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Chapter 1. Introduction

neguati nicora moch nopoliguan quasamota corami yhūan ayotochipa nopoliguan corami yhuān guaxcore nopoliguan corami

I am Cora. My children are all the Cora in Guazamota; in Ayotochpa, my children are Cora; and in Guaxicori, all my children are Cora.

Don Francisco Nayari

1.1. Indigenous Literacy

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Nahuas in the Valley of Mexico employed a pictographic writing system known as the Mixteca-Puebla Style and the Roman alphabet to record the Indigenous language of Nahuatl in this region. Meanwhile, Nahuas who lived in the hinterlands of Guadalajara, hundreds of miles northwest of Mexico City, do not appear to have used a pictorial system of writing and, until recently, only a few of them appeared to have written in the Roman alphabet because only a few Nahuatl alphabetic documents had surfaced. However, the diligent work of archivists working under the direction of Glafira Pérez

---

1 Archivo Histórico del Arzobispado de Guadalajara (AHAG), Documentos en náhuatl, “1649a Tzacamota.”

2 My usage of “Nahua” is more precise than Spaniard. I use Nahua to denote a native Nahuatl speaker, and I rely on non-Nahua to refer to individuals who had a different native language. For example, evidence suggests that Doña Marina was a Nahua, but Nayari and Bernardino de Sahagún were non-Nahuas because they spoke different native languages even if, at a certain point in their lives, they learned to speak and write Nahuatl.

Magaña have unearthed a large number of Nahuatl documents within the correspondence of the Archdiocese of Guadalajara from the seventeenth century. A second corpus of Nahuatl documents sent to the Royal Audiencia of Guadalajara and the Franciscan Order have also survived to shed more light on Guadalajara and nearby Indigenous communities during the sixteenth century. These documents are petitions, letters, and receipts written by peoples who lived in towns that stood within a hundred-mile radius of Guadalajara. The writers were literate Indigenous men who included people like Don Francisco Nayari, Diego Juan, and an unnamed writer who wrote on behalf of María Magdalena. They sometimes wrote on their own behalf but most often represented their communities before the colonial institutions of the region such as the Franciscan order, the Real Audiencia of Guadalajara, and the Diocese of Guadalajara.

In 1649, Don Francisco Nayari, a Cora, wrote three letters to the bishop of Guadalajara, Juan Ruiz Colmenero. Nayari was a ladino, a Hispanicized Indigenous person, because he identifies himself as a resident of the town of Tzacamota, as a Christian, and as a Cora, but he does not write in the Indigenous language of the Cora but in Nahuatl. He writes in response to several letters that Bishop Ruiz Colmenero appears to have written him. Nayari addresses the

---

4 These documents are held by AHAG.

5 These documents are held by Biblioteca Publica del Estado de Jalisco, Juan José Arreola (BPEJ-JJA), McA-UCLA, and the Bancroft Library at UC Berkeley (BAN-UCB).

6 Only Nombre de Dios and Xalisco are farther then this proposed one-hundred-mile radius.


8 Colmenero appears to have been appointed in 1646, but he did not arrive in Mexico until 1648, and he toured the area of his jurisdiction between 1648 and 1649. Several of his letters have been digitized by the Archivo General de Indias, (AGI) including the ship manifest, which was created dated June 6, 1646. AGI, Contratación, 5427, N.3, R.1.

9 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649a Tzacamota.”
first of his letters to “señor obispo (lord bishop)” without naming him. The year of 1649 is significant because, in 1648-49 Bishop Ruiz Colmenero began his time at the Diocese of Guadalajara with a visita, an inspection visit, of the many parishes under his jurisdiction.

Magnus Lundberg asserts that in the archdiocese of Mexico City and the diocese of Puebla, visitas by bishops or their subordinates led to a large number of petitions during the seventeenth century. It is doubtful that Bishop Ruiz Colmenero went to Tzacamota because in 1649 this town was in an independent region known as El Gran Nayar. He most likely wrote from the neighboring province of Izatlan, which bordered El Gran Nayar on the south, or from the province of Acaponeta, which bordered it on the west. Then, Franciscans living in convents in one of these provinces most likely would have taken the bishop’s letters into the highland plateau that made up most of El Gran Nayar. Still later, Nayari’s responses were returned to their convent from where they made their way to Guadalajara.

Nayari presents himself as a Christian Indigenous noble. He responds to the earliest letter from the bishop by explaining how he has heard that others have connected the Cora to the Tepehuanes, who had a reputation for being rebellious and poor Christians. However, he writes assurances that he does not seek the Tepehuanes, but that they come to see him and his people,

---

10 Peter Gerhard writes that Bishop Ruiz Colmenero’s visita journals have been lost. Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España translated by Patricia Escandón Bolaños and with maps by Bruce Campbell (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1996), 71-72.


12 Nayari wrote three distinct letters: “1649a Tzacamota,” “1649b Tzacamota,” and “1649c Tzacamota.” AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
who live in the towns of Guazamota, Ayotochpa, and Guaxicori. These towns form three points in a triangle of territory in the northern part of El Gran Nayar, and they are hemmed in between the Tepehuanes to the north, other Cora groups to the south, militarized Tlaxcalan and Huichol communities to the east, and mixed Spanish-Indigenous communities to the west.13

Diego Juan was a different type of person from Nayari because he served as the notary of San Martín, a town in the province of Ávalos, which was south of Guadalajara and beyond the power of the groups of El Gran Nayar, and he wrote two petitions on behalf of the cabildo (town council). He writes on behalf of petitioners who complain about how the alcalde mayor and the priest residing in the cabecera (head town) of Cocula are taking too much tribute in goods and services from San Martín. He addresses Bishop Ruiz Colmenero without naming him in two petitions with this complaint—one in 1653 and another in 1654—that he wrote on the basis of memories by the petitioners and him of the latter’s 1648 or 1649 visita.

San Martín was located in the province of Ávalos, which may have been the most Hispanicized region in the Diocese of Guadalajara because eighteen Nahuatl petitions are from this region, which is the largest number of any province in this study. The residents of these towns were accustomed to the cabecera (head town) system of Spanish imperial rule in which the head-town served as the seat of both the imperial representative, in the form of an alcalde mayor or a corregidor, and a parish priest. Furthermore, most of the writers from Ávalos wrote during the second-half of the seventeenth century, when the Franciscan order had lost most of its control of the region to the parish priests who were beholden to the secular bishop. These two

13 These Huichol and Tlaxcalan communities were mustered and led by a captain appointed by the Viceroy of New Spain. At times, smaller contingents might be led by Tlaxcalan leaders. Bret Blosser, “By the Force of Their Lives and the Spilling of Blood”: Flechero Service and Political Leverage on a Nueva Galicia Frontier”in Indian Conquistadors: Indigenous Allies in the Conquest of Mesoamerica ed. by Laura E. Matthew and Michel R Oudijk (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007).
hierarchies required tribute from a variety of Indigenous peoples including Coras, Cocos, Tecuejes, and Sayultecos, who could rely on their notaries to write petitions to protest tribute demands or other types of abuses by colonial officials.

In 1622, María Magdalena sent a petition to the provisor, a diocesan judge, to complain about her treatment at the hands of the alcalde mayor if Izatlan.¹⁴ In her petition, she claims to be an official known as a tenantzin within the cofradía of Mary of the Immaculate Conception in the town of La Magdalena. She proposes that she has fulfilled the duties of her office, and that she has only asserted that she was competent as a tenantzin when the alcalde mayor took her from the church and placed her in custody. Magdalena identifies herself as the servant of the provisor, and as a resident of the town of La Magdalena. This town was in the province of Izatlan, which was dominated by a basin and appeared to have had a Nahua majority, although María did not connect herself to a particular group.¹⁵ Izatlan had a strong Franciscan presence with convents at La Magdalena and the nearby towns of Ayahualulco, and Ezatlan, and it appears to have influenced the petition sponsored by María because, like many Franciscans who wrote in Nahuatl, her writer employs a Central Mexican variant (Refer to Chapters 1.3, 1.4, and 3).

Nayari, Diego Juan, and the writer of “1622 La Magdalena” thus record the different degrees of colonization in Izatlan, El Gran Nayar, and Ávalos. They and the other notaries of

¹⁴ AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1622 La Magdalena.”

¹⁵ Gerhard asserts that most of the people spoke a Nahuatl language, but there was an Otomí-speaking minority. The different variants of Otomí belong to the Otopamean family, which has about a dozen extant languages whose speakers inhabit territory to the north and west of Mexico City (Silver and Miller 1997: 344). I propose that, regarding Izatlan, Otomí referred to speakers of a non-Nahuatl Indigenous language (Refer to Chapter 3.3) and agree that most of the Indigenous residents in this province spoke Nahuatl. Gerhard, A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain revised edition (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993), 156.
this corpus of sixty-two documents thus offer Indigenous perspectives from the side of the colonized in an extensive area that includes portions of the present-day states of Jalisco, Michoacán, Nayarit, Colima, Aguascalientes, Durango, Sinaloa, and Zacatecas. However, borders and jurisdictions were different between 1563 and 1694, when Indigenous scribes wrote these documents.

1.2. Northwestern New Spain

The sixty-two Nahuatl-language documents belong to Indigenous towns within a large jurisdiction called “New Spain” that scholars have classified in a variety of ways. Robert Ricard (2005) defines New Spain as the territory that fell under the jurisdiction of the archdiocese of Mexico, and the dioceses of Tlaxcala-Puebla, Michoacán, Nueva Galicia, and Antequera, or all of present-day Mexico except for the southern states of Chiapas, Tabasco, Campeche, and Yucatan. Oakah L. Jones (1979) posits a northern New Spain encompassed by the Spanish provinces of Sinaloa, Sonora, Baja California, Alta California, Nueva Vizcaya, Nuevo Mexico, Coahuila, Nuevo León, Texas, and Nuevo Santander, or the land encompassing what are now all of the Mexican States north of the Tropic of Cancer, Baja California Sur, the American Southwest, and Texas. Furthermore, in The Northern Frontier of New Spain, Peter Gerhard (1982) accepts all of the provinces posited by Jones and also adds the province of Nueva Galicia, which encompasses a territory that contains all or portions of Zacatecas, Jalisco, Nayarit, Aguascalientes, Guanajuato and San Luis Potosí. David J. Weber (1992) uses New Spain interchangeably with Mexico in The Spanish Frontier in North America, and his Spanish frontier in North America represents a region of the United States that goes from the Atlantic to the Pacific by including Spanish controlled and influenced areas in portions of the American
Southeast, Texas, the American Southwest, and California. My study accepts most of these definitions of Spanish frontiers in North America and Northern New Spain, and it proposes a Northwestern New Spain centered on Guadalajara that consists of most of the Diocese of Guadalajara and some disputed parishes bordering the Diocese of Durango, the Diocese of Michoacán, and the military districts of Nombre de Dios and El Gran Nayar (Refer to Map 1 at the end of this chapter).  

My study of correspondence from Northwestern New Spain seeks to illuminate the context in which Nayari, Diego Juan, the writer of “1622 La Magdalena,” and other writers wrote while also exploring the content of these documents. First, Indigenous notaries wrote to address the effects of colonialism on themselves and on their communities, and their words counter a dialogue that Spaniards and other Europeans have dominated. Second, Indigenous notaries wrote in Nahuatl, and although scholars have analyzed Nahuatl-language documents in the basin of Mexico and nearby valleys, few such studies exist for Northwestern New Spain, or for the genre of Nahuatl petitions. Third, Louise Burkhart mentions that Nahuatl genre documents do not generally emphasize female actors, but the mention by Marfa Magdalena of a female official known as a tenantzin suggests that these works from Northwestern New Spain

---

16 The Diocese of Guadalajara was also known as the Diocese of Nueva Galicia and El Gran Nayar was independent until 1722. Thomas Calvo, *Colección de documentos para la historia de Nayarit: Los albores de un nuevo mundo* I ed. (Mexico City: Universidad de Guadalajara and Centre D’Études Mexicaines e Centraméricaines, 1990).

17 Many different groups spoke Spanish in colonial Mexico even though it might not have been their primary language. For example, Pedro de Gante was from Ghent, and Francisco de Ibarra was of Basque descent. I will employ “Spaniard” to refer to them and other fluent Spanish speakers from Europe whether or not they were native speakers.

18 During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Nahuatl was spoken from the Tropic of Cancer to Nicaragua by various groups. From north to south, they include the Caxcanes of western and northwestern Mexico, the Mexica and Acolhua who dominated the Aztec Empire, the Tlaxcalans who helped the Spaniards defeat the Aztec Empire, the Pipil of El Salvador, and the Nicoya of Nicaragua.
may reveal new information about gender. Fourth, some authors of this corpus claimed to be Coras while others may be Huichol, Tepecano, or Coca, which are non-Nahua groups, and they provide some information about non-Nahua socio-political structures from an Indigenous perspective that is non-Nahua. Fifth, Indigenous scribes provide examples of Nahuatl from western Mexico, a different variant from that of the Basin of Mexico and surrounding valleys.

1.3. Alphabetic Nahuatl Writing

No dissertation-length study has focused on petitions written in Nahuatl, or for that matter, on Nahuatl-language writings from Northwestern New Spain. However, previous scholars have identified a correspondence genre that constitutes part of a larger colonial corpus of documents written in Nahuatl with the Roman alphabet. Because the corpus of Nahuatl alphabetic documents comes from Nahua and Hispanic communicative traditions, it is necessary to examine how past scholars have divided and organized these works.

Arthur J. O. Anderson, Frances Berdan, and James Lockhart were the first scholars to examine Nahuatl-language correspondence in *Beyond the Codices: The Nahua View of Colonial Mexico*. They translated, edited, and analyzed a large number of Nahuatl documents that they

19 By “colonial period,” I refer to the time span from 1521, when Europeans arrived in western Mexico, to 1821, the date of the start of the Mexican independence movement. Microbes preceded Europeans in many areas, and a good case can be made that the arrival of microbes signaled the beginning of the colonial period for this region (Crosby 1972). However, Daniel T. Reff argues that the 1518-25 small pox pandemic that struck the Caribbean, Mexico, and Central America did not strike western Mexico. Reff, *Disease, Depopulation, and Culture Change in Northwestern New Spain, 1518-1764* (Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1991), 99-103.

20 James Lockhart describes one portion of this corpus as being, “not only more individual in their language, conventions, and content than the Spanish counterparts, but more complex in belonging to two traditions rather than one…They are both more difficult and potentially richer…than Spanish records. A realization of their nature has called for a New Philology to render them understandable and available and put them in their true context.” Lockhart, *The Nahua After the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth Through Eighteenth Centuries* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992), 7.
divided into four genres: wills and related documents; land documentation; municipal documentation; and petitions, correspondence, and other formal statements. The corpus of my study has petitions, letters, and receipts so they best fit under the fourth category, which these scholars argue have a less formulaic appearance and are more varied and wide-ranging than the other genres. Anderson et al. also divide Nahuatl documents into two sub-types, Classical and Peripheral variants, with the former containing the polished Classical Nahuatl of the high nobility of large towns within or close to the Basin of Mexico, and the latter encompassing petitions by the nobility of small towns whose Nahuatl is less formal. They supported this proposal with nine petitions that could also be divided by century and region because with one exception from Guatemala, those that fit their first sub-type were from the sixteenth century and those that fit the second were from the seventeenth century. Also, the ones that contain more colloquial varieties of Nahuatl were from two regions: Guatemala (one petition), and western Mexico (three petitions). More recent scholars have judged the past reliance on the term “Classical Nahuatl” as problematic, but Una Canger proposed a solution in her paper “Nahuatl Dialectology.” She consulted colonial and present-day Nahuatl variants and suggested a division of Nahuatl into Central and Peripheral variants that encompassed present and past varieties of this language. Now, this two-fold division has been widely accepted (Refer to Chapter 3.2).

Matthew Restall, Lisa Sousa, and Kevin Terraciano present six petitions in “Chapter 4: Political Life” of *Mesoamerica Voices*, which fit into the Central Nahuatl sub-type because they were created by the high nobility of Tenochtitlan, Tlaxcala, and Xochimilco. These scholars

---

21 Kevin Terraciano (p.c., 2013) told me that Lockhart had disagreed with the use of Classical and Peripheral in this work, and that he favored a different division. Later, Lockhart relied on the Central and Peripheral division developed by Una Canger for the colonial language situation in Mexico and Central America. Lockhart, *Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001).
judge that petitions demonstrate how the cabildo functioned as an intermediary between the Spanish bureaucracy and the indigenous commoners who outnumbered both groups. They also propose that Indigenous peoples had to face issues such as Spanish encroachment, the allocation of labor by residents, and even the disappearance of the corporate body through congregación.

Magnus Lundberg also examines petitions from Central Mexico in *Church Life between the Metropolitan and the Local: Parishes, Parishioners and Parish Priests in Seventeenth-Century Mexico Church Life*. Lundberg employs a variety of documents from Central Mexico, including Nahuatl alphabetic petitions, and Spanish documentary genres such as provincial council decrees, archbishop/bishop visitation records, and sacramental manuals to examine the archdiocese of Mexico City and the diocese of Puebla, and their relationships with their respective parishes. He dedicates chapter seven “We Accuse: Indigenous Petitions” to documenting the petition genre within the archdiocese of Mexico City and the diocese of Puebla, concluding that most of these petitions were responses to visitas of bishops to the parishes. He proposes that during a visita bishops interviewed Indigenous elites, who made claims against parish priests, and that cabildo members such as the gobernador, alcalde, and regidor were prominent among the signatories of petitions. He presents differences between the Spanish-language and Nahuatl-language petitions, and he summarizes a number of petitions in a manner influenced by Stuart B. Schwarz’s “serial microhistory,” which is a “series of what are essentially case studies in which each presents peculiar individual characteristics.”22 He then uses them to create portraits of an ideal parish priest and parishioner.

---

On the other hand, scholars who have employed Nahuatl documents from Guatemala have different views about accepting the Central/Peripheral division. In “Algunos documentos Nahuas del sur de Mesoamerica,” Karen Dakin examines different documents, hypothesizing the existence of four types of Nahuatl: central Nahuatl as described by the colonial grammarians; the Nahuatl lingua franca that appears to have been used in areas where other Indigenous languages were dominant; regional variants; and a peripheral eastern dialect. However, in “Nahuatl and Pipil in Colonial Guatemala: A Central American Counterpoint,” Laura E. Matthew and Sergio F. Romero (2012: 779) disagree with Dakin and counter that their study of forty-six documents only supports two Nahuatl variants: Classical Nahuatl and Pipil.

Scholars who have examined petitions and other correspondence from Northwestern New Spain have reached a stronger consensus in favor of the central-peripheral dichotomy. Jim Braun, Barry Sell, and Terraciano examine four Nahuatl petitions from two Cora towns in “The Northwest of New Spain: Nahuatl in Nayarit, 1652” and propose that Nahuatl was being affected by Spanish in ways that mirrored changes in central Mexico; that non-Nahua authors created three of the four petitions; and that the elegant handwriting of the fourth petition suggests a central Mexican author. They also reason that these petitions were political acts because their elite creators took advantage of rivalries between Spanish-speaking colonial elites, since these

---


25 The towns are San Sebastian Huajicori (Guaxicori) and San Antonio Quiuiquinta, which are in my study.
complaints against a Franciscan are not addressed to religious authorities, but to civil authorities.  

Rosa H. Yáñez Rosales examines Nahuatl petitions and other correspondence in the province of Tlajomulco in *Ypan altepet monotza san Antonio de padua tlaxomulco 'En el pueblo que se llama San Antonio de Padua, Tlajomulco': Textos en lengua náhuat, siglos XVII y XVIII.* She translates and analyzes a number of Nahuatl documents from the regional archive of Tlajomulco, a town a few miles south of Guadalajara, whose author examines the province of Tlajomulco as a place influenced by the struggle that resulted in the gradual colonization of this region. Yáñez Rosales places great importance on how the Franciscans relied on their knowledge of Nahuatl and on Indigenous translators who spoke Nahuatl and other Indigenous languages to proselytize within this multi-lingual region. She also notes that the Nahuatl of this province employed a -t absolutive ending, classifying this as a peripheral feature that contrasts with the -tl ending used in Central Mexico.

John Sullivan examined a corpus of Nahuatl documents from Los Altos, another province of Northwestern New Spain, proposing that the Nahuatl from this region differed from both the central and peripheral varieties. In *Ytechcopa timoteilhuia yn tobicario (Acusamos a nuestro vicario): Pleito entre los naturales de Jalostotitlan y su sacerdote, 1618,* Sullivan transcribes and translates the documents from Los Altos explaining that they represent petitions against a priest in a case that was tried in the inquisitorial court of Mexico City. Sullivan suggests that the Nahuatl of these petitions contains some grammatical paradigms that connect them to Peripheral Nahuatl, along with others that differentiate them from any known colonial variants, and he also

---

posits that Nahuatl may not have been the dominant language of Los Altos.\(^\text{27}\) In his second study, Sullivan continues his linguistic analysis of these petitions, observing that the well-attested four classes of Classical Nahuatl verbs have been reduced to two types in this corpus.\(^\text{28}\)

An important work that does not access the New Philology or the Central/Peripheral dichotomy is *Xalisco, la voz de un pueblo en el siglo XVI*, which examines Nahuatl petitions and other documents from the community of Xalisco in Nueva Galicia. It is a collaborative effort transcribed by Eustaquio Celestino and Magdalena Gomez, translated by Ricardo Xochitemol, and introduced and analyzed by Thomas Calvo and Jean Meyer. These investigators divide their work into three chapters that present transcriptions, translations, and analyses of Nahuatl alphabetic petitions from Xalisco (Map 3, #12), and a fourth chapter that transcribes and analyzes Spanish documents from this polity. The authors have made these Nahuatl documents available to other scholars, with a limited analysis of the Nahuatl found in the petitions.

The letters of western Mexico in my study appear to be petitions, letters, and receipts, but what do they represent? They are outnumbered by Spanish documents in the archives of Northwestern New Spain, but they can raise new questions? After all, if “always language was

\(^{27}\) These documents were created in 1618, several years after a petition from Jalostotitlan written in 1611. Sullivan, *Ytechcopa timoteilhuia y n tocario (Acusamos a nuestro vicario): Pleito entre los naturales de Jalostotitlan y su sacerdote, 1618*, 9. *Beyond the Codices: The Nahua View of Colonial Mexico* trans. and ed. by Arthur J. O. Anderson, Frances Berdan, and James Lockhart with a linguistic essay by Ronald W. Langacker (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press Ltd., 1976), 166.

the companion of empire, and followed it in such a way that jointly they began,” what does the use of Nahuatl in Northwestern New Spain represent?29

1.4. Language and Literacy

The petitions in my collection are mediated documents created in Nahuatl for a Spanish audience, which gives rise to several questions. First, to what degree were these petitions influenced by Spanish literary genres? Second, Northwestern New Spain was a multi-lingual area where Nahuatl and Spanish were not the only spoken languages, but did their perseverance suggest that they were lingua francas? If so, what determined the language chosen by a particular group? Third, notaries had to, in a sense, negotiate the content with other Indigenous elites. Do the petitions, letters, and receipts of Northwestern New Spain reveal the mediated content, and if so, what do they say about orality and literacy within a given Indigenous community? These complex issues require the consultation of a corpus of works that examines literary and linguistic methodologies in multi-lingual contexts.

Letters and People of the Spanish Indies and The Indian Militia and Description of the Indies both offer examples of Spanish letter-writing. In the first, James Lockhart and Enrique Otte compile, translate, and edit a large number of letters from the Casa de Contratación and other archives, and they remark that letter-writing was common among Spaniards, and that many of their examples conform to a genre that relied on a well-used set of greetings, endings, and

They begin their study by presenting letters that conquistadors wrote to people in Spain. Two letters—“Pedrarias de Avila, governor of Tierra Firme, in Panamá, to the emperor, 1525” and “Doña Isabel de Guevara, in Asunción, Paraguay, to Princess doña Juan, regent in Spain, 1556”—are addressed to royalty, and each one creates an argument for reward by recounting how each author supported the royal house. These belong to the same sub-genre as the letter in *The Indian Militia*, edited by Kris Lane and translated by Timothy F. Johnson, which examines a book-length letter to the king by Captain Bernardo de Vargas Machuca, a conquistador from the late sixteenth century. Since Bernardo de Vargas Machuca writes his work to list his accomplishments with the aim of obtaining a reward or concession from the person who is addressed, Lane identifies it as a *relación* (account) or *probança de méritos*.

One petition in *Beyond the Codices* and another in *Mesoamerican Voices* resemble these Spanish-language *relaciones* because they also present records of service, but these are different because they refer to the accomplishments of the *altepetl*, a corporate body, and not to those of a single person. First, “Letter of the Council of Huejotzinco to the king, 1560” from *Beyond the Codices* recounts how the Huejotzinca accepted Christianity and gave support to Hernando Cortés, and it asks for a reduction of tribute. “Letter from the Nahua Nobles of Xochimilco to the King of Spain, 1563” explains the aid given by the Xochimilca to Cortés, Pedro de Alvarado, and Nuño de Guzmán, and it makes two requests: that the king lessen the tribute required of the

---


31 One letter that does not resemble Spanish *relaciones* is “Letter from the Nahua Cabildo of Tenochtitlan to the King of Spain, 1554,” which states that the king’s subjects are not following his orders to the detriment of this *altepetl,* *Mesoamerican Voices: Native-Language Writing from Colonial Mexico, Oaxaca, Yucatan, and Guatemala* ed. by Mathef Restall, Lisa Sousa, and Kevin Terraciano (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 64-66.
nobles; and that he bring back the tributary obligations of Xochimilca commoners to Xochimilca nobles.

In another region of Mesoamerica, the most comprehensive study of Indigenous petitions concerns Maya petitions and offers guidelines for investigating Indigenous petitions as a genre.\(^{32}\)

In “Secrets Behind the Screen: Solicitantes in the Colonial Diocese of Yucatan and the Yucatec Maya, 1570-1785,” John Chuchiak uses a large number of Yucatec Mayan petitions accusing priests of soliciting sexual favors at the confessional. Chuchiak explains that historians are ambivalent about how much to rely on the words of the petitioners, hypothesizing that his corpus demonstrates the struggle between three competing sexual worlds: one of Spanish-Catholic morality, another of Spanish lasciviousness, and a third based on pre-Columbian Mayan mores. He posits that many Maya were propositioned as they took their “sins” to a Christian space only to be entreated, cajoled, threatened, and raped by lascivious confessors. He accepts that many of these events happened, but he proposes that elites of Yucatec Maya communities also filed petitions for political aims.

My study also requires that I consult linguistic works that explore the intersection of language and society, such as Ronald Wardaugh’s *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* and Donald N. Tuten and Fernando Tejedo-Herrero’s “The Relationship between Historical Linguistics and Sociolinguistics.” Wardaugh succinctly and authoritatively examines different twentieth-century sociolinguistic issues such as how one person judges another’s use of

---

\(^{32}\) The Maya petitions and the petitions in my study also contain systems of reference that petitioners relied on to organize their place in the physical world. William F. Hanks examines *deixis* (pronouns and perceptual and spatial adverbs corresponding roughly to I, you, this, that, here, and there) as a social construction for the Maya of twentieth century Otkutzcab, Yucatan, and he posits that because *deixis* is a linguistic subsystem and an act, it is central to the organization of communicative practice and intelligible only in relation to the socio-cultural system of Otkutzcab. Hanks, *Referential Practice: Language and Lived Space among the Maya* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).
language, imposes his or her language on others, and changes his or her ways of speaking before perceived social inferiors and superiors. Another sociolinguistic issue is the presence of a lingua franca, which the author explains is not a unitary entity because it “can be spoken in a variety of ways.” Tuten and Tejedo-Herrero examine how the nascent field of historical sociolinguistics affects studies of the history of Spanish. These authors explain that the lack of living consultants results in less reliable data for these studies, but they judge that these investigations can bring back human participants to historical linguistic studies. They suggest that among the most promising sources are digital databases of accurately transcribed historical texts arranged in chronological order. I do not propose to create such a database for my project, but I will include some transcriptions and translations in Appendix B.

Other studies that can be classified as examples of historical sociolinguistics or histories of language are also relevant such as “Cambio social y cambio lingüístico: El ‘náhuatl cotidiano’, el de ‘doctrina’ y el de ‘escribanía’ en Cuauhnáhuac entre 1540 y 1671,” by Brígida von Mentz, and Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe, by Peter Burke. Von Mentz posits that Nahuatl served as two types of registers: “náhuatl de doctrina” and “náhuatl de escribanía.” She reasons that the first was influenced by the Franciscans and Dominicans who proselytized and taught Nahuas how to write their language with the Roman alphabet, and the second, by the structures and legal formulas required by the Spanish colonial bureaucracy. Meanwhile, Burke investigates the historicity of language through an examination of how literate Europeans viewed language, and how the development of a regional dialect influenced the

---

33 Wardaugh, 59.
development of the nation-state from the fifteenth until the eighteenth centuries. He acknowledges that some dialects triumph over others and come to dominate the documents of a historical era, but his assertions are strongest for Europe. He posits that, in the Americas, the spread of printed books influenced the writing and speaking habits of native speakers, and he adds that a convincing example comes from how missionaries, such as the Jesuits, wrote grammars that “fixed” or froze usages within Indigenous languages like Nahuatl.

In Northwestern New Spain, Juan Guerra began his Arte de la lengua mexicana by claiming that the Nahuatl that he heard in western Mexico was different from what he had been taught in central Mexico. This variation within Nahuatl was natural because of the long distance and time involved. Nahuatl had spread over a wide area before these petitions were written, and by the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries, Nahuatl was present throughout most of Northwestern New Spain, Central Mexico, and Central America.

The colonial period was thus a clash of societies and imperial languages. Nicholas Ostler examines the latter in his ambitious Empires of the Word: A Language History of the World, in

34 Burke, 1.

35 Burke, 93. Two investigations present good counterpoints: Guerra espiritual y resistencia Indígena: El discurso de la evangelización en el obispado de Guadalajara, 1541-1765 by Yáñez Rosales, and The Slippery Earth: Nahuá-Christian Moral Dialogue in Sixteenth Century Mexico by Burkhart. Yáñez Rosales analyzes texts used by the clergy to proselytize to Indigenous groups of western Mexico. Her study includes Juan Guerra’s Arte de la lengua mexicana, which was published in 1692, but it begins with a Requerimiento from 1541 and ends with the publication in 1768 of the Arte, vocabulario y confesionario en el idioma mexicano, como se usa en el obispado de Guadalaxara. Yáñez Rosales asserts that these texts were intended for clergymen from the bishopric of Guadalajara, and not for Nahuas, thereby undermining Burke’s assertion that printed grammars fixed Nahuatl among its native speakers. Burkhart examines how the friars employed Nahuatl to proselytize to Nahuas in central Mexico. She posits that several factors led to the Nahuatization of Catholicism in central Mexico. She proposes that the Nahuas and the friars conceptualized the universe in different ways and that in the end, the friars unknowingly perpetuated the Nahuá worldview, a hypothesis that also challenges Burke’s assertion.

36 Juan Guerra, Arte de la lengua mexicana Según la acostumbran hablar los Indios de todo el obispado de Guadalajara de Guadiana y del de Mechoacan (1692) ed. by Carlos Eduardo Gutiérrez Arce with prologues by Miguel León-Portilla and Agustín de Betancourt. Guadalajara, Mexico: Patrimonio Cultural del Occidente A.C., 1992), Al lector.
which he investigates relationships between imperial languages like Aramaic and Spanish and their respective empires. He proposes that large segments of history can be examined through the lingua francas that developed alongside empires and offers plausible conclusions that can be checked against the petitions in my study. For example, Ostler observes that although “nothing matched the symbolic power of the Spanish language to signify empire… it was easier, quicker and more reliable to spread understanding, and hence faith, in one of the native languages.”

1.5. Peoples of Northwestern New Spain

The authors I discussed in the first section of this chapter have examined different genres of alphabetic Nahuatl documents. The second section investigated language dominance in multilingual environments. Now, I will examine works centered on Nahua and non-Nahua Indigenous groups from Northwestern New Spain.

The oldest works to examine Northwestern New Spain treated Spanish colonization as inevitable because they were not critical of the principal sources. José López Portillo y Weber consulted the chronicles of Fray Antonio Tello, the testimonies of the participants of the Nuño de Guzmán entrada, and other Spanish sources in La conquista de la Nueva Galicia in which he examines the wars that led to this region’s incorporation into the Spanish Empire. He devotes one chapter to the Indigenous people who lived here, in a chapter titled “Los conquistados (the conquered).” La conquête spirituelle by Robert Ricard continues to remain relevant because of the wealth of detail about Franciscan proselytization, but Ricard neglects Indigenous motives for accepting Catholicism and takes many of his sources produced by friars at face value. Despite

---

37 Ostler, 334.
the passage of time, the actions and lives of Nahua and non-Nahua Indigenous groups from this region have been addressed in only a small number of works.

The most comprehensive works on Northwestern New Spain are Peter Gerhard’s *A guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain* and *The Northern Frontier of New Spain*, and Rosa Yáñez Rosales’s *Rostro, palabra y memoria indígenas: El occidente de México: 1524-1816*. In both of his studies, Gerhard used the Spanish intendency system in 1786, for the most part, to divide New Spain into regions for which he provided historical and geographic information. For each intendency, he begins with the advent of Spanish colonization and includes geographic, political, ecclesiastical, and socio-economic essays based on Spanish-language sources. Both of his studies are invaluable because, in many cases, they are the most detailed secondary sources about the many different Indigenous groups that lived in Northwestern New Spain during the colonial period. In *Rostro, palabra y memoria*, Yáñez Rosales examines the presence of Indigenous groups in what are now Jalisco and Nayarit during the colonial period. She relies on a variety of Spanish-language sources, and on some Nahuatl sources, such as election documents from Tlajomulco, San Sebastian, and Santa Cruz (Map 4, #12). She also reasons that the *altepetl* was the dominant unit in western Mexico.

Other works emphasize colonial institutions and Indigenous peoples. Agueda Jiménez Pelayo and Eric Van Young examine the relationship between Indigenous communities and *haciendas* in Los Llanos in separate works. In *Haciendas y Comunidades Indígenas en el Sur de Zacatecas*, Jiménez Pelayo investigates the struggle between *haciendas* and Indigenous

---

38 *North American Cattle-Ranching Frontiers* by Terry G. Jordan and *Land and Society in Colonial Mexico: The Great Hacienda* by François Chevalier are two works that focus more on the *hacienda* as a colonial institution.
communities in the south of Zacatecas (Map 4, #11) from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. She does an admirable job of presenting Indigenous towns and their competition with haciendas, but she does not use Nahuatl-language documents. She proposes that the Indigenous people of the region, mostly Cazcanes, were able to portray themselves as frontier people to gain access to large quantities of land, and that they used this same argument when defending their holdings in court.39 On the other hand, Van Young posits in Hacienda and Market in Eighteenth-Century Mexico: The Rural Economy of the Guadalajara Region, 1675-1820 that the demographic and commercial growth of Guadalajara led to the commercialization of the countryside, which was characterized by the growth of haciendas and the decline of Indigenous towns. The region of his study “extended from the edge of Los Altos in the east to the Ameca-Cocula Valley in the west, and from Lake Chapala in the south to the great gorge of the Río Grande de Santiago in the north.”40 Van Young postulates that the principal period of hacienda growth occurred during the late seventeenth century, and that litigation was more prominent during the eighteenth century, when hacendados led an enclosure-type movement to take control of lands previously shared with Indigenous towns. He also examines how agricultural labor was almost always performed by Indigenous people through repartimiento drafts and wage labor.

The petitions in my study suggest that Guadalajara was the dominant city in the region because over half of the notaries addressed this city’s bishop, but few studies have focused on this city. Thomas Calvo’s Guadalajara y su región en el siglo XVII: Población y economía is probably the first comprehensive urban study. Calvo posits that Guadalajara began as a

39 The Caxcanes were native Nahuatl speakers or Nahuas who lived in Northwestern New Spain during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and perhaps the eighteenth centuries (Refer to Chapter 2.3c).

40 Van Young, 7.
consumer settlement, but that the diligence of its people (Africans, Indigenous people, Europeans, and people of mixed-race) and its favorable location between Zacatecas and Mexico City enabled it to grow and become a center of commerce.

Carolyn Baus Reed Czitrom in *Tecuejes y Cicas: Dos grupos de la region de Jalisco en el siglo XVI* examines the Tecuejes and Cicas, two Indigenous groups that lived in Guadalajara and surrounding regions. She proposes that the Cicas controlled towns to the south of Guadalajara, and that the Tecuejes dominated those to the north. She also posits that the Cicas and the Tecuejes had customs and beliefs similar to those of the Mexicas, and that these three groups along with the Caxcanes influenced each other before the Mexicas began their pre-Columbian trek south to Tenochtitlan and Tlatelolco.

Another region northwest of Guadalajara was a military district identified in colonial records as Fronteras de Colotlán. Brett Blosser convincingly proposes in “‘By the Force of Their Lives and the Spilling of Blood’: Flechero Service and Political Leverage on a Nueva Galicia Frontier” that its *flecheros* (Indigenous militiamen) protected Spanish suzerainty and their own privileges during the colonial period. Citing Spanish-language documents held in the AGN, BPEJ-JJA, and other regional archives, he reasons that most of the *flecheros* were either Huichol or Tlaxcalan, and that they were a powerful force that performed well during military operations against Indigenous groups such as the Cora. He also posits that they employed the agreement that their ancestors had made with Viceroy Luis de Velasco “the younger” to defend their lands against Spanish encroachment in Spanish courts. On the few occasions when that

---

41 To date, I do not have petitions from the province of Fronteras de Colotlán, but this region is important to my research because it stood in the middle, between Northwestern New Spain, Southwestern Nueva Galicia, and El Gran Nayar. Gerhard, *La frontera norte de la Nueva España*. 22
agreement failed, he suggests that the *flecheros* gathered a military force to intimidate Spanish squatters. His conclusions are supported by the historiography of this region, which includes Robert Shadow’s *La frontera norteña de la Nueva Galicia: Las parroquias de Colotlán, 1725-1820*, a study that uses parish records to show that Colotlán contained an Indigenous majority and few *mestizos* until the nineteenth-century.

A few studies examine Indigenous people who lived close to Nombre de Dios, the northernmost town in this study. In “The Indigenous Factor in Nueva Vizcaya: The North of Mexico, 1550-1790,” Irene Elizabeth Vasquez proposes that Indigenous peoples from the mountains and highlands that form the present-day borders between the states of Nayarit, Sinaloa, and Durango lived in a fringe region and used different proactive strategies, such as the creation of petitions by Indigenous officials, to slow down the advancement of Spanish hegemony. She suggests that during the eighteenth century two of these groups—the Tlaxcalans and Tepehuanes—created petitions against Spanish priests when they felt that the priests had gone beyond an acceptable level of mistreatment. Vasquez also claims that the strategies of Indigenous women have been ignored, but that Inquisition records contain examples of women’s leadership in cases when they were accused of witchcraft. To some extent, the area in Susan Deed’s *Defiance and Deference in Mexico’s Colonial North: Indians under Spanish Rule in Nueva Vizcaya* overlaps with Vasquez’s study, but it focuses on the histories of five Indigenous groups: the Acaxee, the Xixime, the Conchos, the Tarahumara, and the Tepehuan. Deeds anchors her study on the Jesuit missions and the accounts of Jesuit priests, and she posits that the ephemeral borders of Nueva Vizcayan missions allowed Indigenous people to rely on them for a

---

variety of transactions among themselves and with Europeans.\textsuperscript{43} Her work is valuable for understanding these missions and how they were connected to the correspondence communities in my study. Deeds also notes that the frontier has often been seen as a crucible where civilization and savagery have collided, and although she concedes that this may be true, she also suggests that it fails in specific historical and cultural contexts because it does not explain the disappearance of the Xixime, Acaxee, and Concho as distinct peoples, and the perseverance of the Tarahumaras and the Tepehuanes. To the south, similar processes may have happened because whereas the Cocas and Tecuejes are no longer recognized as unique peoples, the Coras, Huicholes, Tepehuanes, and Mexicaneros (a Nahua group) have survived.

1.6. Sources and Methodology

The sixty-four petitions, letters, and receipts in this dissertation are housed in several archives. One Spanish and forty-four Nahuatl documents come from the Archivo Histórico del Arzobispado de Guadalajara (AHAG).\textsuperscript{44} Seven Nahuatl documents are part of box 20 of the Byron McAfee Collection, which is in the Young Research Library at the University of California, Los Angeles (McA-UCLA). Nine Nahuatl documents are from BPEJ-JJA, two documents are held by the Archivo de Instrumentos Publicos del Estado de Jalisco (AIPEJ) and the last petition is held by the Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley (BANC-

\textsuperscript{43} Deeds, 10.

\textsuperscript{44} Both Spanish-language petitions are at AHAG. One is from Analco-Tetlan, a community in Guadalajara, which apart from these petitions in Spanish also has \textit{memorias} in Nahuatl. The other is from Analco-Tepic, a community adjacent to Tepic, Nayarit.
These petitions span a period of 114 years (1580-1694) and from Northwestern New Spain, Southwestern Nueva Galicia, and El Gran Nayar.

Many of the petitions have an author who identifies himself or herself by writing either *amatlacuilo* (writer) or *escribano* (notary), but many of the writers do not use these titles. For this reason, I refer to each petition with a two-part name beginning with the year and ending with the name of the community where it was written, such as “1626 San Francisco Chapalac.” When several petitions from the same community are from the same year, I write the year followed by a letter such as “1591a Oconahuac” and “1591b Oconahuac.” For petitions that lack a year-date, I use “N.Y.” together before the name of the community, such as “N.Y. Çayolan.” I am also referring to any accompanying words or documents in Spanish as addenda.

I thought about organizing these sixty-four documents in a variety of ways. The simplest would be to group them by centuries (Table 1-1): eleven belong to the sixteenth century, twenty to the first half of the seventeenth century, twenty-six to the second half of the seventeenth century, and seven lack a year. They could also be grouped according to whether the town in which the writer wrote was within the jurisdictional borders of Nueva España or Nueva Galicia; thirty-eight documents belong to the former, twenty-five to the latter, and one does not name a

---

45 BAN-UCB, Bancroft MSS M-M 474.

46 Alonzo de la Mota y Escobar implies that the *mayordomo* of a *cofradía* was also its scribe when he writes, “Lo que generalmente hay en los pueblos de indios es una casa que llaman de comunidad, donde se congregan a tratar lo que conviene a su república, y en esta casa tienen una caja con llaves en que meten el dinero que llaman bienes de comunidad o sobras de tributos, estas llaves suelen guardar una un alcalde y otra el mayordomo y escribano.” For this reason, I propose that in some cases where the titles of *escribano* or *amatlacuilo* are absent, the mayordomo is the scribe. Mota y Escobar, Descripción geográfica de los reynos de Nueva Galicia, Nueva Vizcaya y Nuevo Leon second edition with an introduction by Joaquín Ramírez Cabañas (Mexico City: Editorial Pedro Robredo, 1940 [1605]).

47 I use “N.Y.” instead of the more conventional “n.d.” because a few of the documents have dates that include the month and the day without the year.
town (Table 1-2). A third way would be to organize them by diocesan jurisdictional boundaries, but since these frequently overlap the borders of the regular orders—Franciscans or Augustinians—classifying the petitions requires a more thorough understanding of these documents.

**Table 1-1: Petitions by Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixteenth Century</th>
<th>1600-1649</th>
<th>1652-1694</th>
<th>No Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1580a Nochistlan</td>
<td>1600 Tala</td>
<td>1652 S. Francisco Juchipila</td>
<td>N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca. 1585&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580b Nochistlan</td>
<td>1611 Jalostotitlan</td>
<td>1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>N.Y. Cohuatiyan de Puertos de Abajo, ca. 1637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593a Xalisco</td>
<td>1622 La Magdalena</td>
<td>1652b San Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>N.Y. San Francisco Cayolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593b Xalisco</td>
<td>1622 S. Andres Cohuatiyan</td>
<td>1652a S. Sebastian Guaxicori</td>
<td>N.Y. Aquautitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594 Xalisco</td>
<td>1626 S. Francisco Chapalac</td>
<td>1652b S. Sebastian Guaxicori</td>
<td>N.Y. Tlajomulco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595a Xalisco</td>
<td>1629 Zacoalco</td>
<td>1653 S. Martin</td>
<td>N.Y. San Cacel Tlaximulco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595b Xalisco</td>
<td>1630 Tlajomulco</td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>N.Y. About Diego Alfonso &amp; Fray Nicolas Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593a Oconahuac</td>
<td>1637a Cohuatiyan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td>1654 S. Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593b Oconahuac</td>
<td>1642 Contla</td>
<td>1656 Tonala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593c Oconahuac</td>
<td>1644 Cajititlan</td>
<td>1657 Tonala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y. Xalisco, ca.</td>
<td>1646 Tequepechpan</td>
<td>1658 S. Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1649a Tzacamota&lt;sup&gt;49&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1661 Etzatlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1649b Tzacamota</td>
<td>1664 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1649c Tzacamota</td>
<td>1668 S. Francisco Zacoalco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1649d Tzacamota</td>
<td>1669 Santa Maria Magdalena Tizapan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1649e Tzacamota</td>
<td>1673 S. Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1649f Tzacamota</td>
<td>1678 Santiago Pochotitlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1649g Tzacamota</td>
<td>1679 Analco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1649h Tzacamota</td>
<td>1679 Sayula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>48</sup> “N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca. 1585” does not have a date, but R. H. Barlow and George T. Smisor (1943) suggest 1563, whereas I propose 1585 (Refer to Chapter 5.2a). *Nombre de Dios, Durango, Two Documents in Náhuatl Concerning its Foundation: Memorial of the Indians Concerning Their Services, c. 1563; Agreement of the Mexicans and the Michoacanos, 1585* edited and translated by R. H. Barlow and George T. Smisor (Sacramento, CA: The House of Tlaloc, 1943).

<sup>49</sup> Arias de Saavedra identifies Tzacaymuta as the home of the leaders of El Gran Nayar and places it in this region. Tzacaymuta and Tzacamota appear to be variant spellings that refer to the same community. Arias de Saavedra in Calvo, *Collección de documentos para la historia de México*, 290.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nueva España</th>
<th>Nueva Galicia</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca. 1585</td>
<td>1580a Nochistlan</td>
<td>N.Y. About Diego Alfonso &amp; Fray Nicolas Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593a Xalisco</td>
<td>1580b Nochistlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593b Xalisco</td>
<td>1600 Tala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y. Xalisco, ca. 1593</td>
<td>1611 Jalostotitlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594 Xalisco</td>
<td>1630 Tlajomulco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595a Xalisco</td>
<td>1642 Contla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595b Xalisco</td>
<td>1644 Cajititlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593a Oconahuac</td>
<td>1646 Tequepechpan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593b Oconahuac</td>
<td>1649a Tzacamota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593c Oconahuac</td>
<td>1649b Tzacamota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622 La Magdalena</td>
<td>1649c Tzacamota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622 San Andres Cohuatlan</td>
<td>1649 San Juan Ocotic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626 San Francisco Chapalac</td>
<td>1652 San Francisco Juchipila</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629 Zacualco</td>
<td>1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637a Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td>1652b San Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637b Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td>1652a San Sebastian Guaxicori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649 Tachichilco</td>
<td>1652b San Sebastian Guaxicori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649 San Antonio Tzacacuezeo</td>
<td>1656 Tonala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649 San Francisco Ayahualulco</td>
<td>1657 Tonala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649a La Magdalena</td>
<td>1678 Santiago Pochotitlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649b La Magdalena</td>
<td>1679 Analco-Guadalajara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653 Amatitlán</td>
<td>1683 San Gaspar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653 San Martin</td>
<td>N.Y. Santiago Aquautitan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654 San Martin</td>
<td>N.Y. San Cacel Tlajomulco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

50 This table was created after consulting the works of Domingo Lázaro de Arregui, Antonio de Ciudad Real, Gerhard, and Mota y Escobar. Arregui, *Descripción de la Nueva Galicia* ed. by François Chevalier (Seville, Spain: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos, 1946). Ciudad Real, *Tratado curioso y docto de las grandes de la Nueva España: Relación breve y verdadera de algunas cosas que sucedieron al padre fray Alonso Ponce en las provincias de la Nueva España siendo comisario general de aquellas partes* 2 Volumes edited with a preliminary study, appendices, glossaries, maps and indices by Josefina García and Víctor M. Castillo Farreras, with a prologue by Jorge Gurría Lacroix (Mexico City: UNAM, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, 1976).

---
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Amula, Ávalos, Autlan, and Izatlan were provinces of Nueva España that had Indigenous communities in which Indigenous notaries wrote a large number of documents, but these communities also had ties to Guadalajara, the diocesan seat and the main administrative center in the region. These ties manifest themselves through their correspondence in two ways. First, most of the correspondence from these provinces is stored in the Archive of the Archbishopric of Guadalajara. Second, some of these documents are addressed to the bishop of Guadalajara or to a provisor based in Guadalajara.

Nueva Galicia came into being through the Beltrán de Guzmán entrada, which was composed of thousands of Nahuas and hundreds of Spaniards who left Mexico City in 1529 and went on to explore most of what is now western Mexico, and a portion of northwestern Mexico.

---

51 The Diocese of Guadalajara became an Archdiocese in the nineteenth century.
between 1530 and 1531.\textsuperscript{52} The crown decreed that this region be named Nueva Galicia.\textsuperscript{53} However, its borders continued to grow after silver strikes that began in 1546 in and around Zacatecas, which was also incorporated into Nueva Galicia.\textsuperscript{54}

Spanish chroniclers only began to describe a powerful Cora polity within El Gran Nayar (Map 3, #17) during the seventeenth century. Several chroniclers provide details. Antonio de Ciudad Real, who was a secretary to a Franciscan inspector who toured Franciscan convents throughout New Spain from 1584 to 1589, wrote a journal of his experiences. He describes how the Franciscans had tried to build convents in El Gran Nayar, but had failed because its inhabitants had attacked and killed many of them. Also, two Franciscans provide other details: Fray Antonio Tello mentioned that the Coras occupied most of the Gran Nayar, were led by a military leader known as the Tonati, and had a circular pyramid dedicated to the sun as their holiest site; and Fray Antonio Arias de Saavedra listed a dynastic line of Don Francisco Nayarit,


\textsuperscript{53} The crown also sent a representative who, after an investigation, brought charges and collected testimonies against Beltrán de Guzmán. Many investigators have dealt harshly with Beltrán de Guzmán because of these testimonies, but few investigators have examined how this \textit{entraida’s} actions may have been affected by its complex ethnic composition that included Africans, Cocas, Nahuas, Purepechas, and Spaniards. \textit{Colección de documentos para la historia de México} Vol. 2 published by Joaquín García Icazbalceta. (Mexico City: Antigua Librería, 1866).

\textsuperscript{54} Refer to P.J. Bakewell’s \textit{Silver Mining and Society in Colonial Mexico-Zacatecas} and Dana Velasco Murillo’s “Urban Indians in a Silver City, Zacatecas, Mexico, 1546-1806” for more information about Zacatecas.
Don Pedro Huynoly, Don Alonso Yoquari, and Don Luys Urusty.\textsuperscript{55} This Cora polity remained independent during the period of my study, and it was only conquered after a series of campaigns by \textit{flecheros} and Spaniards in 1721 and 1722.\textsuperscript{56}

Northwestern New Spain thus includes portions of Nueva España, Nueva Galicia, and all of El Gran Nayar and Nombre de Dios, and its boundaries stretch from Zacatecas to the Pacific Ocean and from Nombre de Dios to Amula. Northwestern New Spain remains a large and incredibly complex space, but this study examines only Guadalajara and those communities from which notaries wrote the documents in this study. Lockhart wrote that alphabetic documents in Nahuatl were:

not only more individual in their language, conventions, and content than the Spanish counterparts, but more complex in belonging to two traditions rather than one…They are both more difficult and potentially richer…than Spanish records. A realization of their nature has called for a New Philology to render them understandable and available and put them in their true context. In the wake of the philological activity, often inextricably bound up with it or indistinguishable from it, have come dissertations, articles, and monographs using the new sources for substantive analysis of aspects of Nahua social or cultural history.\textsuperscript{57}

This statement is perhaps the central tenet of the New Philology, and it can serve as a starting point for examining the petitions, letters, and receipts of Northwestern New Spain.

Notaries appear to belong to at least five different ethnic groups, and as such, they accessed at least three different traditions. A European wrote, “1626 San Francisco Chapalac,” as a sermon to address his congregation, but he used a Central Mexican variety of Nahuatl that may not have translated to San Francisco Chapalac, a Coca community, and after writing he may

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{55} Tello, Vol. II, 53; Saavedra in Calvo, \textit{Colección de documentos para la historia de Nayarit: Los albores de un nuevo mundo}, 290.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{56} Blosser, 292; Magriña, 147.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{57} Lockhart, \textit{The Nahuas After the Conquest}, 7.
\end{flushleft}
have had to adapt it when he performed it for his congregation. Furthermore, apart from Don Francisco Nayari’s letters, the petitions of “1652a Guaxicori” “1652b Guaxicori,” and “1652a Quihuiquinta” also appear to be from Cora communities. This means that their writers accessed three cultural contexts: their own Cora culture and language, European alphabetic script, and knowledge of a variant of Nahuatl. Something similar happened with the Coca scribes who wrote “1622 Coatlan” and “1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos Abajo” because they inhabited a Coca context, they learned European alphabetic writing, and they relied on a Nahuatl variant. Meanwhile, Central Mexican Nahuas probably wrote “1652b Quihuiquinta,” “N.Y. Nombre de Dios,” and “N.Y. Xalisco,” but many questions arise about how their migration into Northwestern New Spain affected their conceptualization of the region. Did they come in contact with Nahuas from Northwestern New Spain who spoke a variant that was different from their own? Was this contact enough to posit that these Central Mexican notaries also employed three traditions? Finally, Cazcan notaries probably wrote “1652 San Francisco Juchipila” and they also had an understanding of a certain Cazcan context that included their language, but in their writing, they learned the imported European alphabet and possibly also an imported variety of Nahuatl from Central Mexico.

Generally, notaries from Northwestern New Spain wrote either nochan, tochan, or altepetl to refer to the community for which they wrote a given petition, and scholars of the New Philology have relied on altepetl to describe the Nahua community in which a particular document was created. However, my study will use “correspondence community” as a more neutral term because it accounts for the possibility that either “altepeltl” represented the actual polity, or was the translation of a non-Nahua term.
The correspondence of Northwestern New Spain provides Indigenous perspectives that are missing from Spanish-language sources, which nonetheless remain important to this investigation because they contain information that is not present in the Nahuatl works. Nayari identified his ethnic affiliation, but he was exceptional because most Indigenous writers identified themselves by their community and not by an ethnic affiliation. However, European chroniclers like Ciudad Real, Mota y Escobar, Mota Padilla, Tello, and the scribes of the Relaciones Geográficas often classify Indigenous groups. Also, the Indigenous authors of the correspondence generally write in a synchronic manner because they focus on a particular event that happened within a period in time close to the correspondence event. However, European chroniclers often mention time spans of decades when speaking of Indigenous communities. Thus, this study will rely on European chroniclers to introduce the different correspondence communities, and the perspective will then shift to the words of the Indigenous scribes.

All of the petitions from my study are more local in nature than the letters of Huexotzinco and Xochimilco because they are not addressed to the king, but to officials within Northwestern New Spain. These petitions consist of four basic parts. First, the notaries address colonial officials with metaphorical phrases of respect, and they sometimes mention God or a saint such as the Virgin Mary. Second, they mention the petitioners and their altepetl. In some of the documents, the notaries include references to past service. This narrative, which usually follows the second part, sometimes consists of several folios of text, and I am especially interested in the content of these historical narratives, which resemble the narratives found in the Huexotzinco and Xochimilco petitions, but not those of the Titulos Primordiales. Third, the notaries write a

58 “N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca. 1585” is a narrative of service to the crown.
direct account of the issue or issues in question, and they portray the addressee as a just and considerate judge. Finally, most notaries conclude their petitions with the date that it was written and the names of the petitioners, most of which appear to be written by the notary.

1.7. Chapters

My dissertation is organized into five chapters, a conclusion, and three appendices. The first of five chapters posits that these documents were produced within Northwestern New Spain. It also proposes the theoretical construct of the correspondence community, a unit based on thirty-eight different Indigenous towns that belonged to at least sixteen different Spanish provinces and one independent region (Table 1-3). I place my study within the context of previous studies of documents in alphabetic Nahuatl, and I proposed that the documents in this study represent examples of Indigenous responses to Spanish colonialism.

Table 1-3: Provinces and Towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Correspondence</th>
<th>Independent or Unknown</th>
<th>Correspondence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acaponeta</td>
<td>1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>El Gran Nayar</td>
<td>1649a Tzacamota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 towns)</td>
<td>(1 town)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1652b San Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td></td>
<td>1649b Tzacamota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1652a San Sebastian Guaxicori</td>
<td></td>
<td>1649c Tzacamota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1652b San Sebastian Guaxicori</td>
<td>Unnamed town or province (???)</td>
<td>N.Y. Diego Alfonso &amp; Fray Nicolas Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649 Tachichilco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 towns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalos</td>
<td>1626 San Francisco Chapalac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10 towns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1629 Zacoalco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1653 San Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1654 San Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1658 San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1664 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1668 San Francisco Zacoalco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1673 San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1679 Sayula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1686 San Pedrotepec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>San Andres Atotonilco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>San Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>Sayula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1622 San Andres Cohuatlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 towns)</td>
<td>1637a Cohuatan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1637b Cohuatan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compostela</td>
<td>1593a Xalisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 town)</td>
<td>1593b Xalisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.Y. Xalisco, ca. 1593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1594 Xalisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1595a Xalisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1595b Xalisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>1656 Tonala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 towns)</td>
<td>1657 Tonala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1679 Analco-Guadalajara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izatlan</td>
<td>1593a Oconahuac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 towns)</td>
<td>1593b Oconahuac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593c Oconahuac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1622 La Magdalena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1649 San Francisco Ayahualulco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1649a La Magdalena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1649b La Magdalena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1661 Etzatlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juchipila</td>
<td>1652 San Francisco Juchipila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos (2 towns)</td>
<td>1611 Jalostotitlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1683 San Gaspar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minas de Chimaltitan</td>
<td>1646 Tequepechpan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 towns)</td>
<td>1678 Santiago Pochotitlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minas de Tepeque</td>
<td>1580a Nochistlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 town)</td>
<td>1580b Nochistlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nombre de Dios</td>
<td>N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca. 1563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 town)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacotlan</td>
<td>1642 Contla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 towns)</td>
<td>1649 San Juan Ocoticic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tala (1 town)</td>
<td>1600 Tala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tequila (1 town)</td>
<td>N.Y. Santiago Aquautitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>1630 Tlajomulco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 towns)</td>
<td>1644 Cajititlan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.Y. San Cacel Tlaximulco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 2 examines the natural and human geography of Northwestern New Spain during the period in which these petitions, letters, and receipts were written, 1580 – 1694. This chapter utilizes details offered by Antonio de Ciudad Real, Alonso de la Mota y Escobar, Domingo Lazaro de Arregui, the *Relaciones geográficas*, visitation journals, and the chronicles by Antonio
Tello and Matias de la Mota Padilla. Their accounts describe the correspondence communities of Northwestern New Spain and its micro-climates for this region, in which the rugged Sierra Madre Occidental Mountain Range receives abundant rains into numerous basins, plateaus, and valleys that either trap water in place or channel it toward the Pacific Ocean. The chapter also follows the roads that connect these polities and explain how the Nahuatl correspondence reveals strong economic and social networks that connected the towns with Guadalajara through its institutions of the diocese and the royal audiencia. Finally, Chapter 2 chronicles how both Spaniards and Indigenous people described the inhabitants of correspondence communities of the region through two categorical systems. One relied on group names taken mostly from Nahuatl, whereas another divided Indigenous groups into Christians or Chichimecs, non-Christian barbarians.

Chapter 3 explains how the Franciscans formed a dyad with nahuatlotos, multi-lingual individuals who spoke Nahuatl, to proselytize in Northwestern New Spain and how this collaboration guided the spread of literacy. The chapter begins by analyzing how literacy in this region was scarce, whereas the use Nahuatl was widespread, and it examines how high-ranking

---

59 Most of these sources have been published. Antonio Tello relied on many sixteenth-century Spanish and Indigenous sources to write the Crónica miscelánea de la santa provincia de Xalisco, which documents the Franciscan presence in the region from 1524 until the mid-seventeenth century. Tello, Crónica miscelánea en que se trata de la conquista espiritual y temporal de la santa provincia de Xalisco en el nuevo reino de la Galicia y nueva Vizcaya y descubrimiento del Nuevo México Book 2 with notes by Juan López (Mexico City: Editorial Porrúa, 1997). An example of a Franciscan visita account is Antonio de Ciudad Real’s journal. Ciudad Real was the secretary of Fray Alonso Ponce, and both toured Spanish Nueva Galicia during 1585, 1586, and 1587. Ciudad Real, Tratado curioso y docto de las grandezas de la Nueva España: Relación breve y verdadera de algunas cosas que sucedieron al padre fray Alonso Ponce en las provincias de la Nueva España siendo comisario general de aquellas partes 2 Volumes. Nevertheless, the most valuable sources are the Relaciones geográficas del siglo xvi: Nueva Galicia, which have been edited and transcribed by René Acuña. A few of these had little Indigenous input, but most of them resulted from the collaboration Indigenous peoples and Spanish officials, who sought to answer the crown’s fifty part questionnaire for geographic, linguistic, and social information about a given region. Relaciones geográficas del siglo XVI: Nueva Galicia edición de René Acuña (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1988).
clergy in Mexico directed their subordinates to teach *nahuatlato* to read and write with the Roman alphabet. Chapter 3 then examines the hagiographies of Fray Antonio Cuéllar, a Franciscan friar, and Juan Calero, his *nahuatlato*, by Fray Geronimo de Mendieta to ascertain why they were killed during the Mixtón War. Then, the chapter examines how subsequent dyads taught peoples of Northwestern New Spain to write Nahuatl with the Roman alphabet at first, but that later, this knowledge spread beyond Franciscan control. It concludes with an examination of literacy terms to present connections between convents and correspondence communities.

Chapter 4 presents ways to differentiate the petitions, letters, and receipts of the Nahuatl-language corpus used in this study. It begins with the premise that documents that are named as petitions by their writers or by Spanish-language writers in an addenda can serve as models to identify those that are not identified as such. This examination of named petitions leads to a tripartite organization: the introduction, the grievance section, and the conclusion. The second portion of this chapter examines loan words, which can offer some guidance as to the spread of literacy from specific Franciscan convents like that of Etzatlan to correspondence communities like La Magdalena. The final section proposes that Franciscans promoted Roman alphabetic literacy with Central Mexico Nahuatl, but after the second half of the seventeenth century, Indigenous notaries were more influenced by the two local variants: Cazcan Nahuatl and Sayula Nahuatl.

Chapter 5 examines the content of the correspondence from 1580 to 1694 to posit that diocesan *visitas* and other types of *visitas* created most of the dialogue present in the petitions, letters, and receipts of Northwestern New Spain. The key to this dialogue was the *visita* interview that occurred between bishops and other European officials and the Indigenous elites of cabildos and *cofradías*. These interviews were unique because they required the colonial
apparatus to be multi-lingual and multi-ethnic. In one instance, a bishop such as Ruiz Colmenero could have a nahuatlato who was Cazcan, a native Nahuatl speaker, who had learned Spanish within a Franciscan convent. These two individuals could speak to a nahuatlato from Tachichilco, a Pame town who had learned the Nahuatl of Sayula.

Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 summarize the content of those petitions, letters, and receipts in order to examine life behind the veil of colonialism. The corpus suggests that 1622 was a watershed moment because, up to that time, most notaries dedicated a large percentage of their works to claims that clerics were incompetent. Notaries described the different ways in which clerics were failing to perform the sacraments in the manner that bishops and provisores had described during visita interviews. However, in 1622, the precepts of the Third Mexican Council were published and available to clerics, and Indigenous notaries change the tenor of their writing to emphasize the requirement of too much tribute for too many festivals. This shift suggests that clerics had learned that they had to devote some effort to perform the sacraments or be penalized. As a result, Chapter 5 begins in 1580 with two petitions from Nochistlan and ends in 1622. Subsequent petitions are analyzed in Chapter 6 as notaries shift the content from accusations that included how local clerics failed to performed the sacraments to complaints about the requirement of excessive tribute in money and goods for Catholic festivals and more unique grievances that include land use and the growing power of Guadalajara.

The visita served as a space for checks and balances in which Indigenous elites could check the power of their clerics, these clerics could likewise check the power of Indigenous elites, and the mostly European-born bishops could adjudicate disputes between these colonial subjects of the church and the king. Through this process, the main colonial center of
Guadalajara began to secure the allegiance of correspondence communities to itself. Guadalajara had found its hinterlands.

Map 1-1: Guadalajara and Selected Correspondence Communities in Northwestern New Spain

60 The distance from Guadalajara to Mexico on the present-day 15D highway is 537.8 km (334.2 miles) and that from Guadalajara to Zacatecas on the present-day 54 highway is 339.2 km (210.8 miles). Google (Consulted on June 27, 2016). https://www.google.com/#q=What+is+the+distance+from+Guadalajara+to+Mexico+City

https://www.google.com/#q=What+is+the+distance+from+Guadalajara+to+Zacatecas
Chapter 2. Northwestern Mexico and Northwestern New Spain

Ma huel mani [i]n tlalli; ma huel ica tepetl.  
Let the earth be; let it be with the mountains.  
Ayocuan Cuetzpaltzin, singer/poet

2.1. The Present

During the period of the petitions (ca 1580-1694), Northwestern New Spain’s population consisted of Indigenous peoples, Europeans, Africans, and people of mixed race descent. They contended with a physical space divided by numerous mountain ranges and waterways. Each year precipitation from the Gulf of California and the Pacific Ocean meets the Sierra Madre Occidental Mountain Range in predictable cycles spreading out, over what is now northwestern and western Mexico. The rainy season begins in either late May or early June and lasts until late September or early October. Rains fall on the Sierra Madre Occidental Mountain Range and regularly replenish the Grande de Santiago River and Lake Chapala, two of the natural features that divide and shape this region. These combination of factors have created a rugged landscape.

A good beginning for examining the region is a bird’s eye view of where the waters of the Gulf of California wash over the the boundary between the modern-day states of Sinaloa and Nayarit. On the coast, the fertile lowlands of coastal Nayarit are hemmed in by the Sierra Madre Occidental Mountain Range to the east. These mountains form a wall that channels moisture between the Mexican states that control territory in this study: Colima, Durango, Jalisco, Nayarit,

---

and Zacatecas. The coastal lands of western Nayarit and the interior are very fertile because they are watered by the many rivers that begin in the mountains and empty into the Pacific Ocean (Map 2-1). However, Durango, eastern Nayarit, northeastern Jalisco, and northwestern Zacatecas are drier and more rugged because they are highlands where some Indigenous groups like the Cora, Huicholes, Mexicaneros, and Tepehuanes continue to preserve traditional ways of life. To the west, the mountains diverge into different ranges offering avenues for precipitation to reach Jalisco’s interior, which partly explains a water table that includes Lake Chapala, which is more of an inland sea, and the long-winding Ameca, Grande de Santiago, and Lerma Rivers.

These bodies of water are very important to Guadalajara and nearby towns and cities. Guadalajara is one of the largest cities in Mexico, and the capital of the state of Jalisco. Northeast of this city is a plateau known as Los Altos that is very green during the rainy season. Los Altos has been an important agricultural region for hundreds of years because of its predictable rains and its position between Guadalajara and Zacatecas, the capital of the modern-day state of Zacatecas.

---

62 In Spanish, Durango is the “tierra de alacranes.” This association between Durango and scorpions may date back to the early colonial period because in 1591, Tlaxcalans from central Mexico built a colony named Colotlan, “place of scorpions,” which is now within Jalisco, but surrounded by Durango.

63 I modeled this map after a figure by Jaime Olveda. Olveda, La costa de la Nueva Galicia: Conquista y Colonización (Guadalajara: El Colegio de Jalisco, 2011), 49.

64 The water table has been affected by recent human activity. Lázaro Cárdenas ordered the draining of Lake Magdalena, and also that the Grande de Santiago River used to flow from the Pacific Ocean through the states of Nayarit and Jalisco to Lake Chapala, but that its path is now obstructed in several places. Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España.

65 Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 136.
Guadalajara continues to possess strong colonial character dominated by European symbols, like its imposing cathedral and its government palace, but other influences become apparent in its streets and alleys. Entering the city from the south one goes through Tlaquepaque to the historic downtown of Guadalajara, which is dominated by the twin-tiered cathedral on 16 de Septiembre Street. From this church, one can walk south to reach the Mexicaltzingo neighborhood whose Nahuatl name can be translated as the “place of the Mexica people.”

---

66 Mexicaltzingo can be parsed as Mexic(a)-tzin-go. The Mexica were the dominant group of the Aztec empire. Later, Mexica became a root word that referred to Nahuas from Central Mexico. For example, Mexicano was used to refer to the predominant Nahuatl variety which was assumed to come from Central Mexico. Tzin is an honorific suffix that has been translated as a diminutive, and go (or co) is a postposition that means “on” or “place of.”
Turning east, one enters the neighborhood of Analco, which means “the place across the waters/river” in Nahuatl. In Analco, one encounters the square of San Sebastian where the statues of two Indigenous leaders—Tenamaztle and Cuauhtemoc—stand before the entrance to the church of San Sebastian. Then, by continuing east, one encounters a second square which houses the church of San José. One can then walk a few more blocks south and east to exit Analco but one can only leave Guadalajara by passing through one of five towns with Nahuatl toponyms: Zapopan, Tlajomulco, Tlaquepaque, Tonalá, or Tetlan. Why are so many places in Guadalajara named in the Indigenous language of Nahuatl? The many sources examined in this dissertation can provide an answer, but first let us consider the natural and human contexts of these sources.

2.2. The Past: Climate, Sub-Regions, and Transportation Networks.

Guadalajara, Analco, Tlajomulco, and Tonalá represent the heart of the Mexican state of Jalisco, and their importance dates back to the sixteenth century. By 1580, Guadalajara was the seat of both the audiencia court and the diocese, it had a caja real, and Augustinian and Franciscan monasteries. Analco, Tlajomulco, and Tonalá were all large Indigenous towns that were in the process of becoming correspondence communities because literate Indigenous elites would address colonial bureaucrats during the seventeenth century. Although only a few other correspondence communities were as large as Analco, Tlajomulco, and Tonalá, most of them were also connected to Guadalajara because their elites addressed documents to Europeans in Guadalajara. Therefore, one of the questions posed by this study is, “How did these Indigenous elites form these literate networks with the Diocese of Guadalajara, the Real Audiencia of
Guadalajara, and other colonial institutions in Guadalajara?” Possible answers lie in the cultural context of the colonial geography.\textsuperscript{67}

\subsection*{2.2a. The Rainy Season}

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Northwestern New Spain received abundant rains during a three to four month rainy season. The notaries who wrote the sixteenth-century \textit{Relaciones Geográficas} recorded that the rainy season began in May or June and ended in late August, September, or early October. Close to Guadalajara, the rains lasted from June until August because one observer from the nearby community of Ameca wrote, “The waters that run within…are greatest from the months of June until August,” to explain when the rivers and lakes of the region were at their fullest.\textsuperscript{68} Meanwhile, the rains began in June and lasted until the end of September to the north of Guadalajara in the region between Nombre de Dios and Zacatecas.\textsuperscript{69} Compostela was close to the Pacific Coast and west of Guadalajara, and it had rains

\textsuperscript{67} The road networks of Northwestern New Spain also influenced how chroniclers described the human and natural landscape of this region. Two of the best geographic descriptions of Northwestern New Spain, Nombre de Dios, and El Gran Nayar come from the traveler accounts of D. Alonso de la Mota y Escobar and Antonio de Ciudad Real. Mota y Escobar was the acting bishop of Guadalajara from 1599 to 1606, and during this time, he traveled to inspect many of the Indigenous communities within his jurisdiction. Joaquín Ramirez Cabañas in Mota y Escobar, 13-14. Meanwhile, Alono Ponce was a Franciscan friar who inspected Franciscan convents from what is now the Tropic of Cancer to Nicaragua, and he had a secretary named Antonio de Ciudad Real who wrote about these visits. Josefina García Quintana and Víctor M. Castillo Farreras in Ciudad Real, Vol. II, ix-x. The \textit{Descripción de la Nueva Galicia} by Arregui could also be considered a travel account because, although its author lived in Guadalajara, he traveled and explored many surrounding Indigenous towns. Several other published sources are also important for the region. They include the \textit{Relaciones geográficas} of Ameca, Compostela, Villa de Jerez de la Frontera y Taltenango, Nuchitzlan, Poncitlan y Cuiseo del Río, Villa de la Purificación, Tenamatzlan, Teucaltiche, and Xocotlan. \textit{Relaciones geográficas del siglo XVI: Nueva Galicia} edición de René Acuña, (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1988).

\textsuperscript{68} Acuña, \textit{Relaciones Geográficas del siglo xvi: Nueva Galicia}, 30.

\textsuperscript{69} The notary of the \textit{Relaciones Geográficas} (hereafter RG) of the Villa de Jerez wrote about the East claiming that the common waters began in June and lasted until the end of September and the one from Fresnillo claimed that it the rains started around the feast of Saint John in June (June 24) and ended towards the end of September. Acuña, 105, 138.
from June to October, and Purificación, which was southwest of Guadalajara and south of Compostela, had rains from May until the end of October.70 Amula was south of Guadalajara and it experienced rains from May until September.71 Furthermore, seventeenth-century writers record similar rain patterns. Mota y Escobar wrote that the rainy season began in Guadalajara in late June and added that, in Zacatecas, it was from May until September.72 Meanwhile, Arregui asserted that the rainy season was known as jopantla in Nahuatl, and he added that it lasted from the end of May until the beginning of October.73

Northwestern New Spain’s three to five month rainy season has significantly shaped the topography. In fact, Arregui proposed that the Sierra Madre Occidental Mountain Range and the Grande de Santiago River cut Nueva Galicia in half: the first divided this region from the southeast to the northwest at a point seventeen leagues east of Guadalajara, near the mines of Santo Domingo and the pass of Mochitiltic; and the latter divided it close to Lake Chapala at a place known as Chinautatengo.74 He asserted that regions to the north and east of this divide represented “tierras frias” and those to the south and west were “calientes.”75 This division of hot

70 In the West the notary of the RG of Compostela recorded the presence of “many springs with greater abundance [of water] from the month of June until October;” in the South the RG of Ameca reported that the rains, “were of their greatest quantity from the months of June until August;” and in the Southwest the notary of the RG of Purificación noted, “the watery season, [is] from May until the end of October. Acuña, 30, 88, 211.

71 Juan Bautista was the notary of the RG Amula and the RG of Tuscacuesco, and he wrote that the region experienced rains from May until September. Bautista in Acuña, 60, 70.

72 Mota y Escobar, 52, 147.

73 Arregui, 23.

74 Arregui begins his Descripción de la Nueva Galicia with the sub-division of the territory into hot lands and cold lands. Arregui, 10-11. Today, Chihuatanengo is known as La Barca, the raft, probably because of the importance of this crossing to people traveling between eastern Nueva Galicia and northern Nueva España. Chevalier apud Arregui 58; Gerhard, La frontera norte de Nueva España, 69.

75 Arregui asserts that the Pass of Mochitiltic was 17 leagues east of Guadalajara. Arregui, 10-11. The Diccionario de la Real Academia (consulted on September 9, 2016) defines legua as a variable measurement that varied depending on the region and which was defined by how far a traveler could walk on a road in an hour, and
lands and cold lands applies to Nueva Galicia, and it might also be extended to all of Northwestern New Spain after a careful analysis of the correspondence communities, and their place within a Spanish colonial system that relied on *encomiendas*, *corregimientos*, and *doctrinas*.

### 2.2b. The Hot Lands

Chroniclers and travelers generally described Arregui’s hot lands as being at lower elevations than communities in the cold lands (Map 2-2). The Guadalajara that became the heart of Northwestern New Spain was the last of several sites with this name, and it was in the valley of Atemajac, east of Tonala and Analco, and north of Tlajomulco. This last Guadalajara was on a natural foundation of pumice stone, a porous rock that prevented mud even when it rained heavily. The San Juan de Dios River formed its eastern boundary, separating it from Analco-Guadalajara, and two bridges connected these communities beginning in the second half of the sixteenth century. Opinions about its climate varied. Ciudad Real exclaimed that

which the ancient Spanish system measured as equivalent to 5572.7 meters. [http://dle.rae.es/?id=N5PoXDE](http://dle.rae.es/?id=N5PoXDE). As a result, 17 leagues is approximately 94.7 kilometers, or 58.8 miles.

76 I modeled this map after Josefina García Quintana and Víctor M. Castillo Farreras in Ciudad Real *Tratado curioso y docto de las grandezas de la Nueva España: Relación breve y verdadera de algunas cosas que sucedieron al padre fray Alonso Ponce en las provincias de la Nueva España siendo comisario general de aquellas partes* Vol. I.

77 I write “the Guadalajara” because several other sites hosted a settlement known as Guadalajara before this final one in the Valley of Atemajac. It was first founded in the plateau of Nochistlán by Juan de Oñate following the orders of Nuño de Guzmán, then translated to Tonala in 1533, then Tlacotlán in 1535, and finally placed at its present site in the Valley of Atemajac in 1541. François Chevalier in Arregui, 61.

78 Mota y Escobar, 44; Arregui, 63.

79 Alonso Pérez Marchán built this bridge when he was president of the Audiencia of Nueva Galicia (1613-1619). Arregui, 63. This bridge might have been built over an existing bridge because Hernán Martínez de la Marcha had two bridges built over the San Juan de Dios River during his 1549-1550 *visita*. José Francisco Román
Guadalajara’s location in this valley exposed it to the four winds making “it cold, but not excessively so,” but Mota y Escobar wrote that Guadalajara was “more hot than cold” and added that the heat was excessive and unhealthy from April to September, whereas Mota Padilla regarded its climate as the best in Northwestern New Spain since the hot month of July was bearable because it occurred during the rainy season.\textsuperscript{80}

Guadalajara was governed by a cabildo appointed by the Real Audiencia of Nueva Galicia. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the cabildo consisted of eight regidores and one alcalde mayor. An applicant could become a regidor by paying the Real Audiencia

---

81 Mota y Escobar, 45.
five hundred pesos, an *alcalde mayor* for two thousand pesos, or a notary for somewhat less than two thousand pesos.82

Guadalajara had many Indigenous towns in its jurisdiction, but the largest were San Pedro, Toluquilla, Analco-Guadalajara, and Tonala.83 The last two were correspondence communities because some of their inhabitants commissioned notaries to write three of the documents examined in this study: “1656 Tonala,” “1657 Tonala,” and “1679 Analco-Guadalajara.” Analco-Guadalajara was separated from Guadalajara by the San Juan River so that inhabitants of both communities had the same weather. Beginning in 1549, Guadalajara was the seat of an *alcalde mayor* who also controlled several villages outside of this city, but by 1667 one of its *alcaldes ordinarios* began to hold its magistracy in absentia.84 Meanwhile, Tonala was on higher ground, and it was cooler.85 In 1549, the *audiencia* of Nueva Galicia appointed a *corregidor* to Tonala, and by the mid-1570s, Santiago Tonala was an Augustinian *doctrina* with a convent that housed two Augustinian monks.86

The Grande de Santiago River and Lake Chapala were the two largest bodies of water in Northwestern New Spain, and they met south of Tonala. The Grande de Santiago River left Lake Chapala by a town known as Chinaguatenco, the place of the nine rivers.87 Here, travelers

82 Mota y Escobar, 45.

83 Arregui, 68-69. Nahuas build many communities that they named Analco so I use Analco-Guadalajara when referring to the one was once next to, but is now a part of Guadalajara.

84 Gerhard, *La frontera norte de la Nueva España*, 90, 155.

85 Ciudad Real II: 116; Mota y Escobar, 116.

86 Gerhard, *La frontera norte de la Nueva España*, 155; Mota y Escobar, 116-117; AHAG, Visitas Pastorales: 1678-1679, 6. Santiago may represent the name of a neighborhood of Tonala.

87 Acuña explains that Chicnaguatenco comes from *chicnahui* (nine) and *atentli* (river), and the last piece is -co (place of), or “the place of the nine rivers.” Acuña, 184. However, fray Alonzo de Molina defines *atentli* as “ribera de rio o de mar (shore of a river or the ocean).” Molina, *Vocabulario en Lengua Castellana/Mexicana*, 48.
took a raft to cross the Grande de Santiago, which was too wide to be bridged during the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries. Under different circumstances, the Grande de Santiago River might have served as a highway because it emptied into the Pacific Ocean and was wide enough for large sailing vessels such as Naos, but its many rocks and breakwaters hampered navigation by large vessels, although Indigenous people used canoes and flat-bottom boats to navigate some of its length. Meanwhile, Lake Chapala was a fresh water lake that resembled an inland sea, measuring more than thirty leagues in length and at least sixty leagues in circumference.

---

**Mexicana/Castellana** with a preliminary study by Miguel León Portilla (Mexico City: Editorial Porrúa, 2001), 7. Bachiller Gerónimo Thomas de Aquino Cortés y Zedeño defines *rivera de río* (shore of a river) as “*Tatenco atenko.*” He also defines river as either “*atoiac*” or “*atenco,*” small river as “*atoiac*” or “*atenco tepichi,*” and large river as Cortés y Zedeño, *Arte, Vocabulario y Confessionario en el Idioma Mexicano Como Se usa en el Obispado de Guadalajara* (Puebla de Los Angeles: Colegio Real de San Ignacio de la Puebla de los Angeles, 1765), 66-70, 114. “*atenco*” or “*atoiac huei,*” but it is difficult to find nine rivers intersecting here during colonial times. Gerhard asserts that only the Atotonilco River (now named the Zula River), which began in highlands northeast of Chichaguatenco, emptied into the Grande de Santiago River at this point. Gerhard, *La frontera norte de la Nueva España,* 66-70. As a result, “the places of the nine shores” is a better translation.

---

88 Mota y Escobar asserts that the Grande de Santiago River was not bridged along its entire length because it was too wide, and he added that Indigenous peoples crossed it on either canoes, rafts, or flat-bottomed boats known as *chalupas.* Mota y Escobar, 57. However, the notary of the RG of Poncitlan writes that this river could only be crossed on a boat or a raft during the rainy season. Acuña, 189.

89 Mota y Escobar, 29.

90 Today, CEA Jalisco (accessed on May 19, 2014) measures Chapala Lake as being 79 km long by 28 km wide with a capacity of 7.897 million cubic meters. [www.ceajalisco.gob.mx/chapala.html#nivel-diario](http://www.ceajalisco.gob.mx/chapala.html#nivel-diario) During the sixteenth century, Ciudad Real (Book II 1976: 88) describes it as being more than thirty leagues long, and ten leagues wide at its thinnest place. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 88. Antonio Tello agrees that it is more than thirty leagues long and adds that it is more than seventy leagues to walk around it. Tello, Book II, 6. Mota Padilla writes that it is a little shorter than thirty leagues in longitude with a circumference of more than sixty leagues. Mota Padilla, 31.
The Grande de Santiago River placidly traveled from Lake Chapala to the town of Jonacatlan where it formed a waterfall that fell between twenty and forty estados.\textsuperscript{91} This waterfall marked the beginning of La Barranca Canyon,\textsuperscript{92} which the Grande de Santiago had carved out over the course of eons as it gained strength from the enormous quantities of water deposited by many highland rivers such as the Verde, the Calderón, the Acatic, the San Juan, the San Gaspar, the Cañada Honda, and the Xuchipila.\textsuperscript{93} Then, La Barranca and the Grande de

\textsuperscript{91} Arregui mentions a waterfall of twenty estados, and Mota y Escobar (1940: 55) writes that it was forty estados. Arregui, 58. The dictionary of the Real Academia defines estado (stadia) as a measurement for heights or depths that was taken from the presumed height of a man. http://dle.rae.es/?id=GjqhajH (Consulted on July 14, 2016).

\textsuperscript{92} In the eighteenth century, Mota Padilla was one of the first writers to refer to the large canyon made by the Grande de Santiago River as La Barranca de Huentitlan. Mota Padilla, 500. Previous writers such as D. Alonzo de la Mota y Escobar and Arregui simple referred to it as La Barranca (the canyon). Mota y Escobar, 71; Arregui, 115.

\textsuperscript{93} Mota Padilla names these as the Green River, the Calderon River, the Acatic River, the San Juan River, the San Gaspar River, the Cañada Honda River, and the Xuchipila River. Mota Padilla, 500.
Santiago went west and turned northwest to pass above Guadalajara and the correspondence community of Tala, the site of “1600 Tala.”

Tala sat within the very fertile Valley of Tala, and it had a complex history. It was an encomienda that became a crown possession in 1570, but Diego de Colio held it in encomienda from 1585-1608, and by 1621, it was a corregimiento. Gerhard writes that Tala had a beneficiado (secular priest) beginning in 1605, and Gonzalo Martín de Colmona, the assistant of Bishop Juan de Santiago y Leon Garabito (1677-1694), identifies it as a secular parish in 1678 and 1679.

After Tala, the Barranca and the Grande de Santiago continued northwest and west, but the former ended close to the town of Tequila, whereas the latter continued through the highlands of Chimaltitan and into the Nayarit warm zone before emptying into the Pacific Ocean (Map 2-3). Acaponeta stood north of the Grande de Santiago River, and between 1563 and 1570 it became a corregimiento and then an alcaldía mayor. The alcaldía mayor of Acaponeta included Guaxicori and San Antonio Quihuiquinta from which notaries wrote four petitions: “1652a Guaxicori,” “1652b Guaxicori,” “1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta,” and “1652b San Antonio Quihuiquinta.” Furthermore, its alcalde mayor was also the captain of a nearby presidio.

---

94 Mota y Escobar, 71.

95 Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 169; Mota Y Escobar, 71; Arregui, 70-71.

96 AHAG, Visitas Pastorales: 1678-79; Gonzalo Martín de Colmona, 6.

97 I modeled this map after Carl Sauer’s The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico, 1934. Ibero-Americana 5.

98 Gerhard describes an ambiguous situation in which the audiencia of Nueva Galicia named a corregidor between 1563 and 1570, but he adds that a Tomás Gil was its encomendero. Arregui names it as an alcaldía mayor in his work from 1621. Arregui, 100. La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 78.
whose purpose was the protection of the coastal road from Compostela to Culiacan. Guaxicori and San Antonio Quihuiquinta were both on the Acaponeta River to the north of Acaponeta in a hot and swampy region teeming with natural resources. Nearby land yielded large quantities of cotton, maize, fruits, and vegetables while the Acaponeta River had several types of edible fish and turtles, and the nearby Pacific Ocean had large fisheries, oyster beds, and salt beds.

Finally, by 1604, Quihuiquinta had a recent convent, according to Fray Francisco del Barrio.

---

99 Gerhard, *La frontera norte de la Nueva España*, 78; Arregui, 100.

100 Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 116; Mota y Escobar, 84; Arregui, 100-101.


102 *Los albores de un nuevo mundo, siglos xvi y xvii* ed. by Thomas Calvo, 268.
The province of Compostela included the correspondence community of Xalisco, where at least two notaries wrote “1593a Xalisco,” “1593b Xalisco,” “N.Y. Xalisco, ca. 1593,” “1594 Xalisco,” “1595a Xalisco,” and “1595b Xalisco.” This community had a Franciscan convent dedicated to San Juan Bautista, founded in 1540. Xalisco was close to Compostela, a town whose importance had waned during the second half of the sixteenth century. Compostela had been founded by Beltrán de Guzmán, and it had housed the diocese and the audiencia court, but

---

103 Gerhard, *The Northern Frontier of New Spain*, 141.
it lost the first in 1548 and the latter in 1560. It remained the seat of the *alcaldía mayor* of Compostela, but only twenty Spaniards resided there in 1587.104 The notary of the RG of Compostela recorded that Compostela had a temperate climate that was more humid than dry and added that the land surrounding this community held large quantities of cattle and produced corn, wheat, oranges, and limes.105 By 1621, the *alcaldía mayor* of Compostela had a large jurisdiction that encompassed a coastal area along the Pacific coast with limits that went north to the province of Chiametla along the twenty-second parallel, east to Minas de Chimaltitan, northeast to El Gran Nayar, and south to Banderas Bay and the Valley of Banderas.106 South of this valley stood the canyons, hills, and mountains of Purificación, the southernmost province of Nueva Galicia.

Purificación bordered Autlan, which bordered Amula, but only the latter produced documents: “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco” and “1649 Tachichilco.” The notary of the first document identified San Antonio Tuzcacuezco as being in Amula, and although the other notary did not mention where Tachichilco was, other sources suggest it was also in this province.107 In 1579, the notary of the *Relación de Amula* wrote that Amula was an *alcaldía mayor* with three *cabeceras*—Zapotitlan, Tuzcacuesco, and Cusalapa—and he added that the latter had


105 Acuña, 88.


107 Gerhard wrote that a *corregimiento* named Amula and Tuzcacuezco was created in the 1530s, and during the 1570s, it became an *alcaldía mayor* with its office at Tuzcacuezco. Gerhard, *A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain*, 46.
Tachichilco and Chacala as subject towns. Meanwhile, the Spanish translator of Tachichilco’s petition mentioned that this town belonged to the parish of Chacala. Ciudad Real wrote of visiting Tuzcucuezco on February 16, 1587, and he described it as belonging to the parish of Zapotitlan and was located five leagues from Zacapala. San Antonio Tuzcucuezco would remain subordinate to Zapotitlan for more than a hundred years because Mota Padilla wrote in the eighteenth century that it remained a visita of this town.

The climate of Amula varied between hot and temperate. Cusalapa was situated between two rivers, and it was neither too hot nor too cold. Its nearby hills were filled with oaks, pine trees, and trees known as encinales; its lowlands supported maize, native plants, native vegetables, and wheat, but it was not hospitable to other plants from Castile. San Antonio Tuzcucuezco was on the Tuzcucuezco River, and its climate was either hot and dry or hot and humid depending on the season.

The documents of “1622 Cohuatlan,” “1637a Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo,” and “1637b Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo” appear to belong to a community in the province of Colima. Pedro Puy is the notary of “1622 Coatlan,” and he refers to Cohuatlan as being close to

---

108 This notary also wrote that Tachichila was given this name because it had a lot of reddish earth known as Tlalchichiltique. Acuña, 79.

109 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649 Tachichilco.”


111 Mota y Padilla, 101.

112 Relaciones geográficas del siglo xvi: Nueva Galicia, 77. Mota y Escobar commented that Amula along with nearby Tenamastlan and Zapotitlan had been very hot during pre-Christian times. Mota y Escobar, 64.

113 Ciudad Real recorded excessive heat in February of 1587 between these two valleys. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 130. The notary of the RG of Villa de la Purificación wrote that the climate varied from hot and humid to hot and dry depending on the season. Acuña, 211.
Atlcoçavic and Teculapa, two towns held by encomenderos living in the villa of Colima.114 During the mid-sixteenth century, Juan Bautista de Rápalo held Teculapa, which had 123 tributaries, and Juan Fernández held Coatlan and its 275 tributaries.115 Juan Cruz is the notary of “1637a Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo” and “1637b Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo,” and although he does not name the province, a notary named Juan Días places this community as being in the jurisdiction of Colima.116 The province of Colima had been an alcaldía mayor created by Hernán Cortés with a jurisdiction extending as far north as Tepic and as far east as Lake Chapala, but the creation of Nueva Galicia and new corregimientos like Amula and Ávalos severely shortened its boundaries.117 Colima had a hot and tropical climate which allowed the harvesting of bananas, coconuts, cotton, and peanuts.118

Ávalos was a large province north of Colima. In 1523, it was assigned as an encomienda to three brothers: Fernando de Saavedra, Alonso de Ávalos Saavedra, and Juan de Ávalos.119 However, Juan de Ávalos died a few years later and his portion was given to Jorge Carrillo, a

---

114 “1622 Cohuatlan” has a title page in which a Spanish notary introduces it as a “peticion de los yndios de Colima.” Atlcoçavic was held by Martín Jiménez from the 1520s until around 1550, and by his son until the 1560s, and that Teculapa was held by Juan Bautista de Rapalo during the 1520s and 1530s, and by his son until around 1550. Gerhard, A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain, 80. Rosa Margarita Nettel Ross concurs that Jiménez was encomendero of Atlcoçavic and adds that it had 78 married tributaries during his tenure. Los testigos hablan: La conquista de Colima y sus informantes ed. by Nettel Ross (Colima, Mexico: Universidad de Colima, 2007), 258. However, the writer of one addendum places Cohuatlan close to Contla, a town east of Guadalajara and the Grande de Santiago River. More information about Contla is present in the section titled “The Cold Lands.”

115 Nettel Ross, 237.

116 McA-UCLA, Box 20-42, “1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo.”

117 Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 79.


119 Gerhard allows that Cortés may have given Ávalos in encomienda to the brothers, but he posits it as more likely that a governor Estrada may have given it in encomienda to the brothers because one of his daughters was married to Alonso de Ávalos. Gerhard, A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain, 1972: 239. Hillerkuss writes that Cortés gave this encomienda to the three brothers in 1523. Hillerkuss, 15.
resident of Colima.  Nevertheless, by 1528, the two surviving brothers were its only holders, and when Fernando de Saavedra died, the crown took over his portion and appointed a corregidor on August 20, 1535.  Meanwhile, Alonso de Ávalos kept his half for over forty years and passed it on to his heirs, who died out in the 1620s, but a tenth of its tribute remained in private hands as late as 1801.  The province of Ávalos in its entirety included the land around the western third of Lake Chapala, the lake basins of Sayula and Atotonilco, and the headwaters of the Ameca and Armeria Rivers.

The abundance of water made Ávalos especially fertile and populated, and its eighteen documents from ten different communities (Table 2-1) suggest that literacy in Nahuatl was more widespread here than in other regions of Northwestern New Spain. Eight of these correspondence communities are easy to locate because three were fairly important, and five others were identified as being in the province of Ávalos. During the 1570s and 1580s, the alcalde mayor of the towns of Ávalos and corregidor of the crown had resided at San Francisco Zacoalco, but by 1615 this officer was based in Sayula. Furthermore, San Francisco Chapala had a convent and was on the northern shore of Lake Chapala.  Also, Indigenous notaries

120 Hillerkuss, 15.

121 According to Gerhard the towns of Atoyac, Cocula, Chulitla, Tusitatan, Zacoalco, and Sayula appeared in a tribute assessment from May 1528. Gerhard, A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain, 239. Hillerkuss notes that the first audiencia under Nuño de Guzmán took away this encomienda from the two brothers in 1529, and that the second audiencia restored it to them the following year along with the neighboring province of Chapala, which had belonged to the conquistador Diego de San Martín. Hillerkuss, 15.

122 Gerhard, A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain, 240.

123 Gerhard, A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain, 239.

124 Gerhard A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain, 240. Also, the notary of “1679 Sayula,” wrote that Sayula was in Ávalos. AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1679 Sayula.”

125 Refer to Ciudad Real, Vol II, 91; Gerhard, A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain, 241.
identified Amatitlan, San Andrés Atotonilco, San Juan Evangelista Atoyac, and Santa Ana Acatlan as being in Ávalos, and the Spanish translator of “1692 San Andrés Atotonilco” added that San Andrés Atotonilco was in the parish of Zacoalco. Finally, an unidentified author writes “San Martín de Cocula” in an addenda to “1653 San Martín,” which means that San Martín was subject to the Franciscan convent at Cocula, a town in Ávalos.

Table 2-1: Documents of Ávalos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the document</th>
<th>Province or region</th>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1626 Francisco Chapalac</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Francisco de Torres</td>
<td>Franciscan Friar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629 San Francisco Zacoalco</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Juan Fabian</td>
<td>Notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Not named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653 San Martín</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Diego Juan</td>
<td>Notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654 San Martín</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Diego Juan</td>
<td>Notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658 San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Juan Sebastian</td>
<td>Notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Diego Felipe</td>
<td>Notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668 San Francisco Zacoalco</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Pedro Juan</td>
<td>Mayordomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Not named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673 San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Not named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679 Sayula</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Not named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Not named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686 San Pedrotepec</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>Not named</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126 Atotonilco means the place of the warmed waters, and this toponym demonstrates the importance of having another regional identifier because many Nahuatl names repeat in Northwestern New Spain and elsewhere. For example, there are at least five towns named Atotonilco: Atotonilco and Atotonilquillo (or Atotonilco El Alto) in Poncitlan; Atotonilco El Bajo and San Andrés de Atotonilco in Ávalos; and Atotonilco in Juchipila. Arregui, 59, 61, 103, 106, 118; Baus de Czitrom, 57, 59; Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 90; Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 67-70, 103; Mota y Escobar, 130; Mota Padilla, 33, 35; and Santoscoy, 1050.

127 Ciudad Real places Cocula in Ávalos. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 104. Gerhard places Cocula in Sayula, but adds that Ávalos was another name for the province of Sayula. Gerhard, A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain, 239, 241.

128 San Francisco Zacualco is the same town as that of 1629 Tzacoalco San Fran[cis]co in McA-UCLA, Box 20 Folder 17, which is transcribed and translated by Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart. Beyond the Codices, 196-197.

129 Most cofradías of Northwestern New Spain had a mayordomo and a prioste as its officials, but in other documents, translators appear to have used the term mayordomo to also refer to the prioste. Pedro Juan writes at the beginning of “1668 San Francisco Zacoalco,” “I am the mayordomo of the cofradia of the Holy Sacrament,” and at the end he writes only two names: Alonzo Felipe prioste of the Holy Sacrament and Pedro Juan mayordomo of the Sacrament. AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
The identification of the four other correspondence communities is somewhat more difficult. Three different chroniclers mention a Tizapan that was part of the parish of Cocula, but they did not write whether this town corresponded to San Francisco Tizapan or Santa María Magdalena Tizapan.\textsuperscript{131} The notary of “1673 San Francisco Tizapan” named the community from which he wrote as Tizapan of the lake, but this is not as helpful as it could be because both towns were close to lakes. Gerhard presents Tizapan el Bajo as being a short distance north of Lake Atotonilco and Cocula in the northwest part of Ávalos, and Tizapan el Alto as being a short distance south of Lake Chapala and in the eastern edge of Ávalos.\textsuperscript{132} Meanwhile, during the eighteenth century, Maríano de Torres (1965: 148) and Mota Padilla (1973: 100, 101) mention a Tizapan that was a \textit{sujeto} of Cocula, and Mota Padilla (1973: 101) refers to another Tizapan that was a \textit{sujeto} of the parish of Tecuitatlan, a town in eastern Ávalos and close to Chapala Lake.\textsuperscript{133}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Date & Place & Author & Notary \tabularnewline
\hline
1687 & Santa Ana Acatlan & Ávalos & Antonio de la Cruz\textsuperscript{130} & Not named \tabularnewline
1692 & San Andrés Atotonilco & Ávalos, Feligresia of Zacoalco & Don Miguel & Notary \tabularnewline
1693 & Santa Ana Acatlan & Ávalos & Antonio de la Cruz & Not named \tabularnewline
1694 & San Juan Evangelista Atoyac & Ávalos & Not named & Not named \tabularnewline
n.y. Sayula & & Not named & Not named & Not named \tabularnewline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Identification of correspondence communities.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{130} Antonio de la Cruz’s handwriting is similar to that of “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan.” AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.


\textsuperscript{132} Gerhard, \textit{A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain}, 240.

\textsuperscript{133} Maríano de Torres, 148; Mota Padilla, 100, 101. Spaniards reclassified Indigenous settlements in New Spain into \textit{cabeceras} (head towns) and \textit{sujetos} (subject towns) based on a criteria that included population size, historical importance, and proximity to a Spanish settlement, an important resource, or a prominent topographical feature. Charles Gibson, \textit{The Aztecs Under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico, 1519-1810} (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1964).
However, the answer lies in the present. San Francisco Tizapan El Alto is a town on the southern shore of Lake Chapala, close to where Gerhard places Tizapan El Alto. Furthermore, Czitrom equates Santa María Magdalena Tizapan with a town that is now known as Villa Corona, which is on the northern shore of Lake Atotonilco. The last correspondence community of San Pedro Tepec appears to be the same as San Pedro y San Pablo de Tepec, a town east of Lake Sayula in Ávalos.

Ávalos had a hot climate, but its communities were fertile and never lacked water. Mota y Escobar places Atoyac as next to Atoyac Lake, and Ciudad Real writes that Sayula had a climate suitable for Mediterranean fruits like figs, grapes, and pomegranates. Meanwhile, Mota y Escobar mentions that Chapala was warmer than Guadalajara and that it had orchards of figs, lemons, oranges, and pomegranates.

The province of Izatlan was northwest of Ávalos, and it encompassed a highland basin that had several fresh water lakes and four correspondence communities: San Francisco Ahualulco, Etzatlan, La Magdalena, and Oconahuac. Eight documents refer to these towns

---

134 Baus de Czitrom, Carolyn, Tecuexes y Cocos: Dos grupos de la región Jalisco en el siglo XVI (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Departamento de Investigaciones Historicas, 1982), 60.

135 The Indigenous notary of “1686 San Pedrotepec” uses the phrase *tomachio tofirma*, which is only used by one other notary, the one who wrote “1669 Santa Ana Acatlan” in which it is *tomacheofremas*. Santa Ana Acatlan is a short distance from San Pedro y San Pablo Tepec. AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.

136 Mota y Escobar identifies this body of water as Lake Atoyac, but it is currently dry lake bed known as Lake Sayula. Mota y Escobar, 61. Ciudad Real almost always describes which edible plants grew in a town. Ciudad Real, Vol II, 149.

137 Mota y Escobar, 60-61.

138 Etzatlan is the present-day name of the town, but colonial writers wrote either Etzatlan or Izatlan. I use Izatlan to refer to the province and Etzatlan to refer to the town in deference to Gerhard, who follows this convention. Gerhard, *A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain*, 156-158.

This region was inhabited prior to the conquest, and then Francisco Cortés de San Buenaventura encountered its people and gave them in *encomienda* to Juan de Escarcena and Pedro de Villofrío around 1525. By 1535, Izatlan had escheated to the crown and had become a *corregimiento* of Nueva España, and by the 1540s it was an *alcaldía mayor*. Etzatlan was its *cabecera* and San Francisco Ahualulco, Oconahuac, and La Magdalena were subject towns.

Etzatlan also became a Franciscan base soon after the arrival of Spaniards. The Franciscan lay brother Juan Francisco traveled with the Cortés de Buenaventura *entrada*, and he began to proselytize in Etzatlan around 1525. Then, the Franciscan friars Francisco Lorenzo and Andrés de Cordova arrived in 1530; the former proselytized in surrounding communities, and the latter focused on building what would become the convent of the Immaculate Conception at Etzatlan. By 1605, La Magdalena and San Francisco Ahualulco had *doctrinas*, but these were subordinate to the aforementioned convent of the Immaculate Conception at Etzatlan.

### Table 2-2: Documents from the Province of Izatlan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the petition</th>
<th>Province or region</th>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1593a Oconahuac</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593b Oconahuac</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593c Oconahuac</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622 La Magdalena</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

140 Francisco Cortés de Buenaventura claims to have given Etzatlan in *encomienda*. Cortés de Buenaventura in Boletín del Archivo General de la Nación, 556. However, Mariano de Torres only mentions Escarcena in 1530. Mariano de Torres, 48.

141 Gerhard describes the time frame for when Etzatlan became a *corregimiento* and an *alcaldía mayor*. Izatlan was one of the northernmost provinces of Nueva España, and its *corregidores* and *alcaldes mayor* were appointed from Mexico City. Gerhards, *A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain*, 152.

142 Mota y Escobar, 75.

143 Mariano de Torres, 48.


Izatlan had favorable weather and many natural resources. Its lakes ran north-south and divided the basin in two with Magdalena and San Francisco Ahualulco on the eastern side, and Etzatlan and Oconahuac on the western side. Ciudad Real claimed that these lakes had a good variety of fish before 1566, when an earthquake caused the larger fish to disappear, whereas Mota y Escobar mentioned an abundance of small fish and birds at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Meanwhile, Mota y Escobar describes the temperature of La Magdalena as being cold, and he also notes that San Francisco Ahualulco had pomegranates, a fruit that cannot withstand freezing temperatures. The highlands to the south were also rich in valuable minerals because several mines in the highlands south of San Francisco Ahualulco yielded silver during the 1580s, and mines south of Etzatlan yielded lead and silver during the early 1600s.

The notary of “Oconahuac 1592a” writes of a grievance held by the inhabitants of Oconahuac and four communities on the Ameca River: Amatlan, Tepetlatlaucan, Tzichtic, and Xatlatzinco. Nuño de Guzmán first gave Amatlan, Xatlatzinco, and a few other communities in encomienda to Alvaro de Bracamonte, and Francisco Vásquez de Coronado acquired one half of this territory in 1540, which reverted to the crown in 1544 after his death, whereas the other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notary Name</th>
<th>Notary Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1649a</td>
<td>La Magdalena</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649b</td>
<td>La Magdalena</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>San Francisco Ahualulco</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Juan Pedro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Etzatlan</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

146 Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 106; Mota y Escobar, 74.

147 Mota y Escobar, 74.


149 In a map, Gerhard shows that Tzichtic was the southernmost community followed by Tepetlatlaucan, Xatlatzinco, and Amatlan. Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 115.
half passed to Alonso de Bracamonte around 1570. Cristóbal de Oñate shared Tepetlatluca and Tzichtic with Diego de Villegas, but by the 1570s, both halves had escheated to the crown, which created the corregimiento of Mascota, whose corregidor was responsible for Mascota, Tepetlatuluca, and Tzichtic. Few Spanish-language documents mention these towns, but perhaps Mota y Escobar refers to them when writing that some smaller communities were subjects of Etzatlan, but that their Indigenous inhabitants listened to mass with the Franciscans in the doctrina of Oconahuac.

The last documents from the hot lands of Northwestern New Spain are “1644 Cajititlan,” “1630 Tlajomulco,” and “N.Y. San Cacel Tlajomulco,” from Cajititlan and Tlajomulco, respectively. These correspondene communities were east of Izatlan and south of Guadalajara, and they played important roles during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Nuño de Guzmán gave himself Tlajomulco and Cuyutlan in encomienda, but both escheated to the crown in 1545, joining Nueva España for a short time before becoming a part of Nueva Galicia. By 1549, the corregimiento of Tlajomulco and that of Cuyutlan appeared in colonial documents with the town of Zalatitlan being incorporated to the latter entity, which became known as Cuyutlan and Cajititlan, or simply Cajititlan. In 1621, Arregui continued to identify Tlajomulco as the

---

150 Vasquez de Coronado died in 1544. Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 115.

151 Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 116.

152 Mota y Escobar, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 75.

153 Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 191.

154 Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 191.
seats of a *corregimiento*, and he also asserted that it bordered Cajititlan and Cuyutlan to the southeast, and Ávalos to the west.155

Tlajomulco and Cajititlan were under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Franciscans. Ciudad Real mentions a Franciscan convent dedicated to San Antonio in Tlajomulco and Mota y Escobar and Arregui confirm its continued existence into the seventeenth century.156 Meanwhile, Mota y Escobar writes that Cajititlan was a Franciscan *doctrina*.157

The *corregimientos* of Tlajomulco and Cajititlan had favorable climate and topography. Tlajomulco was between two high hills, but it never got too hot because its temperatures were similar to Guadalajara’s.158 It had an abundant water supply that made its lowlands hospitable for native plants and animals from Castille while its hills held many deer.159 Cajititlan stood on the northern shores of Lake Cajititlan, which had many small fish, and its climate was similar to that of Tlajomulco and Guadalajara.160

2.2c. The Cold Lands

Canyons, plateaus, and highland valleys characterize the coldlands because of the way that the many rivers of Northwestern New Spain flowed through the Sierra Madre Occidental

155 Arregui names Tlajomulco as the largest town in Nueva Galicia, but he does not include the large towns of Ávalos which were outside of this region. Arregui also names Santa Ana Acatlan as one of Tlajomulco’s *sujetos*, but Antonio de la Cruz, the notary of “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan” and “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan” writes that it was in Ávalos. Arregui, 69; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.

156 Mota y Escobar, 62; Arregui, 69.


159 Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 100; Mota y Escobar, 64; Arregui, 69-70.

160 Mota y Escobar, 59.
and several smaller mountain ranges. Different natural processes gave birth to the Sierra Madre Occidental, which begins close to the U.S.—Mexico border and ends above Mexico City.\textsuperscript{161} It has a general altitude of 8000 feet above sea level, but it has exceedingly rough terrain because the many rivers that begin in its peaks have created box canyons, 800 to 1000 feet deep, in their march to the Pacific Ocean (Refer to map 2-1). During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, these cold highlands were rich in minerals, and they also accommodated independent and semi-independent Indigenous \textit{rancherías} and towns whose inhabitants used the rugged landscape to impede the advance of Spanish colonization (Map 2-4).\textsuperscript{162}.

\textsuperscript{161} Robert C. West and James J. Parsons, “The Topia Road: a trans-Sierran trail of colonial Mexico” in \textit{Geography Review} 31-3 (1941), 406.

\textsuperscript{162} Robert C. West and James J. Parsons, 406.
El Gran Nayar was the only independent region of Northwestern New Spain, and it served as the home of Francisco Nayari, who wrote “1649a Tzacamota,” “1649b Tzacamota,” and “1649c Tzacamota.” These three documents are letters in which Nayari appears to respond
to Bishop Juan Ruiz Colmenero, who had written to ask him to turn over some apostates.\textsuperscript{163} Nayari writes in the first \textit{carta} that the Coras, from Huazamota, Ayotochpa, and Guaxicori were innocent of any wrongdoing, and he blames the Tepehuanes for being rebellious and for enticing him to join them. This \textit{carta} and other sources suggest that Huazamota, Ayotochpa, and Guaxicori were, “transactional and transitional crossroads where ethnic identities, subsistence patterns, cultural beliefs, and gender relations were forged and changed over time in a frontier only slowly conquered by non-Indians.”\textsuperscript{164}

Spaniards began to make inroads into Huazamota and Ayotochpa, and another community known as Huaynamota during the early sixteenth century. Tello claims that Pedro Almíndez Chirinos, one of Nuño de Guzmán’s captains, led an expedition north from Huaynamota to Huazamota and back again to Huaynamota.\textsuperscript{165} The probable result of this expedition was that Huaynamota was given in \textit{encomienda} to Juan de Arce, but its inhabitants never paid tribute, and it was rumored that they killed him.\textsuperscript{166} By 1621, Huaynamota belonged to the \textit{alcadía mayor} of Minas de Chimaltitan.\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{163} My study will discuss the difference between a \textit{petición} (petition) and a \textit{carta} (letter) in Chapter 4. Ruiz Colmenero wrote a letter to the Coras regarding the return of some apostates, and Nayari mentioned that the troublemakers were not Coras, but Tepehuanes in the communities of Guazamota, Ayotochpa, and Guaxicori. Gerhard, \textit{La frontera norte de la Nueva España}, 144.

\textsuperscript{164} Susan Deeds writes this statement about Nueva Vizcaya, but it might also apply to the multi-ethnic space of El Gran Nayar. Deeds, \textit{Defiance and Deference in Mexico’s Colonial North: Indians Under Spanish Rule in Nueva Vizcaya} (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2003), 8.

\textsuperscript{165} Tello, Book II, 252.

\textsuperscript{166} The Coras were given in \textit{encomienda} to Francisco Rojo, and the \textit{encomiendas} of the Coras and Huaynamota remained active in 1548. Gerhard \textit{A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain}, 145.

\textsuperscript{167} Arregui, 81.
The Franciscans had many difficulties when proselytizing in Huaynamota, Huazamota, and Ayotuchpa. Several Franciscan friars began to visit Huaynamota in the 1570s, establishing a convent whose two resident friars were Francisco Gil and Andrés de Ayala, but both were killed by its inhabitants in 1585.\textsuperscript{168} The Franciscans established another convent in Huaynamota in 1601, but they abandoned it in 1635.\textsuperscript{169} In Huazamota, the Franciscan friar Francisco Martínez began to proselytize in 1582, and he was still there in 1587.\textsuperscript{170} At the end of the sixteenth century, some Franciscans friars had convinced a number of Indigenous people to come down from the “Cora Mountains” to live in a new settlement known as Ayotuchpa, and this convent survived for more than a hundred years.\textsuperscript{171}

Ayotuchpa, Huaynamota, and Huazamota are thus visible in Spanish records, but Nayari may be the first person to write of Tzacamota. In “1649a Tzacamota,” he names the “alitepet Tzacamota noaltepeuh” (the community of Tzacamota, my community). Twenty-four years later, a Franciscan friar named Antonio Arias y Saavedra describes Tzacamota as one of four provinces in “La Sierra,” the home of the Nayari, and a \textit{ranchería}.\textsuperscript{172} Arias y Saavedra also uses Nayari as more of an ethnic affiliation than a name, and he goes on to classify Tzacamota as the main religious site and adds that it held the home of the Nayari, which had a room with a table in the middle surrounded by the seated cadavers of Don Francisco Nayari, Don Pedro Huaynoli, Don Francisco Gil and Andrés de Ayala spoke Nahuatl. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 108-109.

\textsuperscript{168} Gerhard, \textit{A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain}, 145.


\textsuperscript{170} Mota y Escobar writes that these Indigenous people were newly brought down. Mota y Escobar, 83-84. The Franciscans moved their convent from Ayotuchpa to San Marcos Cuyutlan sometime between 1696 and 1722. Gerhard, \textit{La frontera norte de la Nueva España}, 79.

\textsuperscript{171} Arias y Saavedra in Calvo, \textit{Colección de documentos para la historia de Nayarit: Los albores de un nuevo mundo}, 287-288.
Don Alonso Yoquary, and Don Luis Uristi.173 Is this the Francisco Nayari of “1649a Tzacamota,” “1649b Tzacamota,” “1649c Tzacamota?”

The province of Minas de Chimaltitan bordered El Gran Nayar to the south, and Francisco Rafael wrote “1646 Tequepechpan” and Francisco Martín wrote “1678 Santiago Pochotitlan.” Francisco Rafael did not identify his community, but the Spanish notary Juan Ruiz de Agudelo wrote in an addendum that this document was a petition that concerned Tequepechpan, a town in the province of Minas de Chimaltitan.174 Tequepechpan was south of El Gran Nayar and the Grande de Santiago River, and a short distance northwest of the Pass of Mochitiltic. Tequepechpan was at a high altitude and cold, but it was hospitable enough for farmers to grow maize and fruits from Castille.175 During the mid-sixteenth century, Tequepechpan belonged to the encomienda of Juan de Samaniego, along with two nearby communities: Tetitlan and Camotlan.176 Juan de Valvo was its encomendero during the 1570s, but by the 1580s, it had escheated to the crown.177 By 1621, it was in the alcaldía mayor of the

173 Arias y Saavedra in Calvo, Colección de documentos para la historia de Nayarit: Los albores de un nuevo mundo, 294. Further research may reveal whether Arias y Saavedra’s Francisco Nayari represents the writer of “1649a Tzacamota” and “1649b Tzacamota.”

174 I have kept Tequepechpan because it is more common in the sources. A Tepequechpan in that province was also known as Tequepespan. Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 145. Another town currently known as Tlaquepaque, which is in the greater Guadalajara region, was also known as Tequepechpan during the colonial period.

175 Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 112; Mota y Escobar, 80.

176 Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 182.

177 Gerhard La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 182. It encompassed Tequepechpan, Zapotlan, Santa María, San Luis, Pochotitlan, Tetitlan, and San Pedro de la Lagunilla which were south of the Grande de Santiago, and Guajimiqui, Huaynamota, the mines of Cuitapilco, and an unnamed silver processing site. Arregui, 81.
province of Minas de Chimaltitan which encompassed communities on both sides of the Grande de Santiago River.\textsuperscript{178}

Three communities were named Pochotitlan in Northwestern New Spain—one in Minas de Chimaltitan, one in Fronteras de Colotlan, and the last in Purificación—but Santiago Pochotitlan appears to represent the town in Minas de Chimaltitan.\textsuperscript{179} Francisco Martín, its Indigenous author, dated “1678 Santiago Pochotitlan” to December 13, 1678.\textsuperscript{180} Meanwhile, the writer of the \textit{visita} journal of Bishop Juan de Santiago de León Garabito dated the arrival of a diocesan party to Santiago Pochotitlan in the jurisdiction of Xalisco on December 23, 1678.\textsuperscript{181} The dates closely correlate, and Santiago Pochotitlan was a subject town of Tequepechpan under the Spanish imperial system, and a subject town of the Franciscan convent of Saint John the Baptist in Xalisco.\textsuperscript{182}

Nombre de Dios was a correspondence community north of Huazamota and El Gran Nayar, and it has “N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca. 1585.”\textsuperscript{183} According to Barlow and Smisor, this town was founded in 1564 or 1565 by Nahuas, Tarascans, and Zacatecos of a nearby Franciscan

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{178} Gerhard, \textit{La frontera norte de la Nueva España}, 182.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{179} Gerhard relied on archival sources to document the \textit{encomienda} that included Pochotitlan. No chroniclers refer to a “Santiago Pochotitlan” and only a few of them mention “Pochotitlan.” Gerhard, \textit{La frontera norte de la Nueva España}, 153. Arregui writes “Ochotitlan” and “Pochotitlan,” when referring to the town in the jurisdiction of Chimaltitan. Arregui, 81. Mota y Escobar writes “Ponchotitlan” in a list, but he does not clarify which one he is referring to. Mota y Escobar, 214.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{180} AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{181} AHAG, Visitas Pastorales, 1678.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{182} In 1772, Pochotitlan and the nearby town of San Luis belonged to Tequepespan, but were visited by clerics from the parish of Xalisco. Gerhard, \textit{La frontera norte de la Nueva España}, 183.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{183} “N.Y. Nombre de Dios ca. 1585” and the several other petitions, which are not in my study, are copies made by the nineteenth-century intellectual Faustino Galicia Chimalpopoca of a now lost work. Barlow and Smisor judge it to be a genuine but imperfect reproduction that is “vulgar” in comparison to the colonial Nahuatl of Central Mexico. Barlow and Smisor, xxiii.
\end{flushright}
mission.\textsuperscript{184} Nombre de Dios was between Nueva Galicia and Nueva Vizcaya and both of their 
\textit{audiencias} sought to incorporate it within their borders, but in 1579, the viceroy began to appoint 
its \textit{alcalde mayor}, thus making it one of the northernmost enclaves of Nueva España.\textsuperscript{185} Nombre de Dios sat above the basins of Poana and Xuchi, where it experienced extremes in 
temperature.\textsuperscript{186} Mota y Escobar writes that Nombre de Dios was hot and sick because it was in a 
hole where the heat and humidity harbored many poisonous creatures, but the notary of the 
\textit{Relación de San Martín and Llerena} describes the nearby town of San Martín as cold and dry 
with ice from October through March.\textsuperscript{187}

The province of Fronteras de Colotlan had boundaries with El Gran Nayar to the east and 
Nombre de Dios to the northeast. Fronteras de Colotlan should have some documents in Nahuatl 
because some of its inhabitants were Tlaxcalans from Central Mexico, but to date, no documents 
have been found in the archives of Guadalajara. Fronteras de Colotlan was a response that grew 
from Spanish attempts to contain attacks by semi-nomadic and sedentary Indigenous groups 
from El Gran Nayar and northern Mexico.\textsuperscript{188} In 1590-1591, Viceroy Luis de Velasco “the 
younger” negotiated with the nobles of Tlaxcala to send settlers into northern and western 
Mexico, and they agreed after the colonists were offered concessions normally reserved for

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{184} Barlow and Smisor, xvii.
\textsuperscript{185} Gerhard, \textit{A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain}, 204.
\textsuperscript{186} Gerhard, \textit{A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain}, 203.
\textsuperscript{187} Mota y Escobar, 179; \textit{Relaciones geográficas del siglo xvi: Nueva Galicia}, 247.
\textsuperscript{188} Philip Wayne Powell asserts that Spaniards had tried different strategies against hostile Indigenous 
groups, but that the most effective one was the foundation of Indigenous military districts. Powell, \textit{Soldiers, 
Indians, and Silver: North America’s First Frontier War} (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 
1969).
\end{flushright}
Spanish nobles. In 1591, 401 family units (bachelors and heads of families) founded six settlements in western and northern Mexico. Colotlan was the westernmost community, and it formed the linchpin of what would become Fronteras de Colotlan, a region of mostly Huichol towns that provided flecheros (militiamen) during expeditions led by a Spanish military governor who only answered to the viceroy of New Spain. This special relationship placed it under the jurisdiction of the Audiencia of New Spain at Mexico City, and during the 1620s, it was also taken from the Diocese of Guadalajara and incorporated into the Diocese of Durango, when the latter was created.

Southeast of Colotlan, the correspondence community of Nochistlan and Juchipila shared a common history. Nochistlan, the site of “1580a Nochistlan” and “1580b Nochistlan” was a corregimiento in the alcaldía mayor of the Minas de Tepeque and the Valley of Juchipila in 1584. Nochistlan stood on a flat-topped hill, between two streams that enabled its inhabitants to survive in this dry and cold climate. For a time, Nochistlan was held in encomienda within the jurisdiction of an earlier incarnation of Guadalajara, known as the villa de Espíritu Santo de


191 Blosser, 290, 291, 294.

192 These relationships with the Real Audiencia of New Spain and the Diocese of Durango explain why any extant Nahuatl documents from Fronteras de Colotlan are most likely to be found in archives of Mexico City and Durango rather than those of Guadalajara.

193 Relaciones geográficas del siglo xvi: Nueva Galicia, 165.

194 Relaciones geográficas del siglo xvi: Nueva Galicia, 167-168; Mota y Escobar, 129.
Guadalajara, which was moved to Tonala in 1533 but continued to claim Nochistlan.\textsuperscript{195} Diego Vásquez was Nochistlan’s first \textit{encomendero}, and he held it along with the town of Jalpa until shortly before 1541, when Miguel de Ibarra received and held it until it escheated to the crown.\textsuperscript{196}

Juchipila was west of Nochistlan, and it was where “1652 San Francisco Juchipila” was written. Like Nochistlan, it fell under the jurisdiction of the \textit{alcaldía mayor} of Minas de Tepeque and the Valley of Juchipila in 1584, but by 1621 it was the \textit{cabecera} of the \textit{alcaldía mayor} of Juchipila.\textsuperscript{197} It was on the southern end of the Valley of Juchipila through which the Juchipila River flowed, and it had a hot climate and fertile lands.\textsuperscript{198}

The Franciscans apparently went to Nochistlan and Juchipila during the early 1530s. Two friars named Juan de Badilla and Andrés de Córdova proselytized to the Indigenous inhabitants of Nochistlan, Juchipila, and nearby towns.\textsuperscript{199} In 1586, two friars lived in the small convent of San Francisco in Juchipila, and Nochistlan became a Franciscan doctrine by the beginning of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{200}

\textsuperscript{195} Gerhard, \textit{La frontera norte de la Nueva España}, 132. Tello describes the process in which Guadalajara was founded close to Nochistlan and close to Tonala. Several conquistadors judged that Tonala and its environs offered favorable conditions for a \textit{villa}, but Nuño de Guzmán wanted to keep Tonala’s sizeable Indigenous population for himself. Tello, \textit{Crónica miscelánea en que se trata de la conquista espiritual y temporal de la santa provincia de Xalisco en el nuevo reino de la Galicia y nueva Vizcaya y descubrimiento del Nuevo México} Book 2, 225-237.

\textsuperscript{196} Gerhard, \textit{La frontera norte de la Nueva España}, 132.

\textsuperscript{197} \textit{Relaciones geográficas del siglo 165}; Arregui, 118.

\textsuperscript{198} Ciudad Real II, 98; Mota y Escobar, 130; Gerhard, \textit{La frontera norte de la Nueva España}, 131, 187.

\textsuperscript{199} Tello, Vol. II, 190.

\textsuperscript{200} Mota y Escobar, 129.
A province alternately known as Lagos or Teocaltiche after its two dominant communities was east of Nochistlan, and it included the correspondence community of Jalostotitlan, which was the site of “1611 Jalostotitlan,” and San Gaspar, which was the setting for “1683 San Gaspar.” Teocaltiche was an *encomienda* held by Pedro Cuadrado in 1550, but its escheatment to the crown had occurred by 1563.\(^\text{201}\) Meanwhile, during the early 1560s, Spaniards founded the nearby *villa* of Santa María de los Lagos.\(^\text{202}\) Teocaltiche was the *cabecera* of this province from 1584 until at least 1621 while Lagos was the seat of the parish.\(^\text{203}\) Teocaltiche also had a Franciscan convent that was secularized in 1561, and in 1611, the Indigenous elites of Jalostotitlan with some support from those of San Gaspar sponsored a petition against the Franciscan friar Francisco Muñoz (Refer to Chapter 5.2c).\(^\text{204}\) Then, in 1618, residents of San Gaspar, Jalostotitlan, San Juan, Teocaltitlan, San Miguel El Alto, Mezquitic, and Mitic gave oral testimonies that were recorded as twenty petitions against this same priest in a process that eventually made its way to the inquisitorial court of Mexico City.\(^\text{205}\)

The last petitions are “1642 Contla” and “1649 San Juan Ocoticic.” The first is from Contla, which was probably a subordinate of Cuquío, a community that belonged to the province of Mezquiticacan in 1642; and the second is probably from Ocotic.\(^\text{206}\) The conquistador Diego


\(^\text{202}\) Mota Padilla writes that Santa María de los Lagos was founded in 1563. Mota Padilla, 50. Mota y Escobar writes that it was founded in 1561. Mota y Escobar, 121. The notary of the RG of Teocaltiche asserts in 1584 that it was founded 24 years ago, or ca. 1560. Acuña, 302.

\(^\text{203}\) Acuña, 299, 302; Mota y Escobar, 119; Arregui, 120-121.

\(^\text{204}\) *Beyond the Codices*, 166-173.

\(^\text{205}\) Refer to Sullivan, *Ytecheopa timotellhuiua yn tobicario (Acusamos a nuestro vicario): Pleito entre los naturales de Jalostotitlan y su sacerdote, 1618* and “The Jalostotitlan Petitions, 1611-1618.”

\(^\text{206}\) The notary writes in the first person singular and identifies himself as *neguatl noto Ju\é Miguel nialcalde nochan contlan* (I am named Juan Miguel. I am the *alcalde* in my home of Contla. A second notary wrote in an
Vázquez held the Indigenous communities of Teponaguasco, Cuacuala, and Cuquío in *encomienda* until 1570, and this grant continued in private hands until at least 1645.\(^{207}\)

Furthermore, Mota y Escobar lists towns that were in *encomienda* and includes Contla with forty-nine tributaries at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and Arregui includes Contla in a list of Indigenous towns that did not have any Spanish inhabitants around 1621.\(^{208}\) For Ocotic, Mota y Escobar mentions that it held forty-five tributaries, and Arregui writes that the *alcaldía mayor* of Tacotlan included this town and Teponaguasco.\(^{209}\) Clergy from Guadalajara and Teocaltiche proselytized in the province of Tacotlan until 1570, when the benefice of Los Tecuejes was created in San Francisco Tlacotlan, and by 1696, the beneficiary priest was at San Felipe Cuquío.\(^{210}\)

### 2.2d. Guadalajara and Its Indigenous Correspondence

Indigenous notaries address forty-five of the sixty-four documents to colonial officials in Guadalajara, suggesting the centrality of Guadalajara in Northwestern New Spain. The region surrounding Guadalajara had been important since at least the beginning of the sixteenth century.

---

\(^{207}\) Cuquío was then known as Cuaquioque. Gerhard *A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain*, 105. Mota y Escobar identifies Cuquío as Guaquioque. Mota y Escobar, 216.

\(^{208}\) Mota y Escobar, 216; Arregui, 114.

\(^{209}\) Mota y Escobar, 216; Arregui writes that the province of Tacotlan was very depopulated, and that Indigenous elites were careful for inhabitants to remain in towns in order to keep town lands. Arregui, 115.

The notary of the RG of Teucaltiche records that Cazcan elders from Teucaltiche regarded the peoples of the canyons of Guadalajara as their enemies before the arrival of Spaniards.\(^{211}\) Then, the Nuño de Guzmán *entrada* passed through Tonala, and its members testified a short time later that it was a large town with a population in the thousands, and that a portion of it attacked them from a nearby hill.\(^{212}\) Tonaltecos were indeed people of the canyons, and they knew how to use the defensive positions offered by La Barranca, but the Spaniards would learn to control this important region by moving Guadalajara nearby.

Compostela was the capital of Northwestern New Spain because it housed both the Real Audiencia of Nueva Galicia and the Diocese of Nueva Galicia, but it had achieved this position against the wishes of most of the members of the Nuño de Guzmán *entrada*, who recognized a more favorable location by Tonala. Nuño de Guzmán had favored Compostela because he had wanted to keep the Tonaltecos in *encomienda*, but his arrest removed him as an obstacle, and the Mixton War showed Spaniards that the region around Tonala was indeed a better site.\(^{213}\) For these and other reasons, the *villa* of Guadalajara was placed in the valley of Atemajac in 1542 taking it away from the hostile Cazcan region and within the protective embrace of La Barranca Canyon and the Grande de Santiago River. The new site forced Indigenous people intent on attacking the city to cross a formidable bulwark. Any raiders from La Cazcana who wished to attack Guadalajara would have to cross La Barranca Canyon and the Grande de Santiago River.

\(^{211}\) The author of the RG of Teucaltiche mentions the hostility between the Cazcanes and the Indigenous people who lived in Juchipila, Jalpa, Yahuialica, and towns in the canyons close to Guadalajara.” Acuña, 306.

\(^{212}\) Many members of the Nuño de Guzmán *entrada* testified during a trial against Nuño Beltrán de Guzmán, and many of the the transcriptions of these testimonies have been published separately by Joaquín García Icazbalceta and José Luis Razo Zaragoza.

\(^{213}\) During the Mixton War, the *villa* of Espíritu Santo de Guadalajara was continually threatened by nearby Indigenous people because its location by Nochistlan placed it within La Cazcana, the land of the Cazcanes who formed the heart of the anti-Spanish forces.
twice—once when arriving and once when departing—while also facing the threat of a mounted Spanish response. On the negative side, both of these obstacles hindered travel and required the use of rafts to go north and east from Guadalajara. Nevertheless, the Mixtón War and the subsequent period described by Powell as the Chichimec War showed that safety was more important than ease of travel in this frontier area of the Spanish Empire in the sixteenth century.\footnote{José Francisco Román Gutiérrez focuses more on the centrality of Guadalajara within Nueva Galicia in \textit{Sociedad y Evangelización en Nueva Galicia durante el Siglo XVI}.}

In this frontier period, Indigenous leaders addressed several petitions to officials in Guadalajara, including six of these to members of its royal \textit{audiencia}. The notary of “1593a Oconahuac” addressed the Real Audiencia itself, while that of “1580b Nochistlan” addressed the \textit{residente} (chief judge), and that of “1644 Contla” addressed a \textit{justicia}. The remaining notaries direct their petitions to local officials. The notaries of “1593a Xalisco,” “1593b Xalixco,” “N.Y. Xalisco, ca. 1593,” and “1594 Xalisco” addressed the \textit{provincial} and \textit{definidores} of Xalisco, that of “1652a Guaxicori” addressed the \textit{alcalde mayor} of Acaponeta, and that of “1593c Oconahuac” addressed a \textit{teniente} (lieutenant). Finally, “N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca. 1585” addressed an \textit{alcalde mayor}, but this petition is missing some folios, and it is not clear whether the \textit{alcalde mayor} belonged to Nueva España, Nueva Galicia, or Nueva Vizcaya.

The seventeenth century appears to have brought new responsibilities to the Diocese of Guadalajara, as Northwestern New Spain’s frontier shrunk to the area around El Gran Nayar, and Indigenous leaders sought its assistance. The borders of the Diocese of Guadalajara had been unwieldy during the sixteenth century because its jurisdiction extended beyond Northwestern
New Spain, but they grew more compact with the creation of the Diocese of Durango in 1621.\textsuperscript{215} Was it also more responsive? The documents in this study suggest an affirmative answer because Indigenous writers addressed thirty-nine documents to its officials. They also wrote thirteen documents to the \textit{provisor}, a type of judge appointed by the bishop.\textsuperscript{216} Finally, they wrote two other documents to secular priests in the Catholic clergy—\textit{titaçomahuiztatzin titopastor} and \textit{titomahuiztopixcauh}.

Most of the diocesan documents in this study are from the post-1621 period, and they illustrate the new borders of the Diocese of Guadalajara. The westernmost correspondence community was Xalisco in the province of Compostela; the northernmost was Santiago Pochotitlan in Fronteras de Colotlan; the easternmost were Cuquio and Ocotitic in the province of Tacotlan; and the southernmost ones were Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo and San Andrés Cohuautlan in the province of Colima, Tachichilco and San Antonio Tzacacuze in the province of Amula, and Sayula and Atoyac in the province of Ávalos. This smaller diocese of Guadalajara is better documented than its larger iteration because while the pre-1621 diocese only has Bishop Mota y Escobar’s \textit{Descripción Geográfica de Los Reinos} from 1602-1605, AHAG preserves

\begin{flushright}
\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{215} Chevalier explains that a \textit{cedula real} from June 14, 1621 directed at the president of the \textit{audiencia} of Nueva Galicia ordered the description of Nueva Galicia in order to divide its diocese in two, but Arregui wrote in the introduction that he had written his work at the behest of the Councilor of the Indies. Chevalier, in Arregui 1946: xxxiv. I spoke to a Franciscan friar in 2013, who assured me that the Franciscans continued to administer the sacraments in Etzatlan.

\textsuperscript{216} The petitions are “1593b Oconahuac,” “1622 Coatlan,” “1622 Santa Maria Magdalena Xochitepec,” “1644 Cajititlan,” “1657 Tonala,” “1664 Santa Ana Acatlan,” “1668 San Francisco Zacoalco,” “1669 Santa Maria Magdalena Tizapan,” “1670 Analco,” “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan,” “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan,” “1694 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac.” BPEJ-JJA, Real Audiencia, Ramo Civil, Expediente 9, Progresivo 9; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushright}
several post-1621 visitation records including that of Bishop Francisco Verdín y Molina (1666) and that of Bishop Juan de Santiago de León Garabito (1678–79).\textsuperscript{217}

The notaries of two other petitions address other people, and the remaining ones do not address anyone in particular. In “1626 San Francisco Chapalac,” the notary was a Franciscan Friar who wrote to the Indigenous elites of San Francisco Chapalac to ask them to be better Christians. In “1656 Tonalá,” Indigenous elites ask their former priest, the Augustinian friar Nicolás de Zuñiga, to return to Tonalá to resume his former duties.

\textbf{2.2e. Roads and Correspondence Communities}

Indigenous elites wrote to officials of the Diocese of Guadalajara and the \textit{Audiencia} of Nueva Galicia because they came into contact with them in a variety of ways. Bishops went to Indigenous communities during visitas, inspection visits, decreed by the Council of Trent to fulfill their pastoral duties.\textsuperscript{218} One of the interpretations of this decree was that bishops or their surrogates had to visit parishes in their dioceses to make sure that the inhabitants of each community practiced the proper maintenance of the instruments of the faith, and they also checked to see that each cofradía had livestock or other property to properly fund festivals and festival masses.\textsuperscript{219} These bishops, other diocesan officials, and \textit{audiencia} officials could visit correspondence communities because Northwestern New Spain had an extensive road network between these towns and Guadalajara, but their travels were not always easy.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{217} The complete name of Mota y Escobar’s work is \textit{Descripción geográfica de los reinos de Nueva Galicia, Nueva Vizcaya y Nuevo León}. The AHAG had the extensive visitation records of Bishop Ruiz Comenero’s 1648-49 visit, but these have been lost. Gerhard, \textit{A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain}, 48-49.
\item \textsuperscript{218} Lundberg, 80.
\item \textsuperscript{219} AHAG, Visitas Pastorales, 1666; AHAG, Visitas Pastorales, 1678-1679.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Indigenous peoples in the region had created a road network built and maintained exclusively for foot traffic.\textsuperscript{220} However, Europeans had other needs, and they expanded the most important Pre-Columbian roads to accommodate horses, mule teams, carts, and wagons. They also built new roads especially after the discovery of silver in Zacatecas in 1546 and the need to connect this region to Mexico City and Guadalajara.\textsuperscript{221} Over time, labor drafts constructed a road network that was somewhat precarious because even principal roads between Guadalajara and Zacatecas represented little more than a chain of links between individual villages and towns that could be threatened by inclement weather or Indigenous raids.\textsuperscript{222} Nonetheless, by the seventeenth century, the extensive network of roads facilitated the flow of trade, tribute, and knowledge between Guadalajara, convents, \textit{reales de minas} (mining communities), and correspondence communities.

Guadalajara had three roads to Zacatecas: a northeastern one, a northwestern one, and a northern one (Map 2-5).\textsuperscript{223} The northeastern road went from Guadalajara east to Teocaltiche and


\textsuperscript{221} Ross Hassig mentions that Indigenous depopulation had a strong impact on road construction and improvement after epidemic episodes in Central Mexico in \textit{Trade, Tribute and Transportation}. African slaves were probably also used in this manner.

\textsuperscript{222} Daniel T. Reff’s \textit{Disease, Depopulation, and Culture Change in Northwestern New Spain, 1518-1764} explains the changes faced by Indigenous peoples in the face of epidemics in a Northwestern New Spain that includes the American Southwest and the Mexican states of Durango, Sinaloa, Sonora, and Chihuahua.

\textsuperscript{223} Map 2-5 was adapted from a photograph of a model of the state of Jalisco made of sticks and held at BPEJ-JJA. The topographic technique utilized to construct the model is known as \textit{Pixeleo Individual Manual Autónomo en Tercera Dimensión}; it was developed by Margarita Eulogia Sánchez Alejándrez (1926-2005) from information provided by Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI). Different people participated in its creation. They are Ernesto Sánchez Parbul, José Luis Sánchez Miranda, Aurora Sánchez Miranda, Victoria Sánchez Madrigal, Emilio Sánchez Arévalo, and students from the communities of Tamazula, Ciudad Guzmán, and Casimiro Castillo.
north to Zacatecas, and it was the most popular route because its gradual inclines made it suitable for carts and mule trains.²²⁴ It first went east to San Pedro and Tonala before arriving at Tololotlan, where travelers faced La Barranca Canyon and the Grande de Santiago River, but they could follow this road to traverse the former, and they could cross the river by either relying on the large canoes of the friars of Tonala or those of the Indigenous inhabitants of Tololotlan.²²⁵ On the other side, the road began again and crossed Zapotlan, Tecpatitlan, and Jalostotitlan before reaching Teocaltiche, which was twenty-one leagues from Guadalajara and twenty-six leagues from Zacatecas.²²⁶ San Gaspar was on or close to the road between Jalostotitlan and Teocaltiche.²²⁷ After Teocaltiche, this road went for ten leagues before reaching the presidio of Aguascalientes and continued for eighteen more leagues before reaching Zacatecas.²²⁸

²²⁴ The writer of the RG of Teocaltiche writes that his informants told him it was more llano (level) rather than mountainous. Acuña, 302-303. Mota y Escobar asserts that it was the most level and first among the three roads to Zacatecas. Mota y Escobar, 125.

²²⁵ Arregui does not identify which inhabitants of Tololotlan owned these canoes made of hollowed pine trees. Juanacatlan was south of Tololotlan, but it does not appear to have been on the royal road perhaps because it was next to a very turbulent waterfall. Arregui, 113. Neither Alonzo de la Mota y Escobar nor Ciudad Real mention Juanacatlan (or Jonacatlan), but Arregui asserts that it was a doctrina of Ocotlan. Arregui, 62.

²²⁶ Leagues are used in this study for comparisons and not as an exact measurement. The notary of the RG of Teocaltiche estimates this distance and asserts that it was considered the halfway point between Guadalajara and Zacatecas. Acuña, 302. Mota y Escobar asserts that the distance from Teocaltiche to Zacatecas was twenty-eight leagues. Mota y Escobar, 125.

²²⁷ Mota y Escobar writes that San Gaspar was three leagues ahead on a river that passed by Jalostotitlan, but he does not mention the royal road so that it is not clear about whether San Gaspar was connected to it. Mota y Escobar, 117-119.

²²⁸ Mota y Escobar, 125.
The northwestern road was rougher, but it remained in use throughout the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. It went north and west from Guadalajara for some seven leagues until La Barranca and the village of San Juan, where rafts took travelers across the Grande de Santiago River.\textsuperscript{229} Afterwards, it started again at San Cristobal de la Barranca and continued northwest climbing and descending to enter the basin of Tlaltenango, which was bound by the Tepeque Mountains to the west and the Mixtón Mountains to the east.\textsuperscript{230} Then, it reached El Teul after eleven leagues and turned northwest to skirt the Tlatenango River reaching Tlatenango.

---

\textsuperscript{229} Mota y Escobar, 132.

\textsuperscript{230} Mota y Escobar writes that La Barranca was two leagues long at this point. Mota y Escobar, 132. Arregui explains that the full name of this town was San Cristóbal de la Barranca because of this town’s position within La Barranca. Arregui, 115.
after seventeen leagues, Jerez after twenty-one leagues, and Zacatecas after six or seven leagues.\footnote{231 Mota y Escobar documents the road from Jerez to Zacatecas as being seven leagues. Mota y Escobar, 138. The writer of the RG of Jerez writes that it was six leagues. Acuña, 139. The writer of the RG of Tlaltenango writes that the distance between Tlaltenango and Jerez was about fifteen leagues. Acuña, 145. Mota y Escobar writes that it was seven leagues from Tlaltenango to Colotlan, five leagues from Colotlan to Guajucar, and six leagues between Guajucar and Jerez for a total of eighteen leagues. Mota y Escobar, 133, 135, 136.}

The northern road to Zacatecas changed between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In 1604, it went half a league from Guadalajara to Ixcatlan, which was in La Barranca Canyon and next to the Grande de Santiago River.\footnote{232 Mota y Escobar, 126.} After this natural break, the road went east of the Mixtón Mountains passing several Indigenous towns including Juchipila before continuing on to Zacatecas.\footnote{233 Mota y Escobar writes that Ixtlahuacan was two leagues away from this crossing and that the next towns were Tlacotlan, Mezquituta, and Moyagua. Mota y Escobar, 127-128. The writer of the RG of Nochitlan writes that the road from Guadalajara to Nochistlan was rough. Acuña, 172. Mota y Escobar writes that after Juchipila, Aposl was one league, Atonotillo was half a league, Jalpa was five leagues, Mecatabaso was three leagues, and Zacatecas was eighteen leagues for a total of twenty-seven and a half leagues. Mota y Escobar, 129.} However, the first leg of this road changed by 1621, as travelers stopped going to Ixcatlan in favor of the San Cristobal de la Barranca route, which then split into the northwestern and northern roads to Zacatecas.\footnote{234 The northwestern one was the El Teul-Tlaltenango-Jerez route and the northern one was the Juchipila-Zacatecas route. Arregui, 116.} The northern and northeastern roads to Zacatecas were also connected by an east-west road that started at Teocaltiche and went east for about four leagues before arriving at Nochistlan.\footnote{235 Relaciones geográficas del siglo xvi: Nueva Galicia, 305.} Then, it went for five leagues around several gorges before arriving at Juchipila.\footnote{236 Mota y Escobar, 129.}
Zacatecas forms only a peripheral part of this study despite its importance as a mining and trading center, but it had a road to Nombre de Dios.\textsuperscript{237} This road was hazardous because it ascended and descended several mountains in the Western Sierra Madre Range. It first went nine leagues north to the mining town of Fresnillo, twelve leagues to Saín, seven leagues to Sombrerete, three leagues to the Xuchil Valley, and seven leagues before arriving at Nombre de Dios.\textsuperscript{238}

Guadalajara also had a northwestern road that went to communities on or close to the Pacific Coast. This road skirted many mountains and descended into many valleys as it went south of La Barranca Canyon and south of El Gran Nayar before connecting with the road that ran along the Pacific Coast from Compostela to San Miguel de Culiacan and beyond. It left Guadalajara to arrive at Ocotlan after three leagues and continued for four leagues to Tala.\textsuperscript{239} Then, its trajectory began to get rougher as it neared the Indigenous town of Tequila, which was one league south of La Barranca Canyon and less than a league northwest of the hill of Tequila.\textsuperscript{240} Afterwards, it climbed and descended to enter the highland Basin of Izatlan where it went to La Magdalena from which travelers could reach three other correspondence communities: Ahualulco, Etzatlan, and Oconahuac.\textsuperscript{241}

\textsuperscript{237} Mota y Escobar judges that Zacatecas was eighty leagues from Mexico City. Mota y Escobar, 148. Also, P.J. Bakewell’s \textit{Silver Mining and Society in Colonial Mexico-Zacatecas} and Dana Velasco Murillo’s “Urban Indians in a Silver City, Zacatecas, Mexico, 1546-1806” focus on Zacatecas.

\textsuperscript{238} Mota y Escobar, 173-176.

\textsuperscript{239} Mota y Escobar estimates seven leagues from Guadalajara to Tala, three leagues from Guadalajara to Ocotlan and four leagues from Ocotlan to Tala. Mota y Escobar, 71. Arregui writes that it was about nine leagues. Arregui, 71.

\textsuperscript{240} Arregui, 73.

\textsuperscript{241} Mota y Escobar, 74; Gerhard, \textit{A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain}, 156; Gerhard, \textit{La frontera norte de la Nueva España} 185.
The stretch after La Magdalena became the principal route from the interior of Northwestern New Spain to the Pacific coastal lowlands. This road went from La Magdalena to the Indigenous town of Mochitiltic and then continued over the Tepeque Mountains, which had several canyons, including one known as El Puerto (the Mountain Pass), before arriving at the Indigenous town of Ixtlan, which was on a branch of the Ameca River and within the fertile highland Valley of Aguacatlan.” Ixtlan had two roads to Analco, a correspondence community only a league from Tepic. The northern route went from Ixtlan to Xala, over the northern edge of the active Ceboruco Volcano, southwest to Tetitlan, and northeast to Tequepechpan and Zapotlanejo before arriving at Analco. The first portion of the southern route was a good road because it was mostly flat, and it connected the towns of Ixtlan, Mezpan, and Ahuacatlan before going around the Xala Volcano to arrive at Tetitlan. At this point, travel became tougher for the remaining five leagues as the road passed five or six streams and several ravines before Analco, a hub where the Guadalajara-Magdalena-Analco road met the Pacific road that went

---

242 Sauer suggests that this road dates to pre-Columbian times, and that Indigenous guides showed it to the Francisco Cortés de San Buenaventure expedition, and that it became a royal road. He also asserts that the Southern Pacific Railroad followed this same road. Sauer, The Road to Cíbola, 4. Robert C. West and James J. Parsons posit that Europeans have regularly used this road since at least 1530. West and Parsons, “The Topia Road: a trans-Sierran trail of colonial Mexico,” 497.

243 Arregui, Ciudad Real, and Mota y Escobar all describe the portion between Mochiltic and Ixtlan as an especially difficult journey. Arregui, 78; Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 107; Mota y Escobar, 75. Sauer posited that despite its ruggedness, the route from La Magdalena to Ixtlan was the least complicated way to reach the Pacific Coast. Sauer, The Road to Cíbola, 4-5. Gerhard also describes the Magdalena road. Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 60.

244 This portion of road was bad because it was littered by many volcanic rocks. Arregui, 80. Ciudad Real explains that this road traversed several small cliffs and streams. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 112. Gerhard writes that the Aguacatlan Valley straddles the volcanic divide between the Rio Grande de Santiago and the Ameca River. Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 60. Mota y Escobar mentions a Yora which may refer to the Xora of Arregui. Mota y Escobar, 77.

from Xalisco and Compostela to Acaponeta, Guaxicori, Quihuiquinta, and San Miguel de Culiacan.\footnote{246} Guadalajara had three roads that went south. A southeastern road left Guadalajara by first going east on a stone bridge across the San Juan de Dios River to nearby Analco-Guadalajara, and then southeast to Atotonilco where it split into two branches: one to Poncitlan and the other to Chapala.\footnote{247} The Poncitlan route passed at least one stone bridge before arriving at this town and continuing to Mexico City, and this route from Guadalajara to Mexico became known as “el camino de las barcas (road of the rafts)” because it required two portages: once across the Grande de Santiago River close to Poncitlan and another one across the Lerma River farther south.\footnote{248} The camino de las barcas was on the boundary between Nueva Galicia and Nueva España, and it was dangerous because it climbed, and its width narrowed going around the northeastern portion of Lake Chapala, where travelers walked with cliff walls on one side and a steep drop-off on the other.\footnote{249} The other branch was more forgiving; it turned west at Santa Cruz and entered the province of Ávalos at San Francisco Chapalac, continued around Lake

\footnote{246} I propose that the road went to Analco. Sauer proposes that the road went from Magdalena to Tetitlan to Compostela. However, he relied on Tello and Mota Padilla who were secondary sources for his description of the sixteenth century road from Guadalajara to Cibola because he did not have the better account of Ciudad Real. Sauer, *The Road to Cibola*, 4, 5, 59. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 123.

\footnote{247} Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 90.

\footnote{248} Ciudad Real wrote, “Por aquel pueblo [Poncitlan] es el camino derecho para ir desde México a Guadalajara y llámamele el camino de las barcas, porque en barcas se pasa el Río Grande sobredicho, la una vez antes que entre en la laguna de Chapala y la otra después que ha salido, que no es lejos de Poncitlán…” Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 91. Ciudad Real treated the Grande de Santiago and the Lerma as one river, but I have not. I use Lerma River to denote a long-running river that begins in Toluca and empties into Chapala Lake and the Grande de Santiago as the river that begins at Chapala Lake and empties into the Pacific Ocean from Nayarit.

\footnote{249} Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 91.
Chapala until Jocotepec where it went south to Teocuitlatlan. Then, it went southeast to Mazamitla and Jiquilpan, two towns in the Diocese of Michoacan.\footnote{Ciudad Real writes that the road from Jiquilpan to Mazamitla climbed and went around many cliffs before arriving at Mazamitla. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 86-87, 153-154.}

Guadalajara had a second road to Chapala. It went from Guadalajara to Toluquilla before arriving at Cajititlan, north of Lake Cajititlan.\footnote{Mota y Escobar writes that it was three leagues long. Mota y Escobar, 59.} Then, it turned east to skirt Lake Cajititlan for three leagues before turning south to enter Chapala.\footnote{Mota y Escobar, 59.}

Guadalajara’s third southern road was known as the upper road, and it connected Guadalajara to Tlajomulco and passed through the province of Ávalos before arriving at Mazamitla, an Indigenous town in the Diocese of Michoacan. This road went south from Guadalajara for a distance and turned southwest to pass over several wooden bridges that enabled it to traverse a swampy region, and then, it made a reasonable climb and descent before arriving at Tlajomulco.\footnote{Ciudad Real mentions going from Tlajomulco to Guadalajara twice with Fray Alonzo Ponce. First, on the afternoon of January 13, 1585, they went from Tlajomulco to Guadalajara climbing and descending a reasonable incline and passing over many small bridges that facilitated travel over a swampy area before Guadalajara. Ciudad Real, Vol. I, 30. Ciudad Real and Ponce also went from Guadalajara to Tlajomulco on December 31, 1586 and January 1, 1587, and Ciudad Real again mentioned taking a road that relied on some wooden bridges to go over some springs and swamps and passed a good-sized hill before arriving in Tlajomulco. Ciudad Real, Vol. II 99.} The distance between Guadalajara and Tlajomulco was four regular leagues or three long leagues.\footnote{Ciudad Real judged the distance as between Guadalajara and Tlajomulco as four regular leagues, and Arregui estimated it as three long leagues. Ciudad Real, Vol. I, 30; Arregui, 69.} Afterwards, it went southwest through two steep \textit{cuestas} before arriving at Zacoalco in Ávalos.\footnote{Ciudad Real affirmed that it was five leagues and mentioned the \textit{cuestas}. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 153-154. Mota y Escobar asserted six leagues, and he did not mention the \textit{cuestas}, but he commented that both Tlajomulco and Zacoalco had many nearby hills with wild game. Mota y Escobar, 61-62.}
Tlajomulco was not as central to Northwestern New Spain as Guadalajara, but it did serve as an important road hub because it had three roads in addition to the upper road (Map 2-6). Ciudad Real noted a lower road that was a route that went from Tlajomulco south to several towns including Tuxcueca, a town on the southern edge of Ávalos, before arriving at Jiquilpan. It was a dangerous and difficult road because it traversed many slopes, and its surface was narrow and often covered with loose rocks.\footnote{Ciudad Real preferred the upper road. Ciudad Real, Vol. I, 28.} The second road went to Zacoalco for five or six leagues, and it crossed two slopes.\footnote{Ciudad Real II, 153.} The third road connected Tlajomulco to Cocula, a hub in
Ávalos, and it passed by a hot spring, a lake, Santa María Magdalena Tizapan, and a windmill before arriving at Cocula. 258

Ávalos had many road hubs, but the most prominent ones were Cocula, Zacoalco, Sayula, and Santa Ana Acatlan. Cocula had the Tlajomulco-Guadalajara road and three others: a northwestern road to La Magdalena, a southwestern one that went to Zacualco, and another one to Autlan that eventually reached Colima. Zacualco had five roads: the Cocula road, the Tlajomulco road, a road to Teocuitlatlan, a road to Sayula, and a road to Santa Ana Acatlan, which had roads to Tlajomulco, and Cocula. 259 Sayula had three roads: the road to Teocuitlatlan, a southern one that went to Zapotlan, and a northern one that went to Zacoalco. The southern road went to Axomaxac and San Sebastian before crossing several bridges that allowed it to reach the large town of Zapotlan, which was disputed between the Dioceses of Guadalajara and Michoacán. 260

These roads channeled traffic, tribute, and information from the Indigenous hinterlands through some hubs and to Guadalajara, where Europeans held the highest positions of power. The viceregal administrators relied on these roads to visit the king’s subjects and relied on interpreters to communicate with them. Some of these translators were European clerics, others were Nahuas, and others belonged to a variety of indigenous groups and cultures.

---

258 Ciudad Real II, 103.

259 The road to Teocuitlatlan continued past Mazamitla and Jiquilpan. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 154. Both Ciudad Real and Mota y Escobar mention the importance of Sayula, but only the former writes about the road between them. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 149-150; Mota y Escobar, 61.

2.3. The Colonial Past of Western New Spain: Indigenous Peoples

Peoples of African descent, Europeans, and *castas* dominated portions of Northwestern New Spain during the period of this study. They lived in the larger European-controlled settlements like Guadalajara and in smaller settlements such as Aguascalientes, Compostela, Lagos, and Sayula, but Indigenous people represented the majority of the population. Some of these Indigenous people lived in semi-permanent *rancherías*, but most of them lived in towns that appear in the historical record. I use the historical record, rather than “upstreaming,” to summarize what is known about Indigenous towns at different points in time.  

This survey begins with the *Relaciones Geográficas* of the late sixteenth century (1579, 1584, and 1585) and the chronicle of Ciudad Real (1587) continues with the early seventeenth-century reports of Mota y Escobar (1602-1605); and ends with the works of either Arregui (1621), Tello (1650), Arias y Saavedra (1674), or Mota y Padilla (1742) depending on the group and its correspondence communitie(s).

---


262 My study focuses more on what the Nahuatl documents reveal about the historic actions of Indigenous groups, but other writers have relied on some of these same sources to analyze these peoples from an anthropological perspective. Ralph L. Beals wrote “The Comparative Ethnology of Northern Mexico Before 1750,” and he relied on some of these sources to present the practices shared by Indigenous groups north of what is now Nayarit. Meanwhile, Edward Spicer wrote *Cycles of Conquest* to show the martial interactions between Europeans and Indigenous groups, and he classified the latter on a continuum from the “eastern Pueblo villages” to the “food-gathering bands,” of the Seri, and concludes that most of the others like the Mayo, Yaqui, Lower Pimas, and Opatas were “ranchería-dwelling peoples” who were somewhere in between.
2.3a. Chichimecs

The *Relaciones Geograficas* present a picture of loss in Northwestern New Spain, especially in responses to the fifth question that asks if there were many or few Indigenous people, whether the region had more or less people than in previous times, and whether the cause of the population loss was known (Table 2-3). The Indigenous elites of Teucaltiche answer, “this town and the others of this province had many more Indigenous people than in the present [1585] because this town had more than a thousand men of war, and in the present, there aren’t two hundred.” In other words, Teucaltiche and nearby towns had less than twenty percent of the warriors in 1585 than what they had had before the arrival of Europeans and Africans. The *Relación of Ameca* tells a similar story. In 1579, the Indigenous elites of Ameca respond that, in this town “and its sujetos (subject towns) there aren’t more than one hundred and ninety three tributarios de cuenta (householders) and...some three hundred souls... [but] when the Spaniards arrived, there were more than two thousand fighting Indians...” Here the notary and/or the Indigenous informants use—souls, tributaries, and fighting Indians—to describe the Indigenous population in Ameca, which makes it harder to estimate. Nevertheless, one could judge tributarios de cuenta and fighting Indigenous people to be comparable because both tended to be heads of households. By doing that, one arrives at the conclusion that Ameca retained around ten percent (ca. 9.65%) of its heads of household from a pre-Conquest level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Region (late 1500s)</th>
<th>Name of Town</th>
<th>Population (1579-1585)</th>
<th>Remembered Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

263 Acuña, 18. This table relies on the RG of Ameca, the RG of Amula-Tusucuesco, the RG of Compostela, the RG of Villa de Jerez y Valle de Tlaltenango, the RG of Nochistlan, the RG of Villa de la Purificación, the RG of Tenamatzlan, and the RG of Teocaltiche. Acuña, 30-31, 34, 72, 88-89, 144-145, 167, 211, 278-279, 301.
Despite this depopulation, Spanish and Indigenous writers mention a large variety of Indigenous groups in Northwestern New Spain. In their most basic classification, they refer to Indigenous people as *chichimecs*, a Hispanicized Nahuatl term that was roughly analogous to barbarian, but which they used for non-Christian Indigenous people. The clearest example is from the writer of “1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo” who records how a priest accused the residents of Cohuatlan of being Chichimecs and not Christians. Also, Ciudad Real notes that the Indigenous people who lived west of Huaynamota, “did not give themselves over to idolatries as did those in other regions [of Northwestern New Spain], but they are secret highwaymen and they favor the Guachichil *chichimecs*, with whom they are sent by the nobles, and [with whom] they make their assaults.” Another European writes that Nochistlan was “a land of war where *chichimecs*, Indigenous robbers who have rebelled, travel.” Meanwhile, Indigenous notaries in Northwestern New Spain also employed *chichimec* to refer to a non-Christian Indigenous people. The notary of “1593a Oconahua” claims “*acmo tichichimeca ticristiyanotin*” (we are no longer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ameca</td>
<td>Ameca, 193 tributaries, 300 souls, 2,000 fighting Indigenous people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>Tuscacuesco, 10 or 12 <em>vecinos</em>, Many more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compostela</td>
<td>Compostela, 600 <em>vecinos</em>, Many more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa de Jerez y Valle de Taltenango</td>
<td>Different unnamed towns, 3,000 people, Many more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines of Tepeque and the Town of Nochistlan</td>
<td>Nochistlan and its subject towns, 252 tributaries, 4,000 Indigenous people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa de la Purificación</td>
<td>Most populated town, Less than 40 Indigenous people, Many more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenamatzlan</td>
<td>Towns in the region, 860 tributaries; 2500 total, Twice more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teocaltiche</td>
<td>Teucaltiche, Less than 200 warriors, More than 1,000 warriors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

264 Indigenous groups were survivors of many plague episodes including two major ones—1545-1548 and 1578-1579—that drastically reduced Indigenous populations throughout Northwestern New Spain, a region that includes the region in my study. Reff, 97-179.

265 Acuña, 171.
Chichimecs, we are Christians), and that of “1572 Xalisco” writes that this town's elites regarded the Chichimecs as enemies and hung them due to the instructions of Domingo Arteaga. Nonetheless, these and other sources also refer to more distinct Indigenous groups with Nahuatl or Spanish names.

2.3b. Bapames

Ruiz Colmenero classifies Tachichilco as Bapame, and he translates this term as the “floridos,” but very little information exists about this group. Alberto Santoscoy classifies the Bapame as speakers of Otomí, because of the Descripción de Zapotitlán, Tuscacuezco y Cusalapa (1579) by the Alcalde Mayor Francisco de Agüero. However, Yáñez Rosales relies on a document known as “Visitación que se hizo en la conquista, donde fue por capitán Francisco Cortés (1525)” to counter that “Otomí” generally meant non-Nahua and did not necessarily refer to the ethnic group.

2.3c. Cazcanes or Tochos

The Cazcanes appear to be one of the few Nahua groups native to western Mexico because their language of Cazcan is often recorded as either being a rough variant of the lengua

---

266 Thomas Calvo, Eustaquio Celestino, Magdalena Gómez, Jean Meyer, and Ricardo Xochitemol, Xalisco, la voz de un pueblo en el siglo XVI (Mexico City: Ciesas, 1993), 81.


269 Yáñez Rosales, “Ypan altepet monotza san Antonio de Padua tlaxomulco ‘En el pueblo que se llama San Antonio de Padua, Tlajomulco’ Textos en lengua náhuatl, siglos XVII y XVIII,” 35.
*Mexicana* (Nahuatl), or its speakers are described as speaking the *lengua Mexicana* along with their own.270 Ciudad Real identifies the Cazcanes with the town of Juchipila and writes that they spoke a language similar to the *lengua mexicana*.271 The notary of the RG of Nochistlan notes, “and it is one tongue in all of this province and valley [of Nochistlan], which is called *cazcana*, and the common one in which they all speak, is *mexicana*,” and the notary of the RG of Tlaltenango explains, “in their understandings and interactions, they speak the *lengua mexicana*, and their natural one is the *lengua cazcana*.**272 Furthermore, Tello identifies the Cazcanes as *mexicanos rústicos* (rustic Mexicas) when comparing them to the Mexica-Nahua. Tello writes, “the devil told the *principales mexicanos* (Mexica elites), that their service was necessary to conquer the valleys of Tlaltenango, Teul, Juchipila, and Teocaltiche, and that they should populate them with the *mexicanos rústicos* …who did not speak the *lengua mexicana* in as polished and cultured a way [as the Mexicas].”273 Therefore, the Cazcanes were a Nahua group whose Nahuatl was judged to be more rough and rustic than that of the Nahuas from central Mexico, and although these sources suggest that they mainly inhabited the valleys of Tlaltenango, Juchipila, Nochistlan, and Teocaltiche; they were also present in the *corregimientos* of Xala, Ahuacatlan, Ameca, and Izatlan.

---

270 Harvey proposed that Cazcan was closely associated with Nahuatl, and now, scholars like Sullivan and Yáñez Rosales agree. Harvey, “The Relaciones Geográficas, 1579-1586: Native Languages” in *Handbook of Middle American Indians* Vol 12 (1972), 300.


272 Acuña, 145, 167-168.

273 Phil Weigand and Acelia G. de Weigand first rely on this passage to propose that Tello combines a narrative of the southern expansion of the Cazcanes with a narrative of the Aztec march toward Mesoamerica, and they then propose that the sources suggest that Tuitlan was La Quemada. Weigand and Weigand, *Los orígenes de los cazcanes y su relación con la guerra de los nayaritas. Una hipótesis* (Zapopan, Mexico: El Colegio de Jalisco, 1995), 41, 44-45. I agree with their first proposition, but I can not yet agree to his identification of Tuitlan with La Quemada.
During the 1570s and 1580s, the Cazcanes directly ruled towns in the valleys of Ameca, Juchipila, Nochistlan, and Tlaltenango. However, by the mid-seventeenth century, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero only characterized Ajijic as a Cazcan town and classified Nochistlan, San Juan del Teul, Ahualulco (aka Ayahualulco) and La Magdalena as Tocho towns. What happened? The Mexican scholars Manuel Orozco y Berra, Santoscoy, and José Dávila Garibi suggest that Cazcan and Tocho referred to the same group of people, and an examination of these terms supports their assertion.

The Indigenous town of El Teul (or San Juan del Teul) is the key because it was a short distance north of their holiest place which was known as Tuychi, a large hill that contained a natural spring and masonry structures that included a ball court. Tuychi is composed of tu-, which is a variant of to- (our), and ychi which is probably related to ichtli, which he defines as “cerro o copo de maguey,” which means “a bunch or mound of maguey thread” so that Tuychi literally means “our mound of maguey thread” and metaphorically means “our hill that shelters us.” This supposition is supported by the Cazcanes from Ameca who claim through an

---

274 The RGs of Ameca, Nuchiztlan, Taltenango, and Teocaltiche (apud Acuña 10) identify these areas as being under Cazcan control in the late sixteenth century.

275 Santoscoy refers to Bishop Ruiz Colmenero’s visita journal. Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1049. Santoscoy mentioned Ocho communities, but I propose that he meant to write Tocho, and he uses Ahualulco as an alternate spelling of Ayahualulco. Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1051. Also, the notary of the Relación geográfica of Ameca wrote that this town was populated by Cazcanes and Totonacs. Acuña, 32.

276 Santoscoy, “Observaciones Acerca de la Nómina de las Lenguas Indígenas que se Hablan en el Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1070; Orozco y Berra, quoted in “Observaciones Acerca de la Nómina de las Lenguas Indígenas que se Hablan en el Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1069.

277 Acuña, 146-147. Tello writes Tuix ó Teul when naming towns belonging to Tochos or Cazcanes. Tello, Book II, 354.

278 The words ichcatl (cotton, sheep), ichehuipilli (cotton armor),” and ixcle (maguey or pita thread) appear to be derivations of plants that Nahua relied on to weave. Molina writes that ichtli means “cerro o topo.” Alonso de Molina, 32. Forrest Brewer and Jean G. Brewer learned that in the Nahua of Tetelcingo ixcle refers to a thread of pita or maguey. Brewer and Brewer in Karttunen, An Analytical Dictionary of Nahuatl (Norman, OK: 95
interpreter that Cazcan meant, “those from atop the hill of the mogote.” Furthermore, Tocho was probably a hispanization of Tuychi through the process of Tuychi → Toychi → Toyche for the place, and Toyche → Toycho → Tocho for the people. Finally, in 1650, Salcedo y Herrera wrote that, in the parish of Tlaltenango, the Indigenous people spoke tocho, which was also their given name and adds that it was a mexicano tosco (rustic Nahuatl) that they mixed with some Spanish words.

Cazcanes from Nochistlán, San Francisco Juchipila, San Francisco Ahualulco, La Magdalena, and perhaps San Gaspar were petitioners in a total of seven or eight documents

---

279 Acuña, 32. The dictionary of the Real Academia (accessed December 19, 2013 and July 15, 2016) gives five meanings for mogote:

- **cualquier elevación del terreno que recuerde la forma de un monte** (any elevation in terrain that resembles a hill)
- **montón de piedras** (bunch of stacked rocks)
- **montículo aislado y rematado en punta roma** (isolated hill that is cone-shaped and has a blunt top)
- **hacina de forma piramidal** (linen organized in pyramidal fashion)
- **cada una de las dos cuernas de los gamos y venados, desde que les comienzan a nacer hasta que tienen aproximadamente un palmo de largo** (each deer antler from the time they begin to grow until reaching a palm in length)

However, **montón de piedras** appears to be the most relevant given the context, “atop the hill of the mogote, which the dictionary of the Spanish Royal Academy (accessed December 19, 2013 and July 15, 2016) defines as “a bunch of stacked rocks,” Accessed on at lema.rae.es/drae/?val=mogote.

280 I have found four different spellings in published sources. Mota y Escobar writes Tuich; the notary of the RG of Tlatenango writes Tuychi; Arregui writes “Toychi;” and Tello writes “Tuix.” Mota y Escobar, 132-133; Acuña, 146-147; Arregui, 117.

281 Salcedo y Herrera, Don Francisco Manuel, Descripción del partido y jurisdicción de Tlatenango hecha en 1650 (Mexico City: Jose Porrua e Hijos, Sucs., 1958), 49.
These were shrunken communities because of the many episodes of disease and war prior to the adoption of Roman alphabetic literacy, but Spanish sources show that the inhabitants of these four towns had persevered, adapted, and developed a diverse material culture by the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Cazcanes from Nochistlan grew cotton for clothing, and maguey plants for their medicinal properties and to make syrup, vinegar, and a fermented beverage.\footnote{The notary of this RG wrote that they made many drinks from maguey including syrup, vinegar, and wine. Acuña, 171.} They grew corn and vegetables and sold their surpluses to Spaniards either within or outside the tianguiz (Indigenous market).\footnote{Acuña, 172.} Meanwhile, those from Juchipila raised chickens and made syrup from the maguey plant and sold it throughout Nueva Galicia.\footnote{Mota y Escobar, 129.} They also relied on the Juchipila River to catch catfish and mojarra (two-banded sea bream), and they cultivated a very fertile land where they grew corn, wheat, pomegranates, grapes, figs, quince, and nuts.\footnote{Mota y Escobar, 129.}

Ayahualulco and La Magdalena were in Izatla. Ciudad Real relied on Nahuatl-speaking guides on his travels through Northwestern New Spain, and he wrote that all of the towns of the guardiania of Etzatlan, “speak their own language, but all of them understand and speak the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Petition(s)</th>
<th>Ethnic identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nochistlan</td>
<td>1580a Nochistlan and 1580b Nochistlan</td>
<td>Cazcan (RG of Nochistlan) Tocho (Colmenero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Juchipila</td>
<td>1652 San Francisco Juchipila</td>
<td>Cazcan (RG of Nochistlan and Ciudad Real), Tocho (Colmenero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Ahualulco</td>
<td>1649 San Francisco Ayahualulco</td>
<td>Tocho (Colmenero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Magdalena (or Santa María Magdalena Xochitepec)</td>
<td>1622 La Magdalena, 1649a La Magdalena, and 1649b La Magdalena</td>
<td>Tocho (Colmenero)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Was Ciudad Real writing that the language of the guardiania of Etzatlan was a variant of Nahuatl used as a native-language or as a lingua franca, or were the Franciscans and Nahuatl translators of the convent of Etzatlan very successful in importing Nahuatl of the Basin of Mexico? The documents from Northwestern New Spain may provide an answer.

Ayahualulco had a prosperous economy during the sixteenth century. Ciudad Real gives information that they relied on slash and burn agriculture because he describes how the inhabitants burned their fields for new grass to grow for their herd animals. This was a cyclical practice because crows and other animals already knew to wait for the small animals to flee into the open. Mota y Escobar also describes Ayahualulco as a prosperous town inhabited by eighty married Indigenous men who had a variety of subsistence as well as luxury practices. They fished and farmed corn, chile, and beans by relying on oxen and on ingenuity, and they also had teams of horses and mules that they used to plow, and other teams as pack animals. They made wine and vinegar from pomegranates, and they also hired themselves out as sugar cane workers and used sugar cane to make syrup and wine.

La Magdalena stood at the important junction between the road from Guadalajara to the Pacific Coast and a southern road to Cocula. Mota y Escobar described it as a congregación of the inhabitants of the depopulated town of San Juan and a doctrina of Franciscans. This makes a certain amount of sense because San Juan had been on an island, and it could not offer travelers

288 Mota y Escobar, 74-75.
289 Mota y Escobar, 74-76.
a place to rest before approaching the rugged and dangerous Pass of Mochitiltic on their journey toward the provinces of Acaponeta and Compostela.\textsuperscript{290} La Magdalena had a diverse economy according to Mota y Escobar.\textsuperscript{291} It had seventy Indigenous vecinos who fished and dried their catch to sell throughout Northwestern New Spain. They also hunted ducks, geese, and stork when these were in season. The women relied on reeds and other plants from the lake to make baskets.

The Valley of Teocaltiche differed from most other Cazcan-dominated valleys in several ways. First, its Indigenous inhabitants had a dispensation from the Audiencia of Guadalajara to own horses that they could buy as colts to break and ride, and some Indigenous people also relied on oxen to plow their lands.\textsuperscript{292} Second, Teocaltiche was the dominant Indigenous settlement in the region, but it faced the growing power of a nearby Spanish settlement, Lagos. Teocaltiche housed some Spaniards because it was the administrative center of the region due, in part, to its location halfway between Guadalajara and Zacatecas and its centralized location in Los Llanos.\textsuperscript{293} Its inhabitants harvested corn, beans, cotton, squash, and maguey in enough quantities that Spaniards regularly tried to buy their surpluses to sell to Zacatecas and to surrounding

\textsuperscript{290} Mota y Escobar, 74. Ciudad Real describes San Juan as a town on an island in one of the lakes of Izatlan populated by more than two hundred Indigenous people who cultivated corn. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 107.

\textsuperscript{291} Mota y Escobar, 74-76.

\textsuperscript{292} Acuña, 302. Nevertheless, Ahuacatlan was one of the westernmost Cazcan communities, and even though it was not a correspondence community, it had significant horse wealth because Ciudad Real reported being met by some forty Indigenous horsemen and thirty Coano footsoldiers attired with many feathers and carrying bows and arrows. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 125.

\textsuperscript{293} Acuña, 302, 304.
mining communities. Spaniards wanted this trade because they could sell it for high prices in Zacatecas by relying on the Guadalajara-Teocaltiche-Zacatecas road.

2.3d. Tecuejes

The Cazcanes shared the region of Teocaltiche with the Tecuejes, who inhabited a large number of communities northeast from the vicinity of Teocaltiche, west to the outskirts of Etzatlan, and south to Guadalajara (Map 2-3). Tello proposes that the Valley of Teocaltiche was inhabited by a number of warlike Indigenous people known as the Tecuejes, and Carolyn Baus de Czitrom accepts his assertion, and posits that the Cazcanes and Tecuejes were disputing the area upon the arrival of Spaniards. The name Tecueje itself reveals another piece of information about this group and the region they inhabited.

The notary of the RG of Teocaltiche, Ciudad Real, and fray Tello mention variants of Tecueje. The notary of the RG of Teucaltiche writes that the Cazcanes lived in the Teocaltiche region alongside another Indigenous group that had an unknown tongue and lived in a plateau known as “La Taqüexa,” and he goes on to name many towns without clarifying which towns were on this plateau, and which ones were outside of it. Furthermore, Ciudad Real identifies a group with the somewhat similar appellation of “Tecuexas” and claims that they lived alongside

---

294 Acuña, 301.

295 Acuña, 303.


297 This notary explains, “dijeron que este pueblo y los demás desta provincia que son este pueblo [de Teocaltiche] y Mechuacanejo, Huexotitlan, Ostatlan, San Gaspar Tlacintla, Mitique, San Juan, Mezcatique, Teuctitlan, San Miguel Jalostotitlan, Temacapuli, Tecpatitlan, Acatique, Zapotlan, Santa Fe, Zoyatitlan, and Azcatlan...y mucha parte de los dichos pueblos son en una cordillera de tierra llana que llaman la Taquexa...” Acuña, 304. However, he does not identify which ones were in La Taquexa Ridge and which were outside of it, but within the province of Teocaltiche.
two other Indigenous groups, Mexican and Coca, in the parish of Guadalajara. Tello clarifies the name when writing a seventeenth-century statement about two Franciscan friars who had been based in Tonala and had entered to proselytize through, “La Teqüexa of Mitic, Jalostotitlan, and Tecpatitlán,” and the “Cazcana of Juchipila, Tlaltenango, Teul, Mecatabasco, Nochistlan, and Teocaltiche.” Therefore, Tello uses La Cazcana to refer to the land of the Cazcanes and La Teqüexa to refer to the land of the Tecuejes (formerly spelled as Tecuexe), and either the Tecuejes gave this ridge its name or the Tecuejes were named after this ridge which formed a crucial part of their homeland. San Gaspar was in this region, but it was not as prominent, and sources are unclear as to whether its inhabitants were Cazcanes, Tecuejes, or another group. However, they had a high degree of literacy between 1672 and 1683 because seven different notaries had a hand in crafting its cofradía records during this time period, and one of these was Nicolás Alonso, the notary of “1683 San Gaspar.”

Carolyn Baus de Czitrom has written the best study about these people, and she relies on Beaumont, Ciudad Real, Colmenero, and Mota Padilla to propose that the Tecuejes controlled a territory with borders that went east to Mitic and Jalostotitlan, west to the outskirts of the province of Izatlan, and whose heart was between Guadalajara and the junction of the Green and Grande de Santiago Rivers. In Guadalajara, the Tecuejes interacted with various ethnic groups.

---

298 Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 94.

299 Tello writes, “fray Antonio de Segovia, que había / poco había venido de España en la segunda barcada que fue de religiosos, y era hijo de la Illustríssima Provincia de la Concepción, y fray Juan Padilla [mistake: it should be Juan de Badiano], baptizaban y administraban las Provincias de Tonalán, Tlaxomulco, Ocotlan, Atemajac, y entraron por la Teqüexa de Mitic, Jalostotitlan, Tecpatitlán y toda la Caxcana, que son los pueblos y cabezeras de Zuchipila, Taltenango, Teul, Mecatabasco, Nochistlan y Theocaltich. Tello, Vol. II, 206-207.

300 I believe that Acuña made an error when he transcribed Taquexa instead of Tequexa.
including Central Mexican Nahuas, and another Indigenous people known as the Cocas.\textsuperscript{301} The Tecuejes also lived alongside the Cocas in correspondence communities like Tlajomulco and Tonala.\textsuperscript{302} In Tala, Gerhard posits a Cazcan presence, but Bishop Ruiz Colmenero refers to it as a Tecueje town.\textsuperscript{303}

**Table 2-5: Tecueje Petitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Petition(s)</th>
<th>Ethnic identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuquio</td>
<td>1642 Cuquio</td>
<td>Tecueje (Ruiz Colmenero \textit{apud} Santoscoy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalostotitlan</td>
<td>1611 Jalostotitlan, 1618 Jalostotitlan\textsuperscript{304}</td>
<td>Tecueje (Tello)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitic</td>
<td>1618a Mitic, 1618b Mitic, and 1618c Mitic</td>
<td>Tecueje (Tello)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tala</td>
<td>1600 Tala</td>
<td>Tecueje (Ruiz Colmenero \textit{apud} Santoscoy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonala</td>
<td>1656 Tonala and 1657 Tonala</td>
<td>Tecueje and Coca (Beaumont)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>n.y. San Lacel Tlajomulco</td>
<td>Tecueje and Coca (Ciudad Real)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tecueje from these towns possessed varying degrees of resources and wealth. During the sixteenth century, the notary of the RG of Teocaltiche writes that the Tecuejes did not communicate with the Cazcanes of Teocaltiche and describes them as a barbarous people.\textsuperscript{305} A generation later, Mota y Escobar notes that Mitic was a small town and that Tala only had some fifty vecinos.\textsuperscript{306} By 1618, the inhabitants of Jalostotitlan also had horses because, in one petition, their alcalde complained that the local priest Francisco Muñoz borrowed them without payment,

\textsuperscript{301} Bauz de Czitrom, 16. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 94.

\textsuperscript{302} Tello wrote during the seventeenth century, but here he refers to the Cocas that lived during the time of the Nuño de Guzmán entrada. Fray Pablo Beaumont wrote that Cocas and Tecuejes lived in Tonala. Tello, Vol. II, 120; Beaumont in Baus de Czitrom, 21.


\textsuperscript{304} John Sullivan analyzes petitions from Mitic and Jalostotitlan, which are not included in this study. Sullivan, \textit{Ytechcopa timoteithuia yn tobicario (Acusamos a nuestro vicario): Pleito entre los naturales de Jalostotitlan y su sacerdote, 1618} and “The Jalostotitlan Petitions, 1611-1618.” Baus de Czitrom presents fifty-three Tecueje towns by relying on Beaumont, Ciudad Real, and Tello. She also cites Santoscoy in places where this author cites Ruiz Colmenero, but this is merely a different emphasis on the same sources because the information provided by the former is based on the latter’s visitation accounts. Baus de Czitrom, 19-22.

\textsuperscript{305} Acuña, 304.

\textsuperscript{306} Mota y Escobar, 71, 73, 124, 128.
and this town as well as Mitic and Jalostotitlan also had many types of domestic animals 
because, in another petition, their alcaldes accuse Muñoz of appropriating the property of their 
cofradias, which included mules, milk cows, young bulls, and pigs.\textsuperscript{307} Meanwhile, Arregui 
writes in 1621 that Tala and its subject towns had eighty-five tributaries who mainly labored 
cutting wood from nearby hills to sell to Guadalajara, and he notes that the Valley of Tala was 
the best in the region, and that it had several haciendas, the largest of which was Los Ñuisillos.\textsuperscript{308}

Tlajomulco and Tonala were wealthier than Mitic and Jalostotitlan during the seventeenth 
century, but writers do not mention whether this wealth was owned by Tecuejes or Cocas. Mota 
y Escobar describes Tonala as a formerly famous town that only had two hundred Indigenous 
people in 1602, but he mentions that the inhabitants had nearby springs, raised birds of Castile, 
owned horses, and harvested corn, chili peppers, beans, and a wide variety of fruits and 
vegetables that they sold in Guadalajara; Arregui provides less information because he only 
describes Tonala as one of the largest towns within the province of Guadalajara and refers to a 
nearby hot water spring that was famous.\textsuperscript{309} Meanwhile, Mota y Escobar relates that the 
inhabitants of Tlajomulco had access to fresh water, fertile lands, and large quantities of ganado 
mayor and menor and that they supplied Guadalajara with wheat and meat; and Arregui names it 
as the largest town with close to two-hundred vecinos who were traders and muleteers, and that

\textsuperscript{307} Sullivan translates both of these petitions. The wording of the second is as follows, “Y con respeto a otro asunto: a usted le pedimos su justicia en relación a nuestro sacerdote Francisco Muñoz para que le embargue su propiedad, su hacienda. Hay mulas y vacas lecheras y novillos y puercos y otras cosas de su propiedad, y sus productos frutales. Es necesario que todo aparezca ante usted, todo lo que es su propiedad. Usted enviará a alguien a indagarlo, porque Francisco Muñoz le debe mucho a la gente por todas partes: en el pueblo y en los hospitales.” Sullivan, Ytechcopa timoteithuia yn toboicario (Acusamos a nuestro vicario): Pleito entre los naturales de Jalostotitlan y su sacerdote, 1618, 18, 34.

\textsuperscript{308} Arregui, 71.

\textsuperscript{309} Arregui, 62, 68. Mota y Escobar does not distinguish these Indigenous people as either Tecueje or Coca. Mota y Escobar, 116-117.
two or three Indigenous people were rich because they had three to four thousand pesos.\(^{310}\) Arregui also implies that the women made fine woolen goods.\(^{311}\) Tecuejes and Cocas both lived in these towns, but it is unclear whether the members of each group specialized in certain occupations.

### 2.3e. Cocas

Apart from Tlajomulco and Tonala, the Coca inhabited six correspondence communities to the south: Cajititlan, San Andrés Atotnilco, San Juan Evangelista Atoyac, San Pedro y San Pablo, San Francisco Zacoalco, and Santa Ana Acatlan (Table 2-6). These towns were in a region that extended from the parish of Guadalajara south to Lake Chapala, and from Chicnaguatenco west to San Martín.\(^{312}\) To date, Baus de Czitrom’s *Tecuejes y Cocas: Dos grupos de la region Jalisco en el siglo xvi* is the most comprehensive work about this group.

#### Table 2-6: Coca Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Petition(s)</th>
<th>Ethnic Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cajititlan</td>
<td>“1644 Cajititlan”</td>
<td>Coca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Andrés Atotnilco</td>
<td>“1692 San Andrés Atotnilco,”</td>
<td>Coca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>“1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” and “1694 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac”</td>
<td>Coca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro y San Pablo</td>
<td>“1686 San Pedrotepec,”</td>
<td>Coca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Zacoalco</td>
<td>“1629 Zacoalco” and “1668 San Francisco Zacoalco”</td>
<td>Coca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>“1664 Santa Ana Acatlan” “1687 Santa Ana Catlan,” and “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan”</td>
<td>Coca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>“n.y. San Cacel Tlaximulco.”</td>
<td>Coca/Tecueje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonalá</td>
<td>“1656 Tonalá” and “1657 Tonalá,”</td>
<td>Coca/Tecueje</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{310}\) Mota y Escobar, 62; Arregui, 70.

\(^{311}\) Arregui, 70.

More information is known about Coca towns in the province of Poncitlan than in other regions although no Nahuatl documents to date are from this region. Poncitlan had a small convent with an orchard, and fell on the Grande de Santiago River and on the road from Guadalajara to Mexico; Cuitzeo had been known as Coatlan; and Xocotitlan had been a pre-Columbian pilgrimage site and a major market town. During the late sixteenth century, the inhabitants of these towns spoke Coca, but some of them also knew Nahuatl. During the mid-seventeenth century, Atotonilco El Bajo and Poncitlan were Coca towns.

Cocas in Atotonilco El Bajo, Cuitzeo-Coatlan, and Poncitlan met their needs through a variety of strategies during the 1580s. Cocas fished, harvested beans, raised chickens, and hunted game with bows and arrows, and they harvested corn as a staple that they turned into tamales, tortillas, toasted corn, and made a corn drink mixed with chia. They relied on mesquite and guava trees even as they cultivated and gathered numerous vegetables such as aji and chia and used maguey plants to make pulque. They also had some old world fruits and vegetables such as cabbage, lettuce, quince, peaches, radishes, and pomegranates. They had markets in which they bought salt from both Izatlan and Ávalos, and although some of them farmed cotton close to Lake Chapala, they also relied on cotton from Colima or Compostela to weave. They

---

313 Acuña, 183. Ciudad Real mentioned passing by Xocotitlan on May 4, 1587, but he did not describe it in any meaningful way. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 171.

314 The notary of the RG Cuiseo and Poncitlan writes that the language of the inhabitants was Coca, but many of the inhabitants also spoke Nahuatl, and in that same year, Ciudad Real notes that the Indigenous inhabitants of Atotonilco, Poncitlan, and other towns in the parish of Poncitlan spoke Coca. Acuña, 182, 196; Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 91.


316 Acuña, 182, 190-194.
paid tribute with money, pottery bowls and cups, cotton cloaks, corn, chickens, and other products of the land.

The notary of the Relación geográfica of Poncitlan and Cuiseo also wrote that the Coca from a town named Xamain had, “come from a town named Xocotitlan” and “were the best traders,” implying that other Cocas were traders as well.\textsuperscript{317} Several other sources suggest how the Cocas of Xamain, Poncitlan, Cuitzeo, and adjacent communities had relied on trade since the arrival of Europeans. Francisco de Arceo testifies that, at one point, the Nuño de Guzmán entrada (1530-31) divided itself to march on both sides of a large river (the Grande de Santiago) and as they neared a large town in the province of Cuitzeo, Indigenous warriors attacked them from canoes.\textsuperscript{318} Coca inhabitants lived in towns on the Grande de Santiago River from which they could use their canoes to reach communities upriver until the waterfalls of Jonacatlan, or downriver to Lake Chapala and even unto the Lerma River.\textsuperscript{319} Also, the Grande de Santiago was very wide in the Corregimiento of Poncitlan, and it tended to be calm until the waterfalls of

\textsuperscript{317} Acuña, 183.

\textsuperscript{318} Razo Zaragoza transcribed the testimony of Francisco de Arceo and he writes that the name of the province was Cuysco, but I think it reads Cuyseo. Also, Arceo never named the hostile Indigenous people as Cocas, but Baus de Czitrom posits that they were Cocas based on the region and other sources which name the people of this region as Cocas. \textit{Crónicas de la conquista del reino de Nueva Galicia en territorio de la Nueva España}, edited, annotated, and with a prologue by José Luis Razo Zaragoza, and with drawings by José Parres Arias, (Guadalajara, Mexico: H. Ayuntamiento de la ciudad de Guadalajara, Instituto Jalisciense de antropología e historia, INAH, 1963), 247.

\textsuperscript{319} Acuña connects the inhabitants of Xocotitlan with the pochtecas, the long distance traders that figure so prominently in sources about the Aztec Empire, and Baus de Czitrom (1982: 76) also compares their traders of luxury goods to the pochteca. Acuña, 183. Baus de Czitrom emphasizes the wording of the Relación de Cuiseo, “no tenían mas de los dichos mercaderes [of Xamain] licensia para entrar y salir donde querian (no one but the said merchants of Xamain had permission to enter and leave where they wanted),” to support her comparison between the Coca merchants and the pochteca of Central Mexico. Baus de Czitrom, 76.
As a result, the Coca from these towns appear to have accustomed themselves to exploit the advantages of their waterbourne location for trade.

In the seventeenth century, Arregui notes how the Cocas of this region remained traders even as their towns declined in population and importance. Arregui writes that the Indigenous population of Poncitlan had decreased greatly, but that, together with Indigenous people from Ávalos, they gathered the salt that was used in Guadalajara, and they no longer harvested because almost all the Indigenous people from the jurisdiction of Poncitlan fished and sold their catch to the city of Guadalajara on Fridays. He also criticizes the Cocas of the alcaldía mayor of Poncitlan for not planting and harvesting for themselves, but perhaps there was a dearth of fertile land because, during the dry season, large quantities of ganado menor from Querétaro and Michoacan grazed in estancias in this province, and at other times, the ground was kept fallow.

Cocas in other regions are less well documented especially during the sixteenth century. Ciudad Real writes that Cocas inhabited communities in the parish of Guadalajara alongside Tecuejes and Mexican Indigenous groups who had accompanied the Spaniards during the conquest, but he did not connect these groups to specific communities. Tello emphasizes that the Tecuejes referred to the Cocas who lived in the province of Tonala as Tlajomultecas, and he

320 The Grande de Santiago River was not always tame because the notary of the Relación de Cuiseo y Poncitlan writes that, during the rainy season, this river could and did reach houses in Cuiseo, Poncitlan, and other towns. Acuña, 189; Arregui asserts that it tended to be calm until the waterfalls of Jonacatlan. Arregui, 58.

321 Arregui, 59-60.

322 Arregui writes that ranchers from Queretaro and Michoacan owned these estancias. Arregui, 60. Some Europeans owned estancias of ganado mayor in 1585, but the notary of the RG of Cuitzeo y Poncitlan gives them far less importance. Acuña, 189.

323 Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 94.
notes that both Cocas and Tecuejes lived in this region. Tello suggests that Coca towns in the province of Tonala included Tetlan, Tlaquepaque, and Cajititlan while Bishop Ruiz Colmenero identifies Cajititlan, Tlajomulco, and Santa Ana as Coca towns.

In the province of Ávalos, Coca towns are harder to classify. Bishop Ruiz Colmenero names Atoyac, San Pedro y San Pablo de Tepec, and Zacoalco as Coca towns during the mid-seventeenth century. However, during the sixteenth century, Ciudad Real had asserted that the Indigenous people of Atoyac and Zacoalco spoke Pinome in 1587, and he did not mention San Pedro y San Pablo de Tepec (refer to section 2.3f).

2.3f. Cora, Coanos, and Huainamotas

Evidence suggests that “1649a Tzacamota,” “1649b Tzacamota,” “1652a Guaxicori,” and “1652b Guaxicori” are from Cora towns. During the mid-seventeenth century, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero wrote that “Guajicori” was Cora and Don Antonio Nayari claimed to be a Cora from Tzacamota who ruled the Cora of “Guaxcore,” “Ayotochipa,” and “Quasamota.” Then, in 1673, Arias y Saavedra mentioned that Tzacamota was the name of a town and a province in El Gran Nayar.

---

324 Tello wrote during the seventeenth century, but here he refers to the Cocas that lived during the time of the Nuño de Guzmán entrada. Tello, Vol. II, 119.


326 Ciudad Real used pinome, pinu'tl, or pinonuquina to refer to the language spoken by the inhabitants of Atoyac and Zacoalco. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 116, 118.


328 Calvo, Colección de documentos para la historia de Nayarit: Los albores de un nuevo mundo, 287-288
The Cora appear to have controlled a sizeable portion of El Gran Nayar by 1587. Ciudad Real first identifies the Cora people when entering the town of Xala, south of El Gran Nayar. He relates how a town named Huaynamota was twenty-three leagues north of Xala and adds that the Cora were a people who lived south and west of this town. He also described the Cora as Chichimecs, as a fierce and idolatrous people that spoke a language similar to that of Senticpac. Later, he writes that the inhabitants of Senticpac, and those of other towns in the northern part of the parish of Senticpac spoke Pínutl or Pinonuquia, and he relates how people described this as the language of the Cora, the Coanos, and the Huaynamotecas. He also explains that Pínutl and Pinonuquia referred to a language that was also known as Pinome. Thus, the Cora, Coanos, and Huaynamotecas apparently spoke variants of the same language during the 1580s, if Ciudad Real is correct.

Some twenty years later, Mota y Escobar referred to the Huaynamotecos and Cora as Chichimecs. He wrote that a captain and four soldiers protected several Franciscans who had begun to proselytize in the highland community of Huaynamota, which had fifteen hundred Chichimecs. He also classified the Huaynamotecos and the Cora as barbarian Chichimecs who

---

329 Ciudad Real II, 108-110, 116, 118, 120. Carl Sauer also relies on Ciudad Real when analyzing the presence of the Cora in Nayarit, and to date, he has written the most accurate analysis of the presence of the Cora in Nayarit during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Sauer, *The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico*, 5-14.

330 Ciudad Real mainly uses “Pinome,” but he also relied on “Pínutl” or “Pinonuquia” to refer to the the language spoken by the inhabitants of Atoyac and Zacoalco. He also identifies the inhabitants of Amacueca and Teocuitlatlan in Avalos as speakers of Pinome, and these inhabitants were far from the main centers of Pinome speakers in the western Pacific coastal region. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 87, 150. *Pínutl, Pinonuquia, and Pinome* are Nahuatl words. Molina defines *pinotlatoa* as “speaking in a foreign language,” so Pínutl and Pinome appear to represent the singular and plural forms of the first segment of *pinotlatoa*. Molina, 82.

331 Mota y Escobar, 51, 81.
lived on the San Pedro Analco and Huaynamota Mountain Range and the Cora Mountain Range, where they hunted, fished, and gathered roots.

In 1673, Arias de Saavedra writes a very detailed account about El Gran Nayar and the Cora. He explained that the Cora divided El Gran Nayar into four provinces that they referred to as Tlahuilanalis: Huahuanica, that of the Chimaltitecos and Ixcattecos, Tzacamota, and Mimbres. Tzacamota was a province, and it had a town that was also known as Tzacamota, which was the seat of the ruler known as Nayari, and it also had Aynarit, a community with a thousand sheep and the same number of cattle. The inhabitants of all four provinces sowed and harvested, but Arias y Saavedra singled out the inhabitants of Tzacamota and Mimbres as having fields of potatoes, sweet potatoes, beans, and corn; and as harvesting peaches, quince, bananas, cactus, cactus fruit, and sugar cane. Furthermore, the Cora of Tzacamota and the other provinces also gathered honey and fished to some extent, and they raised century plants with which to make mezcal. Many Cora were also teamsters with a great number of pack animals; those who accompanied Arias y Saavedra had between five and ten mules each, and one was known to have one-hundred mules. Some Cora were also blacksmiths, carpenters, and tailors, and they were so numerous that they even sold their wares to Spaniards.

The presence of these skilled workers can be partially explained because El Gran Nayar served as a sanctuary to Hispanicized Indigenous people and others who wanted to escape Spanish-dominated spaces. In a journal entry from 1587, Ciudad Real explains that some non-

332 I have regularized the spelling from Tzacaimuta and Tzacaymuta to Tzacamota. Arias de Saavedra in Calvo, Colección de documentos para la historia de Nayarit: Los albores de un nuevo mundo, 287-289.

333 The other communities are Upata, Taucamota, Yauca, Moxahuica, Quacta, Xaraute, Theuyca, Tzontla, Quaxmoxitla, Urratta, Xoquipa, Saiolf, Nauita. Arias de Saavedra in Calvo, Colección de documentos para la historia de Nayarit: Los albores de un nuevo mundo, 288.
Christian Indigenous people, and even those who had been baptized, left their towns and went to the ridges beyond Acaponeta where they lived with more freedom and without mass and Christian doctrine.\textsuperscript{334} Were these highlands in El Gran Nayar? The answer depends on the definition of El Gran Nayar. If El Gran Nayar is defined as the highlands of Western Mexico controlled by \textit{pinome}-speaking peoples like the Coanos, Coras, and Huaynamotecas, then Guaxicori falls well within El Gran Nayar during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

The Cora also had spiritual leaders who challenged the ritual power of the Catholic clergy because Arias y Saavedra notes how each Cora \textit{tlahuilanal} had festivals that drew hundreds and even thousands of people.\textsuperscript{335} He heard from witnesses that fifteen hundred men gathered in Tzacamota during its main festival, more than a thousand men went to Huahuanica, between four and five hundred men went to Chimaltitecos, and between three and four hundred men went to Mymbres. Some of these may not have been Cora because Arias y Saavedra grudgingly notes, “many foreigners from all the kingdom incorporated themselves to these [Cora] peoples because vicious people who have committed homicides and kidnappings understand each other, and there are some \textit{mestizos} and \textit{mulatos}, and some of them are slaves.”\textsuperscript{336}

\textsuperscript{334} The main reason that Indigenous people fled into the highlands was bad treatment from Spanish soldiers. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 117.

\textsuperscript{335} Arias y Saavedra in Calvo, \textit{Colección de documentos para la historia de Nayarit: Los albores de un nuevo mundo, siglos xvi y xvii}, 289.

\textsuperscript{336} Arias y Saavedra in Calvo, \textit{Colección de documentos para la historia de Nayarit: Los albores de un nuevo mundo, siglos xvi y xvii}, 289.
2.3g. Totorames

Two petitions are from San Antonio Quihuiquinta, a town that was two leagues upriver from Guaxicori in the province of Acapona, “1659a San Antonio Quihuiquinta” and “1659b San Antonio Quihuiquinta.” In the former, the notary names the inhabitants of this town as Totorame, which corresponds with how Bishop Ruiz Colmenero identifies the people of a town named San Antonio, and how Arias y Saavedra identifies a people who lived along the coast and on some islands in the province of Acapona. Bishop Ruiz Colmenero names the Totorame as “Tamurete” and Arias y Saavedra writes that they were also known as “Themuretes.” Both of these writers translate this term as “toad.”

However, this identification clashes with the way Mota y Escobar and Arregui described an early seventeenth-century town known as Quihuiquinta, presumably the same San Antonio. Mota y Escobar notes that more than two-hundred Tepehuan tributaries lived in Quihuiquinta, adding that only a few of them were Christians. Then, Arregui mentions that it was depopulated after a Tepehuan uprising that lasted from 1616 to 1618.

---

337 Ciudad Real relates the presence of “siete lenguas o diferencias de lengua” in the province of Acapona, which were Pínutl or Pinome, Cuachicanuquia, Guacnuquia, Cuarinuquia, Iruzanuquia, Naarinuquia, and Neuxinuquia. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 116. Sauer translates “siete lenguas o diferencias de lengua” as “seven languages or differences of language” emphasizing that some of these represented different languages and others were simply variants.” Sauer, The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico, 7.


339 Mota y Escobar stated that “Quihuiquintla” was twelve leagues from “here,” referring to either Acapona or the mines of Maloya y San Marcial. Mota y Escobar, 85. I believe that he was referring to Acapona, but in that case the distance of twelve leagues is wrong. Quihuiquinta was less than six leagues north of Acapona. Gerhard, La frontera norte de la Nueva España, 1982: 56.

340 Arregui writes that the Tepehuan uprising occurred in 1617, but Franços Chevalier clarifies that it lasted from 1616 to 1618. Arregui, 101.
Were the Tepehuanes and Totorames two different peoples? Molina defines Tepehuan as the Nahuatl word for conquistador, and a morpheme by morpheme translation yields “conqueror.” Meanwhile, Totorame is connected to the Tepehuan, Lower Pima, and Papago (now universally known as Tohono O’odham) languages, which have been classified as belonging to the Tepiman language family. The Jesuit, Benito Rinaldini, notes in his 1743 Tepehuan dictionary that odame stood for “gente o nación,” and in a more recent dictionary of Papago/Lower Pima, Dean and Lucille Saxton present o’othham as “a person; a human; a tribesman,” O’othham as “a Papago or Pima Indian; the Papago/Pima language,” Akimel O’othham as “Pima,” Tohono O’othham as “the desert people, Papago people,” and Totogwani as a dialect of “Papago.” Totorame, odame, O’othham, and Totogwani show close relationships because, in a comparison between Totorame and Totogwani, the r in the former is a gw in the latter. A comparison of Totorame and odame also suggests two related words because the r in the former is a d in the latter. Furthermore, since o’othham (person) and odame (people) have similar meanings and forms, it is probable that Toto specifies a group of orame (people) that spoke either Papago (Tohono O’odham), Lower Pima, Tepehuan, or a forgotten variant. In other words, the notary of San Antonio Quihuiquinta used Totorame to refer to inhabitants of this town, who spoke a Tepiman language because Totorame is how they identified themselves.

---

341 Lockhart, Nahuatl as Written, 229. Molina, 102. Linguists use morpheme to refer to the smallest unit of meaning: a prefix, a suffix, or a root word.

342 During the early sixteenth century, Lower Pima and Tepehuan may have represented variants rather than separate languages. Sauer mentions that the Jesuit anus of 1616 and 1628 classify the Nebome (or Lower Pima) as having a Tepehuan speech. Sauer, The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico, 38.

2.3h. Huicholes, Tecuales, Tescoquines, and Guachichiles

Tecual inhabitants appear to have lived in the correspondence community of Xalisco, Tequepespa, and Pochotitlan at the time that notaries wrote “1593a Xalisco,” “1593b Xalisco,” “N.Y. Xalisco, ca. 1593,” “1594 Xalisco,” “1595a Xalisco,” “1595b Xalisco,” “1646 Tequepechpan,” and “1678 Santiago Pochotitlan.” The evidence is clearest for Xalisco because, in 1587, Ciudad Real identifies the correspondence communities of Tequepechpan and Xalisco as towns where the inhabitants spoke Tecual. However, the petition “1646 Tequepechpan” requires more information because it is some sixty years removed from Ciudad Real’s journal. Also, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero provides less than conclusive support that Tequepechpan remained Tecual because he mentions that it belonged to the Tequepechos even while adding that it was close to Tecual towns.

Xalisco was a prosperous town during the 1580s, but by the 1620s, it had become less important because of the drastic decline in its Indigenous population. Ciudad Real describes it as a middle-sized town with the Franciscan convent of San Juan Bautista whose inhabitants spoke Tecual. He also mentions that its warm climate allowed for orchards of different kinds of native and even foreign fruits like bananas, oranges, and pomegranates, and that it produced a white honey that was so delicious that it was even sent to Mexico City. However, Arregui writes

---

some twenty years later that the delicious white honey of Xalisco was well-known, but rare in his time because many Indigenous people had left Xalisco.\footnote{Arregui, 93.}

Tecual could be a Nahuatl name that means “the eaten ones,” and as such it stands in opposition to the concept of tecuani, which literally means beast or literally, “eater of humans.”\footnote{Tecuani was the Nahuatl term for a wild beast or a jaguar. The root word of both tecualli and tecuani is cua (to eat), and both of these words also include te-, an object prefix that denotes unspecified humans, which stands in contrast to tla- an object prefix that denotes unspecified non-humans. Lockhart, \textit{Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts}, 232. However, tecualli contains -li, a passive nominalizing suffix, while tecuani has -ni, an active nominalizing suffix. Horacio Carochi, S. J. \textit{Grammar of the Mexican Language with an Explanation of its Adverbs (1645)} translated and edited with commentary by James Lockhart (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001).} These appellations make a certain amount of sense for Tequepechpan during the sixteenth century because its Tecual inhabitants lived a short distance south from a group that Ciudad Real (109-110) names as Zayabecos and describes as indomitable Christian Indigenous people who ate human flesh.\footnote{Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 112. Sauer interprets Ciudad Real’s description to mean that the Zayabecos were, “perhaps above the junction of the Rio Grande [de Santiago] and the Huaynamota [River],” and this would place them some then leagues north of Tequepechpan. Sauer, \textit{The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico}, 8.} The Compostela Map of 1550 depicts “Tecuales” as figures holding bows, and Ciudad Real mentions that, on January 16, 1587, he was escorted to Tequepechpan by eight Indigenous people mounted on horseback, seven of whom carried feather-adorned shields.\footnote{Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 111.} Unlike Xalisco, Tequepechpan appears to have remained prosperous from the late sixteenth to the early seventeenth century. Ciudad Real writes that one of the eight mounted Tequepechpos who met him held a flag, and the other seven carried shields made of reeds and decorated with red and yellow parrot feathers implying a certain level of material wealth, which was further reinforced as he entered this town and was greeted by a procession in
which the inhabitants carried a cross, images, and altars.\textsuperscript{351} He also remarks that they offered him and his party many bananas, Castilian bread, trout, and a wineskin bottle. More than ten years later, Mota y Escobar writes that Tequepechpan had sixty married tributaries who gathered honey and raised fruits from Castile.\textsuperscript{352} Neither Ciudad Real nor Mota y Escobar had referred to the Tequepechpos as farmers, but Arregui writes that they planted and harvested maize.\textsuperscript{353}

Bishop Ruiz Colmenero mentioned Pochotitlan twice, suggesting that there were at least two towns with that name, and he classified one as being inhabited by Tecual and the other by Tepecanos. However, it is unclear when he is referring to the Pochotitlan in the province of Minas de Chimaltitan or to the one in Fronteras de Colotlan. Sauer identifies the Indigenous people living in the drainage of the Bolaños River as Tepecano, which would represent the Pochotitlan in Fronteras de Colotlan.\textsuperscript{354} Meanwhile, Arregui describes that Tecuales of Pochotitlan in Minas de Chimaltitan as being recent migrants to the region and less hard-working than others, perhaps because they did not pay tribute.\textsuperscript{355} He adds that they hunted deer, gathered honey, and farmed squash and watermelon in a nearby canyon. However, another possibility is that the Pochotitlan in Minas de Chimaltitan is Tepecano because Bishop Ruiz Colmenero uses this term to identify this town next to Acaponeta, a town in an adjacent province.\textsuperscript{356}

\textsuperscript{351} Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 111-112.

\textsuperscript{352} Mota y Escobar, 80. Tello remarked that Bishop Mota y Escobar had gone to Tequepespan and Xala on a \textit{visita} and to learn about the miraculous steps of the holy Friar Pedro de Almonte whose footprints were believed to remain on a portion of wilderness between Tequepespan and Xala. Tello Vol. II, 303.

\textsuperscript{353} Arregui, 81.

\textsuperscript{354} Sauer, \textit{The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico}, 55.

\textsuperscript{355} Arregui, 81.

Meanwhile, Lázaro Blanco, the notary of the RG of Compostela, described the martial qualities of a people that he named as Tecosquines, which might refer to the Tecual from Tequepechpan or the Zayabecos.357 Blanco placed the Tecosquines in the vicinity of Tequepechpan by writing that they lived toward the south in the mountain range that began in Compostela. He also wrote that Tecosquin mean “head cutter,” which implied a martial past, but in his time, the Tecosquines only numbered six hundred men with women and children because they had been decimated by epidemics.358 He also denigrated them by describing them as being so lazy that they did not even work for their sustenance, and that they traded with, and hired themselves out to Spaniards and others. This statement suggests that neither Blanco nor his informants saw the Tecozquines farm or herd animals for food.

Ciudad Real did not mention the Tecozquines, but he did note that the inhabitants of the province of Tepeque hired themselves out to the Guachichil.359 He wrote that the people of Tepeque were ruled by two leaders who ordered them to join raids led by Guachichil captains. In return, the captains offered these rulers the clothes taken as spoils. Could the Tecozquines and the inhabitants of Tepeque have been the same people?

The evidence is not conclusive. Sauer quotes a person who testified before the priest of Tlatenango that, in most of the towns, there were Indigenous people who spoke Nahuatl and

---

357 The Relación Geográfica de Compostela, like all of the others, was a group endeavor. It was compiled by Lázaro Blanco, the alcalde mayor, Antonio Muñoz, the notary, and the elders of Compostela, some of whom were Nahuas. Muñoz describes the customs, character, and language of the Tezcoquines. Acuña, 88-89.

358 Tecosquin[i] is a Nahuatl term derived from tecomatl, tzontecomatl, and -qui. Tecomatl refers to a “jar or cup” whose base is round, and tzontecomatl is a compound made up of tzontli and tecomatl referring to the “skull,” or the “head.” The last term is -ni, which is an agentive and is similar in function to the “-er” suffix, which means “one who does” in English, i.e. run-runner or speak/speaker. Lockhart, Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts, 231, 232, 240.

Spanish, but also spoke Huichol, Tepehuan, Nayari, or Cora.\(^{360}\) In the end, Sauer posits that the Tecuales, the Guachichiles, and the Huichol spoke the same language. Gerhard accepts that Tecual is equivalent to Huichol, but he disagrees about the language of the Guachichiles.\(^{361}\)

### 2.4. Indigenous Colonists and Northwestern New Spain

In addition to the many native groups discussed in this chapter, Indigenous colonists from other regions of Mexico also settled in Northwestern New Spain. They inhabited the correspondence communities of Nombre de Dios, San Martín de Cohuatlan, Analco-Guadalajara, San Antonio Quihuiquinta, and possibly Sayula, which were the sites for six petitions: “N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca. 1585” “1622 Cohuatlan,” “1652b San Antonio Quihuiquinta,” “1670 Analco-Guadalajara,” “1679 Sayula,” and “N.Y. Sayula.” In fact, the notary of “N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca. 1585” describes inhabitants of Nombre de Dios as Mexica, and another notary wrote a document about this town in 1585 in which he identifies its people as “Mexicatlacatli” (Mexican people) and “Michoacatlaca” (Michoacan people).\(^{362}\) In this latter document, Mexica refers to emigrants or the descendants of emigrants from towns in and around the Basin of Mexico, and Michoacan can refer to Tarascans, Nahuas, or other inhabitants of a region that lies south of Northwestern New Spain.

Other notaries are not as forthcoming. The notary of “1622 Cohuatlan” writes that its inhabitants had helped strengthen Michoacan, and he uses a Nahuatl that shares some similarities

---


\(^{361}\) Sauer, *The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico*, 14; Gerhard, *La frontera norte de la Nueva España*, 43, 57.

\(^{362}\) Barlow and Smisor, 3, 47.
with the Nahuatl of Central Mexico. San Antonio Quihuiquinta was home to Tepehuanes and Totorames, but Braun, Sell and Terraciano propose that the notary of the third petition, “1652b San Antonio Quihuiquinta,” was a person trained as a central Mexican Nahua notary.\footnote{Braun, Sell, and Terraciano, 89.}

Furthermore, Mota y Escobar mentions that Analco-Guadalajara had Indigenous people from many ethnic groups, especially the Mexicana (Central Mexican Nahuas), and that they practiced European trades.\footnote{Mota y Escobar, 48.} The notary of “1679 Sayula” uses a very refined Nahuatl, and Ciudad Real writes that the inhabitants of Sayula spoke Tzaulteco and Central Mexican Nahuatl, and Bishop Ruiz Colmenero names its inhabitants as Sayultecos.\footnote{Bishop Ruiz Colmenero in Santoscoy, *Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara*, 1051. Ciudad Real writes, “los de Tzayula y los de los otros pueblos de aquella guardanía tienen lengua particular llamada Tzaulteca, pero casi todos hablan y entienden la mexicana.” Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 149.} These petitions are only a fraction of the total, but they exist because Franciscan settlers taught the peoples of Northwestern New Spain to record Nahuatl speech with the Roman alphabet, the subject of the next chapter.
Chapter 3: From the Sword to the Pen: Indigenous Groups, Northwestern New Spain, and Alphabetic Writing

“Our feet made fresh tracks as we weaved through mountains and made unreliable allies of the moon and the night and the stars.”

3.1. Nahuatl and Writing

Northwestern New Spain’s many valleys and ridges probably prevented the development of large states such as the Triple Alliance (also known as the Aztec Empire). However, Nahuatl appears to have been a unifying force because some people from the region spoke it as a native language, and others relied on it as a lingua franca. But was its use a pre-Columbian or Colonial development? This chapter addresses this question in five parts: it argues that Nahuatl was present in Northwestern New Spain before the arrival of Europeans; it proposes that clerics at the highest levels relied on Nahuatl to promote an alliance between clerics and Nahuatl translators to challenge native leaders; it suggests that the struggle between clerics and native leaders was most visible in the killings of Fray Antonio Cuéllar and Juan Calero during the Mixtón War; it posits that the defeat of these native leaders and their groups in this war opened the way for Franciscans and Nahuatl translators to develop the mission as a center of Roman Nahuatl literacy; and it proposes that Nahuatl literacy together with the increased powers of the office of the Diocese of Guadalajara allowed the development of the Nahuatl petition genre.

3.2. Pre-Columbian Nahuatl

Reconstructing the use of Nahuatl before contact requires a multi-disciplinary approach because evidence of its use is scattered in the spoken languages of different Indigenous groups, and in sources written in two different writing systems. Nahuatl is a member of the Uto-Aztecan family (UA), which was widely used during the colonial period (1521-1821). Its speakers had communities from what is now northern California to Nicaragua, from what is now California to Texas, and from what is now Jalisco to Veracruz. However, the Nahua speakers ranged farther south than the speakers of other UA languages. The southernmost non-Nahuatl UA speakers were the Coras and Huicholes who have had communities in western Mexico hundreds and even thousands of miles north of Nahuatl communities in what are now central Mexico, southern Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua.

---

367 I am using Mexico’s colonial period instead of those from Costa Rica, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, or the U.S. for several reasons. First, my investigation focuses on documents from a portion of Mexico. Second, beginning in 1521 allows the inclusion of early Nahuatl communities built by the Spaniards’ Nahuatl allies in Guatemala, western Mexico, southwestern Mexico, and northern Mexico. Third, ending in 1821, allows the inclusion of Apache and Comanche migrations and settlements that reconfigured the American Southwest and the Mexican north during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. The Apache do not speak a UA language, but they did force some UA peoples to move their communities.

368 Although speakers of UA languages were not always the dominant people in these regions, they did inhabit portions of these territories. Most scholars divide UA languages into a northern (N-UA) and a southern branch (S-UA). Some N-UA languages include Comanche, Hopi, and Shoshone and S-UA languages include Cora, Huichol, Mayo, O’odham (formerly Pima/Papago), Tepehuan, and Yaqui. Marianne Mithun (1999), Shirley Silver and Wick R. Miller, and Lyle Campbell (1997) give good descriptions of the scholarship behind the most common classifications of UA languages. Mithun, Languages of native North America (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Silver, Shirley and Wick R. Miller. American Indian Languages: Cultural and Social Contexts (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1997); American Indian Languages: The Historical Linguistics of Native America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

369 Different sixteenth and seventeenth-century chroniclers have written about the early colonial presence of Nahuatl communities throughout Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. Bernardino de Sahagún, Alonso de Molina, Diego Durán, and others mention them in Central Mexico, and Hernando Ruiz de Alarcón and Diego de Landa refer to them in southern Mexico. The oral reciters of the Itza-Maya Popol Vuh and the Kaqchikel-Maya Annals of the Kabil refer to Nahuatl speakers in Guatemala. Finally, Juan de Torquemada mentions two separate Nahuatl communities in El Salvador, and Bartolome de las Casas mentions some communities in Nicaragua.
The spread of Nahua peoples and their isolation from UA speakers to the north have led many scholars to accept the idea that Nahuas migrated from north to south into central Mexico, southern Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. Catherine S. Fowler has written one of the most accepted theories which is that the proto-language, the ancestor of UA languages, was spoken in an area that included portions of the American Southwest, northern Mexico, and perhaps California.\(^{370}\) Jane Hill accepts some of Fowler’s data, but argues that the proto-language developed among maize cultivators living in the northwest of Mesoamerica migrated north, spreading maize agriculture and displacing speakers of other language families, who were hunter-gatherers.\(^{371}\)

Una Canger posits that the features of Nahuatl dialects found in colonial records and spoken by twentieth-century speakers suggest two separate waves of migration across what are now Mexico and Central America: Toltec migrations occurring before 1175 that she associates to an Eastern Peripheral chain of dialects and Aztlan migrations into the Basin of Mexico occurring between 1160 and 1230 that she connects to a Central chain.\(^{372}\) Furthermore, she proposes that the different features shared between the Central chain and a Western Peripheral Chain were due


\(^{372}\) Canger writes, “the ancestors of today’s speakers of the dialects of La Huasteca, Sierra de Puebla, Isthmus, and Pipil represented the first group of Nahuatl speakers—including the Toltecs—in Central Mexico and further south...The dialect areas representing the Aztlan migrants are North Puebla, the whole undivided central area (encompassing Tlaxcala, central Puebla, and Morelos), and to a certain degree Central Guerrero. They share with the dialects of the Western Periphery most of the mentioned characteristic features—(1) *tesi*, (2) *toto:nki, šošo:wki*, (3) presence of *o* ‘past’, and (5) *moči* ‘all’. This indicates that they have been in close contact with these western dialects or formed a group with them at some times in the past; and it may also mean that they entered the Valley of Mexico from the west. Canger, “Nahuatl Dialectology: A Survey and Some Suggestions” *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 54: 1 (January 1988), 64-65.
to long-standing contact, or to sharing those features in a distant past, and that either of those situations may imply that the the Aztlan migrants may have entered the Basin of Mexico from the west. Other scholars agree that Nahuatl was present in Central Mexico and Central America by the late post-Classic Period (ca. CE 1200-1521) based on examinations of phonetic elements in pre-Columbian stelae and codices, colonial documents, and modern dialects, but they disagree over whether any migrations occurred before CE 1000.

Oriana Baddeley, Janet Catherine Berlo, Karen Dakin, John Justeson, Terrence Kaufman, and Søren Whichman are among the investigators who have consulted Pre-Columbian sources written with either the Maya syllabic-pictographic system or the Mixteca-Puebla Style. Kaufman and Justeson state, “Nahua loans in Mesoamerican languages reflect Nahua phonology as we know it from the sixteenth century, and can, therefore, not be earlier than about A.D. 1000,” but Dakin, Whichman, Baddeley, and Berlo posit earlier contact. Kaufman posits that *kakawa was the proto-Mixe-Zoquean word for “cacao.” However, Karen Dakin counters that kakawa (cacao) could be a UA form, the reduplicated version of *kapa. If the latter is the case,

---

373 Canger uses three sources for Western Peripheral Nahuatl: Nahua who speak Mexicanero in San Pedro Jícara, Durango, a present-day variant; Guerra’s Arte de la lengua mexicana published in 1692; and D. Gerónimo Tomas de Aquino Cortés y Zedeño’s Arte de la lengua mexicana published in 1765 (Refer to Chapter 4.5c and 4.6). Canger, “Nahuatl Dialectology: A Survey and Some Suggestions,” 46, 66.


376 Karen Dakin, “Cacao and chocolate: a Uto-Aztecan Perspective” (Unpublished manuscript);” quoted in Søren Wichmann, “A conservative look at diffusion involving Mixe-Zoquean languages” in Archaeology and Language II: Correlating archaeological and linguistic hypotheses ed. by Roger Blench and Matthew Spriggs (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 300. While Wichmann (p. 302) at first believed that kakawa was Mixe-Zoquean, he has now come to agree with Dakin. Kaufman and Justeson disagree and theorize that Mixe-Zoquean
speakers of a UA language may have been in Central America at a very early time because the earliest instance of \textit{kakawa} was transliterated by David Stuart in a Maya vessel that is dated to the fifth century A.D., and Stephen D. Houston, Stuart, and Karl Taube encountered another sample in a vase belonging to Smoking Squirrel, an individual who lived between CE 688 and 719.\textsuperscript{377} Later in time, Oriana Baddeley hypothesizes that the teeth and gums in the iconography of Cacaxtla (ca. CE 700-900) is a phonetic representations of the Nahuatl locative -\textit{tlan} (place of) through the use of the near-homonym \textit{tlantli} (tooth/teeth), and Janet Catherine Berlo posits the same for the carvings of teeth and gums in the Pyramid of the Plumed Serpent at Xochicalco (ca. CE 750-900).\textsuperscript{378}

In what are now the Yucatan Peninsula and Guatemala, Maya records written in the Roman alphabet also show Pre-Columbian interactions between this group and one or more Nahuatl-speaking peoples. Frances Karttunen has found that, in the Yucatan Peninsula, “lexical borrowing has operated in only one direction only; Maya has Nahuatl loan words, but Nahuatl does not have Maya loans.”\textsuperscript{379} Judith M. Maxwell and Robert M. Hill examine several Maya


\textsuperscript{379} Frances Karttunen proposes that the -\textit{tl} absolutive form was retained as -\textit{t} in Nahuatl loans to Yucatec Maya, whereas -\text{\textit{tl}}, -\textit{li}, and \textit{in} were dropped (refer to Chapter 4.5c and 4.6). For example, Karttunen writes that the Nahuatl words \textit{Cinteōtl}, \textit{Xōchihuēhuētl}, \textit{miztli}, and \textit{mācēhualli} became the Maya words \textit{Sinteyut}, \textit{Xuchueuet}, \textit{miz}, and \textit{maezaual}. Karttunen, \textit{Nahuatl and Maya in Contact with Spanish}. Texas Linguistic Forum 26. (Austin: Department of Linguistics, University of Texas, 1985), 7-8. The contact between Maya and Nahua was extensive
Kaqchikel works with the Roman alphabet, such as the Xajil Chronicle, and they note that the Kaqchikel mentioned a delegation in 1509 by Yaki’ aj Kuluwakan, and they explain that Yaki’ was the Kaqchikel word for Nahua, and Kuluwakan stood for Culhuacan. Although this last record represents a remembered event recorded during the colonial period, the classification of Yaki’, Kuluwakan, and other Nahuatl loan words into Kaqchikel reinforce Pre-Columbian interactions between Mayas and Nahuas.

Meanwhile, Kevin Terraciano and John Pohl have consulted Ñudzahui sources to present evidence of the Pre-Columbian presence of Nahuas in La Mixteca, a region that encompasses portions of what are now the states of Oaxaca, Guerrero, and Puebla. Pohl examines the Codex Zouche-Nuttall, noting that its most famous foreigner was a priest-warlord named 4 Jaguar who was drawn with a black mask. He argues that the Mixtec identified the Nahua as sami ñuu, “the people with burned faces,” and drew them with lone ranger-like black masks in their codices. Terraciano writes that the Arte de la lengua mixteca “Grammar of the Mixtec Language” had several terms for Nahuas including tay saminuu “person with burnt face or eyes,” tay ñuu coyo “person from the place of reeds,” and tay ñuudzuma and tay yecoo, which lack other attested definitions. He agrees with Pohl about the definition of tay saminuu adding that this term was not as common in colonial Ñudzahui records as tay ñuu coyo, “people of the place of reeds,”

during colonial period. Dakin asserts that published and unpublished documents in Nahuatl are found in what are now Chiapas and Guatemala in which the mutually unintelligible Maya languages of Kaqchikel, Mam, Q’andjob’al, Tzeltal, and/or Tzotzil were spoken. Dakin, “Linguistic Evidence for Historical Contacts between Nahuas and Northern Lowland Mayan Speakers” in Astronomers, Scribes, and Priests: Intellectual Interchange between the Northern Maya Lowlands and Highland Mexico ed. by Gabrielle Vail and Christine Hernández (Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 2010), 220.


which most likely represented Tenochtitlan, but he notes that it was also a reference to Tollan, a legendary city-state.\textsuperscript{382}

3.3. Nahuas in Northwestern New Spain

Scholars have found only a few examples of non-European writing iconography from the area that this study defines as Northwestern New Spain. These and the earliest alphabetic documents in Spanish suggest the pre-Columbian presence of Nahuas in this region. Hasso Von Winning first connected the pre-Columbian Azatlán tradition and its iconography to what has come to be known as the Mixteca-Puebla Style. Furthermore, Pohl examines two vases from Nayarit, and he notes that in one, a man’s “face is decorated with horizontal black bands,” and in another several personages wear the nose ornaments that characterized the tecuhtli, or lord of a Nahua lineage.\textsuperscript{383} These horizontal black bands and nose ornaments suggest that Nahuas were present in pre-Columbian Western Mexico.

After the arrival of Europeans, Tlaxcallans who accompanied Spanish \textit{entradas} to Northwestern New Spain described their actions to \textit{tlacuilos}, painter-writers, who painted scenes in the Mixteca-Puebla Style showing battles. In these scenes, the Tlaxcallans stand on the left with mounted Spaniards facing Indigenous opponents on the right, and some of the latter have horizontal bands across their eyes. One image shows the Tlaxcallans facing Indigenous people

\textsuperscript{382} Terraciano, 332.

with painted eyes who fight back from a hill labeled as Tototlan, a town close to Colima. Another one depicts ten Indigenous warriors within a two-dimensional hill labeled as Xochipillan, a Cazcan town that became known as Juchipila in most Spanish documents. Four of the warriors wear a horizontal band across their eyes: one stands at the bottom of the hill holding a shield with an obsidian-studded club, two hold clubs and stand behind a shield, and the fourth stands behind a shield while holding a bow and arrow. In another scene, two Tlaxcallans and a Spaniard face five figures—three with the band and two without—in a space identified as Tlaltenanpan, which probably corresponds to Tlaltenanco.

The earliest Roman alphabetic records also mention the presence of Nahuas and Nahuatl in Northwestern New Spain. The earliest one is by Diego de Coria, a notary who accompanied the visitation of Francisco de Vargas and Gonzalo Cerezo in 1525. The document is preserved within the 1531 lawsuit of Nuño de Guzman against Hernán Cortés. Diego de Coria classifies the native inhabitants as either naguatato (more commonly nahuatlato) or otomi in a region that included what would become the provinces of Amula, Ávalos, Etzatlan, Minas de Chimaltitan, Nochistlan, and Xalisco (Refer to Chapter 2.3b and 2.3e). For example, in writing about Atitlan, which is close to Etzatlan, he mentions that most of its residents were “naguatatos,” and that the cabecera of the province of Aguacatlan had two lords, “one is naguatato and the other otomi.”

---


385 http://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/Se%C3%B1or%C3%ADo_de_Juchipila#mediaviewer/File:Xochipilla.jpg viewed on 02/03/2015.

386 I propose that the original settlement was Tlaltenanpan, but that the Spaniards resettled the survivors in a different location, which necessitated the change of the name to Tlaltenanco. Many other scenes contain the warriors with the painted band over their eyes such as Colotlan, which has two with the band and three without, Tonanycapan, which has four with the band and one without, Xonacatlan, which has three with the band and two without, Colhuacan, which has two with the band and four without, etc.
and for Xalisco, he writes that the people “are all otomíes.”387 Yáñez Rosales proposes that Otomí represents non-Nahua without the connotation of belligerence and nomadism conveyed by chichimec and nayar/nayarita.388 The two morphemes of nahuatlato support this interpretation because the first is nahuati “clear speaker,” which modifies tlatoa “speak” to give it a meaning analogous to “intelligible speaker.”389 Diego de Coria thus refers to a Nahuatl epistemology in which naguatatos were the known referent, peoples whose language was intelligible to Nahuas, and otomíes represented the other, a people who spoke an unintelligible language.

Some of the many members of the Nuño de Guzmán entraña (1529-1531) who testified in a court case against their leader employed nahuatlato in their testimonies.390 For example, Juan de Samano, one of the lieutenants, used nahuatlato to refer to the presence of Nahuas in what would become Northwestern New Spain. Samano testified that, in Tonala, “one district of nahuatlatos remained in their homes and gave the friends [Indigenous allies] fruit and water” while differentiating them from another group that resisted “in a tall rocky hill.”391 He also stated


388 Yáñez Rosales, Rostro, palabra y memoria indígenas el occidente de México: 1524-1816, 42.

389 Terraciano writes that the etymological meaning of nahuatlato is “clear speaker,” which is how Molina defines nahuati and its antonym anahuati. Terraciano, The Mixtecs of Colonial Oaxaca: Ñudzahui History, Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries, 45. Molina, 63. Molina writes that nahuati meant, “hablar alto, o tener buen sonido la campana, o cosa asi (to speak loudly or for the bell to have a good sound).” On the other hand, anahuati was, “callar o hablar muy bajo (to be quiet or to speak very softly).”

390 The trial occurred several years after the actual expedition.

391 Samano testified, “Se acogian a un cerro algo alto y el gobernador mandó al maestre de campo y á Hernando Sarmiento y á otros tres fuesen á requerir viniesen á dar obediencia á S. M. y á él en su real nombre; é idos estos mensajeros, los indios estuvieron tirando flechas y dando grita y haciendo muchos ademanes, aunque un barrio de naguatatos se estaban en sus casas y daban á los [indios] amigos alguna fruta é agua.” Icazbalceta, Colección de documentos para la historia de México Vol. 2, 269.
that during an attack on Tepic, “certain nahuatlatos screamed to us to stay still and not kill them,” implying that these Indigenous people had yelled in Nahuatl.\(^\text{392}\)

Two other witnesses of the Nuño de Guzmán trial also relied on nahuatlato, but they used it to mean Nahuatl translator. An unnamed witness testifies that, outside of Tonalá, “certain nahuatlatos of peace said that the lady of that town had received news of how we traveled...”\(^\text{393}\)

He also mentioned that in the province of Cuina, the veedor and a nahuatlato were sent to accept peace and the suzerainty of the king.\(^\text{394}\) In another part of the trial, an interrogator used nahuatlato to mean Nahuatl translator in his questioning of García del Pilar, leading this Spaniard to use it in the same manner.\(^\text{395}\) The questioner asked that García del Pilar address, “the aforementioned alguaciles and nahuatlatos [of Michoacan], and D. Pedro and D. Alonso,” and García del Pilar responded, “we left there [Michoacan] having taken the aforementioned D. Alonso, D. Pedro, and the nahuatlatos and having tortured them to such an extent that they had to be carried in hammocks.”\(^\text{396}\)

---

\(^{392}\) Samano in Icazbalceta, Colección de documentos para la historia de México Vol. 2, 274.

\(^{393}\) The anonymous witness states, “Después de apaciguado esto se partió para Tonalá, y detúvose en el camino dos días, y llegados a ella salieron ciertos nahuatlatos de paz, diciendo que la señora de aquel pueblo había tenido noticias de cómo íbamos...” Anonymous in Icazbalceta, Colección de documentos para la historia de México Vol. 2, 441.

\(^{394}\) Samano says when speaking about a town in the province of Michoaca that a hostile Indigenous person that was a lengua was able to communicate with a lengua from the expedition.

\(^{395}\) García del Pilar knew Nahuatl and was one of the translators of this expedition. García del Pilar in Colección de documentos para la historia de México, 267.

\(^{396}\) The questioner) asks, “podráse saber de los sobredichos alguaciles é napatatos, é Pedro é D. Alonso;” and García del Pilar (apud Icazbalceta) responds, “partimos de allí llevando al dicho D. Alonso é D. Pedro é nahuatatos presos é atormentados, que no podían ir sino en hamacas.” García del Pilar in Icazbalceta, Colección de documentos para la historia de México Vol. 2, 250.
nahuatlato to refer to intelligible speakers, but the interrogator made him shift the meaning from “speaker of an intelligible language” to “Nahuatl translator.”

The interrogator of García del Pilar suggests that at least some Spanish officials had adopted nahuatlato to refer to a translator by the 1530s, which is also confirmed by the notary Martino de Ibarra who recorded a meeting of several important church officials in Mexico City in 1539. The bishops of Mexico City, Michoacan, and Antequera met together with representatives of the Augustinian, Dominican, and Franciscan orders to compose an official policy for the evangelization of Indigenous people. They decided that, in convents and parishes, some mestizos and the most skilled Indigenous persons that could be found in the schools and convents, those that could read and write Latin, should be nahuatlatos who helped priests and friars to administer the sacraments. This decree represented the recognition and unification of three ongoing communicative processes in New Spain: the acceptance by literate Spaniards that a nahuatlato was a person who could mediate a conversation between a Spanish speaker and a speaker of an Indigenous language; the recognition that Spanish religious institutions needed

397 Terraciano finds that, in La Mixteca, which was predominantly inhabited by speakers of Mixtec, notaries define nahuatlato as Nahuatl translator, or as a translator even when Nahuatl was not involved. He notes that in the Codex Sierra, an alphabetic-pictographic codex, there are three adjoining figures and each has a label: “alcalde mayor,” “notary,” and “nauatlato.” Since the alphabetic text is in Nahuatl, nahuatlato refers to a Nahuatl translator. However, he notes that La Mixteca writers also used nahuatlato to refer to interpreters who did not use Nahuatl because, in a 1541 case from Tlaxiaco, a Laçaro de Aunxal is a “naguatato de lengua española y misteca.” Terraciano, The Mixtecs of Colonial Oaxaca: Ñudzahui History, Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries, 45.

398 They included the bishops of Mexico, Antequera, and Michoacan together with representatives of the Augustinian, Dominican, and Franciscan orders. AGI, Diversos-Colecciones, 43, N.3.

399 The notary Martino de Ibarra wrote, “‘algunos mestisos e Indios de los mas habiles que para ello se hallasen en sus escuelas, colegios e monasterios, que sepan leer y escribir, latin, si posible fuere, y que sean de lenguas, nahuatatos.” AGI, Diversos-Colecciones, 43, N.3.
nahuatlatos; and the desire to teach Indigenous nahuatlalos the Roman alphabet so that they could become literate in Nahuatl. ¹⁴⁰

3.4. Nahuatlalos, Franciscans, and the Mixtón War

Establishing a friar-nahuatlato dyad was the first step toward facilitating religious communication and instruction. The dyad was in place at Etzatlan in 1539, when Fray Cuéllar became the guardian of this town, and Calero assisted him as his nahuatlato, translator. ¹⁴¹ Cuéllar was thus in charge of developing a Franciscan convent and attaching nearby Indigenous towns to its authority, but he required a nahuatlato like Calero to communicate with the Nahuatl speakers of Nahua towns and the nahuatlalos of non-Nahua towns. In fact, the Franciscan chronicler Gerónimo de Mendieta noted that Calero was a lay Franciscan who knew the language of the Indigenous people and had worked with them in the company of Cuéllar while fray Antonio Tello also wrote that Cuéllar had baptized, taught, and promoted the faith with Calero in his company. ¹⁴² Nonetheless, Calero’s background is unknown because, although both Mendieta and Tello wrote of him as a lay brother, neither mentioned Calero’s life before arriving at

---


¹⁴¹ By 1539, Etzatlan was one of the northernmost outposts of Franciscan influence because only El Teul was farther north, and Xalisco was not established until the following year. Calero most likely spoke Nahuatl because it was the predominant lingua franca of Northwestern New Spain and Ciudad Real and several Relaciones Geograficas mention the prevalence of this language in communities close to Etzatlan.

Etzatlan so he could have been mestizo, peninsular, or an Indigenous person. One study proposes that he was a mason from the town of Bollulos de la Mitación in the Iberian Peninsula.\footnote{Mendieta Vol. II, 628, 735-739, 748.} If this were the case, Calero could have also supervised the construction of convent facilities by using Nahuatl to communicate with Indigenous laborers.\footnote{Fray Gerónimo de Mendieta identifies him as, “Fr. Juan Calero, lego que sabía la lengua de los indios y había trabajado mucho con ellos ayudando a su guardián.” Mendieta, 464. Furthermore, Tello remarks that the former had preached, baptized, and taught the faith to many Indigenous people in company of Juan Calero. Tello Vol. II, 358.} What is known is that Cuéllar and Calero worked together for a year and a half in which they began to establish the convent of Etzatlan. However, their work would be stopped by the Mixtón War, when they became two of its casualties.\footnote{I am using Mixtón Confederation to refer to those Indigenous groups who formed an alliance to expel Spaniards and other Europeans from this region.}

Spaniards and their Indigenous allies fought a confederation of native groups in what has come to be known as the Mixtón War, which lasted from 1540 to 1542.\footnote{The name comes from a hill-top that the natives of the Mixtón Confederation used as a fort.} Scholars have attributed different causes to the war. Robert Ricard regarded it as anti-Christian in nature, but Lopez Portillo y Weber and J. H. Parry analyzed it as a response against the exploitative nature of the encomienda and slavery, and Pérez Bustamante emphasized slave-raiding by members of the Nuño de Guzman entrada.\footnote{Yáñez Rosales, Rostro, palabra y memoria indígenas: El Occidente de México: 1524-1816, 72; Pérez Bustamante, 73-74; Ricard, La conquista espiritual de México: Ensayo sobre el apostolado y los métodos misioneros de las órdenes mendicantes en la Nueva España de 1523 a 1572 (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2005), 388-389.} Altman has posited that, “the anti-Christian tenor of the uprising suggests that the rebels associated the Spaniards’ attempts to impose their religion with
their excessive and unbearable demands for labor and tribute.”  She also proposes that the Indigenous groups who opposed the Spaniards gathered others to their cause through tlatols (words/speeches/messages) circulated prior to its outbreak. My study accepts these proposals, and it consults Gerónimo de Mendieta’s martyr accounts of Calero and Cuéllar and a tlahtol from Tlaltenango to argue for the consideration of Indigenous leadership by positing that the Indigenous leaders of the Mixtón Confederation struck at Calero and Cuéllar because they regarded them and their communicative actions as direct threats to their military efforts.

The Nahua Cazcanes (Refer to Chapter 2.3c) were one of the most prominent groups of the Mixtón Confederation, and they were led by leaders who had political and religious duties. In the town of Tlaltenango, the Cazcan elders remembered that, during their pre-Christian times, they did not have a kingdom because they only recognized some capitanejos (chiefs) for their bravery. The term capitanejo means the “subordinate of an Indigenous chief,” but the notary who recorded the voices of the Cazcan elders used it to refer to leaders who exercised their powers during war. Furthermore, the elders added that these capitanejos “worshipped the

---

408 Altman, 218.

409 Altman writes that Cazcan or Zacateca messengers with a tlatol (or message) and arrows wrapped with deerskin served as symbols of liberation and death to Christians. Altman, The War for Mexico’s West: Indians and Spaniards in New Galicia, 1524-1550 (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2010), 142. Tlatol comes from tlatolli (word/words, message/messages), and it is the noun form of the Nahuatl verb ihtoa, speak. Lockhart, Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts, 239. Tlatol without the -li usually represents a possessed form so that the actual word may have been totlatol (our word), or notlatol (my word).

410 Altman proposes, “The main vehicle by which the message of liberation (and death for the Christians) spread was a tlatol (from Nahuatl tlatolli, meaning a statement, although in Nueva Galicia the Spaniards seem to suggest that it was a song or a chant). Altman, The War for Mexico’s West: Indians and Spaniards in Nueva Galicia, 142. Mendieta first mentions the death of Calero and then that of Cuéllar. Mendieta, 464-469.

411 RG of Tlaltenango in Acuña, 145.

412 Diccionario de la Real Academia, http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=capitanejo (consulted on 3/6/2015). Pekka Hämäläinen proposes that the Comanche divided political authority between paraibos (civil leaders) and
devil,” which reveals that these leaders had visible religious duties. In Nochistlan, the Cazcan inhabitants remembered a past leader named Panen who was not obeyed, and they recalled how they selected another named Xavalotl who was given tribute and obeyed. In other words, the Cazcan inhabitants of a town could and did replace leaders. Thus, inhabitants of Cazcan towns like Tlaltenango and Nochistlan were invested in their leaders because they selected them, but they were also owed a certain reciprocity that these leaders reinforced with successful military campaigns, speeches, and religious rituals.

The inhabitants of Tequila had Cazcan neighbors to their east and south and were surrounded to the west and north by Coanos, a people who spoke a variant of Cora and also relied on Nahuatl to speak to Spaniards (Refer to Chapter 2.3f). Little is known about their leadership during the sixteenth century because the most detailed account is from 1673 by the Franciscan Friar Antonio Arias y Saavedra. Arias y Saavedra neglected to write of a Cora priesthood, but instead implied that, before going on a raid, war leaders consulted the Nayari shrine, which had the seated remains of four past rulers, and he adds that many weapons were

---

*mahimiana paraibos* (war leaders), and it is possible that some of the groups in Northwestern New Spain had a similar custom for dividing political power. Hämäläinen, 2008: 273.

^413^ Acuña, 145.

^414^ Acuña, 168-169.

^415^ Fernando de Escobar who was the notary of the RG of Minas de Xocotlan wrote that the province of Minas de Xocotlan was east of two Coano provinces: Tequila the east and the ridgeo of the Xora (or Cora) to the north. Escobar in Acuña, 320. This coincides with Mendieta who wrote that the Indigenous people who had rebelled had gone to the hills of Tequila, which was probably a reference to the hills of the Ridge of the Cora. Mendieta, 464. Escobar also wrote that, in Minas de Xocotlan, the Indigenous inhabitants had their own language, but also used Nahuatl with Spaniards. Escobar in Acuña, 317.
kept nearby. Thus, Cora leadership may have been similar to Cazcan leadership in that military leaders were obligated to consult religious forces on behalf of the community.

Cazcan and Cora military leaders were also political and spiritual leaders whose victories in war empowered them by validating the perception that they possessed divine favor, whereas defeats diminished their influence. These leaders could not help but seeCuéllar and Caler als as threats, especially because both Franciscans were based in Etzatlan, a town that divided the Cazcan territory in half and could serve as a base from which to attack the Cora in El Gran Nayar. Calero and Cuéllar had successfully worked in Etzatlan, Ameca, Tequila, and other nearby communities for a year and a half, and they had even brought some people down from Cazcan and Cora mountain rancherías. Then, shortly before the Mixtón War, Cuéllar was called back to Mexico City and before going, he placed another friar in charge of the convent of Etzatlan because Calero was only a lay Franciscan. Afterwards, the Mixtón War began in 1540, and in 1541 the inhabitants of Tequila went into the adjoining hills to join the Mixtón

416 Arias y Saavedra in Calvo, Colección de documentos para la historia de Nayarit: Los albores de un nuevo mundo, 293-294.

417 Mendieta writes Tecuila, but in Northwestern New Spain, some literate Spaniards and Indigenous people used c to represent q even when it was followed by a u. Mendieta, 464. Tello writes Tequila. Tello, Vol. II, 358-359.

418 Mendieta mentions that Cuéllar had populated Ameca with some Indigenous people that he had brought from the hills. Mendieta, 464. Meanwhile, Tello writes, “También tocaron las llamas del alzamiento referido, á los indios de Tequila y los de Ameca, que eran de una lengua.” Tello, Vol. II, 358. Ameca and Tequila were probably populated by the Nahuatl-speaking Cazcanes because Pedro de Moras writes that, in 1579, Ameca was populated by two groups: Cazcanes and a people that he classified as Totonáques, and he was the notary of the Relación Geográfica de Ameca. Moras in Acuña, 32. Also, Fernando de Escobar writes that Indigenous people from Xocotlan spoke Nahuatl, and that they lived east of the province of Tequila, and he was the notary of the Relación Geográfica de Las Minas de Xocotlan. Escobar in Acuña, 320.

419 Mendieta suggests, “El sacerdote que presidia en la casa no debia de saber la lengua de los indios, por lo cual Fr. Juan [Calero] quien los había doctrinado, viendo la gran ofensa que aquellos sus ahijados hacían á Dios en apostatar de su fe, y recelándose que si no volvían á poblado habían de ser muertos por los españoles ó (á mejor librar) dados por perpetuos esclavos...” Mendieta, 737.
Confederation. Upon learning of this event, Calero asked permission from the Franciscan in charge of Etzatlan to go talk to the people of Tequila to see if he could bring them back through the influence that he had with them.

Mendieta’s martyr account of Calero provides details of what happened in the attack, which appears to have been intended to intimidate. Calero had gained permission to travel to Tequila so he went there, arrived, and implored its inhabitants to return to Christianity, but they told him that they knew what they were doing and that he should return to his convent. Calero left and went on the road with four Indigenous aides when an Indigenous group attacked and killed him together with three of his aides while only the Indigenous person named Francisco escaped. The attackers killed Calero in a very specific way. They struck him with arrows and broke his teeth with their war clubs saying that he would no longer speak to them. Finally, Mendieta adds that, in time, people from El Gran Nayar incorporated Calero’s death into their ritual calendar, parading a statue with his habit every year on the anniversary of his death.

Mendieta wrote about the death of Calero as a Franciscan-biased narrative based on Indigenous perceptions filtered by the testimonies of Francisco and others from Tequila who may have come forward to report this event to Spanish authorities and their notaries. The resulting records then led him to write ambiguities, such as the presence of a female leader, into his narrative suggesting that Indigenous witnesses balanced testimonies between historical truths and falsehoods of exoneration in order to avoid punishment for the killing of Calero. At first,

---

420 Mendieta appears to rely on the testimony of Francisco as well as other Indigenous persons from Tequila. Mendieta, 737-739.

421 Mendieta, “Había algunos días que Fr. Francisco y su compañero sabían cómo los indios que mataron al siervo de Dios Fr. Juan Calero (como arriba queda dicho), llevaron su hábito y con él hicieron una estatua, y que cada año el día que lo mataron, celebraban fiesta en memoria de aquella victoria, que (a su parecer) habían alcanzado en matar un destruidor de sus ídolos.” Mendieta, 756-757.
some Indigenous persons who knew Calero had heard him preach his Christian message in Tequila, but they told him to leave, and then, other Indigenous persons arrive. Here testimonies diverge because “some Indigenous people” said that a woman had instigated Indigenous people from the second group by stating that they would not be men if they did not kill that friar who would deceive and enslave them.422 These Indigenous witnesses and/or the Indigenous woman that they reported thus equated manhood with military proficiency, and this claim is supported by documents about Cazcan and Cora leaders. However, Mendieta clarified that not all witnesses mentioned the woman whom he compared to Jezabel. What is the truth? The two main possibilities are that only some of the witnesses heard the woman’s words, or that some witnesses shifted leadership from a man to a woman to protect themselves or someone they knew.

Meanwhile, Mendieta records that an Indigenous leader was also responsible for the death of Cuéllar, who was in Mexico City when the Mixtón War began.423 Mendieta asserts that Cuéllar returned to Etzatlan during the middle of June (poss: 1541). Some time later, Cuéllar had received orders to travel to Zapotlan, a town southeast of Etzatlan stopping at Ameca because it was depopulated since many inhabitants had gone to join the Mixtón Confederation. However, Cuéllar stayed to talk to those who remained to see if they could persuade others to return to the town, and on August 12, he said mass and baptized many children. That same day, he left with

---

422 The alignment of womanhood with a non-martial posture is also evident in Central Mexico where Tlatelolca writers link Tenochca warriors as being womanly, whereas Tlatelolca warriors were brave. Terraciano, *The Conquest all over Again: Nahuas and Zapotecs Thinking, Writing, and Painting Spanish Colonialism* ed. by Susan Schroeder (Portland, OR: Sussex Academic Press, 2010), 15-40. Perhaps the claim that a woman had incited the pursuing group from Tequila was an attempt to deflect blame, but the quote that, “no serian hombres si no matasen aquel fraile, que allí donde estaban los iba a vender y engañar,” sounds like a portion of a narrative to counter Calero’s message of peace and appeal to Cazcan warrior sensibilities. Mendieta, 738.

423 Mendieta, 740-741.
some Indigenous persons to continue his journey to Zapotlan, but a capitanejo led a group of Amecans who remained hostile. The Amecans placed themselves on a ridge adjacent to the road to Zapotlan along with Yagualuzos, an Indigenous group from the nearby town of Ayahualulco. Both groups followed Cúellar and attacked him and his party. They shot him three times in the face with one arrow entering through his mouth and exiting through the back of his neck, and after he fell, they struck him on the face and all over his body with clubs and rocks.

Witnesses from Ameca created the narrative of the killing of Cuéllar. Even though they presented less ambiguities, they also gave testimonies that resemble the aforementioned killing of Calero. First, they mention an Indigenous leader whose participation fades into the background. They also note how an Indigenous group who had not heard the Franciscan discourse carried out the attack. Finally, they detail how Cuéllar, like Calero, was also attacked in the mouth so that he could no longer proselytize.

These attacks on Calero and Cuéllar appear to have been warnings from the leaders of a Nahua oral culture that recognized how the former’s command of Nahuatl and the latter’s command of nahuatlatos enabled them to speak against the status quo. After all, ihtoa (speak) was a verb that denoted several important concepts such as tlatoani (pl. tlatoque), the ruler of an independent polity, which is attested in “1593a Oconahua,” with the recorded utterance, “we are the tlatoque of [the town of] Oconahuac...we are the tlatoque of [the town of] Çichtic...we are the tlatoque of [the town of] Tepetlauhcan...we are the tlatoque of the town of Xatlatzinco.”***424 Furthermore, the messages that members of the Mixtón Confederacy crafted to oppose the

---

424 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1593a Oconahuac.”
Franciscans and other Spaniards came to be known as *tlatols* (sing. *tlatol*). One extant *tlatol* was directed at the people of Tlaltenango. It begins with a statement that announces the impending arrival of the devil who is named as *tecoroli*. This term appears to represent *tecololi* because *r* is a substitute for *l* in some variants of Nahuatl. Also, *tecoroli* is probably a variant of the better known *tecolotl* (owl) except that the former has an absolutive -*li* suffix while the latter has a -*tl* ending, and for this reason, *tecoroli* may refer to *tlacatecolotl* (man-owl or were-owl), a sorcerer in Nahua beliefs that the Franciscans associated with the Christian devil.

The first records of *tlacatecolotl* precede *tecoroli* by about a decade since the first known appearance of the former was within the *huehuetlatolli* (speeches of the elders) that fray Andrés de Olmos recorded between 1533 and 1539, whereas the latter was recorded on or after 1544.

---

425 I have only found one *tlatol* that has survived. It was addressed to the people of Tlaltenango, a Cazcan town.

426 Pérez Bustamante transcribed the 35th charge against Viceroy Don Antonio de Mendoza, which included the *tlatol* sent to Tlaltenango. The 35th charge accused the viceroy of sending cruel people to Northwestern New Spain that abused the natives to such an extent that the natives rebelled during what later came to be known as the Mixtón War. The charges were raised by Licenciado Tello de Sandoval who had a royal decrees dated to May 13, 1543 in Barcelona and June 26, 1543 in Valladolid to investigate the royal *audiencia* of New Spain and its viceroy. “Los orígenes del gobierno virreinal en las Indias españolas. Dr. C. Pérez Bustamante, Don Antonio de Mendoza: Primer Virrey de la Nueva España (1535-1550)” with a preface by Carlos Pereyra and a preliminary note by Luis Blanco Rivero (Santiago, Spain: Anales de la Universidad de Santiago, 1928), 99, 104, 154-155.

427 Bustamante transcribes the beginning of the *tlatol* as, “nosotros somos mensajeros del diablo el cual se llama *tecoroli* y venimos hacedoras saber como el viene.” It is also possible that Pérez Bustamante transcribed *tecoroli* instead of *tecorotl*, transcribing an “*li*” instead of a “*tl*”. Bustamante, 154.

428 Terraciano writes that the Codex Sierra Texupan, which is in a multilingual region, contains instances in which one or more notaries use non-traditional absolutive suffixes in the Nahuatl words *ylhuitli*, *altepetl*, *cacahuatl*, *yxatli*, *teocuitlatl*, *tlacatl*, *yuwaitl*, *petlatl*, *xihuitl*, *amatl*, *tomatl*, *totoltel*, and *mecatl*, which tend to have -*tl* suffixes in Central Mexico and parts of Northwestern New Spain (Refer to Chapter 4.5c and 4.6). Terraciano, “Parallel Nahuatl and Pictorial Texts in the Mixtec Codex Sierra Texupan” *Ethnohistory* 62: 3 (July 2015), 502.

429 Burkhart also supports Jorge Klor de Alva’s assertion that *tlacatecolotl* is absent from the Colloquios, and she writes that it does not appear in two religious dramas, *Juicio Final* and *Sacrificio de Isaac*, that were allegedly written in the 1530s. Burkhart, *The Slippery Earth: Nahua-Christian Moral Dialogue in Sixteenth Century Mexico* (Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press, 1989), 204. Bustamante asserts that Tello de Sandoval wrote a letter to Prince Philip on September 19, 1544 in which he mentioned writing an account of the state of the viceroyalty in order to attack the tenure of Viceroy Mendoza. Bustamante, 103. J.H. Parry writes that the *visita* to
The Franciscans showed a particular millenial zeal, and the authors of the Tlaltenango tlatol responded in kind.\(^{430}\) This tlatol does not mention the Franciscans by name, but it twice names its opponents as friars, and it promises that tecoroli is coming to resurrect Indigenous ancestors whom the friars had condemned to damnation in sermons, and also that female elders would regain their youth and be able to conceive again.\(^{431}\) With this response, the tlatol transfers the powers of resurrection and youth that Franciscans attributed to God and gives them to tecoroli, the devil. Resurrection and everlasting life represent God’s most important promises, but in this tlatol they belonged to tecoroli. In the Book of Job, God rejuvenates Job after his tribulations and enables him to create a family that was in all ways better than his previous one, but the author of the tlatol subverts this action by presenting it as a reward of tecoroli.

The Tlaltenango tlatol also attacks the sacrament of monogamous marriage and the Franciscan role in its propagation among peoples who practiced polygamy, the custom of having more than one wife at a time. The tlatol tells its audience that those who believe in tecoroli and renounce the teachings of the friars will have all the women they want, and not just one as demanded by the friars, and that those who were happy with one partner would die. Clearly, this passage implies that Franciscan efforts to promote the sacrament of monogamous matrimony disrupted families to a great extent if leaders would include it in a tlatol. After all, the Nahua chronicler Antón Muñón Chimalpahin mentions that the Franciscans began to enforce

---


\(^{431}\) The Franciscan writer of “1626 San Francisco Chapala” specifically mentions the damnation of their ancestors.
monogamous matrimony in 1529, and Quetzalmazatzin, the ruler of Tlalmanalco abandoned all his wives despite having children with them to marry his sister-in-law.432

The tlatol of Tlatenango and Mendieta’s martyr narratives also correspond in that they promoted gendered messages directed primarily at men. The former promised that those who abandoned the teachings of the Franciscans would receive masculine objects and status symbols such as bows and arrows that would never break, fields that would produce without labor or rain, jewels for the nose and arms, and as many wives as they wanted. Its promises to women were less well thought-out: food that would cook on its own and the ability to have children until old age. The martyr narrative of Calero conveyed a message that challenges the men’s masculinity in the speech of the female leader who shamed the men from Tequila in order to encourage them to kill Calero. These accounts thus demonstrate that leaders from the Mixtón Confederation felt threatened by the oral power commanded by the Franciscan-Nahuatlato dyad, whose Franciscan message encouraged others to abandon their masculine martial practices in favor of the more peaceful Christian God.

432 Domingo Francisco de San Antón Chimalpahin Cuautlehuantzin gives a clear example of this disruption in Central Mexico from 1529 when the Franciscans implemented the sacrament of marriage. Rafael Tena translates Chimalpahin’s words as, “Y cuando los doce religiosos de San Francisco los obligaron a dejar sus mujeres, al comenzar el santo sacramento del matrimonio, aunque con todas ellas tenía hijos el tlatoani Quetzalmazatzin, a todas las dejó y [.teniendo que escoger,] su corazón se inclinó por su cuñada doña Catalina Chimalmantzin, la señora de Tlalmanalco Chalco, para desposarla en el santo sacramento; ésta había sido esposa del hermano mayor de Quetzalmazatzin...el cual no alcanzó a bautisarse pues murió en el tiempo de su gentilidad.” Tena in Chimalpahin, Las ocho relaciones y el memorial de Colhuacan Vol. II (Mexico City: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, 1998), 175. The original Nahuatl is, “Auh yn ihcuac yn ye motechiuacahualtilia matlactin omomentin teopixque S Fran[cis]co ynic yancuican peuh teoyotica sacramentonica nenamictiliz, macihui mochintin quinquilluati tlahtohuani Quetzalmaçatzin yece çan quincauh mochintin, amo quinnec, ceme quinmonamictiz teoyotica, çan quincauh mochintin auh çan yehuatzin huel oquinec oytch huetz yn iyollo yn omoteneuh y huel yhuelpoltzin ynic teoyotica sacramentonica quimonamictiz yn itocatzin doña Catalina Chimalmantzin yn Tlalmanalco Chalco cihuapilli; y icihuauh ocatca y yachcauhxizin Quetzalmaçatzin yn itoca Huehueyotzintli yn amo mocuaatequitiu y nc tlateotoquilizpan omomiquilli.” Chimalpahin, 174.
The Mixtón Confederation had threatened Spanish settlements such as Compostela and Guadalajara until Viceroy Mendoza arrived commanding a large force recruited from other parts of New Spain. Mendoza’s army included hundreds of Spaniards and thousands of Nahuas from Central Mexico and Michoacan who marched with the Viceroy to attack the forces of the leaders of the Mixtón Confederation. The latter fortified themselves in the peñoles (hill tops) of Northwestern New Spain, but one by one these places were conquered until mid-December 1541, when the peñol of El Mixtón fell, which signalled the end of the Mixtón War.\footnote{Altman, \textit{The War for Mexico’s West: Indians and Spaniards in New Galicia}, 178.}

### 3.5. Franciscan Convents and Indigenous Towns

By 1542, the Franciscans had ten convents in Northwestern New Spain, but their further expansion would be affected by three events: the Epidemic of 1545-1548, the exploitation of silver in Zacatecas, and the continued resistance of Indigenous groups who lived in the cold lands.\footnote{Refugio de la Torre (e-mail: February 25, 2015) posits eight convents by 1540: Ajijic (1531), Tetlán (1531), Zapotlán (1532), Poncitlán (1533-1534), Etzatlán (1534), Tuxpan (1536), El Teul (1536), and Xalisco (1540). Also, Ricard writes that Autlán and Juchipila were established in 1542. Ricard, 144.}

Scholars have not reached a consensus on the type of epidemic that began in Central Mexico and struck Northwestern New Spain for three years (1545-1548).\footnote{Chimalpahin writes that, in Central Mexico, nobles and commoners died from a disease that caused bleeding from the mouth, the eyes, the nose, and the anus. He also explained that so many people died that dogs and coyotes were eating corpses in Chalco. Chimalpahin, 201-203. Reff (1991: 115) posits that this epidemic consisted of typhus, a series of diseases spread by lice, fleas, and ticks.} In 1546, an Indigenous person led Juan de Tolosa to a mountain that held an enormous quantity of silver in a region that became known as Zacatecas.\footnote{Peter Bakewell \textit{Silver Mining and Colonial Society in Mexico, Zacatecas 1546-1700}; Dana Velasco-Murillo, “Urban Indians in a Silver City, Zacatecas, Mexico, 1546-1806.”}

Many Spanish residents from Northwestern New
Spain began to migrate there to develop reales de minas and to build the city of Zacatecas, which for a time, became the second largest city in New Spain after Mexico City. Furthermore, male Indigenous persons from Northwestern New Spain also began to travel regularly to Zacatecas and beyond in search of wage labor.\textsuperscript{437} However, some native groups continued to hamper communication with and travel to Zacatecas until at least 1590.\textsuperscript{438} Therefore, these three events and their consequences led to both permanent and periodic depopulation in Northwestern New Spain as male Indigenous people and, to a lesser degree, Europeans migrated to Zacatecas and its environs.

In this depopulated Northwestern New Spain, Franciscan-Nahuatlato dyads could and did create intellectual and tributary networks among themselves, the Indigenous settlers who remained, and Europeans in settlements like Guadalajara, Compostela, and Acaponeta. One of the clearest examples was an hospital, hospital/hospice, network dedicated to Mary of the Immaculate Conception.\textsuperscript{439} The Epidemic of 1545-1548 had killed thousands by its third year, and to counteract it in Northwestern New Spain, chroniclers suggest that the Franciscans began to build hospitales dedicated to Mary of the Immaculate Conception; Ciudad Real explains in

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{438} Powell refers to this conflict as the Chichimeca War. Furthermore, he also posits that this war began the long history of the presidio, stock ranch, and mission as basic frontier institutions, accompanied by the Spanish-Indigenous establishment of defensive towns and the organization of a settler-soldier cavalry that characterized this and all other advances into the continent. Powell, \textit{Soldiers, Indians, and Silver: North America’s First Frontier War}, vii-viii.

\textsuperscript{439} I have italicized hospital to make it known that I am using the Spanish version, which is spelled like the English version, but which refers to a hospital/hospice building in which Indigenous people cared for the sick, and Franciscan friars administered Catholic sacraments to convalescing or dying patients, and which may have also served as a inns for travelers.
\end{footnotesize}
1587 that each town with a Franciscan or Augustinian convent had a *hospital* and a *cofradía* dedicated to Mary of the Immaculate Conception; Mota y Escobar writes that Indigenous towns generally had an *hospital* and a *casa de comunidad*.\footnote{Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 68; Mota y Escobar, 36.} The *casa de comunidad* was usually the cabildo meeting place, but it may have also served as the site of the *cofradía* of Mary of the Immaculate Conception, the funding arm of the *hospital*. Thus, the most important Indigenous towns came to have at least three civic spaces: the Franciscan or Augustinian convent, the *hospital* of the Immaculate Conception, and the *cofradía* of the Immaculate Conception.

In 1548, the Franciscans had convents in twelve Indigenous towns. These were probably the first to construct accompanying *hospitales* and *cofradías*.\footnote{Refugio de la Torre (e-mail: February 25) posits eight convents by 1540: Ajijic (1531), Tetlán (1531), Zapotlán (1532), Poncitlán (1533-1534), Etzatlán (1534), Tuxpan (1536), El Teul (1536), and Xalisco (1540). Also, Ricard writes that Autlan and Juchipila were established in 1542, Amacueca in 1547, and Chapala in 1548. \textit{Ricard}, 144.} Franciscans made the convent their space in which they had their living quarters, the church, and an orchard that probably also served as a contemplative space.\footnote{Ciudad Real almost always mentioned the orchard when describing a given Franciscan convent. Ciudad Real, Vol. II.} The Indigenous people dominated the *cofradía* because this type of organization was always run by lay people who kept dues and other income within a lockbox situated in the *casa de comunidad*, or *cabildo-cofradía* building.\footnote{Mota y Escobar, 36.} Meanwhile, the *hospital* had to be a shared space where Franciscans took care of the spiritual needs of the sick through the administration of the sacraments, such as confession and the unction of the sick, while Indigenous persons looked after the physical care of patients. The Franciscans were not doctors, but by establishing the *hospital* they founded place to care for the physical and spiritual...
well-being of Indigenous people and some Europeans because in this institution they could care for the sick, shelter travelers, and administer the sacraments.444

However, the Franciscans needed a source of labor to help them perform the many physical duties required by tending to the sick so they relied on the flexible cofradía, an organization of lay people, and on extant labor practices in the Indigenous towns of Northwestern New Spain. Fray Tello explained that the Franciscans required that Indigenous men and women from each neighborhood work each week in service to the sick at the hospital.445 This requirement suggests that the Franciscans relied on the rotational labor mechanisms of the colonial altepetl and its neighborhoods which were known as tlaxilacalli. In Central Mexico the altepetl was made up of generally four or eight constituent parts known as tlaxilacalli that were not hierarchical but cellular in nature and each of these tlaxilacalli rotated supervisory and labor duties in a fixed manner.446 For example, Tlaxcala had four constituent parts (Tizatlán (1), Quiahuixtlan (2), Tepetícpac (3), and Ocotelulco (4)) and their residents rotated the two-year office of governador in a consistent manner from 1545-1614: 1 → 2 → 3 → 4 → 1 → 2 → 3 → 4 → etc.447 The rotational order also manifested itself in the duties that the

---

444 Robert Ricard, 15, 259.


446 Lockhart writes that the Nahua created larger constructs based, “on a series of relatively equal, relatively separate and self-contained constituent parts of the whole,” and adds that these were known as tlaxilacalli during the colonial period. Lockhart, The Nahuas After the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth Through Eighteenth Centuries, 15. Pedro Carrasco describes this cellular nature by stating that altepetl were, “always, and at different levels of organization, aggregates of groups that were both territorial divisions and corporate bodies, whose leaders formed the ruling strata.” Carrasco, “Social Organization of Ancient Mexico” in Handbook of Middle American Indians 10 ed. by R. Wauchope, G. F. Ekholm, and I Bernal (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1971).

447 Gibson, Tlaxcala in the Sixteenth Century, 105-106.
residents of each *tlaxilacalli* performed for the *tlatoani*, the hereditary ruler of the *altepetl*. These residents had leaders who led them when they worked, fought, and performed religious ceremonies. *Altepetl* in Central Mexico were, “always, and at different levels of organization, aggregates of groups that were both territorial divisions and corporate bodies, whose leaders formed the ruling strata.”

Less is known about the *altepetl* and *tlaxilacalli* in Northwestern New Spain, but several writers have identified one or both of these entities in this region. The notary of the *Relación geográfica de Ameca* wrote in 1579 that, before the arrival of Europeans, the residents of Ameca had an order that prisoners taken in war be divided among the *tlaxilacalli*, and while there, the prisoners where to be fed by the *tequitlatoque* (tribute overseers) for forty to fifty days to prepare them for sacrifice. Furthermore, in 1674, Friar Antonio Arias y Saavedra described El Gran Nayar as a region of four “*tlahuilanalis,*” a term related to *tlaxilacalli*, and many notaries from nearby towns—San Antonio Quihuiquinta, San Sebastian Guaxicori, and Xalisco—also used *tlahuilanal*, suggesting that this term was a regional feature concentrated in the northwest of Northwestern New Spain. Finally, notaries in thirty documents from this study named the

---


449 Friedrich Katz proposed that the rulers of the Aztec Empire relied on the *calpulli* (known in some regions as *tlaxilacalli* and others as *chinamitl*) as military and tributary unit. He also suggested that each *calpulli* was a social unit because it had certain physical structures within its boundaries such as a temple dedicated to a specific god and a school for teaching youths (*telpochcalli*), and its residents prepared feasts for a fellow resident that had reached an important milestones such as the capture of a prisoner for the first time. Katz, “Situación social y económica de los aztecas durante los siglos XV y XVI” (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma de México, 1966), 10-11.

450 Carrasico, 360.


452 The notaries of “1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta,” “1652b San Sebastian Guaxicori,” “1593a Xalisco,” and “1593b Xalisco,” used *tlahuilanal* in their documents. BPEJ-JJA, Fondo Franciscano, Volumen 14, Numero 146.
polity that they were representing as an *altepetl* and those in “1679 Sayula” and “1649 San Francisco Ayahualulco” also relied on *tlaxilacalli* to describe the petitioning town.

The *altepetl* was thus very present in Northwestern New Spain, and its mechanisms coincided with how Fray Tello described the functioning of the *hospital*. First, Indigenous people gave alms. Second, the women whose turn it was to aid the sick were asked to make those things specific to their community (i.e. cotton cloaks) during their free time. Third, Indigenous people harvested crops a day or two specifically for the *hospital*; some plants were kept for the infirmary, and others were sold. Here, the Nahuas were experts, and they would have been guided by their *tequitlatoque* because this was one of the types of labor that they had performed before the arrival of Europeans. Fourth, the Franciscans encouraged the Nahuas to raise *ganado mayor* (cattle and horses) and *ganado menor* (sheep, goats, pigs) whose products would be sold for funds. There was a specific division of labor among the Nahuas in which men performed work outside the home, whereas women worked within and around the home, so although Tello did not always comment on the gender of the Indigenous people, men probably worked outside of the *hospital* harvesting crops and raising *ganado* while women took care of the sick and wove garments of cotton and agave to sell.

---

1074; Thomas Calvo, 287. Lockhart defines *tlahuilānalli* as, “something dragged along, often in possessed form, meaning the dependency of something, especially of an indigenous municipality; a patientive noun from *huilāna*, to drag. Lockhart, *Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts*, 236.


454 Stephanie Wood describe this gendered division of labor in Central Mexico in “Matters of Life and Death: Nahuatl Testaments of Rural Women, 1589-1801” and Susan Kellogg proposes parallel feminine and masculine spheres of responsibilities that included labor in “From Parallel and Equivalent to Separate and Unequal: Tenochca Women 1500-1700.”
Men and women also performed religious duties for the hospital according to fray Tello. They sang in a choir at dawn and at dusk, and on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, they sang for the dead accompanied by tolling bells. Also, since the hospital was dedicated to the Immaculate Conception, each Saturday, Indigenous people placed her statue on a litter and adorned it with flowers. Then, four Indigenous people carried the litter around the community while others followed in procession.

These different work parties required supervision that was largely indigenous because the few Franciscans that lived in a given convent had to administer many duties within the cabecera and in nearby towns that were often a ridge or two away. They might also have to rely on a nahuatlato if they did not speak the local language, so that neither one of these officials could supervise the working parties required by the hospital and local Indigenous people had to take on these leadership duties. The cofradías and hospitales of the Immaculate Conception apparently had at least three types of officials: a mayordomo, a prioste, and several tenantzitzihuan (sing. tenantzin). The male mayordomo kept one of the keys to the lock box in which the money that the cofradía containing the dues that members paid and from agriculture and herding activities performed by the people of the town. The male prioste appears to have helped the mayordomo administer the money because his name regularly appears alongside the mayordomo’s at the end of many of the petitions in this study, and it always appears alongside the mayordomo’s in

---


456 Ciudad Real mentioned that, apart from alms, the hospitales kept goats and sheep and relied on the income from selling cheese and wool from these animals. Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 68. The amount of money could be substantial because Mota y Escobar noted that hospitales relied on sheep herds and alms and added that some were so rich that they spent these income from this property on people that were not sick. Mota y Escobar, 36.
Memorias de limosnas and Memorias de gastos, record books of how cofradía alms and property were managed.  

Jonathan Truitt examined the 1552 constitution of the cofradía of San Josef de los Naturales in Mexico City, and he writes that four cihuateopixqui (women in charge of people) were appointed along with four male deputies in this cofradía. Cofradías in Northwestern New Spain also had supervisory roles for women. San Josef de los Naturales was a very large cofradía in Mexico City that required four deputies, but in the towns of Northwestern New Spain, the prioste and the mayordomo may have supervised male labor details sent from the tlaxilacalli, which was had to provide labor for a given week. Meanwhile, two petitions and one addenda name female supervisors as either tenantzin (singular, Nahuatl), tenantzitzihuan (plural, Nahuatl), or capitanas (plural, Spanish). Tenantzin literally means mother to everyone because it has the te- indefinite possessive pronoun together with nan (mother) and -tzin (reverential); in one modern variant of Nahuatl, it means “grandmother.” Also, in “1622 La Magdalena,” the notary named the petitioner as a tenantzin and remarked that the tenantzitzihuan worked in the hospital and were afraid of the alguacil mayor of this town. The notary also mentioned that the prioste had helped the petitioner with her complaint most likely by writing it for her.

---

457 A large number of these are in the Historic Archive of the Archbishopric of Guadalajara from the 1670s and 1680s.

458 Jonathan Truitt, “Courting Catholicism: Nahua Women and the Catholic Church in Colonial Mexico City” Ethnohistory 57:3 (Summer 2010), 416.

459 Lockhart writes that it is an indefinite personal possessive prefix and adds that te- is added to kinship terms, which must always be possessed. Lockhart, Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts, 27, 232. Ofelia Morales is a native speaker of Huasteca Nahuatl and she defines tenantzin as abuela (Skype conversation in 2013).

460 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1622 La Magdalena.”

461 I argue that the prioste recorded her petition.
Furthermore, the translator of this petition described that María Magdalena was a *tenantzin*, one of the *mayordomos* elected by the people of La Magdalena. In “1653 Amatitlan,” the notary included *tenantzitzihuan-capitanas* alongside a *mayordomo*, a *prioste*, and a *fiscal* as the parties involved in this petition. Once again, the notary mentioned several *tenantzitzihuan* so that it was an office with several officials. The words *mayordomo*, *capitana*, and *abuela* thus suggest that the *tenantzitzihuan* in La Magdalena and Amatitlan held supervisory positions in these towns, where they probably oversaw the women from the *tlaxilacalli* that performed labor for a given week. As a result, they were probably very similar to the four *cihuateopixque*, women in charge of people, that Truitt found in the *cofradía* of San Josef de los Naturales in Mexico City.\footnote{In the lay sodality of San Josef de los Naturales in Mexico City, four *cihuateopixqui* were appointed along with four male deputies in this *cofradía*. Truitt, 416.}

In Northwestern New Spain, the *cofradía-hospital* of the Immaculate Conception thus represented a Franciscan addition to the Indigenous *altepetl*, which continued to survive despite the continuing depopulation after the Mixtón War. However, the Franciscans added another layer when they began to teach the male children of the Indigenous nobility to speak, read, and write in Nahuatl with the Roman alphabet to prepare Christian leaders who could serve as *nahuatlato*, *mayordomo*, *prioste*, and also as *alcaldes* and *regidores* of Indigenous communities. Women were excluded from this education. This fact is reflected in the production of the Indigenous documents in this study: of the sixty-three documents that Indigenous writers wrote, only one focuses on a woman, the aforementioned *tenantzin* María Magdalena, and it was likely written by a male *prioste*.

Literary training must have occurred concurrently with the building of *cofradía-hospitales*. In 1550, the friar Rodrigo de la Cruz who was stationed in the convent of
Ahuacatlan, wrote to Carlos V that the Franciscans had already founded schools to teach children how to read, write, count, and recite the prayer of the Virgin Mary that was known as the *horas de Nuestra Señora*.\textsuperscript{463} In other words, by the time Rodrigo de la Cruz wrote, Indigenous students were already learning how to read and write with the Roman alphabet.

Then, on November 8, 1569, the Franciscan friars Alonso de Peraleja, Antonio de Corte
gana, Juan de Villa Robredo, Cristobal Villoldo, and Francisco de Lorança signed a letter in which they described more intensive Franciscan efforts to educate the Indigenous people of Northwestern New Spain.\textsuperscript{464} Fray Alonso de Peraleja was the author of this letter, and he mentioned fourteen convents (Table 3-1) which served as centers of Catholic life in a region close to Guadalajara.\textsuperscript{465} He also explained that the Franciscans faced a daunting task because people in the region spoke a variety of languages (Refer to Chapter 2.3b to 2.3e and 2.4).

\textsuperscript{463} Ricard, 183.

\textsuperscript{464} Fray Alonso de Peraleja addressed this letter to two people, the *provisor* and the treasurer, of the diocese of Guadalajara because the bishop had recently died. This letter was in response to a royal edict ordering that the bishop be provided information about the secular and regular clergy of Northwestern New Spain. Peraleja in *Codice Franciscano* ed. by Joaquín García Icazbalceta (Mexico City: Editorial Salvador Chávez Hayhoe, 1941), 151.

\textsuperscript{465} Table 3-1 was created by information provided by Peraleja in his letter to the king. The first column has the name of the town; the second has the number of religious officials, which are friars and lay brothers, assistants who have not take a religious vow. The third column presents the availability of Christian individuals who knew at least some Nahuatl. For a friar, I have written whether he could take confessions and/or preach since the ability to do the former suggests low competency, whereas the ability to do both suggests high competency, or even fluency. I also present whether a *nahuatlato*, who was possibly a lay brother, lived there to show that Nahuatl communication occurred through an intermediary. The last column shows population being noted by individuals, *Indios* (Indigenous people), or by heads of household, *tributarios*. Peraleja in *Codice Franciscano*, 152-153. Yañéz Rosales uses this letter for Chapter 1 of *Guerra Espiritual y Resistencia Indígena: El Discurso de Evangelización en el Obispado de Guadalajara, 1541-1765*.” In Chapter 1, she posits that the regular clergy focused on Indigenous evangelization and the secular clergy focused on Spaniards in the diocese of Guadalajara, whose boundaries represent those of Northwestern New Spain. Yañéz Rosales, *Guerra Espiritual y Resistencia Indígena: El Discurso de Evangelización en el Obispado de Guadalajara, 1541-1765*.
Table 3-1: Franciscan Convents, Nahuatl-Speaking Clergy, and Indigenous Subordinates in 1569

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convent location</th>
<th>Religious officials</th>
<th>Proficiency with Nahuatl</th>
<th>Indigenous population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahuacatlan</td>
<td>1 friar</td>
<td>1 friar preaches and takes confessions</td>
<td>1200 Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajijic</td>
<td>1 friar</td>
<td>1 friar preaches and takes confessions</td>
<td>1000 Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atoyac</td>
<td>1 friar</td>
<td>1 friar preaches and takes confessions</td>
<td>1600 Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autlan</td>
<td>1 friar</td>
<td>1 nahuatlato</td>
<td>1000 Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coculan</td>
<td>1 friar and 1 lay brother</td>
<td>1 friar learns the language.</td>
<td>700 Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etzatlan</td>
<td>1 friar and 1 lay brother</td>
<td>1 friar preaches and takes confessions</td>
<td>1000 Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>5 friars</td>
<td>2 friars preach and take confessions</td>
<td>700 Tributaries [Indigenous people]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaculco [Zacoalco]</td>
<td>1 friar</td>
<td>1 friar preaches and takes confessions</td>
<td>1000 [Indigenous people]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaulan [Zayula]</td>
<td>1 friar</td>
<td>1 friar preaches and takes confessions</td>
<td>1500 Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juchipila</td>
<td>1 friar</td>
<td>1 friar preaches and takes confessions</td>
<td>1000 Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nombre de Dios</td>
<td>1 friars; 1 nahuatlato</td>
<td>1 friar takes confessions</td>
<td>300 Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xalisco</td>
<td>3 friars</td>
<td>1 preaches and takes confessions</td>
<td>No figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaxomulco</td>
<td>1 friar; 1 lay brother</td>
<td>1 friar learns the language (Coca/Tecuexe/Nahuatl?)</td>
<td>1300 Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>2 friars; 1 lay brother</td>
<td>1 friar preaches and takes confessions</td>
<td>500 Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fray Alonso de Peraleja also gave some basic information with which to reconstruct how Franciscans and *nahuatlatos* divided the teaching of Nahuatl and Roman alphabetic literacy. Every convent had at least one ordained Franciscan, and those of Coculan, Etzatlan, Tlaxomulco, and Izaculco because the friars who co-signed this letter were in charge of these convents. Peraleja was *guardián* of the convent of San Francisco in Guadalajara, Fray Antonio Cortegana was *guardián* of the convent of Etzatlan, Fray Juan de Villa Robredo was *guardián* of the convent of Ahuacatlan, Fray Cristobal Villoldo was *guardián* of the convent of Izaculco, and Fray Francisco de Lorança was *guardián* of the convent of Izaulan. Peraleja in *Codice Franciscano*, 152-153.

---

466 The most accurate information concerned the convents of Guadalajara, Etzatlan, Ahuacatlan, Izaculco, and Izaulan because the friars who co-signed this letter were in charge of these convents. Peraleja was *guardián* of the convent of San Francisco in Guadalajara, Fray Antonio Cortegana was *guardián* of the convent of Etzatlan, Fray Juan de Villa Robredo was *guardián* of the convent of Ahuacatlan, Fray Cristobal Villoldo was *guardián* of the convent of Izaculco, and Fray Francisco de Lorança was *guardián* of the convent of Izaulan. Peraleja in *Codice Franciscano*, 152-153.

467 I agree with Yáñez Rosales who proposes that Izaculco refers to Zacoalco and Izaulan refers to Sayula. Izaulan appears to be harder to reconstruct, but in “n.y. Sayula,” the notary identifies this town as Çayolan, which is probably Izaulan. Yáñez Rosales, *Guerra espiritual y resistencia Indígena: El discurso de evangelización en el obispado de Guadalajara, 1541-1765*, 39.
and Zacatecas also had lay brothers to assist them who, like Calero, may have been chosen for their language skills. Some of the friars in many of these convents also had impressive language skills because eleven could teach and hear confession, which meant that they could not only understand spoken Nahuatl in the confessional but could also create sermons in this language.\textsuperscript{468} Their competence is difficult to measure, but it was probably not at the level of Fray Alonso de Molina, Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, or native speakers of Nahuatl. Some probably wrote their sermons beforehand. The friars of Coculán and Tlaxomulco were probably learning an Indigenous language, which is why they could only take confessions (Table 3-3). In other words, they were probably studying with \textit{nahuatlato}s and were also learning in the confessional space, where they listened to the Nahuatl of penitents while possibly also consulting one of the early \textit{Artes de lenguas y confessionarios} of Nahuatl.

The situations in Autlan and Xalisco represented extremes. In Autlan, the friar who ministered to the Spaniards relied on a \textit{nahuatlato} to translate his sermons for the one thousand Indigenous people in his jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{469} In Xalisco all three friars probably spoke Nahuatl because, although the native language was Huichol (Refer to Chapter 2.3h), the town had more than a few \textit{nahuatlato}s. As a result, one friar preached and took confessions in Nahuatl and relied on a \textit{nahuatlato} to translate his words into Huichol. Furthermore, there were two other friars in a region that Alonso de Peraleja classified as the interior, which most likely corresponded to El Gran Nayar, a Cora-speaking region (Refer to Chapter 2.3f, 2).\textsuperscript{470} As a result,

\textsuperscript{468} I do not know of any sermons that have survived in Central Mexico, but Friar Francisco de Torres authored a sermon-like work, “1626 San Francisco Chapalac by Francisco de Torres,” as an admonishment of the behavior of the nobles of Chapalac in an imperfect Nahuatl (Refer to Chapter 4.2d).

\textsuperscript{469} Peraleja in \textit{Codice Franciscano}, 152.

\textsuperscript{470} Peraleja in \textit{Codice Franciscano}, 152.
the two friars most likely had to use Nahuatl to proselytize while relying on nahuatlatos who spoke Cora and Nahuatl to translate their words.\footnote{The Franciscans did not devote the same resources to decoding Cora or Huichol. While, Franciscans wrote many Artes de lenguas for Nahuatl, the only known arte de lengua for Cora was written by the Jesuit José de Ortega in 1732, and none are known for Huichol, but AHAG has a Huichol word list that appears to be from the nineteenth century. AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.}

Nevertheless, Fray Alonso de Peraleja also wrote that the friars within these convents had very little to do because “few of these Indigenous people were nauales to confess themselves or receive the sacraments.”\footnote{Codice Franciscano, 153; Yáñez Rosales, Guerra espiritual y resistencia Indígena, 39.} By this, he probably meant that only native Nahuatl speakers and nahuatlatos confessed themselves, but he then qualified this statement by explaining what the Franciscans and nahuatlatos had done to expand knowledge of Nahuatl.\footnote{Peraleja mentioned that Nahuatl was the most “general” language in the region and that Tarascan was the general region in the adjacent area of Michoacan. Peraleja in Codice Franciscano, 153.} He explained that on Sundays, he and other Franciscans taught Indigenous people the prayers, recitations, and laws of Catholic doctrine in Latin and Nahuatl and followed this with a sermon (ostensibly in Nahuatl). He also mentioned that they relied on Indigenous teachers to teach teenage boys how to read, write, count, and play instruments. He did not specify the language in which the boys were taught, but judging by his previous statement, the Indigenous teachers clearly taught in Nahuatl.

As a result, the Franciscan-Nahuatlato dyad expanded the knowledge of policía cristiana and Nahuatl in Northwestern New Spain among people who were not necessarily native speakers of this language. According to Fray Alonso de Peraleja, few Indigenous people were “nauales” (Nahuatl speakers) in 1569, but ten to fifteen years later, the notaries of the Relaciones Geográficas and Ciudad Real frequently mentioned how Nahuatl was common throughout Northwestern New Spain. In Ameca, the notary of its Relacion Geográfica noted that the
Cazcanes and Totonacs who inhabited this town spoke their own languages, and that many of them were *ladino* in Nahuatl.\footnote{The notary writes, “Y los cazcanes y totonaques, aunque hablan entre ellos estas lenguas, todos ellos generalmente habla la lengua mexicana, y son muy ladinos en ella.” Acuña, 132. In this context, *ladino* appears to mean that they spoke it as a second language (herafter L2). García examined the Relación of Antonio Ruiz and proposes that this European writer used *ladino en mexicano* to mean educated in Nahuatl. García, “Where Bilingualism Mattered: Nahuatl on the Western and Northern Frontiers of New Spain,” 20-21.} In Amula, the notary likewise remarked that the people in this region knew a language that he referred to as *Otomita*, but that many of them also spoke Nahuatl.\footnote{Acuña, 60.} In Compostela, the notary identified one native language as Tecoxquin and also remarked that Nahuatl was also widely used.\footnote{Acuña, 89.} Also, some of the Franciscan-educated *nahuatlatis* may have gone over to the hostile to Spaniard cold lands west of Zacatecas because the notary of the Mines of Fresnillo remarked that by 1585, almost all of the Indigenous inhabitants spoke Nahuatl even though they also spoke a variety of languages.\footnote{Juan Huidobro wrote in 1585, “Entre estos indios *chichimecos* hay muchas diferencias de lengua, pero, en general el día de hoy casi todos estos saltadores hablan la *mexicana* la cual es la mas general.” Huidobro in Acuña, 122.}

Some of these *nahuatlatis* became notaries whose works from the second half of the sixteenth century have survived. In 1557, a notary wrote a document in Tuxpan.\footnote{Yáñez Rosales, *Y paño altepetl monotza San Antonio de Padua Tlaxomulco/En el pueblo que se llama San Antonio de Padua Tlaxomulco*, 204.} From 1571-1573, several notaries from Xalisco wrote notarial records in which they listed the amount of alms collected in the predominantly Huichol town of Xalisco, and these or other notaries wrote a number of documents in 1593, 1594, and 1595.\footnote{In *Xalisco, la voz de un pueblo en el siglo XVI*, Eustaquio Celestino, Magdalena Gomez, Ricardo Xochitemol, Thomas Calvo, and Jean Meyer transcribe, translate, and analyze a series of documents from Xalisco that are housed in the Franciscan Collection of BPEJ-JJA, but this collection also has three *memorias*, records of
de Dios wrote several documents in which they identified the inhabitants of this town as Mexica. In 1580, two different notaries wrote documents for Nochistlan, and at least three different notaries wrote documents for Oconahuac in 1593 (Chapter 1.6). These and other notaries created documents that record an Indigenous perspective of how literacy spread in Northwestern New Spain during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

3.6. Reading, Writing, Signing, and Marking

The examination of how the Franciscan-Nahuatlato dyad spread Nahuatl and Roman alphabetic literacy in Northwestern New Spain can benefit from the use of sociolinguistic and historical methodologies since the topic represents the relationship between a society, “a group of people who are drawn together for a certain purpose or purposes,” and a language, “what the members of a particular society speak.” However, such an examination has the added complication that the writers cannot be consulted because they died and their colonial society no longer exists. The lack of living consultants and the reliance on the written word will result in an investigation that is somewhat less reliable than a sociolinguistic investigation, which is focused on

---

480 Barlow and George T. Smisor propose that a batch of these documents were written in 1563, but I propose 1585 instead (Refer to Chapter 5.2a). Barlow and Smisor, xvii.


on the present, but it will fit within the nascent field of historical sociolinguistics, which seeks to analyze the words of past writers to answer questions about literacy, dialect usage, and dialect imposition. These are very relevant topics for understanding how correspondence communities adopted writing technologies.

Literacy exists on two levels—reading and writing—so that a person could be very competent on the first level while having only some practice on the second. Writing competence is easiest to measure. In Northwestern New Spain, writing required the use of a feathered ink quill and liquid ink, and writers who lacked practice would be expected to have made numerous blotches on a given document. However, a practiced writer was not necessarily a highly literate Nahuatl practitioner because his command of the language might not have matched his caligraphic competence with the Roman alphabet. For example, Francisco de Torres was a Franciscan who wrote “1626 San Francisco Chapalac” with very legible caligraphy but nonstandard Nahuatl. He demonstrated his ability to write by inscribing vowels and smaller letters like n, r, and c, which have consistently thin lines, and larger letters letters like h, l, p, and q, which have thicker lines and more flourish. For example, he wrote “Xicmatican ca huel no ixpan ohualneci...” on line six using a heavy hand to write the capital X, the high and low points of the two hs, the high points of the two ls, and the lower-case x while using a lighter hand for the vowels and smaller consonants.

However, Francisco de Torres addressed the “teteutli” (lords) of San Francisco Chapalac without following the conventions of Central Mexican Nahuatl. The elites of Tetzcoco, Tenochtitlan, Chalco, and other altepetl in Central Mexico spoke and wrote to each other with

---

483 Tuten and Tejedo-Herrero explain these fields in “The Relationship between Historical Linguistics and Sociolinguistics.”
very polite forms that included the use of reverential forms for nouns and verbs and the use of metaphorical couplets. However, Francisco de Torres seldom employed these forms. For example, he utilized thirty-seven verbs, but only _anmoyezticate_ was in the reverential form in _cequintin principales anmoyezticate to altepeuh San Francisco Chapalac_ (you elites are in our town of San Francisco Chapalac). Throughout his document, he was addressing the nobles of this town so the use of the reverential in _cequintin principales anmoyezticate to altepeuh San Francisco Chapalac_ was expected, but why not elsewhere? Also, with nouns, he only added the reverential -tzin to _ilhuitzin_, or feast-day. Furthermore, he only used one metaphorical couplet _xicanacan machiol temachtiliztli_ (grasp the signs, the teachings). Was Francisco de Torres a competent writer who could only use Nahuatl with great difficulty, or was Nahuatl prose in Northwestern New Spain rougher than what was practiced in Central Mexico?

Francisco de Torres is a good example because he learned to write through a process that had existed in Christian Europe for more than a thousand years, but which the Franciscan-Nahuatlato dyad had only introduced into Northwestern New Spain during the mid-1500s. The first generation of literate Indigenous people began to write some of the examples of correspondence in this study and continued to write in Nahuatl until 130 years after the introduction of the Roman alphabet. Furthermore, literate Indigenous people were not concentrated in one town. The writers used many different types of paper and only “1649 San Francisco Ayahualulco” was written on paper bearing a royal mark suggesting that most of the documents were recorded on locally produced paper.

---

484 An alternate interpretation of the lack of honorifics is that Francisco de Torres thought that the nobles were not worthy of such language.
Indigenous notaries exhibited varying degrees of caligraphic competence between 1579 and 1694. Some commanded this skill to such an extent that their penmanship rivals that of Francisco de Torres (Table 3-2). For example, Juan Pedro wrote an eighty-three line petition in 1649 that has consistently thin and even letters. He created only one word with too much ink, “çe (one)” in line fifty-five. Other Indigenous notaries that were equally proficient include the writers of “1649 San Juan Ocotitic,” “1652 Juchipila,” “1653 Amatitlan,” and “1688 San Pedrotepec.” Other notaries utilized a rougher caligraphy with irregularly drawn letters that had too much ink, too little, and/or several blotches (Table 3-2). For example, Francisco Felipe wrote “1600 Tala” with uneven letters throughout its twenty-seven lines. Likewise, Pedro Puy inscribed “1622 Cohuatlan” with well-written words during the first twenty-three lines, but subsequent lines contain larger, rougher, and more rounded letters. Other examples include the unnamed notary of “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco” who wrote letters such as a, e, and t in an irregular manner; the unnamed notary of “1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta” who made some strokes that were very thin and others that had an inordinate amount of ink; and the notary of “1692 San Andres Atotonilco” who wrote in a more uneven manner than the notary of “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco.” Nevertheless, caligraphy has to be examined with content because a reliance on the former presents a scenario in which a given notary who wrote with an irregular script may have lacked practice, have had a poor teacher, or have been in a hurry to complete his work.

485 I have excluded “N.Y. Nombre de Dios ca. 1585” because the original has been lost and it is only available as a nineteenth-century copy.

486 “1600 Tala,” “1622 San Andrés Cohuatlan,” “1626 San Francisco Chapalac,” “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco,” “1649 San Juan Ocotitic,” “1649 San Francisco Ayahualulco,” “1652 Juchipila,” “1653 Amatitlan,” “1688 San Pedro Tepec,” and “1692 San Andrés Atotonilco,” are from AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl. “1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta” is from McA-UCLA, Box 20.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Writer</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Writing Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Felipe</td>
<td>1600 Tala</td>
<td>Hulan riquiata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Puy</td>
<td>1622 San Andrés Cohuatlan</td>
<td>Ciaxlan sintades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco de Torres</td>
<td>1626 San Francisco Chapalac</td>
<td>SFranChapalac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1649 San Antonio Tuzcacezco</td>
<td>San Antoniio tabacay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1649 San Juan Ocoelte</td>
<td>San Juanucut-yhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Pedro</td>
<td>1649 San Francisco Ayahualulco</td>
<td>Sanjuan ayahuabalcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1652 Juchipila</td>
<td>San franayucipila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>San toniyo quiroiquita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>amatitlan provincia lalbalco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1688 San Pedrotepec</td>
<td>Slepep. Sayo teppec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1692 San Andrés Atotonilco</td>
<td>Sanoneres fia xotonico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indigenous writers were using the Roman alphabet as introduced by the Franciscan-Nahuatlato dyad and for this reason, they employed certain Spanish and Nahuatl words and phrases that refer to the culture of writing. These high-frequency terms appear often because the genres of writing in New Spain required their usage. Spanish terms include *firma* (signature) and *escribano* (notary) while Nahuatl terms consist of *ihcuiloa* (write) and *tlacuilo* (writer). An examination of these terms reveals certain patterns between 1580 and 1622.

Notaries who wrote during the sixteenth century in Oconahua and Xalisco show different tendencies (Table 3-3). For example, the writers of “1593a Xalisco,” “1593b Xalisco,” “N.Y. Xalisco,” and “1594a Xalisco” use *otitlacioiloque* (we wrote) without using *firma*, whereas that of “1595b Xalisco” employs *otitlatlaique* (we set down) with *tomacehualtlatol* (our humble words). Meanwhile, the notary of “1593a Oconahua,” that of “1593b Oconahua,” and that of 1593c Oconahua” employ *firma*. The writer of “1593a Oconahua” uses *filma*, instead of *firma*, as a noun in a phrase *nictlalliya nofilma* (I set down my signature), which resembles the words of the notary of “1595 Xalisco” because it has the verb *tlalia* (set down) and a possessed noun. He also writes *titobilmatique* (we, ourselves, signed), in which he employs non-standard *bilma* (signature) instead of *firma* (signature), transforming it into a verb with Nahuatl affixes. Meanwhile, the notary of “1593c Oconahua” offers a variety of literacy terms when he relies on both *firma* as a verb in present and preterit forms, while also employing *icuilia* (write, transitive) in *oticui[li]que* and *hoquicuilli*, which he uses to refer to the

---

487 The documents from Xalisco are from BPEJ-JJA, Fondo Franciscano, Volumen 14, Numero 1074; those from Oconahua are in BPEJ-JJA, Real Audiencia, Ramo Civil, Caja 1, Expediente 9, Progresivo 9; and those from Tala, San Andrés Cohuatlan, and La Magdalena are from AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
writing of his document, *tlacuilovani espanyor* to refer to a Spanish notary, and *amatlacuilo* to refer to himself.

Table 3-3: Terms of literacy between 1580 and 1622

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition &amp; province</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Signing/Writing</th>
<th>Notary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not identified</td>
<td>1593a Xalisco, Compostela</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>otitlacuiiloque y nican tochan...</em> we wrote here in our home</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not identified</td>
<td>1593b Xalisco, Compostela</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>otit[a]cuiioq</em>⁴⁸⁸ <em>yn nican tochan...</em> we wrote here in our home</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not identified</td>
<td>N.Y. Xalisco, ca 1593</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>otitlacuillo [tear]</em> we wrote</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not identified</td>
<td>1594a Xalisco</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>otitlacuiloque</em> we wrote</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not identified</td>
<td>1595b Xalisco</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>tomace[hual]latol otictlalique</em> we set down our humble words</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not identified</td>
<td>1593a Oconahua, Izatlan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>tiobilmatique</em>, we signed <em>nictlaliya nofilma</em>, I set down my signature</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not identified</td>
<td>1593b Oconahua, Izatlan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>quinfilmatic</em>, he caused them to sign <em>mofilmatiz</em>, it will be signed <em>oquinfilmatic</em>, he caused them to sign</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not identified</td>
<td>1593c Oconahua, Izatlan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>otechfirmati</em>, he caused us to sign <em>titofirmatia</em>, we cause ourselves to sign <em>otichui[tear]que, hoquicuilli</em>, <em>tlacuilovani espanyor</em>, Spanish notary <em>amatlacuilo</em>, notary</td>
<td>escrivano notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Felipe</td>
<td>1600 Tala, Tala</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>tictlalia totlatol yvan tofirma</em></td>
<td>escrivamo notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Puy</td>
<td>1622 San Andrés Cohuatlan, Colima</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>escrivamo notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioste</td>
<td>1622 La Magdalena, Izatlan</td>
<td><em>quipohuiliz motlanavatiltzin</em> to read your order</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>yhuanc escriuano</em> and notary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁴⁸⁸ The symbol q’ denotes *que/qui*, which notaries wrote with an overbar over the q, and which I’ve replaced with q’ because the q with an overbar is difficult to replicate on a computer keyboard.
On the other hand, Francisco Felipe of Tala writes in a manner that resembles more the notaries of Oconahua than those of Xalisco. He writes *tictlalia totlatol yvan tofirma* (we set down our words and our signatures) employing *tlalia* (set down) as a verb with two objects—*totlatol* and *tofirma*—even as he identifies himself as an *escrivano*. His use of *tictlalia* resembles that of the notary of “1593a Oconahua,” and suggests possible interactions between these writers because these petitions are eight years apart and Tala and Oconahua were connected by a road that started in Guadalajara and went to Tala and Magdalena before splitting off into several branches, one of which went to Oconahuac (Refer to Chapter 2.2b).

The *prioste* of La Magdalena and Pedro Puy also present many key terms in their petitions. The *prioste* writes about events that took place in La Magdalena, a town located in the same province as Oconahua, but unlike the notary of “1593c Oconahuac,” he employs *escribano* instead of *amatlacuilo* or *tlacuilovani*, and he is also the only one to refer to the act of reading when he writes *quipohuiliz motlanavatiltzin* (he read your decree) to explain how the enemies of María disregarded the instructions of the *provisor*, to whom the petition was addressed. Pedro writes about Coatlan, a town close to Colima, and he names himself as an *escribano*, and that is his one reference to the aforementioned field of reading and writing terms.

After 1623, colonial officials created the Diocese of Durango from a northern portion of the Diocese of Guadalajara. One effect was to consolidate the latter with contiguous territory that a bishop or a *provisor* could more easily examine in a *visita pastoral*. Consequently, notaries wrote more correspondence. But before investigating the correlation between the consolidation of the Diocese of Guadalajara and increased petition writing in surrounding native communities (which will be done in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6), it is necessary to examine what
reading, writing, and scribal terms they may have borrowed from their predecessors. The most obvious Nahuatl term is *tlalia*, which notaries favored with the noun-form of *firma*.

Francisco Rafael (“1646 Tequepechpan”) appears to follow the convention used by the aforementioned notary of “1593a Oconahua” and Francisco Felipe of “1600 Tala” when he writes *tictlaliya tofirma* (we have set down our signatures), which resembles the earlier notary’s usage of *nictlalliya nofilma* (I have set down my signature) and Francisco Felipe’s *tictlalia totlatol yvan tofirma* (we have set down our words, our signatures) (Table 3-4). Francisco Rafael refers to himself as an *escribano*, like Francisco Felipe, and although the *prioste* who most likely wrote “1622 La Magdalena” does not refer to himself as an *escribano*, he does use this term to refer to a third party. These overlapping usages of *tlalia* with *firma* and *escribano* suggest some interaction between the notaries of these four towns. Indeed, Tequepechpan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Signing/Writing</th>
<th>Notary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not identified</td>
<td>1593a Oconahua, Izatlan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>titobilmatique</em>, we signed it</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>nictlalliya nofilma</em>, I have set down my signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Felipe</td>
<td>1600 Tala, Tala</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>tictlalia totlatol yvan tofirma</em></td>
<td><em>escribano</em> notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María Magdalena</td>
<td>1622 La Magdalena, Izatlan</td>
<td>quipohuliz motlanavitlizin he will read your decree</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Rafael</td>
<td>1646 Tequepechpan, Mines of Chimaltitlan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>tictlaliya tofirma</em> I have set down my signature</td>
<td><em>niescribano fra</em>**co* I am Francisco, notary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

489 The document from Oconahua are in BPEJ-JJA, Real Audiencia, Ramo Civil, Caja 1, Expediente 9, Progresivo 9. All others are in AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
is located northwest of La Magdalena on the aforementioned road that went from Guadalajara to Tala and forked at La Magdalena, with one branch going to Tequepechpan and beyond, and another that went south to Ayahualulco and Etzatlan and west to Oconahuac (Refer to Chapter 2.2e). However, usage diversified over time; the notaries of other documents (“1649a La Magdalena,” “1649b La Magdalena,” “1649 Ayahualulco,” and “1661 Etzatlan”) did not employ *tlalia* together with *firma*, nor did they use *firma* as a verb, whereas those of “1593a Oconahua” and “1593c Oconahua” appear to have converted *firma* (signature) into a reflexive verb.490

In these usages, only one notary refers to the act of signing his own name and witnesses signing their names. The notary of “1593a Oconahua” writes *nictlaliya nofirma* and *titobilmatique* to signal that a variety of nobles signed this document, and the signatures indeed appear different. However, Francisco Felipe of “1600 Tala” writes a similar phrase, *tictlalia totlatol yvan tofirma* (we set down our words and our signatures) with a different meaning. He uses it to signal that he signed for himself and others because, among other things, the name

---

490 Generally, Nahuas from Northwestern New Spain added -*oa* when converting a loan word into a verb when it ended in “r”. Cortés y Zedeño lists *alimentar* (to feed, Spanish) and *alimentaroa* (feed, Nahuatl), *caminar* (to walk, Spanish) and *caminaroa* (walk, Nahuatl), and *cautivar* (to place in captivity, Spanish) and *cautivaroa* (place in captivity, Nahuatl), and many other examples in his dictionary. Cortés y Zedeño, 56, 66, 68.
Francisco appears as the name of three other people, and the four iterations resemble each other. Furthermore, the notary of “1646 Tequepechpan” seems to have also written the names of the other nobles who, in five of six cases, may have made a whirlwind-like rubric next to their name. In other words, tictlalia—tofirma or titafirmatia could mean that the notary and the nobles who witnessed the creation of a document signed it, it could mean that the notary signed it and wrote the names of the witnesses who wrote a mark next to their name, or it could only mean that the notary made a mark and wrote the names of people who witnessed the creation of a given document. These possibilities suggest that, although many people relied on writing, this skill was concentrated in the hands of only a few individuals even among members of the cabildo.

In the province of Tlajomulco, the notary of “1630 Tlajomulco” confirms that some Indigenous people with wealth did not know how to write. The notary writes a receipt on behalf of Simón Agustín, a resident of Tlajomulco and remarks:

nomon Don Juan Vasquez nechtlalis nofirma ypampa amo nicmati amatl
My son-in-law Don Juan Vasquez will place me, my signature, because I don’t know paper.

This phrase represents the notary’s summation of Simón Agustín’s oral explanation that Don Juan Vasquez, the son-in-law, would sign for him because he did not know how to write.

Indeed, there are four names toward the end which appear to have been written with the same

491 These include his own name of Francisco Felipe as well as Francisco Gerónimo, Francisco Brina, and Francisco Martín.

492 The names with symbols to the right are Agustín Lázaro, Pedro Miguel, Pedro Felipe, and Francisco Daniel, whereas Juan Lorenzo does not have any of these symbols to the right or the left.
hand, but next to each one there is a mark that is unique, and that notaries from Ávalos, the most literate region in this study, appear to have defined as *machiotl*, sign.⁴⁹³

Tlajomulco was part of a province of the same name that spread out between Guadalajara and the province of Ávalos. Tlajomulcan notaries employed *firma* as both a noun and a verb, and some also added the word *machiotl* defined by Molina as a “señal, comparacion, exemplo, o dechado” in his late sixteenth-century dictionary.⁴⁹⁴ This definition compares favorably with how Friar Francisco de Torres uses *machiol* in “1626 San Francisco Chapala,” an admonishing letter to the inhabitants of Chapala, Ávalos (Refer to Table 3-5).⁴⁹⁵ He writes *xicanacan machiol temachtiliztli* (grasp the signs, the teachings) to explain to the nobles of this town how they could be better Christians, which supports the notion that *machiotl* meant sign.

Table 3-5: Usages of tlalia and firma in Tlajomulco and Ávalos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Signing/Writing</th>
<th>Notary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francisco de Torres</td>
<td>1626 S. Fr. Chapalac, Ávalos</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><em>xicanacan machiol temachtiliztli</em>, Seize the signs, the teachings <em>oniquicuilo</em>, I wrote</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Fabian</td>
<td>1629 Zacoalco, Ávalos</td>
<td><em>auh otictocaquiltiqui amal</em>, We have read the letter <em>Amatzinli q'emopohueliz</em>, The letter is to be read by <em>tictolalilia tomachiol tofirma</em>, we place our signs and signatures <em>titofirmatia</em>, we sign</td>
<td><em>escribano</em>, notary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>1630 Tlajomulco, Tlajomulco</td>
<td><em>amo nicmati amatl</em>, I do not know paper</td>
<td><em>Don Jué basquýz nichtlalis nofirma</em>, Don Juan Vázquez will write my signature</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴⁹³ Ávalos appears to have had the highest index of literacy because notaries from ten of its towns created sixteen extant documents, more than those of any other province.

⁴⁹⁴ Molina, 50.

⁴⁹⁵ This statement demonstrates how closely the Franciscans relied on Roman alphabetic writing to proselytize (Refer to Chapter 3.7). “1630 Tlajomulco” is from AIPEJ, Tierras y Aguas Vol 2; “1629 Zacoalco” is found at McA-UCLA, Box 20; All others are from AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Gerónimo</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Amatitlan, Ávalos</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>escribano, notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Agustín</td>
<td>1658 S.F.</td>
<td>Tizapan, Ávalos</td>
<td>firma Juº Acastin..., signed by Juan Agustín vitlacueloqui, we wrote</td>
<td>escribano, notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Felipe</td>
<td>1664 S. Ana</td>
<td>Acatlan, Ávalos</td>
<td>nican niltis tomachiofirma, truly, here are our signs-signatures</td>
<td>Dieº Felipe escia, Diego Felipe, notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>1668 S. Fran.</td>
<td>Zacoalco, Ávalos</td>
<td>nican tlami totlatotzin, here end our words</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>1669 S. Ma Mag.</td>
<td>Tizapan, Ávalos</td>
<td>nican tictlalia tomacheofremas, axcan otitlacuiloque</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>1673 S. F.</td>
<td>Tizapan, Ávalos</td>
<td>otilacuiloqui domigo, we wrote on Sunday</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Sayula, Ávalos</td>
<td>timofirmatilo, we sign</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>1682 S. J. Ev.</td>
<td>Atoyac, Ávalos</td>
<td>otilacuiloque martes, we wrote on Tuesday</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>1686 S. Pedrotepec, Ávalos</td>
<td></td>
<td>tictlalia tomachio tofirma, we set down our signs, our signatures</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando Miguel</td>
<td>1692 S. Andres Atotonilco, Áv.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>ye neltes tofirma, they were truly our signatures</td>
<td>es=nº, notary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>1694 S. J. Ev. Atoyac, Ávalos</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>otilacuiloqui, we wrote</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, Indigenous notaries from Ávalos who employed *machiol* (or *machiotl*) together with *firma* appear to have used the former word to refer to a sign (Table 3-3). For example, Juan Fabian wrote a letter on behalf of the cabildo officers of San Francisco Zacoalco.
toward those of San Felipe Cuquio, and he uses *tictolalilia tomachiol tofirma* (we set down our signs and our signatures) towards the end of this document and before identifying himself as the notary. Then, he writes the names of two *alcaldes* and five *regidores* because the handwriting is similar. However, the marks next to each name seem distinct enough to suggest that they were individually made. If this is the case, *tofirma* refers to the handwritten names and *tomachiol* represents the individual marks.496 Likewise, the notary of “1686 San Pedrotepec” writes *tictlalia tomachio tofirma* (we set down our signs, our signatures) using it to denote the presence of handwritten names with marks to the side. Sixteen people are identified, but only the first four names have a mark—Gregorio Jacobo, Pedro Juan, Juan de la Cruz, and Andres Martín—the *alcaldes* and *regidores* of this town.

Two other notaries from Ávalos combined *machio* and *firma*. First, Diego Felipe, the notary of “1664 Santa Ana Acatlan,” writes *nican neltis tomachiofirma* (here are our true signs-signatures) in a document that includes his handwritten name along with thirteen others, who each have an accompanying mark. Also, the notary of “1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan” includes *tomacheo fremas totoca* (our signs-signatures, our names) before five names whose letters are uniform, but which have marks to the left that seem unique.

In Ávalos, the absence of the term *machiotl* generally denotes that only the notary participated in the writing, signing, and marking process. In “1658 San Francisco Tizapan,” Juan Sebastian writes *1658 anos firma* followed by his name and the names of six individuals that lack any type of marks. That of “1679 Sayula” uses *timofirmatilo* (we ourselves signed), but he

---

496 Meanwhile, Juan Fabian also relies on *nican titofirmatia* to introduce a second set of names that represent two married couples—Magdalena Bárbola with Baltasar Lorenzo and Pedro Mendoza with Maríana—whose names are uniformly written but which also have signs that appear distinct, suggesting that the verb form may represent a complex composed of the notary-written name together with an individual sign made by each petitioner next to their names.
writes nineteen names that do not have any accompanying marks. Meanwhile, the notary of “1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” relies on *otitlacuíloque* (we wrote) before a large number of names that appear to have been written by the same person and which lack any type of distinct mark.

However, a few notaries did not use *machiotl* even when others wrote something on a document. For example, the unidentified notary of “1668 San Francisco Zacoalco,” writes *nican tlami totlatotzin* (here our words end) before the presence of two names with accompanying marks that appear to have been made by different authors. Also, in “1673 San Francisco Tizapan,” the notary writes *otitlacuíloqui* (we wrote) before including three names with similar marks that appear to have been made by different writers. Finally, in “1694 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac,” its notary uses *otetlacuíloqui* (we wrote to people) before four names that each have a distinct sign to the right.

These variations show the different degrees with which notaries had mastered writing in Nahuatl with the Roman alphabet. Those that use *machiotl* seem to denote that other nobles placed their mark next to their names, but those notaries who use another expression such as *titofirmatia* (we sign) or *otitlacuíloqui* tended to be less precise about whether other writers had participated in the signing process by writing their names or writing a rubric next to their names. Whether this mattered to Spaniards will be examined in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6, but notaries were very aware that they could speak on behalf of other nobles and their towns before Spanish officials. For example, in “1629 Zacoalco,” Juan Fabian writes two statements about literacy in which he represents other Indigenous people:

1. *auh otictocaquitiqui amal otipaqueque ca nele melahuac*
   
   We understood the paper; we were glad for it is true
In both statements, Juan Fabian employs *amal/amatzinli* (paper) to refer to two different letters. In the first, he explains that the nobles of Zacoalco understood and agreed with the content of a previous letter from the nobles of Cuquio; in the second, he implies that the nobles of Cuquio will understand the words that he penned on behalf of the nobles of Zacoalco.\(^{497}\) It would be easy to interpret that the nobles of each town read and understood both letters, but at least some of them probably had to rely on Juan Fabian and the notary of Cuquio to understand the content of both of these documents.

Despite the rarity of literacy or perhaps because of it, illiterate Indigenous people understood the importance of writing for such things as branding property. The notary of “1630 Tlajomulco” presents one example in the aforementioned statement:

\[\text{notepos yn quipia AOS yhuan yhierro de venta 8A yohqui ynin yeniltis ynin çidola ynic}\]

My iron has AOS, and the seller’s iron is 8A. The *cédula* will verify this, how

\[\text{oniquimacac yhuan nictlatlahtia}\]

I gave them [cows], and I burn[ed] them.

The notary had written that Simón Agustín, the owner of the AOS brand could not sign, but the latter understood the principles of reading to an extent necessary to identify his brand, which changed to the 8A symbol of the local *cofradía*. This is one example, but the very nature of the documents in the correspondence of Northwestern New Spain show that, during the sixteenth

---

\(^{497}\) I have relied on Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart’s translation in *Beyond the Codices*. I also added additional linguistic information such as morpheme boundaries and morpheme descriptions in my translation, which is found in Appendix B.
and seventeenth centuries, Indigenous people relied on literate Indigenous notaries to speak for them before a Spanish-speaking bureaucracy that required writing with the Roman alphabet.

3.7. Literacy as a Weapon

A collaboration of European friars and Indigenous nahuatlatos created pockets of literacy in Northwestern New Spain. Franciscans arrived with nahuatlatos from Central Mexico, and they formed a dyad that challenged the oral power of the leaders of the Mixtón Confederacy with the rhetoric of policia cristiana. Some native leaders responded by killing Calero and Cuéllar. Spanish-led forces won the Mixtón War, but the war of words was less conclusive. Nonetheless, the Mixtón War enabled Franciscans and nahuatlatos to create extensive spaces for a Nahua-Christian education program that incorporated the Roman alphabet to fight the rhetoric of native leaders for control of Northwestern New Spain. Nonetheless, the martial triumph of the Mixtón War enabled Franciscans and nahuatlatos to create a more extensive space for a Nahua-Christian education program that incorporated the Roman alphabet to fight the rhetoric of leaders for control of Northwestern New Spain.

However, Franciscans also worried about the relationships that the caciques of Northwestern New Spain had formed with Spanish corregidores and alcaldes mayores. Fray Alonso de Peraleja writes that these caciques made agreements with Spaniards to rob Indigenous commoners, and he recommended that “it was not convenient that any cacique have the leadership of any town in which he was a native because they were tyrants.” These words represent a political struggle. Depopulated towns, cabeceras and sujetos both, struggled to support the cacique, the corregidor, and a Franciscan convent as the Franciscans began to rely increasingly on those Indigenous people whom they educated to serve as officers in the cabildos
and cofradías of Northwestern New Spain. Some of these office-holding nahuatlatos used their literacy to promote policia cristiana in letters and receipts, but others also began to write petitions denouncing the actions of Franciscans and other Spaniards before the Diocese of Guadalajara and the Real Audiencia of Nueva Galicia. In order to sway a colonial audience, nahuatlatos followed both Nahuatl and Spanish conventions depending on the genre, and these are the subjects of the next chapter.
Chapter 4. Nahuatl and Roman Alphabetic Writing

“Na:-bí hi:li na:-bí wowa:ci na-mu ‘My language is my life (history)’”

Tewa saying

4-1. Types of Documents

Scholars have examined Nahuatl documents with the Roman alphabet and classified them in specific ways. Matthew Restall, Lisa Sousa, and Kevin Terraciano proposed that notarial documents were generated by the cabildo in a manner that fulfilled the notarial requirements of the Spanish bureaucracy, but there were two types of writing: notarial and non-notarial.Arthur J.O Anderson, Frances Berdan, and Lockhart divide the many alphabetic documents that they translated and analyzed into four sub-genres; the category they call “Petitions, Correspondence, and Other Direct Statements” applies to the notarial documents discussed in this study. The Indigenous notaries who wrote the documents in this study call them amal, ylnamicoca, petición, or licet, whereas the writers who add summaries, translations, or rulings in Spanish attached to these Nahuatl documents use several words such as carta, memoria, petición, or pedimiento. These Spanish and Nahuatl terms can be used to identify the structure of the different types of document in my study, which can then serve to classify those works that lack such an identification.
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4.2. Petitions

The petition was a very particular genre of writing within the imperial and church bureaucracy. Magnus Lundberg writes that Spanish and Indian subjects of the king addressed petitions to the crown or his local representative and that parishioners could also address the bishop and the episcopal court of law, claiming that in practice there was no difference between a petición and a memoria.\(^{501}\) This appears to be borne out by the documents of Northwestern New Spain. For example, in “1692 San Andres Atotonilco,” Don Juan Sarmiento writes in Spanish that a preceding Nahuatl document was a memoria, but a subsequent writer, Bishop Juan de Santiago y León Garabito, refers to the Nahuatl document as a petición.\(^{502}\) Similarly, in “N.Y. Aquautitan,” a notary writes in Spanish that a preceding Nahuatl document was a petición, adding that the Indigenous petitioners had also previously submitted another document, a memoria.\(^{503}\)

Thirty-three of the documents in this corpus are easy to classify in that either an Indigenous notary\(^{504}\) or the writer of an addendum, identifies them as a petición or memoria.

---

\(^{501}\) In theory, memorial was made for a record that asked for a particular favor, and a petition was a document with which someone made a judicial claim before a judge or court of law. Lundberg, *Church Life between the Metropolitan and the Local: Parishes, Parishioners and Parish Priests in Seventeenth-Century Mexico*, 174. Hereafter, I will only use the term, “petition.”

\(^{502}\) AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1692 San Andrés Atotonilco.”

\(^{503}\) AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “N.Y. Aquautitan.”

\(^{504}\) Hereafter, I will use the terms “notary” or “writer” before the name of a Nahuatl document to specifically denote an Indigenous author. I will be more specific when describing the author of addenda, documents attached to the Nahuatl documents in this study, because sometimes he was a high-official such as the bishop, and other times he might have been a notary of undeterminate origin: African, European, Indigenous or mixed parentage.
Nine documents are clearly petitions because they are identified as such by both notaries and Spanish writers, whereas identification in one language or the other occurs twenty-four times: seven in Nahuatl petitions and seventeen in Spanish addenda (See Appendix A). These thirty-three petitions thus form a starting point because their identification as identified petitions can provide structural patterns and characteristics for classifying the remaining documents from Northwestern New Spain examined here.

Notaries address twenty-six of these named petitions to officials within the diocese of Guadalajara (Table 4-1). Twelve notaries use the word obispo (bishop), and the thirteenth, the writer of “1679 Analco,” addresses Santiago de León Garabito, the bishop of Guadalajara in 1679. Five different notaries use orthographic variants of provisor, a term that referred to the judge in the ecclesiastical courts that were known as the Provisorato de Indios. Also, Juan Cruz, the notary of “1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo,” employs tixiptlatzin tlo Js (you are the very image of our lord Jesus Christ) without including any more information, but a Spanish notary notes in a brief introduction that the addressee was the presbitero vicario, an ambiguous

505 In an addendum, a Spanish notary describes “1644 Cajititlan” as a pedimiento (request), but for now, I am not classifying this document as a petition.

506 A writer records in an addendum that these two documents represent one petición.

507 The data for this table is found in Appendix A.

508 His full name was Juan de Santiago y León Garabito, and he was bishop of Guadalajara from 1677 to 1694. http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/diocese/dguad.html (consulted on August 21, 2015). Refer to Appendix B for more information about orthographic variations in the titles of the addressees.

509 Chuchiak notes that, in the Yucatan Peninsula, the Holy Office of the Inquisition had no power to enforce sexual morality among the Maya, and that this job was entrusted to the bishops, their ecclesiastical courts of the Provisorato de Indios, and the Indigenous officials of Maya towns who were known as vicarios. Chuchiak, “Secrets Behind the Screen: Solicitantes in the Colonial Diocese of Yucatan and the Yucatec Maya, 1570-1785” in Religion in New Spain ed. by Susan Schroeder and Stafford Poole (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2007), 87.
title that probably referred to the person who temporarily held the office of bishop at that time.\textsuperscript{510}

Francisco Rafael, the notary of “1646 Tequepechpan,” employs *titomahuizteopixcauh* (you are our revered priest) to refer to Antonio Gonzalez, who is identified in an addendum as the *cura Vi[c]a[ri]*\textsuperscript{9} (priest) of the nearby town of Minas de Chimaltitlán.\textsuperscript{511} Also, the notary of “1661 Etzatlan” does not name an addressee, but Diego de Tapia, the translator, uses *vmd* for *vuestra merced* (your grace), which refers to Bachiller Hernando Calderón, who appears to have been an investigator for the diocese (refer to Chapter 6).\textsuperscript{512}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Alcalde Mayor</th>
<th>Royal Audiencia</th>
<th>King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (by title or name)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su señoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Presbítero or Cura)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuestra merced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Audiencia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidente</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcalde Mayor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gobernador</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{510} Guadalajara lacked a bishop when this petition was written. Juan Cruz dated this petition as occurring on June 19, 1637, whereas the Spanish notary who wrote the summary dated it to July 1, 1637. Both of these dates preceded the arrival of Bishop Juan Sánchez Duque de Estrada; he was appointed as bishop in 1636, but was only installed on September 23, 1637. The previous bishop had been appointed bishop of Antequera, Oaxaca on February 18, 1636 and probably left soon after. \url{http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/diocese/dguad.html} (consulted on August 21, 2015). The Diccionario de la Real Academia defines *vicario* as a, “persona que en las órdenes regulares tiene las veces y autoridad de alguno de los superiores mayores, en caso de ausencia, falta o indisposición,” but it mentions two other terms that may be relevant: *vicario capitular* which is a, “Dignidad eclesiástica investida de toda la jurisdicción ordinaria del obispo, para el gobierno de una diócesis vacante...” and *vicario apostolico* which is a “Dignidad eclesiástica designada por la Santa Sede para regir con jurisdicción ordinaria las cristianidades en territorios donde aún no está introducida la jerarquía eclesiástica...” Refer to \url{http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=vicario} (Consulted on August 21, 2015). Furthermore, John Chuchiak (2007: 87) reports that among the Maya of the Yucatan Peninsula a *vicario* is a local assigned priest who has the power of another or who substitutes for him. Meanwhile, *presbítero* is simply an ordained cleric: \url{http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=presbítero} (Consulted on August 21, 2015).

\textsuperscript{511} José Ramirez Flores refers to “1646 Tequepechpan” when identifying Antonio González de Estopiñán as a *cura vicario* and ecclesiastic judge of Minas de Chimaltitlán. AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1646 Tequepechpan”; Ramírez Flores, *Los “Tochos” de Jalisco: Semántica de un vocablo* (Nuevo León, Mexico: Universidad de Nuevo León, 1964), 422.

\textsuperscript{512} AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1661 Etzatlan.”
Further evidence suggests that *su señoría* or *su señoría ilustrísima* was also a reference to the bishop of Guadalajara. The notary of “1652b San Sebastian Guaxicori” identifies the addressee as both *obispo* (bishop) and *su señoría*, and the notary of “1686 San Pedro Tepec” names the addressee as *obispo* (bishop) and *ço señoria ylostrísimo*, a variant of *su señoría ilustrísima*. The notary of “1679 Analco” writes in Spanish and records the phrase, *Su Sta Yllª Sºr D Juan de Santiago de Leon*, which refers to Bishop Juan de Santiago y León Garabito and can be understood as *su santísima ylustrísima señoría*, an orthographic variant of *su señoría ilustrísima*. *Su señoría* probably also refers to the bishop of Guadalajara in three petitions: “1652a San Antonio Quihuitquina,” “1652 San Francisco Juchipila,” and “1692 San Andres Atotonilco;” and *su señoría ilustrísim*a likewise refers to this official in three others: “1673 San Francisco Tizapan” which has *ostrecemo Sr*, “N.Y. Santiago Aquautitan” which has *vstra yllma*, and “1679 Sayula” which has *Su Señoria ylustrisima*. Given this information, twenty-six of these identified petitions were meant for diocesan officials: eighteen petitions for the bishop of Guadalajara, five for the *provisor*, one for a *cura vica* (vicario), one for a *presbitero vicario*, and

---


514 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.

one for an investigator of the diocese who is identified as vmd, the abbreviation for vuestra merced, which was a title of courtesy roughly equivalent to, “your grace.”

Of the six remaining petitions, five are directed toward officials in the imperial Spanish administration and one is somewhat ambiguous (Table 4-1). Three documents are addressed to officials in the Royal Audiencia, and for this reason, I refer to these works as Royal Audiencia petitions. The notary of “1593a Oconahuac” addresses his petition by writing antotlatocahuan...aubençia reyal (you are our lords...the Royal Audiencia). The writer of “1580b Nochistlan” addresses the “señor blexidente” (lord president), the highest official of the Royal Audiencia, and although the writer of “1580a Nochistlan” addresses the tlacate tlatohuaniye (lord ruler), there are good reasons to propose that this term also refers to the president of the Royal Audiencia. The writing suggests that these petitions were written by different notaries, which explains why each one used a different term, but both documents concern the same grievances (refer to Chapter 5.2a). Notaries of Northwestern New Spain tend to use tlacatl tlatohuaniye for the highest officials in the imperial bureaucracy and almost never for the Catholic hierarchy.

---

516 The Diccionario de la Real Academia (consulted on August 31, 2016) defines vuestra merced as, “Tratamiento o título de cortesía que se usaba con aquellos que no tenían título o grado por donde se les debieran otros tratamientos superiores.” [http://dle.rae.es/?id=Oz4Ox7A](http://dle.rae.es/?id=Oz4Ox7A)

517 BPEJ-JJA, Real Audiencia, Ramo Civil, Caja 1, Expediente 9, Progresivo 9, “1593a Oconahuac.”

518 BPEJ-JJA, Real Audiencia: Ramo Civil, Caja 1, Expediente 11, Progresivo 11, “1580a Nochistlan”; BPEJ-JJA, Real Audiencia, Ramo Civil, Caja 1, Expediente 11, Progresivo 11, “1580b Nochistlan.”

519 The address term tlacatl tlatohuani or a variant form is found in several documents from Central Mexico and Northwestern New Spain. The Nahuatl Dictionary/Diccionario (consulted on August 31, 2016) defines tlacatlalatoani as, “our great ruler,” and places this citation as being from, “The Techialoyan manuscript from San Martín Ocoyacac located in the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Ms America No. 7.” [http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso](http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso) Furthermore, Stephanie Wood (personal communication, August 31, 2016) writes that this attestation refers to Axayacatl and adds that she has seen tlacatlatoani in the Techialoyan ms from Texcalucan and Chichicaspa, where it is used to refer to Viceroy Mendoza.
Two petitions are addressed to *alcaldes mayores*, who were the top officials in a given province and possessed judicial powers.\(^\text{520}\) The notary of “1642 Contla” addresses the *alcalde mayor* of a province that included Contla, and the writer of “1652a San Sebastian Guaxicori” addresses Don Pedro Sorit, captain and *alcalde mayor* of Acaponeta.\(^\text{521}\) The last one, “N.Y. Nombre de Dios,” appears to be a royal petition because its writer addresses a *tohuey tlatocatzin* (great lord), suggesting this official was the king or his highest representative, the viceroy (refer to Chapter 5.2a).\(^\text{522}\)

### 4.2a Diocesan Identified Petitions

The identified diocesan petitions demonstrate political ties between literate Indigenous elites and the Diocese of Guadalajara during the seventeenth century, ties that had their roots in the sixteenth century. Lundberg explains that the Third Mexican Council (1585) required bishops to visit the parishes in their jurisdiction, a *visita*, or inspection visit that had two purposes: *visitatio hominum* and *visitatio rerum*.\(^\text{523}\) The former required that the bishop inspect the priests and their congregants, and the latter obligated the bishop or his subordinate to

---

\(^{520}\) Parry writes that, before the foundation of the Audiencia of Nueva Galicia in Guadalajara, the *alcalde mayor* was primarily a judge of first instance even though he held jurisdiction over the whole province, and that they regarded their offices as personal property from which they could extract profit. Parry adds that, in New Galicia, “the office of alcalde mayor...existed only in districts settled or held by Spaniards,” whereas the office of *corregidor* was the highest imperial position in all other districts. Parry, *The Audiencia of Nueva Galicia in the Sixteenth Century: A Study in Spanish Colonial Government*, 34, 36. Brian Philip Owensby explains that *corregidores* and *alcaldes mayores* were usually in charge of the labor draft of Indigenous people known as *repartimiento*. Owensby, *Empire of Law and Indian Justice in Colonial Mexico* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008), 16.

\(^{521}\) AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1642 Contla”; McA-UCLA, Box 20-10, “1652a Guaxicori.”

\(^{522}\) “Documentos historicos sobre Durango: Mexico: ms., 1560-1847” compiled by José Fernando Ramírez (Berkeley, CA: Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley).

\(^{523}\) Lundberg, *Church Life between the Metropolitan and the Local: Parishes, Parishioners and Parish Priests in Seventeenth-Century Mexico*, 81-82.
examine the items and structures necessary for Catholic rituals. The *visitatio hominum* is thus more important to this study because it created an opportunity for the bishop to interact with Indigenous nobles who could praise their local cleric or denounce him in a written grievance. Furthermore, if the bishop could not perform a visitation, he could appoint someone to go in his stead, and in Northwestern New Spain, petitions suggest that the substitute was usually the *provisor.* For example, a writer records an addendum to “1657 Tonala” that the inhabitants of Tonala gave a statement to Don Juan Lopez Cerrato y Canas Candela, whom he identifies as *provisor y Vnt Genl, provisor and visitador general,* and adds that it was, “en la auto al visita” (in the statement during the visit). The two remaining petitions addressed to diocesan officials are “1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo,” which is addressed to a *presbítero vicario,* and “1646 Tequepechpan,” which is for the priest of Minas de Chimaltitlan, who is addressed with the title of *vicario.*

**Introduction**

Identified petitions provide a glimpse of the *visitatio hominum* from an Indigenous perspective. These documents were created through a process that included conversations between Indigenous elites and the given notary, who negotiated the content, but it is most likely that only the author decided to separate the content into three parts: an introduction, a grievance section, and a conclusion. The first step in a petition was the interview of the *visitatio hominum,*

---

524 Pilar Pueyo Colomina, “Propuesta metológica para el estudio de la visita pastoral” in *Memoria Ecclesiae XIV* (1999), 479-480; Lundberg, 82.

525 The notary of “1637 Cohuautlan” does not use any Spanish terms for the addressee, but a Spanish notary uses *presbítero provisor.* McA-UCLA, Box 20-42.

526 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.

527 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1646 Tequepechpan”; McA-UCLA, Box 20-42, “1637a Cohuautlan de Puertos de Abajo.”
which happened at the request of the diocesan official. For example, the notary of “1652 San Francisco Juchipila” writes:

\[
\text{mixpantzinzco otiuhalmohuicaque titechomaquilies mohueinahuatl yca tescomonion}^{528}
\]
\text{we came before you; you gave us your command with our communion.}

Then, during or after the meeting, notaries recorded what had happened by writing a petition. Twenty-one notaries begin their petitions by drawing a sign that clearly represents a cross on the first line at the top-center of the page. Does this cross represents how the Indigenous petitioners crossed themselves upon entering a colonial space and time controlled by the Christian official, or was it simply a writing convention?\(^{529}\)

Either way, the cross represents the first step in the introduction, which recreates the power-dynamic between the petitioners and the addressee during the visitatio hominum interview. In fourteen of the twenty-four petitions, notaries used a Nahuatl phrase that includes moixpantzinzco and the verb neci, [MN].\(^{530}\) Moixpantzinzco translates literally as “in your presence,” while neci means “appear,” which results in moixpantzinzco tinecico (we appear before you) or moixpantzinzco ninecico (I appear before you).\(^{531}\) [MN] phrases thus signal the power-dynamic between the petitioners and the diocesan official implying that the petitioners have to appear when summoned by the official. [MN] also unites the addressee [A], the “you,” to the

---

\(^{528}\) In tescomonion, tes is problematic. I believe that tes refers to to- the first person plural possessive pronominal. I propose that the notary confused tech-, the first person plural subject pronominal, and to-, the first person plural possessive pronominal. AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.

\(^{529}\) Kevin Terraciano (personal conversation, August 30, 2016) proposes that the cross refers to an oath that the writer takes to tell the truth.

\(^{530}\) I write [MN] because the M represents the first letter of mixpantzinzco (in your presence) and the N represents the first letter of the verbe neci (appear).

\(^{531}\) Most scholars generally use “in your presence.” Furthermore, most Spanish notaries generally translated tineci as pareemos as in “1652b San Sebastian Guaxicori” from McA-UCLA and “1678 Pochotitlan” from AHAG.
Indigenous petitioners [P] who are the “we,” or in a smaller number of cases the “I.” However, notaries generally do not use the Christian names of the petitioners [N] in the introduction except when they are representing themselves in an individual petition. Most notaries also usually assign the petitioner or petitioners a communal identity by associating them with a town [ID]. Additionally, many notaries also add an expression of deference [D] that refers to the act of bowing down (pechtēca), or kissing (tenamiqui) the hands, feet, or dress of the addressee [A].

Thus, notaries who represent a group could follow the cross [+] with five phrasal elements—[A], [P], [ID], [MN], [D]—whereas those who represented themselves might use up to six phrasal elements: [A], [P [N]], [ID], [MN], and [D].

Notaries used the cross and the different phrasal elements to introduce the participants and place them within a space dominated by a European Catholic audience, but they varied the content as demonstrated by “1653 Amatitlan,” “1678 Pochotitlan,” and “1622 La Magdalena” (Table 4-2). For example, the notary of “1653 Amatitlan” not only presents the petitioners [P] but also their Christian names in lines two and three [N], and he presents their communal identity by connecting them to the altepetl of Amatitlan in the province of Ávalos in lines three and four.

---

532 Hanks transcribes a petition from San Francisco Xecelchakan, and in line line five he translates Licix ca talez ca chacancunte caba ta yetel capetzcion as, “We come to show ourselves before you with our petition.” This segment suggests a resemblance to the Nahuatl petitions in my study, and explain the reason why Hanks wrote that Maya petitions have “the we” addressing “the you.” Hanks, *Converting words: Maya in the age of the cross*, 315, 332. In the documents from my study, a smaller number of petitions have an “I” when a petitioner represents himself or a single petitioner.

533 Karttunen and Lockhart write that expressions referring to kissing the hands or kissing the hands and feet were imported by Europeans even if they were expressed with the Nahuatl verb tenamiqui. However, they also note that bowing, expressed with the Nahuatl verb pechtēca, seems fully Indigenous. Karttunen and Lockhart in *The Art of Nahuatl Speech: The Bancroft Dialogues*, 25.

534 “1622 La Magdalena” is presented in full in Appendix B. AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1653 Amatitlan”; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1678 Pochotitlan”; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1622 La Magdalena.”
This can be abbreviated as [P [N [ID]]] because the petitioners are the subject of the petition while the phrases that name them and connect them to a town only serve to explain who they are within a Catholic hierarchy in which priests or monks ruled from head towns and the bishop supervised clerics and parishioners from Guadalajara:

1. +
2. \textit{franco de Sanctiag Regedor miquilangel Juñ cruz}+
3. \textit{miquil augostin Jän pablo nican tochin altipe}+

Miguel Agustín, and Juan Pablo here in our home, the community of Amatitlan its province of Ávalos, before you, we appear

Next, he writes \textit{mixpantzincBen tiniçiquiu}, an orthographic variant of \textit{mixpantzincinotece} [MN], to show that the petitioners are in the presence of the bishop who has commanded the interview.

The notary fully understands the addressee’s power, praising him and connecting him to God and the Virgin Mary [A [G][Ma]]:

5-6. \textit{yn titlatohuani yn timahuiztililony n tiopesbo}
You are the ruler, you are the revered one, you are the bishop.

6. \textit{yn titaço yn dios yhuan cehuapilli Sancta María}\textsuperscript{536}
You are precious, [so] are God and the holy noblewoman, Mary.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
Author & Name of the Petition & Addressee & A=Addressee; D=Act of Deference; G=God; ID=Communal identification; Ma=Mary; MN=\textit{mixpantzincinotece}; N=Names; P=Petitioner(s) \\
\hline
\hline
\hline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{The Introduction to Three Petitions}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{535} AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1653 Amatitlan.”

\textsuperscript{536} AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl, “1653 Amatitlan.”
Next, the Amatitlán notary presents an act of deference [D] that begins with the verb *tictotinamiquilia* (we kiss) *momatzin yhuan mocxitzin* (your hands and feet). The notary could have written *tictenamiqui momatzin yhuan mocxitzin* (we kiss your hands and feet), but he chose to use the honorific form of the verb by including a reflexive prefix (*-to*) and an applicative suffix (*-lia*).\(^{537}\) The phrase, *momatzin yhuan mocxitzin* (your hands and feet) is best translated as plural because it is a borrowed Spanish phrase that Franciscan friars alternately write in their correspondence as *besando las manos de V. M* (kissing the hands of your majesty), *sus reales manos besa* (kisses your royal hands), or *después de besar sus reales manos y pies* (after having kissed your royal hands and feet).\(^{538}\)

The notary of “1678 Pochotitlan” includes some of the same phrases used by the previous notary while using verbs like *tinamiqui/tenamiqui* (kiss) in their more direct, non-reverential forms:

1. \(\text{tehuantin timochintin nican ipan ini altepetl}\)
   We are all here in this community of
2. \(\text{Santiago pochotitlan mixpantzinco tinesico ica}\)
   Santiago Pochotitlan. Before you, we appear with
3. \(\text{ini topetision titotlatoani S' obispo tictenamiquilo momatzin ihuan mocxitzin...}\)^\(^{539}\)
   this, our petition for you, our lord bishop. We kiss your hands and feet...

He begins with a mark that resembles the number 2 or the mark that notaries made to begin a new paragraph. He also connects the petitioners to Santiago Pochotitlan [P [ID?]], but there is

\(^{537}\) In line 7, Don Jeronimo writes, “çenca tictotinamiquilia momatzin y huā mocxitzin.”

\(^{538}\) *Cartas de Religiosos de Nueva España* ed. by Joaquín García Icazbalceta (Mexico City: Editorial Salvador Chávez Hayhoe, 1941), 147. *Codice Franciscano*, 161, 169, 175. The notary, like other Nahuas, only pluralizes animate beings and neither hands nor feet fit this mental category. Hanks appears to present a similar construction for the Maya petition of San Francisco Xecelchakán, *Licix ca Sopixti cech yetel ca udzbenic u ni auoc*, which he translates as, “We kneel to you and we kiss your foot...” Hanks, *Converting Words: Maya in the Age of the Cross*, 331-332.

\(^{539}\) AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1678 Pochotitlan.”
some ambiguity because of the statement *tehuantin timochintin nican ipan ini altepetl* (we are all here in this community) instead of more definitive terms like *nican tochan* (here in our home) or *tialtepehuaque* (we are inhabitants/officials). Is the notary implying that the petitioners were residents of this town or only that they had arrived there for the visitation interview? Then, the notary uses *mixmapzinco tinecico* [MN] to explain the reason for speaking before the addressee whom he introduces as *titlatoani Sr obispo* (lord bishop). He concludes with a very direct act of deference in lines four and five, *tictenamiquilo momatzin ihuan mocxitzi* (we kiss your hands and feet) in which the verb *tenamiqui* lacks reverential affixes to indicate deference.

In a third petition, “1622 La Magdalena,” a notary represents a female petitioner, María Magdalena, and his verb usage resembles that of the notary of “1653 Amatitlan.” He writes:

1. 
2-3. *yn çena yntimahuiztililoni ynteoyotica titlatohuani sñor provisor.* You are very much respected for [your] holiness, you are the provisor.

Then, like the notary of “1653 Amatitlan”, he uses *timahuiztililoni* (your are the revered one) and *titlatohuani* (you are lord) and adds *teoyotica* (with holiness) and *Sr* (lord) when introducing the provisor. Next, he presents *mixmapzinco nineçico* [MN] and the act of submission:

3. *mixmapzinco nineçico. nimopechtecaco. nicnotena* 
Before you, I appear. I come to bow down and kiss your

4. *miquillico teoyotica* motlatocamatzin yhuā teoyotica motlato holy lordly hands and your holy lordly feet.

---

540 Lockhart defines the singular form *āltepēhuah* as “inhabitant or official of an *altepetl*.” Lockhart, *Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts*, 210.

541 *Titlatoani Sr obispo* appears to be a multi-lingual couplet that includes two terms that have the same or a similar meaning, ruler/lord: *tlatoani* and *Sr* for *Señor*.

542 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1622 La Magdalena.”

543 Guerra writes “*Teoiotica: espiritual*” (spiritual, holy). Guerra, 32.

544 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1622 La Magdalena.”
He writes the act of deference [D] with two verbs—nimopechtecaco (I come to bow down) and nicnotenamiquillico (I come to kiss...)—the second of which is in the reverential form with a reflexive prefix (no-) and an applicative suffix (-li[a]). Furthermore, he refers to the holiness (teoyotica) of the provisor’s hands and feet, while proclaiming these appendages as lordly (tlatoca) before introducing Maria’s communal identity [ID]:

5. ma xinechnoçelilitzino yni mocnomacevatl notoca m̲̲̲̲̲̲.
   May you receive me, your humble servant. My name is María
6. magdalena nicā nochan Sandra María magdalena545
   Magdalena. My home is here in La Magdalena.

Thus, these three writers arrange phrases in a standardized manner, which suggests that they drew from a common repertoire, which was also available to many of the other Indigenous writers of petitions in Northwestern New Spain.

It is not possible to present a full analysis of all the twenty-six diocesan petitions, but Table 4-3 presents the introduction for the identified diocesan petitions. The writer and addressee are listed in the left column, followed by the name of the petition, and the phrasal elements discussed above.

Table 4-3: The Introductions of Twenty-Six Diocesan Petitions546

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Addressee</th>
<th>Name of Petition</th>
<th>A=Addressee; CH=Church; D=Act of Deference; G=God; ID=Communal identification; Ma=Mary; MN=mixpantzinco tigeico; N=Names; P=Petitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Puy to provisor</td>
<td>1622 San Andrés Cahuatlan</td>
<td>1. [ID][+] 2.3. [A [ID]] 3.4. [P [ID]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown to provisor</td>
<td>1622 La Magdalena</td>
<td>1. [+] 2.3. [P [N]] 3.4 [ID] 4.5 [MN] 5.6 [A] 7.8. [D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Cruz to vicario</td>
<td>1637 Cahuatlan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td>1. [+] 2. [A [G]] 3. [P [ID]] 4. [D]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

545 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1622 La Magdalena.”

546 “1637 Cahuatlan de Puertos de Abajo,” “1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta,” “1652b Quihuiquinta,” “1652b San Sebastian Guaxicori,” and “1652 San Martín” are from McA-UCLA, box 20. All others are from AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petitioner</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649 S. Francisco Ayahualulco</td>
<td>1.[+2-4.[A [G]] 5.[G][CH] 6.[MN] 6-9.[P [ID]] 9-10.[D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649 S. Juan Ocoticic</td>
<td>1.[+2-3.[G] 4-7.[A [G][K]] 8-11. [P [ID][N]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649a La Magdalena</td>
<td>1. [+2. [A] 3. [MN] 3-6. [P [ID]] 6-8 [D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649b La Magdalena</td>
<td>1. [+2. [A] 3. [P] [ID] 4. [D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1652a S. Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>1.[+2-3 [Y] 4-5. [P] 5-6. [ID] [ETH]547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1652b S. Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>1.[+2. [A] 3. [P] [ID] 4-5. [P] 5-6. [ID] [ETH]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>1.[+2-4.[P [N][ID]] 4-5.[MN] 5-6.[A [G][Ma]] 7-8.[D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Juan to bishop</td>
<td>1653 San Martín</td>
<td>1.[+1D] 2-3.[S][S] 4-5.[P] 5.[A] 6.[A [D][G]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo de Ramos to provisor</td>
<td>1657 Tonalá</td>
<td>1.[+2-3.[A [D]] 4-5.[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to unnamed</td>
<td>1661 Etzatlan</td>
<td>1.[+2.[MN] 3.[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to provisor</td>
<td>1668 S. F. Zacoalco</td>
<td>1.[+2-3.[P [ID] 5.[D] 6.[A] 7-8. [D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to provisor</td>
<td>1669 S. María Magdalena Tizapan</td>
<td>1.[+2.[A] 2-3.[MN] 3-4. [P [ID]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1673 S. Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>1.[+2-3.[A] 3-4.[ID] 4.[P] 4-7. [D [G][A]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1678 Santiago Pochotitlan</td>
<td>1.2 2-3.[P [ID]] 3.[MN] 4.[A] 4-5.[D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1679 Analco</td>
<td>1.[+2.[A] 3-7.[P [ID]] 7.[A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1679 Sayula</td>
<td>1.[+2.[MN] 2.[A] 2-4. [P [ID]] 5-6.[D] 6-7.[A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1686 San Pedro Tepec</td>
<td>1.[ID] 2.[+3-5.[A [ID]] 5.[MN] 5-7. [P [ID]] 7-8. [G [P]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando Miguel to bishop</td>
<td>1692 S. Andrés Atonalco</td>
<td>1.[+2-3. [D [G][A]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>N.Y. Aquautitlan</td>
<td>1.None of the aforementioned elements are present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the phrasal elements in the introduction suggest two variations: individual petitions that follow a format similar to “1622 La Magdalena” and collective petitions that follow a format similar to either “1653 Amatitlan” or “1678 Pochotitlan.” However, some variations occur. For example, the notaries of most of these diocesan petitions commonly associate the

547 The collective identification of this petition is unique because it includes an ethnic name, Totoramis, which is associated with a town, nican tochan Samtoniy Quiviquinta (here in our home of San Antonio Quihuiquinta). The only other writer who includes the ethnic identity of petitioners is the writer of “N.Y. Nombre de Dios” (See Chapter 5.2a). In a different genre, Don Francisco Nayari also includes his ethnic identity in a letter to a bishop (See Chapters 1.1, 2.2c, and 6).
petitioners with a communal identity [P [ID]], but Pedro Puy and the writer of “1686 San Pedro Tepec” also connect the addressee with a communal identity [A [ID]]. Pedro Puy writes:

1. *Cuatlan*

2. *Señr frufixotl vmpa timoyetztica: quatlacala*\(^{548}\)
   Lord *provisor*, you are there in Guadalajara

And the notary of “1686 San Pedro Tepec” writes:

1. *Altepel S po tepec*
   The town of San Pedro Tepec

2. +

3-4. *peticion quimocaquitlitztlacatlatovani señor obispo yntima vistililoni*
   Will the ruler, the lord bishop hear the petition? You are the very revered

4. *ço çeñoria ylostrisimo ynonpa timoyetztica ypāma*
   *señoria ilustrísima.* You are there in the splendid

5. *viztic siodad calisia gadalaxara*\(^{549}\)
   city of Galicia Guadalajara.

Both of these writers clearly associate the diocesan official who is the addressee with Guadalajara, the seat of the diocese. They also start their petitions in a similar manner by providing the name of the petitioners’ town even though they will repeat it later when associating the petitioners with their respective towns [P [ID]].

Additionally, three notaries use a variation of *tinecico moixpantzinco*. Juan Cruz writes *timitztotlatlauhtilia mixpantzinco* (we implore before you) together with an act of deference that includes bowing down and kissing in lines 3-4; the notary of “1649 Tachichilco” only has *moixpantzinco* in line 2 followed by an act of deference in line 3, and the addressee and the

\(^{548}\) AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1622 San Andrés Cohuatlan.”

\(^{549}\) AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1686 San Pedro Tepec.”
Indigenous nobles in lines 5-6. Finally, the notary of “1668 Zacoalco” introduces the Indigenous petitioners in lines 2-5, the addressee in line 6, and the act of deference in lines 7-8 while using monahuactzinco, which literally means “near you” in Central Mexican Nahuatl, and which Cortés y Zedeño defines as an adverb that means “with you,” so that this phrase most likely means “before you,” or “before your presence.”

Although the notaries of the 25 diocesan petitions organized these elements in different ways, thirteen of them finish the introduction with an act of deference [D]. They include Juan Cruz, and the writers of “1653 Amatitlan,” “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacezco,” “1668 Zacoalco,” and “1678 Pochotitlan.” Thus, the act of deference [D] served as the most common transitional element to the grievance section, the heart of the petition.

**Grievance Act**

The core of a petition is the grievance section, normally focused on one or more grievances that varied by community (discussed more fully in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6). Here, too, notaries tended to rely on common phrases and formulas to begin and conclude this section. For the most part, they begin the grievance section with verbs that signify the vocalization or reception of a speech-act—caqui (hear/listen), tlatlauhtilia (implore), tlatlania (ask), and mati (know)—or the presentation of a petition before an official, using other verbs like chihua (make), tlaça (put forward), and yz catqui (here is).

---

550 Lockhart writes that -nāhuac is a relational word that means “close to, or near.” Cortés y Zedeño defines monahuac means contigo (with you) and writes that inahuac meant con (with) for animate nouns. Lockhart, Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts, 226; Cortés y Zedeño, 72.

551 Lockhart defines catqui as the archaic present singular of cah, which is most present in the set phrase iz catqui, here is. Lockhart, Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts, 213.
The six notaries who use caqui vary the degree of deference while asking the addressee to listen, adding one or more layers of politeness (Table 4-4). With caqui, this means that a direct expression like ticcaqui nonetequipachol (you hear my grievance) is too impolite, whereas ma xiccaqui nonetequipachol (may you hear my grievance) achieves politeness through its use of the optative. However, the writer of “1622 La Magdalena” took it one step beyond by keeping the optative and using the reverential form of the verb, ma xicmocaquiltitzino. The notary who recorded the statement of this rare female petitioner is either explaining her petition in a gendered manner that reflects her status, or he is following local conventions. Both reasons probably played a role, but the combination of the optative together with the reverential is present in petitions from La Magdalena and nearby towns. It is also used by the notaries of “1649a La Magdalena,” “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco,” and “1679 Sayula,” who write in the towns of La Magdalena, San Antonio Tuzcacuezco, and Sayula, which are connected by an important road (Refer to Chapter 2.2e). Meanwhile, Pedro Puy, Diego Juan, and the notary of “1668 Zacoalco” also use the reverential form of caqui, but instead of the optative, they use the -s suffix to denote a future or irrealis construction that adds an additional level of deference in that it is less direct than the indicative.

Table 4-4: Seven Grievance Acts that Require the Addressee to Hear/Listen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author &amp; Adressee</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Transition to the Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>María Magdalena</td>
<td>1622 La Magdalena</td>
<td>7. ma xicmocaquiltitzino yni techcopa yno netequipachol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to provisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>May you hear my affliction...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Puy to</td>
<td>1622 San Andrés</td>
<td>4-5. ticmocaquititzis toneçentalislatl totlayocoyalls tochoquis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provisor</td>
<td>Cohuatlan</td>
<td>Will you listen to our collective words: our sadness, our tears...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649a La Magdalena</td>
<td>9. Ma xicmocaquititz yn tonetequipachol yntoloaoyalliz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May you hear our affliction, our sadness...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Named to</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cited Line(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezzo</td>
<td>8-9. <em>ma xicmocaquilti tonetequipachol totlaocoyaliz</em> May you hear our affliction, our sadness...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Juan to bishop</td>
<td>1653 San Martin</td>
<td>7. <em>nican ticmocaquitz tonetequipachol tochoquiz...</em> Here, you will hear our affliction, our tears...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to provisor</td>
<td>1668 Zacoalco</td>
<td>9-10. <em>Auh yzcatqui tichualmocaquitis yn tonitiquipacholitzin</em> Here, you will come to hear our affliction...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1679 Sayula</td>
<td>8. <em>axca timocaquilte tonetequipachol ypanpa...</em> Now, you have heard our affliction concerning...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notaries who begin the grievance act with *tlalauhtia* (implore) or *tlania* (ask for) mention the petitioners before shifting to the addressee. In “1637 Coatlan de Puertos de Abajo,” Juan Cruz writes:

6-7. **timitztotlatlauhtilia ma huel xitechmopalehuili**

We implore you. May you really help us, who are

7. *tehuantin timaçehualhuan* $^{553}$ Dios *ynitechcopa* $^{554}$

God’s servants, concerning...

In this way, Juan Cruz creates an atmosphere in which the petitioners are Christians who use the reverential form to ask or implore a diocesan official for aid. Meanwhile, Diego Juan does not use the optative form in “1654 San Martin”:

7. **cenca miyec timotlauhtia monahuac timochintin...**

We very much implore you, all of us [are] before you...$^{555}$

Diego Juan uses two intensifiers, *cenca miec*, “very much,” before *tlauhtia*, which could indicate another grammatical mechanism to show deference before the bishop, the addressee in this case.

In total, four out of five notaries who began the grievance act with a form of *tlauhtia* favored the reverential form; both of the two notaries who rely on *ihtlania* (ask) favor the more

$^{553}$ The first syllable, *timaqehualhuan*, has two morphemes: *ti* represents the first person plural subject pronominal and the third person singular possessive pronominal, which is *i*.

$^{554}$ McA-UCLA, Box 20-42, “1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo.”

$^{555}$ “1654 San Martín” is presented in full in Appendix B. AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1654 San Martín.”
direct form without these affixes (Table 4-5). The unnamed notaries of “1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan” and “1678 Santiago Pochotitlan” respectively use tetlanilo and tictlanilo with no reverential affixes perhaps in an intentional way because they are from communities that Spanish sources identify as Cazcan and Tepecano, two very independent peoples who lived in the cold lands (Refer to Chapter 2.3c and 2.3e). Therefore, either the notaries used a more rustic and less-polished Nahuatl, or they had reached the end of their patience and wished to show the bishop their indignation with their language.

Table 4-5: Seven Grievance Acts that Begin with tlauhtia/lania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author &amp; Address</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Transition to the Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan Cruz to vicario</td>
<td>1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td>6-7. timiztrotlatlauhtilia ma huel xitechmopalehuili... We implore you. May you help us...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649 S. Francisco Ayahualulco</td>
<td>10-11. yhuan séca miec timiztrotlatlauhtilinco yncac tolaocox tochoqiz... We come to very much implore you with our afflictions, our tears...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649 S. Juan Ocotic</td>
<td>11. tepilhuan nican oncate ypan altepetl mochtin michmotlatlauhtililo... The sons here in the community all implore you...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649b La Magdalena</td>
<td>9-10. cenca huel miec timiztrotlatlauh tilia y[n] itechcopa... We very much implore you concerning...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo de Ramos to provisor</td>
<td>1657 Tonala</td>
<td>5-6. ca senca mitzmotatahuahtilia yxquichtin mopilhuan so all of your children very much implore you...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to provisor</td>
<td>1669 Santa María Mag. Tizapan</td>
<td>4-5. tetlanilo monahuac aço tetemacasque lemosna... We ask if we should give alms before you...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1678 Santiago Pochotitlan</td>
<td>5-6. tictlanilo motepalehuilis ticnequilo We ask for your help that we want...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

556 The petitions are McA-UCLA, Box 20-42, “1637a Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo”; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649 San Francisco Ayahualulco”; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649 San Juan Ocotic”; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649b La Magdalena”; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1657 Tonala.”; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan.”

557 Cortés y Zedeño defines taocotnilizti as “passion de Anima,” suffering of the soul. I will define it as affliction. Cortés y Zedeño, 105.
Another series of notaries employs *mati* (know) (Table 4-6).\(^{558}\) However, *mati* is related to many verbs: *ixmati* (recognize), *momachtia* (learn), or *tlamachtia* (teach). Notaries from Northwestern New Spain generally used *mati* in either the irrealis or reverential form. For example, the writer of “1649 Tachichilco” writes:

3. *tehuantin nican altepetl tachichilco moixpantzinco*
   We here in the town of Tachichilco, in your presence,
4. *timopechtecalo ticmatiz quinami guardian Chacala ica chicahualisti*\(^ {559}\)
   bow down. You will know how the guardian of Chacala [is acting] with animosity.
5. *techhuquila*\(^ {560}\) *ipanpa toylhuio San Pedro chiquacen pesos tomines*
   He owes us money, six pesos, for our feast-day of San Pedro.

Here, the writer presents a scenario in which the petitioners are witnesses who are reporting the improper actions of their priest to a superior. The notary of “1652 San Francisco Juchipila,” makes a similar argument with the reverential and the irrealis form of the verb:

9. *ca mixpantzinco tinecico*
   In your presence, we appear
10. *yn ica topetision ynitechcopa ca ticmomachiltis*\(^ {561}\)
   with our petition concerning what you will learn.

With these words, the writer has noted that this petition resulted from the bishop’s quest for information during the *visita hominum*. The writers of “1652b San Sebastian Guaxicori” and “1673 San Francisco Tizapan” likewise convey a similar argument.

Table 4-6: Four Grievance Acts that Seek to Inform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author &amp; Addressee</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Transition to the Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


\(^{559}\) AHAG, “1649 Tachichilco,” Documentos en náhuatl.

\(^{560}\) *Techhuquila* is related to *huīquilia*, “be responsible to someone for something; to owe money to someone; with *huīl*, to bring something to someone; onichuīquilih. applicative of huīca.” Lockhart, *Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts*, 219.

\(^{561}\) AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649 San Francisco Juchipila.”
unnamed to bishop 1649 Tachichiaco 4-5. ticmatiz quinami guardian Chacala ica chicahualisli...
you will know that the guardian of Chacala has animosity

unnamed to bishop 1652 San Francisco Juchipila 10. yn ica topetision yntitechcopa ca ticmomachilitis...
with our petition concerning what you will learn...

unnamed to bishop 1652b San Sebastian Guaxicori 9-10. timitzmachilti amo senca cuali...
we inform you because it is not very good...

unnamed to bishop 1673 San Francisco Tizapan 4-7. ticmomachilitis ypanpa santa confradiya...
you will learn about the holy cofradía...

The last group of notaries use a variety of other verbs including chihua (make), tlaça (put forward), tenamiqui (kiss), decimos (we say), and yzcotqui (here is), but these petitions appear to be more immediate and/or rough in nature (Table 4-7). For example, Sebastian García writes, “I put forward my petition,” and the notary of “N.Y. Aquautitlan” writes, “here is our petition,” to record utterances that appear to be little removed from visitation interviews. The same is true of the writer of “1653 Amatitlan,” who explains that he and the petitioners, “kiss your hands and feet because of our grievance,” and the notary of “1686 San Pedro Tepec who proclaims, “here is our grievance, our sadness concerning...” Then, there is Hernando Miguel who writes in Spanish explaining, “we say it on account of what had occurred before the provisor,” perhaps to clarify a situation that this diocesan official saw during the visitatio hominum.

Table 4-7: Eight Other Words that Begin the Grievance Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author &amp; Addresssee</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Transition to the Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>7. nican ticchihualo tonedequipacholis totlaocoialis...Here we make our grievance, our sadness...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Garcia to bishop</td>
<td>1652b San Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>17-18. nictlaça ca yn nopedicion ytechcopa...I put forward my petition concerning...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Don Jeronimo to bishop | 1653 Amatitlan | 7-8. tictotinamiquilia...ypanpa yn tonitiquipacholiztli yn tochoquitliztli
We kiss your hands and feet because of our grievance, our tears...

| unnamed to bishop | 1679 Analco | 7-8. decimos que por quanto e avido ocurrido ante el...provisor...we say that because it occurred before the provisor... |

562 The petitions in Table 4-7 are McA-UCLA, Box 20-10, “1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta”; McA-UCLA, Box 20-10, “1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta”; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1653 Amatitlan”; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1679 Analco”; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1686 San Pedro Tepec.”
After employing these verbs, notaries present the grievances behind their petitions. In most cases, they name clerics against whom they direct petitions: two against secular clerics, eight against regular clerics, and two against both friars and *alcaldes mayores*. They also present four other petitions against *alcaldes mayores*, two against Spanish landowners, one against a *creole* landowner, and one against a Don Giuseppe, whose identity is unknown. Other notaries describe situations affecting the correspondence community that focused on having too many feast-days requiring tribute, or wishing to retract a previous petition against a priest. The reasons that represent the unique parts of the petitions will be examined in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6.

After the grievance has been stated, notaries transition to more formulaic phrases to close the grievance act. The use of stock phrases vary by province. In the province of Ávalos, notaries tended to conclude the act of grievance with the words *yxquich* (it is all) and *totlatol* (our words). Diego Juan finishes “1653 San Martin” with *ya yxquich totlatol* (they are all our words...); the notary of “1668 Zacoalco” concludes with *yxquich nican tlami totlatotzin* (it is all, here end our words); and that of “1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan” writes *ya yxquich totlatoltzin ticmocaquitiz* (it is all our words that you will hear). The use of *yxquich* and *totlatol* extended to other provinces, as well. In the adjacent province of Amula, the author of “1649 San Antonio Tuzcauezco” wrote *cenca timitztotlatlauhtilia yxquich totlatol yua quinequi toyolo* (we beseech you with all of our words and wishes); in Juchipila (“1652 San Francisco Juchipila”) the notary wrote *ynin tonetequipachol yxquich totlatol* (these are our afflictions, all of our words).
In La Magdalena, Itzatlan, authors used *yxquich* with *mixpatzinco* to terminate the act of grievance. The notary of “1622 La Magdalena” writes *yxquich yc mixpātzinco nimitznotlatlautillico* (it is all that I implore before you), which is very similar in usage to the notary of “1649a La Magdalena” and “1649b La Magdalena” who writes *ca yxquich yc mixpātzinco tinecico* (that is all [the reasons] why we appear before you) in his documents.

**Conclusion Act**

Notaries closed a petition, a recorded speech act, with a conclusion, which generally included the Catholic names of the petitioners [N], and may also include one or more phrasal elements such as the year-date [Y], the communal identity of the petitioners [ID], and references to God [G], writing [W], and signing [S].

The notary of “1653 Amatitlan” and Diego Juan represent two extremes because the former only provided the names of the petitioners [N]:

31-32. *mopelhuā Juan Cruz, Juan Pablo, Francisco de Santiago regidor,*
It is begun by Juan Cruz, Juan Pablo, Francisco de Santiago regidor
32. *Miguel Angel, Miguel Agustín.*
Miguel Angel, and Miguel Agustín.

In contrast, Diego Juan recorded the names and the communal identity of the petitioners [ID], the year-date [Y], and made references to God [G], writing [W], and signing [S]:

42-43. *Nican timofirmatia timochintin huehuetque altepetl Samātin*
Here we, all the elders of the town of San Martín, sign:
43-46. *Luis Vasques, alcalde, Juan Guerra, regidor, Juan Sebastián, fiscal.*
46-48. *principales: Juan de la Cruz, Francisco Miguel, Juan Esteban, Juan Agustín*
48-49. *Bernabé Leandro, Francisco Sebastián, Luis Martín, Pedro Gerónimo*
49-50. *otitlacuiloque axcan 1 tonali abril yhuan xiuitl 1653 anos*
We wrote it today on April 1, 1653.

---

563 I use year-date to indicate that a date includes the year, which forms a vital part of my classification system for the documents in my study.

564 McA-UCLA, Box 20, “1653 San Martín.” Diego Juan also wrote “1654 San Martín,” which is presented in full in Appendix B, and is held by AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
Diego Juan is the notary on behalf of the elders and residents of San Martin.

Other notaries present a conclusion act that falls somewhere in between these two extremes (Table 4-8). The most common phrasal element is N, which appears in Diego Juan’s two petitions, in “1653 Amatitlan,” and in twenty other named-diocesan petitions. The next most common elements are the references to the year-date [Y] in thirteen petitions and the references to signing [S] in fourteen petitions. Writers use other phrases less frequently. Nine refer to communal identity [ID], seven to writing [W], six to God [G], two to the Virgin Mary [Ma], and four to a month-date [M] that lacks the year.

Table 4-8: Phrasal elements in the Act of Conclusion in 26 identified diocesan petitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author &amp; Addressee</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>D=Act of Deference; ID=Collective identification of petitioners; MT=Mixpantzincino tinecico M=Monthly date; N=Names; G=God; S=Ref. to signing; Ma=Ref. to Mary; W=Ref. to writing; Y=Year-date.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Puy to provisor</td>
<td>1622 Coatlan</td>
<td>51. [M] 52. [ID]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María Magdalena to provisor</td>
<td>1622 La Magdalena</td>
<td>44. [G] [Ma] 45. [W] 46. [N] 47. [+]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Cruz to vicario</td>
<td>1637 Cohuatan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td>34. [S] [W] 34-35. [Y] 36. [S] 36-41. [N] 42. [+]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649 S. A. Tuzacuezco</td>
<td>32. [Y] 32-33. [S] 33-36 [N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649 S. F. Ayahualulco</td>
<td>Not finished. 69. [Y] 70-73. [N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649 S. J. Ocotitico</td>
<td>82.[S] 82-85.[N] 85.[W] 86-88.[Y]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1649b La Magdalena</td>
<td>15-16. [D] 16-20. [ID] 21-25. [N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Garcia to bishop</td>
<td>1652b S. Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>Not finished. 79-80. [Y] 81-85. [N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1652b S. Seb. Guaxicori</td>
<td>26-27.[N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>31-32. [N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo de Ramos</td>
<td>1657 Tonalá</td>
<td>66-67.[ID] 67-68.[D] 69-78.[N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to unknown</td>
<td>1661 Etzatlan</td>
<td>15.[MN] 15-16.[D] 16-20.[N]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

565 McA-UCLA, Box 20, “1653 San Martin.”
4.2b. Alcalde Mayor, Royal Audiencia, and Royal Petitions

The notaries of the three named-alcalde mayor petitions, three named-Real Audiencia petitions, and the named-royal petition include elements found in the diocesan model (Table 4-9). Juan Miguel most closely follows the model in that he uses [P [N][ID]] in the introduction of his alcalde mayor petition:

2-3. neguatl noto Ju'miguel nialcalde nochan contlan
    I am named Juan Miguel. I am the alcalde in my home of Contlan.
3-4. *moyspan ninesico nimomacegual yca petition*\(^{566}\)

I, your Indigenous subject, appear before you with a petition.

He ends the introduction with a variant of *moixpantzino tinecico* [MN], and he begins the grievance act with *tinechmopalleguilis* (could you help me), the future/irrealis form of *pallehuia* (help). Then, he concludes:

21-24. *ysquich nican tami tomacegualtotoltzin*\(^{567}\) *to\(^{60}\)ca Fran\(^{60}\) Min, frioste*

it is all, here end our common words. Our Indigenous people are named:

Francisco Martín, *prioste,*

23-24. *Juan Miguel, alcalde, Af\(^{6}\)S Pelipe, rregidor*...\(^{568}\)

Juan Miguel, *alcalde,* Alonzo Felipe, *regidor*...

He uses *ysquich nican tami* (it is all, here ends) to close the grievance act and begins the conclusion act with *tomacegualtotoltzin* (our common words) before introducing the Indigenous officers who sponsored this petition. In the introduction, “1580a Nochistlan,” “1580b Nochistlan,” “1593a Oconahuac” share most of the phrasal elements of the diocesan model, and they all include the Christian names of the petitioners.

**Table 4-9: Non-diocesan Petitions**\(^{569}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Grievance Section</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Diocesan model</td>
<td>[+] [A][MN]][P [ID][D]</td>
<td>listen, ask/implore, know, be/present</td>
<td>[Y][S][N] or [W][N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1580a Nochistlan</td>
<td>1. [+] 2. [G] 3. [A] [D]</td>
<td>we speak...</td>
<td>20-25. [N]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{566}\) AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1642 Contla.”

\(^{567}\) Contla was inhabited by Tecuexes, a non-Nahua group (refer to Chapter 2.2c). As a result, the notary probably wrote *tomacegualtotoltzin* with *itolli*, a non-standard form of *tlatolli*, that he also made plural through reduplication. In this context, *macegual* (commoner) would be functioning as a modifier to *itolli*. A less likely possibility is that the notary combined portions two diminutives, *-izintzin* and *-totontin*, and that the Tecuex language influenced the change from *l* to *n*. Michel Launey defines *-totontin* as a diminutive suffix. Launey, *An Introduction to Classical Nahuatl* trans. by Christopher Mackay (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 108.

\(^{568}\) AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1642 Contla.”

\(^{569}\) “1642 Contla” and “1661 Etzatlan” are from AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl; “1652a San Sebastian Guaxicori” is from McA-UCLA, Box 20; “1593a Oconahuac” is from BPEJ-JJA; and “N.Y. Nombre de Dios” is from BAN-UCB.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca. 1585</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Here is the petition of how...</td>
<td>[N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>1593a Oconahuac</td>
<td>1.[+] 2-7.[P [ID]] 8.[MN] 8-10.[A] 10-13.[D]</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>46-58.[P [ID][N]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Miguel</td>
<td>1642 Contla</td>
<td>1.[+] 2-3.[P [N][ID]] 3.[MN]</td>
<td>help</td>
<td>21-24.[N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>1652a S.S. Guaxicori</td>
<td>1.[+] 2.[G] 2-5.[A [ID]]</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>54-55.[S] 55-57.[N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>N.Y. Aquautitan</td>
<td>1. [P]</td>
<td>Here is our petition. We assembled because...</td>
<td>4-8. [S [Y [A]] [N] 9. [S [G]]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, “N.Y. Aquautitan,” and “Nombre de Dios” are noticeably different from the diocesan model. The notary of “N.Y. Aquautitan” writes a very short introduction in which he rapidly transitions into the grievance act:

1-2.nica ca topetecion otimocentlalique principalis ypampa techtequipacho\ ah teopiscauh\[^{570}\]
Here is our petition. We, the principales, assembled because the priest afflicts us...

In a sense, he embeds a portion of the introduction, principales [P], within the grievance act, which is nica ca topetecion...ypampa techtequipacho teopiscauh (here is our petition...because the priest afflicts us). This introduction is very different from the diocesan model, but it does resemble one diocesan petition, “1661 Etzatlan:”

*Moixpantzinco tinesilo timopilhuan mochintin altepehuaque*  \[^{571}\]
[beginning of the grievance section]

with our petition about...

The notary of “1661 Etzatlan” mentions the petitioners with a variant of moixpantzin tinesico [MN] before beginning the grievance act with topetecion (our petition). Meanwhile, “N.Y.

[^{570}]: AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl, “N.Y. Aquautitan.”

[^{571}]: AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl, “1661 Etzatlan.”
Nombre de Dios, ca. 1585” diverges the most from these petitions and from the diocesan model in that its notary appears to skip the introduction. He begins with the grievance act:

\[
\text{Auh [i]n izcatqui ylnamicoca ynic opeuh yaoyotli yn ica al la bila del no[m]bre de Dios...}
\]

Here is the account of how the war began in the town of Nombre de Dios...\(^{572}\)

He uses \text{auh [i]n izcatqui ylnamicoca} (here is the account) to begin recording the grievance, which arose from a war, without writing about any petitioners who might have sponsored the document (Refer to Chapter 5.2a).\(^{573}\) Finally, although the conclusions vary, they are more regular than the introductions for they all include the Christian names of the petitioners [N].

4.2c. Classifying Unidentified Petitions

Notaries did not classify eighteen documents that resemble petitions: six from the sixteenth century, eight from the seventeenth century, and four that are undated. The absence of year-dates in documents suggests that they represent early examples of alphabetic writing in Northwestern New Spain when writers may have been less aware of the importance of dating writings. As a result, these documents have to be compared with sixteenth-century Indigenous works, which are likewise early examples of Indigenous literacy with the Roman alphabet. The results suggest that these twelve documents are indeed petitions because they have phrasal elements similar to those of the diocesan model in the introduction, grievance section, and conclusion (Table 4-10).\(^{574}\)

\(^{572}\) BAN-UCB, Documentos histórico sobre Durango: Mexico: ms., 1560-1847, compiled by José Fernando Ramírez.

\(^{573}\) Molina defines \text{ilnamicoca} as “mi remembrança, o la memoria que de mi se haze” (my account or the account that is made about me). Molina, 37.

\(^{574}\) “1593a Xalisco,” “1593b Xalisco,” “N.Y. Xalisco, ca. 1593,” “1594 Xalisco,” 1595a Xalisco,” and “1595b Xalisco,” are from BPEJ-JJA, Fondo Franciscano. “1593b Oconahuac,” is from BPEJ-JJA, Real Audiencia.
The introduction of the sixteenth-century unidentified documents generally have most elements of the diocesan model: a cross [+], a European addressee [A], *moixpantzíno tinecico* [MN], petitioners with their collective identity [P [ID]], and an expression of deference [D]. The different writers of the Xalisco documents included most of these elements, and that of “1594 Xalisco” also added a reference to Saint Francis. In another province, Izatlan, the writer of “1593b Oconahuac” wrote an introduction that resembles that of the diocesan petitions in that it refers to the addressee, the petitioners with their collective identity, and *moixpantzíno tinecico*. “N.Y. Sayula, “N.Y. San Cacel Tlajomulco,” and “N.Y. Tlajomulco” have most of the elements of the diocesan model, whereas “N.Y. About Diego Alfonso” only refers to the petitioners and lacks their communal identity.

Most of these notaries also use verbs that mean ask/implore, know, or be/present to establish the supplicant-judge relationship that is found in diocesan petitions. Five use ask/implore, one uses know, and five use be/present. The only exception is the writer of “N.Y. San Cacel Tlajomulco” who asks, “how do you see us.”

In the conclusion, nine notaries include the names of the petitioners [N] while others use a communal expression [ID], and one restates the titles of the addressee [A]. One of the Oconahuac writers and two of the Xalisco writers include the Christian names of the petitioners. All four writers who did not include a year-date write the names of the petitioners. The notaries of “1593b Xalisco,” “1594 Xalisco,” and “1595a Xalisco” present the communal identity of the petitioners without naming them. Even the writer of “N.Y. About Diego Alfonso,” who includes

---
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fewer elements than the others, records a conclusion act with a phrase representing the act of signing [S] followed by the names of the petitioners [N].

Table 4-10: The Diocesan Model and Ten Documents from the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Transition to the Grievance Act</th>
<th>Conclusion Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Diocesan model</td>
<td>[+] [A] [MN] [P [ID][D]]</td>
<td>listen, ask/implore, know, presentation phrase</td>
<td>[Y][S][W][N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1593b Oconahua</td>
<td>[+] [ID] [A] [MN] [P [ID]]</td>
<td>Here is this affliction...</td>
<td>[S] [N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1593a Xalisco</td>
<td>[+] [A] [P [ID]]</td>
<td>We ask for our justice...</td>
<td>[P [ID]] [Y] [N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1593b Xalisco</td>
<td>[A] [MN] [P [ID]]</td>
<td>We, the residents, ask...</td>
<td>[G][W][P [ID]][Y][P [ID]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1594 Xalisco</td>
<td>[A][+][A [ID]][Ma][P [ID]] [SF [D]]</td>
<td>We all ask to...</td>
<td>[G] [P [ID]][Y]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1595a Xalisco</td>
<td>[Y][+][A][P][A [ID][D]]</td>
<td>Here we’ve presented...</td>
<td>[P [ID]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1595b Xalisco</td>
<td>[+] [A][P [ID]]</td>
<td>We implore...</td>
<td>[P [G]] [Y] [N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>N.Y. About Diego Alfonso</td>
<td>[+][P]</td>
<td>This Christian let us know how...</td>
<td>[S][N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>N.Y. Sayula</td>
<td>[+][P][MN][A][D]</td>
<td>Now, we present...</td>
<td>[G][P [ID][N]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>N.Y. S. Cacel Tlajomulco</td>
<td>[+][A][MN][P[ID]][ID][N]</td>
<td>How do you see us...</td>
<td>[N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>N.Y. Tlajomulco</td>
<td>[+][P [N] [ID]] [MN][A]</td>
<td>Here is our suffering...</td>
<td>[N]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining notaries follow the diocesan model closely in their seventeenth-century petitions (Table 4-11).  

Diego Juan, Diego Felipe, and the unnamed notaries of “1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” and “1694 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” present the petitioners and the addressee in the introduction; begin the grievance section with Nahuatl verbs that mean implore, know, learn, or be instructed; and write the names and titles of petitioners in the conclusion act. However, the four remaining documents vary considerably even if they do possess enough elements to classify them as petitions.

---

575 All of these petitions are found in AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.

576 Diego Juan wrote “1654 San Martín” as a similar document to the aforementioned named diocesan petition, “1653 San Martín,” but the former is not identified as a petition in any extant records that I know.
The documents of “1600 Tala” and “1683 San Gaspar” begin and end in a similar manner. Both contain a cross followed by the petitioners and their communal identification [P [ID]] and, in the end, the former has the year-date [Y] followed by the names of the petitioners, whereas the latter once again presents the petitioners with their communal identification [P [ID]] and includes a reference to signing with the year-date [S [Y]] and their Christian names [N]. The main difference between these two documents is in the beginning of the grievance: the former has “we say it truly” while the latter has “there are.”

Table 4-11: Seven Unidentified Documents from the 1600s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Grievance Act</th>
<th>Conclusion Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Diocesan model</td>
<td>[+][A][MN][P [ID][D]]</td>
<td>listen, ask/imply, know, presentation phrase</td>
<td>[Y][S][W][N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1600 Tala</td>
<td>[+][P [ID]]</td>
<td>We say it truly...</td>
<td>[Y][N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td>1644 Cajititlan</td>
<td>[+][N [ID]][MN][A]</td>
<td>We appear before you to talk about...</td>
<td>[G][N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>1654 San Martín</td>
<td>[+][SS][Ma][A][D][G][P [ID]]</td>
<td>We implore you...</td>
<td>[G][A][W][Y][S][P [ID][N]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>1658 S.F. Tizapan</td>
<td>[+][A][D][G][Ma][D][A][G][D][P [ID]]</td>
<td>Here are your children’s worries...</td>
<td>[W][Y][N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>1664 S. A. Acatlan</td>
<td>[+][P [ID]][A [ID]]</td>
<td>You should know...</td>
<td>[Y][S][N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felipe</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>[+] [P [ID]][A [ID]]</td>
<td>May you be instructed...</td>
<td>[D][W][Y][N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas</td>
<td>1683 San Gaspar</td>
<td>[+] [P [ID]]</td>
<td>There are...</td>
<td>[P [ID]][S [Y][N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaspar</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>[+] [Ma][SS][G][P [ID]][MN][A]</td>
<td>We come to learn, to hear your words...</td>
<td>[W][Y][N]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, “1658 San Francisco Tizapan” has one of the most complex introductions found in the petitions of Northwestern New Spain. (Table 4-11). First, the notary refers to the addressee, and then he presents an act of deference that refers to God and the Virgin Mary [D [G][Ma]]:

2-4. Señor tlacoma huiztatluani s'' ostrissimahuitl cenca tictotenamiquilia emahuiz
Beloved and respected lord, illustrious lord, we very much kiss the revered hands

4-6. emahuiz ematzin yn ti' yu'a ecxitzin yu'a totlaçomahuiznantzin ciuapili Santa Maria

577 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1658 San Francisco Tizapan.”
and revered feet of our lord [God] and our beloved and respected mother, the lady Holy Mary...

He follows these phrases with an act of deference to the addressee [D] and another act of deference to both God and the addressee [D [G][A]].

6-8. çan tipan titlatuan iictotenamiqüilia momahuiz momatzin mocxitzin huitl
and after them, you are the ruler. We kiss your revered hands and feet.

9-11. cenca timopichticaqui ynnauac yn te" dios san tipan tiuatzin titlaçomahuiztlatuani
We greatly bow down by God, our lord, and then you, beloved and revered lord.578

Then, the notary becomes more conventional because he uses “here are your children’s afflictions” to begin the grievance act and, in the conclusion act, he refers to writing [W], the year-date [Y], and the petitioner’s names.

These unnamed petitions are addressed to different individuals within the Catholic and Imperial bureaucracies (Table 4-12). Nine are diocesan petitions that probably resulted from the visitato hominum because they are addressed to the bishop, the provisor, or a secular priest. Six are Franciscan petitions directed to members of this order.

Table 4-12: Types of Unnamed Petitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and addressee</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Type of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to provisor</td>
<td>1593b Oconahuac</td>
<td>Diocesan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to Franciscan Order</td>
<td>1593a Xalisco</td>
<td>Franciscan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to Franciscan Order</td>
<td>1593b Xalisco</td>
<td>Franciscan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to Franciscan Order</td>
<td>1594 Xalisco</td>
<td>Franciscan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to Franciscan Order</td>
<td>1595a Xalisco</td>
<td>Franciscan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to Franciscan Order</td>
<td>1595b Xalisco</td>
<td>Franciscan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to unnamed addressee</td>
<td>N.Y. About Diego Alfonso</td>
<td>Unknown petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to unnamed addressee</td>
<td>N.Y. Sayula</td>
<td>Unknown petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to unnamed addressee</td>
<td>N.Y. S. C. Tlajomulco</td>
<td>Unknown petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to provisor</td>
<td>N.Y. Tlajomulco</td>
<td>Diocesan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to Franciscan Order</td>
<td>N.Y. Xalisco</td>
<td>Franciscan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to the priest of Tala</td>
<td>1600 Tala</td>
<td>Diocesan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Sebastian to provisor</td>
<td>1644 Cajititlan</td>
<td>Diocesan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1654 San Martin</td>
<td>Diocesan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1658 S.F. Tizapan</td>
<td>Diocesan petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed to provisor</td>
<td>1664 S. A. Acatlan</td>
<td>Diocesan petition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

578 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1658 San Francisco Tizapan.”
4.2d. A Pseudo-Petition

One last document shows how the colonial period also presented situations in which roles could be reversed; a friar named Francisco de Torres could write “1626 San Francisco Chapalac,” in which he asks the Indigenous nobles of San Francisco Chapalac to pay tribute.\textsuperscript{579} Torres writes phrases in a matter consistent with petitions; in the introduction, for example, he draws the cross and presents the Indigenous addressees together with a communal identity that includes him as a type of petitioner:

1. +
2-3. \textit{Nopilhuan teteutli Alcaldes Regidores prioste}
   My children, lords alcaldes, regidores, prioste
4-5. \textit{mayordomo yhuan cequintin principales anmoeyz ticate}
   mayordomo, and some of the principales. You [who] are
6. \textit{toaltepeuh S Fran\textsuperscript{co} Chapalac}.\textsuperscript{580}
   [in] our altepetl of San Francisco Chapalac.

The introduction can be represented as \([+] [A^2 [ID [P^2]]]) in which A\textsuperscript{2} stands for the addressees who are Indigenous elites and P\textsuperscript{2} stands for Torres who is a European writer literate in Nahuatl, who places himself as a resident of the Indigenous town of San Francisco Chapalac.\textsuperscript{581}

Torres writes a grievance section and a conclusion that also contain elements of Nahuatl petitions. He begins the grievance with an all-too-common \textit{xicmatican ca huel noixpan}

\textsuperscript{579} AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl, “1626 San Francisco Chapalac.”

\textsuperscript{580} AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl, “1626 San Francisco Chapalac.”

\textsuperscript{581} I used superscripts because these positions are inverted; a cleric is addressing Indigenous nobles from San Francisco Chapalac.
ohualneci (may you know that my presence has come to appear) which incorporates the verb
mati (to know) in the optative form but without the affixes that would make it reverential. Then,
he writes the conclusion act with phrases for writing [W], the year-date [Y], and his name [N2].

39-40. oniquicuilo molino⁵⁸² teopan S. Fran⁵⁸² tonali Juebes
I wrote my words [in] Guadalajara in the church of San Francisco, on Thursday
41-42. 30 meztli nobiembre xihuitl 1626
November 30, 1626,
43. MoProvincial fr Fran⁵⁸² de Torres
your provincial Friar Francisco de Torres.

Torres is undoubtedly familiar with the Spanish petition genre and its repertoire, and he uses its
components in this ambiguous document. Was it in response to a petition from the resident friar
who was not getting supplied with the necessary tribute, or was it a written sermon that he
planned to deliver to the Indigenous residents of San Francisco Chapala?

4.3. Cartas and other types of documents

Altogether there are fifty-one petitions in this corpus of Northwestern New Spain.
Eleven other documents in the corpus represent other genres of writing.⁵⁸³ Juan Fabian names
“1629 Zacoalco” as an amal (paper); a translator identifies “1649a Tzacamota” as a carta...en
lengua Mexicana (letter in Nahuatl); a translator names “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan” as el papel
(the paper), and the notary of “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan” names it as an amatl (paper), whereas,
its translator describes it as el papel (the paper).⁵⁸⁴ Finally, “1630 Tlajomulco,” “1649b

---

⁵⁸² Some Indigenous people referred to Guadalajara as either El Molino (the windmill) or Tonala. Ciudad
Real, Vol. II, 93.

⁵⁸³ I do not include the pseudo-petition in this count.

⁵⁸⁴ McA-UCLA, Box 20-17, “1629 Zacoalco”; “1649a Tzacamota,” “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan,” and “1693
Santa Ana Acatlan” are from AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
Tzacamota,” “1649c Tzacamota,” “1649d Tzacamota,” and “1656 Tonala” are not identified in any way.\(^585\) The words *amatl* and *papel* are ambiguous, but the structure of this correspondence suggests a classification into two genres: *cartas* (letters) and *recibos* (receipts).

Lockhart and Otte explain that letter-writing was a well established custom in both Spain and the Indies, but in Northwestern New Spain, the only Indigenous letter-writers belonged to the colonial hierarchy.\(^586\) For example, Don Francisco Nayari wrote a series of letters to Bishop Juan Ruiz Colmenero that combine the features of private letters and petitions. The notary who translates one of them into Spanish describes it as a *carta escrita en lengua mexicana* (letter written in the Nahuatl language). Furthermore, like the notaries of petitions, Nayari organized his texts into three parts, but the content of his letters is different from that of petitions, and for this reason I classify him as an author, and not a petitioner.\(^587\)

Nayari writes an especially lengthy introduction in “1649a Tzacamota.” He begins with the cross [+] and then confers a blessing upon the bishop and asks that God also bless the king and other lords, which can be abbreviated as [G [A][K][L]].

1. [+]  
2. *ma to tecuiyo*\(^588\) *Dios amitzm pieli Señor vispo*  
   May our lord God keep you lord bishop  
3. *yhuño mahuiztapilitzin tlatoan Rei yhuān oce*  
   and my revered and beloved child, ruler, king, and the other  
4-5. *quinti tla to qui ma to tecui Dios a mitzimotlaço ca pieli miyexuiti*\(^589\)  
   lords. May our lord God protect you with his love for many years.

\(^{585}\) AIPEJ, Tierras y Aguas Vol 2, “1630 Tlajomulco”; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649b Tzacamota,” “1649c Tzacamota,” “1649d Tzacamota,” and “1656 Tonala.”

\(^{586}\) Lockhart and Otte, ix-x.

\(^{587}\) AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.

\(^{588}\) Don Francisco has a peculiar way of writing “ui” because he dots the right-most vertical line of the “u” to represent the “i.”

\(^{589}\) AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649a Tzacamota.”
Then, Nayari uses the verb *pie* (guard) with the reverential combination, *amitzmotlaçopieli*, but his use of *amitz* to represent the second person object of this verb is somewhat confusing because in Central Mexican Nahuatl *mitz* represents the second person singular and *amech* the second person plural, while *amitz* appears to be a combination of both forms. Nonetheless, *amitz* represents the second person plural because the verb refers to a group of people that includes the bishop, the king, and other lords. Then, Nayari continues:

6-7.  *yhuān neguati no toca Don Frnc0 nayari totecuiyo Dios nehimomaquilia nochi* and I my name is Don Francisco Nayari. Our lord God gave me all
7-9.  *nopiligua ni pactica*590 my children, and I am healthy...

He names himself as Don Francisco Nayari and writes that God gave him his children, his subjects, to represent himself as a legitimate ruler to the addressee, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero. Nayari is conversant with the language of Christian correspondence. He uses these phrases because he is an independent lord who does not adopt the subservient language of Indigenous notaries who place themselves and the petitioners they represent under the bishop’s power through the use of words like *timopilhuan* (we are your children) or *timomacehuauh* (we are your servants).

Nayari does not create a clear separation between the introduction and the next section. He states:

10.  *yhuān aquimatizqui*591 quenami nivnica and you should know how I am.
11.  *nichristiano nicta nivnca quenami vnixtlal*592 a Christian that

590 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649a Tzacamota.”
591 Nayari appears to have written *aquimatizqui for ac* (who) *quimatizqui* (will know).
592 Nayari appears to have written *nix instead of nech* (1sO).
12. Rei yhuan quenami vnichilihu\textsuperscript{593} marques tlatoani
the king installed, and how the Marques ruler told me
13. ypapa amonimonelos\textsuperscript{594} ynahuaca\textsuperscript{595} tepeuani vnichiliu
that I should not mix with the Tepehuanos. That is what the ruling marques told me.
14. tlatoan marques axca nimatitica nívica tevqui totlatoā\textsuperscript{596}
Now, I know how I am truly the lord ruler,

In this long explanation, he continues to introduce himself not only as an independent lord who
understands Christian benedictions, but also as a Christian lord acknowledged by the king and
the Marques. [Au\textsuperscript{597} [N][ID][K][Mar]]. Nayari thus presents himself as an author who is an
independent Christian ruler. Then, he writes that his community is Tzacamota, an independent
town in El Gran Nayar. However, his communal identity does not matter as much as his
individual identity as a Christian and a Cora (Refer to Chapter 2.3f) because he is not a
subordinate individual presenting a grievance to be adjudicated, but an independent author
requesting a favor. This main part of his letter is therefore not a grievance but rather a request
directed at the bishop of Guadalajara (Refer to Chapter 6).

Nayari uses benedictions instead of a phrase of deference to confer respect, which
preserves an aura of independence for him and his people in his letter. At the same time,

\textsuperscript{593} Nayari appears to have written nich instead of nech (1sO), which he repeats in line 13.

\textsuperscript{594} The sense of nimoneles is associate. Cortés y Zedeño defined neloa as, “Batir, revolver, mesclar,
juntar” (Beat, mix, or join); whereas Molina writes, “remar, mecer o batir algo” (row, rock, or beat). Cortés y
Zedeño, 64; Molina, 66; Therefore, the sense is to mix or join something of a smaller quantity to something of a
larger quantity, and associate makes the most sense in English when referring to people.

\textsuperscript{595} In Northwestern New Spain, -nahuac means “with” for animates. Cortés y Zedeño writes, “Con,
preposición de ablativo: lea, 1. inahuac, para animados el Següdo.” He also has “contigo: adverbio, monahuac.”
Cortés y Zedeño, 71, 72.

\textsuperscript{596} Nayari writes tolatoā (we are the ruler) instead of nitlatoani (I am the ruler), which is probably a
mistake. AHAG Documentos en nahuatl, “1649a Tzacamota.”

\textsuperscript{597} Here, I use Au to represent the author of a letter as a contrast with P, which represents the petitioner or
petitioners of a petition.
Tepehuanos in this document represent the other ethnic power that Nayari uses as a counter-weight to sway the bishop:

28. no piaz\textsuperscript{598} amati yni nic qui ne qui 
   I will guard the paper that I desire.
29. yhuān nimítztetlanilia\textsuperscript{599} notlanavatili\textsuperscript{600} 
   And, I send a message for you. My request will be read.

This \textit{tlanavatili} (message) from the bishop would be a mark of support that Nayari can use to cement his rule with his people and with competing powers like the Tepehuanos. He finishes with a very simple conclusion that lacks the year and includes the phrase \textit{mopoa metžti caztoli tonali nemi mayo umochihua amati} (the document was related May 15).\textsuperscript{601}

Subsequent letters continue the ongoing negotiation between Nayari and Bishop Ruiz Colmenero (Table 4-13).\textsuperscript{602} Nayari does not bother with an extensive introduction in his next letter, “1649b Tzacamota,” apparently the second in the series. He only wishes that God bless Bishop Ruiz Colmenero [G [A]] and asks how the bishop is doing before beginning the request, assuring him that his son is also a Christian. For the conclusion, he restates his name and finishes with \textit{ixquich totlatol} (they are all our words).

Table 4-13: Six Letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Beginning of Content Section</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\textsuperscript{598} The use of \textit{nopiaz} is a mistake. The three grammatical possibilities are \textit{nicpiaz} (I will guard it), \textit{ninopiaz} (it will be guarded by me), or \textit{mopiaz} (it will be guarded).

\textsuperscript{599} \textit{nimitztetlanilia, titlanii: nic}; to send (messages, people on errands); in a Florentine Codex passage, apparently “use” and even “expose something” Lockhart, \textit{Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts}, 235.

\textsuperscript{600} AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649a Tzacamota.”

\textsuperscript{601} AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649a Tzacamota.”

\textsuperscript{602} McA-UCLA, Box 20-17, “1629 Zacoalco”; “1649a Tzacamota,” “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan,” and “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan” are from AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl; “1656 Tonala” is from McA-UCLA, Box 20-11; Box McA-UCLA, 20-17, “1629 Zacoalco.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan Fabian</td>
<td>1629 Zacoalco</td>
<td>[+][G] [A² [G][Ma]] [A² [ID]]</td>
<td>May you thus know...</td>
<td>[G][Ma][Y][S][N][N²]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Francisco Nayari</td>
<td>1649a Tzacamota</td>
<td>[+][G [A][I] [L [N][ID]] [Au [N] [ID] [K]]</td>
<td>I am a Christian...</td>
<td>[M] amati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Francisco Nayari</td>
<td>1649b Tzacamota</td>
<td>[G [A]] [G [A]]</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
<td>[N] ixquich totlatol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Francisco Nayari</td>
<td>1649c Tzacamota</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>You will greatly love me...</td>
<td>[Y]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1656 Tonalas</td>
<td>[+][A [G]]</td>
<td>We are going to speak...</td>
<td>[Au [ID] [G]] [G]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“1629 Zacoalco” is another document addressed to social equals, the Indigenous nobles of San Felipe Cuquito [A²], which makes it a letter (Table 4-13). In the introduction, the notary of “1629 Zacoalco” writes the cross [+], gives thanks to God [G], confers the blessings of God and Mary on the Indigenous addressees [A²] [G][Ma], and collectively identifies them [A² [ID]]. In the request section, he uses the verb *mati* (know) to begin this letter about whether a resident of Zacoalco, whose widower status is in question, can legitimately marry a woman from San Felipe Cuquito (Refer to Chapter 6). The conclusion is especially complex: the notary refers to God [G], the Virgin Mary [Ma], the year-date [Y], signing [S], the names of nobles sponsoring the letter [N], and the names of the parents of the woman and the man getting married [N²].

The notary of “1656 Tonala” also wrote a letter representing the nobles of Tonala, who directly ask their friar to return after being forcibly taken elsewhere (Refer to Chapter 6). The notary begins with the cross [+], followed by wishes that the addressee be blessed by God [A [G]] before beginning the content act with *nican...titlatosqui* (here, we will speak). In the conclusion act, he does not write the Christian names of the sponsors but presents them as:

9-10. *teguantin alcaldes regidoris mochi principales ypan altepetl tonalan*

---

603 McA-UCLA, Box 20-17, “1629 Zacoalco.”
604 This letter has been photographed, translated, and transcribed by Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart, 196-197.
605 McA-UCLA, Box 20-11, “1656 Tonala.”

213
We are the alcaldes, regidores, [and] all the principales of the town of Tonala.

10-11. motequipachogua Dios quichiguan guey Dios padrenuestro bicario
God is afflicted. Great God our father will do it; [So that you] vicario
11-12. ximochicagua ticatlautisqui Dios mopanpa: Amen
resolve yourself, we will ask God.

In other words, this notary presents the cabildo members through their titles in the town of Tonala, which can be abbreviated as [Au [ID]]. Then, he presents God as an adjudicator who can influence the bishop to help cabildo members, and as someone who can vouch for them as Christians.

The last three documents represent receipts, which are characterized by having content about transfers of money and/or goods without any apparent grievance between the parties participating in the exchanges (Table 4-14). In “1630 Tlajomulco,” Simón Agustín is the author but not the writer; he directs the notary to explain how he sold his cattle to the officials of the cofradía of the Immaculate Conception of Tlajomulco. This receipt differs from letters in that the author of the receipt is different from the notary who recorded his wishes. At first, the author names himself, and then immediately begins to describe the content of his receipt:

1. +
   2-3. niquitoa nihuatl notoca simon agustin nican nochan tlaxolmullco
   I, my name is Simón Agustín, a resident of Tlaxomulco, say...

Technically, the receipt begins [+]N [ID]] with the cross followed by the author’s name with his collective identity as a resident of Tlajomulco, but it blends with the first word, niquitoa (I say),

606 McA-UCLA, Box 20-11, “1656 Tonala.”
607 AIPEJ, Tierras y Aguas Vol 2, “1630 Tlajomulco.” The other receipts are in AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
608 AIPEJ, Tierras y Aguas Vol 2.
609 AIPEJ, Tierras y Aguas Vol 2.
which initiates contact. After relating the manner of the transaction and the participants, the notary presents the year-date [Y] followed by the names of the author [N] and two witnesses with familial ties [N²].

Table 4-14: Three Receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Transition to the Grievance Section</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fray Francisco de Torres</td>
<td>1626 S.F. Chapalac</td>
<td>[+][A²][ID]</td>
<td>You should know...</td>
<td>[W][Y][N²]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1630 Tlajomulco</td>
<td>[+][N][ID]</td>
<td>I say...</td>
<td>[Y][N][N²]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1687 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>[+][Y][N]</td>
<td>When lord Ahumada took...</td>
<td>[Au][ID]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1693 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>[+][Y][N]</td>
<td>They surrendered...</td>
<td>[Au][ID]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other two documents, “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan” and “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan,” have the same pattern, which suggests that one notary wrote both of them (Refer to Chapter 6). These documents fit within the genre of receipts; once again, the authors do not appear to have a grievance and the recording notary simply and directly states a transaction (Table 4-14). In both receipts, the notary makes the cross [+ ] and writes the year-date followed by the name of the authors [N]. Then, he begins the content section of “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan” with yquac oquihuica lord Ahumada (when lord Ahumada took...), and the conclusion with otetemacauque (they surrendered). Finally, he identifies the communal identity of the actors of the transaction as residents of Santa Ana Acatlan.

4.4. Spanish Loan Words and Phrases

Lockhart proposed four stages of Nahuatl linguistic evolution during the colonial and national periods (ca. 1521-present) but cautioned that regions probably differed in the relative
timing of those stages (Refer to Chapter 3.4 and 3.5).\textsuperscript{610} Indeed, some Nahuas may have been more conservative than others with regards to their language use, and although they may have had intensive contact with speakers of another language, they may have resisted incorporating loan words. The Nahuas and non-Nahuas who wrote these documents in Northwestern New Spain were individuals who had adapted in one important respect in that they were literate, which probably reflects a propensity to use many more Spanish loan words than non-literate Indigenous people in this region.

Notaries write male Christian first-names as the most prevalent loan words in the documents of Northwestern New Spain (Table 4-15).\textsuperscript{611} Juan was used to refer to 128 distinct individuals, whereas Francisco refers to 79 and Miguel to 55. Last names are less common; the most popular was Hernández followed by de la Cruz. The sample size for women is much smaller because they only name three Indigenous women: María Magdalena, Magdalena Bárbola, and Mariana.

Table 4-15: Most popular Indigenous names in Northwestern New Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most common name</th>
<th>2nd most common name</th>
<th>3rd most common name</th>
<th>Most common last name</th>
<th>2nd most common last name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Magdalena: 2</td>
<td>María: 1</td>
<td>Maríana: 1</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The writers of these petitions, letters, and receipts also employ an extensive ecclesiastical and secular lexicon for officials, which demonstrates an understanding of those respective hierarchies.\textsuperscript{612} For the church hierarchy, they often recorded \textit{mayordomo, prioste, obispo}, and

\textsuperscript{610} Lockhart, \textit{The Nahuas After the Conquest}, 260-261.

\textsuperscript{611} Refer to Appendix C for a complete listing of these names.

\textsuperscript{612} Refer to Appendix C for a listing of these different terms. Lockhart (1992: 293-294) presented complexes that revolved around the introduction of the \textit{caballo} (horse) and \textit{vino} (wine). Lockhart, \textit{Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples}, 293-294
provisor, whereas cleric (cleric), priest (priest), vicar (vicar), and guardian are more rare in part because they generally used Nahuatl words like totatzin (our father) or toteopixque (our priest) to identify clerics. Their other words associated with the church include hospital (hospital), which is named in 13 different petitions, and is often paired with titles referring to Mary, including Santa María (holy Mary) and Imaculada concepción (immaculate conception). These pairings support the assertions of Ciudad Real, Mota de Escobar, and Tello who observed that many hospitales and cofradías dedicated to Mary of the Immaculate Conception had been founded during the colonial period in the region.\footnote{Ciudad Real, Vol. II, 68; Mota y Escobar, 36; Tello, Vol. II, 525.} Five notaries also recorded a second cofradía, the Santísimo Sacramento (Holy Sacrament). Their other loan words describe either days of the Christian calendar, times of day, practices, or implements, such as fiernes (Friday), completas (afternoon), mantamintos (commandments), misa (mass), crismera (chrism urn), and campana (bell).

Loan words associated with the colonial bureaucracy include titles of officers, practices, and administrative regions. The most common titles are alcalde and regidor followed by those that were used for officials who lived in colonial centers such as alcalde mayor, autiençia, visitador, and gobernador. Loans associated with common practices include petición, pleito (grievance), and titofirmatia (we sign) (Refer to Chapter 3.6). Meanwhile, the most commonly mentioned administrative region is Guadalajara, which notaries either named with its proper name or as molino (mill). Writers also referred to the province of Ávalos. A few Indigenous notaries also mention Nueva Galicia and/or Nueva España.
Notaries also included another group of loan words, which reflected how many Indigenous groups had adopted a pastoral life-style in Northwestern New Spain. Some writers refer to domesticated animals such as *bestias* (beasts), *bacas* (cows), *becerros* (sheep), *bueyes* (oxen), *caballos* (horses), *cabras* (goats), *ganado* (cattle), *lleguas* (mares), and *mulas* (mules). Others mentioned places such as *estançia* (piece of land) or *hacienda* (farm-ranch). Still others mention the people who worked with these animals such as *criadores* (shepherds), *harriero* (muleteer), *cocinerotin* (cooks), *mayordomo de carniceria* (overseer of beef), and even *tacurtirohua* (tan a hide).

A third category includes processed goods such *friçada* (woolen blanket), *ymachete* (his machete), and *tocino* (bacon/salted meat).

Many Indigenous notaries also included the Spanish act of deference of kissing the hands in the introduction of petitions. They wrote it in Nahuatl in a variety of ways, but the simplest iteration was similar to that of a Franciscan who, in 1585, wrote, *besando las manos de V.M.* (kissing the hands or your majesty). For example, the notary of “1657 Tonala” expresses those same sentiments with the Nahuatl reverential *tictotenamiquilia momatzi* (we kiss your hands); that of “1661 Etzatlan” writes *tictenamiquilo momatzin* twice, which is a variant in which only the noun is in the reverential form; and that of “1668 Zacoalco” has *tictotinamiquilia momactzin*.

There is little chance of correspondence between the towns in which these petitions were written because Tonala, Etzatlan, and Zacoalco are in different provinces and

---

614 Notaries incorporated Nahuatl affixes in words such as *cocinerotin* and *tacurtirohua*. *Cocinerotin* was written with -tin, a Nahuatl plural suffix. *Tacurtirohua* has *ta*-, a variant of *tla*-, the non-human indirect object and -ohua, a variant of -oa, which Lockhart defines as, “a derivational suffix that creates verbs from nouns meaning to put the thing named by the noun into action, and also creates loan verbs by being added to the Spanish infinitive.” Lockhart, *Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts*, 227.

615 *Cartas de Religiosos de Nueva España*, 147.

616 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
along different roads. The use of similar phrases for the Spanish custom of kissing the hands (and feet) represent a widespread tradition associated with writing and polite discourse.

One Indigenous notary adds an adjectival prefix or word to hands in this act of deference in a somewhat more complex phrase. The writer of “N.Y. San Cacel Tlajomulco” includes *tlaso* (precious) in the phrase *tictlasotenamiquilo momatl* (we kiss your precious hands) which mirrors *sus manos reales besa* (he kisses your royal hands), a phrase that Fray Martín de Hojacastro used in a letter addressed to the Spanish king in 1544.617 Although *real* (royal) and *tlaso* (precious) have very different meanings, they both function to convey respect.

Other Indigenous notaries wrote a phrase that referred to kissing hands and feet without any modifiers, such as *tictenamiquilia momatzin ihuan moccxitzin* (we kiss your hands and feet) or *tictenamiquilo dios ymatzin yuan ycxitzin* (we kiss God’s hands and feet). Five Indigenous notaries from this region utilize similar phrases. All of these notaries wrote within the vicinities of the convent of Sayula, the administrative center of Ávalos, and at least four of them wrote during the second half of the seventeenth century (Refer to Chapter 2.2b).

The two notaries who wrote from Sayula itself demonstrate these two variants (Table 4-16).618 The writer of “N.Y. Sayula” directed the phrase of deference, *tictotenamiquilia momatzin yhuan moccxitzin* (we kiss your hands and feet), to the addressee by using the second-person-posessive prefix, whereas that of “1679 Sayula” refers to God in the third-person in *tictenamiquilo ymatsin dios yyhuanxictzin* (we kiss the hands and feet of God). Notaries from Ávalos also used these conventions. The notary of “1653 Amatitlan” has *tictotinamiquilia*

---

617 *Codice Franciscano*, 175; AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.

momazin yhuan mocxitzin (we kiss your hands and feet) and that of “1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” has otictenamiquilo momazin mocxitzin (we kissed your hands and feet). The notary of “1673 San Francisco Tizapan,” writes a similar phrase directed at God with tictenamiquilo dios ymatzin yuan ycxitzin (we kiss God’s hands and feet).

Table 4-16: Kissing the hands and feet without modifiers in Ávalos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Phrase and [addressee]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>N.Y. Sayula</td>
<td>5-6. titlatohuani çenca <em>tictotenamiquilia momazin yhuan mocxitzin</em> tictotenamiquila...[titlatohuani]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>8-9. yhuan çenca <em>tictotenamiquilia momazin yhuan mocxitzin</em> [bishop]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>1673 S.F. Tizapan</td>
<td>10-11. otiuallaqui <em>tictenamiquilo dios ymatzin yuan ycxitzin</em> 11-12. quin satepa teuatizin ostrecimo S’...[bishop]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>1679 Sayula</td>
<td>4-5. ycan tonetequipachol, huel miyac, <em>tictenamiquilo ymatzin 6. dios vyhuanxictsin</em>...[Dios] [unclear: bishop or provisor]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>1682 S. J. E. Atoyac</td>
<td>5-6. yn tiyxquichtin <em>tictenamiquilo momazin mocxitzin</em> 7. 48-49. tictenamiquia momazin mocxitzin...[bishop]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other documents that have this greeting were written from towns that fell under the jurisdiction of other Franciscan convents, suggesting the possibility of Franciscan influence on the use of this polite phrase of kissing hands and feet. The author of “1580b Nochistlan” represented Nochistlan, a town visited by Franciscans from the convent of Juchipila. That of “1678 Santiago Pochotitlan” wrote from Pochotitlan, a town under the jurisdiction of the Franciscan convent of Xalisco and that of “1649 Ayahualulco” wrote from Ayahualulco, a town that had two nearby Franciscan convents in Etzatlan and La Magdalena. Nevertheless, these three authors were uniform in their intention because all three directed their deference to the addressee by attaching 2nd-person possessive prefixes to hands and feet. The notary of “1580b Nochistlan” wrote *nictenamiquico yn momazin mocxitzin* (I kiss your hands and feet); that of “1678 Santiago Pochotitlan” wrote *tictenamiquilo momazin ihuan mocxitzin* (we kiss your hands...
and feet); and that of “1649 Ayahualulco” wrote tictenamiquico momatzi mocxitzin (we kiss your hands and feet).  

Some Franciscans and notaries also added one or more modifiers to hands and feet (Table 4-17).  

Martín de Valencia, a Franciscan friar living the town of Tehuantepec in what is now southern Mexico, wrote a letter to the king in 1533 in which he includes two phrases that use the modifier reales (royal). In one phrase he represents himself by writing después de besar sus reales manos y pies (after having kissed your royal hands and feet), and in the other, he represents himself together with fellow Franciscans in sus reales manos y pies besan (they kiss your royal hands and feet). In Western Mexico, more than fifty years later, an unnamed notary from the province of Compostela used an expression in Nahuatl that is similar to Valencia’s use of reales:

\[ \text{timochintin tictotenamiquicilia ynmotl[at]ocamatzin yvan ynmotlatocaycxitzin} \]

All of us kiss your royal hands and your royal feet

Here, the writer uses tlatoca (ruling) to represent “royal” in motlatocamatzin (your royal hands) and motlatocaycxitzin (your royal feet); tlatoca can be translated as ruling, royal, or lordly. 

The same notary also uses it to address a member of the clergy, a reference which is repeated in a petition written about thirty years later in La Magdalena, the gateway to Compostela (Refer to Chapter 2.2b). The notary of “1622 La Magdalena” writes:

\[ \text{3-4 nicnotenamiullico teoyotica motlatocamatzin yhuan teoyotica motlatoca ycxitzin} \]

---


620 The table has four columns. They include the author of the petition, the province in which he or she wrote, the name of the petition, and the phrase together with the addressee respectively.

621 Tlahtoāni means ruler, king, or is used in reference to various high Spanish officials while tlahtoca is the combining form of tlahtoani. Lockhart, Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts, 221, 238.
I kiss your holy royal hands and your holy royal feet.

Like the previous notary, he uses *motlatocamatzin* (your royal hands) and *motlatocaycxitzin* (your royal feet) while also adding a second modifier, *teoyotica*, which literally means “with holiness.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Addressee</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Hands, feet, and modifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin de Valencia to the king</td>
<td>Tehuantepec</td>
<td>letter to the king [Tehuantepec, 1533]</td>
<td>besar besan</td>
<td>sus [<strong>reales</strong>] manos y pies sus reales manos y pies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to a Franciscan</td>
<td>Compostela</td>
<td>N.Y. [ca. 1593] Xalisco</td>
<td>tictotenamiquilico</td>
<td>yn mot[<strong>folio</strong>]amatzin yvan yn motlatocaycxitzin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María Magdalena to provisor</td>
<td>Izatlan</td>
<td>1622 La Magdalena</td>
<td>nicnotenamiquilico</td>
<td>teoyotica motlatocamatzin yhuan teoyotica motlatocaycxitzin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>Izatlan</td>
<td>1649a La Magdalena</td>
<td>tictotlaçoñamiquilillo</td>
<td>ynteoyotica ynmotlaçomatzin yhuan teoyotica ynmotlaçoycxitzin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ynteoyotica ynmotlaçomatzin yhuan teoyotica ynmotlaçoycxitzin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnamed to the bishop</td>
<td>Izatlan</td>
<td>1649b La Magdalena</td>
<td>tictotlaçoñamiquilillo</td>
<td>ynteoyotica ynmotlaçomatzin yhuan teoyotica ynmotlaçoycxitzin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The notary of “1649a La Magdalena” and “1649b La Magdalena” follows the usage of *teoyotica* (holy) and replaces *tlatoca* (royal) with *tlaço* (dear):

\[
tictotlaçoñamiquilillo ynteoyotica ynmotlaçomatzin yhuan teoyotica ynmotlaçoycxitzin...
\]

We lovingly kiss your precious holy hands and your precious holy feet...^622^ This progression from Martín de Valencia to the notary of “N.Y. Xalisco” to that of “1622 La Magdalena” to that of “1649a La Magdalena” and “1649b La Magdalena” is an example of a pedagogic discourse between Franciscan friars and Indigenous notaries in which Spanish concepts were translated into Nahuatl.^623^

---

^622^ AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.

^623^ Lockhart asserts that in Central Mexico “Franciscans, other ecclesiastics, and possibly some literate Spanish laymen taught enough Nahua how to write in their own language in the Roman alphabet that the art became self-perpetuating among writing specialists throughout the Nahua world, serving as the normal medium for...
4.5. Nahuatl from Central Mexico and Northwestern New Spain

Europeans had introduced Roman alphabetic writing in and around Mexico City so it was natural that those who learned it should have had some trouble when seeking to communicate with Nahuas from the different region of Northwestern New Spain. Juan Guerra, a Franciscan friar, published a work in 1692 in which he wrote, “the Nahuatl that the natives tend to speak in these [parts of Northwestern New Spain] is very different...because they add syllables to the words or take them away.” In the eighteenth century, don Gerónimo Tomás de Aquino Cortés y Zedeño concurred and judged that, “in this diocese of Guadalajara in which I write, the Nahuatl language is very corrupt and without that purity which it still conserves in some places close to Mexico City.” Cortés y Zedeño’s observation illustrates an attitude about the relationship between Central Mexican Nahuatl and Western Nahuatl that is also reflected in the choices that

This section draws on findings that I present in the article, “Entre la lengua mexicana y la mera mexicana: El náhuatl de Juan Guerra, D. Gerónimo Tomas de Aquino Cortés y Zedeño, y escribanos de la provincia de Ávalos, ca. 1600 a 1765” in Colección Lenguas Indígenas 5: El náhuatl del obispado de Guadalajara a través de las obras de los autores fray Juan Guerra (1692) y el bachiller Gerónimo Cortés y Zedeño (1765) edited by Ricardo García Medina, Álvaro G. Torres Nila y Rosa H. Yáñez Rosales (Guadalajara, Mexico: Universidad de Guadalajara and Biblioteca Publica del Estado de Jalisco, forthcoming 2016).

In Spanish, Guerra writes, “Aunque ay muchos Artes de la lengua Mexicana no sirven para estas partes, porque la lengua Mexicana que acostumbran hablar los Naturales de ellas, es muy diferente, que la mera Mexicana, porque ya le añaden Silabas a los vocablos, ya se los quitan, y muchas veces son en el todo diferentes. Por cuya causa obligado de la obediencia determine al destinarne á escribir este Arte conforme lo hablan los Indios en estas partes, siguiendo en él en cuanto pudiere el Arte de Antonio de Nebrija.” Guerra, no page.

notaries made in their petitions, letters, and receipts in the provinces of Ávalos, Amula, Cajititlán, Colima, and Tlajomulco.

4.5a. The Absolutive Suffix in Ávalos and Nearby Provinces

Ávalos is the best place for an investigation of the Nahuatl variants of Northwestern New Spain because it is the origin of the largest number of documents in the region and borders other provinces with correspondence communities. Different scholars have used the absolutive suffix to classify Nahuatl as -tl, -t, or -l variants, and for this reason it is necessary to compare how Guerra, Cortés y Zedeño, and Horacio Carochi, a Central Mexican grammarian, treated the -tl/-t/-l absolutive in colonial variants of Nahuatl. Carochi published a Central Mexican Arte de lengua in 1645, which is acknowledged as one of the best colonial grammars. Carochi always uses -tl and describes its pluralization in great detail. Guerra is somewhat ambiguous. Although he favors -tl in his orthography, he writes:

The other pronunciation is that of i and l at the end together, and that of l is the one that is pronounced like a letter, not that of t, v.g. zihuatl, tepetl, amatl, but many do not write it,

---

627 Lockhart explains that, in Nahuatl, nouns have subjects, and proposes that for this reason, they require two obligatory affixes, to declare them to be nouns: possessive and absolutive. The first include pronominal prefixes, and singular and plural suffixes, whereas the latter are absolutive because they are not possessed. Lockhart, Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts, 1.

628 Ávalos has eighteen documents—fifteen petitions, one letter, and two receipts—which are more than those of any other province. It also shares borders with the provinces of Amula (2 petitions) and Tlajomulco (3 petitions and 1 receipt), and it is close to that of Colima (2 petitions).

629 Some important works are “The Origin of Aztec tl” by Benjamin Lee Whorf; “Apuntes sobre dialectología náhuatl” por Yolanda Lastra de Suárez; “Nahuatl Dialectology: A Survey and some Suggestions” by Una Canger; and La evolución fonológica del protonáhuatl by Karen Dakin.

630 Lockhart asserts that Carochi’s Arte de lengua provides examples of inestimable value. Lockhart, Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts, viii, ix.

631 Carochi, 30-33.
nor pronounce the \( l \), and \( t \) is the letter that they pronounce, but what should be observed is to pronounce the \( l \) like a letter and not the \( t \).  

In other words, Guerra proposes that even though -\( tl \) represents the orthographic representation of the absolutive morpheme, only /\( l \)/ was pronounced in the region of Northwestern New Spain that he knew. As a result, table 4-17 presents Nahuatl nouns as he spelled them—\( amatl \), \( altepetl \), \( atl \), \( ymachiol \), \( xihuitl \)—and as he described them: \( *amatl \), \( *altepel \), \( *al \), \( *ymachiol \), y \( *xihuil \).  

For his part, Cortés y Zedeño remarks that Nahuas in western Mexico, “Do not use \( t \) and \( z \) when speaking nor \( t \) and \( l \) at the end, v.g. \( tzihuatl \) must be pronounced and is pronounced as \( zihuat \) or \( zihual \),” and he gives examples such as \( altepet \), \( tacat \), \( machiot \), and \( xihuit \) while also presenting \( al \) and \( amal \).

Table 4-17 represents a summary of how Carochi, Guerra, and Cortés y Zedeño wrote and/or described the -\( l \), -\( t \), or -\( tl \) absolutive ending, together with similar evidence from eight different writers who wrote in the province of Ávalos between ca. 1600 to 1654. These grammarians suggests that the -\( tl \) absolutive represents a Central Mexican form while -\( t \) absolutive and/or -\( l \) absolutive are forms found in the spoken Nahuatl of Northwestern New Spain. However, only two writers from Ávalos employ the -\( l \) variant, whereas the others use -\( tl \). Juan Fabian uses the -\( l \) variant in writing \( altepel \) three times, \( xihuil \) twice, and \( amal \) once, and Fray Francisco de Torres uses both the -\( l \) absolutive with \( machiol \) and the -\( tl \) absolutive with

---

632 Guerra writes, “La otra pronunciación es de la T. y L. y de final juntas, y la L. es la que se pronuncia como letra, la T. no, U. g. zihuatl, tepetl, amatl, pero muchísimos ni la escriben, ni la pronuncian. la L. y la T. es la que pronuncian como letra, pero lo que se debe observar, es pronunciar la L. como letra, no la T. Guerra, 2.

633 I have used “*” to indicate a theoretical construct.

634 Cortés y Zedeño, 5.

635 I use the * because even though Guerra described -\( l \) as the pronunciation of the absolutive ending, he wrote it with -\( tl \).
xihuitl. Francisco de Torres was a Franciscan who probably learned Nahuatl in Central Mexico but was then assigned to San Francisco Chapalac, one of the easternmost towns in Ávalos. His two words, machiol and xihuitl, thus suggest that he may have been molding his Nahuatl to better fit what was spoken in this province. Furthermore, in his correspondence, he never uses the -tzin reverential to address the Indigenous nobles who are the addressees in his document, but he does write ilhuitzin (feast-days, reverential), perhaps because it was a difficult word to represent orthographically. How could he decide between ilhuil or ilhuitl?

Table 4-17: The Representation of the -t/-tl/-l Absolutive by Three Grammarians and Six Writers from ca. 1600 to 1653

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Nouns with -t, -tl, or -l endings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horacio Carochi</td>
<td>1645 Arte de la lengua mexicana</td>
<td>āltepētl, ichecatl, pitzotl, tlācatl, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Geronimo Tomas de Aquino Cortés y Zedeño</td>
<td>1765 Arte de la lengua mexicana</td>
<td>amal amatl, altepetl, al, at, taczat, tlacatl, machiot, tzihuatl, xihuit, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>N.Y. Sayula</td>
<td>altepetl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fray Francisco de Torres</td>
<td>1626 S.F. Chapalac</td>
<td>machiol, xihuitl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Fabian</td>
<td>1629 Zacoalco</td>
<td>altepel (2), xihuil (2), amal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>altipetl (4), yehuatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Juan</td>
<td>1653 San Martin</td>
<td>timomaçehuatlhuan, quahuil, çacatl, atl, xiuitl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Juan</td>
<td>1654 San Martin</td>
<td>timomaçehuatlhuan, yehuatl (2), quahuil, çacatl, altl, tlacatl, xihuitl, huehuatlacatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Sebastian</td>
<td>1658 San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>tonitiquipachotl, altipitl, ethuil (2)⁶³⁷, noquitolinichitl, tomaciuatl, xihuitl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, the unnamed notaries of “N.Y. Sayula” and “1653 Amatitlan” along with Diego Juan and Juan Sebastian exclusively use the -tl ending in their orthography. However, Diego Juan and Juan Sebastian also use -tl in syllable final position in situations in which it does not represent the absolutive. Diego Juan writes “timomaçehuatlhuan” instead of ilhuitzin, the only word to which he adds the reverential suffix (in its possessed form) despite addressing the Indigenous nobles of San Francisco Chapalac.

---

⁶³⁶ Francisco de Torres also avoids the absolutive by only using the reverential ending with ilhuitzin, the only word to which he adds the reverential suffix (in its possessed form) despite addressing the Indigenous nobles of San Francisco Chapalac.

⁶³⁷ The noun etlhuiltl resembles ilhuuitl, “day; also, especially when possessed, the feast day of a saint, god, etc.” Lockhart, *Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts*, 220.
timomaçehualhuan and “altl” instead of atl, whereas Juan Sebastian has “tonitiquipachotl” instead of tonetiquipachol, “etlhuitl” instead of ilhuitl, “noquitolinichitl” instead of noquitolinichil, and “tomaciuatl” instead of tomacehual. In other words, “etlhuitl” has a syllable-final and non-absolutive tl even though colonial variants tend to only have an l in this situation while the addition of a possessive prefix like no- is supposed to turn neteqquipacholl into nonetequipachol, quitolinichill into noquitolinichil, and macehulli into nomacehual. These different forms along with the information provided by Guerra and Cortés y Zedeño thus suggest that authors who wrote the -tl absolutive alongside non-absolutive and syllable-final -tl were demonstrating a type of insecurity because they pronounced the absolutive as /l/, but were taught to write it as -tl, which led them to use -tl even in those syllable-final situations that only required an l. Therefore, the use of the -tl grapheme in non-absolutive syllable-final positions can be defined as a type of hypercorrection in which speakers or writers use “a formal form [the -tl grapheme] in a situation where a more casual one [an -l grapheme] may be expected.”

Hypercorrection is “documented as common among socially insecure groups of low socio-economic status...who appropriate linguistic features of socio-economic dominant groups in an attempt to gain social and cultural capital.” This scenario would apply to Indigenous notaries who wrote the documents of Northwestern New Spain used in this study. Scholars have

---

638 I have added the information inside the brackets in the quote by William Labov (apud Blum 2013: 341, 573), who employed the term hypercorrection in his revolutionary study of how the presence or absence of [r] in postvocalic position (i.e. car, card, four, etc) was a strong indicator of socio-economic status in New York City department stores. Labov, “The Social Stratification of (r) in New York City Department Stores” in Making Sense of Language: Readings in Culture and Communication ed. by Susan D. Blum (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 573. The Oxford English Dictionary (consulted on August 2, 2016) defines hypercorrect as being a spelling, pronunciation, or construction that is falsely modelled on an apparent analogous form. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/90314?redirectedFrom=hypercorrection#eid123254130

639 Immaculada M. García-Sánchez (apud Blum 2013: 269) defines hypercorrection phenomena in her study that examines how immigrant Moroccan girls used code-switching to construct gendered identities in Spain.
examined the use of hypercorrection in synchronic studies that focus on spoken language. However, I propose that, in the case of -tl hypercorrection, the visual medium of Nahuatl alphabetic writing has preserved enough evidence for a synchronic study of a historical period. As a result, I propose that the aforementioned examples suggest a -tl hypercorrection pattern in Ávalos during the seventeenth century.

Two other notaries from Ávalos used the -tl hypercorrection pattern (Table 4-18). The notary of “1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” provides thirty-four examples of the -tl hypercorrection pattern, which include the verbs otimitzmachitltique and tihuatlnesilo and possessed words like timopitlhuan and motlatotl. He even writes Spanish loan words that end in l like hospital (hospital) as “ospitałl” and principal (Indigenous elite) as “principatłl.” Meanwhile, his absolutive use is irregular; he writes four nouns with -tl and one noun with -l. On the other hand, the notary of “1694 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” has one example of the -tl hypercorrection pattern, and he also includes the -tl absolutive in altipitl.

Table 4-18: The Use of -tl and -l absolutes and non-word final -tl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autor</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>-tl absolutive</th>
<th>-l absolutive</th>
<th>-tl hypercorrection pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diego Felipe</td>
<td>1664 S. A. Acatlan</td>
<td>yehuatl, cahuitl, xihuitl (2)</td>
<td>altipil</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1668 S. F. Zacoalco</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>altipil</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1669 S. Ma. Magdalena Tizapan</td>
<td>tehuatl, altepétl, xivtl</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1673 S. F. Tizapan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>altipil, yeval</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1679 Sayula</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>al, sacal, tomal, altepél</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1682 S. J. E. Atoyac</td>
<td>altepél (3), altepél, xihuitl, cuahuitl</td>
<td>xihuitl</td>
<td>tiallepehuaque (2), altepél (3), otihuatlnesique (3), timopitlhuan (4), xicmomechitltitzcino (2), tunetequipachotl (2), otimitzmachitltique (2), ospital (5), oticmachitltique, tihuatlhesilo, ticomachitltis (2), motlatotl, ytlaxtabuitl, allar, otichitlhuaitl, Pascautl, prinisipal (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1686 S. Pedro Tepec</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>altepel, altepél, yeval, requil</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1687 S. Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>xivil, altepel, xivil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Altepeli, none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando Miguel</td>
<td>1692 S. Andres Atotonilco</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1693 S. Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>amatel, none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1694 S. J. E. Atoyac</td>
<td>altipilt, none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining writers used -l or -tl as absolutes without the -tl hypercorrection pattern.

The notary of “1679 Sayula” used the -l absolute on four occasions, that of “1686 San Pedro Tepec,” used it on seven occasions, and that of “1668 Zacoalco” used it once. The notary of “1669 S. Ma. Magdalena Tizapan” wrote the -tl absolute three times, that of “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan” used it once, and that of “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan” also used it once.

In total, the four writers from Ávalos that favor the -l absolute do not use the -tl hypercorrection pattern, whereas four of the six notaries who favor the -tl absolute employ the -tl hypercorrection pattern. As a result, the data suggest three patterns about the recording of the absolute suffix in Ávalos:

1. -l pattern: Writers favor the -l grapheme to represent /l/ sound for the absolute more than 50% of the time.
2. -tl pattern: Writers favor the -tl grapheme to represent /ɬ/ sound for the absolute more than 50% of the time.\(^{640}\)
3. -tl hypercorrection pattern: Writers favor the -tl grapheme to represent /l/ because they write at least two examples of syllable-final non-absolute -tl and/or -l absolute.

Can these patterns be extended beyond Ávalos?

Some notaries from the provinces of Amula, Colima, and Tlajomulco also present these patterns (Table 4-19).\(^{641}\) Speakers in Amula appear to favor /l/ in the absolute; the notary of “1649 Tuzcacuezco” has three instances of the -tl hypercorrection pattern, and records the

\(^{640}\) The International Phonetic Alphabet symbol for tl is /ɬ/.

\(^{641}\) The full version of Table 4-19 is found in Appendix D.
absolutive with -l two times and with -tl four times, whereas that of “1649 Tachichilco” favors -l against -tl by a factor of three to one. Furthermore, -l usage is probably also found in Tlajomulco, where two of the three writers from this province present tl hypercorrection. The notary of “N.Y. Tlajomulco” has four instances of the -tl absolutive and one of -tl hypercorrection with “patlr” which probably stands for patr (or pater), and that of “N.Y. San Cacel Tlajomulco” has one case of the -tl absolutive and one case of -tl hypercorrection in momatl (your hands), whereas that of “1630 Tlaxomulco” only has one case of the -tl absolutive in altepeltl. In Colima, Pedro Puy presents the -tl hypercorrection pattern seventeen times and records nine instances of the -tl absolutive, whereas Juan Cruz presents six instances of absolutive -tl and one case of the -tl hypercorrection pattern, which is ambiguous because it could be a non-standard preterit form of tlaçotla (love). Therefore, the evidence suggests that Nahuatl speakers used -l absolutive in a large region that stretched from Ávalos north to Tlaxomulco, west to Amula, and southwest to Colima.

Table 4-19: The Use of -tl and -l absolutives and non-word final -tl outside of Ávalos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>-tl absolutive</th>
<th>-l absolutive</th>
<th>-tl hypercorrection pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649 S.A. Tuzcacuezco</td>
<td>4 instances</td>
<td>2 instances</td>
<td>3 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649 Tachichilco</td>
<td>1 instance: altepeltl</td>
<td>3 instances</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td>Cajititlan</td>
<td>1644 Cajititlan</td>
<td>12 instances</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Puy</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1622 Cohuatzilan</td>
<td>9 instances</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>17 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Cruz</td>
<td>Poncitlan</td>
<td>1637 Cohuatzilan de Puerto de Abajo</td>
<td>6 instances</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1 instance: techilaçotl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>1630 Tlajomulco</td>
<td>1 instance: amatl</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>N.Y. Tlajomulco</td>
<td>4 instances</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1 instance: patlr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

642 The notary of “N.Y. San Cacel Tlajomulco” writes tictlasotenamiquilo momatl (we kiss your precious hands).

643 Lockhart gives the preterit form of tlaçotla as ônitlaçotlac. Lockhart, Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts, 236. Molina has oninotlaçotlac and onitetlaçotlac. Molina, 119.
4.5b. The Plural Subject Marker in Ávalos and Nearby Provinces

Another difference between Western and Central Nahuatl variants is the suffix that marks a plural subject in a present-tense verb (Table 4-20). Horacio Carochi writes “un salto, o singulto, o reparo, y suspensión” (a glottal stop /ʔ/) was added to the last vowel of a verb that had a plural subject. He also adds that speakers added -lo /lo/ to convert a present tense verb with a singular subject from the active to the passive voice, and -lô /loʔ/ to do the same for a verb with a plural subject. Guerra y Cortés and Zedeño suggest that speakers from the diocese of Guadalajara relied on the suffix -lo to distinguish the plurality of a subject in the present tense, but they do not indicate whether this morpheme was pronounced as /lo/ or /loʔ/, and they also do not present it as an option for the passive voice. Therefore, Carochi proposes that that /ʔ/ was the Central Mexican verbal suffix that marked a plural subject while Guerra and Cortés y Zedeño assert that -lo was its Western Mexican equivalent. Both -lo and /ʔ/ are apparently found in the documents of Ávalos and the provinces of Amula, Colima, and Tlajomulco.

Table 4-20: /ʔ//lo/ or /loʔ/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autor</th>
<th>Documento</th>
<th>/ʔ/</th>
<th>/lo/ or /loʔ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horacio Carochi</td>
<td>1645 Arte de la lengua mexicana</td>
<td>Tinemî, We live, annemî, you [plural] live, nemî, they live, etc.</td>
<td>tipōhualô, ampōhualô, pōhualô, etc [passive verbs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Guerra</td>
<td>1692 Arte de la lengua mexicana</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Titazoltlalo, we love, Anquitazoltlalo, you [plural] love, Quitazoltlalo, they love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Gerónimo Tomás de Aquino Cortés y Zedeño</td>
<td>1765 Arte de la lengua mexicana</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Titazoctalo, we love, Antazoctalo, you [plural] love, Tazoctalo, they love</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

644 Carochi, xvii, 22, 94, 96. Lockhart writes that many investigators have concluded that Carochi’s *saltillo* represents the glottal stop. Lockhart in Carochi, xvii.

645 Carochi, 124-125.
Both of these forms of the plural-subject-signalling suffix appear to be found in Ávalos. The notary of “1653 Amatitlan” writes *tictotinamiquilia* (we kiss it, reverential) and *ticchichihualo* (we repair it), in which the first verb appears to have the Central Mexican pronunciation /ʔ/, and the latter has the Western Mexican -lo. Bishop Ruiz Colmenero provides some support that the writer of “1653 Amatitlan” could be using a Central Mexican feature when he writes that Amatlán was inhabited by “Mexicanos advenedizos,” which roughly means Central Mexican immigrants. The first verb, which most likely has a glottal stop, is in the more structured introduction as *tictotinamiquilia momatzin yhuan mocxitzin* (we kiss your hands and feet), whereas the other verb is in the grievance section. Furthermore, the notary of “1686 Pedro Tepec” writes *tictlalia*, which lacks a suffix and suggests the presence of /ʔ/, and eight verbs with the -lo suffix: *quitemacalo, quichivalo, quinotzalo, quinchivalo, tiquipanolo, ticmatilo, monamictilo*, and *ticmacalo*. He places the verb that lacks a suffix in a phrase in the conclusion, *tictlalia tomachio tofirma* (we set down our signs-signatures), that served to present the Catholic names of the petitioners, whereas he writes the -lo forms throughout the grievence section in phrases such as *quinotzalo oficíalis* (the officials summoned him/them) and *quitemacalo candela yvā bino de castillan* (they give candles and Castillian wine). Thus, not only do the introduction and conclusion contain phrasal elements common to most of the

---

646 Carochi places a mark, “\^”, over the last vowel of the verb to signal the presence of the glottal plosive to indicate a present tense verb with a plural subject. Carochi, 124-125. Furthermore, Lockhart asserts in a footnote that, although the glottal stop was sometimes recorded with an “h”, it generally went unrecorded. Lockhart, *Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples and Texts*, 2. Pedro Puy is the only notary in this study who appears to mark the glottal plosive with a grapheme, the colon.

petitions, but “1653 Amatitlan” and “1686 Pedro Tepec” lack a suffix to indicate the plurality of the pronominal, which suggests that the Central Mexican form, /ʔ/, was most prevalent in these sections, whereas -lo was most prevalent in the grievance part of the petition. I propose that these situations demonstrate a weak -lo pattern.

Diego Juan also supports the weak -lo pattern in his two petitions (Table 4-21). In “1653 San Martín,” Diego Juan writes tineçico, tictenamiquico, timofirmatia, and tictelchihua without a grapheme, suggesting that these verbs have /ʔ/, placing all but the last verb in the introduction or conclusion, whereas he writes a large number of verbs with -lo in the grievance section: timotequipacholo, ticmacalo (nine times), and ticnequilo. Furthermore, in “1654 San Martin,” he has timopectecaco, tictotinamiquillico, timotlauhtia in the introduction, timofirmatia in the conclusion and tiquitohua in the grievance section, whereas his -lo forms—ticnequilo, techytało, quipualo, ticchihualo, titemacalo (eight times), ticmacalo, tihuicalo, and tiztlacatilo—are all in the grievance section except for tiztlacatilo, which is in the conclusion.

Table 4-21: -lo and probable /ʔ/ usage in Petitions from Ávalos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Grievance Section</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>N.Y. Sayula</td>
<td>2 in -lo</td>
<td>2 probable /ʔ/ forms</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>1 in -lo</td>
<td>1 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
<td>1 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Juan</td>
<td>1653 San Martin</td>
<td>3 in -lo; 1 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
<td>2 probable /ʔ/ forms</td>
<td>1 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Juan</td>
<td>1654 San Martin</td>
<td>7 in -lo; 2 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
<td>2 probable /ʔ/ forms</td>
<td>1 in -lo; 1 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Sebastian</td>
<td>1658 S. Fco. Tizapan</td>
<td>2 in -lo</td>
<td>2 probable /ʔ/ forms</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1668 S. Fco. Zacoalco</td>
<td>1 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
<td>1 in -lo; 1 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

648 Table 4-21 presents petitions written by these writers and others from Ávalos. They are organized by the year-date. I have included the raw data for this table in Appendix D, which has tables divided by the provinces: Ávalos, Amula, Cajititlan, Colima, and Tlajomulco. The last three columns record the number of indicative present-tense verbs that have plural subjects in the grievance section, the introduction, and conclusion, respectively. Furthermore, a full transcription and translation of “1654 San Martin” is in Appendix B.

649 Diego Juan also writes ma vecetenehualo yn Santisimo Sacramento but, in this case, -lo appears to be a passive suffix because this phrase means, “may the Holy Sacrament be praised. AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1654 San Martin.”
Four other writers from Ávalos also favor the weak -lo pattern, including the notaries of “N.Y. Sayula,” “1658 San Francisco Tizapan,” “1669 Santa María Magdalena,” and “1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac.” The notaries of “1668 Zacoalco” and “1673 San Francisco Tizapan” do not present enough examples: the former uses one -lo form and one probable /ʔ/ form in the introduction and one probable /ʔ/ form in the grievance section; and the latter has one -lo form in the introduction and one probable /ʔ/ form in the conclusion. On the other hand, the notary of “1679 Sayula” uses -lo throughout his petition: twenty-eight times in the grievance section, twice in the introduction, and three times in the conclusion. Therefore, “1679 Sayula” suggests that the overwhelming usage of -lo throughout a petition is possible, to which I will refer hereafter as the strong -lo pattern.

The two notaries writing in the adjacent province of Amula vary their usage of -lo and /ʔ/ in that one follows the weak -lo pattern and another follows the strong -lo pattern (Table 4-22). In Amula, the notary of “1649 Tachichilco” demonstrates another example of the strong -lo pattern when he uses -lo in all situations. Meanwhile, the writer of “San Antonio Tuzcacuezco” favors the weak -lo pattern in the grievance section by writing seven verbs with -lo and only two without any suffix, and in the introduction/conclusion, he uses three verbs without any suffix. Both situation suggest the /ʔ/ form.
The writers of the provinces of Cajititlan, Colima, and Tlajomulco vary their usage. In Cajititlan, Francisco Sebastian follows the strong -lo pattern when he writes eleven forms with -lo in the grievance section and one probable /ʔ/ form in the introduction or conclusion. Pedro Puy and Juan Cruz present another possibility, because they only use probable /ʔ/ forms, which is also the case with the writer of “N.Y. Tlajomulco.” Meanwhile, the writer of “N.Y. San Cacel” does not provide enough examples; he writes one -lo form in the grievance section, one -lo form in the introduction/conclusion and two probable /ʔ/ forms in the introduction and/or conclusion.

Table 4-22: -lo and probable /ʔ/ usage in Petitions from Amula, Cajititlan, Colima, Poncitlan, and Tlajomulco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Grievance Act</th>
<th>Introduction and/or conclusion acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649 S.A. Tuzcacuezco</td>
<td>7 in -lo; 2 probable /ʔ/ forms</td>
<td>3 probable /ʔ/ forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649 Tachichilco</td>
<td>5 in -lo</td>
<td>2 in -lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Sebastian</td>
<td>Cajititlan</td>
<td>1644 Cajititlan</td>
<td>11 in -lo</td>
<td>1 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Puy</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1622 San Andrés Cohuatan</td>
<td>2 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Cruz</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1637 Cohuatan de P. A.</td>
<td>4 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
<td>5 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>1630 Tlajomulco</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>N.Y. Tlajomulco</td>
<td>3 probable /ʔ/ forms</td>
<td>1 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>N.Y. S. Cacel</td>
<td>1 in -lo</td>
<td>1 in -lo; 2 probable /ʔ/ form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous data from petitions makes it possible to theorize the weak -lo pattern, the strong -lo pattern, and the probable /ʔ/ pattern within well-defined fields. I propose:

4. Weak -lo pattern: Notaries favor -lo forms from 50% to 90% of the time in the grievance section even if /ʔ/ forms may be present at a rate that is greater than 50% in the introduction and/or conclusion.

5. Strong -lo pattern: Notaries utilize -lo more than 90% of the time in the grievance section, and they utilize -lo at a rate that is greater than 50% in the introduction and/or conclusion.

---

650 As already mentioned, Pedro Puy appears to use “:;” for the glottal stop in some instances i.e. the verbs ticnequi: (we want) and titotlaitlanilia: (we request).
6. Probable /ʔ/ Pattern: Notaries do not use a grapheme in verbs with a plural subject over 50% of the time in the grievance act, which suggests /ʔ/ usage.

The next step is to correlate the weak -lo, strong -lo, and the probable /ʔ/ patterns against absolutive usage patterns to theorize about what variant of Nahuatl a given notary spoke and whether it was his native language or a second language (hereafter L2).

4.5c. Correlations: Central and Western Nahuatl

The notaries of “1646 Tachichilco,” “1679 Sayula,” “1686 Pedro Tepec,” and “1668 Zacoalco” most likely spoke a variant of Western Mexico Nahuatl because their usage of the strong -lo or weak -lo patterns correlate with that of the -l pattern (Table 4-26). The notary of “1649 Tachichilco” demonstrates the correlation between the strong -lo pattern and the -l absolutive pattern because all five of his present tense verbs with plural subjects have -lo. In Ávalos, the notary of “1679 Sayula” uses the strong -lo pattern and the -l absolutive pattern, whereas the writer of “1686 San Pedro Tepec” has the weak -lo pattern and the -l absolutive pattern. The result of this consistency strongly suggests that these three notaries were native speakers of a Nahuatl variant from Western Mexico. However, the evidence for the writer of “1668 Zacoalco” is not as conclusive. He has one verb with the -lo suffix in the grievance and one noun with the -l absolutive, which is a correlation that suggests that it was somewhat likely that he was also a native speaker of a Nahuatl variant from Western Mexico because these are the only examples.

---

651 Bishop Ruiz Colmenero identifies the inhabitants of Sayula as Sayultecos, a Nahua group (Refer to Chapter 2.4 and Chapter 4.5c and 4.6). Ruiz Colmenero in Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1050. Bishop Ruiz Colmenero also notes that the inhabitants of San Pedro y San Pablo de Tepec (or San Pedro Tepec) and Zacoalco were Coca (non-Nahuas), whereas those from “1646 Tachichilco” were Bapames (poss: Otomi) (Refer to Chapter 2.3b). Ruiz Colmenero, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1049-1050.
Table 4-26: Correlation between the -l and -lo Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>-l pattern examples</th>
<th>Evidence for the -lo pattern in grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1649 Tachichilco - Bapame</td>
<td>-l in 3/4 nouns; -tl in 1/4 nouns.</td>
<td>-lo in 5/5 verbs [strong -lo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1668 Zacoalco</td>
<td>-l in 1/1 nouns.</td>
<td>-lo 1/1 verb [strong/weak?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1679 Sayula</td>
<td>-l in 4/4 nouns.</td>
<td>-lo 28/28 verbs [strong -lo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1686 San Pedro Tepec</td>
<td>-l in 7/7 nouns.</td>
<td>-lo 7/9 verbs [weak -lo]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notaries who wrote from other towns in Ávalos, along with with one writer from Amula and another from Tlajomulco, employed the -tl hypercorrection pattern together with the -lo suffix pattern (Table 4-27). In Amula, the writer of “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco” employed the hypercorrection -tl pattern together with the weak -lo pattern. In Ávalos, Diego Juan wrote the hypercorrection -tl pattern together with the weak -lo pattern in his two petitions: “1653 San Martín” and “1654 San Martín.” Furthermore, Juan Sebastian wrote the hypercorrection -tl pattern together with the strong -lo pattern in “1658 San Francisco Tizapan,” and the notary of “1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” did the same. On the other hand, the writers of “1694 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” and “N.Y. San Cacel” are more ambiguous; the correlation between their use of the -trl hypercorrection and the strong/weak -lo patterns are based on the correlation of one absolutive -l and one -lo suffix. These results suggest that it is highly likely that Diego Juan, Juan Sebastian, and the writer of “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco” spoke a variant of Nahuatl from Western Mexico as an L2, but only somewhat likely that the writers of “1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” and “N.Y. San Cacel” did so, as well.652

---

652 Bishop Ruiz Colemanero supports this assertion because he identifies San Martín, the town in which Diego Juan wrote, as being inhabited by Cocas, a group that Dávila Garibi identified as being speakers of a Cahita variant (Refer to Chapter 2.3e). Ruiz Colmenero in Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1050; Dávila Garibi, El problema de la clasificación de la lengua coca. Mexico City: Libreria editorial San Ignacio, 1943. Furthermore, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero asserts that San Francisco Tizapan, in which Juan Sebastian wrote, was inhabited by Oibzitecos (possibly non-Nahua). Ruiz Colmenero in Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1050.
Table 4-27: Correlation between the Hypercorrection -tl and -lo patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Hypercorrection -tl pattern examples</th>
<th>Evidence for the -lo patterns in grievance section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1649 S. Antonio Tuzcacuezco</td>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>7 in -lo; 2 probable /ʔ/ forms [weak -lo].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Diego Juan</td>
<td>1653 San Martin</td>
<td>2 times.</td>
<td>-lo 3 verbs; 1 probable /ʔ/ form [weak -lo].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Diego Juan</td>
<td>1654 San Martin</td>
<td>3 times.</td>
<td>7 in -lo; 1 probable /ʔ/ form [weak -lo].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Juan Sebastian</td>
<td>1658 S. Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>15 times.</td>
<td>-lo 2 verbs [strong -lo].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1682 S. Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>26 times.</td>
<td>-lo 3 verbs [strong -lo].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1694 S. Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>1 time.</td>
<td>1 in -lo; 1 probable /ʔ/ form [weak -lo].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>N.Y. S. Cacel</td>
<td>1 time.</td>
<td>1 in -lo [strong/weak -lo]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, other notaries use the aforementioned patterns in a manner that suggests that they were influenced by Central Mexican variants. In Ávalos, the writer of “N.Y. Sayula” provides a few examples suggesting that he used the -tl pattern together with the probable /ʔ/ pattern, which makes it somewhat likely that he spoke a Central Mexican variant. However, the writer of “1653 Amatitlan” and that of “1669 Santa Maria Magdalena” provide several examples to support their usage of the -tl pattern together with the -lo pattern, which suggests that they spoke a mixed Central/Western Mexico Nahuatl.

Table 4-28: Other Correlations between the Aforementioned Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Type of Absolutive pattern: H=hypercorrection of -tl; tl=absolutive -tl,  l=absolutive -l.</th>
<th>Evidence for the -lo or /ʔ/ patterns in the grievance section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>N.Y. Sayula</td>
<td>-tl pattern: 1/1 in -tl and 0 H.</td>
<td>2/2 in /ʔ/.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>-tl pattern: 5/5 in -tl and 0 H.</td>
<td>2/3 in -lo [Weak -lo pattern].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan</td>
<td>-tl pattern: 3/3 in -tl and 0 H.</td>
<td>-lo 4 verbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajititlan</td>
<td>Francisco Sebastian</td>
<td>1644 Cajititlan</td>
<td>-tl pattern: 13/13 in -tl and 0 H.</td>
<td>11/11 in -lo [Strong -lo pattern]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>Pedro Puy</td>
<td>1622 Cohuatlan</td>
<td>-tl hypercorrection pattern: 8/8 in -tl and 3 H.</td>
<td>2/2 in /ʔ/ [/ʔ/ pattern]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>Juan Cruz</td>
<td>1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td>-tl pattern: 6/6 in -tl and 0 H.</td>
<td>4/4 in /ʔ/ [/ʔ/ pattern]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

653 “1653 San Martín” is from McA-UCLA, Box 20-8. All of the others are from AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl.
Pedro Puy, Juan Cruz, and the notary of “N.Y. Tlajomulco” also show features of Central Mexican Nahuatl in that they used the probable /ʔ/ pattern (Table 4-28). In Colima, Pedro Puy exhibited the -tl hypercorrection pattern when he used three words with syllable-final, non-absolutive -tl and wrote two of two verbs with a colon to possibly mark the /ʔ/ suffix in the grievance. Such a correlation suggests that it was likely that he was an L2 speaker who spoke a mixed Central/Western Nahuatl variant. Juan Cruz and the notary of “N.Y. Tlajomulco” show a stronger preference for a Central Mexican variant because they both used the -tl and probable /ʔ/ patterns. Juan Cruz wrote six of six nouns with the -tl absolutive suffix without any examples of -tl hypercorrection and four of four verbs without a suffix, whereas the notary of “N.Y. Tlajomulco” wrote three of three -tl nouns and three of three verbs without a plural-marking suffix for the subject pronominals, which suggests the /ʔ/. As a result, it is highly likely that both writers spoke a Central Mexican variant of Nahuatl.

Francisco Sebastián and the writer of “N.Y. Tlajomulco” respectively wrote in Cajititlan and Tlajomulco, towns that were relatively close to each other, but the former was likely a speaker of a mixed Central/Western variant of Nahuatl, whereas the latter was likely a speaker of Central Mexico Nahuatl. Francisco Sebastián used the -tl pattern together with the strong -lo pattern when he wrote thirteen of thirteen nouns with the -tl pattern without any examples of -tl hypercorrection and eleven of eleven verbs in the grievance act with the -lo suffix. The notary of “N.Y. Tlajomulco” used the -tl pattern with the probable /ʔ/ pattern because he respectively used three of three nouns with the -tl absolutive without any instances of -tl hypercorrection and three
of three verbs in the grievance section without a plural-marking suffix, which suggests the /ʔ/ suffix.

The results from the writers of some of the letters and receipts from Ávalos are less than conclusive (Table 4-28). Fray Francisco de Torres writes *xihuitl* and *machiol*, and he also uses one -lo verb form. He provides only a few examples, but since he was a Franciscan, it is probable that he first learned a variant of Nahuatl from Central Mexico before arriving in Northwestern New Spain, where he then learned a Western Mexican variant. Juan Fabian shows a preference for the -l absolutive and also presents nine verbs without a suffix to mark the plural subject pronominals, which suggests the /ʔ/ suffix, but his letter was meant for the Indigenous cabildo of San Felipe Cuquio, whose officers could be expected to be less formal about Nahuatl than a translator who spoke Spanish and Nahuatl. The unnamed notary of “1664 Santa Ana Acatlan” wrote only one of five forms with the -l absolutive, but his use of one verb with -lo suggests that he was, at least, influenced by a Nahuatl variant from Western Mexico, whereas the notary who wrote “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan” and “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan” does not provide enough examples to theorize because he only provides two examples of absolutive -tl.654

Table 4-29: Absolutive Choice and -lo or /ʔ/ in Letters and Receipts from Ávalos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Non-petition document</th>
<th>Type of Absolutive Pattern, Evidence for the -lo or probable /ʔ/ patterns in the whole document.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fray Francisco de Torres</td>
<td>1626 San Francisco Chapalac - l pattern: 1/2 in -l and 0 H. 1/1 in -lo [Weak/Strong -lo].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Fabian</td>
<td>1629 Zacoalco -l pattern: 6/6 in -l and 0 H. 9/9 in /ʔ/ [/ʔ/ pattern].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Felipe</td>
<td>1664 Santa Ana Acatlan -tl pattern: 4/5 in -tl, 1/5 in -l and 0 H. 1/1 in -lo [Weak/Strong -lo].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

654 Bishop Ruiz Colmenero appears to have associated this Santa Ana with the Cocas. Ruiz Colmenero in Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1050. Santoscoy listed it under the Cocas and in between entries for the towns of Santa María Tizapan and Zacoalco, which are a few miles east of Santa Ana Acatlan. Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1050.
I have illustrated these proposed correlations in Map 4-1, in which the solid circles indicate towns where notaries wrote petitions, letters, or receipts that contain evidence of Central Mexican (hereafter C) and/or Western Mexican patterns (hereafter W1) of Nahuatl. These correlations suggest that notaries who wrote during the early seventeenth century tended to favor C patterns, that those who lived in communities close to Franciscan convents could have C and W1 patterns, and that those who lived in more isolated towns tended to favor W1 patterns. Going from north to south, Tlajomulco is preceded by C/W because the notary of “N.Y. San Cacel” in the province of Tlajomulco used two W1 patterns, whereas that of “N.Y. Tlajomulco” used two C patterns. San Martín is preceded by W because Diego Juan favored W patterns in his two petitions. Santa María Magdalena Tizapan and Cajititlan are preceded by C/W for the respective notaries since each used one C pattern and one W1 pattern. Zacoalco is preceded by C/W because the notary of “1629 Zacoalco” favored C patterns, and that of “1668 Zacoalco” favored W1 patterns. Meanwhile, the W before San Pedro Tepec, the W before San Francisco Tizapan, and the W preceding San Juan Evangelista Atoyac show that the respective notaries who wrote from these towns favored W1 patterns. In Amatitlan, the C/W indicates that the notary of “1653 Amatitlan” used a W1 pattern together with a C pattern, whereas the C/W in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>None.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonio de la Cruz</td>
<td>1687 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>-tl pattern: 1/1 in -tl and 0 H.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio de la Cruz</td>
<td>1693 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>-tl pattern: 1/1 in -tl and 0 H.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

655 Although there is some ambiguity as to whether Antonio de la Cruz wrote “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan” and “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan,” the calligraphy of these two receipts, which are attached to a Spanish-language Indigenous petition, suggests that they were made by the same author.

656 Solid lines indicate bodies of water and dotted lines indicate roads. The “C” precedes the name of a town in which one or more writers favored the Central Mexican patterns; “W” precedes the name of a town in which one or more writers favored the Western Mexican patterns; and “C/W” precedes the name of a town in which either a writer favored the Central Mexican patterns and another favored the Western Mexican patterns; or one or more writers used a Central Mexican pattern with a Western Mexican pattern.
Sayula indicates that the writer of “N.Y. Sayula” used two C patterns and the writer of “1679 Sayula” used two W1 patterns. In Tuscacuesco, the notary of “1649 San Antonio Tuscacuesco” favored W1 patterns. In Colima, Pedro Puy used one W1 pattern and one C pattern in his work, “1622 San Andres Cohuatlan,” and Juan Cruz used two C patterns in “1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo.”

Finally, I propose that W1 be known as Sayulteco due to the correlation of historical and linguistic patterns. Bishop Ruiz Colmenero identified the inhabitants of Sayula along with those of seven other towns as Sayultecos: Jocotlán, a coastal town, Jirosto, Mazatlán in the province of Purificación, Apango, Jalpa in the parish of Amacueca, Tapalpa, Atemajac, and Uxmajac. Sayula was also a sizeable town that was the head town of the province of Ávalos and also had a population that included Indigenous people, Spaniards, and people of mixed-race.657

Furthermore, the writer of “1679 Sayula” suggests that W1 was firmly embedded in Sayula because he employed twenty-eight of twenty-eight verbs with the -lo suffix with four of four nouns with the -l pattern. Notaries also favored W1 forms in nearby San Pedro Tepec, San Juan Evangelista Atoyac, Tuxcacuesco, and San Francisco Tizapan. Thus, I will refer to W1 as Sayulteco from now on.

---

657 AHAG, Gobierno-Parroquias, Sayula 1632-1772, “1679 Sayula.”
4.6. Two Western Variants of Nahuatl

Notaries created the petitions, letters, and receipts of New Spain with language that preserves evidence of relationships between themselves, the people they represented, and the Spanish secular and church hierarchies they addressed. In petitions, most writers adhered to a tri-partite division of the text in which the more formulaic introduction and conclusion drew upon an inventory of borrowed Spanish words and phrases. In that respect, letters and receipts were more fluid than petitions.

Writers of all three genres employed a large number of Spanish loan words and phrases to address colonial officials. Notaries recorded “we kiss your hands and feet” to address both secular and ecclesiastical officials, used Christian names for themselves, and employed specific titles for officials of all kinds. However, they more commonly referred to officials by their titles, and only a few used the specific names of their addressees. They also employed a large loan vocabulary to describe the pastoral nature of Northwestern New Spain.

Writers also gave clues to whether they spoke Central Mexican, Sayulteco, or another Western Mexican variants of Nahuatl in their documents by favoring certain grammatical patterns. Those notaries that used the -tl absolutive together with the absence of a suffix for verbs with plural pronominals, which suggests the /ʔ/ suffix, employed two C patterns, which strongly suggests that they spoke C, whereas those who favored the -l absolutive together with the -lo suffix employed two Sayulteco patterns and most likely spoke Sayulteco Nahuatl. Writers who tended to use -tl hypercorrection together with -lo exhibited two Sayulteco preferences and most likely spoke Sayulteco, and their use of -tl hypercorrection also suggests an insecurity that points toward L2 usage.
Both Guerra and Córtes y Zedeño observed the presence of a -\( t \) absolutive suffix, but this tendency is less visible in the petitions, letters, and receipts of Northwestern New Spain (Table 4-30). The only notaries to present multiple examples of -\( t \) usage in their writing are the notary of “1657 Tonala” within the jurisdiction of Guadalajara and that of “1649 Ocotitic” in the province of Tacotlan. The former writes \textit{nehuat} (I), \textit{tacat} (man), and \textit{amat} (paper) while the latter has \textit{xihuat} (woman), \textit{yehuat} (he/she/it), \textit{nehuat}, \textit{amat}, and \textit{xihuit} (year). Furthermore, Don Francisco Nayari and the writer of “1652 San Francisco Juchipila” both write the word \textit{yehuat} once. All of these usages occur in towns that are located to the north of Tlajomulco, the northernmost place in which writers use both -\( l \) pattern or the -\( tl \) hypercorrection pattern together with the -\textit{lo} pattern.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
Author & Province & Document & -\( tl \) & -\( t \) \\
\hline
Don Fco. Nayari & El Gran Nayar & 1649a Tzacamota & none & alitepet \\
\hline
Unnamed & Guadalajara & 1657 Tonala & none & \textit{nehuat}, \textit{tacat} (4 times), \textit{amat} \\
\hline
Unnamed & Juchipila & 1652 S.F. Juchipila & \textit{xiuitl} & \textit{yehuat} \\
\hline
Unnamed & Tacotlan & 1649 Ocotitic & \textit{altepetl} (4 times) & \textit{xihuat} (4 times), \textit{yehuat} (2 times), \textit{nehuat, amat, xihuit} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{The -\( t \) Absolutive}
\end{table}

Do these writers of the -\( t \) absolutive also use the verbal prefix -\textit{lo} to indicate a plural subject in a present tense verb (Table 4-31)? The results are less conclusive than for Sayulteco. Whereas the notaries of “1652 Juchipila” and “1649 Ocoticite” indeed use -\( t \) and -\textit{lo}, Don Francisco Nayari and the writer of “1657 Tonala” do not use a suffix with plural pronominals, which suggests \( /?/ \). In fact, the latter makes use of -\textit{lo} in an unorthodox way by creating \textit{quihuicalosnequi} (they want to take) \textit{tiquitalsnequi} (we want to see), which are optative/irrealis constructions that appear to be treated as compound verbs in the present tense. Therefore, the case for a W2 requires more evidence.
Table 4-31: The -t Absolutive with -lo and/or /ʔ/ Verbal Suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>-t and/or -tl</th>
<th>-lo or /ʔ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Fco. Nayari</td>
<td>El Gran Nayar</td>
<td>1649a Tzacamota</td>
<td>1 in -t</td>
<td>1 in /ʔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>1657 Tonala</td>
<td>6 in -t</td>
<td>11 in /ʔ/; 2 in -lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Juchipila</td>
<td>1652 S. Francisco Juchipila</td>
<td>1 in -t; 1 in -tl;</td>
<td>14 in -lo; 2 in /ʔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tacotlan</td>
<td>1649 Ocotitic</td>
<td>9 in -t; 4 in -tl;</td>
<td>13 in -lo; 1 in /ʔ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison between the towns in which notaries favor -t or -l is instructive (Map 4-2). The northernmost town that contains the -l variant is San Cacel in the province of Tlajomulco, which is southwest of Tonala, the southernmost -t variant town. Then, Ocotitic and Juchipila are both northeast of Tonala and Tzacamota is to the northwest. Tonala is the only -t variant town in the hotlands, but it stood on a road that led to one of the crossings of Huentitan Canyon and the Grande de Santiago River (Refer to Map 4-1). Tonala thus appears to have been one of the gateways to the cold lands and to other towns in which notaries used some examples of a -t variant, whereas the other towns—Ocotitic, Juchipila, and Tzacamota—stood on the other side of the Grande de Santiago River, suggesting that this body of water may have separated speakers of a Sayulteco Nahuatl in the provinces of Amula, Ávalos, and Tlajomulco; and a W2 Nahuatl in Tonala and some towns in the Cold Lands (Map 4-2). Continued study of the documents from Northwestern New Spain may reveal more C, Sayulteco, and W2 patterns, but now, I turn to examine the grievance section of petitions and the content section of letters and receipts to analyze what they reveal about how Indigenous actors responded to the colonial practice of visitations.
Map 4-2: -t and -l Variants in Northwestern New Spain

This map was created with Google Maps on December 16, 2015. It relies on the supposition that the present-day towns of Juchipila and Tonala have not been moved too far from their colonial antecedents. I also propose that present-day La Mesa in the state of Nayarit stands on or near the site of Tzacamota. Finally, I consulted pueblosamerica.com on December 16, 2015 to approximate the location of Ocotitic.
Chapter 5. Writing and Adjudication

May you [bishop] help us by the will of our lord God, who is not like the pharaoh of the Egyptians, because in his hands the children of Israel were redeemed by the will of God.660

Juan Cruz, notary of Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo, Colima

5.1. Indigenous Grievances

The extent to which notaries of Northwestern New Spain were literate—able to read and write Nahuatl in the Roman alphabet—varied considerably. Some notaries wrote Central Mexican Nahuatl because they lived in a town nearby a Franciscan convent, where friars emphasized this variant, but the majority wrote Western Mexican Nahuatl. As in Central Mexico, Indigenous people in Northwestern New Spain taught Nahuatl to others, ultimately perpetuating the practice on their own. Indigneous nobles expanded their use of Nahuatl literacy from the ecclesiastical sphere in which it began to the sphere of colonial law.661 In Central Mexico, Indigenous people began to bring suits and complaints to the viceregal court for adjudication by the middle of the sixteenth century, a pattern that became even more pronounced and widespread.

---

659 McA-UCLA, Box 20-42, “1637a Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo.”

660 There is some ambiguity here because ymacpa maquixtiloque could be translated as “in his [God’s] hands, they were rescued” or “from his [pharaoh’s] hands, they were rescued.” I arrived at this translation with the help of Francisco Maciel and Magnus Pharao Hansen.

661 Lockhart observes that in Central Mexico, “Franciscans, other ecclesiastics, and possibly some literate Spanish laymen taught enough Nahua how to write their own language in the Roman alphabet that the art became self-perpetuating among writing specialists throughout the Nahua world, serving as the normal medium for record-keeping of all kinds.” Lockhart, Nahuas After the Conquest, 6.
in the seventeenth century. The Nahuatl documents in this study confirm that this process began in Northwestern New Spain in the sixteenth century, when a few Indigenous communities turned to ecclesiastical and royal adjudication. In the seventeenth century, many more communities sought legal recourse. Indigenous officers of the cabildos and lay sodalities played a leading role in this legal turn almost three decades after the end of the Mixtón War.

5.2. Early Literacy and Correspondence, 1569-1595

José Francisco Román Gutiérrez proposes that the earliest view of Nueva Galicia was provided by Hernán Martínez de la Marcha, who went on a visita between the end of 1549 and the beginning of 1550. Martínez de la Marcha traveled throughout many of the provinces of Nueva Galicia and even took petitions from Spanish and Indigenous elites who, among other things, complained about the placement of the newly-created Audiencia of Nueva Galicia and a diocese at Compostela. Indigenous petitioners from Etzatlan, Agualulco, and Oconahuac wanted to change jurisdictions from the Audiencia of New Spain to that of New Galicia and from the Diocese of Michoacan to the Diocese of Compostela, which Bishop Pedro Gómez de Maraver wanted to move to Guadalajara. Furthermore, a number of Indigenous petitioners from towns in the province of Guadalajara also claimed to want the audiencia to be located in Guadalajara, probably because of the influence of Bishop Gómez de Maraver.

Some of these petitioners

---

662 Owensby, 51.
663 Román Gutiérrez, Sociedad y Evangelización en Nueva Galicia durante el Siglo XVI, 69.
664 Román Gutiérrez, 217.
665 Román Gutiérrez writes that it was remarkable that so many caciques and principales coincided in their petitions asking for the movement of the audiencia and the see from Compostela to Guadalajara and proposes that Bishop Gómez de Maraver had to have traveled widely to promote this objective. Román Gutiérrez, 217.
were from towns that would become correspondence communities such as Juchipila, Nochtílan, Tequila, Tlaxomulco, and Tonala. At this early date, Indigenous petitioners most likely dictated their petitions to a translator who spoke to a Spanish notary.\footnote{Román Gutiérrez, 217-218.}

Martínez de la Marcha also commissioned a series of four maps; of which apparently only one has survived (Map 5.1).\footnote{AGI, ES.41091.AGI/27.17//MP-MEXICO, 560 (Accessed on September 21, 2016). Román Gutiérrez asserts that the map is from 1550. Román Gutiérrez, 217-218. Neither Nombre de Dios, founded during the 1560s, nor La Magdalena, founded in the early 1600s, are represented, which supports this early date.} It shows a very clear distinction between a pacified hot lands and a hostile cold lands.\footnote{Refer to Chapter 2.2b and 2.2c.} The hot lands are dominated by towns pictured by one or more Spanish-like houses, whereas the latter are beyond lines of sentinels representing different Chichimecs, non-Christian Indigenous people (Refer to Chapter 2.3a).\footnote{Román Gutiérrez, 71.} The map also depicts the first colonial center of Compostela, by the coast, and the second colonial center of Guadalajara, to the south of an undulating ribbon representing the Grande de Santiago River. It also shows the three early correspondence communities of Xalisco, Oconahuac, and Nochtílan.\footnote{Compostela and Guadalajara are classified as cities; Nochtílan has a “P.” for pueblo, and Xalisco and Oconahuac are only identified by their names.} The latter community is unique because it is represented by a Spanish-style house and situated near a peñol, a rocky hill that is a symbol of nomadic space. Surprisingly, the example of Nochtílan is not the only community from the more independent cold lands, where Nahuatl literacy would flourish as a result of friar-nahuatlato dyads and the institutional support of the Franciscan Order.
5.2a. Cycles of Literacy I, 1569-1595

In 1568, a commission was issued to fray Juan de Ovando to conduct a *visita* of the council of the Indies. De Ovando attempted to simplify this daunting task by securing decrees in 1569 to command the senior *oidor* of each *audiencia* of New Spain to draw up an attested summary of the type of government in his district. The Audiencia of Guadalajara responded with a report that estimated the Indigenous population at around twenty thousand households living

---

peacefully in some fifty *encomiendas* and an equal number of *corregimientos*.\textsuperscript{672} Fray Juan de Ovando probably also gained decrees to command the archbishop of Mexico and the bishops in the dioceses, including that of Guadalajara, to produce summaries.\textsuperscript{673} As a result, in 1569, fray Alonzo de Peraleja and four other friars drew up a letter which detailed how the Franciscan convents of Northwestern New Spain relied on friars and *nahuatlato* to teach Indigenous youth to write Nahuatl with the Roman alphabet (Refer to Chapter 3.5). He described how the Franciscans were proselytizing in various convents, including Juchipila, Nombre de Dios, Etzatlan, and Xalisco.\textsuperscript{674} Their process relied on the friar-*nahuatlato* dyad in each convent to teach Nahuatl and literacy to Indigenous male youths as a way to compensate for the many languages spoken in Northwestern New Spain (Refer to Chapter 3.5).

However, there were mitigating factors that affected the learning of alphabetic Nahuatl writing by Indigenous youths. The convent of San Juan Bautista in Nombre de Dios ministered to Indigenous people who had migrated from Central Mexico and Michoacan, and while those

\textsuperscript{672} *Encomiendas* were grants of labor and tribute assigned by the crown to an individual. Yanna Yannakakis, *Native Intermediaries, Indian Identity, and Local Rule in Colonial Oaxaca*, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 22. The main division in New Spain were *provincias mayores*, which had as their nuclei *audiencias*, and were subdivided into *alcaldías mayores* and *corregimientos* ruled by *alcaldes mayores* and *corregidores*, respectively. Charles R. Cutter, *The Legal Culture of Northern New Spain* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1995), 70. Parry also explains, “there were in 1570 about fifteen hundred Spanish householders in Nueva Galicia, distributed among two cities, six towns, and fifteen established mining settlements.” The two cities were Guadalajara and Zacatecas, and most of the peaceful Indigenous people probably lived in the hot lands (Refer to Chapter 2.2d). Parry, *The Audiencia of New Galicia in the Sixteenth Century*, 121.

\textsuperscript{673} Salvador Chávez Hayhoe presents the *relaciones*, accounts, of the archdiocese of Mexico and the diocese of Puebla, the diocese of Michoacan, and the diocese of Guadalajara. Chávez Hayhoe in *Codice Franciscano*. Gerhard proposes that the order of Juan de Ovando led to a questionnaire being sent to the bishop of the diocese of Guadalajara, but since the latter died two days after its arrival, fray Alonzo de Peraleja authored the *relación* for the missions of Nueva Galicia on November 8, 1569 (Refer to Chapter 3.5). Gerhard, *La frontera norte de la Nueva España*, 70. The Franciscan friars in the diocese of Michoacan appear to have responded with a short letter by fray Angel de Valencia on February 4, which explains that fray Francisco Peláez would be sent to the king to give a clearer account of the state of this province. Valencia in *Codice Franciscano*, 241-242.

\textsuperscript{674} The other convents were in Guadalajara, Zacatecas, Ahuacatlan, Autlan, Izahuatlan, Atoyac, Izaculco, Cocula, Tlajomulco, and Ajijic. *Códice Franciscano*, 152-153.
from Central Mexico only had to learn to adapt their native Nahuatl to the Roman alphabet, those from Michoacan had to learn how to write in a new language. Many Indigenous people living around the convents of Etzatlan and Juchipila were Nahuatl-speaking Cazcanes, who only had to learn a new regional variant of Nahuatl. In and around Xalisco, Huichol and Cora people spoke Uto-Aztecan languages, which were closely related to Nahuatl; but Nahuatl, Huichol, and Cora were still mutually unintelligible languages so that Coras and Huicholes also must have had some difficulty in learning to read and write in Nahuatl. The writings of Northwestern New Spain examined in this study began ten to twenty years after the Franciscan letter of 1569: the earliest documents are “1580a Nochistlan” and “1580b Nochistlan.” These two are followed chronologically by “N.Y. Nombre de Dios ca. 1585,” “1593a Xalisco,” “1593b Xalisco,” “N.Y. Xalisco ca. 1593,” “1594 Xalisco,” “1595a Xalisco,” and “1595b Xalisco” (Map 5-2).

---

675 The Franciscans and nahuatlatos relied on Central Mexican Nahuatl during the sixteenth century because the Nahuatl in petitions from this period has forms reminiscent of the Arte de la lengua mexicana by fray Andrés de Olmos. He finished this work in 1547 and claimed that it was a primer for the “lengua mexicana or tetzcucana,” which suggest that the Nahuatl of what became Mexico City and the nearby town of Tetzcoco became the norm for Franciscans in Northwestern New Spain and elsewhere. Fray Andrés de Olmos, Arte de la lengua mexicana edición, estudio introductorio, transliteración y notas de Ascensión Hernández de León-Portilla and Miguel León-Portilla (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, 2002), 22r and 10.

676 In a sense, colonial Nahuatl was like many dominant languages today that are composed of “clusters of dialects.” John McWhorter in Bloom, 286.
The petitions of “1580a Nochistlan” and “1580b Nochistlan” were written by two different notaries in Nochistlan, an important way station for the transport of silver from Zacatecas (refer to Chapter 2.2c and 2.3c). These notaries did not write the date, but their petitions accumulated many Spanish addenda dated 1580, so these petitions must have been written in this year or before. These two petitions and their addenda are bound together with “1580a Nochistlan” followed by “1580b Nochistlan,” representing one cycle of documents begun by the visita of the presidente (chief judge) or an oidor (judge) of the Real Audiencia of Guadalajara.

Both notaries most likely address members of the Real Audiencia to seek an amparo, a written legal decision that they could use to protect their interests in court. The notary of

---

677 Powell, Soldiers, Indians, and Silver, 17.
678 For example, the translator of “1580b Nochistlan” dates his addenda July 13, 1580.
679 BPEJ-JJA, Real Audiencia, Ramo Civil, Caja 1, Expediente 11, Progressivo 11.
680 These petitions deserve a separate study.
“1580b Nochistlan” addresses the presidente, probably referring to the head of the Real Audiencia of Guadalajara. The writer of “1580s Nochistlan” refers to the addressee as tlacate tlahuaniye (o lord ruler!), employing a title generally used for alcaldes mayores, the viceroy, the Real Audiencia of Guadalajara, or an Indigenous lord [refer to Chapter 4.2]. These notaries complain that their alcalde mayor was appointing Indigenous officials, demanding too much tribute in goods and labor, and abusing members of the cabildo by taking away their staffs of office.

Owensby describes the process in and around Mexico City of how a petition led to an amparo or decree that Indigenous petitioners periodically used against the people they accused, which is a good starting point for learning what may have happened in Northwestern New Spain. He states:

By 1640...the bare legal requirements for filing an amparo petition with the Juzgado [or viceregal court] were well established: petitioners had to be Indigenous people (because the Juzgado was a special jurisdiction limited to Indians), the written petition had to allege some sort of individual harm, and it had to request the king’s protection in the form of an enforceable order. As a nonadversarial proceeding—the party complained about rarely appeared to tell its side of the story—the writ was not legally complex. Even so, most petitioners retained legal counsel to help them draft and file their petitions. Procuradores such as Çeli, not full-fledged lawyers but with considerable legal experience, knew best how to present a petition for maximum impact on judges’ minds.681

The main difference between Indigenous petitioners in Central Mexico and in Northwestern New Spain is that many of the former went to the Juzgado General de los Indios in Mexico City instead of the Real Audiencia. Owensby also notes that the amparo only became readily available in the 1590s and goes on to assert:

Usually, the tribunal ruled on the validity of a claim very quickly and issued an order within days. Typically, an amparo was directed to a named justice, often an alcalde

681 Owensby, 51.
*mayor* or *corregidor* in a particular jurisdiction, though at times the order would instruct any justice to whom it was presented to execute it, effectively giving the bearers of the order a choice of judge. Notification was entrusted to “any person who knows how to read and write,” usually a notary, but in a pinch any other person who could read and understand the order. With an *amparo* in hand, petitioners were free to use it when and as they pleased. Frequently they went straight to a notary in their home jurisdiction and asked that it be officially served on the justice named. Less often, especially when seeking to prevent a harm rather than redress one, petitioners would hold the order in abeyance to use at an opportune moment in an ongoing lawsuit or as a way of launching a legal offensive.682

The petitioners of Nochistlan do not appear to have received an *amparo* from the Royal Audiencia.

The document “N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca. 1585” is the third of five *memorias* of what Barlow and Smisor call “Memorial of the Indians Concerning their Services, c. 1563,” but their proposed date of 1563 for this petition is probably too early. It would make Nombre de Dios, one of the most isolated towns at this time, one of the earliest correspondence communities.683 Fray Alonzo de Peraleja’s 1569 letter asserted that Nombre de Dios had a Franciscan convent with a priest and *nahuatlato* who proselytized to three hundred Indigenous people.684 Furthermore, it also claimed that the friar of Nombre de Dios took confessions, which meant that he had begun to learn an Indigenous language and relied on an interpreter in this town, which these scholars and their sources described as being inhabited by three Indigenous groups: Mexica, Michoacanos, and Zacatecos. As a result, the friar was most likely listening to confessions in Nahuatl from Mexica, and those Michoacanos and Zacatecos who knew Nahuatl

682 Owensby, 51.

683 Barlow and Smisor propose that the Indigenous writers were Mexica, and that they were educated by Cintos or fray Pedro. Barlow and Smisor, xxi. The manuscript itself is from BAN-UCB, “Documentos historicos sobre Durango: Mexico: ms., 1560-1847” compiled by José Fernando Ramírez.

684 The Franciscans used the term *interprete* (interpreter) because they addressed the king. If their audience had been from New Spain, they most likely would have used the term of *nahuatlato* (Refer to chapter 3.4).
were serving as translators, as the priest's *nahuatlato* for religious services in Purépecha.

However, the friar’s command of Nahuatl must have been limited since, according to fray Antonio de Peraleja, he could not preach, unlike the friar of Juchipila who supposedly could hear confessions and preach.\(^{685}\) Nothing is mentioned about the literacy of the *nahuatlato* of Nombre de Dios, and even if he had been literate and had written “N.Y. Nombre de Dios” and/or one of the other *memorias*, it is doubtful that he could have done so before 1569.

It is more likely that the cycle of documents to which the *memoria* of “N.Y. Nombre de Dios” belonged were written in response to “the *memoria* of those things that should be answered and should be done regarding these *relaciones*,” which is the questionnaire that led to the large number of responses that have come to be known as the *Relaciones Geográficas* (Refer to Chapter 2.3).\(^{686}\) The questionnaire posed fifty questions that a Spanish *alcalde mayor* or *corregidor* was expected to answer with the aid of Spanish and Indigenous inhabitants under his jurisdiction. Question two asked: “Who was the discoverer and conquistador of the said province and by whose order was it discovered, and the year of its discovery and conquest, whatever can be known.”\(^{687}\) Meanwhile, question fourteen was specifically directed at Indigenous people, “Who were they during their time as gentiles, and what dominion did their

\(^{685}\) *Códice Franciscano*, 152.

\(^{686}\) “Memoria de las cosas a que se ha de responder y de que se han de hacer las relaciones.” I favor 1585 as the date of production because that is year of the *Relación Geográfica* of San Martín, a town that is a short distance to the east of Nombre de Dios. Acuña, 18.

\(^{687}\) “Quién fue el descubridor y conquistador de la dicha provincia, y por cuya orden y mandado se descubrió, y el año de su descubrimiento y conquista; lo que, de todo, buenamente se pudiere saber.” Acuña, 18.
lords have over them, and what did they give in tribute, and, regardless of whether good or bad, what worship practices, rituals, and customs did they have.”

The response to the latter question better applies to “N.Y. Nombre de Dios,” whose answer explains how the petitioners fought under Spanish leadership without receiving proper remuneration. The notary writes that the Mexica contributed sixteen warriors and the Michoacanos contributed twelve to fight under Francisco de Susa, an alcalde ordinario, who promised them that they could keep any captives from their battles. Their opponents were Chichimecs, nomadic non-Christians, but the notary asserts that, after one battle, these petitioners were not allowed to keep anyone. If true, this event took place sometime in the 1560s, but the notary probably presented this event to answer questions two and fourteen around 1585. Also, unlike other notaries, they did not ask for specific acts on behalf of the petitioners but simply wrote these memorias twenty-five years later, apparently to solidify their claim to Nombre de Dios.

The Relación Geográfica of Teucaltiche describes a region southeast of Nombre de Dios, and its content suggests what might have happened in or near Nombre de Dios. The compiler of the Relación of Teucaltiche was Hernando Gallegos, the lieutenant of the alcalde mayor of the province of Teocaltiche; in the introduction and conclusion of this work he described the procedure he used to elicit information from Indigenous nobles from this region. He began by dating his document December 30, 1585 and proceeded to name himself, his office title, and the titles of the alcalde mayor, Antonio Maldonado, who tasked him with this compilation. Then, he

---

688 “Cuyos eran en tiempo de su gentilidad, y el señorio que sobre ellos tenían sus señores y lo que tributaban, y las adoraciones, ritos y costumbres, buenas o malas, que tenían.” The other memorias focus more on their relationship with Franciscan friars in the midst of war against non-Christian Indigenous people. Acuña, 19.

689 For more information about the Relaciones Geográficas, refer to Chapter 2.3.
named the Indigenous officials of Nochistlan who furnished him with information, including Don Baltasar de Mendoza, gobernador, Juan Gregorio, alcalde, Miguel Zacarías, regidor, and a few other named individuals including the nahuatlato Antón Julian, who knew Mexicano (Central Mexican Nahuatl) and Cazcan, a Nahuatl variant from Northwestern New Spain (Refer to Chapter 2.3c). Then, Gallegos asked them the questions required by the Relación Geográfica decree and included the answers as translated by Antón Julian in the Relación Geográfica of Teocaltiche. A similar process probably led to Nahuatl and Purépecha accounts in Nombre de Dios that were recorded in Nahuatl by one or more nahuatlato(s), one or more notary, or a combination of both.

Several years later, Indigenous officers from the town of Xalisco began six petitions to protest the movement of the convent of this town to Itzcuintlan sometime before April 26, 1593, the date of “1593a Xalisco.” In this first petition, the notary (hereafter notary one) addresses a Franciscan provincial and definidores to report the grief that the inhabitants feel about the convent and ask that it be moved back to the neighborhood of Tepehuacan in Xalisco. He also names the petitioners as Don Juan Cristobal, alcalde, Alonzo Abias, alcalde, Tomás de Aquino, síndico, Gonzalo Juan, regidor, and Andrés Felipe regidor. A different notary (hereafter notary two) wrote “1593b Xalisco” in a rougher hand, but he also addressed it to the provincial and definidores of the Franciscan Order. However, he shifted the emphasis by mentioning that

---

690 Acuña, 299 and 308.

691 BPEJ-JJA, Fondo Franciscano, Volumen 14, Numero 1074.

692 Xalisco may have been an altepetl within a multi-altepetl polity because the notary refers to Tepehuacan in a context that can only mean that the latter is a sub-division of the former.

693 Síndico may be a term for treasurer. The Diccionario de la Real Academia (Consulted on September 7, 2016) defines síndico as a person who kept the money that was given to mendicant people.
the petitioners knew that the Franciscans were having trouble in Itzcuintlan and by reminding them that the friars residing at Xalisco had always received support from their community. He dated this document to April 26, 1593.

The previous cycle of petitions had succeeded because Indigenous nobles from Xalisco reported that a new convent was being built in Xalisco in a new cycle that includes “N.Y. Xalisco,” “1694 Xalisco,” and “1695 Xalisco.” Two notaries also worked on “N.Y. Xalisco” because the first few lines were written by notary two, who addressed the provincial general, the comisario general and perhaps the definidores before notary one took over. The latter went on to write thirty-seven lines praising the work and sacrifices of fray Miguel de Lezo, who the petitioners wanted to be reassigned to the Franciscan convent in Jalisco. However, because the bottom right side of the paper of this petition is torn, the month and year are missing and only an “18” is visible with the Nahuatl word for “day”. In “1594 Xalisco,” notary one addressed the provincial general, the comisario general, and the definidores before notary two took over and again asked that fray Miguel de Lezo be sent to them. He then dated this letter to September 30, 1549, instead of 1594, which is more likely. “1595 Xalisco” is the third petition in which the same two notaries asked for the return of this friar and another one named Andrés de Medina. Then, for emphasis, notary two mentioned that many people were no longer trying and, although a piece of the page is missing because it is torn, there is enough evidence to suggest that this petition was supported by the elites of at least eleven subject towns of the convent of San Juan Bautista. They were Analco-Tepic, San Pedro Analco, Matlaticpa, San Andrés, Aqualachtempa, Analco.

---

694 Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG. [http://dle.rae.es/?id=XxphX21](http://dle.rae.es/?id=XxphX21)

695 The word definidores is partially obscured by splotched ink. N.Y. Xalisco, Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.
Mecatlan, Santa Cruz, Itztlapán, San Miguel, and at least two others whose names are only partially readable due to a tear in the document.

The last petition from Xalisco is “1595 Xalisco,” in which a notary presented the resignation of the petitioners who appeared to have realized that neither fray Miguel de Lezo nor Andrés de Medina would be placed in the rebuilt convent of San Juan Bautista. He no longer praised either of these friars but presented the qualities that the petitioners wanted in a new provincial friar. The petitioners explained:

\textit{tictitla[ni] amoyxpanzinco çe toteopixcauh navatl y[pam]pa ticcaquitzque yvan techcaquitz yvan chic[ahuac] tlacatl yn ya veventzin.}

We came to request before your presence a \textit{nahuatlato} priest who we will understand and who will understand us, and a strong man who is an elder.

The nobles accepted the permanent presence of friars, and they simply wanted someone with whom they could reason. They also resigned themselves to the fact that they had lost their bid to retain fray Miguel de Lezo.

"Cycle" is an appropriate word to describe what occurred with these early petitions from Northwestern New Spain. The first is a \textit{visita}-petition cycle that involves “1580a Nochistlan” and “1580b Nochistlan,” which began because of a \textit{visita} by a member of the Royal Audiencia, the reason why their author addresses the president of this institution in his second document. These petitions generated addenda as officers of the Royal Audiencia sought to understand and decide on the nature of the grievances. A different \textit{visita}-petition cycle begins with “N.Y. Nombre de Dios,” which is less complete because it lacks any addenda, since this document is not the original sixteenth-century petition but a copy recorded by Faustino Chimalpopoca in the nineteenth century (Refer to Chapter 2.2c). Indigenous nobles appear to have been the promoters of these petitions by traveling to the Franciscan convent, as a result of their collective understanding of an emerging colonial order in Northwestern New Spain. In this nascent new
order, Indigenous notaries were the new warriors who sought to protect their interests and the interests of their communities against other subjects of the Spanish king and the Catholic Church.696

5.2b. Cycles of Literacy II, 1593-1600

The Spanish King and the Church exercised their power through subordinates, in this case the Real Audiencia of Guadalajara and the Diocese of Guadalajara, respectively, and while the crown continued to grow in power during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Church was besieged by the Protestant Reformation. However, the Church convened the counter-reformation Council of Trent, which would affect the Indigenous groups of Northwestern New Spain.697 The Second Mexican Council, a gathering of important clerics in Mexico City, did not receive the Council of Trent decrees in time to comment on them, so it was left to the Third Mexican Council, which met in 1585. One decree emphasized the role of bishops as pastors to visit the different parishes under their jurisdiction periodically.698 The Third Mexican Council proposed that bishops in this region should visit their dioceses annually or biannually, but when attending bishops pointed out that such visitas would require two to three years, they were permitted to appoint a visitador general to assist them.699 In the diocese of Guadalajara, this

696 Owensby writes, “Parties to legal disputes were under no illusion that they would always prevail: the obvious paradox of litigation is that both parties to a dispute equate justice with victory but recognize that only one of them can win.” Owensby, 296.

697 Lundberg, 80.

698 Burns, 390.

699 Lundberg, 80.
official was the provisor visitador general who is addressed in the sixteenth-century petitions of “1593b Oconahuac,” and “1593c Oconahuac,” whereas the bishop is addressed in “1600 Tala.”

Clerics of the Third Mexican Council also deliberated and passed decrees about how to regulate ways in which parish priests and friars interacted with neophytes.\(^{700}\) One decree even stated that each church had to have two printed copies of these decrees for consultation, but this did not occur until after the decrees of the Third Mexican Council were published in 1622 as the Statuta ordinata, à sancto Concilio Provinciali Mexicano III (hereafter 1622 SCPM).\(^{701}\) Other decrees within 1622 SCPM advised parish priests and friars about what to do regarding the sacraments. Clerics had to say mass and give communion in the church of the cabecera at least once every Sunday and on required feast days.\(^{702}\) They had to perform baptisms and hear confessions.\(^{703}\) They also had to visit the subject towns at least twice a year to administer the sacraments.\(^{704}\) In short, the duties of Catholic clerics revolved around administering the sacraments to parishioners in return for fees. However, at the turn of the sixteenth century, it seemed that Indigenous petitioners knew these duties better than their assigned priests, judging by the effective arguments in “1593b Oconahuac,” “1593c Oconahuac,” “1600 Tala,” “1622 Cohuatlan, and “1622 La Magdalena” that accused priests of incompetence (Map 5-3).

\(^{700}\) Lundberg explains this in his examination of provincial council decrees in his chapter, “Trent Comes to Mexico: Provincial Council Decrees,” in Church Life between the Metropolitan and the Local: Parishioners and Parish-Priests in Seventeenth-Century Mexico.

\(^{701}\) Lundberg names this published manual as SCPM 1622 from Statuta ordinata, à sancto Concilio Provinciali Mexicano III. Lundberg, 67.

\(^{702}\) Lundberg 2011: 73.

\(^{703}\) Lundberg 2011: 73.

\(^{704}\) Lundberg 2011: 72.
Don Pedro Juan Martín identifies himself as the writer of “1593a Oconahuac,” and he probably also wrote “1593b Oconahuac” because the caligraphy of the two is similar. In the first petition, he addressed the members of the Real Audiencia on behalf of petitioners from five

---

705 “1593b Oconahuac” is missing one or more folios because it abruptly ends without a conclusion that identifies the petitioners and the author. BPEJ-JJA, Real Audiencia: Ramo Civil; Caja 1, Expediente 9, Progressivo 9.
Indigenous towns—Oconahuac, Tzichtic, Tepetlatlahcan, Xatlatzinco, and Amatlan—which were located east of the convent of Etzatlan. He related how the Franciscan provincial took too much tribute from them and required them to attend mass in Etzatlan, which was described as being distant from these towns. He also wrote that the provincial had imprisoned some of the nobles from these towns in the convent of Etzatlan. This petition is not dated, but accompanying addenda are dated to 1593, which shows that it was written with the three other petitions on or before this year. Furthermore, Don Pedro Juan Martín addressed “1593b Oconahuac” to titolatocauh profizur (you, our ruler, provisor) demonstrating that the visita protocols decreed by the Mexican Council of 1585 were being followed by the bishops because they were appointing a provisor visitador general who went to visit not only parishes but also regions controlled by Franciscan convents. However, Don Pedro Juan Martín did not address the bishop. Did a provisor perform a visita to Oconahuac due to the high turnover rate of the office of bishop during the 1590s?

In 1582, Domingo de Alzola had begun to serve as bishop but died in 1590, and he was followed by Pedro Suárez de Escobar who had been appointed bishop in 1591 but died in that same year. Then, Francisco Santos García de Ontiveros y Martínez was appointed on May 22, 1592 and died on June 28, 1596. This last bishop probably had to deal with numerous matters in Guadalajara because of the instability of this post, and he either had to appoint a provisor as a visitador general, or he had to accept the provisor visitador general of Domingo de Alzola to perform visitas.

Don Pedro Juan Martín represented petitioners from Oconahuac who knew the decrees of the Third Mexican Council regarding the sacraments. First, they accused a fray Alonzo from

---

706 Information about the tenures of the bishops of Guadalajara in this paragraph are from catholic-hierarchy.org. Consulted on March 16, 2016 at [http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/diocese/dguad.html](http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/diocese/dguad.html).
Etzatlan of not traveling to confess a Pedro Juantzin, who had died without confession, which was one of the key duties required of parish priests; clearly these petitioners also applied these expectations to the Franciscan friars of Etzatlan. In fact, the petitioners claimed that, instead of the friar visiting Pedro Juantzin, he had asked them to take Pedro Juantzin to him with the result that this individual had died and had to be buried on the road. They added that seven other people died without confession and last rites. They went on to accuse other friars of neglecting last rites and/or confessions for other people who died: fray Luis Navarro for five people; fray Martín de Aguayo for four people; and Friar Miguel for three people. They also detailed how fray Miguel did not perform visitas and neglected to baptize the children from the towns of Tzichtic and Tepetlauhcan.

Some of these Indigenous officials were probably literate, but they most likely did not learn of these edicts through the written or printed word. In most cases, they came to learn of these decrees when the bishop or provisor interviewed them through his Nahuatl-Spanish nahuatlato during the visita process (Refer to chapter 4.2a). This interview was most likely followed by a council meeting as the Indigenous notary and the cabildo met to negotiate the content of the written petition. In “1593b Oconahuac,” Don Pedro Juan Martín and the cabildo focused on how the clerics performed the sacraments for those who were sick. However, the last addenda in this visita-petition cycle was unfavorable because the petitioners were sentenced to

———. Lundberg explains that Bishop Juan de Palafox y Mendoza included a questionnaire for visitadores in his Direcciones pastorales (1646) that included a question about whether a given parish priest had visited the home of the sick when called upon. Lundberg, 84.

708 The notary writes nohuiyan altepetl ypan amo quichihua fisital (he did not perform the visita in every town).
jail and their town was deprived of two plots of land: one used for food crops and another used for animals.\textsuperscript{709}

Disagreements within the cabildo could also lead to the retraction of a petition, as in “1600 Tala,” which was addressed to the bishop and referred to Don Alonzo de la Mota y Escobar, who held the office between 1597-1606.\textsuperscript{710} He is best known for having written the Descripción geográfica de Nueva Galicia, which was actually a letter to the king in which he claims to make

as detailed a compendium of the kingdoms of [Nueva] Galicia, [Nueva] Vizcaya, and [Nuevo] León, so that your majesty has information of them and their inhabitants so that their administration is more constant.\textsuperscript{711}

In this work, he described the different parishes of the Diocese of Nueva Galicia during the last years of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century by giving geographical information, including the state of the roads that connect the different parishes, as well as the number of Africans, Indigenous people, Spaniards, and people of mixed race (Refer to Chapter 2.3). He also included information about the state of the church in the head town and the state of the chapels in the subject towns. For example, he described Tala [or Tlala] as a region inhabited by fifty Indigenous householders in the head town, which was also known as Tala, a secular parish that was the seat of government for some one hundred other householders

\textsuperscript{709} The first is named a sementera and the latter an hacienda.

\textsuperscript{710} The notary writes sanc.dre, or sancto padre (holy father), which is a reference to the bishop.

\textsuperscript{711} Mota y Escobar writes “...me he animado a obedecer su mandato haciendo este compendio de los reinos de la Galicia, Vizcaya y León, por lo más menudo que me ha sido posible para que, teniendo vuestra excelencia distinta noticia de ellos y de sus moradores, sea más cierto el juicio y gobierno de ellos (como es necesario que lo sea aquel a quien precede mayor claridad de las cosas).” Mota y Escobar, 25. Also, Joaquín Ramírez Cabañas proposes that Bishop Alonso de la Mota y Escobar gathered the information for his Descripción geográfica de la Nueva Galicia between 1602 and 1605. Ramírez Cabañas in Mota y Escobar, 15.
who lived in sujeto towns (Refer to Chapter 2.2b).\footnote{Mota y Escobar goes on to describe how Tala sits in a fertile valley in which the inhabitants raise \textit{ganado mayor} and \textit{ganado menor} as well as maize, and wheat, that they take to many local mills. Mota y Escobar, 71.} In short, his description of Tala along with that of other towns in the Diocese of Guadalajara suggests this work fits within what Lundberg describes as visitation records.\footnote{Lundberg cites a similar work by Mota y Escobar that the latter wrote while he was bishop of the Diocese of Puebla. Lundberg, 79. Also, Ramírez Cabañas proposes that, although Bishop Alonso de la Mota y Escobar gathered some of the information for \textit{Descripción geográfica de la Nueva Galicia} from his subordinates, the majority of \textit{Descripción geográfica de Nueva Galicia} came from direct observation. Ramírez Cabañas in Mota y Escobar, 15.} 

Although the notaries of the previous petitions referenced the provisor, it was the primary duty of the bishop to perform the \textit{visita}. If possible, the bishop had to use the \textit{visita} to 

\ldots ensure sound and orthodox teaching and the removal of heresies, to safeguard good practices and correct evil ones, to encourage the people by exhortation and warning to the practice of religion, peace and blameless life, and to make any dispositions for the benefit of the people that place, time, and opportunity may suggest to the wisdom of the visitors. That all this may more easily and smoothly come about, each and all those mentioned above who are concerned in visitations are charged to embrace all with fatherly love and Christian zeal.\footnote{This is Lundberg’s translation of the Council of Trent session 24, \textit{decretum de reformatione, canon} 3. Lundberg, 80.} 

As a result, the bishop was tasked with being a patriarch who could encourage, castigate, and adjudicate within the parishes of the diocese. More specifically, the bishop exercised the role of a judge who had to know canon law to perform his duties in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Trent and the Third Mexican Council.

Did Bishop Mota y Escobar excel in this role of judge? His past experience in the church hierarchy would suggest that he was at least very knowledgeable about the decrees of the
Council of Trent and the Third Mexican Council. He had previously served as *deán*\textsuperscript{715} of the Cathedrals of Michoacán and Puebla, and from January 22, 1593 until October 22, 1597 he took on this same post in the Metropolitan See in Mexico City.\textsuperscript{716} His last tenure as *deán* ended when he accepted the position of bishop in the Diocese of Guadalajara on October 22, 1597, but he did not arrive to take power until 1599.\textsuperscript{717} He was well suited to be bishop because during his tenures as *deán*, he had presided over the *cabildos* of three very distinct dioceses: the more peripheral Diocese of Michoacán, which shared a border with the Diocese of Guadalajara, the multi-ethnic Diocese of Puebla, and the Archdiocese of Mexico City. Finally, his residence in Mexico City probably also allowed him time to get acquainted with the decrees of the Mexican Council of 1585 regarding *visitas*.

Bishop Mota y Escobar’s extensive experience, together with his geographic account of Tala in the aforementioned *Descripción de Nueva Galicia*, suggests that he performed at least one *visita* interview in this town. A memory of this event survives in the petition of “1600 Tala,” which was written by the Indigenous notary Francisco Felipe.\textsuperscript{718} The latter writes an unconventional petition that explores both the *visita* interview with Bishop Mota y Escobar and political maneuverings between the members of the extended *cabildo* of Tala.

The Indigenous *cabildo* was different from the Spanish *cabildo*. Robert Haskett proposes that, in the Central Mexican province of Cuernavaca, Spaniards tried to limit the size of *cabildos*

\textsuperscript{715} The *diccionario de la real academia online* (consulted on February 29, 2016) defines *deán* as, “Canónigo que preside el cabildo de la catedral” (Canon who presides over the *cabildo* of the cathedral).


\textsuperscript{717} Joaquin Ramirez Cabañas, “Don Alonzo de la Mota y su descripción de la Nueva Galicia,” 279.

\textsuperscript{718} Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.
because they constituted this institution with a finite number of officers who served for a regulated time. However, Indigenous cabildos included not only the hierarchy of elected officials, but also, “a larger group of past officers, members of the local elite, and a variety of lesser functionaries who might or might not be elected but were still full members of a given town’s ruling group.” He also adds that the institution of the cofradía and its leadership was not completely separate from the cabildo and that the notary was an elected office of the cabildo, which is also relevant to “1600 Tala.”

Francisco Felipe wrote to retract a previous petition in which the cabildo of Tala had accused their priest, Don Fernando Villanueva, of failing to pay for a horse and corn. Francisco Felipe begins:

yc otiyaque molino oticpinautique doteopizqui dom pernado vel melavac teopizqui...
When we went to Guadalajara, we shamed our priest Don Fernando, a true priest...

This statement refers to a trip that some Indigenous nobles of Tala took to Guadalajara to accuse their priest, Don Fernando de Villanueva. However, the petition that resulted from this trip has been lost, and all that remains is “1600 Tala,” which seeks to convince Bishop Alonso de la Mota y Escobar of the innocence of Villanueva.

Francisco Felipe and the cabildo had learned of the decree that ordained clerics must not beg. He wrote that Don Fernando Villanueva had paid for some corn and a mare.

tiquitoa melavac otechtlaztlavi toteopizcauh dompernando
y pampa cauayotli yevah ypap oquiçãã“que ytlaoł mochi otechtlacatlavi
ym quezquich tech viquilia a  amo ten tech viquillia

---

719 Haskett, 5.
721 SCPM 1622 stated that ordained priests could not perform non-clerical labor or beg and had to rely on family support, chaplaincy, or another kind of benefice. Lundberg, 70.
We say truly that Don Fernando, our priest, paid us for the corraled mare, for all his corn. He paid us what he owed us. He does not owe us [anything].

Two people—Gerónimo Ortega and Juan González—had testified against Don Fernando de Villanueva for not paying for the mare and some corn. Ortega appears to have been higherranking than González, but the latter’s position as *mayordomo* clarifies what may have happened. Francisco Felipe wrote:

> ypāp pascua otechtlatolmaca totlatzin ceronimo otltecatl yvan ymayordomo Juº conçaliz yc otiyaque molino...

for on Easter, Gerónimo Ortega and Juan González *mayordomo* testified to us against our father. For this reason, we went to Guadalajara.

In 1600, Easter fell on April 2 and this petition is dated May 13. Prior to their trip to Guadalajara, Gerónimo Ortega and Juan González had first testified against Fernando Villanueva, probably during a *visita*. In another part of the document, the notary mentions that Tala had a *hospital*, which suggests that it also had a lay sodality of the Holy Conception (refer to Chapter 3.5). For this reason, Juan González’ title of *mayordomo* suggests that, as the *mayordomo* of this lay sodality, he administered a sizeable portion of animals and arable land in the town. As a *mayordomo*, he was most likely also a member of the *cabildo*, and he had one of the keys to the locked chest, which held the money from transactions that involved the business of the lay sodality. Thus, González would have interacted with Don Fernando Villanueva regarding any transaction that involved any lay sodality property. For this reason, one interpretation of “1600 Tala” is that Juan González and Gerónimo Ortega were two nobles from the *cabildo* of Tala who had convinced the other members into sending a petition against Fernando Villanueva.

---

722 Refer to Chapter 3.5 for more information about the the lockbox of a lay sodality.
What probably happened was that Juan González and Gerónimo Ortega kept the money and accused Don Fernando Villanueva on Easter, April 2, of not paying for taking the mare and some corn. The *cabildo* then sent a delegation to Guadalajara with an earlier petition, which they wanted returned:

\[ticltatlauhtia\ \totlatocauh\ \titechcuepilliz\ \totlatol\ \yc\ \amo\ \timopinautizque\ \melavac\]

We ask our lord to return our words to us so we will not be truly ashamed.

The phrase *titechcuepilliz totlatol* (return our words to us) is not a metaphorical construction. It represents a plea for the return of the previous petition, which they have since learned was based on false information.

Second, Francisco Felipe represented how the *cabildo* wanted to exonerate Don Fernando Villanueva from repercussions by carefully explaining how this priest followed the decrees of the Third Mexican Council. Francisco Felipe asserted:

\[doteopizqui\ \dom\ \pernado\ \vel\ \melavac\ \teopizqui\ \quitxiva\ \ytequih\ \mochi...\]
\[quitxiva\ \ytequih...\ \quitxiva\ \misqa\ \yvan\ \teyolcuitia\ \yvan\ \melavac\]
\[mexica\ \navau\ \quitxiva\ \ytequih\ \yn\ \teoyotl?\]

our priest don Fernando is a true priest who does all his duties...

he performs mass, he confesses, and with true Mexican Nahuatl, he makes his work, the sacraments.

Felipe described how Villanueva performed the sacraments of mass and confession in the prescribed manner, and he was able to do so because of his command of Nahuatl (*mexica navau*), which he speaks clearly.724 The Indigenous elites both affirmed their knowledge of Villanueva’s duties and explained that this priest performed them in an exemplary fashion. They did not explain where they learned the duties of a priest, but they had to have learned them from the

---

723 “1600 Tala,” Documentos en náhuatl, AHAG.

724 According to SCPM 1622, priests had to administer the sacraments within a place—a church or chapel—that had been designated by the bishop. Lundberg, 72.
visita interview because Francisco Felipe knew enough to address this petition to the bishop, the santo padre (holy father) whom they had met during a visita. They probably also consulted Villanueva because he was the wronged party, but they did not address him or the provisor; they addressed the santo padre, Bishop Mota y Escobar, because they remembered his visita and interview.

Bishop Mota y Escobar’s travels should have spurred the creation of more petitions, but “1600 Tala” is the only extant example. Two reasons for the lack of additional documentation are possible. Either he did not require Nahuatl petitions because of the dearth of Indigenous notaries at this time, or most of these early petitions were lost. The latter possibility sounds more convincing because although this is the only extant petition addressed to the bishop during his tenure, the petitioners also mentioned one other petition which has since been lost.

5.2c. Standardization and Printing, 1611-1622

The tenure of Bishop Mota y Escobar ended on February 12, 1607 when he was became Bishop of Puebla. The next bishop was Juan de Valle y Arredondo, who was appointed on March 19, 1607 and resigned in 1617; he was followed by Francisco de Ribera y Pareja, who was appointed on January 29, 1618 and ended his tenure on September 17, 1629.725 These two bishops relied on one or more provisores to perform visitas during their tenures; the twenty-three known petitions are addressed to the provisor.

Twenty-one petitions concern accusations against the priest Francisco Muñoz by Indigenous notaries from the provinces of Jalostotitlan, San Gaspar, and other towns (Map 5-3).

725 Leonel de Cervantes y Carvajal left the Diocese of Guadalajara to become the bishop of the adjacent Diocese of Michoacan.
A notary from the *cabecera* of Jalostotitlan appears to have initiated litigation with a petition against Muñoz that was translated by Arthur J. O. Anderson, Frances Berdan, and James Lockhart who named it as “Petition for removal of the priest of Jalostotitlan 1611.” They also identify the writer as the *alcalde* Juan Vicente, who identified himself in the first person.

> auh ynehuatl ni ju victenti alld cenca onechmictic...
> He has severely beaten me, Juan Vicente *alcalde*...  

Juan Vicente made this accusation in the first paragraph of the letter, in which he also explains that Muñoz had whipped him three times, had broken his staff of office, and had whipped the *macehualtin* (commoners). In the next paragraph (which he numbered "one"), Vicente accused Muñoz of staying in an *estancia* with a woman, instead of near the church.

---

726 Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart, 166-173. This petition is from McA-UCLA, Box 20.

727 Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart identify the writer in the first paragraph, which is the only one that Juan Vicente does not number. Vicente numbers the next paragraph as one and his petition finishes with the fourteenth paragraph, but it is probably missing a portion because it lacks a conclusion (Refer to Chapter 4.2a). Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart, 166-167.
Juan Vicente numbered the next paragraph "two" and began by accusing Muñoz of taking 15 pesos and 2 tomines from the chest of the lay sodality of the Holy Sacrament. Then, he explained how he complained about Muñoz to the provisor:

*yniquac cepa onicteyxpahuic yxpan señr provisor yhuā san gaspar*
Another time, I complained about him to the lord provisor and [so did] the

*tlaca alld̤e ome altepetl oticteyxpahuiq[u]e*
the alcalde of the people of San Gaspar. We, of the two altepetl, complained.

This statement refers to a *visita* by the provisor to Jalostotitlan, which is the head town of San Gaspar. Jalostotitlan and San Gaspar were Tecuexe towns inhabited by people who spoke an unidentified native language, and a few who were “*ladino en lengua mexicana*” (fluent in Nahuatl).728 Those individuals who were *ladino* in Nahuatl mediated when the provisor interviewed the nobles of the province, and according to this petition, only Juan Vicente and the *alcalde* of San Gaspar complained about Francisco Muñoz, which is the reason why Muñoz resented the author of this document.

After hearing these accusations, the provisor was forced to act. Juan Vicente describes how this happened:

*auh yn señr provisor oquinonoztac oquitolacaquitl quitlacuilhuic*
the lord provisor admonished him; criticized him; wrote to him729

The first two actions represent vocal actions, but did Juan Vicente and the *alcalde* of San Gaspar ask for more? Did they ask the provisor for an *amparo* at the time of the *visita*, or did they go to Guadalajara to meet with the provisor to complain about Francisco Muñoz at a later time? Most

---
728 Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart (1976: 166) explain that, in a Spanish-language addendum, an investigator returned to Jalostotitlan to take testimony from five witnesses who were *ladino en lengua mexicana*. Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart, 166. For a discussion on *ladino*, refer to Chapter 3. For a discussion on the province of Jalostotitlan refer to Chapter 2.

likely, Juan Vicente and/or the alcalde of San Gaspar did not complain during the visita but went to Guadalajara because he claims that both:

\[
auh \text{ yn } se\text{ñr obispo yhu}\text{ā proui quitlacuilhuique oquilhuique} \\
\text{the lord bishop and the provisor wrote him [Francisco Muñoz] to tell him,}
\]

\[
xiquinyolali macehualtin ca mopiulhuaxiquintlaçotla \\
\text{“Console the commoners for they are your children. Love them.”}^{730}
\]

With this statement, Juan Vicente records how the bishop and the provisor followed the instructions of the Third Mexican Council by pressing Muñoz to perform his duties properly.

Then, Juan Vicente referred to a conversation with Francisco Muñoz:

\[
auh \text{ yn iquac oquicaquic yamauh se\text{ñr obispo yhu}\text{ā provisor niman} \\
\text{And when he [Francisco Muñoz] had heard the document of the lord bishop and provisor,}
\]

\[
oquito tleypampa ayahui amoteyxpahui ynahuac provisor niman ayaxquia ynahuac \\
\text{he said, “Why do you go and complain to the provisor, and then you go}
\]

\[
se\text{ñr obispo çan monequí xihuian mexico...} \\
\text{to the lord bishop. You really need to go to Mexico City...}^{731}
\]

This conversation confirms the hierarchy that the Indigenous nobles of Jalostotitlan and San Gaspar could consult. First, the Indigenous elites of Jalostotitlan, San Gaspar, and perhaps other towns in the province of Jalostotitlan directly met with the provisor during the visita. Then, Juan Vicente and the alcalde of San Gaspar went to meet the provisor in Guadalajara to complain again and wait for a document, possibly an amparo, signed by both the provisor and the bishop even if they did not actually meet the bishop.

---


731 Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart, 168-169. Vicente also repeated this conversation in the twelfth paragraph, which is actually numbered as the eleventh paragraph. Vicente in Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart, 172-173.
Juan Vicente continued to record this conversation and proposed that Muñoz challenged the powers of both the **provisor** and the bishop:

çan monequi xihuian mexico ca ompa oniquixtic nonahuatil ynic nican nivicario
You really need to go to Mexico City, it is there where I got my orders to be vicario here... 732

This writer referred to Mexico City for three reasons. First, he emphasized how Muñoz is challenging the authority of the **provisor** and the bishop, who reside in Guadalajara. Second, he showed how Muñoz did not think highly of him because Muñoz, in a sense, challenged him to go all the way to Mexico City for aid. Third, he explained how his visit to Guadalajara to accuse Muñoz before the **provisor** provoked Muñoz’s anger:

ypampa ynin nechcocolia quicocolia mochi altepetl
Because of this, he hates me; he hates the whole town.

This petition shows that the **visita** represented an important check on the power of the provincial priests and friars, but it also suggests that the petitioners could suffer repercussions once the bishop or **provisor** had gone.

Juan Vicente became more specific with his accusations about Muñoz lashing men and women in the paragraph that he numbered eleven. Vicente referred to some information that he received during the **visita** with the **provisor**, or the subsequent meeting with this official in Guadalajara:

no yhuan amo techmachtia teotlatoli sermon ca çan yxquich techcocolitinemi
And also, he does not teach us the holy words, the sermon, but he only hates us

**techtolintinemi**
and mistreats us constantly.

Vicente thus accuses Muñoz of not fulfilling the sacrament of Mass in a satisfactory manner, and that he only mistreats him and fellow residents of Jalostotitlan. Then, once again, Vicente refers to the document from the provisor and presents another response by Muñoz:

*yn iquac señor provisor quitlacuilhuic oquihui xiquinyolali macehualtin*
When the lord provisor wrote him, he said: “Console the commoners for they are

*ca mopilhuan niman quicaquic quitoa tleypampa niquinyolaliz niquintlaçotlaz*
your children.” As soon as he heard it, he said, “Why am I to console them, to love them

*coz nopilhuan ca ypilhuan diablo ca niquintoliniz*
as my children? They are children of the devil. I will mistreat them.”

*amo quitlacamati ytlanahuatil señor provisor yhuan obispo*
He did not obey the order of the lord provisor and the bishop.

Juan Vicente was more explicit here about the mistreatment by Muñoz toward him and the residents of Jalostotitlan, which is a clear violation of the document, the probable *amparo*, signed by the bishop and the provisor.

The other numbered paragraphs also serve to support the argument against Muñoz. In the third paragraph, Vicente claimed that Muñoz beat him once when he was carrying the provisor’s document, and that he beat him two other times. In the fourth paragraph, he asserted that Muñoz whipped an eight-year-old sacristan and also struck this boy’s mother. In the fifth paragraph, Muñoz asked a former fiscal to do something for him, but this individual refused because his service had ended, and Muñoz then beat him. In the sixth paragraph, Muñoz beat the new fiscal. In the seventh paragraph, Muñoz beat someone who went to look for him at the *estancia* when Muñoz was with his woman. In the eighth paragraph, Vicente claims that when his daughter, Catalina Juan, went to the church to sweep:

*auh yn totatzin ompa teopan quitzitzquic quiyecoznequi*
there in the church our father seized her and wanted to have [sex with] her\textsuperscript{733}

However, the girl escaped. The ninth paragraph serves as a type of summary, and the tenth is another complaint about how Muñoz spends too much time in the estancia with his Spanish woman instead of in the church. In the twelfth, Juan Vicente asks that Muñoz be removed and that their parish receive a good priest. In the thirteenth, Juan Vicente requested the return of fifteen pesos and two tomimas that Muñoz took from the cofradía of the Holy Sacrament. Finally, in the fourteenth paragraph, he added that Muñoz does not pay commoners who travel to Guadalajara on his behalf.

Despite this visita-petition cycle, the tense situation only escalated by 1618, when numerous people accused Muñoz in twenty petitions transcribed and translated by John Sullivan. These petitioners include Juan Vicente from Jalostotitlan, who was no longer the alcalde, and officials and inhabitants from the nearby towns of San Gaspar, Santiago Teocaltitlan, San Miguel, Mezquic, Mitic, and San Juan. These towns were in the provinces of Jalostotitlan and Lagos, but they appear to be in the same parish district. Although these towns were situated in a border region shared by the Cazcanes and the Tecuexes, the towns of Jalostotitlan, Mitic, and San Gaspar are mainly associated with the latter (Refer to Chapter 2.3d).\textsuperscript{734}

\textsuperscript{733} Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart translate quiyecoquenequi as “wanted to have her,” suggesting what I have added in brackets. Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart, 171-173.

\textsuperscript{734} Tello writes, “fray Antonio de Segovia, que había / poco había venido de España en la segunda barcada que fue de religiosos, y era hijo de la Illustríssima Provínzía de la Concepción, y fray Juan Padilla [mistake: it should be Juan de Badiano], baptizaban y administraban las Provínzias de Tonalán, Tlaxomulco, Ocotlan, Atemajac, y entraron por la Teqüexa de Mitic, Jalostotitlan, Tecpatitlán y toda la Caxcana, que son los pueblos y cabezeras de Zuchipila, Taltenango, Teul, Mecatabascó, Nochistlan y Theocaltich. Tello Vol. II, 206-207. Sullivan also suggests that the writer of Jalostotitlan was not a native speaker of Nahuatl because he did not omit the absolute suffix on possessed nouns, writing toaltepetl and yqueytl, and he used Spanish forms in Nahuatl, such as nimotoca thomas luiz, which literally translates the Spanish me llamo thomas luiz, instead of the Central Mexican form, notoca thomas luiz. Sullivan, Ytechcopa timoteihuiua yn tobicario (Acusamos a nuestro vicario): Pleito entre los naturales de Jalostotitlan y su sacerdote, 11.
Sullivan names each petition with a number followed by the petitioners, their town, and the date of the petition. The writers of nine petitions (1, 13-20) address one individual with the petitioners of “1. Petición del alcalde, el regidor y otros funcionarios de Jalostotitlán, a 3 de mayo de 1618,” addressing the gobernador, whereas the thirteenth through twentieth petitions address an individual named juez, which presents two possible officials (Table 5-1). First, all of the petitioners reported their accusations to the juez gobernador, the presiding figure in the head town of Jalostotitlan. 735 This official also might have been the chief Indigenous officer of a nearby Franciscan mission like Nochistlan. 736 The final possibility is that they used these terms to address a member of the Real Audiencia of Guadalajara.

The notaries of the petitions from Jalostitlan addressed members of the Real Audiencia of Guadalajara in a less ambiguous manner. They wrote terms such as antomavitzlatocavan (you, our honored rulers), antoqueytatocaquan (you, our great rulers), and tictotennamiguiyiya yn amotaçomatzin yvan amocxitzin (We kiss your [plural] precious hands and your [plural] feet). 737 Three writers identified the addressees: Don Miguel in “6. Memoria de don Miguel, originario de San Miguel, a 3 de mayo de 1618;” Pedro Francisco in “8. Memoria de Pedro Francisco, alcalde

---

735 Gibson asserts that in the Basin of Mexico, the juez gobernador or gobernador was, “the presiding figure in each cabecera...and his office was to signify the separate, non-sujeto status of the cabecera under his rule.” Gibson, The Aztecs Under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico, 1519-1810 (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1964), 167. Meanwhile, Lockhart (1992: 30) and Haskett (100) explain that, in the Basin of Mexico and in nearby Cuernavaca, the first gobernador was often the conquest-era tlatoani or his heir. Lockhart, The Nahuas After the Conquest, 30; Haskett, Indigenous Rulers: An Ethnohistory of Town Government in Colonial Cuernavaca, 100. Lockhart (1992: 34-35) adds that, toward the end of the sixteenth century, gobernadores were used as jueces (judges) who served for a set period in order to examine the local cabildos in the Basin of Mexico, and this is when the person serving in this capacity became known as the juez gobernador.

736 Deeds writes that, in northwestern Mexico, gobernador could also serve as the title of the chief Indigenous officer in a mission. Deeds, 265.

737 Sullivan, Ytechcopa timoteilhuia yn tobicario (Acusamos a nuestro vicario): Pleito entre los naturales de Jalostotitlan y su sacerdote, 20-21,
de San Miguel, a 3 de mayo de 1618;” and Juan Nuñez in “11. Memoria de Juan Nuñez, ex-fiscal de Teocaltitlán, a 3 de mayo de 1618” (Table 5-1). These three writers used very similar phrases to address the provisor, the oidores, and one or more canónigos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Nahuatl phrase with English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Miguel</td>
<td>6. Memoria de don Miguel...</td>
<td>anotatocavan...oyiórez yhuan provisor yhuan cananigo [to] you my lords...the oidores, the provisor, and the canónigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Francisco</td>
<td>8. Memoria de Pedro Francisco</td>
<td>tatuate oyiroriz yhuan provisor yhuan cananicaç yzquich the lords: the oidores, the provisor, and all of the canonigos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Nuñez</td>
<td>11. Memoria de Juan Nuñez...</td>
<td>tatuate provisor yhuan cananicoz yhuan oyirorez the lords: the provisor, canonicos, and oidores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The oidores were the officials who had judicial powers and were led by a presidente in the Real Audiencia of Guadalajara. An oidor was, “a justice of appeal” so it is very likely that the term juez refers to these officials, whereas canónigo represented an official of the diocese. Therefore, the presence of these officials in the petitions demonstrates that a portion of the process against Muñoz began with the visita by a provisor, continued with an investigation by a canónigo, expanded to include one or more oidores, and eventually found its way to the court of the Inquisition in Mexico City.

The different writers of these twenty petitions recapitulated what had been recorded in “Petition for removal of the priest of Jalostotitlan 1611,” and they also included the testimony of new victims. They wrote of Muñoz’s Spanish woman and how she prevented him from carrying

---

738 Sullivan, Ytechcopa timoteilhuia yn tobicario (Acusamos a nuestro vicario): Pleito entre los naturales de Jalostotillan y su sacerdote, 25, 27, and 33.

739 The Diccionario de la Real Academia (consulted on September 7, 2016) defines canónigo, “Eclesiástico que tiene una canonjía,” and canónigo doctoral, “Prebendado de oficio. Es el asesor jurídico del cabildo catedral y debe estar graduado en derecho canónico o ser perito en cánones.” http://dle.rae.es/?id=7AGHh6P

740 Parry defines the oidor in this way. For canónigo, an addenda in “1654 San Martín by Diego Juan” requests that a canónigo translate a petition from Nahuatl to Spanish. Parry, The Audiencia of New Galicia in the Sixteenth Century: A Study in Spanish Colonial Government, 5.
out his duties as priest, how he took money from the treasuries of lay sodalities, how his solicitations for sex in the church caused many women to avoid him, how he whipped Indigenous officials, and how Indigenous residents from the accusing towns had turned to another priest to receive the sacraments. All of these offenses led a larger number of officials from the Diocese of Guadalajara and the Royal Audiencia of Nueva Galicia to investigate and pass on this case to the Court of the Inquisition in Mexico City.  

The remaining two petitions from this period are María Magdalena’s “1622 La Magdalena” and Pedro Puy’s “1622 Cohuatlan.” María Magdalena probably revealed her situation to the prioste of her lay sodality, who wrote to appeal to the provisor to defend her against the aggressive actions of the alcalde mayor of Etzatlan (Refer to Chapter 1.1 and Chapter 4.2a). However, she appears not to have met the provisor during his visita because:  

\[ \text{ya ticmomachiltia tinotlatocauh teoyotica ca ya ovalmovicaya} \]  
As, you, my spiritual ruler, already know,  

\[ \text{mixpätzinco yno tlatocauh prioste ca ya omitzcaquiltico} \]  
the lordly prioste was coming before your presence to inform you.  

In other words, the prioste went to see the provisor about María’s situation because the provisor might not have known female officials of the lay sodality, but would likely be more familiar with its male officials. The result of this visit appears to have been a letter, possibly an amparo that the prioste gave to María, who showed it to the alcaldo mayor. However, she explained that:  

\[ \text{auh yn don Sabastian oquixitini motlanavatiltzin amo químavitzillia çan oquito amo nelli Don Sebastián destroyed your message. He does not show respect. He merely said,} \]  

741 Many of these twenty petitions resemble the Maya petitions against priests soliciting sex in the confessional that John Chuchiak examined in “Secrets Behind the Screen: Solicitantes in the Colonial Diocese of Yucatan and the Yucatec Maya, 1570-1785.’’  

742 “1622 La Magdalena,” Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.  

743 I have included the full petition with its addenda in Appendix A.
oquichihuac tlatovani cācampa omochivac yz catqui oquito don Sebastiā
“it is not true [that] the ruler did it [destroy the message], but where was it done?” That is what Don Sebastián said.

Later, she requested an amparo, and a Spaniard in an addendum agrees that she should indeed receive one.

In the same year, Pedro Puy wrote “1622 San Andrés Cohuatlan”\textsuperscript{744} to the provisor because the residents of San Andrés Cohuatlan were instructed to move their settlement as part of a congregación, a reorganization of Indigenous people into a new location, and the petitioners wanted to remain in their town.\textsuperscript{745} In 1622, San Andrés Cohuatlan had a small population—Pedro mentioned only fourteen married men and five single men. However, he made the case that:

\[
\text{teuati timaçevatl ti:tēchicavique,}\textsuperscript{746} \text{michvactalpan}
\]
We are the commoners who strengthened people in the land of Michoacan.

\[
\text{oticchivque caxtoli civitl oticçelique}
\]
We delivered tribute for fifteen years.

Thus, Pedro Puy made the case that the petitioners were devoted subjects, and he appears to have argued that they should be heard; the one addendum which includes a translation recommends that they receive an amparo in their favor (Refer to Chapter 1.6).\textsuperscript{747}

\textsuperscript{744} Although Pedro Puy writes Coatlan in this petition, I have regularized the orthography of this name so that it resembles how Juan Cruz spelled Cohuatlan in “1637a Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo” and “N.Y. Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo.” Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.

\textsuperscript{745} Pedro Puy writes señor frufixotl. “1622a Cohuatlan,” Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.

\textsuperscript{746} Pedro Puy appears to use the colon for the glottal stop.

\textsuperscript{747} Cohuatlan had disappeared by 1734. Gerhard, A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain, 81.
These diocesan petitions suggest that, as in Real Audiencia petitions, visitas impressed Indigenous notaries and Indigenous officials and spurred them to write to the Spanish officials who had performed the visitas. When a visita took place, the notaries of correspondence communities conferred with the officers of the cabildo and/or the lay sodality to create these early documents. Other Indigenous officials did not have any complaints during the visita, but they remembered when their interests or those of their communities were threatened and wrote to diocesan officials. Therefore, the visita-petition cycle that figured in Real Audiencia petitions was also a factor in diocesan petitions; the visita-petition cycle was a colonial practice by which Spanish officials could govern the many peoples of Northwestern New Spain. However, did Indigenous officers come to trust the diocese to a greater degree? The remaining petitions suggest such a possibility in that most are addressed to diocesan officials, which is the topic of the next chapter.
Chapter 6, Standardization

I wrote by order of all the residents

Diego Juan, notary of San Martín, Ávalos

6.1. 1622 SCPM

The dissemination of 1622 SCPM, the printed publication of the Third Mexican Council, constitutes a break with the previous petitions in that this publication required all clerics to know what was expected of them when assigned to a head town. This mandate extended to the bishops. The 1622 SCPM specified that not only was a bishop required to visit parishes in his diocese, but that he also had to record his visita through a notary. The 1622 SCPM also decreed that each church had to keep at least two copies of the Third Mexican Council publication, and many of the extant copies are from convents, so both priests and friars had to know what was expected of them. Such a standardization of expectations must have led to changes in the behavior of clerics, which Indigenous notaries appear to have recorded in subsequent petitions, turning away from complaints about the sacraments toward grievances about tribute required during the feast-days of the Catholic calendar.

---

748 AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1654 San Martín.”

749 The dissemination of 1622 SCPM occurred during the tenure of Francisco de Rivera y Pareja (January 29, 1618 to September 17, 1629), and the subsequent bishops were Leonel de Cervantes y Carvajal (December 17, 1629 to February 18, 1636), and Juan Sánchez Duque de Estrada (July 21, 1636 to November 12 1641).

750 Lundberg, 85. The earliest such record held by HAAG is from 1666.

751 Lundberg, 67.
6.2. Visita-Petition Cycles, 1626-1646

Indigenous elites would not have had similar access to 1622 SCPM and would continue to rely on visita interviews to learn about how their clerics should behave. Clerics and Indigenous people had different responsibilities in the church, but both had to follow the code of conduct known as policia cristiana, which was used to judge all Catholics.752 Indigenous people learned about policia cristiana from their priests and devout Indigenous residents of their town, but the former exercised much more power, which is visible in the letter “1626 San Francisco Chapalac” and in the decree “1629 Zacoalo.” There are seven extant visita-petition cycles in the period between 1626 and 1646, and they are different because they move away from incompetence to too many requirements. Could this reflect the influence of 1622 SCPM? Finally, only the receipt of “1630 Tlajomulco” represents a document in which the presence of the local priest is hard to discern.753

The Franciscan provincial Francisco de Torres wrote “1626 San Francisco Chapalac” on November 30, 1626 for the alcaldes, regidores, prioste, mayordomo, and principales who were the Indigenous elites of the town of San Francisco Chapalac (Table 6-1).754 His purpose was to admonish these nobles for failing to support adequately their guardian fray Joseph López de Carpio with alms, which suggests two possible scenarios. First, this letter could be a type of amparo given during a Franciscan visita; the title of provincial identifies Francisco de Torres as the head of the Franciscan province of Santiago de Xalisco while that of guardian names López

752 Hanks defines it as “involved at once built space, the care and presentation of the body, a code of conduct, and the orderly relation among the three.” Hanks, Converting Words: Maya in the Age of the Cross, 1.

753 AIPEJ, Tierras y Aguas Vol 2.

754 AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl.
de Carpio as the head of the convent of San Francisco de Chapalac, which is within this province. Perhaps, López de Carpio told Francisco de Torres, his superior, about the difficulties he was having with the inhabitants of this town, and Francisco de Torres responded with this document that he would read aloud before leaving it with the former. Alternatively, this letter may have been a speech that Francisco de Torres wrote to help him deliver it before the residents of San Francisco de Chapalac who might have been critical of his imperfect Nahuatl.

Table 6-1: Letters and Petitions from 1626 to 1646

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates: N=Nahuatl &amp; S=Spanish</th>
<th>Notary</th>
<th>Name of Petition (P), Letter (L), or Receipt (R)</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N: November 30, 1626</td>
<td>Fray Francisco de Torres</td>
<td>1626 San Francisco Chapalac (L)</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Spanish author and Coca town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: October 20, 1629</td>
<td>Juan Fabián</td>
<td>1629 Zacoalco (L)</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Coca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: December 15, 1630</td>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>1630 Tlajomulco (R)</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>Coca/Tecuexe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: June 19, 1637 &amp; S: July 1, 1637</td>
<td>Juan Cruz</td>
<td>1637a Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo (P)</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>Pame/Central Nahua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: June 19, 1637</td>
<td>Juan Cruz</td>
<td>N.Y. Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo, ca. 1637 (P)</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>Pame/Central Nahua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: February 8, 1642 &amp; S: March 10, 1642</td>
<td>Juan Miguel</td>
<td>1642 Contla (P)</td>
<td>Tacotlan and Cuquio</td>
<td>Tecuexe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: October 21, 1644</td>
<td>Francisco Sebastián</td>
<td>1644 Cajititlan (P)</td>
<td>Cajititlan</td>
<td>Coca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: May 11, 1646 &amp; S: May 12, 1646</td>
<td>Francisco Rafael</td>
<td>1646 Tepequechpan (P)</td>
<td>Minas de Chimaltitan</td>
<td>Tecual/Huichol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of the scenario, Francisco de Torres records the different ways in which Indigenous elites used to pay alms to the local friar or priest. He admonishes them for reducing the alms given to López de Carpio during the feast day of the Holy Conception. Then, he asks them to give tribute in the manner that they had in the past and reminds them of the covenant that their ancestors had made with the Franciscans:

*yuc xicchihuacan xicaxiltican quenami muchipan anquichihuaya*
Likewise, pay and supply tribute as you always used to pay it.

755Unless otherwise stated, these ethnic identifications are from Bishop Ruiz Colmenero in Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1049-1052.
Remember that for a long time, they [your grandfathers] returned because of those orders. He also tells them to stop attending masses at the nearby Franciscan convent of Axixic, and to go to their assigned convent of San Francisco de Chapalac to listen to López de Carpio. These words suggest that the nobles of San Francisco had been waging a political struggle against López de Carpio, who felt compelled to ask for the intervention of the highest Franciscan leader in the region.

The letter of “1629 Zacoalco” by Juan Fabián represents another type of negotiation between clerics and the Indigenous elites from two correspondence communities: Zacoalco and San Felipe Cuquio (refer to Table 6-1). Juan Fabián wrote to respond to a letter from the cabildo of San Felipe Cuquio that sought information about whether Juan Diego, a resident of Zacoalco, was widowed. Juan Fabián answered:

\[
\text{yhuā amopahihueyaya toyolo auh yanepa cepa oconana amal ompa çacalan oquihualhueca}
\]

and our hearts were not yet satisfied so he took a letter there to Zacatlan and brought it back...  

Other parts of the letter suggest that the cabildo of Zacoalco questioned Juan Diego to ascertain whether he was widowed, but they were not completely satisfied so they sent him to Zacatlan, the town of his parents, to collect the signatures of his parents, which appear at the end of “1629 Zacoalco.”

Furthermore, Juan Fabián’s letter explains that the clerics of both towns played a prominent role in this investigation. He wrote:

\[\text{Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart, 198-199.}\]
And our prior, whose honored name is fray Melchor, has guided us here

Sancta Eclesea yhuan fry antris meriena prisentinti
[in matters] of the holy church, along with fray Andrés [Maríana?], president.

Both of these friars were assigned to the Franciscan convent of Zacoalco, which had been founded in the early sixteenth century, when San Felipe Cuquio was a secular parish. However, the priest of the latter probably also motivated its elites to begin the process of investigating whether Juan Diego was indeed widowed because clerics in general, and the Franciscans in particular, enforced the view of marriage as a monogamous union that could only be broken by death (Refer to Chapter 3.4).

Sometimes, clerics were not directly involved in the creation of documents. Simón Agustín and/or the lay sodality of Mary of the Holy Conception of Tlajomulco created “1630 Tlajomulco” as a bill of sale. This document emphasizes the importance of cattle to the lay sodalities in Northwestern New Spain. It records how Simón Agustín sold twenty cows for one hundred and twelve pesos to officials of this lay sodality, how he had to have his son-in-law sign because he could not write, and how the cows were rebranded with the mark of the lay sodality.

The documents “1637a Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo” and “N.Y. Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo, N.Y.” represent the province of Colima at two distinct times: June 19, 1637 when the Indigenous writer, Juan Cruz, dated the first petition; and July 1, 1637 when an unnamed Spaniard dated one addendum (Table 6-1). Juan Cruz referred to the addressee in “1637a Cohuatlan” and “N.Y. Cohuatlan, N.Y.” in similar ways:

\[ynçenca timahuiztiloni ynteahuatzin yntixiptlatzin tr' Js\]

(1637a Cohuatlan...)

757 AIPEJ, Tierras y Aguas Vol 2.

758 Although “N.Y. Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo, ca. 1637” lacks the year, I am assuming that it was made at the same time as “1637a Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo.” McA-UCLA, Box 20-42.
You are truly the revered one, you are the image of our lord Jesus Christ

ynçenca timahuiztililoni yntixiptlatzin tto Js°__  (N.Y. Cohuatlan...)
You are truly the revered one, the image of our lord Jesus Christ

Juan Cruz also included several lines in the back of “N.Y. Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo, ca. 1637” in which he addressed the office of the bishop:

quimotoliz amatzintli tlatohuani ohuizpo ompa
Could the lord bishop who is there

moyetztica ymahuizchantzinco mahuiztic altepetl
in his honored home [of Guadalajara], the splendid town, recite a letter.

Here, Juan Cruz requested a letter of 

amparo from the bishop of Guadalajara, but he does not know that the previous bishop, Leonel de Cervantes y Caravajal, had been transferred to Antequera and that the next bishop, Juan Sánchez Duque de Estrada, would not arrive in Northwestern New Spain until September 21, 1637. As a result, he addressed Leonel de Cervantes y Caravajal, whom he remembered from a previous 

visita during his tenure as bishop in Guadalajara, which lasted from June 26, 1631, to February 18, 1636.759 The Spanish writer who dated his addendum to July 1, 1637 also explained that the Nahuatl letter is going to father Antonio, presbítero vicario (Refer to Chapter 4.2).

Juan Cruz used the 

visita of Bishop Leonel de Cervantes y Caravajal to begin “1637a Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo.” He wrote to the bishop: “you gave me the [written] command, but he [a local cleric] does not obey it because of his seniority.”760 This statement suggests that Juan Cruz had received an 

amparo from the bishop during the 

visita to curb the abuses of the cleric mentioned in the petition, who ignored it because of his seniority. Then, Juan Cruz referred

759 Leonel de Cervantes y Caravajal was appointed on December 17, 1629, but he was not installed until June 26, 1631. http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bcercar.html (Consulted on May 16, 2016).

760 In Nahuatl, it is otinechmoamaquilic prohuision amo quitlamic oc tlapanauhti.
to the Chichimec/Christiano classification to describe the conduct of their cleric toward the community by stating:

\[\text{çenca techtolini maca çan yoquin tiyahouan ypan techmati yoqui}\]

He really oppresses us; not just as if we are war-like, but as if he knows we are

\[\text{tichichimeca ypan techmati yoquin amo tichristianos yhuan amo yquin quichiua misa}\]

Chichimecs; he does not think of us as Christians. And, he does not say mass.\(^{761}\)

Juan Cruz used these words to try to convince the bishop of their cause: that their priest treats them like Chichimecs by neglecting to say mass. He emphasized that they fed their cleric as required, and then switched his petition to address how the women of the community were sent to feed the members of an Indigenous group, the Salineros, without being paid. Finally, in “N.Y. Cohuatan de Puertos de Abajo, ca. 1637” he asked the bishop for a written decree to send this priest away from them, and when this is done, he promised that the petitioners will continue to be good Christians by receiving the sacraments from the friars of a nearby convent.

In the next petition in this series, Juan Miguel wrote “1642 Contla” to the alcalde mayor of the province on or before February 8, 1642, which is almost two months after Bishop Sánchez Duque de Estrada had died.\(^{762}\) This is the reason why Juan Miguel, the alcalde of Contla, addresses “1642 Contla” to the alcalde mayor even though the features of this document suggest a diocesan petition.\(^ {763}\) In fact, the most prominent indicator that it is a diocesan petition is that a Spanish notary named Pedro de Placencia wrote in an addendum that it was to be passed on to Pedro Manuel Maçedo provisor and judge of the Diocese of Guadalajara.

\(^{761}\) McA-UCLA, Box 20.

\(^{762}\) He died on November 12, 1641 according to the Catholic Encyclopedia.

\(^{763}\) Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.
Juan Miguel accused a parish priest named Juan Juárez of one main transgression that did not require input from a visita interview. He claimed that when Miguel Ángel died in Contla, Juárez arrived and not only took five cows but also seized Francisca, the eight-year-old child of the deceased, and placed her in chains. Juan Miguel added that Juárez would only release Francisca if he were given an ox and a sheep. Because this petition was addressed to the alcalde mayor, it suggests that neither Juan Miguel nor the other nobles of Contla had significant memories of any recent visita interview by a bishop or provisor.

The next document in time is “1644 Cajititlan”; it has the structure of a petition, but it is never named as such. In fact, the only identifying feature is pedimento, the term which Antonio González de Shipman used at the end of his addenda to this document. A pedimento or informe de pedimento was a request for written testimony that a Spanish official made of the aggrieved party, so for all intents and purposes “1644 Cajititlan” is a petition.

Francisco Sebastián was the notary of “1644 Cajititlan,” and by referring to a visita, he presented a different perspective from Juan Miguel of “1642 Contla.” Francisco Sebastián wrote on behalf of the cabildo/cofradía officers and addressed the provisor to protest several abuses by the Franciscan Friar in charge of the Franciscan convent at nearby Tlajomulco. First, he protested how the Franciscan friar whipped the mayordomo and prioste because, a week before Easter they had not delivered money to him in front of the building of their cofradía. This money was supposed to be for the purchase of an ornament for the church in the convent of Tlajomulco, but

764 Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.

765 The Diccionario de la Real Academia defines the adverbial expression “a pedimento” (by pedimento) as “a instancia, a solicitud, a petición.” The Diccionario defines pedimento as, “Acción y efecto de pedir” (The action and result of asking); “Escrito que se presenta ante un juez” (Written account presented before a judge); and “Cada una de las solicitudes o pretensiones que se formulan en un pedimento” (Each one of the requests and solicitations that result from a pedimento). http://dle.rae.es/?id=SJ7mdNL
the notary claimed that neither the prioste nor the mayordomo knew about this requirement and even suggested that, perhaps, the officers of the cofradía of nearby Cuyutlan had been the ones to agree to this.

At this point, Francisco Sebastián shifted from the topic of tribute to refer to the addressee, the provisor, by explaining:

\[ nel \text{nimā ohual necico mixpātzinco o}^\text{ti}\text{quimo maquili ce mādamiento deāparo ypanpa amo} \]
\[ \text{[So then] they appeared in your presence and you gave a mandamiento de amparo so that qui temacasque tomines others [from Caxititlan] don’t give their money.}^\text{766} \]

This portion of text represents two actions: the arrival of the provisor during a visita and the presentation of an order of amparo. However, Francisco Sebastián did not yet present the visita interview, even though one must have occurred in order for the provisor to create an order of protection for Indigenous people against another cleric.

Francisco Sebastián then detailed the tribute that the officials of Cajititlan were giving to the church and convent of Tlajomulco, and remarked that they were being impoverished and were being beaten when they failed to produce it. He complained:

\[ tlen \text{monequi santaygls}^\text{a} \text{tlaxLco ca Amo motolinia} \]
\[ \text{What does the holy church in Tlaxomulco need? It is not poor.} \]

\[ miac \text{hastienda quipiateopanhuan Santa hospital} \]
\[ \text{The church and the holy hospital have a lot of landed property.} \]

This segment presents an effective contrast with what follows:

\[ teguantin \text{ca tiprobes amo tlen mopia ca motolinia Santa yglza ca no miac} \]
\[ \text{As for us, we are the poor; the holy church [here in Cajititlan] has nothing, it suffers.} \]

\[ totechmonequi miac ytlacauhuti toteopan yhuan santa hospital \]
\[ \text{Thus, we are in great need. Our church and the holy hospital are greatly damaged.} \]

\[ ^{766} \text{AHAG, “Documentos en nāhuatl.”} \]
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This appeal to the provisor about the unfairness of this situation is a reference to the caretaking role of the clergy emphasized in 1622 SCPM, but how could Francisco Sebastián know about this? Francisco Sebastián learned because he and the petitioners had spoken to the provisor during the visita interview. He wrote:

\[
\text{no yhuan ticmomachiltiz ca ya axcan otitenegua ytechpa Santa ospital} \\
\text{Also, you will know today that you acknowledged}
\]

\[
\text{ca moxitiniz calli yahuel xitintiyauhu aocmo quali} \\
\text{that a house next to the Holy Hospital will be knocked down,}
\]

\[
\text{ya omo çencahua quahuimeh...} \\
\text{it is no longer in good shape. The wooden beams are ready [to be razed]...}
\]

This statement suggests that the provisor learned of this house during the visitatio rerum, the inspection of the structures and implements of Catholic ritual (Refer to Chapter 4.2a).\textsuperscript{767} This possibility is confirmed when Francisco Sebastián goes on to talk of the poor state of the images of Cajititlan.

\[
yhuan ymagenez ya mochi yçoltic ytlacauhutica mochi mochichihuaz \\
\text{and the images, they are all old and damaged. All will be remade.}
\]

Francisco Sebastián used this part of the petition to remind the provisor of the dire state of the objects required for practicing the Catholic faith in Cajititlan. This part also served to contrast these conditions to the demands of the friar from the convent of Tlajomulco, which the notary had portrayed as wealthy. Finally, this reference also suggests that, sometimes, the provisor conducted the visita interview, which was a part of the visitatio hominum, at the same time as the visitatio rerum.

\textsuperscript{767} Pueyo Colomina, 479-480; Magnus Lundberg, 82.
Francisco Sebastián did not end the petition there but continued to present hardships that would be remedied by having their own beneficed priest. He wrote that Tlajomulco was three leagues away, too far away to carry the flag that was used for the *Te Deum Laudamus*, and that it was especially far for the elderly residents of Cajititlan. Then, he asked:

\[
\text{axcan ma xitechmopalehuili ma timacocan ce beneficiado glerigo ma onpa} \\
\text{Today, may you please help us? May we be given a beneficed cleric from there}
\]

\[
\text{mochanti yehuatl techpias technocuitlaguiz} \\
to settle [here] so that he can protect and care for us?
\]

However, he demonstrated no malice toward the Franciscans when he said:

\[
\text{aczoyahuelçiya techitalo San Franciscos} \\
\text{Perhaps it is already possible. The Franciscans see us.}
\]

\[
\text{ma techcaguacan no yoqui tehuātin ma tiquincaguacan} \\
\text{May they leave us and may we, likewise, leave them.}
\]

Finally, Francisco Sebastián wrote that the residents of Cajititlan were well-known stonecutters who were also giving many limestone blocks for the church of Tlajomulco. This was another complaint, but its purpose at the end was to convince the *provisor* that Cajititlan was important enough to serve as the seat of a beneficed priest.

The final petition during this period is “1646 Tequepechpan,” written by Francisco Rafael to Antonio González on May 11, 1646. González was identified in an addendum as the priest of the province of Chimaltitan. Rafael wrote this petition in response to a local *visita* by González, who traveled from the *real de minas* of Chimaltitan to the Huichol town of Tepequechpan (Refer to Chapter 2.2c and 2.3h). Francisco Rafael, like many notaries of

---

[^768]: *Te Deum Laudamus* is a hymn to God, meaning “We Praise thee, o God!”

[^769]: Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.
petitions, began by acknowledging the prior visit of González and then informed him that they will stay, instead of leaving the town and its chapel, because of his promised help:

\[ \text{ticmatiznequi aço ya titehmopahuililia yca yehuatl otimiztomaquiliifique}^{770} \text{ topetizion} \]
\[ \text{We want to know if you have helped us with it. We gave you our petition} \]

\[ \text{Auh y naxcan tehhuahztzin ticomomatitiya ca ya monahuac timocahuallo} \]
\[ \text{And now, you know that we remain with you since} \]

\[ \text{ynic teuatzin titehmopahuiliz ypampa dios} \]
\[ \text{you will help us, because of God.} \]

The statement "you know that we remain with you" is important because Tequepechpan was a highland town on the southern side of El Gran Nayar, and one strategy of resistance was to flee. Thus petitioners presented a veiled threat that they would remain in the town as long as their last petition was answered in a satisfactory manner.

At the same time, Francisco Rafael used the appropriate reverential forms, perhaps because he was going to give González bad news. The former wrote:

\[ \text{ca tehuantin timopilhuan amo tihuellitillo yn ten nica timizpalehuizque} \]
\[ \text{We who are your children are not able to help you with that which is here} \]

\[ \text{ca zan nahua timo te machillo ye [tear]xquih} \]
\[ \text{for we only know Nahuatl.} \]

---

770 I have used the “ʃ” in the transcription to represent a symbol that I cannot recreate from unicode, and which appears to represent a glottal stop in this instance and in a previous word, momahuiztocalitzin (your revered name). Lockhart defines tōcāitl with two long vowels, ō and ā. Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples, 239. He also identifies the singular suffix of possessed nouns as, “-hui [ʃw] in IPA notation], which is used after stems ending in a vowel.” Lockhart, Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl with Copious Examples 3. I propose that both of these statements explain why Francisco Rafael wrote ʃ to represent the glide in momahuiztocalitzin as either /tō cāw tzīn/ or /tō caw tzīn/. Also, Lockhart writes that verbs that end in either ia or oa lose the a in the preterit so that a verb such as ticnemitia as either /tō caiz tzn/ or /tō caw tzīn/. I propose that, in this Western Mexican variant, the root nemitī can be modified to nemitīʃ /ni mi tiw/ in the preterit.
The literate nobles claimed to know Nahuatl even though Bishop Juan Ruiz Colmenero would attest a few years later that this was a Tecueje (or Huichol) town (Refer to Chapter 2.3h). The most likely explanation is that a Spanish official had shown them an alphabetic text written in another Indigenous language from the region, but they claimed not to know it or not to be able to read it.

These letters and petitions that followed the dissemination of 1622 SCPM suggest that priests knew the specific ways in which they had to perform the sacraments and sought to follow them. As a result, petitioners had shifted their accusations away from the sacraments and toward more unique situations. Also, the lack of a bishop from 1642 to 1648 may have lessened the number of petitions and those like “1642 Contla” demonstrate that some Indigenous elites were turning to the alcalde mayor for issues that concerned the church. However, the relationship between the diocese and Indigenous nobles had begun to change yet again because, on June 25 1646, Juan Ruiz Colmenero had been appointed in Spain as the new bishop of Guadalajara, and the large number of extant documents suggest that petitioners felt more comfortable writing to him than any other official of Northwestern New Spain.

6.3. Cycles in the Tenure of Bishop Ruiz Colmenero, 1648-1664

Indigenous notaries created at least twenty documents during the tenure of Bishop Ruiz Colmenero, 1646-1663. He was installed on December 24, 1647 and went on visitas to different provinces of Northwestern New Spain between 1648 and 1649, but his visita journal has been lost from the AHAG. However, Mexican historian Alberto Santoscoy had access to this book.

---

771 The Spanish record of the visitas of 1648 and 1649 is not in the AHAG, and it appears to have been lost during the 20th century. Gerhard, “La frontera norte de la Nueva España,”48-49.
and listed more than one hundred forty towns, along with the ethnic identity of the inhabitants from information in the *visita* journal of Bishop Ruiz Colmenero.\textsuperscript{772} These details help identify the notaries and petitioners who crafted petitions to this bishop (Refer to Chapter 1.1, Chapter 2.2c, and Chapter 4.3).

Bishop Ruiz Colmenero probably named the parish and the date he visited it, along with the ethnic identity of its inhabitants, in his now lost visitation journal.\textsuperscript{773} Then, he would have narrated the state of the properties of the church in the given parish, and he also would have provided some information about the priest and perhaps other officials of the parish.\textsuperscript{774} He would have noted the age of the priest and his level of education, including language proficiency, and the manner in which this official performed his duties in the given parish.\textsuperscript{775} The loss of this *visita* book is regrettable, but some of these missing details of Bishop Ruiz Colmenero’s *visita* can be gleaned from the Indigenous, European, and Casta notaries who preserved the *visita* interviews in petitions and addenda.\textsuperscript{776} These petitions and letters with their addenda will, in a sense, represent many *visita*-petition cycles that were made during the tenure served by Bishop Ruiz Colmenero. These extensive *visita*-petition cycles can be organized in four stages: the Long Year of 1649, 1652-1654, 1656-1657, and 1658-1664.

\textsuperscript{772} I counted 149 towns from Alberto Santoscoy’s list. Santoscoy, ““Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,”” 1049-1052.

\textsuperscript{773} Pueyo Colomina, 480.

\textsuperscript{774} Pueyo Colomina, 480-481.

\textsuperscript{775} Pueyo Colomina, 481.

\textsuperscript{776} Lundberg writes that the individual petitions in his corpus of petitions from the diocese of Puebla and the archdiocese of Mexico City have one to nine pages and adds that some are not accompanied by other documents but others have become part of a legal process because they have questionnaires, translations, accounts, and powers of attorney. Lundberg, 176.
6.3a. The Long Year of 1649

The earliest Nahuatl petition from Bishop Ruiz Colmenero’s tenure is “1649 Tachichilco,” from the town of Tachichilco in the province of Amula, which was inhabited by the Bapame, possibly another name for Otomí (Table 6-2). An unnamed notary wrote and dated this petition May 23, whereas the bishop himself dated an attached auto to May 24, 1649. Such a rapid response suggests that Tachichilco had one or more nahuatlatos who spoke Nahuatl and Bapame, and had one or more notaries literate in Nahuatl. These individuals most likely included members of the cabildo, who are named in this petition as Juan Zacarias, alcalde, Juan Miguel, fiscal, and Diego Felipe. Therefore, they probably included at least one nahuatlato who spoke Nahuatl and Bapame, and one literate individual Nahua who communicated to the bishop, but it is not clear whether one or two people exercised these skills.

Table 6-2: Petitions to Bishop Juan Ruiz Colmenero, 1649

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates: N=Nahuatl &amp; S=Spanish</th>
<th>Notary</th>
<th>Name of Petition</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N: May 23. S: May 24, 1649.</td>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>1649 Tachichilco</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>Bapame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: June 7, 1649.</td>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>Bapame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

777 AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl. Bapame may have referred to Otomí. An account of the Cortés Buenaventura expedition that passed through the region identified inhabitants as Otomí, but there is disagreement as to whether Nahuatl informants employed Otomí to refer to speakers who did not speak Nahuatl, in general, or to speakers of the language Otomí, specifically. I briefly discussed this controversy in Chapter 2.3b, favoring the first possibility. Yolanda Lastra presents an analysis that is more neutral. Lastra, Los Otomíes, su lengua y su historia (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma de México Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas, 2006), 30-31.

778 Lundberg defines fiscal as church steward and proposes that he was the leading middleman between the priest and the parishioners at large, and the office itself as restricted to principales. Lundberg, 180. Lisa Sousa defines fiscal as a native official who had responsibilities for different church functions. Sousa, “Tying the Knot: Nahua Nuptials in Colonial Central Mexico” in Religion in New Spain ed. by Susan Schroeder and Stafford Poole (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2007), 40. The Diccionario de la Real Academia (consulted on February 26, 2016) defines fiscal de vara as an, “alguacil eclesiástico.” In Northwestern New Spain, the title of fiscal does not appear very often; only three notaries use it in four petitions: “1649 Tachichilco,” “1653 Amatitlan,” “1653 San Martín,” and “1654 San Martín.”

779 This information about Indigenous identity is from Santoscoy, unless otherwise noted.
In any case, the communication was not direct. There is little evidence to suggest that Bishop Ruiz Colmenero spoke Nahuatl in 1648 or 1649, when he performed his best known *visita*. Instead, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero brought at least two people with him: a *nahuatlato* who spoke Nahuatl and Spanish, and a notary who was literate in Spanish. Indeed, “1649 Tachichilco” has an addendum by the notary Gallardo y Ochoa who summarizes the Nahuatl petition, and in another addendum, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero writes that the translator was Don Diego de Herrera. In other words, Gallardo y Ochoa was Bishop Ruiz Colmenero’s notary and Diego de Herrera was his *nahuatlato*. Diego de Herrera was either an Indigenous person who spoke Nahuatl and perhaps learned Spanish at a young age, or a Spanish-speaking European who had learned Nahuatl (Refer to Chapter 3.4 and 3.5).

This diocesan party met with Juan Zacarias, Juan Miguel, and Diego Felipe on or before May 23 to begin the complex exchange between Bapame, Nahuatl and Spanish. The Indigenous elites of Tachichilco claimed that their diminished population could not pay the money and goods required by their *guardian*, and they asked for the return of what had been given during

---

780 These addenda are in the margins and on the back page of the original petition. AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1649 Tachichilco.”

781 Gerhard writes that, in Amula, “Several dialects (Amultecan, Bapame, Pino, Zapoteco) were spoken of a language known as Otomi,” suggesting that Bapame was a variant of Otomi and mentions in parentheses, “its relation, if any, to the Otomi of the central plateau is not known.” Gerhard, *A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain*, 46. For the neighboring province of Autlan, which was west of Amula, Gerhard writes that a mid-seventeenth century source states, “ ‘Otomite’ was spoken just north of the Cihuatlan River, then ‘Bapame’.” Gerhard, *A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain*, 58. However, Rosa Yáñez Rosales and I conclude that Nahuatl-speakers used *nahuatlato* in contrast to *otomi* when distinguishing Nahuatl speakers from those peoples who speak another tongue (Refer to Chapter 3.3).
the feasts honoring Saint Peter and the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. They told their notary that these amounts were three pesos, one turkey, and four candles for the feast of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, and six pesos, a table cloth, four napkins, a bottle of wine, a quarter of beef, and one turkey for the feast of Saint Peter. The next day, Gallardo y Ochoa wrote a Spanish summary with the aid of Don Diego de Herrera, and Bishop Ruiz Colmenero wrote a favorable auto that he names as a decreto de visita (visita decree) that lessened the tribute of this town to no more than four pesos without any other requirements for each feast day. Bishop Ruiz Colmenero also ordered that this judgement be written down for consultation in the future so it appears that the auto, or decreto de visita, was an amparo because it favored the petitioners, but that would not have been the case if he had ruled against them.

Shortly after this visit, the diocesan party traveled to San Antonio Tuzcacuezco, a nearby town that was also Bapame, but the Nahuatl petition, “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco,” lacks a date so it is harder to know whether the cabildo of this town relied on a nearby nahualtato and notary. However, two of its addenda are dated to June 7, 1649 so the original petition was written on or before this date. The first addendum is a Spanish summary of the Nahuatl petition by Gallardo y Ochoa, and the second is an auto by Bishop Ruiz Colmenero who again acknowledges that Don Diego de Herrera was the acting translator of the diocesan party.

This diocesan party met with Simeon Cardes, alcalde, Francisco Hernández, alcalde, Juan Antonio, regidor, Juan Perez, regidor, and possibly three others: Pablo Joachim, Francisco Martín, and Juan Bonifacio. One of these Indigenous people is probably the notary who

---

782 Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.

783 The Indigenous notary did not append any titles to the last three names.
crafted “1649 San Antonio Tuzcaceuzco” and asked for a reduction of the monetary tribute. For example, he claims that, on the feast of San Antonio, they gave their guardián a total of twelve pesos and four tomines, which included seven pesos for the mass of San Antonio, one peso for a turkey, one peso for beef, one peso for wine, four tomines for hens, four tomines for bread, and seven tomines for something that cannot be identified. He also named lesser but still significant monetary tribute for the mass, for food, and for other goods on the feast days of Resurrection, Lent, Christmas Eve, All Saints’ Day, and Santiago and San Francisco. The discrepancy of tribute obligations between Tachichilco and San Antonio Tuzcaceuzco were significant, but this was due to the fact that the former was a rural sujeto whereas the latter was a cabecera with a Franciscan convent.

After the province of Amula, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero and his party traveled north and west for many days, stopping at towns whose cabildos and/or cofradías had no grievances or wrote petitions in Nahuatl that have been lost. They crossed the Grande de Santiago River and entered the cold lands, stopping in San Juan Ocotitic on or before June 23, when a notary dated a petition on behalf of this town. However, Gallardo y Ochoa did not write a Spanish addendum until July 15, 1649. Why the delay? The most likely possibility is that since the inhabitants spoke Tepecano the diocesan party could not communicate with this town’s Indigenous cabildo. Then, either Bishop Ruiz Colmenero continued on the visita and left Gallardo y Ochoa behind, or the whole party left and was caught elsewhere by a delegation from this town, who asked them to return because a Nahuatl-Tepecano nahuatlato had been found. For one of these reasons,

---

784 Mithun classifies Tepecano as falling within the southern branch of the Tepiman-O’odham language group along with Southern Tepehuan. Mithun, 539.
Gallardo y Ochoa was present to render a verdict on July 15 while the bishop continued toward the province of Izatlan, where a new notary wrote an *auto* on July 17.\(^{785}\)

The meetings between Gallardo y Ochoa, his *nahuatlato*, the Tepecano *nahuatlato*, and the Indigenous *cabildo* of San Juan Ocotitic were probably more tense than those in Tachichilco or San Antonio Tuzcacuezco. The inhabitants of San Juan Ocotitic, like those of the aforementioned Tepequechpan, were close to El Gran Nayar so that leaving their town had to be seen as a viable option. Gallardo y Ochoa received “1649 San Juan Ocotitic” from Agustín Jimenez *alcalde*, Antonio de la Cruz *principal*, Juan Miguel *principal*, Agustín Sebastián, and Juan Diego who had three main complaints. They explained that fray Juan the Castilian had borrowed forty-five pesos for an organ without buying it or returning their money; that he had physically abused some of the residents and children from this town; and that he had neglected his duties to perform the sacraments on one occasion.

In one addendum, Gallardo y Ochoa writes that the petition had been translated by the *maestro* Antonio de Carvajal, and that Bishop Ruiz Comenero had decreed that the *cabildo* of San Juan Ocotitic be granted all of their requests. Gallardo y Ochoa also cautioned the *cabildo* and the residents not to flee the town. This time, Antonio de Carvajal may have written the translation; although he did not sign it, it is in a different hand from Gallardo y Ochoa’s, and it is a translation that very literally follows the content of the original Nahuatl document. The translation was written on or around July 15, 1649.

Around that time, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero was in the province of Izatlan and close to La Magdalena. On July 17, 1649, he signed two *autos* that his new notary, Francisco de la Cruz,
attached to two petitions: “1649a La Magdalena” and “1649b La Magdalena.” The first *auto* was in response to “1649a La Magdalena,” a petition in which the officers of the *cofradía* of the Santo Hospital and the *cofradía* of the Santísimo Sacramento complained of a Spaniard, Martín de Agiazca, who was squatting on lands that belonged to these two *cofradías*. The petitioners are Cazcan, and they explain that Martín de Agiazca was claiming that the king had given him these lands, but were skeptical because he had not produced any document to support his assertion. They also expressed a sense of urgency by saying that it was *xupantla* (the rainy season), and that their cattle would be like locusts because the remaining pasture lands would not provide them with enough to graze and they would in turn need to eat crops. Bishop Ruiz Colmenero decided in the *auto* that they should go before the president of the Real Audiencia because the matter fell under its jurisdiction. This episode shows how Indigenous elites relied on the *visita* for information about Spanish colonial practices that affected them, and how they could not always distinguish between the division of political powers of the Diocese of Guadalajara and the Real Audiencia of Guadalajara.

786 Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.

787 The officers were Juan Bautista *prioste*, Francisco Lucas *mayordomo*, Francisco Simón *prioste*, and Andrés Miguel *mayordomo*. “1649a La Magdalena,” Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG. Also, the *cofradía* of the Santo Hospital probably refers to that of the Holy Conception, which had an attached hospital to take care of the sick according to fray Antono Tello.

788 The people of this town are classified as Tocho, which is another name for Cazcan (Refer to chapter 2.3c).

789 Arregui defined *jopantla* as summer and Guerra defined *xopantla* as the time of waters, or summer, but rainy season is more accurate because although it is warm and humid in this region in July, this month falls during the halfway point of a rainy season that lasts from April to October (Refer to Chapter 2.2a). Arregui, 23; Guerra, 29.

790 Bishop Ruiz Colmenero wrote Tocho, but that was another word used to identify the Nahuatl-speaking Cazcanes (Refer to chapter 2.3c). Ruiz Colmenero, in Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1051.
In “1649b La Magdalena,” the officers of the lay sodality of the Santo Hospital and those of the lay sodality of the Santísimo Sacramento ask that their herds not be culled because too few remain for them to multiply and help the town. However, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero signed a decree that the culling of the herds was just and ordered that it be carried out. He also asked the Indigenous people of this community to inform him if the culling became excessive. He signed his name below this decree while Francisco de la Cruz signed his name to the right and below that of the bishop.

Afterwards, the diocesan party went to San Francisco Ahualulco, another Cazcan town. The officers of this town’s cabildo and cofradía wrote a petition that they dated to July 19. These officials reminded Bishop Ruiz Colmenero about how he had allowed them to celebrate only two feasts with payment of fees to the local priest, and complained that the latter was charging too much, had instituted three feasts, and also wanted to exchange the cattle of the cofradía for mares. Francisco de la Cruz dated the Spanish response to July 20 and Bishop Ruiz Colmenero signed it. The former recorded in the translation that the cows should not be exchanged for horses, and that the constitutions should be followed in response to the number of feast days, which follows what had been decreed in “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacezco.” This statements also suggests that Bishop Ruiz Colmenero had visited San Francisco Ahualulco at an earlier date.

791 For some reason, Francisco Lucas who was the mayordomo in “1649a La Magdalena” is replaced by Lucas Miguel in “1649b La Magdalena,” whereas the names of the other officials remain the same. Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.

792 Andrés Pablo alcalde, Bernabe Lasazon alcalde, Martín Agustín prioste, Juan Bonifacio mayordomo, and many principales. The notary does not name the latter. Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.
Francisco de la Cruz also named Bishop Colmenero as the bishop of Guadalajara in the kingdom of Nueva Galicia and León and the province of Nayar. However, jurisdiction over Nayar was more illusory than real because a writer who named himself as Don Francisco Nayari claimed this region and addressed a Nahuatl letter to Bishop Ruiz Colmenero dated to May 15, 1649 (Table 6-2). Nayari identified himself as a Cora and a Christian from Tzacamota, which was in the heart of El Gran Nayar, and he promised the bishop that neither he nor his people, the Cora from the towns of Ayotochpa, Huazamota, or Guaxicori, were trying to form an alliance with the Tepehuanes, an allegedly hostile Indigenous group (Refer to Chapter 1.1, Chapter 2.2c and 2.3g, and Chapter 4.3). This document appears to respond to an initial letter from Bishop Ruiz Colmenero that has been lost. Bishop Ruiz Colmenero did not mention Ayotochpa or Huazamota in his 1648-1649 visita journal, but he did refer to Guaxicori, which he identified as a Cora town. As a result, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero most likely sent a letter from Guaxicori weeks or more before May 15, 1649, when Nayari dated his letters.

Table 6-3: Letters to Bishop Juan Ruiz Colmenero, 1649

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates: N=Hahuatl &amp; S=Spanish</th>
<th>Notary</th>
<th>Name of Petition (P) or Letter (L)</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N: May 15, 1649</td>
<td>Don Francisco Nayari</td>
<td>1649a Tzacamota (L)</td>
<td>El Gran Nayar</td>
<td>Cora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No date.</td>
<td>D. Fco. Nayari</td>
<td>1649b Tzacamota (L)</td>
<td>El Gran Nayar</td>
<td>Cora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don Francisco Nayari addresses a señor vispo (lord bishop) without naming the addressee, but an accompanying addendum refers to Bishop Ruiz Colmenero. “1649a Tzacamota,” Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.

Bishop Ruiz Colmenero spells it Guajicori. Ruiz Colmenero in Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1050. Guaxicori also served as one of the bases from which the Franciscans proselytized into El Gran Nayar during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Refer to Chapter 2.2b and 2.3f). Refer also to the visita journals of Bishop Francisco Verdín y Molina from 1666 and Bishop Juan de Santiago y León Garabito from 1578-1579. Gobierno, Visitas Pastorales, Box 1, AHAG.

Unless otherwise stated, these ethnic identifications are from Bishop Ruiz Colmenero (apud Santoscoy 1986: 1049-1052).

Bishop Ruiz Colmenero never visited Tzacamota because he never identifies it, but Don Francisco Nayari names himself and his people as Cora in “1649a Tzacamota,” “1649b Tzacamota,” and “1649c Tzacamota.”
Nayari probably traveled on the road from Guadalajara to Izatlan and stopped at San Francisco Ahualulco, where he issued a written decree that the Franciscan in this town should require payment for no more than two feasts. Then, he went to La Magdalena, at the foot of the mountain pass that leads to Acaponeta, the head town of the province of the same name, which has Guaxicori as one of its subject towns. Then, he might have traveled to the port of Matanchen or that of Chacala to take a ship to bypass the Sierra Madre Occidental Mountain Range and land in La Navidad, from where he could have easily taken a road to Tachichilco and arrived by May 24, 1649. His other alternative was to backtrack, climb the imposing mountain range again, pass through La Magdalena, and continue southwest toward the province of Amula.

6.3b. 1652-1654

Four petitions from 1652 confirm that Bishop Ruiz Colmenero had indeed been in Guaxicori. Residents of this town remembered him when they wrote three years later (Table 6-3). On April 23, 1652, Sebastián García addressed a petition, “1652a San Antonio Quihuiquinta,” to complain about the actions of friar Juan de Vizcarre in the nearby town of San Antonio Quihuiquinta. The next day, two other notaries from San Sebastián Guaxicori

---

797 The galleon trade suggests favorable currents from the northwest to the southeast; Olveda describes how galleons from Manila skirted the coast on their way back to Acapulco. Olveda, 222. Shirley Fish proposes that the Manila galleon usually sailed between the last day of June and July 15 to arrive in Acapulco between December or early January after sailing down the California coast and usually taking on water in the port of Navidad, which Gerhard places in the province of Autlan. But the dates of the bishop’s visita do not correspond with the annual timing of the galleon traffic, so he would have gone by some other ship. Fish, The Manila-Acapulco Galleons: The Treasure Ships of the Pacific with an annotated list of the transpacific galleons, 1565-1815 (Central Milton Keynes, UK: AuthorHouse, 2011), 350-351; Gerhard, A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain, 59.

798 McA-UCLA, Box 20-10. Braun, Sell and Terraciano (1989: 89) propose that the scribe of “1652b San Antonio Quihuiquinta” was a person trained as a central Mexican Nahua notary.
likewise wrote to complain about the actions of this cleric (Table 6-4). Both of these towns are north of the town of Acaponeta, within the province of the same name so that Guaxicori refers to the same town mentioned by Don Francisco Nayari (refer to Chapter 1.1, Chapter 2.2b, 2.2d, 2.3f). Also, another notary directed a petition toward the *alcalde mayor* of Acaponeta regarding this complaint, so that four petitions were made against this priest. These accusations may have reached the inquisitorial court in Mexico City, judging by the large number of accompanying Spanish addenda.  

Table 6-4: Petitions to Bishop Ruiz Colmenero, 1652-1654

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Date in Nahuatl</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Date in Spanish</th>
<th>Notary and Addressee</th>
<th>Name of Petition</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>Th, April 11, 1652.</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>August 18, 1652.</td>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1652 S. Francisco Juchipila</td>
<td>Juchipila</td>
<td>Cazcan (Ocho)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>April 24, 1652.</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>May 3, 1652.</td>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1652a S. Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>Acaponeta</td>
<td>Totorami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>April 24, 1652.</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>May 3, 1652.</td>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1652b S. Sebastián Guaxicori</td>
<td>Acaponeta</td>
<td>Cora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>April 1, 1653.</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>March 31, 1653; April 2, 1653, March 2, 1653.</td>
<td>Diego Juan to bishop</td>
<td>1653 San Martín</td>
<td>Añezos</td>
<td>Coca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>May 12, 1653.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unnamed to bishop</td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>Añezos</td>
<td>Coano? Mexicano?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>March 2, 1654</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>May 26, 1654</td>
<td>Diego Juan to bishop</td>
<td>1654 San Martín</td>
<td>Añezos</td>
<td>Coca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twelve days earlier, the unnamed notary of “1652 San Francisco Juchipila” had written a petition in which he referred to the presence of Bishop Ruiz Colmenero in San Francisco Juchipila, a Cazcan town. The notary wrote on behalf of the Indigenous officers or Juchipila to

---

799 The four petitions along with their accompanying addenda are currently in McA-UCLA so it is impossible to know if these had been kept by the Diocese of Guadalajara or the Real Audiencia, or had been passed on by one of these institutions to the inquisitorial court in Mexico City.

800 Unless otherwise noted, the identification of these ethnic groups are from Bishop Ruiz Colmenero in Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1049-1052.

801 “1652 San Francisco Juchipila,” Documentos en nahuatl, AHAG.
acknowledge that his petition had to go to the bishop who was no longer present. This petition has one Spanish addendum whose date of August 18, 1652 appears with a few words signalling that it should be kept for someone whose name is not legible, due to a tear in the document.802

In this document, the notary asks the bishop to help compel the Spaniards in San Francisco Juchipila to sponsor a monumento, a reference to the very elaborate altar on which the tabernacle was placed on the last Thursday of Lent. The Indigenous notary of “1679 Sayula” used this term to refer to an item that required a large quantity of wax for candles during holy week; hence this altar, which was one of the main items that bishops and provisores ensured were in good condition during the visitatio rerum.803 The statement about the bishop compelling the Spaniards to contribute to the monumento is a complex reference to the political reality of Juchipila from the point of view of the Indigenous officers. They lived in a multi-ethnic head town that the bishop had visited, and he found the monumento to be in poor condition. The bishop told the officers to fix it, so they sought contributions from the Spanish population to do so, but when the Spaniards refused the officials wrote a petition to the bishop.

On April 1, 1653, Diego Juan wrote a petition on behalf of the cabildo of San Martín, a Coca town, to complain that the friar and cabildo of the cabecera of Cocula compelled them to send tribute and laborers to work on their church.804 This petition, “1653 San Martín,” has three

802 Guadalaxa 18 de Agosto 1652 an + guartesepara. AHAG, Documentos en náhuatl, “1652 San Francisco Juchipila.”.


804 Santoscoy wrote down the ethnic identifications from information provided by Bishop Ruiz Colmenero. Box 20-8, Byron McAfee Collection, University of California, Los Angeles. Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1050.
The first is by Francisco de Villalobos, who wrote a pedimiento for the whole town of San Martín that he dated to March 31, 1653. He explained that he had been present for three months and that the Indigenous people of San Martín had just cause to complain; he also included a second date, April 2, 1653, at the beginning of this document to explain when it was sent. By this he meant that two documents were sent: the pedimiento and a Spanish translation that was probably done in San Martín. Like in “1644 Cajititlan,” pedimiento appears to refer to a petition that was done at the request of an official sent by the bishop or provisor to investigate grievances that occurred after a visita.

The third addendum is Gallardo y Ochoa’s response from Guadalajara, in which he writes that an investigator will be sent to examine the charges. Gallardo y Ochoa dated his addendum to March 2, 1653, but he probably meant May 2 because the petition was from April 1. Furthermore, an abbreviated signature is present at the end of this document, Jde[[co]], which appears to refer to the bishop, J[uan] de Co[lmenero]. Nonetheless, the problem of tribute remained one year later, when Diego Juan wrote another Nahuatl petition dated March 2, 1654 in which he described similar concerns. This document reached Guadalajara on or before May 26, 1654 when Gallardo y Ochoa wrote the only addendum, which was an instruction that it be sent to a canónigo Casillas for translation (Refer to Appendix A).

---

805 AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl.

806 Gallardo y Ochoa’s addenda is with “1653 San Martín” in the AHAG, and “1654 San Martín” is in McA-UCLA, but it is also possible that Gallardo y Ochoa meant to write March 2, 1654 to refer to the latter petition.

807 In the document, the “co” is underlined twice.

808 AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl, “1654 San Martín.”
Meanwhile, in “1653 Amatitlan,” the cabildo of Amatitlan claimed that Don Giuseppi de Avalos was stopping them from using their church because he wanted the land on which it stood.\(^{809}\) This petition has two addenda: a Spanish translation by an unnamed individual and the decision recorded by Gallardo y Ochoa. The first addendum is a decent translation that closely follows the original meaning of the Nahuatl petition. Gallardo y Ochoa dated the second to May 12, 1653, and recorded that J\(^{809}\), Bishop Ruiz Colmenero, decreed that fray Blas de Mendoza, cura doctrinero of the cabecera of Sayula, should investigate these allegations.\(^{810}\)

6.3c. 1656-1657

Two related Nahuatl petitions were reviewed by officials of the Diocese of Guadalajara in 1656 and 1657, and evidence suggests that Bishop Ruiz Colmenero had begun to delegate the duties of investigating petitions to a provisor (Table 6-5). These documents represent attempts by the cabildo of Tonala, a large Indigenous town a few miles east of colonial Guadalajara, to make their Augustinian friar return (Refer to Chapter 2.2b and 2.2e, and Chapter 4.3 and 4.6).\(^{811}\) The first document, “1656 Tonala,” is a letter addressed to an Augustinian friar in which the unnamed Indigenous notary assures him that he would return to Tonala and promises him that a

---

\(^{809}\) AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl. Bishop Ruiz Colmenero records an Amatlán as being inhabited by Mexicanos (Nahuas from Central Mexico) and an Amatlán-Cuaramita as Coano (Refer to Chapter 2.3f). Bishop Ruiz Colmenero in Santoscoy, “Los Idiomas Indígenas en Varios de los Pueblos del Antiguo Obispado de Guadalajara,” 1050. This town is probably the former because the Nahuatl of the petitions has several Central Mexican features such as the consistent use of in and the use of the glottal stop to signal the marker for plural verbs.

\(^{810}\) As before, “co” is underlined twice in the addendum.

\(^{811}\) Fray Nicolás de Zúñiga belonged to the Augustinian order according to both documents. McA-UCLA, Box 20-11, “1656 Tonala”; AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl, “1657 Tonala.”
petition that they would send to assure his return would be backed by the cabildo.\footnote{McA-UCLA, Box 20-11.} The notary does not date this Nahuatl letter, but a Spanish secretario named Don Thomas Muñoz de Moraza wrote a brief addendum in Spanish, which he dated to December 29, 1656.

Table 6-5: Documents from Tonala to the Diocese, 1656-1657

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = Date in Nahuatl</th>
<th>Notary &amp; Addressee</th>
<th>Name of Petition (P) or Letter (L)</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S: December 29, 1656</td>
<td>Unnamed to fray Nicolás de Zúñiga</td>
<td>1656 Tonala (L)</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: January 4, 1657, December 23, 1656.</td>
<td>Domingo de Ramos to provisor</td>
<td>1657 Tonala (P)</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other Nahuatl document is “1657 Tonala” by Domingo de Ramos, an Indigenous notary; it contains a Spanish addendum in the space between the cross and the first line of Nahuatl text with the date of January 4, 1657.\footnote{The Spanish notary Don Francisco de la Rosa writes this addenda, and he also names the translator as the licenciado Don Diego de Herrera. AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl, “1657 Tonala”.} In this petition, Domingo de Ramos addressed the provisor instead of the bishop while also naming the friar of Tonala as fray Nicolás de Zúñiga. Domingo de Ramos explained that fray Nicolás de Zúñiga was in a building in Tonala on the night of December 13, 1656 when the priors of Guadalajara and Tonala and other people entered with a decree for fray Nicolás de Zúñiga to accompany them. Fray Nicolás responded by claiming that they were violating a decree by the bishop.\footnote{Domingo de Ramos appears to be referring to Bishop Ruiz Colmenero here even though he does not mention him by name. AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl, “Tonala 1657”.} Nonetheless, the priors and their companions took fray Nicolás de Zúñiga away from Tonala and imprisoned him.

Domingo de Ramos wrote that the people of Tonala went to see fray Nicolás de Zúñiga a few days later; they may have shouted encouragement to him, explaining that they would ask for his return. Domingo de Ramos does not record these shouts, but they can be almost heard in the
content of “1656 Tonala,” which was recorded by the other Nahuatl notary on or before December 29, 1656. This unnamed notary wrote a letter asking that God strengthen fray Nicolás de Zúñiga. The alcaldes, regidores, and other principales of Tonala then asked the lord bishop and the lord presidente to bring about the friar's return. On or before January 6, 1656, these same Indigenous elites directed Domingo de Ramos to write “1657 Tonala.”

Domingo de Ramos names the petitioners of “1657 Tonala” as the alcaldes, regidores, principales, and the noble women of Tonala. Domingo de Ramos offered a reason why the initial petition to return the bishop by the previous Indigenous notary was now being directed to the provisor:

\[
titotatocatzin S\textsuperscript{r} provisor ma sanoyoqui topan yn ticmotatauhtilis
\]

You are our leader, lord provisor. Thus on our behalf may you implore

\[
tomahuistatocatzin S\textsuperscript{r} obispo...
\]

our revered lord bishop.

It is likely that the provisor had visited Tonala, and that Domingo de Ramos was hopeful that he would intercede with the bishop.

Diego de Herrera, a Spanish notary, received testimony about “1657 Tonala” that he recorded in a Spanish addendum, which seems to be a direct translation of testimony in Nahuatl because it provides more details than “1657 Tonala.” At first, Diego de Herrera wrote that the

---

815 Domingo de Ramos made this petition on behalf of cabildo officers, principales, and “yxquichtin sihuapipiltin quitemiqui momatzy (the noble women who kiss your hands).” I make a note of this because Indigenous notaries did not generally include women in the conclusion acts of their petitions. This could also be a reference to the tonantzizihuan (grandmothers) or capitanas (female captains) who are mentioned in “1622 La Magdalena” or “1653 Amatitlan.” AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl.


817 Don Diego de Herrera recorded lo que tiene esta petición...es (what this petition contains...is); a different writer records testado (attested) in the margins of this addendum, implying that the former wrote a translation of spoken testimony and not a translation of “1657 Tonala.”
capture took place on December 13, but then crossed it out and wrote that it occurred on December 23. Then, he explained that the priors of Tonala and Guadalajara confronted fray Nicolás de Zúñiga with a letter from the head of the Augustinian Order that directed the friar to accompany them, but that fray Nicolás refused by proclaiming that the bishop had ordered him to administer sacraments in the town. This discussion lasted about two hours, after which the priors and their party took fray Nicolás de Zúñiga to a holding cell in the Augustinian convent of Tonala.

Subsequent addenda describe how Diego de Herrera was seen by the lord *visitador provisor*, Juan López Zerrato y Canas, who decreed in an *auto* that this petition be transferred to the *presbítero promotor fiscal*, Juan Gómez Santiago. Gómez called witnesses who testified in Spanish in separate addenda that support the contents of “1657 Tonala.” However, a final verdict is not among the addenda of this petition.

Despite the lack of a verdict, “1657 Tonala” and its addenda suggest that the *provisor visitador* examined the petitions from Tonala. The initial impulse of the unnamed notary of "1656 Tonala" had been to write a twelve-line letter in which he mentioned the bishop, but he probably did not know about seeking the *provisor*, instead. However, Domingo de Ramos wrote a more complex petition of eighty-one lines and implored the *provisor* to let the bishop know of their grievance, suggesting that he knew that petitions had to go first to the *provisor*. Then, the Spanish addenda confirm that the *provisor* heard it directly and without the bishop before passing it on to a third official who questioned Indigenous witnesses.

---

818 Don Diego de Herrera wrote the addenda of the translation. “1657 Tonala,” Documentos en nahuatl, Folios 3-4, AHAG. Meanwhile Francisco de la Rossa included the title of *Señor visitador provisor* in one addenda and, in another, he shortened this title to *Señor visitador* while naming the holder of this office as Don Juan Lopez Cerrato. “1657 Tonala,” AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl.
6.3d. 1658-1664

The next year, Juan Sebastián wrote a petition to the bishop from San Francisco Tizapan in Ávalos that he dated to July 22, 1658 (Table 6-6). He did not name the bishop or the provisor but used *tlahtoani* (lord), *Sr* (lord), and *osstrismahuitl*, which appears to be a combination of the abbreviation of the Spanish *ilustríssimo* (illustrious), a title for the bishop, and the Nahuatl *mahuitl*, most likely *mahuiztlí* (revered). He either addressed the bishop or used *ilustríssimo* to refer to the provisor on behalf of the nobles of the town: Juan Agustín *alcalde*, Fabián Gerónimo, *principal*, Francisco Jacobo, *principal*, Antonio Cristobal, *prioste*, and two people without any titles, Diego Juan and Gaspar Torres. These petitioners complained that their cleric, fray Esteban Velasco, had not been saying mass, had been yelling at them, had been removing yearlings and horses without paying for them, and had been shearing sheep without paying for the wool. Unfortunately, this petition is on a large folded page that does not contain addenda, and it is impossible to know what became of this grievance.

Table 6-6: Petitions, 1658-1664

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date in Nahuatl</th>
<th>Notary / Addressee</th>
<th>Name of Petition</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 22, 1658.</td>
<td>Juan Sebastián / bishop-provisor</td>
<td>1658 S. F. Tizapan</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Oibzitecos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 1661.</td>
<td>Unnamed / Hernando Calderon</td>
<td>1661 Etzatlan</td>
<td>Izatlan</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 1664.</td>
<td>Diego Felipe / provisor</td>
<td>1664 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Coca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

819 AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl.

820 The term, *osstrismahuitl*, is similar to *osstricimo Sr*, which is found in “1678 San Francisco Tizapan.” Since both petitions are from San Francisco Tizapan, *osstricimo/osstrismahuitl* appears to be a regional term that suggests the continuity of a notarial tradition. Lockhart writes that *mahuiztlí* means fear, respect, or something that deserves respect. Lockhart, *Nahuatl as Written*, 224. Cortés y Zedeño defines *mahuiztiliz* and *mahuiztilizti* as reverencia. Cortés y Zedeño, 113.
A different notary wrote “1661 Etzatlan,” a Nahuatl petition with three addenda, in which memories of the bishop’s visita are preserved. Etzatlan was in the province of Izatlan, like the towns of Ahualulco and La Magdalena, and it had had a Franciscan convent since the early sixteenth century. Its notary records:

*yquac mayordomo catcac Diego Felipe quinequiyaya caxiltis ytlanahuatil*

When the mayordomo was Diego Felipe; he wanted to follow the decree of the

*Señor Obispo oquimictic yhuan oquicaltzacuac totatzin fr Diego Rodrigis*

lord bishop, [but] fray Diego Rodriguez, our priest, beat him and locked him up.

The phrase *Ytlanahuatil Señor Obispo* (the bishop’s decree) most likely referred to an *amparo* or *auto* that Bishop Ruiz Colmenero had issued during his 1648 or 1649 visita to this town. The notary does not give more information about what this document concerned, but Diego de Tapia wrote in Spanish in one of the addenda that the people of Etzatlan were obligated to give too much corn, soap, cows, and *atole*, a corn-meal drink, and that when Diego Felipe had protested that these requirements violated the bishop’s decree, he was beaten and locked up by fray Diego Rodriguez. This information suggests that the decree addressed what was mentioned in “1649 Tachichilco,” “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco,” and “1649 San Francisco Ahualulco”: that Indigenous parishioners should only pay four pesos per feast day and that they were required to pay for only two feast days. Finally, Diego de Tapia added information in the translation not found in the original Nahuatl petition, which suggests that he not only translated the Nahuatl text but also interviewed the petitioners.

Furthermore, the writer of the Nahuatl petition writes *vmd*, “vuestra merced,” (your grace), as a standard polite greeting to refer to the addressee, the secular priest (a cleric who is

---

821 AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl.
not a friar), Hernando Calderón, who made himself known as the recipient of this document in two other addenda. In the first, Calderón wrote in the open space at the bottom that he received it on February 24, 1661 and was waiting for the translation before proceeding. However, the translation occurred quickly because Calderón dates his next addendum, which follows the translation to the same day. He also decided that he would send the Nahuatl petition to the bishop through the person of the provisor visitador so that, again, a Spanish official claimed that a petition must go through the provisor before reaching the bishop.

The last petition is from Santa Ana Acatlan, a Coca town according to Bishop Ruiz Colmenero. Diego Felipe, the author, addressed the provisor and dated it to February 14, 1664, three and a half months after the death of this bishop. News had probably reached this town that the bishop had died and that the provisor had taken charge of addressing Indigenous grievances. Diego Felipe asked on behalf of the cabildo for the return of money to buy clothes from Mexico for their image of the Virgin Mary. It contains one addenda by a secular priest whose name is not legible. He summarized the Nahuatl content of this petition in Spanish and clarified that the amount was a hundred pesos and that the clothes were a frontal (mantle) and a manta (cloak).

822 Wiktionary translates this term into English as “your grace” (Consulted on 02-24-2016).
https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/vuestra_merced. Regular clerics are members of the monastic orders; secular clerics do not belong to the monastic orders.

823 Bishop Ruiz Colmenero died on September 28, 1663 according to Catholic-Hierarchy.org.

824 The Nahuatl notary identifies the addressee as Br, most likely an abbreviation for bachiller.

825 The dictionary of the Real Academia Española defines frontal as, “Paramento de sedas, metal u otra materia con que se adorna la parte delantera de la mesa de altar.” http://dle.rae.es/?id=IW9jtUd (Consulted on February 17, 2016).
During his reign, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero tended to favor Nahuatl petitioners, but none more so than those of “1649 Tachichilco,” “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco,” “1649 San Francisco Ahualulco,” and “1661 Etzatlan.” In all four petitions, he decreed that the tribute for feast day masses be reduced to four pesos per feast day, and that the Indigenous cabildo keep a record of his decree. He also specifically ordered that clerics hold no more than two feast day masses per year. With these rulings, Bishop Ruiz Colmenero favored Indigenous petitioners, but why? First, these decrees may signal an institutional rift between the diocese and the Franciscan order. All four of these petitions were from towns that had a Franciscan convent within their confines or nearby: Amula had one in San Antonio Tuzcacuezco, and Izatlan had convents in La Magdalena and Etzatlan (Refer to chapter 2.2b and 2.2e). Second, Indigenous parishioners had been required to attend mass every Sunday and on eleven obligatory feast days in 1537 by Pope Paul III, but the notary of “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacuezco” had only mentioned six feast days, and Bishop Ruiz Colmenero limited these days even further to only two feast days. Did Bishop Ruiz Colmenero judge that the requirement of six feast days should only apply to secular parishes because the Franciscan convents had other sources of income? Was he trying to curb the power of the Franciscans by limiting the alms they could collect, or did he think that towns within Franciscan provinces tended to be wealthier than those in diocesan parishes?

---

826 According to Lundberg, Pope Paul III had reduced the required feast days of observance for Indigenous parishioners to eleven: Christmas, the Circumcision of Jesus Christ, the Epiphany, Easter Sunday, the Ascension of Jesus Christ, the first day of Pentecost, Corpus Christi, the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, the Purification of the Virgin Mary, the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, and the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul. Lundberg, 75.

827 Secular parishes are controlled by secular priests
6.4. Visita-Petition Cycles within the tenure of Provisor Baltasar de la Peña Y Medina, 1668-1673

The bishop who succeeded Ruiz Colmenero was Francisco Verdín y Molina, but indigenous notaries did not address him in the three Nahuatl petitions from his tenure: “1668 San Francisco Zacoalco,” “1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan,” and “1673 San Francisco Tizapan.” One possible reason was that the office of bishop was vacant until he was appointed on July 6, 1665, and he did not enter Guadalajara until March 1, 1666. In fact, his visita journal from 1666 lists ten other people: the provisor, Don Baltasar de la Peña y Medina; the first notary and interpreter, José Martínes Gudino; the second notary, Don Juan Bautista Verdin Codar; the presbítero promotor fiscal, Don Juan Martínez Gómez; the falcón camarero, Don Juan Marín; the fiscal de vara Diego Tenorio; and four servants who are not named. It also lists fourteen mules for riding and sixteen for baggage. These individuals and animals probably represented who and what was available to take on a given visita and not the total number that went on every visita. Alonzo Felipe of “1668 San Francisco Zacoalco” and the writer of “1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan” addressed the provisor, whereas that of “1673 San Francisco Tizapan” used the more ambiguous title of osstricimo Sr, and the writers of addenda in the last two name the person in charge as the juez provisor, Baltasar de la Peña y Medina.

Alonzo Felipe wrote “1668 San Francisco Zacoalco” on or before December 12, 1668 when the priest José Martínez Gudino added a small addendum in the open space preceding the

---

828 AHAG, Gobierno, Visitas Pastorales, Caja 1.
829 AHAG, Gobierno, Visitas Pastorales, Caja 1.
830 AHAG, Gobierno, Visitas Pastorales, Caja 1.
petition (Table 6-7).\textsuperscript{831} Alonzo Felipe summarized a \textit{visita} by the \textit{provisor} and described a fine imposed by the latter. He identified himself as the \textit{mayordomo} of the lay sodality of the Holy Sacrament and added that his petition also represented the lay sodality of the Rosary, which were both in Zacoalco. He mentioned the presence of a Franciscan convent and explained that fray Diego Servantes struck him and the other \textit{cofradía} officers after the \textit{provisor} had gone, and implied that the two lay sodalities of Zacoalco had not had the money required by the \textit{provisor} for the \textit{visita} because this friar periodically demanded it of them.

Table 6-7: Petitions, 1658-1664

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = Date in Nahuatl</th>
<th>S = Date in Spanish</th>
<th>Notary / Addressee</th>
<th>Name of Petition</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S: December 12, 1668</td>
<td>Alonzo Felipe / provisor</td>
<td>1668 S. Fran. Zacoalco</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Coca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: September 17, 1669\nS: September 18, 1669</td>
<td>Not named / provisor</td>
<td>1669 S. María Magdalena Tizapan</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: 2/22/1673-2; 3/3/1673; 3/6/1673;</td>
<td>Not named / provisor</td>
<td>1673 S. Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Coca?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, Alonzo Felipe also proposed that the nine pesos that were due to the \textit{provisor} were being sent with the petition. The relevant passage is:

\textit{axcan otiquitoqui ytlay ytincopa tlatohuane Sinor probisor yhuan tlatohuane Siñor obispo titimacazqui tominis...aço ticmacazqui ynon 9 p$$^7$s...}

Now, we say if by order of the ruler, lord \textit{provisor}, and the ruler, lord bishop, we are to give money...we must give those nine pesos...

Second, the petition and the money could have been sent to the Franciscan convent, but neither the notary nor the other officers of the lay sodalities appeared to trust the Franciscans. Instead Alonzo Felipe sent the petition to secular priest, Martínez Gudino, in Xonacatlan.

The notary of “1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan” did not identify himself, but he did date his petition to September 17, 1669, whereas three Spanish addenda are dated to

\textsuperscript{831} AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl.
September 18, 1669. In this petition, the notary asked if the petitioners had to provide two cows and some yearlings to the convent of the Franciscans in Guadalajara (Refer to Table 6-7). A notary named Gregorio Gallego wrote the three addenda, but in the ruling, he only recorded the words of the provisor, J. Baltasar de la Peña y Medina, who had held office since at least 1666. The latter ruled that the town should continue to provide the cows and the yearlings from the lay sodality, but added that the younger animals did not have to be the best ones. Also, the rapid response suggests that the provisor remained in Santa María Magdalena Tizapan, a Coca town, for a day, or had not traveled far because he ruled on the petition one day after it was written. It also implies that the nobles had access to one or more people who were literate enough in Nahuatl to create a fairly conventional petition (Refer to Chapter 4.2).

The notary of “1673 San Francisco Tizapan” did not identify himself, but he did date his petition to February 19, 1673. Francisco Huinada, a notary, dated the first addenda to February 22, 1673 (Refer to Table 6-7). The closeness of these dates suggests that one or more Indigenous officials of the small town of San Francisco Tizapan were literate enough to create a petition to take advantage of a visita to Teoquitlan, the diocesan head town. They claimed that a bachiller, José Villaseñor, had branded five mares that belonged to their lay sodality of Mary of the Holy Conception.

Provisor Baltasar de la Peña y Medina appointed Juan Martínez Manzano, a priest from Sayula, to investigate, who traveled to San Francisco Tizapan to decide in favor of the petitioners. The investigation took several days. Martínez Manzano accepted the assignment on

832 AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl.

833 His name is listed as provisor during the first visita of Bishop Verdin y Molina’s tenure from 1666. AHAG, Gobierno, Visitas Pastorales.
March 3 and left on March 6 to travel the seventeen leagues to San Francisco Tizapan. On March 10, he relied on the interpreter León Quintero to interview four Indigenous witnesses: Gaspar Antonio, Miguel Francisco, Andrés Gerónimo, and Juan de la Cruz. He also interviewed a Spaniard named José Hernández. Afterwards, he decided in favor of the petitioners and against Villaseñor, whom he cautioned not to interfere with the mares upon pain of excommunication and to pay two hundred ducats. In his last addenda, Martínez Manzano included the original Nahuatl petition in a conclusion, explaining that the investigation consisted of ten folios.

6.5. Visita-Petition Cycles within the Tenure of Bishop Santiago de León Garabito, 1678-1694

Francisco Martín is the notary of the next Nahuatl petition, “1678 Santiago Pochotitlan,” which he dates to December 13, 1678, but this document is beyond the tenures of both Bishop Verdín y Molina and Provisor Baltasar de la Peña y Medina. Instead, it falls within the tenure of Bishop Juan de Santiago de León Garabito, who left Guadalajara on November 16, 1678 to begin a visita without appointing a provisor. His visita journal identified his support staff as Juan Sedano, a priest who functions as the interpreter; Don Martín de Figueroa, a priest who functioned as a master of ceremonies; Don Gonzalo Martín de Santiago Colmona, the secretario de gobierno and chief notary; and Don Pedro Roberto Paje who was the first notary. The journal also mentions servants without specifying a number, fourteen mules for riding, and sixteen for baggage. This visita journal offer the first occasion of extant dialogue between Indigenous nobles

---

834 Seventeen leagues is approximately 94.7 kilometers, or 58.8 miles (Refer to Chapter 2.2b).

835 It is also after the short tenure of Manuel Fernández de Santa Cruz who was appointed bishop on February 19, 1674 and only served until March 31, 1676.
and Spanish officers, which is also useful for the remaining petitions in this study: “1679 Analco,” “1679 Sayula,” “1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac,” “1683 San Gaspar,” “1686 San Pedrotepec,” “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan,” “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan,” “1694 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac.”

The times between “1678 Santiago Pochotitlan” and the visita journal of Bishop Santiago de León Garabito do not correlate. Francisco Martín dates his document to December 13, 1678, whereas the visita journal documents the arrival of the visita party to December 23, 1678 (Table 6-8). This order suggests three possibilities. The more plausible explanations is simple clerical error. Another possibility is that the petitioners were using December 13, 1678 as a Julian date, which represents the same day as the Gregorian date of December 23, 1678. The final possibility is that the petitioners did not respond to the visita interview itself but to a conversation with an official who was sent ahead to prepare the town for the visita.

Table 6-8: Juan de Santiago y León Garabito: Conf-09/13/1677 to 07/12/1694 dies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = Date in Nahuatl</th>
<th>S = Date in Spanish</th>
<th>Notary / Addressee</th>
<th>Name of Petition</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N: December 13, 1678</td>
<td>S: None</td>
<td>Francisco Martín / bishop</td>
<td>1678 Santiago Pochotitlan</td>
<td>Tequepespan</td>
<td>Huichol?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: May 4, 1679</td>
<td>Not named / Sria Illstriss</td>
<td>1679 Analco</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: December 23, 1679</td>
<td>Not named / Sria Illstriss</td>
<td>1679 Sayula</td>
<td>Avalos</td>
<td>Sayultecos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: August 17, 1683</td>
<td>Not named / obispo</td>
<td>1682 S. Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>Avalos</td>
<td>Coca?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: August 19, 1683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: 1683</td>
<td>Not named / unclear</td>
<td>1683 San Gaspar</td>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>Tecuexe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: February 9, 1686</td>
<td>Not named / obispo</td>
<td>1686 San Pedrotepec</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>Coca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: February 9, 1686 tr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: August 8, 1687</td>
<td>Antonio de la Cruz? / provisor</td>
<td>1687 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>Avalos</td>
<td>Coca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: August 12, 1694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

836 AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl.

837 Toke Norby posted that from October 5, 1582 to February 28, 1700 that a Julian date plus ten equals a Gregorian date. [http://norbyhus.dk/calendar.php](http://norbyhus.dk/calendar.php) (Consulted on July 1, 2016).

838 The notary represents the Sayultecos, but he also names Spaniards, mulatos, and coyotes as living in this town.
The petition of “1678 Pochotitlan” is well-crafted. The petitioners asked for a reduction in alms to their friar during feast days when their lay sodality had to give money and goods for the accompanying masses. They also complained that their friar sold five steers for fifteen pesos to pay himself for masses that he had not yet said for ten people who had died. They also complained that their feet burn because he forces them to make lime without paying them. It only has one addendum, a translation in Spanish that lacks a signature.

The author of the visita journal is different from that of the addendum. The former claims that the bishop appeared before the mayordomos and priostes of the lay sodality of the Holy Conception and records that the sodality had 316 cattle, 5 horses, and 25 mares. He did not name the Indigenous officials, but he described the chapel as an adobe structure with a thatch roof. The vestibule was covered with a red cloth, with an image of Santiago (Saint James the Greater) the Apostle. He described the hospital building as an adobe structure with a thatch roof, but without a door. He added that a decree should be issued to require two beds with sheets, pillows, and blankets for the room for the sick in the hospital, and that two needles should be bought. He also mentioned that the previous visita had occurred in 1670.

---

839 They complained that they had to give fourteen pesos and four tomines [the sum of the money is actually thirteen pesos and six tomines] to the priest during the Feast of the Holy Conception: four pesos for the mass of the anniversary, four pesos for the mass dedicated to the lady, two pesos and two tomines for candles, five tomines for his food, seven tomines for the wine for the host, four tomines for handkerchiefs, and one peso and four tomines for singers.

840 I propose that their feet burned from creating lime, which is derived from limestone, which has to be heated and crushed to produce lime. Website of the National Lime Association (consulted on August 20, 2016), http://lime.org/lime-basics/how-lime-is-made/.
The main factors that unify “1678 Santiago Pochotitlan” with this visita journal entry are circumstantial. The adjusted dates are the same. Whereas the writer of the one addendum of “1678 Pochotitlan” does not name Santiago Pochotitlan, the other two writers identify the town with this name. The Spanish notary located it close to San Luis, which was in the parish of Xalisco, while Gerhard locates both San Luis and Pochotitlan within the province of Tequepespan (Chapter 2.2c, 2.2d, and 2.3h and Chapter 4.2a, 4.4).

The next two petitions are “1679 Analco” and “1679 Sayula.” The notary of the first did not name himself or date his petition, but the aforementioned Martín de Santiago Colmona, the main notary, identified himself as the writer of a small addendum with a date of May 4, 1679. This handwriting matches that of the previous journal entry for Pochotitlan, which suggests that Martín de Santiago Colmona wrote large portions of the visita journal for Bishop Santiago de León Garabito.

Martín de Santiago Colmona wrote in the addendum that Bishop Santiago de León Garabito ordered that the contents of the petition should be sent to the provisor for judgement. The petitioners of “1679 Analco” were Francisco Melchor, Juan Bernabe, and Gregorio Sandoval who are identified respectively as the prioste, the mayordomo, and the diputado of the hospital of Mary of the Holy Conception in Analco (Refer to Chapter 2, 3.5 and Chapter 4.4). They ask that, during feast days, the officers of lay sodalities should observe a decree on June 15, 1672 by provisor Baltasar de la Peña y Medina, who had ordered that the parade of standards go from oldest to newest in order to prevent disturbances.

841 AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl, “1679 Analco.”
The notary of “1679 Sayula” represented the nobles of the six neighborhoods of Sayula, the cabecera of Ávalos, which was a multi-ethnic polity. This petition has two addenda. The first is a translation of the Nahuatl petition by Juan Sedano, which is more of a short summary of the more important points. The second is an unsigned decree. The petitioners addressed the bishop with the title of Señoría Ilustrísima and presented two sets of complaints; the strongest complaint was against the alcalde mayor of Sayula, and the second targeted the prior of the Franciscan convent in this same town.

The notary and petitioners complained about the alcalde mayor, the Franciscan prior, and other Franciscan friars. They claimed that their children had to exercise and feed the horses of the alcalde mayor with grass provided by Sayula, and if their children did not perform these labors adequately, he jailed them and required a fine of one peso to be paid for their release. The petitioners also seemed to imply that the alcalde mayor would sell their children if the fine were not paid. Finally, after signing the document, the petitioners added that he forced his way into the homes of many people to see whether couples were married or only living together, arresting those who were not married. Their complaints against the Franciscan prior are twofold. They protested that the prior requires six tomínes for the amonestación, public notice of a marriage, along with a turkey, two chickens, and bread. They also explained that on holy festivals

---

842 AHAG, Documentos en nahuatl.

843 The writer of “1679 Sayula” claims that these couples included poor macehualtin (Indigenous people), Spaniards, mulatos (African-Spaniards), and coyotes (Indigenous Immigrants).

844 According to the Diccionario de la Real Academia online, amonestaciones or amonestación refers to the act of admonishing; public notice was made in church about those who were going to get married or ordained so that someone could make known any impediments to the ordination or marriage (“Notificación pública que se hace en la iglesia de los nombres de quienes se van a casar u ordenar, a fin de que, si alguien supiere algún impedimento, lo denuncie. U. m. en pl. Correr, leer, publicar las amonestaciones”). http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=amonestacion. Consulted on July 27, 2013.
required by the bishop the prior and other friars require money and food for meals; the petitioners proposed to give only three pesos for each festival. They also claimed that the friars required fifty pesos to buy wax for a monument, but that a lot of this wax goes unused. They complained that they paid too much money for wax and proposed to buy it themselves.

The first addendum is the translation; the second represents a decree that offered a mixed verdict for the nobles of Sayula. The writer explained that they were advised where to go for adjudication of their complaints against the alcalde mayor, by which he most likely meant that they had to go before the Real Audiencia of Guadalajara. However, in the complaint against the Franciscans, the writer required them to continue to give six tomines for the amonestación for each marriage, but that they did not have to give food to the friar who officiated. Furthermore, he agreed that they could buy the wax themselves instead of giving the Franciscans fifty pesos. He reinforced these decisions by writing that they could go to the bishop if any one of the decisions was not followed.

An unidentified notary wrote “1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” on August 17, 1682, which has an incomplete addenda dated to August 19, 1682. The Indigenous notary wrote on behalf of the petitioners who were officers of the cabildo and the lay sodality of Mary of the Holy Conception, and who complained that their priest, fray Juan Pablo, had taken money meant to repair their retablo, which was a structure made from wood that covered the wall behind the altar, and which also had sculpted, carved, or painted images with religious motifs.845 This money would have paid for gold and for the goldsmith who would have repaired the gilding of

845 The most relevant definition of retablo provided by the Diccionario de la Real Academia (consulted on August 21, 2016) is, “Estructura de piedra, madera u otros materiales que cubre el muro situado detrás del altar, compuesta de obras escultóricas o pictóricas con motivos religiosos.” http://dle.rae.es/?id=WFlAxIK The petition, “1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac,” suggests that their retablo was made of gold and was gilded.
this structure. They also assured the bishop that this money belonged to the lay sodality, and even requested a new cleric. If this were not granted, they proposed to fire the *mayordomo* who paid sixty pesos to a master wood carver for his work.

The most likely reason for the concern of the nobles of San Juan Bautista Atoyac was that the bishop had passed through the town and through the *visita rerum* and had seen the poor condition of *retablo*\(^8\). He probably admonished them, and thus “1682 San Juan Bautista Atoyac” represents an attempt to deflect the blame for its condition to fray Juan Pablo, with whom they might have had economic, social, and political disagreements. They also explained that if their friar were not replaced, they would replace the *mayordomo*, Felipe Alonzo, because he had given sixty pesos to a master wood carver to repair the wooden *retablo*. However, the final judgement for this petition is not known because only a small portion of one addendum remains.

Nicolás Alonzo wrote “1683 San Gaspar” to represent the officers of the *cabildo* and lay sodality of Mary of the Holy Conception in a document that lacks the month or day and only bears the year date of 1683. He explained that the father *bicario* took material and ornaments from their chapel, including two *casullas* (chasubles), two cloaks, the censer, a black mantle, a wooden cross, a little bell, and a bell. He also claims that they had bought some of these things for a total of seventy-five pesos.

An unnamed notary records “1686 San Pedrotepec” and dates it to February 9, 1686, whereas a different author wrote what appears to be a very literal translation that has the same date. The petition of “1686 San Pedrotepec” represents a very thorough case against the actions

\(^8\) For example, in the entry for Santiago Pochotitlan, the Spanish notary writes that the church of this town had a *retablo* of St. James, which was in good condition. AHAG, 1678, Gobierno, Visitas Pastorales.
of the secular priest, Agustín Alcalá, but since no decrees accompany it, it is impossible to know what happened. Its notary represents the officers of the cabildo and the lay sodality of this town, who complained that Agustín Alcala was not performing his duties, unlike the Franciscans from Sayula who used to administer their town. The nobles claimed that they used to give candles and Castilian wine to the Franciscan prior, who then said masses, but that Alcala only collects these items without saying masses. The cabildo members go on to explain that Alcalá failed to confess an Indigenous person named Pedro Juantzin before he died. They complained that he had sent Pedro Juantzin’s son, Juan Bautista, to the jail of Sayula and later sold him for thirteen pesos to a Spaniard who worked him to death. They also accused Alcalá of stealing a horse from the alcalde, Francisco Juan. They testified that Alcalá charged five pesos for the derecho to get married and nine more pesos for other marriage requirements. Finally, they accused him of taking the staff of office from the alcalde, Francisco Juan.

Hernando Miguel wrote “1692 San Andrés Atotonilco,” Don Antonio de Chripres, the main notary, wrote the first and third addenda, and Juan de Sarmiento wrote the second addendum for this petition. Hernando Miguel wrote on behalf of the officers of the cabildo and lay sodality to claim that the Spaniards were taking the stallions, mares, and mules that belonged to the lay sodality, and he requested help to recover them. The first addenda introduces this Nahuatl document while the second gives a very short summary of the Nahuatl petition. The third addenda was created by Don Antonio de Chipres and signed by Bishop Santiago de León Garabito, who required that the theft of these horses and mules be investigated, that their brand be checked, and that those that are found to belong to the town be returned. Hernando Miguel dated his petition May 8, 1692, whereas Don Antonio de Chipres dated his first addendum to May 20, 1692.
The provisor exercised a great deal of power in the diocese. The final documents discussed in this chapter suggest that at least one of these officers, Ignaçio de Acevedo y Guzmán, used it to enrich himself. Antonio de la Cruz wrote “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan” and “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan” as receipts, the first dated to August 8, 1687 and the second June 5, 1693. Another notary who wrote a petition in Spanish, “ca. 1594 Santa Ana Acatlan,” lacks a date. These two receipts and the petition detail how provisor Acevedo y Guzmán made the officers of Santa Ana Acatlan sell their cattle without being paid. In the first receipt, Antonio de la Cruz records how, in 1687, a lord Ahumada took thirty-two bulls for ninety-six pesos by the order of provisor Acevedo y Guzmán, and that Ahumada had already been credited with thirty-six pesos because of his donation of a blue wool dress for the image of the Virgin Mary. Antonio de la Cruz adds that Provisor Acebedo y Guzmán would deliver the balance. Antonio de la Cruz wrote the second receipt in 1694 to record how the officers of the lay sodality of Santa Ana Acatlan gave twenty-eight bulls and calves to Jose Motete, mayordomo de carniseria (main butcher), for the price of five pesos each, which was also mandated by the aforementioned provisor.

However, since the officers of Santa Ana Acatlan did not receive full payment for selling their cattle, they had another notary create a petition in Spanish to the bishop. The petitioners claimed that Provisor Acebedo y Guzmán--violently and over their objections--had taken thirty-two head of cattle from their lay sodality on August 8, 1687 for Juan de Ahumada. They alleged that he ordered ten head of cattle be given to Juan de Ahumada on August 30, 1692, and that he ordered that José Motete should receive twenty-eight head of cattle on June 5, 1693. The petitioners explained that they received no money for those seventy head of cattle, and that the money was needed for their lay sodality.
The petition was heard on August 11, 1694 before the president and the other judges of the Real Audiencia of Guadalajara. Antonio de la Cruz translated “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan” and “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan” to Spanish, but he did not record the translation because his signature does not match the handwriting in the two addenda that contain the translations. The Real Audiencia ordered that the documents be taken to the Cathedral of Guadalajara on August 12, 1694 so that the Provisor at that time, Don Antonio de Miranda Villa, could learn whether these cattle belonged to the lay sodality or were bienes de comunidad. Then, the petitioners of Santa Ana Acatlan obtained a lawyer, Antonio de Ayala Natera, who restated the petition in one addendum while the public notary, Felipe de Silva, incorporated the two Nahuatl receipts and the lost receipt into another addendum which claimed that the amount owed totaled 310 pesos and 4 tomines. In a final addendum, Felipe de Silva wrote that the Indigenous people of Santa Ana Acatlan were given the 310 pesos and 4 tomines in the presence of their lawyer.

The final petition is “1694 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac,” and it also concerns cattle and the aforementioned provisor Acevedo y Guzmán. The petitioners were the prior and the mayordomo of the lay sodality of Mary of the Holy Conception in San Juan Evangelista Atoyac; they asked the provisor if he allowed the alguacil, Diego Vázquez, to demand ten cows that he intended to slaughter. This petition is dated December 11, 1694, the same year as the previous case, so it is possible that Provisor Ignacio de Acevedo y Guzmán, who was accused in Santa Ana Acatlan, also allowed this Diego Vázquez to take cattle from San Juan Evangelista Atoyac, since both of these towns are in the province of Ávalos.
6.6. Colonialism and Literacy in Northwestern New Spain

Franciscans and *nahuatlatos* played a prominent role in the development of literacy in Northwestern New Spain, educating male Indigenous children from correspondence communities. Some of these men became notaries in their communities, and began writing to the Real Audiencia in the late sixteenth century. The Diocese of Guadalajara was not as influential as the Franciscan order at first, but by the end of the sixteenth century and the first two decades of the seventeenth century, *provisores* had begun to go on *visitas*, and notaries from select towns responded to these visitas with petitions written in Nahuatl. These early petitions focused on how clerics did not administer the sacraments, did not fulfill their spiritual duties.

After the publication of 1622 SCPM, most clerics in head towns had become aware that they were obligated to perform the sacraments according to certain rules and regulations, and that those who were prone to abusing their charges had to devise other ways to enrich themselves. For this reason, the tenor of petitions shifts after 1622 to a focus on the excessive amount of tribute given during feast days, and away from a focus on sacraments. At the same time, petitioners continued to address most of their diocesan petitions to the *provisor*.

Bishop Ruiz Colmenero’s *visitas* in 1648 and 1649 seems to have encouraged Indigenous petitioners to write--and perhaps even to write in Nahuatl--for more Nahuatl-language documents were produced in Northwestern New Spain during his tenure than during any other official’s tenure. Petitioners may have perceived Bishop Ruiz Colmenero as sympathectic to their complaints, and especially their complaints against the Franciscans, as the bishop was a

---

847 Román Gutiérrez posits that, in Nueva Galicia, the only evidence of the children of Indigenous lords being educated as a group was between 1534 and 1536, when they were taught literacy in Spanish along with *policia cristiana*. Román Gutiérrez, 151.
secular priest. The rivalry between secular priests and friars reached new heights in this period of the mid seventeenth century. But by the mid-1650s, the bishop appears to have turned over the duties of the visita to a provisor.

After Bishop Ruiz Colmenero’s tenure, petitioners in Northwestern New Spain did not write as much correspondence to subsequent bishops, and the provisor appears to have become the most important official in the visita pastoral. As such, petitioners appear to have recognized that each provisor wielded great power, and perhaps they even knew that this official could excommunicate Spaniards. However, some petitioners also learned that this power could force them to do things that were against their best interests. Above all, the correspondence examined in this dissertation documents the struggle between literate Indigenous people who represented their various constituencies, defending the livelihood of women and men who lived in towns of Northwestern New Spain, and officials of the three most powerful institutions in the region. These complex struggles ran the gamut from negotiation and cooperation to legal recourse and war, if necessary.
Conclusion

The Nahuatl-language petitions, letters, and receipts written in Northwestern New Spain provide glimpses of Indigenous life in the long period from 1580 to 1694. The documents demonstrate how Indigenous leaders in this region attempted to hold local Spanish officials accountable for their actions or inactions by petitioning officials in Guadalajara. The documents suggest how Indigenous communities actively sought to negotiate with Spanish authorities whose actions affected their lifeways and livelihood.

The Nahuatl petitions, letters, and receipts in this study were produced between 1580 and 1694, a period when Spaniards were consolidating their control of Northwestern New Spain. By 1580, the Royal Audiencia and the Diocese had moved from Compostela to Guadalajara, which was at the center of a web of roads connecting it to important European and Indigenous towns that served as cabeceras. Many of these cabeceras also had Franciscan convents, which served as centers of Franciscan administration and Spanish, Latin, and Nahuatl literacy. In the sixteenth century, Indigenous towns with convents can be considered correspondence communities, civic spaces that survive in extant Spanish and Nahuatl sources, and by 1694 smaller and more isolated Indigenous towns had also become correspondence communities that would surface in the sources of my study.

Indigenous groups who inhabited the correspondence communities of Northwestern New Spain included Cocas, Coras, Huicholes, Tepecanos, and several Nahua groups. These Indigenous people lived in towns and rancherías in a region characterized by rainy and dry seasons, and in a landscape that might be divided into hot lands and cold lands. Sayula, La Magdalena, and Xalisco were three of the most prominent correspondence communities in the hot lands. Their inhabitants produced thirteen Nahuatl documents: two in Sayula, three in La
Magdalena, and six in Xalisco. Sayula became the *cabecera* of the rich province of Ávalos, which was south of Guadalajara and contained many Franciscan convents. La Magdalena was a *reducción* established at the beginning of the seventeenth century, as the final rest stop before the pass of Mochitiltic, the gateway for two tenuous roads that connected Acapona, Compostela, and other coastal provinces to Guadalajara. In fact, Acapona and Compostela were the only hot land provinces with correspondence communities that were located north of the Grande de Santiago River. Xalisco, located in Compostela, had a Franciscan convent from which friars traveled to the independent region of El Gran Nayar.

All of the correspondence communities from the cold lands were located north or east of the Grande de Santiago River in a highland region where communities were less populated but more isolated and independent than those in the hot lands. Nahuatl literacy was also less prevalent in that prominent correspondence communities there were not as well documented as hot land towns. For example, only six extant Nahuatl documents were produced in Nochistlan, Tzacamota, and Santiago Pochotitlan (with two, three, and one, respectively). Located in El Gran Nayar, Tzacamota was an administrative and religious center for the Coras. Its ruler, Nayari, wrote three strategic letters to Bishop Ruiz Colmenero.

Franciscans spread Nahuatl literacy in Northwestern New Spain by creating friar- *nahuatlato* dyads who took advantage of the importance of Nahuatl in this region. In 1539, the archbishop of Mexico met with the bishops of Antequera, Michoacan, and Franciscan, Dominican, and Augustinian representatives. These clerics acknowledged the presence of *nahuatlatos*, translators who spoke Spanish and an Indigenous language, and promoted their literate education. Such a strategy was vital. The first European-led expeditions to Northwestern
New Spain in 1525 and 1530 had learned through *nahuatlatos* that Nahuatl was a *lingua franca* in this region.

After these initial expeditions, African, European, and Indigenous people from Central Mexico began to settle in Compostela and in other scattered communities. Friars of the Franciscan order also began to arrive with *nahuatlatos*; between 1530 and 1570, they established a good number of convents close to Indigenous population centers such as Etzatlan, Juchipila, Nochistlan, Nombre de Dios, and Xalisco. *Nahuatlatos* helped them to preach in Nahuatl, while local leaders became aware of these activities.

The Indigenous leaders of the Cazcanes and the Cora ruled a variety of semi-nomadic *rancherías* as military and religious authorities. The powers were threatened by the advance of Franciscan-*nahuatlato* dyads. Indigenous leaders heard the Franciscans preach of peace while Spaniards ruled with an iron fist. In response, leaders formed the Mixtón Confederation decided to attack and sent messengers bearing *tlatols*, anti-Christian Nahuatl speeches, to unite as many towns as possible. When the Mixtón War began, leaders struck at European towns and convents. They killed a Franciscan-*nahuatlato* dyad from the convent of Etzatlan by the names of Cuellar and Calero. Fray Gerónimo Mendieta wrote hagiographies for these individuals in which he managed to convey the importance of small-unit Indigenous leadership. He claimed that Indigenous leaders killed and mutilated Cuellar and Calero by striking them in their mouths. If true, these actions suggest that Indigenous leaders understood the power of words, and thus the potential power of Franciscan-*nahuatlato* dyads who could speak Nahuatl.

Cazcan and Cora Indigenous leaders were defeated in the Mixtón War. The discovery of silver in Zacatecas in 1546 ensured a steady migration of outsiders into the region, while periodic epidemics depleted the Indigenous population of Northwestern New Spain. Franciscan-
**nahuatlato** dyads stepped into this demographic void to create intellectual and tribute-paying networks that tied the Indigenous people who remained to Europeans in settlements such as Guadalajara, Compostela, and Acaponeta. Evidence of these ties are present in the selective ways in which notaries from towns adapted Spanish loan words for the acts of reading, writing, and signing, and the all-important position of the notary.

Notaries created Nahuatl-language correspondence in Northwestern New Spain that can be divided into three genres: petitions, letters, and receipts. Petitions were the most numerous. Thirty-three of the Nahuatl documents were identified as petitions by their authors or by writers of accompanying addenda. The petitions were generally divided into three parts: a formulaic introduction, a more discursive grievance section, and a formulaic conclusion. In the introduction, notaries generally included phrases to present the addressee [A] and the petitioners [P] connected by *moixpantzinco tineçico* (we appear before you, [MN]), a phrase that presented the unequal status of the petitioner to the addressee. They also tended to write the communal identity [ID] of petitioners and a phrase of deference [D] such as, *tictotenamiquilia* (we kiss, reverential) *momatzin yhuan mocxitzin* (your hands and feet, reverential). The grievance section was the most unique part of the petition; notaries usually began this section with verbs that referred to speech acts, such as *ma ticmoaquiltia* (may you listen) or *ticmotlatlauhtilia* (we implore you). They also tended to finish the grievance section with the phrase *ya ixquich* (it is all). The conclusion contained elements that were different from those of the introduction. The most prominent one was the names of the petitioners [N], which were only rarely written in the introduction, and nouns or verbs that referred to writing [W] or signing [S]. The introduction and conclusion generally only shared references to God [G] or the Virgin Mary [Ma]. Identified and
non-identified petitions can also be divided into four types based on the addressee(s): diocesan petitions, Franciscan petitions, Real Audiencia petitions, and Alcalde Mayor petitions.

Letters and receipts differed from petitions. Writers of letters did not write MN in the introduction and generally addressed individuals of a similar social status. For example, Nayari addressed the bishop as an equal. He did not include a phrase of deference [D] nor moixpantzinco nineçico [MN]. Letters were also less structured, without a clear introduction, although they did have a discernible conclusion. Receipts were very short, often a quarter of a folio, and they stated in a very direct manner what the author had given to an institution or an individual. For example, the writer of “1630 Tlajomulco” recorded how the author, the person dictating the receipt, had given cattle to a lay sodality.

The Indigenous writers of the documents in my study relied on a repertoire that included Spanish loan words and phrases that show the different ways that the landscape of Northwestern New Spain was being colonized. Every petitioner and author had at least one Spanish name and addressed secular or ecclesiastical officials by their titles. Notaries also wrote a variety of expressions that suggest that time and space were being divided in Spanish ways. Names of the week and ecclesiastical divisions of the day are present, as well as terms that refer to Spanish ranching culture by naming cattle, sheep, butchers, and tanning. These loan words and phrases place the language of these documents from Northwestern New Spain into what Lockhart referred to as "stage two," which included the adoption of Spanish verbs and their adaptation for Nahuatl usage through the addition of Nahuatl affixes such as -oa.848

---
The Nahuatl itself was examined through a study of -tl/-l/-t absolutes and plural-pronominal suffixes in documents from the hot land provinces of Amula, Ávalos, Cajititlan, Colima, and Tlajomulco with results that suggested that notaries employed Central Mexican Nahuatl, Sayulteco Nahuatl, or a Central Mexican/Sayulteco lingua franca. The notary of “1679 Sayula” employed Sayulteco in that his work contains the strong -lo and -l patterns without any use of the Central Mexican -tl and probable /ʔ/ patterns. He probably spoke Sayulteco Nahuatl, like the writers of nearby San Pedro Tepec and Tachichilco, who employed the same patterns. Writers such as the notaries of “1658 San Francisco Tizapan” and “1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac” employed the strong -lo and hypercorrection -tl patterns, suggesting that they spoke Sayulteco as an L2. The notaries who wrote “1649 San Antonio Tuzcacezco,” “1653 San Martín,” and “1654 San Martín” likely also spoke Sayulteco as an L2 because they used the weak -lo and hypercorrection -tl patterns.

The writers of “N.Y. Sayula” and “1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo” were different. They employed -tl and probable /ʔ/ patterns, suggesting that they spoke Central Mexican Nahuatl. The remaining notaries from in and around Ávalos combined absolutive and plural-pronominal patterns, suggesting that they spoke a Central Mexican-Sayulteco lingua franca that varied in being Central Mexican or Sayulteco dominant, depending on the town. Also, writers from the provinces of Amula, Ávalos, Cajititlan, Colima, and Tlajomulco who created documents before 1637 were more influenced by Central Mexican Nahuatl than those who wrote afterward, which might be related to the contraction of Franciscan influence that Román Gutiérrez proposed for the beginning of the seventeenth century.849

849 Román Gutiérrez, Sociedad y Evangelización en Nueva Galicia durante el siglo XVI.
Information about documents from the provinces of Acaponeta, Compostela, and the cold lands is less conclusive. The notaries of “1657 Tonala” and “1649 Ocotitic” favor a -t absolutive, but the former employs the probable /ʔ/ pattern, whereas the latter uses the strong -lo pattern. Nayari identified himself as a Cora and his non-standard forms suggest that he was an L2 speaker, who used the -t absolutive once and the probable /ʔ/ plural-pronominal suffix once. However, none of these writers nor others from provinces in the cold lands demonstrate -l or -tl hypercorrection, suggesting that they employed Central Mexican Nahuatl, W2 Nahuatl, or a Central Mexican-W2 lingua franca. Further research is necessary to test my findings.

My findings reveal two variants of Western Mexican Nahuatl and contribute to a debate about different chains of dialects. Una Canger’s theory of central, western periphery, and eastern periphery variants has gained wide acceptance. My study provides data for two features suggesting two western-periphery variants: Sayulteco and W2. Also, the -t absolutive of W2, which has been examined by John Sullivan and Yáñez Rosales, was probably an independent innovation, but it is also common to eastern periphery variants.850

The content of petitions from Northwestern New Spain in many ways resembles that of petitions examined by Robert Haskett and Magnus Lundberg.851 The notaries of Northwestern New Spain wrote documents on behalf of petitioners who sought to defend their collective

---

850 Sullivan, John, Ytechopa timoteilhuia yn tobicario (acusamos a nuestro vicario): pleito entre los naturales de Jalostotitan y su sacerdote, 1618 and “The Jalostotitlan Petitions, 1611-1618”; Yáñez Rosales, Ypan altepet monotza san Antonio de padua tlaxomulco ‘En el pueblo que se llama San Antonio de Padua, Tlajomulco’: Textos en lengua náhuatl, siglos XVII y XVIII.

851 Haskett, “‘Not a Pastor, but a Wolf’: Indigenous-Clergy Relations in Early Cuernavaca and Taxco;” Lundberg, Church Life between the Metropolitan and the Local: Parishes, Parishioners and Parish Priests in Seventeenth-Century Mexico.
interests, even if it meant challenging the power of the local clergy. This is the type of document that Haskett examined in his study of a petition written in 1818, in Jonacatepec, Morelos. Notaries there documented a struggle between Indigenous elites and local Spanish officials. These conflicts were often adjudicated by officials who relied on decrees from Mexico City, Seville, and Rome. Magnus Lundberg observed much the same in his study of petitions from the Diocese of Puebla and the Archdiocese of Mexico City. However, the content of petitions of Northwestern New Spain also demonstrate a space that was quite unlike central Mexico because it had the land of El Gran Nayar, a region that fell within the sphere of Spanish influence but was also more independent due to its relative geographical isolation and distance from the capital.

Indigenous notaries addressed sixteenth-century petitions to officials of the Royal Audiencia such as the writers of “1580a Nochistlan” and “1580b Nochistlan.” Both of these petitions began what I call a "cycle of literacy," a corpus of documents in which one or two Nahuatl petitions led to subsequent addenda in Spanish. I also propose that cycles of literacy defined the proto-typical correspondence community; they represent a mixed Nahuatl-Spanish record that historicizes Indigenous towns in Northwestern New Spain. Cycles can also be incomplete, as in “N.Y. Nombre de Dios, ca.1585,” a petition copied in the eighteenth century by Faustino Chimalpopoca, a Nahua polymath, which probably dates to 1585 instead of 1563, as proposed by R. H. Barlow and George T. Smisor. Nonetheless, I agree with their assessment that its Nahuatl represents a rustic central Mexican variety because its nouns and verbs have few reverential forms.852

852 Barlow and Smisor, *Nombre de Dios, Durango, Two Documents in Náhuatl Concerning its Foundation: Memorial of the Indians Concerning Their Services, c. 1563; Agreement of the Mexicans and the Michoacanos, 1585.*
Notaries in Xalisco began several cycles of literacy to prevent the movement of a Franciscan convent from this town. They appear to have begun with “1593a Xalisco,” which failed, and continued with “1593b Xalisco” and “N.Y. Xalisco,” which shifted the argument from the convent to attempts to bring back a Franciscan friar who had previously served in Xalisco. These cycles also failed, but notaries continued with “1594 Xalisco” and “1595 Xalisco,” which reveal some success in that a new convent was built in Xalisco.

The Diocese of Guadalajara became a recipient of Nahuatl petitions with “1593b Oconahuac” and “1593c Oconahuac,” which notaries addressed to the provisor. These petitions suggest that a provisor had begun visitas on behalf of the Diocese of Guadalajara. The Third Mexican Council met in 1585 to adapt decrees from the Council of Trent to New Spain.\(^{853}\) The visita was outlined in one of these decrees, and it required the bishop or one of his subordinates, the provisor in Northwestern New Spain, to travel to the parishes to interview elites about the performance of local clerics and to inspect ecclesiastical instruments.\(^{854}\)

Printed copies of these modified decrees only began to circulate in 1622. Perhaps this is why petitions written before 1622 addressed provisores and bishops to complain about the different ways in which local clerics were failing to administer the sacraments. At times, Indigenous petitioners appeared to know the duties of priests better than the priests themselves. Petitioners learned these duties from interviews with visiting bishops or provisores. However, notaries who wrote petitions on or after 1622 turned away from writing about grievances related to the sacraments and began to emphasize the excessive financial obligations of feast days and

\(^{853}\) Lundberg,

\(^{854}\) Pueyo Colomina,
other, more unique, problems. In response to 1622 SCPM, priests were more inclined to fulfill	heir duties to travel, in order to administer the sacraments to healthy and sick Indigenous people.
Their visits often required compensation in the form of food and drink and other amenities,
obligating communities to raise funds for their visits, especially when those visits corresponded
with feast days.

Furthermore, notaries who wrote before 1648 most often addressed *provisores*, which
suggests that they were the ones who made *visitas*. When Bishop Ruiz Colmenero went on a
series of *visitas* between 1648 and 1649, his visits solicited a large number of petitions in
Northwestern New Spain. He wrote a *visita* journal, now lost, which can be reconstructed to
some degree by the petitions produced during his tenure. We know that he visited Tachichilco,
San Antonio Tuzcacezco, San Juan Ocotitic, La Magdalena, and San Francisco Ahualulco.
Notaries from these towns wrote him petitions in 1649. In some of these towns, Bishop Ruiz
Colmenero responded to grievances by granting *amparos* that inhabitants could use against
defendants who, in most cases, were Franciscans. He acted as an itinerant judge. In La
Magdalena, petitioners complained about how a Spanish squatter had claimed a large portion of
land that belonged to the *cofradias* of the Holy Conception and Holy Sacrament, and Bishop
Ruiz Colmenero referred this grievance to the royal audiencia. The bishop also received three
letters sometime after May 15, 1649 from Nayari. These documents were most likely in response
to a letter that Bishop Ruiz Colmenero had sent from Guaxicori, in Acaponeta, to complain about
interactions between Nayari’s fellow Coras and Tepehuanos, an Indigenous group that was
apparently hostile to Spaniards at this time. Nayari responded in his letters that the Tepehuanos
had sought him out and asked for an *amparo* to replace one that had been lost.
Notaries who had grievances after 1648 or 1649 remembered Bishop Ruiz Colmenero’s *visita* and wrote petitions to him several years later. In Acaponeta, writers aimed four petitions against their Franciscan friar in the towns of San Antonio Quihuiquinta and San Sebastián Guaxicori in 1652; and in Ávalos, notaries wrote three petitions between 1653 and 1654. However, by 1657, notaries had begun to address the *provisor*, which suggests that Bishop Ruiz Colmenero had turned over the *visitas* to this official. When the bishop died on September 28, 1663, the cycles of Nahuatl literacy in Northwestern New Spain reverted to the *provisor*.

*Provisor* Baltasar de la Peña y Medina was the recipient of three petitions written between 1668 and 1673. Alonzo Felipe wrote him from San Francisco Zacoalco and explained that nobles from this town had not had the nine pesos required by the *visita* because their Franciscan friar had taken too much tribute from them and assured him that he was sending it with their petition, “1668 San Francisco Zacoalco.” Alonzo Felipe thus presented the price of *visitas* at this time. He also related how Indigenous officers sought to pay the fee in order to maintain the benefits of this practice. His words also suggest that Indigenous officers were aware of the rivalry between officers of the diocese and Franciscans in Northwestern New Spain. The notary who wrote “1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan” provides evidence of a similar understanding of a diocesan-Franciscan rivalry in that he asked whether the petitioners had to continue to provide cows to a Franciscan convent in Guadalajara.

The last cycles of literacy occurred during the tenure of Bishop Santiago de León Garabito; the most notable text included two receipts in Nahuatl, “1687 Santa Ana Acatlan” and “1693 Santa Ana Acatlan,” one petition in Spanish, and a number of addenda. The petitioners accused *provisor* Ignaçio de Guzmán of taking cattle without paying in full. A subsequent petition by a notary from nearby San Juan Evangelista Atoyac in 1694 made a similar claim
against Diego Vázquez, an alguacil. These claims about how officials bought cattle without paying full price may be related to the demand for Spanish-style goods and foods of residents of Guadalajara, which increased in population in the late seventeenth century, according to Eric Van Young.\footnote{855} The integration of the rural countryside of Northwestern New Spain by Guadalajara began to accelerate in this period.

My dissertation examines the largest number of Nahuatl petitions to be found in Northwestern New Spain, fifty-two, along with eleven other Nahuatl documents. Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart were among the first to analyze a large number of Nahuatl documents addressed to imperial or ecclesiastical authorities, classifying them into four genres, the last of which, “petitions, correspondence, and other formal statements,” applies to the petitions, letters, and receipts in this dissertation. Restall, Sousa, and Terraciano identify petitions as notarial works that follow familiar conventions, presenting examples of letters and petitions addressed to the king and other colonial authorities. Haskett used a nineteenth-century petition from Cuernavaca to show that Indigenous officials challenged the local clergy.

Hanks, Sullivan, and Lundberg also identify various characteristics of petitions. Hanks examines Maya petitions from the Yucatan Peninsula, positing that writers generally wrote from a “we” perspective, representing the petitioners to a “you”, often a Spanish official. Sullivan asserts that the phrase tinessico moyspantzin, “we come to appear before you,” embodies the petitioning process that takes place in an oral culture. Lundberg presents the confluence of oral and written cultures within the visita, a practice promoted by the Third Mexican Council and shaped by the archbishops, bishops, and other diocesan officials in his study of Nahuatl

\footnote{855} Eric Van Young. \textit{Hacienda and Power in Eighteenth Century Mexico: The Rural Economy of the Guadalajara Region, 1675-1820}.
documents from the Archdiocese of Mexico City and the Diocese of Puebla. I posit that in Northwestern New Spain the provisor was more important than the bishop in promoting and performing visitas, except during the tenure of Bishop Ruiz Colmenero, who traveled on a visita to begin his tenure and generated a large number of petitions. I propose that writers organized petitions into three parts: introduction, grievance section, and conclusion, as discussed above.

Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart examined the genre of “petitions, correspondence, and other formal documents” from a large area including the Basin of Mexico, Guatemala, and Northwestern New Spain, positing that writers from large towns in the Basin of Mexico wrote a Classical Nahuatl that was more formal than that of the inhabitants of small towns. However, Una Canger problematizes such a classification, theorizing three dialect chains of Nahuatl: an eastern peripheral chain, a central chain, and a western peripheral chain. She adds that the central and western peripheral chains share some affinities.

Sullivan’s examination of the Nahuatl of petitions and Yáñez Rosales’s investigation of Tlajomulco are important for discerning colonial variants from the western periphery. Sullivan examines a large number of petitions from the cold land provinces of Jalostotitlan and Lagos, observing that the writers employed rhetorical constructions that reflected a peripheral variant, features unique to the region, including the use of -lo to represent plural subject pronominals, and features that suggested that the writers used Nahuatl as an L2. He notes the use of initial syllable “tl” in words like hastla and estlancia, suggesting that some of the writers only used “t” in speech and that these were examples of hypercorrection. Yáñez Rosales presents two features in documents from the province of Tlajomulco, positing that one represents writers who used Nahuatl as an L2, and another indicated a Western peripheral variant of Nahuatl. She asserts that confusion of “d” for “t” in a word like dechtolinia (he abuses us) points to writers who used
Nahuatl as an L2, and the apparent confusion between “tl” and “t” indicated a Western peripheral variant of Nahuatl. I agree with Sullivan and Yáñez Rosales about the presence of a western peripheral variant in the provinces of Jalostotitlan and Tlajomulco, since the documents in my study from the cold lands contain examples of the features that they describe. I theorize that the Grande de Santiago River served as a boundary for this western peripheral variant, which only includes a few provinces and towns in the hot lands, such as the province of Tlajomulco and the town of Tonala in the province of Guadalajara. I have named it W2 to differentiate it from another variant.

I have analyzed Nahuatl documents from provinces southwest of Jalostotitlan and south of Tlajomulco in the hot lands, where I posit a different western peripheral variant, which I name Sayulteco, after the town of Sayula, and its identification by Bishop Ruiz Colmenero. I think that writers who used -tl in a syllable-final, non-absolutive position, in Nahuatl words and even Spanish loans, were relying on a -tl hypercorrection pattern that disguised the use of -l as an absolutive, or noun-signalling, suffix. I propose that the use of strong -lo or weak -lo patterns together with -l absolutive or -tl hypercorrection patterns signal Sayulteco Nahuatl. I also believe that those writers that employed -lo patterns together with the -l absolutive pattern were Sayulteco Nahuas, whereas those who relied on -lo patterns and -tl hypercorrection spoke Sayulteco Nahuatl as an L2 in that they belonged to a non-Nahua group. Other writers mixed -lo patterns, -l absolutive, and -tl hypercorrection patterns with those of Central Mexico. In these cases, I propose that the writers were caught between pressures from Franciscans and local Indigenous speakers, and responded by writing a Sayulteco-Central Mexican Nahuatl lingua franca.
Such a lingua franca was influenced by the Franciscans directly or through nahuatlatos, bilingual or trilingual people who knew at least one Indigenous language. In his study of the Mixteca region of Colonial Oaxaca, Terraciano observed that nahuatlato meant simply "interpreter" and referred to individuals who knew at least one Indigenous language, such as Nahuatl or Ñudzahui (Mixtec). Yáñez Rosales investigates documents related to a 1525 expedition into what would become the provinces of Colima and Izatlan, concluding that nahuatlato and otomi were Nahuatl terms to separate Nahuatl speakers and non-Nahua speakers. In Northwestern New Spain, I propose that the earlier meaning was “clear speaker,” referring to a speaker of Nahuatl. Over time, I think the term came to represent a translator who spoke Nahuatl along with one or two other languages.

An area that demands future study is the presence and nature of the altepetl in Northwestern New Spain. Lockhart and Wood propose that the altepetl was the basic Nahua polity in Central Mexico, and it may have extended into Northwestern New Spain. Yáñez Rosales examines documents from the province of Tlajomulco, concluding that Indigenous people in Northwestern New Spain also relied on altepetl organization. I concur with regards to Cazcan, Sayulteco, and other towns inhabited by Nahuas, since notaries often used altepetl to identify their communities and even occasionally mention the names of sub-divisions, tlaxilacalli or tlahuilanal, that are consistent with Central Mexican Nahuatl forms. However, I am uncertain about towns in which Nahuas were not the majority of the population. I suspect that, in some cases, altepetl represented a Nahua-like polity, but in others it simply served as an approximate term for translation.

The colonial altepetl in Central Mexico changed with the introduction of the cabildo and lay sodality. Haskett examines documents from the Central Mexican altepetl of Cuernavaca,
observing that its Nahua inhabitants treated the *cabildo* as a more inclusive institution than Spaniards, and having a leadership that was not completely separate from its lay sodality. I have found similarities, especially among Cazcan towns such as La Magdalena and Nochistlán, in which notaries wrote many names with *cabildo* and lay sodality titles, alongside others names that lack such titles. I propose that such examples present Indigenous interpretations of the *cabildo* and the lay sodality in Northwestern New Spain, which are similar to those of Cuernavaca for Cazcan towns. In the future, I hope to find whether these observations apply to the towns of other Indigenous groups in the correspondence communities of Northwestern New Spain.
Appendix A: Identified Petitions and Letters

This section contains several tables concerning the issue of classification of the petition genre. Table A-1 presents petitions that were identified as such by either the notary who wrote the given petition, or the writer of an addendum. The first column contains the name of the petition together with the name of the writer if he is identified as the notary. The second column has any available information that the writer of a petition provided to identify his document as within this genre. The second column contains the terms or phrases that an addenda author used, whereas “none” specifies that lack of any identifying terms. The last column presents the addressee of the given petition. Table A-2 presents the institution associated with the addressee. The first column has the title of the addressee, and the next four columns represent the institution: Diocese, Alcaldía Mayor, Royal Audiencia of Nueva Galicia, and King.

A-1: Classification of Named Petitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Petition with the author [if named]</th>
<th>Identification by Petition Notary</th>
<th>Identification by Addenda Author</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1580a Nochistlan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>eporpetición quepresentaron</td>
<td>tlacate tlatohuaniye [lord]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580b Nochistlan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>eporpetición quepresentaron</td>
<td>señor blexidente [lord president]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y. Nombre de Dios ca. 1585</td>
<td>Auh nizcatqui ylnamicoca</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>tohuey tlatocatzin [lord]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593a Oconahuac</td>
<td>topedición,</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>antotlatocahuan... auñencia reyal [Royal audiencia]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622 Cuatlan by Pedro Puy</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Peticion de los yndios, una petición</td>
<td>Señor frufixotl [provisor]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622 Santa Maria Magdalena by Maria Magdalena</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>esta peticion, forme la peticion</td>
<td>tlatohuani señor provisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637 Coatlan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Peticion de los yndios</td>
<td>tixiptlatzin tío Jés [you who are the very image of Jesus Christ]; Presbíterro bicario [by a Spanish notary]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642 Contla</td>
<td>nopeticion,</td>
<td>esta peticion</td>
<td>tinoalcaldé mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646 Tequepechpan by Francisco Rafael</td>
<td>topetitiziyon, topetición</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>titomahuízteopixcau [priest]; cura Via[ by a Spanish notary]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>San Antonio Tuzcacuezo</td>
<td>topedicion</td>
<td>esta petición, esta petición, La petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>San Francisco Ayahualulco</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Esta petición, la petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>San Juan Ucutytic (Ocotitic)</td>
<td>amat petición,</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649a</td>
<td>Santa María Magdalena</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>la petición, esta petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649b</td>
<td>Santa María Magdalena</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>por esta petición, esta petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Tachichilco</td>
<td>inin topetización,</td>
<td>por esta petición, la petición de arriba, destos autos y peticiones,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652a</td>
<td>San Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>topedicio</td>
<td>nra petición,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652b</td>
<td>San Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>topedicion</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>San Francisco Juchipila</td>
<td>y n ica topetision</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652a</td>
<td>San Sebastian Guaxicori</td>
<td>pedición,</td>
<td>esta petición, nuestra petición, Petición de los naturales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652b</td>
<td>San Sebastian Guaxicori</td>
<td>topetitzion,</td>
<td>dos peticiones, esta petición, la petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Amatitlan by Don Jeronimo</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>esta petición, esta petición, dha petision,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>San Martín by Diego Juan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>esta petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Tonalá by Domingo de Ramos</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Autos echos por petición, esta petición, dicha petición, esta petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Eztatlan</td>
<td>topetision</td>
<td>esta petición, la petición, nuestra petición, la petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>San Francisco Zacoalco</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>esta petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Santa Maria Magdalena Tizapan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>esta petición, la petición, la petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>esta petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td>Santiago Pochotitlan</td>
<td>topetision</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Analco</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>esta petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Sayula</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>la petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>San Pedrotepec</td>
<td>peticion</td>
<td>Petición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>San Andres Atotolco by Hernando Miguel</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>esta peticion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y. Aquautitan</td>
<td></td>
<td>ca topetecion</td>
<td>esta peticion, petesion de los naturales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A-2: Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Diocese of Guadalajara</th>
<th>Alcaldía Mayor</th>
<th>Royal Audiencia of Nueva Galicia</th>
<th>King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (by title or name)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su señoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Presbitero or Cura) Vicario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuestra merced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Audiencia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidente</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcalde Mayor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gobernador</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlatohuani (2 variants)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Two Petitions and One Letter

The three documents presented here are “1622 La Magdalena,” “1649a Tzacamota,” and “1654 San Martín.” The first is a petition from the town of La Magdalena in the province of Izatlan, whereas the second is a letter by Don Francisco Nayari to Bishop Juan Ruiz Colmenero. Both works figure very prominently in my study. The third document is a petition from San Martín in the province of Ávalos in which notaries wrote the largest number of alphabetic Nahuatl documents.\(^856\) The translations for these three works have four lines in which the first line represents a paleography that approaches the original, the second line presents morpheme boundaries, the third line defines the different morphemes, and the fourth line contains my English translation of the content. Table B-1 presents the abbreviations used to describe the different morphemes in line three, when they are not translated.

Table B-1: Morpheme Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: first person</th>
<th>det: determiner</th>
<th>humIO: human indirect object</th>
<th>O: object</th>
<th>pron: pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2: second person</td>
<td>dim: diminutive</td>
<td>int: intensifier</td>
<td>OP: optative</td>
<td>prt: particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: third person</td>
<td>dim.pej: pejorative diminutive</td>
<td>lig: ligature</td>
<td>P: possessor, or “re-lational word object</td>
<td>R: reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abs: absolutive</td>
<td>dir.ven: venitive directional</td>
<td>loc: locative</td>
<td>p: plural element of pronouns</td>
<td>rev: reverential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>app: applicative</td>
<td>dir.and: anditive directional</td>
<td>masc: masculine</td>
<td>PA: preterit agentive</td>
<td>S: subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>con: conditional</td>
<td>fem: feminine</td>
<td>neg: negative</td>
<td>pass: passive</td>
<td>s: singular element of pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hab: habitual</td>
<td>nhumIO: non-human indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pret: preterite</td>
<td>st: something</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^856\) I have devoted significant portions of chapters 1 and 2 to “1622 La Magdalena,” and I have also written about it in chapters 2 and 5.
En 20 de março [1]622 +

You who are most respectable in your holiness, lord ruler
I come to appear before your presence. I come to bow down and kiss your sacred lordly hands and your holy lordly feet.

---

857 cena, cenca: means very, greatly, and is a general intensifier Lockhart 2001: 213).


859 teoyotica, teōyōtl: divine thing, divinity, sacrament(s), sometimes the sacrament of marriage specifically (Lockhart 2001: 234).

860 teoyotica, -ca: instrumental relational word; by means of, through, with, etc (Lockhart 2001: 212).


5. ca ycxitzin. ma xinechmoçelilitzino yni mo'ñomaçevatl notoca m³. ma xi-nech-mo-čeli-li-tzino⁶³ yni-mo'ñño⁶⁴ maçeua-tl⁶⁵ no-toca
   Maria
   may 2S-O-1S-O-R-receive-app-rev prt.1S-S-1S-P.humble-servant-abs 1S-P-name Maria
May you receive me, your humble servant whose name is Maria

6. magdale na nicā nochan Sancta maria magdalena
   Magdalena nican no-chan Santa Maria Magdalena
   Magdalena here 1S-P-home Santa Maria Magdalena
   Magdalena and whose home is here in Santa Maria Magdalena.

7. ma xicmocaquiltitzino yni techcopa yno netequipachol ca
   ma xi-c-mo-caqui-lti-tzino yn i-techcopa
   may 2S-O-3S-O-R-hear-cau-rev prt 3S-P-about
   yno-ne-tequipachol ca⁶⁶
   prt.1S-P-idef.R-concern prt
May you hear about my affliction.

8. ya⁶⁷ ticmomachiltia tinotlato teoyotica. ca ya o val mo
   ya ti-c-mo-machi-ltia ti-no-tlatocauh teoyotica ca ya o-val-mo-vicaya⁶⁸
   already 2S-S-3S-O-R-know-cau 2S-S-1S-P-ruler spiritual prt already pret-dir.ven-R-come
As, you, my spiritual ruler, already know,

---

⁶³ Lockhart (2001: 240) defines –tzinoa as a class 3 reverential suffix of verbs, used sometimes over and above the normal reverential, but especially when the reflexive prefix has already been used in a semantically meaningful fashion, and he describes –tzinoh as the preterit form. However, this notary does not use -tzinoh in the manner that writers of Central Mexico use it.

⁶⁴ nimo'ñomaçevatl, icnōtl: orphan, poor, humble person; this word is extensively combined with verbs and nouns to add a sense of compassion and humility (Lockhart 2001: 219).

⁶⁵ nimo'ñomacehuatl has the -tl absolutive ending even though it is possessed. The author (Garcia forthcoming) postulates that, in the province of Ávalos, notaries hypercorrected by using -tl in syllable-word final positions because they were first pressured to use -tl for an absolutive that they pronounced as -l. Ricardo García, “Entre la lengua mexicana y la mera mexicana: El náhuatl de Juan Guerra, D. Gerónimo Tomas de Aquino Cortés y Zedeño, y escribanos de la provincia de Ávalos, ca. 1600 a 1765” in [CD] Colección Lenguas Indígenas 5: El náhuatl del obispado de Guadalajara a través de las obras de los autores fray Juan Guerra (1692) y el bachiller Gerónimo Cortés y Zedeño (1765) edited by Ricardo García Medina, Álvaro G. Torres Nila y Rosa H. Yáñez Rosales. Guadalajara, Mexico: Universidad de Guadalajara and Biblioteca Publica del Estado de Jalisco, forthcoming.

⁶⁶ Molina, porque. Lockhart, 212. ca: clause-introductory particle with many uses. Sometimes it indicates reason why, other times the beginning of the nuclear complex, or the beginning of an answer. ca qualli or ca ye qualli, that’s fine, okay. ca nel, because, since, for, etc.

⁶⁷ Lockhart (2001: 241) proposes that ya is used in peripheral areas.

⁶⁸ From mohuicaya. This is reverential of to come.
9. vicaya. mixpātzinco. yno tlatocauh prioste ca ya omitzca
   mo-ixpan-tzin-co  yn  no-tlatoca-uh  prioste  ca  ya
   2sP-presence.of-rev-rel  prt  1sP-lord-sing  prioste  prt  already
   o-mitz-caquití869-co
   pret-2sO-inform-to
   the lordly prioste was coming in your presence to just inform you.

10. quiltico ca ya otcmocaquitíi y notechcopa y notla tequipacho
   ca  ya870  o-ti-c-mo-caqui-lti  yn  no-techcopa  y
   prt  just  pret-2sS-3sO-R-hear-cau  prt  1sP-about  prt
   no-tlatequipacho-lliz
   1sP-concern-nom
   You just heard my concern,

11. lliz cahoncā yxpā altar onechanac Justiçia alvœcil mayor one
   cah  onca-n-ypa871  altar  o-nech-anac  justiçia  alguacil  mayor
   for  there-1sP-before  altar  pret-1sO-seize  Justicia  Alguacil  Mayor
   o-nech-tllali
   pret-1sO-place
   for there, before the altar, the Justicia Alguacil Mayor seized me, placed me

12. chtlalli teylpiloyan nilpitica çeyohuatl.  auh yn moztlatica
   teylpiloyan  n872-ilpi-ti-ca  çe-yohua-tl  auh  yn  moztlà-ti-ca873
   jail  1sS-keep.in.custody-lig-be  one-night-abs  then  prt  next.day-lig-with
   in jail, and he kept me in custody for one night. Then, on the next day,

13. onechquixti onechhuicac Etzatlan onechcahuac ynavac
   o-nech-quixti  o-nech-huicac  Etzatlan  o-nech-cahua-c  y-nahuac874
   pret-1sO-remove  pret-1sO-take  Etzatlan  pret-1sO-relinquish-pret  3sP-
   with
   he removed me, took me to Etzatlan, and relinquished me with

---

869 caqui + tia = inform
870 Lockhart (2001: 100) proposes that when ye and its variant ya precede a preterit verb, they emphasize
pastness, with some Nahuatl writers appearing to use them to distinguish a perfect sense from a simple past narrative
sense.
871 Lockhart, 222. yxpan, relational word. in the presence of, before, facing, ixtili, -pan.
872 nilpitica, ilpia: nite; to tie someone, or to take someone and jail him (Molina 2001: 37). I postulate that
Maria meant nechilpitica instead of nilpitica. The former means “was keeping me in custody.”
873 Lockhart, 235. -ti, -c, pret. ending indicating pret. agentive.
874 Cortés y Zedeño (1765: 71) writes Con, preposicion de ablativo: Ica, 1. inahuac, para animados el
Segúdo.
14. Don Sebastian o-nech-tepositaro. onicçelli ypā chicuey tona
   Don Sebastian pret-1sO-place\(^{875}\) pret-1sS-3sO-accept for eight-days
   Don Sebastian. He placed me under arrest, and I accepted it for eight days.

15. tiuh. auh yniquac ya açico yn motlanavatiltzin ynçenca oti
   auh yn iquaq ya açi-co yn mo-tlanahuatilli-tzin\(^{876}\) yn then prt when already arrive-purp prt
   çenca o-ti-nech-mo-tauhcoli-lia.\(^{877}\) really pret-2sS-1sO-R-show.mercy-app
   When your messenger arrived, you showed mercy to me.

16. nechmotauhcollilia.\(^{878}\) auh yn Señor altemayor oquimoçelili
   auh yn Señor altemayor o-qui-mo-çeli-li
   prt prt Señor Alcalde.mayor pret-3sO-R-receive-app
   The Señor Alcalde Mayor received it [order] and

17. oquimaviztilli. yniquac o quimocaquilti motlanavitiltzin
   o-qui-mahuiztilli yniquac o-qui-mo-caqui-íti mo-tlanahuatiltzin
   preterit-3sO-honor at.the.time pret-3sO-REF-hear-cau 2SPO-message\(^{879}\)
   honored it. At the time he (alcalde mayor) heard it,

18. nimā oquito. ca ya qualli\(^{880}\) niman axcā an quibicazque
   niman o-qu-ito ca-ya-qualli niman axcan an-qui-vica-z-que
   immediately pret-3sO-say That-is-fine then today 2pS-3sO-accompany-fut-pl
   he said, “Very well. Then, today, you [pl] will accompany the

---

\(^{875}\) To place a women on a type of house arrest in someone else’s house; entrust. Kevin Terraciano. May 31, 2011.

\(^{876}\) Molina, 128.  *Tlanahuatilli*. citado, mandado, despedido o licenciado. I also spoke to Ofelia Cruz Morales, a Nahuatl-speaker from Veracruz, and she asserted that *tlanahuatilli* was a “persona con cargo importante.” Ofelia Cruz Morales, personal conversation through Skype on September 14, 2012.

\(^{877}\) Lockhart, 239.  *tlāocolia, nic.* to favor someone, do someone a favor, to grant someone something.

\(^{878}\) This word is troublesome orthographically and semantically. In the manuscript it can either be *otinechmotauhcollilia* or *otinechmotauhcollilia*.

\(^{879}\) I believe that *motlanahuatiltzin* sometimes refers to the messenger and the message because during the colonial period, official proclamations were read aloud by a person, and the Spanish summary mentions that Maria Magdalena received an *orden de amparo* (order for relief), which would have been read aloud.

\(^{880}\) Lockhart, 212.  *ca ye cualli*, that’s fine. *ya.* older form of *ye*, already seen… in peripheral areas.
19. çihuantzintli. yzcatque oquito ypā lonez ypā comple[tas]
   çihuans-tzin-tli881 yz catque882 o-qui-ito y-pa lonez
   y-pa
   woman-rev-abs here is pret-3s-O-say 3sP-rel Monday 3sP-rel
   completas883 afternoon
   the woman.” Here is [what] he said on Monday in the afternoon.

20. tas auh yn don Sabas tian. oquixitini motlanaviltzin. amo
   auh yn Don Sebastian o-qui-xitini884 mo-tla-naval-tzin amo
   prt prt Don Sebastian pret-3s-O-destroy 2sP-message-rev neg
   Don Sebastian destroyed your message. He does not

21. quimaviztillia çan oquito. amonelli oquiczivactlato
   qui-mahuiztillia çan o-qui-chihuac tlatovani
   3sO-show respect merely pret-3s-O-say neg true pret-3s-O-do.pret    ruler
   show respect. He merely said, “it is not true [that] the ruler did it,

22. vani çācampa omochivac. yz catqui oquito don Sebastiā
   çan885 campa886 o-mo-chihuac yz catqui o-qui-ito Don Sebastian
   but from.where pret-R-be.done here was pret-3s-O-say don Sebastian
   but where was it done?887 That is what Don Sebastian said.

23. auh yn moztlatica ypâ martes. yn oquito Sñor alldemayor. amo
   auh yn moztla-ti-ca y-pan martes yn o-qui-ito Señor alcalde mayor.
   then prt next.day-lig-with 3sP-on Tuesday prt pret-3s-O-say señoR alcalde mayor.
   Then, on the next day, Tuesday, the alcalde mayor [Don Sebastian] said, “You will not

24. anquihuicazque çivatzintli axcan. ypandomingo ompatiyazq’
   an-qui-huica-z-que çiva-tzin-tli axcan y-pan domingo ompa ti-ya-z-
   que
   2pS-3s-O-take-fut-pl woman-rev-abs today 3SPO-on Sunday there 3pS-go-fut-pl
   take the woman now. On Sunday, we will go there,

881 The context suggests that cihuantzintli is pejorative instead of reverential here.

882 Lockhart, 213. catqui. archaic present sing. of cah. seen most often in set phrase iz catqui, here is.

883 completas: Ultima parte del oficio divino, con que se terminan las horas canonicas del dia.

884 Karttunen, 326.

885 can, çan: only just, merely, but (Lockhart 2001: 213).

886 campa, cāmpa: to or from where, interrogative; with in relative, dependent; çān, pa.

887 Don Sebastian did not use reverential forms in this statement.
25. ompaticcahuazque toçeltin yhū tlanavatilli. amo anqui ompa ti-c-cahua-z-que to-çeltin888 y-huan tlanavil-li amo there 1sS-3sO-deliver-fut-p 1pP-individual-pl 3sP-with message-abs neg an-qui-vica-z-que 2pS-3sO-take-fut-pl we will deliver her ourselves with a message. You will not take her.”

26. vicazque yz ca yc oquimonavatilli alldes yū mayordomo yz889 ca yc o-qui-monavatil-li alcalde-s y-u-an mayordomo here is what pret-3pO.3pR-order-app alcalde-pl 3sP-and mayordomo That is what they ordered the alcaldes, the mayordomo of the

27. ospital yuā escriuano auh ynaxcā ya chicnavtonatiuh ospital y-huan escriuano auh yn axcan ya chincanhui-tonatiuh hospital 3sP-and notary prt prt now already nine-day hospital, and the notary. Now, after nine days

28. yno quimoca quilti motlanavatiltzin. amonelli quichiva yn o-qui-mo-caqui-lti mo-tlanavatil-tzin amo-nelli quichiva pret-3sO-R-listen-caus.pret 2sP-messenger-rev not-true 3sO-do since he heard your message, he truly did not do it,

29. amo quinel tillia. motlanavatiltzin auh yc oniquiçac onival amo quinel tillia mo-tlanahuatil-tzin auh yc o-ni-quiza-c890 not 3sO-carry.out 2sP-messenger-rev prt for.which.reason pret-1sS-leave-PA o-ni-val-cholo891 pret-1sS-dir.ven-flee.pret he did not carry out your message. For that reason, I left, I fled.

30. cholo axcā onihuala mixpātzincaxcā onihuala mixpātzinc o-ni-huala m-ixpantzin-co today pret-1sS-come 2sP-face-rel Today, I came before you.

888 Lockhart, 213. -cel. necessarily partially possessed indefinite pronoun. Someone alone, by oneself or itself, only, unique. can have a pl. celtin.

889 Lockhart, 222. iy. particle. here. rarer than nican.

890 Lockhart, 215. –co. present/past of the purposive motion form -quiuh/-co for motion in toward the point of reference. pl. –coh.

891 onibalcholo, choloa: ni, to flee, run away; to leap (Lockhart 2001: 215).
31. Nimitznotlatlauhtillico niquitlanico če motlanavatiltzin titechmomomaquiliz
Ni-mitz-no-tlatlauhti-lili-co ni-qui-tlan-co če mo-tlanahuatl-tzin
1sS-2sO-R-implore-app-rel 1sS-3sO-ask-relone 2sP-messenger-rev
ti-tech-mo-mo-maqui-li-z
2sS-1pO-R⁸⁹²-give-app-fut
I implore you, I request a decree. May you give it to us

32. momaquilliz ynic amoče⁹⁰ techmahuhtiz. amotech paçolloz. yni
yn-ic amo če-pa tech-mauhti-z amo tech-paçollo-z yn
prt-so,that neg one-for 1pO-frighten-fut neg 1pO-harass⁹⁰³-fut prt
so that he will not frighten us, he will not harass us in

33. chatzinco totlaçonātzin. caya titequipanova. oncā ospital
i-cha-tzin-co to-tlaço-nan-tzin ca-ya ti-tequipanohua
3sP-home-rev-rel 1pP-precious-mother-rev for-already 1pS-work
oncan hospital there hospital
the home of our precious mother for we have worked there in the Hospital,

Nahuatl: 1 back

34. yno ʰihuá če quitenantzitzihuá ca ya mochi⁹⁴ momauhtia
yn ... cequi te-nan⁹⁴-tzi-tzi-huan ca-ya⁹⁵ mochitín mo-mauhtía
prt ... some humI-mother-redup-pl-pl be-imp all 2sP-frighten
... some of the grandmothers were being frightened, they

35. acmo oncate čā ya campanemi. quimacaçi Justiçia
acmo oncate čā ya campa noemi qui-macaçi Justiçia
no longer have only already from.where live 3sO-fear Justiçia
are no longer living there [because] they fear him. Justiçia,

36. ma čenca xitechmopalehuilli. ma xicmotlacahualtilli yca
ma čenca xi-tech-mo-palehu-i-lili ma xi-c-mo-tlacahualti⁹⁶-lia y-ca
may very 2sO-1pO-R-help-fut may 2sO-3sO-2sR-impede-app 3sP-rel
may you greatly help us, may you grant by

---

⁸⁹² The second -mo- might be a mistake.


⁹⁴ Ofelia Cruz Morales from Tecomate, Veracruz told me that tenantzin means “abuelita” in the Huasteca-
Veracruzana variant of Nahuatl. Skype lesson on August 29, 2011. Also, the notary of “1653 Amatitlan” has yhuán
tinantzitzihua capitanas ypan altipetl amatitlan (and the captain-grandmothers of Amatitlan) in a similar context.

⁹⁵ caya: Past form of ca. Lockhart, 64.

⁹⁶ Francis Karttunen (1985: 251) writes that tlacahualtia means impede. Cortés y Zedeño (1765: ) defines tacahualtia
37. mo tlanavatiltzin ma tech cavaz  
mo-tlanahuatil-tzin ma tech-cava-s  
2sP-messenger-rev may 1pO-leave-fut  
your order that he leave us.

38. [space]

39. teoyotica tinotlatocauh yntla tinechmocnoytilliz yntla tinech  
teoyotica ti-no-latocauh yntla ti-nech-mocnoyi-lli-z  
yn-tla  
sacred  
2sS-1sP-ruler if  
2sS-1sO-2sR.take.pity-app-FUT  
prt-if  
ti-nech-mo-maqui-lli-z  
2sS-1sO-R-give-app-fut  
You are my sacred ruler. If you will take pity on me. If you

40. momaquilliz motlanavatiltzin. ma ytech mocahuilliz yno  
omo-tlanavatiltzin ma y-tech997 ti-c-mo-cahui-lli-z  
yo  
2sP-message may 3sP-joined.to  
2sS-3sO-R-leave-app-fut  
prt  
no-tlaço-teopixca-tzin  
1sP-respected-priest-rev  
give me your message, then may you leave it [message] with

41. tlacoteopixcatzin. noguardian. ynic yevatl quimonavati  
no-guardian yn-ic yehua-tl  
qui-mo-navati998-lli-z  
1sP-guardian  
prt-so.that  
3s.pron 3sS-R-to.give.orders.to-app-fut  
my respected and precious priest, my guardian, so that he will give orders to

42. illiz yhuā quipohuilliz motlanavatiltzin yn Sñor allde  
y-hua  
qui-pohui-lli-z  
mo-tlanavatil999-tzin  
yn  
Sñor allde  
3sP-and.also  
3sS-read-app-fut  
2sS-order-rev  
prt  
Señor Alcalde  
read your order for the lord alcalde

43. mayor yxquich ye mixpātzco nimitznotlatlauhtillico  
mayor yxquich yc m-iixpan-tzinco ni-mitz-no-tlatlauhti-lli-co  
mayor everything when 2sP-face-loc  
1sS-2sO-R-implore-app-rel  
mayor. All that I implore before you.

44. ma ttodios mitzmotlaçoca pilli yua çihuapilli S¹a. Mª  
ma [nues]tro Dios mitz-mo-tlaco-ca pilli i-hua çihuapilli  
Santa Maria  
Let our God 2sO-R-love-pl  
lord 3sP-and lady-abs  
Santa Maria  
May our lord God, the child, and the lady Santa Maria love you.

---

997 *tech:* relational word. joined to, next to; used as a general connector in verbal idioms with greatly varying translations depending on the verb (Lockhart 2001: 232).

998 Lockhart, 226. *nahuatia* (1). *nic.* advise. notify someone, give instructions or orders to someone, take one’s leave of someone. Class 3: *onicnahuatih.* apparently not based on *nahuati.* Karttunen (1985: 157) writes that *nahuatia* means to give orders to.

999 *motlanavatiltzin, tanahuatilizti:* Requerimiento (Cortés y Zedeño 1765: 113). Refer to the previous foonote as well.
onitlacuillo notoca
pret-IsS-wrote 1sP-name
I wrote and my name is:

(signature) Maria Magdalena [signature]
Maria Magdalena.

Nahuatl: 2 back
quimoceliliz peticiō
peticiō
May the petition be accepted by

teoyo tica tlato huani
Holy-lord.

sñor provisor
Lord provisor

Spanish: 1 back
__maria magdalena natural y vezina [different writer]
del pueblo de la magdalena provincia de la
provincia de ytzatlan dize por esta peticion
en la eleccion q se hizo de mayordomos
del hospital de su pueblo la eligeron
pr tenantzi y q sin causa ni telito que
lo viese cometido el alcalde mayor la saco
y dio a un don Sebastian q[ue] reside en
el pueblo de ytzatlan sacándola del dho
hospital donde estaba sirviendo y
de su pueblo y casa sin causa solo por
decir q seria bien. y q los dias pasa [-]
dos sobre esta causa los prior y ma [-]
yordomos del ospital del dho puo de

Spanish: 2 front
la madalena paresieran ante Utn
y se les libio mandamiento de an
paro el qual vin mando q[ue] no sele
hijiese vejacion sino se le anparase
el qual no an querido, obedecer
6. antes de nuevo la persiguen por lo qual
7. se ausento y bien ante mi a pedir
8. fabor que le dexen en el serbicio del
9. d[ic]ho ospital donde fue elegida por
10. tenantzi y q si tubiese algun peca
11. cada entones le castiguen con
12. forme la peticion. ---mo Lopes
13. [space]
14. [space]
15. [note in different handwriting will follow as soon as I can transcribe it]
16. [note in different handwriting will follow as soon as I can transcribe it]

1649a Tzacamota

Page one front
1. ___
2. ma totecuiyo Dios amitzmopieli Señor vispo
   ma to-tecuio Dios amitzi-mo-pie-li-Señor vispo
   may 1pP-lord God 2sO-2sR-protect-app-irr.lord bishop
   May our lord God protect you lord bishop
3. yhu nomahuiztazopilitzin tlatoan Rei yhuān oce
   yhun no-mahuiz-tazo-pili-tzin tlatoan Rei y-huan occequin-tin
   and 1sP-revere-precious-child-rev ruler king 3sP-and other-pl
   and my revered precious child, ruler, king, and other
4. quinti tlatoqui ma totecui Dios amitzimotla
   tlato-qui ma to-tecu Dios amitzi-mo-tlaço-ca-pie-li
   lords-pl may 1pP-lord God 2sO-2sR-love-lig-keep-app
   lords. May our lord God protect you with his love

---

Nayari has a peculiar way of writing ui because he writes u and dots the leftmost line.

Nayari is using amitz (2sO) instead of the more common mitz (2sO). Perhaps, he is combining am (2sS) form together with mitz (2sO).

Nayari is using vispo for obispo. Refer also to lines 20 and 25 in this document, and to his other two letters: “1649b Tzacamota by Don Francisco Nayari” and “1649c by Don Francisco Nayari.”

The overbar over the “u” of yū resembles a “c”.

nomahuiztazopilitzin, tlaçotli: a precious thing, most often seen combined with nouns to mean dear, precious, and when it is possessed, it can mean a person beloved by someone (Lockhart 2001: 236). tazoctalizti: Amor (Cortés y Zedeño 1765: 58).

Nayari writes amitzi- (2sO) here instead of mitz-. Refer to line 2.
5.  ço ca piel miyexuiti
   miyexu"ti" many.year-abs
   for many years.

6.  yhūan neguati notoca Don Frn"co nayari
   Don Francisco Nayari
   And my name is Don Francisco Nayari.

7.  Our lord God gave me all my children, and
   I am healthy, and you may thus make it known.

9.  Nayari appears to have written nivnica instead of ni-\textit{ona} (1sS-be). He does the same in a number of other lines including 11 and 14.

---

906 Nayari unites \textit{miyex xihuitl} (many years) into \textit{miyexuiti}.
908 Nayari again uses a non-standard prefix \textit{nehi-} instead of the more common \textit{nech} (1sO).
909 Nayari writes \textit{nochi} instead of \textit{mochi} (all).
910 \textit{nopiligua, huān}: possessive pl. nominal suffix (Lockhart 2001: 217).
911 \textit{xncchivalimatica} The meaning makes some sense, but the morphemes and orthography are odd.
912 Nayari appears to be using a- to signal \textit{amu\text{\‘}an}, the second person plural prefix.
913 Nayari appears to have written \textit{nivnica} instead of \textit{ni-\textit{ona}} (1sS-be). He does the same in a number of other lines including 11 and 14.
11. nichristiano nica nivnca quenami vnixtlali
   ni-christiano ni-vnca quenami v-nix\textsuperscript{914}.
   1sS-Christian 1sS-be how pret-1sO-install
   a Christian that

12. Rei yhuan quenami vnichilihui marques tlatoani
   Rei y-huan quenami v-nich\textsuperscript{915}.
   3sP-and how pret-1sO-tell Marques ruler
   the king installed, and how the Marques ruler told me

13. ypapa amonimonelos ynahuaca tepeuani vnichiliu
   y-papa amo ni-mo-neloo\textsuperscript{916}.
   3sP-so.that neg 1sS-1sR-associate-irr 3sP-with Tepehuanos pret-1sO-tell
   that I should not mix with the Tepehuanos. That is what the ruling marques told me.

14. tlatoan marques axca nimatitica nivnica tevqui totlatoa\textsuperscript{918}.
   marques axca ni-mati-ti-ca ni-vnica tevqui to\textsuperscript{918}.
   1sS-know-lig-be 1sS-be lord 1pP-ruler
   Now, I know how I am truly the lord ruler,

15. milava ca amo pielu nimoneloa san noyoqui nechicocolia
   milava ca amo ni-mo-neloa san noyoqui nech\textsuperscript{919}.
   truly prt neg 1sS-1sR-mix thus just 1sO-hate
   and I do not mix with them. Thus, the Tepehuanes just hate me.

\textsuperscript{914} Nayari appears to have written \textit{nix} instead of \textit{nech} (1sO).

\textsuperscript{915} Nayari appears to have written \textit{nich} instead of \textit{nech} (1sO), which he repeats in line 13.

\textsuperscript{916} The sense of \textit{nimonelos} is associate. Cortés y Zedeño (1765: 64) defined \textit{neloa} as, “Batir, rebolverse, mesclar, juntar” (Beat, mix, or join); whereas (Molina 2001: 66) writes, “remar, mecer o batir algo” (row, rock, or beat). Therefore, the sense is to mix or join something of a smaller quantity to something of a larger quantity, and associate makes the most sense in English when referring to people.

\textsuperscript{917} In Northwestern New Spain, \textit{-nahuac} means “with” for animates. Cortés y Zedeño (1765: 71) writes, “Con, preposición de ablativo: Ica, 1. inahuac, para animados el Segundo.” He also has “contigo: adverbio, monahuac” (Cortés y Zedeño 1765: 72).

\textsuperscript{918} Nayari writes \textit{tolatoā} (we are the ruler) instead of \textit{nitlatoani} (I am the ruler), which is probably a mistake.

\textsuperscript{919} Nayari writes \textit{nechi} instead of the more common \textit{nech} (1sO). Refer also to \textit{tinechitla} in line 21, \textit{tinechitlazotaz} in line 22, and \textit{tinechipaleuiz} in line 25.
16. Tepehuanes truly scoundrel neg 1sS-1sR-mix 3pP. with Truly, they are scoundrels, and I do not mix with them.

17. I am Cora. My children are all the

18. I am Cora. My children are all the

19. You should know

20. lord bishop, and [so should] the King there in Spain. It will be read

21. before you so you will be happy, and you will always love me, and

22. you will love me a lot. Now, I relate to you my words so

---

920 Lockhart (2001: 236) defines a variant form, tlahuēlīlōc, as scoundrel, rogue, bad person, or evildoer. Cortés y Zedeño (1765: 75, 77, 127) defines tahualiloc as demonio (demon) or diablo (devil), and tahualilo as vellaco (scoundrel).

921 Lockhart (2001: 242) defines yollo as mood or spirits, which is made clear in the translation.

922 It appears that Nayari wrote a type of couplet here in which he first uses the reduplication of tinechitlazotazotaz to signify duration followed by miyequi tinechitlazotaz to signify intensity. Cortés y Zedeño (1765: 58, 84) only presents love as a noun: tazoctalizti (love), tetozaotlizti (love), tazoctali (love), tazoctalizti (loving), tazozaotlizti de nomaxtiz (philosophy, love of learning). Guerra (1992: 38) simply takes the Central Mexican form tetlaçotlaliztli (love). Lockhart (2001: 236) defines tlaçotla as “love, esteem, or treat well.”
23. ticaquiz timoyolaliz yhua nimitzyolalia amo tenonotatlə
   ticaquí-z ti-mo-yolali-z y-hua ni-mitz-yolali-z amo ten你不念 no-tlatacoli
   2S.S.hear-irr 2S.S-2S.R-be.consoled 3S-P-and 1S.S-3S.O-console neg that 1sP-sin
   you will hear. You will be consoled, and I will console you that I have no sins.

24. coli quali nivnica
    quali ni-vnica
    good 1sS-be
   I am good.

25. Señor vispo hueli nimitztlatlautia tinechipaleuiz nicqui nei
    Señor vispo hueli ni-mitz-tlatlautia ti-nechi-paleuiz ni-cqui-neiqui
   Lord bishop int 1sS-2S.O-ask 2sS-1sO-help-irr 1sS-3sO-want
   Lord bishop I implore you to help me. I want

26. qui navatili yehua tivpoliui temaca ya marques ypapa
    navati-li yehua-ti v-poliu你不念 2S.S-1sO-ask 2sS-1sO-help-irr
    order-abs 3s.Pron-abs pret-lost give-imp marques 3sP-so
   the order. It was lost. The Marques gave it so

27. mopiaz ypa alitepet tzacamota noalitepeu
    mo-pia-z y-pa alitepe-t tzacamota no-alitepeu
    3sR-possess-irr 3sP-for community-abs Tzacamota 1sP-community-rel
   it could it be possessed by the community of Tzacamota, my community.

28. no piaz amati yni nic qui ne qui
    no你不念 3sP-1sS-be 1sS-3sO-want
    1pR-guard-irr paper-abs prt.dem 1sS-3sO-want
   I will guard the paper that I desire.

Page one back
29. yhuān nimtztetlanilia notlanavatili mopoa metzti
    y-huan ni-mitz-tetlanilia 不不念 no-tlanavatili mo-poa metzti
    3sP-and 1sS-2sO-send-app 1sP-message.abs 3sR-count month
   And, I send a message for you. My request will be read. The month is May. [and]

---

923 Nayari appears to write ten instead of tein or len which Lockhart (2001: 239) defines as what or that which.

924 Cortés y Zedeño (1765: 106) defines perderse (to get lost) as polihuia.

925 The use of nopiaz is a mistake. The three grammatical possibilities are nicpiaz (I will guard it), ninopiaz (it will be guarded by me), or mopiaz (it will be guarded).

926 nimitztetlanilia, titlan: nic; to send (messages, people on errands); in a Florentine Codex passage, apparently to use and even to expose something to (Lockhart 2001: 235). Possible example of barred i.
Sp: page 4 verso
Line Gloss and translation
1. Carta escrita en lengua Mexicana, al Yffino S[anto] [adresse] Joan Ruis, Colmenero, Dignissimo Obpo de la
2. Sta Yglesia Cathedral de Guadalaxara, Por D. Franco.
3. Nayari, Indio = tradusida como suena =
4. nuestro señor guarde y de muchos días de vida en que se gozen. (Año de 1649)
5. Señor Obispo, Dios nuestro Señor tenga
6. mismo famoso hijo del Rei a quienes Dios guarde muchos
7. años=
8. Y yo que me llamo D. Franco Nayari digo pa q asido Dios servido
9. de darme salud, y a todos mis subditos qu[e] se hallan con ella=
10. Y también as de saber como estoy en el estado de Christiano
11. conforme me puso el Rei, y como me lo dijo aquel Sr Marques
12. para que no me rebolbiese con los Tepeguanes=
13. Sr Marques e sabido que se dice que los mios Los Comunican
14. la verdad es que tal no pasa ni comunico eso qte, si no que estandome
15. quieto ellos me andan a buscar qe de verdad son
16. malos los Tepeguanes, y yo si de los Coras, y los demás mis
17. subditos, los Guasamotas, Coras, Ayotuspas, y Guaxicoras están
18. y quiénes estoy qui lo sepas=
19. Sr. Obpo y también el Rei qe esta en españa, lease este papel
20. en vra Presencia, para que vro corason se quiete, y me quera
21. mucho como yo os quiero, y ahora os digo lo que siento pa que
22. lo sepa y os holguéis y holgarme yo de que no tengo pecado
23. sino que estoy como me avéis puesto=
24. Sr Obpo mucho y con su mision te pido que nos ayudes, en qe
25. se nos embie orden de lo que devemos haser pa que se guarde
26. en el Pueblo, por que la que nos dio El Marques se nos a perdido
27. y deseamos ten ella y este es nro yntento=
28. y también te digo que ynbio este papel y razon qdo le cuentan
29. quinse del mes de Mayo = aquí a caba el un papel =

927 Because of the contest, I have translated nemi as a present perfect form even though it is written as a present tense.
1654 San Martin by Diego Juan, translated by Ricardo García and edited by Kevin Terraciano, Celso Mendoza, León García Galagarza, and Juan Pablo Morales Garza

Page 1 left: Nahuatl and some Spanish

1. Guadalaxa 26 de Mayo 1654
2. Remitese a el Sr canonigo
3. casillas para que la interpre[te]
4. te así lo proveyo yo Su SSa=el B[achille]r [Ju]an Gallardo

1. +
2. ma yecenhualo yn Santis moSacramento
   ma yecenhua-lo yn Santismo Sacramen
to
   may praise-pass prt Holy Sacramen
to

May the Holy Sacrament,

3. yhuan yni chipahualiz yn concepcion
   y-huan yn i-chipahualiz yn concepcion
   3sP-and prt 3sP-immaculate prt Conception

and the Immaculate Conception be praised.

4. y tehuantin timomaçehuatl huan Senyor obizpu mixpantzino timo
   tehuantin ti-mo-maçehuatl928-huan Senyor obizpu m-ixpantzinco929 ti-mo-pechteca-
   co
   1p.pron 1pS-2sP-servant-pl lord bishop 2sP-presence 1pS-1pR-bow.down-rel
   We are your servants, lord bishop. We bow down before you,

5. pechtecaco ticmotinamiquilico momatzin Senyor ma dios es
   ti-c-mo-tinamiquli-co mo-ma-tzin Senyor ma dios espiritu
   1pS-3sO-kiss-rel 2sP-hand-rev lord may God spirit
   we kiss your hands, lord. May God the Holy Spirit

6. pirito Santo moyetzties monahuac mochipacamicac cenca mi
   Santo mo-yetzties monahuac930 mochipa ce micac cenca miyec
   holy 3sR-be with.you always always int int
   be with you always and forever. We

7. yec timotlauhtia monahuac timochintin altepehuaque Samâtin
   ti-mo-tlahtia monahuac ti-mo-chintin altepehuaque Sa mantin
   1pS-1pR-implore with.you 1pS-1pR-all resident.pl San Martin
   the residents of San Martin, beseech you.

928 Diego Juan uses –tl in syllable final position in timomaçehuatl huan. Bishop Juan Ruiz Colmenero (apud Santoscoy 1986: 1050) visited San Martin in 1648 or 1649 and wrote that it was populated by Cocos, a non-
Nahua group.

929 Diego Juan uses mixpantzinco instead of moixpantzinco, which other writers use.

930 monahuac, monahuac: adverbio, contigo (Cortés y Zedeño 1765: 72).
On behalf of God, may you help us concerning our [officials of the] cabecera because, by their

9. huantin yntencopa otechtolini Senyor alcalde mayor axcan ti

yn-tencopa o-tech-tolini Senyor alcalde mayor axcan ti-qu-itohua
3pP-by.order.of pret-1pO-afflict lord alcalde major now 1pS-3sO-say
order, the lord alcalde mayor has afflicted us. Now, we the residents of

tohua timochintin altepehuaque Sa martin ma ypampa dios titech

ti-mochin-tin altepehuaque Sa martin ma y-pampa dios
1pS-all-pl resident.pl San Martin may 3sP-for God
ti\textsuperscript{132}.tech-mo-maqui-li-z
2sS-1pO-2sR-give-app-fut
San Martin say, for God's sake, may you give us

11. momaquiliz ce teyopixque glerigo yehuatl mochiuh tobicario

ce teyopixque glerigo yehua-tl mo-chiu\textsuperscript{33} to-bicario
one priest cleric 3s.pron-abs 3sR-become 1sP-vicar
a priest to be our vicar.

amo ticnequilo tipuhuizque cocolan ypampa yehuantin mochipa

amo ti-c-nequi-lo ti-puhui\textsuperscript{34}-z-que cocolan y-pampa yehuantin mochipa
neg 1pS-3sO-want-pl 1pS-belong-fut-pl Cocula 3sP-because 3p.pron always
We do not want to belong to Cocula because they have

\textsuperscript{931} Diego Juan pluralizes cabeceras here, and Celso proposes that it is probably because the notary is referring to the two officials of the cabecera because this notary also uses quim, the third-person-plural object to refer to the cabecera in line 36, footnote 31.

\textsuperscript{932} Carochi (2001: 106-107) writes that the addition of mā to the future of the indicative yields the imperative future in a phrase such as, “Mā titlapōhuaz, leas tu despues,” which may mirror Diego Juan’s, ma...titechmomaquilis. Carochi (2001: 106) adds that it is common for the temporal adverb quin (later) to be added, “māquintitlapōhuaz, leas tu despues.”

\textsuperscript{933} Mochiuh is literally “was made,” of “he made himself.” Celso opines that mochiuh has become lexicalized. Refer to footnote 1.

\textsuperscript{934} Lockhart (2003: 230) writes that -tech is needed to convey the sense of to belong to, but Diego Juan does not use -tech.
13. techcocoliticate ypan alçı amo tlen ypan tec hytalo yhuan ticmatiz
   tech-cocoli\textsuperscript{935}-ti-ca-te y-pan \textsuperscript{936}alçı\textsuperscript{937} amo tlen y-pan tech-cta-lo y-huan
   1pO-hate-lig-be-pl 3sP-rel arrive neg what 3sP-for 1pO-see-pl 3sP-and
   ti-c-mati-z\textsuperscript{938}
   1pS-3sO-know-fut

hated us from the beginning; they completely disrespect\textsuperscript{939} us. May you know

14. melahuac ca hue ca ticate omealhua yhuan tlaco asta cocolan yahuel
   melahuac ca hueca ti-ca-te ome lehua y-huan tlaco asta cocolan ya huel
ture that distant 1pS-be-pl two legua 3sP-and half to Cocula already int
   truly that we are distant. It is two and a half leagues to Cocula. We have been

15. miyec timotolin ticate yca tequitl ma nel yuhqui amo quipualo yehuā
   miyec ti-motolin-ti-ca\textsuperscript{940} te y-ca tequi-tl ma nel yuhqui\textsuperscript{941}
   int 1pS-afflict-lig-be-pl 3sP-with work-abs although
   amo qui-pua-lo\textsuperscript{942} yehuantin

\textsuperscript{935} techcocoliticate, cocolia: to hate someone or wish someone ill (Lockhart 2001: 215).
\textsuperscript{936} Although writers of Central Mexican nahuatl use different possessive prefixes to precede -pan, every
   writer from Ávalos uses i-/y- (3sP) except for the Franciscan Friar Francisco de Torres who uses in-.
   It appears to have become lexicalized. Refer to footnote one.
\textsuperscript{937} Lockhart (2001: 210) writes that pan aheci means to find a person or thing there on one’s arrival.
   This phrase is not in the past, but it conveys a past sense.
\textsuperscript{938} The -z morpheme appears to act in a similar way to the optative here because it signals a condition
   that has not happened and is either desired, wished, or yet to happen. I judge it to function in a similar way
   to the model verbs in English, which fulfill similar functions.
\textsuperscript{939} The expression amo tlen ypan techytalo resembles other expressions that mean to care nothing such as
   ca tle ypa quita (they cared nothing for precious stones, feathers, or turquoise) in Lockhart (1993, 248),
   and the Huasteca Nahuatl expression axlen (it’s nothing) which is used after tlazcamati (thank-you).
   The Nahuatl dictionary (http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso ) has many other examples
   under the heading ipan quitta.
\textsuperscript{940} Lockhart (2001: 64) writes, “ca is also formally preterit, but it is harder to recognize as such and adds
   that the lost present must have been cati, class 2. Its preterit must have been cat singular, catque plural, although
   in addition to cat there was a variant with the archaic singular -qui, catqui, which still exists in some frozen
   phrases (iz catqui, “here is,” is the most common). As Nahuatl will not long tolerate a final t, cat became ca(h) in
   the same way that the preterit of mati, “to know,” mat, became ma(h). The t of the plural, protected by a suffix,
   survived, but perhaps because of the ultra-frequency of the word, the consonant of the suffix was lost, so that instead
   of catque we now see cate. Starting with cat as the preterit stem, the pluperfect catca is regular, and it is used as a
   preterit/imperfect.”
\textsuperscript{941} Refer to the Nahuatl Dictionary at http://whp.uoregon.edu/dictionaries/nahuatl/index.lasso .
\textsuperscript{942} In this case, the -lo appears to be the passive because it refers to tribute. Lockhart (2001: 223) notes that
   -lō has a long vowel while Carochi (2001: 124) writes it with a regular vowel in the present tense, nipōhualo,
   but with a long vowel in the singular forms of the imperfect, pluperfect, and future aspects. Diego Juan does not mark
The alcalde of Cocula said that, reportedly, we are not doing anything, we are only enjoying ourselves.

Here, ruler, you will see and read how much we give to the cabecera.

The alms to our guardians are:

- We give a cart of wood every week.
- Two carts of hay every week.
- Fish every week.

Vowel length in this petition so -lo (passive) resembles the -lo suffix that signals a plural subject prefix in a verb. Simeon (1988: 388) has poualo as leerse or contarse and describes it as passive or impersonal.

---

943 This could refer to yn quexquich (all).

944 Cortes y Zedeno (1765: 74) writes “Maca, 1. temaca” as definitions for dar (to give) and in “1653 San Martín,” Diego Juan uses ticmaca when listing the tribute that San Martín is giving.

945 The notary appears to be combining the second syllable of çeçe (every) with the first syllable of semana (week) for cecemana, which appears to have a distributive sense. Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart (1976: 175) also notice this in “1653 San Martín.” Refer to footnote one.

946 There is a small fold in this portion that may hide a portion of the te.
We give fish every week_____________________________alms.

22. tlaxcali ome tonali titemacalo chiquacempuali________________limosna
tortilla two day.abs 1pS-give-pl six.twenty.abs alms
y [Each] two days, we give 120 tortillas____________________________alms.

23. mochipa ypan chicomote yhuan ome totolin________________limosna
tortilla two day.abs 3pS-give six.twenty.abs alms
totolin every seven days...and two turkeys____________________________alms.

24. totoltaçempuali momaca axcan quaresma________________________limosna
egg-pl one.twenty 3sP-give during lent alms
turtle.dove every.week 1pS-give-pl always alms
Twenty eggs are given during for Lent__________________________alms.

25. ortelan çeçemana titemacalo mochipa____________________________limosna
tortilla two day.abs 3sP-and two turkeys____________________________alms.

26. cabalyo pixqui çe cemana titemacalo mochipa________________________limosna
horse keeper every.week 1pS-give-pl always alms
We always give a horse-keeper every week____________________________alms.

27. altl para coniz tochtzin çeçemana yhuan nican tihuicalo tochan________________limosna
water-abs drinking 1pP-father.rev every.week 3sP-and here
tihuica-lo to-chan alms
1pS-bring-pl 1pP-home alms

---

947 The use of yhuan (and) and asço (if) do not fit the basic word order of Nahuatl in which particles generally precede a clause or phrase that they connect to another clause or phrase. Celso proposes that yhuan may follow a number that Diego Juan forgot to write. Refer to footnote one.

948 In many Nahua communities, totolin refers to turkeys.

949 Diego Juan dated this document to March 2, 1654, which falls around Lent.

950 hortelano: Diccionario de la lengua española, .

951 The best translation of cabalyo pixqui is probably a horse keeper, a person who is in charge of maintaining the horse.

952 Here, Diego Juan uses titemacalo to either mean that they give the horse keeper or give money to pay a horse keeper.

953 The phrase para coniz literally means to drink, but I’m glossing it as drinking.
We bring drinking water here from our home for our father every week______alms.

28. __yquac monequi bigas ompa compento titemacalo__________________limosna
   y-quac  mo-nequi   biga-s  ompa compento ti-temaca-lo limosna
   3sP-when  3sR-want  beam-pl  there  convent  1pS-give-pl  alms
   When wooden beams are needed there in the convent [of Cocula], we give them____alms.

29. __as çomonequi tablas titemacalo____________________________limosna
   asço  mo-nequi  tabla-s  ti-temaca-lo  limosna
   3sR-need  lumber-pl  1pS-give-pl  alms
   If needed, we give lumber_________________________alms.

30. __yquac monequi as ço ometlacatl tlapalehuia teyopan
   y-quac  mo-nequi  asço954  ome  tlaca-tl  tla-palehuia  teyopan
   3sP-when  3sR-need  if  two  person-abs  nhumIO-help  church
   Whenever needed, we give two people to help at the

31. compento titemacalo_______limosna
    compento  ti-temaca-lo  limosna
    convent  1pS-give-pl  alms
    convent. We give___________alms.

**Page 1 right: Nahuatl**

32. __yn tla monequi titlantli ynahuac toguardian titemacalo________________limosna
   yn-tla  mo-nequi  titlantli955  ynahuac  to-guardian  ti-temaca-lo  limosna
   3sP-if  3sR-need  messenger.abs  3sP-with  1pS-guardian  1pS-give-pl  alms
   If a messenger is needed, we give [one] to our guardian____________________alms.

33. __mochi yn quequich nican yquilotica huel melahuac yxpan
    mochí  yn  quequich  nican  yquilo956  ti-ca  huel  melahuac  yxpan
    all  prt  how  here  writing-lig-with-int  true  before
    Here all that is written here is very true. Before

34. dios amotiztlacatilo catitemacalo amotechtlaxtlahuilia
    dios  amo  t-iztlacati-lo  ca  ti-temaca-lo  amo  tech-tlaxtlahuia-lia
    God  neg  1pS-lie-pl  prt  1pS-give-pl  neg  1pO-nhumIO.compensate957-app
    God we do not lie, for we give and they do not compensate us for it.

954 The use of asço in the middle...
955 sv. titlantli: messenger (Karttunen, 241).
956 Here, the notary uses yquilo, the Italian qui /kwi/.
957 techtlaxtlahuilia, ixtlāhua: nic; to pay, pay back; Class 2, ōniquixtlāuh; it bears tla- object prefix much of the time (Lockhart 2001: 222).
35. ma nel yuhqui amo techtequipachoya tiquimpalehuiya yata toc
man el yuhqui amo tech-tequipacho-ya ti quin⁹⁸⁸-palehuia-ya to-cabeceras
although neg 1P-o-berth-imp 1P-3P-o-help-imp 1P-cabecera
We would help our cabecera as if it did not bother us.

36. beceras axcan ma dios quinmopieli ma yçeltin quite
axcan ma dios quin-mo-pie-li ma y-çeltin qui-tequipano-can
now may God 3S-o-3S-r-guard-app may 3S-p-themselves 3S-o-work-pl
Now, may God guard them, may the priest[s], the guardian[s] serve themselves.

37. quipanocan teyopixqui guardian axcan nican otimoçentlali
teyopixqui guardian axcan nican o-ti-mo-çentlali-que
priest guardian today here pret-1P-1P-r-gather.together-pl
Today, we have gathered here together,

38. que timochintin maçehuatltin yhuan huehuelque ma ypampa dios
ti-mochin-tin maçehuatl-tin y-huan huehue⁹⁵⁹-que ma y-pampa Dios
1P-o-all-pl commoner⁹⁶⁰-pl 3S-p-and elder-pl may 3S-o-because.of God
all of us, the commoners and the elders. On behalf of God,

39. ma titechmomaquilis ce teyopixqui glérico yehuatl
ma ti-tech-mo-maqui-li-s ce teyopixqui glérico yehua-tl
may 2S-o-1P-o-2S-r-give-app-con one priest cleric 3s-pron-abs
may you give us a priest who

40. mochihuas tobicario nican Sa martin yhuan axcan toguar
mo-chihua-s to-bicario nican Sa martín y-huan axcan to-guardian
3S-o-make-fut 1P-3P-vicar here San Martín 3S-p-and now 1P-guardian
will can become our vicar here in San Martín. And now, our guardian

41. dian huel moqualantia tonahuac ypampa nican quichihua misa totatzi bila
huel mo-qualan⁹⁶¹-tia to-nahua-c y-pampa nican qui-chihua
misa int 3S-o-be.angry-cau 1P-3S-with 3S-o-because here 3S-o-perform
mass
to-tatzi bilalobus
1P-father Villalobos
is angry with us because, here, our father Villalobos performs mass.

42. lobus quitohua quitzaquas teyopan yhuan mochi ornamento techquix
qu-ito-hua qui-tzaqua-s teyopan y-huan mochi ornamento tech-quixti-li-s

⁹⁸⁸ Here, the quim- appears to refer to the officials of the cabecera.

⁹⁵⁹ The notary here does not mention nobles, which is instructive and may represent an Indigenous group without less social stratification than Nahua groups from Central Mexico. Refer to Nahua after the conquest.

⁹⁶⁰ The word macehualli could refer to many peoples are using macehualli to refer to a commoner.

⁹⁶¹ Moqualantia is a reverential form.
3sO-say 3sO-lock.up-fut church 3sP-and all ornaments 1pO-take.away-fut He [guardian] says he will lock the church and will remove all of the [church] properties from us [and]

3sO-sO-spec write-3sP-3sP-take-fut 3sO-take-fut there Cocula neg 3sO-want here 3sO-perform-fut mass 1pP-father-rev he will take them to Cocula. He does not want our father

tilis quihuicas ompa cocolan amo quinequi nican quichihuas misa tota
qui-huica-s ompa cocolan amo qui-nequi nican qui-chihua962-s misa to-ta-tzin
3sO-take-fut there Cocula neg 3sO-want here 3sO-perform-fut mass 1pP-father-rev he will take them to Cocula. He does not want our father

43. tsin bilalopus mochipa tech ahu ypanpa yca ynon huel timotequipachoa
bilalopus mochipa tech-ahu[a]963 y-panpay-ca yn-on huel
Villalobos always 1pO-scold 3sP-because 3sP-with prt-that int
ti-mo-tequipachoa964
1-1pR-afflict
Villalobos to perform mass here. He always scolds us. Because of that we are greatly afflicted.

44. çaiizmera yao quihuica otechquixtili yca ynon huel timotequipachohua timo
crizmera965 ya o-qui-huica o-tech-quiixti-li yn-on huel
chrism.urn already pret-3sO-take pret-1pO-remove-app prt-dem int
ti-mo-tequipachohua ti-mochin-tin
1pS-1pR-afflict 1pS-all-pl
He has already taken the chrism urn; he took it away from us. Because of that all of us

45. chintin altepehuaque ya yxquich totlatol ma dios mitzmopieli tlatohuani
altepehua-que ya yxquich to-tlatol ma dios mitz-mo-pie-li tlatohuani
resident-pl already all 1pP-word may God 2sP-3sR-guard-app lord
residents of the altepetl are really afflicted. That is all we have to say. May God guard you lord.

46. otitlaquiloque axcan lunes çempuali 2 tonali março yhuan xiuitl 1654
o-ti-tlaquilo-que axcan lunes çem-puali 2 tonali março y-huan xiui-tl 1654
pret-1pS-write-pl now Monday one-twenty 2 day.abs March 3sP-and year-abs 1654
We wrote today, Monday, March 22, 1654.

47. ynic neltiz totlatol nican timofirmatia timochinti altepehuaque Sa mar[tin]
yn-ic neltiz to-tlatol nican ti-mo-firmatia ti-mochin-tin altepehuaque Sa Martin
prt-how true 1pP-word here 1pS-1pR-sign 1pS-all-pl resident.pl San Martin.
So that our words will be verified, here we sign. All of us residents of San Martin

48. tin mochintin omoçetlalique bernabe leantro
mochin-tin o-moçetlalique bernabe leantro
all-pl pret-3sR-gather-pl Bernabe Leandro
are gathered: Bernabe Leandro alcalde
alcalde Samartin
alcalde San Martin
of San Martin;

diego andres nicolas quitieres fra"miguel huehuetlaca
Diego Andres Nicolas Gutierrez Francisco Miguel elder-abs
Diego Andres regidor; Nicolas Gutierrez fiscal;966
regidor fiscal
regidor fiscal
Francisco Miguel elder;

Juan esteban Juan de la cruz Luyz basques Luyz martin Juan caspar
Juan Esteban Juan de la Cruz Luis Vazquez Luis Martin Juan Gaspar
Juan Esteban; Juan de la Cruz, Luis Vazquez,

tebe [See line above]

Francisco Marcos Alonzo Martin Francisco Sebastian Alonzo Reyes
Francisco Marcos, Alonzo Martin, Francisco Sebastian, Alonzo Reyes,

Juan danyel diego Juçepa diego Juan onitalaquilo yntencopa
Juan Daniel Diego Josepa Diego Juan pret-1Ss-write by.order.of
Juan Daniel, Diego Josepa. Diego Juan, I wrote by order of

mochintin altepehuaque
mochin-tin altepehua-que
all-pl resident-pl
all of the residents.

966 Refer to Gibson. According to Kevin, he is one of the most important people in the town.
Appendix C: Loan Words

Part 1: Tables of Christian Names in the Nahuatl Documents of Northwestern New Spain

Appendix C has tables with loan words from Spanish. The first part has five tables about Christian names in the Nahuatl documents of four regions of Northwestern New Spain. The first column contains the abbreviation of the province together with the name of the document [refer to Chapter 1]. The second column contains names of Indigenous persons, whereas the third column refers to Spaniards. The last column identifies the type of parish, if known, around the time when the document was written.

C-1: Coldlands: Minas de Chimaltitan (Chim), Juchipila (Ju), Lagos (La), El Gran Nayar (Nay), Nombre de Dios (Nom), Tachichilco (Ta), and Tequila (Te)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province and Document Name</th>
<th>Names of Indigenous persons</th>
<th>Names of Spaniards</th>
<th>Type of Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chim: 1580a Nochistlan</td>
<td>Juan Alonzo, Diego Cante, Pedro Sanchez, Pedro Garcia, Miguel Sanchez, Francisco Tepo, and Juan Solio</td>
<td>Francisco Hernandez</td>
<td>Franciscan doctrina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chim: 1580b Nochistlan</td>
<td>JA (see above), Juan Francisco, Pedro Tasual, Pedro Gaspar, Juan Julio, Cristobal Panen, Pablo Soli</td>
<td>Antonio de Medina,</td>
<td>Franciscan doctrina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chim: 1646 Tequepechpan</td>
<td>Agustin Lazaro, Pedro Miguel, Pedro Felipe, Francisco Daniel, Juan Lorenzo, Juan Miguel, Francisco Rafael (notary)</td>
<td>Antonio Gonzalez</td>
<td>Franciscan visita of Xalisco and/or Xala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chim: 1678 Santiago Pochotitlan</td>
<td>Francisco Martin, Sebastian, Juan Martin, Pedro Juantzin, Juan Lopez, Juan Jeronimo</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Franciscan visita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ju: 1652: S.F. Juchipila</td>
<td>Miguel Jose, Francisco Juan, Martin Jose, Francisco Estaban, Martin Felipe, Martin Gabriel, Juan Toribio, Juan Bautista, Juan Petres de Chavez, Juan Flores, and Juan Sebastian</td>
<td>Fray Bernabe</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La: 1683 San Gaspar Tlacintla</td>
<td>Pedro Gaspar, Francisco Martin, Nicolas Dionisio, and Nicolas Alonzo</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nay: 1649a Tzacamota</td>
<td>Don Francisco Nayari</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Franciscans from different cabeceras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nay: 1649b Tzacamota</td>
<td>Juan of El Nayar, DFN (as above)</td>
<td>Francisco, Don Diego Felipe</td>
<td>Franciscans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

967 Provinces changed over time, but this column contains information about the name of the province at the time the document was written.
C-2: Acaponeta et al: Acaponeta (Aca), Compostela (Comp), Izatlan (Iza), and Tala (Ta).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province and Document Name</th>
<th>Names of Indians</th>
<th>Names of Spaniards</th>
<th>Type of Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aca: 1652a S.A. Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>Elias Garcia, Gaspar Garcia, Elias de la Cruz, Melchor Hernandez, Sebastian Garcia, Juan Miguel, Lucas de la Cruz, Miguel Hernandez, Ambrosio Jimenes</td>
<td>Ponce de Leon,</td>
<td>Franciscan convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aca: 1652b S.A. Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>LdC, Bartolome Miguel, SG</td>
<td>Fray Juan Vizcarra,</td>
<td>Franciscan convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aca: 1652a S.S. Guaxicori</td>
<td>Simon Felipe, Mateo Juan, Zacarias, Lucas de la Cruz, Diegon Martin, Jacobo Garcia, Gabriel Miguel</td>
<td>Don Pedro de Zorita</td>
<td>Franciscan visita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aca: 1652b S.S. Guaxicori</td>
<td>LdC (above), Sebastian Garcia, Lucas de la Cruz</td>
<td>Juan Vizcarra</td>
<td>Franciscan visita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp: 1593a Xalisco</td>
<td>Don Juan Cristobal, Alonzo Abias, Tomas de Aquino, Gonzalo Juan, Andres Felipe</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp: 1593b Xalisco</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp: a.n.y. Xalisco, ca. 1593</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>fray Miguel de Lezo, fray Luis Menor</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp: 1594a Xalisco</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>fray Alonzo de Vilviesca, Fray Antonio de Roua</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

968 The notary writes that the petition is on behalf of the Totorames, a group that is possibly Tepehuano/Tepecano.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province and Document Name</th>
<th>Names of Indians</th>
<th>Names of Spaniards</th>
<th>Type of Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ame: 1649 S.A. Tuzcacuezco</td>
<td>Simeon Cardes, Francisco Hernandez, Juan Antonio, Juan Perez, Pablo Juachim</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Franciscan visita of Zapotitlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iza: 1593a Oconahuac</td>
<td>Alonzo Miguel, Pedro Rosas, Martin Mateo, Antonio Marcos, Francisco Zollenzo, Juan Mateo, Alonzo Santzin, Juan Mateo, Alonzo Simon, Hernando Benito, Alonzo Javier, Juan Bernabe, Francisco Simon, Gabriel Melchor, Juan Mateo, Juan Garcia, Pedro Miguel, Don Antonio, Pedro Felipe, Juan Garcia, Don Pedro Juan Martin</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iza: 1593b Oconahuac</td>
<td>Pedro Juantzin,</td>
<td>Fray Alonzo, Fray Antonio, Fray Diego Zatlanono, Fray Luis Navarro, Fray Martin de Aguayo, Fray Francisco, Fray Miguel, Fray Juan de Ableco</td>
<td>Franciscan visita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iza: 1593c Oconahuac</td>
<td>Pedro Martin, AM (above), Pedro Lucas, Hernando Rafael, JM (above), Francisco Lorenzo, Tomas Marcos, JG (above), Antonio Lorenzo, Francisco Mateo, Hernando Sebastian</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Franciscan visita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iza: 1622 S.Ma Magdalena</td>
<td>Maria Magdalena,</td>
<td>Don Sebastian,</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iza: 1649a S.Ma Magdalena</td>
<td>Juan Bautista, Francisco Lucas, Francisco Simon, Andres Miguel</td>
<td>Martin de Agiazca</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iza: 1649b S.Ma Magdalena</td>
<td>JB, Lucas Miguel, FS, AM</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iza: 1649 S. F. Ayahualulco</td>
<td>Not finished</td>
<td>Not finished</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iza: 1661 Etzatlan</td>
<td>Diego Felipe, Francisco Luis, Juan Perez, Juan Marcos, Giuseppe Lorenzo, Juan Miguel, Diego Felipe, Bernardino Esteban</td>
<td>Fray Diego Rodriguez,</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta: 1600 Tala</td>
<td>Juan Felipe, Juan Gonzalez, Francisco Jeronimo, Francisco Felipe, Francisco Anbrinan, and Francisco Martin</td>
<td>Don Fernando, Jeronimo de Ortega,</td>
<td>Before 1605, it had a beneficiado priest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-3: Ameca et al: Ameca (Ame), Amula (Amu), Cajititlan (Caj), Colima (Col), Guadalajara (Guad), Poncitlan (Pon), Tala, and Tlajomulco (Tlaj).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Names and Notes</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amu: 1649 Tachichilco</td>
<td>Francisco Martin, Juan Bonifacio, Francisco Felipe, Juan Zacarias, Diego Felipe, Juan Miguel</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Secular parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caj: 1644 Cajititlan</td>
<td>Baltasar Sebastian, Francisco de la Cruz, Francisco Marcos/Martin, Pedro Simon, Francisco Sebastian (notary), Pedro Jeronimo, Juan Miguel</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera in Tlajomulco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col: 1622 Cohuatlan</td>
<td>Sebastian Juan Martin, Francisco Cuevas, Pedro Puy (notary), Francisco Mateo</td>
<td>Pedro Zolorzano, Juan Alonzo Lezo, Benito Pereyra,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col: 1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td>Juan Agustin, Francisco Mateo, Juan Cristobal, Miguel Daniel, Miguel Jeronimo, Juan Agustin, Miguel Francisco, Martin Jimenez, Lucas Lopez, Juan Cruz (notary),</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guad: 1656 Tonala</td>
<td>Pedro Gaspar, Pedro Gaspar, Juan Baltasar, Juan Felipe, Francisco Miguel, Juan Miguel, Antonio Lorenzo, Francisco Pedro, Juan Felipe, Francisco Simeon, Francisco Martin, Francisco Zacarias, Francisco Miguel, Juan Felipe, Francisco Baltasar, Juan de Chavez, Felipe Juan Martin, Domingo de Ramos (notary)</td>
<td>fray Nicolas de Zuñiga, fray Manuel,</td>
<td>Augustinian cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guad: 1657 Tonala</td>
<td>Francisco Melchor, Juan Bernabe, Gregorio de Sandoval,</td>
<td>provisor Don Baltasar de la Peña y Medina,</td>
<td>Augustinian cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaj: 1630 Tlajomulco</td>
<td>Simon Agustin, Francisco Agustin, Pedro Lorenzo, Francisco Felipe, Miguel, Pedro Juantzin, Diego Martin, Don Pedro Luis, Diego Felipe, Gaspar Jimenez, Miguel Gregorio, Don Juan Vazquez, Gaspar Lorenzo, Francisco Miguel</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaj: n.y. Tlajomulco</td>
<td>PL (above), GJ, Francisco Fernandez, Pedro Fabian, Simon Gaspar, Alonzo Sebastian, Cristobal Esteban, MG, FF, Alonzo Miguel, DF, JV, FA, Pedro Felipe, SA, Juan Gonzalo</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaj: n.y. S. Cacel Tlajomulco</td>
<td>Miguel Gabriel, Juan Antonio, Blas Fabian, Alonzo Martin</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Franciscan visita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province and Document Name</td>
<td>Names of Indians</td>
<td>Names of Spaniards</td>
<td>Type of Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626 San Francisco Chapalac</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>fray Joseph Lopez de Carpio, fray Francisco de Torres</td>
<td>Franciscan cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629 San Francisco Zacoalco by Juan Fabian</td>
<td>Juan Diego, Juan Fabian (notary), Pedro Leon, Juan Ciprian, Juan Agustín, Juan Miguel, Juan Baltasar, Pedro Juan, Magdalena Barbola, Baltasar Lorenzo, Pedro Mendoza, Mariana</td>
<td>fray Melchor, fray Andres Meriena,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653 Amatitlán</td>
<td>Francisco de Santiago Tejedor, Miguel Ángel, Juan Cruz, Miguel Agustín, Juan Pablo</td>
<td>Don Giuseppe D’Abalos, Don Lucas Canbiros, Pedro Sarmiento, Don Jeronimo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653 San Martin</td>
<td>Luis Vasquez, Juan Guerra, Juan Sebastián, Juan de la Cruz, Francisco Miguel, Juan Estevan, Juan Agustín, Bernabe Leandro, Francisco Sebastian, Luis Martín, Pedro Jeronimo, Diego Juan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Sujeto of the Franciscan cabecera of Cocula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654 San Martin</td>
<td>Diego Andres, Nicolas Gutierrez, Juan Gaspar, Francisco Marcos, Alonzo Martin, Alonzo Reyes, Juan Daniel, Diego Giuseppe, Villalobos,</td>
<td>Villalobos,</td>
<td>Sujeto of the Franciscan cabecera of Cocula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658 San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>Juan Agustín, Fabian Jeronimo, Francisco Jacobo, Diego Juan, Gaspar Torres, Antonio Cristobal, Juan Sebastián (notary)</td>
<td>Fray Esteban Velasco,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>Juan Antonio, Juan Jacobo, Francisco Sebastian, Francisco Gaspar, Francisco Esteban, Pedro Diego, Miguel Gregorio, Juan Gabriel, Francisco Diego, Martin Sebastian, Miguel Ángel, Domingo Hernandez, Pedro Miguel, Diego Felipe (notary)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668 San Francisco Zacoalco</td>
<td>Alonzo Felipe, Pedro Juan</td>
<td>Fray Diego Servantes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669 Sta. Ma. Magdalena Tizapan</td>
<td>Juan Alonzo, Sebastian Gabriel, Juan Felipe, Diego Martín, Francisco Miguel</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673 San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>Juan Nicholas, Melchor, Briseño, Diego Jacobo</td>
<td>Fray Alonzo Duran, Don Giuseppe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679 Sayula</td>
<td>Francisco Diego, Nicolas Hernandez, Juan Sebastian, Sebastian Lorenzo, Diego Sebastian, Gaspar Sebastian, Francisco Gaspar, Diego Felipe, Miguel Andres, Pedro Sanchez, Domingo Santiago, Diego Juan, Esteban Francisco, Agustín Francisco, Juan Martín, Sebastian</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>First Name and/or Middle Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>S. Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>Pablo, Tomas Hernandez, Pedro Juan, and Francisco Miguel.</td>
<td>Fray Juan Pablo, lietenant Esteban Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>San Pedrotepec</td>
<td>Felipe Alonzo, Juan Ambrosio, Juan Martin, Pascual Miguel, Antonio Jimenez, Pedro Felipe, Francisco Esteban, Francisco Felipe, Juan Pascual, Juan Baltasar, Francisco Felipe, Felipe Juan, Juan Francisco, Juan Miguel, Antonio Miguel, Mateo Rodriguez,</td>
<td>Agustin Alcala, Nicolas Michele,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>Juan Hernandez, Diego Gomez</td>
<td>Lord Ahumada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>San Andres Atotonilco</td>
<td>Francisco Jeronimo, Diego Lorenzo, Diego Sebastian, Francisco Martin, Juan Francisco, Hernando Miguel, Juan J³º, Miguel Baltasar, Miguel Angel, Miguel Baltasar, Juan Cristobal, Diego Lucas</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>Luis Sebastian, Diego Gomez, Jose Motete</td>
<td>Don Gregorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>S. Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>Diego Vasquez, Tomas Miguel Mateo Rodriguez, Francisco Miguel, Gregorio de la Cruz</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.y.</td>
<td>Sanctiago S. F. Zayolan</td>
<td>Francisco Hernandez, Diego Garcia, Salvador Diego, Agustin Santiago, Andres Juan, Juan Angel, Pedro Juan, Juan Sebastian, Mateo Francisco, Domingo Sebastian, Juan Sebastian, Francisco Gaspar, Juan Tomas, Domingo Sebastian, Pedro Sebastian</td>
<td>Juan de la Cruz⁹⁶⁹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹⁶⁹ There is ambiguity about Juan de la Cruz who appears to be an Indian because de la Cruz tended to refer to Indians. However, the elites of “n.y. Sanctiago San Francisco Zayula” claim that they rented land to him; that he died; that he promised not to leave such land to his child; and that after his death, a Spaniard held this land.
Part 2: Tables of Loanwords from Spanish that are not Names

The second part of Appendix C contains five tables that contain information about loanwords that are not names [Chapter 4]. I have organized the first four tables alphabetically by the name of the province, which appears in the first column. Since many provinces have more than one petition, I have made the year-date of the petition, in the second column, the next factor for organization (Refer to Chapter 1 for naming conventions). If the petition lacks a year-date (N.Y.), I have placed it at the end.

Table B-1 contains all fifteen documents from the cold lands. The third column contains words related to Catholicism including names of saints, names of feast-days, baptismal names, titles of offices, and buildings and practices required by Catholicism. The next column contains the names associated with the imperial government including titles of offices, names for spatial organization (i.e. ciudad), names of towns or cities, and names of European ethnic groups. The last column has all other terms such as temporal terms (i.e. semana, Mayo), animals, and things.

C-6: Loanwords from Spanish in eight cold-land provinces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>13 Petitions</th>
<th>Catholic terms</th>
<th>Imperial government</th>
<th>Other terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chimaltitan,</td>
<td>1646 Tequepechpan</td>
<td>Antonyo gonçalles, dios</td>
<td>topetiziyon/topetición, alde, regidor,</td>
<td>mayo, 1646 años, tofirma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minas de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>niescribano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimaltitan,</td>
<td>1678 Santiago Pochotitlan</td>
<td>S’ obispo, santa maria conspsion/santa maria consepsion,971 misa/ misas/misa aniversario/misa</td>
<td>to s’ alcalde mayor, alcalde, regidor</td>
<td>peso/pesos, cadelas, tomin (fraction of a peso), panishuelos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minas de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

970 Arregui (1946: 10-11) proposed that the Sierra Madre Occidental Mountain Range and the Grande de Santiago River cut Nueva Galicia in half: the first divided this region from the southeast to the northwest at a point seventeen leagues east of Guadalajara, near the mines of Santo Domingo and the pass of Mochitiltic; and the latter divided it close to Lake Chapala at a place known as Chinauatengo. He asserted that regions to the north and east of this divide represented “tierras frias” and those to the south and west were “calientes” [Refer to Chapter 2].

971 I have attempted to place variant orthographies or forms of words side-by-side and separated by the symbol “/”. However, I have made some exceptions when too many forms are present as in santo and santa.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>localidad</th>
<th>año</th>
<th>Fechas y eventos describibles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juchipila</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Cons episoc/misa resada, mayordomo/mayordomos, tenedora, animas, nitoguardia, semana santa, ilhuizin espiritu/ylhuitzin corpus/ilhuitzin san francisco/ilhuitzin san Andres/ilhuitzin nochiue, mantamintos, santospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>San Guasp, padre bicar, dios, caso:la, para Santa gosipal, frioste, mayordomo, Santa yglecia,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Gran Nayar</td>
<td>1649a</td>
<td>Tzcamota, Dios, Señor vispo, Don Fme, nihstiano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Gran Nayar</td>
<td>1649b</td>
<td>Tzcamota, Dios, Señor vispo, gobento, fricafila (Francisco?), filibe, Don franco Nayar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Gran Nayar</td>
<td>1649c</td>
<td>Tzcamota, Señor vispo, miqueli cal Dela, Don Franco Nayari, partolome Roares capitana, Dios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Gran Nayar</td>
<td>1649d</td>
<td>Tzcamota, Señor vispo, Dios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos/Teocaltiche</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Jalostotitlan, Juº Vicenti, Miguel Lopez, toviciar/toviciario, Franco Muños, sachristan/sacristan, alba, ystula, manipulo, padre, vigilia San Andres, huey yglesia, Sancto Sacramento/sanctissimo sacramº, Jueves Sancto, señor prouisor/prouisi/ prouisor, San Gaspar tlaca, su señoría obispo/señor obispo, nivcario, yhuitl Santa Maria Natiuittias, Asperges, Catalina Juana, teotlatoli sermon, ypihuau diablo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nombre de Dios</td>
<td>N.Y. Nombre de Dios ca. 1585</td>
<td>Nobre de Dios, Fracisco de Susa/Fracisco de Sosan, do Diego/Do Diego Domingo, tipedro, partolome de los</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables B-2, B-3, and B-4 contain Spanish loanwords in documents from the hotlands. However, I have divided the large number of documents into three tables: B-2, B-3, and B-4. Table B-2 follows the same conventions as B-1 for the provinces of Acaponeta and Compostela, which are northwest of Guadalajara, and Izatlan and Tala, which are west of this city [Refer to Chapter 2].

C-7: Loanwords in the hotland provinces of Acaponeta, Compostela, Izatlan, and Tala.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>19 petitions</th>
<th>Catholicism</th>
<th>Imperial government</th>
<th>Other terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acaponeta</td>
<td>1652a S. Antonio Quihuiquinta</td>
<td>Samtoniyo, comvento/comvinto, vartian/varianis, Santo, pascua, mayortomo/nimayortomo, ylas, caspar, marolesençia, dios, provinçial, carçiya, miguil, amproçe, Santa maria, Jesus, sinoria</td>
<td>topedeqçio, alnasel, tocapitan, majestat, pleto, alcalte</td>
<td>mardes, aprilis, a&quot;ni/anios, totoramis, banishuilos/banisvilo\os, candela, avansole, xíc\omperma, titofirmatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacotlan</td>
<td>1642 Contlan</td>
<td>tobiciario, Juº Xuares, miqui/miguangel, franca siguantonti, dios, pelipe, frioste</td>
<td>alcalde/ni\alcalde, no\otecion, justicia/mo\usticia, Rei, mayor, rregidor</td>
<td>ce cilla, ce corasa estribas, bacac macualli, ce bueyes, ce prejas\footnote{972}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacotlan</td>
<td>1649 Ocotitic</td>
<td>dios, Señor obriso/Señor tlatohuani, friol/tofriol fray franco, Sa gle\cia, sepultura, cumbento, Anton de la Cruz, Agoustin, Juan miguel, Diego, Anton Pelipe, Pablo</td>
<td>fr\incipal/\incipal, to\erey, destigu/destigos, \alde/\alcalde destig/destigus, Señor correxidor, cubernador, t\umines, bara, mortero, ym\achete, ybonete, mol\inder\a, harriero, tacu\irohua, bino, candela, xabato, to\ifirmas, dom\ingo, anos, castilye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepeque, Minas de</td>
<td>1580a Nochistlan</td>
<td>dios, Sanfa\º, Juº aloso</td>
<td>al\de/alcarte mayor/\altesme, al\guacil mayor</td>
<td>Sal\inas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepeque, Minas de</td>
<td>1580b Nochistlan</td>
<td>dios, sác fran\º, antoniyo</td>
<td>señor blexidente, al\ldemayor/dialldesme/\alde</td>
<td>pesos, cavallo, sapras (goats), prias\footnote{973}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tequila</td>
<td>N.Y. Aquautitan</td>
<td>dios, fran\º miguel, Juº Lucas, chistopar</td>
<td>topetecion, principalis, pleto, compernator, alcaltes, alalate Oqotitic</td>
<td>decempre, virma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{972}{The word \textit{brejas} probably refers to \textit{ovejas} (sheep) even though the notary only refers to one.}

\footnote{973}{\textit{prias}, \textit{priesa}: \textit{yciuhcayotl} or quickly (Molina Spanish-Nahuatl 2001: 219). The word \textit{priesa} appears to be a sixteenth-century form of \textit{prisa} as in \textit{tengo prisa} or \textit{voy de prisa}, which mean, “I’m in a hurry.”}

\footnote{974}{The notary writes that the petition is on behalf of the Totorames, a group that is possibly Tepehuano/Tepecano.}
<p>| Acaponeta | 1652b S. Antonio Quihuiquinta | Espui Sancto/Sancto padre/Sancto Sancto corona, Concilio, gracia/, Sancta Fe Catollica/Sancta Maria, eternidad, Jesus Xpo, confirmacion, Senor Opizbo, Sebastian Garcia, San Antonio Quihuiquinta, noguardian, pasgua, fray Diego Seruandes, Juan Garcia, misa, crixitiano, provincial, Don Filipe, Sebastian Garcia, Sº Antóniu, Lucas de la Cruz, Bartholome Migl | pedicion/nopedicion, bleyto, alde/alcalde, Justicia, fical, Audien Real, Sº Presitente, testigus/testigo, corona/Sancto corona, norancho/yrancho, molas/nomola, cahualos, monumento, mortero, çe macho/nomacho, aratus, nimitzpreçētarua/nicpresentarua/nicpresentaro, martes, aprilis, anos |  |
| Acaponeta | 1652b S. Sebastian Guaxicori | senior opispo, su señoria, san sebastian guaxicore, titopastor, dios, provincial, se mantamiento, toguardian, mantamiento | alcalde/alds/toalcalde mayor, prinsipale/principales, sumag, real audiencia, ome topetitzion, |  |
| Compostela | 1593a Xalisco | toprovinçial, divinedores, conbento/yninconbento/yniconbento, doctrina, espiritu santo, sindico | tialcaldesme, tiregidoresme, toJustiçia, alde, regitor | lones, abril, 1593 años |
| Compostela | 1593b Xalisco | toppincial, tibinitore, ynî conbento, conbento, doctrina, espu.S.to | tiales, tiregioresme, tojustiçia, | lones, aplil, años, |
| Compostela | Comp: N.Y. Xalisco | toproviçial gener[al], tocomisario general, comissario general, dios, Sant Juº Baptista monesterio, San franço, abito, toguardian, fray miguel de leço, Sancta yglesia, fray Luis Menor | [N]veva espania | capitulo |
| Compostela | 1594a Xalisco | Nev Espania/Noveva Espania, top[ol]vinçial general, tocomisario, andividores, toteciuyo dios, Jun Baptista Monesterio, Sº Franço, guardian, fray aº/l/fr aº de Virviesca/fray – antoniyo de rrova, ydoctrina, Spinin Sº | aldesº, regidoresme, | cari[dad], sabato, setiembre, años |
| Compostela | 1595a Xalisco | Sanct Juº Baptista Monesterio, franco, abito, toguardian, fray Miguel de Leço/fray Antres de | presitente, | años |
| Compostela | 1595b Xalisco | comisario general, antivinidores, San adres, doguardian, dios, F pº, Gonçales, Xpoval Franº, Fº pº Angel, J'n Laçaro, | alde, Regidor, | Juves,agosus, mil e quinientos, nenta y cinco años, |
| Izatlan | 1593a Oconahuac | profinciayal, misa, profinçial, fraylles, tocrina, bios (God), çan + po (Pedro), ticristiyanotin, ecsterma onçion, | aubençia real, zu ma masesbat, topedicion, allds, rexibor, | be (de), llehua (legua), costum[bre], titobilmatique, nofilma, bó (don), |
| Izatlan | 1593b Oconahuac | profizur, Sant migl, fray Alos, fray ãbonio (Antonio), fray biego çatlamono, ecestremo onçion, fray luis nahuaro, extrema onçion, fray migl, fray jůā, fraylles, Sant pº, profinciayal, toprofinçial, sacristiyá, ticristiyanotin, toquar[tian] | pleyto, teniyente, espaniøles, rey, | cahuallios, farnes (viernes), cocinerotin, ome t lacatl portero, pohuetlas, ornamento, quinfilmatic, mofilmatiz, psº, |
| Izatlan | 1593c Oconahuac | quartian, San miquel | aubençia real, deniyende, alldesme, rrexidoresme, testicosme, testimonio, tlaçulovani espǎyor, oççe espanyo[r], pleidos, destimonio, alldes, rexidor | fieres, octubre, puerdas, campana, puerta, vinage, toçino, coçinerotin, otechfirmati, titofirmati |
| Izatlan | 1622 Santa María Magdalena | sñor provisor, Snda maria magdalena, prioste, altar, don Sapastian, completas, mayordomo, ospital, noguardian, Sº Mº, | Justiçia alvaçil mayor, Sñor altemayor, alldemayor, escrituano, Justicia, Sñor alde, | onechtepositato, martes, domingo, |
| Izatlan | 1649a Santa María Magdalena | Señor obisbo, Jesu xpō, Sancta ma magdalena xochitepec, cofradas, priostes, mayordomos, Sancta cofradia, Sanctuspital, Sanctissimo Sacraměto, prioste, mayordomo, | alldes, espanyol Martin de Agiazca, Rei, inin espanyol, oficialeles, oficialestin, | ganado |
| Izatlan | 1649b Santa María Magdalena | Señor obisbo, Sancta maria magdalena xochitepec, cofradiastin, Sanctissimo Sacraměto, Sanctuspital, prioste, mayordomo, Sancta cofradia, prioste, mayordomo | alldes, oficialeles | ganado, baga, baca |
| Izatlan | 1649 S. Francisco Ayahualulco | Señor obizpo/Señor obispo, tº dios, San Franº, Sancta ospital, prioste/friosten, mayordomo/mayordomoz, toluuardian/touuardia/huardianez, totlasomahuiznantzi consepçion, | alldez/alde, oficialez/oficiales, teputado escribano, espanoles, pricipalez, | 2 ps, cadelas, pan, plantanos, se mateleze, pañesuelo, xabon, nosalario, azta, ybacaz/bacaz/bacas |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Petitions</th>
<th>Catholicism</th>
<th>Imperial government</th>
<th>Other terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ameca</td>
<td>1649 S.</td>
<td>Antonio Tuzcacuezco</td>
<td>11 Petitions</td>
<td>Co Sanctiçimo çacramento, dios, Santo obispo, topedición, San Antonio Tuzcacuezco, toguardian, misa Sanc Andonio, pazqua resurecion misa, noyoqui pazqua espirit, noyoqui pazqua navaid, cuaresma, todo Sancto, Sanc Antonio, ylivit Sanctiago Sanc françizco, guardianes</td>
<td>topeticion, alldde, Rº (regidor), prinsipal</td>
<td>tomites, ce peso, vino, 4 t°, candelas, tomin, panis belas, titofirmatia, de Junio 1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Tachichilco</td>
<td>11 Petitions</td>
<td>toyilhuio San Pedro, dios, totlatzonantzi asmption, misa, Señor obispo,</td>
<td>topetitzion, alcalde, fiscal,</td>
<td>chiquacen pesos tomites, ce tabla manteles, nahui panisuelos, ce votihuela vino, ce quart nacal, nahui candelas, mestli mayo, timofirmatilo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajititlan</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>Cajititlan</td>
<td>11 Petitions</td>
<td>prioste, Señor probiso, pº guardiá, npiroiste, mayordomo, oquiçêçemana...de Ramos, Santa ospital, ce mädamiento de amparo, limosna, guardiá, noyoqui, Chonlco tlali, Yotlco totecayotl, Zolotayotl, yca ycara, ce tedeuladamas, dotria, ce beneficiado glerigo, San Franços, Conbenton,</td>
<td>alldde, Regidor, palacio</td>
<td>tomites (money), hornâmento, ce media dosena, chiucuace tomites, carneros, ce entero carnero, quesqui baca, nahui bacas, nahui terneros, tiprobes, yey leguaz, bandera, mohuey Justº, çiudad,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>Col: 1622</td>
<td>Cohuatlan</td>
<td>11 Petitions</td>
<td>Sefr frufixotl, sintadres, motlateulchiuatlapito, pº Zololcanot, alozolezo, penito peleliá, apito, çacrameto</td>
<td>estacia, guatlacala, caliscu tlali,</td>
<td>motlatocacoronatzin, eneru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Cohuatlan de Puertos de Abajo</td>
<td>11 Petitions</td>
<td>Jsº, Dios, tosanta igleçi,</td>
<td>prohuisiion, Stopped at 30</td>
<td>Salinas, Salineros, yspuliado,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-3 represents loan words in documents from provinces west and south of Guadalajara.

C-8: Loanwords in Ameca, Amula, Cajititlan, Colima, Guadalajara, and Tlajomulco.
| Guadalajara | 1656 Tonala | Dios, Señor obispo, clerigo, provincial, agustinos, payes agustinos, titobicario, Dios padrenuestro, bicario, Amen, | Señor presidenti, teguantin alcaldes, regidori, mochi principalis, | none |
| Guadalajara | 1657 Tonala | Sr probisor, tobiocario fray niculas de suniga, prior, fray manoguel, probinsial, S' obispo, bicario, noprobinicial, prior, fray niculas, s.tisimo sacramento, prios, fray manohuel, toRey, s.tiago de tonalan, Juan fhelipe | Rey, su magestad, Guadalaxara, patente, S' presidente, alilde, Regidor, principalis, escribano | yei tonali disienbre, ora, ventana franciculos, molino (Guadalajara), porere, por feria, "no ai que tratar," caballeria, canpanilla, ventana, sabado, yjos, se semana, 22 disienbre, |
| Guadalajara | 1679 Analco | Spanish petition | Spanish petition | Spanish petition |
| Tlajomulco | 1630 Tlajomulco | s. maria, s.ta ospital cofraria, freoste, mayortomo, miquil, | alldes, Regetorisis, frenzipalis, tisgus, cidula, | cenpoali bacas, tomenis (money), ome ps, yhiro te venta, nofirma, decompri, anos, |
| Tlajomulco | N.Y. Tlajomulco | patlir nuestro, probisor, santo padre, nuestra señora. s.ta hosp[i]tal, c assaca, | alldes hordinarios, Rexidoriz, principalis, Rexidor, principal, | tomines (money), bagas, teletic cruz pantli, |
| Tlajomulco | N.Y S. Cace Tlajomulco | Señor tlaotani, mayordomo, prosti, cofrades, Santa Cofradia Na Sa de la cādelaria, tocofraadia, cofrade, | juridicion tlaximulco, | criadores, se Bes[e]rro, besera, pro, tranquilla, para Obra, |

Table B-4 has one less column than all of the other tables because it only represents the documents from the province of Ávalos. In all other ways, it resembles Tables B-1, B-2, and B-3.

C-9: Loanwords in the hotland province of Ávalos

<p>| 16 Petitions | Catholic terms | Secular government | Other terms |
| 1626 San Francisco Chapalac | prioste, mayordomo, San Francisco, Guardian, Joceph, limosna, Concepcion, dions, Clerigos, missa, doctrina, moprovincial | Alcoldes, Regidores, principales | carneros, entierros, molino, Juebes, Noiberniemb |
| 1629 Zacoalco by Juan Fabian | dios, nohuesta Senora, Sancha eclesea/ Sanctia gelesia, Sancta ma/Sancha ma, San pelibe, Senores, San froano, Jn³, sserdotis, doquartian, milchior, fry antris, San Pelipe, | Justiçiatzin, alldes, Regedores, autinçia, Regedor, alilde, prsentinti | sabato, ocopre, anos, tifirma, titofirmatia, |
| 1653 Amatitlan | franco, Sanctiago, miqul, tipesbo, dios, Sanctamaria, Juçepi, opisbo, Sancta yglesia, Juçepe, canpana, Juçepe, tiopisbo | yprovincial, estancia, tenyente, alvaçel mayor, escribano, estancia, Regedor, fiscal, priosti, mayordomo, capitanas, | none |
| 1658 San Francisco Tizapan | Señor, otrissima, santa maria, dios, çà fraco, missa, conpinto, eztancia, tiquibećitador, prioste, | alld, principal, principatl, ezcribano | friçada, lones, julio, anos, firma, cañiros, cabullos, |
| 1664 Santa Ana Acatlan | probesor, dios, miquil, | alldes, preçipalis ordenarios, regedor, principial, escia, hualalaxara, | Años, fiprero, fma, |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fecha</th>
<th>Localidad</th>
<th>Eventos</th>
<th>Personas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>nimayordomo/mayordomo rosario/</td>
<td>alldes, moliçençia, pös's,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacoalco</td>
<td></td>
<td>mayordomos, sanctisimo sagraminto/S.tisimo sagraminto,</td>
<td>sabado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>probesor/probor, dios, fre diego, preost, bistador, Sinor/Sifior,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>misa, filipe,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Sta. María</td>
<td>Señor, probesor, santa ospital, Sta ma magdalena, lemosna, Sta ma</td>
<td>ofesialis, gonbendo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena</td>
<td>Tizapan</td>
<td>cosision, tto dios, prioste/prisote,,</td>
<td>depotado, alcalde, regedor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mayordomo, meguel,</td>
<td>baca, Septiembre,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>camiros, tomacheofremas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>ostrecemo Sr/ostrecimo Sr, santa confradiya, santa marea, fre aloço</td>
<td>testego, oficialis, alcalde,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tizapan</td>
<td></td>
<td>doran, jucipi/don jucipi, freosti, mayordomo,</td>
<td>llagona, nicecida, para,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yas, asenda, yeuts,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>domingo, genero, anos,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bahilier, domigo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>befero, anos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Sayula</td>
<td>Su Señoria, ylustrisima, toSeñor capitan, toSanta ylecia, topadres</td>
<td>yprobincia, alcalde mayor, casa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>guardianes/topadre guardian, amonestaciones, dios, Santos, Santas,</td>
<td>Reales, Rey de su magestad,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Semana Santa, crus, Santa yclecia, Santa espal, Santo munimento,</td>
<td>licencia, arancel, tocsa Reales,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prenispales, Rexitores/Rexitores,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alcaldes/toalcalde mayor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ynimicnistros, españoles,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>S. Juan Evangelista</td>
<td>Señor obispo, Señor, Santa ospitatl, tdocura, fray, Santa ospital,</td>
<td>tialdes, rejidor/rexidores,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atoyac</td>
<td></td>
<td>alltar, mayordomo/tomayordomo, migl, rexidor, ximenes, feliphe, priost,</td>
<td>provinsia, totiniente,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>allde, prinpal/prinsipatl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prinispales ordinarios,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>siudad de guadalaxara,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>San Pedrotepec</td>
<td>San Pedrotepec, señor obispo, co çeñoria/so çeñoria Eloostrisimo,</td>
<td>peticion, alle/allde/alldes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ylostrisimo, tocura, misa/missa/missa cantada, fransicanos, Ju’chin,</td>
<td>Regidor/Regidores, priniplal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cōfecion, ymissa, ospital, tocora, caçamiento, dios, doctrina</td>
<td>siodad, oficialis/ofesialis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cabiçera/cabisera,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>derecho, yxpanol,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gadalaxara,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>mayordomo, prioste, Señor, prouisor, para nrā señora madre de Dios</td>
<td>Alcaldes y demas principalis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pru de Abalos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mes de ag, de 1687 años, toros y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>novillos, Res, pesos, bestido de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lama asul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>San Andres</td>
<td>dios, su seneorea, señeora, preoste, maeordomo, megel</td>
<td>dila probensea di abalos,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atotonilco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alcaldis, regedor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>albaslemaeor, es=nº,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>presepalas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ycorona, molas, magus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cabalios, tecobrarolo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>espanesoneoles, toferma, maeco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693a</td>
<td>Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>mayordomo, prioste, Jusepe, Señor probisor</td>
<td>Señor lesintiado, testgos,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y demas principals, prou de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abalos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>del mes de Junio de 1693, toros y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nobillos, mayordomo de caminicera,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693b</td>
<td>Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>Thie petition is in Spanish.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694 S. Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>Santissimo sacramento, Santa Maria concepcion, Amen, Jisis, San Juan ebangilizta Atoyac, pr'ost/eprioste, mayordomo, cofradia Santa ospital, probisol,</td>
<td>iprobinsia de abalos, lisinicia, secretario, alcochil, alde</td>
<td>bacass, deçiembre, 1694 años</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.y.</td>
<td>Sanctiago San Francisco Sayula</td>
<td>Jù te la Cruz, San° ospindal, Sanctiago Sã franço çayolan,</td>
<td>alDes ordinarios, rexitores, altepehuaque principales, alde, alde, Regitor, Rexitor, yzpaniol,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Correlations

Ávalos

D-1: The -tl/-t/-l absolutive in Ávalos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>-tl, -t, -l</th>
<th>-tl</th>
<th>-t</th>
<th>-l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1626 San Francisco Chapalac</td>
<td>-tl: ½ -l: ½</td>
<td>xihuitl</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>machiol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629 Zacoalco by Juan Fabian</td>
<td>-l: 9/9, 100%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>altepel, xihuil, cehuatiznii, altepel, metzle, xihuil, amal, Amatznii, altepel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>-tl: 5/5</td>
<td>tonitiquipacholiztli, tochoquiliztti, altepetl, altepetl, yehuatl, altepetl, altepetl</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658 San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>-tl: 4/4 5 OC</td>
<td>altepetl, ethuitl975, etluhitl, xihuitl</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>-tl: 4/5 -l: 1/5</td>
<td>yehuatl, cahuitl, xihuitl, xihuitl</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>altepil,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668 San Francisco Zacoalco</td>
<td>-l: 1/1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>altepil,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669 Santa María Magdalena Tizapan</td>
<td>-tl: 3/4 -l: 3/4</td>
<td>tehuatl, altepetl, mitzlti, xivtl</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673 San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679 Sayula</td>
<td>-l: 4/4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>al, Sacal, tomal, altepel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>-tl: 7/8 -l: 1/8 4 OC</td>
<td>altepetl, altepetl, altepetl, xihuitl, cuahuitl, ospitaatl, cuahuitl,</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>xihuitl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686 San Pedrotepec</td>
<td>-l: 7/7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>altepel, altepel, yeval, chicavalisli, tequil, xivl, altepel, xivl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>-tl: 1/1</td>
<td>Altepetl</td>
<td>mautacte, mautacte,</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692 San Andres Atotonilco</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693 Santa Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>-tl: 1/1</td>
<td>amatl</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694 San Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>-tl: 1/1</td>
<td>altepitl</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.y. Sanctiago San Francisco Zayolan</td>
<td>-tl: 1/1</td>
<td>altepetl</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D-2: Pronominal Plural Suffix Use in Present Tense Verbs in Ávalos

| Petition and author | Verbs and their location in a petition: (I) = introductory act; | Totals: /tl/ or -lo | Totals: (G) or (I/C) |

---

975 etluhitl, ilhuhitl: day or feast-day; it especially refers to the latter when possessed (Lockhart 2001: 220).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lo: (G)</th>
<th>Lo: (I/C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Amatitlan by unnamed</td>
<td>tictotinamiquilia (I) and ticchichihualo (G).</td>
<td>1/2 (G)</td>
<td>1/2 (I/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>San Martín by Diego Juan</td>
<td>tictenamiqullo (I), timotequipacholo (G), ticmacalo (G), ticnequilo (G), ticwelchihua (G), timoffirmatia (C).</td>
<td>3/6 (G)</td>
<td>2/6 (I/C) &amp; 1/6 (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>San Martín by Diego Juan</td>
<td>timopechtecaco (I), tictotinamiquillo (I), ticnequilo (G), techytalo (G), timotlauhtia (G), quipualo (G), ticchihualo (G), titenmacalo (G), ticmacalo (G), tihuicalo (G), tiquitohua (G), tiztlacatilo (C), timoffirmatia (C).</td>
<td>7/13 (G) &amp; 1/13 (I/C)</td>
<td>1/13 (G) &amp; 3/13 (I/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>San Pedrotepec by unnamed</td>
<td>quitemacalo (G), quichivalo (G), quinortalo (G), quinchivalo (G), tiquipano (G), ticmatillo (G), ticmacalo (G), tictalaia (C).</td>
<td>7/8 (G)</td>
<td>1/8 (I/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y. Zayula by unnamed</td>
<td>tineçico (I), tictotinamiquilia (I), timizxpantilia (G), timizmachitigia (G).</td>
<td>&amp; 2/4 (I/C)</td>
<td>&amp; 2/4 (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Tizapan by Juan Sebastian</td>
<td>tictotenamiquilia (I), timopichitcaqui (I), tiquitalo (G), tictlactotillo (G).</td>
<td>2/4 (G)</td>
<td>2/4 (I/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>San Francisco Zacoalco</td>
<td>timpipichicalo (I), tictotinamiquilia (I), ticmoniquilta (G).</td>
<td>1/3 (G)</td>
<td>2/3 (I/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Santa María Magdalena Tizapan</td>
<td>teltlatlanilo (G), timiztatlanilo (G), timizcaquel (G), temitztlatlanilo (G), tictlalia (C).</td>
<td>4/5 (G)</td>
<td>1/5 (I/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>tictenamiqullo (I), timopichitcalo (C).</td>
<td>1/2 (I/C)</td>
<td>1/2 (I/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Sayula</td>
<td>tinesilo (I), tictenamiqullo (I), ticmacalo (G), quiquixtilo (G), quinhuitequilo (G), quintlalilo (G), quinquixtilo (G), timotlautluto (G), ticquictolo (G), ticoalo (G), quinequilo (G), ticquictolo (G), monamictilo (G), tectlapalolo (G), ticquietulo (G), ticquictolo (G), quixtilo (G), tiquitolo (G), ticquictolo (G), ticmacalo (G), quicoalo (G), motolinilo (G), ticquictolo (G), ticnequilo (G), quimechigilo (G), quinepanolo (G), ticmacalo (G), timotlautluto (G), timoffirmatilo (C), ticquictolo (C), tlatemoctinemilo (C).</td>
<td>28/33 (G) &amp; 5/33 (I/C)</td>
<td>These include verbs that the writer repeats like ticmacalo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>S. J. Evangelista Atoyac by unnamed</td>
<td>tihuahnesilo (G), timochicahualo (G), timotequipacholo (G), tictenamiquia (C).</td>
<td>3/4 (G)</td>
<td>1/4 (I/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>San Andres Atotonilco</td>
<td>tectenamequllo (I), temotequipagaulo (G), poliguiulo (G), tecobraralo (G), quipealo (G), quineq'lo (G), temopesitecalo (G), tientoamacalo (G), tetanamacalo (G), temotequipusalo (G), teneselo (G), temopolgua (G), tectemaquilo (C).</td>
<td>10/13 (G) &amp; 2/13 (I/C)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>San Juan Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>tehualahue (G), temetzmachitillo (G)</td>
<td>1/2 (G)</td>
<td>1/2 (G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table: -l preference and verbal suffix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>-l preference</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>I/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1668 San Francisco Zacoalco</td>
<td>-l preference 1/1 times.</td>
<td>-lo 1 verb.</td>
<td>/&amp;_ 2 verbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1673 San Francisco Tizapan</td>
<td>-l preference 2/2 times.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-lo 1 verb; /&amp;_ 1 verb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1686 San Pedrotepec</td>
<td>-l preference 7/7 times.</td>
<td>-lo 7 verbs.</td>
<td>/&amp;_ : 1/8 (I/C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: -tl hypercorrection and verbal suffix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Instances of -tl hypercorrection</th>
<th>Grievance Act</th>
<th>Introductory or Conclusion Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diego Juan</td>
<td>1653 San Martín</td>
<td>2 times.</td>
<td>-lo 3 verbs; /&amp;_ 1 verb.</td>
<td>/&amp;_ 2 verbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Juan</td>
<td>1654 San Martín</td>
<td>3 times.</td>
<td>-lo 7 verbs; /&amp;_ 1 verb.</td>
<td>-lo 1 verb; /&amp;_ 3 verbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Sebastian</td>
<td>1658 S.F. Tizapan</td>
<td>15 times.</td>
<td>-lo 2 verbs.</td>
<td>/&amp;_ on 2/4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1694 S. Ju. Evangelista Atoyac</td>
<td>1 time.</td>
<td>-lo 1/2 (G); /&amp;_ 1/2 (G).</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: -tl preference and verbal suffix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>-tl preference</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>I/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>N.Y. Zayula</td>
<td>-tl preference 1/1 times.</td>
<td>/&amp;_ 2 verbs.</td>
<td>/&amp;_ 2 verbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>-tl preference 5/5 times.</td>
<td>-lo 1 verb.</td>
<td>/&amp;_ 1 verb.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D-3 Full Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Non-petition document</th>
<th>Type of absolutive</th>
<th>Verbs in /&amp;_</th>
<th>Verbs in -lo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fray Francisco de Torres</td>
<td>1626 San Francisco Chapalac</td>
<td>-tl in 1/2 times: xihuitl.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>anquicaxanilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-l in 1/2 times: machiol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Fabian</td>
<td>1629 Zacoalco</td>
<td>-l in 6/6 times.</td>
<td>anguilanhueya, tictochialia, tonlatohia, ticlayecoltia, ticpanahuezneque, tictolalilia, tictolalia, titofirmatia, tonlochia</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Felipe</td>
<td>1664 S. Ana Acatlan</td>
<td>-tl in 4/5 times.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>timitzmotlatlauhtilo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amula, Cajititlan, Colima, and Tlajomulco

D-4: Verb-Usage in Amula, Colima, and Tlajomulco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Grievance Act</th>
<th>Introductory and/or conclusion acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649 S.A. Tuzcacuezco</td>
<td>tiquixtia, titemacalo, ticmacalo, titemacalo, ticmacalo, timoyolecuitilo, titemacalo, ticmacalo, titemacalo, timiztotlatlauhhtila,</td>
<td>tineçico, ticoteniamicuil, titofirmatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649 Tachichilco</td>
<td>timextatautilo, timotolinilo, timechnahuatilo, ticchihuato, tatilo,</td>
<td>timopectecoco, timofirmatilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td>Cajititlan</td>
<td>1644 Cajititlan</td>
<td>tiquitolico, timatxilo, tetemacalo, tienquelotia, ticmacalo, tiquitolico, tiquitolico, tiquitolico, tiquitolico, tiquitolico,</td>
<td>tineçico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Puy</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1622 Cohuatlan</td>
<td>ticnequi, tiosisotlaniliao</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Cruz</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1637 Cohuatlan de Puertos de</td>
<td>timiztotlatlauhhtila, ticmomaquilia, ticomacalo, tiquitolico, tiquitolico, tiquitolico, tiquitolico, tiquitolico,</td>
<td>timiztotlatlauhhtila, timopecteco,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abajo</td>
<td></td>
<td>tictoquenamiquilia, ticoteniamicuil, titofirmatia, timopectecoco,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>1630 Tlajomulco</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>N.Y. Tlajomulco</td>
<td>tiquitolona, timopecteco, tiquitolon</td>
<td>tineçico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>N.Y. S. Cacel Tlajomulco</td>
<td>ticpialo,</td>
<td>tinesico, tictlasotenamiquilo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>timopectecoco,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grievance and Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Grievance Act</th>
<th>Introductory and/or conclusion acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649 S.A. Tuzcacuezco</td>
<td>7 in -lo, 2 in /ʔ/</td>
<td>3 in /ʔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649 Tachichilco</td>
<td>5 in -lo</td>
<td>2 in -lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fco. Sebastian</td>
<td>Cajititlan</td>
<td>1644 Cajititlan</td>
<td>11 in -lo</td>
<td>1 in /ʔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>Type of Absolutive:</td>
<td>-lo and /tl/ in the grievance act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Puy</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1622 Cohuatlan</td>
<td>H in 8/8 times;</td>
<td>7 in -lo; 2 in /tl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Cruz</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1637 Cohuatlan</td>
<td>-tl in 4/6 times;</td>
<td>7 in -lo; 2 in /tl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>1630 Tlajomulco</td>
<td>-l in 2/6 times;</td>
<td>5 in -lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>N.Y. Tlajomulco</td>
<td>-tl in 1/4 times;</td>
<td>4 in /tl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>N.Y. S. Cacel</td>
<td>-l in 1 time;</td>
<td>1 in -lo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Numbers Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Type of Absolutive:</th>
<th>-lo and /tl/ in the grievance act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649 S.A. Tuzcuezco</td>
<td>H in 3 times</td>
<td>7 in -lo; 2 in /tl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Amula</td>
<td>1649 Tachichilco</td>
<td>-l in 3/4 times;</td>
<td>5 in -lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fco. Sebastian</td>
<td>Cajititlan</td>
<td>1644 Cajtitlan</td>
<td>-tl in 12/12 times</td>
<td>11 in -lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Puy</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1622 Cuatlan</td>
<td>-tl in 8/8 times;</td>
<td>2 in /tl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Cruz</td>
<td>Poncitlan</td>
<td>1637 Cohuatlan</td>
<td>-tl in 6/6 times;</td>
<td>4 in /tl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tlajomulco</td>
<td>N.Y. S. Cacel</td>
<td>-l in 1 time;</td>
<td>1 in -lo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D-5 -t Correlation with -lo or /tl/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>-tl</th>
<th>-t</th>
<th>-lo</th>
<th>/tl/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Fco. Nayari</td>
<td>El Gran Nayar</td>
<td>1649a Tzacamatla</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>alitepet</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>nechicocolitla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>1657 Tonala</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>nehuat, tacat (4), amat</td>
<td>quihuicalosnequi, tiquitalosnequi, mizmototauhtilia, ticnetoica, anquanequi, anquahuicasnequi, ticnetenamiquilia, timpechecata, ticnequi, timotequipachala, timotolinia, timizinemahuistilitila, quitemqui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Juchipila</td>
<td>1652 S.F. Juchipila</td>
<td>xiuitl</td>
<td>yehuat</td>
<td>tihualmohuical, ticpialo, titotequipachalo, titalatanilo, timotequipachalo, techcuesolo, timitztotlatautilia, titopechecaco, titochoquitalo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

976 ticnequi:, titotlaitlanilia.

977 ticnequi:, titotlaitlanilia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>-t and/or -tl</th>
<th>-lo or /ʔ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Fco. Nayari</td>
<td>El Gran Nayar</td>
<td>1649a Tzacamota</td>
<td>1 in -t</td>
<td>1 in /ʔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>1657 Tonala</td>
<td>6 in -lo</td>
<td>11 in /ʔ/; 2 in -lo&lt;sup&gt;978&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Juchipila</td>
<td>1652 S.F. Juchipila</td>
<td>1 in -t; 1 in -tl.</td>
<td>14 in -lo; 2 in /ʔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Tacotlan</td>
<td>1649 Ocotitic</td>
<td>9 in -t; 4 in -dl</td>
<td>13 in -lo; 1 in /ʔ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tonala**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>-t and/or -tl</th>
<th>-lo or /ʔ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>1656 Tonala</td>
<td>2 in -tl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>1657 Tonala</td>
<td>6 in -lo</td>
<td>11 in /ʔ/; 2 in -lo&lt;sup&gt;979&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D-6 Correlation between three factors (Not used in chapter 4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>-l, -tl, and/or hypercorrection (H)</th>
<th>-lo or /ʔ/</th>
<th>mo- or no-/to-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>N.Y. Sayula</td>
<td>1 in -tl</td>
<td>4 in /ʔ/</td>
<td>2 in no-/to-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Fabián</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>1629 Zacoalco</td>
<td>5 in -l</td>
<td>9 in /ʔ/</td>
<td>5 in no-/to-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Ávalos</td>
<td>1653 Amatitlan</td>
<td>5 in -tl</td>
<td>1 in -lo; 1 in /ʔ/</td>
<td>1 in no-/to-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>978</sup> quihuicalosnequi, tiqitalosnequi.

<sup>979</sup> quihuicalosnequi, tiqitalosnequi.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Cultural Terms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Puy</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Cuatlan</td>
<td>16 in</td>
<td>H; 8 in -tl</td>
<td>2 in /ʔ/ timocuepasque, titotlatlanilia, timitztotlauitili, titotlatoca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Cruz</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Cohuatlan de P. A.</td>
<td>6 in -tl; H in 1 time</td>
<td>4 in /ʔ/ tititztotlauitiliia, tontopechteca, ticlotlaçotenamiquliia, timitztotlauitiliia, ticmomaquilique, timofirmatia, timofirmatia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Fco. Nayari</td>
<td>El Gran Nayar</td>
<td>1649a</td>
<td>Tzacamota</td>
<td>1 in -t</td>
<td>1 in /ʔ/ nimonelos, nimoneloa, nimoneloa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Tonala</td>
<td>6 in -t</td>
<td>11 in /ʔ/; 2 in -lo⁹⁸⁰ ootimocuepaqui, ootimocuepaqui, ticlotenamiqulili, tismopechteca, timotequipachua, timotolitilia, timitzmomahuistilia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Tonala</td>
<td>6 in -t</td>
<td>11 in /ʔ/; 2 in -lo⁹⁸⁰ ootimocuepaqui, ootimocuepaqui, ticlotenamiqulili, tismopechteca, timotequipachua, timotolitilia, timitzmomahuistilia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹⁸⁰ quihuicalosnequi, tiquitalosnequi.
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