The Techialoyan Codices

Stephanie Wood*

TECHIALOYAN "codices" have intrigued manuscript collectors since at least the days of Lorenzo Boturini, an Italian emissary from the Counts of Moctezuma to New Spain in the early eighteenth century. Boturini became fascinated with indigenous pictorial manuscripts, including Techialoyans, and began to acquire as many examples as he could.[1] It was not until the mid-twentieth century that scholars came to realize that these central Mexican Nahuatl language manuscripts painted on native fig-bark paper were not the sixteenth-century treasures collectors hoped they would be. Controversies still rage about precisely who made them, under what circumstances, for what motives, and whether we should give them more than passing notice. I believe that strong evidence points to their being late seventeenth century mass-produced efforts to demonstrate not only community territorial claims but the power and influence of central Mexican indigenous settlements as heirs to a glorious indigenous heritage.

Like mundane Nahuatl documents that were being recorded in pueblos from the 1550s into the late eighteenth century, the roughly fifty Techialoyan manuscripts we recognize today utilize the Roman alphabet and European calligraphy, but surprisingly, they avoid the use of European paper, which was standard in Nahuatl writing over most of this period. Techialoyan authors took unusual pains to write and paint on fig-bark paper, apparently hoping to convey a sense of antiquity and native tradition, recalling what scholars now often call "codices"—preconquest and early postconquest manuscripts in a clearly indigenous style. The material on which the Techialoyan authors wrote, however, is rather thick and dark, and it easily separates and frays. It is not up to the work of skilled Mexican paper makers whose fine products we can still purchase in tourist markets today. The poor quality of the paper necessitated a large, scrawling hand and a less refined pictorial style than Mexican artists had produced in the past, though that may not have been the only reason for the style (see Figure 1).

The fact that so many of these Techialoyan manuscripts appeared within a relatively short span of time of only one or two generations (with most seeming to date from ca. 1685 to 1703), across a wide geographic area, and with a strikingly unique[2] yet consistent style and content—though with some internal variation —supports the assessment that a studio of writers and artists, probably with subgroupings, made and distributed them. Their focus on agricultural lands and *monte* (undeveloped lands good for pasture, firewood-gathering, and hunting), and on illustrious indigenous leaders of an earlier time, taken together with their timing, suggests their purpose: to ward off encroachments by Spaniards who were increasingly settling in the pueblos of central Mexico and to shore up the waning

[1]Robertson 1975, p. 264.

[2]The murals in the Franciscan church (now cathedral) of Cuernavaca are reminiscent of the Techialoyan style, but the connection remains elusive (see Robertson 1975, p. 225).

Figure 1:
Sample Techialoyan Graphic Styles
(Men in Colonial-Style Clothing)

Techialoyan 705*

Techialoyan 717

Techialoyan 718

Techialoyan 724

Techialoyan 727

Techialoyan 735

Techialoyan 739

Techialoyan 744

Iztacapan Ms.

Note: The numbers following a name refer to the manuscript number in the Robertsons' Techialoyan catalog published in the *Handbook of Middle American Indians* in 1975. Manuscripts not yet identified in that listing are identified here by the pueblo with which they are associated.

authority of the native elite.

While we increasingly find contrived aspects in them, Techialoyan manuscripts are authentic in that they grew out of, and reflect, a power struggle of the time. Their authors intended them to help restore balance to a situation in which the pueblos were perceived to be losing ground. Techialoyan writers may have consulted with individual towns in order to prepare papers for them that would reflect local claims and history, but they also seem to have used some pages in the nature of templates, filling in the blanks, sometimes hastily and with wording that repeats almost verbatim across the corpus. The producers may have offered manuscripts of varying length for varying prices. But all told, the resulting product is highly worthy of study for what it might convey about competition for resources, understandings of documentation requirements and legal forms of expression, later-period indigenous literacy in Nahuatl, evolving pictorial representations, the writers' access to and understanding of sixteenth-century and preconquest ethnohistorical sources, and finally, a possible late seventeenth-century surge in appreciation of the indigenous precontact heritage.[3]

The state of research in the 1970s

When I was an undergraduate searching for a senior thesis topic on some aspect of the struggle by indigenous communities to hold onto their lands in the face of the Spanish presence, William Taylor suggested I take a look at the so-called Techialoyan Codices. He had been doing research that would lead to his *Drinking, Homicide & Rebellion* (1979), and had found the Valley of Toluca, the region most closely associated with Techialoyans, rife with conflict over land in the eighteenth century. Taylor, a student of Charles Gibson, recognized the importance of getting at indigenous perspectives on the land struggle, and he thought these manuscripts, in Nahuatl, could provide some important clues. So I followed his suggestion and started keeping an eye out for Techialoyans and contextual information about them as I researched my senior thesis in the archives in Mexico in 1977.[4]

[3]A major example of this movement among local Spaniards is don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora, an eminent scholar of the period (1645–1700), who studied Nahuatl, collected Nahuatl writings and codices, and did relevant writing himself. His contemporary and friend, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, composed the occasional Nahuatl poem.

[4]It was also while I was in Mexico in 1977 that I first saw a copy, shown me by Jeffrey Bortz, of *Beyond the Codices* (1976) and began to think about studying with Jim Lockhart. My recent book, *Transcending Conquest: Nahua Views of Spanish Colonial Mexico* (2003), is the result of the more than a quarter century of subsequent study directed and inspired by Jim, concentrating above all on the little-exploited type of expression of community history that stands aside from the main corpus of mundane Nahuatl documentation and even from Nahuatl annals. Although the book does not contain much analysis of Techialoyan codices per se, *Transcending Conquest* is a study of indigenous points of view on the changes set in motion by the Spanish colonization of Mexico, including perspectives from the provinces and from as late as the eighteenth century. Thus it easily could have included a chapter on an exemplary Techialoyan manuscript. Techialoyans are post-1650 and provincial, though they show some consciousness of the Mexica capital, its rulers, and allies. Techialoyan images of Spaniards, such as the common representation of Cortés standing relatively benignly although dressed [*cont'd*]

In the late 1970s Techialoyans were gaining considerable attention due to a feature article about them, accompanied by a special catalog, published in the *Handbook of Middle American Indians*.[5] Federico Gómez de Orozco had been the first to catalog Techialoyans. In the 1940s Robert Barlow, another scholar of Nahuatl, pushed Techialoyan studies forward before his untimely death.[6] Art historian Donald Robertson then picked up the thread in the 1950s and eventually authored what remains the most comprehensive study of the manuscripts, the *Handbook* piece.[7] It was Robertson who so convincingly established that the Techialoyans, while colonial, were not from the sixteenth century. He had not yet uncovered many of the clues about the period of composition (estimating ca. 1700–1743), nor had he settled the question of precisely whose were the various hands responsible. Despite their studio-type production, Robertson felt the Techialoyans were not "forgeries in the looser sense; they seem to have been fairly accurate statements" on indigenous landholding.[8]

Cautionary approaches

For those trained in European ways of thinking about documentary legality, it has often been difficult to appreciate that the texts might be in a certain sense authentic and usable even if the content, taken literally, was of questionable truth. Charles Gibson's was one of the voices recommending caution about these manuscripts. When Gibson published his *Aztecs Under Spanish Rule* in 1964, scholars in Mexico and the United States were in the throes of struggling with questions of Techialoyan authenticity. In his monumental work Gibson warns that this group may fall into the category of "forged documents of land assignment."[9]

---

in armor, coincide with my discussion of other Nahua views of him, not as a hated overlord but as a figure of authority and a temporal marker, whose appearance lent importance and legitimacy to their documents. Some of the points made in the chapter on primordial titles in *Transcending Conquest* could also apply to Techialoyans, for although their texts are far less elaborate or detailed, their general purpose falls within the títulos genre. They all record people and events of importance in community history, such as native social and political leaders, the demarcation of territory, the creation of civil congregations, church construction, patron saint selection, and any other enhancements to a town that could give it an increasing prominence over time. The historical consciousness that Techialoyan manuscripts manifest links to the other kinds of sources studied in *Transcending Conquest*, with their shared concern for the indigenous community, its heritage, and its collective survival, largely derived from and depending upon the actions and status of its native leadership and, only secondarily Spanish colonial authorities.

[5]Vol. 14 (1975), 253–80.

[6]Barlow's files are in the Sala Porfirio Díaz of the library of the Universidad de las Américas in Cholula. The collection contains correspondence, transcriptions, translations, photographs, drawings, and copious notes on Techialoyan manuscripts.

[7]Robertson 1975; see also Harvey 1986.

[8]Robertson 1975, p. 264.

[9]Gibson recommended that readers consult Robertson's work. Miscellaneous notes in the Robertson collection at Tulane indicate that Gibson spent some time studying Techialoyans. He corresponded with Robertson many times. In one letter (9/16/60), he wrote that the itinerant Techialoyan vendors sold the manuscripts to the pueblos, who believed them to come from the archives: "Thus the Indians are deceived and are not the parties to fraud."

Another scholar who expressed mixed feeling about Techialoyans to Robertson was Fernando Horcasitas, one of the most prominent students of Nahuatl of that era. He wrote early in 1964 about his misgivings concerning the Techialoyan from San Nicolás Totolapan.[10] He wondered whether sympathetic priests may have indirectly encouraged a revival of "Aztec Culture," inspiring some native men to make "ancient documents" for certain communities. He had not yet studied the Nahuatl text of the Totolapan manuscript in great detail, but he found that "many things seem fake," such as the use of a preconquest date as though it were no longer familiar but rather something lifted out of a textbook. The paintings of eagle and jaguar warriors, he commented, were "really fake-looking, something you could buy at Teotihuacán, if they were in clay." While doubting that the Totolapan manuscript emerged from a natural recordkeeping tradition in the pueblo, Horcasitas knew the desperate situation that many indigenous communities faced. It may have been "creoles and mestizos" who "'helped' the natives in their land title problems," he speculated.[11]

Jim Lockhart, who is intimately familiar with hundreds of Nahuatl records from the central Mexican countryside, was the first to devote some study to the language of Techialoyans from the point of view of someone expert in older Nahuatl documentation and language. Speaking of the Techialoyan from Tlahuac, D. F., he found it sorely lacking in authenticity as a sixteenth-century text.[12] He minced no words, calling the Techialoyans "false titles . . . made to order," antiqued in order to appear to be from the sixteenth century. Their "fabricators bent over backwards to use indigenous vocabulary, as well as letter substitutions in names and any loanword they could not manage to avoid." They "went much too far, destroying credibility, for they invented indigenous equivalents of universally used loans and substituted letters in items always spelled standardly (even though pronounced just as the fabricators surmised)."

If we stretch our imaginations, the practice Lockhart unveils could be seen as fitting in with a well-meaning effort to bring about a revival of older indigenous culture, as Horcasitas suggested. Perhaps a number of would-be caciques decided to return to the use of native fig-bark paper, having seen some sixteenth-century

[10]In the 1930s Mexican courts declared the Totolapan Techialoyan to be "apocryphal," but the people of the town today claim that the Archivo General de la Nación recently proclaimed them "authentic," according to a *Jornada* newspaper article (Jan. 31, 2001, Mexico City). The manuscript can of course be apocryphal as a sixteenth-century product and authentic as one of the late seventeenth. I would urge that the information in it, as in similar cases, be taken seriously as evidence of what the community in the seventeenth century embraced as its history and its boundaries. Woodrow Borah (1984, p. 33) also praises the value of this kind of source, "if it is examined as a record of its true time, including the circumstances that led to its preparation."

[11]Horcasitas to Robertson in a letter dated Jan. 18, 1964, in the Totolapan file in the Robertson collection. In this same letter Horcasitas gives great credibility to an accompanying land grant. Yet to me the hand and map are reminiscent of a known forger. Further research could provide connections between forged Spanish land grants and the production of Techialoyan codices, all used to defend indigenous land rights.

[12]Lockhart 1992, p. 414. Lockhart was, of course, very interested in these documents as an expression of the time in which they were written.

codices that used it. Perhaps they were the forerunners of a cultural patriotism lacking until their time, trying to strip their language of foreign intrusions and recapture the dress and customs of local people before the arrival of the Spaniards. Perhaps, for this reason, they shunned the well trained notaries in indigenous communities who were accustomed to making records on European paper and in the Nahuatl that was spoken at that time, laced liberally with Spanish loanwords. Their intentions may have been at least partly idealistic, aimed at helping settlements that were struggling to document their land claims and their ancient hold on a certain territory. But we will see that the Techialoyan authors had something to gain personally in this endeavor.

Mendoza Moctezuma family involvement

During my graduate research trips to Mexico in the 1980s, under the guidance of Jim Lockhart, I continued to keep watch for new information that might turn up in the archives about these manuscripts. My most dramatic discovery was a court case against a cacique (a word by this time meaning simply an indigenous man of some prominence), don Diego García de Mendoza Moctezuma, implicated in the early eighteenth century in the production and/or distribution of suspicious *cacicazgo* records.[13] Scholars have rejected his relatives' claim to descent from Quauhtemoc. One of the suspect genealogies of this family appears in the Techialoyan codex called the García Granados,[14] a link between the family and Techialoyan production. A figure from the genealogy appears on the cover of the Tolcayuca Techialoyan.[15] Don Diego also, when arrested in 1705, had in his possession a manuscript that sounds, from its translation, just like yet another Techialoyan codex, from a "San Pedro Totoltepec."[16]

As it appears from the court case against him, don Diego was making manuscripts or at least selling them to indigenous communities to help them in their land struggles. He was also busy shoring up his own claims to a distinguished and noble heritage, and probably selling titles of cacique status to some of his cousins. By sprinkling the names of favorite Mexica emperors—from many of whom he and other caciques might truly or allegedly descend—through the titles he was distributing all over central Mexico, he was increasing his own importance and that of his relatives.[17]

---

[13]See Wood 1989.

[14]Number 715 in Robertson and Robertson's Techialoyan catalog. Further evidence of the link between the Mendoza Moctezumas and the Techialoyan corpus appears in the manuscript from San Simón Calpulalpan (725).

[15]This is not the large panel map, but the more standard Techialoyan from that town. Both Tolcayuca Techialaoyans have been in the collection of Jay I. Kislak since the 1980s, but they have just become part of the holdings of the Library of Congress.

[16]If I am correct, the Techialoyan from Totoltepec, or rather Tototepec, as it may have originally and more correctly been named, has subsequently surfaced and recently been published in Mexico (Noguez 1999).

[17]These men may not have held governorships in indigenous settlements, judging by the modus operandi we are detecting. They may have partially entered the Spanish world, being mestizos or having married humble Spanish women when it served their interest. They may have been keeping one foot in the indigenous world, hoping to [*cont'd*]

If don Diego was a Techialoyan studio artist or author, he did not work alone. Rather, as Robertson found, multiple hands were at work in the production of these manuscripts. Who were these various people and how did they operate? What were their sources of information? Did they interview inhabitants of the pueblos they served? Did they operate within the intellectual circles of Mexico City? Knowing these manuscripts were mass produced and sold does not change the fact that they can provide a window into indigenous conceptualizations of the role and importance of manuscripts, pictorial and textual, the use of Nahuatl, the celebration of certain people and events of the past, and the nature of the altepetl, that basic Nahuatl ethnic and sociopolitical entity usually called a pueblo in Spanish. Exploring how these manuscripts were mass produced was only one small part of the story. The relationships between them and the relationships they illuminated between the indigenous community and the broader world cry out for attention.

So, besides continuing to hunt for contextual information, I wanted to devote further study to the Techialoyan codices' internal characteristics. One of the ideal locations is Tulane's Latin American Library, where I went for a brief research stint toward the end of the 1980s. The late Donald Robertson's files were being managed there by his widow, Martha Barton Robertson (also now deceased). She kindly gave me unlimited access and copying privileges. Because so few of the Techialoyans had been published at that time,[18] and because so many of them have strayed so far from the pueblos for which they were made, it was immensely helpful to have copies of large numbers of them in one place, plus correspondence about them and unpublished studies of various aspects such as their calligraphy.

Calligraphic analysis

In the *Handbook* article, Robertson had recommended that we watch for the handwriting variations within the Techialoyan corpus by paying particular attention to certain key letters. The variation in them can indeed be notable. In Robertson's files there is an unpublished report of 1970 made by his research assistant James R. Ramsey. Limiting his analysis to the most distinctive letters, Ramsey found three or four subgroups within the corpus of 50 manuscripts identified by that time. The subgrouping suggests that the Techialoyan studio had a number of author/artists producing manuscripts for different communities, but at the same time pueblos within a single subgroup were not always in the same geographic vicinity.[19]

Ramsey also determined that text calligraphy was different from gloss calligraphy, which suggests to me that the Techialoyan studio may have had different people working on the pictorial pages and the text pages. Alec Christensen might concur, for he has suggested that the paintings were made before the glosses were

convince Spanish authorities they descended from Mexica rulers in order to win special tributes, titles of nobility, and land concessions.

[18]Xavier Noguez, a former Robertson student, now at the Colegio Mexiquense, has energetically advanced the publication of Techialoyans over the years.

[19]Similarly, Alec Christensen (1997, p. 263) finds that a subgroup of Techialoyans he studied "cannot be delineated on geographical grounds."

Figure 2.
Techialoyan Calligraphic Samples

Ms. #	*"z"/"tz"*	*"y"*	*"x"*	*"h"*	*"p"*
701*					
712					
713					
716					
717					
718					
722					
724					

Note: As elsewhere in this article, the numbers refer to the manuscript number in the Robertsons' Techialoyan catalog published in the *Handbook of Middle American Indians* in 1975.

added, and while the glosses may include local details, more often they were improvised based on the content of the scene. He concludes that the "relationship of the glosses to the images and to other texts in each codex is somewhat arbitrary," and observes that studies which emphasize the accuracy of individual drawings and the glosses describing them are "somewhat misguided."[20]

Painstaking comparative handwriting studies (of the sort begun in Figure 2) may also get us closer to an understanding of whether all the Techialoyans came from a single though diverse studio or whether some were from copycat writers working in the eighteenth century. It may also be that the studio remained active over a number of decades, with individual members and styles changing somewhat over that period of time.[21] In addition, further calligraphic analysis might turn up relationships between the Techialoyans and other kinds of Stage 3 Nahuatl-language manuscripts.[22]

[20]Christensen 1997, p. 263, and see Galarza 1980.

[21]Christensen suggests a combination of diachronic and synchronic variation (1997, p. 258).

[22]See Lockhart 1991A, pp. 15–22, and Lockhart 1992, pp. 304–18.

Orthographic analysis

Although Robertson was not an advanced scholar of Nahuatl, he did pay attention to the way words were spelled, not simply how the letters were written. The same report prepared by his research assistant James Ramsey notes a preliminary effort to compare, for instance, the use of "cohuaxochtl" versus "coaxohtli" (variants on *quaxochtli*, "boundary," a frequently recurring item of vocabulary). One could push this effort much further, expanding the list of words being compared, or even better, going beyond words to investigate the representation in letters of certain sound segments. One should also watch for possible pronunciation differences in regional dialects as a clue to finding out who may have been involved in a text's production. The tendency to use *h* in lieu of standard syllable-final *ch* is notable in Stage 3 mundane documents from the Valley of Toluca. Perhaps Toluca Valley scribes introduced this variation into the Techialoyan studio while scribes from other regions used the more standard spelling. But though *h* for *ch* is perhaps seen most frequently in the Toluca Valley, it existed also in other regions, and the two variants coexisted not only in the Toluca Valley but in single pueblos and within the manuscripts of a single writer, so certainty is not easily attained.

Jim Lockhart detected one of the most notable orthographic affiliations of the Techialoyans, overlooked by Ramsey and Robertson. In a personal communication[23] he pointed out to me the fact that the Techialoyan spelling for Francisco ("Palacizco") was reminiscent of the Cantares Mexicanos, the great sixteenth-century song collection.[24] An epenthetic [a] breaking the consonant cluster [fr] and the [f] changing to *p*, giving a written *Pala-*, is identical in both sets of manuscripts and corresponds to Stage 1 and 2 Nahuatl pronunciation. The *z* predominant in the Techialoyans, whereas an *x* is predominant in the Cantares, is more problematic; we will see the implications just below.

The orthographic similarity between the Cantares and the Techialoyans sent me off on a quest to do a more thorough comparison, going beyond Palacizco/ Palacixco. Sure enough, I found, in both sets of manuscripts, Marqués as "Malquex," *santo* as "xanto," Juan as "Xihuan," María as "Malia," Pablo as "Papolo," Pedro as "Petolo," and Diego as "Tieco." Many other near matches also exist, such as "coloz" (in the Cantares) and "colox" (in the Techialoyans) for *cruz*, or "Capilel" (in the Cantares) and "Calapiel" (in the Techialoyans) for Gabriel.[25] We

[23]And see Lockhart 1992, pp. 594–95, n. 84.

[24]Published in Bierhorst 1985.

[25]Wood 1998B, pp. 190–91. The *x* as the equivalent of *z* in *cruz* is a puzzling feature. The normal Nahuatl rendering of *cruz* in the time of the Techialoyans was *crus*, with the *s* that widely replaced *z* for the sound [s] in the writing of both Nahuas and Spaniards in that epoch. It seems unlikely, however, that the writers were not familiar with the [s] value of *z*, and indeed they often demonstrate their grasp of it. Sometimes it seems that the Techialoyan writers tried to make their spellings as exotic as possible over and above the phonetics of older Nahua pronunciation. The two versions of Gabriel are equally plausible; both use epenthesis to break up a cluster of consonant plus [r]; the Techialoyan version is based on Grabiel, as common in the Spanish of that time as the form standard today.

see in this list a number of additional consonant clusters ("bl" in Pablo, "dr" in Pedro, "br" and "gr" in Gabriel/Grabiel, "cr" in *cruz*) broken in a similar way.

The orthography for Spanish loanwords shared by these two bodies of manuscripts, the Cantares from Stage 2 and the Techialoyans from Stage 3, stands out as somewhat unusual. In most colonial Nahuatl manuscripts, notaries and other educated writers typically wrote loanwords, at least ones as common as these, the same way as they were spelled in Spanish manuscripts. Nonetheless, the Cantares/ Techialoyan orthography captures a believable phoneticism, particularly for the sixteenth century.[26] By the late seventeenth century, however, we would expect to see more change than we do see in the Techialoyans, particularly when they are compared with other Stage 3 Nahuatl. This suggests that Techialoyan writers were seeking an archaic effect.

To compare spellings in the Techialoyans and in the Cantares Mexicanos, it is relevant to point out that Stage 3, after the middle of the seventeenth century, was a time when Spanish *s* had become less retracted and less like the *x* [sh] of Nahuatl. Where Xuarez and Suarez (neither one accented at that time) were somewhat interchangeable in the sixteenth century, by Stage 3 this was less the case, as pronunciation of the *s* had approximated its sound in modern Mexican Spanish and was interchangeable with the pronunciation of *z*. Although both sets of manuscripts use "z" and "x" for "s," there is a greater tendency toward "z" in the Techialoyans, which seems indicative of their later composition, seeing that sixteenth-century *s*, being virtually equivalent to [sh], was often rendered in the Nahuatl of that time as *x*, whereas by the time of the Techialoyans, as we have seen, *s* was [s], the same sound as *z*. We see, for example, "Palazizco" and "Palanzizco," along with the more expected "Palacisco" and "Palasisco" in the Techialoyans.[27] The Techialoyan use of "z" in "Loz Angelez," "Zantiaco" (Santiago), and "Zepastian" (Sebastian, or today, Sebastián) also stands out, logical for its pronunciation but unusual for the spelling of the time. Was this reflective of Techialoyan authors' preference for what they imagined were older spellings, even if they seem bizarre to us?

Yet if in some subtle ways the Techialoyans betray the time of their origin through spelling, in others they hew to older pronunciations. It is hard, and indeed at present impossible, to be sure to what extent these pronunciations were current at the time of the Techialoyans, for while there is no doubt that *s* in new loans was being pronounced [s], in older loans it might either retain the *x*, with [sh] pronunciation, or be affected by the new [s]. Thus *señora* is often pronounced [shino:la'] in Nahuatl to this day, and *vacas* (as the singular for cow) is still *huacax*. When we see Techialoyan writers using "x" where we would expect to see an initial *s*, as in "Xalome" (Salomé), "Xantiaco" (Santiago), "Xepaxtian"

[26]Another exception to the general orthographic pattern for Spanish loans is the Bancroft Dialogues, originally done at much the same time as the Cantares and also under ecclesiastical auspices. See Lockhart 1992, pp. 594–95, n. 84.

[27]In a sixteenth-century Nahuatl manuscript, *s* is usually an equivalent of *x*, as in *isquich* for *ixquich*, "everything." In a Stage 3 manuscript, *s* is to be interpreted as [s], and that is no doubt the intention in a form such as Palacisco; in Palasisco it is obvious. All these forms, both those with *s* and those with *z*, are indicative of late composition.

(Sebastián), "Ximon" (Simón), "Xalpatol" (Salvador), "Xanto," "Xantiximo" (Santísimo), or "xapato" (sábado), all we can say for sure is that the actual spelling varies from the norm. The same is true when we see *x* substituted for *s* preceding a consonant: "Acoxtin" for Agustín, "Caxpal" for Gaspar, "Clixtopal" and "Quilixtopal" for Cristóbal, "Extepa" and "Extepan" for Estéban, "Caxtilan" for Castilla, or again "Xepaxtian" for Sebastián. Techialoyan texts regularly give "x" in lieu of final "s," too: "Antelex" for Andrés, "Leyex" for Reyes, "Locax" for Lucas, "Lohuix" and "Loyx" for Luis, "Malcox" for Marcos, and "Tomax" for Tomás, among numerous examples one could cite. Many of these very common words, heard in the everyday speech of Spanish priests and others, would seem unlikely to have retained the older pronunciation beyond 1650, but we cannot be absolutely sure. In any case, the Techialoyan authors were apparently making an effort to present a kind of "classical" or antiquated pronunciation and a spelling that would assertively represent it. Although they sometimes slipped, they were reluctant to write the *s*, perhaps thinking it was too common in their own day and not appropriate for the early language they sought to convey.

If the Cantares really served as an example of classical Nahuatl orthography for Techialoyan writers, these writers nevertheless elaborated on the substitutions and created transformations that also allow us to differentiate between the two bodies of manuscripts. The greater use of "z" in the Techialoyans is one notable difference, already mentioned. The occasional Techialoyan use of "s" in place of "ç" is another distinguishing feature: "Ynasio" (for Ignacio) and "Palasisco" (for Francisco), as noted above, are two examples. This substitution, a slip-up that falls outside the Cantares pattern, betrays their post-1650 formulation.

The larger genre: *títulos*

Just as Jim Lockhart's work on the Cantares orthography was helpful in my Techialoyan studies, in that same period of the late 1980s and early 1990s, I began to see a relationship between the Techialoyan corpus and primordial titles, or *títulos*. Jim had recently completed his study of titles from Chalco[28] when I stumbled upon and began work on some examples from San Bartolomé Capulhuac and San Martín Ocoyacac in the Valley of Toluca. Comparing mine with his, I found some strong similarities, as though these manuscripts too came from a studio or, at a minimum, some crossregional sharing had taken place. The Ocoyacac titles and the Atlauhtla titles share an orthographic and calligraphic similarity, while a pictorial element links the titles of Ocoyacac with those of Los Reyes of Chalco.[29] Furthermore, Ocoyacac, among other pueblos, has both a set of primordial titles and a Techialoyan codex, and all of these manuscripts appear to date from the late seventeenth century. While the Techialoyan texts tend to be more rudimentary, their content and purpose also coincide in some ways with títulos. With time, I came to see the Techialoyans as a particular variant within the

[28]Lockhart 1982, reprinted as 1991B.

[29]Wood 1998A, p. 215; Wood 1998B, pp. 214–15. A fruitful place to start searching for links between títulos and Techialoyans would be with a manuscript from Coacalco (743), which has the handwriting of a título and the imagery of a Techialoyan.

genre of primordial titles.[30]

Comparing the texts of Techialoyans and títulos is one of my highest priorities for future work in this area. The New Philology movement has much to offer in such a pursuit.[31] What vocabulary and terminology do each of these related strains use, what kind of thinking and purpose do their key terms seem to represent, and how do they compare, both one with the other, and with the larger body of Stage 3 writings in Nahuatl? What does all this tell us about the manuscript authors' intentions and their position within the larger framework of Mexico in their time? A few initial trial forays will follow.

Philological analysis

Tlalamatl/*altepeamatl*. Beginning with the quest to understand their basic nature, one can turn to the imbedded descriptors of Techialoyans for clues. For even though traditional Nahuatl historical writing overwhelmingly abstained from giving specific labels to compositions, attempts at self-classification are much more characteristic of the Techialoyans, probably because of Spanish influence. Gordon Brotherston fastens on the internal label *tlalamatl* (containing *tlalli*, "land," and *amatl*, "paper, document, letter, book") instead of Techialoyan, calling the manuscripts "landbooks."[32] When we survey the corpus carefully, we do find *tlalamatl* with a relatively high frequency, in nine different documents at least. With its emphasis on land rights, *tlalamatl* could serve as a Nahuatl equivalent to *títulos* in Spanish.

The loanword *título* (in Spanish, virtually always used in the plural) was not unknown to authors of primordial titles,[33] and we might expect to find it in various kinds of mundane Nahuatl-language land records, but in fact we do not to date, and Techialoyan writers were reluctant to use it, just as they shunned Spanish loanwords in general.[34] I have located this loanword in only one Techialoyan manuscript so far, as part of the expression "tlilmachiotili titola", "ink-record/title," from San Pedro Tlahuac, or Cuitlahuac. The first part of this phrase, *tlilmachiotilli*, which Lockhart calls an invention, is a term that runs through a small number of Techialoyans.[35] The author of the Tlahuac manuscript,

[30]Herbert Harvey (1986) incorporated this assessment into his update on Techialoyans for the *Handbook of Middle American Indians*.

[31]See Lockhart 1992, pp. 7–8.

[32]Brotherston 1995, p. 185. The label Techialoyan does leave something to be desired. The word means "inn," and its present use is thought to derive from its appearance as a place name in connection with one of the first manuscripts of its kind to be studied, from San Antonio La Isla in the Valley of Toluca. La Isla derives from Atlixtlan. This settlement never bore the name Techialoyan. Furthermore, the term "Techialoyan" has almost come to mean "fake" in some people's minds, deflecting attention from the interesting complexities of the manuscripts' purpose and composition.

[33]The Chalco titles, however, preferred *interrogatorio*. See Lockhart 1991B, pp. 60–61.

[34]Lockhart (1992, p. 414) sees this as an effort to give a greater impression of antiquity. He also notes, however, that it was so unusual for a Nahuatl manuscript of the sixteenth century *not* to have loanwords that it is a distortion.

[35]The Tlahuac manuscript is 736. The only other places where I have so far seen *tlilmachiotilli* are in 746 and the unnumbered manuscript from Tolcayuca.

more than any other, apparently tried to find whatever native construction might capture the essence of "titles," inserting the greatest variety of synonyms. These include "tlilyquiloli," "ink writing," and "tlalamachihuali," "land-paper-creation," among others. Similar efforts mark the Techialoyan from Santiago Capulhuac, as we see in the terms "toamatlachializ," apparently "our paper-expectation (possibly creation)," and "tomazehualtlatol," "our commoner-statement (i.e., our humble statement)." Hardly any of these terms appear in the dictionaries or in mainstream Nahuatl documents, with the exception of the last, which is a simplified version of a phrase used in mock humility that Lockhart has seen in petitions.

The same subgroup of Techialoyans that give *tlilmachiotilli* also regularly use *tzontecomac tlacuilolli*, "head-town document," as a self-descriptor; *tzontecomatl*, "head, skull," is sometimes used in mainstream documents as an equivalent for the Spanish *cabecera*, a concept not fitting within the traditional indigenous sociopolitical framework. The Tlahuac manuscript uses the loanword *cabecera* openly. By the time of the Techialoyans the word had penetrated into the indigenous consciousness, since suits in Spanish courts for fully independent status had to be in terms of obtaining the status it designated. The archives are full of petitions from small communities wanting to obtain the designation, elect their own governors, and escape tribute obligations now thought of as to a larger settlement, though originally they were to the entity that embraced both.[36]

Altepetl was the Nahuatl term for any inherently independent state, and in central Mexican conditions it usually referred to the numerous local ethnic states that after the conquest the Spaniards set up as autonomous municipalities, though the way their organization was conceived varied greatly between Spaniards and Nahuas.[37] By the late seventeenth century some key words and perhaps the concepts they carried were beginning to merge. In mainstream texts the word for a constituent district of the altepetl, *tlaxilacalli*, is replaced at times by *barrio*, the Spanish word for district or neighborhood, and less frequently *cabecera* appears instead of *altepetl*. These terms occur regularly in the Techialoyan texts, and also *sujeto*, "subordinate settlement," which is rare in mainstream mundane documentation. In line with the importance of the altepetl, a self-descriptor that occurs even more frequently in the Techialoyans than *tlalamatl*, fifteen times to nine in the items surveyed, is *altepeamatl*, "altepetl document." The two terms are perhaps more parallel than distinct, and in manuscripts from Chalco (716) and Ocoyacac (733) they are paired as equivalents. Nevertheless, *altepeamatl* strikes me as the more appropriate term, pointing to the basic entity rather than the immediate issue. The word is almost the same as *altepetlacuilolli*, "altepetl writing," which was known in the meaning of historical annals since the time of Molina.[38]

Besides recording agricultural fields, maguey plantings, bodies of water, and wilderness areas, Techialoyan manuscripts take pains to embrace many other

[36]Wood 1984, ch. 6.

[37]See Lockhart 1992, ch. 2.

[38]Lockhart 1992, p. 376. Gruzinski (1993, p. 130) detected the use of *altepeamatl*, finding that títulos share this term with Techialoyans. Anneliese Mönnich (1974) caught it as the opening word in the Ocoyacac Techialoyan and gave the manuscript that title.

critical elements that comprise the altepetl. Central is the identification of the subdistricts (called *tlaxilacalli* as in mainstream documents, never *calpolli*, but sometimes *tlatilanalli*, "something dragged along," an equivalent for *sujeto* in occasional use in mainstream documents since the sixteenth century), which are marked by streamlined symbolic houses. Another purpose is to present venerable ancestors, both the famed hunter-warriors, the Chichimecs, wearing their animal skins and carrying arrows, and eminent Mexica warriors in their elaborate feathered costumes. Regal indigenous men and women, draped in the white cotton garments that came in the wake of the Spanish occupation, also occupy a prominent place in the Techialoyan manuscripts, watching over the towns and sporting titles of nobility, *don* and *doña*, as heirs to precontact dignitaries.

The inhabitants described as populating Techialoyan communities are called *altepemanque*, "founders of the altepetl" (those who set up the town, from the verb *mana*, a term occasionally found in the older annals literature), *altepehuaque*, "citizens of the altepetl," *tlaxilacaleque*, "citizens of the tlaxilacalli," and *macehualtin*, "commoners, indigenous people, people." The founding father and/or narrator typically speaks in the first person, starting off his remarks with *nehuapol*, "wretched me," humbling himself on the one hand, and on the other calling himself the one who first gained the land, *tlalmaceuhqui*.[39] I was a bit surprised that, considering the attention given to the leading men in these narratives, only one example has surfaced of the term *tlatocaamatl*, "ruler papers," as a self-identifying label in Techialoayan texts (716). It may have to do with the fact that the word *tlatoani* in its meaning of dynastic ruler fell into virtual disuse in Stage 3 Nahuatl, so that sometimes the Spanish *cacique* replaces it even in Nahuatl texts.[40]

Christian priests appear in some manuscripts, baptizing the local people, and saints' images are paraded in processions. Local churches, some of them with bell towers that typically were not built until well into the Spanish era, occupy a prominent place on the pages of Techialoyans. The celebrated arrival of the faith will find its way into the historical narratives here, just as in the wider body of primordial titles. But there is less of a story surrounding that introduction, and there are comparatively fewer "events" recorded in these abbreviated texts.[41]

Awkward revivalism in recording dates. If European calendrical vocabulary and dating methods are chaotic in títulos,[42] they are even more obscure here—seemingly by design. Techialoyan vocabulary for year counts is varied. The most common method is to represent sixteenth-century dates as an abbreviation omitting the first number, as in 532. But these dates are also spelled out in written Nahuatl, usually beginning with *xihuitl itlapohual*, "the count of years," and then *centzontli* (400), plus *macuilpohualli* (five twenties, or 100), plus one or two twenties, plus anything less than twenty. This procedure varies sharply from

[39]Louise Burkhart pointed out to me that *nehuapol* is a term associated with confession. It was also used in various contexts of polite humility in elevated speech.

[40]See Lockhart 1992, pp. 132–34.

[41]See for comparison Wood 1991.

[42]See Lockhart 1991B, p. 61; Wood 1998A, p. 221.

practice in the few early mainstream documents giving the date in Nahuatl words, in which the number is never abbreviated, and indeed abbreviating by omitting a thousand makes no sense in terms of the Nahuatl system.

Another variant, with three attestations found so far, intends *centzontli* as 1000, adding fifteen twenties plus ten twenties to arrive at 1500. A third version, also with three attestations so far, uses *xiquipilli*, 8000 in the traditional Nahua system, as 1000, adding the same fifteen plus ten twenties for 1500. These examples show that like most Nahuas of their time, the writers of the Techialoyans normally used native words and the vigesimal system only for relatively small numbers. Even in the early seventeenth century a writer such as Chimalpahin, with an elaborate Nahuatl literacy, often used the Spanish *mil* if dealing with large numbers.[43] Ever since the mid-sixteenth century dates in mainstream documentation had been almost entirely in the Spanish system, with the years either as numbers or written out as Spanish words. The Techialoyan writers were searching for a substitute for the *mil* that everyone in their lifetime used, but they no longer had a full grasp of the larger number words in the traditional system. They used both of the common ones as an equivalent for a thousand, in which they were right in a sense, in that a thousand has a similar function in the European system. Actually, the Techialoyan writers seem to have seen a few examples of correctly managed Nahuatl counting in older documents. The few sixteenth-century examples we have, in expressing 1500, use not *centzontli*, one 400, but *yetzontli,* three 400's (1200), leaving 300, in other words, the same fifteen twenties that the Techialoyan writers insert, but the latter had to add an additional ten twenties impossible in the traditional system.[44]

The Techialoyan writers were clearly overstepping the bounds of their own comprehension in attempting to reproduce what they wrongly imagined was the sixteenth-century fashion of reproducing dates in the Christian calendar. Their style is sharply distinct from what is seen in mundane documents of any time, or in Nahuatl annals. It remains to be seen if some of the same tendencies can be found in títulos.

Nahuatl annals, unlike mundane documents, retained the precontact dating system up until the time of the Techialoyans, giving a number from one to thirteen plus one of the four rotating year signs for each year (plus the Christian year in almost all cases). We do find hints of the old system in the Techialoyan

[43]For example, Chimalpahin 2006, p. 104, where in a 1607 entry seven thousand is given as "vii mill."

[44]A rare example of a date written out in Nahuatl is in a famous letter of the cabildo of Huejotzingo dated 1560: "etzontli xihuitl ypan caxtolpoualli xivitl yvan Epoualli xivitl," "3 x 400 years plus 15 x 20 years and 3 x 20 years" (Lockhart 1993, p. 296). The twenties can be multiplied only once; the apparent duplication here is because 15 + 3 is the way Nahuatl says 18.

An interesting example in the Techialoyans is entirely Spanish at the root despite being clothed in the Nahuatl system. One of the dates in the apparent Techialoyan from Santiago Capuluac includes "five times five twenties," "macuilmacuilpohualli." (AGN Tierras 180, exp. 3.) Although he disguised the expression in traditional twenties, the writer was actually thinking in hundreds.

manuscripts, again as part of a conscious effort to return to an archaic indigenous style, and yet we do not see much facility with it. Only a select few such year names appear in the manuscripts, apparently ones that had stuck in people's consciousness for some reason. Yet the famous One Reed year, in some systems reputed to be the year of the arrival of the Spaniards, makes not a single appearance in the Techialoyans.

Rather *ome acatl*, Two Reed, is a popular Techialoyan date. It appears in at least seven manuscripts, though never in association with a clear historical reference. It could conceivably refer to 1559, when the viceroy don Luis de Velasco recognized the territories of numerous altepetl by giving them land grants (*mercedes*). Or it may simply be an important or symbolic date with which people were familiar. Did the Techialoyan authors, who give more evidence of looking to ancient Mexico Tenochtitlan than one might have expected, know that Two Reed was the reputed date of its founding?

The other recurring year name is *ce tecpatl*, One Flint, again without an overt historical anchor. Could the writers have read or heard somewhere that this year name was associated with the alleged launching of the Mexica migration in 648 AD? Since three manuscripts include both Two Reed and One Flint in their narratives, one doubts that these were locally specific dates. That the Techialoyan authors were no longer conversant with the old calendar is suggested in the way we find "nahui cali tecpatl cali tochi acatl," that is, a year name, Four House, followed by a succession of the four year signs but without the numerical element (736).[45]

Tlacuilo names

Akin to the awkward use of traditional indigenous dating is the surprisingly systematic use within the Techialoyan corpus of the Nahuatl word *tlacuilo* (writer/painter) in lieu of the standard Spanish loanword *escribano*, "notary.[46] I would wager there was not a single native notary in New Spain after 1550 or so who did not know and regularly use the term *escribano*, which carried considerable prestige in the society of the time. Its avoidance can only represent an effort to archaize the text and/or avoid Spanish words. As with so many characteristics of the Techialoyans, this trait does not represent actual usage in sixteenth-century documents. It is perhaps consonant with the fact that the Techialoyan studio members seem not to have been true notaries, but rather scribes and painters working outside the standard recordkeeping framework.

The names of the Techialoyan tlacuilos represent an object worthy of study as one more element that was probably manipulated for effect. Presumably the names given are of those who are imagined to have written the documents in the sixteenth century. Yet the names do not correspond well to what one would expect of a sixteenth-century notary, early or late in the century. The great majority of the Techialoyan tlacuilos bear the don; virtually no sixteenth-century notaries did until possibly a few began to acquire it at the end of the century. In the

[45]Perhaps there was some intention of specifying the cycle. The rotation of the four signs is correct, although the cycle is usually thought of as beginning with *acatl*, "reed."

[46]See Lockhart 1992, p. 414.

Table 1.
Techialoyan "Tlacuilos" (Writers/Painters)

Type of Name	*No "don"*	*"don"*
One Christian name		
Don Andrés (Santa María Iztacapan)		√
Two Christian names		
Don Lucas Martín (729)		√
Don Lucas Mateo (729)		√
Esteban Jacobo (711)	√	
Christian name and saint's name or religious name		
Don Esteban de San Miguel (San Pedro Tototepec)		√
Don Lucas de Santiago (736)		√
Don Marcos de Santiago (San Juan Tolcayuca)		√
Don Baltasar de San Miguel (732)		√
Juan de la Cruz (?) (728)	√	
Christian name and indigenous name		
Don Antonio Chimalpopoca (724*)		√
Two Christian names and indigenous name		
Nicolás Moisés Mozotzin (702)	√	
Christian name, saint's name, and indigenous name		
Don Juan de San Martín Axayacatl (733)		√
Don Bernardino de Santa María Nezahualcoyotzin (San Pedro Tototepec)		√
Christian name, Spanish surname, and indigenous name		
Don Juan Cortés Ecatzin (722)		√

Note: As elsewhere, the numbers following a name refer to the manuscript number in the Robertsons' Techialoyan catalog published in the *Handbook of Middle American Indians* in 1975. Manuscripts not yet identified in that listing are identified here by the pueblo with which they are associated.

Techialoyans about half the tlacuilos have additional indigenous names, often with dynastic implications; no sixteenth-century notaries had such names. Are the names those of notaries living and working in the indigenous communities involved at the end of the seventeenth century? They surely are not those names in unadulterated form. By this time it was no longer uncommon for a notary to bear the don, though only a minority did so. No notaries of the time will be found in mundane documents with indigenous surnames added. Otherwise, some of the names are plausible enough, with two Christian given names like Esteban Jacobo (711), which was perhaps the predominant style among notaries of the Toluca

Valley at this time, or with the second element given overtly as a saint, as in don Baltasar de San Miguel (732). The second style was the origin of the first and by the seventeenth century was often revived in the case of a person who came up in the world, that is, Baltasar Miguel would become Baltasar de San Miguel on being appointed notary. A couple of the tlacuilos have the name de Santiago, among the most common for notaries and cabildo members in the Toluca Valley of the time. It would be worthwhile to make a systematic comparison between the list of Techialoyan tlacuilos and notaries active in the communities concerned. It is notable that despite the frequent repetition of material from one Techialoyan to the next, the tlacuilos in each manuscript have their own unique names. Or at least in the sixteen manuscripts surveyed so far, there is no overlap.

Since the indigenous names given to the tlacuilos do not correspond to anything in the actual history of naming patterns, it behooves us to look into the intention and background of attributing such names to them. In the first generation of the Spanish presence, nearly all indigenous people still had a traditional Nahuatl name; the quickly growing group who were baptized also had a Spanish name as a first name. Indigenous second names remained common well into the second half of the sixteenth century, but generally speaking, by the seventeenth century a hierarchy of Spanish second names replaced them almost entirely among people of any rank in society. Only a few indigenous names with high dynastic implications remained current among those at the very peak of indigenous society, and these were used in addition to a full-scale name with Spanish constituents. The names given to the Techialoyan tlacuilos are of this type, although the highest indigenous nobility usually bore a good-sounding Spanish surname in addition to the indigenous name, and that is true of only one tlacuilo so far in the Techialoyan corpus.

Some of the indigenous names in the Techialoyans could have local connections, like Ehecatzin in Tepotzotlan (722), but more of them are associated with Tenochtitlan, like Axayacatl (701, 733) and Moteucçomatzin (727). Others are names shared by the Tenochca and the Tepaneca of the western part of the Valley of Mexico, like Chimalpopoca (724). The famous Neçahualcoyotzin of Tetzcoco, also mentioned frequently in the lore of Tenochtitlan, appears as well (in San Pedro Tototepec) in the name of a tlacuilo. It is hardly likely that all these names actually represent local families of the pueblos concerned at any point in time. They show a tendency to look to Tenochtitlan that was lacking in most sixteenth-century Nahua expression across the country but that did come more into vogue the farther one advances in time. Most such macropatriotic naming occurs within a generation or so of Mexican independence, but the seeds of it may go back a good deal farther.[47]

The tlacuilo names may be a manifestation of a trend seen more directly in the Techialoyans, namely the glorification of kings and warriors of the Mexica. The names of acclaimed fifteenth-century rulers were inserted into local histories, perhaps in an attempt to bring certain altepetl and families a greater stature from which to maneuver in the environment of their time. If this recalling of powerful

[47]See Lockhart 1992, p. 130; Haskett 1991, p. 158.

emperors was not part of a general revivalism concerning the ancient indigenous world, it may represent a genealogical and territorial scheme that was intended to benefit the specific caciques who were making and distributing the manuscripts, rather than true local leaders.[48] Don Diego García de Mendoza Moctezuma claimed descent from Quauhtemoc and had ambitions of political authority in the orbits of Azcapotzalco and Tlatelolco. Quauhtemoc's proud portrait, reminiscent of the Codex Ixtlilxochitl,[49] appears in the Coacalco Techialoyan (743).

Conclusion

Indigenous leaders who navigated the stormy seas of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century New Spain, trying to mediate between the native world, which was just beginning to recuperate from devastating epidemics, and the threats and attractions of the Spanish world, might not have been in an enviable position, but they did their best to maintain themselves. Their power and influence had been steadily declining as Spaniards and Hispanic people of mixed descent increased in their midst. When they appealed to Spanish authorities for support, they were repeatedly asked for proof of a given leader's noble status, proof of a pueblo's antiquity and independence, proof to sustain the community's claims to agricultural lands and other natural resources. And yet documentation of their reasonable assertions was all too rare. Why not help fill the void in such a good cause?

It is ironic that "caciques" who may have been living largely outside the life of the pueblos by the late period, having adopted many of the practices and values of the Europeans, possibly having taken up residence on large estates or in nearby cities, were the ones who were trying to come to the rescue of the very pueblos they had virtually abandoned. They had witnessed how the authorities recognized the corporate entity, the pueblo, the altepetl, entitled to its minimum allotment of land[50] and its right, as conceived in these late times, to receive tributes from outlying or subordinate settlements. Perhaps the caciques who made and distributed the Techialoyans had come full circle, recognizing their own fortunes as historically linked to the wellbeing of the altepetl and its inhabitants, from whom they might extract tributes in some form. Membership in a recognized and favored corporate entity could once again seem attractive; to exaggerate communality could bring benefits. To advance their own position they saw, perhaps not always consciously, a logic in promoting the pueblos of their homeland. They also touted a royal descent from omnipotent Mexica emperors and promoted a revivalism that would lift all boats in the rising tide. The methods they pursued to help pueblos meet the growing and often unreasonable demands of the Spaniards are testimony to their resourcefulness as much as their cunning. As often in the past, here too Nahua actions were for individual and corporate gain at the same time.

But after all, the exact authorship of the Techialoyans and their exact stra-

[48]Kings of Tacuba and Azcapotzalco, Chimalpopocatzin and Acolnahuacatzin, are honored in the Techialoyan from Tezcaluca and Chichicaspa (744). There are numerous other examples across the corpus. Manuscript 739, of Tzictepec, goes so far as to call Moteuccoma "totecuyo," "our lord," in various places.

[49]See Wood 1998B, pp. 193–95, for discussion of a possible relation between the *Historia chichimeca* of Ixtlilxochitl and the Techialoyans.

[50]See Wood 1984, ch. 5.

tegic and tactical intentions are among the aspects most hidden from us. We have before our eyes the documents in all their tangibility, not of the sixteenth century as they purport to be, but anchored firmly in the late seventeenth, able to tell us a great deal about how much the indigenous people of that time understood of their past and how their vision of it was evolving. Subtle analysis, compilation, and comparison have found in these documents complexities and trends not previously dreamed of and put them in the context of their time and of other genres, especially the "titles" of which they prove to be a subgenre. Such methods can doubtless go much further in identifying the sources of much Techialoyan lore, whether in the broader genre, in the writers' study of texts and pictorials of earlier times, or in places still unsuspected.

Bibliography

Barlow, Robert. 1946. "El reverso del Códice García Granados," *Memorias de la Academia Mexicana de la Historia*, 5: 422–38

Borah, Woodrow. 1984. "Some Problems of Sources." In H. R. Harvey and Hanns J. Prem, eds., *Explorations in Ethnohistory* pp. 23–39. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Brotherston, Gordon. 1995. *Painted Books from Mexico: Codices in UK Collections and the World they Represent*. London: British Museum

Bierhorst, John, ed. and trans. 1985. *Cantares Mexicanos*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, don Domingo de San Antón Muñón. 2006. *Annals of His Time*. Trans. and ed. by James Lockhart, Susan Schroeder, and Doris Namala. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Códice de San Nicolás Totolapan. 1964. México: Museo Agrario, Departamento de Asuntos Agrarios y Colonización.

Códices de México. 1979. México: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.

Galarza, Joaquín. 1980. *Codex de Zempoala: Techialoyan E 705*. México: Mission Archéologique et ethnologique française au Mexique.

_____. 1996. *Códices y pinturas tradicionales indígenas en el Archivo General de la Nación: Estudio y catálogo*. México: Centro Urbano Alemán.

Glass, John. 1964. *Catálogo de la colección de códices*. México: Museo Nacional de Antropología.

Gómez de Orozco, Federico. 1933. "El códice de San Antonio Techialoyan: Estudio histórico-paleográfico," *Anales del Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Historia, y Etnografía*, 4a época, 8: 311–32.

Gruzinski, Serge. 1993. *The Conquest of Mexico: The Incorporation of Indian Societies into the Western World, Sixteenth–Eighteenth Centuries*. Trans. by Eileen Corrigan. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Harvey, Herbert R. 1986. "Techialoyan Codices: Seventeenth-Century Indian Land Titles in Central Mexico." In *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, Supplement no. 4, pp. 153–64. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Haskett, Robert. 1991. *Indigenous Rulers: An Ethnohistory of Town Government in Colonial Cuernavaca*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Karttunen, Frances and James Lockhart. 1976. *Nahuatl in the Middle Years: Language Contact Phenomena in Texts of the Colonial Period*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 85. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Lockhart, James. 1991. *Nahuas and Spaniards*. UCLA Latin American Center Nahuatl Studies Series, 3. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press and UCLA Latin American Center Publications.

_____. 1991A. "Postconquest Nahua Society and Culture Seen Through Nahuatl Sources." In Lockhart, *Nahuas and Spaniards*, pp. 2–22.

_____. 1991B "Views of Corporate Self and History in some Valley of Mexico Towns: Late Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." In Lockhart, *Nahuas and Spaniards*, pp. 39–64.

_____. 1992. *The Nahuas After the Conquest*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Molina, fray Alonso de. 1977 (1571). *Vocabulario en lengua castellana y mexicana y mexicana y castellana*. México: Porrúa.

Mönnich, Anneliese. 1974. "El altepeamatl de Ocoyacac, México," *Indiana* (Berlin), 2: 167–82.

Noguez, Xavier, ed. 1999. *Códice Techialoyan de San Pedro Tototepec*. México: El Colegio Mexiquense and Estado de México.

Robertson, Donald. 1975. "Techialoyan Manuscripts and Paintings, with a Catalog." In *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, vol. 14, *Guide to Ethnohistorical Sources*, Part 3, pp. 253–65. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Robertson, Donald, and Martha Barton Robertson. 1975. "Catalog of Techialoyan Manuscripts and Paintings." In *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, vol. 14, *Guide to Ethnohistorical Sources*, Part 3, pp. 265–80.

Ruiz de Alarcón, Hernando. 1984. *Treatise on the Heathen Superstitions . . ., 1629*. Trans. and ed by J. Richard Andrews and Ross Hassig. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Taylor, William B. 1979. *Drinking, Homicide & Rebellion in Colonial Mexican Villages*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Wood, Stephanie. 1984. "Corporate Adjustments in Colonial Mexican Indian Towns: Toluca Region, 1550–1810." Doctoral dissertation, UCLA.

_____. 1987. "Pedro Villafranca y Juana Gertrudis Navarrete; falsificador de títulos y su viuda (Nueva España, siglo XVIII)." In David G. Sweet and Gary B. Nash, eds., *Lucha por la supervivencia en América colonial*, pp. 472–85. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

_____. 1989. "Don Diego García de Mendoza Moctezuma: A Techialoyan Mastermind?" *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl*, 19: 245–68.

_____. 1991. "The Cosmic Conquest: Late Colonial Views of the Sword and Cross in Central Mexican *Títulos*," *Ethnohistory*, 38: 176–95.

_____. 1998A. "The Social vs. Legal Context of Nahuatl *Títulos*." In Elizabeth Hill Boone and Tom Cummins, eds., *Native Traditions in the Postconquest World*.

_____. 1998B. “El problema de la historicidad de los títulos y los códices Techialoyan.” In *De tlacuilos y escribanos*, Xavier Noguez and Stephanie Wood, eds. Zamora, Michoacán: El Colegio de Michoacán and El Colegio Mexiquense, 167-221.

_____. 2003. *Transcending Conquest: Nahua Views of Spanish Colonial Mexico*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.