CHIPPING AWAY ON EARTH

Studies in Prehispanic and Colonial Mexico

in Honor of Arthur J. O. Anderson and Charles E. Dibble

ELOISE QUIÑONES KEBER

Editor

with the assistance of

SUSAN SCHROEDER and FREDERIC HICKS

LABYRINTHOS

F1219
.73
.C490
1994
c.1
Gen

8.

Looking Back at the Conquest: Nahua Perceptions of Early Encounters from the Annals of Chimalpahin

SUSAN SCHROEDER
Department of History, Loyola University, Chicago

Of all the historical writings about early encounters between Spaniards and American Indians, surely the conquest of Mexico is the one most richly documented.[1] The conqueror Hernando Cortés himself wrote at least five letters to the King (and Queen Mother) of Spain, telling of his exploits particularly.[2] Later, he related another personal account to his secretary and chaplain, Francisco López de Gómara, which saw publication as early as 1552 (López de Gómara 1943).

Among others, Bernal Díaz del Castillo and a man now referred to as the "Anonymous Conqueror" were in Cortés' company and each produced his own version of the conquest as well.[3] Religious such as Fray Diego Durán (1967) and Juan de Tovar (1944) also included information about the conquest in the histories they compiled.

Always in Spanish and cast from the Iberian point of view, the glory of conquest was rewritten and elaborated upon over the centuries until William H. Prescott's 1843 *History of the Conquest of Mexico* became the all-time classic. Mexico's Indians, of course, were a crucial part of the content of the conquest literature, but their perspectives of those first encounters and the outcome were seldom taken into consideration. Thereafter, within a generation or so after the conquest many Indians were educated and became skilled in European techniques of record keeping.

However, we find no firsthand native language epic histories (after Cortés and Prescott) that portray the native Americans' experiences. Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, the Franciscan philologist who worked so closely with Nahuatl-speaking populations in central Mexico, did his best to assemble an informed account of the conquest, based primarily on questions he put to survivors and other knowledgeable Nahuas with whom he collaborated. His version is not as impartial as it might have been, for, considering his purpose, it is difficult to elucidate the originality and spontaneity of the indigenous contributions (Sahagún 1950-1982: Book 12; Lockhart 1993:8-9,12). Subsequently, Sahagún revised his conquest history considerably (Sahagún 1989).[4]

The Indigenous Perspective

Recently James Lockhart (1993) has brought together a critical translation, analysis, and comparison of the Sahaguntine conquest accounts along with all that is extant of the early Nahuatl materials treating the subject. This includes what could be gleaned from *The Annals of Tlatelolco*, *The Codex Aubin*, *The Annals of Quauhtitlan*, *The Historia Tolteca-Chichimeca*, and the *Letter from the Council of Huejotzingo, 1560*. By no means do I intend to undervalue Lockhart's contribution, but overall there is simply very little by the Nahuas about the conquest. What exists is fragmentary and primarily imbedded in the Nahuatl literary genre, the annal, about which I shall have more to say later.

But indeed that was Lockhart's purpose.[5] Contrary to popular misconception that indigenous ways of doing things came to an abrupt end with subordination to the Spaniards, there is abundant evidence of great continuity of many traditions for centuries. For most native populations the conquest signified domination by another ethnic group with obligations to recognize and pay tribute to yet a new sovereign and another deity. Moreover, it is obvious that the only Indians who wrote detailed accounts about the conquest of Mexico were those who were the most affected by it—either they had the most to gain or the most to lose (Lockhart 1993). The Tlaxcalans fit the first category, the leaders of the Triple Alliance, the second. Other groups, if they have a recorded history, typically wrote about immediate and personal conquest consequences. Additionally, the Nahuatl conquest accounts are almost always anonymous; it was not common even for Sahagún to name his co-workers, except on rare occasions.[6]

In truth, unique to the corpus of Nahuatl-language annals, and invaluable to our ethnohistorical studies, are the writings of the seventeenth-century Nahua historian known as Chimalpahin. He alone compiled and authored a comprehensive history of Indian Mexico (680-ca.1630) in his own language and signed the accounts himself, thus affording a rare, personal perspective of the Nahua world. Written exactly one hundred years after the conquest, Chimalpahin's histories are telling examples of what life was like for an Indian by that time. He is also one of the few Nahua personalities of whom we have knowledge. To appreciate fully the significance of his contributions to our understanding of the indigenous perspective of the Spanish conquest, it is important first to have a sense of both the man and the setting.

The Formation of Chimalpahin

According to his own account, Chimalpahin (and this name is an alias dating from at least 1776)[7] was born in 1579 in Tzaqualtitlan Tenanco, a subkingdom of the *altepetl* ("kingdom" or "ethnic state") Amecameca Chalco.[8] A son of parents one to two generations removed from traditional connections with local nobility, and baptized Domingo Francisco (two Spanish first names are a sure sign of his commoner status in the colonial world), he moved to Mexico City in 1594. As a teenager in the capital he found employment as a steward, or *fiscal*, at a tiny church, San Antonio Abad, located in Xolloco, exactly at what must have been a very busy junction of the Ixtapalapan causeway and the entrance to the island of Tenochtitlan.

We know little of Chimalpahin's actual duties, only that he recorded in 1620 that it had been his good fortune to take care of "San Antón" for 26 years. By 1610 too he noted that Fray Agustín del Espíritu Santo, son of the patrons of San Antón, had assumed clerical responsibilities at the church. Chimalpahin held Fray Agustín in high regard, and in general there must have been an ambience supportive of Indians, for acquaintances of Chimalpahin from Amecameca came to the church for religious instruction. And surely it was Fray Agustín who furnished Chimalpahin with the expensive paper, ink, and leisure to work on an Indian history.

What provoked Chimalpahin to write I have yet to determine. It seems that he began to gather data shortly after the turn of the century, working with a wide range of documents. I believe at some point he was employed as a professional copyist, perhaps in association with Juan de Tovar, who seems to have been a regular visitor at San Antón as well as rector and teacher at the Jesuits' Mexico City secondary school for Indians, the Colegio de San Gregorio, located just behind the cathedral.

Indeed, in spite of the peripheral location of his church and his humble beginnings, it appears from his accounts that Chimalpahin in some manner came in contact with some of Mexico City's most important citizens, men like don Sancho Sánchez de Muñón, *maestrescuela* of the Cathedral Chapter, ecclesiastical governor of the archbishopric, and agent at the court of Spain for the Mexican churches. Also influential were the above-mentioned Father Tovar and Doctor Pedro de Morales ("el Pontifice Chiquito") (Zimmermann 1965:137),[9] both pioneer Jesuit educators at the capital, Archbishop-Viceroy Fray don García Guerra, and Enrico Martínez, the Royal Cosmographer for the Council of Indies in New Spain, to name a few.

While at San Antón Chimalpahin changed his name and began to sign himself "don" (a Spanish title for social distinction) "Domingo de San Antón" (after the church) "Muñón" (after the *maestrescuela* and the patrons of the church) "Chimalpahin Quautlehuanitzin" (after long-deceased high-ranking nobles from his hometown), although in reality it is likely he was known only as "[don] Domingo de San Antón." This can be seen as a definite indication of his changing self image, perhaps the product of his contacts and the favorable environment at the church. As Chimalpahin began to write, he interpolated his new name from time to time to remind his readers of his authorship.

Probably because of his pen name and the colonial milieu, it was said that Chimalpahin was both fully Christian and European in his world view. J. Jorge Klor de Alva (1982), moreover, adds that Chimalpahin was even "creole" in his customs, surely referring to the privileged Indians whom Chimalpahin described as *quiespañolchichiuh*, literally, "adorned as a Spaniard"; but in this particular instance it meant "someone who possessed the license to carry a sword and dagger and ride a white horse" (Zimmermann 1965:3).

It is unlikely that Domingo Francisco ever outfitted himself as a Spaniard, unless it was intellectually—substituting European pen, ink, and paper for sword, dagger, and horse. Although he knew some Spanish, he wrote in Nahuatl for an Indian readership, anticipating their literacy. Of his contemporaries, I am constantly reminded of the grand South American histories of Garcilaso de la Vega (1986) and Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala (1980). These are equally precious accounts, to be sure, but written in Spanish for a different purpose and obviously a non-Indian audience.

The same is true for Chimalpahin's Mexico City associate, don Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, a mestizo descendant of the royal house of Tetzcoco, whose histories (1975-1977) are also in Spanish. Better known is the

Nahuatl history dating from about the same time (1598), the *Crónica mexicayotl*, by don Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc (1975). This work, extant only from later copies, is now known in its original form to be in Chimalpahin's own Nahuatl hand.

Only the Nahuatl annals by Juan Buenaventura Zapata y Mendoza are comparable to Chimalpahin's, but they deal with events in Tlaxcala and cover a more limited period of time.[10] As an individual from outside the capital and as a person somewhat marginal to the events he describes, Chimalpahin is all the more valuable, not only for his abundance and detail but also because his accounts can be mined for information and attitudes about what concerned Nahuas outside the coterie of rulership and power.[11]

Chimalpahin's eloquence and capability as a historian have led me to a broader study of indigenous literacy in early seventeenth-century Mexico City.[12] My findings, while still incomplete, indicate that many Indians were reading and writing for various purposes, and some were ordinary people, like Chimalpahin, who capitalized upon available opportunities and used their educations to conserve Nahua culture and perpetuate its legacy through much of the colonial period. As a copyist, Chimalpahin surely worked with other Nahuas—sharing, examining, transcribing, and otherwise trying to make sense of an extraordinary variety of manuscript and published materials. A large portion of his history has to do with his hometown, Amecameca Chalco. He wrote, he said, so Indians for generations to come would know of this glorious kingdom.

Chimalpahin's production was quite remarkable. It was drawn from ancient pictorials, written Nahuatl and Spanish records, books in Spanish, and oral interviews, as well as what he observed.[13] Where all these materials were located, I do not know; perhaps at the Colegio de San Gregorio.[14] He also traveled to examine other sources in private repositories in distant *altepetl*, and asked Nahua elders to help explain or corroborate his findings, including, when possible, the names of the men.

The Nahuatl Annals Genre

It is interesting to note that, writing one century after the arrival of the Spaniards, Chimalpahin in his Nahuatl histories writes almost exclusively in the annals genre. Annals reflect an attitude about Indian-Spanish encounters that is not tendentious yet all the while very Nahua. The annals themselves are good evidence of Chimalpahin's intention to keep his Nahua tradition, for it is thoroughly an indigenous style.

Chimalpahin's annals, what he called *ynxiuhtlapohualmotenehua Anales*, "their year-count called annals" (Zimmermann 1963:39), bits and fragments of miscellaneous information organized year by year but scattered throughout hundreds of folios in numerous manuscripts, were the usual indigenous method of record keeping during the early colonial period, but doubtless an adaptation of the form used before the conquest.

In a sense each annal is a capsule of everything of importance that transpired in a given period, whether calculated according to the indigenous or the Gregorian calendar. Typically, an entry began with something like "*10 tochtli xihuitl 1606*," "the year 10 Rabbit 1606" (Zimmermann 1965:57), always with a conjunction of both counting systems. Following the date he added what he could decipher and translate and what he felt was important. For the annals of the preconquest period he noted migrations, the installation of rulers, wars and conquests, comets, earthquakes, pronouncements from deities, etc.

During the colonial era the topics repeat, but ultimately there was less about Indians and more about life in Mexico City; the entries are more detailed (many are eyewitness reports—"truly I saw it"); and his dates become all the more precise, down to the month, day, and hour (calculated by the ringing of the church bells). The annals genre, which often seems mechanical and terse (one always wishes for more from Chimalpahin), must still be appreciated as a classic vehicle for the expression of authentic Nahua thought.[15]

For scholars critical of the reliability of data based upon a chronology of events derived from the mnemonic pictograph-oral explication historical system generated by Chimalpahin and other Nahuatl authors, it will be possible to begin testing and decoding the annals once they are all assembled.[16] It will not be an easy task, however. For example, by what methodology did Chimalpahin identify and transform the content of an ideographic representation into a record in Roman script? How does one fully discern his meaning when comprehension of his sophisticated and complex Nahuatl remains incomplete? And how—even with the New Philology (see Lockhart 1992:7)—are we to calibrate from his many sources the confluence of languages and literary styles in his annals production?

Some researchers have criticized Chimalpahin for being repetitious and contradictory.[17] Had they understood the nature of Nahuatl annals or been familiar with Chimalpahin's oeuvre and his endeavors as a copyist, it would have been apparent that he was transcribing and translating a great variety of pictographic and other sorts of Nahuatl records, from many places covering several centuries, in order to record as much as he could. Duplication and overlapping were inevitable. The fact that so

much survived and was still understood and practiced affirms Nahua cultural persistence even in Mexico City.

It is improbable that we shall ever be able to reconstruct Chimalpahin's situation—to know the sophisticated array of materials within his reach, to know the degree of "copista's license" that he enjoyed,[18] to know the pressures from both Spaniards and Indians at the time, or to be certain of his purpose. From time to time he went beyond synthetic annals and shifted into a reflective mode, humanizing colonial Mexico City with sensory-rich, graphic descriptions of particular events. Rolena Adorno (1991:257), in her study of "*indios ladinos*" as interpreters in Peru, finds good evidence that the Indian translators were most often inherently resistant to Spanish colonialism as they plied their trade, in spite of appearances. Likewise, Chimalpahin resisted. Situated in the heart of the capital, he copied, rewrote, ordered, and maintained the history of Indian Mexico in its most classic tradition.

Spaniards, Conquest, and Nahuatl Annals

Chimalpahin for this reason is surely one of our best sources for information about the Nahua view regarding the presence of Europeans in central Mexico. I have culled, translated, and analyzed what he has to say about the topic from his three primary manuscript collections: the Relaciones (Fonds Mexicain 74) and the Diario (Fonds Mexicain 220), known and housed for the last century at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris; MS. 374 in the Foreign and British Bible Society Library, London, discovered in the 1980s;[19] and the earliest known copy (by Boturini, in Spanish, ca. 1746) of Chimalpahin's version of Francisco López de Gómara's *La conquista de México* (1552), also recently discovered.[20]

Chimalpahin reported many things in his annals, but he seldom wrote specifically about the Spaniards and the conquest outside a Nahua context. This holds even when he borrows information from a Spanish book, translates it into Nahuatl, and works it into his annals. Thus his Nahua readership learned about Christopher Columbus. Increasingly cosmopolitan in his sources, in addition to Nahua culture, especially his own in Amecameca Chalco, Chimalpahin included, among his interests, world geography, Catholicism, Gregorian calendrics, *mestizaje*, the Inquisition, even the Manila galleon, and he laced his year-by-year and subsequent month-by-month accounts with such information. To include it all in a Nahua history demonstrates that after a century of interaction with Spaniards not all aspects of colonial culture were negative to him; in fact, some items served his purpose well.

What is not said is as important as what is said, and, as can be expected, Chimalpahin says very little about the Spanish conquest. Essentially, he reported what was happening at the time—that some other ethnic group (the Spaniards) was attempting to conquer the Mexica, something not altogether untoward for the indigenous populations already suffering subjugation. For centuries, conquest and subordination had patterned sociopolitical development in Middle America. Coming from Chalco, Chimalpahin made his annals archetypal, and knowing his bias and style one would expect him to run on about the great deeds of his fellow Chalca.

However, we must read Spanish chronicles like Fray Diego Durán's *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España* for particulars about Cortés' reception in Chalco and how Indian nobles came from afar to offer their services, or Francisco López de Gómara for information about battles, especially Gonzalo de Sandoval's marshaling of Chalca troops, Chalca formidability, and the importance of making Chalco secure for travel from Mexico City to Veracruz.[21]

Indeed, Chimalpahin's earliest actual mention of anything about Spain is not a Nahua recollection at all but was taken directly from a Spanish book, Enrico Martínez's *Reportorio de los tiempos e historia natural de Nueva España*, published in Mexico City in 1606 (see Martínez 1948). In a passage translated into Nahuatl and immediately juxtaposed with his 1484 annal entry about *tlatoani* ("king") Nezahualpilli's activities in Tetzcoco, he tells about Christopher Columbus going to King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella's palace, and then about the *yancuic tlalli*, the "new land," that will be "discovered" (Zimmermann 1963:119-20; Martínez 1948:139-43, 147,149-52). This is Martínez's language, not that of Chimalpahin.

Chimalpahin borrowed heavily from Martínez (without giving credit) for his information about Spain, incorporating whole passages from the *Reportorio* in Nahuatl translation into several of his Relaciones and the Diario.[22] Interestingly, to conclude his lengthy and detailed narrative about the grand Indian dynasties in his own Amecameca, he paired it with similar information from the *Reportorio* about the early history and splendor of the Iberian monarchy, obviously intending to portray the two royal houses as equal (Zimmermann 1963:175-78).

But he did not ignore the conquest of Mexico; it is just more difficult to identify his sources. He credits Hernando Cortés[23] with bringing the Spaniards, called by the loanword "*Conquistadores*," to "our" land, now called "New Spain," and destroying the rulership (*tlatocayotl*) of the great state of Mexico Tenochtitlan. Symbolically, he states that Cortés then replaced the indigenous diadem (*copilli*) with the crown (*corona*) of the kings of Spain (Zimmermann 1963:163). More specifically, he touches

upon the Spaniards' march from Tlaxcala to Cholula to Amecameca to Tlalmanalco and then on to the island capital of Mexico Tenochtitlan. He identifies which groups fought the Spaniards and which did not. Although he lists the rulers of Tlaxcala, he says little more (p. 141). Possibly he is minimizing the role of other indigenous kingdoms in order to exalt that of his own.

However, once Cortés and his party reached Amecameca there is considerably more detail. He identifies the two Amecameca *tlatoque* (plural of *tlatoani*, "kings") who went to meet Cortés, names another ruler who fled to Tenochtitlan to join his relative Moteucçoma Xocoyotl, and tells of another ruler who took all his wives and went into hiding (pp.141,164).

According to Chimalpahin the two Amecameca kings gave Cortés forty young, pure, beautifully attired girls. He says the kings solicited and collected the daughters of *macehualtin* ("commoners") but that some nobles were also approached for their daughters. (The verbs here are *itlania*, "to solicit," and *maca*, "to give.") Elsewhere we see Spaniards *demanding* women, and Chimalpahin reports that some of these women died.[24]

The Spaniards also received 3,000 pesos of gold and some finely worked jewels (Zimmermann 1963:164). Then the rulers of Amecameca offered their services against the Mexica, and kings from Tlalmanalco and other *altepetl* joined in. In subsequent entries Chimalpahin methodically reported the death within a year of each one of these kings by epidemic disease. From time to time he describes the symptoms and other horrors of the diseases and tells of women and children dying as well (Schroeder 1987).

Concerning Mexico Tenochtitlan, Chimalpahin barely says anything about Moteucçoma, except that he and other Triple Alliance rulers welcomed the Spaniards and offered their hospitality only to find themselves manacled (e.g., Zimmermann 1963:142). He charges the Spaniards with the killing of *huey tlatoani* ("great king") Moteucçoma (of Tenochtitlan), *tlatoani* Cacamatzin (of Tetzcoco), and interim king (*quauhtlatoani*) Ytzquauhtzin (of Tlatelolco),[25] and he describes in several annals the atrocities carried out by the Spaniards against Cuauhtemoc and other Indians on the march to Honduras (Zimmermann 1965:2,3; BSM). He gives all credit to Cortés for conquering the Mexica (the island people of Tenochtitlan and Tlatelolco) but adds, as we would expect, that the Chalca helped (Zimmermann 1963:143; 1965:80-81).

Continuing his annals, Chimalpahin poignantly tells of how surviving Mexica later returned to their homes and tried to collect their belongings (p.1). To reward supporters Cortés invited Indian nobles to Coyoacan, where he used Malintzin (the Nahua form, not "doña Marina") and Gerónimo de Aguilar as interpreters, and had them relate to the assembled Indian *tlatoque* the all-too-familiar story about how the Mexica and their warriors had taken their land and subjugated everyone.

Cortés then told how he had done the same—taken the land by force and made everyone a subject of the king of Spain. But now, magnanimously, he (Cortés) was giving all the land and indigenous royal titles back to the kings and their peoples for them to work as they had before (we call this *encomienda*). And Cortés personally installed the rulers in office (Zimmermann 1963:143-44). On several occasions Malintzin appears as an advocate for Cortés, giving orders to Nahua groups to bring food, water, wood, and fodder, and carrying out other directives (see BSM especially).

Wars of conquest and epidemic disease interrupted dynastic procedures in many of the kingdoms in central Mexico, and Chimalpahin bemoaned the fact that rightful rulers no longer succeeded to their proper thrones. It becomes clear that the reasons are complex—and that Chimalpahin was aware of them. In part, it was because many Indians had died, but also it was because Cortés was playing favorites, installing his most loyal Indian allies in positions of high office (Zimmermann 1965:2-3).

In Amecameca, Chimalpahin tells of two ambitious brothers who joined forces with Cortés and participated in the battles against the Mexica. They conspired with the newly installed (but probably not legitimate successor) kings[26] in Tlalmanalco and murdered two princes in line for Amecameca thrones. Cortés then installed the brothers and even became *compadre* (godparent) with the elder, seeing to the baptism of the man's son (Zimmermann 1965:2,6). The two brothers then usurped all the kingships in Amecameca and held sway for more than twenty years (pp.4,11). By 1523, of all the legitimate rulers alive when Cortés first marched through Amecameca, only a child-king survived (Zimmermann 1963: 164).[27] Cortés insisted that the boy be baptized and given his name. Shortly afterward, young don Hernando Cortés Cihuailacatzin Chichimeca teuhctli was deposed and driven from Amecameca, terminating the rulership in another important kingdom (Zimmermann 1965:2,4).

Summing up his offerings about the conquest, Chimalpahin implicitly was most concerned about the brutalities and deaths of so many Indian rulers and the effect of these on dynastic procedures in the kingdoms. Royal genealogies (*tlatocatlacamecayotl*) were sacrosanct to him, and he deplored any violation of this centuries-old institution. The noble lineages traced back to the time when each kingdom was established, that is, the permanent settlement of a given region after decades or cen-

turies of migration from place to place, the building of a temple and the inauguration ceremony for the group's deity, the installation of the leader as king and his investiture with a royal title. Chimalpahin's first seven Relaciones are essentially dynastic histories of Amecameca and greater Chalco, traced from at least the year 1160.[28] To him, the royal lineage was the essence of each kingdom. When succession was interrupted or compromised, he considered the kingdom destroyed, and all that mattered, lost.

Overall, Chimalpahin's information on the conquest is minimal. Of the close to fifteen hundred pages of his Nahuatl histories, his data regarding the Spanish conquest, condensed, warrant little more than two or three pages. Pieces of information appear, but never do we find an annal set aside just for the conquest. What is of greatest interest is that the Spaniards were perceived as essentially just another ethnic entity. The destruction of the hegemony of the Triple Alliance signified the end of Mexica tyranny—welcome news for many Nahuas.

For the Chalca, fifty-six years before, in 1464-1465, the Mexica had conquered their confederacy, cutting off and destroying the royal lineages as all legitimate kings were forced into exile and then replaced by men chosen by Mexica overlords.[29] The termination of the dynasties was the worst of all fates. The glorious golden era of Chalca sovereignty was thus over; while subsequent kings were Chalca, they were not descendants of the official ancient lineages. Subjugation to the Mexica meant the Chalca were *ye tepehualtin catca*, "conquered people" (Zimmermann 1963:163), as were other Indian kingdoms in central Mexico. Lamentably, things would never really be the same again.[30]

Spanish conquest meant the end of the royal lineages in the capital as well. Chimalpahin reports that the genealogy of Tlacaelel cihuacoatl, who held the office second-in-command to the Mexica *huey tlatoque* and was based in the district of Acatlan (almost next door to where Chimalpahin was living), came to an end in 1610 with the death of don Miguel Sánchez Huetzin (Zimmermann 1965:91, 119); for the Tenochca, the last heir of the imperial house was don Luis de Santa María Nanacacipactzin, who died in 1565 (pp.22,77). Thereafter, in an effort to retain some form of traditional indigenous sociopolitical organization, Tenochtitlan had Indian kings, but they were brought in from outside *altepetl* (p. 77). And finally Chimalpahin reports that, for want of a suitable Indian candidate, a mestizo was installed as *juez gobernador* of Tenochtitlan (p.77).[31]

In a wonderful, revealing passage Chimalpahin complains bitterly about *mestizaje* and how damaging it was for the ancient, great noble indigenous lineages (Zimmermann 1965:22):[32]

> And with these mestizos we do not know how their lineage is on the side of the Spaniards, whether their grandfathers and grandmothers back in Spain, from whom the mestizos' fathers who came from there descended, were nobles or commoners; they have come here and married daughters of people of New Spain, some high nobles, and the Spaniards have married some daughters of poor commoners, so that those who have been and continue to be born of these matches are always mestizos, male or female; and some are born just through concubinage and illegitimacy, so that mestizos male and female descend from us local people. The honorable mestizos, male and female, acknowledge that they come from us; but some misguided mestizos, male and female, do not want to acknowledge that part of the blood they have is ours, but rather imagine themselves fully Spaniards and mistreat us and deceive us the same way some Spaniards do.

The long lists of royal genealogies that we can compile for Chalco, Mexico Tenochtitlan, Tetzcoco, Tlatelolco, and other *altepetl* from Chimalpahin's Nahuatl annals span four to five to six centuries. Now he reiterates his protest about the end of kingship and royal succession in the Indian kingdoms, which would bring about eventual changes in other native traditions.

Looking carefully at Chimalpahin's annals themselves, we may find that the conquest of Mexico Tenochtitlan signaled the end of one cycle and the start of another. Such interpretations are not unique to the Nahuas, as Victoria Bricker and Grant Jones have shown for some Maya groups. In Yucatan the Maya saw the conquest as not altogether unusual, since the timing of the Spaniards' arrival coincided with the completion of a *katun* cycle, marking a given period of time after the event of the arrival of an earlier group, the Itza, 256 years before (Bricker 1981:28; Jones 1989:17-20). We already know about the auspicious culmination of the Nahua 52-year cycle and the sighting of Spanish ships off the coast of Veracruz.

Typically, like cyclical formulae throughout his annals, Chimalpahin concluded certain episodes with phrases like "and it is x years since the Mexica left their home at Aztlan Chicomoztoc" (e.g., Zimmermann 1963: 12,14,16,17,36); or "in this year the Mexica paused to bundle their years" (pp.12,17; Sahagún 1950-1982,7: 25); or "it is y years since the Mexica conquered the Chalca" (Zimmermann 1963:144); or "it is z years before (or since) the arrival of Hernando Cortés (pp.9,36; 1965:4,6,12). All were major, crucial events in the history of Indian Mexico, but to Chimalpahin Cortés and the conquest are reported as hardly more than another time marker.

It should be noted, in addition, that Chimalpahin invested considerable space and time to try to reconcile the indigenous day and month counts with the European calendar. Interspersed in his annals are long lists of day/month names, something he called the "reportorio de los tiempos," and he states more than once that he double-checked the coordinate with the collaboration of (a specialist?) Martín Tochtli.[33] Knowing that the prehispanic calendar was entwined with non-Christian ritual paraphernalia, Chimalpahin possibly intended to incorporate information about ancient religious practices into his annals. Arthur Anderson, who has examined and translated these particular accounts, however, states that in spite of Chimalpahin's assiduous efforts his reckoning of the ritual calendar is off (BSM; see also Anderson 1984).

Another point that should be noted is that the Christian religious motives for writing about the conquest attributed to Sahagún's native informants cannot be generalized.[34] Though living and working in a church in Mexico while writing his history, Chimalpahin (apparently very devout) nowhere associates the arrival of the Spaniards with any sort of providential enterprise.

Chimalpahin and the Spanish Version of the Conquest

Of great importance to our study of Chimalpahin's annals is one other major work attributed to Chimalpahin: his copy of López de Gómara's chronicle (1552) on the conquest of Mexico. Whether written in Nahuatl or in Spanish,[35] it is still the most puzzling of all his historical accounts. One cannot help but wonder: why the fascination on the part of an Indian with the Spaniard López de Gómara's history?

Apparently, it was not all that uncommon to find non-Spaniards reading about the conquest, in spite of the fact that as early as 1531 the Queen had prohibited the shipping of fiction and all other non-religious literature to the Indies. Her concern was that the Indians might gain access to these works and read them instead of preferred ecclesiastical materials.[36] My colleague Juan López y Magaña tells me that Diego Muñoz Camargo also owned a copy of López de Gómara's book.[37] Even though Prince Philip issued an edict banning the printing, selling, and reading of the work in 1553, his censure in no way reduced the book's popularity.[38] It was subsequently published in Italian, English, and French within a few decades. A Spanish edition of it is itemized on a shipment of books from Spain to Mexico in 1600 (Leonard 1949:253). Obviously, reading López de Gómara was fashionable in a wide range of intellectual circles.

As mentioned above, it is likely that Chimalpahin worked at least part time as a *copista*, and this possibly explains his access to López de Gómara's book. I suspect that Chimalpahin may also have had an affiliation with the Colegio de San Gregorio, the Jesuits' secondary school for Indians in Mexico City, where he copied books and manuscripts for the Colegio's rector, the famous Nahuatl orator Father Juan de Tovar.[39] It may have been his duty to reproduce López de Gómara's "La Conquista," but it does not seem likely, since Chimalpahin did not make an exact copy—far from it.

I have just begun the enormous task of comparing Chimalpahin's "La Conquista" manuscript with the original book as well as the later copies (see Schroeder 1992). The Spanish copy tends to follow López de Gómara's book rather carefully, at least in terms of replicating toponyms and individuals' names, which he would normally spell very differently. But as he copied, he edited, corrected, and expanded certain passages, even signing his new name at one point. But to what end? As we might expect, Chimalpahin added and enhanced the information about particular Indian groups and places, and left out whole sections on Spanish activities. Eliminated paragraphs about the Spaniards are replaced with specifics on Indian towns and their inhabitants.

Later Spanish copies of this conquest chronicle are at variance with Chimalpahin's rendition, but the record of the Spanish work is tangled. (The various copyists took great license in organization, editing, and commentary.) Of these, I have identified one complete manuscript and four partial copies, which are located in repositories in Mexico City, the United States, France, and Spain.[40] Carlos María Bustamante published a confusing, inexact edition in Spanish in 1826; which copy he used for his master I have yet to determine. For the interest and use of readers in English, my version, when comparisons and translations are completed, will represent the first 235 chapters of "La Conquista" and include most of the crucial sections about Mexica culture deleted from Lesley Byrd Simpson's 1966 edition (see Schroeder n.d.).

By the 1620s Nahua demographics and culture in Mexico had changed significantly. For all Chimalpahin's labor to leave a Nahuatl record of Amecamecan history, it is possible that he felt something should also be done about the Spanish version of the conquest. Others were rewriting history as well. As noted, Fray Bernardino de Sahagún directed the recording of a Nahuatl account of the conquest for his *Historia general* and provided a parallel in Spanish, which he completed by 1579. He then set about revising it (1585), stating that he was making linguistic refinements as well as correcting errors in the original text,[41] but he recast and enhanced the role of Cortés and stressed Spanish accomplishments in New Spain.

Sahagún, of course, gave the Church its due attention. Sarah Cline proposes that Fray Bernardino's purpose in revising his texts was both personal and political. Faced with changing religious and government policies, he had to champion the conquest and defend the subsequent Franciscan enterprise in the Americas in order to promote the sponsorship and continuity of its mission among the Indians—his life's work.[42]

At about the same time, Bernal Díaz del Castillo, a stalwart member of Cortés' original company, was doing the same thing.[43] Though it is too often said that Díaz wrote his history only to challenge López de Gómara's pro-Cortés account, he actually began writing in 1551—a year before the other work was published (see Adorno 1988). Certainly Díaz del Castillo received a copy at some point, and his gripe is obvious; but for him, like Sahagún, other things were at stake. Rolena Adorno has shown that Díaz's purpose was defensive: he too had to justify the conquest in order to protect his investments. But his concerns were in the economic sphere. The *encomienda* was in jeopardy—the product of the Ginés de Sepúlveda-Las Casas polemic.[44] The entitlement and legacy due the veterans of the conquest had to be secured. Díaz spent years writing and rewriting his history (ca. 1551-1568) to prove his point.

As yet, we do not know how concerned Chimalpahin was with New Spain's political and economic affairs, or if he was familiar with either Sahagún's or Díaz del Castillo's personal versions of the conquest. The fact that he took it upon himself to make a copy of the Cortés account indicates that he too felt the work warranted some attention. Was it to be a third revisionist conquest history but with a Nahua slant?

Nahuas and Colonialism

Chimalpahin's annal entries for the years he was living in Mexico City are dense with information about Spanish activities in the capital. The tone is reportorial and informative. He is especially taken with the human traffic—whether travelers from Spain and other places he is learning about,[45] the passage of the *China acalli*, "China water/house" (the Manila galleon), and its ambassadors (Zimmermann 1965:91-94,123,132-34,136), or the incredible number and variety of processions through the streets.[46] I marvel at the turnout of people he describes—the best of all groups, including royal officials, secular clergy and the many regulars, local creoles, and members of the indigenous *cofradías* (brotherhoods, socioreligious organizations) that were being formed at that time.

Chimalpahin was especially proud of one *cofradía* because it was founded by a close friend, Diego López Cuauhtlacuillo (Zimmermann 1965:110,120). He tells of the banners and other ceremonial paraphernalia, and how a local Nahua governor, don Melchor de Soto, marched along as everyone watched. The Jesuits had been instrumental in securing the permission for and helping Diego López with the *cofradía*'s organization.[47] With the biological and cultural assault on native royal genealogies and kingdoms, Chimalpahin and his friends likely enjoyed an aspect of indigenous corporateness as it came to be known in the institution of the colonial *cofradía*.

It is very possible that Chimalpahin's friend Diego López Cuauhtlacuillo was a fellow *copista*, or Nahuatl notary, judging by his surname, literally, "to write or inscribe in wood," and tracing from ancient times the craft of the *tlacuilo*, the artist who painted historical images in pictorial manuscripts (Gibson 1964:81; 1966:138). Crucial events, concepts, and time markers became graphic renderings as history was codified. Esteemed in Nahua society (Karttunen 1982:399), the manuscript authors and the tradition survived the transition to colonial scribes under the Franciscan campaign for *alphabetización*.[48]

Diego López was from the Franciscan-centered town of Santiago Tlatelolco, famous for its Indian college (Colegio de Santa Cruz de Santiago Tlatelolco), which produced generations of literate Indians and whose graduates became its rectors and teachers (see Steck 1936: 449-62,603-17; 1943:3-19,71-94). Other graduate Indians worked with the friars and helped in the development of Christian texts,[49] while some returned to their hometowns to become local officials. And just when the Franciscan enterprise was on the decline, the Jesuits arrived to take up the evangelical and educational slack. The Jesuits made the best of the changed political climate and were encouraged to provide higher education for the sons of creole as well as indigenous nobles. Great effort went into learning native languages and writing texts.[50]

The abundance, variation in style, and numerous categories of Nahuatl documents are good evidence of the dispersion of literate Indians in the colony. The ability to read and write assured social mobility and prestige. Making good use of these skills, Nahua notaries all over central Mexico were detailing and witnessing wills for the sick and dying (e.g., Kellogg 1986; Cline and León-Portilla 1984), keeping *cabildo* records for Indian towns (see Lockhart et al. 1986; Anderson et al. 1976:118-65), tabulating censuses and tribute data (see Haskett 1991; Cline 1993), recording bills of sale and land petitions (e.g., Horn 1989; Wood 1984, 1991; Lockhart 1982), and writing transcripts of litigation in the Indian Court, until it was abolished upon Independence (Borah 1983).

Some Nahuas recorded wonderful songs and poems (Bierhorst 1985) and discourses on proper speech and

behavior (Karttunen and Lockhart 1987). Chimalpahin and others wrote histories, whether for friars and priests or themselves. And there was the area of personal correspondence—long letters to kings, governors, and family, some official, some not (Mendieta 1980:411).[51]

Of particular interest is the work by Stephanie Wood (1991) with another genre of Nahuatl documents, the "*títulos primordiales.*" These are accounts about Indian towns written by local Indians—but those outside the ruling corps. Intended for the edification of the indigenous community, and unsophisticated and conservative in nature, the *títulos* are rich sources on regional folklore and history, as well as strong evidence of the nonexclusive character of Nahua literacy. Appearing in increasing frequency in the mid-seventeenth century and afterward, the *títulos* were purposefully designed by knowledgeable authors to heighten common identity and emphasize the integrity of the town, protecting it from outsiders and great change.

Conclusion

Over the centuries there had been many conquests and much accommodation. For the Nahuas in the seventeenth century, colonial New Spain was their reality. Chimalpahin was proud to live in Mexico City and work at San Antón.[52] It does not sound, in fact, as though life was all that bad for Indians in the capital.

But I have not mentioned that the charge of Chimalpahin's little church was to serve the city's lepers,[53] or that its operation was dependent upon the donation of alms (San Antonio Abad 1589). I have said little about the epidemics (e.g., Schroeder 1987) or the great poverty of even Indian nobles in the capital, who no longer had traditional sources of revenue for support.[54] Nor have I said anything about the *congregaciones* that caused so much hardship in the countryside (*auh yc cenca innetoliniliz mochiuh yn macehualtzitzintin*) (Zimmermann 1965:57). I have not mentioned that Chimalpahin had family in Amecameca, and he probably commuted between two homes (Schroeder 1991:13,18-19), a good distance even today by *pesero*. And I have said nothing about Chimalpahin's never being mentioned by even one of his contemporaries, whether religious or Indian, indicating his marginal status all the while he lived in Mexico City (p.15).

Chimalpahin's solution for these everyday problems was to make the very best of his situation. He never forgot he was Nahua, referring to himself and others as *timacehualtin, titlaca,* "we commoners," "we people" (Zimmermann 1965:22,27,98,150). That he dedicated his histories to these people and their descendants informs us of his profound concern for his Nahua culture. The one sure way to see to its preservation was to make the most comprehensive Nahuatl account possible. This was not a man who camouflaged his Indianness with European rhetoric and appurtenances.

Indeed, Chimalpahin did what other Nahuas did at this point in New Spain's history: he selected key items from Spanish culture and used them for Nahua purposes. In this instance, it was the Roman alphabet and script and the benefit of the Franciscans' perspicacity in adapting them to Nahuatl. This writing system educated Indians appropriated to perpetuate Nahua institutions in colonial culture. Above all, Chimalpahin was grateful to Fray Alonso de Molina, who produced a Nahuatl-Spanish dictionary (1555) that Nahuatl scholars depend on even today. Molina, Chimalpahin says (paraphrasing), "wonderfully, . . . using Spanish letters [characters] created an order and script of Nahuatl speech and wrote it in Nahuatl in a great *bocapolario* [vocabulary] . . . so that each priest could teach us through our language . . ." (Zimmermann 1965:28-29).

It may be that Chimalpahin and other Nahuas idealized their past, but there was still plenty of the present and much to look forward to. They obviously continued to conserve traditions, using, for just one example, the many forms of record keeping available to them—as evidenced by the great wealth of extant Nahuatl documents in Mexico and elsewhere yet to be studied.[55]

NOTES

Acknowledgments: I believe that Chimalpahin would be pleased to have a study of his annals included in an *homenaje* for Arthur Anderson and Charles Dibble. Indeed, Chimalpahin was familiar with some of Sahagún's *Historia* (using it in his annals), and it is certain that he worked as *copista* for the *Exercicio Quotidiano*. Both Fray Bernardino and Chimalpahin dedicated themselves to preserving the legacy of the Nahuas, and Anderson and Dibble have done so much to keep that tradition. To all, I am grateful.

1. Selected portions of this essay were presented at the VIII Conference of Mexican and North American Historians, San Diego, October 1990; the American Historical Association meeting, Chicago, December 1991; and the Conference on Early Encounters between Europeans and Indians in Latin America, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, April 1992. I thank S. L. Cline, Susan Ramírez, and Eric Van Young for their comments and questions.

2. In English translation, see Pagden 1986.

3. In English translation, see Díaz del Castillo 1979 and the Anonymous Conqueror 1963.

4. Here Sahagún presents the contrary opinion, portraying the conquest as an all-important political event, rationalized by means of the respective religious views of both conquered and conquerors.

5. For an exhaustive discussion of indigenous cultural continuity, see especially Lockhart 1992.

6. Additionally, Lockhart 1993:44 suggests that two of Sahagún's Nahua assistants may have been the authors of the *Annals of Quauhtitlan.*

7. An asterisk on the front leaf of a conquista manuscript (Fonds Espagnol 173, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris), dated 1766 and 1807, is followed by "Alias Chimalpain."

8. For biographical information about Chimalpahin, see Schroeder 1991:7-37.

9. Unless stated otherwise, all references from Chimalpahin's Nahuatl texts are taken from Zimmermann 1963-1965.

10. I anticipate Frances Krug's translation and analysis of these works. Another collection of Nahuatl annals of importance are those by Cristóbal del Castillo. Many are known just from later translations or are fragments. For a recent, somewhat more critical study, see the 1599-1606 writings about Mexico City in Castillo 1991.

11. Even though much of Chimalpahin's accounts can be described as "dynastic history," or history of "extraordinary" people, they should not be discounted. His concern with rulership, *tlatocayotl*, and all that it signified, was one very important way for him to emphasize indigenous culture continuity over the centuries. See Sharpe 1992 for a study of history by non-elites. See also Gruzinski 1989:12,105-72. He attempts to distinguish personality, culture, and power among the "anonymous, silent presence of crowds of Indians" through his study of resistance, apotheosis, and millenarianism. Unfortunately, Gruzinski minimalizes or seems unaware of "power" by means of Nahua literacy in central Mexico, especially in the region ("Popocatepetl") of one of his most important case studies, and, of course, it is Chimalpahin's home territory.

12. As an ongoing project, I am investigating the Jesuits' secondary schools for Indians, most particularly the Colegio de San Gregorio in Mexico City and the Colegio de San Martín at Tepotzotlan, seeking to identify Indian students and career patterns as a product of the educational programs and subsequent literacy.

13. For a survey of his known sources, see Schroeder 1991: 13-20.

14. One indication of a possible association is that Chimalpahin's Diario was somehow part of the Nahuatl manuscript collection in San Gregorio's library, even at the time of the expulsion of the Jesuits. See CG (Colegio de San Gregorio), vol. 121, fols. 294v-298v in the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Archivo Histórico.

15. For an informative discussion of both the value and limitations of annals to the historiography of history, see White 1987:4-25.

16. See Schroeder n.d.

17. See, for example, Davies 1980:115,225,257; Hicks 1979:87-88; Gillespie 1989:26-28,134.

18. For example, did anyone proof his work? Lockhart 1992:73 discusses individual initiative and variations in style among Nahua authors.

19. The London Bible Society Manuscript (hereafter BSM) was discovered by Wayne Ruwet (Powell Library, UCLA) in 1983, as he searched for Sahagún materials. Instead, he found two volumes of original unknown works by Alva Ixtlilxochitl and one large volume of Nahuatl materials, mostly by Chimalpahin. See volumes 2 and 3 of Schroeder n.d. for corrected folios and a concordance with pagination.

20. Long in a private collection in Yuma, Arizona, and identified by Michael C. Meyer, former director of the Latin American Area Center, University of Arizona, the manuscript (hereafter the Browning manuscript) was donated to the Newberry Library, Chicago, in November 1991; it is being catalogued in Special Collections.

21. For the English edition, see López de Gómara 1966.

22. See endnotes in Zimmermann 1963, 1965, for comparisons of Chimalpahin's writings with other accounts. One reference to Cortés (or the "Marquez") appearing early in the annals sequence relates to the settlement of Quauhnahuac (Cuernavaca) which, he states, became part of the Marquesado (Zimmermann 1963:65). This entire Nahuatl section is a direct translation from the *Reportorio*—or is it possible that Enrico Martínez used the same source?

23. Chimalpahin, who meticulously identified all Indian leaders and Spanish officials by their proper titles, errs when he refers to Cortés as "don" Hernando Cortés, for Cortés himself did not take the "don" (at least not until he had gone to Spain and received his rewards and the title of marqués). The natives who helped write the history of the conquest with Sahagún also favored Cortés. And as we might expect, Sahagún (1989), even though he revised and corrected many errors in the natives' version, let the "don" stand. Durán in his *Historia* also gives Cortés the "don"; but Díaz del Castillo in his *Verdadera historia* omits it.

24. See BSM, for not all fared as badly. Some annals show that the children of these women became the owners of mines and sugar and cacao plantations.

25. There are two basic opinions about the death of Moteucçoma, the natives saying the Spaniards were responsible, the Spaniards reporting that the Indians had killed their own leader. Chimalpahin is consistent with other Indians. For a summary, see Anderson and Dibble's note 1 in Sahagún 1975:65.

26. Chimalpahin most often, but not always, states when a successor to the throne was the king's son. He gives no background on these particular kings. See Schroeder 1991:89-101.

27. This was Cihuailacatzin Chichimeca teuhctli and *tlatoani* of Itztlacoçauhcan, the highest ranked kingdom in Amecameca. He had been installed (as an infant) by Moteucçoma when his father was killed in battle. Of all, the lineage and office of Chichimeca teuhctli was held to be the most important.

28. See Schroeder 1991:45-88. Of course, Chimalpahin idealized the royal genealogies and succession practices; a careful reading and analysis reveal subtle and definite accommodation, thus the longevity and durability of the Chalca kingdoms.

29. The Alvarado Tezozomoc account that Chimalpahin used in the BSM also speaks of Chalca resistance to the Mexica and then utter defeat.

30. In spite of Chimalpahin's bias; see Tortolero 1993 for a comprehensive treatment of the history of Chalco.

31. From the 1530s on the position of *tlatoani* was being replaced by the Spanish office of *gobernador* or *juez-gobernador*. Don Francisco Ximénez of Tecamachalco became *juez-gobernador* of Tenochtitlan in 1568, initiating the practice of outsiders officiating in the Indian polity of Tenochtitlan. Chimalpahin lists all officials, Indian and Spanish, in the colonial capital up to the time he was living there.

32. See Lockhart 1992:384-85 for additional translation and discussion.

33. BSM; similar lists can be found in Durán and López de Gómara.

34. See Sahagún 1989, which presents the contrary opinion; see also Note 4.

35. See Boturini 1746:62,75-77. From what can be determined from the listing of manuscripts in Boturini's 1746 catalog it is possible that he owned the original as well as a copy; and it is not clear if the manuscripts were in Spanish or Nahuatl. However, Boturini's collection as enumerated by him in 1743 lists only one item by Chimalpahin relating to the conquest. Boturini states that he (Boturini) made (or had made) a copy from the original, that his copy is in Spanish, and that it numbers 172 pages, as does the Browning manuscript. See also Peñafiel 1890,Ch.12:58.

An inventory of the Boturini collection commissioned in 1745-1746 in Mexico City by order of the viceroy lists a manuscript by Chimalpahin in Spanish numbering 172 pages, which again matches the Browning manuscript; see Boturini 1925.

36. There were several similar follow-up decrees, but to little avail, obviously. Cited in Leonard 1933:3.

37. López y Magaña, personal communication, May 1989.

38. Prince Philip's royal decree of 17 November 1553 is reproduced in Torre Revello 1940 and cited in Adorno 1988: 242. The last official Spanish issue was in 1554-1555; six editions had already appeared. Philip repeated his edict of suppression in 1566. In 1572 all of López de Gómara's papers were confiscated (Simpson 1966:xvi).

39. For example, when Fray Agustín said mass for the first time at San Antón, Tovar served as sponsor.

40. Several copies of the Spanish Chimalpahin version exist, but there is nothing (yet) in Nahuatl. To date, I have been able to locate one complete copy (1766, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris); another complete copy (n.d.) in matching halves—one at John Carter Brown Library, Providence, and the other at DeGolyer Library at Southern Methodist University, Dallas; one-half of a copy made by Carlos María Bustamante (1807, Biblioteca Nacional, Mexico City); and fragments of a copy (n.d., Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid).

41. The original is apparently lost, but a sixteenth-century copy exists, the Manuscrito de Tolosa. For reproductions of eighteenth-century copies, see Sahagún 1989. To date, no study has been made of the possibly contemporaneous Tolosa manuscript with the later copies.

42. For the revisionist view of Sahagún's reason for his 1585 revision, see Cline 1989:93-106.

43. Díaz del Castillo's *Historia verdadera* was first published in 1632. See Cerwin 1963 for a careful study of Díaz del Castillo's writing of his conquest accounts.

44. Las Casas' *Brevíssima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* was already circulating by 1552. Sepúlveda was having difficulty getting his work published in Spain. He took it to Rome, where it was printed in 1550, although Charles V forbade its distribution in Spain.

45. For example, he copied and translated passages from Martínez's *Reportorio* about the "four land divisions of the Earth" (Zimmermann 1965:150-53).

46. Two examples are the funeral and processions in commemoration of the death of Archbishop-Viceroy Fray don García Guerra, to which Chimalpahin devoted numerous folios (Zimmermann 1965:104-109), or the celebration in honor of the beatification of Ignatius de Loyola (p.90).

47. The Jesuits were supportive of indigenous *cofradías*, sponsoring at least two at the Colegio de San Gregorio (Cofradía de Circuncisión and another in 1600 made up of "*forasteros*"). Their charge was to recruit and support the very large numbers of *nonencomienda* (or unattached) Indians in the capital. According to Jesuits' reports the *forasteros* adapted readily to the routine of religious activities at the church. The "forasteros" are described as "*gente desamparada*." Women were also active in the *cofradías* (Zubillaga 1956-1981,6:608, 7: 125,179-82,608).

48. For an excellent example of the process of transition from preconquest pictorial methods to those of the literature of the early colonial period, see Dean 1989.

49. Even as late as the turn of the century, Fray Juan Bautista was reworking sermons and giving liberal praise to his talented Nahua assistants. See the introduction in Juan Bautista 1606.

50. Chimalpahin reports, "*matlactlonnahuintin teopixque de la Compañia de Jesus . . . quintocayotia Teatinos*," "fourteen priests of the Company of Jesus, . . . [he/they] called them 'Teatinos' " (Zimmermann 1965:25). I have yet to identify his source, which confuses the Society of Jesus with the Theatines. Another collection of annals, one that duplicates much of Chimalpahin's information, also contains this error, "*yhuan yquac maxitico. diatinos, teopixq*" (Vollmer 1981:83-84). Tovar was known as the "Cicerón de mexicano," and his fellow Jesuit, mestizo Antonio del Rincón, produced the first Jesuit Nahuatl grammar, *Arte mexicana*, in Mexico City in 1595.

51. See Mendieta 1980:411. There are several letters in English translation in Anderson et al. 1976:176-208,221-31; see also BSM for a long eloquent letter by Juan de San Antonio, a man surely quite close to Chimalpahin in social status.

52. See Schroeder 1991:13 for his personal statement, or Zimmermann 1963:153.

53. Chimalpahin devotes some space to a discussion of the "Fire of St. Anthony" (*tlecocoliztli*, usually "leprosy") and the role of the Antonians in caring for lepers (Zimmermann 1965:135-36).

54. Tovar, in a report to superiors, while lauding the capabilities of his Indian students ("quicker than young Spaniards"), expressed great concern about Mexico City's native nobility, who were suffering great hardship. See Memorial del Colegio de San Gregorio and Del tratar los nuestros con los indios (1588) in Alegre 1956,1:552-53,561-68.

55. For a survey of Nahuatl production and scholarship, see León-Portilla 1988.

REFERENCES CITED

Adorno, Rolena

1988 Discourses on Colonialism: Bernal Díaz, Las Casas, and the Twentieth-Century Reader. MNL 103(2):239-58.

1991 Images of *Indios Ladinos* in Early Colonial Peru. In *Transatlantic Encounters: Europeans and Andeans in the Sixteenth Century*, Kenneth J. Andrien and Rolena Adorna, eds., pp. 232-70. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Alegre, Francisco Javier

1956 *Historia de la provincia de la Compañía de Jesús de Nueva España*, 3 vols. Ernest J. Burrus and Felix Zubillaga, eds. Institutum Historicum S.J., Rome.

Alva Ixtlilxochitl, Fernando de

1975-77 *Obras históricas*, 2 vols. Edmundo O'Gorman, ed. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City.

Alvarado Tezozomoc, Hernando

1975 *Crónica mexicayotl*. Adrián León, trans. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City.

Anderson, Arthur J. O.

1984 Nahuatl Documents in British and Foreign Bible Society MS. 374. Paper presented at the American Society for Ethnohistory meeting, New Orleans.

Anderson, Arthur J. O., Frances Berdan, and James Lockhart, trans. and eds.

1976 *Beyond the Codices: The Nahua View of Colonial Mexico*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Anonymous Conqueror

See Fuentes 1963

Bautista, Juan

1606 *A Iesu Christo S.N. se ofrece este sermonario en lengua mexicana*. Diego López Dávalos, Mexico City.

Bierhorst, John, trans. and ed.

1985 *Cantares mexicanos: Songs of the Aztecs*, 2 vols. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Borah, Woodrow

1983 *Justice by Insurance: The General Indian Court of Colonial Mexico and the Legal Aides of the Half-Real*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Boturini Benaduci, Lorenzo

1746 *Idea de una nueva historia general de la América septentrional*. Juan de Zúñiga, Madrid.

1925 Inventorio de los documentos recogidos a don Lorenzo Boturini por orden del gobierno virreinal. *Anales* 1(4):9.

Bricker, Victoria Reifler

1981 *The Indian Christ, the Indian King: The Historical Substrate of Maya Myth and Ritual*. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Bustamante, Carlos María

1826 *Historia de las conquistas de Hernando Cortés: Escrita en español por Francisco López de Gómara, traducida al mexicano y aprobada por verdadera por D. Juan Bautista* [sic] *Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, indio mexicano*, 2 vols. Ontiveros, Mexico City.

Castillo, Cristóbal del

1991 *Historia de la venida de los mexicanos y otros pueblos e Historia de la conquista*, Federico Navarrete Linares, trans. and ed. Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Mexico City.

Cerwin, Herbert

1963 *Bernal Díaz, Historian of the Conquest*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Cline, S. L., trans. and ed.

1993 *The Book of Tributes: Early Sixteenth-Century Nahuatl Censuses from Morelos*. Latin American Center, University of California, Los Angeles.

Cline, S. L., Ed., and Howard F. Cline, trans.

1989 *Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, Conquest of New Spain, 1585 Revision*. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Cline, S. L., and Miguel León-Portilla, eds.

1984 *The Testaments of Culhuacan*. Latin American Center, University of California, Los Angeles.

Davies, Nigel

1980 *The Toltec Heritage: From the Fall of Tula to the Rise of Tenochtitlan*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Dean, Carolyn S.

1989 Praying with Pictures: A Reading of the *Libro de oraciones*. *Journal of Latin American Lore* 15(2):211-73.

Díaz del Castillo, Bernal

1979 *The True History of the Conquest*. Maurice Keatinge, trans. Renaissance Press, La Jolla.

Durán, Diego

1967 *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España e islas de la Tierra Firme*, 2 vols. Angel María Garibay K., ed. Editorial Porrúa, Mexico City.

Fuentes, Patricia de, trans. and ed.

1963 The Chronicle of the Anonymous Conqueror. In *The Conquistadors: First-Person Accounts of the Conquest of Mexico*, pp. 165-81. Orion Press, New York.

Garcilaso de la Vega

1966 *Royal Commentaries of the Incas, and General History of Peru*. Harold V. Livermore, trans. and ed. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Gibson, Charles

1964 *The Aztecs under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico, 1519-1810*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

1966 *Spain in America*. Harper & Row, New York.

Gillespie, Susan D.

1989 *The Aztec Kings: The Construction of Rulership in Mexica History*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Gruzinski, Serge

1989 *Man-gods of the Mexican Highlands*. Eileen Lorrigan, trans. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Guaman Poma de Ayala, Felipe

1980 *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno*, 3 vols. John V. Murra and Rolena Adorno, eds. Siglo Vein-

tiuno, Mexico City.
Haskett, Robert
1991 *Indigenous Rulers: An Ethnohistory of Town Government in Colonial Cuernavaca.* University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
Hicks, Frederic
1979 "Flowery War" in Aztec History. *American Ethnologist* 6(1):87-92.
Horn, Rebecca
1989 Postconquest Coyoacan: Aspects of Indigenous Sociopolitical and Economic Organization in Central Mexico, 1550-1650. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
Jones, Grant D.
1989 *Maya Resistance to Spanish Rule: Time and History on a Colonial Frontier.* University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
Karttunen, Frances
1982 Nahuatl Literacy. In *The Inca and Aztec States, 1400-1800: Anthropology and History*, George A. Collier, Renato I. Rosaldo, and John D. Worth, eds., pp. 395-417. Academic Press, New York.
Karttunen, Frances, and James Lockhart, eds.
1987 *The Art of Nahuatl Speech: The Bancroft Dialogues.* Latin American Center Publications, University of California, Los Angeles.
Kellogg, Susan
1986 Aztec Inheritance in Sixteenth-Century Mexico City: Colonial Patterns, Prehispanic Influences. *Ethnohistory* 33(3):313-30.
Klor de Alva, J. Jorge
1982 Spiritual Conflict and Accommodation in New Spain: Toward a Typology of Aztec Responses to Christianity. In *The Inca and the Aztec States, 1400-1800: Anthropology and History*, George A. Collier, Renato I. Rosaldo, and John D. Wirth, eds., pp. 345-66. Academic Press, New York.
Leonard, Irving A.
1933 *Romances of Chivalry in the Spanish Indies with Some Registros of Shipments to the Spanish Colonies.* University of California Press, Berkeley.
1949 *Books of the Brave: Being an Account of Books and of Men in the Spanish Conquest and Settlement of the Sixteenth-Century New World.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
León-Portilla, Ascensión H. de
1988 *Tepuztlahcuilolli: Impresos en náhuatl, historia y bibliografía*, 2 vols. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City.
Lockhart, James
1982 Views of Corporate Self and History in Some Valley of Mexico Towns: Late Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. In *The Inca and the Aztec States, 1400-1800: Anthropology and History*, George A. Collier, Renato I. Rosaldo, and John D. Wirth, eds., pp. 367-93. Academic Press, New York.
1992 *The Nahuas After the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries.* Stanford University Press, Stanford.
Lockhart, James, trans. and ed.
1993 *We People Here: Nahuatl Accounts of the Conquest of Mexico.* University of California, Berkeley.
Lockhart, James, Frances Berdan, and Arthur J. O. Anderson
1986 *The Tlaxcalan Actas: A Compendium of the Records of the Cabildo of Tlaxcala (1545-1627).* University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
López de Gómara, Francisco
1943 *Historia de la conquista de México*, 2 vols. Joaquín Ramírez Cabañas, ed. Editorial Pedro Robredo, Mexico City.
1966 *Cortés: The Life of the Conqueror by his Secretary.* Lesley Byrd Simpson, trans. and ed. University of California Press, Berkeley.
Martínez, Enrico
1948 [1606] *Reportorio de los tiempos e historia natural de Nueva España.* Secretaría de Educación Pública, Mexico City.
Mendieta, Gerónimo de
1980 *Historia eclesiástica indiana: Obra escrita a fines del siglo xvi.* Joaquín García Icazbalceta, ed. Editorial Porrúa, Mexico City.
Molina, Alonso de
1555 *Aqui comença un vocabulario en la lengua castellana y mexicana. Compuesto por el muy reverendo padre Fray Alonso de Molina, Guardián del convento de Sant Antonio de Tetzcuco, de la Orden de los Frayles Menores.* Juan Pablos, Mexico City.
1970 [1571] *Vocabulario en lengua castellana y mexicana y mexicana y castellana.* Miguel León-Portilla, ed. Editorial Porrúa, Mexico City.
Pagden, Anthony, trans. and ed.
1986 *Hernán Cortés: Letters from Mexico.* Yale University Press, New Haven.
Peñafiel, Antonio
1890 *Monumentos del arte mexicano antiguo: Ornamentación, mitología, tributos y monumentos*, 3 vols. A. Asher, Berlin.
Sahagún, Bernardino de
1950-1982 *Florentine Codex: General History of the Things of New Spain*, 12 vols. Arthur J. O. Anderson and Charles E. Dibble, trans. and eds. School of American Research Monograph 14, 13 pts. School of American Research, Santa Fe, and University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
1989 *Conquest of New Spain, 1585 Revision.* Howard F. Cline, trans., S. L. Cline, ed. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
San Antonio Abad
1589 San Antonio Abad. MS. G 12-25, Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas, Austin.
Schroeder, Susan
1987 *Cocoliztli* (epidemic disease): The Impressions of

a Nahua Annalist from Amecameca. Paper presented at the Latin American Indian Literatures Association meeting, Cornell University, Ithaca.

1991 *Chimalpahin and the Kingdoms of Chalco.* University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

1992 Real Indian History. D'Arcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian, *Meeting Ground* 25(5).

Schroeder, Susan, ed.

n.d. *Codex Chimalpahin*, 6 vols. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman. Forthcoming.

Sharpe, Jim

1992 History from Below. In *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, Peter Burke, ed., pp. 24-41. Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park.

Simpson, Lesley Byrd, trans. and ed.

1966 *Cortés: The Life of the Conqueror by his Secretary, Francisco López de Gómara.* University of California Press, Berkeley.

Steck, Francis B.

1936 The First College in America: Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco. *Catholic Educational Review* 34:449-62,603-17.

1943 Education in Spanish North America during the Sixteenth Century. *Catholic Educational Review* 41:3-19, 71-94.

Torre Revello, José

1940 *El libro, la imprenta y el periodismo en América durante la dominación española.* Buenos Aires.

Tortolero, Alejandro, ed.

1993 *Entre lagos y volcanes: Chalco Amecameca, pasado y presente*, 2 vols. El Colegio Mexiquense, Toluca.

Tovar, Juan de

1944 *Códice Ramírez: Relación del origen de los indios que habitan esta Nueva España, según sus historias.* Manuel Orozco y Berra, ed. Editorial Leyenda, Mexico City.

Vollmer, Günter, ed.

1981 *Geschichte der Azteken: Codex Aubin und verwandte Dokumente.* Gebr. Mann, Berlin.

White, Hayden

1987 *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation.* Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Wood, Stephanie

1984 Corporate Adjustments in Colonial Mexican Indian Towns: Toluca Region, 1550-1810. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

1991 Cosmic Conquest: Late Colonial Views of the Sword and the Cross in Central Mexican *Títulos*. *Ethnohistory* (2):176-95.

Zimmermann, Günter

1963 *Die Relationen Chimalpahin's zur Geschichte México's, teil 1: Die Zeit bis zur Conquista 1521.* Cram, DeGruyter, Hamburg.

1965 *Die Relationen Chimalpahin's zur Geschichte México's, teil 2: Das Jahrhundert nach der Conquista (1552-1615).* Cram, DeGruyter, Hamburg.

Zubillaga, Felix, ed.

1956-1981 *Monumenta mexicana*, 7 vols. Institutum Historicum S.J., Rome.