Introduction

yn ipampa yc nican nictlallia nicmachiyotia yn imiquilitzin ynin omoteneuhtzino huey teopixqui omoyetztieatca yniqu iuhqui yxiptlatzin omochiuhtzinoticatca nican Sancto Padre ynic huel omohuelitiltiaya yniqu icatzinco ypampatzinco miec Jubileos oquimotemaquillitia yn iuh otiquittaque auh monequi no quimatizque oncan in quittazque ytocatenehuallocatzin yn aquique çatepan ye nemiquihui yn amo quimottilique yn amo quimiximachilique ynin yc huey teopixqui ocatca ypampa yuh ninomati caocac yuhqui nican Mexico oc ce teopixqui yttoz yn oc ompa ye tonitztihui ypan cahuitl

The reason that I set down and record here the death of this said late great religious is that he became like the representative of the holy Father here because he was fully authorized to go along issuing many jubilees in his name and on his behalf, as we saw. And also those who will live later, who didn't see and know how great a religious he was, need to know of him and see his name mentioned, because I think that in future times another religious like him will not be seen again here in Mexico.

(From Chimalpahin's entry for September 7, 1614.)

Annals of His Time

The premier practitioner of the genre of Nahuatl annals in the form they took after the conquest was born in 1579 in Amaquemecan (Amecameca), baptized apparently as Domingo Francisco, then went very young to Mexico City, and eventually came to be known there as don Domingo de San Antón after the church where he worked, sometimes referring to himself in magnificent fashion as don Domingo de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin. Scholars somehow settled on calling him Chimalpahin, one of two names of earlier lords of Amaquemecan that he appropriated to himself, and though that convention is not well founded, it is too late to protest, and we will call him Chimalpahin too.[1]

The item we publish here is devoted overwhelmingly (despite one abbreviated resumé of Mexica history from the beginning) to events occurring in the time after Chimalpahin was born, and indeed the momentum accumulates as he reaches the years of his early prime. After very brief annual entries for the 1570s and 80s, clearly set down after the fact, for the 1590s and early 1600s we find usually from two to four pages. For 1604 to 1608 we see an increase to five to nine pages a year, and then a further large and rapid increase in the first years of the second decade of the seventeenth century, when Chimalpahin was in his thirties, reaching a maximum of 41 pages for 1613 before the series as we know it halts in 1615. A reader cannot avoid the impression that the material certainly from about 1608 to the end, and possibly from considerably earlier, was first written primarily at the time of the events, and it deals for the most part with things the author saw or heard about as they happened. No wonder that from as early as the eighteenth century

1. We even retain the practice, originating with the author himself, of writing the name with an *h*, though by standard orthography it is not justified. The second element of the name appears to be a preterit agentive form of the verb *paina*, "to run, hasten," in which a glottal stop is not otherwise attested.

the work was being called the *Diario*, diary or journal. The word "Diario" by now has a tradition as strong as it is lasting, but there can be no doubt that it did not originate with Chimalpahin, and we consider it to be highly misleading.

For a century and more after his rediscovery in the late nineteenth century, translators and commentators gave their attention above all to his massive effort to tell the precontact history of central Mexico (principally Amaquemecan and Mexico Tenochtitlan),[2] but recently his extensive and equally impressive writing on postcontact times has also drawn attention,[3] and the present publication is part of that trend.

The texts published here belong in the clearest and fullest way to the tradition of Nahuatl annals, a genre concerned primarily with events of interest to the public, and indeed to the public of the author's own local sociopolitical entity. They are no diary; Chimalpahin's own activities are barely mentioned, his feelings fully and openly expressed only on rare occasions. And indeed it would have been against the annals tradition to give the work a title at all, or even perhaps to conceive it as a separate entity as opposed to other texts Chimalpahin wrote or compiled.[4] We publish this set of annals separately, respecting its character as an independent corpus and sequence in the original, but in a sense it belongs together with a large number of similar entries scattered through Chimalpahin's other manuscripts despite their often preponderantly precontact subject matter, and we hope that in due course all this material can be subjected to a common analysis.

2. The Paris annals that have come to be called the "Relaciones" constitute the bulk of Ch.'s writings about the precontact era. Dating to the time that the materials seem first to have become available in Paris, Rémi Siméon published the sixth and seventh Relaciones in French in 1889. The Germans followed after an interval, with several scholars translating and publishing different Relaciones; Ernst Mengin published the fifth Relación in German (1944, 1949, 1950), followed by a handsome series of volumes with facsimiles of all the Paris Relaciones. In 1958 Walter Lehmann and Gerdt Kutscher published more selections from the same sources. Günter Zimmermann, the most accomplished member of this school, published portions of the second, third, and eighth Relaciones in 1960, and in 1963–65 he brought out his invaluable transcription of both the corpus of Relaciones and Ch.'s contemporary annals (the so-called "Diario," the text edited here). A set of analytical notes to the edition conveyed many of Zimmermann's insights, but a planned full translation of the texts never came to pass. In the edition Zimmermann reorganized all of the Relaciones into chronological order by individual entry. On the one hand he for the first time brought out the scope of Ch.'s work and made research in it more feasible, while on the other hand he obscured the integrity of the individual texts and caused considerable confusion regarding the nature of annals and of Ch.'s oeuvre. A recent publication by Elke Ruhnau (Chimalpahin 2001A) with all of the Relaciones sums up the accomplishments of the German school.

In the time after World War II Mexican scholars also began publishing portions of the Relaciones in Spanish translation, often without transcriptions; most of this work is mentioned in Schroeder 1991, pp. 26–30. Far the best of these efforts, by Rafael Tena (Chimalpahin 1998), embraces the entire Relaciones, containing both a full transcription and an excellent translation.

3. As in Chimalpahin 2001 (the Tena edition) and Namala 2002.

4. See the passage on pp. 238–39, at n. 4, which could be construed as including Ch.'s contemporary annals within the same framework or as a later part of the same work as preconquest portions.

Although the original strong pictorial component of postconquest annals has virtually disappeared in Chimalpahin (only in some of the later years do we find even any pictorial representation of the Nahuatl year signs),[5] in every other way the work published here has the characteristics of a classic set of annals, in addition to some transformations and developments of those characteristics that are rarely seen elsewhere. In the annals tradition, the present work is organized into year units, giving both the Spanish calendar year and what is taken for its Nahuatl preconquest-style equivalent. Within each year every entry is separate from every other, connected only by a strictly chronological sequence of months and days.

The content is broadly speaking ultra-typical of Nahuatl annals both before and after the conquest: the celebration of the local sociopolitical entity by detailing its officers and public functions and in other ways; a record of the installation and removal of local high officials; reports of plagues, storms, and earthquakes, and of scandalous and other locally newsworthy events. Its main anomaly is its breadth. Almost any set of annals one can point to will concentrate overwhelmingly on and have as its focal point the author's home entity, where he invariably writes. The same principle obtains in Chimalpahin, but his migration gave him two homes. The primary focus in his contemporary annals is on the place of his residence as an adult, when he was doing the writing of the present text, on the indigenous Mexico Tenochtitlan and the Spanish Mexico City, including the amorphous single overall entity that they were becoming; the double nature of that entity explains much that seems quite unique in Chimalpahin's work here. But the reader will also find many traces of his roots in Amaquemecan and even specifically in Tzaqualtitlan Tenanco within it.

Chimalpahin's contemporary writings have many possible uses. It appears to us that they illuminate in the first instance the author's mentality and conceptual equipment, and to an extent Nahua mentality and concepts in his time more generally. They are surely the best developed of known annals material with a postconquest range, not forgetting the Tlaxcalan don Juan Buenaventura Zapata y Mendoza, whose writings can be considered at least in the same class.[6] Although the Nahua annalists may report facts mentioned nowhere else, especially on matters purely inside the indigenous context, the annals should not be taken for objective reporting, nor is their main value a contribution of facts. Chimalpahin, exceptional though he is in many ways, is the same as the others in this respect. The most obvious use of Chimalpahin's writing on his own time is in intellectual and cultural studies dealing with Nahua attitudes and concepts in the urban centers of central Mexico in the first half of the seventeenth century. The picture that emerges is one of persistence, if in a modified form, of Nahua concepts, structures, and values at the very core of Nahua-Spanish contact.

With his well developed writings, his repeated use of the same terms in many slightly varying contexts, Chimalpahin offers a rich opportunity for the study of Nahua categories of various kinds. Studies based primarily on his writings with precontact content, though ranging over the whole corpus, have already illuminated his sociopolitical

5. Although Ch. is a rather extreme example, the gradual diminishing of the pictorial element is a fact of the evolution of the genre; also, from early on there were annals without a pictorial element, such as the "Annals of Juan Bautista" (Reyes García 2001).

6. See Lockhart 1992, pp. 391–92.

categories.[7] In his contemporary writings Chimalpahin makes copious use of Nahua social categories.[8] He demonstrates how Nahuatl responded to the need to talk about indigenous people as a single ethnic group by expanding the semantic range of existing terms as well as mining the language's great potential for new formations. The most all-embracing of these terms, the related *macehualli* and *nican tlaca*, will be discussed in greater detail below under matters of translation (p. 17), in which they figure so strongly. Both used native vocabulary and built on while extending native meanings. They even both appeared at first above all in the first person plural, with the prefix *ti-*, "we," which had been used in preconquest times to indicate ethnic or gender solidarity. This form proved transitional, since as the new meanings became established the *ti-* was increasingly dropped, as we see happening in the very texts published here.

Despite these large ethnic terms, the use of already established references to smaller groups of indigenous continued to predominate. Chimalpahin's writings demonstrate that the *altepetl* and *tlaxilacalli* (i.e., the Nahua ethnic state and its constituent parts; see the discussion below, pp. 17–18) still functioned as the Nahuas' primary source of ethnic identity, since individuals and groups are identified by altepetl and tlaxilacalli names, and the terms *altepehuaque* and *tlaxilacaleque* ("people of the altepetl and tlaxilacalli") abound. At the same time, however, *altepehuaque* undergoes some semantic change, as its meaning extends to embrace the non-indigenous population too. *Chaneque* ("possessors of homes, residents, citizens") also becomes an ethnically open term, as it refers to people of any ethnicity who reside within the limits of an altepetl or tlaxilacalli. The term *tlacanechicoltin* ("people gathered from various places") in reference to the non-Nahua indigenous residents of Mexico Tenochtitlan is a Nahuatl construction but apparently not part of the basic traditional vocabulary and may have been influenced by Spanish designations of outsiders.

Regarding Chimalpahin's categories for non-indigenous people we find a very different scenario. Here well established Spanish loanwords prevail, suggesting that by Chimalpahin's time people of non- or partially indigenous descent had long been accepted as part of the Nahuas' daily lives. Much as with the relatively fewer occurrences of the archaic *nican tlaca* in reference to the indigenous, Chimalpahin rarely calls the Spaniards *cristianos*, "Christians," which tended to be the preferred term in the early postconquest years. Instead, the hybrid word *castilteca* and Spanish *españoles*, as well as forms with double plurals, one from each language, *españolestin* and *españolesme*, far outnumber the earlier term. A careful analysis of these contemporary annals even suggests that *castilteca* too was declining during the time of Chimalpahin's literary activity. Whereas *castilteca* and the double plurals of *españoles* dominate in the earlier entries, after 1613 they disappear entirely. During the same time period, between 1613 and 1615, simple *españoles* without the double plural appears 50 times. Thus we learn in Chimalpahin not only about Nahuatl social categorization but something about the chronology of its evolution.

In the context of all other ethnic groups, Chimalpahin uses Spanish loanwords from the beginning. Whether it be other Europeans, blacks, Japanese, or people of mixed descent, Chimalpahin calls these groups exactly as the Spaniards did. Even Nahuatl

7. Schroeder 1991, pp. 119–97; Lockhart 1992, pp. 14–44, passim.

8. For more on the categories and topics of Ch. as discussed in the following several paragraphs, see Namala 2002.

tliltique, literally "blacks," in reference to people of African descent represents a direct translation of Spanish *negros*. Perhaps the use of *criollo* is a bit of an exception, as Chimalpahin always pairs it with the Nahuatl circumscription *nican tepiltzin*, "a child of people here," implying his relative unfamiliarity with the word, and after all it was only at that time beginning to come into use in Spanish to refer to ethnic Spaniards, and that usually in the restricted realm of officeholding.

Chimalpahin's gender categories partake of some of the same trends observed with ethnic categories. As with the evolution of Nahuatl words that came to designate indigenous people as a group in the postconquest years, the basic Nahuatl gender terms *cihuatl*, "woman, female" and *oquichtli*, "man, male," also took on a distinct ethnic dimension by referring not merely to women and men but specifically to indigenous women and indigenous men. With men, the form using *ti-*, "we," also appears with ethnic meaning, extending its preconquest use to indicate the solidarity of males as a group.[9] Regarding Spanish women and men, Chimalpahin consistently uses Spanish loanwords, if not always in exactly the same way as in Spanish texts.[10] Chimalpahin's vocabulary demonstrates that Spanish gender terms were subjected to the same gendered rules as their Nahuatl counterparts, for the male and female terms were generally borrowed separately.

In his reporting in general, so close to traditional annals fare, Chimalpahin documents a thriving indigenous culture despite or perhaps because of the interconnectedness of the indigenous and Spanish worlds. For example, Chimalpahin's often repeated respect for the ruling authorities, indigenous and Spanish alike, speaks to the annalist's deeply felt responsibility to portray the greatness of his altepetl, and it is both Spanish and indigenous officials, both secular and ecclesiastic, who more than anyone else represent this greatness. Altepetl reportage and magnification is thus Chimalpahin's basic thrust, and a quite noncommittal but approving stance is his main mode, both of these things fully within the Nahua annals tradition. If we look at the text as a whole, we will soon grasp that demographic decline, economic woes, and other scourges of the indigenous population are not major themes, and not much space is devoted to them. When Chimalpahin does turn to such a topic, it is usually to speak of something that was of great public concern in Mexico City, often among high civil and ecclesiastical officials, as in his reporting of great loss of indigenous life in connection with the vast project of draining the Valley of Mexico, the *Desagüe*. Likewise, negative comments on officials are rare, and when we see them, the reason is often, apparently, that the majority consensus in Spanish officialdom, especially in the ecclesiastical sector, was also negative, as with the criticism of the Franciscan fray Gerónimo de Zárate, chaplain at the central Franciscan establishment for indigenous people, San José, or of Archbishop Guerra for his continued frivolities after a major earthquake had struck and devastated the city.[11] At times, it is true, we seem to detect a more personal note, as when Chimalpahin deplores the denuding of the slopes of Chapultepec, which he had thought so beautiful, as the result of a Spanish effort to locate some entirely illusory deposits of gold, with the wood of the formerly glorious

9. I.e., in precontact and even postcontact usage any group of men was called "we men" if a man was speaking; the same expression now took on an ethnic coloration as well. For a subtlety of this usage see pp. 182–83, n. 7.

10. See below, p. 20, for the meaning of *señora* in Nahuatl.

11. Pp. 194–201, 212–13, 250–51 (Zárate), pp. 188–93 (Guerra).

felled trees going for cooking.[12] Even here in a sense the greatness of the altepetl is at issue.

In Chimalpahin's portrayal of natural phenomena and in particular natural disasters his split personality in terms of upholding indigenous traditions versus embracing modernity sometimes comes to the fore. On the one hand, he fully accepts and eagerly passes on to his readers modern scientific explanations of, for example, a solar eclipse, clearly rejecting his ancestors' non-Christian religious interpretation of such an event. On the other hand, and again mirroring his own times, Chimalpahin is not immune to superstitious beliefs regarding this matter, either, and not merely indigenous beliefs, for the Spaniards had their own superstitions, not clearly distinguished from scientific findings, on such matters. Ultimately, church processions replace ancient Mexica rituals as a means of coping with natural disasters in the annalist's accounts. They also become symbols of unity, joining together the altepetl's Spanish and indigenous citizens in their plea to a common deity for help, as well as in the display of altepetl magnificence. Yet processions by cofradías and various other kinds of organizations are also a way in which a series of sociopolitical, corporate, and religious entities and subentities, Spanish and indigenous, expressed themselves within a framework of rivalry, and Chimalpahin reports the processions with a sharp sense of their significance within the politics of entities.

It becomes clear that Chimalpahin's notion of the altepetl was in the process of changing, as the Spanish city that was developing within its boundaries became more and more integrated with the indigenous entity and into Chimalpahin's writing. This tendency is seen in other annals too but is more pronounced in Chimalpahin's work, in part because of the nature of the capital city, in part because Chimalpahin was himself so embedded in the Spanish ecclesiastical world. While ethnicity remains an important factor in the definition and acceptance of localized identities, spectacles and scandals illustrate the ever-changing boundaries of rivalry and unity, as they cut across ethnic lines. For example, Chimalpahin's entries show that localized identities continue to reflect the original Nahua arrangement of Mexico Tenochtitlan's four separate and separately functioning parts, each of them displaying a strong sense of microethnic identity and pride; moreover, his often condescending remarks regarding Tlatelolco not only reinforce his Tenochca perspective, but also acknowledge the separate, if clearly inferior, status of that altepetl, even though from the Spanish point of view it was becoming just another part of the colonial City of Mexico. And Chimalpahin gives us examples of pride and separatist tendencies among Mexica entities far smaller than the four great districts.

In his few explicit statements about his motives for writing his contemporary annals, Chimalpahin tends to stress the need to convey to future generations how things in the altepetl were in his day. He wants future citizens to know and be amazed that the area around the church of San Antón, by their time well developed, had in his been almost a lake; he thinks they will need to know that there had been such a figure as a particular Jesuit savant whom Chimalpahin and many others admired.[13] If we look at his writing itself as mute evidence on this point, over and above the traditional annalist's stance we can detect a reporter's urge to portray unusual events vividly, as with the great earthquake or the arrival of the Japanese.[14] We also find him intent on explaining to indigenous

12. Pp. 300–03.

13. Pp. 258–59 (San Antón), 284–87 (Jesuit).

people and even to himself new Spanish or European lore that has just been relayed to him by some Spaniard, generally an ecclesiastic, as in his discussion of the mechanics of the solar eclipses just alluded to, or in his treatise on the order of San Antonio Abad.[15]

In the long run the serious reader of this large portion of Chimalpahin's work will learn how his qualities are reflected, if sometimes subtly, in virtually all parts of it. At first the reader may get an ultimately false impression of an endless series of short, trivial, uncommunicative entries. Until one acquires the background and then develops the sensitivities needed to appreciate such material fully, it can be helpful to concentrate on some of the more spectacular passages in the work, where Chimalpahin's qualities are more immediately evident. Some of the outstanding examples are the already mentioned earthquake account (pp. 186–93) and the descriptions of the Japanese (pp. 170–73, 272–77);[16] others include the funeral procession of Archbishop Guerra (pp. 200–11), the tales related to an alleged uprising by those of African descent (214–25), and two accounts about women who opposed the erection of crosses and were miraculously struck down (pp. 250–57). First reactions may vary to the description of the solar eclipse (176–85) and the accounts of water channeling projects (96–107, passim, and 292–95).

Processions and other public events in Mexico City play such a role in Chimalpahin that one gains a better sense of things if one knows the general layout of the Mexico City of his time, especially the location of churches and public buildings. With no attempt to be exhaustive, we have provided a map which we hope will be of use to the reader.

We have done our best in the English translation to give the reader most of the content and a good deal of the flavor of the Nahuatl original. Something that cannot easily be conveyed in a translation is the way that Chimalpahin used Spanish loanwords in his Nahuatl original; only a survey of the transcription of the original will give one a full sense of how Chimalpahin on the one hand was very conversant with a large amount of Spanish lore and concepts, and the corresponding Spanish loanwords had become a prominent feature of his vocabulary, no more problematic to him than vocabulary of native origin. But the reader of the transcription will also see many forms that from a Spanish point of view are misspelled; virtually all of these represent typical sound substitutions used by Nahuatl speakers in the long time before Nahuatl acquired the Spanish sounds that were lacking in its phonetic repertoire, using unvoiced stops instead of voiced stops for example. Presumably such substitutions were typical of Chimalpahin's pronunciation despite his in some ways great erudition in Spanish matters. We even find "fuente," the word for a fountain, with the intention *puente*, "bridge,"[17] because Nahuatl lacked [f] and used [p] as the closest equivalent, so that from the point of view of a Nahuatl speaker *f* and *p* were pronounced identically and could be interchanged. One wonders if this type of pronunciation was only for loanwords in Nahuatl, or if Chimalpahin carried it into Spanish conversation as well. A bit of writing in Spanish is to be found in our text, and it is perfectly spelled by the Spanish standards of the time, though its syntax and idiom subtly betray a non-native speaker.[18]

14. Pp. 186–93; 170–73, 272–77.

15. Pp. 176–85 (eclipse), 278–83, 290–93 (San Antonio Abad).

16. Related bits about the Japanese, rounding out the story, are on pp. 174–77, 236–37, 278–79, 282–83, 290–91, and 294–95.

17. Pp. 300–01 at n. 5.

18. As on pp. 232–33 at n. 1.

The Manuscript and its History

The primary original manuscript of the set of annals published here is housed in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (BNP), as Fonds Mexicain 220, and is in remarkably good condition.[1] It is bound in velum with five leather ties through the spine, with two additional leather ties to close the volume. Written on the spine in brown stencil-like letters is "Diario d. D. Domingo d. S. Antón."[2] The paste-downs on the inside front of the binding are pages from *Vida del Venerable Padre* . . ., which is similar to the treatment of a copy of Chimalpahin's version of Francisco López de Gómara's *Conquista de México* (1552) made by Lorenzo Boturini Benaducci ca. 1740.[3] The annals text numbers 284 pages (the pagination was added later by another hand).

The beginning of the text as presented here is a separate manuscript fragment that is now located in Mexico City.[4] No doubt remains that Chimalpahin intended its contents to go with those of the main manuscript, not only because the years and months mesh perfectly, but because of specific indications made by the author in the originals. Lead-in words added at the lower right of the last page of the first section are identical with the first words of the main part. On that same last page Chimalpahin made a notation that an entry slightly out of chronological order should be inserted further on, and at the correct place on the first page of the main manuscript he indicated that the entry from above should be inserted.[5] The set as we know it, then, starts with the year 1577, 7 House, two years before Chimalpahin was born.[6] The fragment continues to 1589, 6 House, usually with an entry for each year. The annals for 1589 then merge into the main BNP text (beginning with the same year), which is characterized thereafter by many more details for each year.

Although the existence of a lead-in from the last page of the fragment to the first page of the main part would seem to indicate that at one time the two were joined together, such a conclusion cannot be drawn with certainty. It seems rather that when doing the present fragmentary first part, which is attached to another set of material, the idea of composing a major sequence concentrating upon his own lifetime may have gradually dawned upon Chimalpahin, and that having decided upon such a project he transferred to a new manuscript but did not carry out the laborious recopying required to start afresh from the beginning. It is also not clear that the section we are including as the first part was conceived of by Chimalpahin as a beginning of anything. Indeed, with the exception of the genealogical work on his home entity which he called a chronicle,[7] it is not clear that

1. See Schroeder 1991, pp. 27–29, for a more detailed treatment of the physical history of Ch.'s known manuscripts.

2. Schroeder visited the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1995 to examine both the manuscripts 74 and 220 of the Fonds Mexicain. She returned in 2001 to check the present transcription against the original. This description incorporates her observations on these occasions.

3. Browning Manuscript, CASE 5011, Newberry Library, Chicago.

4. For background on the manuscript see Reyes García 1971.

5. See pp. 32–33, nn. 4, 5, 6.

6. Ch. was born on Tuesday, May 26, 1579, the year 9 Reed in his scheme. The date of his death has not been verified.

7. Entitled by Ch. "La genealogia y declaracion de la DeScenden[cia] linage E generaçion y Origen de sus antepas[ados] del Señor Don domingo Hernandez Ayopochtzin. . ."

he considered any of his various collections of papers to be well defined separate units. He may have thought of them as portions of a single large work. Even in this first part he refers to a viceroy's not having any encomienda "either,"[8] i.e., either he had somewhere else written material for his contemporary annals sequence going back even farther in time than 1577, or he viewed similar statements he had already made in other connections as belonging to the same work in a larger sense.

Despite its relative cleanness, throughout the whole primary manuscript one will find marginal and superscript additions and words and passages crossed out. Part of Chimalpahin's normal procedure are dashes connecting the text with the right margin in the case of short lines, especially at the end of paragraphs. Each verso page has a lead-in word or words at the bottom anticipating the beginning of the following recto page. These words are not mentioned or reproduced here, except for the crucial one connecting the two parts of the manuscript. Perhaps only a total of five lead-ins from bottom verso to top recto are missing in the entire main manuscript. There are no recto to verso lead-ins.[9] The paper is European and linen-like in finish, with paper size, ink, and writing quite uniform (especially when one compares this set with Chimalpahin's other manuscripts); most entries are neat, unhurried, and well spaced. The last entry is on p. 282, dated October 14, 1615, and concludes a little over half way down the page.

How to answer the question of whether or not the present ending of our principal manuscript also represents the end of Chimalpahin's enterprise of keeping contemporary annals systematically is related in part to events that occurred after 1615. Pp. 283 and 284 of the manuscript contain a copy made by don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora (a Mexico City savant and bibliophile, 1645–1700) of what was apparently the first part of the diary of bachiller Gregorio Martín de Guijo of Mexico City, beginning in October 1623.[10] An entry for June 22, 1624, tells of the sudden death of Chimalpahin's patron, fray Agustín del Espíritu Santo, after which the church of San Antonio Abad was commandeered by a group of Augustinian friars who refused to leave but then were forcibly evicted, after which in turn city officials closed the church the next month. This move must have put Chimalpahin out of his primary job. Somehow he managed to add occasional bits of information to his other annals up to at least the year 1631.[11]

What became of Chimalpahin's manuscripts upon his death is not certainly known, but we have some reason to believe that they were acquired by don Hernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, affiliated with Tetzcoco and famous for his historical writings in Spanish.[12] Alva Ixtlilxochitl was a great collector of pictorial and alphabetic manuscripts, which he

8. In the entry for 1580, pp. 26–27 at n. 6.

9. Occasional small paper pasteovers are found covering the text or on the margins and may be considered irrelevant because they are mostly in French, clearly of a much later date, and never in Ch.'s handwriting.

10. For the remainder of the diary, see Guijo 1952.

11. For an item from 1629 see Chimalpahin 1963, p. 41; for one from 1631 see ibid., p. 49.

12. Although Alva Ixtlilxochitl held the position of judge-governor in both Tetzcoco and Tlalmanalco, and he was a prominent person, Ch. never mentions him, perhaps because Alva Ixtlilxochitl was much more Hispanized, of partly Spanish descent and writing almost exclusively in Spanish. Though he was the approximate contemporary of Ch. as to birthdate, he was in effect of a later cohort.

used to exalt his home region in his books. Since Sigüenza is known to have inherited much of Ixtlilxochitl's collection, it is natural to suspect that the writings of Chimalpahin were among it. What is certain is that the manuscripts of both Alva Ixtlilxochitl and Chimalpahin became part of Sigüenza's impressive collection of antiquities. Toward the bottom of the last page of our primary manuscript with Chimalpahin's writing on it, in a hand that closely resembles that of Sigüenza, is written: "Although the good don Domingo de San Antón Chimalpahin lived longer, I did not find any more personal papers on this matter other than those contained here, etc."[13]

The facts as known, then, are that it was not until some years after 1615, in 1624, that Chimalpahin's circumstances of employment changed in a way that might have affected his production of the contemporary annals, and that he made some additions to his writings even after that time. Yet Chimalpahin's manuscript ends on a half-filled page, something that otherwise does not occur in it, and there was some slacking off of the pace of writing already in 1614 compared to 1613. Among the mass of Chimalpahin's writing that was once in Sigüenza's possession he found nothing more apparently closely related to it. We can only suspect that Chimalpahin in fact halted the effort here, perhaps to concentrate more on preconquest material.

Upon his death Sigüenza willed his collection of books and manuscripts to the Jesuits' Colegio de San Pedro y San Pablo in Mexico City. Yet no copy of the will is extant, and we do not know for certain that all of Chimalpahin's works were delivered to the colegio as prescribed. Fray Agustín de Vetancurt, a close friend of Sigüenza writing at the end of the seventeenth century, credits Chimalpahin as one of his sources of information for his history of ancient Mexico in his "Catálogo de autores impressos, y de instrumentos manuscritos." It is not clear whether he knew Chimalpahin's writing while it was still in Sigüenza's hands or after transferral to the Jesuits.

The first published record of Chimalpahin's manuscripts comes from Lorenzo Boturini's catalog (1746). However, Chimalpahin's "Diario" is not mentioned by Boturini, and it was only in recent years that Schroeder discovered that it had been in the library of the Jesuits' secondary school for Nahua boys, the Colegio de San Gregorio in Mexico City. An inventory of the library's collection was made upon the expulsion of the Jesuits (1767), and the manuscript was listed among the Nahuatl-language materials in the collection.

The record of the subsequent whereabouts of the contemporary annals manuscript is sketchy, but most likely it became part of a large collection of manuscripts, rare books, and other antiquities that were acquired by Joseph Maria Alexis Aubin in the 1830s during a buying trip to Mexico, then being taken to Paris in 1840. E. Eugène Goupil purchased the same materials from Aubin in 1889, and his widow donated the entire collection of 384 manuscripts and other items to the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in 1898. It is likely that the contemporary annals were acquired separately from Chimalpahin's other Nahuatl annals at the BNP, for they have different catalog numbers, and the contemporary annals are paginated, whereas all of his other manuscripts are numbered by folio.

13. The comments by Sigüenza at the end of Ch.'s contemporary annals are not signed, but Schroeder has compared the writing with signed remarks by Sigüenza on a manuscript attributed to Alva Ixtlilxochitl, MS 374, vols. 1 and 2, in the Bible Society Library, Cambridge University.

Only eighteen folios of manuscript by Chimalpahin remain in Mexico. Referred to as the "Anales Tepanecas," this manuscript is housed in the Archivo Histórico of the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia. It is the last two folios in this set that Chimalpahin designated as belonging with his larger contemporary annals manuscript.

Let us now try to see what the above rather technical considerations add up to. We have already expressed the suspicion that the project of an annals sequence covering Chimalpahin's own lifetime, with current entries added indefinitely into the future once he had reached the year in which he was writing, seems to have come to him bit by bit, and that the new cleaner manuscript now in Paris represents the point at which he undertook the enterprise definitively.

The manuscript, however, contains some apparently contradictory clues. The mere fact of additions, deletions, and changes points toward an original, that is, that Chimalpahin first wrote down his thoughts in exactly this form on this very paper. These features surely tell us that the author continued to revise the manuscript, but they do not necessarily prove that it was the first form the material took in the author's hands. Indeed, we find some cases in which whole phrases were left out inadvertently, then placed between the lines or in the margins, phrases without which the other material would make no sense.[14] We also find entries which appear to be current with the event narrated, and then in the body of the entry will appear some retrospective remark, such as that the image referred to is still there today, and this obviously posterior comment is part of the material written in the original lines, not an insert.[15] On reflection, however, one sees that these things do not necessarily prove that Chimalpahin had written an earlier version, merely that there was an earlier version of that particular entry on which he was basing himself, and he could equally well be copying from texts written by others, as we know he so frequently did. One must also consider the cost of paper to a person in Chimalpahin's circumstances, the effort of recopying, and the fact that he did not recopy and physically integrate the first part of the sequence, even though it was quite imperative to do so. On balance, we consider it probable that the version we now have represents in most cases Chimalpahin's only redaction of the material. On the basis of the facts mentioned above we can also speculate that the full-scale enterprise of contemporary annals, having gone on for several years, ended in 1615 as it appears to in the manuscript.

To such considerations one can add the evidence of Chimalpahin's orthography. The general impression given by the whole, in both its parts, is of a sameness of the hand and of the spelling, so that nothing would seem to say that it was not all written at the same time. Chimalpahin was trained in a mainly standard form of Nahuatl orthography of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, a style sometimes referred to as Franciscan, but in truth it was simply the general style in educated circles of that time before some innovations came in in the course of the early seventeenth century, often associated with the Jesuits, but actually somewhat broader than that. The most unusual feature of Chimalpahin's writing is the use of *uhc* for syllable-final [k^W]. The three main styles

14. As for example on pp. 212–13 at n. 4, or on pp. 262–63 at n. 4, or on pp. 280–81 at n. 3.

15. See the example on pp. 258–59, where a house presently being built in one part of the entry is later referred to as already finished. For examples of an even larger interval of time, see pp. 16–17, n. 3.

were *cuh*, as in most mundane Nahuatl writing, *cu* as in Molina, and *uc* as in Carochi. The word "lord" will often be seen in mundane writing as "tecuhtli"; in Molina it is "tecutli," in Carochi "teuctli." Chimalpahin is rare in writing "teuhctli," but this feature like much else in the manuscript never varies.

Other aspects do vary, and what is more, they evolve meaningfully across the manuscripts. In Chimalpahin's mature style, a syllable-final, word-internal glottal stop is often but not always represented in writing, taking the form of an *h*. With some common roots the *h* ultimately becomes almost invariable in the author's renderings. Such is not the case uniformly throughout our manuscripts, however. If we take the common word *iquac*, "at that time, when," which in pronunciation has a glottal stop at the end of the first syllable, one will find no instance of *h* ("ihquac") in the fragment in Mexico City. The same is true in a large initial part of the manuscript proper; the first instance of "ihquac" that we have seen comes on p. 121 of the manuscript, in an entry for September 1609. Then both versions occur, until with the entries for 1612 and after, the version with the *h* becomes predominant, in long stretches universal. Virtually the same story can be told for the word *tlatoani*, "ruler," first often "tlatohuani," then almost always "tlahtohuani"; the trend with related words is the same.

In the early part of the text Chimalpahin follows the convention of his time (and indeed it continued to be the main convention in Nahuatl writing for long afterward) in rendering [k^{W}a] as *qua*. Taking again the same word *iquac*, we find that it appears in the early fragment and in a large first part of the main manuscript in several variants, but always with *qua*. But in the 1612 entries, variants with *cua* become predominant, and after that *qua* is virtually absent. The same trend is seen with other words containing [k^{W}a].

Although its study is more subjective and we have not gone into it as thoroughly as the orthography, some traces of evolution can also be detected in Chimalpahin's mainly stable calligraphy. For example, at one point late in the game he seems to change the orientation and shape of the character representing the cedilla; he also begins to write more capital *E*'s.

All this evidence of orthographic and calligraphic evolution strengthens the notion that Chimalpahin was writing the manuscript bit by bit over an extended time, hence that what we have is truly his original version, with much of the part after perhaps 1605 or so written close to the time of the events as they occurred. The evidence also strengthens the connection between the two parts of the manuscript, showing a seamless continuity of trends from the fragment into the main part. In this context we can be even more assured that the change over the course of the text in Chimalpahin's ethnic terminology, alluded to in the first section above, represents an evolution in his usage over the years covered.

Some Aspects of the Edition

Conventions. The transcription in our edition adds nothing and attempts to retain all the letters, diacritic marks and abbreviations of the original as closely as they can be

1. We do not capitalize anything Ch. does not. An element of subjectivity enters in because only certain letters have an actual different form for capital and lower case; in others one must judge from variations in size alone. Perhaps we have put too many capital J's in the transcription because Ch.'s universal *j* is a large letter. Some other letters, notably *f*, present somewhat similar problems. We do sometimes include in brackets characters which are not clear in the manuscript.

reproduced in print.[1] As in comparable editions, however, the original spacing of letters is disregarded in favor of spacing by the norms of present-day grammarians; as in similar cases, the justification is not only the lack of entire consistency in the original but great difficulty in determining whether at a certain juncture it intends a space between letters or not, as one might indeed expect in a situation where the "space" as we know it did not exist.[2]

Many instances of syllable-final *n* and sometimes *m* are written in Chimalpahin, and in the work of other writers of his time, as a variously curved line over the preceding vowel. One can dispute whether this overbar is exactly the same in appearance as the diacritic that Chimalpahin puts where one would expect a Spanish tilde (~) (neither of them in practice is confined to a position directly over the letter affected). Following precedent in some printed books of that time and of this, we have reproduced both signs the same, as a tilde over a printed letter.

Reproduction of the original extends to punctuation and lack thereof. Some otherwise highly respectable editions of Nahuatl texts still follow the policy of repunctuating everything as though it were in modern English, Spanish, or German. One problem with such a procedure is that it commits the transcription once and for all to a particular interpretation of the sentence structure, precisely the part that we moderns are least likely to grasp. It also involves abandoning distinctions made in the original which not only can help in comprehending the meaning and organization of the text, but can place the text at a certain point in the tradition of Nahuatl orthography, often telling a great deal about its affiliations.

To indicate paragraph-like entities or the beginning of an entry, Chimalpahin like many others uses a sign in which two curved lines converge at a horizontal line forming the foot of the character; we have reproduced it as an underlined *v*. A separate entry usually begins at the left margin, ending wherever the words dictate, and we have followed the original exactly in this respect. To indicate divisions or new topics within such an entity, Chimalpahin sometimes uses a double or single diagonal (// or /). We have reproduced these signs just as in the original. It may be that the double diagonal indicates a more significant division than a single one, but we are not sure. At times one can detect hardly any justification for the presence of a given diagonal. Since these signs and the spacing of units are the best indication available of the author's sense of the organization of his material, we have reproduced them also in our translation in the corresponding places and have strictly followed the original's division into units or lack thereof.

At the level of words and sentences, Chimalpahin has signs that in appearance more or less approximate the period, comma, semicolon, and colon. They do not, however, behave like punctuation marks in European writing, either of that time or of ours. They come out of a tradition in which Nahua writers used one or all of these marks to indicate the end of a phonological/semantic phrase.[3] In Chimalpahin's writing, however, the origin of the practice can hardly be detected. In effect the marks come mainly at the end of

2. See Lockhart 1992, pp. 338-339; Lockhart 1993, pp. 26–27; and Lockhart 1995, pp. 134–35. To the justifications may be added that even experts, much less neophytes, are severely hampered in scanning the texts unless they are respaced. The deterrent effect of an unspaced printed text is much greater than that of a handwritten original.

3. Lockhart 1992, pp. 339–40; Lockhart 1993, pp. 25–26; Lockhart 1995, p. 134.

significant words, especially nouns, and particularly certain favorite nouns which usually bear such a mark. They also, as in Spanish writing, often accompany numbers, appearing even on both sides of the number. The period and comma are identical in their function and manner of distribution; the semicolon and colon are possibly different at times, but mainly they too follow the same lines. Chimalpahin thus had little motivation to distinguish period from comma or colon from semicolon. Rather than a clearly demarcated dot for a period versus a dot plus a curved line for a comma, he produced a continuum, some pure dots, some dots with the barest hint of a tail, some with a small tail, and some with a long one. The editors have not been entirely of one mind as to where along this line the point of demarcation should be. In the end, dots with only tiny additional marks were counted as periods, the rest as commas. Since there is no difference from Chimalpahin's point of view, the matter can rest there. Semicolons and colons presented the same problem, even less significant because they are far fewer in number.

It was Chimalpahin's general policy (not universally observed, however) to draw a dash from the last letter on a given line of text to the normal right margin. Since these lines have no syntactic or other grammatical or semantic function but are part of the physical allocation of the text on the original written page and would be out of place on a page with a different physical allocation of letters, they have been omitted in the transcription. A special case are some lines or dashes, occasionally ornamented, that Chimalpahin sometimes put at the end of a paragraph-like unit, occasionally without reaching the right-hand margin. We have reproduced some of these lines.

Translation philosophy. Our translation policy is a simple one, to try to give the closest equivalents available in idiomatic modern English, taking advantage of the progress in grammar and lexicon achieved over the last generation,[4] and also of experience with the wider variety of older Nahuatl texts circulating during the same time.[5] In choosing between an idiomatic English version that corresponds closely to the sense of the original and a more literal rendering which is less idiomatic and does not give the sense, we prefer the first alternative. We take advantage of the indications given in subordinating particles of various kinds to build longer English sentences than were often characteristic of older translations, believing that in the original too the syntax is often complex and long of breath. Yet while we generally tend toward a pragmatic rather than a literal translation, we are also trying to convey to a reader who does not know Nahuatl a number of important things in the original that do not correspond to anything in normal English discourse. Thus to the quite self-explanatory basic side of our translations the reader will find rather numerous exceptions, which do call for explanation. Explaining them will at the same time throw light on Chimalpahin's procedures and vocabulary.

4. As in Andrews 1975, Carochi 2001, Karttunen 1983, Launey 1979, and Lockhart 2001.

5. The translations here are comparable to those in Karttunen and Lockhart 1987 (the less literal of the two versions), Lockhart 1993, and Sousa, Poole and Lockhart 1998.

6. As in the entry for June 6, 1593, where an eagle was put on top of a church "as it appears today" (pp. 42–43); or the entry for July 23, 1594, in which the Discalced moved to a new site, and the remainder of the entry says that they were there thirteen years before moving again (pp. 50–51); or the entry for April 4, 1599, in which some images were set up "as they appear today" (pp. 66–67); or the entry for September 7, 1603, in which a church was inaugurated "where today mass is said" (pp. 76–77); or the entry for October

Axcan. A great many of Chimalpahin's entries begin with the word *axcan*, meaning in this context "today." It gradually becomes clear that many entries so beginning were not written on the actual day of the events narrated; surely not those in the early part of the work, occurring when Chimalpahin was still a child (though these entries may have been copied from others which in fact were written closer to the events). Not infrequently we see evidence that some or even the bulk of an entry was written years after the fact.[6] In view of its use in the original one might be justified in rendering this kind of *axcan* as "at this point," or leaving it out altogether, as Rafael Tena quite justifiably does at times in his 2001 Spanish edition of these texts. But since the word is an important item in the stylistics of Chimalpahin and of Nahuatl annals in general, and it is lacking in many entries, we have felt it best to give the reader the full information, putting "today" every time that this sort of *axcan* appears.

Macehualli and nican tlaca. An important item in Chimalpahin's vocabulary is *macehualli*. The word may originally have meant "human being"; by the sixteenth century it most often referred to social rank, to a commoner as opposed to a noble, although in the plural or collective it still could approach the sense "the people." By around 1600 this word, while often retaining its earlier senses, was becoming the primary term for indigenous people when their altepetl or other affiliations were not mentioned, often appearing in the first person plural.[7] Its field of reference in this sense was virtually the same as Spanish *indio*, "Indian," and in some cases it can be seen as an attempt to find an equivalent for the Spanish word. Its implications are not at all the same, however, so we have not felt it appropriate to translate *macehualli* as Indian. "Indigenous person or people" could have been justified in many cases, but the evolution and ramifications of the word are of such interest and complexity that we have retained "commoner," from which even a reader with no knowledge of Nahuatl can track the word through the text and see that it sometimes refers to indigenous people of low rank, and sometimes—generally or always in the plural—to the indigenous population in general (in one case it even refers to the indigenous population of an Asian region).[8]

Through much of the sixteenth century, before "macehualli" became dominant, the same sense had been expressed by the phrase *nican titlaca*, "we people here," which faded after 1600. Chimalpahin, however, still sometimes uses it as a stylistic alternative to "macehualli" or uses the two as a pair for effect. The expression is quite transparent, and we have retained the literal translation.

Altepetl. With the key term *altepetl* we have taken a somewhat different tack, retaining the Nahuatl term itself in the English translation, as has already been done in many publications in the field of Nahuatl studies and Mexican ethnohistory. It is becoming a part of the vocabulary of early Mexican history as important as the Spanish

18, 1603, in which the brothers of San Juan de Dios arrived, who "today are at the Hospital de los Desamparados" (pp. 76–77). Note that all these examples are from the earlier part of the text. In later years instances are fewer, as in the entry for November 17, 1610 (pp. 168–69), which speaks of some names being inscribed in a chapel "as they now appear." Other cases are more subtle or debatable.

7. See Lockhart 1992, pp. 115–16. The ethnic sense was present from an early time; see a fully developed instance, even in the first person plural, from the 1560s in the "Annals of Juan Bautista" (Reyes García 2001, pp. 152–53, paragraph 36).

8. See Namala 2002 for more detail.

"encomienda," and indeed, an altepetl was usually the basis of an encomienda.[9] The word, originally a doublet meaning "water(s) and mountain(s)," had come to be the primary term in Nahuatl for an independent state. In central Mexico it referred usually to a local ethnic state, of which there were many in the region before the Spanish conquest, and most of them survived into Chimalpahin's time, seen by the Spaniards as indigenous municipalities, but still called altepetl by the Nahuas when using their own language. The altepetl was the master institution of the Nahua world both before and after contact, and it is important that we gain a full understanding of the word's meaning and use in a variety of contexts. In Chimalpahin's usage here, it will be seen that he can mean any individual sociopolitical entity of the traditional type, including the indigenous corporation of Mexico Tenochtitlan as it existed under the Spaniards, but it seems at times to indicate the total complex formation of the capital city, including Spaniards and their corporation as well as the indigenous component.[10] When the word is used with a plural sense (not always easy to detect because Chimalpahin like most Nahuatl speakers did not make any external distinction between singular and plural), it usually refers to the various altepetl surrounding Tenochtitlan throughout the Valley of Mexico, or perhaps at times in an even wider area. The term will also be found occasionally as a description of entities in Europe, Asia, and South America, sometimes seeming to refer to vast realms and sometimes to individual cities; such instances are hard to assess because it is not always certain that Chimalpahin himself understood the nature of the foreign entity.

Tlaxilacalli. The constituent parts or districts of an altepetl were called primarily *tlaxilacalli*, and we have retained the Nahuatl word in the English as with the broader term and for the same reason, to allow readers of English only to follow the terminology of Nahuatl sociopolitical organization. It was once thought that entities at this level were uniformly called *calpolli*, but such turns out not to be the case, at least for the postcontact period. In other annals with a larger precontact content, Chimalpahin tends to call the entities calpolli as long as they are migrating and tlaxilacalli after they have settled permanently and taken on a landed dimension.[11] The word itself has not yet been securely analyzed, though it seems to have *calli*, "house," as the last element; there is a glottal stop before the *x*.

Mexico. In Chimalpahin "Mexico" still has the traditional Nahuatl meaning of the area inhabited by the Mexica in the narrower ethnic sense, limited to Tenochtitlan and Tlatelolco; sometimes the meaning seems to be Tenochtitlan only, and sometimes the whole mixed Spanish-indigenous capital of New Spain. Yet since the indigenous connotation still predominates, we have not felt it appropriate to translate "Mexico City" except in the relatively few instances where the Spanish loanword *ciudad* is used in addition. Let the reader understand, then, that "Mexico" in our translation refers approximately to the area now called Mexico City. The term was not yet and long afterward would not be used for New Spain as a whole or for the country we call Mexico today. At some point the word, in Spanish at least, seems to have come to refer to Mexico City and its environs, more or less the Valley of Mexico, but just when such usage became common is not yet

9. For more on the altepetl and tlaxilacalli see Lockhart 1992, pp. 14–58, and Schroeder 1991, pp. 119–53.

10. See Namala 2002.

11. Schroeder 1991, pp. 143–53.

well understood, and there is no hint of it in Chimalpahin. In Spanish, *mexicano* from an early time meant the Nahuatl language, and in Nahuatl *mexicatl*, "Mexica person," was sometimes used among the migrants in north Mexico to mean all Nahuatl speakers,[12] but again Chimalpahin has no reflection of such usage.

One will see reference in the translation to the four parts of Mexico Tenochtitlan, in the Nahuatl usually simply *nauhcan*, literally "in four places." Tenochtitlan was a complex altepetl consisting of four separate sub-altepetl, each large and complex in itself. The units are of the type that Chimalpahin calls *tlayacatl altepetl* in referring to his native Amaquemecan, but he never uses that word for the four parts of Tenochtitlan; indeed he gives them no specific appellation at all. The four parts rotated in all matters in a counterclockwise direction starting with San Juan Moyotlan in the southwest, then going on to San Pablo Teopan in the southeast, San Sebastián Atzaqualco in the northeast, and finally Santa María Cuepopan in the northwest. In an ongoing rotation there was really no distinction of first and last, but in virtually any listing of Chimalpahin's the order will put San Juan first and go through the list to Santa María.[13] The municipal council building for all Tenochtitlan (the *tecpan* or palace, variously translated here) was also in San Juan Moyotlan. Tlatelolco, though a Mexica altepetl, was separate from Tenochtitlan and did not partake in the four-part order. The Spaniards may not always have been aware of the distinction.

Other altepetl. The names of Nahua altepetl are generally given in the translation in their standard Nahuatl form, though a few well known names retain their Spanish form so that the reader can be sure that that is the settlement that is in question: thus Tlaxcala, Tacuba, Tacubaya, rather than Tlaxcallan, Tlacopan, and Atlacuihuayan. Nevertheless, the well known Amecameca, since it was so important to Chimalpahin as his homeland and because he understood the entity in such a different way than the Spaniards, appears here as Amaquemecan.

Teopixqui. In postcontact times the Nahuatl word *teopixqui*, having originally referred to priests of the indigenous gods, was expanded by normal processes to mean Christian priests. But since mendicant friars were so predominant in the first decades after the conquest, the word normally meant friar or at least religious, a member of a religious order (such as a Jesuit), with the Spanish loanword *clérigo* being used for secular clerics. Nevertheless, in principle the word could refer to any Christian priest. Our usual translation is friar or religious, but occasionally, depending on the context, priest. At times it is not entirely clear whether Chimalpahin means religious, all clergy, or secular priests.

Celar/seral/selar. A puzzling word in Chimalpahin's vocabulary is "seral," "selar," or "celar," which refers to some institution or building on the central square of Mexico City in his time and must be a loan from Spanish. "Seral" occurs eight times in the present corpus, "celar" four times, and "selar" twice. It has been proposed[14] that "selar," which could conceivably be the basic form despite being the least used by Chimalpahin, is from Spanish *seglar*, "secular," and stands for the longer phrase *cabildo seglar*, "secular (municipal) council," as opposed to the *cabildo eclesiástico*, the ecclesiastical council,

12. As in Anderson, Berdan and Lockhart 1976, Doc. 23.

13. See for example the passage of 1600 in which for the first time four alcaldes were named (pp. 66-67).

14. Tena in Chimalpahin 2001, p. 420.

i.e., the cathedral chapter. This interpretation is tempting, but the situation is still puzzling. The written form "selar" (probably pronounced [sela:l] by Chimalpahin, so that "seral" would merely be a preferred hypercorrection representing the same pronunciation) is a plausible rendering of Spanish *seglar*, for the Nahuas would have had problems with the [gl] cluster and would have been likely to reduce it. One implausibility in this interpretation, however, is the relative rarity of the word *seglar* in Mexican Spanish sources of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century. It surely was not on the lips of the general populace on ordinary occasions and is hardly in the same class with other words that the Nahuas took as their own and changed in meaning, like their *tomin*, "money," originally derived from a Spanish coin of that name, or their *señora* (often pronounced [xino:la']), "Spanish woman."

Whatever the origin, the word in Chimalpahin does seem to refer to the building housing the Mexico City municipal council or cabildo on the southeast corner of the main square, and can be translated as municipal building or cabildo building. Chimalpahin's entries show unambiguously that his seral or selar was a notable edifice on the square, that it was distinct from the viceregal palace, that it had an arcade in front of it, and that it was the headquarters of the corregidor of Mexico City. These attributes are sufficient to indicate what the word means; moreover, if the seral is not the cabildo building, that important feature of the central square of Mexico City is left unaccountably unmentioned. The word sometimes seems to refer specifically to the jail associated with the building, and it occurred to us that the origin might be Spanish *cárcel*, but too much omission and metathesis must be postulated to make this derivation at all likely.[15]

The expression was by no means new with Chimalpahin. The Codex Osuna, prepared in Mexico City in 1565, has an instance in which the sense seems fully developed. A Spaniard who is pictured as involved in land allocation is labeled an "alcaldes çelar."[16] Although only one alcalde is shown, the accompanying text has the reliable plural "alcaldesme," so that this does not seem to be a hypercorrect plural actually meaning a singular. From the nature of the activities and the fact that the alcalde pictured is accompanied by a regidor, it is clear that they are from the Spanish cabildo of Mexico City. The exact meaning of "çelar" is left somewhat ambiguous; it could equally well mean "secular" (secular alcalde) or "municipal building" (alcalde from the municipal building) but since it does not agree in number with "alcaldes," it seems more likely that it is a substantive referring to the institution or the building. Freestanding loan adjectives hardly existed at this time and were very rare even in Chimalpahin's time.

The so-called Annals of Juan Bautista, done in Mexico City in the 1560s, contain the word three times, always in the form "celar." Luis Reyes in his recent excellent edition puts forth the interpretation that the meaning is "roof terrace," based on the phrase "celar

15. The *c* with which the word begins four times in Ch. might have more affinity with *cárcel*. In the early seventeenth century *s* and *c/z* seem to have been converging in Mexican Spanish as [s], whereas in earlier decades the Nahuas perceived them differently, keeping the Spanish *c/z* the same in their writing, where it represented [s], but often converting *s* to *x*, pronounced [sh]. That the word begins with *c* in both the "Juan Bautista" annals and the Codex Osuna (see the two notes immediately following) is ominous for the interpretation of the word as originating in *seglar*, implying, as we in fact have come to believe for now, that the form at its inception began with *c*.

tlapanco" found in the margin at one point. Reyes believes that the notation was made by a person learning to translate Spanish and that "celar" and "tlapanco," "roof terrace," are to be taken as equivalents. Possibly so, but it is our belief that the phrase just as likely says that the events referred to were viewed from the roof of the cabildo building. Two occurrences in the text proper are highly obscure and do not settle the meaning to our satisfaction.[17]

Tlatoani. A term almost as crucial for Nahua sociopolitical organization as "altepetl" is *tlatoani*, literally "speaker" and in practice the dynastic ruler of an altepetl.[18] The word underwent constant evolution in the postcontact period. Much change had already occurred before Chimalpahin's time, and it continued after that. We might well have kept the Nahuatl word in our English, but it is so frequent and would in many situations be so awkward that we have translated it instead. "Ruler" in our translation usually renders *tlatoani* in the sense of dynastic ruler of an altepetl. The plural, "rulers," most often represents the plural of the Nahuatl word, *tlatoque*, but the sense is often not of several dynastic rulers but of the members of an indigenous municipal council, usually that of Mexico Tenochtitlan. This different meaning of the plural was widespread in Nahuatl as early as the mid-sixteenth century. The word also appears in Chimalpahin (and other Nahuatl writings) applied to certain high Spanish officials, above all the viceroy and sometimes Audiencia judges as well. Here the term, although surely very meaningful, has something of the flavor of an additional courtesy title, and our most usual translation is "lord." Chimalpahin uses the Spanish loanword *obispo*, "bishop," but also, often in tandem with it, *teopixcatlatoani*, which we translate as "priestly ruler." At times other high ecclesiastical officials also receive the appellation. A related term in Chimalpahin's usage, seen less here than in other works of his but still present, is *quauhtlatoani*, literally "eagle speaker" or "eagle ruler," meaning ruler through war or more broadly through individual merit rather than dynastic claim. In view of the nature of the office, we translate it as "interim ruler."

Treatment of saints, names of feasts, etc. We go very far toward putting not only the names of churches but the corresponding names of saints and religious concepts or events in Spanish. Most would agree that it is better to call the main Franciscan establishment in Mexico City the church of San Francisco rather than of St. Francis. Once that step is taken, if we then give the saint the name of Francis (and the churches are named more frequently than the saints), the unity of the two is lost. Also, after enough exposure to these matters one tends to develop a sense that the Spanish terms have a different feeling and even to an extent a different meaning than their English equivalents. Thus with a very few exceptions for ad hoc reasons, the names of the churches and saints are in Spanish, as well as such things as Anunciación, Purificación, etc.

Other names. Nahuatl names are given in our standard orthography in the translation. Spanish names, whether of Nahuas or of Spaniards, are given using modern Spanish spelling conventions for clarity of identification. Given the vagaries of Chimalpahin's orthography of loanwords, full clarity has not always been established. When reconver-

16. *Códice Osuna*, f. 7v. Ch. himself has exactly the same phrase, "alcalde celar," in an entry for March 25, 1594 (pp. 50–51).

17. Reyes García 2001, pp. 150–51, 152–53, 240–41.

18. See Lockhart 1992, pp. 18, 31–35, and Schroeder 1991, pp. 162–93.

sion of Chimalpahin's letter substitutions leads to a well known Spanish name, we have proceeded with confidence and made no comment. With less well known names, we have carried out a certain amount of research in publications, both of that time and of ours, to identify officials, clerics, and other prominent persons, but we were not able in the present context to perform such research exhaustively. In some cases where we are not sure of the intended name we have simply inserted a note with the comment "Name not established." We have little doubt that quite a few persons named in the text will later be identified with greater precision.

Commentary on problems of translation. Our position on how to deal with translation uncertainties is an intermediate or provisional one. Many translators of this kind of material have provided virtually no notes or commentary other than alternate readings of words apparently incorrect in the original, if that. As translations have grown more sophisticated in recent years, more commentary is called for. Yet the field has not yet reached the stage of definitive editions, in which every single passage of dubious or contested meaning would be discussed in detail, all alternatives presented, and the thinking behind them elucidated. In the present state of things, such a procedure would lead to notes more copious than the texts, without corresponding profit. We have discussed in the notes only certain problems that have particularly occupied us and that have a relatively limited scope, for many larger puzzles are not yet ripe for discussion. One cannot complain unduly of Chimalpahin's difficulty despite the richness of his vocabulary and syntax, for his often repeated words and phrases give us many clues toward their decipherment, but the very nature of the annals genre, in which some unattested technical term may surface in a brief entry without much or any context and never be repeated again, can present problems which in the short run have no solution.

Reference numbers for the notes appear in both the transcription and the facing translation, even when the topic concerns only one of the two, to help the reader keep track of parallel words and passages on the two sides, for it is our experience that even the veteran reader of Nahuatl can use such help. Words or short passages which are repeated in the notes literally from Chimalpahin, or which are given as it is thought he intended them, are in roman and in quotes: "teuhctli," "tlahtohuani," etc. Nahuatl words cited in the abstract are in italics and in our standard orthography: *teuctli, tlatoani*, etc.

Acknowledgments

Intellectually, our greatest debt is to Rafael Tena. Our transcription and translation was complete in a first draft before we became aware of his Spanish edition of the same material published in 2001, but it has helped us very considerably nevertheless. Tena's translations are on a distinctly higher level than those of any earlier translator of Chimalpahin working in Spanish.[1] We have compared his translation quite systematically with our own. In many cases where there is a difference (aside from those which are the result of somewhat divergent philosophies of translation), by our understanding either interpretation could be justified; in other cases we believe we have hit on a more accurate solu-

1. It may be that consultation with Luis Reyes has had its effect here, but we have come to the conclusion that Tena is a translator of exceptional qualities in his own right.

2. Notably in the case of *señora*, which Tena does not recognize as meaning "Spanish woman of any rank."

tion.[2] But in yet other cases Tena had found a solution which we had not yet recognized, and in such cases after full consideration we have often followed him in that conclusion, with consequent gain to the translation.[3]

Our debt is nearly as large to Stafford Poole, C.M., whose deep knowledge of the Mexican church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and beyond that of church lore of all kinds, has been essential to our explorations and saved us from many an egregious error. We have consulted him again and again, often several times on the same matter, and we vastly appreciate his patience with us as well as his advice. In some cases we have specifically acknowledged him in notes, but his contribution goes well beyond that. On the other hand, to spare him we did not consult him on every last church-related point, so any mistakes remaining in such matters are our own responsibility. We also express our gratitude to Frances Berdan, whom we consulted on some points of indigenous-style dress.

No thanks are enough for Rebecca Horn, who from a gift copy and without our prior knowledge did a full proofreading after we had finished, finding a multitude of errors we had sought in vain.

We are exceedingly grateful to Madame Monique Cohen, Conservateur general of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Manuscrits, Division Orientale, for granting Schroeder access to Chimalpahin's manuscripts in 1995 and again in 2001. We thank the Stone Center for Latin American Studies at Tulane University for subvention assistance.

3. Tena follows older policies of transcription, adding modern-style punctuation and capitalization and not reproducing abbreviations as in the original, in addition to which the division into words is occasionally erroneous, especially in mistaking a possessive prefix *in-* for the particle *in*. In fact, Zimmermann, as sophisticated as he was, preceded Tena in a good many of these errors and may have influenced him. Tena also, again like Zimmermann, does not rigorously respect Ch.'s original units in terms of paragraphs and sections.