

The Annals of Chimalpahin

Susan Schroeder*

I HAVE BEEN INTERESTED in Indian history ever since elementary school, when Miss Sherman, my second grade teacher, helped us build a pueblo in the corner of our classroom. I remember the vigas and a little ladder to climb to peer out the windows. But a very long time passed before I was able to get myself into graduate school at UCLA and begin to follow up on an event that had made such a lasting impression. As it happened, Jim Lockhart was just beginning his work on Nahuatl history, and I joined a group of his students. Somewhere along the way he asked if I had heard of Chimalpahin, a seventeenth-century Nahuatl historian. It seems that Jim had acquired a copy of Günter Zimmermann's transcription of Chimalpahin's Nahuatl annals.¹ At the time, Chimalpahin's only known writings were housed at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BNF), and Zimmermann had taken the whole lot and reordered them chronologically by entry, intending to translate them into German.² Zimmermann's publication was a major contribution to Nahuatl studies, for even though a few scholars had worked on one or another of Chimalpahin's Nahuatl annals, no one had published the entire collection, and the chronological organization gave some notion of the nature and scope of the whole.

I was indeed interested in having a look at Zimmermann's transcription, and I subsequently obtained copyflow duplicates of Chimalpahin's original manuscripts for comparison. I have by now traveled to Paris on two different occasions to examine the manuscripts personally and to check my transcriptions against the originals. The Paris corpus, essentially, is what is extant of nine Nahuatl texts, most of which are in the form of indigenous annals dealing with all the things that one expects—migrations, battles of conquest, foundings of kingdoms, the birth, installation in office, and death of rulers, incidentals about women, environmental and celestial phenomena, and, of course, Spanish activities too. But there are also treatises on biblical topics and astronomy, and information about world geography. Additionally, there is a chronicle, or history, as opposed to a set of annals, about Chimalpahin's home town, Amecameca Chalco. The earliest date pertaining to Nahuatl history according to Chimalpahin's reckoning is 670 AD; the last entry is dated 1631 AD.

The Paris manuscripts are divided into two volumes.³ Someone other than Chimalpahin collected into one volume eight assorted texts, which are in a great variety of inks and papers, ordering, numbering, and labeling them as "Relaciones." The remaining manuscript appears to have been collected separately, and indeed it has quite a separate history; it has been labeled the "Diario," which, of

*© Susan Schroeder 2007.

¹Zimmermann 1963, 1965. Jim's copy was a photocopy acquired from Luis Reyes.

²Unfortunately, Zimmermann died before publishing his translation. His transcription, however, contains invaluable notes on translation problems for those who read German.

³They are catalogued as BNF Fonds Mexicain 74 and 220.

course, was not Chimalpahin's doing either. Both titles have endured, which is unfortunate. Chimalpahin mainly adhered to the Nahuatl tradition of providing no special title for a particular work, including his largest manuscript, the set of contemporary annals, but his Spanish-style chronicle (the "eighth relación") is a major exception, and several other works with Spanish-influenced titles or near-titles are scattered through his oeuvre. Each annals text constitutes a separate set of information organized by year sequence from a different source altogether. Chimalpahin never numbered the pages. Nevertheless, a couple of scholars have gone to great lengths to establish the order in which he wrote his "relaciones." Had they examined the original documents in Paris they would realize how very different the manuscripts are in size, shape, presentation, and wear, to say nothing of content. These scholars also seem to be unaware that the Paris manuscripts represent less than half of Chimalpahin's oeuvre.

A new method is now evolving that shows some hope of establishing a better chronology, or at least sequence, for Chimalpahin's various compositions. In the course of our working with Chimalpahin's contemporary annals, it was discovered that the author's way of spelling certain sounds changes across the manuscript, and since it appears for various reasons that many of the entries were written down close to their announced date, it is possible to establish approximate dates for certain spellings. For example, the only extant contemporary copy of the large text known as the *Chronica mexicayotl*, traditionally attributed to don Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc, is not only by reliable indicators in Chimalpahin's hand, but must have been written down by him very close to the announced date of 1609, for it not only keeps the spelling *qua* of [k^Wa] rather than the *cua* he adopted a few years later, it gives the word *iquac*, "at that time, when," as "iquac," a spelling which in these years was already ceding to "ihquac" and by 1612 would normally become "ihcuac."⁴ All of Chimalpahin's manuscripts can be assessed using this method, which in some cases can establish the time of writing within two or three years, and in other cases can give dates after which or before which the item must have been put on paper.

Chimalpahin's Nahuatl writing is eloquent, abundant, and consistent, if sometimes a bit diffuse and repetitive, and his works are especially rich in information about the social and political makeup of his own Amecameca. For my dissertation Jim suggested that I examine his sociopolitical terminology in order to make sense of what Chimalpahin was saying about Amecameca and perhaps all of Chalco. This entailed compiling lists of specific terms such as *altepetl*, *tlayacatl*, *tlaxilacalli*, *calpolli*, and *chinamitl*, and examining them within their contexts in the original. A very revealing development was that *altepetl*, kingdom or ethnic state, is used to describe three different levels of state organization. Let it not be thought, however, that Chimalpahin provides careful definition of terms; nearly everything must be deduced from the sentences in which the words are embedded and from their repeated use. Fortunately Chimalpahin is one of the few Nahuatl annalists who provides a rich context in many cases, as well as a large sample of

⁴Chimalpahin 1997, 1: 60, 62, and passim. See the introduction to Chimalpahin 2006, pp. 13–14.

the use of each of many key terms.

My work represented an early example of a reorientation of Chimalpahin studies (and by implication of the study of annals in general), a reorientation that though still not universal is significant in the historiography of the topic. From Siméon through the line of German scholars, including the outstanding Zimmermann, the purpose of delving into Chimalpahin's work and translating his texts was to discover facts, the "facts" that the author lined up one after another, year after year, in his annals. It has long since become clear that although some, possibly many, of the events narrated by Chimalpahin and other annalists may be literally true as presented, the mere circumstance of their appearing in the text of one of his manuscripts, or manuscripts of other annalists, does not by itself constitute proof of factuality, above all with the preconquest portions and portions before the author's time, but to a large extent even with contemporary material.⁵ Traditional interest had concentrated precisely on preconquest events.

In my first work I too took Chimalpahin's work on preconquest matters as the primary scope, but not because of the time frame; rather because it was in this part of his work that he had most occasion to use indigenous sociopolitical terminology. Thus the study of annals became primarily intellectual history, the study of the cultural baggage of the writers, in the first instance of that particular annalist, here Chimalpahin, but by implication of others living at that time. It is clear that the key terms and organizational devices in Chimalpahin's accounts originated generations earlier and have, in the long run, great significance for the sixteenth century and for preconquest times, but we see and study them first as used by a particular Nahua historian of the early seventeenth century. The actual detailed political history of Chalco which I have investigated in my work is of the same nature.

For Chimalpahin, rulers (*tlatoque*) and rulership (*tlatocayotl*) were as important as the altepetl itself, and indeed an indispensable element of altepetl structure, so I proceeded to compile lists of terms and related information about kings, queens, lords, nobles,⁶ and interim rulers, essentially every category of individuals who had a role in the governing of Amecamea. What had once been a great array of references scattered through hundreds of pages, mere fragments of in-

⁵I fully realize that large-scale sifting of evidence such as that in Chimalpahin's entries, compared across the board with evidence in the whole annals corpus, in other documentary genres, and in archaeological research, can authenticate some of the narrated events and establish the existence and approximate dating of some of the individuals involved. I myself treat some of Chimalpahin's data as "true," but more as illustrative of trends and structures than accepting as proven fact the version of timing and event presented in a certain annals entry.

⁶I have used and continue to use this traditional English sociopolitical terminology. All four terms are as close to the Nahuatl equivalents, *tlatoani*, *cihuatlatoani*, *teuctli*, and *pilli*, as a translation can normally be. For some reason "lord" and "noble" are widely accepted and to my knowledge contested by no one (though *teuctli* in its stricter sense means specifically the head of a noble or lordly household), but for *tlatoani* "ruler" is more current, and for the less common *cihuatlatoani* one would say "female ruler." I do use the latter terms as well, but I see no real objection to "king" and "queen," especially in translations that are likely to be read by a somewhat broader public than ethnohistorical experts.

formation about the situation in Amecameca and greater Chalco, was finally rendered coherent. To mention one crucial aspect, it turned out that proper royal marriages were critical to the maintenance of royal lineages and official rulership in order to maintain in turn the integrity of the altepetl. An altepetl could be conquered or destroyed by enemies, but as long as the traditional rulership was intact, the king retained at least formal sovereignty over his subjects. There was also substantial information in Chimalpahin about the original four, then five, constituent altepetl of Amecameca, each constituent subdivisions in turn, as well as about the founders of the rulerships, how the rulerships all began, how they changed upon conquest by the Mexica, said to have taken place in 1465, how things were restored some twenty years later, and then about life in Amecameca and other areas in central Mexico when they came under Spanish sway.⁷ The results of my study were published in 1991 as *Chimalpahin and the Kingdoms of Chalco*.⁸

Chimalpahin wrote almost exclusively about men, but he did mention women from time to time too—women as wives, mothers, and sisters, and even women as rulers. In fact, in Chimalpahin's accounts the women of Chalco had almost as critical a role in the establishment and consolidation of the altepetl as did their male counterparts. I wondered if there was information for comparison with other polities, and I asked numerous colleagues about the role(s) of indigenous women in the research that they were conducting. Almost all responded that there really wasn't much of anything on that topic, but I asked them to continue looking anyway. Then, following the same method as before, I began to compile lists of a full range of names, related terms, and other information about women that I gleaned from Chimalpahin's annals. In particular, *cihuatl*, woman, appeared in compounds of *cihuapilli*, female noble, and *cihuatlatoani*, queen or female ruler. These women were typically the daughters of high-ranking men and women. In the absence of brothers, women succeeded their fathers as rulers, and they held official titles. They also passed the office and title on to their male heirs.⁹

Rank and order were critical to Chimalpahin, and in his annals he consistently listed the altepetl, their subdivisions, the rulers within the polity, and even their wives and children in a given order, so that structures and patterns become easy to discern if one realizes the implications of the order of mention. In Chalco, the sons of first wives seemed to succeed their father-kings in office more than others. Although the exact mechanisms are never explained, marriage to a high-ranking woman was the imperative. An example is Chimalmantzin, later baptized doña Catalina Chimalmantzin, who was the daughter of King Itzcahuatzin, Tlatquic teuctli, of Itzcahuacan Tlacoachcalco (later Tlalmanalco), which ranked higher than Amecameca within Chalco. She first married King Huehueyotzintli, Tlailotlac teuctli of Tzaqualtitlan Tenanco, one of the constituent altepetl of

⁷It is worth noting that this same five-altepetl organization continued in Amecameca until 1857, when the Juárez reforms drastically altered local indigenous structure of governance.

⁸Schroeder 1991.

⁹See Schroeder 1992 for a full treatment of what Chimalpahin has to say about royal women in his home region.

Amecameca. While married to Huehueyotzintli, according to Chimalpahin's history, she had an affair, became pregnant, and had a son who succeeded her husband, the king, when he died. Not long afterward she married Huehueyotzintli's half-brother, don Tomás de San Martín Quetzalmaçatzin, Chichimecateuctli, who was ruler of Itztlacoçauhcan, the highest-ranked polity in Amecameca. It could have been the levirate in operation, for, in truth, doña Catalina was ranked fifth among don Tomás's many wives. When don Tomás died, he was first succeeded by the son of his primary wife, the daughter of the Cihuacoatl of the much larger entity Mexico Tenochtitlan; that son was then followed upon his death by the child don Tomás had with Chimalmantzin before their marriage was formalized by the church. Their grandson subsequently succeeded his father in the same polity. The example of high-ranked doña Catalina of Tlalmanalco, who, despite her indiscretions, doubtless brought prestige and fortune to the lesser kings of Amecameca, made sense once I had recognized Chimalpahin's purpose in ordering things as he did. It is interesting to note that two of doña Catalina's sisters married kings in other altepetl in Chalco.

Hoping for comparisons of the situation of royal women in Chalco with that of other Mesoamerican women, I consulted my colleagues once again. By that time, every one of them had located substantial information about native women in their sources and had written about it. Unfortunately, because of the nature of those sources, there was nothing equivalent to what was contained in Chimalpahin's annals. Nevertheless, the various histories about women were collected and published in 1997, to wide acclaim, it turned out, for this was the first publication on native women that contradicted the old stereotypes of their being silent and invisible, focusing instead on their adaptability and great variety of activities across time and New Spain.¹⁰

Zimmermann's transcription had been critical to my identifying and analyzing Chimalpahin's social and political vocabularies, and I was able to take my studies through Chimalpahin's works covering times from the remote preconquest era right up to when he was writing (ca. 1605–1631). Heretofore, the scholars who had worked on Chimalpahin had limited their investigations to the precontact period; I was able to include the sixteenth century and go well into the seventeenth, although, as explained earlier, I was studying Chimalpahin's view of things more than events themselves. Despite the advantages of Zimmermann's reorganization of Chimalpahin's annals into one general chronology, it caused considerable confusion among numerous scholars, especially those unfamiliar with the unique nature of traditional annals. In Chimalpahin's case, his annals are almost exclusively alphabetic and based in large part on copies that he made of a great variety of materials, some of which seem to have been pictorial, expounded for him by their custodians; others were apparently already Nahuatl alphabetic texts, and still others were printed books in Spanish. Each set of annals begins at a given time and typically focuses on events relevant to a given Nahua altepetl. Genealogical information is also included, and Chimalpahin, when possible, tells us something about his sources. Each, ostensibly, is a distinct set of annals, but in

¹⁰Schroeder, Wood, and Haskett 1997.

some instances some of the information overlaps, and not all dates and facts are in agreement, leading some researchers, then, to say that Chimalpahin could not keep his own stories straight. For the most part, however, Chimalpahin was reproducing and only to an extent rationalizing certain sources in a series of manuscripts each with its own characteristics and not meant to be combined in a single account. He was at the same time collector, copyist, and composer of original material, and these roles are often inextricably interwoven.

I had used Zimmermann to great advantage, but I also believed that Chimalpahin, as the greatest of the Nahuatl annalists, had been abused. I wanted Chimalpahin and indigenous annals in general to be appreciated for what they are. Already in 1971 Luis Reyes García had discovered what has turned out to be the only manuscript by Chimalpahin left in Mexico,¹¹ a set of annals mostly about Azcapotzalco, covering the years 1426–1522.¹² The last two folios, however, are the first pages of Chimalpahin's contemporary annals, the so-called *Diario*, located in Paris. Then, in 1983, another heretofore unknown collection of annals in Chimalpahin's hand was discovered at Cambridge University, England.¹³ Three years later, the earliest known version of Chimalpahin's copy of Francisco López de Gómara's *Conquista de México* (1552), turned up in Yuma, Arizona,¹⁴ and shortly thereafter I discovered that the known example of the *Exercicio quotidiano*, said to be authored by fray Bernardino de Sahagún, was in Chimalpahin's handwriting.¹⁵ With Chimalpahin's oeuvre now more than twice the size of what had been known for decades, I decided that all his works should be brought together and published as separate entities in a series of complete critical editions. But before we consider these efforts, a review is in order of how Chimalpahin came to be known and used as a prime source for Nahuatl history.

There is no mention of Chimalpahin by his contemporaries, although he was known to don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora, a member of the following generation who apparently at one point had several of Chimalpahin's manuscripts in his possession.¹⁶ In the later colonial period, his writings circulated among Mexico City intellectuals and were used in particular by Antonio León y Gama to put together a good case in praise of the quality and substance of early Mexico's literary history.¹⁷ In 1827 Dr. José María Luis Mora traded some of Chimalpahin's Nahuatl annals along with two volumes of works attributed to don Hernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl to the British and Foreign Bible Society agent in Mexico for Protestant bibles. What remained of Chimalpahin's works in Mexico

¹¹Reyes García 1971.

¹²Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Biblioteca Nacional, Archivo Histórico, Ms. 256B, ff. 1–16v.

¹³British and Foreign Bible Society Library, Cambridge University, Cambridge, England, Ms. 374, vol. 3.

¹⁴It is now housed at the Newberry Library, Chicago, and called the Browning Manuscript, Ayer Collection, Manuscript Case 5011.

¹⁵Newberry Library, Chicago, Bernardino de Sahagún, Ayer Collection, Ms. 1484.

¹⁶Sigüenza y Góngora added a personal note at the end of Chimalpahin's contemporary annals, p. 282. On pp. 283–84, he also began to copy what was apparently the first part (1623–24) of a diary kept by Gregorio Martín de Guijo.

¹⁷For an excellent study of Chimalpahin and Antonio León y Gama, see Cañizares-Esguerra 2001.

City was then acquired in the 1830s by Joseph Marius Alexis Aubin and taken to Paris, where they came into the possession of E. Eugène Goupil and were eventually donated to the BNP by his widow in 1898. The Paris corpus then became the exclusive focus of all Chimalpahin studies for the next eighty years. In 1889, Rémi Siméon published a translation to French of the sixth and seventh *Relaciones*.¹⁸ In Germany, Ernst Mengin published the fifth *Relación* in 1944 and five years later brought out his three huge volumes of the *Relaciones* in facsimile.¹⁹ In 1958 Walter Lehmann and Gerdt Kutscher followed with a German translation of part of the second *Relación*,²⁰ and in 1963–65 Zimmermann published his reordered transcription. In Mexico, Silvia Rendón published a Spanish translation of the second through the seventh *Relaciones* in 1965,²¹ and in the United States John Glass studied, compared, and published portions of the *Relaciones*.²² More recently, Jacqueline de Durand-Forest published a two-volume study and translation of the third *Relación*,²³ Elke Ruhnau has transcribed and translated all eight of the *Relaciones* into German,²⁴ and in Mexico Rafael Tena in an outstanding set has transcribed and translated all the Paris manuscripts into Spanish and published them in three volumes.²⁵ Since the publication of Tena's work, several other Mexicans independently and together have also transcribed and translated all the *Relaciones* to Spanish.²⁶

Reversing Zimmermann's reordering of things, all of these scholars aimed to treat each manuscript as a distinct set of annals. Unfortunately, however, in preparing their transcriptions not one has followed Chimalpahin's style conventions and orthography, instead constructing modern paragraphs, punctuation, and spellings. Moreover, there is seldom any analysis. Of all of them, with the exception of Ruhnau, Tena's volumes tend to follow most closely the texts as they are now organized in Paris, although he has taken the liberty of inserting his transcription and translation of the Mexico City manuscript discovered by Reyes García in between the *Relaciones* in one of the volumes. It is his translation that appears to be the most reliable.

Fairly soon after the discovery of the new materials at Cambridge University, Arthur Anderson started to work ordering, transcribing, and translating them. I eventually joined him as co-translator, but he had already done the bulk of the work by that time. Most of the Cambridge corpus of annals concerns Mexico Tenochtitlan, Tlatelolco, and Tetzaco, although inevitably information about Amecameca does appear. It was especially gratifying to observe that Chimalpahin's sociopolitical vocabulary, which I had studied so assiduously for Amecameca and Chalco, was consistently applied to Mexico Tenochtitlan and other Nahua polities in central Mexico, with omission of only the term *tlayacatl*. I also became certain that Chimalpahin was working at least part-time as a copyist. It was confirmed by the great diversity of the Cambridge materials, the other recently discovered writings, and the fact that Chimalpahin himself frequently

¹⁸Chimalpahin 1889.

²⁰Chimalpahin 1958.

²²See Chimalpahin 1975, 1978.

²⁴Chimalpahin 2001.

²⁶Chimalpahin 1983, 1991, 1997, 2003, 2003A.

¹⁹Chimalpahin 1944, 1949, 1950.

²¹Chimalpahin 1965a.

²³Chimalpahin 1987.

²⁵Chimalpahin 1998 and 2001A.

tells us that he is copying.

Supporting this notion, one of the most surprising things found in the Cambridge collection of annals was don Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc's Nahuatl accounts of Mexica history. For decades there has been considerable controversy over the authorship of the Alvarado Tezozomoc annals, for what was published was based on copies of lost originals. After analyzing the signature orthography that is consistent in all of Chimalpahin's Nahuatl writings, I can state unequivocally that the (earlier lost) original is in the hand of Chimalpahin, not of Alvarado Tezozomoc. In fact, it is not possible to distinguish exactly how much was composed originally by Alvarado Tezozomoc, for numerous other credited sources have been brought in, presumably by Chimalpahin, and there seems to be no way of knowing the full extent of Chimalpahin's own parenthetical comments. Frequency counts of Chimalpahin's typical vocabulary throughout the text may shed further light on the matter. Even so, it may be forever impossible to tell sentences and paragraphs originally written by Chimalpahin and inserted in the text from those in which he was only using some of his own vocabulary in reproducing already existing material. At any rate, the *Chronica mexicayotl* in the form we know appears to have undergone substantial alteration at the hands of Chimalpahin.

The entire corpus of the Nahuatl-language materials at Cambridge University was published as the two-volume *Codex Chimalpahin* with myself and Arthur Anderson as editors. Entitled *Society and Politics in Mexico Tenochtitlan, Tlatelolco, Texcoco, Culhuacan, and Other Nahua Altepetl in Central Mexico*, the volumes included assorted anonymous Nahuatl accounts from Tetzoco that had been tucked into the Chimalpahin manuscripts, and we also incorporated the *Exercicio quotidiano*, since Arthur had already translated it to English.²⁷ The transcriptions adhere strictly to Chimalpahin's writing conventions in his original manuscripts.

Another item in the evolving series of editions of Chimalpahin's works under my general editorship is the set of contemporary annals, published as *Annals of His Time*.²⁸ This set is by far the largest of all the annalistic manuscripts that the author produced and represents a compilation of the observations and records that he both kept and copied while living in Mexico City in the early seventeenth century. As mentioned, the first pages are presently located in Mexico City, with the bulk in Paris. These annals cover the years 1577–1615, and they are rich in details about the goings on in the capital. It is apparent that although he was living, working, and enjoying the patronage of the priest at San Antonio Abad in Xoloco, Chimalpahin was also very much involved with the circle of Nahuas affiliated with the chapel of San Josef at the church of San Francisco. I have speculated elsewhere that some of the sources for his Mexico City annals may have been from the library at San Francisco. These writings are rich in information about the friars, church activities, and local *cofradías*. Additionally, Chimalpahin was certain to include the names of the new *cabildo* officers, ranked and in order, from each of the four parts of the old Mexico Tenochtitlan political system, who

²⁷Chimalpahin 1997A.

²⁸Chimalpahin 2006.

were elected each year on the first of January. But these matters are only part of Chimalpahin's reporting on society at large in Mexico City from a unique perspective.

Succeeding volumes in my series will include the remaining Nahuatl materials housed in Paris and the annals in Mexico City. As with all these volumes, the transcriptions will be on the verso page, with the translation to English on the facing recto page. Annotations include cross-references to other volumes and explanations relating to translation, as well as other matters when necessary. A volume "The Later Annals" will be divided into two parts and will contain all the writings that in some manner touch on the years before and after the arrival of the Spaniards. For example, Part 1 will include Chimalpahin's translation into Nahuatl of excerpts on world geography and Christopher Columbus taken from Enrico Martínez's *Reportorio*,²⁹ the Azcapotzalco annals in Mexico City, the sixth *Relación* because it deals, in part, with information relating to Chimalpahin's history of Amecameca, and the history or chronicle itself, the eighth *Relación*. Chimalpahin specifically refers to this work as a chronicle, using the Spanish word, and it differs in presentation and content from his more traditional annals. His purpose, he states, was to write the history of his home entity, Tzaqualtitlan Tenanco, so that future generations would know of its glorious past. In doing so he furnishes considerable information about the larger altepetl of Amecameca and greater Chalco.

In this work Chimalpahin provides a great deal of insight into his sources and procedures, going far beyond what we find in any other Nahua annalistic writer. He describes how he interviewed everyone who was still alive who knew the history, and he names them, telling how it is that he knows them. He also tells how the ancients painted and kept the ancient altepetl histories and royal lineages, how they were passed down from generation to generation, and how they eventually "fell into my hands," as he says. He recognizes that women were involved in preserving the traditions, and possibly they even participated in producing pictorial/written records, though no details are known and all record-keepers known to us are male.³⁰

Elsewhere I have discussed the possibility of a royal nobleman, a *tlatocapilli*, closely affiliated with the ruler but never a ruler himself, who had responsibility for all the precious writings, including keeping them current, storing them, and seeing that they passed to a successor, also a *tlatocapilli*. The term *tlatocapilli* appears in Chimalpahin's writings most frequently to describe dynastic nobles, the sons of high-ranking rulers as well as the rulers themselves before they succeeded to office. In Amecameca it is possible to trace the keepers of the ancient accounts back several generations, and all were described as *tlatocapilli*. Succession was not broken until the writings passed on to Chimalpahin's father, who even in Chimalpahin's over-optimistic phrasing could be identified as no better than a *teuctli*, lord, never a *tlatocapilli*. Even then, though, there was a good

²⁹Martínez 1948.

³⁰Chimalpahin 1963, 1965, 1: 146, 153, includes passages mentioning ancient women as well as men in the process of the preservation of traditional lore.

reason for this exception, for the rightful heirs were too young at the time to have such a charge. They did eventually get the accounts, and Chimalpahin used them to write his history of Tzaqualtitlan Tenanco. Thus using the same methods as before but by now with a significantly expanded collection of Chimalpahin's writings, evidence can be adduced to suggest that what Chimalpahin describes for Amecameca could well have been the case in Mexico Tenochtitlan also. Don Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc is my case in point here, although I cannot trace the keeper of the Mexico Tenochtitlan accounts through several generations due to the lack of complementary sources. He is a *tlatocapilli*, though, and he does state that he collected all the precious history from the ancients.³¹

Something else that warrants investigation in this connection is that Chimalpahin seems to have used Alvarado Tezozomoc (who precedes him in Mexico City in writing his history) as a model for his book about Amecameca, especially the eloquent, florid prefaces to the histories of their respective home towns and even more importantly, in one of his major writings, using the term *chronicle* and eschewing strict organization by year as in the annals tradition. There are other notions and phrases that seem to have been borrowed as well, with both writers admonishing "Christian readers" as they tell about the past in Amecameca and Mexico Tenochtitlan, their writing for future generations, and their preoccupation with royal lineages. But as I emphasized before, it is hard to be certain what is Tezozomoc and what Chimalpahin in the *Chronica mexicayotl*.

Part 2 of the later annals in my series is a very long set of annals covering the years 1272–1591. Many of the accounts relating to the sixteenth century appear to have been written in anticipation of the large set of contemporary annals, yet there is an abundance of information about Nahuatl and Spanish life that is found nowhere else. The next volume, "The Early Annals," will contain all the rest of the precontact annals along with the Old Testament and Classical treatises that Chimalpahin wrote in Nahuatl.

A sixth volume, "Chimalpahin and the Conquest of Mexico by Francisco López de Gómara," is a different sort of literary undertaking altogether, although if anyone ever doubted Chimalpahin's role as a copyist it is impossible to deny it after examining this manuscript. Nothing was known of Chimalpahin's "Conquista" manuscript until Lorenzo Boturini Benaduci listed it in his catalog, noted that it was by Chimalpahin, and remarked that he (Boturini) had made a copy. He also listed the number of folios (172). The manuscript changed hands, and the next notice of it was in 1826, when don Carlos María de Bustamante published a sorely defective copy in two volumes.³² Bustamante not only had Chimalpahin's name wrong, but he also claimed that Chimalpahin had translated the work into Nahuatl. There is no evidence of a Nahuatl version, and Bustamante's publication was in Spanish (which would have required that Chimalpahin translate it into Nahuatl and then back again into Spanish). It is not even certain if Bustamante was working with the Boturini copy or Chimalpahin's original.

It was a hundred and sixty years before the Conquista manuscript surfaced again, this time in a private collection in Yuma, Arizona. Subsequently, the manu-

³¹Schroeder forthcoming.

³²Chimalpahin 1826.

script, all 172 folios in an eighteenth-century hand and with a note by Boturini on the front page, was donated to the Newberry Library. The manuscript follows Gómara's original fairly closely, with Hernando Cortés's corrupted spelling of Nahuatl place names and peoples as Gómara recorded them. Some passages, it appears, have been omitted, but without Chimalpahin's original it is difficult to say at this stage if it was Chimalpahin or Boturini's copyist who is responsible. Chimalpahin did make emendations, mostly interpolating corrections of some of Cortés's "facts," and, most importantly, he signed himself in the manuscript as he copied it. Chimalpahin never mentioned this account in his other work, but then his oeuvre is far more eclectic and abundant than anyone ever imagined. Through studying his work of this kind, we can approach closer to an understanding of the extent to which Chimalpahin was bilingual and bicultural, able to function in either context, with each influenced by the other.

A team of us is in the process of translating Chimalpahin's "Conquista" manuscript to English.³³ I have completed a transcription, and I have compared the manuscript with all known later copies as well as with the first six editions by Gómara published in Spain (1552–1556). We do not know which edition Chimalpahin had in his possession, but certain omissions suggest that he used the one published in 1552, and that is what we will use as our copy-text. This "Conquista" copy also contains most of the chapters about Nahua life that were omitted from Lesley Byrd Simpson's 1966 English translation.³⁴

The oeuvre of Chimalpahin constitutes the largest known corpus of writing by a single Nahua in his own language and without direct supervision by anyone else. Thus it represents a prime opportunity for Nahua intellectual history and especially for the discovery and analysis of key concepts or categories embodied in the author's vocabulary. Such category analysis has been at the heart of the research of Doris Namala and myself. But since the size and variety of the Chimalpahin corpus is the primary condition of such research, it ultimately needs to rest on the full availability of everything that Chimalpahin wrote, authentically transcribed, in its original units, carefully translated, with an adequate scholarly apparatus, and that is what in the series of critical editions I am attempting.

³³Chimalpahin in progress.

³⁴Gómara 1966.

Bibliography

- Cañizares-Esguerra, Jorge. 2001. *How to Write the History of the New World: Historiographies, Epistemologies, and Identities in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, don Domingo de San Antón Muñón. 1826. *Historia de las conquistas de Hernando Cortés, escrita en español por Francisco López de Gómara, traducida al mexicano y aprobada por verdadera por D. Juan Bautista [sic] Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, indio mexicano*, 2 vols. Ed. by Carlos María de Bustamante. México: Ontiveros.
- _____. 1889. *Annales de Domingo Francisco de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, Sixième et Septième Relations (1258-1612)*. Ed. and trans. by Rémi Siméon. Paris: Maison-nueve et Ch. LeClerc, Editeurs.
- _____. 1944. *Diferentes historias originales de los reynos de Culhuacan y Mexico, y otras provincias. El autor de ellas dicho Don Domingo Chimalpahin. Das Manuscrit Mexicain No. 74. der Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, 5. Relación*. Ed by Ernst Mengin. Berlin: Baessler Archive.
- _____. 1949, 1950. *Diferentes historias originales de los reynos de Culhuacan y Mexico, y de otras provincias, el autor de ellas dicho Don Domingo Chimalpahin. Corpus Codicum Americanorum Medii Aevi*, vol. 3, in 3 volumes. Ed. by Ernst Mengin. Copenhagen: Det Berlingske Bogtrykkeri.
- _____. 1958. *Das memorial breve acerca de la fundación de la ciudad de Culhuacan*. Ed. and trans. by Walter Lehmann and Gerdt Kutscher. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag.
- _____. 1963, 1965. *Die Relationen Chimalpahin's zur Geschichte México's*. 2 vols. Ed. by Günter Zimmermann. Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter & Co.
- _____. 1965A. *Relaciones originales de Chalco Amaquemecan: Francisco de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin Cuauhtlehuanitzin*. Ed. and trans. by Silvia Rendón. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- _____. 1975. *The Lesser Writings of Domingo Chimalpahin, Compendio de la historia mexicana, 1064–1521*, pt. 7. Ed. by John Glass, trans. by Gordon Whittaker. Lincoln Center, Mass.: CONAMEX Associates.
- _____. 1978. *Historia mexicana: A Short History of Ancient Mexico, 1064-1521*, pt. 5. Ed. by John Glass. Lincoln Center, Mass. CONAMEX Associates.
- _____. 1983. *Octava Relación, Obra histórica de Domingo Francisco de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin Cuauhtlehuanitzin*. Ed. and trans. by José Rubén Romero Galván. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- _____. 1987. *L'Histoire de la vallée de Mexico selon Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin (du XIe au XVIe siècle and Troisième relation de Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin*. 2 vols. Ed. and trans. by Jacqueline de Durand-Forest. Paris: Editions L'Hartman.
- _____. 1991. *Chimalpain Cuauhtlehuanitzin, Memorial breve acerca de la fundación de la ciudad de Culhuacan*. Ed. and trans. by Victor M. Castillo F.. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- _____. 1997. *Chimalpain Cuauhtlehuanitzin, Primer Amoxtli Libro, 3a Relación de las Diferentes Histoires Originales*. Ed. and trans. by Victor M. Castillo R. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

- _____. 1997A. *Codex Chimalpahin: Society and Politics in Mexico Tenochtitlan, Tlatelolco, Texcoco, Culhuacan, and Other Nahuatl Altepetl in Central Mexico*. 2 vols. Ed. and trans. by Arthur J. O. Anderson and Susan Schroeder. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- _____. 1998. *Las ocho relaciones y El memorial de Colhuacan*. 2 vols. Rafael Tena, ed. and trans. México: Cien de México.
- _____. 2001. *Diferentes Historias Originales*. 2 vols. Ed. and trans. by Elke Ruh-nau. Markt Schwaben: Verlag Anton Saurwein.
- _____. 2001A. *Diario*. Ed. and trans. by Rafael Tena. México: Cien de México.
- _____. 2003. *Primera, segunda, cuarta, quinta y sexta relaciones de las Diferentes Historias Originales*. Ed. and trans. by Josefina García Quintana, Silvia Limón, Miguel Pastrana and Victor M. Castillo F. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- _____. 2003A. *Séptima Relación de las Diferentes Historias Originales*. Ed. and trans. by Josefina García Quintana. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- _____. 2005. *Annals of His Time*. Ed. and trans. by James Lockhart, Susan Schroeder, and Doris Namala. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- _____. In progress. *Chimalpahin and the Conquest of Mexico by Francisco López de Gómara*. Ed. and trans. by Anne J. Cruz, Cristián Roa-de-la-Carrera, Susan Schroeder, and David E. Tavárez. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Gómara, Francisco López de. 1966. *Cortés: The Life of the Conqueror by His Secretary, Francisco López de Gómara*. Ed. and trans. by Lesley Byrd Simpson. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Martínez, Enrico. 1948 (1606). *Reportorio de los tiempos e Historia natural de Nueva España*. Ed. by Francisco González de Cossío. México: Secretaría de Educación Pública.
- Reyes García, Luis. 1971. "Un nuevo manuscrito de Chimalpahin," *Anales del Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia*, 2: 333–48.
- Schroeder, Susan. 1991. *Chimalpahin and the Kingdoms of Chalco*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- _____. 1992. "The Noblewomen of Chalco," *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl*, 22: 45–86.
- _____. Forthcoming. "The Meaning of *Amoxitli* (Book) in Nahuatl New Spain," in *New World, First Nations: Native Peoples of Mesoamerica and the Andes under Colonial Rule*. Ed. by David Cahill. London: Sussex Academic Press.
- Schroeder, Susan, Stephanie Wood, and Robert Haskett, eds. 1997. *Indian Women of Early Mexico*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.