

5274203

cta//s

Smoke and Mist
Mesoamerican Studies in
Memory of
Thelma D. Sullivan

edited by

J. Kathryn Josserand and
Karen Dakin

Sections coordinated by

H. B. Nicholson, Doris Heyden,
Karen Dakin and
Nicholas A. Hopkins

Part ii

Poctli, ayauitl: tenyotl, mauizyotl.

*Inin tlatolli: itechpa mitoaya in aca tlatoani,
ayamo uecauh omic, ayamo poliui in ipocyo,
in iayauhyo: quitoznequi: imauizo, itenyo . . .*

Florentine Codex, Book VI, Chap. 43

Smoke and mist: fame and glory.

*This was said about a king not long dead
whose smoke and mist, meaning his
fame and glory, had not yet vanished . . .*

*Translated by Thelma D. Sullivan,
1963*

BAR International Series 402(ii)

1988

B.A.R.

5, Centremead, Osney Mead, Oxford OX2 0DQ, England.

GENERAL EDITORS

A.R. Hands, B.Sc., M.A., D.Phil.
D.R. Walker, M.A.

BAR -S402, 1988: 'Smoke and Mist'

Price £45.00 post free throughout the world. Payments made in dollars must be calculated at the current rate of exchange and \$8.00 added to cover exchange charges. Cheques should be made payable to B.A.R. and sent to the above address.

© The Individual Authors, 1988.

ISBN 0 86054 517 2

For details of all new B.A.R. publications in print please write to the above address. Information on new titles is sent regularly on request, with no obligation to purchase.

Volumes are distributed from the publisher. All B.A.R. prices are inclusive of postage by surface mail anywhere in the world.

Printed in Great Britain

THE ROOTS OF SIXTEENTH-CENTURY MESOAMERICAN LEXICOGRAPHY

Frances Karttunen
University of Texas at Austin

DEDICATION

Thelma Sullivan was in the vanguard of a movement among scholars of Mesoamerican culture to understand that culture through the indigenous languages proper to it. While acknowledging our debt to the European observers who described in Spanish what they found in New Spain, we have turned to close examination of indigenous language texts in order to perceive that world more as it was perceived by its native participants. In much the spirit of her teacher Angel M. Garibay and her North American colleagues Arthur J. O. Anderson and Charles Dibble, but independently from them, Thelma engaged in studying the great ethnological collections of Fray Bernardino de Sahagún in the original Nahuatl of Sahagún's informants rather than through the accompanying Spanish glosses. The fruit of her meticulous examinations is to be found in her numerous published works and in the example of dedicated scholarship she has bequeathed to us. Although this study that I offer in her memory does not bear directly on work that she was doing in the years I was privileged to know her, I feel that had we the opportunity, we would have engaged in rousing conversation and debate about it, and I would have learned a thing or two more from Thelma before her career was so prematurely ended.

INTRODUCTION

With the possible exclusion of the initiation of our own atomic age less than a half century ago, sixteenth-century contact between the eastern and western hemispheres was undoubtedly the most traumatic human event the world has known. As soon as the contact was made, diseases were let loose in both directions with devastating effect; conveyed to new parts of the world, plants and animals (including men and women) took over for lack of effective natural enemies; and human institutions that survived were radically transformed. It would be hard to find a corner of the world that was not soon touched, for better or for worse, by the shock waves of contact.

There was and there remains great racial, linguistic, and cultural diversity in the eastern hemisphere, but over thousands of years of human history the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Europe had encountered each other time and time again. Nothing the Europeans had seen before quite prepared them for the New World experience, and this was even more true for the indigenous peoples of the Americas. Face to face with each other in the throes of profound culture shock, each side seriously doubted that the beings they confronted were actually human.

This boded ill for communication, and yet the sixteenth century, in spite of the wholesale destruction it witnessed, also saw the completion of marvels of ethnographic and linguistic investigation, among them the works of Sahagún and the many grammars and dictionaries of Mesoamerican languages.

Perhaps it may be easy for us to overlook, but it was a considerable achievement of the missionary friars responsible for these works to recognize that the languages of New Spain were full human languages for which grammars and dictionaries could be constructed. Although in many ways they did not fit Spanish and Latin grammatical models, the languages are treated respectfully and without condescension by the Spanish grammarians and lexicographers of the sixteenth century. This stands in marked contrast to the popular belief widespread in Latin America today that indigenous peoples speak "dialects" (dialectos) which are deficient and impoverished by comparison with real "languages" (idiomas, lenguas).

What made these friars such good linguists? What enabled them to accomplish what they did? Undoubtedly one important factor was the Moorish chapter of Spain's history. More than most Europeans, the Spanish had been in long-term direct contact with non-Christians speaking a non-Indo-European language. In spite of (or perhaps because of) the bitter conflict between them, the Spanish and the Moors held each other in mutual respect, however grudgingly. Given that Arabic, despite its complete difference from Spanish and Latin, was undeniably a vehicle of high culture and literature, it was not so outlandish to assume that the languages of Mesoamerica's strange city states might be too.

And then, the Mesoamericans did have books, impressive pictorial volumes painted on screenfold paper. They had a type of literacy of their own, and apparently their skills were transferable to Spanish/Latin alphabetic writing. As a result, the friars found some common ground with the people they chose and trained as intermediaries between themselves and the peoples of New Spain.

And finally, the friars came to Mesoamerica with recently published and absolutely invaluable models for their work, namely Antonio de Nebrija's grammar and dictionary of Spanish. Without these models, I very much doubt that they would have succeeded in compiling the works they have left to us.

We need only look to the Canary Islands for a contrasting example of utter failure. By the end of the fifteenth century, when the first editions of Nebrija's works were published, the people of these islands off the coast of Africa, who were known as Guanches, had already been decimated by Spanish military incursions and, even more effectively, by disease introduced by the Spanish. In the introduction to his translation of Alonso de Espinosa's account of fifteenth-century contact between the Guanches of Tenerife and the Spanish, Clements Markham remarks, "The greatest loss of all is caused by the neglect of the Spanish priests to make grammars and vocabularies of the language, as was done in South America. Espinosa, Galindo, and Viana have preserved a few words and nine sentences; that is all." (Markham 1907: xviii).

Throughout the fifteenth century, when the Canaries had been well-populated and in on-going contact with the Spanish, negotiations were carried on through interpreters; there is no evidence of any linguistic work even attempted by missionary friars in the Canaries during the

fifteenth century. The models embodied in Nebrija's works came too late for the indigenous people of the Canaries.

In Mesoamerica the course of events was quite different. Although Nebrija's Latin-based grammatical description was sometimes rather forced on New World languages, his extraordinarily timely dictionary provided the missionary lexicographers with an elicitation word list, and it is their dictionaries' evolution from this list that I will now trace here.

THE FAMILY OF MESOAMERICAN DICTIONARIES

That the substantial sixteenth-century dictionaries of Nahuatl (Molina 1555, 1571), Tarascan (Gilberti 1559), Zapotec (Córdova 1578), and Mixtec (Alvarado 1593) bear striking similarity to each other in content and actual wording has led to speculation that a basic elicitation list was shared by these lexicographers. To the company also belongs a trilingual dictionary of Spanish/Nahuatl/Otomí (Urbano 1605). It is possible that the dictionaries of Yucatecan Maya do too, but that is hard for me to determine at this time. The Motul dictionary (Martínez Hernández 1929) is only Yucatec-to-Spanish, which makes it difficult to compare directly with the others in question. Consultation with an unpublished Spanish-to-Yucatec listing of the Motul (Lounsbury n.d.) seems to indicate a very marked difference in content, so I will leave the whole matter of Yucatec dictionaries to some future study.

This leaves six Mesoamerican dictionaries too alike for coincidence (Molina 1555 and 1571, Gilberti, Córdova, Alvarado, and Urbano). I have heard their hypothetical common source referred to as "the Franciscan elicitation list," but this is unjustified, since Alvarado and Córdova were Dominicans and Urbano an Augustinian. True, the two earliest dictionaries (Molina 1555 and Gilberti 1559) were produced by Franciscans, and they could have then served as models for the later dictionaries. And the fact that Molina and Gilberti were engaged in creating their dictionaries almost simultaneously does argue for them using a common elicitation list; even with Molina hot off the press in 1555, Gilberti could hardly have used it as a model in compiling his large dictionary from scratch, publishing it just four years later.

But we don't have to imagine the Franciscans creating an in-house master list to be carried to New Spain and there pirated by the Dominicans and the Augustinians. We can turn to direct comparison of all these dictionaries with Antonio de Nebrija's dictionary, or we can work our way back through an elicitation list that has actually been preserved. In either case the outcome is the same. Let us here take the second route.

THE NEWBERRY MANUSCRIPT

Aztec ms. 1478 of the Edward E. Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library in Chicago is a small leatherbound book of 147 folios. In a

diminutive, exceptionally clear hand Spanish words and phrases are written followed by Latin glosses. Beneath each entry a blank line is left to be filled in with the corresponding word or phrase. Nahuatl glosses are written in contrasting red ink in a different hand, albeit one equally precise. Many entries are left without a Nahuatl gloss.

There is no doubt that this is an elicitation list. The lexicographer worked from the Spanish/Latin, asking for Nahuatl translations. Where there was no ready equivalent, the line was left blank, and lexicographer and informant moved on. Or possibly another scenario: Well before the middle of the sixteenth century, professional Nahuatl informants had been trained in reading Spanish and Latin and in writing their own language in the Spanish-based orthography devised by the friars. Possibly this list was simply placed in the hands of such an informant for him to work out on his own. (In fact, some telltale letter substitutions involving c, ç and q in Spanish words suggest that the elicitation list was even copied out by a Nahuatl speaker.) But however the list was actually filled in, someone had decided what the Nahuatl citation forms should be. For nouns the absolutive singular form was the obvious answer, but for verbs it was more problematical.

The convention of giving Nahuatl verbs in the first person singular, present tense, with the third person singular object prefix in the case of transitive verbs, which is institutionalized in Molina's dictionaries, is already in use in this word list, but not the convention of separating the prefixes from the stem by punctuation. Although the Newberry manuscript gives as the Nahuatl gloss of pesar en balanca the verb form nitlapexiotia, derived from Spanish peso, most of the Spanish loan words in Nahuatl recognized already in Molina 1555 are missing from the manuscript. The Nahuatl orthography of this manuscript is consistent with that used throughout the sixteenth century with one striking exception; the ever-predictable Nahuatl penultimate stress is indicated with accent marks, a redundancy eschewed by Molina and missing from Nahuatl writing conventions in general.

There is no date on the manuscript, and the date 1590 suggested by the Newberry catalogue is unlikely for several reasons. First of all, according to the catalogue the manuscript has been "perhaps erroneously" attributed to Sahagún, and among the marginalia there is supposed to be a note in his hand. This would virtually rule out 1590 as a date for the manuscript, since Sahagún died that year in great old age. Secondly, by the end of the sixteenth century there was a long tradition of Nahuatl orthography that recognized that stress is predictable and need not be marked. But the strongest evidence that the date is unreasonable resides in the fact that by 1590 Molina's bilingual dictionary had been published for nearly twenty years, and there was absolutely no reason to begin elicitation of Nahuatl lexical material from scratch.¹

Instead, the Newberry manuscript must predate Molina 1555. This is not to claim that it is necessarily Molina's own elicitation list, but given the conventional parallels between the manuscript and Molina's 1555 Spanish-to-Nahuatl dictionary, it certainly looks like a

contributing source. Still, the fact that Molina and Gilberti share some identical innovations that are missing from the Newberry manuscript implies that they must have had some common supplementary source at hand as well. What the manuscript represents is someone's first attempt to systematically collect Nahuatl lexical material before it was clear exactly what conventions were most useful; i.e., sample verbal prefix strings were crucial, but marking stress was unnecessary.

The Newberry manuscript is none other than Antonio de Nebrija's Spanish/Latin dictionary of 1516 (MacDonald 1973) copied into notebook form with blank lines to be filled in with glosses. Banishing all doubt is the fact that at the beginning of the manuscript there appears the literal sentence that opens Nebrija's Spanish/Latin work, "Dictionarium ex hispaniensi in latinum sermonem interprete Aelio Antonio Nebrissensi. Lege feliciter." Here and there blocks of entries are out of order, and there are some letter substitutions, but it is clearly and simply a hand copy of Nebrija's published work, and it likely had close parallels in what was used to elicit similar data for the other Mesoamerican dictionaries.

NEBRIJA'S DICTIONARY

Nebrija's 1516 Spanish/Latin dictionary appeared more than twenty years after his original dictionary, the publication of which nearly coincided with the expulsion of the Moors from Spain and the return of Columbus from the West Indies. Apparently it remained in great demand, because a vigorous series of editions continued long after Nebrija's death in 1522, each edition providing opportunity for emendations and additions. In the Humanities Research Center Rare Books Collection at the University of Texas there is a 1560 Latin/Spanish-Spanish/Latin edition showing the cumulative effect of such revision.

Certain conventions peculiar to Nebrija carry on through the editions and also manifest themselves in the Mesoamerican dictionaries. One such convention is deviation from strict alphabetical order in favor of grouping entries in derivational families. For example, the entries sufrimiento, sufrido, and sufrible o sufridera cosa follow the verb sufrir. Secondly, Nebrija eschews grammatical class labels, relying instead on Spanish morphology, the Latin gloss, and frequent citation of Spanish synonyms to make clear what part of speech each entry is. In general this works, but it is problematical for Spanish adjectives, which agree in gender with the nouns they modify. Nebrija's solution is to give adjectives in feminine form followed by the noun cosa (for example, buena cosa). This convention, too, is perpetuated by the missionary friars in their dictionaries. Finally, the ubiquitous notations assi, desta manera, en esta manera, and este mesmo of their dictionaries are all originally Nebrija's conventions.

LEXICOGRAPHY IN NEW SPAIN

Molina 1555

The first of the Mesoamerican dictionaries to be published was Fray Alonso de Molina's Spanish/Nahuatl dictionary, which appeared in 1555. It is a now familiar story that as children in Mexico Alonso de Molina and his brother became bilingual in Spanish and Nahuatl and that pressing need forced one of them into the service of the Church. Alonso was chosen and lived a long and fruitful life as a Franciscan friar/grammarian.

His first dictionary is Spanish-to-Nahuatl only. Comparison of any section of it shows that it closely follows Nebrija, but Molina has pruned out some items irrelevant to the New World (Nebrija's entry for zebra, for example, which in Mexico certainly was not, as Nebrija's dictionary would have it, an animal conocido), and has expanded considerably to include fine distinctions in Nahuatl that would otherwise be slighted (65 entries involving echar, compared to Nebrija's 29). Nebrija's entry formage o queso 'cheese' has been omitted, and the two entries queso and queso fresco added, and this change proves to be significant. The Newberry manuscript follows Nebrija 1516 and has only the formage entry. Not surprisingly (and underscoring the earliness of the document), there is no Nahuatl gloss in the Newberry manuscript, since cheese was a Spanish introduction to Mexico along with the cows and goats to provide milk for the cheese-making process. By mid-century cheese was known, and Molina's Nahuatl gloss of queso has a descriptive circumlocution involving the Nahuatl word for 'breast milk,' while the gloss for queso fresco modifies that circumlocution with Nahuatl yancuic 'new, recent.' Queso itself actually appears compounded into quesopayantli as the Nahuatl gloss for migajas de queso, an entry shared by Molina and Gilberti but not present in Nebrija 1516 (hence not in the Newberry manuscript either), Alvarado or Córdoba.

The significance of this difference between Molina 1555 on the one hand and Nebrija 1516 and the Newberry manuscript on the other goes beyond the substitution of a more common Spanish word for a less common one. First of all, it demonstrates that by the 1550's the word queso had an equivalent in Nahuatl, no matter how awkward that equivalent might seem, and that cheese was no longer a foreign substance, as it apparently was for the respondent to the Newberry list.

In Molina 1555 there are similar Nahuatl circumlocutions for things having to do with horses and which are built on Nahuatl macatl 'deer' (examples to be found under herrar and domar). But Spanish horses had become so much a part of daily life in Mexico that Nahuatl had early borrowed the Spanish word, as Molina's dictionary records in many an entry. Even in the Newberry manuscript, where most Nahuatl glosses under cauallo, domar, and herrar are built on macatl, cauallo appears a few times.

By 1555 cauallo is joined in Molina's dictionary by about two hundred more Spanish loan words, and a new use for the convention mesmo is adopted which is subsequently shared by the other dictionaries (with

the exception of Alvarado, who uses idem). When a Spanish word had come into use in the indigenous language because the thing it named had only recently been introduced by the Spanish themselves, the gloss for that entry is given as lo mismo or lo mesmo. If, on the other hand, a Spanish word in the course of being borrowed was altered to the morphology of the recipient language, the changed form is spelled out. An example of a single dictionary entry incorporating both of these conventions is sayo de varon. lo mismo. vel. oquich xaiotli (Molina 1555, f.219v), where xaiotli is the assimilated Nahuatl form of Spanish sayo.

In addition to documenting Spanish introductions into Mexico, the entries queso and queso fresco have some significance in the history of sixteenth-century lexicography, since the Tarascan, Zapotec, and Mixtec dictionaries (and of course Molina's own 1571 dictionary) all include the same entries, the Tarascan and Mixtec dictionaries indicating by lo mismo and idem that the word queso had been borrowed outright in those languages.

Turning to the 1560 edition of Nebrija preserved at the University of Texas, we find that by then, it too had been emended to include queso generalmente and queso fresco, while still retaining the old formage entry. It also has entries for cow's milk cheese, mare's milk cheese, and apparently for Swiss cheese (literally "cheese with many holes"). Since the University of Texas does not have copies or facsimiles of intervening editions, I cannot say when these additional entries first appeared in Nebrija's dictionary, but if some post-1516 edition of Nebrija were the source of the entries in both Molina 1555 and Gilberti 1559, it would have to be an edition of well before mid-century. Córdova 1578 shares Nebrija's exact phrasing queso generalmente, while the other dictionaries have simply queso. Given how slight are the chances of spontaneous identical innovations, this appears to establish that the published dictionaries had some common source other than copies of Nebrija 1516. Possibly it was a later edition of Nebrija already available to both Molina and Gilberti when they were compiling their dictionaries. Or perhaps these two Franciscans were in direct contact with each other as they did their pioneering lexicographical work, sharing ideas about what to include or exclude, so that their published dictionaries came to share innovations that were then appropriated from their published works by the non-Franciscans Alvarado, Córdova, and Urbano.

Gilberti 1559

Gilberti's Tarascan dictionary, which appeared four years after the publication of Molina's first dictionary, took a great stride forward by being bilingual; it contains both Tarascan-to-Spanish and Spanish-to-Tarascan sections, with the Tarascan-to-Spanish section preceding the Spanish-to-Tarascan one.

As with Molina 1555, comparison of any section of Gilberti's Spanish-to-Tarascan section reveals that it is very close to Nebrija 1516 in wording, order, and content for long stretches, but it has also been tailored to its context. Like Molina, Gilberti has discarded

zebra and replaced formage with queso and queso fresco. On the other hand, like Molina again, Gilberti has retained Nebrija's entries for box 'boxwood,' ostia 'oyster,' faysan 'pheasant,' and haca 'small horse,' somewhat exotic items (from a Mesoamerican point of view) which might logically have shared the fate of zebra. (In fact, box is carried through all the dictionaries and evokes a native-language response only in the Mixtec dictionary, while ostia is much more successful, getting some sort of native response in each dictionary, although ostias as a loan word figures in the glosses for the next entry ostiero/ostiaro de ostias 'oyster bed' in the Nahuatl, Tarascan, and Mixtec dictionaries.

Molina 1571

Molina's second dictionary remains to this day the inseparable companion of every scholar of Nahuatl. Catching up with Gilberti's lead, Molina 1571 is bilingual. The first section is a reworking of the 1555 Spanish-to-Nahuatl work containing expanded glosses, additional entries, and improved alphabetization; the second section is Nahuatl-to-Spanish.

Over the four centuries since its publication, there has been a shift in how this dictionary is used. Molina's contemporaries were actively engaged in translating religious texts from Spanish to Nahuatl, while the main occupation of users of the dictionary today is reading Nahuatl texts. As a result, we tend to wear out the Nahuatl-to-Spanish section of our copies while hardly touching the Spanish-to-Nahuatl side. But it is through careful examination of the first section that we can observe the dynamics of Molina's lexicography.

To begin with, the dictionary is not entirely symmetric. There are Nahuatl words of some significance in the glosses of the first section that do not appear as main entries in the second, such as matlatl 'sling', tlaquittli 'woven cloth', pacyotl 'weft of cloth', toca (intransitive) 'to be engaged in sowing,' and itonia 'to sweat.'

On the other hand, there are many Nahuatl entries in the second section that do not correspond to unitary entries in the Spanish side. Given the noncongruence of Mesoamerica with Europe, it could hardly be otherwise. The Nahuatl gloss for peacock (already in Molina 1555 and repeated in 1571) is literally 'Castilian quetzal-bird.' Quetzals, pocket gophers, sweet potatoes, and the like all had to be described and explained in Spanish, just as such things as peacocks, cheese and horseshoes had to be described in phrases in Nahuatl or the words for them borrowed outright. Describing the xicamatl 'jícamá' in a Spanish gloss, for instance, Molina says that it is a very sweet root that is eaten raw. Under rayz on the Spanish side of the dictionary there is no mention of xicamatl. Clearly, the Nahuatl-to-Spanish section is the result of new compilation, based not on a Spanish word list, but on the actual Mesoamerican context. As a result, the two sections are equally large, but their contents only partially overlap. This contrasts with Gilberti's Tarascan dictionary where the Tarascan-to-Spanish section is much briefer than the Spanish-to-Tarascan one.

Among the additions to the Spanish-to-Nahuatl side of the 1571 dictionary are culinary terms reflecting the use and preparation of New World foodstuffs. A number can be found under the verb echar. Already in 1555 there is an entry for echar cacao de una xical a otra para hazer espuma 'to pour liquid chocolate from one vessel into another to raise a head of foam on it.' In the 1571 dictionary this is joined by entries for adding tomatoes and husk tomatoes to salsa, adding chilies to stew, and adding salt and onions to dishes. Gilberti (1559) and Córdova (1578) share the original cacao entry but not the 1571 additions, while Alvarado (1593) includes the echar items for salt and chilies but not those for tomatoes and onions. The identity of Alvarado's wording with Molina's indicates that he had a copy of Molina 1571 at hand as he compiled his dictionary. Timewise, Córdova might also have had a look at it before his own work went to press, but if so, he chose not to go into such fine culinary detail as Molina. (In the Nahuatl-to-Spanish side of Molina we find the whole inventory of indigenous vegetables and seasonings, including tomatoes, jícamas, chayotes, tunas, epazote, achiote, and many entries involving chilies.)

One might expect that in the sixteen years between the two Nahuatl dictionaries many new Spanish loan words would have entered the language and that this would be recognized in the second dictionary. But in fact most of the Spanish loan words that appear in Molina 1571 are already to be found in Molina 1555, and there is no particular pattern to the 1571 additions. Comadre joins compadre, which was already in the 1555 dictionary; the gloss describing cucumbers as little green edible squashes is expanded to include lo mismo, indicating that pepino was now in use as a loan word in Nahuatl; and the gloss for silla de cauallo o mula 'saddle' is expanded to include xile, an assimilated form of silla. There are some more additions as well, but it is clear that Molina gave low priority to recording the creep of Spanish words into Nahuatl. I think we can be confident that the Spanish loan words that appear in his dictionary do so because they really were in regular use and not because he was on the lookout for them and certainly not because he encouraged them.

As mentioned above, most of the direct Spanish loans of Molina 1555 are absent from the Newberry manuscript, with one particularly intriguing exception, the verb tlapexoiotia 'to weigh something on a scale' derived from Spanish peso. Molina 1555 does not include this derivation but has only the native Nahuatl tlatamachia, while Molina 1571 expands the gloss to include tlapexouia, a different derivation from peso. If Molina had the Newberry manuscript at hand while preparing his dictionaries, he must have rejected tlapexoiotia as an error but later admitted the widely used and accepted tlapexouia.

Comparing spelling in the 1571 dictionary with that in the 1555 one, we see some instances of Molina making an effort to deal with variation in pronunciation. One such variation is between o and u, where there really is no contrast in Nahuatl. For 'flower' Molina has both xochitl and xuchitl in different entries, for 'heart' both yollotli and yulotli. But in 1571 Molina increases the number of alternative spellings with u and o and also changes some 1555 entries. For instance, he alters cozcatl.tlapoualcozcatl 'bead for counting' to cuzcatl.cuentaxtli.tlapoalcuzcatl, exchanging o for u as well as

acknowledging that Spanish cuenta had entered Nahuatl as a morphologically assimilated loan word.

In this example Molina has also altered tlapoual to tlapoal, dropping out the u that represents an intervocalic /w/. There is a difference in Nahuatl between /owa/ and /oa/, but this distinction is easily obliterated, and he moves closer to pronunciation in the latter spelling.

Molina also seems to be moving closer to actual speech in 1571 by representing the loan form of Spanish peso as pexo, changing 1555 tlapesouiloni to tlapexouiloni 'scale for weighing things' and adding nitlapexouia 'to weigh something in a scale,' although retaining the Spanish spelling in tlatamachiualoni peso 'scale.' Spelling it with x more accurately represents the characteristic Nahuatl approximation of the somewhat retracted sound represented by s in sixteenth-century Spanish. The Newberry manuscript already recognizes this pronunciation in nitlapexoiotia, which does not appear in either of Molina's dictionaries. There are many examples of Nahuatl x for Spanish s in Molina 1555, and the adjustment of this particular loan word brings it into line.

Finally, we see Molina give rare acknowledgement to the segmental glottal stop that never found representation in conventional Nahuatl spelling. In the Nahuatl-to-Spanish side of the 1571 dictionary there are two entries, tlahneuia and tlaneuia, both glossed as 'to mistake one thing for another.' But there is also another entry for tlaneuia meaning 'to borrow something.' Horacio Carochi, the best of the Nahuatl grammarians, points out that the verb for confusing things contrasts in pronunciation with the verb for borrowing something by virtue of a glottal stop in the first syllable (Carochi 1645: f. 128v). Molina gives two spellings, one indicating the glottal stop with h and the other omitting it. This is an exceptional case, however; Molina does not make such distinctions systematically in either of his dictionaries.

Córdoba 1578

Juan de Córdoba's large Spanish-to-Zapotec dictionary was published seven years after Molina's second dictionary. It keeps very close to Nebrija 1516 but has in common with Molina and Gilberti innovations such as queso and queso fresco, etc. Both Molina 1555 and Gilberti must have been readily available to Córdoba, but in checking additions and emendations of Molina 1571 against Córdoba's dictionary I have found no firm evidence that he had a copy of Molina's later work. The remarkable thing is that there are so many additional entries in Córdoba's dictionary. The entire z section of Nebrija 1516 consists of twelve entries. Molina 1555 and Gilberti, having eliminated zebra and made some other changes, both contain eleven. In Molina 1571 the number rises to sixteen, but Córdoba has no less than sixty-seven z entries including zebra, which is described not as an animal conocido but as an animal ligero (not suited for riding), and for which he has elicited a complicated gloss including the Spanish words cauallo and zebra. On the other hand, for the entry box Córdoba has no printed

gloss at all, although there is an inked-in note reproduced in the 1942 facsimile.

Córdoba appears to have practiced unrelenting elicitation, creating many new Spanish entries to distinguish the finest shadings of meaning expressed by Tarascan and eliciting descriptive phrases in Tarascan for even the most unfamiliar items in Nebrija's dictionary.

Alvarado 1593

The last of the sixteenth-century Mesoamerican dictionaries is Francisco de Alvarado's Spanish-to-Mixtec dictionary. Comparison of the initial pages of each letter section shows that it too is based squarely on Nebrija 1516, but it also shares the queso and queso fresco entries, the one about cacao, etc. In the Tarascan dictionary Córdoba had slightly altered the cacao entry. Molina 1555 and Gilberti share the wording de una xical a otra; Molina 1571 replaces a with en; but Córdoba has de una xicara en otra, and Alvarado also has xicara en rather than xical a. This suggests to me that Alvarado had a copy of Córdoba's dictionary at hand. A bit more evidence is the expansive nature of both dictionaries. Consider the numbers of echar entries. Córdoba's Zapotec dictionary has one hundred thirty entries, twice as many as Molina 1555, and Alvarado is not far behind with one hundred six. Instead of following Gilberti and Molina 1571 into producing bilingual dictionaries, Córdoba and Alvarado have painstakingly expanded the basic Spanish word list to give very full expression of lexical distinctions in Zapotec and Mixtec. This was all to the good for writing sermons and translating religious works into these languages, but the lack of Zapotec-to-Spanish and Mixtec-to-Spanish counterparts makes reading and translation of texts in these languages more difficult for modern scholars than the reading and translation of Nahuatl texts.

Urbano 1605

At the beginning of the seventeenth century Alonso Urbano produced a short grammar of Otomí and a trilingual Spanish/Nahuatl/Otomí word list of 404 folios. There can be no doubt that his elicitation list was Molina 1555, since the Spanish/Nahuatl wording is copied out as exactly as Nebrija's Spanish/Latin wording is copied in the Newberry manuscript. The editorial improvements of Molina 1571 are not present in Urbano's work. Taking the beginning of the a section as an example, the first dozen entries are exactly as in Molina 1555 with the exception of one entry being out of order. But Molina 1571 adds three new entries and slightly rewords one, and these changes are absent in Urbano. Moving through the dictionary we find the entries for boxwood and oysters, both kinds of cheese, etc. There are three entries for different types of mushrooms, worded exactly as in Molina 1555. But Molina 1571 adds the entry hongo generalmente, and this too is missing from Urbano.

With the Otomí dictionary we come full cycle in a bit less than a century. During the second quarter of the sixteenth century someone

had copied out Nebrija 1516 and used it to make the first lexical collection for Nahuatl. By 1555 Molina had produced a sophisticated Nahuatl dictionary, and then Gilberti did Molina one better by creating a bilingual dictionary for Tarascan. Molina rose to the challenge by producing a bilingual dictionary for Nahuatl as well. Then Córdova and Alvarado surpassed Molina's and Gilberti's Spanish sections with dictionaries that are much richer in lexical entries. At the end of the century Urbano has copied out not Nebrija, but Molina 1555 and used it to elicit words in Otomí. Nebrija, the parent of the sixteenth-century dictionaries, has become the grandparent of the first seventeenth-century one.

CONCLUSION

With this study I wish to bring out in detail Antonio de Nebrija's enormous historical contribution not only to Spanish linguistics but to Mesoamerican linguistics as well. Without his works in hand, the missionary grammarians/lexicographers in New Spain would have had no foundation upon which to build.

Secondly, I have traced the actual accomplishments of the New World lexicographers, who have sometimes been perceived as unoriginal in their adherence to Nebrija's model. True, they stuck very close to his content and wording, and they didn't take time to improve on it. In their dictionaries they let the less than strictly alphabetical order stand and even made it worse as they intercalated new entries of their own. They did leave out some irrelevant entries that had no referents in Mesoamerica, but others they let stand, glossed awkwardly or with lo mismo. They did not devise grammatical labels to identify parts of speech, although such labels might have been very helpful to users of their dictionaries.

But they were facing a task of intimidating proportions. They wisely took advantage of Nebrija's published works as research tools and directed their ingenuity to the novel tasks at hand. Employing consistent orthographies for languages that had not previously been written alphabetically, they had not only to collect words for things and actions, but to understand how these words worked morphologically and to provide paradigmatic information as well as sense. To this end we see sample prefix strings already in the Newberry manuscript and the citation of preterit forms of verbs, which unambiguously identify verb class membership, in the Nahuatl-to-Spanish section of Molina 1571. The size and sophistication of the dictionaries of the New World languages speak for themselves. In these volumes Antonio de Nebrija's work shines through, as it properly should, and by its own light illumines the accomplishments of his worthy intellectual successors, the lexicographers of sixteenth-century Mesoamerica.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am much in debt to Jane Rosenthal, who facilitated my research for this study twice over. When I visited Chicago to examine the Newberry manuscript, she put me up at her home, and then through her library contacts she helped me find my way to the manuscript the more easily. Later she provided me with detailed information about the Urbano trilingual dictionary, with which I had first become acquainted through Norman McQuown. Gerald MacDonald, whose critical edition of Nebrija's 1516 dictionary has been of inestimable help, kindly checked facsimiles and photocopies of earlier versions for me. James Lockhart contributed mightily by keeping a record of every Spanish loan word he came across in Molina 1571 and calling my attention to unlikely items he found there. These items (boxwood, cheese, oyster, etc.) served as keys to the comparative work presented here. I wish to thank each and all for their contributions.

I also wish to thank the staff of the Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection at the University of Texas at Austin, especially those in charge of the Rare Books Room, for years of unfailing interest and helpfulness.

I have been especially fortunate to be working at the Latin American Collection, where I have had at hand original copies of Molina 1555, Molina 1571, and Alvarado 1593, together with a 1901 reprinting of Gilberti 1559, a facsimile edition of Córdova 1578, and a microfilm of the Newberry manuscript. The comparative work I have done on the dictionaries would hardly have been possible if they were not all available in one place. Urbano's dictionary is located in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, and it was only by chance and good luck that I saw Professor McQuown's copy at the University of Chicago.

Research for this study was supported by National Science Foundation grants BNS78-17447, BNS80-17608, and BNS82-08213.

NOTA

1. A manuscript dictionary of Nahuatl in the Tulane University Latin American Library, which has been incorrectly dated 1598, is a compilation by Francisco Xavier Araoz based on neither Molina nor Nebrija. However, the library has corrected the catalogue date to 1778, and inspection of the handwriting and of the date written at the end confirm that it is indeed a late eighteenth-century manuscript. It seeks to rigorously exclude Spanish loan words, sometimes going to such absurd lengths as glossing caballo with Nahuatl yolcatl "livestock, vermin," and sometimes failing to recognize assimilated loan words such as xolalli from Spanish solar "house lot." In this it is an exemplar of a misguided restorationist movement of the eighteenth century which ignored first-hand sixteenth-century records in favor of reconstructions of "ideal" forms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALVARADO, Francisco de
 1593 Vocabulario en lengua mixteca. Pedro Balli, México.
- CAROCHI, Horacio
 1645 Arte de la lengua mexicana con la declaración de los adverbios della. Juan Ruiz, México.
- CORDOVA, Juan de
 1578 Vocabulario en lengua çapoteca. Pedro Charre y Antonio Ricardo, México. (Facsimile edition: Instituto de Antropología e Historia, México, 1942).
- GILBERTI, Maturino
 1559 Vocabulario en lengua de Mechuacan. (Reprinted under the direction of Antonio Peñafiel, Palacio Nacional, México, 1901).
- LOUNSBURY, Floyd
 n.d. Manuscript listing contents of Motul dictionary by Spanish.
- MACDONALD, Gerald
 1973 (See Nebrija 1516)
- MARKHAM, Clements
 1907 The Guanches of Tenerife: The Holy Image of Our Lady of Candelaria and the Spanish Conquest and Settlement, by the Friar Alonso de Espinosa of the Order of Preachers. (Originally published in Seville in 1594).
- MARTINEZ HERNANDEZ, Juan
Diccionario de Motul maya español. Atribuido a Fray Antonio de Ciudad Real. Y Arte de lengua Maya por Fray Juan Coronel. Talleres de la Compañía Tipográfica Yucateca, Mérida.
- MOLINA, Alonso de
 1555 Aquí comienza un vocabulario en la lengua castellana y mexicana. Juan Pablos, México.
- 1571 Vocabulario en lengua castellana y mexicana y mexicana y castellana. Antonio de Spinosa, México.
- NEBRIJA, Antonio de
 1516 Vocabulario de Romance en Latín. Seville: Johannes Varela. (Republished with an introduction by Gerald MacDonald. Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1973).
- 1560 Dictionarium Latino Hispanicum, et vice versa. Johannes Steelfij, Antwerp.
- URBANO, Alonso
 1605 Vocabulario trilingue español, mexicano, otomí. ms. American 8. Department des Manuscrits. Bibliothèque Nationale. Paris.

(Author Unknown)

n.d.

Vocabulario trilingue. Cast.Lat.Mex. Aztec ms. 1478. Edward
E. Ayer Collection, Newberry Library, Chicago.