Early Seventeenth Century Nahua Poetics: Domingo Chimalpahin and the *Cemanahuac* Archive

By

Carlos Macías Prieto

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Hispanic Languages and Literatures
in the
Graduate Division
of the
University of California, Berkeley

Committee in Charge:

Professor Ivonne Del Valle, chair
Professor Estelle Tarica
Professor Genaro Padilla

Summer 2020

Abstract

Early Seventeenth Century Nahua Poetics: Domingo Chimalpahin

and the *Cemanahuac* Archive

by

Carlos Macías Prieto

Doctor of Philosophy in Hispanic Languages and Literatures

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Ivonne Del Valle, Chair

My dissertation examines the writings of don Domingo Chimalpahin, a Nahua intellectual who produced a large body of written texts in Nahuatl and Spanish in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. My study reframes his work as an Indigenous intellectual project that safeguards the history of Cemanahuac—the Nahua Indigenous world—and preserves for future generations of Nahuas and their descendants the possibility to reclaim their history, government institutions, and land. As such, the archive Chimalpahin compiles and produces forces us to rethink Indigenous intellectual production during a critical time in which the very existence of Indigenous peoples of New Spain was at risk. My dissertation argues that Chimalpahin continues and expands the tradition of an earlier generation of Nahua *tlacuiloque*—scribes—who painted and wrote in Nahuatl for Nahua readers of the future. My study illustrates that Chimalpahin transcends the *altepetl*-centered histories of his predecessors and refutes Spanish historiography by revising the narratives of Spanish authors while putting Indigenous history in global context. This intellectual project, I show, entails an alternative political and cultural history rooted in the perspective of an Indigenous commoner.

My dissertation contributes to scholarship on colonial Latin America by focusing on a time period often neglected or seen as uneventful. Most specifically, it centers on Indigenous voices to illuminate an alternative intellectual project of self-preservation and self-determination that challenges the views of Spanish intellectuals and Indigenous authors appealing to the Spanish Crown as well as Christian friars writing about the history of New Spain.

Namechtlatlatlalhuilia ni tequitl notahtzin ihuan nonantzin ihuan ce personatzin tlen amo niquixmatqui.

Namechtlazohtla miac!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

CURRICULUM VITAE v

ABSTRACT 1

1. **INTRODUCTION**: "The Colonial *Tlacuilo* and the *Cemanahuac* Archive" 1

Chimalpahin's Biography and His Intellectual Project 3

Relevant Scholarship on Indigenous Intellectuals 6

Postconquest Traditional Nahua Annals in Written Form 12

Chimalpahin's 17th Century Nahua Annals 13

The Cemanahuac Archive 14

The Chapters 17

2. **CHAPTER 1**: "Writing from the Margins, Challenging Elite Spanish Discourse: Chimalpahin's View of Mexico Tenochtitlan" 19

Balbuena's *Grandeza mexicana* and Chimalpahin's (counter)vision of the colonial capital 21

Martínez's *Repertorio de los tiempos* and Chimalpahin's revision of his narrow historical narrative and his critique of "sabios espanoles" 28

Alemán's narrative of a "great prince" and the splendor of the city and Chimalpahin's critique of the archbishop-viceroy and the devastating earthquake 39

Morga's narrative of the black and mulatto uprising of 1612 and Chimalpahin's counternarrative 47

3. **CHAPTER 2**: "Nahua Writing at a Moment of Crisis: Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc, Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, and Domingo Chimalpahin" 57

Tezozomoc's Mexica Tenochca-centered chronicles: the *Crónica mexicana* and the *Crónica mexicayotl*. 60

Ixtlixochitl's "Lord's Discourse" and his Texcoco-centered *Relaciones* 65

Chimalpahin's Historical Annals, beyond Chalco and Mexico Tenochtitlan 70

Chimalpahin's Intellectual Heritage and Sources 70

Searching for the common origin of his Indigenous ancestors 77

Tracing the Political History of Cemanahuac 84

Subordinated Lords and Governors 90

4. **CHAPTER 3**: "Christians Friars' Histories of Ethnocide and Chimalpahin's Historical Annals as a Project of Ethnogenesis" 95

Sahagún and Durán's Histories of the Indies and their Projects of Ethnocide 96

Tovar and Acosta's Providentialist Histories and the Predetermined End of the Mexica State and Indigenous People's Self-determination 108

Chimalpahin's Revisionist History and His Project of Ethnogenesis 120

5. **CONCLUSION: "**Chimalpahin's Project For the Future" 130

6. WORKS CITED 135

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I want to thank the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of California, Berkeley. I am immensely grateful to the department for supporting my work throughout the years. Without the support of the department, its faculty, staff, and colleagues, I would have never been able to embark on this project. Special thanks to Professor Ivonne Del Valle and Professor Estelle Tarica who believed in my project and supported me from the beginning through each of the steps in the graduate program, guiding me and reminding me that my work is important. I also want to thank all the professors in the department for everything they taught me along the way. Thanks also to my dear graduate student colleagues in the department who made the experience of being in graduate school memorable. *¡Muchísimas gracias! Tlazohcamati miac.*

I am also grateful for the colleagues in the Padilla Collective—a graduate student writing group Professor Genaro Padilla started so that his graduate students could collaborate and carry our dissertation projects. Gracias *profe* and friends for making the dissertation writing a fun and exciting experience. It was great to see our projects take shape as we learned from each other!

I also owe an immense amount of gratitude to my dear friends and colleagues at UC Berkeley who served as a support system from my time as an undergraduate student until the completion of the dissertation. Special thanks to Alberto Ledesma from the Division of Arts and Humanities, Luisa Giulianetti from the CE3 program, Marcos Ramos from EOP, Lupe Gallegos from CLSD, and Laura Jiménez-Olvera from the Chicano Studies undergraduate program. Special thanks also to Celia Herrera Rodríguez for giving me the opportunity to return to Cal back in 2006 after having withdrawn from the university. Thank you all for the important role you played in my success at Cal.

It is also important to recognize my friends at Café Milano and other spaces outside of campus (spaces not related to the university) that sustained me during my time at Cal, both as an undergraduate and graduate student. Without the friendship, support, and *carrilla* of the employees at Milano and colleagues that studies there, my experience at Cal would have not been the same. Thank you for carving a space for Chicano/Latino students that feels like home. *¡Gracias camaradas!*

Special thanks also to the *macehualmeh* and the *huei tlamachtiquetl* from the Instituto de Docencia e Investigación Etnológica de Zacatecas (IDIEZ) for teaching me the language of our Nahua ancestors. Thank you so much for teaching me what I know about the Nahuatl language. Without your teachings this project would have never been possible! *Tlazohcamati miac notlazohtequixpoyohuan!*

Finally, *quiero dar gracias a mi familia por todo su apoyo y amor durante estos años de estudio y trabajo. Sin ustedes nada de esto fuera posible. Quiero dar las gracias especialmente a mi madre, la señora María Isabel Prieto Rodríguez, y a mi padre, que en paz descanse, el señor Rafael Macías García, por haberme dado la vida y por enseñarme a ser una persona humilde, honesta, responsable, trabajadora, y de bien. Gracias también a mi hermano Tun-Tun por haberse hecho cargo de nosotros y de mi madre después del fallecimiento inesperado del jefe.*

CARLOS MACÍAS PRIETO

1152 Cortez St., Hayward, CA 94544
510-909-2757 * unmacias@berkeley.edu

EDUCATION

(2020) Ph.D., Hispanic Languages and Literatures, University of California, Berkeley
Dissertation: "Early Seventeenth Century Nahua Poetics: Domingo Chimalpahin and the Cemanahuac Archive"
2011 M.A., American Studies, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana
2007 B.A., Chicano Studies, University of California, Berkeley
2003 A.A., Liberal Studies, Chabot Community College, Hayward, California

ADDITIONAL EDUCATION

2019 Certificate of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, UC Berkeley
2014-2016 Summer Nahuatl Language Institute, Yale University, New Haven, CT
2013-2019 Classical Nahuatl language coursework (online), Instituto de Docencia e Investigación Etnológica de Zacatecas (IDIEZ), Zacatecas, Mexico

PUBLICATIONS

"Preserving the History of Cemanahuac: Domingo Chimalpahin's Rewriting of Spanish Narratives in the *Annals of His Time*," *Early American Literature,* revise and resubmit.

FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS

2020 Dissertation Completion Fellowship, Chancellor's Doctoral Incentive Program, California State University
2019 Chancellor's Doctoral Incentive Award, California State University
2018-2019 Dissertation Completion Fellowship, Berkeley Graduate Division, UC Berkeley
2018 New Leader Scholars Graduate Student Scholarship, Marin County Community Foundation
2017-2018 Mentored Research Award, Berkeley Graduate Division, UC Berkeley
2013-2017 Chancellor's Fellowship, Berkeley Graduate Division, UC Berkeley
2015-2016 Summer Research Grant, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, UC Berkeley
2014 Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowship, Center for Latin American Studies, UC Berkeley
2013-2016 New Leader Scholars Graduate Student Scholarship, Marin County Community Foundation
2011 Vice Provost for Engagement Student Grant, Purdue University
2009-2011 David M. Knox Fellowship, Purdue University
2008 Institute for Recruitment of Teachers (intern), The Phillips Academy
2007 New American Scholars Fund, Immigrants Rising
2007 New Leader Scholars Scholarship, Marin Community Foundation
2003 President's Award for Academic Achievement, Chabot College

INVITED TALKS

2018 "Writing from the Margins, Challenging Elite Spanish Discourse: Chimalpahin's

View of Mexico-Tenochtitlan," Creating Connections Consortium (C3) Summit, Middlebury College, Middlebury, VT, November 9-11.

CONFERENCE ACTIVITY

2019 "Domingo Chimalpahin's Rewriting of Antonio de Morga's Narrative of Black Conspiracy in 1612," Translating America/America Translated Symposium, University of California, Santa Cruz, February 22-23.

2015 "Fernando de Alva Ixtilxóchitl's 'Original Historia' and the Post-Conquest (Elite) Native and Mestizo Historiographic Tradition," American Society for Ethnohistory Annual Conference, Las Vegas, NV, November 4-8.

2014 "Preserving the History of Anáhuac: Fernando de Alva Ixtilxóchitl as Ethnographer, Historian, and Archivist," American Society for Ethnohistory Annual Conference, Indianapolis, IN, October 8-12.

2014 "Another Reading of Acacictli's Chronicle (1541)," Decolonizing Empires: A US and Global Third World Dialogue, UC Berkeley Power and Peripheries Conference, UC Berkeley, April 7.

2012 "Life After College: Attending Graduate or Professional School," Annual E4FC Life After College Conference, San Francisco City College, San Francisco, CA, January 6.

2011 "*Guerra fuego y a sangre* or War through Fire and Blood: The *Requerimiento* of 1541," Early Atlantic Reading Group Colloquium, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, April 5.

2010 "What Happens to American Studies When We Put Ethnic Studies at the Center?" Annual Purdue University American Studies Symposium, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, April 23.

2010 "Brown Power and Red Power Social Movements," Difficult Dialogues on Race and Social Movements Conference, Black Cultural Center, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, April 14.

2009 "Undocumented Immigrant Students in Higher Education," Annual Latino Education Summit, California State University, East Bay, Hayward, CA, January 20.

CONFERENCES ORGANIZED

2016 "Indigenous Intellectual Culture in Sixteenth-Century New Spain," UC Berkeley, April 29 (co-organizer with Jessica Stair).

CAMPUS LECTURES

2019 "Early Seventeenth Century Nahua Poetics: Domingo Chimalpahin and the *Cemanahuac* Archive," Lunch on the Latinx Research Center, UC Berkeley, April 29.

2018 "Writing from the Margins, Challenging Elite Spanish Discourse: Chimalpahin's View of Mexico-Tenochtitlan," Mexico: A View from UC Berkeley Roundtable, Spanish and Portuguese Department, UC Berkeley, September 13.

2017 "The Anahuac Archive and Domingo Chimalpahin's Cartographies of Power," Latin American Art and Literature Working Group, UC Berkeley, November 17.

2010 "The Purdue Latino Cultural Center as a Space of Possibility," Politics of Race,

Class, and Gender in Social Inquiry Forum, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, April 19.

2010 "To Be or Not to Be Chicano?" Embajadores Social Justice Committee, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, April 10.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

UC Berkeley, Department of Spanish and Portuguese (Instructor of Record)

Lectura y análisis de textos literarios (Fall 2019)

Literaturas alternativas americanas: de la crónica indígena a la nueva novela latinoamericana y la novela chicana (Summer 2019)

Intermediate Spanish (Summer 2019)

Spanish for Heritage Speakers (Spring 2016, Fall 2016)

Elementary Spanish (Fall 2015)

UC Berkeley, Reading and Composition (Instructor of Record)

Reading and Composition Through Readings from the Spanish-Speaking World (Summer 2017 and Spring 2017)

UC Berkeley, Departments of Ethnic Studies and Social Welfare (Instructor of Record)

Field Study in Communities of Color / Field Studies in Social Welfare (Fall 2012)

UC Berkeley, Summer Bridge Program (Graduate Teaching Assistant)

Introduction to Chicano History (Summers 2011, 2012, 2013)

Inequalities in Education (Summer 2013)

Modern U.S. History (Summer 2012)

Purdue University, History Department (Graduate Teaching Assistant)

Introduction to the Modern World (Spring 2011)

Colonial Latin America to 1824 (Fall 2010)

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

2018 - Scholarship Review Committee Member, Achievement Award Program, UC Berkeley Alumni Association

2015-2017 Coordinator, Latin American Art and Literature Working Group, UC Berkeley

2013-2017 Member, Graduate Students de la Raza (GSRza), UC Berkeley

2013-2015 Co-founder and Coordinator, Femtor/Mentor Colectiva Mentorship Program, UC Berkeley

2013-2014 Co-chair, Graduate Students de la Raza, UC Berkeley

2012 Coordinator, Starting Point Mentorship Program, UC Berkeley

2011-2012 Scholarship Review Committee Member, Achievement Award Program, UC Berkeley Alumni Association

2011-2012 Panel Moderator, National Ronald E. McNair Scholars Symposium, UC Berkeley

2009 Writing Workshop Leader, Summer Bridge Program, UC Berkeley

2009 Research and Writing Tutor and Workshop Facilitator, Student Learning Center, UC Berkeley

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

2019 -	Board Member, SIREN (Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education Network), San Jose, CA
2012-2013	Scholarship Review Committee Member, Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute (CHCI)
2011-2013	Scholarship Review Committee Member, Hispanic Scholarship Fund (HSF)
2011-2013	Scholarship Review Committee Member, Gates Millennium Scholars
2011-2012	College Advisory Leader, College Track, San Francisco, CA
2011	Creator and Coordinator, Empowering Communities Through Action (ECTA), Frankfurt, IN

LANGUAGES

Spanish: native
Portuguese: intermediate
Nahuatl (colonial and modern): intermediate

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP

American Society for Ethnohistory

REFERENCES

Ivonne Del Valle, Associate Professor
Department of Spanish and Portuguese
UC Berkeley
5226 Dwinelle Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720
Tel. 510-642-8037
Email: idelvalle@berkeley.edu

Estelle Tarica, Associate Professor
Department of Spanish and Portuguese
UC Berkeley
5214 Dwinelle Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720
Tel. 510-642-8037
Email: etarica@berkeley.edu

Emilie Bergmann, Professor Emerita
Department of Spanish and Portuguese
UC Berkeley
5229 Dwinelle Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720
Email: elb@berkeley.edu

Genaro Padilla, Professor
Department of English
UC Berkeley
322 Wheeler Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720

Introduction: The Colonial *Tlacuilo* and the *Cemanahuac* Archive

How can one reconcile the idea that the moment of severe crisis for the Nahuas of Central Mexico at the turn of the Seventeenth Century, a moment in which, according to prominent historian Charles Gibson, "Indian society seemed to be headed for extinction" (407), corresponds to the time another prominent historian, James Lockhart, has identified as the "golden age of writing in Nahuatl" (*The Nahuas After the Conquest* 70)? The idea that the moment in which a people "headed for extinction" coincides with the time in which these same peoples' literary production flourished is perplexing. Why would a people on the verge of extinction turn to the written word? And why would some of these Nahua *tlacuiloque* (singular: *tlacuilo*, i.e. scribe) write specifically in Nahuatl? Who were they writing for and what did they seek to accomplish with their narratives written in elegant 17th century Nahuatl? Moreover, how can the modern reader and scholar avoid essentializing these authors and their works as authentic (or inauthentic) Nahua histories and prevent us from imposing Western categories of thought and binary thinking? While it is important to remember that during this time—and throughout the 16th century—a number of educated Nahuas turned to the written word to write their histories, responded to inquiries by the religious and secular colonial authorities, served as scribes in the colonial bureaucracy, and some even appealed to the viceroy and to the Spanish Monarch, it is imperative to point out that not all *tlacuiloque* shared the same vision of the world—of their past, present, and future. At the same time, it is necessary to highlight that not all of those who wrote were members of the native nobility, nor were they educated in the same way and under similar circumstances, that is, not all were educated by the friars or worked under the supervision of the different religious orders. Hence, one should not assume that Nahua intellectuals of the late 16th and early 17th centuries shared the same intellectual project.

With the above questions in mind, my dissertation examines the writings of don Domingo de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin (henceforth Chimalpain [1579-1660?]) in relation to the works of Peninsular Spanish authors, Indigenous, mestizo, and castizo writers, and Christian friars writing about New Spain and Nahua history and culture. My reading of Chimalpahin's oeuvre is informed by José Rabasa's theorization of the colonial *tlacuilo* who, writing from *nepantla*, from a space in-between, has the capacity to dwell in a plurality of worlds, thereby creating a discursive space which allows him or her to point to the failures, intolerance, and limitations of the colonial state. In writing from *nepantla*, the colonial *tlacuilo* is neither here nor there, neither in the ancient world of his ancestors nor solely in the Christian world; rather, the colonial *tlacuilo* dwells in a plurality of worlds ("Historical and Epistemological Limits" 73). Hence, the *tlacuilo* has the "capacity to create a discursive space that does not merely react to but instead adopts elements from Western codes to communicate the specificity of the plurality of worlds [he or she inhabits]" (72-73). As Rabasa illustrates when comparing the work of the colonial *tlacuilo* of *Codex Telleriano-Remensis* (c.1550) with a Zapatista communique, the capacity to dwell in multiple worlds is "a constant in subaltern discourses from the conquest to the present" (65-66).

Even though Rabasa's analysis of the colonial *tlacuilo* is focused on a Nahua "painter" who borrows from both pre-Hispanic codex tradition and European Renaissance painting techniques, one can extend his analysis to the colonial *tlacuilo* who works primarily with written alphabetic texts. As Serge Gruzinski points out: "It is significant… that in the sixteenth century

the terms *cuiloa*, *tlacuilo*, *tlacuilolli* and many others which referred in Nahuatl to the painter, the act of painting and the painting, were also applied to the world of writing" (*The Conquest of Mexico* 48). If Nahua scholars who painted pre-Hispanic glyphs and wrote in alphabetic script in Latin, Spanish, and Nahuatl were referred to as "*tlacuiloque*" towards the end of the sixteenth century, why would one assume that the title of *tlacuilo* would suddenly be dropped and replaced with the Spanish *escribano*, *escritor*, or *autor* when referring to a Nahua writer? By taking Rabasa's insight of the colonial *tlacuilo* as theoretical approach to read the work of Chimalpahin we avoid falling into essentialist and binary thinking that would either reduce his annals to a mere analysis of the continuation of pre-Hispanic forms of recording the past into the colonial era or lead us to condemn or praise Chimalpahin as a devout Christian. As Rabasa explains:

> the conception of dwelling in a plurality of worlds does not imply a hybrid complex but rather the coexistence of different hybrid spaces... As such, the coexistence of plural worlds gives place to an antiessentialist thought that spares us the need to establish so-called strategic essentialisms—that is, identities grounded in a binary opposition to a hegemonic essentialism (67-68).

The fact that Chimalpahin writes in Nahuatl and follows the pre-Hispanic annals form does not reduce his work to this; also, the fact that he includes a number of Christian references throughout his text does not preclude him from criticizing the colonial authorities.[1] He can be both Indigenous and Christian at the same time without incurring contradiction.[2] Hence, by taking this approach we can see that Chimalpahin dwells in a plurality of worlds while pointing to the failures and intolerance of the colonial state. What is more, as a non-elite Nahua writing in Nahuatl for future generations of Nahua readers and their descendants, he presents an oppositional discourse which reveals the limitations of the Spanish colonial system. Consequently, reading Chimalpahin's annals as the work of a colonial *tlacuilo* with the ability to dwell in a plurality of worlds—the Indigenous world of his ancestors and the European/Christian world—brings his intellectual project into focus. He is not merely continuing the Mesoamerican tradition of the annals form from an apolitical, detached perspective but expands and politicizes the Mesoamerican annals while creating an Indigenous archive for future generations.

My study examines the writings of Chimalpahin to illustrate that his intellectual project diverges from that of European-born authors who had adopted New Spain as their home, Indigenous, castizo, and mestizo intellectuals who wrote primarily in Spanish and appealed to the colonial authorities, and Christian friars writing about the pre-Hispanic history of New Spain and the continuation of Indigenous "idolatries." Thus, my study reframes Chimalpahin's work as an Indigenous intellectual project that safeguards the history of Cemanahuac—the Nahua Indigenous world—and preserves for future Nahua generations and their descendants the possibility to reclaim their history, land, and government institutions. I argue that Chimalpahin compiles and produces an archive that forces us to rethink Indigenous intellectual production during a critical time in which the very existence of Indigenous peoples of New Spain was at risk

[1] While James Lockhart reads Chimalpahin as an "orthodox religious professional" and Susan Schroeder reads Chimalpahin's Christian references as a strategy to protect him from the Inquisition, neither of these two readings preclude Chimalpahin from presenting a critique of the colonial authorities.

[2] Monica Diaz explains this point when she writes: "The indio identity of *nepantla*, or "being in the middle," informed the lived experiences of many natives who shared the values of both Catholicism and their pre-Hispanic pantheon without necessarily causing conflict between the two worlds" (18).

due to severe epidemics and labor exploitation. I illustrate that Chimalpahin continues and expands the tradition of an earlier generation of Nahua *tlacuiloque* who painted and wrote in Nahuatl for future generations. My study also illustrates that Chimalpahin's writings transcend local, ethnically-based Nahua histories of his predecessors and refutes Spanish historiography by revising the narratives of Spanish authors while putting Indigenous history in global context. Thus, I contend, Chimalpahin's intellectual project entails an alternative political and intellectual history rooted in the perspective of an Indigenous commoner, a project of self-preservation and self-determination at a critical moment for the survival of Nahua peoples of New Spain. Such a project forces us to reconsider the significance of Nahua intellectual production at the turn of the 17th century and when we consider it in relation to other Indigenous intellectual traditions and contemporary Indigenous struggles, it can serve as a starting point to image alternative futures that support Indigenous struggles for land and self-determination.

Chimalpahin's Biography and His Intellectual Production

Little is known about Chimalpahin's life given that what is known about him comes primarily from his own writings. The only reference to Chimalpahin's life outside of his own writings during the 17th century comes from a note attributed to the Creole savant Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora (1645-1700) in the final page of Chimalpahin's *Annals of His Time* when he writes: "Aunque vivio mas tiempo el bueno de D. Domingo de S. Anton Muñon Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin no halle mas papeles suyos pertenecientes a este asunto. y todo quanto aqui se contiene es la misma verdad" (*Ms. Annals of His Time* 282). Besides this short and ambiguous annotation the Creole intellectual writes at the end of the *Annals* affirming that Chimalpahin lived beyond the year 1615 (the year in which the Nahua annalist writes the final entry of his *Annals*) and that the information Chimalpahin includes in the *Annals* is true, Chimalpahin is not mentioned by his contemporaries. Neither Indigenous writers, Spanish or Creole intellectuals, or religious friars reference the Nahua annalist or his works. As David Tavárez has argued, "Chimalpahin is not cited by his contemporaries, although he was trusted enough to work with ancient manuscripts" (18). Thus, what is known about Chimalpahin's life is to be found scattered throughout his own writings.

Born in 1579 in Tzaqualtitlan-Tenanco, a subdivision of Amecamecan Chalco, a region at the southeastern edge of the Valley of Mexico, he descended from the Chalca peoples who had settled in the Valley of Mexico in the mid-13th century. From his father's side, he descended from a line of Chalca rulers since his father descended from the younger-brother of the Chalca ruler Huehue Chimalpahin; from his mother's side, he descended from the elder-brother of another Chalca ruler, Cuauhtlehuanitzin (Townsend 145). Thus, it could be said that his family descended from the lower reaches of Nahua nobility. However, even though his ancestors had been part of the Chalca nobility in pre-Hispanic times, neither his immediate family nor himself inherited the titles and privileges of Indigenous nobility and he was not recognized as such during his own time. As Susan Schroeder has shown: "[His] family had descended from rulers. But his mother, María Jerónima Xiuhtoztzin, although the daughter of Chimalpahin's esteemed intellectual-grandfather, don Domingo Ayopochtzin Hernández (d. 1577), did not enjoy the title of *doña*, nor did his father, Juan Agustín Ixpintzin, use *don*. Chimalpahin himself was baptized Domingo Francisco, a sure sign of his commoner status" ("The Truth About the *Crónica mexicayotl*" 236). As such, Chimalpahin was a commoner and did not benefit from the privileges members of the Nahua nobility enjoyed. Nevertheless, his status as commoner did not prevent him from adopting the title of "don" and reclaiming the names of both of his distant ancestors,

"Chimalpahin" and "Cuauhtlehuanitzin". As Schroeder explains, "It was not until he was well established in Mexico City that he took the title *don* for himself and his interesting and more formal name" (236), to then add in a note, "It is highly unlikely that Chimalpahin was ever addressed in such a magnificent manner, since no Nahuas used such names in the seventeenth century" (244).

By the time Chimalpahin was born, Amecamecan had long been under the control of the Dominican friars. Thus, Chimalpahin must have either learned to read and write through the friars or through an Indigenous person who had learned from them and later taught the young Chimalpahin how to read and write (Townsend 146). As it is evident in his writings, Chimalpahin was not the first in his family to read and write as he mentions in his writings that his relatives owned both painted texts and "letratica amoxpan"—books in written in letters.

In 1593, at the age of 14, Chimalpahin migrated to the colonial capital to live and work at the church of San Antón Abad, a small chapel located at the margin of the colonial capital, two miles away from the city center and next to the causeway that connected the island of the colonial capital with the southern region of the Valley of Mexico.[3] From the time of his arrival in the capital until 1624, the year the chapel closed, Chimalpahin worked at the chapel. Even though the details of his life as copyist are not well-known, one thing that is certain is that during his time at the chapel he worked as a copyist. As Schroeder explains, "It is not known if he was a professional *copista*, or if he worked on his histories after completing his chores as fiscal at the San Antón church", to then add, "The great majority of his annals are transcriptions from pictorial texts to Roman alphabetic script, a laborious undertaking. But he was good at it and only occasionally revealed when he was stumped by an image" (240). However, Chimalpahin's intellectual production was not merely that of a copyist since his writing makes evident that he wrote his own annals and often incorporated the material from documents he copied. Thus, his intellectual project went well-beyond that of a mere copyist. Working at the chapel must have given Chimalpahin the opportunity, resources, and time to produce his own writings. Moreover, his work as copyist and the fact that he worked at the chapel must have given him an opportunity to interact with both friars and Indigenous and mestizo intellectuals and granted him access to texts and libraries. Two important intellectuals sites that may have influenced Chimalpahin's intellectual work include the chapel of San José, a site which Schroeder considers as "a hub of indigenous Christian intellectual activity in the capital" and the library of the church of San Francisco which held an ample collection of texts that Chimalpahin could have utilized (236).

Even though scholars have situated his death in the year 1660, an attribution that may be rooted in the perspective of the German scholar Günter Zimmerman in the 1960s who situates Chimalpahin's death in the year 1660, although he makes this assertion "sin seguridad"—without certainty (Zimmerman 12)—, the existing evidence suggests that Chimalpahin disappears from the written archive in 1631. Thus, situating his death in 1660 might be an error as there is no concrete evidence of his death. As Townsend has recently argued: "Chimalpahin's death is unrecorded" (173). Consequently, rather than situating Chimalpahin's death in the year 1660 given that there is no concrete evidence to support this claim, a better approach would be to highlight the fact that he continued to write after the closure of the chapel for at least seven more years. There is also the possibility that he continued to write after the 1631, as Rodrigo Martínez

[3] Juan Gómez Transmonte's painting of Mexico City in 1628 illustrates that up until the late 1620s, the colonial capital continued to be an island, connected to the mainland by a series of causeways.

opines when he asserts that Chimalpahin could not have passed the opportunity to document significant events that took place in the capital after 1631 (40). However, there is also the possibility that his work was censored or that he ended up facing a tragic end. Given the graphic descriptions he includes in his *Annals* of the executions of individuals who challenged colonial institutions, it is evident that Chimalpahin understood that the colonial authorities—both secular and religious authorities—would not tolerate the transgressions of their colonized subjects. Thus, it is probable that if secular or religious authorities found his writings and realized that he was challenging the narratives of high-ranking Spanish officials and friars and calling for Indigenous peoples and their descendants to reclaim their land and political institutions, he could have been punished for his transgressions.

Even though it is not clear when or how Chimalpahin died, what is certain is that he was a prolific Nahua intellectual who produced the largest body of written texts in Nahuatl and Spanish among Nahua writers of the 16th and 17th Centuries. Besides producing a history in annals form that documents life in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century New Spain, from 1577 to 1615, in a manuscript known as the *Annals of His Time*, a text often referred to as his *Diario* (1606-1615), Chimalpahin also wrote eight *Relaciones históricas* and the *Memorial de Colhuacan* (1620-1631), texts related to the pre-Hispanic history of central Mexico and leading into the early colonial era. Moreover, Chimalpahin is credited with having copied and, at times, emending a number of important 16th and 17th Century texts, among them Fernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicayotl*, the *Annals of Don Gabriel de Ayala*, and numerous ancient genealogies and annals believed to be transcriptions of oral narratives by the Nahua elders, texts compiled in the collection known as *Codex Chimalpahin*, as well as Fray Bernardino de Sahagún's *Sermonario* and Francisco López de Gómara's *La Conquista de Mexico*. Given the amount of writing he produced and considering his method of collecting the oral, painted, and written histories of his predecessors and using these as primary sources for his reconstruction of the pre-Hispanic past, Chimalpahin's corpus is a rich source of textual material to illustrate a Nahua historiographic, intellectual, and archival project of the late 16th and early 17th Centuries different from that of Spanish and creole intellectuals who legitimized themselves as the rightful inheritors of the land, from native lords petitioning for restitution of privileges as members of the Indigenous nobility, and from Christian friars seeking to advance their evangelizing mission. Hence, my study examines the extant writings of Chimalpahin to trace an alternative historiographic, intellectual, and archival project.

Positioning himself as an observer and, at times, as participant and witness of the events he describes, in the *Annals of His Time*, Chimalpahin presents the social, political, and religious institutions of colonial Mexico City, describing both secular and religious institutions—the viceregal palace, city government institutions, churches, monasteries, nunneries, religious fraternities, and other social institutions central to the governance of the colony. He explains how institutional power is passed from individual to individual, from the Spanish monarch appointing a viceroy as his representative, to the transfer of power from viceroy to viceroy, from archbishop to archbishop, bishop to bishop, and, at times, from archbishop to viceroy, and how lower ranking positions of power within secular and religious institutions function. As part of the execution of this power, Chimalpahin's *Annals* illustrates the deployment of this power and the brutality of the Inquisition in their executions of Jews and political rebels and the public displays of power through exemplary punishments—public hangings, burnings, the quartering of the bodies of the rebels, the display of severed heads in the central plaza, and the exile of vagabonds,

criminals, and other so-called "undesirables". In other words, Chimalpahin's *Annals* describes the machinery of colonial power.

In the *Ocho Relaciones* and the *Memorial de Colhuacan*, the Nahua annalist presents the deep history[4] of various *altepeme* (city states) of central Mexico from an Indigenous and global perspective. Even though he begins his annals by recounting the Christian story of the creation of the world and man by making references to the Bible and Christian thinkers and philosophers of Western antiquity in the *Primera relación*, Chimalpahin does not deny the idolatry of his ancestors but equates it with that of the Greeks. Starting in the *Segunda relación*, however, it is evident that his focus is in writing the pre-Hispanic history of the Nahua peoples of central Mexico, documenting the migration of various ethnic groups from Aztlan into central Mexico, their noble genealogies, the foundational moments of various city states, and their conflicts, wars, conquests, and alliances. He also recounts the arrival of the Spaniards; the encounter of Cortés and Moctezuma; the massacre of Toxcatl; the imprisonment and execution of Cuauhtemoc and other native lords; the imposition of native rulers after the conquest; and the deaths of Indigenous lords as a result of epidemics. Thus, his *Relaciones* and the *Memorial* trace the webs of power in pre-Hispanic times and how the intrusion of the Spaniards altered existing power relation as the Spaniards took control of Indigenous political and economic structures.

Similar to the *Relaciones*, the collection of documents in the hand of the Nahua annalist in *Codex Chimalpahin* are related to the political history of the Nahuas of Central Mexico, that is, the political history of Cemanahuac. Among the texts one finds in the codex are: Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicayotl;* a Chronicle of Mexica history written in Nahuatl; a Chronicle of Mexica history written in Spanish; a genealogy of the rulers of Colhuacan and Tenochtitlan; a genealogy of the rulers of Tenochtitlan, Tlacopan, and Texcoco; and the Mexica annals of Don Gabriel, among other texts that focus on the political history of Cemanahuac. These texts, which informed Chimalpahin's historical annals, are clear evidence that his interest in documenting the history of the lake region was in archiving the political history of Cemanahuac. The fact that Chimalpahin archives the histories and genealogies of various Nahua groups in *Codex Chimalpahin* stand as evidence that he transcends specific *altepetl*-centered histories, just as he does in his historical annals. Thus, among the texts he copies and archives in *Codex Chimalpahin* the reader finds documents related to the histories of the peoples of Mexico Tenochtitlan, Culhuacan, Tlacopan, Tezcoco, Azcapotzalco, Coatlinchan, and Tlaltelolco. Hence, it is evident that Chimalpahin is not confined to the narrow *altepetl*-centered histories of his predecessors but rather archives a wider history of Cemanahuac with a particular focus on its political history. When read from this perspective, it becomes clear that Chimalpahin preserves for posterity the political history of his Indigenous ancestors in such a way that it enables future generations of readers to retrieve and reactivate the broader political history of Cemanahuac.

Relevant Scholarship on Indigenous Intellectuals

My interest in engaging the works of Chimalpahin stems from the fact that scholars of Latin America have given little attention to the early 17th Century, specially to the works of Nahua intellectuals. As María Elena Martínez illustrates in *Genealogical Fictions* (2008) as she explains the contribution of her study to the field of colonial Latin American studies:

[4] By deep history I mean the ancient history of pre-Hispanic America, going back to the historical time in which, according to Chimalpahin, the ancestors of the peoples of central Mexico arrived into the island of Aztlan.

> For one, the centrality of the seventeenth century to the development of the sistema de castas places the focus on a period that historians of colonial Latin America have tended to understudy. Perhaps unduly influenced by anthropologist George Foster's characterization of colonial Latin American culture as having 'crystalized' or acquired its basic social institutions by 1580, the historiography has generally regarded the years between that decade and 1750 as largely uneventful (14).

If Martínez is right in her assessment of the lack of attention scholars have given to the period between the last two decades of the 16th Century and the first half of the 18th Century, my study of Chimalphain contributes to scholarship on this period by focusing on the intellectual production of a Nahua author who pursues a project that cannot be reduced to creole patriotism, the attempt of the descendants of native lords to secure privileges as part of the native nobility, or Christian friars' attempts to uproot idolatry. Furthermore, as Martínez explains, 17th Century New Spain was far from static since "[New Spain] not only had strong connections with Spain but underwent crucial social and cultural transformations" (14). Hence, the period in which Chimalpahin wrote is part of an era in which the colony was still undergoing significant social, cultural, and political transformations. Royal decrees, the establishment of secular and religious institutions, social upheavals, and the continuous expansion of the Spanish Empire in the Northern frontier of New Spain and into Asia make clear that this historical period is far from static and uneventful. Chimalpahin's *Diario*, his *Relaciones*, and the annals in *Codex Chimalpahin* illustrate just this.

I am also interested in examining the writings of Chimalpahin because his work presents us with an intellectual project which diverges from that of creole patriots who appropriated the writings of native historians and the history of the pre-Hispanic past as their own. While prominent scholars such as David Brading (1991), Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra (2001), and, more recently, Anna More (2013) have described the development of the creole intellectual project—that is, the ways in which creole elites claimed legitimacy as rightful rulers of Spanish America beginning in the early 17th Century—little attention has been given to the possibility of a Nahua intellectual project in its own right which transcends a focus on narratives of Indigenous lords asking for restitution of privileges as native nobles. While Brading's monumental study illustrates how Spanish American creole patriots created an original intellectual and political tradition engaged with native history and Spanish American reality, he laments that the works produced by Indigenous and mestizo authors such as the Inca Garcilaso and religious friars such as Torquemada who relied on Indigenous sources "were destined to figure as primary texts for the patriotic tradition in Mexico and Peru" (3). Hence, Brading's reading of the works by Indigenous and mestizo authors accounts for the way in which creole patriots appropriated the pre-Hispanic past for their own projects, foreclosing the possibility of reading the works of mestizo authors such as Garcilaso and other Spanish American Indigenous, mestizo, and castizo writers in their own right, as texts presenting a different vision to that of creole intellectuals. Similarly, the work of Cañizares-Esguerra also treats the works of native and mixed-race intellectuals as mere sources in the writings of European and creole authors. This appropriation of Indigenous sources is evident when Cañizares-Esguerra describes his concept of creole "patriotic epistemology" as "the discourse of a patrician class that evaluated sources according to the social standing of the witnesses. Creole critics argued that the history of America had been misinterpreted because early European authors lacked the linguistic tools and the practical knowledge of Native Americans to understand the sources and evaluate and weight their

credibility" (9). Hence, Cañizares-Esguerra is also focused on the development of the creole intellectual project and their appropriation of native sources. More recently, More's study of the Spanish American creole patriot Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora also explores the development of the creole project by focusing on the political crisis of 17th Century New Spain as a problem of governance and the formation of creole regional histories by appropriating Indigenous history and the Indigenous archive. While More's study magnificently illustrates the way in which creole authors such as Sigüenza y Góngora appropriated the Indigenous archive to authorized their visions of a creole *patria* (27), her study is focused on the second half of the 17th Century and she only suggests the possibility of competing intellectual projects without pursuing this question fully[5]. Hence, in More's study we see, once again, how creoles appropriated native history and the native archive for their own purposes. Consequently, my study presents a distinct intellectual Nahua project by focusing on the writings of Chimalpahin and his social and intellectual milieu, a project that cannot be reduced to the vision of Spanish or creole patriots, the descendants of Indigenous lords asking for restitution of privileges, or Christian friars.

In relation to recent scholarly work on Indigenous intellectuals and the native archive, my study of Chimalphain's writings engages the works of literary scholars Salvador Velasco (2003), Kelly S. McDonough (2014), and Amber Brian (2016). While Velasco's *Visiones de Anáhuac* explores the Spanish writings of Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl (1579-1650), Diego Muñoz Camargo (1528-1599), and, in part, Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc (1525- c.1610),[6] his study does not consider Chimalpahin's "vision" of Anáhuac as he does not explore the works of the latter Nahua author in his study. According to Velasco, the writings of Nahua chroniclers such as Ixtlilxochitl, Muñoz Camargo, and Tezozomoc, all writing in Spanish, create:

> un *locus* de enunciación para las noblezas indígenas de los respectivos *altepeme* (Texcoco, Tlaxcala, México-Tenochtitlan), a través del cual se intenta recobrar la pérdida del estatus de nobleza, tierras, poder político, mando y autoridad… Estamos en presencia de una historiografía producida para afirmar o retener una posición política, social, y cultural. En este sentido [los tres autores] imaginan el pasado para vivir el presente (269).

Hence, Velasco's study, while focusing on the writings of Nahua intellectuals, presents the works of these Nahua writers as engaging an intellectual project in order to preserve their position and privilege as part of the surviving Indigenous nobility, surveying and documenting their past to claim their privilege as the descendants of the native nobility. Chimalpahin, on the contrary, does not make this claim to nobility even though he could stake a claim as a descendant of the Indigenous lords of Chalco Amaquemecan many generations removed. Instead, Chimalpahin positions himself as a *macehualli*, a commoner, and in his *Diario* and in his *Relaciones* there is no claim to native nobility or a petition to the Spanish monarch for his

[5] While More's study is focused on the development of the creole intellectual project, in the concluding remarks of her study she explains that "Sigüenza's works also document the everyday forms of memory and politics that countered [his] vision and prevented its implementation. Further studies of the crucial period of the late seventeenth century, outside the language of continuity and stagnation, will surely show that the [political] crisis engendered innovations from Creoles and non-Creoles alike that prevented any realization of absolute sovereignty" (262).

[6] Velasco's study does not explore Tezozomoc's Nahuatl text, *Crónica mexicayotl*; his discussion of Tezozomoc is based on the Spanish text known as *Crónica mexicana*, a text which is different from the text in Nahuatl.

personal restitution as a direct descendant of noble lineage.[7] Hence, Chimalpahin's intellectual production is different from that of Ixtlilxochitl, Muñoz Camargo, and Tezozomoc's Spanish text as Chimalpahin's *Diario, Relaciones,* and his emended texts cannot be reduced to accounts seeking restitution of Indigenous privileges.

Similarly to Velasco's study of Nahua writers' attempts to be recognized as part of the native nobility through their writings, McDonough's book on Nahua intellectuals in post-conquest Mexico, a study which illustrates the continuity of Nahua intellectual production from the early colonial era into the Twenty-First Century, treats the work of Tlaxcallan Nahua author Juan Buenaventura Zapata y Mendoza (c. 1600?- 1688) in a similar manner. Even though Zapata y Mendoza wrote his *Historia cronológica de la ciudad de Tlaxcala* in Nahuatl and in pre-Hispanic annals form, much like Chimalpahin's own writings, he has more in common with the authors Velasco explores because he deploys the discourse of native nobility in order to make a claim as a direct descendant of the Tlaxcalan native nobility. According to McDonough, Zapata y Mendoza's text illustrates the way in which Tlaxcalan elites promoted their political autonomy and rights as leaders by appealing to three discursive pillars: "the assertion of pre-Hispanic noble lineage, loyalty to the Crown (first as military allies and later as administrators), and finally, faithful conversion to the Catholic religion," a discursive strategy shared by other Nahua writers of his time.[8] Moreover, as McDonough explains, "Records of the public performances found in Zapata's annals show each of the three discursive pillars deployed as critical tools in the affirmation and defense of the elite Tlaxcalan cabildo members' rights (and by extension that of their indigenous subjects) to continue to enjoy their separate, privileged status established in the earliest days of European conquest and colonization" (64). Hence, in McDonough's reading of Zapata y Mendoza's text one can clearly see his deployment of the discourse of elite native nobility to secure privileges under the Crown. For his part, Chimalpahin neither identifies as part of the native nobility nor invokes the discursive pillars of native nobility, much less performs it. Chimalpahin's intellectual project, then, is different as he writes from the perspective of an Indigenous commoner and directs his writings at Nahua readers of future generations. He is neither seeking recognition as a member of the native nobility, nor seeking to prove his loyalty to the Crown, nor is he focused on proving his faithful conversion to Christianity or that of his ancestors. Instead, as a Christian Indigenous observer who distances himself from the Indigenous nobility, he traces a cartography of power of the pre-Hispanic past and of his contemporary moment, explaining how the various groups in Cemanahuac gained, maintained, and, eventually lost political power and how Indigenous peoples had been dispossessed and marginalized after the conquest.

Additionally, my study of Chimalpahin also engages the recent work of Amber Brian, whose book on Ixtlilxochitl's native archive and the circulation of knowledge in Colonial Mexico focuses on the connections between Indigenous, mestizo, and creole intellectuals in

---

[7] In his *Diario,* Chimalpahin deliberately situates himself as a macehualli. In the *Relaciones*, even though he traces the genealogy of the native lords of Amaquemecan and his own family, he does not explicitly claim native nobility nor petitions for his recognition as such.

[8] For an in-depth discussion on lord's discourse see the work of Peter Villella. According to Villella, in post-conquest Mesoamerica, local native rulers developed a particular discursive genre as early as the 1550s which consisted of a series of recurring tropes and rhetorical formulas attuned to the Crown's priorities of monarchical loyalty, noble pedigree, and catholic orthodoxy in discourse known as "lord's discourse" in order to petition the Crown restitution for lost privileges as native nobles (19).

Seventeenth Century New Spain. By focusing on the works of Ixtlilxochitl and Sigüenza y Góngora, Brian proposes to rethink Ángel Rama's concept of the Spanish "lettered city" by highlighting the relationships between native, mestizo, and creole intellectuals and replacing it with the concept of "the colonial economy of letters" to present a "more nuanced and vibrant image of colonial intellectual life in Mexico" (10). Nevertheless, even though Brian's work broadens our understanding of the intellectual community of seventeenth-century New Spain by illustrating how authors such as Ixtlilxochitl were part of "an alternate lettered city with strong ties to the provincial countryside and the native communities" (30-31), it is important to differentiate between native authors such as Chimalpahin and mestizo and castizo authors such as Ixtlilxochitl given the biographic and historiographical differences between the two. One clear difference between the two authors is that Ixtlilxochitl insists on his native noble lineage even though he is a castizo while Chimalpahin does not claim native nobility even though both of his parents are of Nahua descent. Another important difference is that Ixtlilxochitl writes in Spanish for a Spanish speaking audience, i.e. the Spanish King, while Chimalpahin writes in Nahuatl for a Nahua speaking audience. Hence, my study focuses on the writings of Chimalpahin to trace an alternative Indigenous project rooted in what I call the "Cemanahuac archive"—an archive which comprises of pre-Hispanic pictographic histories and oral histories put into writing and the elaboration and re-elaboration of this tradition by Indigenous intellectuals into pictographic and alphabetic written form in Nahuatl after the conquest; an archive that safeguards the political history of the pre-Hispanic past and documents the dispossession of Indigenous peoples and their continuous marginalization and exploitation under Spanish rule. Given that Chimalpahin collected oral and pictographic histories and transcribed them into written texts—many of them clearly directed at a Nahuatl-speaking audience, much like Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicayotl*—Chimalpahin should be credited as one of the most significant contributors to this archive and tradition.

Besides engaging the scholarly work of literary scholars such as Velasco, McDonough, and Brian, my study of Chimalpahin also contributes to the work of historians of Colonial Latin America who have explored the historical writing of Chimalpahin. First and foremost, my study seeks to complement the work of Susan Schroeder, one of the most important scholars on Chimalpahin.[9] Besides her important work as translator of Chimalpahin's Nahuatl texts, Schroeder's works also explains Chimalpahin's known biography, his intellectual production, and his reconstruction of the ancient history of the pre-Hispanic past (not only that of his native *altepetl* of Chalco Amaquemecan but also other Central Mexican city states). While Schroeder presents an excellent explanation of Chimalpahin's reconstruction of the pre-Hispanic past from a Nahua perspective, she does not present an interpretation of his work beyond his reconstruction of the pre-Hispanic past and its preservation as a "glorious past" for future generations of Nahuas to admire. For instance, in her introduction to her edition of *Codex Chimalpahin* Schroeder

[9] Susan Schroeder has published a number of works on Chimalpahin, among them: *Chimalpahin and the Kingdoms of Chalco* (1991); in collaboration with J. O. Anderson, *Codex Chimapahin: Society and Politics in Mexico Tenochtitlan, Tlatelolco, Texcoco, Culhuacan, and Other Nahua Altepetl in Central Mexico* (1997); in collaboration with James Lockhart and Doris Namala, *Annals of His Time* (2005); "The Annals of Chimalpahin" (2007); in collaboration with David Tavárez and Cristián Roa de la Carrera, *Chimalpahin's Conquest: A Nahua Historian's Rewriting of Francisco Lopez de Gómara's* La Conquista de Mexico (2010); and "The Truth About the *Crónica mexicayotl*" (2011).

writes: “In deed, the politics of colonial life in Mexico City were Chimalpahin’s reality, but the Indian world continued to be his immediate reference, and he did what he could to ensure that future generation of Nahuas would have a record of their illustrious past” (4). And in her introduction to the English translation of Chimalpahin’s edition of Gómara’s *La conquista de México,* Schroeder writes: “Presumably, [Chimalpahin’s] interest was in providing a comprehensive history of Indian Mexico so that future generations of Nahuas would know of their glorious past” (6), to later add, “Chimalpahin wrote, he said, so that future generations would know of ancient Mexico’s cultural heritage” (14). Here we see Schroeder’s emphasis on Chimalpahin’s efforts to document a “glorious past” that does not present an interpretation of the value of this knowledge aside from “knowing” the greatness of their “cultural heritage." Similarly, in their English translations of Chimalpahin’s *Annals of His Time,* Schroeder, James Lockhart, and Doris M. Namala illustrate the way in which Chimalpahin continues the tradition of the Mesoamerican annals form and interpret the *Annals* as a celebration of the greatness of the *altepetl* of Mexico Tenochtitlan, i.e. the colonial capital. The authors explain:

> Chimalpahin often repeated respect for the ruling authorities, indigenous and Spanish alike, speaks to the annalist’s deeply felt responsibility to portray the greatness of his altepetl, and it’s both Spanish and indigenous officials, both secular and ecclesiastic, who more than anyone else represent this greatness. Altepetl reportage and magnification is Chimalpahin’s basic thrust, and a quite noncommittal but approving stance is his main mode, both of these things fully within the Nahua annals tradition (*Annals of His Time* 7).

Hence, my study builds on Schroeder’s work by exploring the utility of his careful reconstruction of the pre-Hispanic past and his documentation of his present historical moment as more than mere preservation of a “glorious past” and “greatness” of ancient Mexico’s cultural heritage and that of the colonial capital.

Additionally, my study of Chimalphain engages the work of historians of colonial Latin America who interpret the writings of Indigenous, mestizo, and castizo writers of late 16th and early 17th Century as efforts to preserve native privileges with the elaboration of dynastic histories. In her discussion of the dynastic histories of Indigenous, mestizo, and castizo authors, among them Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc, Ixtlilxochitl, and the Inca Garcilaso, among others, María Elena Martínez writes:

> Colonial Spanish American literature thus shared rhetorical formulas with probanzas, petitions, (e.g. for cacicazgo titles), and accounts (*relaciones)* submitted to the Spanish king… The descendants of pre-Hispanic dynasties and Spanish conquerors were particularly invested in the construction of those narratives because it gave them a double claim to political and economic privileges (114-115).

While Martínez interpretation of the works of Indigenous, mestizo, and castizo authors explains how they used dynastic histories to make claims as direct descendants of the native nobility in order to gain political and economic privileges, one must distinguish between the works of authors who presented themselves as members of the native nobility and those who did not. As I mention above, Chimalpahin does not make a case for himself as a direct descendant of the native nobility nor petitions for personal privileges. In tracing the genealogy of who were the legitimate Indigenous rulers of various city states before and after the conquest, Chimalpahin’s

efforts are different; he traces a genealogy of power, explaining how the various city states came into prominence, how they lost political power, and how the remaining existing nobility were losing their positions of power as governors in the *repúblicas de indios*[10] by being displaced by non-Indigenous and Indigenous rulers who were not the legitimate rulers of a particular *altepetl*. Moreover, one must not reduce the historical writings of these authors to *probanzas*, petitions, or *relaciones* seeking political and economic privileges. Instead, one could explore the possibility of reading the dynastic histories of Nahua intellectuals as more than efforts to secure noble privileges, perhaps as efforts to inspire Indigenous peoples to reclaim their political institutions and land.

Postconquest traditional Nahua Annals in Written Form

Before continuing, it is important to briefly discuss the Mesoamerican annals tradition and explain how Chimalpahin both continues and transcends it. According to Lockhart, the pre-Hispanic annals tradition continued into the colonial era and throughout the 16th and 17th centuries in written form in the works of Nahua authors such as Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc, Zapata y Mendoza, and other anonymous annalists (*The Nahuas After the Conquest* 387-392). Accordingly, these postconquest annals histories followed the preconquest tradition of the *xiuhpohualli* ("year count" or "count relation"), the *xiuhtlacuilolli* ("year writing"), the *(ce)xiuhamatl* ("[each] year paper") and the *altepetlacuilolli* ("altepetl writing") (376). Either as "year count", "year writing", "year paper", or as "altepetl writing", the preconquest tradition continued with Nahua annalist of the 16th and 17th centuries. Furthermore, as Lockhart makes explicit, "All known postconquest annals, whether the author is named or not, are personal, unofficial enterprises even though the altepetl is their primary topic, and they are correspondingly full of partisanship" (376). Here Lockhart points to important characteristics of the postconquest annals that are worth highlighting. On the one hand, Nahua annals are both personal (focused on events relevant to the life of the *tlacuilo* writing) and unofficial enterprises, two major features that distinguish the genre from the works of Nahua authors working under the auspice of the religious or secular authorities and those who wrote "official" reports and petitions directed to the viceroy or the Spanish Monarch. On the other hand, postconquest Nahua annals are also *altepetl*-centered and partisan. As such, even though postconquest Nahua annals are personal and unofficial, they preserve the pre-Hispanic characteristic of *altepetl*-centered histories, texts which document the history, genealogies, and experience of a particular *altepetl*.

In terms of content, Nahua annals follow the preconquest tradition of documenting changes in political office and major events affecting the *altepetl*. When referring to events in the preconquest era, "migrations, foundations, wars, [and] dynastic conflicts" are among the events recorded; for the postconquest era, events such as "election disputes, changes in tribute, jurisdictional strife and rearrangements including *congregaciones*, and any other striking or controversial developments" are among the events prioritized (378). Besides these *altepetl*-centered concerns related to the history of the *altepetl* and political offices, annals include noteworthy events such as natural phenomena—comets, solar eclipses, earthquakes, snow and

[10] The *república de indios* refers to the colonial juridico-political system which granted distinct rights, privileges, and obligations to native communities as integral part of the colonial system. According to María Elena Martínez, the *república de indios* "essentially allowed political and socioeconomic subordination of the indigenous people at the same time that it granted them special status as Christian vassals of the Crown of Castile" (*Genealogical Fictions* 92).

hail storms, heavy rains, floods, dry years and years of famine—social and political spectacles, scandals, theatrical productions, public hangings, social disturbances, murders, the arrival of papal bulls, miraculous images of saints, among other noteworthy events (378). Nevertheless, according to Lockhart and other experts on Nahuatl writing, these annals were centered on the history and experience of the *altepetl.* Additionally, Nahua annals include personal information related to the author or authors, even when the authors do not identify themselves by name.

In relation to form, postconquest Nahua annals contemporaneous to Chimalpahin consist of two parts. The first part narrates events which took place prior to the time in which the *tlacuilo* begins his career as writer, extending back in time into the history of his ancestors and preconquest era.[11] The second part deals with the time in which the *tlacuilo* wrote, often incorporating other Nahua annals, current events, personal observations, and public knowledge into his account (380-381). It is worth noting that the entries corresponding to the time in which the *tlacuilo* wrote are usually longer and contain more detailed information about the events described; however, as we will see in Chimalpahin's case, some events capture the attention of the *tlacuilo* more than other events. Moreover, most Nahua annals begin each annual entry with the Nahua name of the year, in Nahuatl, by referring to one of the four year-signs and its corresponding number (from 1 to 13), followed by its equivalent in the Christian calendar written in Arabic numerals. Thus, the reader encounters the two calendric system throughout text as the *tlacuilo* narrates significant events in each of the entries.

Another important feature of postconquest Nahua annals is that they are nonreflective and noncommittal. In Lockhart's view, "The one thing that does often draw the annalist commentary is spectacle. For any occasion, good or bad, the highest and most frequently seen accolade is 'never was the like of it seen before' or 'never since the arrival of the true faith had such a thing happened'" (383). This nonreflective and noncommittal perspective of the Nahua annalist appears as a detached and disinterested gaze that merely reports on what the *tlacuilo* observes. Even when reporting on spectacular events, the Nahua annalist appears as a detached observer, without evaluating or judging the occurrence or issues reported, "without explicit reflection, analysis, or generalization" (384).

Chimalpahin's 17th Century Nahua Annals

Even though Chimalpahin's *Annals* retains the traditional annals form and includes the content discussed above, following it "almost to the letter" (387), he is exceptional and unique for several reasons. Besides his elegant use of the Nahuatl language, Chimalpahin is the only annalist who openly reflects. Lockhart makes this point clear when referring to Chimalpahin's views of hispanized mestizo governors:

> For open reflection by a true Nahua annalist on this topic (or indeed any other, to my knowledge), we must go to Chimalpahin… [He] give[s] open, emotional praise to certain high-ranking mestizos who still acknowledge and revere their origin… The greatest of the annalist, Chimalpahin is both typical and atypical. This reflective mode is his alone,

[11] According to Lockhart, following his study of the development of colonial Nahuatl, Stage 2 annals, annals written between 1550 to 1650, include the history of pre-conquest era while Stage 3 annals, written from 1650 onward, "are often without any preconquest section at all" (386).

> possibly as a function of the fact that his work is more highly developed in general than any other (385).

This "reflective mode" of Chimalpahin is important to consider as it sheds light on his intellectual project. Hence, one must pay close attention to those moments of reflection and critique in which Chimalpahin speaks to the reader not merely as a detached observer but as a critical observer who wants to communicate certain aspects of the worlds he inhabits.

Besides including moments of reflection in his annals, entries which are usually longer narratives which describe specific events in detail, another aspect of Chimalpahin's work which sets him apart from other Nahua annalist is that he writes not only about his native *altepetl* of Chalco but also about Mexico Tenochtitlan and other Nahua *altepeme*. While Nahua authors such as Tezozomoc and Zapata y Mendoza focus their writings on their native *altepeme*, Chimalpahin writes about both his native Chalco and Mexico Tenochtitlan, the city in which he spent most of his adult life. Writing extensively about both *altepeme* and other Nahua polities while incorporating events taking place across the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans, in Europe and Asia, is an important aspect of Chimalpahin's annals that must be seriously considered.

Even though scholars have identified Chimalpahin's "reflectiveness" and his tendency to write not only about his native Chalco but also about Mexico Tenochtitlan, scholars have not given enough attention to the significance of these two unique aspects. Hence, it is important to explain the significance of the unique characteristics that make Chimalpahin's work stand out from other Nahua annalists. For instance, it is important to analyze the events or issues he reflects on and critiques and seriously consider the significance of Chimalpahin's interest in writing not only about his native Chalco but also about Mexico Tenochtitlan and other polities and about events taking place in Europe and Asia. Moreover, one must try to explain the possible influences which lead Chimalpahin to include longer narratives in some of his entries and not simply see it as an anomaly or as "more developed annals." (385). By focusing on these key aspects of Chimalphain's writing we can shed light into his intellectual project and not only explain how he stands out from other Nahua annalist but also illustrate how he positions himself in relation to European-born authors of his time and other Indigenous, mestizo, and castizo authors and Franciscan, Dominican, and Jesuit friars.

The Cemanahuac Archive

Chimalpahin compiles and produces an archive that safeguards the political history of the pre-Hispanic past and documents the dispossession of Indigenous peoples and their continuous marginalization and exploitation under Spanish colonialism. He draws from Indigenous painted and written texts and from the oral tradition and incorporates them into his annals. At the same time, Chimalpahin engages the work of European authors writing about New Spain in the early 17th century, not only copying from texts but challenging and revising the narratives these authors present based on his experience on the events he witnessed. As he does this, Chimalpahin incorporates the history of his Indigenous ancestors into global history, not merely subsuming Indigenous history into the history of the West, as his center of references is, throughout, the Indigenous continent. Chimalpahin utilizes the Indigenous sources he has at his disposal as well as European texts and the Bible to present an alternative narrative on the origin of Indigenous peoples and traces the political history of Cemanahuac as he presents a critique of the usurpation of legitimate Indigenous governments and the violence of the conquest. Thus, by documenting the political history of the Nahuas from time immemorial and situating Indigenous

peoples as the original inhabitants of the land while documenting the dislocation and dispossession of Nahua peoples after the conquest, Indigenous peoples, those who would survive his current moment of crisis, could reclaim their government institutions and land.

In compiling and producing such an archive, Chimalpahin extends the work of an earlier generation of Nahua *tlacuiloque* beyond *altepetl*-centered histories while appealing to Nahua readers of future generations. Such an intellectual project presents an alternative vision in which surviving Indigenous communities could retain and reclaim their Indigenous government systems and institutions while legitimizing their Indigenous rights to the land. In this way, Chimalpahin renews and archives the histories of his predecessors, putting them in writing, in Nahuatl, once again, to ensure they will be preserved for future Nahuatl readers.

Consequently, Chimalpahin's annals and the archive he compiles and produces preserve an alternative Indigenous history of Cemanahuac so that future generations of Nahuas and their descendants could one day reclaim their history, and in doing so, they could also reclaim their political institutions and their Indigenous lands for they were the original inhabitants of Cemanahuac who had been systematically displaced and marginalized by European invaders who had reduced Indigenous peoples to the status of commoners—dispossessing them of their land and denying them the right to govern themselves according to their millenary traditions. Thus, the histories Chimalpahin copies and produces make evident that he produces an archive of a history of survival and continuity, an Indigenous intellectual and historiographic project of self-determination in Nahuatl for Nahua readers and their descendants, a project for an Indigenous future.

Chimalpahin's archive, which I have called the "Cemanahuac archive", although fundamentally similar to the archive José Rabasa discusses in "In the Mesoamerican Archive: Speech, Script, and Time in Tezozomoc and Chimalpahin" as it illustrates that the Nahuatl annals of Tezozomoc and Chimalpahin "retain the Mesoamerican annalist tradition, the *xiuhamatl* (count of years), and express their accounts in a most elegant and refined Nahuatl speech, often citing verbatim the elders whose voices they collect" (205), calling it "Mesoamerican" can be misleading as it is too broad. To my mind, a Mesoamerican archive accounts for the histories of diverse Indigenous peoples who speak a variety of Indigenous languages—from Nahuatl, to Otomi, to Mixtec, and Maya, among others. Thus, a Mesoamerican archive can encompass a broad range of texts written in various Indigenous languages. Similarly, by calling it "Nahuatl archive", as Rabasa does when referring to the Mesoamerican archive toward the end of his article (229), also has its limitations as a Nahuatl archive can also encompass a diversity of texts written in Nahuatl—from language grammars to confessionals and other religious texts as well as an array of legal documents written in Nahuatl. Thus, my conception of the "Cemanahuac archive" seeks to refine Rabasa's concept of the Mesoamerican/Nahuatl archive by highlighting that the historical annals Chimalpahin, Tezozomoc, and other anonymous *tlacuiloque* of the 16th and 17th centuries write in the form of the *xiuhtlapohualli* preserve the political history of Indigenous peoples of Cemanahuac so that Indigenous peoples and their descendants could one day reclaim their history, land, and political institutions.

My conception the Cemanahuac archive also diverges slightly from Diana Taylor's concept of the "archive and the repertoire" in that the Cemanahuac archive continues to focus on written texts. It is focused on texts written in Nahuatl by Nahua *tlacuiloque* for Nahua readers.

As such, the Cemanahuac archive does not shift the focus of analysis away from written texts into "embodied memory: performances, gestures, orality, movement, dance, singing—in short, all those acts usually thought of as ephemeral, nonreproducible knowledge" (19), nor does it challenge the centrality of writing (16) but rather highlights Nahua intellectual production in Nahuatl for Nahua readers and their descendants. However, the Cemanahuac archive brings together the archive and the repertoire as the written texts capture the Nahua oral performances of the histories it documents. As Taylor rightly affirms: "Although the Aztecs, Mayas, and Incas practiced writing before the Conquest—either in pictogram from, hieroglyphs, or knotting systems—it never replaced the performed utterance. Writing, though highly valued, was primarily a prompt to performance, a mnemonic aid" (17). Consequently, the archive Chimalpahin compiles and produces captures theses performances as part of the histories he documents in alphabetic writing as they are derived from the oral tradition and from readings of painted texts. Thus, the Cemanahuac archive encompasses both the archival and the performative for, ultimately, as Taylor points out, the archive is not limited to written texts just as the repertoire contains verbal performances—songs, prayers, and speeches as well as non-verbal practices (21). Finally, as Taylor reminds us, "Part of the colonizing project throughout the Americas consisted in discrediting autochthonous ways of preserving and communicating historical understanding" (34). The Cemanahuac archive that Chimalpahin compiles and produces serves as an antidote to the colonialist impulse to discredit Indigenous ways of preserving and communicating historical understanding. As we will see in the chapters that follow, Chimalpahin's annals does exactly this: it preserves and communicates Indigenous historical understanding, in written form, for Indigenous readers of future generations and their descendants in the form of the *xiuhtlapohualli*.

Additionally, my conception of the Cemanahuac archive also diverges from Amber Brian's concept of the "Native archive." Whereas Brian's Native archive is informed by the collection of Indigenous texts the Tezcocan castizo intellectual Ixtlilxochitl archived and produced to highlight the interests of elite Nahua intellectuals and their connections, negotiations, and collaborations with the colonial authorities in defense of their privileges as Nahua elites, the Cemanahuac archive is focused on the political history of Cemanahuac before and after the conquest so that Indigenous peoples could reclaim their autonomy and self-determination as the original inhabitants of the land. Brian describes the Native archive as: "[A] collection [that] offers us an example not of an archive directly generated by viceregal power but one that represented the perspective and concerns of native landed elites as they engaged with the institutions of authority that kept the great public records of New Spain" (16). Even though Brian's conception of the Native archive shifts the analysis of the archive away from Spanish intellectuals and creole elites by privileging the production and archival of Indigenous documents by a castizo who was recognized as a member of the Indigenous nobility of Tezcoco and centers on the perspectives and concerns of Indigenous peoples, it is nevertheless focused on the interests of Nahua elites and their connections, negotiations, and collaborations with the Spanish colonial authorities. As such, although Brian's conception of the Native archive focuses on Indigenous texts and Indigenous archival practices under Spanish colonialism and expands Rama's insular model of the Spanish *lettered city*, it is nevertheless focused on the project of Nahua elites such as Ixtlilxochitl who retained certain degree of privileges and power as descendants of the pre-Hispanic Nahua nobility, through which they claimed their right to govern the *macehualtin*—Indigenous commoners—and served as mediators between Spaniards and native communities. The Cemanahuac archive, on the contrary, shifts the focus from an

Indigenous intellectual project of Nahua elites who sought the recognition of the colonial authorities to an Indigenous project that seeks to preserve for future generations of Nahuas and their descendants the political history of Cemanahuac so that Indigenous peoples could reclaim their autonomy and self-determination based on their right as the original inhabitants of the land. Similar to what the Indian subaltern studies scholar Ranajit Guha identified in the case of colonial Indian, in which "parallel to the domain of elite politics there existed throughout the colonial period another domain of Indian politics in which the primary actors were not the dominant groups of the indigenous society or the colonial authorities but the subaltern classes" (42), in colonial Mexico there also existed a parallel intellectual and political domain, that of the *macehualtin*.

Finally, my conception of the Cemanahuac archive also differs from the "Creole archive" we find in the works of Brading, Cañizares-Esguerra, and More. Rather than focusing on the way in which creole intellectuals appropriated themselves of Indigenous archives—whether as sources to figure as part of the Creole patriotic tradition (Brading 3); as the development of Creole "patriotic epistemology" (Cañizares-Esguerra 9); or as the "invention of [a] tradition" by which Creoles legitimized themselves as the "natural lords of their lands" (More 13)—the Cemanahuac archive focuses on how Nahua *tlacuiloque* of the late 16th and early 17th centuries preserved the political histories of their Indigenous ancestors in Nahuatl, in the form of the *xiuhtlapohualli*, for future generations of Nahua readers and their descendants in order to assert and reclaim their legitimacy as the original inhabitants of the land and as the legitimate rules of Cemanahuac. As such, the Cemanahuac archive presents a distinct conception of the archive by focusing on the archive Chimalpahin compiles and produces, an archive that is clearly distinct from that of creole patriots.

The Chapters

In the first chapter, "Writing from the Margins, Challenging Elite Spanish Discourse: Chimalpahin's View of Mexico Tenochtitlan", I explore the ways in which Chimalpahin systematically copies from, revises, and translates into Nahuatl the works of European-born authors Bernardo de Balbuena (1568-1624), Henrico Martínez (1560-1632), Mateo Alemán (1543-1615?), and Antonio de Morga (1559-1636), authors who had adopted the capital city of New Spain as their home and held positions of power in the colonial administration. The chapter illustrates that Chimalpahin does not merely borrow or copy from the texts of these European authors who perpetuate the celebratory discourse Balbuena's poem *Grandeza mexicana* inaugurates. By presenting a close reading of the Spanish texts Chimalpahin copies from and revises and comparing them to Chimalpahin's own Nahuatl text, I illustrate that Chimalpahin's *Annals of His Time* counters the Eurocentric discourses that celebrate the greatness of New Spain and its capital city, reclaiming the city he unapologetically calls by its autochthonous name, Mexico Tenochtitlan, as he creates a Nahua archive for future generations of Nahua readers to understand the political history of Cemanahuac during pre-Hispanic times and how Indigenous peoples had been dislocated with the conquest and their continuous marginalization at the turn of the 17th century.

In the second chapter, "Nahua Writing at a Moment of Crisis: Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc, Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, and Domingo Chimalpahin", I focus on the works of two prominent Nahua authors of the late 16th and early 17th Centuries in relation to the writings of Chimalpahin and the intellectual projects that can be discerned from their works. I begin by

exploring the works of Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc (c. 1520s – c.1610), a direct descendant of Moctezuma II who is perhaps the best known and most celebrated Mexica chronicler and annalist who wrote both in Spanish and Nahuatl. I then turn to Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl (1578-1650), a *castizo,* who descended, through the maternal line, from the famous Texcocan ruler Nezahualcoyotl and whose known works are written in Spanish in the form of *relaciones*. Finally, I turn to Chimalpahin, who, although from a commoner background, exceeded by a great margin the intellectual production of his Nahua contemporaries and wrote primarily in Nahuatl. In exploring the works of these three Nahua authors, I illustrate that while Tezozomoc was still limited by the *altepetl*-centered histories of his predecessors and contemporary *tlacuiloque* and writes for both Spanish-speaking and Nahua audiences, Ixtlilxochitl deployed a discourse of native nobility focused on his personal and familial interests by appealing to the colonial authorities, perpetuating a discourse that has become known as "lord's discourse." For his part, Chimalpahin extends the work of an earlier generation of Nahua *tlacuiloque* beyond *altepetl*-centered histories while appealing to Nahua readers. Thus, I argue that in the work of Chimalpahin we encounter a continuation and expansion of the Nahuatl work of Tezozomoc and other *tlacuiloque* of an earlier generation and one that deviates from Ixtlilxochitl's project directed at the colonial authorities, an intellectual project for the future at a moment of crisis which not only preserves the ancient history of his ancestors but also documents their dislocation and dispossession.

In the third chapter, "Christians Friars' Histories of Ethnocide and Chimalpahin's Historical Annals as a Project of Ethnogenesis", I explore the works of Bernardino de Sahagún (1499-1590), Diego Durán (c.1537-1588), Juan de Tovar (1543-1623), and José de Acosta (1540-1600) in relation to the historical annals of Chimalpahin to illustrate that Chimalpahin's historical writings diverge significantly from the works of the friars. While the friars write a history that focuses on the Mexica and present Indigenous history as foreclosed while also writing ethnographic treatises to extirpate Indigenous idolatric practices in order to advance their evangelization projects, Chimalpahin's historiographic project is very different. The Nahua annalist writes a broader history in Nahuatl for Nahua readers of future generations that focuses on the political history of Indigenous peoples of Cemanahuac to reactivate the Indigenous subject as subject of history and calls on Indigenous peoples to reclaim their history, land, and political institutions. Consequently, contrary to the friars' treatises and histories of ethnocide, Chimalpahin's historical annals evidence an Indigenous project of ethnogenesis— the writing and archiving of texts that allows Nahua readers and their descendants to reclaim and reactivate the history of their ancestors, that is, the history of Cemanahuac, thereby allowing Indigenous peoples recover and reclaim their cultural, social, and political practices.

Writing from the Margins, Challenging Elite Spanish Discourse: Chimalpahin's View of Mexico-Tenochtitlan.

De la famosa México el asiento,
origen y grandeza de edificios,
caballos, calles, trato, cumplimiento,
letras, virtudes, variedad de oficios,
regalos, ocasiones de contento,
primavera inmortal y sus indicios,
gobierno ilustre, religión y estado,
todo en este discurso está cifrado.

Bernardo de Balbuena, *Grandeza mexicana* (1604)

Yn ipan axcan viernes ye XXVII mani metztli de agosto de 1604 a[ño]s, ça iuh moztla ylhuitzin S[an]t Augustin, auh huel iquac peuh in tlapaquiyahuitl ynic momanaco, huell ipan yn ivisperatzin S[an]t Augustin; chicueylhuitl yn quiyauhtimanca cemilhuitl cecenyohual, huel tetlaocoltin yn topan mochiuh. Yhuan nohuian tlatlaxicac yn tochachan in timacehualtin yhuan castilteca, yhuan in teopan nohuian atl nenez mollon yn atl… Auh ynic cecemilhuitl yhuan yn cecenyohual quiyauh, ca nohuian ynic moch ipan Nueva España yquac nohuian mollon motlatlapo yn aoztotl, ynic cenca miec oncan oquiz atl, yhuan yn intech tetepe nohuiampa hualtemoc yn atl; auh ynic nohuian ypan Nueva España mieccan yn atocohuac yhuan netlapacholloc, xixitin yn calli,yhuan yquac cequi hualmomimillo yn ceppayahuitl huallixxitin yn Iztactepetl. Auh occenca nican Mexico yn ipan ohualtemoc yn tepetitech atl, ynic cenca ypan otemico ye polihuizquia yn altepetl; auh ynic nohuiampa hualtemoya yn hualla miequiliaya yn atl, huel huey ynic macoc, auh mieccan papachiuh xixitin yn calli yhuan ahapachiuh acallac yn calli,ye mocalcauhque in chaneque; yhuan yn otli nohuian popoliuh, yhuan yn chinamitl huel nohuian poliuh [12]

Domingo Chimalpahin, *Annals of His Time* (1608-1615) [13]

[12] El viernes 27 de agosto de 1604, víspera de la fiesta de San Agustín, comenzó a caer un aguacero muy fuerte; durante ocho días estuvo lloviendo, día y noche, [esa] gran aflicción se abatió sobre nosotros. Hubo goteras en todas las casas de los naturales y de los españoles, y en todas las iglesias empezó a brotar el agua.... Y porque estuvo lloviendo día y noche, en toda la Nueva España se abrieron los manantiales, salió de ellos mucha agua, y también de los cerros bajó [en abundancia]; en muchas partes de la Nueva España hubo ahogados y enterrados, porque se cayeron casas, y además se rodó nieve del Iztactepetl. Principalmente a la ciudad de México bajó agua de los cerros, y se llenó tanto que estuvo a punto de perecer; y como bajaba de todas partes, hubo muchísima agua, en muchas partes se derrumbaron las casas o se anegaron, por lo que sus habitantes tuvieron que abandonarlas; todos los caminos se echaron a perder, y lo mismo las chinampas.

[13] The Nahuatl citations translated into Spanish that appear in this chapter are taken from Rafael Tena's Spanish edition of Chimalpahin's *Annals of His Time*. I opted for Tena's Spanish translation over Lockhart et al's English

Introduction

Chimalpahin's *Annals of His Time*, a text often referred to as Chimalpahin's "Diario", presents a critical vision of the colonial capital of New Spain, a city he does not hesitate to call by its autochthonous name, Mexico-Tenochtitlan. Responding to European authors Bernardo de Balbuena, Henrico Martínez, Mateo Alemán, and Antonio de Morga who had adopted the colonial capital as their home and present an ideal image of the city and praise its greatness, Chimalpahin's *Annals* presents a radically different image of the city, revising their narratives and celebratory discourse and translating it into Nahuatl for future generations of Nahua readers to understand how the colonial capital came into being and the dire condition of indigenous people at the turn of the 17th century. This reading of Chimalpahin's *Annals* diverges from the interpretation of scholars who read his *Annals* as a celebration of the greatness of the colonial capital (*Annals of His Time* 7). My reading of Chimalpahin's *Annals* builds on José Rabasa's insight that one can find a critical consciousness in Chimalpahin's accounts of contemporary events ("In the Mesoamerican Archive" 224). I argue that Chimalpahin's *Annals*, far from being a celebration of the colonial city, maps the structures of colonial power and illustrates the failure and intolerance of the colonial state and the precarious condition of the indigenous people of central Mexico at the turn of the 17th century. Writing from the margins of the colonial capital as a member of the indigenous community that had been dislocated with the conquest and continued to be exploited and marginalized during his own time, Chimalpahin's *Annals* presents a critical view of the colonial capital which undermines the views of his contemporary European-born men of letters who, in their representations of the colonial capital, celebrate the colonial city and its grandeur, erasing, distorting, or dismissing the history and existence of the indigenous people.

As the *mayoral*[14] of the chapel of San Antonio Abbad in Xoloco, a district at the margin of the city center, Chimalpahin was in a privileged and unique position to document life in the colonial capital: not only was he a literate Nahua and a keen observer, living and working at the chapel gave him the opportunity to observe and write, documenting what occurred in the colonial capital from the margins. However, even though Chimalpahin was literate and held a position at the chapel, it is important to highlight that, as an indigenous commoner, he could not have been part of the intellectual community and circles of power to which his European-born contemporaries belonged. Moreover, he could not benefit from the privileges allotted to the indigenous nobility,[15] excluding him from the elite intellectual circles other indigenous and mestizo authors of his time participated in. As Camilla Townsend has shown, Chimalpahin was not the social equal of authors such as Tezozomoc and Ixtlilxochitl (Townsend 155). Thus, Chimalpahin was removed from the native nobility and from Spanish intellectual circles. As a

translation because Tena's Spanish edition precedes the latter and it facilitates comparison to other Spanish texts I cite throughout the chapter. Yet, I have consulted the original manuscript found in digitalized form in the BNF website along with both Tena and Lockhart et al's editions throughout and where I have found errors, inaccuracies, and/or mistranslations I point them out. I have also kept the page number of the manuscript in my citations.

[14] According to the *Diccionario de Autoridades*, "mayoral" refers to "El primero y más autorizado sugeto de alguna comumindad, cuerpo u otra cosa. Lat. *Praefectus. Major*." (cited in Rodrigo Martínez's "El Diario de Chimalpahin") (29).

[15] Among the privileges allotted to native nobility that Chimalpahin could not receive were: being able to hold the office of juez gobernador; be employed as interpreter in the courts; and be able to participate in social circles of Nahua elites.

subaltern subject writing from the margins of the city center and colonial society, his gaze maps the structures of colonial power and puts into question the discourse of European-born authors invested in presenting an idealized image of the city, an image that attempted to erase or distort the history of his ancestors. And, unlike more privileged Nahua authors who direct their writings to the colonial authorities, Chimalpahin does not.

Given the historical moment in which he wrote, a time in which severe demographic decline combined with labor exploitation and the continuous displacement of indigenous communities threatened the very existence of indigenous peoples in Central Mexico (Gibson 407), it was important for Chimalpahin to document the history of his indigenous ancestors and register their continuous presence in the city. While European authors who had settled in the colonial capital projected an idealized image of the city that either erased or distorted its indigenous history and marginalized its indigenous inhabitants, Chimalpahin's *Annals* serves as a corrective to the image these European authors project; thus, presenting an alternative image of the city, one that documents the deep history of his ancestors and presents them as the original and legitimate inhabitants of the land as he registers the dire condition of indigenous peoples of Central Mexico at the turn of the 17th Century.

Even though scholars have pointed out that Chimalpahin makes references to and borrows from Martínez, Alemán, and, to a certain extent, Morga, scholars have not explained the systematic way in which Chimalpahin copies, revises, and translates into Nahuatl the works of these European authors as he presents a more critical vision of the colonial capital. Moreover, scholars have not shown that Chimalpahin's *Annals* as a whole counters the *Grandeza mexicana* of Balbuena, a poem that inaugurates the celebratory discourse of the greatness of New Spain and the colonial capital the three other European authors mentioned above perpetuate in their writings. Thus, the aim of this chapter is to build on the work of Rodrigo Martínez who points out that Chimalpahin might have been inspired to write after seeing the published works of Henrico Martínez and the Creole Friar Juan Bautista in 1606 (Martínez 30) by exploring the ways in which Chimalpahin revises their narratives. Similarly, contrary to Camilla Townsend's interpretation that Chimalpahin borrowed "large passages" from Henrico Martínez and Fray Juan Bautista's texts (150-151) and Doris Namala's affirmation that Chimlalpahin "copi[es] extensively from Alemán['s]" narrative of the funeral procession of the deceased viceroy (167-168), my chapter seeks to illustrate that Chimalpahin does not merely borrow from his European contemporaries but revises theirs narratives, revisions that amount to Chimalpahin's critical revision of European authors. Additionally, this chapter contributes to Daniel Nemser's reading of Chimalpahin's critical perspective in his treatment of the execution of 36 blacks and mulattos in 1612 by focusing on Chimalpahin's use of the Nahuatl particle "quil"—"it is said that" / in Spanish "dizque,"—and the verb form "mihto"—"it was said"—, two Nahuatl expressions which are significantly different; it is important to highlight the difference between these two expressions because Chimalpahin's critical revision of the narrative of the state that criminalizes the black and mulatto population lies precisely in this difference.

Balbuena's *Grandeza mexicana* and Chimalpahin's (counter)vision of the colonial capital

The first of the Spanish-born authors I will discuss who adopted New Spain as his home and celebrates the greatness of the city is Bernardo de Balbuena. Born in Valdepeñas, Spain, in 1568, Balbuena immigrated to New Spain at the age of twenty-two and lived there for several

years before becoming bishop of Puerto Rico in 1624. After receiving an education in both Mexico and Spain, Balbuena earned fame as one of the most important poets of colonial America. He sang praises to the greatness of the colonial capital in his poem *Grandeza mexicana* (1604), an epistolary poem which propelled him to fame in New Spain's lettered city and in the Iberian Peninsula. The poem, one of the first Baroque style poems in the New World, consists of 1,964 verses; it begins with an *octava real* (cited in the epigraph) and through nine chapters in *terza rima* celebrates the greatness of New Spain's' capital city, presenting it as "insigne ciudad" (184), "pueblo ilustre y rico" (293), "ciudad ilustre, rica y populosa" (309), "centro del mundo" (309), "centro y corazón de esta bola" (333), "ciudad llena de todas las grandezas y primores" (337), among other praises which Balbuena writes throughout the poem.[16] Thus he presents an idealized image of the city.

In his ideal representation of the colonial capital, Balbuena systematically makes invisible the historical past and present of the indigenous peoples in the city. Unlike Chimalphain who insists on calling the colonial city by its indigenous name, Mexico-Tenochtitlan, Balbuena eliminates part of its autochthonous name, referring to it throughout the poem as simply "México." This mutilation of the name of the Aztec capital and his refusal to account for the origin of its indigenous inhabitants is one of many instances in which his poem attempts to make invisible the ancient roots of the city and its native population. There is clearly no room for indigenous people and culture in the marvelous city he presents. Consequently, it is not a surprise that the only reference to the native population of the 17th century appears toward the end of the poem when he refers to the figure of the native as "indio feo", an ugly subject—or rather, object—responsible for filling the Spanish fleet with the wealth that makes the capital city of New Spain the center of the world (343). As Stephanie Merrim has argued, "Balbuena exiles the Indian to the margins of the civilized world and to the bookends of the text" (122), ending the poem with "the infamous reference to the 'indio feo' [ugly Indian] who devotes himself to offering the tribute that fills imperial coffers" (123).

In the first chapter of the poem, Balbuena situates the colonial city as a place of perfection and as the "quicio" of the world, an important place in the global order from which other regions of the world depend (279).[17] This positioning of the viceregal city as a place of perfection and singular importance is significant because it presents the city as an ideal metropolis and positions New Spain as a place of geopolitical importance in the new global order. Thus, for Balbuena, Mexico City is the center of transcontinental commerce and not merely the periphery of either European or Asian empires. It is the greatest city and center of the world, a city in which products from all over the world find their destination (294). Yet, for all its magnificence, he fails to include any references to those responsible for constructing the city, i.e. the native population who constructed and maintained the city with the tribute labor they performed.

Balbuena's description of the origin of the city also reveals his vision of what constitutes its greatness. Far from situating the origin of the city in its pre-Hispanic past—the marvelous city

[16] In the citations of the four European authors and 17th century texts I discuss I have retained the original orthography found in the text . Thus, the reader will find orthographic variation and errors.

[17] According to the Diccionario de Autoridades, *Quicio* "Se llama metafóricamente qualquier cosa en que se afianza, mantiene, assegúra, o de que depende otra."

Bernal Díaz del Castillo describes in his *Historia verdadera de la conquista de Nueva España*— Balbuena situates the origin of the city after the conquest. If a spectacular Aztec city had existed before the arrival of the Spaniards, it is of no consequence to Balbuena. Thus, in his vision of Mexico City there is no room for the pre-Hispanic past and its grandeur since the greatness of the city clearly relies on the Spanish presence.

In the epilogue of the poem, once Balbuena has outlined the reasons that make Mexico City the center of the world, the poem suddenly shifts its focus on the city to praise Spain and its vast empire. It is in the epilogue where the reader can clearly see the imperialist impulse of Balbuena's poem even if the poem is appropriated by Creoles soon after its publication and used as part of the Creole project, as Merrim has argued when she points to the "exorbitant afterlife and performativity that run counter to the poem's original intent" (132). However, right before the poem shifts to praise Imperial Spain, the poet distorts the pre-Hispanic history of the Aztec capital once again in two stanzas that precede the final section of the poem. In the first stanza, Balbuena reduces the Aztec capital to a place of "chozas humildes, lamas, y laguna" (340). There is nothing here remotely close to a reference to the impressive Aztec capital early Spanish chroniclers such as Bernal Díaz and Cortés reported on and praised for its greatness and beauty. In second stanza, the poet makes clear that nothing remained of the old city when he writes: "y sin quedar terrón antiguo enhiesto, / de su primer cimiento renovada / esta grandeza y maravilla a puesto" (340). Thus, from its ruins, the magnificent colonial city rose into prominence.

Once the Spanish poet affirms that nothing remained of the Aztec capital, Balbuena turns to praise Imperial Spain in a stanza which marks a clear shift in focus from praising the greatness of the colonial city to the greatness of the Spanish Empire. Balbuena writes: "Oh España valerosa, coronada, / por monarca del viejo y nuevo mundo / de aquel temida, deste tributada" (340). This shift from praising the colonial city to praising Imperial Spain is significant because it illustrates that the Spanish-born poet imagines the city of Mexico as another European city, a city akin to the cities of his native Spain, leaving no room in his vision of the city and its population to incorporate indigenous influences. Thus, he presents the capital of New Spain as a European metropolis, a Spanish city in terms of culture, religion, and language, an ideal *república de españoles* insulated from the influences of its indigenous past and the thousands of indigenous peoples that surround the city and labor in it, day and night, developing its infrastructure and, at times, repairing the damage brought to the city by the sever rains. In this way, Balbuena's poem makes invisible the presence of indigenous peoples in the city and their forced labor in the development of the magnificent city he presents. Hence, for Balbuena, the only way in which the indigenous peoples of early 17th century New Spain become relevant is in their role as tributaries, as vassals of the Spanish empire responsible for filling the Spanish fleet with precious tribute (343). In the end, it becomes clear that besides celebrating the colonial city, Balbuena praises Imperial Spain and its vast empire, Mexico City being the noble Spanish city and center of the world that connects Spain to the Americas and Asia.

The chapter dedicated to the lettered city and its trades further illustrates Balbuena's vision of the city as the center of the world, a city in which one can find an abundance of "alquimistas sutiles, lapidarios, / y los que el oro hurtan a la plata / con invenciones y artificios varios; / el pincel y escultura, que arrebata / el ama y pensamiento por los ojos, / y el viento, cielo, tierra y mar retrata" (298). Even though Balbuena mentions numerous arts and trades here, he only considers the arts and trades of the European inhabitants of the city; thus, referring to

Spanish-born painters who, like himself, immigrated to the New World and established themselves in the colonial city, painters such as Andrés de la Concha, Alfonso Franco, and Baltasar de Echave (298). These immigrants are the "radicados" Merrim mentions in her study of the Spectacular City, "foreigners who had put down roots in the New World" (4). There is not even a remote reference to the indigenous artists of the barrio of San Juan mentioned in the *Annals of Juan Bautista* or the *tlacuiloque* of Sahagún's *Florentine Codex*. Balbuena also distinguishes between the Spanish lettered city and the rudeness of the surrounding towns and villages—i.e. the *república de indios*—when he writes: "si deseas vivir y no ser mudo, / tratar con sabios que es tratar con gentes, / fuera del campo y pueblo rudo, / aquí hallarás más hombres eminentes / en toda ciencia y todas facultades, / que arenas lleva el Gange en sus corrientes," (303). This vision of the lettered city clearly excludes the indigenous inhabitants. The men of knowledge and artists he describes are the *peninsulares*—and perhaps some *criollos*—but the figure of the *tlacuilo*, the feather workers, and the indigenous lapidaries are made invisible. Hence, the image of the intellectual and artistic city Balbuena represents is the city of Spanish intellectuals and artists.

For Balbuena, Mexico City is also a marvelous and vibrant place in which the pleasures of the world abound. Precious ivory from India, perfumes from Arabia, iron from Vizcaya, gold from Dalmacia, silver from Peru, spices from Maluco, silk from Japan, pearls from the Pacific, mother of pearl from China, among other valuable products find their destination in the colonial city (308). These products abound in the capital city, and their exuberance is displayed in the lavish celebrations promoted by the colonial authorities (311).

Besides the city's wealth, Balbuena writes, its temperate climate and ideal landscape make Mexico City an ideal place in the world, a "paraíso mexicano" in which "Todo el año es aquí mayos y abriles" (312). As such, in this Mexican paradise one can also find magnificent flora and fauna. With this image, Balbuena projects an inviting image of the city to the Spanish reader.

In the chapter entitled "Gobierno Ilustre," the poet describes the eminence of its political leader, viceroy Gaspar de Zuñiga y Acevedo, who governed as he wrote his celebrated poem and to whom he dedicates it. According to Balbuena, viceroy Gaspar de Zúñiga embodied the virtues of the seven preceding viceroys while attributing the city's greatness to its present ruler (319). Along with the viceroy, Balbuena praises the colonial government institutions and its adminitrators: the Real Audiencia, the *cabildo*, "Fiscales, secretarios, relatores / abogados, alcaldes, alguaciles, / procuradores, almotacenes, otro tiempo ediles, / recetores, intérpretes, notarios, / otros de menos cuenta y más serviles" (320). This description of Balbuena is, without a doubt, the lettered city Ángel Rama theorizes in his influential study.

In the chapter focused on "Religión y Estado," Balbuena highlights the religious and secular institutions located in the city which make it a city without equivalent, venturing to call it a "nueva Roma" (330). However, for all its magnificence, Balbuena never mentions where the labor for constructing all those institutions comes from. As Merrim has shown in her study of the colonial city, "the poem itself never shows the Indian at work" (123). In Balbuena's representation of the city, the buildings and infrastructure that make the city great appear to come out of thin air. In doing this, Balbuena makes invisible the native tribute labor at the core of the development of the city, the labor of thousands of indigenous peoples from all the corners of

Central Mexico who were forced to provide the labor for the construction of the city by mandate of the viceroy. As we will see, this tribute labor and the deaths and suffering of thousands of indigenous peoples is highlighted in Chimalpahin's vision of the colonial city.

After considering Balbuena's representation of the colonial city, we can turn to the way in which Chimalpahin's text presents a vision which undermines the vision of the Baroque poet. Although it is not known if Chimalpahin read the poem, his *Annals* presents a vision of the colonial capital that serves as a corrective to the Eurocentric, idealistic vision of Balbuena. Even though the reader encounters in the *Annals* a description of religious and secular institutions and exuberant secular and religious festivities, the reader also encounters their opposites: destructive natural disasters, cruel exemplary punishments, the disparate mortality rates of indigenous people, labor exploitation, the usurpation of Spanish governors in indigenous municipalities, and the constant threat of foreign empires and pirates along its coasts. Thus, Chimalpahin's *Annals* present an image of an unstable and violent colonial capital which exploits and threatens the continuing existence of indigenous people and exerts violence on certain minority sectors of society. Hence, far from presenting an ideal image of the Spanish colonial capital, Chimalpahin's *Annals* traces the machinery of colonial power and its violence.

Chimalpahin's text also recasts Balbuena's ideal representation of the city by tracing the origin of the indigenous inhabitants of central Mexico and their continued presence in the city he insists on calling Mexico-Tenochtitlan. Early in the annals, Chimalpahin writes: "1 Tecpatl xihuit, 1584. Ypan in yn xihuitl onca matlacpohualxihuitl ypan yepohualxihuitl quichiuhque ynic cate mexica Tenochtitlan." [Año 1 Tecpatl, 1584. Entonces los mexicas cumplieron 260 años de estar en Tenochtitlan.] (BNAH, 18r). In this brief entry for the year 1584 Chimalpahin marks the arrival of the Mexica to Tenochtitlan as the indigenous origin of the city as he points to their continuous presence in the capital city. Unlike Balbuena, who does not discuss the indigenous origin of the city, Chimalpahin situates the city's origin in the arrival of the Mexica while pointing to their continuing presence.

Chimalpahin also makes the presence of indigenous people visible as he describes their participation in colonial life within the viceregal city. This is evident throughout the *Annals* when he describes their participation in religious and secular processions and ceremonies and in the everyday life of the city. For instance, he describes the participation of indigenous people in the church festival celebrating the Transfiguration of Christ when he explains:

> Yn ipan axcan domingo a V de septiembre, yquac macehualloc yn oncan quanpatlanilizquauhtitlan, ye motlanahuatilli visurrey; michcuicatl yn meuh. Yxquichtin huallaque in chinampaneca, xochmilca nauhteuhctin, yxquich hualla yn intlahuiz yn ipan macehuaco, yhuan yn Mexico Tlatilolco oficialesme yhuan tlacopaneca yn macehuaco, cenca tlamahuiçoque in tlahtoque yhuan obispome.
>
> [El domingo 5 de septiembre hubo danzas en la plaza del Volador, por órdenes del virrey; se ejecutó un canto de pescadores. Vinieron todos los chinampanecas, los cuatro señores de Xochimilco, que trajeron sus divisas para la danza, y también danzaron los oficiales de México Tlatelolco y los tlacopanecas, de que se admiraron mucho las autoridades civiles y los obispos] (8-9).

In this entry under the year 1593, Chimalpahin presents the continuation of indigenous traditions as they are performed in front of religious and secular authorities. These are public performances that highlight the presence of indigenous peoples in the viceregal city. Pages later, Chimalpahin presents another instance in which the indigenous people participated in a procession along the Spanish residents of the city, a religious procession in which they prayed for the end of a deadly epidemy (16). This procession and the religious celebration I describe above are just two instances in which Chimalpahin makes visible indigenous people's presence in the city as he describes their participation in religious processions and civic events. However, these descriptions should not be interpreted as mere celebratory inclusion of indigenous people in the colonial city but as Chimalpahin's conscious efforts to resist the erasure of indigenous people we find in Balbuena.

Chimalpahin also makes visible the labor they perform. Within the first two pages of the text, in the entry for the year 1583, Chimalpahin writes: "XIII Acatl xihuitl, 1583. Ypan in yquac moyecti motlacuicuilli yn acallotli yn nican Mexico, yn izqui acallotli; nohuiampa huitza yn altepetlypan tlaca." [Año 13 Acatl, 1583. En este año se repararon y se limpiaron todas las acequias de la ciudad de México; de todos los pueblos vino gente a prestar servicio] (BNAH 17v). This short entry illustrates the labor exploitation of indigenous people who were forced by the *repartimiento* to labor in the city by clearing the canals, repairing the stone walls that kept the water from flooding the city, developing the infrastructure, and constructing the colonial buildings Balbuena describes. Consequently, throughout Chimalpahin's text the reader encounters descriptions of the imposed labor tribute the various indigenous *altepetl* of central Mexico were required to provide for the colonial capital by order of the viceroy and Chimalpahin's critique. In the entry for the year 1607, for instance, he documents the labor imposed on the native people of the four subdivisions of Chalco (BNF 57). In the wake of destruction brought by the heavy rains, the viceroy demanded the Chalcas to provide the labor necessary to clear the flood that had destroyed the city, showing little concern for their well-being as he demanded them to first complete the widening of the stone wall before repairing their own homes (62).

In the entry for the following year, Chimalpahin continues to describe the suffering and death of the indigenous people of the lake region as a direct result of the imposed labor demands and makes clear that it was not only the Chalcas who provided the labor for the reconstruction of the city; the Mexica and others were also summoned to provide labor tribute. As scholars have pointed out, Chimalpahin is not only concerned with accounting for the history of the Chalca but also the Mexica and other indigenous peoples of central Mexico (Schroeder 230; Townsend 153; Lockhart 388). As Chimalpahin writes:

> Auh ye ytlamian in yn omoteneuh metztli de febrero de 1608 años, yquac mochintin onotzalloque nohuian yn anahuaca yn techyahuallotoque ytencopatzinco yn visurrey, ynic oncan huallaque mochintin macehualtin yn tlacpac omotocateneuh yn itocayocan Huehuetocan Citlaltepec; oncan otequitico ynic omoquetz yn aotlih, ynic omotatacac, ynic omotlapo omotlacohuiltec omocoyoni yn tepetl…. Auh yhuan cenca miec tlacatl macehualli oncan omomiquillico yhuan cequintin omococo oncan yn omoteneuhque altepetlypan tlaca yn otequitico ypan in ontetl metztli henero yhuan febrero yhuann ipan yn occequi metztli. Auh çan inceltin yn amaquemeque yn amo ompa tehuanme otequitito, çan yehuatl yntequiuh mochiuh yn tlacpac omoteneuh morillos quauhtlan quiquixtique.

> [Al final del mes de febrero de 1608 fueron llamados todos los macehuales vecinos de los alrededores, por disposición del virrey, para que fueran a Huehuetocan y a Citlaltepec; allá fueron a prestar servicio para hacer el canal, para excavar, abrir, cortar por en medio y horadar el cerro…. Allá murieron muchos macehuales, y otros enfermaron, de los pobladores que fueron a prestar servicio durante los dos meses de enero y febrero y otros más. Solo los amaquemecas no fueron a trabajar con los demás, porque su tarea consistía en sacar morillos del monte, como arriba se dijo] (66-67).

This passage makes clear that Chimalpahin not only accounts for the labor, suffering, and deaths of the Chalca and Mexica but also that of other *altepetl* who were summoned to provide labor and the number of indigenous people who perished and fell ill as a direct result of the labor demands. According to Townsend, the deadly toll that resulted from this imposed labor was a turning point for Chimalpahin given that "[i]n that year [1608], Chimalpahin began to write the deep history of his people's deep past. He would not see it swept away in the general devastation he saw everywhere" (150). As we can read from Chimalpahin's text and as Townsend points out, labor demands were taking a toll on indigenous communities. Thus, Chimalpahin understood the need to document the death and destruction that surrounded him, archiving for posterity the critical moment indigenous communities faced. If European authors such as Balbuena would dismiss the harsh reality of indigenous peoples during this moment of crisis, Chimalpahin would make sure that the demise of native communities as a direct result of labor demands would be documented for posterity.

Furthermore, Chimalpahin's counters the ideal image of the city Balbuena presents, an image that undermines the Baroque poet's view of a magnificent colonial government and its institutions. This opposing view is also evident in his critique of the religious authorities when he describes the abuses of Fray Jerónimo de Zárate, the *capellán* of the church of San José, a story he interweaves with his critique of the bad government of Fray García Guerra (162-163). Thus, in interweaving the two narratives which critique the religious and secular authorities, Chimalpahin's *Annals* opposes the idealistic vision that celebrates religious and secular colonial institutions.

Lastly, to conclude my discussion on how Chimalpahin's text counters Balbuena's *Grandeza mexicana*, let me add that the *Annals* serves as a corrective to Balbuena's Spanish lettered city. As I have explained thus far, Chimalpahin presents a critical vision of the colonial city, accounting for the ancient history of the indigenous people, placing the Aztec capital as the orign of the city, and showing the continuous presence of the indigenous people in the city both as participants in colonial life and as an exploited class. As such, Chimalpahin's intellectual project undermines the elite Spanish lettered city of Balbuena and serves as a clear example of what Rabasa terms "savage literacy" when he argues that "[a]lphabetical writing does not belong to the rulers" since "it also circulates in the mode of savage literacy… a form of grassroots literacy in which indigenous writers operated outside of the circuits controlled by missionaries, *encomenderos*, Indian judges and governors, or lay officers of the Crown (*Writing Violence* 12). As it is evident in Chimalpahin's text, European elites, their descendants, and the indigenous nobility were not the only ones writing. Indigenous commoners such as Chimalpahin also wrote and they presented a vision of the city and the world that did not conform to the vision and desires of European-born elites who had adopted the colonial city as their home. Nor did Chimalpahin's writing conform to the vision of elite Nahua intellectuals who sought to preserve

their privileges as members of the indigenous nobility, a topic I will turn to in the following chapter. Thus, Chimalpahin's *Annals* reveal a colonial *tlacuilo* whose intellectual project counters the vision of Balbuena's Spanish lettered city, documenting the continuous presence of indigenous peoples in the city and the exploitation of labor they endured.

Martínez's *Repertorio de los tiempos* and Chimalpahin's revision of his narrow historical narrative and his critique of the "sabios españoles."

Two years after Balbuena's poem is published and begins to circulate throughout the New World and Europe, another European-born author who had adopted the colonial city as his home presents Mexico City as the center of the world and as an ideal place. However, unlike Balbuena who praises the city in poetic verse, the German-born Heinrich Martin, known in the Spanish-speaking world as Henrico Martínez, turns to scientific discourse to place the city at the center of the world and present it as a place of opportunity for European immigrants who have adopted the city as their home. According to Serge Gruzinski, even though Martínez has been read as a Spaniard, a Frenchman, and even a Creole, Martínez was born in Hansburg, Germany, circa 1560, spending part of his adolescent years traveling through various cities in the Iberian Peninsula as he received training as printmaker and mathematician. He lived and traveled across Europe until 1589, the year he set sail to the New World in the fleet which brought Viceroy Luis de Velasco II to New Spain (*What time is it there?* 10-13).

Once in New Spain, Martínez became Royal Cosmographer under viceroy Velasco II, informing the Council of Indies about the New World as he provided detailed information about its territory and its people. He also served as interpreter for the Holy Office of the Inquisition and collaborated with the Dominican and Jesuit Orders by printing religious texts. Martínez played an important role in the colonial administration while maintaining a privileged position to publish his own scientific treatises about the continent and city he had adopted as his home since 1589. Consequently, he published a series of scientific works, among them his widely circulated *Repertorio de los tiempos y historia natural desta Nueva España* (1606), a text which Chimalpahin's *Annals* engages, revises, and rewrites in Nahuatl. Given his privileged position and training as mathematician, he led one of the largest and more complex engineering projects of his time, the draining of the lake, a project to which he was appointed soon after publishing his *Repertorio* in 1606.[18]

Martínez's *Repertorio* consists of five treatises on astronomy and a short history in European annals form on significant events on global history covering the years 1520 to 1590. In the first treatise, Martínez lays out his model of the universe based on Western ancient knowledge and the Holy Scriptures, situating the world as the center of the universe as he engages philosophers of antiquity who were, according to him, in error because they had not

[18] At the beginning of the 17th Century, the heavy rains and overflowing of the lakes presented a serious problem for the colonial authorities. The project of the draining of the lakes--*el Desagüe*-- started during the reign of Luis de Velasco II (1590-1595 and 1607-1611). Henrico Martínez was appointed as the person in charge of the massive project, hoping to find a solution to the continuous flooding of the city. Unfortunately, neither Martínez nor others' were successful in preventing the city from the floods as the city continued to experience flooding throughout the colonial era. See María José Rodilla León's book *Aquestas son de México las señas: La capital de la Nueva España según los cronistas, poetas, y viajeros (siglos XVI al XVII)* for a succinct explanation of the problem of the draining of the lake during the colonial era (103-107).

known the omnipotence of the Christian God who created the world from nothing (3). Early on he also provides a succinct definition of the science of Astrology and explains how it can be used to predict what takes place in the terrestrial world. Martínez writes:

> Astrología es lo mismo que ciencia de los Cielos y estrellas, divídese principalmente en dos partes, la primera trata de los movimientos de los Cielos y planetas, de sus varias conjuciones, oposiciones y concursos, y esta se dice comunmente Astronomía: la otra de que este capítulo se trata se dice Astrología Judiciaria que enseña a saber los efectos que los movimientos, conjunciones y aspectos de los cuerpos, movimientos y aspectos de los cuerpos celestes causan en estas cosas inferiores: es sciencia natural, porque tiene su fundamento en causas y razones naturales, y a venido a saberse por medio de la experiencia en la forma siguiente. (11)

With this precise definition of the science of Astrology Martínez illustrates that he is writing a scientific treatise and throughout the *Repertorio* he uses this science to present an explanation of the natural and social world by placing the sky of New Spain as the focus of analysis. Thus, like Balbuena, Martínez places the colonial capital at the center of the world but, unlike the Spanish poet, he incorporates the history of the original inhabitants of New Spain and the history of the Mexica empire and the Spanish conquest only to prove that the fate of the Mexica had been written in the stars.

Before engaging the questions of how the cosmos determine the fate of empires, however, a topic he turns to in treatises two and five, Martínez explains the practical uses of Astrology and Mathematics and how they can predict the climate and eclipses and allow him to calculate the distance between major cities in the world by situating Mexico City as the center of analysis, thereby repositioning the point of perspective of European cosmographers and geographers who explained the world by centering Europe and seeing the New World as peripheral. In this way, Martinez echoes Balbuena's repositioning of the New World and New Spain's colonial capital as the center of the globe.

It is important to note that in centering Mexico City as the reference point from which to calculate the distance between major cities in the world, most of the cities he includes are cities in New Spain and Peru without including any European city outside of Spain (76-80). By taking this approach, Martínez decenters Europe and places Mexico City as the center of scientific analysis. Neither the great European cities of the Spanish monarchy nor the cities of the Renaissance could continue to serve as the focal point of scientific analysis. Instead, the capital of New Spain becomes the focal point of scientific inquiry. Consequently, as Gruzinsky points out, "In this way Martin managed to specify a viewpoint which combined the local—the meridian of Mexico City—and the universal, while basing himself firmly in the American continent. This was a silent revolution in relation to the Eurocentric bias of the atlases and treatises of the Old World" (67). Yet, even though Martínez shifts the focus of scientific analysis to the American continent by centering it in the capital of New Spain, he continues to perpetuate a colonialist discourse. In the shifting of his gaze, looking at the world from Mexico City and privileging the colonial capital, one cannot avoid reading echoes of Balbuena's *Grandeza mexicana*. His scientific treatise had turned Mexico City into the center of scientific observation from which to predict the weather, natural phenomena, and the time difference between major cities in the world while marginalizing indigenous ways of knowing and being.

In the second treatise, Martínez shifts the focus of his discussion to the effect of celestial bodies on the social world, namely the fate of the Aztec empire. He begins to narrate the origins of the indigenous peoples of the New World by explaining they migrated from Asia through a land mass in the northern part of the American continent, echoing the explanation Joseph Acosta had established in his famous *Historia natural y moral* (1590) years earlier, discarding "fabulous" explanations of the origins of native peoples of the New World (103). [19]

Martínez's narrative moves quickly from their departure from an unnamed place in the north to their arrival in the lake region and their appointment of the first Mexica *tlahtoani*, Acamapichtli (108-110). This treatment of the origins of the indigenous inhabitants of New Spain and their migration story reveals that his main interest is in explaining the rise of the Mexica state to later justify its fall. There is no mention of the mythical Aztlan or Chicomoztoc, two important sites predominant in indigenous narratives of the origin of their ancestors. Consequently, as we will see below, Martínez's narrative on the origins of the Mexica rulers and their supposed fateful end is limited, as Chimalpahin will illustrate in his revision and translation of a portion of Martínez's text.

After describing the history of the expansion of the Mexica state and its leaders, Martínez's narrative turns to the omens which announced the fall of the Aztec empire, citing numerous examples from the Old Testament and from Western history to validate the omens that announced the fall of the Aztec empire (119-125). Even though the reader finds in the descriptions of these omens a mixture of natural phenomena and fabulous stories, when one considers the way in which Martínez frames the history of the Aztec empire and its end as part of his scientific treatise, it becomes evident that what Martínez pretends to show is that Astrological science can also predict the fall of empires, something he does in the following treatise when he discusses the effects of the conjunction of Saturn and Mars under Capricorn as it appeared in the sky of New Spain. Nevertheless, before presenting this claim, Martínez recounts the history of the discovery of the New World and the history of conquest, ending the second treatise with a list of Mexica rulers, beginning with Acamapichtli and ending with Moctezuma II, followed by a list of the Spanish viceroys of New Spain (152-155).

In the third treatise, Martínez extends his analysis on the effects of celestial bodies on the terrestrial world to explain the fall of the Aztec. According to Martínez, historical experience proves the effects of the cosmos on empires to be true as he proceeds to present examples on how the fate of the indigenous people of New Spain had been written in the stars (159). Thus, the fall of the Aztec empire had been predetermined since the conjunction of Saturn and Mars under Capricorn determined the territory's fate.

Besides attributing the fall of the Aztec empire to astrological causes, Martínez also attributes to this same planetary alignment the great epidemics of 1520, 1546, and 1576 (159-160). In taking this approach to explaining the depopulation of the native inhabitants of New

[19] In Book I, Chapters 16-20, of *Historia natural y moral de las Indias* (1590), Acosta engages this question of origins concluding that the people of the Americas came through the continent through land. As Acosta explains: "Así que ni hay razón en contrario, ni experiencia que deshaga mi imaginación u opinión, de que toda la tierra se junta y continúa en alguna parte; a lo menos se allega mucho. Si esto es verdad como en efecto me lo parece, fácil respuesta tiene la duda tan difícil que habíamos propuesto, cómo pasaron a las Indias los primeros pobladores de ellas, porque se ha de decir que pasaron no tanto navegando por mar como caminando por tierra" (56).

Spain during the colonial era, Martínez avoids accounting for the colonial violence and forced labor brought by the *repartimiento* which continued to threaten the existence of the native people of central Mexico, which, as Chimalpahin is sure to point out, was directly responsible for the demographic decline and suffering of his native compatriots.

The deadly epidemics which decimated the native population and hardly affected the Spanish residents leads Martínez to believe that the Spaniards were better suited than the indigenous inhabitants to live in this territory since they would be able to survive such natural phenomena. This view not only echoes Balbuena's description of the "buen temple" of the colonial city but also underpins one of Martínez central claims: the location of New Spain awakens the "ingenio"—ingenuity—of European immigrants. Basing his argument on the idea that just as the climate of any given territory can change, he concludes that the natural condition of individuals can also change (172). Martínez then proceeds to present a typology of the natural condition of indigenous peoples, Spanish *peninsulares*, and creoles—those of Spanish descent born in New Spain (178)—leading him to affirm that:

> De aqui viene que los q vienen de España y de otros reynos de Europa a estas partes, reciban alguna mudanza segun el temperamento e influencia celeste deste clima… está claro, que se avivan los ingenious a las personas que gozan de ellas, y así se ve por experiencia, que este reyno, las buenas habilidades forasteras se mejoran y las no tales se reparan (182).

This explanation illustrates that European *radicado* authors such as Martínez challenged European discourses that associate the Indies with degeneration and refuted European authors who continued to believe that the Torrid Zone was uninhabitable (168). However, even though Martínez challenges European discourses of degeneration, he insists on the natural superiority of Europeans when he explains that not all peoples are affected the same way and, thus, the *ingenio* of Europeans awakens in the Indies (176-177).[20]

As an appendix to his treatises on astrological science, Martínez presents a history in annals form covering the political and religious history of Europe from 1520 to 1590, particularly the expansion of the Spanish empire in the New World and Asia. However, far from simply including short entries for each of the years in his annals history, some entries consist of a longer narratives providing details for the specific historical event it describes. For instance, as his annals history comes to an end, in the entry for the year 1571, Martínez presents a narrative on the establishment of the Holy Office of the Inquisition in New Spain and its history in the Iberian Peninsula with a list of the leader of the institution in New Spain from the year it was stablished until the year of 1605, a list which Chimalpahin copies and translates into Nahuatl and extends to the year 1608 (265-269).

Now that I have discussed Martínez' *Repertorio*, I will turn to how Chimalpahin revises Martínez's narrow historical narrative in the second part of his *Annals*, the so-called "Compendio histórico", and his critique of the "sabios españoles." According to Rodrigo Martínez, the *Repertorio* served as a model to Chimalpahin's text (35) and he copied from Martínez "la lista de

[20] The pagination of Martínez's 1606 edition of the *Repertorio* is wrong. After page 196 it returns to page 167. The citation comes from the second set of pages.

virreyes e inquisidores, la historia de Cristóbal Colón y datos acerca de la semejanza entre españoles y europeos" (30). However, unlike Henrico Martínez who presents a brief and narrow account on the origins of the indigenous people of central Mexico, Chimalpahin presents a long and detailed account of the migration story of his ancestors after describing their arrival in Aztlan Teocolhuacan 1559 years from the time in which he wrote this section of his *Annals*, in 1608 (*Annnals of His Time* 73). After describing his indigenous ancestors's arrival in Aztlan, he proceeds to document their history of migration, the genealogy of their rulers—the *tlahtocayotl*—inter-ethnic conflicts, conquests, and other information found in traditional Nahua annals histories, leading into the conquest and continuing with the history of the early colonial era into the year 1608 to end with a list of indigenous rulers, viceroys, archbishops, and leaders of the Holy office of the inquisition (72-116). In this way, Chimalpahin writes the history of his ancestors in traditional Nahua annals form, in the form of a *xiuhpohualli* (the count of years), extending and revising Martínez's Spanish narrative.

Consider also the way in which Chimalpahin revises the failure of Martínez to include the name of the place of origin of his indigenous ancestors and their long history of migration. As Chimalpahin explains:

> Auh ya yetzonxihuitl ypan caxtolpohualxiuitl ypan cenpohuallonnahui xihuitl axcan yn opeuhque huehuetque chichimeca yn ompa ye huitze Aztlan Teoculhuacan, yn oncan ye hualquiztimani Chicomoztoc Quinehuayan, ynic ye moxexellohua ynic ye tlatlamancahuitze, ynic nican omotecaco omocecenmanaco yn ipan tlalli motenehua Nueva España; oiuh ye ce xihuitl mocuecuep yn intlahtol yn iquac opeuhque ye hualquiztimani, yn achtopa çan oc centetl catca yn intlahtol. Auh cenpohuallocaxtolli xihuitl yn çan oc ornpa cepan onoca cepan catca yn Aztlan, auh çan oncan quiçaco yn Chicomoztoc. Ca ye yzqui xihuitl oquichiuh ynic axcan ypan in yn itlamian yxiuhtzin t[o]t[ecuiy]o Dios de 1608 años.
>
> [Han pasado 1524 años desde que los antiguos chichimecas empezaron a salir de Aztlan Teocolhuacan para venir hacia acá, cuando se fueron pasando a Chicomóztoc Quinehuayan, cuando se dividieron para venir por grupos, para venir a asentarse y establecerse en esta tierra de Nueva España, al año de que se les habían confundido las lenguas, pues antes una sola era su lengua. Treintaicinco años habian estado todos juntos en Aztlan, cuando empezaron a irse a Chicomóztoc. Esos años se cumplen ahora, en este final del año de Dios nuestro señor de 1608] (74)

In this way, Chimalpahin names the land from which his ancestors migrated to later settle in the lake region, naming two important ancestral sites as their original homeland, Aztlan and Chicomoztoc, something Martínez simply ignores. Additionally, in what appears to be a recasting of the Biblical story of the Tower of Babel when he mentions that "mocuecuep yn intlahtol" [their tongues had changed], Chimalpahin points to the common origin of indigenous peoples of the Central Mexico, a topic he explores in depth in his *Relaciones históricas*.[21] Consequently, from the first two entries with which Chimalpahin begins to present the ancient history of the indigenous ancestor of the people of central Mexico, it is evident that he is

[21] In the next chapter I explore this question further as Chimalpahin engages this question in depth in the *Relaciones históricas* as he tries to explain the origin of his indigenous ancestors.

attempting to capture their origin and ancient history, carefully naming the places from which they migrated, the time of migration of the different ethnic groups, and identifying those who were already settled in the lake region. As he discusses the early migration of his ancestors, Chimalpahin documents the beginning of the *tlahtocayotl* of the Colhuacan people, the people from which the first Mexica ruler descended (75) to then proceed with a detailed history of the migration of the various ethnic groups, identifying their leaders, tracing their genealogies, describing some of the conflicts, the late arrival of the Mexica into the region, and the foundation of Tenochtitlan. In this way, Chimalpahin's revises the brief and narrow history Martínez presents in his *Repertorio*, a narrative which focuses on the rise of the Aztec state and its predetermined fall. In revising Martínez's narrative in annals form and writing it in Nahuatl, Chimalpahin produces an indigenous Nahua archive which challenges the narratives of European-born authors such as Martínez who distort the history of his indigenous ancestors and dismisses their place of origin as unimportant. By tracing the ancient history of his indigenous ancestors and naming the place from which they came, Chimalpahin situates indigenous peoples as the legitimate rulers of the land; they had settled and occupied the land from time immemorial and were, thus, the original inhabitants of the land.

Chimalpahin's *Annals* also serves as a corrective to the way in which Martínez treats the Mexica rulers. While for Martínez Moctezuma was the last Mexica ruler, intentionally excluding the two rulers who lead the indigenous resistance in defense of the Aztec capital, that is, Cuitlahuac and Cuauhtémoc, Chimalpahin not only includes these last two, but he continues tracing the genealogy of Mexica *pipiltin*—native lords—who continued to govern the Mexica people after the conquest while also explaining how the intrusion of the Spaniards altered the governing structures of Mexico-Tenochtitlan.

Far from simply dismissing the legitimacy of Cuitlahuac and Cuauhtémoc as Mexica rulers, Chimalpahin also includes a short narrative in his entry for the year 1524 on the torture the defeated indigenous lords experienced during this time, something Martínez's narrative does not mention (92). Additionally, in the entry for the following year, the year 7 Calli, 1525, Chimalpahin describes in a short narrative the unjust cause for which Cuauhtémoc and other indigenous lords were hanged, a narrative that contrasts with Martínez's explanation of the same event. Consider Chimalpahin's explanation of the event:

> Auh yhuan ye nauhpohualxihuitl ypan nauhxiuitl yn ipan 7 Calli xihuitl, 1525 años, yn omomiquillico yn tlacatl don Hernando Quauhtimoctzin, zan quinpilloque ytech pochotl ynehuan yn don P[edr]o Tetlepanquetzatzin tlahtohuani Tlacupa; çan tentlapictli yn quitzauhctiaque, yehuatl quintlatzontequilli yn marques don Fernando Cortes. Ompa yn Hueymollan quinpilloque; auh yn itech catca tlahtocayotl Quauhtimoctzin yn Tenochtitlan çan macuilxihuitl. Yhuan ompa momiquillito yn Hueymollan yn don Carlos Oquiztzin tlahtohuani catca Azcapotzalco Mexicapa; auh ynin tlahtohuani Oquiztzin çan cocolmic yn onpa Ondora. Auh yn don Juan Velasquez yn Tlacotzin cihuacohuatl ompa quitlah tocatlallica yn Marques yn Hueymollan, ye ytech hualyetihuia yn tlahtocayotl Tenochtitlan; ye hualmocuepaya yn Tlacotzin, auh ye oncan Nochiztlan Quatzontlan yn onmomiquilico. Ca ye yzqui xihuitl oquichiuh ynic axcan ypan in yn itlamian yxiuhtzin t[o]t[ecuiy]o Dios de 1608 años. Auh çan niman iquac yn ipan omoteneuh xihuitl 7 Calli xihuitl, 1525 años, yn oquauhtlahto don Andres de Tabian Motelchiuhtzin yn Tenochtitlan.

> [Han pasado 84 años desde que, en el año 7 Calli, 1525, murió el señor don Hernando Cuauhtemoctzin; lo colgaron de una ceiba, junto con don Pedro Tetlepanquetzatzin, tlatohuani de Tlacopan; fueron condenados por una acusación falsa, y quien los sentenció fue el marqués don Hernando Cortés. Los ahorcaron en Hueimollan; y Cuauhtemoctzin tuvo el señorio de Tenochtitlan solo durante cinco años. También murió en Hueimollan don Carlos Oquiztzin, tlatohuani de Azcapotzalco Mexicapan; este tlatohuani murió de enfermedad en Honduras. En Hueimollan, el Marqués puso a gobernar al cihuacóhuatl don Juan Velásquez Tlacotzin, con el cual terminó el tlatocayotl de Tenochtitlan; venía ya de regreso Tlacotzin, cuando murió en Nochiztlan Cuatzontlan. Esos años se cumplen ahora, en este final del año de Dios nuestro señor de 1608. Y luego, en el dicho año de 7 Calli, 1525, don Andrés de Tapia Motelchiuhtzin fue puesto como cuauhtlato de Tenochtitlan] (93).

In this short entry for the year 1525 Chimalpahin documents the "false accusation" for which the indigenous lords were hanged by order of Cortés, thus preserving for posterity the unjust way in which the last Mexica *tlahtoani* and other indigenous lords were executed. At the same time, Chimalpahin captures the way in which Cortés took control of the governing structures of the Mexica, assigning a *Cihuacoatl*[22] to govern to later place a *juez gobernador*[23] as ruler of the Mexica people, documenting how the governing structures of the Mexica had been interrupted and altered by the colonial rulers and bringing to an end the *tlahtocayotl* of Mexico-Tenochtitlan.

Now compare Chimalpahin's explanation of the execution of Cuauhtémoc with Martínez's narrative on the hanging of Mexica leader. At the end of his list of the Mexica rulers, after explaining that both Cuitlahuac and Cuauhtémoc should not be considered as part of his list of Mexica rulers "porque no tuvieron mando ni potestad absoluta de Reyes," Martínez writes:

> Por muerte de Moteçuma eligieron los Mexicanos a Cuethauac hermano de Moteçuma, el qual murió de viruelas… y en su lugar eligieron a un sobrino de Moteçuma llamado Cuautimoc, el qual como mancebo valeroso deffendio a Mexico todo lo possible, mas al fin fue preso… el dia que los Christianos ganaron a Mexico, y el marques le hizo mucha honrra y buen tratamiento llevandole consigo a cauallo y a su lado, en las jornadas y conquistas que hazia, y con el muchos y de los principales de Mexico, a fin de quitarles el aparejo de poderse alçar hasta que en la jornada que el Marques hizo a la pacificacion de la provincia de Tauasco y Yucatan se descubrió y averiguó, que Quautimoc tenia ordenado de matar al Marques y a su gente viendolos descuydados por lo qual fue justiciado al principio del mes de Março del año de mil y quinientos y veinte y cinco en el pueblo de Yzancanac (153).

This description of the execution of Cuauhtémoc and other native lords contrasts with the description Chimalpahin gives in his *Annals*. While the Nahua *tlacuilo* points to the "false accusation" as the reason for the execution of the native lords and describes the torture they experienced the year before, Martínez description states the opposite. According to Martínez, Cuauhtémoc was not only treated with "mucha honra y buen tratamiento" by Cortés, but the Mexica leader had been executed because he had plotted against Cortés and his men. Thus, Martínez never questions Cuauhtémoc's intention to kill Cortés the way Chimalpahin does. On

[22] Cihuacoatl refers to the one of the top political leaders within the Aztec governing structure.
[23] Juez Governador refers to indigenous governors who are from an altepetl different from the one they govern.

the contrary, Martínez assumes it to have been true, justifying the reason for the hanging of the native lords. Thus, when one juxtaposes the ways in which both authors treat the end of the Mexica *tlatoque* one can see that Chimalpahin revises Martínez's narrative, exposing the lies of Cortés and European chroniclers invested in presenting a narrative which justifies the execution of native lords by accusing them of plotting against Cortés and his men.[24]

As further evidence of Chimalpahin's revision of Martínez's *Repertorio*, one can point to the way in which Chimalpahin extends and revises the list of secular and religious leaders Martínez presents. Building on Rodrigo Martínez who illustrates that Chimalpahin copies the lists of Mexica rulers, viceroys, and leaders of the inquisition, it is important to stress that Chimalpahin does more than merely copy these lists; he expands the three lists and includes another, a list with the names of the Archbishops of New Spain (114). In his comprehensive list of rulers of the Mexica, for example, Chimalpahin not only includes the "Reyes mexicanos" Martínez includes but also the ancient rulers who governed the Mexica before departing from Aztlan, those who lead them into the lake region and settled in Mexico-Tenochtitlan, and the *pipiltin* and native governors that ruled the Mexica people after the conquest (105-106). Hence, Chimalpahin includes the ancient Mexica leaders and indigenous governors who continued to govern the Mexica people after the conquest and into the colonial era.[25] As Chimalpahin makes clear, the Spanish conquest does not mark the end of the Mexica governing structure as the survivors of Mexica lords continued to govern the Mexica people after the conquest. Instead, he marks the moment in which the Mexica governors are replaced by *juez governadores*—indigenous rulers from other *altepetl* (98)—and the moment in which a Spanish governor takes control of the indigenous government of Mexico-Tenochtitlan (123).

Given Chimalpahin's efforts to trace the secular and religious institutions, it is not surprising to find that he also includes a list of the archbishops of New Spain, beginning with fray Juan de Zumárraga and ending with Fray García Guerra, a list Martínez does not include. (Martínez 155; Chimalpahin 114). Thus, Chimalpahin is even more concerned than Martínez with documenting the names of the secular and religious authorities and their institutions. He not only copies and translates into Nahuatl the list of secular and religious authorities Martínez includes but also revises, extends, and rearranges them, presenting the genealogy of power in the pre-Hispanic era and after the conquest in the four lists. If Martínez's annals history captured the genealogies of power in Europe and the expanding Spanish empire while tracing a limited genealogy of power of the Mexica, Chimalpahin does it for the pre-Hispanic past and the colonial era, mapping the pre-Hispanic and colonial structures of power while illustrating how the indigenous people of central Mexico had arrived at the dire condition they now faced, their ancestral governments usurped and native communities suffering from tributary labor demands.

Besides copying from and revising Martínez's text, Chimalpahin's *Annals* also puts into question the astrological science Martínez boasted of allowing him to be able to explain the physical and social world. While Martínez presumed to be able to predict the exact moment in

[24] See Hernán Cortés's *Quinta carta de relación* and Gómara's *Historia de la conquista de México,* chapter CLXXIX on the death of Cuauhtémoc.

[25] In Chimalpahin's incorporation of the indigenous rulers of Mexico City after the conquest we can see parallels between Chimalpahin's text and *Codex Aubin* (1608), a hybrid text that is both painted in annals form and written in Nahuatl.

which a solar eclipse would occur in the sky of Mexico City and other major cities in New Spain and the world, Chimalpahin points to the error of the "sabios españoles" who predicted the eclipse of June 10, 1611, to begin at 11:34 a.m. and end at 2:20 p.m. (Martínez 80). As Chimalpahin explains:

> Auh ye oc conpanahui yn cahuitl yn imman ypan tlateneuhque tlamatinime, ye quin ipan yn omochihuaco ome tzillini ypan tlaco hora, yn opeuh huel yequene tlacocahuia, yn can ihuiantzin ye tlayohuatiuh, aocmo chicahuac tonaya, yhuan mixtli çan ipan oquiquiztinenca tonatiuh. Auh yn ipanpa in yn oc conpanahui yn ipan tlateneuhque tlamatinime pehuazquia, matlactlonce tzillini, ynic tlayohuatiazquia, yxquichica tlamitiuh ypan ome tzillini ynic occeppa necitiuh tonatiuh, yniqu ipampa oc conpanahui, yuh mochi tlacatl momatca ca aocmo mochihuaz yn iuh oquihtoca tlamatinime yn iuh ypan mochihuaz tonatiuh….
>
> [Pasado ya el tiempo y el momento que habían dicho los sabios, cuando dieron las 2 y media, finalmente comenzó a amarillear, y lentamente fue oscureciendo, ya no alumbraba tan fuerte el Sol, y las nubes se fueron poniendo sobre el Sol. Y porque ya había pasado el momento en que, según habían dicho los sabios, comenzaría a oscurecer, es decir las 11 horas, para ir a terminar a las 2, cuando nuevamente aparecería el Sol, por haber pasado ese momento, mucha gente pensó que ya no sucedería lo que habían dicho los sabios que le pasaría al Sol. Los tacharon, pues, de mentirosos…] (144-145).

Here Chimalpahin presents an indirect critique of the prediction by Spanish men of knowledge. While he does not explicitly mention Martínez's name, his statement points at the error of the "sabios españoles" who had miscalculated the time of the eclipse. Their precise astronomical science had failed to predict the exact time of the eclipse. Given that Chimalpahin's *Annal*s shows a clear engagement with Martínez's text, one is left to wonder why he did not include Martínez's description of solar eclipses, opting instead to incorporate into his account the explanation the Creole Fray Juan Bautista presents in his *Sermonario en lengua mexicana* (1606), copying, almost verbatim, the section in which the Franciscan friar presents a concise scientific explanation of how the movement of the sun and moon produce a solar eclipse, adding to Juan Bautista's narrative his own experience as a witness of the eclipse (Bautista 198-199; Chimalpahin 142-143). The friar's concise description of the eclipse better explained to the Nahua reader the way in which their ancestors had interpreted such natural phenomena as "tonatiuh cuallo"—the sun is eaten—without criticizing their indigenous understanding and without providing an intricate scientific explanation that included the astrological effects such natural phenomena would have on the terrestrial realm.

Chimalpahin continues to point at the error of the "sabios españoles" when he critiques Spanish men of knowledge who believed the eclipse would have adverse effects on the terrestrial realm, highlighting the superstitions of the Spanish learned men and the panic they caused on the residents of the city (144). To challenge this claim of the "sabios españoles" Chimalpahin presents himself as witness, reporting what was experienced when he writes:

> Auh yn ixquichica in ynie tlayohuatihuetzca huel yxquiehica ça huel momatticatca yn tonatiuh yan hueI tlanaliuhtoca, yn ixquichica omoteneuh ye quiyahualiuhcatlalcahuica mixtli, çan huel oneanahcitieatca yn oncan ypan ye peuh aheitoya mixtli, ynic

> otlayohuaca ynic oqualoe tonatiuh; yan niman aoctle ypan hualla, aoctle ypan oquiz. Auh yn ihquae ye noceppa noeuel ohualnez, yn huel ohualtehuilacaehiuheanez mochi tonatiuh, in huel ye tlanextia, ye niman yxeo hualmocençouh yn mixtli, ye nohuianpa yn ilhuieatl ye hualmixtzauhetimomah yn omoteneuh mixtli, aocmo cenca cana hualnez yn ixquichiea onaquito tonatiuh yn ieaeallaquiyampa ynic onyohuato.
>
> [Mientras duró la oscuridad, el Sol estuvo tranquilo e hizo buen tiempo, y entretanto, como se dijo, las nubes se apartaron en círculo, aunque estaban muy cercanas, hasta que se oscureció y el Sol fue comido; después ya nada pasó, nada sucedió. Y cuando apareció de nuevo, cuando se mostró el Sol en toda su redondez, cuando volvió a brillar, enseguida las nubes se desplegaron sobre su faz, y todo el cielo volvió a quedar cubierto de nubes, en ningún sitio volvió a aparecer el Sol hasta que se ocultó por el poniente y se hizo de noche] (149).

Here we see that Chimalpahin reports on what he witnessed to challenge the predictions of the Spanish men of science who believed the eclipse would have an effect on the conditions on earth. Thus, contrary to their predictions, Chimalpahin reports that nothing happened: "yan niman aoetle ypan hualla, aoetle ypan oquiz" [después ya nada pasó, nada sucedió] (149). Not only did his personal experience showed that the "sabios españoles" were in error; he also explains that the religious friars knew nothing would happen, comforting the church people when they explained: "'Ayac momauhtiz miyahuiz ynic qualoz tonatiuh, ca çan achitonca yn tlayohuaz; teopan ximocenquixtiqui, nican timechyolchicahuazque.'" ["Que nadie tema ni se espante cuando el Sol sea comido, porque estará oscuro solo un momento; venid a reuniros en la iglesia, donde nosotros os confortaremos"] (148). Thus, Chimalpahin aims at illustrating the error of the Spanish men of knowledge who had not only failed to predict the exact time of the eclipse but also presented an array of superstitions which were proved to be wrong. His experience of the eclipse showed it and the religious men also knew it.

Even though Chimalpahin appears to embrace modern science in his explanation of the eclipse, a scientific explanation that appears to be more "modern" than that of his contemporary "sabios españoles" who still believed in the effects of such natural phenomena on humans, he does not condemn or critique his ancestors for not knowing how these natural phenomena took place. Instead, following Juan Bautista's straightforward description of solar eclipses, Chimalpahin simply explains that his ancestors did not know how the celestial bodies circulated in the heavens without judging them. This is evident at the beginning of his narrative on the eclipse of 1611, before citing Juan Bautista's text, when Chimalpahin writes: "Auh ye omihto, ynin mochiuh yehuatl yn quiteneuhtihui tachcocolhuan catca "tonatiuh quallo"; ynic motlapololtiaya, ca nel arno huel oquimattiaque yn quenin hui yn quenin mochihua ynic yzqui tlanepanoltitimani yn ilhuicame, ynic otlatoca ynic momarnallacachotihui ynic mopapanahuitihui ynic cecenteotlatoca, ynic yzqui tlanepanoltitimani ylhuicame." [Como se acaba de decir, ocurrió lo que nuestros abuelos llamaban "el Sol es comido"; con ello se turbaban mucho, pues no sabían por qué o cómo es que los varios cielos se hallan juntos, están superpuestos, siguen su curso, van girando, se adelantan, va cada uno de ellos siguiendo su camino] (141). This short passage illustrates that Chimalpahin does not judge or condemn the lack of knowledge of his ancestors; he simply explains that they did not know how the celestial bodies circulated in the sky while also pointing out that not knowing "disoriented" them. Chimalpahin restates this later in the narrative once he has explained the error of the "sabios españoles" in also believing that

the eclipse would bring "amo qualli yn ehecatl" [un viento maligno] (144). However, it is important to point out here that even though Chimalpahin critiques the superstitious science of the Spanish men of knowledge, he does not discuss—neither critiques nor defends—the *arte divinatoria* of the Nahuas of Central Mexico, the divinatory science Sahagún so carefully documents in the *Florentine Codex*. Given that he wrote during a time in which religious authorities continued to persecute indigenous idolatry, openly discussing the divinatory science could lead him to be burned at the stake. Thus, in limiting himself to citing Fray Bautista he would protect himself from being charged with idolatry.[26]

It is also important to note that when Chimalpahin discusses the eclipse, he never abandons the expression "tonatiuh cuallo", preserving it for posterity along with the modern scientific explanation he presents. Even though Chimalpahin could have easily borrowed the Spanish word "eclipse" or "conjunción" given that, according to Lockhart's explanation of the evolution of colonial Nahuatl, the period between 1550 and 1650 is characterized by heavy borrowing of Spanish loan words (Lockhart 253), Chimalpahin continues to use the expression his ancestors used, "tonatiuh cuallo," as he explains the astronomic phenomenon, thereby preserving it for posterity and refusing to participate in what Rabasa terms "violencia epistemológica del saber nahua", i.e discarding the knowledge of his ancestors (*Crónicas religiosas* 332).

As Chimalpahin brings his discussion of the solar eclipse of June 10, 1611, to an end, he explains that he is writing for the future, for the Nahuatl reader to know what had taken place, setting the record straight while producing an archive which evidences the errors of the "sabios españoles" and their superstitions. As Chimalpahin explains:

> Oyhuin mochihuin ynic mihtohua "oqualoc tonatiuh" yn ipan in omoteneuh cemilhuitl viernes, nican omochi motecpan yn itlahtollo yn iuh omochiuh, ynic nican quittazque yhuan quimatizque yn ixquichtin in quin ye tlacatizque in quin çatepan ye nemiquihui nican tlalticpac, yn aquique amo yeah yuhqui quittazque, auh quemaca yn iquin canin quemma cequintin yn aquique yuh quittatihui, yece oc huecauh oc miyec xihuitl quiyaz yn ihquac occeppa yn iquin nocuel ypantitiuh in zan ye iuh no mochihuatiuh, ye quin ihquac occeppa ye no yuh quittatihui quimahuizotihui yn iuh mixtlapachoz tonatiuh yn rnotenehua qualoz tonatiuh, yn iuh axcan ypan in xihuitl ticate otopan mochiuh.
>
> [Sobre esto que sucedió el dicho día viernes y que se llama "el Sol fue comido", aquí se ha puesto toda la relación de cómo sucedió, para que por ella puedan ver y enterarse todos los que en el futuro han de nacer y venir a vivir sobre la tierra, tanto los que nunca verán algo semejante, como los que alguna vez en algún lugar lo verán, aunque todavía falta mucho y han de pasar muchos años antes de que otra vez suceda, y entonces nuevamente puedan ver y admirar cómo se ocultará el Sol y será comido, como nos ocurrió a nosotros ahora en este presente año] (149-150).

[26] During the first half of the 17th century, religious authorities continued persecuting indigenous peoples for idolatry. See Justyna Olko and Agnieszka Brylak's recent article "Defending Local Autonomy and Facing Cultural Trauma: A Nahua Order against Idolatry, Tlaxcala, 1543." Also see Hernando Ruíz de Alarcón's *Tratado de las supersticiones y costumbres gentílicas que hoy viven entre los indios naturales desta Nueva España* (1629).

This explanation illustrates Chimalpahin's ability to dwell in a plurality of worlds. He inhabits both the ancient world of his ancestors, the world that interpreted the conjunction of the sun and moon as "tonatiuh cuallo", and the modern colonial world, the world in which Juan Bautista explained the way in which solar eclipses occur, without incurring contradiction and without one succumbing to the other, an approach that, according to Rabasa, "may be termed 'autochthonous enlightenment criticism' of the conflicting epistemologies for understanding the eclipse of 1611" ("In the Mesoamerican Archive" 224). Moreover, Chimalpahin's explanation of the eclipse also serves as a corrective to scientific discourses that claimed to be able to predict the exact moment in which an eclipse would take place and the adverse effects it would have on people. As such, Chimalpahin's explanation, along with that of the friars, appear to be more enlightened than that of the "sabios españoles".

Alemán's narrative of a "great prince" and the splendor of the city and Chimalpahin's critique of the archbishop-viceroy and the devastating earthquake

The second Spanish-born author I will discuss, who, like Balbuena, celebrates the greatness of the colonial city and its viceroy is the novelist Mateo Alemán. Born in Seville, Spain, in 1547, he immigrated to the Indies in 1608 in his early sixties. Even though he was a doctor and had earned fame in the Iberian Peninsula with his picaresque novel *Guzmán de Alfarache,* Alemán sailed to New Spain in 1608 in hopes of improving his financial situation. Having arrived to the New World in the same fleet that brought the Dominican fray García Guerra as the new archbishop of New Spain, the Spanish novelist witnessed the celebration in honor of the religious leader as he recounts in detail the solemn celebration prepared in his honor.

Once in the capital of New Spain, Alemán explains his intention to publish his *Ortografía castellana* (1609) in the colonial capital, a gesture that illustrates his view of the greatness of the colonial city, a view that echoes Balbuena's representation of the magnificent Spanish lettered city in the New World. Alemán writes in the prologue to is *Ortografía*:

> No se lo pude imprimir [en España] por no tenerlo acabado… y porque … tuve por justa causa traer conmigo alguna que (cuando acá llegase) manifestase las prendas de mi voluntad. Y entre otras elegí solo ésta que me pareció apropósito en tal ocasión, para que por ella se publicase a el mundo que de tierra nueva de ayer conquistada sale nueva manera de bien escribir para todas las naciones. Ayuda mucho a esto lo que sin exageración y con evidente verdad se puede a voz viva publicar por el universo, haber aquí (generalmente) tan sutiles y felices ingenious que ningunos otros conocemos en cuanto el sol alumbra… Recibe agora, pues, oh ilustre ciudad generosa, este alegre y ventajoso peregrino… (Leonard 364).

Echoes of Balbuena are evident in this preface since the colonial capital is, in Alemán's view, a place of intellectual production where one can find "sutiles y felices ingenios" which can only be found in such "ilustre ciudad." Four years later, in 1613, Alemán published his last known work, a book titled *Sucesos de don Frai García Guerra, arçobispo de Mejico, a cuyo cargo estuvo el govierno de la Nueva España*, an account of the arrival of archbishop Fray García Guerra to New Spain, his appointment as viceroy after his predecessor, viceroy Luis de Velasco, was appointed as president of the Council of Indies, and his untimely death. In his account, Alemán presents an

idealized image of the archbishop-viceroy while revealing Alemán's own connection to the circles of power in the colonial capital.

Alemán's *Sucesos* begins with the arrival of archbishop García Guerra at the port of Veracruz in June 12, 1608. Written in the Baroque style of his time, the author presents the extravagant welcoming of the religious leader as he slowly advances in his march into the colonial capital, describing in detail the numerous *arcos triunfales*, musical performances, indigenous dances, and joyful reception with which the archbishop was received. Upon his arrival in the city, Alemán describes a magnificent *arco triunfal*, "muy costoso i bien estudiado, adornado de muchas i varias istorias de injeniosa erudición" which was later accompanied by religious songs and a "coloquio q pareció muy bien su buena disposición i mucho ingenio" (382). With this image of an elaborate *arco triunfal* and its accompanying performances, symbols par excellence of the Spanish Baroque colonial city, Alemán presents the greatness of the city, a view consistent with the description he makes of the city years earlier in the prologue to his *Ortografía* in which he expresses the splendor of the colonial capital.

According to Alemán, the archbishop was an exemplary religious leader, tending to his flock and fulfilling his duty as leader of the church in an extraordinary manner, "celebrando las ordenes jenerales, confirmava mui de ordinario, era grande limosnero de secreto, visitó su arçobispado con tanto silencio i templança, q jamas del se oyó qeja de agravio, ni lo izo alguno de sus ministros ni criados a persona viviente, de obra ni de palabra" (383). In these few lines Alemán presents the virtues and infallibility of the archbishop as the leader of the church and as a good shepherd of his flock, a view that, as we will see below, Chimalpahin contradicts in his description of Fray García Guerra.

Given that the archbishop's appointment as viceroy was, according to Alemán, well received by both religious and secular authorities and common people, his entrance into the city as the new ruler had to be as opulent as his entrance as archbishop (385). Hence, in his procession through the adorned streets of the colonial capital, the archbishop was led to the viceregal palace by a military regiment in extravagant dress and guided by the "señores de la real audiencia" and other dignitaries of the colonial authorities (386). Alemán's description of the elaborate ceremonies in honor of the newly appointed viceroy reflects Merrim's account of the "Spectacular City" and its pompous festivals that evoked wonder, "spectacles so lavish and costly that almost defy credibility" (26).

When a major earthquake devastated the city and its surroundings as the inaugural celebrations in his honor continued, Alemán reports, the newly appointed viceroy showed reluctance to attend these celebrations, showing his humility and preoccupation for the situation (389). Contrary to the indifference displayed by colonial elites who insisted on continuing with the celebrations, ignoring the destruction brought by the earthquake and the cost of the celebrations, the viceroy showed concern and, according to Alemán, only stayed in order to avoid being seen as weak. Hence, Alemán's narrative insists on presenting the modesty of the viceroy and his concern for the impact of the earthquake vis-à-vis the indifference of those who wanted to continue the celebrations, ignoring the damage caused by the earthquake and the cost of having day-long celebrations.

As it turned out, the "calenturas" that overwhelmed the viceroy since his first day in office were the first signs of a condition which would kill him in February of 1612, only months after assuming the role of viceroy, causing great grief among the residents of the city and its surroundings. Alemán laments the great loss when he writes:

> Aviendo fallecido ya su S. Ilus. lo tuvieron en su cama, la cual era muy moderada, i no mejor q la ordinaria de un religioso... Començó a doblar la Iglesia mayor con grande solenidad en que aqella ora, i las mas iglesias paroqiales, conventos i colegios hizieron lo mismo, con tan grande sentimiento como pedia semejante Perdida, de un principe tan bien qisto i amado de todos (394).

Here Alemán points to, once again, the humble condition of the viceroy, whose bed, far from being that of a prince, was that of an ordinary religious man and the grief his death brought to the city and the esteem its residents had for the deceased viceroy. Moreover, as the body of the archbishop-viceroy laid in the chapel of the palace, an immense crowd consisting of peoples of all social conditions, "asi Españoles como naturales, ombres i mujeres de todas calidades," attended the funeral to honor the viceroy, which was, in Alemán's view, a sign of "la grandeza de aqesta ciudad, i amor a su principe, de cuya falta mostraron sentimiento notable" (395).

Once Alemán's narrative describes the display of the viceroy's body in the chapel of the viceregal palace, the narrative turns to the grand ceremonies which would culminate with the burial. According to Alemán, the solemn ceremonies in honor of the viceroy were among the greatest he had ever witnessed (397). In this way, Alemán not only presents the grand ceremonies but also presents himself as witness while comparing it to the fine ceremonies of great figures of Spain, events Alemán claims to have witnessed.[27] We encounter here, once again, echoes of the preeminence of Mexico City we find in Balbuena's poem, ceremonies that could only be rivaled by those in honor of Spanish kings and royal figures.

After describing the ceremony in honor of the viceroy, Alemán turns to the procession which accompanied the body of the viceroy from the chapel in the viceregal palace to his final place of rest. As could be expected, his narrative presents in detail the lavish procession, describing the different contingents of people representing both religious and secular institutions that marched in orderly fashion accompanying the beloved viceroy. At the head of the procession were "las Cruzes de los barrios i parroquias de indios con su cera i campanillas i estandartes" (398). Notice that Alemán presents here a general description of the indigenous peoples who headed the procession, just as he does in other references he makes to the presence of indigenous people, presenting them simply as "indios", without concern to distinguish between the *altepetl* affiliations, an aspect of the narrative Chimalpahin revises in his *Annals* when he describes this same procession. Behind the contingent of indigenous peoples leading the procession, Alemán explains, were the children of the hospice Juan de Letrán, followed by numerous confraternities and two "hospitales," and right after them, the various religious orders, which were followed by clergy, the Real Universidad, a contingent of soldiers, accountants, the educated elites—*doctores* and *licenciados*—, the Real Audiencia, the infantry, and, at the very end, a contingent consisting

[27] According to Alice H. Bushee, Alemán's narrative of the funeral processon of Fray García Guerra was inspired by the celebration he witnessed in Seville, Spain, in 1579 in honor of the transfer of the bodies of Castilian kings and princes to the Royal Chapel of Seville (441).

of the personal servants of the viceroy, all marching in an orderly fashion (398-403). In the almost six pages describing the procession, it is worth noting that Alemán describes the elaborate dress of some of the participants in order to highlight the wealth and power of the colonial capital and its institutions, exemplifying the greatness of the colonial city Balbuena imagined as the center of the world.

Towards the end of his narrative on the impressive procession and the novena which followed the burial of viceroy, Alemán's narrative turns to praise the Real Audiencia and its oldest members, Don Antonio de Morga, for planning and executing such solemn ceremonies in honor of the viceroy, who, in Alemán's view, "verdaderamente se puede afirmar aver sido el alma i vivo de aquella insigne grandeza" (406). Hence, as Alemán's narrative of the ceremonies organized in honor of the viceroy come to an end, we encounter, once again, echoes of the *Grandeza mexicana* of Balbuena, this time celebrating the Real Audiencia and its members, an institution Chimalpahin will not hesitate to critique in his revision of Morga's narrative.

Now that I have described Alemán's ideal representation of archbishop and viceroy García Guerra, we can turn to the ways in which Chimalpahin's *Annals* revises Alemán's narrative. According to Rodrigo Martínez, Chimalpahin's narrative is comparable to Alemán's (37); however, given the ways in which Chimalpain's *Annals* engages and revises both Balbuena's poem and Martínez's *Repertorio*, Chimalpahin's narrative is not simply another narrative of the same event, but a critical revision and counter narrative. Contrary to the Spanish novelist's celebratory narrative on the life and death of the archbishop and viceroy, Chimalpahin presents a clear critique of the archbishop turned viceroy. Even though Chimalpahin does not mention Alemán's name or the title of his book as he does when referring to Juan Bautista's *Sermonario* nor copies as extensively as he does from Martínez's text, the parallels between both narratives are evident, as if Alemán's text laid in front of Chimalpahin as he copied, revised, and translated into Nahuatl the Spanish Baroque text.[28]

While Alemán presents a detailed account of the solemn celebrations made in honor of fray García Guerra in his arrival as archbishop and, later, in his promotion as viceroy, Chimalpahin writes very little about these celebrations. For instance, the only reference he makes to the welcoming ceremonies as archbishop appears when Chimalpahin describes him as the incumbent archbishop in 1608 in his list of archbishops of New Spain when he mentions that "yn mocallaquico Mexico ypan yehuatl in xihuitl de 1608 ye 29 mani metztli de setiembre, huel qualli ynic quimonamiquillique" [entró a la ciudad de Mexico el 29 de septiembre de 1608, donde le hicieron un solemne recibimiento] (114). Besides this reference, Chimalpahin does not state anything else about fray García Guerra before his appointment as viceroy. Hence, it is clear that Chimalpahin's vision of the archbishop is not the same as Alemán's; there is clearly no discussion on the supposed humility and humanity of the religious leader Alemán presents in the first part of his *Sucesos*. Moreover, in relation to the celebrations in honor of the archbishop's promotion to viceroy, Chimalpahin says very little, reducing his explanation of the promotion and festivities to four short entries (151-152).

[28] Even though Chimalpahin does not mention Alemán's name, given the way in which he engages Martínez and Fray Juan Bautista's texts in the *Annals* and how he continues to borrow from Martínez and from Mexica sources such as *Codex Aubin* and the *Manuscript 85* in the *Relaciones históricas* (a topic I explore in the next chapter), it is very likely that Alemán's *Sucesos* was one of the sources he copies, revises, and rewrites in Nahuatl.

In his description of the arrival of the archbishop into the city to take possession as viceroy there are no descriptions of the lavish Baroque celebrations we find in Alemán's narrative. The elaborate and breathtaking *arcos triunfales* Alemán exalts are reduced to "hueyi puerta tlacuilollolo" [una gran puerta pintada] (152) without any attempt of Chimalpahin to describe the ingenuity with which the triumphal arches were designed. This reduction of the "arco triunfal"—symbol par excellence of New Spain's Baroque culture— to a "gran puerta pintada" illustrates the way in which Chimalpahin's vision of the colonial city undermines Alemán's "spectacular" city.

Similarly, his description of the innagural ceremony is very brief compared to Alemán's Barroque description of the event, as Chimalpahin illustrates in a short passage in which he summarizes the inaugural ceremony, a narrative which contrasts sharply with the extensive narrative Alemán presents of the elaborate ceremonies made in honor of the viceroy (152). Thus, it is clear that the interests and preoccupations of both authors are diametrically opposed and that Chimalpahin is not merely copying Alemán's text but also countering his celebratory discourse. As I will illustrate below, Chimalpahin is more concerned with documenting the destruction brought by the earthquake and the dire condition of indigenous people of central Mexico than documenting the lavish celebrations of colonial elites. Thus, Chimalpahin's focus is in capturing the harsh reality of the indigenous peoples of Central Mexico and the indifference of the colonial authorities towards the indigenous population.

Soon after Chimalpahin summarizes the inauguration of fray García Guerra as viceroy, he turns to narrate the destructive earthquake which took place only weeks after fray García Guerra had been inaugurated as viceroy. Chimalpahin begins his narrative of the earthquake with a detailed description of how the ground shook and disturbed the water in the lake, canals, and wells, producing great noise and splashing into their homes (152-153). After presenting a vivid description of the seismic event, Chimalpahin describes the destruction brought on the city and its surroundings, presenting himself as witness to explain and document what had taken place. Chimalpahin explains:

> …Yuquinma içа ticepantlahuanque otochiuhque, ynic titomauhtia yn tiquitta calli quemman in mochi ye pachi yn tlaltitech ye yauh, yehica cenca miyec yn hualtepehuia tetl yn xamitl calticpac; nohuian techachan tlalli tepehuia, nohuian ytlacauh yn calli yn tepantli, moch cuitlatzayan ynmanel yancuic calli yn quin moch omochiuh omoquetz, mochi occenca yehuatl moch itlacauh tzatzayan. Yhuan yn la Compafiia de Jesus golejio teatinos teopancalli yn icpac ye tetzopqui tlacotzayan; auh yn S[an] Fran[cis]co teopancalli, yuh mihto, omapilli ynic tlallac; auh yn S[anc]tiago Tlatilolco teopancalli yancuic achi quezquican yn cuitlatzatzayan…
>
> [… Todos andabamos como borrachos, espantados al ver cómo las casas se venían abajo y caían por tierra, porque caían muchas piedras y adobes de arriba; por todas partes las casas se derrumbaron, se dañaron las casas y los muros, se agrietaron hasta las casas nuevas que acababan de construirse, hasta esas se dañaron y se agrietaron. En la Compañía de Jesús, se agrietó por en medio la bóveda de la iglesia del colegio de los teatinos; la iglesia de San Francisco, según se dijo, se hundió dos pulgadas; la iglesia nueva de Santiago Tlatelolco se agrietó en varias partes del ábside…] (153).

In this passage Chimalpahin not only captures the fear the residents of the city felt when they experienced the earthquake but also the great damage it caused on the city's infrastructure.

However, the colonial capital was not the only site to be affected by the earthquake; its surrounding towns had also experienced its wrath, some even more than the capital, causing great fear and trauma among its residents:

> cenca huel temamauhti ynic mochiuh, yhuan tetlaocolti tlatzatziztlehua yniqu iuh topan ye mochihua. ça huel yayatimani tlalli, aocmo huel titoquetzaya, va tihuetztihuetzia yn titoquetzaya; huel yuh ypan nemachoc ca ye ye tlamin cemanahuatl. Mochi tlacatl aocac quilnamiquia yn tleyn cecenyaca cecentlacatl ynchaehan quimopiallia yn teoeuitlatl yn tlatquitl, moch callitic moeauhtiquiz; aocac conittac aocac conmocuitlahui ynie chollolohuac ynic necholtiloc quiyahuac yn ohtlipan, yn ixquichcauh manca tlallolinaliztli.
>
> [se sintió mucho miedo cuando esto sucedió, y se alzaron gritos lastimeros cuando esto nos ocurrió. Era como si la tierra se deslizara, no podíamos tenernos en pie, y nos caíamos al querer incorporarnos; creíamos que se estaba acabando el mundo. Nadie se acordó del oro o de los bienes que tenían en sus casas, todos allá lo dejaron; nadie se detuvo a ver o a preocuparse mientras huían y salían a la calle, mientras duró el temblor] (153-154).

Here Chimalpahin captures the trauma the earthquake brought not only to the residents of the colonial capital but also to those from its surrounding towns. As he continues to narrate the effects of the earthquake, he presents himself as witness to validate his account. Thus, Chimalpahin's detailed description of the destructive earthquake supported by his own experience contrasts sharply with Alemán's account of the tragic event, an account the Spanish author summarizes in a few lines when he writes:

> Viernes veinte i seis de agosto del dicho año de seisientos i onze, sería como entre las dos o tres de la madrugada, uvo en esta ciudad i su comarca, el mayor temblor de tierra de q se acordaran los mas antiguos della, cayeron muchos edificios, peligraron i murieron muchas personas cojiendolos debajo; demanera se sintio, q andavan despues los onbres, como asonbrados, i en muchos dias no se trató de otra cosa (388-389).

With this brief, generic description of the earthquake Alemán summarizes the tragic event. When one compares this short description of the natural and human disaster with Chimalpahin's treatment of the same event it is clear where the priorities of each author are. For Alemán, giving a detailed account of the solemn celebrations of the arrival of the archbishop and his innaguration as viceroy is more important than describing the details of the tragic event. For Chimalpahin, on the contrary, describing the lavish ceremonies organized in honor of the archbishop and viceroy is less important than narrating the details of what had taken place and how he and his compatriots had experienced the earthquake, documenting the trauma and destruction brought to the colonial city and particular communities surrounding it.

Once Chimalpahin describes the destruction and terror the earthquake caused, he presents a direct critique of fray García Guerra when he explains:

> Auh yn oyuh tlathuic yn ipan in omoteneuh cemilhuitl viernes, atle conmotequipachilhui yn tlahtohuani don fray García Guerra arçobispo Mexico yhuan visurrey mochiuhtzinotica; atle conmitalhui, yn ma tlatlatlauhtilo yn manoço tlayahuallolo, ma mihto letania yn ipampa yuh omochiuh cenca temamauhti tlallolinaliztli, yehica ca yuh yntech ca huey tenahuatili huel yntequitzin ynmacaça ychcapixque. Ca ychcapixque yn obisposme yn arçobisposme, yn ihquac yuh tley tepan mochihua yn yn cenca temamauhtiteyçahui, yn oquic tzonteconti moteyacanillia motepachilhuia yn ipan Sancta Iglesia, ca yehuantzitzin achtopa tzatzizque, quiteylhuizque ye tenemachtizque yn tleyn yn catlehuatl huel monequi: yn tlatlatlauhtiliztli, yn tlamacehualiztli, yn tlayahualoliztli quichihuazque yn imichcahuan yn intlapacholhuan yn altepehuaque. Achtopa yehuantin yntech hualpehuaz yn tlahtoque yn tlamacehualiztli, ynic yntech quittazque quintocatiquiçazque yn incuitlapilhuan yn imatlapalhuan, ynic tlamacehualiztica ynic choquiztica tlaocoyaliztica nezahualiztica quimoyolcehuilizque yn t[o]t[ecuiy]o Dios, yn ipampa aço totlacocol ypanpa, aço yquallanticatzinco yn mochihua yn tley tepan mochihua, yn aço cocoliztli yn anoço ytla occentlamantli yn çaço quenami yn temamauhti yn teyçahui yn çaço campa yuh tepan mochihua, yn iuh axcan nican Mexico otopan mochiuh.
>
> [Y cuando amaneció el dicho día viernes, ninguna preocupación mostró el señor don fray García Guerra, que era el arzobispo de México y el virrey; nada dispuso, ni que se hicieran plegarias o procesiones, ni que se dijera la letanía por el espantoso temblor que había habido, no obstante que tal es la obligación y el mandato de los que son como pastores. Porque los obispos y los arzobispos, como pastores que son, cuando acontece algo grave y espantoso, ellos, que encabezan y gobiernan a la Santa Iglesia, deben ser los primeros en hablar y advertir sobre lo que conviene: sobre las plegarias, las penitencias y las procesiones que han de realizar sus ovejas, sus gobernados. Por los que tienen autoridad ha de comenzar la penitencia, para que viendo su ejemplo puedan seguirlo los que son como su cola y sus alas, a fin de que con penitencias, llanto, tristeza y ayunos aplaquen a Dios nuestro señor, porque quizá por nuestros pecados, por su enojo, sucede lo que sucede, ya sea la enfermedad o cualquiera otra cosa espantosa que en algún lugar ocurre sobre la gente, como ahora nos ocurrió a nosotros en la ciudad de México] (154-155).

This passage captures Chimalpahin's critique of the newly appointed viceroy who did not show concern for the catastrophic event that had taken place hours before. Instead of tending to his flock, an obligation he continued to have given that he retained the position of archbishop even after being appointed viceroy, he arranged a bull fight and invited the members of the Real Audiencia to attend, ignoring the disaster that had occurred hours earlier. Thus, as Chimalpahin illustrates, fray García Guerra had failed both as archbishop and viceroy. This direct critique of Chimalpahin contrasts sharply with Alemán's representation of the exemplary religious and secular leader, the man he calls "great prince."

Pages later, after Chimalpahin interrupts his narrative on the negligent archbishop-viceroy with five short entries[29] leading to an extended narrative on the abuses of fray Zárate, he returns to his narrative on fray García Guerra, describing the religious processions and prayers made for the viceroy to recover his health (164), his decaying medical condition (165), and his eventual death (166). He then turns to narrate the funeral procession which lead the archbishop-viceroy to his final resting place, a narrative which, even though it parallels Alemán's narrative in the way it is structured and the two narratives converge at some points, most of the content of the two narratives is significantly different. For instance, consider the description of the group that headed the procession. Alemán writes: "Delante de todo fueron las cruzes de los barrios i paroqias de indios con su cera i campanillas i estandartes caidos a tras" (398). For his part, Chimalpahin writes:

> Auh ynic netecpanoc ynic quixohuac oncan tecpan palacio, huel tlayacac mantiaque in timacehualtin mexica, huel yzquicanpa oncan huallaque quihualcencauhque mochintin yn izquicampa cofradias quimopialia mexica: in S[an] Juan Moyotlan tlaca yhuan S[an] Pablo Teopan tlaca yhuan S[an] Sebastian Atzacualco tlaca yhuan S[anc]ta Maria Cuepopan, yhuan in Sanctiago Tlatilolco. Huel yzquicampa cecen cruz manca quihualhuicaque, yhuan cecen estandarte ahnoço vanderra yn izquiypan cofradias mopia; huel yzquican hualla, auh yehuantin tlayacac mantiaque yn omoteneuhque mexica ynic oncan quixohuac tecpan palacio.
>
> [al frente avanzaban los naturales mexicas, pues habían acudido para hacer adornos todas las cofradías que tienen los mexicas en las diversas partes: los habitantes de San Juan Moyotlan, los de San Pablo Teopan, los de San Sebastian Atzacualco y los de Santa Maria Cuepopan, y también los de Santiago Tlatelolco. Cada lugar llevaba su manga de cruz, y asimismo cada una de las cofradías que había llevaba su estandarte o bandera; de todas partes vinieron, y al frente avanzaban los dichos mexicas cuando salieron del palacio] (167).

The differences are striking between Alemán's brief description of the group leading the procession and Chimalpahin's description. While Alemán reduces his description of the indigenous participants to two lines, referring to them simply as "indios," Chimalpahin presents a more detailed description, identifying who were the participants and the neighborhoods they belonged to. This effort to present more details on native people and their presence in the city is consistent with the way in which Chimalpahin revises Balbuena and Martínez and with the assessment of scholars who have discussed this as one of the features of Chimalpahin's editorial work.[30]

---

[29] These five entries are about the death of a member of the Council of Indies; the arrival of the religious order of San Francisco de Paula; the celebrations in honor of St. Nicholas of Tolentine and St. Gregory; the appointment of don Antonio Valeriano Jr. as juez gobernador of Azcapotzalco and his noble lineage; and days of heavy rain and snow (158-160).

[30] See the introductory chapters to Schroeder et al.'s *Chimalpahin's Conquest: A Nahua Historian's Rewriting of Francisco Lopez de Gómara's* La Conquista de México.

Similarly, whereas Alemán focuses his narrative on describing the participation of the colonial authorities, Chimalpahin focuses on describing the indigenous people and religious orders who participated (169-172). Consequently, even though the narratives are similar in the way they are structured, it is evident that they are significantly different in content. While Alemán presents his narrative as an insider intimately familiar with the colonial authorities and circles of power, Chimalpahin writes from the margin, as an outsider to the elite circles of power, documenting the presence of the Mexica in the city and presenting a more detailed explanation of the religious orders familiar to him. Hence, Chimalpahin's account of Fray García Guerra is less invested than Alemán in documenting the ritualized conventions of Baroque festivities. It then becomes clear that, instead of simply copying Alemán's narrative and focusing on describing the colonial authorities and elite members of colonial society, Chimalpahin focuses on describing the people and institutions he is familiar with, the indigenous members of the Mexica *cofradías* and the religious orders, while incorporating what he knows about the colonial authorities and his own observations of the funeral procession. Thus, in writing from the margins of colonial society, Chimalpahin registers a more complex image of the colonial capital, an image that not only accounts for the indigenous residents of the city and the religious orders but also critiques the indifference of the colonial administration towards the indigenous population.

The evident parallels between Aleman's narrative on the funeral procession of viceroy García Guerra and Chimalpahin's own narrative of this same event have led Namala to affirm that Chimalpahin uses Alemán's text as the basis for his description of the funeral procession. As Namala explains:

> To begin with, it is interesting to note that, even though Alemán gives a complete account of the archbishop and viceroy's political career and untimely death, Chimalpahin uses only his description of the funeral preocession as a model for his own entries. Especially, Chimalpahin chooses not to engage Alemán's discussion of unfortunate and ominous incidents during fray García Guerra's ecclesiastical and political tenure in New Spain. At the point of the archbishop and viceroy's funeral, however, Chimalpahin borrows heavily from Alemán, spilling over onto twelve pages, Chimalpahin follows Alemán minutely, as he lists in order their appearance all groups who participated in the procession (166).

While I agree with Namala's affirmation that Chimalpahin uses Alemán's text as a basis to structure his narrative of the funeral procession, it is important to point out that the two narratives differ greatly in terms of content. This difference in content is significant to highlight because it illustrates the way in which Chimalpahin's revision of Alemán's text counters the celebratory discourse the latter presents of the archbishop and viceroy and the celebration of the splendor of the great colonial capital. Given Chimalpahin's direct critique of fray García Guerra and his discussion of the plight of indigenous people as tributaries and the Spanish colonial system's interruption of native government and institutions, Chimalpahin's narrative revises the celebratory discourse of Alemán who, echoing Balbuena's *Grandeza mexicana*, celebrates the greatness of the archbishop turned viceroy and the colonial administration.

Morga's narrative of the black and mulatto uprising of 1612 and Chimalpahin's counternarrative.

Another Spanish-born author and high-ranking colonial official who, like Alemán, perpetuates the discourse of the greatness of the colonial government Balbuena presents in his famous poem is Antonio de Morga. Born in Seville, he began his career in the colonial administration in the Philippines in 1590. He later settled in New Spain in 1603, serving as member of the Audiencia as *alcalde de corte* and as special council to the viceroy and to the Holy Office of the Inquisition until the year of 1615, the year he was appointed president of the Audiencia of Quito in the viceroyalty of Peru (Cummings 560-561). During his time in Mexico, Morga also published his seminal *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (1609), a text considered to be one of the most important works on the early history of Spanish colonization of the Philippine Islands. As *alcalde de corte*, Morga played a central role in the verdict that culminated with the violent execution of 35 black and mulatto residents of the colonial city.[31]

In his *Relación del alçamiento que negros y mulatos libres y cautivos de la ciudad de Mexico de la nueva Hespaña pretendieron hazer contra los Españoles por cuaresma del Año 1612 y del castigo que se hizo de los caueças y culpados* (1612), Morga narrates the circumstances of a suspected plot of rebellion as he attempts to assert the culpability of the black men and women, highlighting the diligence of the colonial authorities in containing the rebellion and explaining the legal process which brought the suspected rebels to justice, a narrative which clearly echoes Balbuena's discourse on the distinguished colonial government.

The chronicle begins with a *dedicatoria* to former Viceroy Luis de Velasco II, governor of New Spain from 1590 to 1595 and from 1607 to 1611, the year he was appointed as president of Council of Indies. Written in first-person narrative perspective, the *dedicatoria* serves as introduction to the text, praising the former viceroy for finding a solution to the problem of the draining of the lake and preventing the black population of New Spain from rebelling during his time in office (142). Even though the author does not reveal his name in the *dedicatoria*, he presents himself as the person who, having been informed, proceeded to investigate and capture those responsible and bringing justice, labeling the black and mulatto residents of New Spain as "mala semilla" and racializing them as enemies of the Republic (141).[32] As it turns out, it is Morga himself the one who investigates, captures, and brings to justice the supposed rebels.

In an interesting shift of narrative perspective from first- to third-person, the chronicle identifies Antonio de Morga as the one responsible for investigating, capturing, and bringing to justice those responsible for plotting against the colonial state, thus revealing Morga as the author of the text. As further evidence of Morga's authorship, the *Actas de Cabildo* of the colonial capital present Morga as the author and documents his efforts to disseminate his account throughout the city and his investment in preserving it in the municipal archive, thus illustrating

[31] According to historian J.I. Israel, rebellions in the countryside provoked fear in the capital, where rumors circulated of a black and mulatto conspiracy in the city to annihilate the white population and istall a black king along with dukes and other lords, carrying out a black St. Bartholomew's day in the colonial capital. Accordingly, the black and mulatto residents of the city would butcher the white population and take control of New Spain (69).

[32] Referring to Frantz Fanon's use of the term "racialization", Daniel Martínez HoSang and Oneka LaBennet define "racialization" as "the hierarchical production of human difference through race" and point to it as "a necessary pre-condition for colonial domination and hindrance to the process of internal self-making among Black subjects" (213). Thus, in referring to the black and mulatto population of New Spain as "mala semilla", Morga criminalizes them, marking a difference between the black population of the colonial capital and its European and indigenous population.

Morga's attempt to impose the narrative of the state that criminalizes the black and mulatto population (*Actas de Cabildo*, Book XVIII, June 1612).[33] It is important to highlight Morga's authorship of the chronicle and his investment in archiving it because scholars often treat this chronicle as anonymous and it clearly illustrates his efforts to impose the official narrative of the state that criminalizes the black and mulatto population.[34]

The chronicle begins with a statement of alarm at the large population of black and mulattos living in New Spain,[35] particularly those living in the colonial capital while pointing to their supposed privileges, their arrogance, and natural inclination to rebel (143). Soon after, Morga briefly narrates the rebellion of 1609 which was successfully contained by viceroy Velasco II, a rebellion for which, in Morga's view, the sentence was too lenient since it was limited to corporal punishment (144-145). Immediately after, Morga's narrative turns to the uprising of 1612. According to Morga, blacks and mulattos in the city were planning to annihilate all Spanish males (read: white males) and keep their women as their servants and objects of desire. In this reversal of the social order, the black population would rule, eliminating white males and keeping white women subordinated to their new rulers. In this way, Morga racializes the black population of the city as bloodthirsty and lustful while presenting a narrative which assumes the veracity of the planned rebellion and the determination of the black and mulatto population in the city to overturn the social order.

In the second part of the chronicle, Morga describes the process by which the plot was dismantled while praising himself as an exemplary servant of the colonial administration, echoing Balbuena's discourse of the grand government of New Spain and Alemán's praise of Morga as an exemplary servant of the colonial administration. According to Morga, the plot was discovered when two Portuguese sailors overheard an Angolan woman talk about the plans for rebellion in one of the city's plazas. The two sailors who claimed to understand the Angola language reported it to Morga who immediately after communicated the news to the Audiencia (148). This description of the dismantling of the plot raises suspicion on the veracity of the account since, from the beginning, it appears to be based on gossip; the sailors may have misunderstood, or the incident could have been an invention of the sailors or Morga himself. Nevertheless, Morga takes immediate action, informing the Audiencia about the supposed plot and compiling testimonies that incriminated the black and mulatto residents (149-150). If the

[33] The Actas de Cabildo del Ayuntamiento de México for July 9, 1612, record Morga's petition to the cabildo asking them to publish his chronicle and distribute it and to keep a copy in its archive so that everyone would know about what had taken place. The document states: "Este dia abiendose juntado la ciudad a tratar de lo conthenido en el billete bio la rrelacion del alzamyento que los negros yntentaban acer en esta ciudad dedicada al cavildo della por el señor doctor antonio de morga alcalde mas antiguo en esta corte la qual por ser tan berdadera y que en los tiempos venyderos se bea el castigo que se hizo a los que lo yntentaron y la prebencion que se tubo para su rreparo se ordeno y mando queste libro y rrelacion se queden en el archivo deste cauildo y que el señor depositario en nombre del pida a la rreal audiencia sea seruida de dar licencia a esta ciudad a quien viene dirigida para que se ymprima para que a todos sea manifiesto y gozen dello y lo que constare la imprenta sea a costa de propios desta ciudad para que lo libre y el original que aqui se a presentado se entregue al señor depositorio para que lo presnte en el rreal aquerdo para la licencia que se a de ympetrar y lo bueva a el" (Actas de Cabildo del Ayuntamiento de México, Libro XVIII)

[34] One recent critic who treats Morga's narrative as anonymous is Daniel Nemser in his essay "Triangulating Blackness" (2017). As I have shown in my discussion of the Spanish chronicle, a close reading of the text, along with the document in the *Actas de Cabildo*, clearly establish that the author is Morga himself.

[35] Height of slave trade in Mexico, 1580-1640

various testimonies had not been sufficient to prosecute the suspected rebels, Morga insists that the torture they underwent clearly revealed their intentions (152).

After claiming to prove the culpability of the black and mulatto leaders, Morga presents a succinct description of the exemplary punishment they received for plotting against the colonial order. As Morga explains:

> Executose publicamente en dos dias de mayo en nueve horcas altas que se hizieron en la plaça mayor desde las nueve oras de la mañana hasta las dos de la tarde, con grande concurso de gente. Fueron ahorcados juntos treinta y cinco negros y mulatos y entre ellos siete mugueres. Estubieron en las horcas hasta el dia siguiente que fueron quitados dellas dejando alli las cabeças clavadad y solo se hizieron quartas seis cuerpos porque los medicos dijeron que siendo tantos inficionarian el ayre y cuausarian enfermedad. A los demas se dio sepultura (152).

With this description of the cruel punishment, Morga reports bringing to justice the principal leaders of the plot, presenting it as exemplary punishment to prevent future rebellion. It was not enough to kill the suspected leaders; they needed to be executed in public in the central plaza, in a ritualized way, their heads and severed bodies exhibited in order to create fear among the population. In this way, Morga illustrates the colonial authorities' spectacularization of violence.

If the exemplary punishment of the leaders and the exile of their collaborators was not enough to prevent future rebellions, the colonial administration presented a set of new regulations known as the *Ordenanzas* of 1612 which illustrates the systematic way in which the black and mulatto population was repressed.[36] Morga's narrative mentions some of these new regulations aiming to control the black and mulatto residents, among them: the prohibition of black and mulatto cofradías; the prohibition of blacks and mulattos from carring and owning arms, particularly swords and firearms; prohibition of traditional African burial ceremonies; the requirement to serve or learn a trade; the prohibition of black and mulatto women from wearing jewels and luxury items such as silk robes; and the reinforced policing of black and mulatto residents (153). With this, Morga brings his narrative to a close, stressing that the exemplary punishment and the new regulations on the black and mulatto residents had not only brought justice but had also created great fear among the black and mulatto residents. As Morga explains, "Hecho el castigo en los delinquentes an quedado al parecer los negros tan Rendidos y sujetos a sus amos que los sirven con mas cuydado y submission, y los libres se han atemorizado y acobardado de manera que ya no se muestran ni parecen en publico y con la libertad y licencia que solian" (153). Thus, Morga ends his narrative by highlighting the way in which the colonial authorities successfully dismantled the plot, brought "justice," and took the necessary steps in preventing future uprisings by systematically repressing the black population.

When one considers the way in which Morga frames the narrative in the *dedicatoria* and the way the narrative is structured, it becomes evident that Morga's narrative attempts to prove the culpability of the black and mulatto residents while highlighting the central role he played in

[36] A document dated April 14, 1692, and titled "Nuevas ordenanzas de negros (esclavos y libres) de la audiencia de México" outlines the new regulations set in place to supress the black and mulatto population. The document is transcribed in Manuel Lucena Salmoral's *Regulación de la esclavitud negra en las colonias de América Española (1503-1886)* (156-157).

dismantling the plot and the colonial authorities' efforts to prevent future rebellions. In praising his work as *alcalde de corte* and those of his collaborators in the Audiencia, we read echoes of Balbuena's discourse of the distinguished colonial government and the Baroque poet's praise for the Audiencia when he writes: "Una Audiencia Real, espuela y freno / de virtud y el vicio, claustro santo, / si es santo lo que sumamente es bueno" (Balbuena 320), a vision that Chimalpahin contradicts in his *Annals* when he discusses the supposed rebellion and the ejecution of its leaders, openly critiquing the Real Audiencia.

Similar to the way in which Chimalpahin's *Annals* undermines Alemán's triumphalist narrative, it also serves as a corrective to Morga's triumphalist discourse that celebrates the colonial authorities' execution of 35 black and mulatto men and women. Here I will analyze each step of Chimalpahin's account of the Spanish repression of the rebellion to show how it rewrites and criticizes Morga's account of the same event. Unlike Morga, who attempts to show the culpability of free and enslaved blacks and mulattos, Chimalpahin's narrative does the opposite: it questions the supposed conspiracy to overturn the social order and does not racialize the black and mulatto residents as "mala semilla" or enemies of the state. In questioning the veracity of the supposed rebellion, Chimalphain highlights the brutality of the colonial state in the execution of innocent men and women while critiquing the colonial machinery of power. Thus, my reading of Chimalpahin's revision of Morga's narrative of the conspiracy builds on Daniel Nemser's recent publication which presents Chimalpahin's narrative of the supposed plot of black and mulatto residents of the city "not as another account of Black conspiracy itself, more or less equivalent in form if not in content to its Spanish counterpart, but rather as a critical commentary on the Spanish narrative and by extension on the racialization process" (347).

My reading of Chimalpahin's narrative of the execution also diverges from Doris Namala's reading that interprets the incorporation of such public execution in the works of Nahua annalists as celebration of the grandeur of the colonial capital. As Namala explains when discussing public "spectacles and scandals" in the works of 17th century Nahua annalists:

> Discussions of notorious murders, public executions, and disturbances of peace also assume spectacular qualities. With regard to the latter, annalist go into detail in particular with regard to the form and execution of the punishment leveled against criminals. Hence, the emphasis is on the eradication of evil, which again adds to the grandeur of the altepetl and city at large (164).

This reading, like Morga's own narrative, criminalizes the black and mulatto population while spectacularizing colonial violence. My reading of Chimalpahin's account of the supposed plot and the execution moves in the opposite direction, highlighting Chimalpahin's critique of the colonial authorities and the intolerance of the colonial state. As Rabasa has pointed out, "The criticism of the colonial authorities includes the exposure of the paranoia that led to the hanging of thirty-five Blacks who had been accused of inciting an uprising in 1612" ("In the Mesoamerican Archive" 224).

Chimalpahin's narrative of the rebellion of 1612, like Morga's own narrative, also begins with a brief discussion of the rebellion viceroy Velasco had successfully contained in 1609. In Chimalpahin's rendition of this earlier rebellion, however, he does not question it nor comment on the "leniency" of the punishment the rebels received; he merely reports on what was said by

using the Nahuatl expressions “mihto”—“it was said”—, “machiztic”—“was known”—, and “momatca”—“was believed”—without using the Nahuatl particle “quil” to distance himself from the narrative he presents (116-117). Thus, up to this point in the narrative, the reader does not yet encounter the Nahuatl particle “quil”, a particle that, according to Nahuatl language scholar Michel Launey, is used “to indicate that the speaker is not vouching for the statement in which it appears because [the] statement is known from a third party rather than from personal experience” (373).[37] Hence, in this first instance of a black conspiracy, Chimalpahin simply reports on what was said and known without questioning the narrative or source of information.

Similarly, when he describes the great fear and commotion the supposed rebellion of 1612 caused among the Spanish residents, Chimalpahin does not distance himself from what he reports nor questions what was said. He simply reports on what the Spaniards said, citing them as they expressed their fear by saying: "’Ca otechcentlahtalhuique in techmictizque totlacahuan yn totlilticahuan’” [‘Nos han asegurado que nos matarán nuestros esclavos negros’] (181).

As Chimalpahin describes the paranoia the rebellion produced among the Spaniards, he describes the way in which the Spanish authorities prepared to defend themselves against an imminent attack by fortifying themselves in the colonial city (183). As Chimalpahin explains:

> Auh yn axcan ye ycomilhuitl yn ipan martes saneto omoteneuh, yn ic 17 mani metztli abril, yhcuac nican caltenco S[an] Anton Xolloco ypan hueyotli omotlallico miequintin yaotiacahuan soldadostin españoles yn oyaotlapiaco tlahuiztica; no yhui yhuan yn ipan hueyotli Tepeyacacpa yahticac Coyonacazco no miequintin yn oncan motlallito soldadostin; no yhui yn ipan ohtli Chapoltepecpa yahticac, oncan calyacac temetzcruztitlan no cenca miequintin yn oncan motlalito soldadostin; yhuan ynic nohuiyan yzqui ohtliypan hualcallaqui ciudad Mexico huel yzquican ye yaotlapiallo, za ce ynic nohuiyan in yahualiuhcan yn icaltenyoc yxquich ye ciudad Mexico. Yhuan yn ipan huehuey acallotlih nohuiyan ye yaotlapiallo tlachiallo in campa ye quiçaquihui tliltique yn quinmictiquihui españoles, ypampa yuh mihtohuaya umpa huallazque in ilhuicaatenco in hueyatenco Acapolco omotlallique cimalonti tliltique, yhuan cequintin Bela Cruz huallazque in tliltique cimalonti omocuepque in nican Mexico chollohua yn oquincauhtehuaque yntecuiyohuan.
>
> [Al día siguiente, 17 de abril, martes santo, en las orillas de San Anton Xoloco, se dispusieron sobre la calzada muchos soldados españoles con sus armas para vigilar; también se dispusieron muchos soldados sobre la calzada del Tepeyac, que pasa por Coyonacazco; también se dispusieron muchos soldados sobre la calzada que va a Chapultepec, donde acaban las casas, junto a la cruz de plomo; se puso asimismo vigilancia en todas las calzadas que entran a la ciudad de México y en todos los caseríos que rodean a la ciudad de México. Y también en todos los canales principales se puso vigilancia, a fin de ver por donde saldrían los negros para venir a matar a los españoles, porque se decía que vendrían de la costa de Acapulco, donde se habían asentado algunos

[37] It is important to point out that my reading of Chimalpahin’s use of the Nahuatl particle “quil”—"it is said that”, in Spanish, “dizque”— does not correspond to the verbal expression “mihto”—“it was said”—which, according to Nemser both expressions “perform a similar function” (361). I hightlight this difference between the two expressions because Chimalpahin’s distancing from the official narrative of Morga and his critical stance against the execution of the suspected conspirators lies precisely in this difference.

> negros cimarrones, y que otros negros cimarrones vendrían de la Vera Cruz, regresando a la ciudad de México, de donde habían huido escapando de sus señores] (183-184).

In this description of the fortification of the colonial city, Chimalpahin reports on it without distancing himself from the narrative or questioning it. It is not a surprise to find that he does not distance himself from the narrative here as he is perhaps reporting on what he observed taking place near his chapel of San Antonio Abbad, the chapel where he lived and worked, in the outskirts of the capital city. Moreover, as Chimapahin describes the paranoia of the Spanish residents, he begins to cast doubt on the narrative of the supposed plot of rebellion, going as far as stating that the threat of an imminent attack could very well have been the invention of a "telpochtlaueliloc español"—a wicked Spanish youngster (184).

Besides questioning the veracity of the rebellion, he ridicules the Spaniards for believing what was said. According to Chimalpahin, while the Spanish residents were in panic, the religious orders and the Mexica did not show concern. As Chimalpahin explains:

> Auh yn izquitlamantin teopixque Mexico monoltitoque çan mohuetzquitiaya, amo quinmomauhtiliaya yn quimocaquiltiaya yn ipampa yxquichtlamantli mihtohuaya yaotlahtolli yntechpa tliltique yn cuix quichihuaznequi. Auh yn mexica timacehualtin atle ytlan quinmauhtiaya, çan tlatlachia yhuan tlatlacaqui, çan quinmahuiçohuaya yn españoles yn iuh mopollohuaya in innemauhtiliztica, yniqu iuhqui macamo huel yaotiacahuan ypan nezque.
>
> [Los diversos religiosos que hay en México nomás se burlaban, y para nada se asustaban al escuchar todo lo que se decía acerca de que los negros querían hacer la guerra. Los naturales mexicas, que tampoco estaban asustados, se limitaban a mirar y oír, y se admiraban de que los españoles anduvieran tan abatidos por el miedo, pues mostraron no ser muy valientes] (184-185).

Here Chimalpahin locates the fear of rebellion on the Spanish residents, excluding the members of the religious orders and the Mexica residents of the city. In this marked distinction between the Spaniards, that is, secular Spanish residents and the members of the various religious orders, Chimalpahin echoes his narrative of the eclipse in which he presented the "sabios españoles" as superstitious while presenting the religious orders as certain that nothing extraordinary would happen. Thus, in situating the panic on the secular Spanish residents, he ridicules them and questions their valor.

Once Chimalpahin has described the great panic among Spaniards and the careful vigilance with which they guarded the city, he turns to the execution of the 35 men and women in the central plaza of the colonial capital. Up to this point in the narrative, Chimalpahin has only reported on what was taking place in the city without distancing himself from the narrative he presents. However, once he starts describing the execution, the reader encounters a clear distancing of Chimalpahin with a repeated use of the Nahuatl particle "quil", a repetitive use that illustrates his way of questioning the veracity of the official account Morga presented to the residents of the colonial capital as justification for the execution. Chimalpahin writes:

> Axcan miercoles yn ic 2 mani metztli mayo de 1612 años, yhcuac piloloque cenpohuallonchicuey tlacatl yn tliltique oquichti, auh in tliltique cihua chicome tlacatl yn ihuan piloloque, in ye mochi ye mocenpohua cenpohuallon caxtolli tlacatl in piloloque; oynpan neltico ynic otlatzontequilliloque ynpan yah yn sentencia yn ipampa yniqu intech tlan, ye omoteneuh tlacpac, **quil** macocuizquia quinmictizquia yn intecuiyohuan españoles. Yn iuh omoteneuh yuh chihuililoque información, **quil** ypan juebes sancto yn ihcuac tlayahualolo ynnehuitequian yn españoles quinmictizquia, yn iuh quihtoque testigostin; ypampa ynic cenca tlamauhtique ypan omoteneuh semana sancta ynic amo campa huel tlayahualoloc. Auh **quil** yntla huel quinchihuani yntecuiyohuan españoles, yntla huel quinmictiani, **quil** ye niman yehuantin tlahtocatizquia; **quil** ce tliltic rey mochihuazquia yhuan ce mulata morisca **quil** quimonamictizquia, reyna mochihuazquia ytoca Isabel yn otlahtocatizquia Mexico. Auh **quil** yn ixquich altepetl ynic nohuiyan ypan Nueva España, **quil** ye moch oquimomamacaca yn tliltique yn oncan otlahtocatizquia ynic cequintin duques, cequintin marquestin, cequintin condesme; **quil** omochiuhca ynic tinmacehualhuan otochihuazquia otiquintlacallaquilizquia otiquintlayecoltizquia, oc yehuantin yn nican titlaca timacehualtin techcamaycuilozquia ynic necizquia ca totecuiyohuan.
>
> [El miércoles 2 de mayo de 1612 fueron ahorcados 28 negros y siete negras, de modo que por todas fueron 35 las personas ahorcadas; en ellas se aplicó la sentencia dictada, porque se les acusó, como arriba se dijo, **dizque** querer alzarse y dar muerte a sus amos españoles. Se tenía información de que el jueves santo, cuando se hiciera la procesión con los disciplinantes, **dizque** habrían de matar a los españoles, pues así lo afirmaron los testigos; y por el gran miedo que hubo en esta semana santa, en ninguna parte se hicieron procesiones. Y **dizque**, si hubieran dado muerte a sus señores los españoles, ellos luego habrían tornado el gobierno; **dizque** habría habido un rey negro, el cual desposaría a una mulata morisca de nombre Isabel, para que fuera reina y gobernara en México. **Dizque** los negros ya se habían repartido todos los pueblos de la Nueva España, donde algunos de ellos habrían de gobernar como duques, otros como marqueses y otros como condes; y **dizque** los naturales de esta tierra habríamos de ser sus esclavos, pagándoles tributo y sirviéndoles, y que nos habrían de marcar en la mejilla en señal de que ellos eran nuestros amos] (185-186).

The reader cannot avoid immediately capturing the repetitive use of "quil"—"dizque"— and the irony in Chimalpahin's tone as he narrates the supposed rebellion. It is important to point out the sense of irony the Nahuatl expression conveys because Launey's explanation of the term does not account for this sense of irony—a meaning that is preserved by native Nahuatl speakers today and that can easily be understood when Spanish speakers use the expression "dizque"[38]; thus, signaling Chimalpahin's double distancing from Morga's account and revealing the way in which his text opposes Morga's narrative. It is also worth noting that this is the only section in the entire text where the reader encounters this repetitive use of "quil," highlighting the way in

[38] According the the monolingual Nahuatl dictionary of Modern Huastecan Nahuatl recently published by IDEZ, the meaning of the Nahuatl world "quil" corresponds to the Spanish "dizque". As an example of its meaning the dictionary provides the following example: "**Quil** naman tiyazceh tianquiz pampa ticcohuitih miac tlamantli tlen motequihuiz pan Xantolon" [**Dizque** ahora irémos al tianguiz para comprar muchas cosas que se van a ocupar para el Xantolon (i.e. Día de Muertos)].

which Chimalpahin distances himself from the information he reports while questioning the veracity of Morga's narrative.

Chimalpahin's description of the final moments before the execution points to the innocence of the prisoners and his compassion in seeing them executed for a crime they may not have committed, a gesture which directly counters Morga's account of the culpability of the black and mulatto men and women who were executed. In the passage of the final moments before the execution, he refers to the black and mulatto prisoners as "tliltzitzin"—that is, "dear or revered blacks"—a word which appears only in this instance in the entire text, having referred to the black men and women throughout the text as simply as "tliltique," that is, "blacks." According to Launey's Nahuatl grammar, the suffix "tzin" (plural: "tzitzin") was "originally used as a diminutive suffix but by the time of the classical period, it essentially indicated respect or affection" (106). Interestingly, neither of the two-best translation of Chimalpahin's *Annals*, Lockhart, Schroeder and Namala's English translation nor Tena's Spanish translation, mention this reverential use, simply translating it as "blacks" and "negros", respectively. By using the plural honorific "-tzitzin", I argue, Chimalpahin shows respect and affection for the men and women who were at the verge of being executed.

Chimalpahin also censors himself from reporting on some of the crimes imputed to the prisoners and expresses in their own words their innocence when they explain, as they face the gallows, not knowing the reasons for which they were being punished. As Chimalpahin explains:

> O yxquichtlamantli yn yn italhuililoque yn tenehuililoque yn **tliltzitzin**, yhuan occequi miectlamantli yn italhuiloque yn amo huel moch nican motenehuaz tlahtolli, ca cenca miec yn intech tlan; yn ayo nelli quichihuazquia yn anoço amo, ca çan iceltzin huel yehuatzin quimomachiltia yn t[o]t[ecuiy]o Dios yntla yuhtica, yehica ypampa ca amo huel mellahuac quimocuititihui yn cequintin. Ynmanel oquitzauhctiaque opiloloque, çan oquihtotiaque: "Ma ycatzinco t[o]t[ecuiy]o Dios ticcelican yn miquiztetlatzontequililiztli topan ye mochihua, ca amo ticmati in tleyn in totech tlami ye tictzauhctihui."
>
> [Todas estas cosas se decían de **los [queridos] negros**, además de otras muchas que no se dirán aquí, porque les imputaban muchas acusaciones; y si es verdad que eso iban a hacer, o no es verdad, solo Dios nuestro señor sabe si era así, porque la mayoría de ellos no lo reconocieron. Pues aunque los condenaron y los colgaron, no hacían sino repetir: "En el nombre de Dios nuestro señor aceptemos la sentencia de muerte que se nos impone, pero nosotros no sabemos por qué se nos acusa ni por qué nos castigan"] (189).

This is another important moment in which Chimalpahin questions the official narrative while showing compassion for the victims. Moreover, immediately after this passage which introduces the innocent voice of the prisoners, Chimalpahin includes a list of the names of the colonial officials responsible for sentencing the men and women, thereby preserving for posterity the names of those responsible for such a horrible injustice (189).

After documenting the names of the Audiencia members responsible for the sentence, Chimalpahin presents a graphic description of the execution as a critique of the violence of the state. In four full pages of text, Chimalpahin describes in graphic detail the hanging, the decapitation of the inert bodies, the quartering of six of the bodies, the exhibition of the severed

heads throughout the city, and the dispersal of the body parts of those who were quartered along the roads of the city entrances as exemplary punishment for plotting against the colonial state (190-194). This graphic description of the execution and display of mutilated bodies illustrates Chimalpahin's critical perspective on the brutality and violence of the colonial authorities. Far from spectacularizing violence, Chimalpahin's detailed description of the execution documents the violence of the colonial state, its intolerance and injustice.

My reading of Chimalpahin's narrative of the supposed rebellion of 1612 builds on Nemser's reading of Chimalpahin's narrative as a critical stance, an interpretation which counters Namala's reading of Nahua annalists' incorporation of such violent public displays of power as "a vehicle to express pride in their altepetl" (191). Even if it is true that during Chimalpahin's time the notion of altepetl had expanded to include various Nahua ethnicities and non-indigenous people (191), I resist reading Chimalpahin's narrative as a celebration of the city. Instead, I read Chimalpahin's narrative as a critical revision of Morga's official account and his triumphalist Eurocentric discourse, documenting for the Nahuatl reader, the intolerance and brutality of the colonial state.

Conclusion

By comparing the works of Balbuena, Martínez, Alemán, and Morga with Chimalpahin's own text, it becomes evident that the Nahua annalist does not simply copy or borrow from the works of these European authors as some scholars have suggested. On the contrary, Chimalpahin systematically revises, and rewrites in Nahuatl the narratives that celebrate the greatness of the colonial capital and its colonial administrators. Thus, Chimalpahin challenges the celebratory discourse Balbuena inaugurates in his *Grandeza mexicana* by presenting a counter vision of the city, placing its origin in the pre-Hispanic past and making visible the continuous presence of indigenous people in the city in the everyday life and as an exploited laboring class while making clear that his vision of the city did not conform to the vision and desires of Balbuena and colonial elites. Also, in his revision of Martínez's text, Chimalpahin presents a longer and critical narrative on the history of his ancestors while presenting a critique of the scientific knowledge of European men. Furthermore, Chimalpahin's engagement with Alemán's narrative of Fray García Guerra's life and funeral procession shows that far from celebrating the legacy of a "great prince" and the splendor of the city, Chimalpahin presents a direct critique of the archbishop-viceroy while highlighting the destruction brought by the earthquake of 1611. Lastly, Chimalpahin's distancing from Morga's narrative that asserts the culpability and criminality of blacks and mulattos illustrates Chimalpahin's critical perspective as he documents the injustice of the colonial authorities and the violence of the colonial state. Chimalpahin presents a counter narrative to the celebratory discourse of these four European-born authors while creating an archive for future Nahuatl readers (and listeners) to understand how the colonial capital had developed and the conditions of its indigenous inhabitants at the turn of the 17th century.

Nahua Writing at a Moment of Crisis: Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc, Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, and Domingo Chimalpahin

> As the sixteenth century ended, the supports for indigenous memory confronted the combined assaults of widespread death and deculturation: the death of informants who had memorized the 'words of the older people'; the loss of techniques of reading and making 'paintings'; the disappearance, finally, of those documents, lost, confiscated by the friars, destroyed by the Indians themselves, or neglected as they became indecipherable.
>
> *The Conquest of Mexico*, Serge Gruzinski

As the 16th century came to an end, indigenous communities in what is known today as Central Mexico continued to experience demographic decline due in large part to deadly epidemics. According to historian Charles Gibson, the indigenous population in the area reached its nadir in the mid-17th Century as the population decreased from about one million and a half in 1519 to about 70 thousand in the 17th century (6). At the same time, even though native communities saw their population diminish, they continued to face increasing tributary demands from both *encomenderos* and the colonial administration. Moreover, indigenous governments were still threatened by the interests of colonists who sought to displace them, altering the indigenous government structures that had survived the conquest. As Sylvie Poperstraete has shown when referring to the state of decay of native nobilities: "[E]n los primeros años que siguieron a la Conquista, los indígenas nobles fueron mantenidos en puestos importantes en la nueva admistración colonial… Pero poco a poco, a medida que el poder colonial se fortificaba, la Corona comenzó a retirarles las distinciones que les había otorgado" (203-204). These pressures were accompanied by yet another major threat: their ancient heritage was at a risk of disappearing as educated Nahuas who carried this ancestral knowledge were aging and dying. This is evident in the prologue to Fray Juan Bautista de Viseo's *Sermonario en lengua mexicana* (1606) where he explains that most educated Nahua scribes—the famous *colegiales* from the Colegio of Santa Cruz de Tlaltelolco—and friars who had worked with these Nahua scribes were dying. This was the generation of Nahua *tlacuiloque*[39] who had assisted friars such as Pedro de Gante, Alonso de Molina, and Bernardino de Sahagún, among others, in the development of their works on Nahua Civilization before the conquest and taught them the intricacies of the Nahuatl language throughout the 16th century, assisting them in the development of grammars and vocabularies. Among the Nahua intellectuals the Dominican friar Juan Bautista mentions, the reader finds the Texcocans Hernando de Ribas and Estevan Bravo; the Huexotzinca Don Juan Bernardo; the Tlaltelolcan Diego Adriano; and the Azcapotzalcan Don Antonio Valeriano; these were the same *colegiales* Sahagún mentions in his *Florentine Codex* a quarter of a century earlier. Not surprisingly, the Dominican friar also expresses alarm for the state of decay the

[39] *Tlacuiloque* is the pluralized form of *tlacuilo*, which refers to painter or scribe.

Nahuatl language was in as the learned scribes and the elder generation of educated Nahuas were dying. As he explains when referring to Don Antonio Valeriano, governor of Mexico Tenochtitlan from 1573 to 1599:

> El qual me ayudo muy bien, assi en cosas particulares que le consulté, como en la Ethimologia, y significacion de muchos vocablos, cuya declaración va inserta en el cuerpo del *Sermonario,* para mayor consuelo de los Ministros, que sin trabajo los hallen: por que el dia de oy ay tan pocos Indios a quien poder preguntar cosas de su lengua, que son contados y muchos dellos que vsan de vocablos corruptos, como los vsan los Españoles (Prologo)[40].

This concern for the deaths of educated Nahuas and friars who had written texts on Nahua Civilization and the Nahuatl language clearly shows that this was a moment of crisis. Not only was the indigenous population in severe decline but the survival of their ancestral knowledge was at risk of being lost. Given that those who safeguarded the knowledge of the past were dying, it was critical for those who were still able to, while they still could, to do something to preserve the knowledge and history of the pre-Hispanic past. If it was not done during this critical moment, there was a chance that their histories and knowlege would be lost for ever. Additionally, what Fray Juan Bautista considered to be the "uncorrupted" language of the Nahuas was also in decay as those who had learned it from their ancestors and had maintained it in the oral tradition and in painted codices and alphabetic texts throughout the 16th century, were dying. As the epigraph above illustrates, this was a moment of crisis for the preservation of the wisdom of the Nahua peoples of Central Mexico as the 16th century came to an end. How would educated Nahuas who had survived the epidemics respond to this crisis? How would they preserve their traditions and history? How would they make use of it and for whose benefit? And, ultimately, which narratives would survive into the future?

Moreover, during the 17th century the polemics of possession of the New World continued. As Jorge L. Terukina has recently shown, in the first half of the 17th century peninsular immigrants such as the Baroque poet Bernardo de Balbuena attributed to themselves the moral and intellectual virtues to rule New Spain (24), presenting themselves as the ones posessing the necessary virtues for the "ejercicio del poder en el virreinato" (27). Similarly, Ana More's study of the writings of the Creole savant Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora illustrates how the Creoles of New Spain promoted themselves as the natural lords of their regions (16). However, recent European immigrants and Creoles where not the only ones claiming ownership and legitimacy over the land. As the Spanish and Nahuatl writings of indigenous authors illustrate, indigenous peoples of Cemanahuac were also making a claim to the land and their legitimacy to rule, although the strategies Nahua intellectuals employed to make their claims and the readers they appealed to in their writings varied, as I will illustrate below. Thus, the polemics of possession of the New World continued well into the 17th Century. As Rolena Adorno has pointed out:

> Who owned the lands opened out the question of who had the right to rule them. Who had the right to rule was answered, for some, by who was fit to rule. Here the question devolved onto that of the possession of virtues needed for self-governance: the exercise

[40] I have kept the orthography of 17th century texts and manuscripts in my citations.

> of prudence over oneself, one's household, the wider social and political order, that is, the categories defined by sixteenth-century interpretations of the political philosophy of Aristotle (12).

However, if the debate between Spanish peninsular immigrants and Creoles hinged on the question of who possessed the virtues needed for self-governance in terms of Western political theory, the Nahuatl writings (and paitings) of some Nahua intellectuals insist on the legitimacy of indigenous peoples to rule themselves by other means. As Domingo Chimalpahin illustrates in his writings, the indigenous peoples of Cemanahuac are the original inhabitants of the land and the Spanish conquest and subsequent colonization had dislocated and usurped the legitimate governments of various *altepemeh* (city states) of central Mexico. Thus, the descendants of the original inhabitants of the land, those who lived and those who would survive the deadly epidmics, could reclaim what was legitimately theirs. As such, Chimalpahin's writings present an alternative logic to the polemics of who owned the land and who were the legitimate rulers, going beyond the categories defined by interpretations of the political philosophy of Aristotle to center on the political history and institutions of Cemanahuac.

In this chapter I explore the works of three prominent Nahua authors of the late 16th and early 17th Centuries and the intellectual projects that can be discerned from their works. I begin by exploring the works of Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc (c. 1520s – c.1610), a direct descendant of Moctezuma II who is perhaps the best known and most celebrated Mexica chronicler and annalist who wrote both in Spanish and Nahuatl. I then turn to Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl (1578-1650), a *castizo*, who descended, through the maternal line, from the famous Texcocan ruler Nezahualcoyotl and whose known works are written in Spanish in the form of *relaciones*. Finally, I turn to Domingo Chimalpahin (b.1577-1560?), a native of Chalco whose noble lineage was more modest than the previous two and who wrote primarily in Nahuatl in traditional Nahua annals.

In exploring the works of these three Nahua authors, I illustrate that while Tezozomoc was still limited by the *altepetl*-centered histories of his predecessors and contemporary *tlacuiloque* and writes for both Spanish-speaking and Nahua audiences, the second deployed a discourse of native nobility focused on his personal and familial interests by appealing to the colonial authorities, perpetuating a discourse that has become knows as "lord's discourse."[41] For his part, Chimalpahin extends the work of an earlier generation of Nahua *tlacuiloque* beyond altepetl-centered histories while appealing to Nahua readers of future generations. Thus, I argue that in the work of Chimalpahin we encounter a continuation and expansion of the Nahuatl work of Tezozomoc and other *tlacuiloque* of an earlier generation and one that deviates from Ixtlilxochitl's project directed at the colonial authorities, an intellectual project for the future at a moment of crisis which not only preserves the ancient history of his ancestors but also

[41] According to Peter Villella, in post-conquest Mesoamerica, local native rulers developed a particular discursive genre as early as the 1550s which consisted of a series of recurring tropes and rhetorical formulas attuned to the Crown's priorities of monarchical loyalty, noble pedigree, and catholic orthodoxy, a discourse known as "lord's discourse" (19). Villella illustrates this native historiographic tradition by discussing the native ruler of Texcoco, don Hernando de Pimentel Nezahualcoyotl's, petition to King Carlos I of Castile in 1554 (18). Hence, this type of historical writing" was a specific genre developed to defend the native nobility and their prestige under colonial rule.

documents their dislocation and dispossession. Such an intellectual project presents an alternative vision in which surviving indigenous communities could retain and reclaim their indigenous government systems and institutions while legitimizing their indigenous rights to the land.

Tezozomoc's Mexica Tenochca-centered chronicles: the *Crónica mexicana* and the *Crónica mexicayotl*.

The first indigenous chronicler I will discuss is Tezozomoc. As it is well-known, Tezozomoc was the grandson of the last Aztec ruler, Moctezuma II (1466 -1520) and the son of don Diego Huanitzin, ruler of indigenous Mexico Tenochtitlan from 1538 to 1541. As scholars have pointed out, little is known about Tezozomoc's life—his exact date of birth, the date when he died, his marital status, and his educational experience are not known (Cortés 27). However, given that he descended from high-ranking noble lineage, it is well documented that he was a public figure and he enjoyed the privileges granted to the native nobility in postconquest society.[42] Tezozomoc was able to serve as *Nahuatlato*—i.e. as Nahuatl interpreter—in the Real Audiencia. As Rocío Cortés points out, "Sabemos que Tezozómoc gozaba de un cierto estatus como letrado, también tenía fama como Nahuatlato (experto en el Náhuatl) como lo evidencian dos documentos de delimitación de tierras y uno en el que fungió como testigo en 1610" (29). Thus, even though many of the details about Tezozomoc life are unknown, what is known leaves no doubt that, since he descended from a high-ranking Mexica Tenochca family, he enjoyed a privileged position in colonial society. Even Chimalpahin, who is significantly younger than Tezozomoc, noted this privilege in the *Annals of His Time* in the entry for the year 1600 when he documents Tezozomoc's representation of his grandfather Moctezuma II in a viceregal celebration in which he was led to the door of the viceregal palace (*Annals of His Time* 25). Additionally, the two surviving texts attributed to Tezozomoc illustrate his status as "letrado" and his concern with documenting the history of Mexica rule.

Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicana* (1598), a text written in Spanish in the form of a Spanish chronicle, narrates the history of the expansion of the Mexica state. In 112 chapters,[43] the author recounts the history of the Mexica Tenochca, from their humble beginnings when they migrate out of Chicomoztoc to the rise of the Mexica as the rulers of *Cemanahuac*, "the world."[44] The chronicle begins with:

[42] According to Romero Galván, some of the privileges granted to indigenous nobles were: exemption from tribute payments; the right to posess land and livestock, own weapons and be able to dress as Spaniards; and the right to become gobernors or "caciques" of the altepetl from where they hailed ("Las fuentes de las diferentes historias" 56)

[43] In their description of the manuscript, Gonzalo Díaz Migoyo and Germán Vázquez Chamorro point out that the chapters in Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicana* are numbered (22). As evidence of this they also cite Sigüenza y Góngora who writes in the second half of the 17th century when referring to the original manuscript: "Assi lo dice D. Hernando de Alvarado Teçoçómoctzin, hijo de Cuitalhuactzin, successor de Motecuhçoma en el imperio, en el cap. 82 fol. 113 de la Histora que escrivió de los mexicanos; y tengo original M.S. en mi libreria" (19).

[44] Cemanahuac was the term the Nahuas used to refer to their world. The term consists of the prefix "Cem" (the whole or entirety of someting) and "anahuac", the lake region ("atl" + "nahuac", next to the water). Thus, the term refers to the entire region surrounding the lakes and beyond.

> La benida que hizieron y tiempos y años que estubieron en llegar a este Nueuo Mundo, adelante se dirá. Y así, ellos propios persuadiendo a los naturales, por la estrechura en que estauan, determinó y les habló su dios en quien ellos adoraban, Huitzilopochtli, Quetzalcoatl, Tlalocateutl y otros, como se yrá tratando. La benida de estos mexicanos muy antiguos, en la parte que ellos binieron, tierra y casa antigua llaman oy día Chicomoztoc, que dize Casa de siete cueuas cabernosas; segundo nombre llaman Aztlan, que es dezir Asiento de la garça (53).

With these opening lines, Tezozomoc begins his account by naming the place from where his Mexica ancestor migrated while highlighting his efforts to translate the Nahua world for the Spanish reader. Besides explaining that the "god" these indigenous ancestors venerated were multiple gods (among them Huitzilopochtli, Quetzalcoatl, Tlalocateutl and others), he also translates the meaning of the name of the place from where they migrated, Chicomoztoc and Aztlan. Thus, from the beginning, the reader can perceive Tezozomoc's efforts to translate for the Spanish reader the world of his ancestors, something he does throughout his narrative when he incorporates Nahuatl terms and expressions and translates them into Spanish or explains their meaning. However, Tezozomoc is strategic in choosing the categories he uses to narrate his story; at times, he uses Western terms and concepts to refer to pre-Hispanic institutions, particularly those related to political institutions.

In 160 folios of Spanish text with countless references to Nahuatl terms and expressions, Tezozomoc describes in detail their wars of conquest, marriages, alliances, the coronation of Mexica rulers, etc. In his narrative, he celebrates the greatness of the Mexica state as he describes their rise to power and their hegemony into the time of Moctezuma II. According to Cortés, the structure of the narrative itself reveals "el énfasis en la grandeza *mexica-tenochca* y un razonamiento de las ganancias o pérdidas del imperio de acuerdo a una estructura mítica, por medio de la cual, se ajustan los hechos" (31). Hence, Tezozomoc presents what could be called an 'other' *grandeza mexicana*, one that, unlike Balbuena's celebrated poem, is focused on the preeminence of the Mexica state in pre-Hipanic times since throughout the narrative the reader finds numerous references to the grandeaur of the Mexica state. For instance, early on in the narrative when referring to the settlment of the Mexica in the island of Tenochtitlan he writes:

> De manera que éstos son los prençipales balerosos mexicanos y los fundadores de Mexico Tenuchtitlan y los primeros capitanes y conquistadores que ganaron y ensancharon esta gran rrepública y corte mexicana, y las tierras y pueblos que pusieron en suxeción y cabeça de Mexico Tenuchtitlan; que estos tales prençipales por ellos a sido y es cabeça de Mexico Tenuchtitlan y su grandeza y señorio que oy es, siendo primero Mexico Tenuchtitlan nonbrado 'el lugar del tular y cañaberal y laguna çercado' ['*tultzalan, acatl ytic, atlytic Mexico Tenuchtitlam']*… (80).

Notice that in pointing to the supremacy of the Mexica state, Tezozomoc uses Spanish categories when referring to pre-Hispanic institutions. Thus, the reader encounters references to "república", "corte", and "señorio". There is no mention of the Nahuatl terms *altepetl*, *tlahtocayotl*, or *tlahtocamecayotl*, terms that are central to understanding pre-Hispanic political

institutions.[45] Also notice that, similarly to the opening lines, Tezozomoc translates the designation of Mexico Tenochtitlan as "the place of bulrush and reeds in the middle of the water" for the Spanish reader while incorporating the original Nahuatl expression. Soon after, as he references the city states conquered by the Mexica, Tezozomoc explains:

> todos los quales pueblos, tierras ganaron y señorearon estos mexicanos balerosos en breue tiempo, de los quales y de sus rrentas de ellos traían de tributo lo más supremo y preçiado: piedras preçiosas, esmeraldas, otras piedras *chalchihuitl*, oro, preçiada plumeria de diuersas maneras y colores, de diuersas maneras de preçiadas abes bolantes, nomrados *xiuhtotol*, *tlauhquechol*, *tzinitzcan*… finalmente de toda cosa que se cría y hazen las orillas de la mar los naturales de las costas, piedras xaspes y cristales y otras que llaman *tlaltcocolt* y *nacazcolli*, y todas las flores de colores de tintes para pintar que los tales tributarios traían (81).

Here the reader encounters, once again, the grandeaur of Mexico Tenochtitlan as Tezozomoc describes the variety of tribute the conquered peoples brought to the Aztec capital. This passage also shows his attempt to translate the Nahua world for the Spanish reader as he incorporates Western concepts to describe the Mexica state in pre-Hispanic times.

Interestingly, Tezozomoc's Spanish chronicle ends presicely at the moment when the Spanish forces are received by the Tlaxcaltecs in what appears to be the beginning of their alliance. As Tezozomoc explains: "Y así, llegaron a Tlaxcalan, a donde fueron muy bien rresçibidos y serbidos muy bien. Y a esto, cada día tenía Monteçuma abiso de lo que pasaua en los caminos y como quedauan en Tlaxcala, y hizo llamamientos de todos los prençipales de sus comarcas para hazer acuerdo y cabildo, como adelante se dirá en otro cuaderno" (484). With this, the Mexica chronicler brings his narrative to a close, leaving the reader in suspense on what took place after the Taxcaltecs received the Spaniards and as Moctezuma summoned other indigenous lords to discuss what would be done. To my knowledge, there is no other text written in Spanish by Tezozomoc in which he continues his narrative. Hence, Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicana* is limited to narrating the history of the Mexica and their rise to power, from their departure from Chicomoztoc/Aztlan to the rise of the Mexica state, clearly illustrating that Tezozomoc's Spanish narrative is focused on the history of his Mexica Tenochca ancestors. Tezozomoc's Nahuatl text, *Crónica mexicayotl*, on the other hand, is very different from his *Crónica mexicana*; yet, its focus continues to be the history of the Mexica Tenochca.

Before continuing with my discussion of the *Crónica mexicayotl*, it is important to point to the debate surrounding the text. As Susan Schroeder as shown, up until recently, the chronicle had been attributed solely to Tezozomoc, disregarding the fact that the existing manuscript is in the hand of Chimalpahin. According to Schroeder, only 19 of the 49 folios were written by Tezozomoc ("The Truth About the *Crónica Mexicayotl*" 233-235). Thus, Schroeder attributes the chronicle mainly to Chimalpahin, concluding that "Alvarado Tezozomoc was simply one source among many" and that "Chimalpahin does indeed draw on the work of the aristocratic historian, but he tells us even more about the possession, preservation, and use of precious documents among their fellow intellectuals, and their collective concern for posterity" (243). In

[45] The Nahuatl term "altepetl" refers to a local ethnic state or an independent sociopolitical unit; "tlahtocayotl" refers to a dynastic rulership; and "tlahtocamecayotl" refers to a royal genealogy. (see Schroeder 1991).

this way, Schroeder highlights the work of Chimalpahin, making clear that Tezozomoc's text was one of many sources. On the other hand, Gabriel Kenrick Kruell's philological reconstruction of the *Crónica X*[46] convincingly shows that the first part of *Crónica mexicayotl* itself is an incomplete version of the famous *Crónica X* written by Tezozomoc himself and the second part is authored by Chimalpahin (302-304). Consequently, both Schroeder and Kenrick Kruell have brought to the attention of scholars that the existing manuscript, in the hand of Chimalpahin, cannot be merely attributed to either Tezozomoc or Chimalpahin, but to both authors. However, even if Tezozomoc's text was only one of the sources Chimalpahin copied, it is important to point out that the sections he copied from Tezozomoc's text, i.e. the introductory section of the *Crónica mexicayotl*, informed Chimalpahin's own intellectual project, as I will illustrate below.

In *Crónica mexicayotl* (1609), a text written in Nahuatl in annals form for a Nahua reader of the future, Tezozomoc presents a detailed genealogy of the rulers of Mexico Tenochtitlan before and after the conquest. His annals diverge significantly from his Spanish chronicle. First, unlike his Spanish text, his *Crónica mexicayotl* is written in traditional annals form in Nahuatl; it also does not limit itself to the pre-Hispanic era but continues until the year 1579, carefully tracing the genealogy of Mexica Tenochca rulers from the time of their migration until the last descendant of the Mexica Tenochca ruled Mexico Tenochtitlan in 1565. And most importantly, Tezozomoc's Nahuatl chronicle also begins with an introductory statement that makes clear that he is writing for the descendants of the Mexica Tenochca, that is, Nahuatl readers of the future. Moreover, Tezozomoc's text diverges from the narratives of missionary authors such as Las Casas and Sahagún who wrote about the Nahuas world before the conquest. Unlike Las Casas who presents indigenous peoples as noble savages in need of protection from the colonial state to survive, and Sahagún's description of Nahua Civilization as a thing of the past and living Indians as a mere shadow of their past, Tezozomoc's text presents an alternative view which points to the survival and continuity of the Mexica Tenochca. Instead of pointing to a great past which culminated with the arrival of the Spaniards and the destruction of Mexico Tenochtitlan, Tezozomoc presents a detailed genealogy of the Mexica Tenochca nobility and its continuity into his colonial present. Hence, for Tezozomoc, the conquest of Mexico Tenochtitlan did not mark the end of the Mexica Tenochca peoples. Thus, throughout his annals, from beginning to end, Tezozomoc includes the dates for the events he describes in both the Mesoamerican and the Christian calendrical system. For instance, in the first date he includes to mark the initial migration of the ancestors he writes: "Ynic quizque yn Chichimeca yn Azteca, ynic ompa hualquizque inichan Aztlan ypan ce Tecpatl Xihuitl, 1069 años" [Entonces salieron los chichimecas, los Aztecas, de Aztlan, que era su morada, en el año uno-pedernal, 1069 años] (León 14), and throughout his narrative he presents the year in the Nahua calendar system followed by the year in the Christian era. Instead of marking a rupture in time with the arrival of Cortés and the destruction of Mexico Tenochtitlan, pointing to the imposition of the Western/Christian world over the Nahua world and the absorption of Nahua Civilization into the

[46] *Crónica X* is the name given to a primary source on the history of indigenous peoples of Central Mexico that scholars theorize served as the baisis for several 16th century historical texts, including Diego Durán, Juan de Tovar, and José de Acosta's narratives on the history of indigenous peoples of Central Mexico. See Robert H. Barlow's "La crónica X: Versiones coloniales de la historia de los mexica tenochca" (1945), María Castañeda de la Paz's "El Códice X o los Anales del 'Grupo de la peregrinación" (2008), and Gabriel Kenrick Kruell's "Resucitando la Crónica X" (2013).

universal history of Christianity, Tezozomoc points to the continuity of Nahua calendar and the continuity of the native nobility into the colonial era and into the future.

In the opening statement to his annals, before he begins narrating the history and genealogy of the Mexica Tenochca, it becomes clear to the reader that Tezozomoc is writing for future generations, for the descendants of the Mexica Tenochca:

> yn notechcahui cahuilitiaque. Yn axcan tonnemi yn in techtiquiça auhayc polihuiza yc ylcahuiz. Yn oquichihuaco yn oquitlallico yn intlillo yn intlapallo yn polihuiz ayc ylcahuiz nochipa ticpiezque in tehuantin yn titepilhuan yn titeyxhuihuan yn titete ycca to tonhuan yn titemin totonhuan yn titepiptotonhuan yn titechichicahuan. Yn titletlapallohuan yn titeheçohuan quitotihui quitenehuatihui yhuan y noc yollizque yn tlacatizque. Yn Mexica tepilhuan yn tenochca tepilhuan.
>
> [[Esta historia] nos la legaron a los que vivimos, a quienes de ellos procedemos, y nunca se perderá, ni olvidará lo que hicieran, lo que asentaran en sus escritos y pinturas, su fama, y el renombre y recuerdo que de ellos hay, en los tiempos venideros jamás se perderá ni olvidará, siempre lo guardaremos nosotros, los que somos hijos, nietos, hermanos menores, biznietos, tataranietos, descendientes, sangre y color suyos; lo dirán y lo nombrarán quienes vivan y nazcan, los hijos de los mexicanos, los hijos de los tenochcas] (5).

As their ancient heritage, Tezozomoc exhorts the descendants of the Mexica to "huel Xiccaquican Xicanacan yn antepilhuan yn çaço ac yehuantin. yn amotech quiçatihui yn yollizque. in nemitihui yn amo tlacamecayo huan yezque" [oídla y comprenderla bien, vosotros, los hijos y nietos los mexicanos, los tenochcas y todos quienes quiera que de vosotros provengan, quienes nazcan, vivan, y sean de nuestro lineaje] (9-10). Immediately after, he begins to narrate the history of his ancestors who migrated from the north and two and a half centuries later founded the great city of Mexico Tenochtitlan to later present a detailed genealogy of rulers of the Aztec city and their descendants into the mid-Sixteenth Century.

As Tezozomoc documents the genealogy of the governors of Mexico Tenochtitlan and their descendants, describing the intermarriages with other Nahua polities and stating the names of their descendants, he does not present an interruption in the government of the city and the genealogy of Mexica nobility with the arrival of Cortés and the fall of the Aztec capital. Instead, Tezozomoc continues tracing the genealogy of the Mexica nobility, including the intermarriages of Mexica nobles with nobles from other Nahua polities and the marriages of Mexica women and Spanish men, presenting the names of their off-springs and their descendants. Hence, Tezozomoc continues describing the genealogy of the rulers of Mexico Tenochtitlan into the mid-Sixteenth Century until the death of Don Luis de Santa María, the last Mexica ruler "in tlatocat zan ye xihuitl, once ipanin tlamico inintlapacholliz in Tenochca tlazotlatocatepilhuan in Mexico Tenochtitlan Atlihtic" [que reinó no más de tres años allá en el se vino a acabar su gobernamiento de ellos los hijos de los amados reyes de los tenochca, en Mexico Tenochtitlan Atlìtic] (174-175). For Tezozomoc, the death of Don Luis, unlike the arrival of Cortés and Cuauhtemoc's surrender, marks the end of the Mexica Tenochca rule of the city. Moreover, it marks the moment in which the residents of Mexico Tenochtitlan take it upon themselves to protect their heritage. As Tezozomoc explains: "11 Tecpatl xihuitl, 1568 años, ipan in hualla ce

Juez Govenador Tecamachalco ichan, itoca Dn. Francisco Ximenez, quin yehuatl compehualtico yece in nican Tenochtitlan inic altepehuaque ye quihualpachohua in Mexicayotl Tenochtcayotl." [En el año 11-pedernal, 1568 años, fue cuando vino un Juez Gobernador, habitante de Tecamachalco, llamado Don Francisco Jiménez desde que vino a principiar que por ello tomaron los citadinos a su cargo la guarda de las cosas mexicanas, de las cosas tenochcas] (175). It is important to highlight this passage because it illustrates the preoccupation of the residents of Mexico Tenochtitlan to protect the Mexica Tenochca heritage, an aspect Rafael Tena's translation of the *Crónica mexicayotl* completely disregards when he translates the expression "ye quihualpachohua in Mexicayotl Tenochtcayotl" as simply "gobernaron en Tenochtitlan a los mexica tenochcas" (153).[47] While one might read this preoccupation of Tezozomoc as a critique of the antagonism that existed among Nahua polities before and after the conquest, in this case the antagonism between the Mexica and the Tlaltelolcans, another reading could be that Tezozomoc is indirectly critiquing the illegitimate colonial government by presenting a clear genealogy of the legitimate rulers of Mexico Tenochtitlan and highlighting the continuity of the Mexica Tenochca nobility after the conquest. Moreover, Tezozomoc's insistence on the importance of future generations to understand and remember the history of their ancestors and the continuity of the native nobility into the future presents an alternative intellecual project from the one we see in his *Crónica mexicana* and in Las Casas and Sahagún. Tezozomoc's project thus presents the possibility of the living Indians, and their descendants, to reclaim what is legitimately theirs—not only their government of Mexico Tenochtitlan but also their heritage, a heritage they had been protecting for decades. Hence, by presenting a critique of the imposition of an "outsider" governor and the Mexica's efforts to protect their heritage, Tezozomoc presents a critique of the colonial authorities without directly mentioning the Crown and the illegitimate colonial government. For Tezozomoc, the history and genealogy of the Mexica Tenochca people remains open into the colonial era and beyond, imagining the possibility of an alternative future.

Ixtlilxochitl's "Lord's Discourse" and his Texcoco-centered *Relaciones*

In the last decade, the writings of the *castizo* historian Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl have captured the attention of historians and literary scholars. This renewed interest in his works is evident in the 2014 issue of the journal *Colonial Latin American Review*, an issue dedicated to Ixtlilxochitl's life and works. What is surprising about the articles featured in this journal is the lack of attention scholars give to his notion of "*original historia*" given that this is the foundation of his early historical writings. Moreover, critics often dismiss his work as ethnographer, which cannot be overlooked because it informs his historiographic and political projects. These two omissions lead me to ask: what exactly is this "original historia" Ixtlilxochitl constantly references in his writings? Where does it come from? And what is the purpose of his writing?

[47] Tena's translation of the passage for 1568 in Crónica mexicayotl states: "11 Tecpatl, 1568. En este año vino un juez gobernador, llamado don Francisco Jiménez, que era natural de Tecamachalco; él fue el primero de los venidos de fuera que gobernaron en Tenochtitlan a los mexicas tenochcas" (Tena 153). My own translation of this passage differs from Tena's and is more in line with León's translation as the expression Mexicayotl Tenochcayotl cannot simply translate as "mexicas tenochcas" but it refers to the abstract idea of the Mexica state. Thus, my translation of this passage is as follows: "Año 11 tecpatl. 1568 años. En el que vino un juez gobernador de Tlacamachalco. Se llama don Francisco Ximénez. Luego él fue el primero aquí en Tenochtitlan que vino a retar a los residentes que vienen gobernando el estado mexicano."

Recent critical work on Ixtlilxochitl's historical writings points to divergent interpretations.[48] Amber Brian captures the different ways in which Ixtlilxochitl's work has been interpreted and used for various historiographic and intellectual projects in an article on Ixtlilxochitl's narratives of the conquest. According to Brian, Ixtlilxochitl's historical writings have been interpreted in four major different ways: as the work of a Creole patriot; as the mediation of a subaltern colonial subject between the Nahua and Western traditions; as an early manifestation of the formation of the Mexican nationalist consciousness; and as an assimilated *mestizo* pretending to be native (137-141). This divergence of perspectives is also evident in a more recent edited collection on Texcoco in the pre-Hispanic and colonial eras in which Jerome Offner points out that scholars of Ixtlilxochitl pay very little attention to (and barely understand) the pre-Hispanic historiographic tradition from which Ixtlilxochitl draws, and José Rabasa questions Ixtlilxochitl's incorporation of Nahua voices into his writings and his failure to account for the history of the peoples without history, state, and the Christian religion.[49]

Instead of merely defending or critiquing any of the authors and readings of Ixtlilxochitl presented above, my aim here is to show that Ixtlilxochitl uses the "original historia" in his early writings to make a case for the restitution of land and the rights and privileges of Texcoco's native nobility. As his early historical writing make clear, they were written in Spanish for the colonial authorities, for the viceroy himself. Thus, Ixtlilxochitl continues the indigenous and mestizo historiographic tradition Peter Villella identifies as "lord's discourse." According to Villella, in post-conquest Mesoamerica local native rulers developed a particular discursive genre as early as the 1550s which consisted of a series of recurring tropes and rhetorical formulas attuned to the Crown's priorities of monarchical loyalty, noble pedigree, and catholic orthodoxy, a discourse that has come to be known as "lord's discourse" (19). Villella situates the beginning of this historiographic tradition in the petition of the native ruler of Texcoco, don Hernando de Pimentel Nezahualcoyotl, to King Carlos I of Castile in 1554, a tradition Ixtlilxochitl continues in his defense of his family's prestige and privileges as survivors of the native nobility (18). Consequently, Ixtlilxochitl's historical writings are part of a specific genre directed at the colonial authorities and developed to defend the native nobility and their privileges under colonial rule.

---

[48] The articles in the *Colonial Latin American Review* illustrate not only the renewed interest in Ixtlixochitl's works but also a variety of interpretations. While Brandley Benton interprets Ixtlilxochitl's efforts to write the history of his ancient past as primarily motivated by personal gains, Leisa Kauffmann's reads Ixtlilxochitl's most controversial piece, the *Historia de la nación chichimeca*, as the work of a cultural mediator. Meanwhile, Camilla Townsend denies any connection of Ixtlilxochitl to the Colegio of Tlaltelolco (and other native intellectuals) and presents the Franciscan friar Torquemada as the man responsible for Ixtlilxochitl's intellectual development. On the other extreme, Peter Villella associates the writings of Ixtlilxochitl with the continuation and further development of a post-conquest native historiographic tradition he identifies as "lord's discourse." For her part, Brian makes a direct connection between Ixtlilxochitl and the native intellectual community of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

[49] In "Voice in Alva Ixtlilxóchitl Historical Writings" José Rabasa presents a strong critique of Ixtlilxochitl's historical writings for his filtering the voices of the elders as he "imposed a shroud of silence on the same sources he drew from to validate the idea that his narratives are devoid of all fables" (i.e the "original historia") and pointing to his failure to account for the history of the peoples who chose to remain without history, state, and the Christian religion (188).

Before I begin my analysis of Ixtlilxochitl, it is important to briefly discuss his biography and his work as historian. It is well-known that he was a *castizo* born in 1578 and that he descended from noble lineage. The son of Juan de Peraleda and Ana Cortés de Ixtlilxochitl, heir of the cacicazgo of San Juan Teotihuacan, Ixtlilxochitl's lineage can be traced to Don Fernando de Cortés Ixtlilxochitl, ruler of Texcoco and ally of Cortés, and the previous generations of Texcoco rulers, including the famous poet-philosopher-ruler Nezahualcoyotl (Carrera Stampa 223). As the direct descendant of a noble family, Ixtlilxochitl had access to an elite education through which he learned to read and write in Spanish (and possibly Nahuatl), while studying Christian theology and the European literary traditions[50]. Consequently, it is not surprising to see in his writings a clear understanding and use of European forms and references to the Christian religion and Western historical and literary traditions. As a bilingual and bicultural educated member of a noble family, Ixtlilxochitl also had access to government positions, becoming Juez gobernador of Texcoco in 1612, of Tlalmanalco in 1616, and Chalco in 1619, and interpreter in the Court of Indians for many years (Dávila 3). In the assessment of Susan Schroeder, Ixtlilxochitl was very entitled and privileged due to his Texcocan family affiliations, which facilitated his role as an intellectual and intermediary in seventeenth-century New Spain (*The Conquest All Over Again* 10).

As a descendant of the indigenous nobility, Ixtlilxochitl was in a privileged position to write the history of his ancestors and to document their present condition as a social class, a class which continued to be marginalized and was becoming irrelevant in the seventeenth century. His historical works can be divided into two groups: the *Relaciones históricas*, written around the year 1600, and the *Historia de la nación Chichimeca*, written around the year 1616.[51] Whereas the *Relaciones históricas* are somewhat shorter pieces consisting of "escritos sueltos, cantares, opúsculos, fragmentos en los que hay varias repeticiones de hechos y personajes," individual narratives which function independently of each other, the *Historia de la nación Chichimeca* comprises a single, long narrative in which Ixtlilxochitl narrates the history of Texcoco from the origins of the world to the arrival of Cortés (Carrera Stampa 223).[52] My intention in pointing to the difference between his early works and his *Historia de la nación Chichimeca* is to show that his early works were written for a different purpose than his latest and longest piece.[53]

---

[50] There is no agreement among scholars on where and how Ixtlilxochitl received his education. While some argue he attended the Colegio de Tlaltelolco, others refute this explanation. See the articles by Townsend and Cortés for a glimpse at these opposing views.

[51] There is no agreement on the exact dates on when Ixtlilxochitl wrote each of his pieces. This debate continues now that the original manuscripts have been bought by the Mexican government and more historians and literary scholars are undertaking work on the manuscripts.

[52] Another important thing to point out about the *Historia de la nación Chichimeca* is that it is truncated; consequently, it is not possible to know how it ends. In his study of Ixtlilxochitl's historical writings O'Gorman suggests that we should assume that the *Historia* ends just like his thirteenth relación in the *Relaciones históricas*. However, this is not an acceptable suggestion given that it has been shown that Ixtlilxochitl shorter historical writings are clearly different from the *Historia*.

[53] The *Historia de la nación chichimeca* also makes references to the pre-Hispanic sources he uses as the basis for his history, although these references are not as present as in his early writings. From the beginning Ixtlilxochitl references his sources by including phrases such as "declaran por sus historias", "según la *Historia general*", "la *Historia general del imperio de los chichimecas*", "la *Historia general del imperio de los chichimecas*, cuyos autores se decian el uno Cemilhuitzin y el otro Quauhquechol…", etc. The interesting thing here is that Ixtlilxochitl never

Within his historical narratives, Ixtlilxochitl weaved into his text the testimonies of the elders who told him the experience of those who lived before and after the conquest or those who were "ear-witnesses" and who could read the surviving paintings and manuscripts.[54] However, he translates the Nahuatl speech of the elders into Spanish, not merely translating the language but also using Spanish concepts to explain the history of his ancestors—concepts related to Spanish courtly life.

One of the key characteristics of Ixtlilxochitl's *Relaciones históricas* is the constant references to the primary sources he used for writing his histories and his use of the term "original historia." His *Sumaria relación de las cosas de Nueva España* explicitly explains what these sources are and how he went about collecting them; it begins with a brief "Dedicatoria" in which he describes the material sources and oral traditions he used, while explaining the legitimacy and validity of these sources:

> Desde mi adolescencia tuve siempre gran deseo de saber las cosas acaecidas en este Nuevo Mundo, que no fueron menos que las de los romanos, griegos, medos y otras repúblicas gentílicas que tuvieron fama en el universo, aunque con la mudanza de los tiempos y caída de los señoríos y estados de mis pasados, quedaron sepultadas sus historias; por cuya causa he conseguido mi deseo con mucho trabajo, peregrinación y suma diligencia en juntar las pinturas de las historia y anales, y los cantos con que las observaban; y sobre todo para poderlas entender, juntando y convocando a muchos principales de esta Nueva España, los que tenían fama de conocer y saber las historias referidas (526)

Here we see a concise description of the "original historia" he references, the painted histories and the songs or performances that accompanied the readings of those painted histories; his opening statement also shows his effort in collecting these painted histories and learning of their meaning from the individuals of noble rank. Even though Ixtlilxochitl does not use the term "original historia" here, there is no doubt that the history he is describing is the pre-Hispanic historiographic tradition he draws from. Moreover, his description also points to the process by which he gathers the information, congregating the elders who had kept the memory of this tradition and who were able to decipher the painted histories to later translate them from Nahuatl to Spanish.

The "Prólogo al lector" which follows the "Dedicatoria" provides a description of the various types of historical writing the Nahuas of Central Mexico used to document their histories, which included annals, genealogies of the native nobility, paintings indicating territorial boundaries, maps, and books about law, rites and ceremonies, science and philosophy, among others (527). Yet, Ixlilxochitl does not provide the Nahuatl names for these sources the way Chimalpahin does. Immediately after referencing the pre-Hispanic tradition, Ixtlilxochitl laments the destruction of books of native knowledge going as far as stating that the burning of books was one of the worst damages done to the native peoples of New Spain (527). After

---

mentions the term "original historia" in this history; instead, he refers to the pre-Hispanic sources he utilizes without using the term "original historia" and refers to some of his pre-Hispanic sources as *Historia general*.

[54] As I have stated above, in the *Historia de la nacion chichimeca* Ixtlilxochtil also points to the pre-Hispanic sources he uses to write his history, although he does it less frequently and not as directly as he does in his earlier pieces.

presenting his critique, Ixtlilxochitl ends his prologue by describing his personal archive and explaining that these painted histories are the sources he uses to write (527-528).

In the other three *Relaciones históricas,* Ixtlilxochitl utilizes the term "original historia" to refer to the pre-Hispanic historiographic tradition from which he draws. A short passage at the end of his *Relación sucinta en forma de memorial* points to his conception of "original historia" when he explains:

> Esta relación he sacado, excelentísimo señor, de los nueve libros que estoy escribiendo de cosas de la tierra, de más de dos mil años a estas partes, según está en la original historia de los señores de esta tierra, conforme lo he interpretado y los viejos, personas principales y doctos con quien yo he comunicado, me lo han declarado; que para quien lo entiende es tan claro como nuestras letras (413)

Here we see the native archive Ixtlilxochitl consults, going to the source, to the "*viejos, personas principales y doctos*" who communicate their knowledge of the past to him. Notice here that the reference to "excelentísimo señor" makes evident that he is writing for the colonial authorities, to the viceroy himself.

The Nahua archive Ixtlilxochitl draws from is evident throughout his four *relaciones* when he uses phrases such as "como aparece en sus historias y pinturas" (397); "de los cuales se les hallan historia y pintura" (398); "como aparece en sus historias" (408, 411); "conforme a la original historia" (423); "según parece en los cantos que compuso este rey sobre estas cosas, que hasta hoy día tienen algunos pedazos de ellos los naturales" (447), "según parece en las historias y muchas relaciones que tengo en mi poder de don Alonso Axayaca y otros autores y yo he oído platicar a algunos viejos" (514); among other similar expressions. Hence, his "original historia" refers to both the painted histories, chants, and oral histories he gathers and from the elders.

As part of the *Sumaria relación de todas las cosas que han sucedido en la Nueva España,* he includes a section titled, "Declaración del autor sobre sus informantes." This "Declaración" begins by stating: "Ésta es la verdadera historia de los tultecas según yo lo he podido interpretar, y los viejos principales con quien lo he comunicado me lo han declarado, y otros memoriales, escritos de los primeros que supieron escribir me lo han dado…" (285). Notice here that Ixtlilxochitl insists on the validity and authenticity of his sources, referencing the oral traditions of the elders and the material sources he draws from to write his history. He then proceeds by mentioning the names of the *principales* from whom he gathered information, identifying them by name, age, and mentioning specific details about each of them and the sources from which they got their information (285-286). By identifying the name of his informants, their noble titles, and the type of material sources they draw from, Ixtlilxochitl points to the legitimacy of his sources and makes clear that he is writing the history of the native nobility.

His "Declaración" also makes a direct critique of Spanish historians for not having access to the "original historia" when he writes: "Muchas historias he leído de españoles que han escrito las cosas de esta tierra, que todas ellas son tan fuera de lo que está en la original historia y las de todos estos, y entre las falsas, la que en alguna cosa conforma es la de Francisco Gómara, clérigo, historiador que fue del emperador don Carlos, nuestro señor…" (287). In effect,

Ixtlilxochitl identifies his informants to authorize himself as author as he points to the privileged Nahua archive he had at his disposal to write the history of his ancestors.

His early historical writings tell a similar story by focusing on four main concerns, concerns that are at the core of what Villella and others have identified as "lord's discourse." First, Ixtlilxochitl's historical writings trace the genealogy of his indigenous ancestors. For instance, his *Relación sucinta,* after tracing the genealogies of various city-states of Central Mexico in fifteen short narratives, concludes that "*Todos los naturales de esta tierra descienden de dos lineajes; chichimecas y tultecas*" (412), thereby grounding his claim to their legitimacy to the land. Second, Ixtlilxochitl's historical writings make a case for the just and good government of his acestors. For example, in the *Compendio histórico* he devotes nine pages to Nezahualcoyotl's virtues and good government, highlighting his qualities as "*hombre sabio*", "*hombre de gran gobierno y justiciero*", and "*hombre muy misericordioso y caritativo*" (447). Third, Ixtlilxochitl's writings describe the demise of the native nobility after the conquest. In the *Compendio histórico*, for instance, Ixtlilxochitl presents the decline of the native nobility with the arrival of the Europeans when he critiques Cortés's murder of Cuauhtemoc and other native lords in order to displace the native nobility and take over as ruler (505). Yet, in his narrative of the conquest, Ixtlilxochitl highlights his great-grandfathers's important contribution to the conquest of Mexico Tenochtitlan as an ally of Cortés, going as far as to argue that his great-grandfather saved Cortés's life. Finally, the *Relaciones históricas* complain to the viceroy about the present condition of the native nobility and ask for restitution of lost privileges. In his "Dedicatoria" to the *Relación sucinta*—a short passage in which he dedicates his narrative to the viceroy—Ixtlilxochitl states: "Suplico a vuestra excelencia reciba pequeño servicio y se acuerde de los pobres descendientes de estos señores cuando se ofrezca ocasión que vuestra excelencia escriba a su majestad, que en ello recibiremos muchos bienes. Humilde criado de vuestra excelencia que su mano besa" (413). What is interesting in Ixtlilxochitl's dedication to the viceroy is that he manages to complain about the present condition of the native nobility without antagonizing the viceroy himself, denouncing the condition of the native nobility while remaining loyal to the Crown. This approach is in-line with Villella's discussion of the discourses native nobles developed after the conquest to make their claims to their rights and privileges as members of the native nobility while remaining loyal to the King.

Thus, in dedicating his writings to the viceroy and pointing to the present condition of the native nobility, Ixtlilxochitl petitions directly to the viceroy for the restoration of the rights and privileges the native nobility were entitled to while denouncing the bad government of the colonists who had marginalized them from the beginning. Hence, Ixtlilxochitl utilizes the "original historia," the history he claims to have received from the elders and from the various native sources he consults to legitimize the native nobility's claims to their rights and privileges during a time in which the few privileges they had maintained after the conquest were threatened.

Chimalpahin's Historical Annals, beyond Chalco and Mexico Tenochtitlan.

Chimalpahin's Intellectual Heritage and Sources

Throughout the *Relaciones históricas*, the reader encounters references to the intellectual traditions Chimalpahin inherited from his indigenous ancestors when he names specific sources

either by mentioning the name of specific individuals from whom he received the information and actual texts in painted or written form. The *Octava relación,* for example, a text written in Nahuatl in narrative form, presents an extended discussion on the sources he used for his history related to his native *altepetl* of Amaquemecan Chalco. According to Romero Galván, Chimalpahin relied on the testimonies and painted and written texts of six indigenous informants in his composition of the history of Chalco ("Las fuentes" 52-55). In the *Tercera relación*, on the other hand, a text written in Nahuatl in annals form, the reader finds that he also uses post-conquest Mexica annals that are both pictographic and alphabetic, texts that I will refer to as hybrid texts. Moreover, in the *Primera relación*, the reader finds that Chimalpahin is also conversant with the Holy Scriptures, Christian Theologians, Greek philosophers, and European authors of his own time; hence, in the *Segunda*, *Tercera*, and *Cuarta relación* the reader can easily perceive Chimalpahin's engagement with Henrico Martínez's *Repertorio de los tiempos* (1606) as he describes the four parts of the world and the origin of the indigenous peoples of the continent.[55] However, before engaging the topic of how Chimalpahin engages the Western tradition and Martínez's narrative in his *relaciones* and the question of the origin of indigenous people, it is important to discuss the indigenous intellectual traditions he inherits from his ancestors and how he fuses it with the European tradition.

In the *Octava relación*, a text which begins with an exhortation similar to the one we find in Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicayotl*, Chimalpahin not only identifies the sources he uses to write the history of Amaquemecan Chalco but also the types of sources these are. Hence, besides including the actual names of the *huehuetque* (elders) who either told him the story or owned the painted or written text he copies, Chimalpahin describes the type of sources he is using.[56] What is clear from the different types of sources that Chimalpahin mentions is that he uses both oral narratives and painted and written texts as his sources. One must keep in mind that pictographic texts were accompanied by readings or performances of the text, encompassing both oral and textual tradition at once. A brief consideration of the types of sources he mentions makes clear that these sources are partially derived from the oral tradition known as "tlahtolli" (word[s]). For instance, in the composite Nahuatl noun "huehue-tlahtolli" (the word[s] of the ancients) one can see the reference to the oral tradition as its root word "tlahtolli" refers to "word(s)" and the modifying word, which functions as an adjective, "huehue", refers to the ancients. From this first composite noun we can then identify other genres that are derived from the oral tradition, genres such as the *huehuenemiliztlahtolli*, the *huehuenemiliztenonotzaliztli*, among others; in the second

[55] In his study of the sources Chimalpahin may have used, Galván speculated on the possibility of Chimalpahin's engagement with other European texts, among them the *Historia pontifical católica* of Gonzalo de Illescas (1574) and the anonymous *Crónica de Spaña* (56); as far as I know, scholars have not shown that Chimalpahin uses these two texts. On the other hand, more recently Andrew Laird has convincingly shown that Chimalpahin references the classical Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian traditions in his *relaciones*, particularly Isidore of Seville's *Etymologies* (96-98)

[56] Among the types of sources Chimalpahin describes the reader finds: the *huehuenemiliztli* (account of the ancient life), which Chimalpahin translates as "crónica"; the *huehuetlahtolli* (the word[s] of the ancients); the *huehuenemiliztenonotzaliztli* (account of the life of the ancients); the *tenonotzaliztlahtolli* (an account); the *huehuetlahtocanemilizamoxtenonotazliztli itlahtocatlacamecayotzin* (account of the book of the life of their rulers, their genealogy); the *altepehuehuenenotzalizamoxtlacuilolli* (written/painted book on the dialogues of the elders of the *altepetl*); the *altepehuehuetlahtocatlacamecayotl* (genealogy of the ancient rulers of the *altepetl*); the *huehuetlahtocamecayotl* (genealogy of the ancient rulers); the *huehuenemilizamoxtli* (book on the life of the ancients); and a *letratica amoxpan* (book of letters).

example, the root word "tenonotzaliztli" refers to lectures or sermons. However, once the composite Nahuatl word includes the word *amoxtli* (book) or *tlacuilolli* (painting/writing) as its root word, it is clear that Chimalpahin is referring to painted or written texts; for instance, when he refers to *huehuenemononotzalizamoxtlacuilolli* or *huehueteixamoatlacuilolli*. Similarly, for the types of sources which include the word "altepe(tl)" as its prefix, it is clear that it refers to the history of a city state—the *altepetl*. Also, when the Nahuatl word has as its root the word "tlacamecayotl" (noble lineage), it refers to the noble genealogies. Consequently, Chimalpahin not only references the names of the elders from whom he gathered information but he also makes explicit that he is borrowing from a tradition that is both oral and textual, both in painted and written alphabetic form. Interestingly, when he uses the Nahuatl phrase "letratica amoxpan", an expression he uses to refer to a text he inherited from his grandfather, we find a colonial Nahuatl neologism which refers to a book written in letters as "letratica" is a Nahuatlized Spanish word that refers to letters and "amoxpan" refer to the surface of a book; hence, a book written in letters.

In the *Octava relación* Chimalpahin incorporates the stories he hears from the elders into his own manuscript. For instance, when referring to the account of Don Feliciano de la Asunción, he captures the narrative the old man gives as he cites him verbatim (298-299).[57] This is important to mention because, as Rabasa has pointed out in multiple occasions, one characteristic that distinguishes the works of Tezozomoc and Chimalpahin from other Nahua authors who write in Spanish is that they preserve the voices of the elders, their informants, citing them verbatim in Nahuatl as they incorporate their accounts into their works (Rabasa 2010 228; 2016 184). In many instances Chimalpahin is careful to point out to the reader when one source begins and when it ends; this is not only clear in the *Octava Relación* but also in the other *relaciones* when Chimalpahin does not mention the name of the person or text he is copying but points to an "amatl" (a paper or page) or "amoxtli" (book) from which he is borrowing. Thus, when Chimalpahin is copying from a written or painted text, he signals to the reader that he is copying from one of the sources he has at his disposal.

Even though Chimalpahin incorporates the sources of the elders, he makes clear that it is his own project and he is the one compiling the information and incorporating the sources into his manuscript. As Víctor Castillo has pointed out, "luego de copiar sus datos fue agrupándolos, ordenándolos y renovándolos según convenía al nuevo proyecto de la historia que escribía" (xli). Chimalpahin's renovation of his sources is evident when he explains:

> Itlatlalil itlatecpan in don Domingo de San Antón Muñon Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, yxhuiuh yn omoteneuh tlacatl señor don Domingo Hernández Ayopochtzin catca, umpa ychan yquizcan yolcan yn ipan omoteneuh ycontlayacatl altepetl Tzacualtitlan Tenanco Amaquemecan provicia Chalco.
>
> [La disposición y el ordenamiento son de don Domingo de San Antón Muñon Chimalpahin Cuauhtlehuanitzin, nieto del dicho señor don Domingo Hernández Ayppochtzin, natural y oriundo del dicho segundo tlayácatl que es la ciudad de Tzacualtitlan Tenanco Amaquemecan, en la provincial de Chalco] (294-295)

[57] Romero Galván's article identifies some of the sources Chimalpahin incorporates in his *Octava relación*.

Besides presenting the reader with biographical information about his personal life, in this passage, which also appears in other *relaciones* and in the *Annals of His Time*, he situates himself as the one responsible for arranging the manuscript. Thus, even though he draws from multiple sources, he is the one responsible for collecting and archiving the histories of the elders and incorporating them into the manuscript.

Pages later, when he refers to a book on the history of the *altepetl* (an *altepetlamoxtli*) and a book on the noble genealogies he inherited from his grandfather (a *huehuetlacamecayoamoxtli*) and other texts, Chimalpahin explains:

> Auh yn ihquac omomiquilli omoteneuhtzio don Domingo Hernández Ayopochtizin, yn omoteneuh altepeamoxtli libro yhuan tlahtocatlacamecayotltlacuilolli nicuelle quimopialtilitehuac yehuatl yn imontzin yn itocatzin catca Juan Agustín Yxpintzin, yn omomiquilli yn oquimohuiquilli t[o]t[ecuiy]o Dios ypan xihuitl de 1606 años; ynin quimomontitzino çan nauhtlamampa ymachtzin catca, ynic oncan onitlacatico nehuatl don Domingo de San Antón Muñon Chimalpahin Quauhtelehuanitzin, ynic ye no axcan occeppa nicyancuilia nicuicuillohua amoxpan yn in mochi huehuetlahtolli, ca nel ono nomac huetzico yn amoxtli libro.
>
> [Y cuando murió el dicho don Domingo Hernández Ayopochtizin, dejó asimismo en custodia el dicho libro de la ciudad y las pinturas con las geneologias señoriales a su yerno Juan Agustín Ixintzin, el cual murió en el año 1606… y del nací yo don Domingo de San Antón Muñon Chimalpain Cuauhtlehuanitzin, que ahora nuevamente vuelvo a escribir en este libro todos esos *huehuetlahtolli*, porque también a mis manos vino a parar aquel libro] (304-305)

This passage not only points to the archive Chimalpahin is drawing from but also shows that he is "rewriting" the sources he inherited from his grandfather, the words of the ancients as found in the book on the history of the *altepetl* and the paintings of the noble genealogies which belonged to his grandfather. In this way, Chimalpahin archives and renews the histories of his ancestors, putting them in writing, in Nahuatl, once again, to ensure they will be preserved for the future Nahua reader.

In the *Octava Relación*, the reader also encounters the influence of Tezozomoc. According to Camilla Townsend, Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicayotl* was "[p]erhaps the most important document he copied" (153) and Kenrick Kruell affirms that Chimalpahin had Tezozomoc's text "bajo sus ojos" (305). However, these critics do not explain how the Mexica annalist influenced Chimalpahin's ouvre or the significance of Chimalpahin's borrowing Tezozomoc's formula of writing for the future Nahuatl readers. Nonetheless, Chimalpahin's text reveals that, soon after he explains that this *relación* will focus on the history of one of the subdivisions of Amaquemecan Chalco, he uses Tezozomoc's formula of appealing to the reader of the future almost to the letter when he explains the legitimacy of his sources and the tradition he draws from:

> "Ayc polihuiz ayc ylcahuiz, mochipa pialoz, ticpiazque y titepilhuan in titeixhuihuan in titeyccahuan in titemintonhuan in titepiptohuan in titechichucauan, in titetentzonhuan in titeyxquamolhuan in titeteyztihuan, in titetlapallohuan in titehezçohuan, in

> titlayllotlacatepilhuan, in ipan otiyolque otitlacatque in iccetlaxillacalyacatl motenehua Tlayllotlacan Tecpan, y huel oncan catca y huel oncen omotlahtocatillico yn izquintin in tlaçohuehuetque in tlaçotlahtoque chichimeca, in tlayllotlacatlahtoque in tlayllotlacateteuhctin, ynic mitohua inin tlahtolli "Tlayllotlacan Tecpan pielli."
>
> [Nunca se perderá ni se olvidará, siempre se guardará, pues la guardaremos nosotros, los que somos sus hermanos menores, sus hijos, nietos, bisnietos, tataranietos y choznos, los que somos sus barbas, cejas, uñas, color y sangre, los que somos descendientes de los tlailotlacas, los que hemos nacido y vivimos en el primer tlaxilacalyacatl, llamado Tlailotlacan Tecpan, donde vivieron y gobernaron todos los legítimos antiguos y legítimos tlatoque chichimecas, los tlatoque y teteuctin tlailotlacas, por lo que a esta relación [apropiadamente] se le llama la 'Tradicion de Tlailotlacan Tecpan'" (274-273)

In this passage the reader can see that Chimapahin copies almost verbatim the formula Tezozomoc uses in the *Crónica mexicayotl* when referring to the legacy of the Mexica Tenochca, adapting it to his narrative and using it to legitimize his sources. Like Tezozomoc in the *Crónica mexicayotl*, also makes clear the intention of preserving this history for the future Nahua readers as it will be guarded and preserved by the descendants of the Tlailotlacan Chalcas.

Towards the end of the *Octava Relación* he utilizes, once again, Tezozomoc's formula for appealing to the future reader and stating the commitment to preserve it for future generations. Chimalpahin writes: "Nican quittazque yhuan quimatizque yn axcan cahuitl ypan monemiltia tepilhuan, yhuan quin ye nemiquihui yn amo quimatia yn iuh catqui yhuehuenenonotzallo yn ihuehetlahtollo altepetl; yn iuh niman ye onneciz ye onmotecpancapohuaz yn ipan in huehuealtepetenonotzaliztlahtolli huehuenemilizamoxtli." [Por aquí podrán verse los *tepilhuan* que viven en el tiempo presente, y así mismo los que después vengan y no sepan cual es la antigua relación e historia de la ciudad; así aparecerá y se referirá la antigua relación de la ciudad en el libro sobre la antigua vida] (362-363). Thus, Chimalpahin writes for those who are currently living and their "tepilhuan" (their children), those who are to live in the future who will not know the history of the *altepetl* as it is found in the *huehuenemilizamoxtli* and the *huehuexiuhtlapohualamoxpan*, the book of the life of the ancients and the book of the count of years of the ancients, respectively. Thus, contrary to Durand-Forest who reads Chimalpahin's efforts to document the history of his indigenous ancestors "a fin de que los españoles se dieran cuenta de la importancia y del poder que Chalco había tenido en tiempos remotos" ("Los grupos chalcas" 37), Chimalpahin's use of Tezozomoc's formula to appeal to future generation of Nahuatl readers makes clear that he is writing for Nahua readers of future generations.

Besides identifying the archive he draws from when referring to the history of Chalco in the text that has come to be known as the *Octava relación*, in the text known today as the *Tercera relación* the reader encounters other indigenous sources.[58] One text Chimalpahin

[58] Before continuing it is important to mention that the titles of these text are not Chimalpahin's. According to Rafael Tena and Víctor M. Castillo (and as the manuscript shows), these were later additions ("La estructura textual de las relaciones" 355-356; Castillo v). The organization and binding of the manuscript as we know it today are not attributed to Chimalpahin either; according to Castillo, these are attributed to the German scholar Zimmerman who was the last scholar to rearrange the manuscript. Nevertheless, as Tena and Castillo have argued, there is coherence in each of the texts and in the eight Relaciones as a whole. In the *Tercera relación*, for instance, even

incorporates into his annals throughout is a post-conquest annals known today as *Codex Aubin* (1576-1608). At the beginning of the *Tercera relación*, as Chimalpahin explains the names of the indigenous peoples who had settled in Aztlan and the groups that eventually migrated to the lake region of Central Mexico, he copies, almost verbatim, parts of the alphabetic text and translates into writing the images of the codex that appear in folios 3v to 6r, practically the first three folios of the codex in which an anonymous Mexica *tlacuilo* wrote and painted the place of origin and names of his ancestors.

Even though Chimalpahin does not mention the names of the *tlacuiloque* who painted and wrote the codex, much less mention its late 19th century name, i.e. *Codex Aubin*, he nevertheless references the text when he reports that part of the information he presents derives from a specific source when he writes [yn iuh quitohua huehuetque yn iuh quimachiyotititihui] "según dicen y dejaron pintado los antiguos" (178-179) and [ypan in yn cequintin huehuetque yn quimachiyotia] "algunos antiguos dejaron pintado" (184-185) as he incorporates the information from the codex into his own writing. Hence, when comparing the opening sections of the codex and Chimalpahin's text it is evident that he had in his hands the text we know today as *Codex Aubin*.

Nevertheless, it is also clear that he is not merely copying. For instance, Chimalpahin incorporates the first folios of the codex into his annals by adding phrases that make the text more legible to a wider Nahua readership, not just the Mexica, making minor additions that will clarify the content of the text he borrows from. As María de Castañeda has pointed out, Chimalpahin explains who the protagonists of the story are, adding "yn azteca" (the Aztecs) and "yn colhuacan" (the Colhuaque) since the text Chimalpahin copies assumes that the reader (or listener) is a Mexica and would not need this "extra" information as he or she would already know who the protagonists of the story are (Castañeda 191). Similarly, whereas the hybrid text simply refers to the tutelary god of the Aztecs who led them out of Aztlan as "in diablo" (devil), Chimalpahin clarifies that the god he is referring to in this passage is "yn diablo Huitzilopochtli" (184-185). Thus, Chimalpahin does not passively copy from *Codex Aubin* but makes minor changes as he incorporates it into his annals in the *Tercera relación*. This illustrates Chimalpahin's efforts to extend the Mexica-centered history captured in *Codex Aubin* as he not only copies but also extends it by incorporating other histories and sources as he develops his annals. The entries in the codex which document eclipses and earthquakes and other natural phenomena are clear examples of this as well (*Aubin* 38-39; 40, 41).

According to Castañeda, Chimalpahin also borrows from *Ms. Mexicain 85* in the *Tercera relación*, pointing to a passage in both texts where the Mexica reflected on how difficult their migration had been soon after their founding of Mexico-Tenochtitlan in 1325 (193). However, her focus is on showing that Chimalpahin abandons *Codex Aubin* to focus on the *Ms. Mexicain 85* and showing that Chimalpahin does not follow the order of the narrative in the hybrid text he has in front of him; consequently, she does not provide an analysis on how Chimalpahin

---

though the text is mutilated and its original organization was altered in multiple occasions, there is a clear internal structure of the text that follows the annals Chimalpahin is writing. Moreover, in the *Primera, Segunda, and Cuarta relación* there is also clear coherence and continuity just as in the *Quinta, Sexta, and Séptima relación* and the *Memorial*.

translates the pictorial images into written text, thereby failing to point out that just as he does when borrowing from *Codex Aubin,* Chimalpahin translates the images from the sections he copies from *Ms. Mexicain 85* into written text (212-215). Thus, my reading of Chimalpahin's incorporation of pictoral and oral histories into his own texts is more in line with Walter Mignolo who, according to David Webb, reads Chimalpahin as a "transitional annalist between the pictorial and alphabetic Nahuatl annalists" and less with Webb's own assestment that situates Chimalpahin's writing as a "mature, alphabetic" annalist (19). Rather than reading Chimalpahin's writing as "an indigenous parallel discourse to Spanish letters during the colonial period" (21), allowing "individual communtities to posture as a disefranchised minority under Spanish colonial institutions" (10), I read Chimalpahin's writing and his incorporation of indigenous sources as a counter discourse to Spanish letters at a moment of danger.

A very different type of source that Chimalpahin integrates into his *Tercera relación* annals is Henrico Martínez's *Repertorio de los tiempos* (1606). As we saw in the previous chapter, Chimalpahin does not merely copy from Martínez's text but also revises his narrative. In Chimalpahin's revision, translation, and incorporation of the Spanish text into his annals we see how Chimalpahin integrates the history of his indigenous history into global history. This point is important because Chimalpahin's historical texts are often interpreted as his efforts to subsume the indigenous history of his ancestors into Western history and the history of salvation (Romero Galván 1978; Durand Forest 1990; Ruhnau 1998; Tena 1998). My reading diverges from this interpretation. Instead of merely incorporating indigenous history into the sacred history of the West, he integrates global history into indigenous history. Consider, for instance, the way in which Chimalpahin incorporates the story of Columbus, a narrative he borrows from Martínez, as he integrates it into his annals. Chimalpahin writes:

> "V Tecpatl xihuitl, 1484. Nican upan in temictique yn matlatzinca, quinmictique yn mexica yn calpixque yhuan cihuatequitque ypampa yn tlacallaquilli… Auh no ypan in yn xihuitl yn Macuilli Tecpatl, de 1484, yn ocallac yn intlahtocatecpanchantzinco yn tlahtoque reyes don Fernando yhuan doña Isabel tlahtoque yn Castilla, auh yehuatl yn itoca don Christóval yn callca tecpan… Auh in ypan in yn xihuitl yn oquipehualti in ye quinmitlanillilia inhuellitzin yhuan yntepallehuillitzin y tlahtoque don Fernando yhuan doña Isabel ynic huallaz nican upan Nueva España, inic quineztiquiuh yancuic tlalli yn intechtzinco pohuiz tlahtoque España."
>
> [5 Tecpatl, 1484. En este año los matlatzincas mataron a los calpixque Mexicas y a las mujeres mandonas por causa del tributo… También en este año de 5 Tecpatl 1484, don Cristobal Colón hizo su entrada en la corte de don Fernando y de doña Isabel, reyes de Castilla… Así pues en este año comenzó a solicitor la licencia y la ayuda de los reyes don Fernando y doña Isabel para venir a descubrir tierras que perteneciaran a los reyes de España] (274-275).

As the reader can see, Chimalpahin incorporates the history of Columbus not at the moment of his arrival in the Caribbean in 1492 but almost a decade before when he petitions to the King and Queen of Castile for support for his enterprise as Chimalpahin continues with the history of the indigenous peoples of *Cemanahuac*—the indigenous world—, including an entry for the year 8 Acatl, 1487, an entry dedicated to the inauguration of the expansion of the temple of Huitzilopochtli in which thousands of prisoners were sacrificed (280-283).

Similarly, in the entry for the year 13 Tecpatl, 1492, he intertwines the history of Columbus's arrival in the Caribbean with the history of the indigenous people of Central Mexico (288-289). Thus, his focus continues to be the indigenous continent as he incorporates Western history into indigenous history, translating the European world (European history) for the indigenous reader.

When Chimalpahin's annals presents the year 1519 towards the end of the *Tercera relación,* it is evident that he is not following Martínez narrative on the conquest of Mexico as he references another source, an account that is derived from an indigenous source as it emphasizes the ritual Mexica calendar (302-303). Besides telling the reader that he is using a painted or written source when he states "Nican neztica" [aquí se ve] (302-303), it is clear that he is not copying Martínez narrative as there is nothing remotely close between the narrative Chimalpahin includes here at the end of the *Tercera relación* and Martínez's narrative. For instance, while Chimalpahin's narrative on the arrival of Cortés captures the ritual months in the Mexica calendar, there is no trace of this in Martínez. Also, whereas Chimalpahin's annals emphasizes Pedro de Alvarado's instigation of the massacre during Toxcatl and the brutality of the Spaniards as they murdered Mexica warriors, priests, and members of the nobility (304-305), Martínez's narratives puts the blame on the indigenous people themselves for provoking the massacre (Martínez 149).

The *Primera relación* also makes evident that Chimalpahin is conversant with the Biblical tradition and with authors of Western antiquity. However, his engagement with Biblical and Western sources is mainly present in the *Primera relación* since throughout the following seven *relaciones* and the *Memorial de Colhuacan* his engagement is primarily with the history of his ancestors and indigenous sources. How, then, do we explain Chimalpahin's engagement with these Biblical sources and non-Christian authors of antiquity? To answer this question, I turn to the *Primera*, *Segunda* and *Cuarta relación* in the following section where I explore the way in which Chimalpahin engages the Biblical tradition as he searches for the common origin of the indigenous peoples of the continent.

Searching for the common origin of the indigenous peoples of Cemanahuac

In the *Primera relación,* Chimalpahin explains that humanity is one since all the peoples of the world descend from the same branch, that is, from Adam. Chimalpahin references not only the Bible but also Christian theologians from antiquity and Greek authors such as Plato, Sophocles, and Diogenes. According to Chimalpahin, both religious and pagan authors of antiquity began their written works with God and the creation of the world. Even the Christian God himself began his "teoamoxtlacuilolli" (written book of god), through his chronicler and prophet, Moses, with the creation of the world (36-37). Consequently, Chimalpahin insists, his book must also begin with the creation of the world and the common origin of humanity.

Even though the *Primera relación* led some scholars in the 1970s and 1990s to interpret Chimalpahin's *Relaciones históricas* as his efforts to integrate the indigenous history of his ancestors into Universal History and the sacred history of salvation (Galván 1978; Durand-Forester 1990; Ruhnau 1998; Tena 1998) and more recent scholars have read it as a strategy to conceal the "profane" history of his ancestors (Schroeder 2010 and 2016), I read this first *relación* as Chimalpahin's effort to assert the humanity of the indigenous peoples of the

continent and as a strategy to present a broad spatial and temporal framework that would allow him to situate the ancient history of his ancestors and their legitimacy to the territory. By acknowledging that both Christian and pagan authors began their written works with God and the creation of the world, Chimalpahin would also begin here, providing a broad framework that would allow him to trace the history of his ancestors without succumbing to the dominant narratives of European authors who automatically situated the origin of indigenous people to one of the lost tribes of Israel, presented the indigenous people as noble savages, or worst, questioned the humanity of the indigenous peoples of the continent. As Miguel León-Portilla points out in a short and rarely cited article:

> Pero, mientras algunos otros cronistas siguiendo principalmente a Las Casas y fray Diego Durán se habían dejado llevar por la idea de que los indígenas eran en realidad descendientes de las diez tribus perdidas de Israel, Chimalpahin es quizás el primero en ensayar una forma de explicación bastante más objetiva en la que incluso critica la opinión de un escritor y científico tan conocido como Henrico Martínez (León-Portilla 1961, 475).

Thus, in the second part of the *Primera relación*, as Chimalpahin references the works of Christian Theologians such as Saint John Damascene, Saint Thomas, Saint Dionynius, and Saint Agustin and their discourses on the nature of man, he makes clear that the indigenous peoples of the continent are human as they also possess a living, rational soul and the possibility of salvation, through "libre albedrío"—free will—if they choose as long as no one forces them, "sin que nadie lo[s] obligue" (48-49).

Chimalpahin then proceeds to explore the material structure of the universe in order to situate the indigenous land of his ancestors, clearly setting aside indigenous creation stories to focus on an explanation of the physical world. Unfortunately, just as it occurred in the *Tercera relación* when Chimalpahin's annals start to engage Martínez's narrative, the manuscript is interrupted at a significant moment in which Chimalpahin will discuss the structure of the cosmos, the last word in the page before the interruption being the Nahuatlized Spanish word "panetas" ("planetas", planets) (50-51). However, in the *Segunda* and *Cuarta relación* it becomes evident to the reader that Chimalpahin will continue challenging Martínez narrative as he discusses the origin of the indigenous peoples of "Yancuic Cemanahuac"—the New World. Thus, unlike Castillo who assumes that Chimalpahin only copies from Martínez's text (Castillo x), Chimalpahin's engagement with Martínez's narrative in the *Relaciones históricas* and in the *Annals of His Time* illustrate that he was revising the Spanish chronicler's narrative.

In the *Segunda relación,* Chimalpahin begins to recount the history of his indigenous ancestors starting with their arrival to the continent as he incorporates other texts into his writing. Given that Chimalpahin is writing almost a century after the conquest of Mexico Tenochtitlan, one should not expect his writing, or that of any Nahua writer of his time, to be uninfluenced by the colonizing culture. However, even if his writing incorporates references to the Bible and Western culture and history, he does not reject or condemn the history of his ancestors. This is clear as he begins to recount their history with the following statement:

> Auh ca ye omito omoteneuh ca nelli ca ypaltzinco yn t[o]t[ecuiy]o Dios yn onemico yn huehuetque yn tlateotocanime catca; auh yece no mahiztic ynic onemico ynic

> otlamanitico ynic ohuallahuicaque ynic tlatecpanaya. Ca izcatqui yn quicauhtihui yn intenyo yn imitauhca huehuetque catca, ynic xiuhtlapohuaya yhuan yn izquixiuhtica quiyancuilliaya quipehualtiaya yancuic… oonpohualxiuhtica ommatlatlactica ypan onxiuhtica in quiyancuilliaya in cecentetl temallacachtic xiuhtlatlapohualli.
>
> [Ya se dijo que ciertamente por disposición de Dios nuestro señor vinieron a morar aquí los antiguos, los cuales eran idólatras; pero aún así fue maravilloso el modo en que vinieron [a vivir], el modo en que se dispuso que vineieran a asentarse acá. He aquí la fama y tradición que nos dejaron los antiguos sobre como contaban sus años y cuáles fueron los diversos años en que renovaron y comienzan un nuevo [ciclo]… y cada 52 años renovaban sus cuentas cíclicas de años] (56-57)

Even though Chimalpahin states that they came by order of God, he does not deny their idolatry nor attempts to Christianize their indigenous past the way Ixlilxochitl does. On the contrary, he asserts that his ancestors were idolaters and, even then, it was magnificent the way in which they came to settle in the continent. Moreover, Chimalpahin makes clear that what will follow is the "fame" and "tradition" his ancestors left for them, i.e. indigenous people, in the form of the *xiuhtlapohualli*, the Mesoamerican count of years, not only continuing the indigenous annals tradition but also archiving the history of his ancestors for future generations of Nahua readers.

After the introductory statement cited above, Chimalpahin continues his annals with the year 1 Tochtli (3 B.C.), marking the following year, 2 Acatl, as the beginning of a Mesoamerican calendar cycle; he proceeds to the year in which his indigenous ancestors arrived into the continent, a year which, coincidentally, marks the beginning of another Mesoamerican calendar cycle, a new beginning. As he explains: "1 Tochtli xihuitl, 50. Nican ypan in yn acaltica yn ohuallaque yn huehuetque chichimeca yn motenehua teochichimeca, yn heyapan ylhuicaapan ohuallaque, yn ohuallanellotiaque, ompa quiçaco achto once motlallico yn itocayocan Teocolhuacan Aztlan." [1 Tochtli, 50, En este año, los antiguos chichimecas llamados teochichimecas vinieron en canoas sobre las aguas grandes y celestials [del mar], vinieron remando hasta desembarcar primeramente en el sitio llamado Teocolhuacan Aztlan, donde se establecieron] (64-65). Here Chimalpahin marks the precise moment of arrival into the legendary island of Aztlan while specifying that they arrived by boat, a perspective that clearly contradicts Martínez affirmation, and that of respected authors such as father Joseph Acosta who asserted that the indigenous people had arrived through land. Also, by pointing out that the place from which they came from were the "great celestial waters", Chimalpahin mystifies the place of origin of his ancestors. The reader is then left to wonder which great celestial waters they could have come from. Is he merely referring to the ocean or to a mythical place he does not explain? Did they come from the east, where the sun rises, or did they come from the west, where the sun sets? Chimalpahin does not explain this. He only affirms what he sees in the Mexica annals he is borrowing from to incorporate into his own annals, i.e. that his indigenous ancestors arrived into the island of Aztlan in the year 1 Tochtli.

Chimalpahin continues to elaborate on the arrival of the ancient Chichimeca into Aztlan when he writes:

> Auh yn ompa omoteneuh Teocolhuacan Aztlan yn oncan motlallico huehuetque ca anepantla aytic, yn ompa tlalli ca mochi atl yn quiyahualotoc. Auh omoteneuhque

> huehuetque chichimeca ynic oncan quiçaco ca çan oc centetl yn intlatol hual mochiuhtia ynic huallatotiaque; auh yece çan ixquich amo huel mellahuac momati campa ynchan campa tallli yn ipan huallehuaque, yhuan tleyc quihualcauhque yn intlal yn imaltepquh, cuix yaoyotica yn huallaque auh cuix noço çan ica yteyollehuiliztzintica yn t[o]t[ecuiy]o Dios yn ohuallaque, ynic hueyapan acaltican hualmotlallique, ynic nenenque atlan yn motenehua teohuapan, ynic ompa quiçaco yn campa oquiçaco.
>
> [El dicho Teocolhuacan Aztlan donde se establecieron los antiguos era una isla, pues esa tierra estaba rodeada de agua por todas partes. Y cuando allá llegaron los dichos antiguos chichimecas, todavía una sola era la lengua en que hablaban; pero no se sabe bien de que hogar y tierra partieron, y tampoco por qué abandonaron su tierra y su provincial, si vinieron por causa de guerras, o si tal vez sólo por disposición de Dios nuestro señor vinieron, cuando se lanzaron al mar en canoas, y mientras navegaron sobre las aguas divinas, hasta llegar a donde [finalmente] llegaron] (64-65).

Besides stressing that Aztlan was an island, he also points out that those ancient ancestors who arrived shared the same language, constituting the same people who would eventually separate to form different ethnic groups who would later establish the different *altepeme* of central Mexico. He continues to insist that the place from which they arrived and the reason for leaving is uncertain. Nonetheless, he emphasizes that they arrived in canoes. This brief description of his ancestors' arrival into Aztlan by crossing the great, celestial waters directly contradicts Martínez narrative in the *Repertorio de los tiempos* in which he defends the notion that the indigenous peoples of the continent arrived by land (Martínez 103). This was a perspective that, as I have mentioned above, was in line with the explanation Acosta had carefully reasoned in his *Historia natural y moral* (1590), concluding that the only way in which the indigenous peoples of the continent could have populated the land was by migrating from Asia through a landmass that was contiguous with the American continent (Acosta 56). Chimalpahin, on the other hand, cannot affirm the place from which his indigenous ancestors came; what he does affirm, however, is that they came in boats. Thus, while both Martínez and Acosta's explanation overlook the place of origin of indigenous people in the continent, Chimalpahin remains firm in stating that even though he cannot explain the place from which the indigenous people came from exactly, he can affirm that their place of origin in the continent was a placed named Teocolhuacan Aztlan. The fact that Chimalpahin is unequivocal about the arrival of his indigenous ancestors into Teocolhuacan Aztlan by boat after crossing the great, celestial waters and not presuming to know the exact place from where they came from not only shows that he was not blindly following and perpetuating the narrative of Martínez and other prominent European chroniclers of his time but he was also challenging this perspective.

It is also important to mention here that Chimalpahin's explanation for the origin of his ancestors also diverges from the stories missionaries such as Diego Durán presented in his *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España e islas de Tierra Firme*. Thus, the reader does not find in Chimalpahin's explanation for the origin of his indigenous ancestors' stories of their emergence from the caves of Chicomoztoc. His explanation is more modern and, one could say, scientific, grounded on the Western idea of the world as being divided into four great continents. To my mind, this strategy of avoiding indigenous origin stories and favoring a Western approach to explaining the origin of the indigenous peoples of the continent illustrates Chimalpahin's attempt to focus on the political history of his indigenous ancestors. By situating the arrival of his

ancestors into Teocolhuacan Aztlan in the year 1 Tochtli, 50 A.D., he could begin to trace the genealogy of the indigenous groups who eventually migrated out of Aztlan to settle into the lake region in central Mexico.

In the *Cuarta relación*, Chimalpahin returns to the question of the origin of his ancestors, this time turning his focus to the Chalca. In what appears to be a continuation of the *Segunda relación*, he begins his annals with the year 1 Tochtli, the year in which the Chichimec arrived at the island of Teocolhuacan Aztlan. In this first entry, Chimalpahin discusses their arrival into the continent as he continues to insist that they arrived in canoes while adding a detail about a tempest that "perhaps" pushed them there (308-309). The use of the Nahuatl word "aço" (perhaps) as he explains the arrival of his Chichimec ancestors into the island of Aztlan is consistent with his refusal to presume to know exactly where his indigenous ancestors came from before reaching Aztlan. They could have come from one of the continents in the Old World, from Asia, Africa, or Europe (308-309). All he can affirm, however, is that they disembarked in Teocolhuacan Aztlan in the year 1 Tochtli, 50 A.D., and that they arrived by boat, regardless if they had calmly rowed or were pushed by a tempest.

Once Chimalpahin has situated the arrival of his indigenous ancestors into the continent, he confronts, head on, the narrative of Martínez on the origin of the indigenous peoples of the continent and their arrival. Chimalpahin explains:

> Ye omito camo huel momati yn campa yehuatl tlalli ypan ohuallehuaque yn huehuetque, aço Asia, anoço Africa, onoço Europa, yn moxelloque yn ompa hualtecauhque huehuetque chichimeca, ynic ohuallaque ynic oncan atequiçaco Aztlan. Auh ce tlacatl tlamatini, anoço tlalmatini nohuiampa, ytoca Henrrico Martínez, hahuatlahto Ynquissisión yn Mexico, yuh quimomachiztia quilman oquimittato yn ompa ypan ce provincia Europa ytocayocan Curlant, nmacehualpan yn Polonia reyesme yn tlahtoque, yn ompa tlaca yn ipan omoteneuh altepetl Curlant, **quil** tohuanpohuan yn ompa tlaca; quilmach çan huel notiuhque, yn iuhquin tonacayo çanno yuhquin yn innacayo ompa tlaca, **quil** yn iuhquin toyeliz yn nican Nueva España titlaca **quil** çanno yuhquin yn inyollo yn inyeliz yn ompa tlaca, huel quinnenehuilia yn chichimeca ynic huehueyntin tlaca. Auh aquin huel quimatiz?; ca çan iceltzin quimomachiltia yn t[o]t[ecuiy]o Dios.
>
> [Ya se dijo que no se sabe bien de cuál de aquellas tierras partieron los antiguos, si de Asia, o de Africa, o de Europa, caundo esos antiguos chichimecas se separaron y dejaron allá a los demás [pobladores] para venir a desembarcar en las costas de Aztlan… pero un sabio llamado Henrico Martínez, nahuatlato del Santo Oficio de la Inquisición en México, quien ha estado en muchos países dice que él conoció en una provincia de Europa llamada Curlandia, la cual se haya en los dominios de los reyes de Polonia, a los habitantes de aquella región, los cuales **dizque** son como nosotros; **dizque** nos parecemos bastante pues el cuerpo de aquellas gentes es como el nuestro, y **dizque** también el ánimo. ¿Mas quién podría saberlo? Sólo Dios nuestro señor sabe si es verdad] (308-311).

Notice here how Chimalpahin questions Martínez's narrative by using the Nahuatl particle "quil" just as he does when he questions the narrative of Antonio de Morga in relation to the supposed rebellion of black and mulatos in Mexico City in 1612 in the *Annals of His Time*. And just like in the *Annals*, this is the first and only instant in the *Relaciones históricas* in which this repeated

use of the "quil"—"dizque" in Spanish; "supposedly" in English—appears. Moreover, Chimalpahin puts Martínez's affirmation into question by stating that only God would know if this is true or not. In this way, he leaves the question of the origin of indigenous peoples of the continent before reaching Aztlan open while resisting the narratives of Martínez and Acosta who affirmed that the indigenous people of the continent must have migrated from a landmass somewhere in the north.

Chimalpahin then returns to his narrative on the arrival of the Chichimec in relation to the number of years that had passed since the creation of the world, the great flood, and the foundation of Rome, "data" that, according to Andrew Laird, he borrows from Isidore's *Etymologies* (96), to then recount the geneology of Noah (Tena 310-311). By incorporating the Biblical story of creation and the survival of humanity through Noah after the great flood, Chimalpahin ascertains the humanity of indigenous peoples of the continent. While he cannot ascertain from which of the three descendants of Noah the indigenous people descend—from Japheth, Shem or Ham—nor does he seem interested in pursuing this question. What he affirms is that they are part of the human family and they could have descended from anywhere in Europe, Asia, or Africa.

According to Chimalpahin, in the year 7 Tochtli, 82 A.D., after having been in Aztlan for only 32 years, "çan oc centetl yn intlahtol catca, ayemo mocuecuepa yn tlahtolli" [todavía una era su lengua, todavía no se les mudaba el lenguaje] (314-315). Thus, they were part of the same people. If the Biblical story of Babel, which Chimalpahin engages in the *Séptima relación*, explains the dispersal of the peoples of the world, here Chimalpahin makes clear that the Chichimec peoples who arrived in Aztlan were part of the same people as they shared a common language.

Immediately after, he points to another moment of transformation which took place in the year 8 Acatl, year 83. As he explains: "Ypan in yn ocenmanque yn chichimeca huehuetque yn ompa Aztlan, yquac cequintin omotoncuepque, cequintin motinicuepque, cquintin cuexteca mochiuhque yn ipan in xihuitl omoteneuh Chicuey Acatl; amo huel momati yn quenin yn iuhqui yn ynpan mochiuh huehuetque." [En este año, hallándose juntos en Aztlan, los antiguos chichimecas, algunos se volvieron otomíes, otros tenimes, y otros más se volvieron cuexteca, en este dicho año de 8 Acatl; más no se sabe bien como les sucedió esto a los antiguos] (314-315). This passage, which could be read as another account of Babel, one that took place in ancient Aztlan, sheds light into Chimalpahin's efforts to explain the common origin and diversity of indigenous peoples centuries later given the references he makes to the "otomitl" (the Otomi, members of an indigenous people of Central Mexico not related to the Nahuatl speaking peoples), the "tenitl" (a Nahuatl word which refers to foreign or barbarous peoples, i.e., speakers of a different tongue) and the "cuexteca" (peoples of the Huastec region who spoke a language not related to Nahuatl). Even though Chimalpahin does not presume to be able to explain how this change took place, he nevertheless points to a transformation (and eventual dispersion) of the peoples who had arrived in Aztlan as part of the same linguistic family. By pointing to a supposed transformation that took place in Aztlan soon after the arrival of the ancient Chichimec, Chimalpahin presents an explanation that could account for the linguistic and ethnic variation of the indigenous people of central Mexico without denying their common origin. Thus, even if his explanation mirrors the Biblical story of Babel, the reader can perceive Chimalpahin's efforts to account for the origins of his indigenous ancestors.

It is not surprising to find that in the next entry, in the entry for the year 9 Tecpatl, year 84 A.D., the first groups of the ancient Chichimec begin to migrate out of Aztlan, leaving in groups as they make their journey into Chicomoztoc Quinehuayan (the place of the seven caves). Yet, in the *Cuarta relación*, Chimalpahin treats Chicomoztoc not as the mythical place of origin from which the Chichimec emerged, but as a sacred site and as the site from which the first ancient Chichimecs continued their migration in the year 84. Hence, according to Chimalpahin, various groups who migrated out of Aztlan early on, stopped in Chicomoztoc before starting their journey into Central Mexico while some groups remained in Aztlan to migrate south centuries later. This suggests that in Chimalpahin's purview, all the indigenous peoples of central Mexico in the sixteenth century could be traced to Aztlan as the indigenous peoples of Anahuac[59]could be the descendants of those who had migrated early on. Thus, according to Chimalpahin, Aztlan was the place from which [In nepapan tlaca timacehualtin] "las varias tribus de nostrostros los macehuales" descended (314-315).

After Chimalpahin describes the first migration south from Chicomoztoc, he makes a huge leap in time from the year 9 Tecpatl, 84 A.D., to the year 1 Tecpatl, 1064, A.D., the year the Mexica Chichimec left Aztlan, almost a thousand years after the first groups migrated out of Aztlan and Chicomoztoc to begin their journey into the lake region. Thus, for Chimalpahin, the Mexica where among the last tribes to leave Aztlan, stopping at Chicomoztoc to eventually make their way into Central Mexico (314-315). He then turns to the migration story of the Chichimec groups that would later comprise the Chalca, situating their departure from Aztlan almost 100 years after the departure of the Mexica Tenochca. In this way, Chimalpahin distinguishes between the Chichimec who were the descendants of the Mexica Tenochca and the Totolimpanec, one of the groups that would eventually comprise a subdivision of the *altepetl* of Chalco. Unlike Mexica Tenochca sources such as *Codex Aubin*, *Ms. Mexicain 85,* and Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicana* and *Crónica mexicayotl* which focused on the Mexica migration without specifying the names of the various groups that comprised the Chalca *altepetl*, we see here Chimalpahin's efforts to specify who these Chichimec ancestors were.

Chimalpahin also explains that other indigenous groups who were already settled in the region were not hunters like the migratory groups but had become agricultural peoples. For instance, the Nonohualca Teotlixca Chalca were, according to Chimalpahin, "Tecpantlaca"—"people of the place"—who venerated Tezcatlipoca and had a very distinct culture from that of the Chichimec who arrived into Central Mexico later (320-321). Even though Chimalpahin does not explain the exact moment when the Nonohualca Teotlixca Chalcas settled in the lake region, he nevertheless makes clear that they had a very distinct culture from that of the Chichimec. They were a sedentary culture and lived from their agriculture, unlike the more recent migrant Chichimec who, as Chimalpahin points out immediately after, "yn imitac hualmochiuhtia çan yehuatl ynic hualmotlayecoltitiaque yn inmiuh yn intlahuitol" [su sustento consistía sólo en lo que podían procurarse con sus flechas y sus arcos] (320-321). But this was not the only group of Chalca who was already settled in the region by the time the Totolimpaneca arrived since they had come from the Toltec city of Tollan. Thus, in Chimalpahin's explanation we see his attempt to account for the various indigenous groups that would eventually identify as Chalca,

[59] Anahuac—literally, next to the water (atl + nahuac); according to Eduard Seler, Anahuac also referred to the Toltec region, indigenous groups already settled around the lake region by the time the Mexica and others who migrated from Aztlan almost a century later, arrived. See Jacqueline de Durand-Forest's "Los grupos chalcas" (41).

supplementing the Mexica-centered histories of migration he found in the *Codex Aubin* and other Mexica-centered narratives.

Even though Chimalpahin does not explain the origin of some of the indigenous groups that were already settled in the lake region and had a very distinct culture from that of the Chichimec who had recently arrived, what is clear from Chimalpahin's *Cuarta relación* is that he is attempting to present a narrative that both expands the Mexica annals he is borrowing from while challenging Martínez's account of the origin of the indigenous peoples of the New World. And even if he does not explain the origin of indigenous peoples who were agricultural peoples, the reader can perceive Chimalpahin's efforts to give an account of who his Chalca ancestors were without reducing it to the narratives of Europeans like Martínez's, or Mexica accounts that would simply refer to his ancestors as "Chalca." This is the thrust of Chimalpahin's historical annals, to resist reductive narratives of both European and Mexica sources, whether they be in oral, painted, or alphabetic form. As Durand-Forest has pointed out, there are lacunae in Chimalpahin's account of the ancient histories of his indigenous ancestors—the origin of the Nonohualca and the Acxoteca being one of them—but as much as he is able to account for, he puts it in writing ("Los grupos chalcas" 43). If the pressures of the conquering Mexica were not enough to suppress the history of the peoples of Chalco beginning in 1465, the mounting pressures coming from the Christian friars and the Spanish colonial authorities in the 17th century further threated the survival of the history of the indigenous peoples of Chalco; yet, even if Chimalpahin could not explain the origin of some of the groups already settled in the lake region by the time his Chichimec ancestors arrived in the lake region, he would explain as much as he could given the texts and sources he had at his disposal, including the Bible. Preserving the history of his predecessors for future generations of Nahua readers was such an important endeavor that he would not cease writing when he encountered the history of a people he could not fully explain.

Tracing the Political History of Cemanahuac

In the *Memorial de Colhuacan* and in *Relación* 5, 5 Bis., 6, and 7, Chimalpahin traces the political history of various city states in Central Mexico from their time of arrival into the lake region and into the postconquest era. Once he had established that he could not affirm exactly where his indigenous ancestors had come from before reaching the island of Aztlan in the year 50 A.D., he could now proceed to trace the political history of his ancestors. The *Memorial* begins in the 7th Century with the arrival of the Colhua peoples into the lake region after their migration from Aztlan (72-73). The opening entry not only situates the moment of arrival of the ancient Colhua peoples into the lake region but it also makes evident that other indigenous groups were already settled when the Colhua arrived, groups that had, according to Chimalpahin, also migrated from Aztlan. Chimalpahin then proceeds to trace the political history of the Colhuas as he documents the establishment of the city of Colhuacan, the inauguration of its first *tlahtoani*, and the establishment of a tripartite government structure with the *altepetl* of Colhuacan at the center (74-75). He then recounts the arrival of other Chichimec groups into the region, their settlement and the establishment of their own *altepeme* as he begins to trace the *tlahtocamecayotl* (the genealogy of the ruling line) of Colhuacan and other city states. For instance, as he traces the ancient history of Colhuacan, he also traces the histories of migration of the Texcocans, the Azcapotzalcans, the Huexotzincas, the Mexica, and their conflicts with groups already settled in the region.

Since the *Memorial* only covers the years 670 to 1299 A.D., Chimalpahin does not describe the foundation of Mexico Tenochtitlan and the rise of the Mexica Tenochca state here; nevertheless, he highlights the courage of the Mexica and their preoccupation with the legacy they would leave for their descendants if the Mexica people were to survive even before they became the rulers of the land, the rulers of Cemanahuac (168-171). Citing a passage from the *Annals of don Gabriel de Ayala* (*Codex Chimalpahin* 222), Chimalpahin marks a critical moment in the history of the Mexica, the moment in which the Mexica *tlahtocayotl* ended even before the rise of the Mexica state, a rulership that, ironically, would re-initiate with the Colhua people themselves as the first Mexica *tlahtoani* would be the son a noble woman from Colhuacan and a Mexica commoner. As such, this passage towards the end of the *Memorial* serves as a prelude to the rise of the Mexica state, a history Chimalpahin presents in *Relación* 5, 5 Bis., 6, and 7.

In the *Quinta relación*, a text which is significantly shorter than the *Memorial* in length and in the number of years it covers, as it only covers 1269 to 1333, Chimalpahin focuses on the establishment of Amaquemecan Chalco as he intertwines the history of the Mexica. The annals begin at *media res* with the last part of an entry for the year 1269 in which he references indigenous accounts and a painted text which shows when two Chalca rulers took possession of some lands (324-325). The first full entry that follows also explains who were the Chichimec leaders who came to settle the land of Chalco (326-327). Thus, he documents Chalco's political history, noting who were the Chichimec Chalca leaders that had settled the different subdivisions of Amaquemecan Chalco as he incorporates the accounts of the elders and the Chalca sources he had at his disposal. As he does this, he also incorporates the foundation story of Mexico Tenochtitlan, naming the Mexica leaders who took possession of the land in the island of Tenochtitlan and the founders of the *altepetl* that would rule *Cemanahuac* for nearly two hundred years (360-361).

In the following annals, a text that has become known as the *Quinta relación Bis.*, a set of annals often referred to as the *Tepaneca annals*, Chimalpahin presents the rise of the Mexica state and the beginning of the interruption and dislocation of indigenous govenments with the arrival of the Spaniards. The annals begin with the year 1426, the year the Tepaneca defied the Mexica, igniting the conflict. After describing the conflict between the Tepaneca and the Mexica in detail, it becomes evident that the focus of these annals is the rise of the Mexica state since Chimalpahin proceeds to describe the conflicts with Chalco and Tlaltelolco as the Mexica state expands.

Similar to Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicana*, Chimalpahin's narrative on the rise of the Mexica centers Tlacaelel's role as the mastermind behind Mexica imperial expansion. This is manifested in a dialogue between Moctezuma and Tlacaelel as Chimalpahin describes the conflict of the Mexica with Chalco as a result of their resistance to the Mexica state in the year 13 Calli, 1453.[60] According to Chimalpahin, the refusal of the Chalca to accept Huitzilopchtli as their tutelary god and tribute lead to the conflict between the Chalca and the Mexica (398-399). Unfortunately, the text is interrupted in the middle of folio 12r, interfering with Chimalpahin's narrative on the response of the Chalcas to Moctezuma's demands (398-399). Pages later, in the year 12 Calli, 1465, Chimalpahin documents the defeat of the Chalca (402-403).

[60] Dialogue from Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicana* (114-115)

Besides registering the expansion of the Mexica state, in *Relación 5 Bis*., Chimalpahin also intertwines the indigenous history of Cemanahuac with the history of Europe as he explains the Spaniards' exploration of the gulf coast by making clear that he is writing from an indigenous perspective. He writes: "Matlactlionce Acatl, 1503. Yquc conitaque hualnez yn ilhuicaapan yn Castilla acalli" [11 Acatl, 1503. Entonces vieron aparecer sobre el mar las naves de Castilla] (408-409). Notice here how Chimalpahin recounts the history of European exploration of the gulf coast from the perspective of the indigenous observers as they see the Castillian ships appear in the horizon. This situating of the indigenous gaze is evident in Chimalpahin's use of the expression "conitaque hualnez". First, the expression "conitaque" (qui/on/itta/que—they saw them) illustrates that the ones observing were the indigenous subjects. The Nahuatl morpheme "on", which marks movement in the out-bound direction is revealing as it situates the indigenous observer looking out into the horizon, into "ilhuicaapan"—the place where the sky meets the water—, watching the ships approach. Second, in the expression "hualnez" (hual/nez—[they] appeared), the directional "hual", which marks in-bound direction, marks the movement of the ships in the direction of the indigenous obervers. Thus, Chimalpahin situates the intersection of the two histories from an indigenous perspective. The history of Europe is incorporated into indigenous history and not viceversa, the way Christian universal history tends to subsume indigenous history. This incorporation of European history into indigenous history is also evident when one considers that Chimalpahin continues to tell the history of Cemanahuac in his annals after the Castillian ships had first appeared in the horizon (410-411). There is no rupture in indigenous time with the arrival of Spanish ships in the coast; indigenous history persists and its point of reference continues to be the indigenous world. In this way European history enters into indigenous history and the indigenous world.

When describing the arrival of Cortés and his men into Tenochtitlan, Chimalpahin continues to highlight indigenous time by introducing the sacred indigenous calendar as he documents the death and destruction brought by the conquerors, a practice other indigenous *tlacuiloque* use when referring to this critical period in the history of indigenous peoples of Central Mexico (410-411). Similarly, in the entries for the years 1520 and 1521, as he describes the war of conquest, Chimalpahin continues to document the deaths of indigenous lords as he references indigenous ritual calendar just as other indigenous chroniclers do when describing this event (410-415).[61] By including the ritual calendar Chimalpahin preserves it for future generations of readers while he also highlights the transgression of the Spanish conquistadors for not respecting the ritual practices of his predecessors, thus, pointing to the intolerance and violence of the Spanish conquistadors. Moreover, by including the ritual calendar when describing these events it is clear that Chimalpahin continues the practice of an earlier generation of Nahua *tlacuiloque*.

Chimalpahin also documents the dislocation of legitimate indigenous rulers with the arrival of the Spaniards and the central role Cortés played in their dislocation by focusing on the government of one of the subdivisions of Amaquemecan Chalco. Besides pointing to the "false

[61] According to Durant-Forest, the Nahua Christobal del Castillo, the *tlacuiloque* of Book 12 of *Florentine Codex*, the *tlacuiloque* who wrote the *Anónimo de Tlaltelolco* and *Unos anales históricos de la nación mexicana*, and Chimalpahin share this characteristic of referring to sacred time when writing about the conquest ("Sistema de fechamiento" 272). Thus, it is important to point out that Nahua *tlacuiloque* writing in Nahuatl for Nahua readers referred to the ritual calendar when writing about the conquest while European authors such as Martínez did not.

accusations" made on the legitimate rulers, an expression he also uses in the *Annals of His Time* when he critiques the assassination of Cuauhtemoc and other native lords, he attributes the "good position" of those who murdered the legitimate rulers of Tzacualtitlan Tenanco to their friendship with Cortés, who, far from bringing "justice", allowed terrible events such as this to happen (414-415). As Miguel Ángel Ruz Barrio has pointed out: "Durante la conquista, apoyaron a aquellos individuos que prometían mayor cooperación, causando pertubaciones en la organización y en la sucesión del altepetl" (23). This was the postconquest reality of Central Mexico: the indigenous lords who befriended Cortés could get away with murder and displace legitimate indigenous rulers.

In the *Sexta relación*, a text significantly shorter than the previous *relación* given that it consists of only 5 folios, Chimalpahin returns to the topic of the usurpation of the legitimate govenments of Amaquemecan Chalco. Here Chimalpahin focuses on how Acacitzin (i.e Acacitli) and Omacatzin took possession of Tlalmanalco, another subdivision of Chalco. This is significant because these two figures are the same two figures Chimalpahin critiqued in *Relación 5 Bis.* for supporting the illegitimate government of don Tomás de San Martin Quetzalmazatzin (henceforth don Tomás), ruler of Itzacozauhcan, and who became allies of Cortés early on.

In the last three folios of the *Sexta relación*, Chimalpahin swifly covers the years from 1530 to 1613, briefly recounting events relevant to the history of Chalco (432-433). Interestingly, in the last passage of this set of annals, Chimalpahin continues his discussion of the illegitimate government of don Tomás by presenting a dialogue in which both Acacitli and Omacatzin turned a blind eye to the way in which don Tomás marked his territories (434-435), and registers the collusion between the *tlahtoque* of Tlalmanalco and don Tomás when he explains that don Tomás reciprocated the favor by granting them vassals and lands from which they could benefit (434-435). This was the new reality rooted in the interruption of legitimate indigenous governments with the arrival of Cortés and his men. Almost a century after the initial invasion of Mexico Tenochtitlan, Chimalpahin documents the way in which the Spaniards had altered indigenous governents and structrures, the effect of which were still relevant during the first quarter of the 17th century as surviving indigenous governments continued to be threatened and indigenous communities were further displaced.

In the *Séptima relación*, Chimalpahin continues on the topic of the usurpation of legitimate indigenous governments with the intrusion of the Spaniards. As Chimalpahin explains the war of conquest, he narrates the story from the perspective of the indigenous subjects who resisted the Spaniards and their indigenous allies. While Chimalpahin could, as a Chalca, position himself as an ally of Cortés and highlight his ancestors' participation in the conquest, much as Ixtlilxochitl does when he emphasizes the role his Texcocan ancestors, he does the opposite, taking instead the side of his indigenous ancestors who resisted until the end and were defeated by Cortés and his allies (154-155). While he acknowledges the participation of some Chalca as allies of Cortés, there is no effort to identify with the Spaniards or the Chalca who assisted Cortés. Instead of exalting the role of the Chalca in the conquest, Chimalpahin proceeds to document the torture indigenous lords received as prisoners of war and the Spaniards' greed for gold (156-157). Thus, Chimalpahin continues to capture the violence of the Spaniards on indigenous lords.

After the conquest, Chimalpahin explains, the governments of Chalco were altered with the support of Cortés who favored the indigenous lords who supported him with the conquest, among them don Hernando Guzmán Omacatzin and don Francisco de Sandoval Acacictli (156-159). Gibson's study of the post-conquest Nahua of Central Mexico points to this issue when he writes: "Cortés and other encomenderos interfered with succession rules, approved or disallowed particular cacique inheritances, and at times assumed full powers of cacique appointments" (155). Omacatzin and Acacictli were the two Chalca *tlahtoque* Chimalpahin critiques in the previous *relaciones* for colluding with don Tomás and his brother Juan to usurp the government of Tzaucualtitlan Tenanco and Itztlacozauhcan Amecamecan Chalco (158-159). While acknowledging the collaboration between Cortés and these Chalca *tlahtoque*, Chimalpahin does not celebrate their collaboration. On the contrary, by making explicit the connection between Cortés' execution of Mexica rulers and the usurpation of legitimate rulerships, Chimalpahin presents a critique of how these men usurped power.

His critique is more explicit when he explains the way in which the legitimate rulers of Tzacualtitlan Tenanco Amaquemecan were murdered. Chimalpahin restates, almost to the letter, what he writes in the entry for 1521 in the *Quinta relación* (cited above), making clear that the legitimate lords of Tzacualtitlan were "falsely accused" and killed, just as Cuauhtemoc and other Mexica lords, with the support of indigenous rulers who had befriended Cortés early on and supported him with the conquest. Nevertheless, Chimalpahin makes explicit that the descendants of the legitimate rulers had survived by going into hidding (160-161). Thus, the possibility for the descendants of those who were once the legitimate rulers to reclaim what was legitimately theirs remained open; those who would have survived, could claim what was rightfully theirs.

In the entry for 1524 Chimalpahin returns to the fate of Mexica *tlahtoque* who had been imprisoned and later executed due to false accusations (166-167). With the execution of Cuauhtemoc and other indigenous lords, Cortés had altered the governance of the Mexica, just as he had done with the rulers of Chalco. As Chimalpahin explains,

> Auh yn oiuh piloloc Cuauhtimoctzin, oc yeuatl yn don Juan Velásquez Tlacotzin cihuacohuatl ompa Hueymollan quitlahtocatlalli tlahtohuani mochiuh yn Tenuchtitlan yn capitán Cortés; quiespañolchichiuh, espada quimacac yhuan daga, yhuan ce cavallo yztac quimacac yn ipan yetinemiz Tlacotzin.
>
> [Después de que Cuauhtemoctzin fue colgado, allá mismo en Hueimollan el capitán Cortés puso al cihuacóhuatl don Juan Velasquez Tlacotzin como tlatohuani de Tenochtitlan; lo vistió como español, dándole espada y daga, y le dio asimismo un caballo blanco para que cabalgara] (168-169).

This passage captures the way in which Cortés altered the governance of Mexico Tenochtitlan. The passage also reveals the symbolic violence of Cortés by dressing the newly appointed ruler in European clothes, granting him a sword and knife, and giving him a white horse in which to ride, privileges reserved for the Spanish conquerors. Even though Tlacotzin might have received privileges for becoming the new ruler of the Mexica, his dress in European clothes documents the colonial violence and imposition to which indigenous lords were now subjected. As such, this evocative passage adds to Chimalpahin's critique of the violence of the conquest and the interruption of indigenous governments.

Even though the newly appointed Mexica ruler did not survive the journey back to Mexico Tenochtitlan and other Mexica rulers were appointed by Cortés, Chimalpahin is sure to point out if these Mexica rulers were legitimate, that is, if they were the legitimate descendants of the Mexica *tlahtoque* who had ruled Tenochtitlan and, thus, inheritors of the Mexica *tlahtocayotl*. This is clear towards the end of the *Séptima relación* when, similarly to the *Annals of His Time*, Chimalpahin inserts the genealogy of the legitimate Mexica rulers from the time they departed from Aztlan to the year 1565, the year don Luis de Santa María Nanacacipatzin died (220-225). Interestingly, this Mexica genealogy echoes Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicayotl* in the entry for the same year, 1565. With this, Chimalpahin, just as Tezozomoc, marks the end of the Mexica governors of Mexico Tenochtitlan who descended from the Mexica *tlahtoque* and "ruled" the island after the arrival of the Spaniards, not the end of the Mexica *tlatocapilli* themselves. It is important to highlight this difference because Chimalpahin is marking the end of Mexica governance of the city, not the end of the Mexica descendants themselves. As he points out pages later once he reviews the names of postconquest governors of Tenochtitlan, the *tlahtoque* of the Mexica before the conquest, and those who led the Mexica Tenochca into Tenochtitlan:

> "Auh yn oyuh momiquilli oncan in, yc niman opeuh yn aocmo nican chaneque Mexico ye hualjuezgovernadorti y ye quihualpachohua altepetl Mexico Tenuchtitlan yn aocmo ymezçohuan yntlapallohuan yn tlacpac omoteneuhque huehueyntin tlahtoque yhuan tlaçotlahtocapipiltin tenuchca, ça campa altepehuaque; cequintin pipiltin, cequi aocmo pipiltin, yequene cequintin mestiçotin."
>
> [Tras la muerte de éste [don Luis], comenzó a haber jueces gobernadores que gobernaban la ciudad de Mexico Tenochtitlan sin ser naturales de Mexico, los cuales ya no pertenecían a la sangre y lineaje de los arriba mencionados grandes tlatoque y legítimos tlatocapipiltzin tenochcas, sino que provenían de otras ciudades; algunos de ellos eran principales, otros no eran principales, y finalmente otros eran mestizos] (228-229).

Here, once again, just as Tezozomoc in the *Crónica mexicayotl*, Chimalpahin marks a clear shift in the governance of Mexico Tenochtitlan. Even after the conquest, the Mexica *tlahtocayotl* continued and the governance of the Mexica people in the city remained under the control of the direct descendants of pre-Hispanic Mexica tlahtoque, those who "yn oquipiaco yn imaltepeuh Mexico" [Velaron por su ciudad de México" (224-225). With the death of don Luis, however, the rulership of the Mexica had come to an end as outsiders were now in charge of the government of the island. It was not that the descendants of the Mexica *tlahtoque* had perished; on the contrary, they had survived and continued into the colonial era but had been displaced by governors who were outsiders. Chimalpahin emphasizes this when he references the descendants of Moctezuma by naming them, just as Tezozomoc does. Thus, the possibility of reclaiming what was legitimately theirs remained open as the descendants of the Mexica *tlahtoque* continued into the colonial era, even if these descendants were no longer of pure indigenous blood.

In referencing the descendants of the Aztec rulers, Chimalpahin also points to the pride these descendants had of their indigenous origin and identity. Even though some of these descendants were now *mestizos*, they continued to pride themselves in their indigenous origin and identity, unlike others who despised their indigenous origins. As he explains:

> Yn mahuiztique tlaca mestiços mestiças techmocuitia ynic totechcopa quiça; auh yn cequintin yllihuiz tlaca mestiços mestiças amo techmocuitiznequi ynic cequi tezço totlapallo quipia, çan huel moespañolnehnequi, techtolinia no toca mocahcayahua yn iuh techihua cequintin españoles.
>
> [Algunos mestizos y mestizas se honran reconociendo que descienden de nuestros lineajes; pero otros mestizos y mestizas sin razón se niegan a reconocer que algunos conservan nuestra nobleza de sangre, y hasta pretenden hacerse pasar por españoles, despreciándonos y burlándose de nosotros, como hacen así mismo algunos españoles] (230-231).

It is important to point out here that Chimalpahin is not merely referring to the noble blood of indigenous lords but is pointing to the indigenous pride in both the native nobility and commoners. Thus, Chimalpahin marks a clear distinction between indigenous people—both indigenous lords and commoners—who embrace their indigenous origin and identity and those who reject it, those who pretend to pass as Spaniards and despise their indigenous background, ridiculing it. The passage cited above reveals Chimalpahin's political vision: he is not only embracing his indigenous origin and identity but he is also pointing to an indigenous identity that blurs the lines between indigenous nobility and indigenous commoners while presenting a critique of indigenous peoples who are ashamed of their indigenous origins.

Subordinated Lords and Governors

In the *Octava relación*, Chimalpahin continues his critique of the dislocation of indigenous governments brought by the Spanish conquest by introducing two related terms: "tetlahtocamacehualhuan" and "tetlahtocatetlapacholhuan". While the first refers to "sujetos señoriales" (rulerly subordinates) and the second refers to "gobernados señoreales" (rulerly governed), both terms point to the subordinate position of the *tlahtoque* as subjected lords. Chimalpahin introduces these terms as he explains the impact the Mexica conquest had on the governments of Chalco in pre-Hispanic times:

> Auh macihui yn iuh omoteneuh yn occeppa macoco cuepilliloque yn intlahtocayo yn inmahizço Chalco tlahtoque catca, yece ca ça yuhqui yn ompa tettlahtocamacehualhuan mociuhque Mexico Tenuchtitlan, ompa ça tetlahtocatetlapacholhuan, ça temac yn catca; ca ça quexquich ynic mahizçoque mochiuhque, yhuan aocmo yxquich ynic huelitia nican Chalco, yn iuh omoteneuh tlacpac quenin catca achtopa nican tlahtoque catca oc tltzintla, yn ayemo yuh nican hualtepehuaya mexica, yn iuh cenca ymixcoyan oncatca huey inhuelitiliz ynic moyocaytquiya moyocamamaya tlahtoque chalca catca.
>
> [Y aunque se dijo que nuevamente se les restituyeron su dignidad y sus señoríos a los de Chalco, estos fueron sólo como "macehuales señoreales" o como "gobernados señoreales" de Mexico Tenochtitlan porque le estaban sujetos; sólo en parte recobraron su dignidad, y ya no tuvieron en Chalco todo el poder, según se dijo arriba cómo eran anteriormente los dichos tlatoque, cuando aún no los conquistaban los mexicas, pues [en efecto] los tlatoque chalcas habían sido muy independientes y poderosos mientras se rigieron autónomamente] (326-329).

This passage is of extreme importance to understand Chimalpahin's intellectual project and his effort to recount and archive the pre-Hispanic history of Cemanahuac vis-à-vis postconquest history. On the one hand, the passage points to a time in which the Chalca were independent and autonomous. On the other, it also points to the status of Chalca *tlahtoque* as conquered subjects, as "macehuales señoreales" or "gobernados señoreales", a status which was significantly different from that of indigenous *tlahtoqu*e after the Spanish conquest.

Chimalpahin is explicit in illustrating that during pre-Hispanic times, even as conquered subjects, Chalca rulers continued to be taken into account. This is evident in the passage immediately after Chimalpahin introduces both terms when he writes:

> Auh macihui in yehuantin in omoteneuhque in catepan oc ocuepilliloco tlahtocayotl chalca ynic motlallique nican tlahtoque in motenehua ye tepehualtin catca, ca ça ompa tetlahtocatlatititzalhuan mochiuhticatca, ça ompa intech ontlatemachiticatca ynic tleyn quinhualnahuatiaya quichihuazque in huehueyntin tlahtoque catca Mexico Tenuchtitlan; ynic ompa hualpacholloya nican tlahtoque catca. Auh yn omoteneuh Ahuitzotzin in tlahtocat Tenuchtitlan caxtollomome xihuitl, no yxquichcauh yehuatl ytlahtocatlapacholhuan mochiuhque yn omoteneuhque nican Chalco tlahtoque catca, ynic niman omomiquillico ypan xihuitl de 1502 años.
>
> [Mas, aunque se diga que los señores mencionados a quienes después se restituyeron los tlatocayotl chalcas cuando se les puso como tlatoque, estaban conquistados, pues [en efecto] eran solo como sujetos señoreales, sin embargo se les pedía [previamente] su parecer cuando los grandes tlatoque de Mexico Tenochtitlan tenían que ordenarles que hicieran algo; así es como eran gobernados los tlatoque aquí. El dicho Ahuitzotzin gobernó en Tenochtitlan durante 17 años, y durante ese tiempo los dichos tlatoque de Chalco fueron sus gobernados señoreales, hasta que murió en el año 1502] (328-329)

Here Chimalpahin explains the way in which the conquered *tlatohque* were considered by the conquering Mexica, becoming "sujetos señoreales." Nevertheless, Chimalpahin is explicit in stating that even though they were conquered, the ruling Mexica considered their views and that this was the way it was done in pre-conquest times. This statement is significant because here Chimalpahin marks a clear contrast between the colonial practices in pre-Colonial times and colonial practices after the Spanish conquest.

With the Mexica conquest under the leadership of Tlacaelel and Moctezuma I, the *tlahtocayotl* of Chalco had been interrupted; instead of having a *tlahtoani* as their ruler, an interim ruler was placed, a *cuauhtlahtoque*. However, with the succeeding governments of the Mexica—with Tizoc and Ahuizotl—the *tlahtoque* of Chalco were reinstituted. This was another major difference between the indigenous modes of conquest and colonialism and the Spanish modes (318-319). Eventhough the Mexica *tlahtoani* had searched for the legitimate rulers to reinstate them as rulers of the various subdivisions of Chalco, "restituy[endoles] el copilli o corona de sus señoríos" (320-321), he was only partially successful. Tizoc's successor, Ahuizotl, reinstituted the remaining *tlahtoque*, although some of these *tlahtoque* were illegitimate. Chimalpahin explains:

> Oyhui yn, ynic hueycan catca oncen omoteneuh Tlayllotlacan, ynic huel oncan in yehuatl omoteneuh tlacatl Xiuhtzin Tlatquicatzinteuhctli ytech pohuia yyaxca catca yn oncan in tlahtocayotl Tlayllotlacan catca, yn quicuillique çan texihxicoliztica. Auh amo yehuantin intech pohuia yn omoteneuhque Atlauhtlan tepilhuan pipiltin, amo yehuantin ymaxca catca in tlahtocayotl Tlayllotlacan; auh yehica ypampa ca yuh huallaque, yuh huallatlatocatiaqye y oc ye nea ye huecauh, y ihquac ayemo yun techpehuaya mexicatl, ca amo huel quimocuiliaya amono huel quimopatiliaya yn inpetl ymicpal yn intlahtocayo, ca çan huel nononqua catca çan huel yyeyeyan momatticatca.
>
> [Así pues, [el tlatocayotl] de Tlailotlacan era el principal, y al dicho señor Xiuhtzin Tlatquicatzihteuctli pertenecía por derecho ese tlahtocayotl de Tlailotlacan, del cual por tanto despojaron en forma ilegítima. Y ciertamente no pertenecía a los dichos principales de Atlauhtlan, los cuales no tenían derechos sobre el tlahtocayotl de Tlailotlacan; porque así [fue desde que] vinieron, desde que hace mucho tiempo vinieron caminando, y cuando aún no nos conquistaba el Mexica, de modo que no se les podía quitar ni intercambiar [libremente] el petate y asiento de sus tlatocayotl, pues se consideraba que ambas sedes subsistían aparte] (324-325)

Here Chimalpahin explains that the Mexica ruler wrongly innagurated the *tlahtoani* of Tlailotlacan, giving it to those of Atlauhtlan and dispossessing the legitimate ruler Xiuhtzin. Thus, Chimalpahin stresses that a rulership cannot be simply taken or exchanged freely. There were traditions that needed to be respected.

Nevertheless, even though Ahuizotl had made a mistake in appointing the wrong *tlahtoque*, the rulership of these *tlahtoque* was not absolute. Other legitimate lords assisted him in his government and these lords, much as the "sujetos señoreales", were taken into account. Chimalpahin writes:

> Auh ynin omentin omoteneuhque teuhctlahtoque ca ymomeztin mochipa quintemachiticatca, quinahnamicticatca yn omoteneuh tlahtohuani Huehueyotzintli, amo tle huel quicihuaya amo huel mixcahuiya in tleyn quitzontequia justiciatica intlacamo ymeyxtin quicepanhuiaya; quecahuiaya tlatzontqequia ynic qualli yectli otlamanitico.
>
> [A estos dos teuctlatoque siempre se les consultaba, pues ellos asistían al dicho tlahtoani Huehueyotzintli, el cual nada hacía y nada ejecutaba al administrar justicia si los tres no estaban de acuerdo; entre los tres dictaban las sentencias para que todo se hiciera correctamente] (326-327)

Here Chimalpahin insists on a system of government in pre-Hispanic times which differs from the Spanish colonial system that interrupted the legitimate rulerships immediately after the conquest and continued to displace legitimate indigenous rulers in the 17th century.

Under Moctezuma II, Ahuizotl's succesor, the rulers of Chalco continued to be "subordinated rulers" as they had been during the time of Tizoc and Ahuizotl. However, with the arrival of Cortés and his men, which Chimalpahin explains in relation to the sacred ritual calendar just as he does in other *relaciones*, the relationship between conqueror and conquered was radically altered:

> Mochi poliuh y huel nelli intlahtocayo xihuitzolli anoço copilli yn incorona catca mexica tlahtoque yhuan Nueva España tlaca; oquincuillico yn españoles, auh yc niman ohualcallac, yehuantin quicallaquico yn intlahtocayotzin yn incoronatzin in huehueyntin tlahtoque reyes España.
>
> [En verdad se perdieron todos los tlatocayotl y los xiuhhitzolli o copilli, que eran como coronas, de los tlatoque Mexica y de los [demás] señores de Nueva España; se los quitaron los españoles, y enseguida [aquellos] se sometieron y pagaron tributo al reino y a la corona de los reyes de España] (328-329).

This passage contrasts sharply with his previous discussion on the "rulerly subjects" or "subordinated governors" under the previous three Mexica *tlahtoque*. The passage is also in line with the explanation the *tlacuiloque* of the *Florentine Codex* give at the end of *Book XII* on how conquest was done in pre-Hispanic times.[62] Thus, with the arrival of Cortés and his men, all the rulerships were lost. The new conquerors did not leave even though the conquered peoples had agreed to pay tribute. On the contrary, as Chimalpahin shows in the *relaciones*, with the arrival of Cortés the legitimate governments of central Mexico had been interrupted and dislocated and the effects of this dislocation were evident in Mexico Tenochtitlan and Chalco, the two *altepeme* Chimalpahin focuses on. Unlike the pre-Hispanic form of conquest he presents, under Spanish colonialism all the *tlahtocayotl* had been lost. Thus, Chimalpahin juxtaposes the pre-Hispanic history of the Mexica conquest of Chalco wih the Spanish conquest of Cemanahuac to critique the displacement of legitimate rulerships beginning with the conquest and continuing into the 17th century. Even though the legitimate descendants of the Mexica *tlahtoque* had continued to govern the indigenous people of the island for four decades after the conquest, during the second half of the 16th century the descendants of the Mexica had been displaced as legitimate rulers and replaced by indigenous or mestizos from other city states.

During his own time, towards the end of the 16th century and beginning of the 17th century, the surviving indigenous nobilities continued to be displaced. The violence of the conquest had innagurated a new form of conquest and colonization that was radically different from the form of colonization in Mesoamerica before the arrival of the Europeans. Whereas the

---

[62] The *tlacuiloque* of Book XII of the *Florentine Codex* write: "Niman ie ic ontlatoa in Mixcoatlailotlac, auelitoctzin: quijto. tla quimocaqujti in tlacatl in totecujo in Capitan, in oc vnca Motecuçoma, in jquac ontepevaloia cana, ca cemolinj in Mexica, in tlatilulcatl, in tepanecatl in aculhoa: in jxquich tepanecatl, in ixquic aculhoa yoan in jxqujch chinampanecatl, ca ticemolinj, in tontepeva: auh in onia altepetl, ca njman ie ic valnecuepalo, ceceniaca conmati in jmaltepeuh. Auh çatepan valhui in altepevaque in ie pevallaca, quivalitquj in intlacalaqujl intlatqui valmuchiuhtiuh in chalchivitl in teucujtlatl, in quetzalli yoan in oc cequi tlaçotetl, in teuxivitl, in xiuhtototl, in tlauhquechol: quioalmacaia in Motecuçoma, çan ce vmpa valaci, ça vmpa valmocemaci in tenuchtitlan in ixquich tlacalaquili in teucuitlatl."
[Upon this the chief justice Auelitoctzin spoke, he said: "May the lord, our Captain, hear! When Moctezuma yet was [alive], when somewhere there was to be a conquest, the men of Mexico and of Tlatilulco, the Tepaneca and Acolhua, moved together. All the Tepaneca, all the Acolhua, and all the dwellers in the swamp lands—we set out together when we conquered. And when the city fell, there upon all turned back. Each man returned to [his] city. And thereafter came the masters of the city, the conquered ones. They brought their tribute, which had become the goods of the [victors]: green stone, gold, quetzal feathers, and the other precious stones—fine turquoise; and the blue cotinga feathers, and red spoonbill feathers. They offered this to Moctezuma. All together it reached there. All together, there to Tenochtitlan, came all the tribute, all the gold.] (Anderson and Dibble *122*).

pre-Hispanic mode of conquest gave the conquered *altepetl* certain authority on what was done, the mode of conquest innagurated by Cortés and his men was different. Surviving indigenous nobilities, i.e. legitimate indigenous rulers, were displaced and government structures altered. This is, to my mind, an alternative discourse, not appealing to the Crown but documenting the dislocation and dispossession of legitimate indigenous rulers of central Mexico. By focusing on the governments of the Mexica and Chalco, Chimalpahin presents the possibility for indigenous peoples to reclaim what was legitimately theirs. As he illustrates for both the descendants of the Mexica and those of Chalco, their indigenous lineage had not disappeared. It had been interrupted by the Spanish conquest and the descendants of those who were once legitimate rulers had been reduced to the status of commoners by the Spanish conquest and colonialism but the descendants of the legitimate rulers had survived well into the 17th century. Those descendants and their descendants in future generations could reclaim what was legitimately theirs. However, unlike Nahua authors such as Ixtlilxochitl and others who laid claim to their rights as legitimate rulers by writing in Spanish and petitioning to the colonial authorities, in Chimalpahin's writings we encounter an alternative approach: he appeals to Nahua readers (and speakers of Nahuatl) of future generations to reclaim what is legitimately theirs. He does not say when or how this is to be done but he is sure to document and archive for future generations who are the original and legitimate inhabitants of the land and the way in which indigenous rulerships and government institutions had been usurped with the intrusion of the Spaniards. Only time would tell when and how indigenous peoples of the continent would reclaim what was legitimately theirs.

Conclusion

In sum, Chimalpahin's *Relaciones históricas* illustrate that his intellectual project continues and expands the work of Tezozomoc and other *tlacuiloque* of the 16th century while deviating from Ixtlilxochitl's project of appealing to the colonial authorities for reinstitution of privileges of the native nobility. As I have shown above, Chimalpahin not only uses Tezozomoc's formula of appealing to future generations of Nahua readers but also borrows from other Mexica hybrid texts of the late 16th century by putting into writing their iconic script and incorporating their Nahuatl alphabetic writing into his *relaciones*. At the same time, Chimalpahin continues to engage the work of Henrico Martínez, just as he does in the *Annals of His Time*, not only copying from Martínez's text but challenging the European author's narrative. As he does this, Chimalpahin incorporates the history of his indigenous ancestors into global history, not merely subsuming indigenous history into the history of the West as his center of references is, throughout, the indigenous continent. Thus, Chimalpahin utilizes the indigenous sources he has at his disposal as well as European texts and the Bible to present an alternative narrative on the origin of indigenous peoples while presenting a critique of the usurpation of legitimate indigenous governments and the violence of the conquest. Furthermore, in juxtaposing the Mexica conquest of Chalco with the Spanish conquest of indigenous *altepeme*, primarily that of Mexico Tenochtitlan and Chalco, Chimalpahin presents a critique of the Spanish colonial enterprise. Indigenous governments had been dislocated and usurped starting with the conquest and its impact continued to affect the condition of indigenous peoples into the 17th century. Thus, documenting the history of dislocation and dispossession for Nahua readers of future generations, those who would survive his current moment of crisis, was of paramount importance as it presented the possibility for Nahuas and their descendants to reclaim what was legitimately theirs: their indigenous history, government institutions, and land.

Christians Friars' Histories of Ethnocide and Chimalpahin's Historical Annals as a Project of Ethnogenesis

Introduction:

During the second half of the 16th century, as religious orders in New Spain came to realize that the evangelization project was far from consolidated and as colonial institutions continued to search for ways to effectively manage the colonized populations, religious friars turned to writing ethnographic treatises on the rituals and ceremonies of Indigenous peoples and the workings of the Mesoamerican calendar, along with historical narratives of the Nahuas in pre-Hispanic times, in order to assist the missionaries with the evangelizing mission. The works of Franciscan friar Bernardino de Sahagún (1499-1590) and the Dominican friar Diego Durán (c.1537-1588) are a case in point. Both friars, even though they belonged to distinct religious orders, investigated and documented the religious and cultural practices of the Nahuas and their histories in order to extirpate the "idolatry" they continued to practice well into the second half of the 16th century. As Robert Ricard's influential study of the evangelizing methods of Mendicant Orders in New Spain from 1523 to 1572 illustrates, the "spiritual conquest" of the Nahuas of Central Mexico was far from being consolidated. Moreover, as José Rabasa has shown, both the Franciscan and Dominican Orders understood that their projects of evangelization had not taken hold: while for the Franciscans, "the central explanation of what was perceived by the mid-sixteenth century as failed conversion was the notion that the Nahuas had lied and deceived the first missionaries about their willingness to embrace the tenets of Christian dogma," the Dominicans "attributed the failed conversion to the impossibility of replacing the old habitus that infused with superstitious meaning the material and spiritual objects introduced by the Spaniards" (*Tell Me the Story* 8). Thus, both religious orders turned to the development of written texts—some in Nahuatl, others in Spanish—to explain the religious and cultural practices of the Nahuas to be able to eradicate them. This approach led to the systematic destruction of Indigenous peoples religious and cultural practices. In this way, the works of both Sahagún and Durán contribute to the epistemic terrorism and ethnocide[63] colonial religious institutions deployed on Indigenous communities throughout the 16th century and into the 17th century.

Similarly, towards the end of the 16th century, Jesuit friars such as the *castizo* Juan de Tovar (1543-1623) and José de Acosta (1540-1600) also turned to the written word to explain the culture and history of Indigenous peoples in order to advance the Jesuit project of evangelization. While Tovar provided Acosta with a history of the Nahuas and a brief

[63] I use the term "ethnocide" here to refer to the systemic destruction of Indigenous peoples religious and cultural practices. According to Robert K. Hitchcock, "Indigenous populations frequently have been denied the right to practice their own religions and customs and/or to speak their own languages by nation-states, a process described as 'cultural genocide' or 'ethnocide.'" Thus, the term ethnocide "refers to the destruction of cultures rather than people per se. Ethnocide ultimately may have a significant impact on the well-being of indigenous societies since it sometimes results in people becoming so dispirited as to lack the desire to survive" (532-533).

explanation on Nahua religious practices and the workings of the Mesoamerican calendar, Acosta writes a treatise that systematically explains the ways in which Indigenous peoples of the continent were to be evangelized and governed, thus, exceeding the work of Sahagún and Durán, while also writing a history which purportedly settled the debate—for the Spanish reader—on the natural and moral history of the Indies. However, even though Acosta's historical narrative presents itself as a more rational and objective history that valorizes Indigenous peoples and cultures, his historical account perpetuates the narrative of the supposed predetermined end of the Mexica state and Indigenous Civilizations as it denies their right to self-determination and autonomy.

In this chapter I explore the works of Sahagún, Durán, Tovar, and Acosta in relation to the historical annals of Chimalpahin—The *Annals of His Time*, the *Relaciones históricas*, and historical annals in the collection known as *Codex Chimalpahin* written by the Nahua annalist—to illustrate that Chimalpahin's historical writings diverge significantly from the works of the friars. While the friars write a history that focuses on the Mexica and present Indigenous history as foreclosed while also writing ethnographic treatises to extirpate Indigenous idolatric practices in order to advance their evangelization projects, Chimalpahin's historiographic project is very different. The Nahua annalist writes a broader history in Nahuatl for Nahua readers of future generations and focuses on the political history of Indigenous peoples of Cemanahuac to reactivate the Indigenous subject as subject of history, thereby providing Indigenous peoples of future generations the ability to reclaim their history, political institutions, and land. Consequently, contrary to the friars' treatises and histories of ethnocide, Chimalpahin's historical annals evidence an Indigenous project of ethnogenesis— the writing and archiving of texts that allows Nahua readers and their descendants to reclaim and reactivate the history of their ancestors, that is, the history of Cemanahuac, thereby allowing Indigenous peoples recover and reclaim their cultural, social, and political practices.[64]

Sahagún and Durán's Histories of the Indies and Their Projects of Ethnocide

Sahagún's *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España*, also known as *Florentine Codex* (c.1540-1585), points to the great catastrophe of the conquest and the moment of crisis Nahua peoples experienced as a direct consequence of the Spanish invasion. If the Nahua peoples of Mesoamerica had built a great civilization as Sahagún seems to suggests in his detailed explanation of Nahua culture and society throughout the twelve books of his *Historia*—often expressing admiration for the pre-conquest Nahuas—surviving Indigenous peoples where a mere shadow of their great past. Sahagún illustrates this point in the general prologue when he explains:

[64] In my definition of the term "ethnogenesis" I'm building on José Rabasa's use of the term by extending it beyond the production of individual texts to consider the broader question of an Indigenous Nahua archive. In *Tell Me the Story of How I Conquered You*, Rabasa conceptualizes the term "ethnogenesis" in opposition to the term "ethnosuicide" to illustrate that "in the objectification of culture and history in images [and Nahuatl alphabetic writing by Nahua *tlacuiloque*] there remains a slippage that leads from self-destruction into healing and invention (13-14). Moreover, according to Jonathan D. Hill, "Cultural anthropologists have generally used the term *ethnogenesis* to describe the historical emergence of a people who define themselves in relation to a sociocultural and linguistic heritage [but it] can also serve as an analytical tool for developing critical historical approaches to culture as an ongoing process of conflict and struggle over a people's existence and their positioning within and against a general history of domination." (1).

> Aprovechará mucho toda esta obra para conocer el quilate de esta gente Mexicana, el cual aún no se ha conocido, porque vino sobre ellos aquella maldición que Jeremías de parte de Dios fulminó contra Judea y Jerusalem… Esto a la letra ha acontecido a estos indios con los españoles: fueron atropeyados y destruidos y todas sus cosas, que ninguna aparencia les queda de lo que era antes (16).[65]

Besides pointing to the violence of the conquest and its destruction, this statement also makes clear that Indigenous peoples were nothing but remnants of a great past. This image of the defeated and deteriorated Nahuas is not too different from the image Las Casas presents in his *Brevísima relación* (1555) of Indigenous peoples who were at the verge of extinction and needed the protection of the Crown to survive. In Sahagún's view, Nahua Civilization was at a moment of crisis. Yet, those who had survived the conquest continued their idolatry and it was necessary to understand pre-conquest Nahua culture and society in order to uproot the remaining idolatry (15).

As a moment of crisis in which the generation of those who lived before the conquest and had survived were aging and dying—and with them the knowledge of the ancient past which survived only in ruins—Sahagún turned to the surviving native nobility to understand Nahua culture and society (and their language) before it further deteriorated. Lacking sources and information to explain the history, culture, and society of the Nahuas prior to the conquest, Sahagún turns to painted histories and the Nahua elders for his *Historia*. In the prologue to Book II, a book focused on Nahua religious celebrations, Sahagún explains his method of compiling the information for his study, compiling the painted histories and gathering the testimonies of the elders with the assistance of Nahua scholars from the Colegio of Tlatelolco (71-72). His meticulous method of gathering information about Nahua Civilization before the conquest is impressive as he is able to present a detailed account of Nahua culture and society before the arrival of the Spaniards. Moreover, even though Sahagún's *Historia* may be seen as a great achievement given that he was able to preserve the knowledge of a great past with diligence and great efforts, one must not conclude that his work favored the condition of Indigenous peoples who had survived the conquest and now lived under colonial rule. Consequently, it is appropriate to seriously consider the motivation of Sahagún for elaborating such a detailed account of the Nahuas before the conquest. Even though one can easily argue that his project exceeded his intentions given that his texts have become one of the principal sources for understanding Nahua culture and society in pre-Hispanic times and the Nahuatl language itself, his text nevertheless provides an explanation of why he embarked on this project and how he saw his work contributing to the evangelizing mission of the Christian friars.

Even when one considers Sahagún's investigation of the Nahua past and his detailed description of the Mesoamerican world before the intrusion of the Spaniards in a positive light, one must not forget that Sahagún was commissioned to develop a comprehensive study of the Nahuas in order to uproot their remaining idolatry. Sahagún describes this in the Prologue to Book II when he explains: "Como en otros prólogos de esta obra he dicho, a mí me fue mandado por santa obediencia de mi prelado mayor, que escribiese en lengua mexicana lo que me pareciese ser útil para la doctrina, cultura y manutencia de la cristianidad de estos naturales de esta Nueva España, y para ayuda de los obreros y ministros que los doctrinan" (71). Moreover, in

[65] I use the original orthography in my citations of 16th and 17th century texts.

the other prologues Sahagún insists on the need to understand the ancient practices and the Nahuatl language in order to "cure" Indigenous peoples from their idolatry. For instance, early on in the general prologue Sahagún insists that idolatry was a sickness and, as such, "El médico no puede acertadamente aplicar las medicinas al enfermo (sin) que primero conozca de qué humor, o de qué causa proceda la enfermedad" (15). Consequently, in treating the "malady" of idolatry, the friars needed to understand its causes. Similarly, the brief prologue to Book V, a book about omens and superstition, also presents Sahagún's preoccupation with understanding the ancient practices of idolatry in order to uproot them when he states: "Y porque, para cuando, llagados de esta llaga [la idolatria] fueren a buscar medicina, y el médico los pueda fácilmente entender, se ponen en el presente libro muchos de los agüeros que estos naturales usaban y, a la postre, se trata de diversas maneras de estantiguas que de noche (se) les aparecían" (259). Here we see once again that Sahagún envisioned his work as contributing to the efforts of the friars to identify and uproot the superstitions of the Nahuas. Thus, throughout his prologues we see Sahagún's insistence in using his *Historia* as an instrument to uproot the idolatry of the Nahuas who survived the catastrophe of the conquest to shape them into good Christians.

By having a good understanding of Nahua cultural practices and Nahua society prior to the conquest (and knowing the Nahuatl language), the friars could identify the practices of idolatry to be able to uproot them. Hence, Sahagún's careful description of the Nahua world could serve as a tool to further the evangelizing and civilizing mission of the friars. While his description of the need to "cure" the natives from their idolatry makes clear that the Mesoamerican belief system and cultural practices continued into the mid-Sixteenth Century, the zeal of the Christian Church would not allow for the Nahuas to continue their ancient cultural and religious practices and preserve their "superstitious" belief system. The friars had a mission to put an end to the religious and cultural practices which deviated from the Christian religion. There was no room for coexistence here. Those who still believed in the ancient practices had to be "cured" and brought into the Christian Faith and into (Western) Civilization, leaving their non-Christian religious and cultural practices in the past; hence, the post-conquest Nahuas had no alternative but to accept the Christian doctrine and the Christian God as the true and only God. Consequently, even if Sahagún shows admiration for Nahua Civilization, the purpose of his detailed account of the Nahuas before the conquest served as an instrument to dominate those who had survived the conquest. Even though, in Sahagún's estimate, Nahua Civilization was decimated and all that remained was a mere shadow of what it used to be, those who survived needed to be "cured" from the remnants of the past; hence, Indigenous Civilization was, for Sahagún, safe and admirable only as a secure and dead past. Any signs of its continuity into the modern, Christian present was seen as a disease which had to be cured.

Similar to Sahagún's *Historia*, Durán's *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España e islas de Tierra Firme* (c.1574-1581) also contributes to the friars' project of extirpating the religious and cultural practices that had survived the conquest and had continued throughout the 16th century. Even though Durán's text might seem, superficially, as being different, the Dominican friar's *Historia* also affirms the end of Indigenous Civilization. Thus, just as Sahagún, he expresses admiration for a great Indigenous past while denying the continuation of Indigenous peoples' spiritual and cultural practices in the present colonial moment.

The prologue to his treatise on rituals and ceremonies of the Nahuas in pre-Hispanic times makes clear that, just as Sahagún, the purpose of his writing is to uproot the idolatric

practices Indigenous peoples continued to practice. The opening paragraph in the prologue is unequivocal when he states:

> Ame movido christiano lector á tomar esta ocupacion de poner y contar por escrito las ydolatrias antiguas y religion falssa con que el demonio era servido antes que llegasse á estas partes la predicacion del santo evangelio el aver entendido que los que nos ocupamos en la dotrina de los yndios nunca acabaremos de enseñarles á conocer al berdadero Dios si primero no fueren raidas y borradas totalmente de su memoria las supersticiossas cerimonias y cultos falssos de los falssos Dioses que adoraban… (13).

Durán does not vacillate here on what moved him to write his treatise on the rituals and ceremonies of the Nahuas of Central Mexico. Notice that in these opening lines to his treatise he discards Indigenous religion and its practices while presenting the deities they revered as "falssos"—false—, automatically discarding their religious belief system. Additionally, Durán makes clear that these religious practices continued into the 16th century and in order for the friars to carry out their evangelizing mission they needed to eradicate from the memory of Indigenous peoples their ancient traditions and religious practices, an attitude that amounts to epistemic terrorism and cultural genocide—ethnocide.

However, even though Durán acknowledges in his writings (c.1574-1581) that Indigenous peoples had been abused (14), he insists on the need to extirpate their idolatric practices much as Sahagún does (c.1540-1585). The Dominican friar explains: "Y assí destas y de otras cosas colijo (lo que arriba dixe), que jamas podremos hacerles conocer de beras á Dios, mientras de raiz no les uvieremos tirado todo lo que huele á la vieja religion de sus antepasados" (15).

At the end of the prologue Durán reiterates his effort to bring to light the rituals and ceremonies of Indigenous peoples of Central Mexico when he writes: "Pues el que quissiere leer este libro hallará en él la relación de todos los principales Dioses que esta ignorante y ciega gente antiguamente adoraban, los cultos y ceremonias que se les hacian en toda esta tierra y provincia mexicana" (16). Thus, with Durán's writings, the friars would be able to identify and confront the idolatric practices that Indigenous peoples continued to practice during the second half of the 16th century. In this way, Durán's treatise on the rituals and ceremonies contributes to the extirpation campaigns of the friars and to the epistemic terrorism and ethnocide they deployed on Indigenous peoples who refused to renounce to the religious and cultural practices they had inherited from their ancestors.

Interestingly, before Durán presents an explanation of the primary pre-Hispanic deities and the ceremonies made in their honor, the first chapter begins with a discussion of Topiltzin which, according to Durán, was a Christian Apostle that preached the Gospel to Indigenous peoples in ancient times with the help of the Toltecs. Durán writes:

> Topiltzin era un hombre adbenediço de tierras extrañas, que cassi quieren [los indios] certificar que apareció en esta tierra porque ninguna relacion puede allar de que parte ubiese benido; empero savese muy de cierto que, después que llegó a esta tierra y enpeço a juntar discipulos y a edificar yglesias y edificios, que él y sus discipulos salían a predicar por los pueblos y se subían a los cerros a predicar… y asi podemos

> probablemente tener que este baron fue algún apóstol de Dios que aportó á esta tierra, y los demás que llamaban oficiales, ó sabios [toltecas], eran sus discípulos, que confirmando su predicación con algunos milagros trabaxando de convertir á estas gentes a la ley ebangélica y viendo la rudeça y dureça de sus terrestres coraçones, desanpararon la tierra y se volvieron á las partes de donde abian venido… (19)

Here, with a stroke of the pen, the Dominican friar grossly disfigures the history of Cemanahuac in two significant ways. First, it evangelizes the Indigenous continent in ancient times, arguing that before the arrival of the Europeans, the Christian Gospel had been preached. Second, it presents the Toltecs—one of the most advanced Mesoamerican Civilizations—as Christian disciples of the Topiltzin, a name which translated from Nahuatl means "our revered lord" (*to-pil-tzin*: Our-lord-revered). This approach of Durán to begin his treatise on Indigenous deities and ceremonies with a Christian Apostle is significant because it sets the ground for his discussion on Indigenous religion as "false" while, as I will explain below, legitimizing the arrival of the Spaniards and their dispossession of Indigenous peoples. Thus, Durán presents an image of Topiltzin and his disciples as the first missionaries in Indigenous lands, preaching among Indigenous peoples while setting temples and altars throughout the land as they spread the Gospel.

This early Apostle of the Christian faith and his disciples, as Durán explains, where expelled from the land by two of the principal Indigenous deities the Nahuas venerated, Tezcatlipoca and Quetzalcoatl. Durán writes: "[C]ontra Topiltzin y contra sus discipulos se levantó gran persecusión, que oi certifican que se levantó guerra contra ellos por que el numero de gente que había tomado aquella ley era mucha y los que seguian la predicación y exemplo de aquel Santo baron y de sus discípulos" (19). Notice here that Durán refers to Topiltzin as a "Santo baron" and to his followers, just as he does in the previous passage, as "discípulos", two terms central to Christian evangelizing discourse. Also notice that Durán's narrative of Topiltzin differentiates the figure of Topiltzin from that of the pre-Hispanic deity Quetzalcoatl. In fact, Durán presents them as enemies since Quetzalcoatl was one of the pre-Hispanic deities responsible for the persecution that resulted in the exile of Topilztin. In this way, Durán explains the way in which Topiltzin and his disciples where exiled from the land with the persecution led by Tezcatlipoca, one of the most revered Nahua deities, with the help of Quetzalcoatl, another important deity for the Nahuas and principal god of the Toltecs. Durán later affirms as he references the accounts Indigenous people gave of the Christian Apostle before departing: Topiltzin left symbols of the cross and other Christian images throughout the land as a reminder that the Christian Gospel had been preached in these lands and there had been evidence of a Bible, perhaps written in Hebrew, that Indigenous people had burned not long before (21).

Besides evangelizing the Indigenous continent during the time of the Toltecs, the narrative of Topiltzin's exile also serves to legitimize the idea that the descendants of Topiltzin, i.e. the Christians, would one day return to reclaim the land Topiltzin and his disciples had been forced to abandon. Durán writes,

> Preguntele [a un indio] á donde saven ó an oido que aportó; aunque me dixo algunas cosas fabulosas, bino á conformar en que acia la mar se avia ydo y que nunca mas se supo del, ni saven donde aportó, y que solo saven quel fue á dar avisso a sus hijos los españoles desta tierra, y quel los truxo para bengarse dellos; y asi estos yndios, como

> tenian profesía de tan atras de la benida de las estrañas gentes, siempre estubieron con avisso (23)

Here Durán relies on the story of an Indigenous informant to present an explanation of the arrival of the Christians and the eventual dispossession of Indigenous peoples while affirming the supposed prophecy that a strange people would come from the East to reclaim the land. Thus, in starting his book on the rituals and ceremonies of the Nahuas with the story of Topiltzin and his exile from the Indigenous continent by the revered pre-Hispanic deities, Durán Christianizes the Indigenous past while legitimizing the eventual dispossession of Indigenous peoples and presenting their ancient deities as false and as the ones responsible for interrupting the spread of the Christian faith among Indigenous peoples during the time of the Toltecs.

If Durán's treatise on the rituals and ceremonies leaves doubt on what his aim is in writing a detailed account on the religious practices of Indigenous peoples before the arrival of the Europeans, his treaties on the ancient calendar makes clear that his aim is to understand their ancient practices and cosmovision in order to identify and eradicate it. This is clear in the introductory page to the treatise on the calendar when he writes: "Pónese aquí para aviso de los Ministros y para honra y gloria de Nro. Dios y aumento de la Santa Fé católica y estirpación de las ceremonias y rituos antiguos" (221). Durán could not be more explicit on what the objective of his study is: to document the ancient calendar and how it ruled the Nahuas in order to inform the friars so that they could identify and extirpate the ancient traditions that had survived the conquest and continued into the 16th century.

In an epistle directed at "[E]l curioso lector", a sort of prologue to the treatise on the Mesoamerican calendar, Durán restates the need to uproot the memory of Indigenous peoples' pre-Hispanic cultural practices. He is unequivocal in this when he explains:

> Y aun que sea assí que la memoria de Huitzilopochtli y de Tezcatlipoca y Quetzalcoatl y de los demás inumerables dioses que esta nación adoraba esté ya olvidada y aquel sacrificarse á los dioses y aquel matar de hombres y ofrecer de sacrificios y comer carne humana &c. Sospecho con vehemente sospecha que debe de haber quedado un olorcillo de alguna superstición en algunos que tienen gran afinidad con sus idolatrías (224)

Here Durán explains that even though the memory of three of their primary deities and the supposed ritual practices the Christians found most abominable in Indigenous peoples' religious practices—i.e., sacrifices to the gods, murder of men and the ritual eating of human flesh—may have been forgotten, he does not doubt that certain aspects of their ancient practices continued. Consequently, he adds:

> …y que no faltan el dia de hoy algunos viejos y los ha habido domatizadores agoreros doctos en su vieja ley que han enseñado y enseñan á los mozos que agora se crían enseñandoles la cuenta de los dias de los años y ceremonias y rituos antiguos los falsos y engañosos milagros y mandatos que los Dioses tenian (225)

Durán's sense of alarm at the continuation of idolatric religious practices is evident here as he makes clear that the ancient practices and their teachings of what he calls "vieja ley"—ancient law—were not isolated events but current practices found in Indigenous communities. Durán

also point to the efforts of the elders—those who carried the knowledge of the ancestors—to pass on this knowledge to the younger generations of Nahuas who would continue these practices. Thus, in his description of the continuation of ancient practices half a century after the conquest, the reader encounters the continuous existence of a Nahua community that attempted to preserve their ancient practices and belief system and the missionaries calculated efforts to suppress and destroy this community and knowledge system.

Consequently, Durán insists on the need for the friars to understand idolatric practices to uproot them. This motivates Durán to document the ancient calendar system, just as he had done in the treatise on rituals and ceremonies, hoping that in shedding light into those religious practices his brothers in the faith would be successful in uprooting idolatry from the minds and lives of the Indigenous population. Adding to his statement of alarm on the continuation of idolatric practices and his motivation to write a treatise on the calendar system and its accompanying idolatric practices discussed above, Durán writes:

> La cual sospecha me puso no poco ánimo a emprender de salir con este tratado solo movido con celo de dar aviso y lumbre a los Ministros para que sus trabajos no sean en vano y de ningun efecto como en algunas partes lo han sido para lo cual debian los Ministros y obreros de esta divina obra de la conversion de estos natuales de procurar sabellos muy bien si pretenden hacer algun effecto y fruto con su doctrina… (225)

Thus, it is clear that Durán is moved by an effort to inform his brothers in the faith and assist them in carrying out the evangelizing mission. Thus, if one follows Durán's logic, without a clear understanding of the ancient idolatric practices, including those that were directly tied to the calendar system, the efforts of the friars to evangelize the Indigenous population would be fruitless. As such, in order to eliminate those ancient practices, the friars would have to be able to know and identify them first and then proceed to eradicate them. This approach to the calculated and systematic destruction of Indigenous religious practices is tantamount to epistemic terrorism and ethnocide.

In sum, Durán's treatise on the calendar aims to explain the ways in which the calendar worked and how it ruled Indigenous people's daily lives and destinies. Thus, his treatise is akin to the *arte divinatoria* of the Nahuas the Franciscan Sahagún expounds in his *Florentine Codex*, carefully explaining how the ancient calendar worked and the divinatory science that accompanied it in order to identify it and uproot it from Indigenous communities. In a similar way, Durán also aims to document the ancient knowledge of the Nahuas in order to identify their current idolatric practices and be able to eradicate them, hence, contributing to the epistemic terrorism and cultural genocide Indigenous peoples of Central Mexico faced as the 16th century started to come to a close.

Durán's book on the pre-Hispanic history of the Nahuas, although different from his treatises the rituals and ceremonies and the calendar, also contributes, like Sahagún's magnum opus, to the narrative of the end of a great civilization, even when it is supposed to tell the history of the Nahuas from an Indigenous perspective. As numerous scholars have pointed out, Durán's *Historia*, just as Tezozomoc's chronicle in Spanish, *Crónica mexicana,* is believed to have been derived from an Indigenous account painted and written in Nahuatl, the famous *Crónica X* (Barlow; Bernal; Kenrick Kruell; Castañeda de la Paz). Durán's sympathy and

admiration for the pre-Hispanic past, specifically the grandeur of the Mexica and the Aztec Empire, is evident throughout the text. For instance, his admiration for the Nahuas becomes apparent when one considers Durán's critique of Cortés and the Spaniards, whom he calls "ministros del demonio"; his positive representation of Moctezuma; and his admiration for the last Mexica *tlahtoani*, whom he calls Cuauhtemoctzin as he praises his defense of the Aztec capital. These representations and the fact that Durán focuses on Indigenous history has led scholars such as José Rabasa to read Durán's texts as having the possibility to rehabilitate Indigenous history and the Indigenous subject as a subject of history (*Crónicas religiosas* 443). Nevertheless, Rabasa also points to an inherent contradiction in Durán's text: on the one hand, Durán disqualifies Indigenous knowledge while on the other rehabilitates the political imaginary of the Nahuas (444). Thus, for Rabasa, this contradiction remains unresolved in Durán's text, an approach that I find problematic given that Durán's own history is not too far removed from his other two treatises that disqualify Indigenous knowledge and attempt to repress the religious and cultural practices of the Nahuas. In other words, how can one explain that two of Durán's texts systematically discard and attempt to destroy Indigenous knowledge and culture while one revives and rehabilitates Indigenous history? For his part, Ignacio Bernal points to the duality of Durán, "which forces him to be strict and almost inexorable in matters of the Faith, but which permits him to feel and understand a culture which he does not wish to destroy but to evangelize" (576). My own reading of Durán's text on the history of the Nahuas, in light of his treatises on the rituals and ceremonies and the calendar—and as the historical narrative illustrates—is more in-line with José Rubén Romero Galván and Rosa de Lourdes Camelo who read Durán's text as a history that is foreclosed: "Se trata, el primer volumen, de una historia ya concluida, aquélla del México antes de la Conquista española, hecho histórico este último que marcó el final del proceso que se relata, puesto que violentamente a partir de entonces el devenir tomó otro camino en el que ciertamente el autor estaba ya inmerso" (42). Thus, Durán presents the history of the Nahuas prior to the conquest as a great civilization that had come to an end and even though it is sympathetic to the Indigenous past, it reinforces its end. Furthermore, besides disqualifying Indigenous epistemology, it also presents a narrow Indigenous history focused on the Mexica and their ascent to power while reiterating their imminent fall. This is evident in the way Durán treats the stories of the origin Indigenous peoples purportedly told him and manuscripts he claims to have seen; his narrative on the rise of the Mexica and their eventual fall; and his narrative of the end of the grandeur of the Mexica. Thus, when read from this perspective, Durán appears to be more of an apologist for the end Nahua Civilization rather than someone who rehabilitates Indigenous history.

The first chapter of Durán's treatise on pre-Hispanic history, which he titles, "De dónde se sospecha que son los indios de estas indias y islas y tierra firme del Mar Oceano", begins with an explanation that Indigenous peoples of the continent descended from one of the ten tribes of Israel who had been expelled from their homeland in ancient times. Thus, Durán finds in the religious and cultural practices of Indigenous peoples of Central Mexico an affinity to the Hebrew peoples of Israel. Referring to the lack of knowledge there was on the origin of Indigenous peoples, Durán explains:

> empero, faltando esto, será necesario llegarnos á las sospechas y conjeturas, á la demasiada ocasión que esta gente nos da con su bajísimo modo y manera de tratar y de su conversación tan baja, tan propia de los judios y gente hebrea, y creo no incurriria en

> capital error el que lo afirmase si considerando su modo de vivir, sus cerimonias, sus ritos y supersticiones… (53)

Thus, for Durán, Indigenous peoples of Central Mexico were Hebrews given their religious and cultural practices. Basing his explanation on Scripture and on the "antiguas pinturas" Indigenous people shared with him in which they documented their own arduous history of migration, Durán asserts: "con lo cual confirmo mi opinion y sospecha de que estos naturales sean de aquellas diez tribus de Israel" (54). With this statement, Durán affirms that the true origin of Indigenous peoples of the continent is to be found in the ancient tribes of the Middle East.

Interestingly, in situating the origin of Indigenous peoples as one of the tribes of Israel, Durán justifies the dispossession and punishment Indigenous peoples received with the arrival of the Europeans to the continent. Durán writes:

> Jeremías, Ezequiel, Miqueas, Sophías [es] donde se hallará que Dios prometió á estas diez tribus por sus grandes maldades y ambiciones y nefandas idolatrías, apartandose del culto de su verdadero Dios, de quien tantos beneficios había recibido. Por pago de tal ingratitud les promote Dios, en los lugares acotados, un azote y castigo rigurosísimo qual le vemos cumplido en estas miserables gentes; conviene a saber, que les auian de ser quitadas sus tierras, casas, tesoros, sus joyas y piedras preciosas, sus mujeres e hijos y llevarlos a vender á tierras extrañas gozando otros de sus haciendas (55).

With this explanation of the divine punishment Indigenous peoples had received, Durán justifies the dispossession and destruction of the Nahuas of Central Mexico. As one of the ten tribes of Israel that had deviated from the True Faith, the Christian God had promised to punish them, dispossessing them of their lands and all the things they had of value. Consequently, in light of the devastation brought by the conquest and the massive dispossession and genocide of Indigenous peoples of Central Mexico, Durán is convinced that Indigenous people had descended from one of the idolatric tribes of Israel and were, thus, descendants of the Hebrews.

Besides imposing an explanation of the origin of Indigenous peoples as being the descendants of one of the ten tribes of Israel, Durán also presents the explanations Indigenous peoples themselves gave for their origin. However, instead of considering their own explanations, he discards them. Durán makes this clear at the beginning of the first chapter: "y dado el caso que algunos cuenten algunas falsas fábulas, conviene á saber: que nacieron de unas fuentes y manantiales de agua; otros que nacieron de unas cuevas; otros que su generación es de los dioses, etc; lo cual clara y abiertamente se vee ser fábula y ellos mesmos ignoran su orígen y principio" (54). Here Durán dismisses Indigenous peoples' own stories of creation as mere "fábulas"—fables—and presents them as being ignorant of their own past. Furthermore, in the explanations Indigenous people gave for the arduous migration into the lake region, Durán imposes a Christian frame on Indigenous history by reading their stories in relation to the Biblical story of Exodus (56).

According to Durán, given that Indigenous peoples creation stories were only fables and they could not explain their own origin prior to their emergence from the caves of Chicomoztoc in Aztlan, the Dominican friar accepts the idea that the Nahuas' place of migration was located in the seven caves of Chicomoztoc. However, he continues to insist on his own explanation that

situates Nahua peoples' as descendants of one of the ten tribes of Israel. Durán writes: "Pero porque la noticia que tengo de su origen y principio no es más, ni ellos saben dar más relación, sino desde aquellas siete cuevas… la que queda de mi opinion de su origen no sea muy dudosa" (60). Here Durán restates that Indigenous people cannot account for their own origin prior to their emergence from the caves of Chicomoztoc, the place from where they migrated into the lake region. Thus, by situating the origin of Indigenous peoples as one of the tribes of Israel, Durán incorporates Indigenous peoples as part of Universal Christian history while dismissing Indigenous peoples' own stories of origin.

Once Durán had established that Indigenous peoples descended from the Hebrews and had migrated from Chicomoztoc, he proceeds to tell their story of migration, recounting the names of the seven groups that left Aztlan to settle in the lake region of Central Mexico centuries before and had developed into the Nahua Civilization the Europeans encountered in the 16th century. However, even though Durán's narrative of the migration mentions the seven groups that migrated out of Aztlan, it becomes evident early on that Durán's narrative, just as Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicana*, is focused on the history of the Mexica, their rise to power, and their eventual fall. For instance, while the second chapter briefly mentions the seven groups that left Aztlan, it ends with a discussion of the migration of the Mexica guided by their tutelary god, Huitzilopochtli (67-68). From the third chapter on, Durán's narrative is focused on Mexica history, leaping from their departure from Aztlan to their arrival into the lake region and continuing with their ascent to power and their eventual fall. Thus, by the sixth chapter, Durán's narrative begins to focus on the Mexica rulers and Mexica imperial expansion. As such, it becomes clear to the reader that Durán's seventy-three chapters are akin to Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicana*, the Spanish text, in which he recounts the story of the Mexica from their migration from Aztlan to their rise to power and their eventual ruin, indeed, an "other" *grandeza mexicana*.

Interestingly, Durán's history of the Mexica ends in a similar way to Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicana*. Just as the Mexica chronicler who reports to have written a history of the Nahuas in Spanish from the time of the conquest until the moment in which he wrote, the early 17th century, Durán also promises to write another treatise in which he would document the history of the Nahuas from the conquest until his present moment, 1581, the year in which he finished his *Historia*, a history which would focus on the dire condition of the Nahuas after the conquest. As far as I know, Durán never wrote this other treatise and, more significantly, he ends his history on the pre-Hispanic Mexica by emphasizing their ruin:

> y porque de aquí en adelante me obligan á hacer otro tratado de las cosas pasadas, desde este punto hasta estos infelices y desdichados tiempos y de las calamidades que esta fertilísima, riquisima y opulentisima tierra tiene y la ciudad de México á pasado y decaido, desde aquellos tiempos hasta á acá, y la caida de su grandeza y excelencia, con pérdida de tanta nobleza de que estaba poblada y acompañada y de la miseria y pobreza a que a venido… (651)

Notice that even though Durán praises the greatness of the Indigenous past and presents the valley of Mexico in a positive light, he contrasts its great past with its fall and ruin, pointing to the loss of a great civilization and its present state of ruin. As such, in this description we also find echoes of Sahagún's *Florentine Codex* in which he praises the grandeur of a great past while

emphasizing its demise and pointing to the degraded state of the Nahuas after the conquest. Thus, as Romero Galván and Camelo have pointed out, Durán's *Historia* presents a narrative of pre-Hispanic Nahua Civilization as a dead past, as a history foreclosed (42) and worthy of admiration as a dead past. While there were aspects of Nahua Civilization that were admirable, their idolatric religious and cultural practices were incompatible with Euro-Christian Civilization and were, thus, to be admired from a distance as they presented a threat to the Euro-Christian religious-political order.

Towards the middle of Durán's *Historia*, in chapter XXII, the friar returns to the questions of the of the homeland of the Mexica when he recounts a fascinating story of how Moctezuma I sent a group of sorcerers to find the original homeland of his ancestors. The chapter tells the story of how Moctezuma I, following the advice of his right hand man, Tlacaelel, sent a group of sorcerers to find their homeland in Aztlan. The story Durán recounts serves to emphasize yet again Durán's perspective that the doom of the Nahuas had been prophesized by their own gods. As Durán explains after recounting the way in which, through magic, the Nahua sorcerers had reached the land of Aztlan, where the ancestors and deities of the Indigenous peoples of Central Mexico lived. According to the story, Coatlicue, the mother of Huitzilopochtli, principal deity of the Mexica, tells the sorcerers:

> decidle [a Huizilopochtli] qual estoy, en ayuno y penitencia, por su causa: ya sabe que me dijo, cuando se partia: madre mía, no me detendré mucho en dar la Vuelta, no mas de cuando llevo a estos siete barrios y los aposento en donde an de avitar y poblar aquella tierra que les es prometida; y aviendolos asentado y poblado y consolado luego volveré y daré la vuelta… y esto será en cumpliendose los años de mi peregrinación y el tiempo que me está señalado en el qual tiempo tengo que hacer guerra a todas las provincias y ciudades, villas y lugares, y traellos y sujetallos á mi servicio; pero por la mesma órden que yo los ganare, por esa mesma órden me los han de quitar y tornar á ganar gentes estrañas, y me han de echar de aquella tierra (274-275).

This dialogue between Coatlicue and Huitzilopochtli before his departure from Aztlan prophesizes the ascend and eventual downfall of Indigenous peoples that had left Aztlan to settle in the lake region. As Huitzilopochtli makes clear to his mother who awaits him: just as his people had conquered others through arms, a strange people would come and dispossess them of the lands they had conquered and subjected, and once this happened, he would return to the land from where he had departed centuries before. Thus, this dialogue between the two Nahua deities serves as a prelude to the conquest, the strange people being the Spaniards who, through arms, would conquer the Aztecs. In this way, by presenting this fascinating story towards the middle of his history of the Mexica as they begin their ascend to power with the leadership of Moctezuma I and Tlacaelel, Durán prefigures the eventual end of the Mexica state.

Durán's narrative on the conquest, even though it appears to tell the history of the Spanish conquest from an Indigenous perspective, it reiterates the fall of the Mexica state. Thus, while his account is critical of Cortés and the violence the Spanish conquistadors perpetuated against Indigenous peoples, his narrative nevertheless serves to emphasize and justify the decline of the Mexica. For instance, Durán situates Cortés as being responsible for having been present and ordering the massacre at Toxcatl soon after the arrival of the Spaniards into the lake region, a narrative that differs from other accounts by both Spaniards and Indigenous chroniclers. Thus, in

situating Cortés as being present and ordering the massacre, Durán presents a direct critique of Cortés. Nevertheless, his account contributes to the narrative of the demise of Indigenous civilization since, according to Durán, this massacre was "la mayor y mas atroz que se cometió en esta tierra, por ser cometida contra la flor y nobleza de México, murieron tantos y tan valerosos varones" (621). As such, this was the beginning of the demise of the Indigenous nobility and the decline of the Mexica state as it was at Toxcatl where the majority of the Nahua priests and high-ranking nobility were massacred.

Moreover, Durán's representation of the Spaniards' murder of Moctezuma also contributes to his critique of the Spaniards while advancing the idea that the fall of the Mexica state was imminent. Durán does not vacillate when he explains that Moctezuma was murdered by the Spaniards as he explains that after the retreat of the Spaniards out of the capital city during the Spanish Night of Sorrows, the Nahuas found their supreme ruler chained and stabbed with five dagger wounds in the chest (630), a narrative that is in-line with Indigenous accounts and Durán himself states having found this explanation in Indigenous texts—both written and painted texts. However, even when Durán expresses sympathy towards the Mexica *tlahtoani* and appears to tell the story from the perspective of the Nahuas, his narrative serves to reaffirm and justify the end of the Mexica state. Referring to the murder of Moctezuma, Durán writes, "con lo cual se le cumplieron los pronósticos y profecías que él de sí mesmo abía profetizado y dicho; cosa que admira y se conoce ser verdaderamente permision del muy alto, en quien quiso executar rigoroso castigo por sus intolerables tiranías y crueldades y vicios nefandos y sucios en que estaba…" (630). Thus, Durán quickly shifts from showing sympathy for the murdered Mexica *tlahtoani* to justify his murder as divine punishment. Consequently, even though Durán purportedly narrates the story of conquest from an Indigenous perspective, even when basing it in Indigenous accounts, he nevertheless perpetuates a narrative that justifies the end of the Mexica state. As such, Durán appears to be more of an apologist for the end of the Mexica state than a chronicler narrating the history of conquest from an Indigenous perspective.

Similarly, Durán's treatment of Cuauhtemoc and his fierce defense of Indigenous peoples of Central Mexico may also lead readers to perceive his narrative as a history told from an Indigenous perspective. However, upon close analysis, it becomes clear that the friar's narrative does not question the execution of Cuauhtemoc the way Indigenous annalists and chroniclers do. To begin with, Durán appears to show admiration for the Mexica ruler and his fierce defense of Mexico Tenochtitlan at the beginning, showing reverence for the Mexica ruler by calling him Cuauhtemoctzin (622) and narrating with admiration the Indigenous resistance led by the young Mexica *tlahtoani*. For instance, Durán writes, "Asi Cuauhtemoc, con deseo de reinar y mostrar valor de su persona, propuso de defender su ciudad hasta la muerte; el cual no admitió ni quiso conceder a los mensajes y ruegos que el Marques le enviaba para que se sujetase al servicio de dios y de su majestad" (636). Even though Durán does not call the Mexica leader Cuauhtemoctzin here, he nevertheless presents the Mexica ruler's determination to defend his city and people at all costs. Such an explanation is similar to the explanations Indigenous annalists and chroniclers give in their accounts—for instance, the narrative the *tlacuiloque* of the *Florentine Codex* give—, narratives which present a brave Mexica ruler determined to fight to the end. However, even though Durán treats Cuauhtemoc as a heroic figure who defends his people until the end, his positive treatment of the Mexica ruler is betrayed when Durán narrates his execution. While Indigenous *tlacuiloque* such as Chimalpahin and others are sure to point out that Cuauhtemoc was unjustly accused of wanting to rebel and criticize Cortés for ordering his

execution based on unfounded accusations, Durán does not question it. He writes: "y parece que á pocas jornadas después que salió de México le acumularon que quería cometer traición á los españoles y procuraba hacellos matar, y levantandose contra él algunos testigos le mandó ahorcar y así feneció el gran Cuauhtemoc ahorcado, el cual reinó en México tres ó cuatro años" (649-650). As this passage towards the end of Durán's historical treatise makes clear, the friar does not question the accusations made against Cuauhtemoc the way Indigenous scribes do; on the contrary, in a very detached way, Durán simply reports on how the Mexica ruler was accused and Cortés' order to execute him. The sympathy Durán expressed in narrating the fierce resistance of the Mexica ruler in defense of the Aztec capital is not present here; neither is there a direct critique of Cortés for having ordered the execution of the Mexica ruler. Consequently, the reader can perceive at the end of Durán's historical narrative his detachment and insensitivity for the fate of the Mexica ruler and his affirmation of the end of the Mexica state. When read from this perspective, Durán's narrative on the history of the Mexica rise to power and their eventual fall turns out to be a narrative that emphasizes and justifies the end of Mexica rule, a history of a past that is admirable only as a distant and dead past.

Tovar and Acosta's Providentialist Histories and the Predetermined End of the Mexica State and Indigenous Peoples' Self-determination

The works of the Jesuit Friars Juan de Tovar (1543-1623) and José de Acosta (1540-1600) can help us further situate Chimalpahin's intellectual project as their works differ significantly from the works of the two friars discussed above and from the work of the Nahua annalist himself. Besides the fact that Tovar provided Acosta with most of the information on the Nahuas of New Spain, as evident in the correspondence between the friars (*MS. Tovar* 3-5), Tovar's narrative on the rituals and ceremonies is different from Durán's. Thus, rather than simply being a summarized version of the Dominican friar's account, Tovar's narrative is significantly different from Durán's; and yet, like Durán, his relative and brother in the Faith,[66] Tovar's narrative also presents a narrow history focused on the Mexica that points to the end of the Mexica state and Nahua Civilization. However, even though Tovar's narrative of the pre-Hispanic past presents a narrative of the end of Nahua Civilization, there are significant differences between Tovar's account and that of Durán. First, there is no discourse on the need to learn about Indigenous religious practices and knowledge systems in order to extirpate them. Consequently, it does not perpetuate the epistemic terrorism and cultural genocide we find in Sahagún and Durán. Second, Tovar's account challenges Durán's narrative on the origin of Indigenous peoples. Thus, in Tovar's account the reader begins to encounter a narrative that treats the history of Indigenous peoples of New Spain from a perspective that does not demonize the Indigenous past and Indigenous peoples that had survived the conquest, epidemics, and systemic violence that had plagued Indigenous communities since the arrival of the Spaniards into the so-called *Nuevo Mundo*. This, in turn, is the narrative Acosta receives to write his

[66] In Tovars' letter to Acosta, Tovar explains that in drafting his manuscript, "ví un libro que hizo un frayle dominico, deudo mío, que estaba el más conforme a la librería antigua que yo he visto, que me ayudó a refrescar la memoria para hazer esa Historia que Vuestra Merced agora ha leydo" (Tovar 4). Even though Tovar does not specifically name Durán, critics have established that the reference he makes to the book written by his relative refers to Durán. O'Gorman validates this in his critical edition of Acosta's *Historia natural y moral* when he writes: "Tovar no cita de nombre a Fr. Diego Durán, pero la crítica ha establecido que lo alude cuando asienta en dicha carta que para escribir esa segunda hsitoria vio 'un libro que hizo un fraile dominico', deudo suyo" (O'Gorman LXXVIII).

monumental *Historia natural y moral de las Indias*. Thus, Tovar's narrative is a history that does not insist on the eradication of idolatry and challenges Durán's narrative of the origin of Indigenous peoples but nevertheless emphasizes the early evangelization of the continent and the supposed fateful end of the Mexica state and the Indigenous world.

Tovar's treatise on the rituals and ceremonies of the Nahuas of New Spain is the second part of a text known as *Manuscript Tovar*, a text significantly shorter than Durán's treatise on rituals and ceremonies. Consisting of four short chapters, Tovar describes Nahua rites and ceremonies by focusing on the ceremonies in honor of the main deities in the Aztec pantheon, that is, Huitzilopochtli, Tezcatlipoca, and Quetzalcoatl. However, the main difference between Tovar's narrative and Durán's is that in Tovar's treatise there is no discourse of the need to document Indigenous rites and knowledge of the pre-Hispanic gods in order to extirpate them from the minds and lives of Indigenous peoples. On the contrary, Tovar's narrative is focused on describing the rites and ceremonies in order to provide Acosta with information about Nahua religious practices. Consequently, Tovar's treatise avoids commentary like that of Durán and Sahagún when they emphasize the need to know Indigenous pre-Hispanic practices in order to uproot them and to serve as a tool to assist the friars in the evangelizing mission. Thus, it is clear that Tovar's text serves a different purpose than the treatise of the Franciscan and Dominican friars discussed above since its purpose is to describe Nahua rites and ceremonies by focusing on the ceremonies in honor of the main deities in the Aztec pantheon.

Tovar's treatment of the Mesoamerican calendar system towards the end of the fourth chapter of his treatise on rites and ceremonies is also significantly different from Durán's. Unlike the Dominican friar's narrative on the pre-Hispanic calendar which consists of an entire treatise that meticulously describes the eighteen months in the Mesoamerican calendar preceded by three chapters describing the pre-Hispanic calendar system and the superstitions that accompanied it, Tovar's explanation is reduced to two folios and does not detail the feasts celebrated on each of the months. Instead, Tovar's description is straight forward without describing the ritual practices that accompanied each of the months and the *arte divinatoria* of the Nahuas. Thus, Tovar's description of the Mesoamerican calendar system is more of a general description of the Mesoamerican calendar without a discourse on the need to uproot or eradicate Indigenous knowledge and practices. Consequently, Tovar's treatise is clearly different from Durán's as it is not merely a reduced version of Durán's text and does not have the same objective of knowing and documenting Indigenous ritual practices in order to eradicate them. In taking this approach, Tovar does not participate in the epistemic terrorism and cultural genocidal project both Durán and Sahagún carry out.

Tovar's narrative on the history of the Nahuas, although it presents, much as Durán's *Historia*, a narrative of the end of the Mexica, it nevertheless challenges the friar's narrative on the origin of Indigenous peoples. To begin with, he does not situate the origin of the Nahuas as the descendants of the exiled tribes of Israel as the Dominican friar affirms and defends throughout his narrative. On the contrary, Tovar situates the place of origin of the Nahuas as being Aztlan and Teocolhuacan, a territory that had become known to Spanish explorers as New Mexico, todays Southwestern United States. As Tovar explains in the first chapter of his historical narrative: "En esta tierra están dos provincias, la una llamada Aztlan, que quiere dezir 'lugar de garças', y la otra se dize Teocoluacan, que quiere decir 'tierra de los que tienen abuelos divinos', en cuyo distrito están siete cuevas, de donde salieron siete caudillos de los Nahuatlaca,

que poblaron esta Nueva España, segun tienen por antigua tradición y pintura" (9). Thus, far from situating the origin of Indigenous peoples of New Spain as the descendants of the Hebrew peoples of Israel, Tovar begins his history by situating their original homeland in Aztlan/Teocolhuacan while also acknowledging the seven caves from which the leaders of the seven groups departed. In this way, Tovar situates the origin of the Nahuas in the Southwest region without affiliating them to the descendants of the Hebrews. The Jesuit friar then continues, challenging the perspective that attributes the origin of Indigenous peoples to having emerged from caves:

> Y es de advertir que aunque dizen que salieron de cuevas, no es porque avitaban en ellas, pues tenían sus casas y sementeras con mucho orden y policía de república, sus dioses, ritos y ceremonias, por ser gente muy política como se echa bien de ver, en el modo y traza de los del Nuevo Mexico de donde ellos vinieron, que son muy conformes con todo. Usase en aquella provincial tener cada lineaje su sitio y lugar conocido, el cual señalan en una Cueva, diziendo la Cueva de tal y tal linaje o descendencia, como en España se dize la casa de los Velascos, Mendoças, etc. (9-10)

Here Tovar presents the image of a cave as a metaphor that represents a given lineage, much as in Spain a house represented a noble lineage, thereby correcting the idea that the Nahuas who eventually settled the lake region "emerged" or where born out of caves, a story of origin that would classify them, in the eyes of the Spanish reader, as beasts or savages. Thus, while acknowledging the seven caves from where the original Nahua groups began their migration, Tovar civilizes the inhabitants of Aztlan/Teocolhuacan, making clear that they were as civilized as the Indigenous peoples of the Southwest, perhaps the Pueblos of today's New Mexico. In this way, Tovar rejects the explanation that presents the origin of the Nahuas as being savages that emerged from caves, an explanation that would essentially dehumanize or dismiss the story of their original homeland in the continent as a mere fable.

Even though Tovar challenges the explanations Durán gives for the origin of the Nahuas, the rest of his historical narrative is very similar to Durán's own narrative. Tovar's historical narrative is also focused on the history of the Mexica, their rise to power and their eventual fall. Once Tovar situates the origin of the Nahuas in Aztlan/Teocolhuacan and presents them as "civilized" groups that migrated south at different moments, calling them Nahuatlaca—"gente que se explica y habla claro" (9)—, it soon becomes evident that his narrative, just as Durán's, is focused on the Mexica and their rise to power. Hence, Tovar's narrative focuses on the Mexica migration, their journey into the lake region and their settlement, and the foundation of Tenochtitlan, to then continue with a description of the rise of the Mexica state, the appointment of the various *tlahtoque,* and their wars of expansion, culminating with the death of Moctezuma II and the fall of the Mexica state. Thus, Tovar's narrative, just as Durán's, is another narrative of the *grandeza mexicana* the reader encounters in Tezozomoc's *Crónica mexicana,* a narrative that is believed to have been derived, just as Durán's *Historia,* from the famous *Crónica X*.

Interestingly, even though Tovar does not call for the extirpation of idolatry of the Nahuas in his treatise on rituals and ceremonies, his historical narrative, just as Durán's, also evangelizes the pre-Hispanic continent with the story of Topiltzin, arguing that this figure had preached the Christian Gospel in pre-Hispanic times (73). Thus, Tovar includes a short narrative in which he repeats Durán's narrative of Topiltzin as a Christian evangelist who was also known

by the name of Quetzalcoatl and Papa and who had preached the Christian Gospel in the time of the Toltecs, promising to return to take revenge on those who had exiled him from the land and reclaim his reign (73). This narrative, as I discuss above, not only evangelizes the Indigenous continent but also serves as the basis to announce and legitimize the forthcoming of the end of Indigenous Civilization. Having arrived from the land to which he had departed, Topiltzin, in the figure of Cortés, had returned to claim his reign. Thus, the story of Topiltzin's early evangelization of the continent and his return prefigures and determines the end of the Mexica state and the reign of Mesoamerican gods as he evangelizes the Indigenous continent in pre-Hispanic times.

Tovar's detailed explanation of the multiple omens that announced the fall of the Mexica state further illustrate that his historical narrative emphasizes the end of Indigenous rule. Thus, he gives a detailed explanation of the omens that announced the end of Mexica rule and the arrival of the Christian Faith. Even though Tovar's historical narrative is significantly shorter than Durán's, Tovar's narrative emphasizes more than the Dominican friar the omens that announce the end of Moctezuma II and his reign. Accordingly, the fall of the Mexica and the arrival of Topiltzin/Quetzalcoatl/Cortés had been announced and predetermined.

Besides the detailed explanation of the multiple omens, Tovar also points to the end of the Mexica state in his narrative when he incorporates a story of how the revered Aztec deity Tezcatlipoca announced the fall of the Aztec capital. As the Spaniards were advancing into Tenochtitlan, Tovar presents a short narrative in which the Aztec deity appears to Moctezuma's sorcerers who were asked to use their magic to prevent the Spaniards from reaching the Aztec capital, announcing the end of Indigenous rule and the destruction of Mexico Tenochtitlan. Tovar writes: "[Tezcatlipoca] díxoles con enojo: ¿Para qué bolvéis vosotros acá? ¿Qué es lo que Moctezuma pretende hacer por vuestro medio? Tarde ha buelto sobre sí, que ya está determinado de quitarle su reyno, su honra, y quanto tiene por las grandes tiranías que ha cometido contra sus vasallos, no ha regido como señor sino como tirano" (78). Then, asking the Nahua sorcerers to return their gaze to the Aztec capital, Tovar further explains, "Los nigromanáticos volvieron a verla y vieron que ardía toda en vivas llamas y con aquella visión el ydolo les mostró la destrucción que avya de aver en la ciudad de México" (78). In this narrative section of Tovar's history, in the voice of the revered Tezcatlipoca, the Jesuit friar once again points to the imminent end of the Mexica state and the fall of the Aztec capital. The magic of the Nahua sorcerers had become ineffective and their own god would allow the destruction of the city. There was nothing the Nahuas could do to avert the fall of their capital city. Not only had Topiltzin announced his return and multiple omens had presaged the end of Indigenous rule, one of their most important deities had accepted the defeat. With this, Tovar affirms the imminent end of Aztec rule and the beginning of the Christian era.

Tovar's narrative of the conquest also reiterates the end of Indigenous Civilization. Even though the Jesuit friar's narrative incorporates graphic descriptions of the violence perpetuated by the Spanish conquistadors, mainly the massacre at Cholula (77) and that of the Templo Mayor in the Aztec capital during the feast of Toxcatl (79), his narrative presents the end of Nahua Civilization. After briefly describing the arrival of the Spaniards into Tenochtitlan, the imprisonment of the Mexica ruler, and the beginning of the war, Tovar situates the end of the Mexica with the death of Moctezuma when he writes: "feneció el gran imperio mexicano" (83). These words are unequivocal as Tovar makes explicit that after Moctezuma's death, the Mexica

empire came to an end. Tovar then adds, "No quissieron hacer exequias (o algunas honrras) a este miserable rey, antes al que tratava dello le denostavan y afrentavan, y de lastima un mayordomo suyo, sin más aparato que él solo." (83). With these words of contempt for the Mexica ruler Tovar starts to bring his narrative to a close, highlighting the supposed disdain the Nahuas felt for their ruler.

However, more revealing than the negative representation of the deceased Mexica ruler are the final lines of Tovar's narrative on the retreat of the Spaniards during the *Noche Triste*. Tovar writes: "Y desde allí favoreciéndoles Dios Nuestro Señor con manifiestos milagros vinieron a término de que se hizo toda la tierra de su vando contra los Mexicanos, permitiéndo assí la Divina Providencia para que entrase en esta tierra por este medio la Luz de su Sancto Evangelio" (83). In this way Tovar brings his narrative to an end, unlike Durán, without discussing the native resistance lead by Cuauhtemoc after the retreat of the Spaniards into Tlaxcala, his determination to fight to the end, or his execution and that of other Indigenous lords by order of Cortés. Nevertheless, Tovar ends his history by emphasizing that Divine Providence made it possible for the Christian Gospel to enter—or, to re-enter, if once considers his narrative of Topiltzin—into the Indigenous land that would become New Spain. Consequently, for Tovar, the Spaniards's safe retreat into Tlaxcala and the alliances they made with other Indigenous groups that had been enemies of the Mexica and their allies marked the beginning of the end of the rule of the Mexica and the beginning of the Christian era, thereby presenting a history of the Indigenous past that is foreclosed to the future.

In sum, while Tovar's treatise on the rituals and ceremonies deviates from Durán's and does not contribute to the epistemic terrorism and cultural genocide evident in both Sahagún and Durán's treatises on rituals and ceremonies, Tovar's narrative on the pre-Hispanic history of Cemanahuac presents the end of Nahua Civilization. In ending his story with the triumph of the Spaniards and their Indigenous allies guided by Divine Providence, Tovar presents the end of the pre-Hispanic world without the possibility of an Indigenous future. As the Jesuit friar makes clear with his detailed explanation of the omens that presaged the fall of the Mexica state, the return of Topiltzin/Quetzalcoatl, and Tezcatlipoca's own acceptance of the imminent destruction of the Aztec capital, it was only a matter of time before the Mexica state came to an end. Consequently, it is clear that Tovar's narrative, even though it does not explicitly pursue the epistemic terrorism and cultural genocide that both Sahagún and Durán present in the prologues to their works, the Jesuit friar presents Indigenous history as foreclosed. This is the narrative Tovar sends to Acosta to inform him on the history and religious practices of the Nahuas of Central Mexico before the intrusion of the Spaniards in the region. The question then becomes, how would Acosta use Tovar's manuscript in his influential book on the natural and moral history of the Americas?

Before turning to the way in which Acosta incorporates Tovar's manuscript into his *Historia natural y moral* (1590), it is important to briefly discuss an earlier text by Acosta in which he discusses the Christian evangelization project in the Americas, *De procuranda Indorum salute* (1577). This text, originally published in Latin and later translated into Spanish, precedes Acosta's *Historia* by more than a decade. In it, the Jesuit friar outlines the way in which Indigenous peoples of the Americas are to be evangelized and governed. Unlike the religious treatises of Durán and Sahagún, the focus of *De procuranda* is not merely on identifying Indigenous peoples' idolatric practices but rather to explain the systematic way in which they are

to be evangelized and governed. Thus, Acosta's *De procuranda* becomes a treatise that outlines the ways in which the Spanish colonial enterprise is to administer its colonial Indigenous populations. Consequently, it could be said that Acosta takes the treatises of his Franciscan and Dominican brothers in the Faith to a new level, and unlike Tovar who avoids participating in the epistemic and cultural genocide of Sahagún and Durán as it relates to the question of Indigenous idolatry, Acosta's text extends into the realm of governance of the colonized Indigenous populations.

In the *Dedicatoria* of his text, Acosta makes explicit his objective for writing his treatise. According to the Jesuit friar, the various and competing accounts on the Indies and the doubt that existed in relation to the question of the possibility of salvation of Indigenous peoples is what led him to write his text (39). Hence, Acosta seeks to give a more objective and impartial account in order to settle the debate and to provide a better explanation of what needed to be done in order to secure the evangelization mission and to be able to effectively govern Indigenous peoples. Having lived in the Indies for fifteen years, primarily in the viceroyalty of Peru, Acosta was well aware that native peoples of the Indies were diverse and that simply calling them "Indians" and assuming that they all shared the same cultural characteristics was a mistake (45-46). In order to correct this error and in an attempt to explain to the Spanish reader the diversity of peoples that inhabited the lands that had come to be called the Indies, Acosta develops a typology of the three different types of peoples that inhabited the non-Christian world, peoples he called "bárbaros"—barbarians. According to Acosta, the first type of people consists of peoples who do not deviate from reason, what he calls "recta razón", and the ways of civilized nations. In this category Acosta situates the Chinese, Japanese, and certain peoples of Southeast Asia, peoples who have writing, stable governments, fortified cities, "ministros", etc., all characteristic of civilized peoples. Therefore, they are to be brought into the Christian fold through reason (just as the Greeks and Romans were), not through arms and force (46). The second type of people, Acosta explains, consists of barbarous peoples that are partially civilized; they have a form of writing and philosophy and some form of government, military, and religious institutions but lacked certain traits of fully civilized peoples. In this category Acosta situates the "mejicanos" and "peruanos" and explains that they need to be brought into the Christian fold by allowing those who accept the Christian Faith to be under the jurisdiction of the Christian rulers and be allowed to retain their "fortunas y bienes" and their laws and customs as long as they do not contradict (Euro-Christian) reason or the Holy Scriptures (46-47). Finally, the third type of barbarous peoples of the Indies are those who, in his view, live like savages and beasts, those who do not have laws, political pacts, or a state, in a word, "hombres a medias". These "savages", Acosta explains, need to be brought into the Christian fold and into civilization by force if necessary (47-48). With this typology, Acosta accounts for the diversity of peoples that inhabited the continent and the different ways in which they needed to be brought into the Christian fold and into civilization. Notice that in this typology Acosta situates Indigenous peoples of Cemanahuac as not fully civilized even though they possessed some of the traits of civilized peoples of Europe and Asia. Consequently, having explained that Indigenous peoples of the Americas possessed various degrees of civilization—ranging from being partially civilized to being "savages", almost animals—he concludes that "no se deben señalar unas mismas normas para todas las naciones de indios, si no queremos errar gravemente" (48). Thus, Acosta's treatise argues for different approaches to bring non-Christians into the Christian Faith and under the colonial state. Fundamentally, his treatise provides a detailed explanation on the ways in which Indigenous

peoples should be brought into the Christian fold and how these colonized populations are to be governed.

A brief consideration of the six books in Acosta's *De procuranda* makes evident that his treatise is much more than a treatise on idolatry. Rather than simply being a text which identifies continuing idolatric practices in order to uproot them, Acosta's text is a detailed account on how the evangelizing project is to be carried out at a continental level and how Indigenous peoples are to be governed. Thus, Acosta's text presents a larger colonial project that transcends a treatise on idolatric practices and, thus, becomes a text on how to carry out the evangelizing mission and how to govern colonized Indigenous populations. For instance, while the first book makes clear the imperative of procuring the salvation of Indigenous peoples and argues for the possibility of their salvation, the second and third books explain the rights of Christians over Indigenous peoples and territories and what needs to be done in order to manage them. The fourth book, on the other hand, shifts its focus to the question of religion, the types of ministers that are necessary to carry out the evangelizing mission, and how to discipline Indigenous populations. Book Five, continues on the topic of religion to focus on religious doctrine while explaining the remedies against idolatry and the destruction of idols and temples. Finally, Book Six deals with the Christian Sacraments and how they are to be taught to Indigenous neophytes. Consequently, it is clear that Acosta's treatise transcends the focus of a treatise on idolatry as it extends into the realm of governance of Indigenous peoples. In this way, Acosta exceeds the work of both Sahagún and Durán, going beyond the question of idolatry and into the question of colonial administration of Indigenous peoples, thus taking to another level the epistemic terrorism and ethnocide we find in both Sahagún and Durán.

Now that I have briefly discussed the ways in which Acosta's *De procuranda* exceeds the works of Sahagún and Durán, I can turn to the Jesuit friar's *Historia natural y moral* and his treatment of the narrative he received from Tovar. Even though Acosta's account of Indigenous peoples of central Mexico varies slightly from Tovar's, primarily in terms of scope and their treatment of the origin of Indigenous peoples, both narratives present a providentialist history that affirms the end of Indigenous civilization and forecloses the possibility of their continuity as sovereign Indigenous peoples into the future. As Edmundo O'Gorman points out:

> Y en efecto, no otra cosa significó la interpretación providencialista Cristiana de la historia de los indios americanos, puesto que se trata, en definitiva, de considerarla, no en sentido propio, sino dotándola de una significación derivada de una forma de vida histórica ajena (la europea), previamente postulada como historia universal o, si se prefiere, como la única verdaderamente significativa (LI).

Thus, as O'Gorman explains, a providentialist interpretation of Indigenous history subordinates it to Western/Christian history and forecloses the possibility of considering the continuity of Indigenous history in its own right. In this way, Western/Christian history absorbs the history of Indigenous peoples of the Americas and subsumes it as part of Western/Christian Universal history, without the possibility of allowing for a history of Indigenous peoples independent of Europe.

From the beginning, it is evident that Acosta places Tovar's history of the Mexica into a broader context. He begins the first book of his *Historia* by discussing the limits of Western

ancient knowledge and Holy Scripture as they did not account for Indigenous peoples and the lands that had become known as the Indies. Thus, similar to the approach he takes in *De procuranda*, Acosta's aims to settle the debate on the natural and moral history of the Indies in his *Historia*. Consequently, in the first fifteen chapters of Book One Acosta engages philosophers of Western antiquity such Aristotle and Plato and religious thinkers such as Saint Thomas while engaging the Bible to point to the limits of knowledge of his predecessors who could not account for the history of the peoples of the Indies and its territories. Hence, Acosta seeks to present a better history that would explain to the Spanish reader that the continental territory of the Indies is part of the same world as that of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and that Indigenous peoples, just as other non-Christian idolaters, are to be evangelized now that Divine Providence has revealed them to the Christians. Moreover, Acosta claims that he relies on reason in order to explain the way in which the Indies are part of the same world. In this way, Acosta's text incorporates Indigenous peoples and their territories into Christian Universal history and the expansionist history of the West.

In explaining the history of Indigenous peoples of the continent, Acosta needed to account for their origin. Interestingly, his explanation on the origin of Indigenous peoples diverges from those of Durán and Tovar. Consistent with his earlier text and with the framing of his *Historia,* Acosta seeks to explain through reason, that is, through "razón y cosas humanas" (46), the way in which Indigenous peoples arrived into the continent and how they populated it. Thus, Acosta seeks to explain the origin of Indigenous peoples "no con fábulas o poética pero con verdad", that is, through reason (48). This approach leads Acosta to discard the "fabulous" stories his contemporaries gave while also rejecting Biblical interpretations that attempted to explain the way in which Indigenous population populated the continent. Among the explanations Acosta rejects is the idea that presents the arrival of Indigenous peoples into the continent by boat. In Acosta's view, it was impossible for Indigenous peoples to have navigated through the vast oceans as they did not have the technology that would make it possible to do it. Thus, Acosta affirms that the only way in which Indigenous peoples could have arrived at and populated the continent was by crossing through a lands mass were the Asian continent and the New World meet and through which Indigenous peoples migrated. As Acosta affirms:

> Así que no hay razón ni contrario, ni experiencia que deshaga mi imaginación u opinion, de que toda la tierra se junta y continua en alguna parte; a lo menos se allega mucho… Y ese camino lo hicieron muy sin pensar mudando sitios y tierras su poco a poco, y unos poblando las ya halladas, otros buscando otras de nuevo, vinieron por discurso de tiempo a henchir las tierras de Indias de tantas naciones y gentes y lenguas (56).

Here Acosta clearly situates the origin of Indigenous peoples to the Old World as they migrated from Asia, discarding fabulous stories of his contemporaries and revising the knowledge system of thinkers of antiquity and religious thinkers who did not account for the existence of Indigenous peoples. At the same time, Acosta's narrative transcends Tovar's narrative of the origin of Indigenous peoples as he situates their origin in the Old World prior to their settlement of Aztlan/Teocolhuacan.

Besides putting Tovar's narrative of the origin of Indigenous peoples in broader context, Acosta also challenges Durán's explanation that insists on Indigenous peoples as being the descendants of the exiled tribes of Israel. Acosta explains:

> [En la] escritura de Esdras quieren algunos acomodar a los indios, diciendo que fueron de Dios llevados donde nunca habitó el género humano, y que la tierra en que moran es tan apartada que tiene año y medio de camino para ir a ella, y que esta gente es naturalmente pacífica. Que procedan los indios de linaje de judíos, el vulgo tiene por indicio cierto ser medrosos y descaídos, y muy ceremoniáticos y agudos, y mentirosos (61).

Here Acosta challenges the assertion Durán made a decade earlier in his *Historia* that situates Indigenous peoples as the descendants of the tribes of Israel that had been exiled and that legitimized their punishment and dispossession and how people—the masses—projected on them the stereotypical image they had of the Jews. Consequently, Acosta seeks to present a more rational explanation of the origin of Indigenous peoples that calls into question Biblical interpretations that would present Indigenous peoples as the direct descendants of the Jews, going as far as considering the Biblical story in Esdras as much of a fable as Plato's story of Atlantis (62).

After refuting the religious explanations that would situate the origin of Indigenous peoples of the New World as the descendants of the tribes of Israel, Acosta affirms that it is not possible to know exactly their origin as there is no written record or memory of the original inhabitants. With this Acosta returns to his explanation that posits that the inhabitants of the New World came through land:

> Mas al fin, en lo que me resumo es que el continuarse la tierra de Indias con esas del mundo, a lo menos estar muy cercanas, ha sido la más principal y más verdadera razón de poblarse las Indias; y tengo para mí que el Nuevo Orbe e Indias Occidentales, no ha muchos millares de años que las habitan hombres, y que los primeros que entraron en ellas, más eran hombres salvajes y cazadores que no gente de república y pulida (63).

With this Acosta presents an explanation that clearly deviates from Biblical interpretations, an explanation based on European reason and knowledge of the world that situates Indigenous peoples as part of humanity but nevertheless challenges religious accounts that would legitimize their punishment and dispossession. However, this alternative narrative on the origin of Indigenous peoples continues presenting them as savages. Even if, in the case of the Mexica and the Incas, they had become somewhat civilized, it is significant that Acosta situates them as the descendants of savages who had populated the continent not long before. In this sense, his narrative also deviates from Tovar's account given that the castizo Tovar begins his narrative by emphasizing that the ancestors of those who settled the lake region in central Mexico were civilized Nahuatlaca, a cultured people like the Pueblos of today's U.S. Southwest, peoples with "order y policía". Thus, it becomes evident to the reader that Acosta's narrative of the origin of Indigenous peoples deviates from the narratives of both Durán and Tovar.

Acosta also discards Indigenous peoples knowledge of their own past much as Durán does. He begins chapter 25 of Book One, a chapter he entitles, "Qué es lo que los indios suelen contar de su origen" with: "Saber lo que los mismos indios suelen contar de sus principios y origen no es cosa que importa mucho; pues más parecen sueños los que refieren, que historias" (63). Here Acosta dismisses from the beginning the accounts Indigenous peoples give of their own origin, seeing them as unimportant. Thus, Acosta regards their own stories of origin as being closer to dreams than stories worthy of value, much less as stories that could be considered

history. In this way Acosta systematically dismisses any narrative Indigenous peoples give of their own origin as they do not conform to his European reason. To emphasize his dismissal of Indigenous peoples accounts of origin Acosta further explains: "Mas, ¿de qué sirve añadir más, pues todo va lleno de mentira y ajeno de razón? Lo que hombres doctos afirman y escriben es que cuanto hay de memoria y relación de estos indios, llega a cuatrocientos años, y que todo lo de antes es pura confusion y tinieblas, sin poderles hallar cosa cierta" (64). Here Acosta dismisses Indigenous peoples accounts once again by calling them lies and narratives not supported by reason. Moreover, he points to their supposed limited knowledge of the past as they cannot account for their history beyond four hundred years. Thus, through his rational approach, Acosta systematically discards the narratives Indigenous peoples give of their own origin while presenting himself as the arbiter of truth and historical knowledge. In taking this approach, the Jesuit friar perpetuates the epistemic terrorism and cultural genocide we find in Sahagún and Durán and, to a lesser extent, in Tovar.

In Book V of his *Historia*, after describing the natural history of the Indies in Books II, III, and IV,[67] Acosta returns to the question of Indigenous peoples' idolatry. Like Durán, Acosta points to the continuing idolatry of Indigenous peoples and the need to eradicate it. However, unlike the Franciscan and Dominican friars, and unlike Tovar's own narrative, Acosta does not evangelize the continent prior to the arrival of Europeans into the Americas. Consequently, there is no need for Acosta to include the story of Topiltzin/Quetzalcoatl to argue for the pre-Hispanic evangelization of the continent. Instead, Acosta affirms the idolatry of Indigenous peoples prior to the arrival of the Europeans and, interestingly, the figure of Topiltzin does not appear as a Christian Apostle or evangelist in pre-Hispanic times. Instead, Topiltzin appears in his narrative as a high-ranking sacrificial priest as he describes the ways in which the Nahuas sacrificed their victims:

> El ministro que tenía oficio de matar, que era el sexto de éstos, era tenido y reverenciado como supremo sacerdote o pontífice, el nombre del cual era diferente, según la diferencia de los tiempos y solemnidades era que sacrificaba; asimismo eran diferentes las vestiduras cuando salían a ejercitar su oficio en diferentes tiempos. El nombre de su dignidad era *papa* y *topiltzin*; el traje y ropa era una cortina colorada a manera de dalmática, con unas flocaduras por orla (251).

Here we see that Acosta's explanation of the figure of Topiltzin is far different from the one we encounter in Durán and Tovar, explanations that are diametrically opposed. While for Durán and Tovar the figure of Topiltzin served to illustrate that in pre-Hispanic times Indigenous peoples had received the Christian Faith and announced the return of the Christians to reclaim their kingdom, Acosta's representation of Topiltzin serves to remind the reader of the bloody sacrifices the Nahuas of New Spain practiced during pre-Hispanic times. However, even when Acosta does not evangelize the continent in pre-Hispanic times, this does not preclude him from

[67] In Books II, III, and IV, Acosta focuses on the natural history of the continent, that is, the physical world. In Book II, Acosta explaining the nature of the New World, challenging the explanations of his predecessors and thinkers of antiquity, the climate, and the habitability of the Torrid Zone. In Book III, Acosta turns to describing the geography, environment, and atmosphere of the New World in relation to the four elements—air, wind, earth, and fire. Finally, in book IV, Acosta discusses metals, plants, and animals to be found in the New World.

asserting that Indigenous peoples were tired of their idolatry and their supposed welcoming and acceptance of the Christian Faith. Acosta writes:

> Esta tan excesiva crueldad en derramar tanta sangre de hombres, y el tributo tan pesado de haber de ganar siempre cautivos para el sustento de sus dioses, tenía ya cansados a muchos de aquellos bárbaros, pareciéndoles cosa insufrible… Y fue providencia del Señor que en esta disposición hallasen a esta gente los primeros que les dieron noticia de la ley de Cristo, porque sin duda ninguna les pareció buena ley y buen Dios el que así se quería servir (254).

In this way, Acosta presents the supposed rejection Indigenous peoples had of their own religious practices and their welcoming of the Christian Faith. Thus, even though Acosta does not evangelize the pre-Hispanic continent the way both Durán and Tovar do, he nevertheless presents a narrative that demonizes pre-Hispanic religious practices and exalts the triumph of the Christian Faith over the idolatry of Indigenous peoples, a narrative we encounter in the works of other Jesuit Friars well into the 17th century.[68]

In Book VI, a book in which Acosta focuses on the government institutions Indigenous peoples had in pre-Hispanic times, what at first glance appears to be a radical proposal in defense of Indigenous peoples turns out to be a proposition to find the best way to govern them. Initially, the opening chapter of Book VI appears to be a defense of native peoples as he explains that the objective of this book is to correct the false opinion that Indigenous peoples are brutes—"gente bruta, bestial y sin entendimiento" (280). However, far from being a defense of Indigenous peoples and a proposition to allow for their self-determination, Book VI serves to explain the best way in which they are to be governed. This is clear at the end of the chapter when Acosta writes:

> El otro fin que puede conseguirse con la noticia de las leyes y costumbres y pulicía de los indios, es ayudarlos y regirlos por ellas mismas, pues en lo que no contradicen a la ley de Cristo y de su Santa Iglesia, deben ser gobernados conforme a sus fueros, que son como sus leyes municipales, por cuya ignorancia se han cometido yerros de no poca importancia, no sabiendo los que juzgan ni los que rigen, por dónde han de juzgar y regir sus súbditos (281).

In this passage the reader can perceive echoes of Acosta's earlier text in which he outlines the ways in which Indigenous peoples should be governed. As the passage above makes clear, it is convenient to learn the laws, customs, and government institutions of Indigenous peoples in order to find the best way to govern them and, as long as their own practices do not interfere with religious doctrine, they should be governed according to their own ways. This proposal, which may appear at first as a desirable approach given that it allows for the continuity of Indigenous customs and institutions is nevertheless focused on finding ways to effectively govern the colonized population. Thus, we find in Acosta's text, just like in *De procuranda*, a supplement to

[68] The Jesuit friar Andrés Pérez de Ribas' "Historia de los triunfos de nuestra santa fe entre gentes las más bárbaras y fieras del Nuevo Obre" (1645) is an excellent example of the continuation of the Jesuit's discourse that demonizes pre-Hispanic religious practices and exalts the triumph of the Christian Faith over the idolatry of Indigenous peoples, inventing the northern frontier as a place of opportunity for the spread of the Jesuit evangelizing mission and the continuous expansion of the Spanish-American Empire.

the work of friars such as Sahagún and Durán as he makes clear that it is important to understand the laws, customs, and government institutions in order to effectively govern them. Thus, in Acosta we do not merely encounter a fascination or admiration for the Indigenous past but a motivation to learn about pre-Hispanic institutions in order to assist with the colonizing project.

Similar to Book VI, the last book in Acosta's *Historia*, Book VII, which is focused on the history of Indigenous peoples, also gives the impression at the beginning that it is a defense of Indigenous peoples as it begins with a statement that the objective of this book is to highlight the positive attributes of their history to learn how to treat them and "quitar mucho del común y necio desprecio en que los de Europa los tienen" (319). However, upon close analysis it becomes evident that it perpetuates the narrative of the end of Indigenous Civilization we find in Sahagún, Durán, and Tovar. Hence, it is not a surprise to find that he incorporates Tovar's narrative of the Mexica into his narrative. As O'Gorman points out in his critical edition of Acosta's *Historia*, the Jesuit friar transcribed "Todo lo relativo a la historia antigua de los mexicanos, hasta la muerte de Moctezuma" (LXXIX). Thus, it is not surprising to find that Acosta perpetuates the narrative of Tovar in relation to the history of the Mexica and their predetermined end. Accordingly, in Acosta's treatment of the history of the Mexica we encounter, once again, the *grandeza mexicana* we find in Tezozomoc's Spanish text, in Durán's *Historia*, and in Tovar's manuscript, a narrative that focuses on the rise to power of the Mexica and their eventual fall with the arrival of the Europeans and the Christian Faith. Consequently, Acosta's narrative also highlights the various omens that presaged the end of the Mexica Empire while including others found in the Biblical tradition. For instance, in chapter 23, which he titles, "De los presagios y prodigios extraños que acaecieron en México antes de fenecer su imperio", Acosta points to Biblical examples in the Book of Maccabees and the Book of Wisdom, as well as in other religious texts, in which certain omens appeared announcing great events. As Acosta affirms:

> Aunque La Divina Escritura nos veda dar crédito a agüeros y pronósticos vanos, y Jeremías nos advierte que las señales del cielo no temamos, como lo hacen los gentiles; pero enseña con todo eso la misma Escritura, que en algunas mudanzas universales y castigos que Dios quiere hacer, no son de despreciar las señales, y monstruos y prodigios suelen preceder muchas veces, como lo advierte Eusebio Cesariense (359).

With this statement Acosta validates the explanations of the omens announcing the end of the Mexica state he received from Tovar. Consequently, rather than simply incorporating Tovar's narrative of the omens, Acosta validates what Tovar writes by using Biblical accounts and the writings of religious authors to support the veracity of these accounts. It then becomes clear that Acosta's narrative of the history of Indigenous peoples of central Mexico perpetuates the narrative of the end of the Mexica state. Thus, Acosta's historical narrative turns out to be a providentialist history like that of Tovar that supports the Spanish colonial project and emphasizes the supposedly predetermined end of Indigenous peoples as the rulers of the land.

Chimalpahin's Revisionist History and His Project of Ethnogenesis

Chimalpahin's writings, when considered as a whole—the *Relaciones históricas*, the *Annals of His Time*, and the documents written in his hand in a collection of texts known as *Codex Chimalpahin*—reveal a very different history and intellectual project from that of friars such as Sahagún and Durán. Unlike the friars who see Nahua Civilization as a dead past that can

only be appreciated from a distance, Chimalpahin rehabilitates the Indigenous subject as a subject of history, enabling him and her to reclaim their history, language, land and political institutions. As we have seen in the previous two chapters, Chimalpahin refutes the historiography of Spanish authors writing about New Spain while also deviating from the intellectual projects of Nahua elites who sought restitution for their status as members of the Nahua nobility by appealing to the colonial authorities. Thus, in Chimalpahin's writings the reader encounters an alternative project written in Nahuatl for future Nahua readers and their descendants. This intellectual project safeguards Indigenous history and knowledge of pre-Hispanic political institutions while defending their legitimacy and the viability of Indigenous civilization, making it possible for Nahua readers and their descendants to reclaim them. Thus, far from presenting a view of a glorious past and a history that is foreclosed to the future, Chimalpahin points to the continuity of Indigenous peoples and Mesoamerican Civilization into the future. In this sense, the Nahua annalist does not present the history of the Nahuas as foreclosed. On the contrary, he does not hesitate to document the persistence of Nahua peoples and political institutions after the conquest and into the 17th century while safeguarding Nahua history so that future generations of Nahuas and their descendants can reclaim it and, thus, be able to recover it along with their language, land, and political institutions.

In Chimalpahin's *Relaciones históricas*, for example, the Nahuatl reader can easily perceive that Chimalpahin challenges the views of friars such as Durán on the origin of Indigenous peoples. As I illustrate above, Durán argues that the origin of Indigenous peoples is to be found in one of the exiled tribes of Israel. Chimalpahin challenges this view in his *Relaciones* when he argues that, as I show in detail in the previous chapter, it is not known exactly where Indigenous peoples of the continent came from prior to their arrival in Teocolhuacan Aztlan. They could be the descendants of any of the children of Noah—Japheth, Shem or Ham—but he does not presume to know. For Chimalpahin, what is important is that Indigenous peoples are the original inhabitants of the land and that they came by boat, their original place of arrival being the island of Teocolhuacan Aztlan. Thus, Chimalpahin's narrative on the origin of his ancestors clearly contrasts with Durán's explanation that automatically situates Indigenous peoples as the descendants of the Hebrew peoples who were forced out of Israel and were to be punished for deviating from the True Faith.

Similarly, Chimalpahin contradicts Durán's narrative in relation to the accounts Indigenous peoples give for their own origin and his dismissal of their accounts as mere fables and seeing them as ignorant of their own history. In Chimalpahin's account of the origin of Indigenous peoples from somewhere in the Old World and his hesitancy to affirm from where they came from, the reader does not encounter any of the narratives Durán reports Indigenous people giving him nor the paintings in which the friar claims to have seen these stories. As we have seen, according to Durán, while some Indigenous peoples claimed to have emerged from a spring of water, others to have emerged from caves, and yet others to have been born from the gods, in Chimalpahin's explanation of Indigenous peoples's crossing of the "great celestial waters" and arriving by boat to the island of Aztlan the reader encounters a very different narrative from the ones Durán presents. In doing this, the Nahua annalist avoids falling into narratives that would either dehumanize indigenous population for having been born out of caves, dismiss them as fabulous stories, or justify their punishment and dispossession by presenting them as the descendants of one of the tribes of Israel that was punished for deviating from the Christian Faith. Consequently, Chimalpahin situates Indigenous peoples's history prior

to their arrival in Aztlan as a mystery without framing their origin story as one that would dehumanize them or justify their punishment and dispossession.

Furthermore, unlike the friars who dismiss Indigenous epistemology and seek to understand it in order to uproot it, Chimalpahin's does not do this. He is not interested in documenting Indigenous ritual life, ceremonies, and the workings of the Mesoamerican calendar in order to destroy them and uproot them from the memories of Indigenous peoples. Similar to his approach in avoiding Indigenous stories of creation that would be compromising, his writings do not seek to extirpate Indigenous ritual practices and knowledge. Thus, neither the *Relaciones históricas*, the *Annals of His Time*, nor his documents in *Codex Chimalpahin* focus on the rituals and ceremonies and the calendar system with commentary on the need to know it in order to extirpate it, as Durán insists, from the lives and minds of the surviving Indigenous population. The only two texts written by the Nahua annalist in *Codex Chimalpahin* in which he discusses the calendar system are a text known as "The Ancient Mexica Count" and much shorter text known as "Calendars, Native and Christian; signs of the Zodiac". While the first of these texts attempts to "harmonize"—that is, find correspondences between—the Mesoamerican calendar system and the Christian calendar system, documenting the names of the months in Indigenous calendar in relation to the Christian calendar, he does not mention anything about the feasts and rituals celebrated nor the need to uproot them. Thus, his text simply tries to adjust the two calendar systems. As Chimalpahin explains: "Auh ca quin nehuatl in nidon domingo franco de S. anton cuauhtleuanitzin yn axcan onicnehnehuillico yn onicnanamictico in xpiano metztlapohualli, y huel onictemo ynic huel onicacicyttac yn campa quinanamictoc yn ihuan christiano tetonalpohualliztli yn iuh nican neztoc tecpantoc yn iuh nican ye onmottaz." [And now I, don Domingo Francisco de San Anton Quauhtlehuanitzin, have adjusted and harmonized (the ancient count) with the Christian month count. I have informed myself well so that I have learned very thoroughly where it harmonized with the Christian count of days, as is evident and in order and is to be seen here] (*Codex Chimalpahin* 119). Thus, in Chimalpahin's explanation the reader finds that his attempt is to find correspondences between the two calendar systems, not to explain the rituals and ceremonies in order to uproot them. Furthermore, in his explanation of the calendar and his juxtaposition of the "huehue Mexica Tonalpohualiztli" and the European "Reportorio de los tiempos" (i.e. an almanac), Chimalpahin does not disqualify Mesoamerican epistemology the way Durán does. On the contrary, he affirms its difference: "No yhuan nican motenehua in huehue Mexica Tonalpohualiztli in ipan omoteneuh occ e cahuitl catca. Motenehua Reportorio de los Tiempos. ynic cecemilhuitlapohuaya yn omoteneuhque ye huecauh huehuetque yn oc tlateotocanime catca Tachtoncohcolhuan. Yn cecen Semana quitlalliaya." [Likewise here is set forth the ancient Mexica day count [as] it was known in those other times. It was called 'an almanac.' Thus, the aforesaid ancestors in ancient times counted each day when our forefathers were still idolaters. They established that each week had thirteen day; thus did they count them] (119). Here we see that instead of dismissing the knowledge of this ancestors, Chimalpahin affirms it. Consequently, Chimalpahin's "Ancient Mexica Month Count" is far from Sahagún and Duran's treatises on the calendar system that carefully documents Indigenous rituals and ceremonies in order to extirpate them.

The second text in *Codex Chimalpahin* in which the Nahua annalist discusses the Mesoamerican calendar makes evident that his interest in explaining how the Indigenous calendar system worked is far from the way in which the friars treat it. In this second text, the Nahua annalist also explains how the Mesoamerican calendar measured time in a year.

Chimalpahin writes: “In ye huecauh huehuetque catca ynic tlamantitiaya ynic metztlapohuaya ynic quitecpanaya yn inmetz ce xihuitl ynic ontlamia in ye mochi yc quitecpanaya caxtollomey metztli auh çan cenpohualilhuitl qyitlaliaya yn ce metztli.” [In ancient times it was customary for those who were the ancestors to count the months, to arrange their months in order; for a year to be complete, they arranged it in order of eighteen months in all, and they placed only twenty days in a month” (127). In this succinct explanation of how the Nahuas calculated their year—eighteen months of twenty days—the reader can see, once again, how Chimalpahin reaffirms the Mesoamerican knowledge system without passing judgement or calling it into question. Hence, his explanation of the ancient calendar system based on the solar calendar affirms Mesoamerican epistemology.

Besides refusing to participate in the epistemic terrorism and cultural genocide the friars engage in when documenting rituals and ceremonies and the Mesoamerican calendar system, the collections of documents in the hand of Chimalpahin in *Codex Chimalpahin* also illustrates that his intellectual project is much different from that of the friars. To begin with, most of the documents in *Codex Chimalpahin* are related to the political history of the Nahuas of Central Mexico, that is, the political history of Cemanahuac. Among the texts one finds in the codex are: Tezozomoc’s *Crónica mexicayotl;* a Chronicle of Mexica history written in Nahuatl; a Chronicle of Mexica history written in Spanish; genealogies of the rulers of Colhuacan, Tenochtitlan, Tlacopan, and Texcoco; and the Mexica annals of Don Gabriel, among other texts that focus on the political history of Cemanahuac. These texts, which informed Chimalpahin’s historical annals, are clear evidence that his interest in documenting the history of the lake region was in archiving the political history of Cemanahuac. As I discussed in the previous chapter, Chimalpahin uses Tezozomoc’s *Crónica mexicayotl* as the foundation for his historiographic project but transcends it in order to write a broader history that goes beyond his predecessor’s *altepetl*-centered histories. Similarly, as I shown in the previous chapter, Chimalpahin borrows from the Mexica annals of don Gabriel by incorporating passages from it into his wider political history of Cemanahuac. The fact that Chimalpahin archives the histories and genealogies of various Nahua groups in *Codex Chimalpahin* stand as evidence that he transcends specific *altepetl*-centered histories, just as he does in his historical annals. Thus, among the texts he writes and archives in *Codex Chimalpahin* the reader finds documents related to the histories of the peoples of Mexico Tenochtitlan, Culhuacan, Tlacopan, Tezcoco, Azcapotzalco, Coatlinchan, and Tlaltelolco. Hence, it is evident that Chimalpahin is not confined to the narrow *altepetl*-centered histories of his predecessors but rather archives a wider history of Cemananhuac with a particular focus on its political history. When read from this perspective, it is clear that rather than archiving the history of a dead past while writing a broader history of Cemanahuac that transcends individual *altepeme* (even the celebrated altepetl of Mexico-Tenochtitlan), Chimalpahin preserves for posterity the political history of his Indigenous ancestors in such a way that it enables future generations of readers to retrieve and reactivate the broader political history of Cemanahuac. Thus, rather than being limited by the histories of friars that present the history of the Nahuas as a dead past and also tend to present a history that is, just as Tezozomoc’s histories, focused on the Mexica, the histories Chimalpahin archives in *Codex Chimalpahin* allows future Nahua readers to reclaim and reactivate Indigenous history. Consequently, instead of a historiographic and archival project that has as its basis epistemic terrorism and ethnocide, in the histories Chimalpahin writes and preserves the reader encounters an archival project of ethnogenesis—the writing and archiving of texts that allow Nahuatl

readers of future generations to reclaim and reactivate the history of their ancestors—the history of Cemanahuac.

Even though Chimalpahin, just like Tovar, also presents a description of the Mesoamerican calendar system without commenting on the need to extirpate idolatry and situates Aztlan as the homeland of the Nahuas, the Nahua annalist's history is vastly different from Tovar's. Besides the fact that Chimalpahin's history is written in Nahuatl for a Nahua reader and, for the most part, follows the form of the *Xiuhtlapohualli*—that is, the Mesoamerican count of years—he presents a longer history of Indigenous peoples by discussing their arrival into the continent and their settlement of the Island of Aztlan in the year 1 Tochtli, 50 A.D. However, it is important to keep in mind that Chimalpahin's attempt to situate Indigenous peoples' history within a broader, global context does not mean that he is subsuming Indigenous peoples' history into the expansionist history of the West, as I explained in the previous chapter and as I will further illustrate below. Thus, rather than reading Chimalpahin's efforts to explain a broader and longer history of Indigenous peoples as an attempt to incorporate Indigenous peoples' history into Christian Universal history and as another example of providentialist history, as various authors have argued (Romero Galván 1978; Ruhnau 1998; Tena 1998; Durand Forest 1990), Chimalpahin's historical annals should be read as an attempt to explain the history of Indigenous peoples in a broader, global context without subsuming it to the providentialist and expansionist history of the West.

Another significant way in which Chimalpahin's historical annals diverge from the historical narrative of Tovar and Acosta is in their treatment of the story of Topiltzin/Quetzalcoatl. While Tovar, following Durán's narrative, presents Topiltzin as a Christian evangelist that lived in the time of the Toltecs and purportedly began the evangelization of Indigenous peoples before being expelled by the principal deities in the Aztec pantheon during pre-Hispanic times, in the *Memorial de Colhuacan* Chimalpahin treats the figure of Topiltzin, whom he calls Topiltzin Acxitl Quetzalcohuatl, very differently. Rather than presenting Topiltzin as a Christian evangelist, Chimalpahin presents him as the successor of Hueimac, *tlahtoani* of Tollan (Tula), the famous Toltec capital in the year 5 Calli, 1029 A.D. (78-79). Thus, far from presenting Topiltzin as a Christian evangelist as Durán and Tovar do or as a high-ranking Nahua sacrificial priest as Acosta does, Chimalpahin presents him as a ruler of the Toltecs. However, his representation of Topiltzin is not merely a representation of a terrestrial ruler as he mystifies his origin. The Nahua annalist writes: "IIII Tochtli xihuitl, 1002 años. Nican ipan in tlacat yn Topiltzin Acxitl Quetzalcohuatl yn oncan Tullam; auh amo nelli yn tlacat, ca çan hualmohuicac ynic oncan monextico, campa hualmohuicac amo huel momati, yn iuh quihtotihui huehuetque." [4 Tochtli, 1002. En este año nació Topiltzin Acxitl Quetzalcohuatl en Tollan; aunque en realidad no nació [entonces], sino simplemente llegó y se apareció allí, y no se sabe de dónde venía, según dicen los antiguos] (78-79). Notice how Chimalpahin mystifies the origin of Topiltzin, calling into question the place of his birth and only affirming the time in which he "appeared" in Tollan. Shortly after, after describing the succession of Topiltzin as ruler Tollan, the fall of the Toltec capital, the dispersal of its people throughout the region, and the rearrangement of the governments of Colhuacan, Azcapotzalco, and Coatlinchan, Chimalpahin explains the departure of Topiltzin:

> Ce Acatl xihuitl, 1051 años. Nican ypan in huel mellahuac yn mohicac y Topiltzin Acxitl Quetzalcohuatl ynic ye cemi pollihuico altepetl Tullam; ypan in yn Ce Acal xihuitl yn

> mohicac ynic hueyapan ylhuicaapan callaquito tonatiuh yquiçayampa ytztia. Ynic mihtohua motenehua ompa poctlantito tlapallantito, quihtotia occeppa mocuepaquiuh occeppa quitlaliquiuh y ialtepeuh Tullam yn oquizizitinilique, ca yuh mochipa oquimocuititiaque yn chiuhcnahuintin otlahtocatico atlihtic Mexico Tenuchtitlan yn catepan, occenca yehuatl yn Moteuhcçomatzin Xocoyotl yn ipan acico españoles, ynic çan cualtica yectica quimonnamicque ynic achto ahcico callaquico Mexico Tenuchtitlan, yn momatque mexica yehuatl yn capitán Hernando Cortés yn Quetzalcohuatl ohuacico.
>
> [1 Acatl, 1051. En este año, en verdad se marchó Topiltzin Acxitl Quetzalcohuatl, con lo que pereció definitivamente la ciudad de Tollan. En este año se marchó para ir a meterse en las aguas grandes y celestes [del mar], dirigiéndose hacia el oriente. Dicen que se internó en la región del humo y del rojo; dicen también que de nuevo vendrá, y así lo sostuvieron siempre los nueve [tlatoque] que después gobernaron en la isla de México Tenochtitlán, y en especial Moteuczomatzin Xocoyotl, en cuyo tiempo llegaron los españoles, y es por esa razón que salieron a recibirles cuando entraron por primera vez a México Tenochtitlán, pues los mexicanos pensaron que el capitán Hernando Cortés era Quetzalcohuatl que había regresado] (80-81).

This explanation of the departure of Topiltzin is very different from the narratives we find in Durán, Tovar, and Acosta. There is clearly no discourse on the Christianity of Topiltzin or its supposed early evangelization of the Toltecs. Moreover, his explanation of the departure mystifies the figure of Topiltzin and the place where he retreated to. This is clear in Chimalpahin's description of the orient—"quiçayampa", literally, the place where the sun rises—as "poctlantito tlapallantito" [la región del humo y del rojo] (80-81). Moreover, there is no Christian discourse in the description of Quetzalcoatl's prophesied return. Additionally, Chimalpahin's explanation also points to the idea that led the Mexica to believe that Topiltzin had returned when the Spaniards first arrived. However, even though his explanation accounts for such an idea, there is still no discourse of Topiltzin's evangelization of the continent. While the belief of the return of Quetzalcoatl is accounted for, Chimalpahin's representation does not conflate the figure of Topiltzin/Quetzalcoatl with that of Cortés or the early evangelization of the continent and the Toltecs. Thus, in Chimalpahin's history, the Toltecs continue to be the idolaters of pre-Hispanic times and the origin of Topiltzin remains a mystery.

Towards the end of the *Memorial*, Chimalpahin returns to his discussion of the Toltec city of Tollan in relation to the political history of Colhuacan and other city states in the lake region at the time of the arrival of the Mexica into the region. In the final passage of the *Memorial* Chimalpahin continues to mystify the figure of Topiltzin when he writes:

> Auh yhuan yn ihcuac yn yn oncan callaquico Culhuacan y mexica, ye oiuh nepa matlacpohualxihuitl ipan nauhpohualli ipan nauhxihuitl opoliuh y huey altépetl Tullam; quimoxixinilli yn iceltzin t[o] t[ecuiy]o Jesuchri[ist]o ypanpa yn inhueytlatlacol, auh yehica ipampa matlactlonce xihuitl yn inpan opopocac ce Citlalli yn ilhuicatitech. Yhcuac oncan otlahtocat onpohualli ipan ey xihuitl, y huel quiteneuhtihui huehuetque, yn huey tlahtohuani yn quitocayotiaya Topiltzin Acxitl Quetzalcohuatl. Nohuiyampa tlamamauhtiaya in ipan Nueva España ynic tlacamachoya, yn iuh mochipa quimocuititihui yn çatepan chiuhcnahuintin omotlahtocatillico Mexico Tenuchtitlan, occenca yehuatl yn ça oquitzacuico Moteuhcçomatzin yn icteomeca yn iuhqui yntoca, yn

> quihtohuaya: "Ca ça titenientehuan; ypal yn titlahtocati huey nahuelli catca, yehuatl ytlanextil y nahuallotl" Auh ynin huey tlahtouani, macihui ye popolihuia yn hueyaltepetl Tullam, amo yciuhca quicauh yn altépetl, ca oc omatlactloncexiuhti yn oncan y mochintin yn occequintin ymacehualhuan tulteca. Auh y ye omatlactloncexiuhti, yc niman oyah omocholoIti ynic tonatiuh yquiçayampa oytztia; ompa oyah yn ialtepepan Tonatiuh yn itocayocan Tlapallan, ompa quihualnotz yn Tonatiuh. Auh yn quihtotihuiye huecauh huehuetque: ca: nomah yoltica yn axcan, amo miqui, auh ca occeppa hualmocuepaz yn tlahtocatiquiuh.
>
> [Asimismo, cuando los mexica se establecieron en Colhuacan, hacía 284 años que había perecido la gran ciudad de Tollan; la destruyó Jesucristo nuestro señor a causa de sus grandes pecados, y por eso durante 11 años estuvo humeando sobre ellos una Estrella desde el cielo. Entonces, como afirman correctamente los antiguos, llevaba 43 años gobernando allá el hueitlatohuani Topiltzin Acxitl Quetzalcóhualt. En toda la Nueva España se le temía y se le obedecía, según reconocieron siempre después los nueve [tlatoque] que gobernaron en México Tenochtitlan, y en especial el último de ellos, Moteuczomatzin Segundo, el cual solía decir: 'Somos sólo sus tenientes; y gobernamos por aquel que era un gran hechicero e inventó la hechicería.' Y este hueitlatohuani, aunque ya estaba pereciendo la gran ciudad de Tollan, no abandonó enseguida la ciudad, sino que se quedó allí todavía 11 años, junto con otros muchos de sus macehuales toltecas. Pasados estos 11 años, huyó marchándose con rumbo al oriente; se fue a la ciudad del Sol llamada Tlapallan, pues allá lo mandó llamar el Sol. Y esto decían los antiguos: que todavía está vivo, que no ha muerto y que habría de Volver nuevamente para gobernar] (174-175).

In this closing passage of the *Memorial* the reader can perceive again how Chimalpahin's narrative of Topiltzin differs from that of Durán, Tovar, and Acosta. Even though Chimalpahin mentions that the Christian God destroyed the Toltec city, he does not conflate the figure of Topiltzin with a Christian figure nor Christianizes it. Instead, he continues to present him as the ruler of Tollan and as a mythical figure that was held in great reverence and was believed to one day return to govern. Thus, in Chimalpahin's representation it was possible for the Christian God to coexist with other Indigenous deities. Just as the Mexica tutelary god, Huitzilopochtli, coexisted with the primary god of the Toltecs, Quetzalcoatl, and others, it was possible for the God of the Spaniards to coexist as another deity. As such, Chimalpahin presents a history of his ancestors in which multiple gods could coexist. Moreover, notice that the representation of Topiltzin, in Moctezuma's own words, does not Christianize the figure of Topiltzin. On the contrary, the Mexica *tlahtoani* conceptualizes Topiltzin as great sorcerer and as the inventor of sorcery. This representation of Topiltzin as a sorcerer is far from the Christian Apostle and evangelist we find in Durán and Tovar and from the sacrificial priest Acosta represents. Additionally, notice that toward the end of the passage, Chimalpahin continues to mystify, in Nahua terms, the name of the place Topiltzin had retreated to after being summoned by the Sun and the belief that he was still alive and would return to govern them. In this way, it becomes clear to the reader that Chimalpahin's explanation of the story of Topiltzin does not Christianize the figure of Topiltzin but Nahuatlizes it, presenting it as a figure of an ancient, non-Christian ruler who was highly revered and who had vowed to return one day to govern them. Consequently, Chimalpahin's representation of Topiltzin's story clearly contradicts the narratives of Durán and Tovar, a representation that presents an alternative explanation of

Topiltzin/Quetzalcoatl as a mythical, non-Christian deity that had promised to reclaim the Toltec city the Christian God had destroyed. When read from this perspective, the dominant narrative that Quetzalcoatl had returned in the figure of Cortés is called into question as the Nahuas, including Moctezuma, soon found that Cortés could not have been the deity they had prophesized given the violent way in which he responded to the Aztec ruler's reception. Thus, Chimalpahin's narrative of Topiltzin/Quetzalcoatl presents an alternative explanation: the revered Topiltzin/Quetzalcoatl the ancestors had expected had not arrived with Cortés and there existed the possibility of the "true" Topiltzin Acxitl Quetzalcoalt to return one day. In this way, the history of the Nahuas was far from being foreclosed as the friars insisted; it is a history that was (and is) still to come.

Another significant way in which Chimalpahin's history diverges from the narratives the friars present of the supposed predetermined end of the Mexica state lies in the absence of a narrative of the omens that announced the end and fall of Mexico Tenochtitlan. Unlike the friars who insist on a narrative of the fateful end of Indigenous peoples' rule that was announced through a series of omens soon before the arrival of the Spaniards, Chimalpahin's annals do not include a discussion of these omens nor the supposed preordained end of Indigenous rule. Neither the *Annals of His Time*, the *Relaciones históricas*, nor the documents in *Codex Chimalpahin* include an extended discussion on the omens that announced the fall of the Aztec capital and the end of Indigenous rule. For instance, the only references to omens appear in *Tercera relación* for the year 1510, and in the *Séptima relación* for the years 1509 and 1510. However, in both instances, the Nahua annalist does not explain what the omens presaged. In the *Tercera relación* Chimalpahin writes: "V Tochtli xihuitl, 1510. Nican neztica yn iquac peuh y hualmoquequetzaya yn ilhuicatitech yn tlanextli yn iuhqui mixpanitl; auh nohuian ohuallitoc yn cemanahuac yn techyahuallotoc, nohuian onetetzahuilloc y tlanextli yn hualmoquetzaya." [5 Tochtli, 1510. Aquí se ve cómo empezó a aparecer en el cielo una luz en forma de nube; fue vista por todos los pueblos circunvecinos y en todas partes esa luz fue interpretada como agüero] (300-301). And in the *Séptima relación* he incorporates a similar entry for the year 1510, preceding it with a brief description of an omen that appeared the previous year: "Auh çan ypan in yn omoteneuh xihuitl yn quimachiyotia huehuetque amaquemeque yn peuh yn ilhuicatl ytech hualmoquetzaya yn tetzahuitl: yuhqu yn ecamallacotl, cenca tliltic yn mixpanitl; ynepantla yn ilhuicatl y huallacia, nohuian oyttoc yn cemanahuac." [En este mismo año (1509), según dejaron pintado los antiguos amaquemecas, comenzó a verse en el cielo un agüero: era como un remolino, como un nubarrón muy negro; llegaba a la mitad del cielo, y fue visto desde todos los rumbos de la cuenca] (144-147). While these entries clearly show that the peoples of the lake region witnessed signs in the sky that they interpreted as omens, Chimalpahin does not explain what these omens represented or how they were interpreted, much less argue that they presaged the fall of the Mexica state and the demise of Indigenous rule. He simply mentions what he appears to be copying from painted texts without further commentary. Moreover, as the arrival of the Europeans into Mexico Tenochtitlan approached, there is no discussion in Chimalpahin's annals about the omens that announced the supposed predestined end of the Mexica state and Indigenous rule and the supposed defeat of pre-Hispanic deities. Rather than explaining the divergence of Chimalpahin's narrative from that of the friars' as being a question of genre, that is, assuming that the Spanish narrative (in European narrative form) allows for such an explanation and Chimalpahin's traditional Mesoamerican annals do not—it seems to me that the difference is ideological. While it was convenient for the friars to include a narrative of the preordained end of the Mexica state and Indigenous rule, a series of omens that supposedly

announced the end of Indigenous rule was not a narrative Chimalpahin was convinced of nor was he interested in preserving it for future generations of Nahua readers and their descendants. Thus, far from presenting a history of a supposed announced end of the Indigenous world with the arrival of the Europeans, Chimalpahin presents a history of survival and continuity, a history for an Indigenous future.

Similarly, Chimalpahin's narrative of the conquest in his annals also diverge from the narratives the friars present. While the narratives of Durán, Tovar, and Acosta emphasize the end of Mexica rule, the supposed ruin of Indigenous peoples, and Divine Providence as the determinant in the victory of the Spaniards, Chimalpahin's narrative of the conquest does not emphasize these. Instead, just as other Nahua annalist do, Chimalpahin discusses the conquest in relation to Indigenous sacred time while emphasizing the violence the Spaniards perpetuated on Indigenous peoples from the beginning and how Indigenous rulers were dispossessed. When read from this perspective, it becomes evident that Chimalpahin's history of the conquest, far from being a narrative of the supposed end of Indigenous peoples, it is a history that documents the violence and dispossession of Indigenous peoples and their continuation into the colonial era as a displaced and colonized people; however, unlike the narratives of the friars that present Indigenous history as foreclosed, Chimalpahin's narrative presents the possibility for Indigenous peoples to recover and reclaim their history. Rather than being a history of the end of a people, Chimalpahin's historical annals serve as a reminder of the dispossession and displacement of a people who had inhabited the lake region for centuries and who refused to vanish, opening up the possibility of continuing into the future as sovereign and self-determined peoples.

Additionally, Chimalaphin's treatment of the origin of Indigenous peoples also challenges Durán and Acosta's narrative. As I explain in the previous chapter, in the *Segunda* and *Cuarta relación* Chimalpahin directly contradicts Acosta's narrative that ascertains that the only way in which Indigenous peoples could have arrived into the Indies was through a land mass that connected the Old and the New World. As Chimalpahin writes in the *Segunda relación*: "I Tochtli xihuitl, 50. Nican ypan in yn acaltica yn ohuallaque yn huehuetque chichimea yn motenehua teochichimeca yn Hueyapan ylhuicaapan ohuallaque, yn ohuallanellotiaque, ompa quiçaco achto oncan motlallico yn itocayocan Teocolhuacan Aztlan" [1 Tochtli, 50. En este año, los antiguos chichimecas llamados teochichimecas vinieron en canoas sobre las aguas grandes y celestes [del mar], vinieron remando hasta desembarcar primeramente en el sitio llamado Teocolhuacan Aztlán, donde se establecieron" (64-65). And in the *Cuarta relación* he writes*:* "yn ihquac yn ipan in omoteneuh yn intlapohual huehuetque yn Ce Tochtli xihutl, yn ipan yn acaltica yn ohuallaque yn huehuetque chimimeca yn moteneuha teochichimeca yn Hueyapan ylhuicaapan, ohuallaque ohuallotlahtocaque yn campa ynchan yn cmapa tlalli ypan huallehuaque yn ohuallanellotiaque, oncan atenquiçaco on[motla]llico y[n yt]ocayocan Aztlan." [En el dicho año de 1 Tochtli de la cuenta de los antiguos, entonces los antiguos chichimecas, que se nombran teochichimecas, vinieron en canoas sobre las aguas grandes y celestes [del mar], vinieron avanzando desde su morada y tierra, de donde partieron para venir remando hasta desembarcar en el [sitio] llamado Aztlán, donde se establecieron" (306-309). This explanation clearly contradicts Acosta's narrative and illustrates that even though the Jesuit friar attempted to settle the debate in relation to the origin of Indigenous peoples, Chimalpahin's explanation resists it. Thus, while Acosta might have settled the debate for Spanish readers, Chimalpahin's *Relaciones históricas* illustrates that for the Nahuatl reader the debate was not settled as the Nahua *tlacuilo* continues to assert that Indigenous peoples arrived into the continent through

water and not by land as Acosta affirmed. This was the narrative of origin Chimalpahin archived for future generations of Nahua readers and their descendants.

Chimalpahin's historical annals also deviates from Acosta's historical narrative in that the Nahua annalist focuses primarily on Indigenous sources and does not discard Indigenous peoples' knowledge of the past. Rather than dismissing Indigenous peoples' stories of their past, Chimalpahin focuses on Indigenous accounts—primarily historical annals in the form of the *Xiuhtlapohualli*—as evident in the historical documents he copied and archived in *Codex Chimalpahin* and in his own *Relaciones históricas* and the *Annals of His Time*. In this sense, it is clear that Chimalpahin's intellectual and historiographic project deviates from that of Acosta. At the same time, the historical narrative Chimalpahin preserves in his annals refutes Acosta's statement that Indigenous peoples knowledge of their past was unimportant and limited to the last four hundred years, that is, the Twelfth Century, and that Indigenous peoples' history prior to that was nothing but confusion and darkness. As Chimalpahin's historical annals clearly illustrate, based on the Indigenous sources he uses, both oral and written in pictographic form and in Latin script, Indigenous peoples knowledge of their own past extended further back, at least to the beginning of the first millennium—the moment in which the Teochichimeca arrived in the island of Aztlan in the year 1 Tochtli, 50 A.D. Moreover, the reader can clearly see in Chimalpahin's efforts to explain their history prior to the arrival of the Teochichimeca in Aztlan that Indigenous *tlacuiloque* such as himself and the anonymous *tlacuiloque* who painted and wrote the annals he copied were looking for ways to account for their longer history without subjecting Indigenous peoples' history to the dominant narratives of the friars. As Chimalpahin makes clear in his *Segunda* and *Cuarta relación*, it was not known exactly were Indigenous peoples came from before their arrival in Aztlan—they could have descended from the peoples of Europe, Asia, or Africa—but, without a doubt, they were the original inhabitants of the so-called New World. In taking this approach, Chimalpahin mystifies the origin of Indigenous peoples prior to their arrival in Aztlan while challenging Acosta's view that Indigenous peoples were ignorant of their own past and that the stories they told of their past were insignificant and limited in scope. As the Nahua annalist makes clear, Indigenous peoples knowledge of the past extended well beyond the four hundred years Acosta mentions and *tlacuiloque* such as Chimalpahin continued to grapple with explaining the origin of Indigenous peoples when they encountered the history of a strange people—the Europeans—that extended farther back in time and presented itself as the true and only universal history and viable civilization. Thus, in Chimalpahin's annals the reader encounters a clear effort to recount and archive an alternative history, a history of Indigenous peoples for Indigenous peoples and their descendants, a history that resisted being subsumed into Christian Universal history and the expansionist history of the West.

Conclusion

In closing, when one compares Chimalpahin's historical annals with the histories of Sahagún, Durán, Tovar, and Acosta, it is evident that the historical narrative the Nahua annalist presents deviates significantly from those of the friars. While Sahagún presents a detailed account of the Nahuas in pre-Hispanic times, the purpose of his *Historia* is to serve as a tool for the extirpation of Indigenous idolatry. Thus, the Franciscan friar presents a narrative of the pre-Hispanic past that is to be admired only as a dead past and its continuation into the colonial, Christian present is to be denied; thus, Sahagún presents Nahua Civilization as foreclosed. For

his part, Durán's *Historia* is similar to Sahagún's as it is also written to extirpate Indigenous peoples' idolatry while presenting a historical narrative that affirms the end of the Mexica state and Nahua Civilization. On the other hand, while Tovar's historical narrative is not a mere summary of Durán's *Historia* as it does not present a discourse on the need to extirpate Indigenous idolatry and challenges Durán's narrative on the origin of Indigenous peoples, the Jesuit friar nevertheless presents a providentialist history that emphasizes the predetermined end of the Mexica state and the end of Indigenous peoples as sovereign and self-determined peoples into the future. For his part, Acosta not only exceeds the histories of both Durán and Sahagún by writing a treatise that transcends the question of idolatry to consider the governance of Indigenous peoples of the Indies but also puts Tovar's historical narrative into broader context while presenting a providentialist history that affirms the end of the Mexica state and forecloses the possibility of Indigenous peoples to continue into the future as sovereign and self-determined peoples. Consequently, the writing of the friars discussed above contribute to the ethnocide of Nahua peoples during the second half of the 16th century. Chimalpahin's historical narrative, on the contrary, is not a history of how to extirpate Indigenous peoples' idolatry or how to govern them but a history that safeguards the political history of the pre-Hispanic past and documents the dispossession of Indigenous peoples and their continuous marginalization and exploitation throughout the first century after the fall of Mexico Tenochtitlan. Thus, Chimalpahin's historical annals, written in Nahuatl for Nahua readers of future generations and their descendants, clearly presents an alternative narrative from the religious narratives Sahagún, Durán, Tovar and Acosta present. Thus, Chimalpahin's annals preserve an alternative history of Cemanahuac so that future generations of Nahua readers and their descendants could one day reclaim their history, and in doing so, they could also reclaim their political institutions and their Indigenous lands for, ultimately, they were the original inhabitants of Cemanahuac who had been systematically displaced and marginalized by European invaders who had reduced Indigenous peoples to the status of commoners—dispossessing them of their land and denying them the right to govern themselves according to their millenary traditions. Thus, the histories Chimalpahin copies and produces make evident that he produces an archive of a history of survival and continuity, an Indigenous intellectual and historiographic project of self-determination in Nahuatl for Nahua readers and their descendants, a project of ethnogenesis for an Indigenous future.

Conclusion: Chimalpahin's Project For the Future

To conclude, I want to reiterate that in Chimalpahin's Nahuatl writings the reader encounters an Indigenous intellectual and political project written in Nahuatl for Nahua readers and their descendants that safeguards the political history of Cemanahuac and documents the dispossession and continuous marginalization of Indigenous peoples throughout the 16th and early 17th centuries. As I illustrate in the three chapters above, Chimalpahin was a prolific Nahua intellectual that challenged the narratives of both secular and religious European authors writing about the pre-Hispanic past and the first century under Spanish colonialism while expanding the narrow *altepetl*-centered histories of his Nahua ancestors. Thus, he produced and compiled an archive—which I have called "the Cemanahuac archive"—that stands as evidence of an alternative, Indigenous intellectual and political project written in Nahuatl for future generations of Nahuas and their descendants that centers Indigenous peoples' history while situating it in global context.

Chimalpahin's historical annals also illustrate the existence of a Nahua intellectual tradition written in Nahuatl for Nahua readers of the future generations, thereby revealing an "other" lettered city radically different from Rama's Spanish lettered city, one inhabited by colonial *tlacuiloque* who paint and write about the ancient history of their ancestors and document the dire social condition of Nahuas under Spanish colonial rule at the turn of the 17th century. These Nahua *tlacuiloque* preserve the ability to dwell in a plurality of worlds, navigating between the Mesoamerican world of their ancestors and the modern colonial world. Hence, these colonial *tlacuiloque* write and paint about the pre-Hispanic and colonial worlds without succumbing to the logic of secular or religious colonial authorities and without demonizing or rejecting the idolatric past and knowledge of their Indigenous predecessors as some Nahua authors writing in Spanish do.[69] Therefore, my reading of Chimalpahin's historical annals is in line with Rabasa's reading of the colonial *tlacuilo* of *Codex Telleriano-Remensis* who has the ability to dwell in a plurality of worlds and creates a discursive space which allows her to point to the failures and intolerance of the colonial state ("Historical and Epistemological Limits" 73), a perspective that parallels Gruzinski's view that "One can belong to many worlds and at many different times without seeking to reduce them or standardize them" (*What time is it there?* 160). Thus, one should not expect or demand from Chimalpahin or any colonial *tlacuilo* to remain frozen in time in the ancient world of his or her ancestors or, worse, to assimilate into the modern colonial world, leaving behind his ancestral knowledge and ways of knowing and being. A better approach would be to appreciate how the colonial *tlacuilo* navigates between worlds while presenting a lucid critique of the colonial authorities and pointing to the limits, intolerance, and violence of the colonial state.

Thus, my reading of Chimalpahin as a colonial *tlacuilo* working in Nahua annals form in alphabetic writing—in the form of the *xiuhtlapohualli*— situates him as part of an intellectual tradition of Nahua *tlacuiloque* such as the painter of *Codex Telleriano-Remensis* and the painters and writers of *Codex Aubin* and *Ms. 85,* and Nahua annalists such as Tezozomoc, Don Gabriel de Ayala, and other anonymous Nahua annalist who carried the tradition of painted and written

[69] See Diego Muñoz Camargo's *Descripción de la ciudad y provincial de Tlaxcala* (1585), a text directed at King Phillip II.

Nahua annals into the future, preserving the Mesoamerican Nahua annals form while incorporating alphabetic writing and European forms into their works. As Rabasa has shown for the *tlacuilo* who painted *Codex Telleriano-Remensis* and Angela Marrie Herrer has shown for the *tlacuiloque* who painted and wrote *Codex Aubin* (1608),[70] Nahua *tlacuiloque* used both Mesoamerican and European forms to preserve the ancient histories of their ancestors and to document the reality of Nahua peoples under Spanish rule. However, it is important to point out that Chimalpahin not only continues but also expands this Indigenous tradition by writing a broader history of Indigenous peoples and putting it in global context from the perspective of a *macehualli*, a commoner. In this way, it makes sense to situate Chimalpahin as part of a Nahua intellectual tradition of painters and writers who preserved the history and knowledge of their ancestors in painted and written form rather than situating him as part of a Hispanized Nahua community of scholars who wrote in Spanish and appealed to the colonial authorities for recognition as part of the native nobility. Hence, my reading of Chimalpahin's intellectual project clearly differs from the "colonial economy of letters" Brian presents in her analysis of the works of the Texcocan Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl who writes in Spanish in the form of *relaciones* and appeals to the colonial authorities for recognition as a descendant of the Indigenous nobility.

After carefully tracing the ways in which Chimalpahin borrows from and revises the works of European-born authors, the way in which he continues and expands the *altepetl*-centered histories of his Indigenous predecessors, and the way in which his historical annals diverge from the ethnocidal histories of the friars, it becomes evident that Chimalpahin's intellectual project is different. Chimalpahin offers a vision of the colonial capital which is far from a celebration of the colonial city. His vision of Mexico Tenochtitlan before and after the conquest points to the limits of Angel Rama's concept of the "lettered city" which, as Amber Brian succinctly explains, "[it] describes a society in which the colonial city is organized as a city of rings where the lettered city is at the center of administrative and official power and is inhabited by 'group of religious, administrators, educators, professionals, notaries, religious personnel, and other wielders of the pen'" (18). However, Chimalphain's revision of the triumphalist discourse of European authors who celebrate the grandeur of the colonial capital and his writing in Nahuatl also complicates Brian's own notion of the "colonial economy of letters" that revises Rama's concept of the lettered city by focusing on the "exchange and dialogue between those who occupied the centers of power and those who existed at the margins" since "the lettered city should be appreciated as a manifestation of various sorts of relationships and collaborations rather than a dichotomy [between the Spanish center and the Indigenous margin]" (8). While I agree with Brian's view that the lettered city of Rama should account for the relationships between Spanish men of letters and those at the margin, Chimalpahin's historical annals point to an Indigenous lettered city that does not seek collaboration or negotiation with the colonial authorities or centers of power. While Chimalpahin draws from Spanish men of letters, he also challenges them, revising their narratives and translating them in revised form into Nahuatl; in taking this approach, he turns away from the Spanish letter city to continue and expand the work of other Nahua intellectuals that preceded him and ensure that future generations of Nahua readers would understand the political history of their ancestors from time

[70] See Angela Marie Herrer's recent book chapter "Early European Book Conventions and Legitimized Mexica History in Codex Aubin" in which she discusses the *tlacuilo*'s use of European books as a model for his painted and written codex.

immemorial and their condition under Spanish rule in order to reclaim their history, political institution, and land. Writing at a moment of crisis, during a time in which deadly epidemics and the passing of the older generations of Nahua men and women of knowledge threatened to obliterate the knowledge of the Indigenous past, Chimalpahin takes it upon himself to safeguard their history. Working in solitude in the chapel of San Antón Abad at the margin of the colonial capital, Chimalpahin copies the Indigenous histories of his ancestors while writing his own histories and observations of the colonial capital at the turn of the century to create an archive that would safeguard the political history of Cemanahuac for posterity. Hence, Chimalpahin writes and revises the narratives of Spanish authors and incorporates their work in revised form into his annals for future generations of Nahua readers and their descendants to understand how the colonial capital came into being and to document the dire condition of Nahuas at the turn of the 17th century. Consequently, Chimalpahin's intellectual project does not fit Rama's paradigm of the lettered city nor should be reduced to an analysis that explains how Nahua authors of the early 17th century collaborated or negotiated with the colonial authorities. As Guha has argued for the case of colonial India, under a colonial situation, parallel to the domain of elite politics, there also exists a politics in which the principal actors are not Indigenous elites or the colonial authorities but the subaltern classes (40). Chimalpahin's archive and his intellectual project illustrates just this: parallel to the Spanish lettered city there existed a lettered city of Nahua *tlacuiloque* who insisted on their legitimacy as the rulers of the land, a Nahua lettered city written in Nahuatl for future generations of Indigenous peoples and their descendants

As my discussion of Chimalpahin's *Annals of His Time* in Chapter 1 illustrates, the Nahua annalist revises the narratives of peninsular authors in important positions of power who present an ideal image of the city and exclude or distort the history of his ancestors and the presence of Indigenous people in the city. As I have shown above, Chimalpahin counters Balbuena's triumphalist discourse and his ideal image of the colonial capital by presenting a city that is far from ideal, a city that excludes and exploits the native population and exerts extreme violence on minority sectors of society, while making visible the presence of Indigenous people in the city and tracing the origins of his ancestors and situating the origin of the city in its Indigenous past. Also, in his revision of Martínez's text, Chimalpahin presents a longer and critical narrative on the history of his ancestors while presenting a critique of the scientific knowledge of European men. Moreover, while Chimalpahin borrows from Alemán's narrative of the funeral procession of fray García Guerra in terms of narrative structure, he revises Alemán's narrative and counters the Spanish Baroque author's ideal image of the archbishop and viceroy and downplays magnificent Baroque celebrations of the colonial city. Further, Chimalpahin also counters Morga's official narrative of the execution of 35 black and mulatto men and women, a narrative in which Morga attempts to persuade the residents of the city and former viceroy Luis de Velasco II that justice had been made. Thus, Chimalpahin presents a counter narrative to the celebratory discourse of the aforementioned European-born authors while creating an archive for future generations to understand how the colonial capital had developed and the condition of its Indigenous inhabitants at the turn of the 17th century.

Also, as I show in Chapter 2, Chimalpahin not only continues the Mesoamerican tradition of the Nahua annals but also extends it by writing not only about his native *altepetl* of Chalco and Mexico Tenochtitlan but also incorporating the histories of other *altepeme* and including longer entries in narrative form, narratives in which he presents a critique of secular and religious colonial authorities. Thus, Chimalpahin's *Relaciones históricas* illustrate that his intellectual

project continues and expands the work of Tezozomoc and other *tlacuiloque* of the 16th century while deviating from Ixtlilxochitl's project of appealing to the colonial authorities for reinstitution of privileges of the native nobility. As I illustrate in the chapter, Chimalpahin not only uses Tezozomoc's formula of appealing to future generations of Nahua readers but also borrows from other Mexica hybrid texts of the late 16th century by putting into writing their iconic script and incorporating their Nahuatl alphabetic writing into his historical annals. At the same time, Chimalpahin incorporates the history of his Indigenous ancestors into global history, not merely subsuming Indigenous history into the history of the West as his center of references is, throughout, the Indigenous continent. Thus, Chimalpahin utilizes the Indigenous sources he has at his disposal as well as European texts and the Bible to present an alternative narrative on the origin of Indigenous peoples while presenting a critique of the usurpation of legitimate Indigenous governments and the violence of the conquest. Spanish colonists had dislocated and usurped Indigenous governments starting with the conquest and its impact continued to affect the condition of Indigenous peoples into the 17th century. Thus, documenting the history of dislocation and dispossession and creating an archive for Nahua readers of future generations, those who would survive his current moment of crisis, so that they could reclaim their Indigenous history, government institutions, and land.

Furthermore, as I illustrate in Chapter 3, when one compares Chimalpahin's historical annals with the histories of Sahagún, Durán, Tovar, and Acosta, it becomes evident that the historical narrative the Nahua annalist presents deviates significantly from those of the friars. Chimalpahin's historical narrative is not a history of how to extirpate Indigenous peoples' idolatry or how to govern them but a history that safeguards the political history of the pre-Hispanic past and documents the dispossession of Indigenous peoples and their continuous marginalization and exploitation throughout the first century after the fall of Mexico Tenochtitlan. Thus, Chimalpahin's historical annals present an alternative narrative from the religious narratives Sahagún, Durán, Tovar and Acosta present. In this way, Chimalpahin's annals preserve an alternative history of Cemanahuac so that future generations of Nahua readers and their descendants could one day reclaim their history, and in doing so, they could also reclaim their political institutions and their Indigenous lands for, ultimately, they were the original inhabitants of Cemanahuac who had been systematically displaced and marginalized by European invaders who had reduced Indigenous peoples to the status of commoners—dispossessing them of their land and denying them the right to govern themselves according to their millenary traditions. Thus, the histories Chimalpahin copies and produces make evident that he produces an archive of a history of survival and continuity, an Indigenous intellectual, political, and historiographic project of self-determination for an Indigenous future.

Finally, it is important to stress, yet again, that Chimalpahin's Cemanahuac archive speaks to future generations of Indigenous peoples and their descendants, those who had been dispossessed of their lands and had been marginalized and exploited as a result of the Spanish conquest of Mexico Tenochtitlan—those whose cultural, political, and religious traditions had been suppressed by the secular and religious colonial authorities. These descendants of the Nahuas of 16th and 17th century colonial New Spain are the *macehualtin* and *castas* of the colonial era who were marginalized by creole elites who not only usurped Indigenous lands but also appropriated for themselves the pre-Hispanic history of Cemanahuac. They are also the marginalized and dispossessed *mexicanos* of the 19th, 20th, and 21st centuries who continued to be marginalized and exploited by the elite classes and the Mexican national government and its

institutions. These descendants are also the Chicanas and Chicanos of the 1960s who began the project of reclaiming *our* Indigenous history and land and masterfully articulated Aztlan as our homeland. Finally, the descendants Chimalpahin writes for and for whom he archives the history of Cemanahuac are the Xicanas, Xicanos, and Xicanxs scholars and activists of the 21st century who continue to struggle to reclaim our Indigenous history, language, and political institutions and are committed to pursue projects of Indigenous autonomy and self-determination that go beyond the logic of the modern nation state and imagine an alternative future, a future in which, as the Zapatistas have articulated: "Un mundo en donde quepan muchos mundos"—A world where many worlds fit.

Works Cited

Acosta, José de. *De procuranda Indorum salute.* Spanish translation in Francisco Mateos (ed). *Obras del Padre José de Acosta*. Madrid: Atlas, 1954.

_____. *Historia natural y moral de las Indias*. Ed. Edmundo O'Gormán. México D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Econónica, 1940.

Actas de Cabildo del Ayuntamiento de México, Libro XVIII. Mexico: Imprenta de la Compañía Editorial Católica, 1902.

Adorno, Rolena. *The Polemics of Possession in Spanish American Narrative*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Alemán, Mateo. *Sucesos de D. Frai García Gera arcobispo de Mejico, a cuyo cargo estuvo el govierno de la Nueva España (1613)*. In Alice H. Bushee's "The 'Sucesos' of Mateo Alemán." *Reveu Hispanique* 26 (1911): 369-457.

Alva Ixtlilxóchitl, Fernando de. *Obras Históricas*, ed. Edmundo O'Gorman. Vol 1. Mexico D.F.: UNAM, 1997.

_____. *Obras Históricas*, ed. Edmundo O'Gorman. Vol 2. Mexico D.F.: UNAM, 1997.

Balbuena, Bernardo. *Grandeza mexicana*. In *Poesía Lírica*. Ciudad Real: Biblioteca de Autores Manchegos, 2000. p. 272-351.

Barlow, Robert H. "La Crónica X: Versiones coloniales de la historia de los mexica tenochca." In *Revista mexicana de estudios antropológicos*." 7 (1945) : 65-87.

Bautista, Juan. *Sermonario en lengua mexicana*. Ciudad de México: Casa de Diego López Dávalos, 1606.

Benton, Bradley. "The Outsider: Alva Ixtlilxóchitl's Tenous Ties to the City of Tezcoco." In *Colonial Latin American Review* 23.1 (2014): 37-52.

Bernal, Ignacio. "Durán's Historia and the Crónica X." In *The History of the Indies of New Spain by Fray Diego Durán*. Trans. and Ed. Doris Heyden. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.

Brading David .A. *The First America: The Spanish Monarchy, Creole Patriots, and the Liberal State*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Brian, Amber. "Don Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl's Narratives of Conquest of Mexico: Colonial Subjectivity and the Circulation of Native Knowledge." The Conquest All Over Again. Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2010.

_____. "The Original Alva Ixtlilxóchitl Manuscripts at Cambridge University." In *Colonial Latin American Review* 23.1 (2014): 84-101.

_____. *Alva Ixtlilxochitl's Native Archive and the Circulation of Knowledge in Colonial Mexico*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2016.

Bushee, Alice H. *"*The 'Sucesos' of Mateo Alemán*." Reveu Hispanique* 26 (1911) : 369-457.

Cañizares-Esguerra, Jorge. *How to Write the History of the New World: Historiographies, Epistemologies, and Identities in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

Carrera Stampa, Manuel. "Historiadores indígenas y mestizos novohispanos, siglos XVI-XVII" *Revista Española de Anthropología Americana*. Vol. 6. (1971) : 205-243.

Castañeda de la Paz, María. "El Códice X o los Anales del 'Grupo de la peregrinacion': Copias, duplicaciones y su uso por parte de los cronistas" In *Tlalocan*. 15 (2008) : 183-214.

Castillo, Victor M. *Primer amoxtli libro: 3a relación de las différentes histoires originales*. México D.F.: UNAM, 1997.

Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, don Domingo de San Antón Muñón. *Annals of His Time*. Manuscript 220 of Biblioteca Nacional de Francia (BNF). Pages 1-82.

_____. *Diario*. Manuscript 256B in CAAH of Biblioteca Nacional de Antropología e Historia (BNAH). Folio 17r – 18v.

_____. *Codex Chimapahin: Society and Politics in Mexico Tenochtitlan, Tlatelolco, Texcoco, Culhuacan, and Other Nahua Altepetl in Central Mexico*. 2 vols. Ed. and trans. by Arthur J. O. Anderson and Susan Schroeder. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997.

_____. "Don Gabriel de Ayala's Year Count." In *Codex Chimalpahin*. Eds. Arthur Anderson and Susan Schroeder. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997.

_____. *Las ocho relaciones y El memorial de Colhuacan.* 2 vols. Rafael Tena, ed. and trans. México: Cien de México, 1998.

_____. *Diario.* Ed. and trans. by Rafael Tena. México: Cien de México, 2001.

_____. *Annals of His Time*. Ed and trans. by James Lockhart, Susan Schroeder, and Doris Namala. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2005.

Codex Aubin, Manuscript. The British Museum.

Cómo te confundes? Acaso no somos conquistados? Anales de Juan Bautista Ed and trans. by Luis Reyes García. Mexico D.F.: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social, 2001.

Cortés, Rocío. "Don Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc (ca. 1525-ca. 1610)." In *Narradores indígenas y mestizos de la época colonial (siglos XVI-XVIII): Zonas andinas y mesoamericana*. Eds. Rocío Cortés and Margarita Zamora. Lima: Latinoamericana Editores, 2016.

Cummins, J.S. "Antonio de Morga's sucesos de las Islas Filipinas." In *Journal of Southeast Asian History*. 10.3 (1969) : 560-581.

Dávila, Arturo. *Fernaado de Alva Ixtlilxoçitl. El Imperio Tultekatl.* México: U.T.I Aztekatl, 1991.

Durán, Diego. *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España e islas de tierra firme*. Vol 1 and 2. México D.F.: Cien de México, 1995.

Durand-Forest, Jacqueline. "Los grupos chalcas y sus divinidades según Chimalpahin." In *Estudios de la cultura Náhuatl*. 11 (1972): 37-44.

_____. "Sistema de fechamiento en Chimalpahin." In *Estudios de la cultura Náhuatl*. 12 (1976): 265-277.

_____. "Extractos de la Primera relación de Chimalpahin. In *Estudios de la cultura Náhuatl*. 20 (1990): 65-76.

_____. "Algunas observaciones sobre el *Diario* de Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin" in *Estudios de la cultura Náhuatl*. 25 (1995): 417-423.

_____. "Compedium de la historia precolombina: Extractos del *Diario* de Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin" in *Estudios de la cultura Náhuatl*. 25 (1995): 425-461.

Galindo Trejo, Jesús. "Eclipse total del sol de 1611 según el Diario de Chimalpahin. In Estudios de la cultura Náhuatl 21 (1991)

Galván, José Rubén. "Las fuentes de las diferentes historias originales del Chimalpahin." In *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*. 64 (1977): 51-56.

_____. "Dos atestaciones en la obra de Chimalpahin." In *Estudios de la cultura Náhuatl*. 13 (1978): 113-127.

_____. "La historia según Chimalpahin." In *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*. 84 (1998): 183-195.

García Reyes, Luis. "Un nuevo manuscrito de Chimalpahin en Anales del Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia. Séptima Época. Tomo II. México: INAH, 1971. p. 333-348.

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

Gruzinski, Serge. *The Conquest of Mexico: The Incorporation of Indian Societies into the Western World, 16th to 18th Centuries*. Trans. Eileen Carrigan. Malden: Polity Press, 1993.

_____. *What Time Is It There? America and Islam at the Dawn of Modern Times*. Trans. Jean Birrell. Polity Press, 2010.

Guha, Ranajit. "On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India." In Selected *Subaltern Studies.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Hill, Jonathan D. *History, Power, and Identity: Ethnogenesis in the Americas, 1492-1992.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1996.

Hitchcock, Robert K. and Tara M. Twedt. "Physical and Cultural Genocide of Indigenous Peoples." In *Century of Genocide*, 3rd Ed. Taylor and Francis, 2009.

Iñigo-Madrigal, Luis. *Grandeza mexicana*. Intro. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva S.L. 2012.

Israel, J. I. *Race, Class, and Politics in Colonial Mexico, 1610-1670*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Karttunen, Frances. *An Analytical Dictionary of Nahuatl*. Norman: Oklahoma Universiy Press, 1983.

Kauffmann, Leisa. "Alva Ixtlilxóchitl's Colonial Mexico Trickster Tale: Nezahualcoyotl and Tezcatlipoca in the *Historia de la nación chichimeca*." In *Colonial Latin American Review* 23.1 (2014): 70-83.

Kenrick Kruell, Gabriel. "Resucitando la Crónica X. Reconstrucción filológica de un fragmento inicial de la Crónica mexicayotl de Hernando de Alvarado Tezozómoc." In *Tlalocan*. 19 (2013): 301-461.

Laird, Andrew. "Universal History and New Spain's Indian Past: Classical Knowledge in Nahua Chronicles." In *Antiquities and Classical Traditions in Latin America*. West Sussex: Wiley, 2018.

Launey, Michel. *An Introduction to Classical Nahuatl*. Trans. Christopher Mackay. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Lesbre, Patrick. “Los anales mexica (1243-1562) de don Gabriel de Ayala: cultura Acolhua colonial.” In *Identidad en palabras: Nobleza indígena novohispana*. México D.F.: UNAM, 2015.

Leonard, Irving A. “Mateo Alemán en México.” In *Thesaurus*. 5.1-3. (1949).

León-Portilla, Miguel. “Chimalpahin y los origenes del hombre americano.” In *Homenaje a Pablo Martínez del Rio en el XXV aniversario de la edición de los origenes americanos*. México D.F.: Edimex, 1961. 475-482.

Lienhard, Martin. “La crónica mestiza en México y el Perú hasta 1620: Apuntes para su studio historic-literario.” In *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana* 9.17 (1983) : 9-21.

Lockhart, James. *The Nahuas After the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Colonial Mexico, Sixteenth Through Eighteenth Centuries.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Lucena Salmoral, Manuel. *Regulación de la esclavitud negra en las colonials de America Española (1503-1886)*. Madrid: Universidad de Alcalá, 2005.

Manuscrit Mexicain 85. Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BNF). Web.

Martínez, Henrico. *Repertorio de los tiempos y historia natural desta Nueva España.* Ciudad de México: Emprenta de Henrico Martínez, 1606.

Martínez, María Elena. *Genealogical Fictions: Limpieza de Sangre, Religion, and Gender in Colonia Mexico*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008.

Martínez, Rodrigo. “El Diario de Chimalpahin” In *Estudios de la Cultura Náhuatl*. 38 (2007): 25-40.

Martínez HoSang, Daniel and Oneka LaBennett. “Racialization.” In *Keywords: Keywords for American Cultural Studies,* edited by Bruce Burgett and Glenn Hendler. Second Ed. New York, US: NYU Press, 2014, pp. 212-214.

McDonough, Kelly S. *The Learned Ones: Nahua Intellectuals in Postconquest Mexico*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2014.

Merrim, Stephanie. *The Spectacular City, Mexico, and Colonial Hispanic Literary Culture*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010.

Monroy Castillo, Ma. Isabel. *Guia de las actas de cabildo de la ciudad de México. Años 1611-1620.* Mexico D.F.: 1988. p. 64-65.

More, Anna. *Baroque Sovereignty: Carlos Sigüenza y Góngora and the Creole Archive of Colonial Mexico*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Morga, António. *Relación del alçamiento que los negros y mulatos libres y cautivos de la ciudad de Mexico de la Nueva España pretendieron hazer contra los españoles por cuaresma del año 1612 y del castigo que se hizo de los caveças y culpados*. In Luis Querol y Roso, "Negros y mulatos de Nueva España (Historia de su alzamiento en México en 1612)," *Anales de la Universidad de Valencia* 12.90 (1931-1932): 141-153.

Namala, Doris M. "Chimalpahin in His Time: An Analysis of the Writings of a Nahua Annalist of Seventeenth Century Mexico Concerning His Own Lifetime." Diss. UCLA, 2002.

Nemser, Daniel. "Triangulating Blackness: Mexico City, 1612." In *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 33.3 (Fall 2017) : 344-366.

Offner, Jerome A. "Improving Western Historiography of Texcoco." In *Texcoco: Pre-Hispanic and Colonial Perspectives*. Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 2014.

O'Gorman, Edmundo. "Prólogo." In *Historia natural y moral de las Indias*. México D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Econónica, 1940.

Olko, Justyna and Agnieszka Brylak. "Defending Local Autonomy and Facing Cultural Trauma: A Nahua Order against Idolatry, Tlaxcala, 1543." in *Hispanic American Historical Review*. 98.4 (2018) : 573-604.

Peperstraete, Sylvie. "La manifestación de la identidad de la nobleza indígena en los escritos de F.A. Tezozomoc." In *Identidad en palabras: Nobleza indígena novohispana*. México D.F.: UNAM, 2015.

Rabasa, José. "Crónicas religiosas del siglo XVI." In *Historia the la literature mexicana*. Mexico, D.F.: UNAM / Siglo XXI Editores, 1996.

_____. *Writing Violence on the Northern Frontier: Historiography of Sixteenth-Century New Mexico and Florid and the Legacy of Conquest*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2000.

_____. "In the Mesoamerican Archive: Speech, Script, and Time in Tezozomoc and Chimalpahin." In *Without History: Subaltern Studies, The Zapatista Insurgency, and the Specter of History*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010.

_____. "Historical and Epistemological Limits In Subaltern Studies" In *Without History: Subaltern Studies, The Zapatista Insurgency, and the Specter of History*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010.

_____. *Tell Me the Story of How I Conquered You: Elsewheres and Ethnosuicide in the Colonial Mesoamerican World*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011.

_____. "Voice in Alva Ixtlilxóchitl Historical Writing." In *Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl and His Legacy*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2016.

Ricard, Robert. *The Spiritual Conquest of México: An Essay on the Apostolate and Evangelizng Methods of the Mendicant Orders in New Spain: 1523-1572*. Trans. Lesley Byrd Simpson. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.

Rodilla León, María José. *Aquestas son de México las señas: La capital de la Nueva España según los cronistas, poetas, y viajeros (siglos XVI al XVII).* Mexico D.F.: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, 2014.

Romero Galván, José Rubén and Rosa de Lourdes Camelo. "Estudio preliminar: Crónica de una crónica." In *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España e islas de tierra firme*. Vol México D.F.: Cien de México, 1995.

Romero Galván, José Rubén. "La historia según Chimalpahin." In *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*. 84 (1998): 183-195.

Ruhnau, Elke. "The Theological Discourses in Chimalpahin's Diferentes historias originales." In *Latin American Indian Literatures, Messages and Meanings.* Lancaster, CA, 1998.

Ruz Barrio, Miguel Ángel. "Cholula, siglos XVI-XVIII: ¿Quién es un noble indígena?" In *Identidad en palabras: Nobleza indígena novohispana*. México D.F.: UNAM, 2015.

Sahagún, Fray Bernardino de. *Historia General de las cosas de la Nueva España*. Ed. Ángel María Garibay. 11th ed., Mexico: Editorial Purrúa, 2016.

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

_____. *Chimalpahin's Conquest: A Nahua Historian's Rewriting of Francisco López de Gómara's* La Conquista de Mexico. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

_____. "Introduction." *The Conquest All Over Again*. Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2010.

_____. "The Truth About the Crónica Mexicayotl." In *Colonial Latin American Review*. 20.2 (2011): 233-247.

_____. "Writing the Nahua Cannon: Ethnicity, Identity, and Posterity According to Chimalpahin" In *To be Indio in Colonial Spanish America*. Ed. Mónica Díaz. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2017.

Sullivan, John et al. *Tlahtolxitlauhcayotl: Chicontepec, Veracruz. A monolingual dictionary of Modern Huastecan Nahuatl*. Totlahtol Series. Eds. Justyna Olko and John Sullivan. Warsaw: IDIEZ/University of Warsaw, 2016.

Tavárez, David E. "República de indios." In *Encyclopedia of Mexico: History, Society & Culture.* Ed. Michael S. Werner. Vol. A-L. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1997.

_____. "Reclaiming the Conquest: An Assessment of Chimalpahin's Modifications to La Conquista de México." In *Chimalpahin's Conquest: A Nahua Historian's Rewriting of Francisco Lopez de Gómara's* La Conquista de Mexico. Eds. Susan Schroeder et al. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

Taylor, Diana. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Tena, Rafael. "La estructura textual de las relaciones de Chimalpahin." In *Estudios de la cultura Náhuatl*. 28 (1998): 355-364.

Terukina Yamauchi, Jorge L. *El imperio de la virtud: Gradeza mexicana (1604) de Bernardo de Balbuena y el discurso criollo novohispano*. Rochester: Tamesis, 2017.

Tezozomoc, Fernando Alvarado. *Crónica mexicayotl*. Ed. and trans. Adrián León. Mexico D.F.: UNAM, 1975.

_____. *Crónica mexicayotl*. In *Tres crónicas mexicanas*. Ed. and trans. by Rafael Tena. México: Cien de México, 2001.

_____. *Crónica mexicana*. Ed. Gonzalo Díaz Migoyo and Germán Vázquez Chamorro. Madrid: Dastin, S.L, 2011.

Tovar, Juan de. *Manuscrit Tovar*. Ed. Jacques Lafaye. Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1972.

Townsend, Camila. "Introduction: The Evolution of Alva Ixtlilxóchitl's Scholarly Life." In *Colonial Latin American Review* 23.1 (2014): 1-17.

_____. *Annals of Native America: How the Nahuas of Colonial Mexico Kept Their History Alive*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Velazco, Salvador. *Visiones de Anáhuac: Reconstrucciones historiográficas y etnicidades emergentes en el México colonial: Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxóchitl, Diego Muñoz Camargo y Hernando Alvarado Tezozómoc*. Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara, 2003.

Villella, Peter. "The Last Acolhua: Alva Ixtlilxochitl and Elite Native Historiography in Early New Spain." In *Colonial Latin American Review* 23.1 (2014): 1-116.

Webb, David. "The Nahua Annal'. Genre from the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century (Mexico)". In *Scripta Ethnologica*. 24 (2005) : 9-23.

Zimmerman, Günter. "Chimalpahin y la iglesia de San Antón Abba en Mexico." In *Traducciones Mesoamericanistas*. 1 (1966) : 11-26.