# I.
# The History of Chimalpahin's "Conquista" Manuscript

*Susan Schroeder*

In 1552 the historian Francisco López de Gómara (1511–c. 1559) published his monumental *Historia de las Indias y Conquista de México*.[1] The book was an instant success, and five additional Spanish-language editions were published over the course of the next five years, as well as numerous translations. López de Gómara knew Hernando Cortés (1482–1547) well, reportedly served as his priest for a time, and can be considered his biographer. *La conquista* is a recounting of the circumstances of Cortés's birth, the travails he experienced as a young man in Medellín and later in Seville as he waited to set sail for Santo Domingo, and his activities, including his marriage, while living in Cuba. By far the greatest detail, however, is devoted to the conqueror's exploits as he explored the land that he eventually named New Spain, his negotiations with local peoples, and his inexorable march toward and defeat of Mexico Tenochtitlan, the capital of the Aztec empire. López de Gómara aimed to furnish the best of all insight into the thought and will of the great captain and included, purportedly verbatim, the eloquent speeches that Cortés made to rally his men and exalt the glory of imperial Spain and their Christian mission. Cortés was inevitably Gómara's hero.

However, in the interest of maintaining stability in the colonies, Prince Philip of Spain came to be concerned about the tone of the portrayal of Cortés and the other conquerors of New Spain, and in 1553 the Council of the Indies ordered the suppression of the printing and sale of the book. In 1566, as King Philip II, he prohibited its reading in Castile and in the Americas and imposed large fines for infringement of this order.[2] Nevertheless, the censorship did little to prevent the work from being shipped to the colonies and read by the inhabitants of New Spain and even indigenous

peoples in Mexico City. It warrants noting that, by 1573, the use of the term *conquista* was prohibited, although the term continued to be used by some Spanish authors.[3] To date, there is no evidence of its use as a loanword in any native-authored, native-language text in the Americas.[4]

At some point, *La conquista* fell into the hands of the seventeenth-century Nahua historian Chimalpahin (b. 1579), who lived and worked at the church of San Antonio Abad in the district of Xoloco, site of the famous first encounter of the conqueror Hernando Cortés and Emperor Moteuczoma Xocoyotl, "the younger." Chimalpahin is best known for his epic histories of Indian Mexico in the Nahuatl language, but he occasionally worked with Latin- and Spanish-language documents as well. His histories represent the most comprehensive extant corpus of the history of Indian Mexico written by a known indigenous author in his own language. Chimalpahin had access to an extraordinary collection of ancient pictorial manuscripts; writings in alphabetic Nahuatl, his native language; and published books in Spanish and Latin. Moreover, because he was located in Mexico City, he was able to furnish copious firsthand reports on the contemporary goings-on in the capital. Chimalpahin's histories are therefore invaluable, as they provide a unique, indigenous perspective on life in the colony.

Chimalpahin took it upon himself to make a copy of López de Gómara's great tome. It is said that he also translated the work into Nahuatl, but the whereabouts of that manuscript are unknown. He did transcribe the Spanish book, and as he copied it he deleted and corrected portions and interpolated abundant information about the Nahuas, as if he felt there was much more to the story of the conquest than had been told. As such, then, his work constitutes a major contribution to the New Conquest History genre.[5]

Chimalpahin was writing his histories exactly one hundred years after the Spanish invasion, thus he had not only a temporal advantage but also a material bounty of Spanish- and Nahuatl-language colonial accounts to draw upon. In and around Mexico City, Spaniards—particularly fray Bernardino de Sahagún—collected Tlatelolca histories of the conquest, and mestizo and Nahua authors wrote massive tomes about key actors and events that either preceded the fall of Mexico Tenochtitlan or related their home regions' participation in it. All wrote with an agenda—to exalt the contributions of their own people and towns.[6] Best known are Chimalpahin's contemporaries, don Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl of Tetzcoco and don Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc of Mexico Tenochtitlan. Both men were highly esteemed in their respective communities, and both wrote major historical works in Spanish.[7] It is believed that Alvarado Tezozomoc also wrote in Nahuatl, but

what is extant in that language is known only from writings by Chimalpahin.[8] Of unique and particular importance to this study is the entrance of a seventeenth-century Nahua intellectual into a sixteenth-century Hispanic conquest literary tradition, and his successful manipulation of that genre.

## BACKGROUND OF THIS VOLUME

In December 1986 the late Michael Meyer, then director of the Latin American Area Center at the University of Arizona, telephoned me to say that in front of him, on his desk, was a manuscript entitled "La conquista de México" by don Domingo de San Antón Muñón [Chimalpahin] Quauhtlehuanitzin. I was astonished because it had been close to one hundred years since the work was last seen. It seems that a family physician in Yuma, Arizona, Ellis Browning, had for many years been in possession of the manuscript and was presently in Meyer's office to determine its value or, at the least, to have it translated into English.[9] I eventually met Dr. Browning, examined the manuscript, and determined that it was Chimalpahin's version of Francisco López de Gómara's grand opus of the same title that was published in Spain in 1552.[10] I confess my disappointment on seeing that it was not written in Nahuatl or even in Chimalpahin's hand but was instead an eighteenth-century copy. Subsequent research determined unequivocally that it was the copy made by Lorenzo Boturini Benaduci, who listed it in his 1746 catalog.[11] The manuscript was loaned to me, and I transcribed the entire work in typescript. Dr. Browning donated the manuscript to the Newberry Library in 1991.

Some fifteen years elapsed before I was able to return to Chimalpahin's "Conquista" manuscript. The occasion was a National Endowment for the Humanities fellowship at the Newberry Library in 2000, to research the Spanish conquest of Mexico and the manuscript itself. In the course of that fellowship year I fortuitously met Anne Cruz, whose interest is the Golden Age literature of Spain. She, in turn, introduced me to Cristián Roa-de-la-Carrera, whose specialty is the life and writings of Francisco López de Gómara. Suddenly, I had the makings of a translation team. I was already acquainted with David Tavárez, who is known for his work on Nahua and Zapotec peoples in colonial Mesoamerica, and I invited him to join the project. Cruz, Roa-de-la-Carrera, and Tavárez are native Spanish speakers, and all three possess the scholarly expertise that was needed to realize the translation of the manuscript into English. In 2005, we were awarded an NEH Collaborative Translation Grant, and we began working on the translation at the Newberry Library that July.

We subsequently met in Chicago for one month during each of the next two years. The opportunity to bring to light Chimalpahin's abundant emendations to López de Gómara's text has been an arduous, but highly rewarding, undertaking. Although this work by Chimalpahin is known to some scholars, it has been dismissed for it was believed that he had done little more than add a list of Indians and sign his name. Doubtless, we will never know how it was that Chimalpahin came to make a copy of *La conquista*. There is good evidence that he worked at least part time as a copyist of Nahuatl pictorial and alphabetical texts while living in Mexico City (1593–c. 1624). Presumably, his interest was in providing a comprehensive history of Indian Mexico so that future generations of Nahuas would know of their glorious past. As noted above, López de Gómara's book was forbidden reading in New Spain, yet we are certain that at least one copy was shipped there in 1600.[12] Cristián Roa-de-la-Carrera discusses the life and works of López de Gómara in his introduction below. We know that the mestizo historian Alva Ixtlilxochitl, a contemporary of Chimalpahin, possessed a copy of *La conquista* and declared it to be the best account of the conquest that he had seen.[13] But how did the book come into Chimalpahin's possession? He does not say; indeed, there is no record that he ever mentioned having read it, much less going to the trouble of making a copy. Did he translate it into Nahuatl, as the nineteenth-century historian and politician don Carlos María de Bustamante so assiduously asserts? Was it his purpose to write the history of the fall of Mexico Tenochtitlan from the indigenous perspective?

## CONVENTIONS

By all the evidence, Chimalpahin intended to make an exact copy of *La conquista*. Otherwise, he would have corrected the egregious Spanish phonetic spellings of Nahuatl personal and place names, among other things. We are quite certain which of the six editions published in Spain (1552–1557) he had access to, after Roa-de-la-Carrera's careful comparison of them. In truth, there are relatively few differences in the various editions,[14] and we are confident that he used either the original 1552 or the 1553 edition. We have thus opted for the 1552 work as our copy text for comparison with Chimalpahin's manuscript. We adhere to Chimalpahin's intention to furnish a full account of López de Gómara's book. In the course of copying the book, Chimalpahin inadvertently omitted two folios (1552, ff. xix, xx). We have translated the missing folios and include them in our text, enclosed in brackets, to maintain continuity

of the history. In addition, while López de Gómara used chapter titles, Chimalpahin numbered the chapters, but not all of them, and he omitted an occasional title altogether and added a couple of his own. Another marked difference is Chimalpahin's use of parentheses, which are familiar in his Nahuatl annals. Most often, his parenthetical comments are direct quotes from López de Gómara, although the latter rarely, if ever, used parentheses. Chimalpahin also commonly posed questions in his histories and punctuated them with question marks. Yet these, like parentheses, are stylistic features that appear sparingly in López de Gómara's published book. As he famously did in all his other writings, Chimalpahin signed his name in the text as he made his emendations. All such additions are characteristic of the Chimalpahin canon.

However, conspicuously absent in the eighteenth-century copy we worked from are the scholia that would typically fill the blank spaces between the lines and in the margins of an original, handwritten version. We can nevertheless imagine Chimalpahin's densely scripted holograph. His additions are numerous and usually pertinent, and they ultimately enhance our understanding of his particular perspective of the Spanish invasion. And, despite the "editing" nature of most of his interpolations, we are reminded of his eloquence as a Nahua historian when he laments the loss of five hundred Mexica during the final siege, describing the men as "the flower of Tlatelolco" (f. 116). Yet he is seemingly capricious in his description of the natives of Tabasco, remarking that "they were such simpletons" when they gave flowers and turkeys to the Spaniards' horses to eat (f. 17).

Mention should also be made of Boturini's copyist, who presumably made an exact transcription of Chimalpahin's manuscript. Occasional copyist errors are apparent, such as inconsistencies in the spelling of certain terms. When an error was obvious and easy to correct, we have done so in the text without comment. When it was not so easily resolved, we have consulted other sources and explained the action or answered the question in a note. We cannot be absolutely certain who it was that omitted the two folios from the original book, Chimalpahin or the copyist, but all subsequent copies of Chimalpahin's manuscript are missing the same two folios. In keeping with Chimalpahin's style—and to avoid López de Gómara's repeated use of *yndios* in his many references to native peoples of a given polity, such as the *Mexicanos* of Mexico Tenochtitlan—we have substituted the Nahuatl plural endings (without the glottal stops) *-ca*, *-teca*, and *-que*. Hence, *Mexica* for *Mexicano*, *Chololteca* for *Cholulanos*, and *Colhuaque* for *Culhuas*. We have attempted to identify and explain or to correct ambiguities on the parts of López de Gómara and Chimalpahin, when possible, in relevant notes.

An example is López de Gómara's, or perhaps Hernando Cortés's, habit of confusing the native *altepetl*, "kingdom or ethnic state," of Colhuacan with Acolhuacan (generally known as Tetzcoco), or sometimes using Colhuacan interchangeably with Coyoacan (yet another altepetl), and even mistaking Colhuacan for Culiacan (a different polity altogether). Chimalpahin usually caught the errors and corrected them, but not always. In most instances, we have standardized the spellings of Nahuatl place and personal names, following the Nahuatl lexicon, except when a spelling has changed significantly and the modern form is readily familiar—for example, Cuernavaca for Quauhnahuac, and Oaxaca for Huaxacac. Many Spanish-language terms are specific to their institutions, places, and dates, and we have retained these in the translation after defining them when they first appear. We also have compiled a glossary with English translations of all the foreign terms that appear repeatedly in this work. López de Gómara frequently used more than one spelling for particular places and personal names. On the first appearance of each variation, we have retained his spelling in the translation, corrected it in a note, when possible, and used the standard spelling thereafter.

The Aztec capital at the time of the Spanish invasion was Mexico Tenochtitlan, but early on, López de Gómara referred to it as México (for greater Mexico City), and Chimalpahin let it stand. Another error that Chimalpahin glossed over is López de Gómara's use of Nahuatl place names as individually titled personal names, stating that a certain lord was called Tabasco (f. 18), and referring to a Lord Iztacmixtitlan (f. 34v), even when they are obviously the names of locales, judging by the locative endings. In one instance Chimalpahin adds "Lord" (before "Chinantla"; f. 106v) to indicate that a person was being referred to rather than a place. In his Nahuatl histories, Chimalpahin was fastidious about such details, and he was nearly obsessive about rank, office, title, reverentials, and correct spellings, as discussed below by David Tavárez. Additionally, several of Chimalpahin's manuscripts are unfinished, often breaking off in midsentence. All totaled, López de Gómara's book contains 252 chapters. In Chimalpahin's version, Chapter 229, "On Judges and Laws,"[15] had barely begun when the narrative abruptly ends.

As noted, Chimalpahin's "Conquista" manuscript is an amalgam of authorial voices and editorial practices. Moreover, because we were working from an eighteenth-century copy rather than from Chimalpahin's original holograph, we had to contend with an additional layer of mediation provided by a copyist who may have contributed his own misreadings or inaccuracies. The following are some of the theoretical and linguistic assumptions that we made as translators in order to convey the complexity of the manuscript into English.

One of the first tasks was to generate an accurate transcription of the Spanish-language manuscript. Roa-de-la-Carrera edited and revised my transcription and performed painstaking multiple checks, which were supplemented by on-the-spot verifications by Tavárez and Cruz. Next, we addressed two broad historical and linguistic questions: first, how did the structure and composition of the manuscript differ from that of its putative source, López de Gómara's 1552 edition? A meticulous, word-by-word comparison of the eighteenth-century manuscript, again by Roa-de-la-Carrera, yielded a number of significant differences, which we noted in our transcription of the manuscript by using regular typeface for all the words found both in the aforementioned López de Gómara edition and in the Chimalpahin manuscript, **boldface** for the words and phrases found only in Chimalpahin, and [brackets] around text prefaced by "LdeG:" for those found in López de Gómara but not in Chimalpahin. When certain phrases in Chimalpahin seemed to be glosses but not exact renderings of phrases found in López de Gómara, they were included in the text in brackets. When those phrases seemed to intrude upon the legibility of the narrative as a whole, they were put in footnotes. A third purpose for brackets is to identify names of subjects and objects where C.'s and LdeG's use of pronouns may be ambiguous.

We approached the project with the expectation that we would find a marked contrast in terms of syntax, language registers, word choices, use of colloquial expressions, and use of honorifics and titles between López de Gómara and Chimalpahin. Our observations have been consistent with this key assumption, and, as mentioned, we have been able to identify a few errors that were surely introduced by the eighteenth-century copyist. Our collaboration has yielded a Spanish-language edited transcription that highlights these crucial differences throughout the text.

The second major issue that we faced was how to convey both the semantic content of the "Conquista" manuscript and its peculiar structure into scholarly but accessible twenty-first-century North American English. In his celebrated essay, "The Task of the Translator," Walter Benjamin asserts that "the language of a translation can—in fact, must—let itself go so that it gives voice to the *intentio* of the original, not as reproduction but as harmony, as a supplement to the language in which it expresses itself, as its own kind of *intentio*."[16] Benjamin, who also regards transparency as the cardinal virtue of translation, would perhaps have been baffled both by Chimalpahin's text and by our efforts. Nevertheless, we have found useful his suggestion that one must depart from one form of linguistic intention in the original and seek to arrive at a separate, well-formed intentionality in the language into which one is translating. Therefore, our first and foremost objective as translators has

been to render the hybrid structure of the text—López de Gómara's narrative and Chimalpahin's emendations—as possessing its own particular intentionality in English. We have regarded other effects that a translator may see, such as clarity, aesthetic, impact, originality, and voice, as tools for achieving this task.

An example is our translation of the final sentence of Cortés's oration to his men after the capture of Tzompantzinco, when some Spaniards begin to abandon their resolve to march to the great capital, Mexico Tenochtitlan (f. 40v). In the following transcription of the original Spanish text, we use boldface type to highlight Chimalpahin's additions to the 1552 López de Gómara edition, and brackets to indicate wording that he chose to delete.

Venzereis tanbien con aiuda de Dios y con Vuestro esfuerzo los que de estos mas quedan que **ya** no pueden ser muchos y **mas** los **que son** de Culhua que no son mejores, **asi que pues hasta agora nos estamos en pie nadie se acuerde, ni desmaieis, y si** [LdeG: si no desmayais y] me seguis **con la gran confianza de todos nuestros Amigos y Compañeros sera Dios con nos Amen.**

It was rendered into English as:

With God's help and through your own efforts, you will defeat all those remaining, who should not be many in number **now**, as well as the Colhuaque, who are no better than the rest. **And since until now we are still standing**, let us not **falter or** faint, **for** if you follow me **with the great trust of all our friends and companions, God will be with us. Amen.**

The bilingual reader will note that the multiple clauses contained within one long sentence and divided by commas in the original version have been reconfigured into two shorter sentences in the English version. Our lexical choices sought to reflect the tone of the oration, which manages to be concise and eloquent and avoids the use of unusual words; it is, after all, a text that was written to be read both privately and before audiences that contained illiterate individuals. A great deal of deliberation went into the ways in which the text in regular typeface (common to both López de Gómara and Chimalpahin) interweaves with the bold typeface (Chimalpahin's additions) in our translation. We trust that the final product can be read at a glance by the casual reader, while at the same time rendering highly visible the density and content of Chimalpahin's additions and subtractions for the more determined reader. Moreover, we made a number of choices that improve legibility without sacrificing the apparent intention behind Chimalpahin's additions. Thus, the sentence section "que **ya** no pueden ser muchos y **mas** los **que** son de Culhua que no son mejores," which features three words added by Chimalpahin, has been rendered as "who should not be many

in number **now**, as well as the Colhuaque, who are no better than the rest." This translation takes into account Chimalpahin's addition of the indexical "**ya**" (now), but chooses to overlook the verb repetition in "**que** son/que no son." Moreover, Chimalpahin's addition, "**desmaicis**," in the subjunctive mood, is treated as an equivalent to "desmayais," the indicative conditional form originally used by López de Gómara. These two minor departures from an absolutely literal translation improve, in our view, the oration's readability. The remaining additions in this sentence are translated in a more literal manner, recognizing that the coordinated clause "let us not **falter or** faint" was a deliberate stylistic and rhetorical modification introduced by Chimalpahin, which serves to illustrate the balance between literal translation and overall legibility that we strove to achieve throughout the translation. Additionally, we have tended to divide the text into more manageable paragraphs with somewhat shorter sentences. Whenever possible, however, we have preferred to leave the sentences their original lengths so that readers can experience the full flavor of the sixteenth-century narrative.

## REFERENCE WORKS

We acknowledge and greatly appreciate Lesley Byrd Simpson's pioneering a modern English translation of López de Gómara's *La conquista de México*, published in 1964.[17] Indeed, as if it were not enough of an endeavor in its own right, it appears that Simpson was simultaneously working on a translation of Robert Ricard's *Conquista Espiritual*.[18] Both conquest works, obviously, were major contributions to the historiography of sixteenth-century colonial Mesoamerica. And as far as can be determined, Simpson's translation of Ricard's book is exact and complete. However, he had a different, somewhat draconian (we feel) approach to translating and editing López de Gómara. First and foremost, Simpson omitted all forty-nine chapters (200–248) about native society and culture. Second, his approach is less literal than ours, and his version is considerably abridged—doubtless the result of his aim to provide a modern and accessible English-language account of López de Gómara's sixteenth-century Spanish chronicle. It proved to be a handy, popular edition with a wide readership for many years, but it has been out of print for a long time.

We have, of course, consulted the Simpson edition when challenged by troublesome terms or concepts in order to corroborate our own findings. His facility in Spanish and his knowledge of New Spain afforded us no end of reassurance. We also had abundant access to Peter Gerhard's

encyclopedic three-volume work on New Spanish geography (1972, 1979, 1982)[19] and Hugh Thomas's resourceful *Conquest: Montezuma, Cortés, and the Fall of Old Mexico* (1993) and his *Who's Who of the Conquistadors* (2000).[20] These works greatly facilitated our research and improved the present translation considerably, and we used them to identify as many key figures and places in the narrative as were relevant and possible. We have also availed ourselves of other primary sources and consulted numerous Spanish and Nahuatl dictionaries and grammars to define puzzling terminology and clarify problematic phrasing.

## ABOUT THE MANUSCRIPT

The earliest published notice of Chimalpahin's "Conquista" manuscript is in Boturini's 1746 catalog of his Museo. Boturini noted: "Another history of the Conquest, its author is don Domingo de San Antón Chimalpahin [Quauhtlehuanitzin]. It is a complete, polished, and extensive work. Vol. 20, in folio size. Original."[21] In the earlier (1743) version of his catalog, Boturini was even more explicit: "Another folio-size manuscript volume in Spanish. It is about the conquest in general terms, and also about the conquest of Mexico [Tenochtitlan], and was copied from the original. Its author is D. Domingo de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin, an indigenous *cacique*, "leader," and it has one hundred and seventy-two folios."[22] Boturini compiled his catalog the same year he was arrested, imprisoned, and sent to Spain. His collection of antiquities was purportedly held by the government and then, from 1771 to 1788, housed in the library of the Royal University. But many of the books and manuscripts were dispersed. Moreover, the Spanish crown ordered that all the materials in the Boturini collection were to be sent to Spain, and in the 1790s a delegation of officials was sent to Mexico City for that purpose. Copies of the many manuscripts were made by creoles, and eventually there were at least six copies of Chimalpahin's "Conquista" manuscript.[23]

Some of the Boturini manuscripts were sold and taken to England and France; others were collected by creole bibliophiles, who used them as the basis for writing often profound treatises in response to disparaging philosophical and political attacks from Europe and the United States.[24] Chimalpahin's writings were among those cited most frequently. By the nineteenth century, however, New Spanish creoles turned their attention to matters more pressing on the homefront, namely, the colony's independence from Spain. The creole historian, lawyer, and politician don Carlos María de Bustamante (1774–1848) was an ardent supporter of the

independence movement and devoted considerable time to promoting the glories of Mexico's indigenous past (as compared to its infamous colonial era). To do so, he began to publish the manuscripts of Alva Ixtlilxochitl, Alvarado Tezozomoc, Sahagún, and many others—Chimalpahin among them. He stated that Chimalpahin's "Conquista" manuscript had fallen into his hands as well as a Nahuatl translation of it also written by Chimalpahin. He added that he had the manuscript translated back into Spanish and published it in two volumes in 1826.[25] The work, like so many of Bustamante's publications, was deeply flawed; among other errors, he has Chimalpahin's name wrong on the title page. Nevertheless, in publishing the manuscripts, Bustamante saved them for posterity and ensured Mexico's patrimony. He claimed that he was publishing the ancient works for the benefit of Mexico's youth, since "we have so few good books."[26] Among Bustamante's private papers is a receipt for the sale of a manuscript about the conquest.[27] The historian Alfredo Chavero (1841–1906) claimed to have owned the Bustamante copy of Chimalpahin's manuscript—although Chavero also claimed not to believe that Chimalpahin existed.[28] The anthropologist Nicolás León (1859–1929) seems to have been the last to be in possession of the manuscript, writing on the final folio, "This was the MS don Carlos María de Bustamante published with a thousand errors and in great disarray as 'Historia de las Conquistas de Hernando Cortés, escritas en español por Francisco López de Gómara' [History of the Conquests of Hernando Cortés, written in Spanish by Francisco López de Gómara], &c &c México, 1826, 2 volumes. In quarto, N. León." There is no further notice of "Conquista" until 1986.

The Browning Manuscript (Vault Folio Case Ms 5011) is housed at the Newberry Library, Chicago. It is bound in mission binding in coarse, limp vellum with ties, with five stitches in the front and back securing the spine. The lettering on the spine is difficult to read: "C llo(?) Conquista d. Mex." Front and back pastedowns display printer's waste from a work entitled *El peregrino septentrional atlante: delineado en la exemplarissima vida del venerable padre F. Antonio Margil de Jesús*, escribela el P. Fr. Isidro Felis de Espinosa. México: Joseph Bernardo de Hogal, 1737, with watermarks similar to those on some of the manuscript's leaves. The date of the publication suggests that Boturini himself had the manuscript bound. Preceding the first folio is a torn page that appears to have been written by Boturini: "Nota Bene: The author of this Conquista is don Domingo de S. Anton Muñon Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, who was alive in the year 1620, as attested by another original Mexican historical manuscript that I have almost finished [copying], which I suppose was written by this same author . . ." The manuscript numbers 172 folios and is written in brown ink in the same eighteenth-century script

throughout, although the title is in a different hand and ink and appears to have been added later. Marginalia in a variety of hands are present, although scholar John Glass believes that one of these may well be that of Boturini. The marginalia have not been included in this English translation but will appear in the critical Spanish transcription edition, with commentary by Roa-de-la-Carrera. The Spanish transcription of Chimalpahin's manuscript will be published in Mexico City by the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

It has been a privilege to translate Francisco López de Gómara's great history and to identify, research, and come to understand Chimalpahin's many modifications to what has always been a remarkable but very Spanish version of the conquest of Mexico. Chimalpahin's emendations furnishing his Nahua perspective are indeed important, and they enable the reader to appreciate what concerned him most about López de Gómara's book. We sincerely wish that we had his Nahuatl translation of the same text for comparison as well as, doubtless, an even greater abundance of information about Nahua life. Chimalpahin wrote, he said, so that future generations would know of ancient Mexico's cultural heritage. We are pleased to bring to light in English translation this quite extraordinary contribution of what Chimalpahin believed should also be known about the fall of Mexico Tenochtitlan.

## NOTES

1. It is likely that López de Gómara was known only by "Gómara" in his day, but we have opted to use his full name, as he called himself, since that is how he is now known and in order to facilitate bibliographic referencing. Additionally, the title of his opus is *Historia de las Indias y Conquista de México* but the title page of the work itself within the volume has *La conquista de México*. Throughout this book we have used the short form "Conquista" to refer to Chimalpahin's manuscript and *La conquista* to refer to López de Gómara's published book.

2. For information about the role played by the Council of Indies and its officers regarding censorship during these years, and the effect of censorship on the publication and circulation of López de Gómara's writings, see Cristián Roa-de-la-Carrera, *Histories of Infamy: Francisco López de Gómara and the Ethics of Spanish Imperialism*, trans. Scott Sessions (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2005), 55–61.

3. For discussion of the use of the term in the sixteenth century, see Javier Villa-Flores, *Dangerous Speech: A Social History of Blasphemy in Colonial Mexico* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2006), p. 29.

4. The one known exception does not pertain to the scores of early colonial Mesoamerican writings. For a unique example, to date, of the use of the word

*conquista* in a primordial title from the 1690s, see Lisa Sousa and Kevin Terraciano, "The 'Original Conquest' of Oaxaca: Nahua and Mixtec Accounts of the Spanish Conquest," *Ethnohistory* 50:2 (2005), 349–400.

5. See Matthew Restall, "Commentary," Conference on Latin American History, American Historical Association meeting, 5 January 2009, and Susan Schroeder, "Introduction: The Genre of Conquest Studies," in *Indian Conquistadors: Indigenous Allies in the Conquest of Mesoamerica*, ed. Laura E. Matthew and Michel R. Oudijk (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007), 5–27.

6. Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, *Florentine Codex, Book 12—The Conquest of Mexico*, ed. and trans. Arthur J. O. Anderson and Charles E. Dibble (Santa Fe and Salt Lake City: School of American Research and the University of Utah), 1975.

7. Don Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, *Obras históricas*, 2 vols., ed. Edmundo O'Gorman (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1975, 1977), and don Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc, *Crónica mexicana*, ed. Gonzalo Díaz Migoyo and Germán Vázquez Chamorro (Madrid: Dastín, 2001).

8. Don Domingo de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, *Codex Chimalpahin: Society and Politics in Mexico Tenochtitlan, Tlatelolco, Texcoco, Culhuacan, and Other Nahua Altepetl in Central Mexico*, 2 vols., ed. and trans. Arthur J. O. Anderson and Susan Schroeder (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1977).

9. By no means was the Latin American Area Center or Mike Meyer in the business of appraising manuscripts or arranging for their translation. Dr. Browning had additional antiquities, but no other manuscripts.

10. Francisco López de Gómara, *Historia de las Indias y Conquista de México* (Çaragoça: Agustín Millán, 1552).

11. Lorenzo Boturini Benaduci, *Catálogo del Museo Histórico Indiano*, in *Idea de una nueva historia general de la América septentrional: Fundada sobre material copioso de figuras, symbolos, caracteres y geroglíficos, cantares y manuscritos de autores indios, ultimamente descubiertos* (Madrid: Juan de Zúñiga, 1746).

12. Irving A. Leonard, *Books of the Brave: Being an Account of Books and of Men in the Spanish Conquest and Settlement of the Sixteenth-Century New World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 253, 298.

13. Mariano Veytia, *Historia antigua de México*, ed. C. F. Ortega (1836; México: Editorial Leyenda, 1944), 2:52.

14. Roa-de-la-Carrera is currently preparing a critical edition of the Chimalpahin "Conquista" manuscript for publication in Spanish.

15. This follows Chimalpahin's reckoning of the chapters. It would be Chapter 226 in López de Gómara.

16. Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1968), 79.

17. Francisco López de Gómara, *Cortés: The Life of the Conqueror by His Secretary, Francisco López de Gómara*, ed. and trans. Lesley Byrd Simpson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964).

18. Robert Ricard, *Conquête Spirituelle du Mexique*, in *Travaux et Mémoires de l'Institut d' Ethnologie*, vol. 20 (Paris: University of Paris, 1933) and *La conquista espiritual de México*, trans. Ángel María de Garibay K. (México: Editorial Jus, 1947). In July 1965, Simpson wrote a personal letter to William Spratling in Mexico, complaining that his work on *Conquista espiritual* was "crawling along at a glacial pace." Of particular interest are his and Spratling's comments on how the book would be received by "our official friends" because of its emphasis on contributions by religious in the early colonial period. William Spratling Correspondence, Spratling Ranch, Taxco el Viejo, México.

19. Peter Gerhard, *A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972); *The Southeast Frontier of New Spain* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979); and *The North Frontier of New Spain* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982).

20. Hugh Thomas, *Conquest: Montezuma, Cortés, and the Fall of Old Mexico* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993) and *Who's Who of the Conquistadors* (London: Cassel, 2000).

21. Boturini, *Catálogo*, 76.

22. Cited in Carlos María de Bustamante, *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] de San Antón Muñón Chimalpain Quauhtlehuanitzin, indio mexicano* (México: de la testamentaria de Ontiveros, 1826), 1:ii.

23. In addition to the Browning Manuscript at the Newberry Library, the extant copies are in Paris (BNP-FE 173, c. 1776); Madrid (BNMa 13367); Mexico City (BNM-FR 1727); New York (Hispanic Society, HC 411/678, c. 1755); and Munich (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c. 1805). One half of one manuscript is in Dallas, Texas (DL-SMU, c. 1800), and the other half is in Providence, Rhode Island (JCBL, c. 1800). The original Bustamante copy, as well as that by Chimalpahin, has yet to be located.

24. For a full discussion of the creole indigenista movement and the rather extraordinary use of Chimalpahin's "Conquista" manuscript as both a patriotic and an intellectual tool to enhance inchoate Mexican nationalism, see Susan Schroeder, "Chimalpahin, don Carlos María de Bustamante, and *The Conquest of Mexico* as Cause for Mexican Nationalism," *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl* 39, 287–309, 2008.

25. Bustamante, *Historia de las conquistas*.

26. Bustamante, *Historia del descubrimiento de la América septentrional por Cristóbal Cólon, escrita por el R.P. Fr. Manuel de la Vega, religioso franciscano de la provincial del Santo Evangelio de México* (México: Ontiveros, 1826), prologue, n.p.

27. Carlos María de Bustamante, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Archivo Histórico, Colección Antigua, 439 (1834), where Bustamante notes the sale of a manuscript, "La conquista de México sin mascara" for 250 pesos.

28. Alfredo Chavero, "Historia antigua y de la conquista," in *México a través de los siglos*, ed. Vicente Riva Palacio (México: Ballesca y Co., n.d.), 1:xlvi.