother goddess as we know it in the Western world, but not long afterward traces began to appear in the Fertile Crescent and the Indus Valley, as well as in Crete and the area around the Aegean Sea. During these early stages the female figure appeared alone, unaccompanied by any male figure, and for this reason she is sometimes described as the "unmarried mother."⁷

All around the eastern and northern rim of the Mediterranean, the goddess figure multiplied and appeared in various aspects. In Mesopotamia she took on many names and faces: Ninhursaga, Mah, Ninmah, Innana, Ishtar, Astarte, Nintu, Aruru.⁸

At a somewhat later period, we begin to see indications of a growing consciousness of male individuality; the goddess, while still dominant, is depicted in the company of a young male figure, who is somewhat ambiguously seen as either the son of the goddess or as her consort, more likely as both at the same time. The notion that he, too, might actually be performing an indispensable function in the creation of life seems to have dawned rather slowly on mankind.

As far back as the Mesopotamian culture, we see the young god depicted as suffering and dying, in the regular sequence of changing seasons of the year, and being taken into the underworld. The goddess then appears as the grieving and searching mother. This figure of the *mater dolorosa* is found over a wide geographical area and a long time span which includes the New Testament account of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In this conscious or unconscious allegory of the seasons, we can see the realization of the importance of man in the creation of new life: while he is gone the earth is barren; the female cannot give birth without his help.

The island of Crete is generally credited with being the cradle of the mother goddess cult in the form in which it spread throughout Italy and southwestern Europe, particularly in Spain. Around the third millennium b.c. statuettes appeared in Crete, depicting an earth mother, known variously as Gaea, Rhea, or Cybele. Some of the epithets applied to this goddess were

Mountain Mother, Mistress of the Trees, and Lady of the Wild Beasts. In this latter guise she is familiar to the world as the delicately fashioned "snake goddess" from the Middle Minoan III period, which has been exhibited by the Candia Museum and pictured in many books on art history.

Soon after the earliest Neolithic settlers arrived in Spain, they contributed to the propagation of the cult by producing a large number of female figurines first, apparently, in the area around El Garcel but rapidly diffusing out from that center.

In early Christian worship there was no place for the figure of a woman. The new sect drew heavily on Hebrew sources for its inspiration, since the Jews had long before abolished their primitive pantheon, and in so doing they found it both necessary and politic to expunge all goddesses from their theological structure. The result was a conceptually neat and ideologically powerful monotheism, heralding a patriarchal and nationalistic divine leader.

Earlier, however, the Semitic cultures had provided a rich array of female divinities and personifications, among them the goddess Asherah, Astarte-Anath, the Shekinah (the visible and audible manifestation of God's presence on earth which in late Midrash literature appears as a mediatrix between God and man), and the Matronit—the goddess of the Kabbala, whose figure in many ways resembles that of Mary.⁹ In the process of "purifying" their theology, that is, constructing a logically coherent religious system, the Jews successfully argued that the goddess figures were inventions of their enemies, introduced to sow confusion and divide the faithful. By jettisoning their superfluous gods and goddesses, the Jewish prophets were able to weld an efficient instrument for the unification of their tribes.

In spite of this hiatus, the history of men's attempts to expunge the female figure from their pantheon has met with only partial success. In almost every culture of the Mediterranean littoral, woman has returned from doctrinal exile stronger, more appealing, and more influential than before. Even where the doors of Scripture have remained closed to her, who can deny the triumph of the Jewish mother?

The sister disciplines of archaeology and comparative mythology speculate that Christian hagiology manifests a remarkable similarity, at a number of crucial points, to pre-Christian beliefs diffused over the geographic area described above. During the early Christian era, the female figure had no place in religious rites, but this situation was changed by the pronouncement of the Council of Ephesus in 431 a.d. As *Theotokos*, Mother of God, Mary was integrated into Christian dogma, and the two poles of creative energy, the masculine and the feminine, emerged into conscious recognition and received their most sublime expression.¹⁰ After the Council of Ephesus, however, mariology grew so rapidly that popular adoration of the Mother has threatened at times to eclipse that of the Father and the Son, thus degenerating into what some religious commentators have called mariolatry. A number of Catholic writers have deplored this "tendency to exalt the cult of the Virgin Mary in a way which exceeds the teaching and the spirit of

the Church."¹¹ In recent times, three popes have cautioned the faithful against Marian excesses.¹²

New World Development

It is an easy task to trace the migration of the Marian cult to the New World. Church history tells us that within ten years after the Conquest of Mexico, an illiterate Indian neophyte who had been baptized with the name of Juan Diego saw an apparition of the "Most Holy Mother of God" on a mound called Tepeyacac, north of Mexico City. The place of the apparition is significant, because Indian tradition had long held it sacred to the worship of a goddess whom they called Tonantzin ("Our Mother"). Archaeologists have identified Tonantzin with the pre-Columbian female Aztec deity known as Coatlicue or Cihuacoatl (serpent woman, mother of the gods, weeping woman).¹³

By the middle of the seventeenth century, tradition recognized Juan Diego's vision as an authentic apparition of the Virgin Mary—the first in the New World—and she was given the name of Our Lady of Guadalupe, in honor of a figure venerated in southwestern Spain.¹⁴ In 1756 the Lady of Guadalupe was declared patroness of New Spain (Mexico) by Pope Benedict XIV.

The religious symbol, accepted by the conquerors and venerated by the native population, became a rallying point for nascent nationalistic sentiments, so that when the war for independence broke out in 1810 it was fitting that Mexico's first mestizo hero, Father Hidalgo, should lead the rebels with the famous *Grito de Dolores*: "*Viva Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, muera el mal gobierno, muera los gachupines!*" ("Long live our Lady of Guadalupe, down with bad government, down with the spurred ones [Spaniards resident in Mexico]").¹⁵ One hundred years later, Pope Pius X declared the Lady to be patroness of all Latin America.

Just how the excessive veneration of women became a distinguishing feature of Latin American secular society is difficult to determine. Two points are clear, however: this veneration parallels that which is rendered to the religious figure of the Virgin Mary, and the secular aspect is different both qualitatively and quantitatively from the attitude toward women which prevails in those very European nations where the religious cult is most prevalent.

Latin American mestizo cultures—from the Rio Grande to the Tierra del Fuego—exhibit a well-defined pattern of beliefs and behavior centered on popular acceptance of a stereotype of the ideal woman. This stereotype, like its *macho* counterpart, is ubiquitous in every social class. There is near universal agreement on what a "real woman" is like and how she should act. Among the characteristics of this ideal are semidivinity, moral superiority, and spiritual strength. This spiritual strength engenders abnegation, that is, an infinite capacity for humility and sacrifice. No self-denial is too great for the Latin American woman, no limit can be divined to her vast store of patience

with the men of her world.¹⁶ Although she may be sharp with her daughters—and even cruel to her daughters-in-law—she is and must be complaisant toward her own mother and her mother-in-law for they, too, are reincarnations of the great mother. She is also submissive to the demands of the men: husbands, sons, fathers, brothers.¹⁷

Beneath the submissiveness, however, lies the strength of her conviction—shared by the entire society—that men must be humored, for after all, everyone knows that they are *como niños* (like little boys) whose intemperance, foolishness, and obstinacy must be forgiven because "they can't help the way they are." These attitudes are expressed with admirable clarity by the editor of a fashionable women's magazine in Chile. When asked, "Is there any Chilean woman whom you particularly admire?" she answered, "Sincerely, I would mention a humble woman from the slums who did our laundry. She had ten children, and her husband spent his time drunk and out of work. She took in washing and ironing, and gave her children a good start in life. She is the typical Chilean woman of a [certain] sector of our society. She struggles valiantly until the end."¹⁸

But to the unalterable imperfection of men is attributable another characteristic of Latin American women: their sadness. They know that male sinfulness dooms the entire sex to a prolonged stay in purgatory after death, and even the most diligent prayerfulness of loving female relatives can succeed in sparing them only a few millennia of torture.

The sadness is evidenced in another highly visible characteristic of women. Custom dictates that upon the death of a member of her family, a woman shall adopt a distinctive mourning habit. The periods of mourning and the types of habit are rigidly prescribed. The death of a parent or husband requires lifetime full mourning: inner and outer clothing of solid black, unrelieved by even a white handkerchief. Deaths of brothers, sisters, aunts, and uncles require full mourning for three years, and those of more distant relatives require periods varying from three months to a year. After each period of full mourning ensues a prescribed period of "half-mourning" during which the grieving woman may at first wear touches of white with her black clothes, graduating with the passage of time to gray and lavender dresses.

Mourning is not simply a matter of dress. The affected person must also "show respect" for the deceased by refraining from any outward manifestation of happiness or joviality and to deny herself the company of others who may legitimately indulge in levity. This means abstention from attending parties, going to the cinema, or even watching television. Purists insist that cultural events such as concerts and lectures also fall under the ban.

Of course, these rules are supposed also to apply to men, but as "everybody knows" that they do not possess the spiritual stamina to endure such rigors, they usually render only token compliance with custom, often reduced to the wearing of a black armband for a short period. Although during mourning periods their women-ruled households are gloomy places, their escape to more joyful surroundings is condoned and often encouraged. Mistresses and other female companions "by the left" are not required to mourn.¹⁹

By the age of thirty-five, there are few women who have escaped the experience of at least a short period of mourning and by forty-five, a large majority of women are destined to wear black for the rest of their lives. It is thus in the woman of middle age that we finally see all of the characteristics of full-blown *marianismo* coming into majestic flower. The author is familiar with the rather extreme case of a reputedly saintly Puerto Rican woman who had been widowed in her early twenties and who boasted that she had not attended the cinema since then, had never seen a television program, and had refused to pass the house in which her husband had died. Such exemplary devotion made the woman an object of general admiration, an example held up to the younger generation of more frivolous females.

As a result of this usage, the image of the Latin American woman is almost indistinguishable from the classic religious figure of the *mater dolorosa*, the tear-drenched mother who mourns for her lost son. The precursor of that figure can be found in the myths of many pre-Christian Mediterranean cultures: the earth goddess who laments the seasonal disappearance of her son and who sorrowfully searches for him until the return of spring restores him to her.²⁰

Does this mean that all Latin American women conform to the stereotype prescribed by *marianismo*? Obviously not; as in most human societies, individual behavior often deviates widely from the ideal. But the image of the black-clad mantilla-draped figure, kneeling before the altar, rosary in hand, praying for the souls of her sinful menfolk, dominates the television and cinema screens, the radio programs, and the popular literature, as well as the oral tradition of the whole culture area. This is Latin America's chief export product, according to one native wit.²¹

The same culture provides an alternate model in the image of the "bad woman" who flaunts custom and persists in enjoying herself. Interestingly enough, this kind of individual is thought not to be a "real woman." By publicly deviating from the prescribed norm, she has divested herself of precisely those attributes considered most characteristically feminine and in the process has become somewhat masculine.

This brings us to the question of sexual behavior and here, too, as might be expected, practice frequently deviates from prescription. The ideal dictates not only premarital chastity for all women, but postnuptial frigidity. "Good" women do not enjoy coitus; they endure it when the duties of matrimony require it. A rich lexicon of circumlocutions is available to "real" women who find it necessary to refer to sexual intercourse in speaking with their priest, their physician, or other trusted confidant. "*Le hice el servicio*," they may say ("I did him [my husband] the service").²²

The norm of premarital chastity is confined principally to the urban and provincial middle class, as consensual unions predominate among peasants and urban slum dwellers. Nubility and sexual activity are frequently almost simultaneous events, although the latter occasionally precedes the former.²³

Even in middle- and upper-class society, norms of sexual behavior are often disregarded in practice. Premarital chastity is still highly prized, and many Latin American men take an unconscionable interest in the integrity

of their fiancées' hymens. But the popular refrain, *el que hizo la ley hizo la trampa*, is particularly applicable in this context. A Peruvian woman writes with convincing authority that a large number of socially prominent young women in that country engage in coitus and then have surgical repair of the hymen performed in private hospitals—a practice that goes back at least to fifteenth-century Spain, when the operation was performed by midwives who often acted in the dual capacity of procuresses and mistresses of houses of assignation (see for example the *Tragicomedia de Calixto y Melibea*, the literary classic known popularly as *La Celestina*).²⁴

An undetermined number of upper-middle and upper-class young women practice other varieties of sexual activity, calculated to keep the hymen intact. But a girl will usually engage in these variations only with her fiancé, and then largely as a stratagem for maintaining his interest in her until they are married. As long as he feels reasonably certain that his fiancée has not previously engaged in this kind of behavior with another man, a Latin American male may encourage or even insist on her "obliging" him in this way. But he must reassure himself that she is not enjoying it. A Peruvian journalist reveals the male insistence on the fiction of the frigidity of "good" women in such reported remarks as: "So-and-so is a bad woman; once she even made love with her husband in the bathtub," and "American women [*gringas*] are all prostitutes; I know one who *even takes the initiative*" (italics in original).²⁵

At first glance, it may seem that these norms are imposed on women by tyrannical men—"male chauvinists," as contemporary English-speaking feminists would call them. But this assumption requires careful scrutiny, especially when it is remembered that during the preschool years the socialization of boys takes place almost entirely through the medium of women: mother, sisters, widowed or spinster aunts who live under one roof as part of the extended family, and female servants. From the women in the family a boy absorbs the attitudinal norms appropriate for his social class and from the servants, when he reaches adolescence—or often even before—he picks up the principal store of behavioral expertise which will suffice him in adult life. It is common practice for a prudent middle-class mestizo mother of a pubescent boy to hire a young female servant for general housework "and other duties," the latter expression being a euphemism for initiating the boy into adult heterosexual experience. "On such creatures," comments the writer previously cited, "a man lavishes his store of honorable semen and his Christian contempt."²⁶

At this juncture it may be useful to ask ourselves a question suggested by the apparent contradiction posed by the foregoing material. On the one hand, our Latin American informants paint us a picture of the ideal woman which would inspire pity in the most sanguine observer. Woman's lot seems to be compounded of sexual frustration, intellectual stagnation, and political futility in a "repressive and *machista* society."²⁷ On the other hand, it is quite apparent that many women contribute to the perpetuation of the myths which sustain the patterns described. Why would they work against their own interests—if, indeed, they do? Might it not be possible that while employing

a distinctive repertory of attitudes, they are as "liberated" as most of them really wish to be?

Alternative Models

If we picture the options available to women, we can see that they cover a wide range including the ideal prescribed by myth and religion as well as an earthy and hedonistic life-style, and even occasionally a third variant characterized by an achievement-oriented puritan ethic. Some women choose to pattern their behavior after the mythical and religious ideal symbolized by the figure of the Virgin Mary. Others deviate from this ideal to a greater or lesser degree in order to obtain the satisfaction of their individual desires or aspirations. The ideal itself is a security blanket which covers all women, giving them a strong sense of identity and historical continuity.

As culture-bound foreigners, we are not qualified to define the interests of Latin American women. We cannot decide what is good for them or prescribe how they might achieve that good. If we were to ask whether, on the whole, Latin American women are happier and better "adjusted" (adjusted to what?) than, say, North American women, we would be forced to admit that the measurable data on which to base an answer are not available and probably never will be. It would appear then that the only meaningful question is whether the restrictions on individual action are so ironclad as to preclude any possibility of free choice.

Undeniably, the pattern of attitudes and behavior which we have described puts a distinctive stamp on Latin American society; certainly there are enormous pressures on individual women to conform to the prescriptions. Sometimes the results are tragic, both for the individual and for the society which is deprived of the full benefit of the individual's potential contribution. A notable example of this kind of tragedy is provided by the life and death of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz of Mexico, whose genius was denied and finally crushed by her ecclesiastical superiors.

But what of Manuela, the mistress of Simón Bolívar? Sublimely unconcerned with the stereotype of saintliness, she made her own decisions. The collective judgment of Latin American society accords her a measure of esteem not often associated with women who conform to the *marianismo* ideal.

The question of personal identity is much less troublesome to Latin American women than to their North American sisters. The Latin American always knows who she is; even after marriage she retains her individuality and usually keeps her family name, tacking on her husband's name and passing both names on to her children. The fiction of unassailable purity conferred by the myth on saint and sinner alike makes divorce on any grounds a rather unlikely possibility, which means that married women are not often faced with the necessity of "making a new life" for themselves during middle age. When her husband indulges in infidelity, as the *machismo* norm expects and requires him to do, the prejudice in favor of the wife's saintliness guarantees her the support of the community.

In developing societies plagued by massive unemployment and widespread underemployment, economists might question the value of throwing larger numbers of women into the already overcrowded labor market. It is hard to assess the extent to which *marianismo* contributes to the present low participation of women in economically productive endeavors.²⁸ To assume that all or nearly all women would work outside the home if they were given the opportunity to do so is an example of the kind of thinking that sometimes vitiates the conclusions of militant feminists. My inquiries among a very small sample of women from several Latin American countries indicate that when a woman acquires expertise of a kind that is socially useful, she is quite likely to find a remunerative post in conditions far more favorable than her counterpart in, say, the United States or Western Europe. Expertise in Latin America is at such a premium that she will find little competition for a suitable post.

A Latin American mother is seldom faced with the dilemma, so publicized in the United States, of having to choose between her children or her paid job. When women work outside of their home, *marianismo* makes it plain that no employer, whether he or she be a corporation president, a university dean, or a government official, has the right to ask a mother to neglect a sick child in order to keep a perfect attendance record at the office, classroom, or factory. The granting of sick leave to the mother of a sick child is not so much a matter of women's rights as a matter of the employer's duty to respect the sacredness of motherhood which the individual woman shares with the Virgin Mary and with the great mother goddesses of pre-Christian times.

Middle-class women who have marketable skills also have fewer role conflicts because other female members of the extended family, and an abundant supply of low-cost domestic servants, are available for day-to-day care of dependent children. Nonworking married middle-class women are far more fortunate than their North American counterparts; the Latin American women are free to shop or visit with friends as often as they like, without worrying about their children. The point is that as we simply do not know why only a small proportion of women work outside of the home in Latin America, we must leave open the possibility that a considerable number may have freely chosen to have their *marianismo* cake and eat it too.

Conclusion

This excursion into the realm of Latin American culture has revealed a major variant on the universal theme of male-female relationships. We have traced the major characteristics of these relationships as they have developed over thousands of years and as they are observed today. Our historical perspective enables us to see that far from being an oppressive norm dictated by tyrannical males, *marianismo* has received considerable impetus from women themselves. This fact makes it possible to regard *marianismo* as part of a reciprocal arrangement, the other half of which is *machismo*.

The arrangement is not demonstrably more "unjust" than major variants on the same theme in other parts of the world. While some individuals of both

sexes have been "victimized" by the strictures, it appears that many others have been able to shape their own life-styles and derive a measure of satisfaction, sometimes because of and sometimes in spite of the requirements of the system.

It seems unlikely that this pattern of male-female relationships can persist indefinitely without undergoing important modification. The mestizos—precisely that part of Latin American society which is characterized by *machismo-marianismo*—are not a traditional group, in the sense of that word used by anthropologists. All observable facets of Latin American mestizo society are experiencing the effects of rapid and far-reaching changes, from which the phenomenon we have described could hardly be exempt. In fact, some signs are already apparent that the current generation of middle-class university students hold somewhat different values with regard to relationships between the sexes than those of their parents. This was particularly evident during the 1968 student strike in Mexico, with reference to male-female role perceptions.

In my opinion, however, *marianismo* is not for some time yet destined to disappear as a cultural pattern in Latin America. In general, women will not use their vote as a bloc to make divorce more accessible, to abolish sex discrimination (especially preferential treatment for women), or to impose upon themselves some of the onerous tasks traditionally reserved for men. They are not yet ready to relinquish their female chauvinism.

NOTES

1. Interviews with American youths who visited Cuba to assist in the sugar harvest show that they use the term *machismo* as a synonym for "male chauvinism." See Carol Brightman and Sandra Levinson, ed., *The Venceremos Brigade* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971), passim.
2. For a discussion of this term and its social and political implications, see Evelyn P. Stevens, "Mexican Machismo: Politics and Value Orientations," *Western Political Quarterly*, 18, no. 4 (December 1965), pp. 848–57.
3. *Mundo Nuevo*, no. 46 (April 1970), pp. 14–50, devotes an entire section to the topic of "Machismo y feminismo," in which several authors use the term *hembrismo*. Neither *feminismo* nor *hembrismo* seem to me as satisfactory as my own term *marianismo*, for reasons made plain by the text.
4. See for example Julian Pitt-Rivers, ed., *Mediterranean Countrymen, Essays in the Social Anthropology of the Mediterranean* (Paris and La Haye: Mouton, 1963).
5. Julio Caro Baroja in *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, ed. J. Peristiany (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 116.
6. Samuel Ramos, *Profile of Man and Culture in Mexico* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1962).
7. See Edwin Oliver James, *The Cult of the Mother Goddess* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1959), and Erich Neumann, *The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1955).
8. Stephen Herbert Langdon, *Tammuz and Ishtar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914).
9. Raphael Patai, *The Hebrew Goddess* (Ktav Publishing House, 1967).
10. See especially Jean Danielou and Henri Marrou, *The Christian Centuries: A New History of the Catholic Church* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), vol. I, *The First Six Hundred Years*, and John Patrick Dolan, *Catholicism: An Historical Survey* (Woodbury, N.Y.: Barron's Educational Series, 1968).
11. One of the best of the ecclesiastically approved criticisms of the Marian cult is

René Laurentin's short scholarly treatise, *The Question of Mary* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965).

12. Catholic University of America, eds., *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, McGraw-Hill: 1967), vol. IX, p. 368.

13. Alfonso Caso, *The Religion of the Aztecs* (Mexico City: Central News Company, 1937), p. 34.

14. Luis Lasso de la Vega, *Hvei Tlamahvicoltica* (Mexico: Carreño e Hijo, 1926). But for a profane view of the same subject, see also Francisco de la Maza, *El guadalupanismo mexicano* (Mexico: Porrúa y Obregón, 1953). A dramatic treatment of the subject is provided by Rodolfo Usigli, *Corona de Luz* (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1965).

15. See Eric Wolf, "The Virgin of Guadalupe: A Mexican National Symbol," *Journal of American Folklore*, 71 (1958), pp. 34–39. My translation.

16. Carl E. Batt, "Mexican Character: An Adlerian Interpretation," *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 5, no. 2 (November 1969), pp. 183–201. This author refers to the "martyr complex."

17. See Rogelio Díaz-Guerrero, "Neurosis and the Mexican Family Structure," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 112, no. 6 (December 1955), pp. 411–17, and by the same author, "Adolescence in Mexico: Some Cultural, Psychological, and Psychiatric Aspects," *International Mental Health Research Newsletter*, 12, no. 4 (Winter 1970), pp. 1, 10–13.

18. Rosa Cruchaga de Walker and Lillian Calm, "¿Quién es la mujer chilena?" *Mundo Nuevo*, no. 46 (April 1970), pp. 33–38. The woman quoted in the interview is the wife of an engineer and the mother of two children. Although she professes to admire the laundress, she obviously does not emulate her life-style.

19. *Por la izquierda*: illicit.

20. James, *Cult of the Mother Goddess*, pp. 49 ff.

21. Salvador Reyes Nevares, "El machismo en Mexico," *Mundo Nuevo*, no. 46 (April 1970), pp. 14–19.

22. J. Mayone Stycos, *Family and Fertility in Puerto Rico* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955). See also Theodore B. Brameld, *The Remaking of a Culture* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959).

23. Lloyd H. Rogler and August B. Hollingshead, *Trapped* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965), pp. 133–47. See also the publications of Oscar Lewis on Mexico and Puerto Rico.

24. Ana María Portugal, "La peruana ¿'Tapada' sin manto?" *Mundo Nuevo*, no. 46 (April 1970), pp. 20–27.

25. José B. Adolph, "La emancipación masculina en Lima," *Mundo Nuevo*, no. 46 (April 1970), pp. 39–41.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 39.

27. Portugal, "La peruana ¿'Tapada' sin manto?" p. 22.

28. Some representative figures for Mexico and other Latin American countries are given in Ifigenia de Navarrete's *La mujer y los derechos sociales* (Mexico: Ediciones Oasis, 1969).