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In most circumstances, I would welcome any effort to publish the Spanish text of the documents of the Hispanic Southwest. Having organized the “Cíbola Project” for exactly that purpose, i.e., to make those documents accessible in their original language (for a description of the project, go to http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~rescent), I should be delighted that such a substantial book could be published without the usual sacrifice of the Spanish text. However, I must confess that the manner in which Flint has edited the texts seems to me to be likely to discourage readers from favoring similar enterprises.

During the preparations for a symposium that took place October 2, 1999, at the Fort Burgwin campus of Southern Methodist University, Los Ranchos de Taos, New Mexico, jointly sponsored by the Clements Center for Southwest Studies, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, and the Research Center for Romance Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Flint sent me samples of his transcriptions, which I returned with critical observations. It was perfectly clear to me that if he persisted in his method, none of his transcriptions could be used for philological purposes, and, would, in fact, have to be done over again. I explained my objections in a letter of February 11, 1999. David Weber, Director of the Clements Center, suggested during and after the Fort Burgwin symposium that we reach some kind of compromise with regard to transcription norms, but since none of the innovative features of Flint’s method of transcription would be tolerable in a transcription carried out by philologists, it seemed pointless to me to pursue the issue.

The purpose of this publication is to provide a detailed critique of Flint’s transcription, while at the same time to make concrete proposals conducive to what I argue is a more satisfactory method of editing the documents that rightly fascinate the students of the Hispanic Southwest so much. Here I would like to emphasize that the “Cíbola Project” is designed to promote editions containing facsimiles of the original documents so that the accuracy of the transcriptions can be immediately verified by any reader. In such editions, it becomes less important to signal features of the document not directly related to the text itself, since those features can be observed visually.

On the next two pages, a facsimile of the first page of the trial record appears opposite a page containing Flint’s transcription (also in facsimile), and a traditional paleographic transcription. What strikes one forcefully at first glance is the remarkable esthetic impact of the original, since the page was written by a scribe with no ill opinion of his own penmanship. Of course, none of this visual impression can come across in a transcription, and we realize what a pity it is that publication with facsimile reproductions of the originals has been in general so costly as to be impracticable.

The most immediately salient of Flint’s transcription is the extraordinary typographical complexity. Scholars, and I dare say many less specialized readers, have had a long time to get used to the conventions of traditional paleography, so I find myself bound to claim, though I can speak for no one but myself, that the relatively clean appearance of the paleographic transcription on page five possesses important advantages, in fact, is far easier to read, despite the fact that no concession whatsoever is made to the conventions of modern Spanish orthography. In my view, the basic problem is that Flint has attempted to encode in his transcriptions information that can be more appropriately and adequately treated in the introduction, the notes, or the glossary.
Esthetics aside, what I wish to comment on here are primarily the philological aspects of Flint’s transcription method.

The text begins with a dramatically scrolled capital E which imitates the large initial letters of medieval manuscripts. The vertical strokes of various letters in the first line of text are extended in a handsome set of interlocking flourishes. The main portion of the text is written with remarkable clarity, and certain letters appear to have been shaped with conscious esthetic intention, especially capital R. At the foot of the page appears the notary’s indication that the page is genuine, a horizontal line with flourishes at each end, interrupted in the center with his rubric.

None of these features can be reproduced adequately in a transcription.
en la gran ciudad de
la ciudad tenían me seco
mevace gana venía
yo seys tras están de
me yo) año del reino
amplio de mi salió
que no se a sí se po semble
a) amplio de mi reino

Cayon donde se te ayuda y voz seca
espera que es de casa haba
sas de mesa como parte de
mi pedr de re gana) hauano de omo ma
y seca ha
seca ha
seca ha

poz quanto oso ma
por un real comisión se
mandaban que siguie de cierta y
información sobre lo tocante a los malos tratamientos

O perre amós que más que
sean, basque
se tonzado que se
sede ame va Hahui Capí
tan general que fue para el ser cubriente
seca hiera media se cubra y otras seis Capí
franço Abían feih & Abrían casa fa uvo
& a yanda pliego que para hacer la misma
formación con formó lo que omn la man
sada nombre va y mon tro voz como y ha
seco. Amo se oso pedr de - ame va 5

(espans: 72x72 a 540x720)
En la gran ciudad de Tenuxtitan Mexico de la Nueva España, veinte y seys días del mes de mayo Año del nombre del Cimiento de nuestro salva-
dor Jesus Christo de mill'E quinientos E quaren-|Ta e quatro Años El muy magnifico señor licenciado | Lorenzo de Tejada oydor de la Audiencia Real | de la nueva esPaña que reside en la dicha ciU-|dad de Mexico mando parescer ante sy | a mi Pedro de Requena escrivano de sus magnitudes | Y de la dicha Audiencia Real E dixo que | por quanto sus magnitudes por su real comision le | mandaban que hiziese cierta yformacion | sobre lo tocante a los malos tratamientos | Aperreamientos y que mas que Francisco Vazquez | de Coronado gobernador de la nueva Galizia Cap-
itan general que fue para el descubrimiento | de la tierra nueva de Cibola y otros sus Capitanes | tan que habian (F)hecho E habian dado favor | E ayuda a ello que para hacer la dicha yformacion Conforme a lo que su majestad le man-
daba nobraba y nonbro por escrivano para | ello a mi El dicho pedro de Requena e
1. Nothing complicates a transcription more than the attempt to imitate variations of size of letters in the manuscript by the use of modern capitals. Capital letters now have, indeed already possessed in the sixteenth century in printed works, important semiotic functions, that is, primarily, to signal proper names and the beginning of sentences. Secondarily they are used as a particularly strong form of visual emphasis. All these functions militate against using capital letters as Flint has done; our ingrained habits of reading have to struggle desperately to ignore the ubiquitous capitals that pepper his transcriptions in order to begin to apprehend the sense of the text. Furthermore, there is an important difference between a true majuscule, to use the technical term, and a letter merely written large. I would claim that only such majuscules as can be clearly distinguished in form as opposed to size alone qualify for representation as capital letters; even then I remain firmly convinced that no useful purpose is served by imitating the totally arbitrary variation between majuscules and minuscules in handwritten materials of the Colonial period.

In any case, authentic majuscules, those distinguishable by form, in fol. 814r include word-initial “R”:

```
Reside 814r11
```

as opposed to minuscule “r” in its various shapes:

```
quatro 814r9  lorenço 814r10  paresçer 814r12
```

Word-initial “A”:

```
Ante 814r12  Amj 814r13
```

versus word-internal or final “a”:

```
espãna 814r3
```

Word-initial “E”, including the coordinating conjunction:

```
El muy 814r9  E quatro 814r9
```

versus word-internal or final “e”:

```
Reside en 814r11
```
It is not always an easy matter to decide whether a letter is a true majuscule rather than an enlarged minuscule.

The letter “c” varies remarkably in size, but the forms may not be sufficiently distinct to justify the use of capital letters for the larger graphic variants, often preferred at the beginning of words.

The letter “g” varies in size, but even though a proper name is involved in one instance, it is unlikely that there was any intentional use of a majuscule in the proper sense of the term.

The positions these letters take within words are not entirely consistent; I have indicated the general preferences of the scribe. The majuscules occur within words, and the minuscules word initially.

I see no convincing justification for the other capital letters that appear in Flint’s transcription. Particularly strange is his transcription of long “s” as a majuscule:

Many paleographers use a special symbol for long “s”, a practice I consider unnecessary, and indeed inconsistent, since the varying shapes of minuscule “r” and “a” are, for instance, just as remarkable as those of “s”, but are rarely, if ever, reflected in paleographic transcriptions. But what is the motive for representing a patently minuscule long “s” with a capital letter? My guess is that for Flint the appearance of extenders or flourishes converts letters into majuscules, but that is an unreasonable position to take. Any letter is subject to extension and the addition of flourishes, for instance, very noticeably at the end of lines, but no transcription that I have seen attempts to reflect such details.

None of the three instances of “d” in the first line qualifies as a majuscule; they have acquired flourishes by virtue of having open space above them, an emptiness that presented an apparently irresistible temptation to waste ink, though I must say I admire such virtuosity in scrollwork.
In addition to the capital D’s used in Flint’s transcription, we find a capital U in place of the manuscript “b”. This is a consequence of two transcription practices followed by Flint: (1) Regularization of the use of the letters “u” and “v”, according to phonetic criteria. The former represents the high back labiovelar vowel /u/, the latter the voiced bilabial occlusive/fricative /b/. This “regularization” is a common practice among paleographers, but is unnecessary and inconsistent. Phonetic criteria are fundamentally irrelevant to a paleographic transcription. Furthermore, why are “u” and “v” singled out for regularization but not “i” and “y”, for instance? And why is the phonetically irrelevant cedille retained when “c” precedes the front vowels /i/ and /e/? In any case, when Flint comes upon what he assumes is a vowel, but represented with a larger, in my view, only slightly larger “v” than in other cases, he represents it with capital “U”; correspondingly, a consonant represented by a supposedly large “u” is represented with capital “V”. (2) Modernization of graphic “b”, since by the end of the Middle Ages the phonetic distinction between occlusive /b/ and fricative /v/ (or its bilabial counterpart) had disappeared. One consequence was that “b” could also, and often did, represent the vowel /u/ in manuscripts of the period. In such cases, Flint transcribes “b” as “U” if he imagines that the “b” was a majuscule. Again, why is the use of “b” and “v” modernized when so many other archaic traits are retained, like the “c” with cedille mentioned above? Flint’s preferences add up to a truly bizarre transcription of “çibdad”.

The “b” in “çibdad” is patently minuscule, so nothing justifies its representation with a capital letter. However, this word involves an important philological problem which calls into question the practice of “regularizing” the use of “u” and “v” in transcriptions, a topic I will return to below.

In other cases, Flint’s use of capitals seems capricious and inconsistent. The letter “x” appears in differing sizes but virtually identical shapes in

The second “x”, represented as a capital, is the same size at that which appears in the name of Jesus Christ, but Flint does not capitalize the “c” with which he transcribes it.

In expanding this abbreviation, Flint simply follows modern Spanish spelling, but the initial capital of the latter goes directly against the norms adopted in his edition.
The validity of the distinction drawn between allegedly majuscule “f”, “p”, and “v” and their minuscule counterparts is not supported by the written forms (Flint 2002:46, lines 15, 14; 3, 16; 7, 15-16):

Many other examples of dubious capitalization could be adduced, but the ones provided constitute a sufficient illustration. However, for my purposes, the crucial point is that capitalization should simply be modernized.

2. With regard to spelling, I believe modernization should be strictly avoided. Flint has modernized the use of “b” and “v” tacitly, as his transcription of “nonbrava” 814r25 reveals. He also chose to remind his readers of cases in which silent “h” is required in spelling of the modern Spanish counterparts of various words that occur in the text. The phrase “avian fecho” provides an apposite illustration:

The use of the cursive font for “h” puts it in the same class as the letters supplied in expanded abbreviations; one can observe numerous examples in the facsimile of page 46 of Flint’s edition. As often happens in documents of this time, the scribe preferred the archaic form “fecho”, even though it is more than doubtful that the initial “f” continued to be pronounced in his own time. The parentheses signal editorial deletion. Thus Flint graphically tells his readers that an allegedly majuscule “f” would be replaced in modern Spanish with an “h”. Who exactly needs this information? Or, if there do indeed exist readers who need to be reminded of modern spellings involving “h”, why deny them information about the current spellings of “Lorenço” and “hiziese”?

I find it rather sad that many modern editors seem to consider their readers incapable of dealing with occasional scribal archaisms, among which the most notable is the name of Jesus Christ. Its abbreivated form passed from Greek into Latin and thence into vernacular manuscripts, a more than millennial tradition that deserves respect. In Latin and the vernacular, the literal form of the abbreviation contains imitations of Greek letters, some of which coincide approximately, that is i = iota, and u = upsilon, and o = omicron; but h corresponds to Greek eta, x to chi, and p to rho (see Thompson 1912:86, 89). In fact, it might be preferable neither to expand the abbreviation nor capitalize the names as I have done.

“ihu xpo” or “Jh$$u$$ Xpisto” 814r7
From this point forward, readers will be referred to the facsimiles that appear in the appendix to this essay. All forms cited and illustrated will appear with the appropriate page and line numbers; the lines of the facsimiles are numbered in the margins to facilitate location of the forms in context.

2.1 I have never understood why some editors imagine that modernized spelling by itself is a great benefit to their readers’ comprehension of the text being edited. So much has changed in the Spanish language since the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that only a thoroughgoing modernization of the morphosyntax and the lexicon, as well as the spelling, would really meet the purpose of making a text transparently and effortlessly apprehensible to a person who has never read a work composed and published before the twentieth century.

As we have seen, Flint modernizes both tacitly and overtly some features of his text, but many others are transcribed as they stand in the original, with no criterion of selection that I can discover.

Here the archaic and regional variant “ansi” is transcribed without alteration, but on the same page “escripita” is overtly modernized.

In Flint’s transcription (2002:47.22) of the phrase “Retitud e fidiljdad” 815r21, one finds that the first word has been overtly modernized, but not the last.

Flint’s treatment of words containing the palatal nasal consonant ñ is difficult to understand, if one assumes that his goal in partially modernizing the transcription was to make it more comprehensible to his readers. He not only fails to alter the text when the scribe has inadvertently omitted the tilde, but he on occasion omits it himself, apparently persuaded that some tildes are otiose even when placed over an “n” that represents a palatal nasal. Now the texts of this period are full of otiose tildes, for instance:

In this passage, Navarre bears one tilde and Galicia two; Flint quite properly ignores them. But what criterion explains the difference between the representations of the palatal nasal in the following two transcriptions (Flint 2002:46.23, 47.5)?
3. Viewed according to the remarkably aberrant criteria Flint has adopted, a strange combination of extreme conservatism and often radical modernization, his transcriptions are quite accurate. In fact, virtually all my criticisms refer to deliberate transcriptional decisions by the editor, not to errors or misreadings, which are few and far between. The remarks that follow treat not just matters of spelling, but rather concern linguistic issues, in particular, phonology and morphosyntax. The following items are discussed in the order in which they appear in the text.

3.1 814v6  Flint 2002:46.21

The scribe has written this name as “Araña”, the dot placed above and to the right of the “n” constitutes the tilde. Araña actually exists as a family name, alongside Arana and Aranda. If an editor believes that the scribe was in error, the conventional way to correct the form would be to place the correction in square brackets: “Ara[nd]a”, with a note in the apparatus of variants to the effect that the actual reading is “Araña”. In any case, “d” cannot be reasonably regarded as an expansion of the abbreviation represented by the tilde.

Here is an example of how Flint overtly corrects a scribal error:

815r12  Flint 2002:47.16

The drawback is that the symbolization of the correction, i.e., the incorrect element placed in parentheses and the correction represented in italics, is the same as in the modernizations, for which there is no assumption of scribal error, cf. Flint’s “(F)echo” discussed above. The traditional form of editorial emendation would be “Cor[o]nado” with the scribal “Coranado” listed in the apparatus; the HSMS method would require both the parentheses and the brackets: “Cor(a)[o]nado”.

3.2 814v19  alemania  Flint 2002:47.5

The tilde here is almost certainly otiose, like the one in the previous example, so that the transcription misrepresents the phonetic nature of the nasal consonant. A vernacular variant of “Alemanja” would more likely be “Alemaña”, with merger of the nasal consonant and the following palatal glide into a single palatal nasal consonant.

Such a vernacular variant of a well known geographical name occurs in the same passage, a list of the domains of Charles V.
Two features characterize “Seçilla” as vernacular, vis-à-vis the learned standard form Sicilia: the merger of the lateral consonant with the following palatal glide to form a single palatal lateral consonant “ll”, and the dissimilation of the vowel of the first syllable (i-i > e-i). The tilde that appears over the name is otiose, so there is in fact no abbreviation to be expanded. Flint’s introduction of “i” after the palatal lateral misrepresents the phonetics of the name. If an effort at modernization was intended, the presence of the “i” is no great help, since the two vernacular features mentioned above have been maintained in Flint’s transcription.

3.3  

This is the second person singular form of relatively formal address, corresponding to the subject pronoun vos, of the future subjunctive of the verb ver ‘to see’. The second person plural familiar form was identical, except that the subject pronoun was vosotros. This particular form of the future subjunctive was often syncopated during the medieval period, and syncopated forms continue to appear with decreasing frequency during the sixteenth century. The form is not a scribal abbreviation, and if the restoration of the syncopated vowel is meant to be a modernization, it is nonetheless pointless, since that particular tense and mood has fallen into desuetude in modern Spanish.

3.4  

Flint probably modernized the verb routinely, but in fact it seems doubtful that in this context one can exclude with any certainty the juridical verb fallar ‘to reach a verdict’, the conservative etymological doublet of hallar ‘to find’, particularly since “hallaredes” occurs on the same page (815v24) with the meaning ‘to find’ (“don- | dequiera que vos hallaredes”).

3.5  

This must be one of the few typographical or transcriptional errors I have found. The context requires the imperative form “prended”, corresponding to the form of address vos.
References

Archivo General de Indias, Sevilla. Justicia 267, fol. 814r
Ese hombre, que asimismo se hace tomar encargado de nueva galicia, dice y niega que se ha traído con sí en ella consigo y lo señalo. Conque un filo y sena añada hacer el Juan de Arana y el fruto de azúcar.

Luego se dio mi orden de licenciar entre el conde de Pedro de Heere quenava no pase, no dándose sólo presente, y firmado del príncipe don Felipe no senor velllos del que ecra consigo y qudias, y de fen atada se han desamansado en se no licitar a eso, y se nos oficialde para hacer la ofa

Vistos en este que se apruebe

Un caso en que la misma encuénza en pe

No me apruebe, y aunque se cierne

Ese mismo don carlos que campe magra

Se cierce castilla en el conde Dragón

Las dos se suelen ser del en senabrar

Se hiran de toledo de balde de galiza
Convenio que la presente y ocupo en do lo que el documento que se manifiesta con un informe de un país donde se encuentra provinca de igual como en la ciudad de Sevilla. Y en que se hace constar que todas las personas que tienen derecho a conceder como se justifica el discurso, está bien que acate la ley sin más notable. Y todos si quieren y quieren, se lo ven en gran parte de España. Y todos se pueden lo que quieran. Y quiera en partes de España. Y también. El que se ha hecho en provecho de que todas las personas que tienen derecho a conceder como se justifica el discurso, está bien que acate la ley sin más notable. Y todos si quieren y quieren, se lo ven en gran parte de España. Y todos se pueden lo que quieran. Y quiera en partes de España. Y también.
Lecces como en el Tribunal Arier que
sunque los habladores la que se impuesen con
su alado mixuerdo presente sò se vieron en
los mandaes que ve is ciubanos (cubanos)
ono asi los letrados treso se ayn forma
ción y proceso que con traeceos o vice se
bien lo mientience con mostra largos y lo
sean y procedan con traeceos como sale
zen pues el raya de la yeno de alas
por enseñanza a pro visiones dadas pues de
ayres ojucos como puzel en verdiod mis
para e bien tratar de los indios emando
mos alas de a quienes don do beca a
que no a ce ha que ale a mer personas
se bien en tener de se y formado
pa basta ver de ser caso en susbilo
se siendo y par en cant Ante 296
ved el momento y en plazas dijont
una 26 y supriesona en los plaza 280
een gente que con se era prelo mis
se diesel que con duer pediente
no puede d se sente las aprenedado
que prestas (hoy pover se exclutan
en que lozbe 205) soy mediento fre en
sia para bazer se cumpli con simo se fas taf
a en vida 20 fre de moned fer durela